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ABSTRACT

This thesis investigates how psychotherapeutic and managerial practices sustain a complex relationship that instigates the alignment of emotions towards managerial discourses of professionalism and productivity. To explore this ‘psycho-managerial complex’ the thesis takes specific interest in ‘management coaching’, which has recently become an influential and widely used person-centered Human Resource Management intervention. It is suggested that management coaching represents a new generation of person-centered interventions that encourages employees to engage in intensive self-work and promotes the regulation of emotions. Based on a theoretical framework which emphasizes the processual dynamics of discourse, two supplementary empirical studies are conducted to explore the concrete discursive practices of management coaching.

The first empirical study (‘talk in coaching’) is based on transcribed coaching sessions and investigates the discursive positioning processes between a professional coach and middle managers in three separate management coaching cases. This study suggests that the coach consistently uses internalizing and emotionalizing problem constructions to frame the managers’ experiences and applies linguistic practices commonly found in psychotherapy. Furthermore, it is shown how the coach attempts to persuade managers to work on their experiences and regulate their emotions to become more productive and more professional workers.

The second empirical study (‘talk about coaching’) is based on 31 transcribed interviews with main stakeholders of the coaching and explores how coaches, managers and HR-managers legitimize the use of coaching processes in organizations. The analysis suggests that the key stakeholders generally account for management coaching by drawing upon variations of managerial and psychotherapeutic discourses. Moreover, the analysis unravels the emergence of three relational patterns through which these managerial and psychotherapeutic discourses are related in the form of assimilation, unfolding and countering moves. It is suggested that these complex discursive maneuvers enable the translation of psychotherapeutic practices into the work realm.

The findings of the two empirical studies are further discussed in relation to the ongoing transformations of capitalism towards a soft / emotional capitalism by which intimacy and productivity are espoused to unleash the whole of human resourcefulness. Overall, the thesis illustrates how the psycho-managerial complex is constituted in and through management coaching. It situates the study of management coaching into the emerging field of Critical Human Resource Management and connects these to discussions concerning the transformation of capitalism and the management of emotions. Moreover, the thesis introduces discourse analysis as a means to study and reflect critically on concrete discursive practices and their processual unfolding in the field of Organization Studies.
ZUSammenfassung


Die erste Studie („Gespräche im Coaching“) basiert auf transkribierten Gesprächsaufnahmen von drei Coachingsitzungen mit jeweils unterschiedlichen Managern. Diese Studie untersucht die micro-linguistischen Positionierungsprozesse, die sich im Laufe der Gespräche entfalten. Die Analyse weist darauf hin, dass der Coach stringent emotionalisierende und internalisierende Problemkonstruktionen verwendet, um die Erfahrungen des Managers zu deuten und dabei linguistische Praktiken verwendet, die gewöhnlich in der Psychotherapie angewandt werden. Darüber hinaus zeigt die Studie, wie der Coach versucht die Manager davon zu überzeugen an ihren persönlichen und emotionalen Erfahrungen zu arbeiten, um so produktiver zu werden.

Die zweite Studie (Gespräche über Coaching) basiert auf 31 qualitativen Interviews mit den Managern, Coaches und Mitarbeitern des Personalmanagements. Diese Studie untersucht, wie diese Akteure die Verwendung von Coaching als organisationale Intervention legitimieren. Die Analyse weist darauf hin, dass die Akteure meist Variationen von Psychotherapie- oder Management-Diskursen verwenden. Darüber hinaus zeigt die Analyse auf, wie diese Diskurse zueinander in Beziehung gebracht werden durch s.g. assimilierende, aufdeckende und entgegentretende Übersetzungsmanöver, welche es dem Management Coaching ermöglicht haben, psychotherapeutische Praktiken in die Arbeitswelt zu transportieren.
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Prelude

The train takes me from St. Gallen to Munich, a journey that I have grown familiar with over the last years. Experiencing the passing, scenic landscapes through which the train rushes, I have had quite a few moments of inspiration. Also, these travels on board the train have given me many opportunities, both willing and unwilling, to overhear what people converse about and thus gain an insight into what themes occupy the collective (un)consciousness. There have been public discussions about the position of Switzerland towards the EU, which Swiss beer is the best, and which places to visit at the Octoberfest. Then there have been endless phone conversations (which due to the collapsing phone net are interrupted every few minutes) in which partnership problems are negotiated, the deceased are mourned, and daughters are brought back on track. There have been many variations of a special kind of conversation one might call ‘psy talk’; conversations saturated with psychological terms in which people analyze themselves and others in search of a liberating insight. I hear such ‘psy-talk’ almost every time I take the train. I would, for example, move through the corridor and hear one woman says to another: ‘You know, your body is only cold when you have fear inside of you — you have to work on these fears so you will be warm again’. Then there are the two salespersons who converse about the psychodynamic of their clients. I have also encountered two psychologists during my travels; the first gave me her business card and offered to coach me. The second had an interest in the history of psychiatry and had abandoned the psychological profession to sell carpets across the world.

From all these small encounters I find one anecdote especially thought provoking and worth telling: I remember sitting in the board restaurant on a rainy summer night, trying to work, yet unable to help overhearing a conversation that was taking place at the table next to mine. Two business men, both around their forties, were engaged in a highly concentrated conversation with long pauses and an earnest, almost ceremonial character. The man closer to me talks about different experiences and, through my unintentional eavesdropping, I learn of his struggles at work, that he feels unhappy because he does not achieve what he would like to, and that he wants to get more intensity out of his life. The man further from me nods, listens intensively and, every once in a while, interrupts to ask a question or comment on what has been said; he speaks slowly, accentuating words, and makes pauses to emphasize specific meanings. The warm timbre of his voice suggests that he understands and accepts the other. As I grow weary and embarrassed at having to listen to this
conversation, I head out of the board bistro but on my way out I look onto the table of the two men. What I see is a brochure laid out on the table with the title: ‘NLP [Neuro-linguistic programming] Coaching’.

There are three characteristics of this incident that connect to this work and illustrate some of the themes that have motivated my personal engagement with the topic ‘management coaching’.

First, the use of NLP, which stands for neuro-linguistic programming. NLP has the reputation of an easy-to-learn toolkit full of psychotherapeutic techniques, especially rich in hypnotherapeutic interventions. While it is not well accepted in academic health professions and is considered a ‘pseudo-psychological practice’ (Roderique-Davies, 2009), NLP has for many years found wide acceptance among alternative health practitioners, and, what is more interesting in foresight of this work, recently managers have increasingly enrolled in NLP training courses. From a naive understanding of the realm of managers I had always thought there was an antipathy towards emotions and the ‘soft stuff’ in favor of rationality and ‘hard facts’. The question this has evoked in me is how and why psychotherapeutic techniques have become so popular, especially among managers.

My second thought on this incident was the use of the word ‘coaching’. Indeed, I have from my personal experience registered that ‘coaching’ has become en vogue and has ascended to a most fashionable term. Yet, I began to wonder: ‘If they do psychotherapy, why don’t they just call it that?’ I thus came to wonder what cause and effect it might have to relabel and associate therapeutic practices to the term ‘coaching’.

The third point I thought about was the role of the manager and how he or she — in this semi-private space — talked about intimate experiences, feelings, and desires. Is it now normal that managers reflect their work life in such ways? And if so, what effect does this yield, what sort of social dynamic does this produce and how are spaces of emancipation (or control) inscribed in the practice of coaching?

It is this sort of contemplation and question that has led me to engage personally in the study of management coaching. While I have not been able to answer all these questions in a conclusive way, this work is my attempt to open a reflexive, empirically informed discussion of management coaching and thus illuminate the phenomenon.
1. INTRODUCTION

This thesis considers the constitution of the psycho-managerial complex and the ways in which psychotherapeutic and managerial practices have become related in the realm of work. The focal site of investigation is management coaching, which has, in only a few years, proliferated and become a widely used Human Resource Management intervention. To explore the discursive enactments of management coaching the thesis undertakes an empirical study of the discursive practices employed in management coaching conversations between a coach and managers. A second empirical study investigates how coaches, managers, and HR-managers account for and legitimize management coaching as an organizational intervention. These empirical findings are discussed against the backdrop of current debates about the transformation of capitalism from classical managerial capitalism towards a form of capitalism that takes particular interest in the management of emotions and the therapeutization of the work ethos. In doing so the thesis responds to calls to explore the concrete practices and effects through which Human Resource Management interventions, such as management coaching, are constituted. Moreover, the thesis also aims to supplement the young and developing field of studies on coaching by offering alternative modes of conceptualizations that contextualize the intervention, explore its concrete practices, and illuminate the intervention in a more critical-reflexive light.

The outline of this thesis is as follows:

Chapter 2 opens the argument of the thesis by connecting to ongoing discussions on the transformation of capitalism towards soft / emotional capitalism (Thrift, 2005, Illouz, 2008) in which intimacy and emotions are seized and made profitable. Associated to this shift is the rise of a therapeutic culture (Rose, 1990), which supplies practices through which the intimate priorities of individuals are made accessible to intensive self-work. The chapter further argues that Human Resource Management has played a key role in the promotion of this new form of organizing work life. It is argued that Human Resource Management, the discipline that takes particular interest in the management of the workforce through interventions (Watson, 2004; Janssens & Steyaert, 2009), has increasingly moved away from interventions that attempt to control employees through external mechanisms towards interventions that govern employees from the inside by implementing regimes of self-work and emotional self-control (Iedema, Rhodes, & Scheeres, 2006). In this respect, it has been observed that recent HRM interventions, which are prone to internal forms of government,
heavily draw upon psychotherapeutic practices as a means to manage the workforce (Bjerg & Staunaes, 2011). The chapter further argues that the utilization of person-centered interventions such as mentoring, supervision, and coaching is the most recent attempt to manage the workforce through HRM interventions. The detailed study of coaching at work therefore offers a unique possibility to reflect upon the question of how newer forms of HRM interventions are concretely enacted and how psychotherapeutic and managerial discourses are related to these interventions. Coaching has become a widely used intervention in work contexts (Bresser 2009, Bodsworth, 2011) yet a large number of, partly conflicting, interpretations of the intervention are in use. The chapter therefore introduces the focal point of research ‘management coaching’, which is defined as a one-on-one conversation between a coach and manager that is organized and funded by the manager’s host company.

Chapter 3 maps out the academic field of management coaching on the basis of a systematic literature review. The aim of the review is to understand which conceptual models are used to theorize management coaching, which methods of research are employed, and what insights have been produced through this form of research. The literature review, which also corresponds to reviews of the psychology-based coaching journals (Ely et al., 2010; Seger, Vloeberghs, Henderickx, & Inceoglu, 2011), suggests that theoretical and empirical approaches to management coaching are still at an early stage of development. In reaction to the state of current discussions on management coaching I problematize (Alvesson & Sandberg, 2011) current representations of management coaching along three considerations. First, management coaching is commonly conceptualized through individual-focused, psychotherapeutic models of change. This circumstance hints at the necessity to look into alternative, more contextualized conceptualizations. Secondly, empirical research especially explores management coaching by means of survey, case, and questionnaire studies. These produce functional and generalized results, which insufficiently illustrate the concrete practices applied in management coaching. Thirdly, discussions on management coaching are mainly affirmative of the effects of the intervention. It is suggested that a more in-depth examination through the application of critical thinking might thus open the field to a more balanced representation. Moreover, as a broader focus of this work it is suggested to engage in empirical research that considers the contextualized practices of management coaching in addition to reflecting on its effects.

Chapter 4 tailors a general framework for the study of management coaching practices at different ‘sites’ of their enactment. The application of discourse theory is advocated due to
its ability to address the three problematizations of management coaching (lack of contextualization, lack of knowledge of the practices and processes, and lack of critical voices). The rich corpus of discourse theory ranges from the inquiry into paradigm-type discourses to the study of text-based discourses (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2011; Iedema, 2011). Discourse theory allows us to contextualize social phenomena at different sites, offers methodologies to study the enactment of discursive practices, and is prone to critical thinking. Due to the lack of a coherent framework that accounts for the multiple practices of management coaching, the thesis applies Fairclough’s (1992) integrative model of discourse as a general framework for the study of management coaching. Based on this model I differentiate between discourse as textual practice, discourse as organizational practice, and discourse as social practice. The adaptation of Fairclough’s model allows the contextualization of management coaching along three complementary sites of management coaching. The first site, 'management coaching as conversation', considers how management coaching is constituted through textual discursive practices. The second site, 'management coaching as organizational intervention', considers how management coaching is constituted through organizational discursive practices. The third site, 'management coaching as a socio-historic phenomenon', considers how management coaching relates to socio-ideological dynamics. Furthermore, to be able to grasp the unfolding practices of management coaching I draw upon process theorizing (Tsoukas & Chia, 2002, Hernes & Maitlis, 2011; Langley & Tsoukas, 2010), which emphasizes the processual and ongoing nature of discourse (Cooren, 2004). Deriving from these assumptions more specific frameworks are presented for the two empirical studies. It is also suggested that the three sites of management coaching be discussed through a critical lens. This general theoretical framework leads to the set-up of the thesis as portrayed in Table 1.
Table 1: Structure of the thesis, oriented round three 'sites' of management coaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Basic question</th>
<th>Processual stance</th>
<th>Critical stance</th>
<th>Empirical site</th>
<th>Theoretical resources</th>
<th>Location in text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management coaching as conversation</td>
<td>How are the textual discursive practices of management coaching enacted within coaching conversations?</td>
<td>Studies discursive processes through which managers and coaches position themselves and other in a coaching session</td>
<td>Discusses issues of power in the coaching conversation</td>
<td>Transcribed coaching conversations between an Emotional Intelligence coach and middle managers</td>
<td>Positioning Theory, Conversation analysis, Interpretative and Discursive Device Analysis</td>
<td>Chapter 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management coaching as organizational intervention</td>
<td>How are the organizational discursive practices of management coaching enacted through accounts of the intervention</td>
<td>Studies discursive translation processes through which agents account for coaching</td>
<td>Discusses issues of power in associated to the use of management coaching in organizations</td>
<td>Transcribed interviews with coaches, managers and HR-managers</td>
<td>Interpretative Repertoire Analysis, Translation Studies, Sociology of translation</td>
<td>Chapter 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management coaching as socio-historic phenomenon</td>
<td>How is the psycho-managerial complex related to management coaching as a socio-historic phenomenon?</td>
<td>Relates processes of management coaching to transformation of capitalism and the psycho-managerial complex</td>
<td>Discusses how management coaching manifests a new form of capitalism</td>
<td>Theoretical discussion illustrated through the two empirical studies</td>
<td>Foucauldian based Analysis, Sociology of capitalism, Sociology of psychotherapy socio-cultural analysis, Neo-Marxism</td>
<td>Chapter 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapter 5 investigates the dynamics that unfold in management coaching conversations to be able to understand better the relation between psychotherapeutic and managerial discourses at the level of this talk at work. On the basis of transcribed sessions from three separate cases, the empirical study explores the developing dynamic between middle managers and an ‘Emotional Intelligence’ coach. To work out the relational and temporal dynamics of the textual discursive practices I draw upon Positioning Theory (Davies & Harré, 1990, Harré, Moghaddam, Cairnie, Rothbart, & Sabat, 2009; Slocum-Bradley, 2010). Following this specific theoretical framework the research design consists of three constitutive steps, each answering to a specific analytical question. For the first analytical step I suggest that the discursive negotiation of problem constructions (Miller & Silverman, 2005) is the most significant characteristic of first-time management coaching sessions. Subsequently, the first analytical step investigates the discursive negotiation of problem constructions as ‘positions’. Interpretation of the sessions suggests that five reoccurring problem constructions dominate the sessions: hauntings of the past, unconscious motives, incomplete development, organizational pressures, and personal entanglements. It is
furthermore suggested that the first three problem constructions internalize and individualize the problem, while the last two externalize and contextualize the problem. The second analytical step considers the linguistic practices that the coach employs to position herself and the manager. The linguistic practices can be further categorized into ‘backwards interpreting’ (linguistic practices used to interpret the narrations of past experiences of the manager), ‘forwards interpreting’ (linguistic practices used to steer the conversation in a specific direction), and ‘setting interpreting’ (linguistic practices that formulate and fix the ground assumptions of the session, including the ‘rights and duties’ of the agents in the conversation). The third analytical step is grounded on the two preceding analytical steps and considers the positioning process over the course of the session. This analytical step concludes that the coach would consistently use the internalizing problem constructions and seek to inscribe managers into these by ‘empathetic persuasion’. The notion of empathetic persuasion attempts to condense how the coach stays close to the manager’s narrations while persistently attempting to steer these in the preferred direction. Finally, the analysis of the relational dynamics between coach and managers suggests variations in the coach’s use of the positioning practice. If the manager complies with the interpretative scheme, the coach mainly uses forwards and backwards interpretations, while if the manager resists the agenda, the coach more strongly uses ‘setting interpretations’. Overall, the study suggests management coaching internalizes and individualizes problems, uses linguistic practices commonly found in psychotherapy, and that the coach employs a highly routinized agenda to inscribe managers into a prescribed set of discourses.

Chapter 6 explores the organizational discursive practices at the site of ‘management coaching as organizational intervention’. Concretely, it looks into the open and ongoing discursive movements through which management coaching is accounted for by managers, coaches and HR-managers. To study the dynamic of the organizational discursive practices I draw upon the concept of ‘translation’ (Czarniawska & Sevón, 2005; Czarniawska-Joerges & Sevón, 1996; Latour, 2005; Callon, 1986, Janssens, Lambert, & Steyaert, 2004; Chávez, 2009) and further introduce the notions ‘translative historic scapes’ (the historically formed and institutionalized organizational discursive practices) and ‘translative moves’ (the patterns through which historic scapes are brought into relation). The related research design differentiates two successive steps. The first empirical step analyzes how the interviewed agents account for management coaching and concludes that four representations predominate in the interview materials: ‘controlling performance’, ‘steering development’, ‘restraining symptoms’, and ‘nurturing the psyche’. The first two
representations can be aligned to general management discourses and the latter two to general psychotherapeutic discourses. It is thus suggested that management and psychotherapy discourses function as translative historic scapes that agents draw upon to legitimize the use of management coaching. The second analytical step investigates how the two translative historic scapes ‘management’ and ‘psychotherapy’ are dynamically related to each other. It is argued that psychotherapeutic and managerial discourses are related through three translative moves: assimilating, in which the managerial discourse absorbs the psychotherapeutic; unfolding, in which the incompatibility of the two discourses is brought into the open; and countering, in which the psychotherapeutic discourse challenges the managerial. The sighting of the interviews further suggests that the assimilating move dominates the accounts of management coaching. Overall, the clear conclusion is that in management coaching psychotherapeutic discourses are primarily absorbed into the managerial discourse, thus aligning intimacy and emotions towards professionalism and productivity.

Chapter 7 considers management coaching as a socio-historic phenomenon and relates it to the social discursive practices into which it is weaved. The chapter contextualizes the two empirical studies by questioning the different forms of power used and by drawing upon discussions concerning the translation of capitalism, the managerialization of emotions, and the spread of a therapeutic culture. A secondary interpretation of the first study suggests that management coaching conversations are a form of confessional talk (Foucault, 1988) through which employees are obliged to open their self-narrations to normative evaluations; this allows organizations to colonize individuals with hegemonic, managerial discourses. Management coaching thus establishes a habitus, which expects employees to undergo continuous self work and extract their full human resourcefulness (Costea, Crump, & Amiridis, 2007). Moving the findings of the second study into a socio-historic perspective allows us to underline the broader theoretical relevance of the study and argue that management coaching has been able to translate psychotherapeutic discourses into the realm of management due to the arbitrary associations the term ‘coaching’ evokes; making it an ‘isopraxism’ (Erlingsdottir & Lindberg, 2005), a practice that stays relatively unchanged in the translation process but changes its name. Finally, I suggest that the use of psychotherapeutic practices to enhance human resourcefulness reflects the management trend to invest in socio-ideological interventions that seek to govern individuals from the inside.
Chapter 8 gives a résumé and outlook. It is argued that zooming into the three sites of management coaching supplies supplementary understandings of this new form of HRM intervention. The variation of temporal and spatial scope makes it possible to reflect on the discursive practices and their effects at different levels of their enactment. This thesis thus deepens the understanding of management coaching practices by empirically studying how the intervention is enacted in the one-on-one conversations as well as through accounts given by managers, HR-managers and coaches. Moreover, the thesis broadens current understandings of management coaching by placing it in relation to discussions on the emotionalization of work, the place it takes as a new form of HRM intervention, and the way it reflects the transformations of the organization of work life.
2. MANAGEMENT COACHING: A HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT INTERVENTION OF THE PSYCHO-MANAGERIAL COMPLEX?

This chapter sets out to present the larger interest of this thesis, the investigation of how newer forms of HRM interventions, and specifically management coaching, apply psy-practices to promote emotional management at work.

The first part of this chapter introduces the overall argument by zooming out and drawing upon an ongoing discussion that considers how managerial-capitalism has been transformed and is now succeeded by softer and more emotional forms of capitalism. This will allow us to discuss the socio-historic embeddedness of HRM and management coaching and will thus add an important layer to an understanding of the intervention. It is suggested that in these contemporary forms of capitalism the managerial and psy spheres have been fused to form a psycho-managerial complex in which emotional and intimate characteristics have become aligned to managerial interest. The second part of this chapter takes a more narrow perspective and argues that the Human Resource Management intervention has become a prime mechanism for organizing the workforce in modern organizations. In reference to ongoing discussions I suggest that Human Resource Management interventions have shifted from external forms of control to interventions which attempt to regulate employees’ emotions and motivations from the inside. Moreover, I suggest that HRM has increasingly employed therapeutic practices to manage the workforce. As the concrete practices through which employees are managed have seldom been empirically explored, I propose to turn to one of the most successful new forms of HRM interventions: coaching at work.

The third part of this chapter gives an overview of the phenomenon, coaching at work. I show that the field of coaching, despite its common use in organizations, is fundamentally insecure about the characteristics and core competencies that define the intervention. On the backdrop of the etymology of the term I explain how today coaching is an umbrella for a broad spectrum of professionalized services. This leads me to specify my focal interest in ‘management coaching’, that is, coaching for managers organized and funded by the managers’ host companies. Finally, I suggest that the study of management
coaching offers a excellent opportunity to look into how new forms of HRM interventions are constituted.

2.1. The Transformations of Capitalism and the Rise of the Psycho-Managerial Complex

This section illustrates the wider social background from which the shift towards emotional management through HRM interventions and more specifically the rise of management coaching might be interpreted. Following the idea that managerial capitalism has been succeeded by ‘soft capitalism’ or ‘emotional capitalism’, I suggest that these current dynamics might be best explained by acknowledging the agency both the psy-disciplines and management have on what I will call the psycho-managerial complex. It is thus suggested that both management and the psy-disciplines take an active part in reshaping modern life; it is the relationship between these two that this thesis sets out to explore in depth.

My argument is situated in contemporary appraisals of Western society that have stated that the late-modern self is increasingly organized towards the commodification, commercialization, and control of intimate aspects of the self (Hochschild, 2012). These ramifications of the self in modern life take note of the adaptive capacity of capitalism (Boltanski & Chiapello, 2005) and its ability to transform and incorporate knowledge, practices, fashions, ideas and discourses that were not initially present in the traditional spirit of capitalism. Capitalism has managed to remain the dominant ideology of the Western World, despite the circumstance that the dominant means of wealth production has shifted from production to service, to the knowledge and creative industries. Capitalism has evolved and been able ‘to sustain the capitalist process in its historical dynamism while being in phase with the historically specific and variable forms it takes’ (Chiapello & Fairclough, 2002, p. 187). It seems that capitalism has the capacity to adapt continuously its social interface by ‘vacuuming up all those knowledges which have evaded capitalism until now’ (Thrift, 2005, p. 6). By this means, capitalism\(^1\), which advocates ‘the belief that organizations have to be managed for the economic benefit of owners’ (Cunliffe, 2009b, p. 17) has progressed in modern society. Furthermore, capitalism has become aware of itself

\(^1\) I use the term capitalism as an analytical category, which helps describe the ideological outlines by which work is organized today. While the term capitalism is also associated with pleas to overcome this ideological system, I would like to suspend the normative affiliation in favor of its analytical power.
and grown self-reflective, thus incorporating the critiques against it. As will be demonstrated for the management interventions, management departs from rigid systems of surveillance and control, but in its place, so the critiques postulate, capitalism has now learnt to regulate the modern self from the inside (Hochschild, 2012). To understand these dynamics better, it is helpful to examine different forms of capitalism and clarify that the managerial-capitalism that is exemplarily represented through the works of Ford and Taylor is no longer the only form, as Soft-Capitalism or Emotional Capitalism are on the rise.

### 2.1.1 Soft Capitalism and the Reign of Management

Management plays a fundamental role in actively enacting the capitalist ethos and can be considered as its executive institutionalization. The field of management is assembled out of knowledge and practices of how best to organize employees towards the aims of the organization and the production of wealth. The intensification of the ideology of management, and its sudden interest in the emotions of employees, is a notable shift that has been conceptualized as a move towards ‘soft capitalism.’ By soft capitalism, Thrift (2005) means to illustrate the adaptive and vital nature of capitalism, its ‘supposedly caring, sharing ethos’ (p. 11). Thrift goes on to explain how this new mode of capitalism differs from the past: ‘capitalism as a vital intensity, [is] continually harvesting ideas, renewing people, reworking commodities and recasting surfaces – for the sake of profit, of course, but also because capitalism is now in the business of harnessing unruly creative energies for its own sake. Long ago now, Marx depicted capitalism as dead labor haunting the living, but I am not sure that this is an adequate description, for it gives credence to the notion of capitalism as a deadening force when, increasingly, capitalism has a kind of unholy vitality, a kind of double duty, to possess but also to create, to accumulate but also to overflow, to organize but also to improvise’. (p.17)

This new discursive outline of capitalism has turned to the ‘soft’ priorities of the self, the intimate, the creative, the emotional. It seems that the discourses of performance and productivity have been linked to the realization ‘that individuals have vast reservoirs of untapped potential within them’ (Spence, 2007, p. 257), whose salvageable potentials can be utilized in the workplace. Yet these potentials are not extractable by force — they must be given freely. While the term ‘soft’ implies less external forms of control, this does not mean that its governing effects are less or innocent: individuals are expected to bring their whole being into their work, as ‘productivity, profitability, efficiency and effectiveness have increasingly become dependent upon a new cultural and political economy of subjectivity at work’ (Costea, Crump & Amiridis, 2008, p. 666). The argument says that only if a human
being learns to intensify its performance in all areas of life, can the full potential of human resourcefulness be unleashed — only then can corporate performance thrive. In this ideology, the inventive force of capitalism brings together movements that once seemed to have contradictory horizons; as the intimate and the public merge into each other, capitalism outmaneuvers the traditional boundaries of the private and working self, allowing it to unlock new territories of human productivity.

It is here that the field of management comes into play. Management is assembled out of knowledge and practices of how best to organize employees towards the aims of the organization and the production of wealth. In other words management attempts to fulfill concretely, through various means, the aims of capitalism. The presented HRM interventions and their underlying frameworks are some examples of how management attempts to interfere and organize the work world along the capitalist agenda. The notion of ‘soft capitalism’ thus also correlates with the suggestion that HRM interventions are now increasingly interested in governing the emotions of the workforce, a relationship I will explore in more depth in section 2.2. Before doing so I will first supplement the discussions of soft capitalism with those of emotional capitalism, which accent the role of the therapeutic.

2.1.2. Emotional Capitalism and the Expansion of the Therapeutic Culture

The reflections on the emergence of soft capitalism can be used to highlight how management, which concretely implements the new outlines of capitalism, has begun to direct its attention to the development of knowledge and practices that allow the management of employees from the inside. These thoughts can be complemented by a second impression, which highlights the particular agency of the psy-disciplines in the reshaping of capitalism. This works towards a perspective in which management not only vacuums up psy-discourses, but psy-discourses also have an agency of their own. Eva Illouz is a representative of this position, as she has recently looked into the question of how capitalism has been able to seize the intimate priorities of the self (Illouz, 2008). Like Thrift, but more focused on the role of the psy-aspects on capitalism, Illouz has emphasized the emergence of ‘Emotional Capitalism’. She suggests that today ‘emotional and economic discourses mutually shape one another, so that affect is made an essential aspect of economic behavior, and [that] emotional life, especially that of the middle classes, follows the logic of economic relations and exchange’ (Illouz, 2008, p. 60). She assumes that the psy-disciplines have a persuasive energy, as she illustrates how for large parts of the Western world the psychological discourse has become omnipresent and central for the
constitution of the modern self, and thus a central agent in the capitalist dynamic. The main contribution of Illouz has thus been to emphasize the persuasiveness and agency of the psy-discourse in the transformation of capitalism. In this perspective, the psy-discourse has actively poured into all areas of modern life because it offers a new language of the self. This psy-nomenclature has allowed people to make sense of their experiences and enact themselves in novel ways that correspond with the liberation from former, more rigid systems of social control. The extent to which this vocabulary has spread is summarized in the following quote:

‘Therapy under many forms has been diffused worldwide on a scale that is comparable (and perhaps even superior) to that of American popular culture. Whether it has assumed the form of introspective psychoanalysis, a New Age ‘mind-body’ workshop, or an ‘assertiveness training’ program, it has mustered a rare level of cultural legitimacy across a wide variety of social groups, organizations, institutions, and cultural settings. The therapeutic discourse has crossed and blurred the compartmentalized spheres of modernity and has come to constitute one of the major codes with which to express, shape, and guide selfhood.’ (Illouz, 2008, p. 6)

Illouz’s argument — even if it accents the agency of the psy-discourse more than others — is not totally new and can be placed within what Elaine Swan (2008) has termed the sociology of therapeutic cultures (c.f. Parker, 2002; Parker, Georgaca, Harper, McLaughlin, & Stowell-Smith, 1995). Wright has, in my understanding, given the most useful definition of the therapeutic culture, when describing it as ‘a diverse range of social practices and cultural discourses unified by the imperatives of talk and self-disclosure, the privileging of the psychological and emotional realms, and a heightened concern with the self and interior life’ (Wright, 2009, p. 123). The therapeutic culture has been reflected along a number of different notions such as the ‘therapeutic machine’ (Miller & Rose, 2008), the ‘therapeutic culture’ (Furedi, 2004; Swan, 2008; Nolan, 1998; Cushman, 1990, 1996), the ‘therapeutic discourse’ (Illouz, 2007, 2008), the ‘psychological discourse’ (Illouz, 2008) or the ‘psy-complex’ (Rose, 1979, 1985). The variety of notions used can be partly explained through the circumstance that scholars of neighboring disciplines — such as sociology, psychology, history or medicine — have kept to their home disciplines or have used varying theoretical and methodological approaches. The mutual point that connects these authors is that they join into an academic conversation that debates the effects of an increasing psychologization and the intensified use of psychotherapeutic practices.
Nicolas Rose, maybe one of the most prominent figures in this conversation, has for almost two decades (Rose, 1990; Rose, 2007; Rose, 1998; Rose, 1985; Miller & Rose, 1994), explored — mainly through the lens of Foucauldian concepts (Foucault, 1988; Rose, O’Malley & Valverde, 2009) — how psy-discourses have fueled practices in management and everyday life that allow the governing of the modern self. Rose concludes that the rise of a therapeutic culture has produced novel ways of problematizing, diagnosing and intervening in intimate life, where ‘thoughts, feelings and actions may appear as the very fabric and constitution of the intimate self, but they are socially organized and managed in minute particulars’ (Rose, 1990, p. 1). This is tied to the production of stigmatization through normative doctrines and the establishment of more intense, and thus de-liberating forms of governance, as well as the installment of intense regimes of self-control (Foucault, 1988; Rose, 1990, 1998). Moreover, as Furedi (2004, 2006) adds, the use of psy-discourses also bears the danger of drawing attention away from the contextual conditions that constrain individual well-being. In an ideology that follows the assumption that one is the architect of one’s own fortune, social constraints are defocused. Based on this observation he argues that the psy-discourse bears the danger of individualizing social and political problems by de-politicizing the social and thus de-emancipating the democratic subject of the right to resist social orders.

2.1.3. The Psycho-Managerial Complex: Where Management and Psychotherapy Rendezvous

While Thrift emphasizes the vacuuming power of management and Illouz stress the proliferation of the psy-disciplines I argue that a more integrated understanding of the current transformations of work life can be acquired when the close ties between management and the psy-disciplines are more closely considered. From this perspective I endeavor to equip both domains with agency, and to search for the ways in which they relationally shape the assemblage of modern working life, and relate to the installment of specific practices and bodies of knowledge. Assuming a double agency presumes a movement in which psy-disciplines and management engage in an emergent connection in which they may orbit each other, connect, fuse and repel. With this line of thought, I come to consider current developments as part of a psycho-managerial complex, in which management and the psy-disciplines have built a mutual, continuously evolving relationship. This complex can be understood as a result of the transformations of capitalism and thus as a force that upholds and constitutes the relational dynamics between the psy-disciplines and management. The intention of introducing this notion is to place attention on
the overall impact of the above described dynamics. Moreover, my use of the notion of the psycho-managerial complex does not mean simply to lump together the multiple discourses and practices of the managerial and psy-disciplines. On the contrary, by emphasizing the processual and relational nature of this complex dynamic I closely observe the specific elements through which it is enacted. I would now also like to differentiate two discourses within the psy-discipline: the discourse of psychology and the discourse of psychotherapy.

The reader will have noticed that I have mostly used the term ‘psy-disciplines’. My aim was to emphasize that both psychology and psychotherapy play their part in the psycho-managerial complex. Generally, it seems that psychology and psychotherapy are often used interchangeably in everyday life, and indeed, also in the academic literature2. By means of a short differentiation between the discourse of psychology and the discourse of psychotherapy I wish to ground my further steps on a clearer understanding of these two terms.

The difference between the psychotherapeutic and managerial discourses corresponds to the contrast between the disciplines, psychology and psychotherapy. Psychology is the ‘study of the mind and behavior. The discipline embraces all aspects of the human experience — from the functions of the brain to the actions of nations, from child development to care for the aged. In every conceivable setting from scientific research centers to mental health care services, the understanding of behavior is the enterprise of psychologists’ (APA, 2007). Psychotherapy, on the other hand can be defined as ‘[a]ny of a group of therapies, used to treat psychological disorders, that focus on changing faulty behaviors, thoughts, perceptions, and emotions that may be associated with specific disorders’ (APA, 2007). Psychotherapy rests on the seam between psychology and medicine; it can be attributed to Clinical Psychology in the discipline of Psychology, and to Psychosomatics and Psychiatry in the discipline of medicine. The psychological discourse is a broad discourse that highlights the importance of emotional development, relations, and communication in human interaction and offers theories of explanation therein. The more general ideas of psychoanalysis, like the unconscious mind or the Freudian slip have disseminated into everyday culture and are associated with psychological discourse (Illouz, 2007) but also other ideas from humanist-psychology (e.g. Maslow's hierarchy of needs), behavioral psychology (classical and operant conditioning) and to some extent cognitivist-

---

psychology, neuro-psychology and development psychology have entered the collective consciousness. It is this broad psychological discourse that Illouz, Rose and others have suggested has ‘triumphed’ (Illouz, 2008, p. 8) and deeply shapes the basis for how people interpret their social worlds.

Flanking the psychological discourse, the (psycho)therapeutic discourse accentuates the therapeutic momentum. Historically the psychotherapeutic discourse has strong associations to the nomenclatures of medicine and the ethos of healing. It is also noteworthy that today, when people speak of the therapeutic, they often mean the psychotherapeutic. The psychotherapeutic discourse advocates that healing and salvation are to be found in self-reflection. It suggests that people’s problems can be resolved through psychotherapeutic practices and the intimate therapeutic relationship. Self-work is viewed as the key to happiness, as it allows the self to free itself from forms of ill-being. This key to happiness, as the therapeutic commonly suggests, lies within the self, as every person is seen to be the architect of his or her own fortune. The psychotherapeutic discourse thus promotes the necessity to undergo self-reflection and self-work, and fused with the normative language of psychopathology, it creates a quasi-moral obligation for people to attempt to change.

In correspondence to the psychotherapeutic discourse (rather than the psychological discourse), Costea, Crump, and Amiridis (2007) have theoretically introduced the helpful notion of the ‘therapeutic habitus’. The therapeutic habitus describes the discursive arrangement when the psychotherapeutic discourse is worked into the managerial discourse of maximizing (personal) productivity. Through the notion of the therapeutic habitus the authors aim to capture ‘the underlying character of the mentality of self-perfection invoked by managerialism’ (p. 256) and thus give heed to the ways in which psychotherapeutic discourses have been incorporated into management so that employees work towards becoming the best possible human resource. This alignment of the therapeutic with the managerial creates a discursive representation of work ‘in which the dialectic of labour is reconstructed as a series of acts of self-understanding, self-examination and “self-work”, and through which the “self qua self” is constituted as the central object of management technologies’ (Costea, Crump, & Amiridis, 2007, p. 245). It is exactly here that Costea, Crump & Amiridis (2008) have suggested that soft capitalism acquires its immediate, everyday concreteness through the installment of the therapeutic habitus. The relevance of this insight for this thesis lies in the idea that we need to take a close look at how psychotherapy and management have become related to be able to understand the dynamics in which the psycho-managerial complex comes into being.
It is here that my argument turns to Human Resource Management and considers how the psycho-managerial complex manifests itself in this field of management.

2.2. Developments in Human Resource Management: Managing Emotions through Psychotherapeutic Practices

Today, Human Resource Management has become the ‘preferred international discourse to frame employment management issues’ (Delbridge & Keenoy, 2010, p. 799) and has played a key role in building a body of knowledge along which employees are organized. Along with the mechanisms of recruitment, HRM encompasses a number of performance management and evaluation interventions through which the workforce is organized (McKenna, Richardson & Manroop, 2011). While the larger part of the literature on HRM is predominantly represented in positivist and functional terms, an increasing number of scholars are exploring alternative perspectives, often employing post-positivist paradigms, which give heed to interpretative and critically-reflexive outlooks on the logic and effects of HRM interventions (Thompson, 2011). These perspectives question the performance-driven, managerial logic of HRM and consider its contextual individual and collective effects, suggesting alternative modes of organization (Janssens & Steyaert, 2009; Paauwe & Boselie, 2005). It is with reference to these discussions that I attempt to work out an argument which fundamentally informs this thesis.

In this chapter I cover three aspects of the nature of HRM: I give a brief illustration of some interventions that have been used to organize the workforce, discuss the increasing interest of these interventions in the management of emotions and show the tight relationship between the psy-disciplines and management. My concluding point suggests a more in-depth exploration of these dynamics by engaging in empirical research that studies the concrete practices of HRM interventions.

2.2.1. A Brief History of Human Resource Management: The Proliferation of Socio-Ideological Modes of Control

Throughout the history of management, practitioners and scholars alike have attempted to find interventions that organize the workforce in more productive ways. To illustrate some of the developments Table 2 lists a number of popular interventions through which the working force has been organized. While these interventions have not replaced each other, the popularity of these interventions — both in academia as well as among practitioners —
has shifted over time and is subject to management trends and fashions (see Clark, 2004; Abrahamson and Fairchild, 1999; Czarniawska, 2005; Røvik, 2011).

Table 2: Overview of different HRM interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HRM Intervention</th>
<th>Logic of intervention</th>
<th>Portrayal of emotions</th>
<th>Influenced by</th>
<th>Base literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Management</td>
<td>Motivation has linear function to income</td>
<td>Should be shut out during work</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Taylor (1911)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Relations Movement</td>
<td>Motivation is a function of relationships</td>
<td>Represent the social bond which determine group dynamics</td>
<td>Psychoanalysis</td>
<td>Mayo (1933)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management by Objectives</td>
<td>Tasks should be partitioned and outcomes connected to rewards / sanctions</td>
<td>Are reactions to stimuli</td>
<td>Classical Behaviorism</td>
<td>Drucker (1954)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Organizational Behavior</td>
<td>People and organizations should focus on happiness and well-being</td>
<td>Should be steered to positive aspects of (work) life</td>
<td>Positive Psychology</td>
<td>Luthans (2002)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The five interventions illustrated can be summarized as follows: Scientific Management follows a strict logical pattern of the engineering profession and adheres to a ‘hard’ logic of functional rationality; Human Relations Movement is inspired by psychoanalytic ideas on group relations and is a significant first shift towards ‘soft’ (meaning a focus on emotions and relationships) priorities of workers; Management by Objectives is prone to classical behavioral theory, which stresses stimuli-reaction patterns and the need to install reward systems. Emotional Intelligence Training is based on cognitive learning models which target inner attributions and emphasize that emotional responsiveness is an important work asset; and finally, Positive Organizational Behavior interventions attempt to make ‘happiness’ and ‘well-being’ a part of corporate cultures (for a discussion of the development of ‘happiness’ in Organization Theory see Steyaert & Schulz, 2010).
Through this overview I would like to call attention to two aspects which I then deal with in greater depth: first, these interventions work around specific ideas of how emotions should be managed in the work process and of how we can notice a gradual shift towards more direct attempts to shape the emotional priorities of employees; secondly, most of these interventions (excluding those associated with scientific management) have profited from the theories and practices of the psy-disciplines. It is these two aspects I discuss, as they are central to the current discussion of HRM and are central to the argument of this work.

2.2.2. Human Resource Management and the Management of Emotions

While the early management models of people management still debated whether emotions should be considered in work life, midpoint approaches placed emotions as an intermediate to motivation, while more recent models openly address emotions and their modification. Companies today promote styles of management that directly address the management of emotions (Bolton, 2005). For example, leaders more than ever ‘try to engender in followers feelings of passion and enthusiasm for the organization and its well-being; groups speak of esprit de corps; and organizational consultants seek to increase job satisfaction, commitment, trust and loyalty’ (Ashkanasy, Zerbe & Härtel, 2002, p. 3).

As Table 2 hints, and as Kärreman & Alvesson (2004) advocate, there has been a shift in management theory and interventions from surveillance and technological techniques of control to emotionalized and socio-ideological forms of management. The former method attempts to control employees directly and has ‘an understanding of worker subjectification framed in terms of disciplinary mechanisms and techniques of surveillance’ (Iedema, Rhodes, & Scheeres, 2006, p. 1111). In contrast, the latter method aims to modify employees’ behavior indirectly, by influencing their systems of beliefs. Such socio-ideological interventions target ‘social relations, emotions, identity formation and ideology’ (Kärreman and Alvesson, 2004, p. 152). While technocratic interventions have adapted psychological knowledge to manage employees from the outside (with mechanisms of positive and negative reinforcement), socio-ideological interventions transport psychological and especially psychotherapeutic practices to management employees from the inside. It seems that the majority of management interventions now focus on socialization and emotional management through ‘feeling rules’ as well as inscription into dominant discourses.

The programmatic socialization of emotions in the work realm and its deteriorating effect has been extensively discussed in recent years (Fineman & Sturdy, 1999; Doorewaard & Benschop, 2003). Fineman explains in 1993 that ‘a serious analytical interest in emotions
is general, and in the negative emotions in particular is almost entirely missing in recent study of work and organization’ (Fineman, 1993, p. 68). However, the present state of studies offers a variety of empirical investigations (for overviews see Powell & Gilbert, 2008, Ashkanasy & Humphrey, 2003, 2011; Ashkanasy, 2003; Elfenbein, 2007; Domagalski, 1999; Miller, Considine & Garner, 2007; Sieben & Wettergren, 2010). The critical reflection of emotions finds an important initiation in Arlie Hochschild’s seminal work, *The managed heart: the commercialization of human feeling* (1985). In arguing that the display of emotions is dependent on representations of context dependent ‘feeling rules’, Hochschild comes to the conclusion that people organize emotions according to anticipation of what is socially accepted and desirable. In commercialized contexts, the installment of specific ‘feeling rules’ follows a market agenda, where, for example, in the service industry, employees are expected to display friendliness and joy in order to bind clients emotionally to the services. Hochschild defines such forms of emotional display as ‘emotional labor’: ‘The management of feeling to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display; emotional labor is sold for a wage and therefore has exchange value’ (ibid., p. 7). Moreover, Hochschild suggests that emotional labor can lead to negative effects for employees, as they can become de-personalized and drained of their intimate integrity. With this Hochschild introduces the idea to management scholars that emotions are not only a product of a person’s upbringing or genes, but are socialized at work.

Following Hochschild’s work, scholars have begun to study these socializing effects in more depth, often on the basis of explanatory models. The literature following a critical agenda towards the emotionalization of work has set out to explore how ‘organizational controls reach the individual’s emotional life, colonizing his/her emotions in and out of work’ (Gabriel, 1999, p. 182), and indeed, how employees manage to resist attempts to colonize the emotive. Recently, for example, Fleming (2005) has interpreted the display of cynicism, irony or skepticism in unofficial spaces as important mechanisms with which individuals attempt to protect their self from the ‘emotional drain’ of emotional socializing in organizations (for further empirical illustrations see also Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Cropanzano, Rupp, & Byrne, 2003; Grandey, 2000; Holman, Martinez-Iñigo, & Totterdell, 2008). Increasingly, discursive studies have been applied to the study of emotional management in the workplace (e.g. Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993; Ashforth & Tomiuk, 2000; Theodosius, 2006, 2008; Ogbonna & Harris, 2004; Tracy, 2000) suggesting that the current stance towards emotions, in the organizational context, is one of validating the expression of positive emotions, such as happiness, self-confidence or self-enhancement, while at the same time expecting the professional to control and manage negative feelings such as anger.
or disappointment. Thus, as Sieben and Wettergren (2010, p. 4) have stated: ‘the contemporary focus on emotion is not equal to “letting emotions out”, rather it recognizes their existence and value while simultaneously demanding their use in accordance with norms of an “intelligent” management of emotions.’

It can then be further argued that in the ‘pro-emotional organizational arena’ (Fambrough & Hart 2008, p. 741) HRM interventions play a key role in the implementation of emotional management as these interventions now strive to unlock the full potential of the self as ‘human resourcefulness’ (Costea, Crump & Amiridis, 2007). This then leads to the second, interrelated, development in HRM that I would like to accent: the implementation of psy-practices.

2.2.3. HRM and the use of Therapeutic Practices

My second point about the development of HRM is the influence of psychological and psychotherapeutic practices. HRM can be understood as a ‘network of expert knowledges, based particularly on the ‘psy’ disciplines that have developed around the emotions, seeking to measure and survey emotional response and to counsel people on how best to deal with and express their emotions’ (Lupton, 1998, p. 6). Through the use of psy-practices the self learns to deal competently with feelings and emotions. This concurrently led to the emergence of a new system of (psy-)expertise (Pawelczyk & Graf, 2011) that has led to the development of strategically applied interventions, in which emotions are a resource to be designed (Neckel, 2005) and a capital in which to invest intelligently.

There have been a number of attempts in functionally oriented management studies to apply psychotherapeutic practices to enhance intentional organizational change, for example through consulting (Driver, 2003), through T-Groups (Klein & Astrachan, 1971) or personal growth programs (Edwards, 1984). Yet, the exploration of the use and effects of psy-practices in the realm of management have surprisingly seldom been touched upon from a reflexive perspective (Janssens & Steyaert, 2009). This thesis therefore connects to the field of reflexive and critical Human Resource Management studies that has recently begun to show an interest in the investigation of the relational effects of HRM interventions; especially what has been called socio-ideological forms of management (Kärreman & Alvesson, 2004), which attempt to control employees by influencing the soft, ludic and affective priorities of the self (Costea, Crump, & Amiridis, 2008).

In this body of debate, the influence of psy-practices on work life has been discussed as the sidekick to the Foucauldian-inspired concept of governmentality (Nolan, 1998; Rose, O’Malley, & Valverde, 2009) and the emotionalization of work life (Bolton, 2005). In a
recent study, Ainsworth and Hardy (2009) have for example shown how managers use psychological discourse to frame the unemployment of older workers as their personal and private problem. Another interesting example is John Cullen’s (2009) analysis of Steven Covey’s management bestseller *The 7 habits of highly effective people* in which Cullen (2009, p. 1245) reflects how the text produces ‘a self that is simultaneously de-saturated, financialized and expressivist, but supportive of conservative, universalist and late-capitalist modes of being’. While these studies are inspirational, Bjerg and Staunaes (2011) have noted they often take a macro perspective on normative and moral orders while focusing less on the precise machinery of productive processes as they play out in life. In reaction to this lack of concrete empirical studies Bjerg and Staunaes’ study on psy-leadership and self-management through shame in school settings is indeed an excellent example of how psy-practices are used to regulate emotions. Following in the footsteps of this study I then suggest a closer consideration of the concrete enactments of psy-practices and of their effects on the regulation of emotions. Moreover, Francis and Sinclair (2003) have noted that there are a number of studies that help us to understand better the general dynamics of socio-ideological forms of control, but that we still know little about the enactment of concrete relational (discursive) practices that constitute and perform HRM interventions. The question of how people are enrolled and inscribed into specific discourses through HRM interventions could thus be studied further. Consequently, recent calls stress that Human Resource Management should be explored more *in situ* and research should address how HRM practices come into being, how managerial discourses are enacted in concrete practices and how the politics of these practices shape everyday interactions (Watson, 2004, p. 447).

In search of a suitable HRM intervention to study how the psycho-managerial complex unfolds, I turn to the emerging person-centered interventions (e.g. mentoring, supervision and coaching) that have recently become fashionable, and are increasingly applied to employees. Due to their rapid development these interventions have only lately gained the attention of the academic community and have not yet become a field of varied investigation. Specifically, in looking to expand our understanding of how the workforce is managed through current forms of HRM practices, I turn to coaching at work as a promising area for studying the psycho-managerial complex. My hypothesis, which I deepen over the course of this thesis, is that coaching draws strongly on psychotherapy and indeed promotes the management of emotions.
2.3. Embedding and Disclosing the Focal Issue: Management Coaching

The aim of this section is to show the relevance of management coaching in today’s corporate world and bring clarity into the multiple meanings of the term ‘coaching’. This section first discuss the prevalence and proliferation of coaching at work, then gives an overview of the multiple semantics of the term, and finally narrows down to my specific area of interest, ‘management coaching’.

2.3.1. The Rapid and Fragile Formation of Coaching

With a development that might be seen as viral (Røvik, 2011), work-based coaching has established itself as an HRM intervention in many Western companies (Bresser, 2009; Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development, 2009). The use of coaching at work has become common for executives, managers and employees of all positions, but especially for those working for knowledge-intensive and creative-economy services. Three survey-based studies have attempted to grasp the prevalence of management coaching in organizations. All three surveys were conducted in Britain by private coaching research institutions, which also sell their coaching and coaching training services to companies. Both Day, Surtees and Winkler (2008) and Bresser (2009) have reported that between a half and two-thirds of companies make use of coaching. More recent reports suggest that ‘80% of organisations surveyed, had or were, using coaching. Another 9% were planning to. The more employees in the organisation, the more likely it was to use coaching. 90% of organisations with 2,000+ employees used coaching in the past five years, as opposed to just 68% of those with 230–500 employees’ (Bodsworth, 2011, p. 1). The reported surveys were conducted via questionnaire methods, though no further specification could be found towards the exact methods used in the research reports. We might assume that interpretation of results may be subject to the companies’ self-interests. A higher number of companies using coaching will normalize the coaching intervention and will most probably persuade companies not yet using coaching (to a great extent) to follow this trend. Seen in this light, we also learn something about the ways in which the industry presents itself (Clegg, Rhodes, & Kornberger, 2007). While Bodsworth’s figures might be questionable, it is clear that coaching has become a worldwide, multi-billion-dollar industry that is continually growing (Dingman, 2006; Passmore & Fillery-Travis, 2011). This remarkable rise of the use of coaching manifests itself in a number of visible ways: the extensive references to coaching in the media; the fact that coaching books have become international bestsellers; the establishment of coaching training institutions; the training of thousands of coaches; the
presentation of coaching as a unique selling proposition in universities; the current debates about the legal status of coaching and the attempts of associations to regulate and dominate the coaching service market. Coaching has become a common occurrence in people’s experiences, for many people have had coaching, have taken coaching training or know people who have been coached. I suggest that coaching has become one of the most used HRM interventions in organizations and influences organizational life to a considerable extent.

While coaching has become a common phenomenon, management coaching is not (yet) a stabilized professional practice. From the perspective of the sociology of professions, management coaching has been defined as a newly emerging industry that is engaged in a substantial identity struggle (Fietze, 2010; Clegg, Rhodes, Kornberger, & Stilin, 2005; Feldman, 2005). This identity struggle is due to a lack of differentiation from established Human Resource Management (Hamlin, Ellinger, & Beattie, 2008), psychological (Hart, Blattner, & Leipsic, 2001; Grimmer & Neukom, 2009) and consulting practices (Bjørkeng, Clegg, Pitsis, & Rhodes, 2008). Moreover, coaching not only wrestles with these established professions (Garvey, 2004), as a number of co-emergent practices supposedly do similar things, such as supervision (Kühl, 2007, 2008), mentoring (Clutterbuck, 2009), or systemic counseling (Resch, Dey, & Schulz, 2009), but as an emerging profession, coaching is ‘haunted by ontological insecurity’ (Clegg, Rhodes & Kornberger, 2007, p. 509), which is not astonishing, as there are currently no formal regulations as to who can become a coach, or who can train coaches (Cunningham & Honold, 1998). Merely by saying one is a coach, one becomes a coach. Therefore, despite its economic success and its common use as an HRM intervention, coaching appears to be in a pre-professional state with coherent structures of (narrative) institutionalization only gradually beginning to solidify.

To understand better the roots of the ‘ontological insecurity’ of coaching I look into the historical development of the term coaching and thus make the multiplicity of coaching comprehensible.

2.3.2. The Multiple Semantics of Coaching

Not so long ago, when people spoke of ‘coaching’ they understood it to be the handling of horses or the training of athletes. Coaching has only recently emerged as a fashionable term (Czarniawska, 2005), which serves in a rather arbitrary way to include such dissimilar vocations as executive coaching, leadership coaching, life and spiritual coaching, and various other types of coaching at work (Clegg, Rhodes, & Kornberger, 2007). Kühl demonstrates the range of diversity involved:
‘In the meantime the term ‘coaching’ possesses a ‘high semantic elasticity’, in such a way that the term encompasses almost every service in which advice is offered in some form: IT coaching, astrology coaching and coaching for parents belong to the standard offers found on the internet. Moreover, you can find counselors of both sexes for ‘Zen-coaching’, ‘relaxation coaching’, ‘flirt coaching’ or – if the flirt coaching was successful – ‘sex coaching’ and eventually even ‘SM coaching’.‘ (Kühl, 2008, p. 13, author’s translation)

As Kühl’s statement suggests, ‘coaching’ has become a container for all sorts of activities, not only for work-related services, which raises the question of how ‘coaching’ has managed to become such a hype word. This section thus attempts to make some sense of the term ‘coaching’ and bring light into this ill-defined and fuzzy concept. The following etymological examination gives an overview of the different contextual uses of the term ‘coaching’ and their origins. This historical summary will make clearer why the intervention ‘management coaching’ (which now almost seems like a pleonasm) specifically makes use of the term ‘coaching’ while it might also have been called ‘counseling’, ‘consulting’, ‘supervision’ or even ‘psychotherapy’. This section is arranged in three historical parts: the early days starting in the 15th century, the period from the middle of the 19th century until the 1960s and then the period to the present time.

Table 3: Popular meanings of 'coaching' through time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coach</th>
<th>First use</th>
<th>Subject to be coached</th>
<th>Meaning of verb</th>
<th>Practices used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carriage driver</td>
<td>16th century</td>
<td>horse</td>
<td>yoke and discipline</td>
<td>whip and apple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports instructor</td>
<td>19th century</td>
<td>athletes</td>
<td>train and drill</td>
<td>demonstration of movements and sports tactics, visualization and motivation techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service provider</td>
<td>From 1990s onwards</td>
<td>service seeker</td>
<td>train, counsel, support, teach, instruct, tutor</td>
<td>undifferentiated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coaching Horses: the Early Days

A first glance into the origin of the term reveals that we seem to owe the terms ‘coaching’ and ‘management’ to an interesting analogy: both originating in association with the domestication of horses. While ‘management’ can be traced back to the Italian *maneggiare*, ‘the handling of horses’ (Grey, 2009, p. 55), ‘coaching’ can be traced back to the English ‘to coach a horse’ (Hartmann, 2004). The genesis of the modern word ‘coaching’ begins in the 15th century in Kocsi Szekér, then a small town that lies in the northern part of today’s Republic of Hungary. The people of Kocsi Szekér built horse wagons, and due to the fame of their craftsmanship the ‘wagons of Kocsi’ became well known across the country (Kubowitsch, 1995, p. 243). Over time the town’s name more generally became a synonym for horse wagons — and not only in Hungary, as by the 16th century the term had also been taken up and phonetically adapted into other European languages (Pitsis, 2008). In particular, the English modified the term into today’s well-known form ‘coach’ (Kubowitsch, 1995; Hartmann, 2004). It was then also in England that the verb to ‘coach’ a horse developed. This described a relationship between a horse, the coach (wagon) and the coach driver, and meant that the driver would bring a horse to be yoked in front of a carriage (Bayer, 2000, as cited in Hartmann, 2004).

The next transition of the term took place in the 19th century, when English university students began to mock their tutors, identifying themselves with the horses and seeing their tutors as the coach drivers, thus calling them ‘coaches’. We can imagine that this mockery was partly due to the circumstance that preparing for university exams (in those times) meant long hours of hard and monotonous learning, where the tutors demanded uninterrupted and attentive learning from their students. (Palmer & Whybrow, 2006). The term ‘coaching’ had therefore found its way onto campus and found an entry point to the realm of sports.

Coaching Athletes: until 1960

It did not take long for this mockery to spread and it was seemingly Oxford students (Evered & Selman, 1989) who first began to call their sports instructors ‘coaches’. While it remains a mystery why sports instructors began to use the term themselves and identify with it, it is certain that the term ‘sports coach’ has established itself as a synonym for the sports instructor (Brock, 2008). ‘To coach’ someone had once again gained a layer of meaning, as it became associated with enhancing physical performance in others.
In the 19th century, with the industrialization and urbanization of Great Britain, modern sport was connected with industrial interests, which led to the commercialization of various disciplines, enabling people to live from sponsorship contracts, and sporting achievements were linked to financial gratification (Lyle, 2002; Lyle & Cushion, 2010). This not only led to the professionalization of the athletes and their practices, but also to the professionalization of coaches, whose job it was to guarantee the success of the sportspeople. It is then no surprise that sports coaches also looked into psychology, especially into visualization and self-motivation techniques, to improve athletes’ learning abilities and motivation (as recounted in Coleman Griffith’s book, *Psychology of Coaching*, published in 1926 (Silva & Weinberg, 1984; Gordon, 2007)).

**Coaching Managers: Present Representations**

From the 1970s onwards, popular sports coaches (relying on their image of being able to help others win) used their fame to market their services in the form of management training. The most renowned example is Timothy Gallwey’s (1974) bestselling book, *The Inner Game of Tennis*, which in its 2008 updated edition, bears the subtitle, *The Classic Guide to the Mental Side of Peak Performance*. The metaphoric associations with sport found resonance in managers, leading to a heightened interest and thus resources spent for training workshops led by sports coaches. Parallel to this development, many managers (especially in top management positions) were looking for ways to cope with their day-to-day work lives, for which consultants of all sorts offered their services, calling this a one-to-one coaching session. The idea of coaching as a professionalized one-to-one service has become increasingly popular, not only in management, but in other realms of life. From the 1990s onwards the term ‘coaching’ has seen a rapid and widespread usage that is no longer limited to its initial repertoires of meaning.
While Figure 1 only shows data until 2009, a simple Google search suggests that this trend has continued. There has been an increase of 150 million Google hits in the use of the word ‘coaching’ between June 2010 (131 million Google hits) and June 2012 (280 million Google hits). Moreover, a look into the recent developments in online coaching interventions (as given in Table 4 below) shows that today sports coaching is far outnumbered by the newer forms of coaching. Most remarkably, the use of the term ‘management coaching‘ seems to have exploded in only two years from 175,000 to 1,240,000 Google hits.
Table 4: Google hits for the most common kinds of 'coaching'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>June 2010</th>
<th>June 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life coaching</td>
<td>4,330,000</td>
<td>9,580,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive coaching</td>
<td>1,830,000</td>
<td>3,320,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports coaching</td>
<td>1,310,000</td>
<td>2,380,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management coaching</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>1,240,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This leads us to the question of how to define and outline coaching at work, a question addressed in the next sub-section.

2.3.3. Management Coaching: A Company Organized HRM Intervention

Finding suitable definitions for coaching has indeed been a matter of heated discussion, which is attested to by the associated debates in the professional and academic coaching literature. While some try to define coaching in a more general sense (Rauen, 2000, 2005; Grant & Cavanagh, 2004; Stober & Grant, 2006b), others differentiate between forms of coaching, such as, life and executive coaching (Kilburg, 1997; O’Neill, 2007; Stern, 2004; Cox, Bachkirova, & Clutterbuck, 2009). Typical examples of work-situated coaching, which is what motivates this thesis, can be found in the following definitions given by Pitsis (2008) and Greif (2008):

‘[A] facilitation process that aims to instruct, inspire, develop, mentor, and motivate individuals, teams, and organizations to produce the best possible results within the specified context. At the helm of the coaching process is a coach who acts as a facilitator or catalyst using a range of techniques, abilities, or skills in the coaching process.’ (Pitsis, p. 173)

Only slightly less all-encompassing is the popular definition by Greif (2008), who sees coaching as:
‘[An] intensive and systematic advancement of goal-oriented problems and self-reflection as well as counseling of individuals or groups to improve the attainability of self-congruent aims or the conscious change and development of the self.’ (Greif, p. 59)

The common ground of these and other popular definitions is that they define coaching in terms of normative constructs, while failing to define the concrete audiences and practices used in the intervention. There is also considerable discrepancy in the use of terms: e.g. ‘executive coaching’ is not necessarily the coaching of top level managers (Glunk & Follini, 2011) and leadership coaching can be the one-on-one coaching of leaders (Ely et al., 2010), leaders coaching their subordinates (Hackman & Wageman, 2005), or group trainings for leaders (De Vries & Manfred, 2005).

This work takes a different approach to the research field by avoiding making normative definitions and by limiting its context and constituting activities. This thesis thus focuses exclusively on what I determine as ‘management coaching’. Management coaching is defined as a HRM intervention that is paid for and organized by the host companies who require their staff to be coached. This specialization in management coaching excludes all forms of coaching in which people pay privately for the coaching intervention, even if they are managers. This also excludes the investigation of life coaching and more generally all forms of coaching in the private realm as this would go beyond the particular interest and scope of this thesis. Yet, as Arlie Hochschild (2012) hints in her most recent book The Outsourced Self: Intimate Life in Market Times, the investigation of the constitution and effects of private based forms of coaching is surely a worthwhile endeavor.

The term ‘management coaching’ carries a double semantic. It clearly addresses the target group for the intervention: managers and employees, who are managed. Secondly, management coaching can also be associated with the fact that it is used as a HRM practice, and thus refers back to its institutionalized organization. Even if management coaching has seldom been explicitly framed as a HRM intervention I will show in this work that its organizational priorities (being funded by companies), its organization through HRM departments, and its aim to change employees clearly suggest that it is indeed affiliated with the general HRM agenda.
2.4. Chapter Summary

This chapter has suggested that HRM interventions have increasingly taken an interest in the management of emotions as well as the application of therapeutic practices. Moreover, I have suggested that the study of management coaching offers a unique opportunity to study the psycho-managerial complex in the making. It allows a zooming in and out of different levels of the enactment and the connecting of different sites with each other to gain a more complex and rich picture of the intervention. The study of management coaching allows us to trace empirically how work life is emotionalized; it allows us to look into the effects of an emerging HRM intervention and to trace how the psycho-managerial complex is established through the intervention. We can better understand the link between psychotherapeutic and managerial discourses when taking a concrete example of how this happens. This answers calls to engage in research that studies the concrete practices and relational processes of HRM to gain a better understanding of how these interventions affect work life (Francis & Sinclair, 2003). Indeed, as has been noted, there are few detailed studies of how the work world is emotionalized and how new forms of management are organized. Moreover, the strategic organization of newly emerging, and rapidly spreading psy-based interventions (like mentoring, coaching, team coaching or supervision) has hardly exceeded a popular and affirmative debate. Thus I would like to explore the implications of Eva Illouz’s statement:

‘If all the critics of the psychological discourse agree that it has ‘triumphed’ and if some remarkable studies now detail what in the therapeutic has ‘triumphed’ we still do not know much about how and why it has triumphed.’ (Illouz, 2008, p. 8; original emphasis)

The questions of how and why enactments of the psycho-managerial complex play out in HRM the way they do is still to be concretely addressed. I would suggest that we need to back the theoretical considerations associated with the psycho-managerial complex with empirical studies and to work out more precisely the emergent effects these dynamics have in everyday work life. My research, then, is an attempt to answer fully these questions in the field of management coaching.
3. Mapping Management Coaching: Current Discussions and Uncharted Dimensions

As management coaching is my access point to study the psycho-managerial complex at work, the aim of this chapter is to map out what is currently known about management coaching, and, based on this knowledge, explain the specific path this thesis takes. The metaphor ‘mapping’ is employed here, as maps are understood as tools of orientation that condense areas into representations: they plot out variations in dimensions and describe the characteristics of these territories. Moreover, with a map, the boundaries between the known and the unknown can be depicted.

To better understand the state of the art on management coaching three questions structure this mapping. These questions attempt to give a comprehensive overview of the field by investigating how management coaching has been theoretically and empirically explored and how the field has reflected the effects of the intervention. The first question asks: how has management coaching been theoretically conceptualized and what underlying source theories are used? This question seeks to comprehend the different perspectives in which management coaching is conceptualized. The second question supplements the first by asking: how has management coaching been empirically explored? This question explores the methodological approaches that have been used and some of the major findings of the research. The third question asks: how has management coaching been (critically) reflected? Based on this mapping of management coaching I problematize current discussions and suggest that there is a lack of conceptualizations to contextualize the intervention, that little is known about the emergence of concrete coaching practices, and that their (critical) effects have yet to be discussed.

3.1. Literature Review: Representations of Management Coaching in Organizational Studies

To learn more about the current debates around management coaching and better understand how the academic community conceptualizes management coaching I turn to the Organizational Studies literature. In the following I present the results of a systematic literature review.
3.1.1. Methodological Issues of the Literature Review

For the purpose of this review, 61 peer-reviewed OS journals (see Table 26 in Appendix) were screened for relevant articles in the time frame between January 1980 and April 2012. Although there are a number of newly founded (psy-based) coaching journals, like The Coaching Psychologist, International Coaching Psychology Review, and Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice, these journals were not included in this literature review, due to the existence of several recent comprehensive literature reviews which have summarized this field extensively (Kampa-Kokesch & Anderson, 2001; Passmore & Gibbes, 2007; Hamlin, Ellinger, & Beattie, 2008; Ely et al., 2010; Seger, Vloeberghs, Henxerickx, & Inceoglu, 2011).

Coaching publications were identified through their use of the term ‘coaching’ within the title, abstract, author-given abstract or keywords. Search terms were processed using the EBSCO ‘Business Source Premier’ and ‘PsycINFO’ databases. Additionally, relevant articles already known to the author were integrated into the review.

The reviewed papers were carefully read and brought into relation to each other as well as to the guiding questions of this review. The term ‘coaching’ was used instead of the more specific terms ‘management coaching’, because work-based coaching currently also runs under a variety of terms such as ‘executive coaching’, ‘business coaching’ or ‘leadership coaching’. Due to the arbitrary meanings these terms hold, each article had to be individually screened and the inclusion criteria of this work validated. Not included were works in which coaching was equivalent with everyday leadership activities, sports coaching or standardized group trainings. Also, book reviews and editorials were not included. Examples for each category of exclusion criteria are given in the Appendix in Table 24. Additionally, articles concerned with the development and organization of coaching (as a profession) have been excluded from this section, as they have been discussed separately in section 2.3. The sample is made up of thirteen theoretical papers and twenty empirical-based papers. Also, a comprehensive list of excluded papers by category is given in Table 25 in the Appendix.

In the following sections I answer the three relevant questions posed for this review by closely looking at these empirical and theoretical-based papers.
3.1.2. Position Papers on Management Coaching

The thirteen position articles produced by this review are summarized in Table 5. The table names the author of the article (see reference list for full paper title), the scope of interest of the article and its main argument, and a categorization of the theoretical framework on which the paper is based. Furthermore, I will in the following give a brief overview of the main argument of each of the articles.

Three papers lacked frameworks, as well as empirical illustrations altogether. I have called these works *anecdotic* as their argument is grounded on personal experiences. The paper *Coaching Professionalism and Provider Size* by Geoffrey Ahern (2005), a professional coach, in the *Journal of Management Development* argues that the size of the company that offers coaching services will have an impact on the quality of the intervention. This argument is neither grounded on literature (only one reference is used in the article) nor is the argument strengthened through illustrative examples. Similarly lacking references are the works of Burdett (1998), and Giglio, Diamante and Urban (1998) in which the authors lay out their view of good coaching, but fail to support their assumptions by literature or description of concrete experiences. Three of the position papers grounded their arguments on the assumption that psychotherapeutic models and practices can be usefully applied to management coaching (Barner & Higgins, 2007; Gray, 2006; Cavicchia, 2006). The most explicit theoretical positions were by position articles that aligned psychoanalytic and narrative-systemic approaches to management coaching.

Psychoanalytic theory highlights relational dynamics and makes assumptions about the biographical interplay of unconscious motivations and desires in people. As a practice it prepares for the liberation from biographical toxicities, self-destructive behavior and psychic symptoms, by bringing these dynamics to light. The two psychoanalytic papers see psychoanalytically informed management coaching as a means to resolve conflicts. Arnaud (2003) makes the point that psychoanalytic management coaching offers the possibility to help managers look into the unconscious dynamics of the organization and thus overcome work-related tensions. Moreover, Goldman (2008) speaks of the necessity of ‘placing the organization on the couch’ (ibid, p. 243) to help dismantle individual and organizational toxicities.
Table 5: An overview of the argument-driven articles found in the literature review. (*) indicates that the first author works as a coach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position paper</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Theoretical framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahern*, 2005</td>
<td>Considers the effects of coaching service providers size on service quality</td>
<td>Size matters: Professional quality characteristically varies with different types of coaching provider</td>
<td>Anecdotic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnaud*, 2003</td>
<td>Develops a Lacanian perspective of coaching intervention</td>
<td>Psychoanalytically guided coaching can satisfy the needs of clients, their relational expectations and unconscious desires</td>
<td>Psychoanalytic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barner* &amp; Higgins*, 2007</td>
<td>Explores relationship between coaching and psychotherapy</td>
<td>Coaching practitioners use the following models: clinical, behavioral, systems or social constructionist</td>
<td>Psychotherapeutic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burdett*, 1998</td>
<td>States 40 things managers must know about coaching</td>
<td>The authors identify a number factors that positively adhere the outcomes of coaching session</td>
<td>Anecdotic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavicchia*, 2010</td>
<td>Uses psychotherapeutic insights, especially from Gestalt therapy</td>
<td>Suggests that shame can be an important part of coaching processes</td>
<td>Psychotherapeutic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drake*, 2007</td>
<td>Translates ideas from narrative psychotherapy to coaching</td>
<td>Advocates a narrative coaching psychology</td>
<td>Narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Du Toit, 2007</td>
<td>Considers how coaching can enable individual sense-making</td>
<td>Coaching greatly supports and enhances the quality of the sense making activities of the individual</td>
<td>Narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giglio,* Diamante, &amp; Urban, 1998</td>
<td>Explains structured approach to facilitate coaching processes</td>
<td>9 steps needed for a successful coaching session</td>
<td>Anecdotic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glunk &amp; Follini, 2011</td>
<td>Explains how polarity coaching can foster meaningful change</td>
<td>Coaches should become aware of the polarities in client (systems)</td>
<td>Narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldman*, 2008</td>
<td>Reflects the role of the coach in the coaching process</td>
<td>Argues to investigate organizational toxicities and venture into the the dark and destructive behavior in companies</td>
<td>Psychoanalytic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray, 2006</td>
<td>Summarizes different models of change used in coaching</td>
<td>Argues for a fusion of Psychotherapy and Transformative Learning frameworks</td>
<td>Psychotherapeutic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson, 2010</td>
<td>Shows the benefits of working with narrative literary devices in coaching</td>
<td>Literary language devices associated with narrative can be applied in the coaching context.</td>
<td>Narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stelter*, 2009</td>
<td>Uses a dialogical approach to understand coaching as a reflective space</td>
<td>Argues of the use of narrative frameworks</td>
<td>Narrative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Articles using narrative sense-making frameworks ground on the materials commonly referenced in narrative therapy, which again take notice in various traditions of narrative theories (c.f. Combs & Freedman, 1996; Seikkula, 2003) and autopoietic-systemic concepts (Luhmann, 1995; Bateson, 1979; Maturana & Varela, 1980), which are commonly used as a theoretical basis for the so-called second-order cybernetics systemic approaches in psychotherapy. The notion of cybernetics first and second order was introduced by Heinz von Förster (1979) and signifies that the change agent is aware of his/her co-constructive effects on the system dynamics. These considerations built the basis of what would come to be known as the Milan School of Family Therapy (Selvini, Boscolo, Cecchin, & Prata, 1980; Cecchin, 1992; Kaslow, 2000). Applied interventions built on these theoretical foundations were first developed in family therapy, solution-focused therapy (de Shazer et al., 2006; Tarragona & Lebow, 2008) and narrative therapy (White & Epston, 1990; McNamee & Gergen, 1992). Papers describing management coaching in these terms explain the need to reflect on limiting narrations and work towards their re-scripting (Sluzki, 1992). Interventions following this narrative understanding of change therefore aim to support the individual to author alternative narrations and thus overcome the limiting and marginalizing effects of dominant interpretations.

Making up the largest group of position articles, all five narrative papers suggest that management coaching can help individuals reflect on and make sense of their complex personal and work experiences. Du Toit (2007) states that coaching is a sense-making practice that helps people reflect and thus ‘make better informed decisions, which lead to a better quality of sense making’ (Du Toit, 2007, p. 290). Employing the same argument, Stelter (2009), Glunk (2010), and Drake (2007, 2008) also suggest that coaching can help people reflect and develop coherent narrations. Finally, Robinson (2010) in her position paper argues that the use of literary techniques, such as stream of consciousness or metaphors, can enhance the repertoires of coaches’ techniques as these techniques are potent means of sense-making. The techniques promoted here have been extensively explored and adapted by family therapy / systems therapy (for a detailed description of the use of metaphor in narrative psychotherapy see for example Legowski & Brownlee, 2001).

3.1.3. Empirical Articles on Management Coaching
The twenty empirical-based articles are summarized in Table 6. The table indicates the contents of the study (the main findings), the methodological approach (the study design, analytical method and the unit of analysis), and the theoretical approach used in the article to conceptualize management coaching.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author &amp; Year</th>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Analytical method</th>
<th>Unit of analysis</th>
<th>Main findings</th>
<th>Base Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachkirova &amp; Cox, 2007</td>
<td>Survey of coaches personal theories of emotion</td>
<td>Hermeneutic</td>
<td>Coaches (N=39)</td>
<td>Identifies three types of emotional representation</td>
<td>Phenomenological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baron &amp; Morin, 2010</td>
<td>Pre-Post quantitative self-report questionnaire study</td>
<td>Classical test theory (analysis of variance)</td>
<td>Managers (N=73)</td>
<td>Coaching increases managers self-efficacy related to soft skills</td>
<td>Behavioral learning theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baron, Morin &amp; Morin, 2010</td>
<td>Pre-Post quantitative self-report questionnaire study</td>
<td>Classical test theory (analysis of variance)</td>
<td>Coach-coachee pairs with managers of manufacturing company (N=30 dyads)</td>
<td>The working alliance plays an important part in the coaching process</td>
<td>Behavioral learning theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowles et al., 2007</td>
<td>Intervention vs. non-intervention group - external productivity assessment</td>
<td>Classical test theory (analysis of variance)</td>
<td>Military recruiters (N= 59; intervention group n = 30, non-intervention group =29)</td>
<td>Coached military recruiters recruited more staff</td>
<td>Behavioral learning theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyce*, Jackson, Neal, 2010</td>
<td>Post-intervention self-report questionnaire</td>
<td>Classical test theory (analysis of variance)</td>
<td>74 client-coach pairs participating in a voluntary leadership coaching program at a military service academy during pre-partnering and post-transition phases</td>
<td>Relationship processes of rapport, trust, and commitment positively predicted coaching program outcomes</td>
<td>Behavioral learning theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day*, 2010</td>
<td>Single case study based on authors experiences</td>
<td>Hermeneutic</td>
<td>Reflection on a single coaching case of 12 sessions with a middle-aged finance director</td>
<td>Praises use of psychoanalytic frameworks</td>
<td>Psychoanalytic Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Haan, Bertie, Day, &amp; Sills, 2010</td>
<td>Clients written feedback of ‘critical moments’ and 8 problem centered interviews</td>
<td>Hermeneutic</td>
<td>Executive managers in England (N=67)</td>
<td>Critical moments appear to involve new realizations</td>
<td>Behavioral learning theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubouloy*, 2004</td>
<td>Case vignettes and unsystematic post-intervention interviews</td>
<td>Hermeneutic</td>
<td>MBA students (N=16) undergoing soft skill training with coaching</td>
<td>Psychoanalytic coaching bring out unconscious talents and desires</td>
<td>Psychoanalytic Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant, 2010</td>
<td>Quantitative self-report study</td>
<td>Hermeneutic</td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>Managers undergo different stages of adopting workplace coaching Skills</td>
<td>Behavioral learning theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooijberg &amp; Lane, 2009</td>
<td>Qualitative self-report survey</td>
<td>Hermeneutic</td>
<td>Managers in Executive Education (N=230)</td>
<td>Coaching participants feedback on coaching experiences</td>
<td>Phenomenological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author &amp; Year</td>
<td>Study design</td>
<td>Analytical method</td>
<td>Unit of analysis</td>
<td>Main findings</td>
<td>Base Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Rafferty, &amp; Griffin, 2006</td>
<td>Quantitative self assessment study with multiple post-session measurements</td>
<td>Classical test theory (analysis of variance)</td>
<td>Managers (N=11)</td>
<td>Self-reported managerial flexibility increased throughout the duration of executive coaching</td>
<td>Behavioral learning theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Vries, 2005</td>
<td>Case vignettes based on author’s experiences as a coach</td>
<td>Hermeneutic</td>
<td>Executive board members (N=8)</td>
<td>Suggests coaches undergo clinical training</td>
<td>Psychoanalytic Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luthans &amp; Peterson, 2003</td>
<td>Pre-Post quantitative 360 degree assessment study</td>
<td>Classical test theory (analysis of variance)</td>
<td>Managers (n=20) in a manufacturing company</td>
<td>Coaching can be used to improve 360 degree trainings</td>
<td>Behavioral learning theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rappe* &amp; Zwick, 2007</td>
<td>Quantitative self assessment study</td>
<td>Classical test theory (analysis of variance)</td>
<td>Lower-level managers (N=38) in manufacturing plant</td>
<td>Coaching workshop intervention improves managers performance</td>
<td>Behavioral learning theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Styhre, 2010</td>
<td>Repeated interviews over the course of the coaching process / action research</td>
<td>Hermeneutic</td>
<td>Construction managers (N=6)</td>
<td>Construction site managers find coaching helpful to articulate, discuss and reflect their problems</td>
<td>Narrative-systemic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thach, 2002</td>
<td>Quantitative self assessment study</td>
<td>Classical test theory (analysis of variance)</td>
<td>Executives and high potential managers (N=281)</td>
<td>Coaching increases leadership effectiveness</td>
<td>Behavioral learning theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orenstein, 2002</td>
<td>Case vignettes based on author’s experiences as a coach</td>
<td>Hermeneutic</td>
<td>Three illustrative extracts from one coaching session</td>
<td>Considers coaching as a multi-stakeholder process</td>
<td>Narrative-systemic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser (2010)</td>
<td>Transcript from one coaching conversation</td>
<td>Hermeneutic</td>
<td>Account Manager in a professional services firm</td>
<td>Combination of behavioral and system approaches may be fruitful for coaching</td>
<td>Narrative-systemic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales*, 2003</td>
<td>Survey study using semi-structured questionnaire</td>
<td>Hermeneutic</td>
<td>Managers in the financial sector (N=15)</td>
<td>Coaching increases self development of managers</td>
<td>Phenomenological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenson (2010)</td>
<td>Interview study</td>
<td>Hermeneutic</td>
<td>Manager (N=20) of a construction materials organization</td>
<td>Summarizes common performance themes</td>
<td>Phenomenological</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In my understanding the empirical studies can be roughly distinguished by their methodological design into hermeneutic-qualitative studies and statistical-quantitative studies. My analysis further revealed that the epistemological choice of the methodological approach corresponds with the theoretical approach of the specific article. All behavioral theories used quantitative methods, while the hermeneutic-qualitative studies worked with psychoanalytic, narrative and phenomenological theories.

**Statistical-Quantitative Studies**

Each of the nine studies based on behavioral learning theories also used quantitative measurements to assess variations in agent characteristics. The behavioral theories described learning and change mechanisms by examining the linear relationships between stimuli and responses, as exemplified in the well-known functional analysis used in behavioral therapy. Change in coaching is brought about through learning techniques such as conditioning and cognitive restructuring, which allow a planned steering of new behaviors and cognitions. Theoretical behavioral models would then be expressed as path models, showing the statistical relations between the variables used to operationalize change. Results showed correlations between the use of the coaching intervention and performative characteristics, such as ‘leadership effectivity’ (Thach, 2002), ‘self-efficacy’ (Grant, 2010; Baron & Morin, 2010), ‘workplace well-being‘ (Grant, 2010), ‘managerial flexibility’ (Jones, Rafferty, & Griffin, 2006), ‘achievement of quota and outside evaluation’ (Bowles, Cunningham, Rosa, & Picano, 2007) and ‘leadership competence’ (Rappe & Zwick, 2007).

Baron and Morin (2009), for example, suggest that there is a direct relationship between self-efficacy and productivity. Their intervention, in the form of a one-to-one coaching training program, thus targets the increase of three variables that were assumed to correlate with self-efficacy: utility judgment, learning goal orientation, and affective commitment. These variables were measured and then statistically correlated with personality traits of the managers and brought into a multi-variate analysis.

Another example is the study by Bowles, Cunningham, Rosa and Picano (2007), that investigated how coaching influences the efficiency with which army recruiters were able to enlist new recruits. For the sake of the study, a group of 30 military recruiters (managers) were enrolled in a 12-month coaching program, and their recruiting quota was then compared to those of a non-coached control group, suggesting that the coached managers were slightly more productive. While this study can be considered to be one of the better quantitative studies (in terms of methodological rigor) it nevertheless shows some
methodological shortcomings: the intervention and control group were not randomly assigned; a large number of assessment instruments were used without adjusting the ideal study population; the coherence of the intervention was not controlled for, and the population between the control and intervention group was not controlled. These methodological shortcomings make it difficult to interpret the directionality of the shown correlations. Jones, Rafferty and Griffin (2006) also argue that management coaching offers a boost in effectivity, by training the coachee through coaching. In this empirical work, 11 coached managers completed several self-assessment questionnaires that asked how flexible they felt in their role as leaders. The study reports an increase in the managers’ assessment of their flexibility at work. These studies also show some methodological limitations: no control group was appointed, the results were not controlled for a social expectancy bias, the sample size was insufficient, and the sample population had considerable selection effects.

Hermeneutic-Qualitative Studies

Half of the empirical studies used a hermeneutic-qualitative research approach. Among these were three studies that can be described as phenomenological survey studies. All three studies investigated agents’ opinions on coaching issues and categorized responses inductively. Bachkirova and Cox (2007) for example, gave management coaches an open questionnaire, which asked about their theories of emotions. Based on the analysis, the study identified three common theories and illustrated these with text examples. Similarly, De Haan, Bertie, Day, and Sills (2010) asked coaches and managers to identify critical moments in coaching sessions, and Wales (2010) asked coaches to identify commonly worked-upon performance issues in coaching sessions.

Next to the three inductive based survey studies, the remaining seven papers in this category can be considered deductive, as they use the empirical materials mainly to illustrate their theoretically based arguments. These papers, also, do not describe the use of analytical procedures The psychoanalytically informed empirical papers all use case examples to illustrate that psychoanalytic theory can be an important asset to management coaching practitioners. These studies follow a deductive mode in which vignettes are used to illustrate the argument. Kets de Vries (De Vries, 2005), for example, suggests that in-depth reflection can be used in professional contexts to bring out unconscious talents and desires, and thus promote efficacy; he illustrates these examples from his experiences as a executive coach. Moreover, Dubouloy (2004) uses a case vignette based on an intervention with a group of MBA students to show how psychoanalysis can be made serviceable. The most elaborate psychoanalytic study is Day’s (2010) case vignette through which he shows
‘how [Adlerian] psychoanalytic theory of individuals and organisations can be integrated into a relational approach to coaching which facilitates the exploration of the client’s experience of their work in an organisation context’ (Day, 2010, p. 864).

Two studies adhere to a narrative framework. The study by Orenstein (2002) uses a case vignette to present management coaching as a multi-stakeholder process that brings together different voices. Finally, the empirically informed research of Styhre (2008) is the only interview-based study in this review. It studies how construction managers experienced the coaching process and suggests that the ‘coach helps the coachee to step outside the situation and account for his or her own actions or non-actions, behaviors, responses, and other relevant reactions to a particular event’ (p. 286), and thus make a ‘meaningful experience out of the event’ (ibid, p. 286). Although the study states that it is based on (an isolated aspect of) Luhmann’s systems theory I would suggest that it can be assigned to the narrative category, as it mainly uses Luhmann’s notion of first order and second order reflection.

3.2. Problematizing Current Discussions of Management Coaching

Based on this map of management coaching, I now more specifically problematize some of the key issues around the current representations of management coaching. Rather than constructing gaps within the current conceptualizations of the topic, problematization has the advantage that it allows ‘identifying and challenging assumptions underlying existing literature’ (Alvesson & Sandberg, 2011, p. 247) and based on this formulates research questions that lead into uncharted dimensions and potentially to more interesting theories.

In the following I problematize the literatures along three questions: how has management coaching been theoretically conceptualized and what other conceptualizations might be relevant; how has management coaching been empirically studied and where should we look next; and how has it been reflected (and what has stayed out of sight)?

While I discuss these three questions separately I am aware that empirical and theoretical frameworks cannot be considered as independent, as the creation of knowledge is always dependent on specific epidemiological and ontological decisions (Law, 2004). These decisions are reflected both in the choice of research methodological designs, and in the interpretation of a phenomenon through a theoretical framework.
3.2.1. Contextualizing Management Coaching
The review of the present coaching literature suggests that the intervention is currently theorized through psychotherapeutic models of change. These models allow us to describe the outcomes of the intervention, and to interpret the effects of the intervention. In general, behavioral, psychoanalytic and narrative approaches were most commonly used. The use of theoretical models varied between the empirical and the position papers. In the position papers, psychoanalytic and narrative models were predominantly used, while in the empirical studies, half of the works were oriented towards behavioral theories. A number of reasons may contribute to this circumstance. The published position papers might be understood as the current ‘theoretical avant-garde’ of management coaching, which has not yet found its way into the empirical research community, and the choice of papers might reflect fashionable debates in academia. Notable is that behavioral models were not used in the position papers, but were strongly drawn upon in the empirical papers. On the other hand, behavioral models are known to be highly cherished as a basis for quantitative studies, due to the objectification of their claims through linear correlation of variables. Therefore, behaviorism is the dominant research approach in mainstream empirical psychology.

While there is a variation of the conceptualization of management coaching between these three approaches (which can themselves be further differentiated into sub-schools of various sorts), I argue that management coaching is overall conceptualized in a homogeneous way. All three approaches construct the intervention in close proximity to psychotherapeutic models of change, and thus to the psychotherapeutic discourse. While the question ‘how psychotherapeutic is coaching’ is vividly discussed in the field of coaching (at least by practitioners; (Hart, Blattner, & Leipsic, 2001)), my interpretation of the literature sides with a number of scholars who have generally pointed out that coaching and psychotherapy are based on similar theoretical constructs (Hart, Blattner, & Leipsic, 2001; Barner & Higgins, 2005, Gray, 2006, Visser, 2010; Gray, Ekinci, & Goregaokar, 2011; Segers & Inceoglu, 2012) and have functional similarities (McKenna & Davis, 2009) and claim that coaching draws on the principles and processes of psychotherapy (Judge & Cowell, 1997).

Furthermore, the Organization Studies papers tend to conceptualize management coaching in sole reference to the effects of the intervention on the individual (and his or her effects on organizational productivity). Most studies did not consider the organizational or social context in which the intervention was embedded. Only three psychoanalytic-inspired papers and one narrative paper mentioned the context of the intervention. The three psychoanalytic papers acknowledged that the coached individual has to balance between
one’s individual needs and the needs of the organization. The call is to ‘focus on more than
the individual and more than what is conscious’ (Orenstein, 2002, p. 372) in the course of
the coaching intervention, yet the organizational dimension of management coaching is left
unexplored. Stelter’s paper (2009), which is based on a narrative framework, considers the
social context of the intervention when he suggests that coaching should be seen to help
people adapt to the requirements of post-modernity.

Taking issue with this assessment I suggest that management coaching phenomenon
lacks contextualization. While I later use discourse theory to discuss the notion of
contextualization in more depth, let me at this point merely state that the idea of
‘contextualization’ has been pondered upon in Organization Studies for the last 30 years.
This is no wonder given the importance context has for the understanding of a phenomenon.
When I thus suggest that current discussion on management coaching lacks contextualization I mean to say that the organizational, social, cultural, and historic
embeddedness of this intervention might be more thoroughly brought forward.

3.2.2. Exploring Practices and Processes of Management Coaching

Turning to the question of how management coaching has been empirically explored, it can
be stated that phenomenological survey studies, interpretative-deductive case vignettes and
positivistic-quantitative questionnaire studies are the most common means of investigation.
Furthermore, the base theories used to frame management coaching stand in direct relation
to the research methods used in the study. The studies based on behavioral models of change
used normative-functional research methodologies, especially self-report questionnaires.
These studies aimed to measure the effectivity of the intervention, either by retrospective
assessment or through pre-post study designs. Psychoanalytic studies were based on case
vignettes, which were used to illustrate the client’s psycho-dynamics, as well as the merits
of psychoanalytic interventions. Finally, the only empirical study based on a narrative model
of reflection used interviews with coached managers over the course of the intervention to
work out the advantages of the intervention in terms of a more coherent sense-making.

The greater part of empirical papers might be considered exploratory. This applies to
both quantitative and qualitative studies. Statistic-quantitative studies seldom fulfilled the
standard outcome study conventions that are needed to interpret the statistical results
(Millsap & Maydeu-Olivares, 2009). Most studies used post-hoc designs or pre-hoc designs
without control groups, and selection effects were not controlled so that the directionality of
correlations could not be interpreted. The phenomenological survey studies, except one
(Bachkirova & Cox, 2007), did not present the research questions of analytical methods
used to categorize the data. These studies might be described as content studies that probe into the field. Furthermore, most hermeneutic studies can be described as ‘action research’ in which the authors themselves facilitated the intervention and on this basis wrote up their experiences. These empirical studies did not explicitly reflect their role in the intervention / data collection process, and few actual empirical examples were given to illustrate their assumptions.

My conclusions on the quality of the presented empirical works stands in line with those of other coaching reviews conducted in the more psychological tradition of coaching research. These reviews suggest that coaching research ‘is still in the early stages of development’ and that current empirical works tend to lack methodological rigor (Grant & Cavanagh, 2007). Concerning the themes studied, a comprehensive review of the empirical coaching research by Ely et al. (2010) conclude that ‘self-reported changes in clients’ leadership behaviors are the most frequently assessed coaching outcome, followed by clients’ perceptions of the effectiveness of coaching’ (Ely et al., 2010, p. 358).

Overall, in the empirical studies the authors seldom accounted for the practices used in the intervention. Even if different coaches were used in the study design, the coherence of the practices was not controlled, and the studies hardly gave any information on the background of the coaches and their favored coaching procedures. Moreover, contextual information on the organizations and the coached managers was also scarce.

My suggestion here is to be more doubtful of the assumptions that are currently in vogue in the discussions and instead to unravel the practices and processes that constitute management coaching. The analysis of concrete practices would allow an in-depth reflection of the effects of management coaching and thus supplement the current assessments, which are largely based on speculative assumptions or generalized questionnaire materials. Bringing the actual practices of management coaching under review gives more contour to the intervention and its effects.

3.2.3. Engaging in Critical Reflections on Management Coaching

In this section I answer the question: how has management coaching been reflected upon? My problematization focuses on the current theoretical and empirical representations, making use of the schema first presented by Burrell and Morgan (1979; Morgan, 1980) and further developed by Stanley Deetz (1996). The schema might be understood as a means of orientation that allows us to differentiate between different representations of management coaching.
To be able to use these schemata I need to make a brief introduction: basically, the schema of Deetz recognizes that various theories give different answers to basic epistemological and ontological questions. It is also suggested the production of knowledge commonly takes place within the outlines of specific discourses. As a result different paradigms about the nature of the world, the relation of the researcher towards it and the means to investigate empirical phenomena co-exist. Basically, Deetz then distinguishes four different modes of representation (see Figure 2), each linked to a specific agenda and bound to specific discourses which define its relation to the production of knowledge. The four prototypical paradigms are further distinguished along two dimensions.

**Figure 2: Differences in research approaches in Organization Studies (Deetz, 1996, p. 198)**

The axis ‘local / emergent’ vs. ‘elite / a priori’ asks out of which understanding the research concept arises. As Deetz indicates: ‘In the two extremes either concepts are developed in relation with organizational members and transformed in the research process or they are brought to the research ‘interaction’ by the researcher and held static through the research process - concepts can be developed with or applied to the organizational members being studied.’ (Deetz, 1996, p. 159; original emphasis).
The second prototypical dimension, ‘consensus’ vs. ‘dissensus’, focuses on the relation between the research approach and the existing social order. This dimension asks how far a theme is politicized or maintained. This dimension is thus sensitive to the question of emancipation in research. It asks how far dominant discourses (which place limitations on people and constrain their human needs within organizational life) are being contested or reproduced (see Deetz, 1996, p. 197). Research near the consensus pole tries to display the order of a presumed shared world; it supports the status quo without challenging the priorities of this condition — thus treating it as politically neutral. Such research can be understood as affirmative. The antagonistic discourse is situated near the dissensus pole, which is research that challenges existing orders, values, practices and routines, and highlights the tensions, struggles and conflicts within them. Such research will attempt to deconstruct restraining discourses by uncovering them and showing their malicious effects.

Ordering the reviewed empirical literature along these dimensions, I suggest that the behavioral and anecdotic papers might be best understood as normative and functional. Their understanding of management coaching is consistently positive, aiming to make general assumptions about the nature of the intervention. In this paradigm research follows the unquestioned basic assumption that management coaching is helpful. When Burdett, for example, states that coaching is the ‘secret weapon of many outstanding organizations’ (Burdet, 1998. P. 142), he leaves little doubt as to the positive effects of management coaching. This research does not question the assumption that coaching is wholesome. Moreover, both the theoretical and empirical research attempt to support the existing apparatus and affirmative ideology of management coaching. This is, for example, the case when Giglio, Diamante and Urban (1998) attempt to make a general description of coaching processes (without an empirical grounding to illustrate this), or when Rappe & Zwick (2007) use various analytical methods to support the positive effects that bring about change in the manager. They work from an assumption that management coaching is a legitimized, hegemonic administrative process that produces fruitful results.

The phenomenological surveys and the psychoanalytic-based papers might be understood as being closer to the local / emergent pole. The phenomenological studies would ask relevant agents what they thought were the important characteristics of management coaching and then attempt to categorize these statements. These categories are then treated as a first exploratory step to a better understanding of management coaching and presented as objective representations. The presented psychoanalytical papers can be described as interpretative. The empirical and position papers attempt to interpret the dynamics of the managers through the use of psychoanalytic theory. With the exception of
the papers from Arnaud (2003) and Day (2010), which also considered how management coaching might help reflect the tension between organizational and individual needs/desires, the psychoanalytic papers hardly relate to its political character.

Finally, the large group of narrative-based theoretical papers and the empirical work grounded on Luhmann’s notion of first and second order reflection have an affinity to a dialogical paradigm. However, as the theories are individual-centered, they mostly consider the multiple-voices and tensions within the manager, and how special techniques can be used to bring these into dialogue. These papers do not identify tensions or the multiplicity of the organizational world, and we might thus understand them as consensus-oriented, concerning the role of coaching intervention in the organization.

Concluding, and in reference to Deetz’s schema, I suggest that overall there is a lack of dissensus-oriented, critical-reflexive approaches to management coaching. Furthermore, the local and emergent qualities of the intervention have to date been scarcely empirically studied. While it is understandable that coaching practitioners have a heightened interest in the promotion of their services, it might be of advantage to all parties involved to consider also the constraining and negative effects. This, I believe, might add to the professionalization of management coaching. It is also suggested that a more diverse theorization of the intervention, in terms of dialogical and critical perspectives, might yield a more integrative understanding of management coaching. This would mean engaging in research that questions the motives, justifications, and power relations that this intervention entails.

3.3. Chapter Summary
In this chapter I have mapped out the field of management coaching. Through a comprehensive literature review of the OS literature, I have attempted a fuller understanding of how this intervention is currently represented in academic discussions. I have shown that management coaching is commonly conceptualized through psychotherapeutic models of change, that the main concern of the applied base theories is to describe the basic mechanisms of the coaching process, and that both the social and the organizational context have been defocused at the expense of acknowledging issues of power and politics associated with the application of the intervention. Furthermore, I have documented that empirical coaching studies commonly use either quantitative-statistical, (explorative) survey-phenomenological, or qualitative-hermeneutic study approaches.

This mapping and the discussion of the literature have led to three larger problematizations of the current debates. First, it can be assessed that the academic
discussions of management coaching focus on the manager and are oriented towards psychotherapeutic theories of change. Even if interpretative or dialogical theories have been used, these are limited to the ‘inside’ of the coaching session and to the experiences of the manager. They conceptualize only the variables and mechanism of change that affect the manager within management coaching sessions. The map of management coaching has a large unexplored territory, in that the intervention itself does not appear as an organizational phenomenon and neither does the social background become explicit.

Secondly, questions of the emergent and local becoming of management coaching have only been marginally touched upon (empirically). Therefore, the actual practices and institutional routines have not been disclosed. In other words, we still know little about what goes on in management coaching and how the intervention is constituted within specific organizational and socio-historic contexts. As Feldman (2005) has stated, coaching currently remains a ‘black box’, by which he means that we know next to nothing about the concrete practices used by coaches, the dynamics in which the conversations unfold and the relational processes between coach and manager. This corresponds to the calls of HRM research in general, to engage in more in-depth research of the actual practices in use.

Thirdly, critical and reflective voices on management coaching have been quite sparse. There has been hardly any debate about how the intervention installs social and organizational power relations, what possible side-effects might be, and how underlying logics might be based on one-sided or false assumptions.

Overall, this thesis therefore takes specific interest in conceptualizing and exploring the practices of management coaching within different levels of their enactment as well as critically reflecting on its effects. By exploring these dimensions of management coaching and looking into the concrete practices of the intervention, the thesis more generally answers the general research interest to uncover the workings of the psycho-managerial complex in HRM interventions. Moreover, to be able to engage effectively in such a procedure a coherent framework is needed that is sensitive to multiple contexts, allows us to study the unfolding of concrete practices, and is conscious of issues of power and politics. Currently such a framework has not been manifested in the study of management coaching. However, Human Resource Management studies have anticipated such a framework and it has been suggested that the study of discursive practices of HRM interventions might be a fruitful field (McKenna, Richardson, & Manroop, 2011; Harley & Hardy, 2004). The next section therefore advocates the use of discourse theory and fabricates a theoretical framework that allows us to study the practices of management coaching at different levels of enactment and critically reflect on their effects.
4. EXPLORING MANAGEMENT COACHING THROUGH DISCURSIVE PRACTICES

The aim of this chapter is to craft a theoretical framework to study the psycho-managerial complex by investigating the practices of management coaching. The theoretical framework more specifically works around the three problematizations I have made about management coaching: I conceptualize the contextual predicaments of management coaching to be able to open the so-called ‘black box’ and thus be able to discuss critically the effects of the intervention. To fulfill this investigation, I examine the rich corpus of discourse theory, which provides a suitable theoretical apparatus with which to examine management coaching.

In section 4.1.1. I offer a brief introduction into discourse theory and orient the reader towards different traditions of discourse analysis. In section 4.1.2. I present an integrative model of discourse which differentiates between three levels of discursive practices: discourse as textual practice, discourse as organizational practice and discourse as social practice. In section 4.2., using the integrative model of discourse, I discuss three ‘sites’ of management coaching: management coaching as conversation, management coaching as organizational intervention, and management coaching as a socio-historic phenomenon. Sections 4.3. and 4.4. then add additional layers to the exploration of these three sites of management coaching. Section 4.3. maintains that the discursive practices of management coaching are best studied by looking into their processual unfolding over time. This section, therefore, argues for a processual stance, which accents the relational and temporal unfolding of discursive practice. In section 4.4. I advocate critical thinking as a means to reflect the effects of the discursive practices and thus add a reflective note to the exploration of management coaching. Section 4.5 then introduces how I explore the three perspectives through two empirical studies of the first two sites and an integrative discussion of the last site on the basis of the two studies. Finally, the last section 4.6. summarizes the chapter.

4.1. Mobilizing Discourse Theory to Study the Practices of Management Coaching

Addressing the three problematizations of management coaching (lack of contextualization, lack of knowledge about the enactment of practices and lack of critical discussion) I incorporate discourse theory as a general framework for engaging in the study of
management coaching. The study of HRM interventions through discourse analysis has been suggested by a number of authors (Lawless, Sambrook, Garavan, & Valentin, 2011; Francis & Sinclair, 2003; Kärreman & Alvesson, 2004; Ainsworth & Hardy, 2009; Martin, Beaumont, Doig, & Pate, 2005). This is not at all surprising since discourse analysis offers ‘a range of linguistic and rhetorical categories to capture the “know how” of a professional group, while also being able to distance oneself from passing judgment about individual practice’ (Sarangi 2002, p. 127, cited in Pawelczyk, 2011. p. 15). In other words it enables us to look into a number of questions about the enactment of management coaching without being a priori tied down by assumptions about the nature of management coaching.

Discourse theory generally acknowledges the importance and organizing capacity of language (Fairhurst, 2009; Grant, Hardy, Oswick, & Putnam, 2004). In Organizational Studies discourse has become a well-established theory (for an introduction see e.g. Grant, Hardy, Oswick, & Putnam, 2004, Phillips & Domenico, 2009, Dijk, 2011) as language (and language use) ‘is increasingly being understood as the most important phenomenon, accessible for empirical investigation, in social and organizational research’ (Alvesson & Kärremann, 2011b, p. 1137). Advocates of discursive theory adhere to its superiority over functional research approaches, as it ‘provides a theoretical and methodological framework for exploring the social production of organizational and interorganizational phenomena’ (Phillips, Sewell & Jaynes, 2009, p. 549). It has recently been suggested by Lawless, Sambrook, Garavan and Valentin (2011) that discourse analysis might offer a way to investigate the local and contextualized practices used in HRM interventions, as well as describe in critical terms the processes they bring forth. As this work operates with several concepts of discourse I will briefly give a summary of some of the major differences between these established theories, before proposing an integrative framework to examine fully management coaching.

4.1.1. Orientations in the Labyrinth of Discourse Theories

The richness of discourse theory and its many analytical applications have produced a heterogeneous body of applications. Accompanying the rise of discursive approaches in Organizational Studies is an increase in debate on how to order, delineate, border and distinguish different conceptualizations. This is attested by several journal special issues e.g. in the Academy of Management (2004), Organization Studies (2004) and Human Relations (2011) that attempt to clarify different understandings of discourse. A number of calls have been made by scholars who view the use of discourse theory as vague, allusive, incoherent, problematic, and greatly varied. It has been stated ‘that the word [discourse] is used to cover
up muddled thinking or postponed decisions on vital analytical matter’ (Alvesson and Karreman, 2000b, p. 1128), that there is a ‘widespread use of broad, non-specific definitions and a bewildering array of methods, approaches and perspectives’ (Grant, Hardy, Oswick and Putnam, 2004, p. 2), and that academic texts using discourse are characterized by ‘notorious vagueness, slipperiness and incoherence’ (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2011a, p. 1194).

In response to these critiques, Alvesson and Kăremann have, in their widely quoted 2000 paper, Varieties of Discourse: On the Study of Organizations through Discourse Analysis, categorized discourse into two types: d-discourse and D-Discourse. In a reworked version of this paper from 2011 they have, for reasons of further clarification, termed d-discourse as text-focused studies (TFS) and D-Discourse as paradigm-type discourse studies (PDS). On the basis of this categorization, Alvesson and Kärremann have shown how some of the tensions that have occupied academic debate on discourse can be attributed to the underlying variance in paradigms and interests. Concretely, text-focused studies (also known as micro-discursive studies, conversation analysis or text-based discourse analysis) place emphasis on the construction of social worlds through linguistic interactions with discourse, which are understood as ‘all spoken and written forms of language use (talk or text) as social practice’ (Wood & Kroger, 2000, p. 19). Within this model, discourses are viewed as locally produced achievements, possessing little or no generalized content (Alvesson & Kärremann, 2011a) as there is no socio-historic context outside people’s linguistic interactions. Such studies generally focus on the concrete performance of text and follow a ‘bottom-up’ or inductive research strategy. On the other hand paradigm-type discourse studies (also known as Foucauldian-type studies, macro-discursive studies or the study of ideology-based world views) accentuate the ways in which social reality is created and reproduced through historically formed systems of ideas. Such representations of social life are less about everyday linguistic interaction ‘and more about historically developed systems of ideas’ (Alvesson & Karreman, 2011, p. 1129); these studies look for repetitive patterns in which ideas are articulated in particular periods of history.

The differentiation offered by Alvesson and Kāremann is a helpful heuristic for the distinction between two different approaches to discourse. The present work is, through the two empirical studies, primarily grounded on text-based discourse analysis. Yet, the discussion of management coaching as socio-historic phenomenon is inspired by paradigm-type approaches to discourse and in this way supplements the text-based analysis of the materials. In the following I introduce my understanding of discourse which I apply in the investigation of management coaching throughout this work.
4.1.2. An Integrative Model of Discursive Practices

Hybrid approaches to discourse, which encompass text-focused and paradigm-based discourse analysis are seldom applied to empirical research (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2011a; Cooren, Matte, Taylor & Vasquez 2007). This is mainly due to what seems like a micro-macro divide in Organization Studies that separates the different traditions of discourse theories. As has been pointed out by Molloy, Ployhart and Wright (2010), the main issue is not that there are actually two incompatible dimensions, but that the micro-macro divide is continually reenacted as academics tend to situate their contributions along one of these poles (perhaps partly due to the macro or micro structure of academic journals).

Furthermore, Cooren, Matte, Taylor, and Vasquez (2007) have suggested paradigm-type discourses ‘must be embodied, materialized or even incarnated in [text-based] discourses, that is, tokens of text or talk, in order for it to be reproduced, sustained and transported from one point to another’ (Cooren et. al, 2007, p. 155). The benefits of more integrative approaches are evident and become visible when considering the limitations that either approach has. In this sense, PDS have been criticized for viewing the world through an interpretative determinism, in which the socio-cultural context is viewed ‘as a bucket somehow externally constraining individuals’ actions and experiences’ (Sutherland, 2007, p. 198); the scope of this research is seen to be too far removed from concrete contexts and local enactment of discourse. On the other hand, TBS are seen to run the risk of being too narrowly focused on the actual texts, thus failing to reflect critically on the broader social dynamics and contextualizations, as well the dynamics that make up hegemonic systems where power and control are perpetuated.

In response to these struggles with discourse, Fairclough, in his attempts to work out the interconnectedness between ideologies and their concrete enactments in everyday life (Fairclough, 1992, 1995), has suggested discriminating between three dimensions of discourse: \textit{discourse as textual practice}, which puts emphasis on language and meanings as the linguistic components of the production of text; \textit{discourse as practice}, which is concerned with contextual ways in which text is produced, consumed and distributed and \textit{discourse as social practice}, which gives attention to ideological and hegemonic formations of text in the wider socio-cultural context. Henceforth I will make Fairclough's second notion ‘discourse as practice’ into ‘discourse as organizational practice’. This has the advantage of avoiding confusion but also fits thematically as it is organizational discourses I consider here. I also take the freedom to call these three notions ‘textual discursive practices’, ‘organizational discursive practices’ and ‘social discursive practices’. These distinctions between discursive practices do not attempt to install fixed hierarchies between
levels of discourse but serve as analytical nomenclatures as ‘[a]ny discursive ‘event’ (i.e. any instance of discourse) is seen as being simultaneously a piece of text, an instance of discursive practice and an instance of social practice’ (Fairclough, 1992, p. 4).

The term ‘practice’ has of course enjoyed an increasing popularity in the social sciences and I am aware that this might lead to confusion as the term is increasingly associated with more-than-discursive frameworks. Reckwitz (2002), for example, distinguishes between practices of the body, practices of the mind, material practices, knowledge practices and discursive practices. It is important to note that my use of the term ‘practice’ is stringently reduced to the notion of discursive practices. While this excludes a wide spectrum of the complexity of social life, I argue that this reduction of complexity is essential for an in-depth understanding of the dynamics discussed in this thesis.

4.2. Discursive practices of management coaching: Textual, Organizational and Social

In this section I argue that Fairclough's model offers an elegant way to respond to the first problematization of management coaching: the lack of theoretical conceptualizations that contextualize the intervention. When studying the discursive practices of management coaching, we gain an understanding of the context in which these practices unfold. I suggest that the three levels of discursive practices can be studied by looking into three different ‘sites’ of management coaching: at each of these sites one of the levels of discursive practices emerges. The three sites are management coaching as conversation, management coaching as an organizational intervention and management coaching as a socio-historic phenomenon. Each of these sites engenders a closer examination of the fundamental areas of management coaching enactment. The first two sites (management coaching as conversation and management coaching as organizational intervention) are examined empirically in this work. The last site (management coaching as socio-historic phenomenon) embeds the other two sites and is used to discuss both the textual and the organizational discursive practices in the concluding chapter of this thesis. Table 7 sets a rudimentary guide to these sites, which I later fully examine in relation to their theoretical frameworks.
These three sites of management coaching should not be understood as incompatible or even detached from each other. Rather each site allows us to focus on aspects of management coaching that supplement each other and add to a more integrative understanding of the workings of the intervention. Taken together the sites show different levels of how discursive practices constitute management coaching.

Overall, conceptualizing management coaching in the form of three discursive practices broadens and deepens the understanding of the intervention. Its enactment is considered at different, interconnected levels taking us from talk in coaching sessions, through talk about management coaching to its position in time and culture. In the following I propose to reflect on, and thus enrich, the analysis of these sites of management coaching through two additional stances: firstly, by exploring how the discursive practices are constituted, through their processual movement through time and space; and secondly, by taking a critical reflexive stance towards the effects the discursive practices of management coaching harbor.

4.3. Enabling the Study of the Discursive Practice of Management Coaching: Taking a Processual Stance

In direct response to the second problematization of management coaching I suggest opening the ‘black box’ of the intervention and considering the relational enactments of management coaching through its practices. The study of practices, I further suggest, is brought to its full potential when exploring how these practices relationally unfold and affect in context.
Here it is necessary to examine how discourses are constituted and how their sequentiality and movement can be studied. Although the potential of discourse analysis to look into the ongoing and processual dimension of social life has been repeatedly attested (Blaschke, Schoeneborn, & Seidl, 2012) this potential seems to have been seldom used for empirical research. Conrad (2004), for example, suggests that in many empirical studies, discourse is still treated as a quasi-static, object-like entity, leading to deterministic theories (p.428) in which ‘the problem of language as the “mirror of nature” that preoccupied the positivists was replaced by simply focusing on the mirror as an object’ (Deetz, 2003, p. 425). The recent evaluation of Blaschke, Schoeneborn and Seidl (2012) goes even further in pointing out that current discursive approaches have not yet used ‘the idea that an organization is not reified and given, but, on the contrary, its perpetuation is continuously at stake and necessitates a continuous reproduction of communication’ (p. 5). That discourses are constituted through different (discursive) actions is, of course, nothing new. Still, as Kärremann and Alvesson argue, too little attention has been placed on exploring how discourses are continuously enacted and thus they suggest that the concept of ‘constituting’ might be further looked into (Alvesson & Kärremann, 2011b, p. 1138). To overcome the traditional, somewhat static view on discourse I suggest looking for alternative, supplementary theories that make it easier to develop discourse into a processual framework.

Process-based approaches such as Actor-Network theory (Whittle, Suhomlinova, & Mueller, 2010), Narrative Theories (Cunliffe, Luhman, & Boje, 2004; Pentland, 1999) or Scandinavian Institutional Theory (Czarniawska, 2009; Czarniawska & Sevón, 2005), have been identified as showing developmental potential for discourse theory. For example, Doolin, Grant and Thomas (2011) ask how new discourses become established and legitimized by using the notion of translation. Discourse analysis, according to the authors, should then ‘understand organizational change as the movement of meanings [and focus] on explaining how new meanings enter the organization and how they gain legitimacy to engender new ways of understanding, being and action’ (Doolin, Grant, Thomas, 2011). Taking on an even broader perspective, Cooren, Vaara, Langley and Tsoukas (2012) argue that organizational scholars should ‘place particular attention to the constitutive role of language in specific organizational contexts and to the study of communication at work through investigating ongoing discursive practices’. The authors especially stress the necessity for developing frameworks that are able to bring a better understanding of the constituting effects of practices in everyday life.
While process thinking has a long tradition in the social sciences, an explicit and organized turn to process thinking in Organizational Studies is a relatively new formation. Process Organization Studies (as it is beginning to be called) might be understood as a loosely connected body of literature, which takes its inspiration from process thinking in a wide range of disciplines, including philosophy, physics and biology. Its common character is that these theories contemplate the temporality and sequentiality of social phenomena. This shifts attention from the study of phenomena (as quasi-objects) to the study of ‘movement and becoming’ (Nayak, 2008, p. 187) and the unstoppable transformation of the social world or, as Hernes (2008) has stated: ‘what we see as an organization is one of many possible outcomes, and that is why it is so important to study the processes by which it becomes rather than just the outcomes’ (Hernes, 2008, p. xviii). Process theorists stress that organizations should be understood through ongoing acts of organizing, rather than as static entities. To organize, from a processual stance ‘implies the transition from a situation of many opportunities in a complex world to one where we apply models of organizing to solve a problem’ (Hernes, 2008, p. xvii). Following an ontology of becoming, process thinking often transforms nouns into verbs (Tsoukas & Chia, 2002), thereby stressing the temporal dimension of social life, its ongoingness as movements through time and space, placing ‘becoming over being, difference over self-identity, and time and temporality over simple spatial location’ (Nayak & Chia, 2011, p. 282).

Taking process thinking onboard I enhance the three sites of management coaching by considering how each of the discursive practices are in movement and which processual patterns we can trace. I follow the proposition that discourses are in constant movement. Discourses travel, occupy new spheres, establish new fields of influence, gain dominance, undergo fusions with other discourses, are marginalized and merged with the contextual surface. With regard to textual discursive practices, they shape conversations and establish specific ways of interpreting experiences. In relation to organizational discursive practices they crystalize in more or less coherent organizational practices, and in relation to social practices they organize social life along broad socio-historic trajectories. Table 8 summarizes the focus of the processual explorations, which I also further elaborate below.
Table 8: Management coaching sites: Processual explorations and frameworks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Coaching as</th>
<th>Focus of processual analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conversation</td>
<td>Linguistic Patterns that unfold over the course of the coaching conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Intervention</td>
<td>Movement and relational arrangement of discourses between realms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-historic phenomenon</td>
<td>The social and historic connects of the intervention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4. Awakening the Potential of Critical Thinking for Management Coaching

A critique is not a matter of saying that things are not right as they are. It is a matter of pointing out on what kinds of assumptions, what kinds of familiar, unchallenged, unconsidered modes of thought the practices that we accept rest upon. (Rose, 1998, p. 155).

I now turn to the third problematization of management coaching: the lack of critically oriented discussions. Once again, the rich corpus of discourse theories can supply us with alternative approaches. Many discourse based studies stand in the tradition of critical-reflexive thinking and have been influenced among others by Marxist theory, the heritage of the Frankfurter School, Feminism, Post-colonial studies and Queer Theory as well as prominently by Michel Foucault, Pierre Bourdieu, Jacques Derrida, Gilles Deleuze and Judith Butler. My suggestion is to operate with a general stance of critical thinking as the basis for the discussion of the discursive effects of management coaching. Critical thinking can then be understood as a research stance, which is not restricted to a specific discipline, paradigm, school or theory of discourse. This allows for an interdisciplinary discursive approach that bridges the borders of different critical ‘schools’. I will take up ideas from Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA; Fairclough 1989, 1992; Wodak & Meyer, 2001; Wodak 2005; van Dijk 2008, 2009), Critical Management Studies (Alvesson & Willmott, 1992a; Barratt, 2003; Fournier & Grey, 2000), and critically informed discussion of the transformations of capitalism (Chiapello & Fairclough, 2002; Thrift, 2005; Illouz, 2011). My special interest is in ‘the ways discourse structures enact, confirm, legitimize, reproduce, or challenge relations of power and dominance in society’ (van Dyk, 2001, p. 353). Moreover, critical thinking is often fueled by an emancipatory agenda as it attempts to bring the dynamics of implicit power structures into the open and, through the examination...
of these structures, counter and de-construct the hegemony of oppressive discourses (Alvesson & Willmott, 1992b).

The critical stance will inform the discussions of the discursive practices and their effects in terms of how management coaching re-enacts and installs oppressive and de-liberating discourses. For each of the discursive sites of management coaching, I will interpret the processes through a critical lens and consider if and how the intervention (re)installs discourses and practices that limit the individual. These critical discussions add an important voice to the discussion of management coaching and relate to the emerging field of Critical HRM studies. As each site of management coaching zooms into a different set of discursive practices each site is attached to a specific discussion. Table 9 gives an overview of the sites, the themes of the critical analysis, and the referenced literatures used therein.

**Table 9: Overview of critical discussion of the management coaching sites**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Coaching as</th>
<th>Theme of critical analysis</th>
<th>Critical literatures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conversation</td>
<td>Inscription of manager into oppressive discourses</td>
<td>Critical speech based discourse studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Intervention</td>
<td>Organization of management coaching as a socio-ideological and technological means of control</td>
<td>Critical (Human Resource Management) Studies, studies of the emotionalization of working life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-historic phenomenon</td>
<td>Management coaching as an agent of the psycho-managerial complex</td>
<td>Sociology of the therapeutic culture, Analysis of transformation of capitalism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From all three sites I suggest that the workings of the psycho-managerial complex, with its tendency to intensify the mechanisms of self-control and the self-management of emotions, will become apparent. Moreover, the discussions will highlight that the different critical positions flow into each other, and supplement our understanding at different levels of the enactment of management coaching.
4.5. Exploring the Discursive Practices of Management Coaching

This section more specifically explains my relation to the three sites of management coaching.

Table 10: Levels of discursive practices and fields of exploration for the three management coaching sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Level of enactment</th>
<th>Explores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management coaching as conversation</td>
<td>Textual Discursive Practice</td>
<td>Positioning Processes in Conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management coaching organizational intervention</td>
<td>Organizational Discursive Practice</td>
<td>Translation Processes in accounts of management coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management coaching as socio-historic phenomenon</td>
<td>Social Discursive Practice</td>
<td>Relationship between textual and organizational discursive practices and the transformations of capitalism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 10 shows I intend to study the textual discursive practices at the site of management coaching as conversation and the organizational discursive practices at the site of management coaching as organizational intervention. Moreover, the third site, management coaching as socio-historic phenomenon, acts as a broader contextualization of the two empirically explored practices; it places the interpretations of the two studies into a larger context and based on a theoretical discussion helps interpret their findings.

4.5.1. The Study of Management Coaching as Conversation

In the first study I explore the question: how are the textual discursive practices of management coaching enacted within coaching conversations? This empirical study understands management coaching as a specific form of conversation. This perspective is grounded on the circumstance that the management coaching intervention is effectively realized through a one-to-one conversation between a coach and manager. The study thus highlights the interplay of textual (discursive) practices that unfold over the course of the coaching sessions. It examines closely the linguistic characteristics of the dialogue that takes place in these conversations. To be able to understand the processes through which the textual practices constitute management coaching, I introduce the notion of ‘positioning’
derived from discursive positioning theory (Davies & Harré, 1990; Harré, Moghaddam, Cairnie, Rothbart, & Sabat, 2009). The theoretical framework — presented in detail in Chapter 5 — will investigate how the coach and manager position self and other in relation to a limited number of discourses in the management coaching sessions. To study the positioning processes that unfold in the conversation, I turn to the more recent developments in discursive psychology, which have focused on the analysis of conversational texts. I concretely use interpretative repertoire analysis (Potter & Wetherell, 1987) and discursive device analysis (Mueller & Whittle, 2011) to operationalize the textual practices in conversation. Furthermore, this exploration is informed by conversation analysis in the tradition of pragmatic linguistics (Drew & Heritage, 1992; Scheglof, 2007).

Moreover, I critically reflect on the management coaching conversations by discussing the effects the positioning processes have on the manager. I especially highlight issues of power, which lead to an inscription of the managers into institutionalized and dominant (managerial) discourses. This discussion targets the effects of positioning processes and contemplates the constraining character of these discourses, especially in regard to the intensification of the self-management of emotions by use of therapeutic practices.

4.5.2. The Study of Management Coaching as Organizational Intervention

The second empirical study understands management coaching as an organizational intervention. This perspective takes into consideration that management coaching takes place in a work setting. It is paid for and organized by the manager’s host organization and stands in the tradition of other HRM interventions. From this perspective, I study how the organizational practices constitute management coaching in the public arena of working life. The perspective focuses on the dynamics through which management coaching becomes constructed from ‘talk about management coaching’. The ways in which people talk about management coaching reflects on the discourses they draw on to make sense of the intervention. Here I examine how the enactment of management coaching involves the interplay of different agents, which actively establish it through their accounts. The analytical resources used to explore this perspective also derive from discursive psychology and I rely strongly on Interpretative Repertoire Analysis (Potter & Wetherell, 1987) through which I explore how agents draw upon the discourses to construct management coaching in the organizational realm.

To bring out the processual aspects of how management coaching is constituted as an organizational practice, I make use of the notion of ‘translation’ as conceptualized in the sociology of translation (Callon, 1986) and in translation studies (Chávez, 2009;
Czarniawska & Sevón, 2005). My use of the notion of ‘translation’ gives attention to the processes through which historically formed discourses spill over into new domains and in the process undergo modifications, but also modify the discourses dominant in these domains. The theoretical framework — which I present in greater detail in chapter 6 — suggests that discourses travel through time, and that we can find clues to these movements in agents’ accounts. Thus, by looking into how management coaching is legitimizised and accounted for as an organizational intervention, it becomes possible to retrace how the psychotherapeutic discourses have been translated into the realm of management. Moreover, I investigate how the managerial and psychotherapeutic discourse that agents draw upon to account for management coaching have been modified and relationally arranged into novel patterns.

I evaluate the effects of the translation of the psychotherapeutic discourses into the managerial realm and I argue that the assimilation of psychotherapeutic discourses into the managerial ethos produces more productive employees by creating a new discursive outline that professionalizes the intimate realms of the self. Here a direct link can be made to the discussions in critical HRM studies on the emotionalization of work life.

4.5.3. The Discussion of Management Coaching as a Socio-historic Phenomenon

This theory-driven discussion of management coaching as a socio-historic phenomenon perceives management coaching in relation to other social practices that have formed over the course of time and in specific cultural contexts. When examining management coaching as a socio-historic phenomenon, I consider how the psycho-managerial complex — as a historically formed movement — is constituted in (and constitutes) management coaching. This perspective is based on the assumption that the intervention is both a product of social and historic dynamics and a continuum and modification of these. The intervention is, on the one hand, a continuation of historically older practices, and on the other, a new developing perspective in an ever changing context. The central process that is described here is the way in which Western societies are moving away from classical capitalism modes — which use technocratic modes of control — towards adapted forms of capitalism — which apply socio-ideological and emotionalized modes of control. Scholars looking into the broader social dynamics of the transformation of capitalism tend to have a critical reflexive position towards capitalism (Thrift, 1997; Illouz, 2007). Moreover, many discussions in the sociology of the therapeutic (Rose, 1990) and the development of HRM (Townley, 1993; Barratt, 2003) are grounded on Foucauldian, critical-based terminologies. This discussion thus considers the larger paradigm-type discourses associated with
management coaching. While deductive in nature this interpretation connects to the two empirical studies and attempts to show how the larger developments towards a new form of capitalism are manifest in the discursive practices of management coaching.

4.6. Chapter Summary

This chapter has refined the general research interests of this thesis — the exploration of the practices employed by management coaching to explore the psycho-managerial complex — by using discourse theory, processual theorizing and critical thinking. The theoretical framework presented in this chapter furthermore responds to the three problematizations of management coaching (lack of contextual conceptualizations, lack of knowledge on the concrete practices and processes and lack of critical voices). Concretely, I have proposed to explore the enactment of management coaching along three sites, which are grounded on an integrative framework of three levels of discursive practices. Furthermore, I have suggested looking into these discursive practices more closely by considering how these practices processually constitute management coaching. Finally, I suggest critical thinking as a means to reflect on issues of power, injustice and dominance at the various levels of management coaching. This leads to two empirical research questions and a theory-based discussion on the larger implications of the study results:

Research Question 1 asks: how are the textual discursive practices of management coaching enacted within coaching conversations? My answer to this question is based on a theoretical framework that applies positioning theory. This study adds to the general research interest of this thesis by making visible how, through the enactment of specific positioning processes, management coaching enacts the psycho-managerial complex.

Research Question 2 asks: how do the organizational discursive practices of accounts of the intervention enact management coaching as an organizational intervention? My answer to this question is based on the notion of ‘translation’ and considers how different discourses are arranged in accounts of management coaching. This study explores, similarly to the first, how management coaching forwards the emotionalization of work life by applying therapeutic discourses.

The theory-based discussion asks the question: how does the psycho-managerial complex become enacted through the discursive practices of management coaching? To answer this I draw upon theoretical discussions on the transformation of capitalism, which I relate to the two empirical studies. This discussion is handled in the form of an interpretative outlook and binds management coaching into a larger context.
The main questions, theoretical concepts and fields of research are summarized in Table 11.

Table 11: Summary of the further structure of the thesis, oriented round three sites of management coaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Basic question</th>
<th>Processual stance</th>
<th>Critical stance</th>
<th>Empirical site</th>
<th>Theoretical resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management coaching as conversation</td>
<td>How are the textual discursive practices of management coaching enacted within coaching conversations?</td>
<td>Studies discursive processes through which manager and coach position themselves and other in a coaching session</td>
<td>Discusses issues of power in the coaching conversation</td>
<td>Transcribed coaching conversations between an Emotional Intelligence coach and middle managers</td>
<td>Positioning Theory, Conversation analysis, Interpretative and Discursive Device Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management coaching as organizational intervention</td>
<td>How are the organizational discursive practices of management coaching enacted through accounts of the intervention</td>
<td>Studies discursive translation processes through which agents account for coaching</td>
<td>Discusses issues of power in association to the use of management coaching in organizations</td>
<td>Transcribed interviews with coaches, managers and HR-managers</td>
<td>Interpretative Repertoire Analysis, Translation Studies, Sociology of translation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management coaching as socio-historic phenomenon</td>
<td>How does the psycho-managerial complex become enacted through the discursive practices of management coaching?</td>
<td>Relates processes of management coaching to transformation of capitalism and the psycho-managerial complex</td>
<td>Discusses how management coaching manifests a new form of capitalism</td>
<td>Theoretical discussion illustrated through the two empirical studies</td>
<td>Foucauldian based Analysis, Sociology of capitalism, Sociology of psychotherapy socio-cultural analysis, Neo-Marxism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the course of the remaining work I present and discuss the study of the textual discursive practices of management coaching as a conversation in Chapter 5, and the study of management coaching as an organizational intervention in Chapter 6. Moreover, informed by these empirical studies, I explore the site of management coaching as a socio-historical phenomenon in form of a discussion in chapter 7.
5. A STUDY OF THE DISCOURSIVE POSITIONING PROCESSES IN MANAGEMENT COACHING CONVERSATIONS

This chapter focuses on the discursive unfolding of interactive processes between a professional coach and middle managers during management coaching conversations. I thus explore the workings of the psycho-managerial complex within the coaching conversations, which allows an in-depth understanding of these dynamics at the level of textual discursive practices.

By selecting management coaching conversations I explore the enactment of a HRM practice that has recently been shown to have a significant impact on the everyday life of the workforce (Clegg, Rhodes, & Kornberger, 2007; Pitsis, 2008) and has become a common form of talk-at-work. Due to its explicit emphasis on the transformation of the employees’ personal priorities, it is regarded as a very powerful form of ‘conversation’ (Wales, 2003; Ellinger, Ellinger, Bachrach, Yu-Lin Wang, & Elmadağ Baş, 2011), particularly applicable to the management of emotions (Wales, 2003). Examining management coaching conversations allows us to understand how the workforce is managed through acts of modifying discourses on emotions. As a consequence, the study connects to the field of reflexive and critical Human Resource Management studies that has recently begun to show an interest in the in situ investigation (Watson, 2004) of the relational effects of HRM interventions; especially what has been called socio-ideological forms of management (Kärreman & Alvesson, 2004) which attempt to control employees by influencing the soft, ludic and affective priorities of the self (Costea, Crump, & Amiridis, 2008). Therefore, I explore how coaches attempt to inscribe managers into a set of emotionalized discourses over the course of a coaching conversation by following the question: how are the textual discursive practices enacted in management coaching conversations?

I first develop a more specific conceptual framework, drawing upon positioning theory, which allows us to study the relational processes between coach and manager along their temporal unfolding. The second part of the chapter then illustrates the processual analysis used and explores the interpretation of this analysis. The final section discusses the materials and the possible effects they suggest.
5.1. A Discursive Framework of Positioning Processes

To be able to study the dynamic of the textual discursive practices in management coaching conversations I draw upon positioning theory (Davies & Harré, 1990; Harré & Langenhove, 1991; Harré & Langenhove, 1999; Harré, Moghaddam, Cairnie, Rothbart, & Sabat, 2009; Slocum-Bradley, 2010) due to its ability to portray the relational dynamics in interaction. Positioning theory is based on psychological social constructionist thinking (Burr, 2003) and has close ties to discursive psychology and to narrative theorizing (Rhodes & Brown, 2005) that has its philosophical foundations in the writings of Bakhtin, Vygotsky and Wittgenstein (see Howie & Peters, 2007). As Harré and van Langenhove (1999, p. 16) have suggested, ‘positioning can be understood as the discursive construction of personal stories that make a person’s actions intelligible and relatively determinate as social acts and within which the members of conversations have specific locations’. Narrative theorists have also suggested (Rhodes & Brown, 2005) that often parallel and conflicting stories exist and that there is a tendency for some narrations to gain interpretative dominance over others. The stories and the ‘locations’ of self and other are thus not fixed, but are constituted through discursive acts in which the self and others are negotiated. Moreover, positioning theory is ‘concerned with revealing the explicit and implicit patterns of reasoning that are realized in the ways that people act towards others’ (Harré, Moghaddam, Cairnie, Rothbart, & Sabat, 2009, p. 9); it aims to understand how positions are constituted through dynamic processes of interaction.

Historically, positioning theory was first suggested as a means to overcome static understandings of ‘role’ by replacing it with the more dynamic metaphor of positioning (Davies and Harré, 1989). Although positioning theory has recently been applied to the study of larger scale communications, such as military conflicts (Harré, Moghaddam, Cairnie, Rothbart, & Sabat, 2009) or patent conflicts (Moghaddam, 2003), most positioning studies have favored the analysis of conversations. Here lies the greatest potential of positioning theory for this study, as it depicts the practice of conversation and argues that people position themselves and others ‘in relation to discourse in the very moment of making an utterance’ (Winslade, 2005, p. 352). Even though positioning theory emphasizes the continuous nature of positioning and is sensitive to the moment-by-moment negotiations of meaning in conversation (Davies & Harré, 1990), there is a scarcity of empirical studies that have made use of this processual capacity (Harré, Moghaddam, Cairnie, Rothbart, & Sabat, 2009); especially those tracing constitutive processes in longitudinal episodes.

The relative lack of processual positioning studies is partly due to the circumstance that scholars have not examined the processual aspects inherent in positioning theory.
radically enough. I share the recent evaluation of Blaschke, Schoeneborn and Seidl (2012) who have pointed out that current discursive approaches have not fully explored ‘the idea that an organization is not reified and given, but, on the contrary, its perpetuation is continuously at stake and necessitates a continuous reproduction of communication’ (p. 5).

A noteworthy exception to this is Bisel and Barge’s (2011) in-depth study of a planned change in a healthcare and hospice organization. This study is based on interviews and field observations that reveal the continuity of the repositionings of employees, and suggests that we need to ‘explore the connection among positions, storylines, and speech acts’ (Bisel & Barge, 2011, p. 261). The study attempts to forward the slumbering richness of positioning theory by reading it against the considerations of current developments in process theorizing (Hernes, 2008) and attempts to reinvent the processuality of discourse theory in particular. By focusing on positioning, we can analyze the continuum of discursive practices and their movements by acknowledging the premises of process theory that situate ‘becoming over being, difference over self-identity, and time and temporality over simple spatial location’ (Nayak & Chia, 2011, p. 282). Taking an interest in the movements of discourses over time, this work aims to study the mechanisms of change by following how agents are positioned and repositioned in conversation (Marshak & Grant, 2008; Bisel & Barge, 2010).

Applying these processual considerations to positioning theory means also differentiating between position and positioning, which is, of course, not new to positioning scholars, as Davies and Harré (1990) have stated: ‘With positioning, the focus is on the way in which the discursive practices constitute the speakers and hearers in certain ways and yet at the same time is a resource through which speakers and hearers can negotiate new positions. A subject position is a possibility in known forms of talk; position is what is created in and through talk as the speakers and hearers take themselves up as persons’ (Davies & Harré, 1990, p. 63, emphasis added). What, however, can form an expansion of the theory is an attempt to analyze the constituting positioning actions, as well as the representations of this action, the discursive positions, over the course of time. The theoretical framework thus aims to trace the temporal positioning dynamics of interaction between various agents, and thus to study the complex relational patterns that emerge therein. Concretely, I suggest differentiating between positions (the discursively shaped representations of reality against which agents construct self and others), positioning practices (the linguistic/discursive actions through which agents bring self and other into relation to positions) and the positioning process (the evolving patterns of communication which are composed of complex maneuvers between positioning practices and positions.
5.2. Towards a Research Design for the Study of Positioning Processes

The attempt to trace the complex relational patterns of positioning in management coaching conversations involves ‘yet another struggle for the researcher — how to connect feasible empirical studies to the complex reflections on the ontological and epistemological role of discourse and provide new explanations of organizational structures and processes’ (Grant & Hardy, 2004, p. 9). Specifically, I identify three methodological challenges that require further examination. Firstly, in analogy with Bateson’s (1979) dictum of finding a difference that makes a difference, we need to identify which kinds of discursive position make a relevant difference; a question that will construct a specific understanding of change. In other words it is necessary to define the discursive positions relevant for the managers. Secondly, I need to develop a research design that makes positioning processes feasible for empirical research. Thirdly, there is a need to operationalize the analytical distinctions that ground this research design.

Concerning the first methodological aspect, I focus on the unfolding process through which a coach and managers negotiate the aims of the intervention by means of constructing ‘the problem’. Coaching conversations, like other forms of counseling, such as psychotherapy, medical counseling or business counseling, can be described as professionalized problem talk between a manager as a lay person and a coach as expert facilitator (Watzlawick, Weakland, & Fisch, 1974). Problem talk ‘consists of portrayals of (and interactions about) aspects of people’s lives as undesired and, perhaps, warranting change in behavior or perspective’ (Miller & Silverman, 1995, p. 725). Problem constructions are then of central importance, as they focus attention on some interpretations while marginalizing others; in so doing, they legitimize specific (discursive) actions which have considerable consequences (Carroll, Hatakenaka, & Rudolph, 2006). This of course resonates with the general idea of positions as ‘a cluster of rights and duties that limits the repertoire of possible social acts available to a person’ (Moghaddam, Harré, and Lee, 2008, p. 294). I thus suggest that the discursive positions used to construct the problem have a significant impact on the managers and that a repositioning towards these discourses makes a difference because problem constructions attribute attention.

With regard to my second point, research design, I suggest making positioning processes feasible for empirical study by dispersing its complexity through several
constitutive analytical steps. Here, the framework takes inspiration from the study of shifts in patients’ self-narrations, as studied in narrative and discursive psychotherapy process research (Matos, Santos, Goncalves, & Martins, 2009; Sluzki, 1992; 1998). Based on the above analytical distinctions between positions-as-discourses, positioning through discursive practices and positioning process, the analytical design consists of the following three analytical steps, each guided by an analytical question. Firstly, I investigate the discursive positions managers and coaches use to construct ‘the problem’. Secondly, I ask which linguistic practices the coach used to position him or herself and the manager towards the construction of the ‘problem’. While these two analytical steps do not take the temporality of the conversation into account, the last step will do so. Here I analyze how the relational discursive positions and positioning practices develop over the course of the sessions. This last step of analysis brings out the repetitive temporal patterns (Langley & Tsoukas, 2011) visible in each conversation. As a means of demonstrating the variability of patterns, the analysis finally contrasts three cases, but due to space restrictions, only represents one in great detail.

For the third methodological point, the operationalization of discursive positions, positioning practices and the positioning process, I draw upon the rich expertise of discursive psychology (Potter & Wetherell, 1987) which shares the fundamental assumptions of positioning theory. Here, I operationalize discursive positions by representing the constructions of the ‘problem’, through Interpretative Repertoires (IRs) defined as ‘clusters of terms organized around a central metaphor, often used with grammatical regularity’ (Wiggins & Potter, 2008, p. 74). Moreover, I use the recent concept of discursive devices (DDs) to conceptualize the use of positioning practices within the conversation. Recently, interpretative repertoires have been criticized for tending ‘to reduce the complexity and variability of language use to a few distinct repertoires’ (Mueller & Whittle, 2011) and as being an ill-defined concept and analyzation process. In opposition, Mueller and Whittle propose the use of discursive devices, where they suggest a closer examination of performative language and thus analyze the ‘micro-linguistic tools that people use in interaction in order to construct a particular version of the world and their relationship to it’ (Mueller & Whittle, 2011, p. 189). Discursive devices are understood as the linguistic markers that arrange and position the interpretative repertoires as representation of content within the text. In other words, discursive devices (micro-level of interpretation) display actions within the texts, while interpretative repertoires (meso-level of interpretation) are the abstracted central category of textual meanings, which unfold their agency as specific representations of the world. Furthermore, I conceptualize the positioning
process as the relational patterns of IRs and DDs between coach and manager over the course of time. A multi-step analysis is needed to come to an understanding of the positioning processes and it is necessary to understand how the problems are constructed (positions) and which linguistic practices are used (positioning practices):

Analytical Question (AQ)1: How are the problems which account for the coaching intervention constructed through use of specific problem constructions (IRs)?

AQ2: How do the coaches position themselves and the manager through the use of linguistic practices (DDs)?

AQ3: How does the positioning process unfold over the course of the session?

The third analytical question further differentiates between two (interrelated) forms of process. A first understanding considers ‘process-as-change’ and looks to understand the shift of positions over the course of the session. The processes described here help us to understand what changes over the course of the session and where it changes to. A second consideration focuses ‘process-as-relational-dynamic’ and looks at how the relational interplay between coach and manager is accentuated over the course of the sessions. This differentiation leads to two sub-questions:

AQ3a: How are the problem constructions (operationalized through the problem consolidating IRs) distributed across agents and over time?

AQ3b: How do coach and managers interact over the course of the session (interplay between the use of problem constructions and positioning practices)?

5.3. Research Methods: Data collection, Sample Selection and Analysis

The data for this chapter stems out of a corpus of nine audio-taped and fully transcribed ‘Emotional Intelligent Coaching’ management coaching processes. Each coaching process consisted of three to nine sessions, with each session lasting between 1 and 2.5 hours, totaling over 115 hours of video material, or close to 80,000 lines of transcript. Written consent to use the materials for academic study was given by both the managers and the coaches (who recorded the sessions in their practices).
Emotional Intelligent Coaching was selected as the site of research as it offered to be a highly appropriate site to study how psy-practices are employed to management emotions through management coaching. As Graf has summarized:

‘Emotional Intelligent Coaching applies the core features of Emotional Intelligence as formulated by Goleman (2006), namely self-awareness, self-regulation, self-management, empathy and relationship management. The coaches overall professional coaching goal is to re-direct clients’ attention from a cognitive, fact-oriented to an experiential, emotion-oriented access to their questions and concerns, and to raise their self-awareness and self-reflection, thus strengthening their self-regulation.’ (Graf, forthcoming)

Furthermore, the set-up of this form of coaching could be identified as a typical form of management coaching: the intervention was directed at middle managers (all working in the financial industries), the company organized and funded the intervention, the coaching sessions took place in the form of one-to-one conversations between the coach and the manager, the sessions were held in the practice of the coach and the coach worked as a freelancer. Finally, the coachings were all facilitated by a renowned coach — with a background in business administration and more than 10 years of freelance coaching experience — who also heads a coaching training institute; this ensured that the coaching processes were performed by a ‘professional’ management coach.

Moreover, to be able to study the variations between different positioning processes I analyzed three different cases. As a first step all sessions were transcribed using the halb-interpretative Arbeits-Transkription (HIAT) agreements (see figure 7 in the Appendix for an example of the HIAT format). The selection criteria for the three selected cases were based on a close reading of all nine coaching cases. A first close reading of the transcripts suggested that the selected three cases would allow the illustration of variation in the interactions between coach and managers. The presented analysis is overall based on more than 460 pages of verbatim transcript3.

3 Any selection is, of course, a compromise between complexity and feasibility of a study. I would follow Cooren’s (2006) statement that ‘more complex and less bounded episodes would have been too messy and more difficult to clearly analyze in the (...), even if we are convinced that the analytical frame-work proposed in this article could also have revealed their structure and organization” (Cooren, 2006, p. 541).
As stated, all coaching sessions were funded by the managers’ host firms and organized through the HRM departments of these companies, suggesting that the HR managers were aware of the agenda of the ‘Emotional Intelligent Coaching’ and explicitly selected it for their managers. The background of the managers can be described as follows: Josef⁴ is a head of department of an insurance company, Julia is a senior finance consultant of an insurance company, and Richard is the head of a branch office.

Grounding on Graf’s (2011) argument that the negotiations of the constituting agenda are central to the coaching encounter I chose to analyze the first sessions, each lasting between 2 and 2.5 hours. First session encounters have indeed been connected to the negotiation of the overall agenda and it has even been stated that the process of these sessions has predictory power concerning the overall and outcome of problem based consultation (Saltzman, Creaser, & Howard, 1976).

The data was analyzed along the three analytical steps, c.f. Table 12.⁵

**Table 12: Overview of the theoretical concepts, their operationalizations and the attached analytical steps**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operationalization</td>
<td>Interpretative Repertoires</td>
<td>Discursive Devices</td>
<td>Relation between DDs and IRs over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical Analysis</td>
<td>Analytical Step 1</td>
<td>Analytical Step 2</td>
<td>Analytical Step 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the first two analytical steps data was analyzed in a recursive process involving first open interpretations, coding of episodes and categorization of similar text fragments using ATLASTi and Scrivener, a multi-layered text organization tool. In an attempt to find interpretative categories that would allow variation as well as coherence, I moved through a number of ‘models’ which were validated, tested and reworked going through the empirical material, until I felt confident that they could sufficiently summarize the agents’ accounts of coaching to one or more of the built repertoires (Alvesson, 2010). In a recursive coding process, the texts were tagged, primary interpretations were discussed with a group of

⁴ All names are pseudonyms. Transcripts were modified to ensure the anonymity of the managers.

⁵ Sessions transcripts were analyzed in the original German language. For the purpose of this paper illustrated sequences were translated into English by the author.
colleagues, texts recoded, meta-categories built, then discussed again in various iterative cycles (Wiggins & Potter, 2008; Potter & Hepburn, 2008). Figure 3 shows one of the early analytical steps in which DDs and IRs were tagged along side each other for the whole transcripts. Moreover, the first analytical step was cross-validated through a separate analysis of the interview materials in study 2, which showed that similar problem constructions were used in agents’ account of management coaching (see Table 28 in appendix). Also, to ensure the validity of the interpretations regular peer feedback meetings with colleagues were held to present and discuss the interpretation of the materials; this led to a recursive sharpening and reformulating of the interpretations. Finally, the analysis was also presented and discussed in front of an international expert audience.

Table 13 summarizes the elements used in the analytical process. While these elements tend to succeed each other the presented order of the table does not mean to suggest a linear procedure; rather — to use a metaphor — the data analysis can be understood as a weaving process in which different threads produce the tight interpretative fabric that is presented in the following sections. To further ensure the conformability of the interpretations the analysis section gives extended examples of the initial transcripts, followed by my interpretations.

Table 13: Elements of analytical process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Close reading and transcripts</th>
<th>Probing materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commenting and highlighting of interesting episodes (see figure 7 in Appendix)</td>
<td>Probing materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First categorization and summary of episodes (see figure 6 in Appendix)</td>
<td>Condensing interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarizing of clusters of episodes</td>
<td>Condensing interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer discussions to substantiate first interpretations on the basis of extended data reports</td>
<td>Condensing interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reworking of categorizations to assess if interpretations represent the aggregated materials</td>
<td>Stabilizing interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rereading of entire materials with a ‘fresh’ perspective and integration of yet unaccounted episodes</td>
<td>Stabilizing interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reworking of categorizations and stabilizing of analysis</td>
<td>Stabilizing interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation of categories with secondary materials on the basis of the interview materials</td>
<td>Stabilizing interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation with studies looking into similar materials and / or using similar analytical methods</td>
<td>Stabilizing interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of materials in front of expert groups to spot incoherent explanations or aspects that were insufficiently accounted for</td>
<td>Stabilizing interpretation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The third analysis is built on the IR and DD categories extracted in the first two analyses. I thus once again went over the full transcripts, now to explore specifically the temporal and relational dynamics of the sessions. This third analysis first counted how often the IRs were represented in each case and then considered how the coach in each case would interact with the managers. Based on this analysis a comparison concerning the variation of positioning processes between the three cases was perused.

5.4. Elements of positioning processes: problem constructions and positioning practices

The following section introduces the basic elements of the positioning process, the problem constructions (positions = IRs) as well as the linguistic practices (positioning practices = DDs). These two elements are a necessary prerequisite to be able to explain the positioning process (the relational patterns between positions and positioning practices across agents and over the course of time).

5.4.1. Positions as Problem Constructions

This first analysis of the coaching conversations aims to answer the analytical question: how are the problems that account for the coaching intervention constructed through use of specific interpretative repertoires? This analysis aims to work out how managers and coaches would argue why the management coaching session was necessary, and which subjects should be given attention. Within the three studied cases, the analysis found a total of five variations of the problem construction: unconscious motives, hauntings of the past, incomplete development, organizational pressures, and personal entanglements. In the following I give a precise description of how these five Interpretative Repertoires were represented in the texts.

Unconscious motives

This IR’s construction of the problem suggests that the manager lacks awareness of currently important psychic dynamics, consisting of emotions and desires, and consequently lacks measures of adequate control over his or her emotions. Emotions in this IR are given an independent agency and portrayed much like an invisible, mischievous leprechaun who plays tricks on the manager by manipulating his or her actions. This is illustrated through the following statement:
» ... in our everyday lives, right?, we are often required to take fast actions, right?, there our routines run automatically or such an automatism runs through, ahm, like you described, right?, there the tension comes up automatically, something controls, yes, ahm. You can’t influence that at all, that just happens... « (Coach in case Joseph)

This IR suggests that rational analysis alone will not liberate the person from these agents, as unconscious and suppressed emotions have a logic of their own, which must be discovered through intensive self-reflection; only then will the person learn to control these mysterious leprechauns and find the pot of gold:

» ... and this ‘’Why’ coming from your head never really gets you anywhere, ahm. And often it’s like this: that, ahm, as long as something stays veiled, as long as something is not emotionally comprehended - you don’t have any orientation at all what really goes on inside of you, ahm - it runs through automatically. So, sometimes, ahm, or very often, you can better control such patterns, such automatic reactions, once you understand what really reacts in a sensitive way inside of you ... « (Coach in case Joseph)

Haunting of the past

In the ‘Hauntings of the Past’ IR, the problem is considered to be a loose end in the manager’s biography, which needs to be attended to, otherwise resulting in untimely, anachronistic and uncalled-for reactions. It is assumed that the person has an ‘emotional experience memory’ into which past experiences, especially ‘traumatic’ experiences are ingrained into the manager’s psyche (coach in case Julia) or as this coach once commented:

» this sounds as if something is really - - almost traumatic (-1-) in any case it seems to have shaken you to the very core « (Coach in case Julia).

Upsetting events, that may lie years in the past or may have just happened, will, according to this IR, become internalized, embodied and stored in deep layers of the self, but will sometimes surface and haunt the person and thus affect present activities. The next extract hints at this as the coach interprets a narration of Richard in which he describes an episode where he was overpowered in an important decision by his boss.
» And there, you can’t reach the sore spot, right? So, with your boss there is just this sore spot of powerlessness « (Coach in case Richard).

In this excerpt the sore spot takes the function of a relic of former experiences that Richard is not able to access and control, and thus they haunt him, so that he cannot but feel helpless in interaction with his boss. This repertoire puts an emphasis on the manager’s past, suggesting that these experiences need to be worked up and reflected upon to resolve the ‘real’ issues at hand.

**Incomplete development**

The problem construction of this IR suggests that the manager has not yet acquired the level of emotional maturity needed to fulfill important psychic functions in his or her private or professional life:

» Well, there is something thin-skinned, yes, something thin-skinned and precisely there the personality plays a role « (Coach in case Joseph).

The metaphor of thin-skinned is used here to indicate that the manager needs to improve his ability to process emotions without reacting negatively to them; thus acquiring a ‘thicker skin’ is seen as a personal development step.

In the next statement Julia describes her problem as a missed development that goes back to her childhood days and is now something of a ‘psychic handicap’:

» I think I am insecure deep inside. I was very insecure as a child, I also had, never had, didn’t have such an outstanding self-esteem« (Julia).

In essence, this repertoire is based on the assumption that the manager has missed a developmental step which coaching can successfully address.

**Organizational Pressures**

The causes of the problem as represented in the ‘Organizational Pressure’ IR are power struggles, politics, bad organizational routines and organizational and economic constraints in the manager’s company that build up high pressures in which the manager becomes an involuntary valve. The problems of the manager are thus reactions to the organizational conditions. One manager explained his stress in the following way:
» Well, of course the pressure has now shifted and increased from then on [due to financial crisis], because the required performance, the goals given to us, to every employee, to me, are exaggerated. Things are running out of perspective and we already know now that we will not be able to meet the goals at the end of the year « (Richard).

The real problems, we learn here, are the unrealistic expectations put forward by senior management. Another similar example is brought up by Julia, when she states that she struggles with the performance-driven corporate culture of her company. She further explains this through an example where she was overburdened with a project:

» He [her boss] gave me the feeling that I have to do it all alone that, that it’s my, my job, my job and that, that’s part of the job to do the project alone and that spiced with anecdotes from a project with COMPANY where the senior consultant got dumped because they blew a project which wasn’t even their fault, but they were sacrificed anyway « (Julia).

Overall, this IR focuses on depicting the contextual work conditions into which the manager is situated.

**Personal Entanglements**

In the last IR the problem is caused by difficult personal relationship dynamics with family members, close friends or colleagues, which then need to be sorted out. In the following excerpt a father explains that he finds the behavior of his son troubling:

» Yes, well, what really gets on my nerves is that he takes everything for granted, ahm, he often takes advantage of my time or my, well yes, money, that really annoys me. It’s less the money, more important is the time. And, what especially annoys me is this taking things for granted - things I do for him like cleaning up the apartment, moving his things, being of service for something « (Joseph).

Basically, strong emotional responses are seen as a consequence of personal interdependencies, entanglements of needs and personal space.

**Discussion of Problem Constructions through Interpretative Repertoires**
A close look at five IRs further indicates that each IR falls into one of two broader categories, which correspond with attribution theory (Kelley, 1973). The first three IRs are constructed in such a manner that they give agency to the person’s emotions and internalize the problem. The last two IRs place attention onto the outer world, contextualizing the manager’s behavior, thoughts and feelings, and refer to structural constraints. Thus these latter two IRs externalize the problem and agency is distributed among several actors to which the manager has complicated relationships.

Table 14: Overview of problem constructions by coach and managers, operationalized through Interpretative Repertoires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRs</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Empirical Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hauntings of the Past</td>
<td>Manager has ‘unfinished business’ which leads to untimely emotionally laden reactions</td>
<td>» ... these psychic wounds, resurfacing out of her youth, were connected to this rebellious behavior and [she realized] that she needs to take care of that and make her biography into a personal concern « (Coach in case Julia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconscious Motives</td>
<td>Manager lacks knowledge of emotional inner world and is steered by unconscious and autonomous motives which conflict with social and professional norms</td>
<td>» ... as long as something stays veiled, as long as something is not emotionally comprehended - you sort of have no real orientation of what really goes on inside - it will just happen«. (Coach in case Joseph)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete Development</td>
<td>Manager has not yet reached the required level of personal development to emotionally perform in an adequate professional manner.</td>
<td>» Well, there is something thin-skinned, yes, something thin-skinned and precisely there the personality plays a role «. (Coach in case Julia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Pressures</td>
<td>Manager is faced with organizational tensions resulting from power struggles, politics and economic constraints in the firm</td>
<td>» ... this is running out of perspective and we already know now that we will not reach the set goals end of the year «. (Richard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Entanglements</td>
<td>Manager is entangled with conflicting personal relationships</td>
<td>»Yes, well, what really gets on my nerves is that he [the son] takes everything for granted, ahm, he often takes advantage of my time or my, well yes, money, that really annoys me. « (Joseph)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The presented problem constructions are much more than simple descriptions of what difficulties the manager faces. The problem constructions are linked to discourses about emotions, productivity and the role the context plays therein. The problem constructions are

---

6 It should be noted that the first three IRs cannot be separated accurately as they are variations of a larger psychotherapeutic discourse, which in itself is a rather heterogeneous body of interpretations. While other orderings might have also been possible (and were extensively pondered during the recursive data analysis process) these three IRs were found most helpful in understanding the dynamics of the conversation.
the points of crystallization around which the sessions are organized. They focus attention and legitimize action; in the terminologies of positioning theory, one might say that they distribute rights and duties over the course of the session. Yet these problem descriptions go further than defining rights and duties. The problem constructions can also be understood as schema in which the narration of the manager is interpreted. In this way they have an indirect impact on the ways in which the managers construct their experiences.

5.4.2. The Coach’s use of Positioning Practices

This section aims to understand better how the coach directs the manager through a number of discursive positioning practices, operationalized through discursive devices. To gain a better understanding of the discursive positioning practices used by the coach, the text was reanalyzed in search of reoccurring discursive devices. While the presented DDs were gained through a ‘bottom up’ analysis, I consulted linguistic conversation analytic literatures (Drew & Heritage, 1992; Peräkylä, 2006; Heritage & Watson, 2009; Heritage & Watson, 1979; Schegloff, 2007) to further define and name the DDs. Table 15 gives an overview of the most frequently used DDs by the coach.

The DDs can further be ordered into three categories. In the first category, ‘interpreting backwards’, all DDs are used by the coach to code or re-code the narrations of the manager. ‘Backwards’ stresses that these positioning acts by the coach are always based on past narrations of the manager. With the second category of DDs, ‘forwards interpreting’, the coach attempts to direct the flow of the conversation onto a new trajectory. Here ‘forwards’ means to capture the future-directed attention the coaching takes. Finally, the DDs in the last category, which I label ‘setting interpreting’, can be considered actions that address the conversation itself. These DDs are talk about talk and interpret how the setting and the rights and duties of the agents are to be distributed. An overview of these three categories and the corresponding DDs is given in Table 16.
Table 15: Overview and examples of positioning practices used by the coach, operationalized through Discursive Devices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCURSIVE DEVICE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessing</td>
<td>Evaluation or estimation of the nature, quality, or functionality of an account (c.f. Heritage &amp; Watson, 1979, 2009)</td>
<td>»Well, there is something thin-skinned, yes, something thin-skinned and precisely there the personality plays a role «.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformulating</td>
<td>Proposition of a version of events which (apparently) follows directly from the other person's own account, but introduces a transformation (c.f. Heritage &amp; Watson 1979; Peräkylä et al. 2008: 48).</td>
<td>»You said it would be good, it would be nice or it would be helpful, ahm, to get a bit more of distance, yes a bit more calmness, right, yes, a bit more calmness so that this doesn't get under your skin «.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirming</td>
<td>Statement which strengthens (or negates) an account though labeling it with disapproving tokens. (c.f. Schegloff in Drew &amp; Heritage 1992)</td>
<td>»Great. Fine. Very good of you to implement it. «</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noticing</td>
<td>Statement which comments non-verbal or paraverbal aspects of emotional communication (c.f. Schegloff, 2007)</td>
<td>»In this moment, as you are speaking, there, there the pressure is rising within you, right.«</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeating</td>
<td>Verbatim repetition of a statement to highlight its importance</td>
<td>»Well, there is something thin-skinned, yes, something thin-skinned «.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrading</td>
<td>Account which emotes or dramatizes an episode</td>
<td>»This sounds as if something is really - - almost traumatic «.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising</td>
<td>Suggestion of a course of action or way of understanding something.</td>
<td>»Essentially, this would be the next step, that you, that one looks together with the leaders &quot;why is it not working?&quot; «</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td>A sequence worded or expressed so as to elicit information</td>
<td>»Now, can you plunge into how you feel, how is the condition in your body and what kind of feelings are shown in your body right now? «</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliciting</td>
<td>A linguistic token used to establish conformity rather than to elicit information.</td>
<td>»... but emotionally its different, right? Yes, yes. «</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>Statement in which a possible action, or inner dialogue of the counterpart is formulated</td>
<td>»If you were to say: &quot;Maybe I have too much drive «</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipative</td>
<td>A linguistic maker that points to the relevance of something</td>
<td>»This is a then a very important question «</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasizing</td>
<td>Statement which explicitly attempts to define the characteristics of one's own role, for example, as professional, experienced or trustworthy etc.</td>
<td>»...okay, where I also have a lot of experience is basically exactly to explore how are the processes of the inner world «</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-displaying</td>
<td>Statement that explains the setting, agenda and thus implies norms</td>
<td>»Good, Yes, then I’ll maybe tell you a little bit about the procedure because you probably do not have a feeling how this could happen now «</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16: An overview of the Discursive Devices used by the coach ordered into 3 categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCURSIVE DEVICE</th>
<th>META-CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessing</td>
<td>Interpreting Backwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformulating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noticing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising</td>
<td>Interpreting Forwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliciting Conformity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipative Paraphrasing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasizing</td>
<td>Setting Interpreting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-displaying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considering these three categories of DDs a further abstraction can be made. The backwards directed DDs focus on the manager’s narrations and specifically comment on these. Supplementarily, the forward directed interpretations attempt to steer the conversation into a desired direction. Finally, the setting interpreting DDs function as a form of talk about talk. They act as a meta-communication through which the coach attempts to establish norms about the aims of the coaching session and the rights and duties of coach and coached manager.

**Discussion of Positioning Practices**

The second analytical step, which aims to trace how the coach positions the manager through a number of reoccurring positing practices (here operationalized through discursive devices) indicates that the discursive practices used in management coaching resemble those commonly found in psychotherapy. The presented DDs, especially those falling into the ‘interpreting backwards’ category (e.g. assessing, reformulation, upgrading, repeating and noticing), have been identified as commonly used linguistic practices within psychotherapy conversations (Pawelczyk, 2011; Kogan & Gale, 1997).

Building on this insight, I propose to conceptualize the pattern of positioning practices used by the coach as ‘empathetic persuasion’, a strategic style of interaction, which does not openly negotiate the relevance of the IRs, but brings the preferred IRs forth, while at the
same time defocusing alternative interpretations. This idea captures a somewhat paradoxical mode of conversation: on the one hand, the notion of ‘empathic’ proposes that the coach tunes into managers in a supposedly sympathized way by highlighting, mirroring and commenting on the emotional aspects of the narration. On the other hand, the notion of ‘persuasion’ accents the persistency of the coach to persuade the manager towards the coach’s own favored interpretations and ends. Taken together ‘empathetic persuasion’ describes how the coach seizes the manager’s narrations with her interpretative scheme while staying in close proximity to the manager’s self-narrations.

By looking at the concrete processes of interaction between coach and managers, I will now demonstrate how this mode of interaction plays out over the course of the session.

5.5. Tracing the Positioning Processes: Distribution of Problem Constructions and Relational Patterns

The third analytical step draws on the two preceding steps. In this section I attempt to answer the analytical question: AQ3: how does the positioning process unfold over the course of the session? My analysis of this question grounds on the assumption that we must differentiate between two forms of processes, which are interconnected but must be analyzed individually. The first form of process is process as change. It considers the problem constructions’ shift over the course of the session. It also looks into variations of the use of problem constructions over the three cases and alongside coach and managers. The second form of process accentuates the relational interplay between agents over time in which the process is described as interaction patterns between agents (process-as-relational-patterns). This leads me to the two analytical questions of this section:

AQ3a: How are the problem constructions distributed across agents and over time?

AQ3b: How do coach and managers interact over the course of the session?

5.5.1. Analysis of Temporal Distribution of Problem Constructions

I first turn to the question of how the problem constructions are distributed over the course of the sessions and cases. The results presented rely on an analysis in which I first coded how often the IRs were used by the coach and the managers in each case. Table 17 shows a summary of this analysis.
Table 17: Use of the problem interpretations in the three cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretative Repertoires</th>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>Case 3</th>
<th>Attribution mechanism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>Julia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauntings of the Past</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconscious Motives</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete Development</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Pressures</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Enmeshments</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results summarized in Table 17 show the relative prevalence of IRs in the text. The interpretation indicates that the use of the five problem-defining IRs were not equally distributed across the three analyzed cases and across agents. It is noteworthy that the coach hardly used the ‘externalizing’ IRs while relying heavily on the ‘internalizing’ IRs. Moreover, Joseph and Julia used the whole spectrum of IRs while Richard only used externalizing IRs. During the analysis it also became apparent that the distribution patterns shifted over time within the individual session, calling for a more in-depth analysis of the temporal effects.

Moreover, taking the sequentiality of the conversations into account I considered how the use of the IRs shifted over the course of the session by analyzing their distribution within the sessions. My analysis suggests the coach’s use of IRs hardly shifted over the course of the session. Concerning the managers: Joseph employed the externalizing IRs at the beginning of the sessions, while later in the conversation he adapted to the internalizing repertoires. Julia, who had already visited an Emotional Intelligence workshop as part of a HRM intervention, also initially used externalizing IRs and internalizing IRs at an early stage of the conversation, but later in the session, like Joseph, she shifted to the exclusive use of internalizing IRs. Finally, Richard’s case showed a different dynamic, as he exclusively used the externalizing IRs, thus dismissing the interpretations of the coach. These dynamics are summarized in Table 18.
Table 18: Constructing the problem dynamics over the course of the three cases.
E = Externalizing; I = Internalizing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case 1: the complicit</th>
<th>Case 2: the experienced</th>
<th>Case 3: the resistant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coach: Internal → Internal</td>
<td>Coach: Internal → Internal</td>
<td>Coach: Internal → Internal (E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion of Distribution of Problem Constructions over Time
While the coach occasionally used the externalizing IRs (for example when agreeing with Richard that family problems may arise when spending too much time at work) and there is variation of the specific use of IRs between cases, the analysis suggests that the coach dominantly used the internalizing IRs. This somewhat contradicts the coach’s claim ‘that coaching is a really close, differentiated work on where the client wants to go’ (coach in case Julia). This claim is further contradicted by two examples: the application of the ‘it gets under your skin’ metaphor in which the coach explains the problem, as well as the employment of the slow-motion hypnotherapy technique (in all the three cases). The omnipresence of the ‘under your skin’ comment and the use of the same hypnotherapeutic intervention suggests rather a standardized intervention than an individually tailored one. This leads me to the conclusion that despite the large variety of concerns initially presented by the managers, the coach enacted the sessions in a routinized form in which the problems were internalized and emotionalized, while contextual circumstances were defocused.

The analysis of processes-as-relational-patterns will show the session dynamics as well as the interactions between the coach and managers in more detail.

5.5.2. Analysis of Relational Pattern over the Course of the Sessions and across Cases
The analysis of the relational interaction processes between coach and manager over time allows us to gain insight into the dynamics of the sessions, the application of positioning practices and the use of problem constructions. In this sense the following analysis binds together the preceding analytical steps. The analysis will also show the application if IRs and DDs through a number of examples, thus adding to the understanding of the analytical steps one and two.
The episodes presented in each of the three cases were selected as they illustrate the overall development of the session. The episodes, ordered along their temporal sequence, illustrate the shifts in the patterns of IR and DD between the two agents. I begin with the case of Joseph, as this in many ways resembles the ‘ideal’ coaching session, in that Joseph has no former experience with coaching and adapts to the interpretations of the coach without objection.

Case 1: Joseph, The Complicit
Joseph is head of a department of an insurance company and has no former experience with coaching or similar person-centered HRM interventions. The coach had been contracted by the HR department of the company, and Joseph had been offered coaching as part of an initiative for top and middle managers. There had been a short telephone conversation before the first meeting in which they had agreed to discuss some of Joseph’s stressful private and work situations. The first shown extract takes place in the first moments of the session.

**Episode 1.1**

9 C: Okay, maybe I should tell you a bit about
10 the procedure, because you probably don’t, ahm, have a feeling
11 how this could take place yet. And, ahm, like a
12 particular situation you just described, ahm,
13 here in the coaching one of the next important steps could be that we
14 look at situations together, that (-2-) yes, are familiar to you. - These can be
15 work context or also from the private area. - that we
16 together, ahm, in detail, like in slow-motion, like, almost like under
17 a microscope, ahm, like that, very precisely, really precise, ahm, be attentive,
18 you could also say observe with more mindfulness, does that
19 word tell you anything? (Mhm) Yes, ahm, because in our everyday lives, right, we are
20 often required to act fast, right, there our routines run automatically or such
21 an automatism runs through, ahm, like you described, right, there the
22 tension comes up automatically, something controls, yes, ahm. You can’t
23 influence that at all, that just happens, (mhm) And you are probably
right, ‘Why is it like this?’, ahm, and this ‘Why’ coming from your head never really
gets you anywhere, ahm. And often its like this: that, ahm, as long as
something stays veiled, as long as something is not emotionally comprehended
- you don´t have no orientation at all what really goes on inside of you, ahm -
it runs through automatically. So, sometimes, ahm, or very often,
one can better control such patterns, such automatic reactions,
once you understand what really reacts in a sensitive way inside of you
or, ahm, what parts of the personality play a role here
so, ahm (mhm) ahm. And that would generally be a big part of the procedure.
So, where I have a lot of experience, ahm, is to exactly to
explore the, the processes of the inner world and the question what can be
- with a better understanding - ways, in real life outside of
this setting here, to become more attentive

M: Mhm, okay.

In episode 1 the coach begins the session by forwarding her understanding of the problem — here using mainly the *Unconscious Motives IR* — even before asking the manager to formulate his concerns (lines 19-34). A large spectrum of DDs are present in this episode: the coach uses the *Orienting DD* to highlight her understanding of coaching, for example, in stating: ‘then I will tell you a bit about the procedure...’ (lines 9f.), additionally emphasizing the importance of working with past experiences. She also advises using a hypnotherapeutic slow-motion technique commonly used in trauma therapy as a means to explore these experiences (lines 16-19). By reformulating the narration Joseph gave during the telephone conversation (‘ ... like you described ...’; lines 21) and further assessing it (‘ ... there the tension comes up automatically, something controls, yes, ahm. You can’t influence that at all, that just happens ...’; lines 21-23), the coach binds the manager’s narration into her interpretative schema: making her assessments seem as a natural consequence of Joseph’s narration. Similarly, by using the *Anticipative Paraphrasing DD* (‘ ... you are probably asking yourself “Gosh! Why? Why?”’; lines 24f.), and then assessing her own statement (‘”Why?” coming from your head never really gets you anywhere ...’; lines 25f.) the coach applies her interpretative schema onto Joseph. Finally, the coach uses the *Self-Displaying DD* to position herself as experienced, combining this with the agenda she set up (‘I have a lot of experience ...’; lines 34f), thus giving her more authority on the matter. This episode is
relevant as the coach implements her authority and defines what coaching is about, how it should be done and how problems are to be interpreted.

This initial episode is followed by an investigation of one of Joseph’s stress situations. Joseph reports repeated conflicts with his son and how this affects his marriage. Concretely he states how he is unnerved by his teenage son’s unending demands and tendency to take Joseph’s efforts for granted.

**EPISODE 1.2**

215  M:  And its always a question (2-) of how much I tell my wife
216  because: ‘How is she going to react?’. Because sometimes
      C:  Yes, yes, yes
217  M:  when I turn down a request of [the son] too fast, ahm, she takes sides with
218  him ahm, and says ‘Hey, you are always opposing him’ or
219  What more do you what from him?’. Yes? No?
      C:  Yes, yes, if … So, if the children had not been then
220  you probably would have had a relaxed marriage (laughs)
      M:  That’s probably true (laughs)
221  C:  Okay convinced! (laughs)
      M:  You never know what would have been different. You never know (laughs)
222  C:  Oh dear; ahm, very wise (laughs), ahm, if there are some issues at hand that need to
      be
223  resolved there will always be some trigger: This time it was simply the kids.

Central to this episode is how Joseph talks about his attempt to navigate between family coalitions and thus uses the **Personal Enmeshment IR**, while the coach positions his experience using the **Unconscious Motives IR** by assessing: ‘if there are some issues at hand that need to be resolved there will always be some trigger’ (lines 222f). This is a typical interaction, which demonstrates how the coach begins to position the manager, on the basis of his narration, towards internalizing interpretations, thus stripping away the complex family dynamics and reducing them to ‘triggers’.

In the progressing conversation, the coach then asks Joseph to report a stressful work situation. Joseph remembers an experience during a meeting, in which a partner organization sidestepped important agreements and thus forced Joseph to bring the
negotiations to a full stop. Joseph explains how he had to swallow hard and keep his temper at bay during the session:

**EPISODE 1.3**

568 \[C:\] Yes, ahm, and this adequate behavior costs
569 \[\] you a lot of energy, right? ahm, because underneath something is agitated,
570 \[\] That’s the real problem, that your somehow not able to /
571 \[M:\] Exactly, also, because you said earlier on: ‘Are you afraid
572 \[\] you could lose grip on your emotions?’ Of course it could not work out someday.
573 \[\] In such moments it costs me an incredible amount of energy to keep the emotions from
574 \[\] becoming too intense and to keep them at a normal level
575 \[C:\] Yes, yes, yes, yes, yes,
576 \[M:\] It’s like, (Yes, yes), ahm, to somehow keep them suppressed and (Yes) at the same
577 \[\] time, ahm, (yes) function professionally and consider how I can respond (Yes) and to
578 \[\] keep the emotions so far down/ to have / to be able to bring out the professional.
579 \[\] Until now I have always managed, but it is a balancing act. (Yes, yes) There is always the
danger that it will not work someday.

In episode 3 the coach again assesses the manager’s narration along the *Unconscious Motives IR*, by stating that the real problem is the agitated, suppressed emotions of the manager. In turn, the manager confirms this assessment (line 575) and elaborates it further to which the coach reacts by intense *confirming*, thus showing strong agreement. This episode takes place half through the session and indicates that Joseph has now tuned into the mode of interpretation of the coach.

Finally, episode 4 shows a similar dynamic. Again, the manager reports an emotional situation, this time of a crucial meeting with a senior manager in which Joseph tries to prevent the down-sizing of his unit. Joseph states that the senior manager simply ignored important arguments, opposing the decision to down-size. Overall, Joseph suggests that due to the lack of grounded arguments, the senior manager’s true motives were driven by
personal interest and organizational power struggles. Thus Joseph formulates his problem through the organizational pressure IR.

**EPISODE 1.4**

722 M: ...I didn't get agitated, I was simply baffled and bitterly disappointed.

723 C: Exactly, ahm, and that's a situation where you would say 'Aha, ahm, this could be

724 an example for a feeling where you are disappointed, baffled' right?

725 Other situations might be annoying, but in situations like this one, where there

726 are strong emotions, (Yes). - you can't express those.

M: Exactly, Hhm (-1-)

727 C: because it seems as if it were, when you don't

728 express them, - as you probably know, you're probably aware,

729 that they ferment inside of you, right, Yes.

M: That builds up inside. (Hmh) And it is also

730 (-1-) I becomes, ahm, the, the same old story

731 of discontent and insecurity,

C: Yes, yes, sure.

M: thats simply not good.

C: Yes, yes.

M: that's unpleasant.

732 C: Exactly. Yes, ahm, and it also is connected to ... you are a very

733 emotional person, ahm, well (-2-) the feelings are simply there, they move you

734 yes? (Hmh) Maybe a bit more than for others, ahm,

735 but there is some sort of / some sort of mechanism inside of you, ahm, through

which

736 emotions are suppressed, maybe more than to the normal extent.

M: Yes, too much suppressed, Yes.

737 C: And in those situations you don't see a way, ahm, to adequately express the

emotions.

In the beginning of the episode, the coach uses the *Anticipative Paraphrasing DD* when stating ‘... and that’s a situation where you would say Aha, ahm, this could be an example for a feeling where you are disappointed, baffled’ (lines 723f), followed by an assessment,
‘in situations like this one, where there are strong emotions, (Yes). (-1-) you can’t express these.’ (lines 725f.) . These DDs position Joseph towards the *Hauntings of the Past IR*, and more concretely, towards the assumption that he is overwhelmed by emotions, making it impossible for him to express them. Also notice the use of the *Assessing DD* in line 728: ‘you are probably aware, right, that it ferments inside of you’. By the coach’s stating that suppressed emotions are viewed as a common fact, Joseph is positioned as if he would need to contradict a common truth, as well as challenge the authority of the coach, to reject the interpretation. Furthermore, the coach assesses Joseph’s problem: the manager is more emotional than others and has built up a regulative mechanism, which suppresses emotions ‘more than the normal extent’ (line 732) suggesting his *Incomplete Development*. Clearly visible in this extract, Joseph *confirms* (line 726) and *reformulates* (line 729) the assessments of the coach again, taking onboard the proposed interpretations. What follows in the session is an ‘in-depth’ exploration of Joseph’s emotional fragility, using the ‘slow-motion’ hypnotherapy technique.

**Discussion Case Joseph**

Joseph readily accepts the authority of the coach and her interpretations of his narrations. In this sense, I consider Joseph to be complicit with the agenda of the coach. The coaching in this session uses the setting interpreting DDs almost exclusively at the beginning of the session, and then, as Joseph readily narrates different emotional experiences, the greater part of the sessions deals with concrete interpretations of these narrations.

Julia’s case is similar to Joseph’s, as both move from externalizing to internalizing problem constructions. Julia, however, differs from Joseph, as she has already visited group based Emotional Intelligence Coaching, and is familiar with the interpretative heuristics of the coach.

**Case 2: Julia, The Experienced**

Julia is a senior finance consultant of an insurance company and was offered the chance to see a coach by her boss, because she was experiencing emotional distress. As part of a Human Resource Development program at her company, Julia had previously participated in an Emotional Intelligence workshop, facilitated by the coach’s firm, and was therefore already aware of the discursive practices used by the coach. In contrast to the other two
cases, in which the coach takes the initial lead to explain her coaching agenda, this session begins with a narration by Julia.

**Episode 2-1**

40 M: I was in a really difficult project and, and then the point came where I just couldn’t go any further. {Yes} So, in the morning, on the way to the airport, in the taxi to the client, I suddenly started to sob and cry and I realized that I have to do something really badly.

44 C: Yes, how is that [Julia], the emotions are still really strong in this very moment, right?

In this sequence Julia begins to narrate her understanding of the problem, which can be condensed in her statement, ‘I was in a really difficult project’ (2-1:40). Julia's approach thus represents the logic of the *Organizational Tensions IR*, as it externalizes the source of the problem and places it in relation to the difficulties of the work situation. In response, the coach does not directly interpret Julia's narration, but rather, by using the *noticing DD*, puts emphasis on her present emotional state. This indirect steering of attention is a course of action that the coach persistently employs throughout the first 20 minutes of the session. The attention is generally brought onto feelings and emotions of the manager, which are validated through the ‘interpreting backwards’ interpretations and suggest that the coach attempts to enroll Julia into a state of self-disclosure through which she begins to acknowledge her emotional deficits.

This episode is followed by a detailed explanation from Julia about how she was engulfed in a series of projects where she had ‘bad luck’ and which left her emotionally drained. Julia describes that the projects were burdensome above the usual degree of her very demanding job. She described that in the project she headed, several of the staff on extended sick-leave were not replaced; she also cited unskilled colleagues, highly pressurized deadlines, neurotic clients, and no support from her boss, as factors that led her to the brink of her capacities. This climaxed in her last project, which she called a ‘suicide mission’ where she ‘worked 170% but still 30% did not get finished’ (line 56). The pattern shown in episode 2-1 is repeated, as Julia uses the *Organizational Tensions IR*, while the coach consistently stresses Julia's emotionality.
Episode 2-2 is significant, as Julia herself offers a shift of interpretation of the problem from the external to the internal:

In this episode, Julia once again summarizes her previous narration by stating that she thinks she had a lot of bad luck and had more than the usual amount of work put upon her (2-2:91-93). She then goes on to make a differentiation between the external and the internal factors (2-2:95) and goes on to say that she is generally able to work at 100 percent at a successful rate (2-2: 95-101) and usually manages to keep everything under control. On this basis Julia shows her astonishment that she suddenly crashed and could not keep herself stable in the ways she is used to (2-2:102). She concludes this episode by stating that she wants to develop mechanisms that allow her to not let things affect her so much. She now sees the problem as her inability to function continuously in full productivity without ‘crashing’ emotionally. In the last part of the episode, Julia then goes on to state that she wants to grow a thicker skin — a metaphor often used by the coach — and how she had a chance encounter with her boss where she nearly started to cry. In the following extract the coach makes her first explicit interpretation of Julia’s narration:
Episode 2-3

118 M: [my boss] asked me how I was doing and I thought to myself: ‘For heavens sake, if I stay in here any longer I will begin to dissolve in front of him and that’s something I would like to avoid’

119 C: I’ll put it a bit differently, what I hear is that the good fellow asked so you could work a bit on it with him. Because wh/ it is / that sounds like as if it is really almost something traumatic, very existential in any case

120 Y:ou’re really shaken to the core.

121 M: Yes, exactly. And I don’t really know why yet.

122 C: Why? Exactly!

123 M: Because it is / there is actually no reason for that. Projects sometime go wrong and at the end of the day it was not that dramatically bad, but it can {Yes} go wrong, it wasn’t my fault. How can I manage to simply forget about that so that it doesn’t bother me anymore?

124 C: Yes, and the problem is / that’s a really important question, right, yes, / because from your head you know, yes, ahm, actually it’s, it’s totally normal, but emotionally its different, right. Yes, Yes.

Following Julia’s remark that she felt uneasy crying in front of her boss, the coach (2-3: 120-123) made use of the Hauntings of the Past IR; an interpretation positioning several DDs. Firstly, the coach reformulates Julia’s statement and suggests that her boss was emotionally responsive and offered her the possibility to ‘work a bit on it with him’ (2-3: 121). The effect of this reformulating DD is that it implies that there is something in need of being worked on. This ‘something’ is made explicit (line 122). when the coach uses the upgrading DD, thus transforming emotional distress into ‘something traumatic, very existential in any case’ (2-3: 122), and thus Julia is seen to be ‘shaken to the core’ (2-3: 123).
123). Julia seems to accept the coach’s interpretation, and begins to question why she is so emotionally affected by these events (2-3: 123), a question that the coach repeats and emphasizes (2-3:123-124). Julia then normalizes the external conditions presented in her earlier narration by stating ‘there is actually no reason for that’ (2-3:124). Also, she wonders why she is still bothered by these recent events. The coach emphasizes this to be a very important question and assesses — while also normalizing the external conditions — that the problem is not the external conditions but rather something connected to her emotions (2-3:127ff.)

A little further in the session, the coach asks Julia what she thinks was helpful in the Emotional Intelligence training she had participated in. Julia recounts that the mindfulness exercises are helpful and claims that she sometimes retreated to the ladies room during her lunch break to do the exercises. The choice of location, we learn, is due to the fact that her office does not allow private spaces where she can withdraw. The coach encourages the use of these practices without commenting on the situation further.

**Episode 2-4**

228 C: Yes, we will also work with mindfulness here, right? Can you imagine to / if you agree
229 I will support you to get into better contact with that what
230 dominates inside of you. In full awareness that the answers to these questions
231 are, are naturally inside of you, emotionally very close. So, ahm (1s) I
232 can help you go there, with these questions in mind, yes, to discover
233 and also to feel more. {Hm} My experience is, that the answers, the answer is,
234 is in here [points to herself]. Yes.
234b M: Where else should it be? Honestly, where? (laughs)
234c C: Yes. yes yes. yes. Well, of course I know
235 some principles, ahm, I, ahm, or like, (-4-) which I will make transparent to you, {Hm}
236 right? I will help you, through this technique to slow down
237 a little bit, be more aware and ask the questions that will be, yes
238 can be goal-orienting.
239 M: Hmh, (laughs) (-2-) I know the procedure insofar as it
240 is similar to what I do, only it’s an entirely different field. (laughs)
The answer is obviously / yes, they clearly lie in here [points at her chest]. But there are mechanisms that you know {Exactly} which I don`t know.

C: Yes, exactly.

M: specific behaviors which you have already often seen before {Yes} and know where they come from {Yes}. So you can of course help me understand. {Yes, exactly} and become capable of dealing with it. (-2-) I do something similar every day (laughs) for the companies.

C: Hmh, (-3-), ahm, well that means if we begin to come closer to this in the next two and a half hours - we will naturally have a lot to do with emotions. So, we will deal with some kind of (-2-) hurt emotions or some parts of your personality which are very wounded or very tender.

M: {Hm} Yes (-4-) I brought along my knitting bag just in case. (laughs) Well because /

I already knew.

C: Yes, Yes, Yes, Okay. (-2-) And it is also like this: because my experience, yes, is, that if, ahm, you reach such a place where you can precisely notice / this pain, well this (-1-) / at some time, it will not overcome you like that anymore. {Hm} Well, so a part of the being overwhelmed almost always has to do - well, being overwhelmed in that sense that these feelings that flood you - always have to do with the fact that you don`t really understand something.

And you also say that:`Somehow I don`t understand something thoroughly` right, it`s not integrated, something is being suppressed and muffled. So it`s only from the head, that`s also obvious.

The beginning of this sequence is marked by the *Unconscious Motives IR* which is made quite explicit through the statements ‘I will support you to get into better contact with that what dominates inside of you ….. and the answers to these questions ….. naturally inside of you’ (2-4:230–231f). These statements suggest that Julia is currently not in contact with the dominating agents inside of her, her emotions. Moreover, the IR is linguistically
positioned in this first part mainly by two DDs. Firstly, the coach uses the orienting DD: ‘we will also work with mindfulness here’ (2-4:228), thus indicating that they will use a specific type of emotion focusing practice. Furthermore, the coach uses the self-displaying DDs to underline her professional expertise: ‘I will support you’ (2-3: 229) and ‘My experience is’ (2-4: 333) which gives her assessments more weight. Julia actively confirms the coach’s interpretation by stating, ‘Where else should it be? Honestly, where?’ (2-4:234b) but also the coach’s professional status and expertise (2-4:342ff.). This I find notable, as it seems that Julia has accepted without question the coach’s mode of interpretation, and the coach [in her role as expert] confirms that Julia has come to the correct assessment.

From line 245 onwards, the coach brings forward the Hauntings of the past IR by assessing that the suppressed painful experiences are actually overwhelming the manager. The coach’s statement ‘this pain, well this (-1s-), at some time, it will not overcome you in such a way anymore’ (2-4: 252f) can also be understood as an upgrading of the manager’s narration, as she neither used the term pain nor indicated that she was overwhelmed. There is also use of the reformulating DD when the coach states ‘And you also say that: “Somehow I don’t understand something thoroughly”’ (2-4:256) which reformulates the manager’s question and attaches an assessment that this suggests that ‘it’s not integrated, something is being suppressed and muffled’ (2-4: 257). This last sequence makes the emotional problem more severe and is seen to be common knowledge of existential traumata that needs to be professionally taken care of.

Discussion of Case Julia

Julia, like Joseph, is complicit with the coach’s interpretations. Moreover, she is already familiar with the agenda of the Emotional Intelligence framework, and has seemingly accepted this and attempted to put into practice the mindfulness exercises recommended to her. In this sense, Julia is not only complicit, but also experienced in the Emotional Intelligence regime. Concerning the shift of problem interpretations, Julia, earlier in the session, uses the Organizational Tensions IR while she later almost exclusively uses the internalizing IRs that are consistently presented by the coach. Episodes 2 and 3 make the transition from the external to the internal particularly clear. Concerning the use of DDs, the coach does not begin the session (Julia starts by describing what is bothering her) and therefore, her construction of the setting takes place a bit further in the session. The main dynamic of the session is characterized by the work on Julia's narration.

In the following case a different dynamic becomes evident, as Richard is not as compliant as Julia and Joseph.
Case 3: Richard, The Resistant

Richard is the head of a branch office and worked at a bank during the time of the coaching. The bank had recently undergone massive restructuring in the aftermath of the financial crisis. As a result Richard was asked to coordinate a larger department of the bank. The coach was offered to Richard as part of a supportive HR development measurement. While this was Richard’s first coaching experience, he had some years before taken part in a sensitivity training group (T-group) which he describes as very personal and intensive.

As seen in the episode 3-1, the coach commences the conversation by explaining her understanding of coaching and her role within it:

**Episode 3-1**

38 C: Now, to my approach: As you said you are curious about what will happen here, right. That’s totally normal. We will talk with each other {Mhm} and probably there will always be moments, ahm - when we start to work further on the issues - {Mhm} ahm, that I will ask you to accurately feel what is going on inside of you, or to internally bring back situations which we can then observe, like in slow motion: What exactly is going on in there? {Mhm} (-1-) So, keyword: ‘work-life-balance’. If you were to say: ‘Maybe I have too much drive’, or you don’t take enough rest for yourself, then we can analyze these situations, where (-1-) your head would say: {Mhm} ’could actually let loose but I don’t’. And we can then simply look closer: ‘What is going on there?’, Yes.

50 M: Yes, okay.

C: You can immediately think of something, right?

51 M: Noo. {No?} That is … Yes, well, ahm, what I am thinking of, when you said that, well, I have difficulties getting a grip on this kind of work {mhm} // I have real difficulties comprehending it.

In Episode 3-1 the coach uses the agenda setting DD to frame the monologue, which explains her agenda (see 3-1:38ff.). The coach then advises that they should focus on the manager’s emotions and work with hypnotherapy, awareness and mindfulness practice. Also, the coach anticipates the manager’s problem, by stating: ‘ If you were to say: “Maybe
I have too much drive”” (3-1:45–46) thus indirectly suggesting possible aims for the conversation. The coach concludes the introduction by using the noticing DD, saying: ‘You can immediately think of something, right?’ (3-1:50).

While the coach does not bring forth one specific IR in this episode, she does follow the overall internalizing logic by emphasizing emotional contents and suggesting the manager needs to take a closer look at his inner world (line 42ff). The manager’s response to this introduction might be understood as a polite rejection. He does not accept the invitation to share a concrete situation, and instead states that he has difficulty comprehending the coach’s agenda.

Shortly after this, in episode 3-2, Richard attempts to bring forward his own agenda for the coaching session, as he suggests to map out the fields of tension he has situated within.

**Episode 3-2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>M: Okay, maybe it’s also important for you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>to simply also get to know a bit about my person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>so that you can, well, categorize a bit, in what kind of areas of conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>I am momentarily /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>C: Yes, that might be, that might be that would be after…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>M: in which I operate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>C: Yes, we could do/ that could be important. {Yes.} Yes. Also today,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>also for our becoming familiar; ahm, I wanted to come back (-2-) to,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to how we work here. So, first of all you can feel safe, because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nothing will happen here that you do not want to happen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In episode 3-2, Richard states his wish to explore some of the personal and professional fields of tension he is situated in, thus externalizing the problem constellation. This is answered by a vague agreement of the coach, as she states: ‘Yes, that might be, that might be that would be after…’ (3-2: 91), which is then followed by an alternative agenda-setting DD (lines3-2: 93-95) that draws the attention away from Richard’s proposal. The self-displaying DD visible in the statement (‘you can feel safe, because nothing will happen here that you do not want to happen’) can be seen as an attempt to reassure Richard and diffuse his doubts. The statement responds to Richard’s skepticism and his reservations about engaging in the emotional analysis. Indeed, the coach takes some time to elaborate her
expertise and the usefulness of coaching for all sorts of issues, which she sums up with the remark: ‘So, I really have to say that coaching is a really close, differentiated work on where the client wants to go’ (lines 128-129). The coach concludes this first introduction by asking Richard if he has any more questions to which he responds:

**Episode 3-3**

138 M: Ahm, I will assume
139 that the bank will have deliberately selected you and
140 your pool of colleagues. Therefore, I will surely not do the
   C: Yes, yes
141 M: the credibility assessment again.

In the following episode the coach then asks Richard what he thinks are good aims for the session, to which Richard responds that he would like to talk about his work routines and the fields of tension that surround him. Both the linked episodes 3-4a and 3-4b illustrate Richard’s problem formulation as a form of externalizing problem construction.

**Episode 3-4**

260 M: Of course this has become a more difficult task, especially in these difficult times,
261 ahm, the personal leadership on the one hand and then the pressure coming
262 from the numbers, right?
263 C: I understand, I totally understand
264 M: So, it is definitely a balancing act to get these things together at the moment.

The central dilemma around which Richard repeatedly formulates the problem over the course of the session — in terms of the Organizational tensions IR — is that the goals of the company have become unreachable, while he feels inclined to be among the upper half of the performance scale to ensure his subordinates and himself secure positions. Moreover, he directly states that he is expected to motivate his employees to the greatest possible performance. What is notable in this case is that both coach and manager attempt to define the agenda and aims of the session. This results in a struggle over the interpretative
authority, even if Richard in the episode 3-3 has (half-heartedly) stated that he will not challenge the coach’s legitimacy.

The session is made up of a series of formulations from both sides in which the coach focuses attention onto emotional topics while Richard mainly reflects his dilemma in terms of how he can reach a reasonable balance between pushing himself and his team towards high performance and letting things simply evolve. The following episodes demonstrate this dynamic.

**Episode 3-5**

780 I believe, that if I were to build up a certain distance, ahm, would not be so engaged anymore and therefore let things run by themselves... (--.) And ahm,
781 what I have learned in the last years is something that
782 has always comes true, is that: 'When you are successful, success feeds
783 success', right? And, ahm, there is a nice picture to that, when a (-)
784 company or a unit is thought of as a tanker, like a
785 tank ship. When it has motion, then it runs in the right direction
786 Yes, but once it stands still, to then rev it back,
787 then you get a suspension, it’s then a difficult,
788 situation, right?
789 C: Yes, that's a great picture, ahm, may speak /
790 ahm, maybe for your / what you apprehend. Right, you say on the one hand it would
791 be good, it would be, it would be nice or it would be helpful,
792 ahm, a bit more distance or, yes, a bit more peacefulness
793 M: Yeah, sure.
794 C: right, that it does not get under your skin that much
795 ahm, without / now we are making two, two polarities, right,
796 without that spilling into the other again,
797 into indifference. Well, you can, can, could (-3-)
798 - you already said it spontaneously - you would also begin to feel better.

In the first half of episode (3-5) Richard describes his dilemma in the form of the tank ship metaphor; here stressing more the idea that it is important to keep things running smoothly. He is still trying to direct the conversation into his preferred direction. In response, the coach confirms the metaphor, but then sidesteps it and begins to reformulate Richard’s aims (3-5: 795f.), leading him towards an emotionalized interpretation of the problem. What was
in the first place a reflection by the manager on the balance between a number-driven leadership and a somewhat more personal, *laissez-faire* form of leadership, is transformed into an emotional topic.

In the middle part of the session, the coach attempts to position Richard by the more empathetic means of reformulation and assessment (while Richard does not change his externalizing position) but in episode 3-6 the coach attempts to define the contents of the session.

877 C: You’ll remember that I said on the phone
878 If you have classical leadership questions, right, then I might
879 not be able to, to answer everything as one hundred percent accurately
880 Well, I think that you have to know yourself how you do your job
881 and how to organize your important meetings so that they are efficient,
882 right? {mhm, okay} But what I can do, I can help you
883 if you are not so sure of yourself, I can help you
884 find out, what you think is important for such a meeting, right,
885 well, next to the contents and the organization
886 especially the emotional preparation

In this episode the coach assesses that Richard should know how to do his job, thus implying that the specifics of his working day is not on the agenda of the coaching session (3-7: 880). Furthermore, she uses both the self-displaying (‘I might not be able to, to answer everything as one hundred percent accurately’; 3-7: 878-879) and orienting DDs (‘I can help you if you are not so sure of yourself’;3-7:882-883) to strengthen her position and affirm that the coaching should be more about the emotional aspects of Richard’s work life. In other words, ignoring the external pressures imposed on him by the company, and internalizing everything into how Richard should respond. Richard once again notes the coach’s position without acknowledging its validity. In the next episode, Richards begins to talk about the difficulty of balancing private and work demands and desires, but three quarters into the session he also demonstrates that he is still trying to set the agenda
according to his own interests, which are concerned with finding better ways of organizing this schedule.

**Episode 3-7**

122 M: If you notice things that do not fit one to one into the philosophy of the bank, (-) that would be helpful for me
122 if you could reflect that with me {Yes} Because we are required, to put it in headlines ‘leadership for results’. Best, to bring out the best, that’s a clear demand to the line managers, that’s how we have to organize our work days. There is a scheme what we have to fulfill in a weeks time. So
122 It’s clear that the employees, and in my case the managers and employees (-) are in the spotlight. And if the demands are always one hundred percent compatible and achievable, there I have my justifiable doubts.

**Discussion of Case Richard**

The last case is characterized by an ongoing negotiation about the aims of the session and how to formulate the problem. As both agents aim to bring forward their understandings, there is the sense of a *status quo* concerning the distribution of the problem formulations between manager and coach over the course of the session. By following his own agenda, Richard resists the positioning attempts of the coach. The coach on the other hand tries to reassure Richard and simultaneously stress the need to work on emotional topics. While she states that coaching is very close to the aims of the manager, her linguistic practices contradict this somewhat, as she actively tries to win the manager to standardized
procedure. In this case we find setting interpreting DDs all across the session. In these episodes the coach attempts to gain the interpretative authority over the flow of the session.

**Discussion of the Analysis**

In the shown samples the three managers reacted differently to the coach’s positioning attempts, which in turn led the coach to employ different variations of empathetic persuasion, oscillating between more empathetic and more persuasive actions. Joseph gradually moved from the use of externalizing to internalizing problem constructions. Here the coach used the setting interpreting DDs, especially at the beginning of the session to establish her interpretative authority, and once Joseph began to narrate emotional experiences and adopt the internalizing IRs, the coach oscillates between the use of forward and backwards interpreting of these narrations. This is similar to the case of Julia, who already used both externalizing and internalizing problem constructions at the beginning of the session and quickly adopted the coach’s interpretative schema. In both Julia’s and Joseph’s case, the coach strongly enacts the empathetic side as her interpretations are readily taken up. This is different in the case of Richard, who counters the coach’s internalizing interpretations and attempts to use the coaching session as a means to reflect on his work context and routines. Richard thus shows consistency in using external problem attributions, to which the coach reacts using the setting interpreting DDS and suggesting that the session should be used to reflect on emotional topics rather than organizational ones. In the case of Richard I would thus suggest that a stronger, more direct form of persuasion is used by the coach, in an attempt to regain interpretative authority.

**Table 19: Summary of the interactional dynamics over the three cases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case 1: the complicit</th>
<th>Case 2: the experienced</th>
<th>Case 3: the resistant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joseph: Internal → Internal</td>
<td>Julia: External (I) → Internal</td>
<td>Richard: External → External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach: Internal → Internal</td>
<td>Coach: Internal → Internal</td>
<td>Coach: Internal → Internal (E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Joseph eventually adopts internalizing IRs.** | **Julia fluently adopts internalizing IRs.** | **Richard resists coaches interpretation.** |
| Coach uses primarily forward/backwards interpreting | Coach uses primarily forward/backwards interpreting | Coach uses setting interpreting DDs |

**5.6. Chapter Discussion**
On the basis of the empirical materials the chapter discusses how the psycho-managerial complex is constituted through the emergent textual discursive practices in management coaching conversations. To be able to explore these dynamics the study has investigated the question: how are the textual discursive practices enacted in management coaching conversations? To answer this question I have been guided by positioning theory. The key to my approach has been to differentiate between positions (which relate to discourses), positioning practices (which relate to the micro-linguistic actions) and positioning processes (which relate to the temporal enactment that unfolds when positions are situated in talk). This framework allows us to study how the discursive textual practices are used over the course of the session. It reveals the complexity of the conversation by untangling the tightly entwined discursive elements and considering the dynamics of these elements (firstly independently and then in their interrelatedness).

Based on this framework, the analysis first explores which discursive positions are used over the course of the sessions by coach and managers to construct the problem. Furthermore, it identifies a number of positioning practices with which the coach attempts to forward her favored discourses. Finally, it considers the shifts of problem uses and the patterns of interaction across agents and over the course of the session. Overall, the analysis gives an in-depth representation of the ongoing dynamics of the textual discursive practices in management coaching. In the following I discuss the analytical steps; each adds a layer to help figure out how the discursive textual practices employed in management coaching conversations enact the psycho-managerial complex.

5.6.1. Internalizing Problems
The point of departure for this first analysis is the suggestion that management coaching is a form of ‘problem talk’, in which a professional and a lay-person meet to solve the problem of the lay-person via discursive means (Miller & Silverman, 2005). The definition and description of the problem therefore orders the aims of the intervention and legitimizes the use of concrete discursive practices. The first analytical step thus considers how coach and manager construct versions of ‘the problem’. My interpretation of the materials suggests that five interpretations of the problem (operationalized through interpretative repertoires) are used within the sessions. I have illustrated these and called them ‘Hauntings of the Past’, ‘Unconscious Motives’, ‘Incomplete Development’, ‘Organizational Pressure’ and ‘Personal Entanglements’. The first three IRs internalize the problem and emotionalize the experiences of the manager. The latter two externalize the problem and suggest that the key tensions that need to be addressed lie in the social world of the manager.
This interpretation reveals two details about the studied coaching process: first, that clients and coach (implicitly) negotiate the aims of the session by drawing into different understandings of ‘the problem’. These negotiations are of central importance, as they shape the course of the session and thus the effects of the intervention. Moreover, the problem constructions can be ordered along the category ‘internalizing’ vs. ‘externalizing’ (Tomm, 1989) which helps understand how attention is fundamentally distributed through these problem constructions. The generated actions to solve the problem will be directed externally (the managers will seek to change their private and work conditions and the relationships therein) or internally (the managers will seek to change their feelings and thoughts). My second point is therefore that the coach predominantly used problem constructions which would emotionalize and internalize the problem of the manager while the managers — at least in the beginning of the sessions — preferred externalizing problem constructions.

Taking this dynamic one step further, and through a reflexive lens, the emotionalization and internalization can also be associated with a shift in responsibility for the problem, from the world outside the manager (the external working conditions) to the inside world (biographical experiences, feelings, suppressed needs). Impressions of being unjustly treated are delegitimized and seen merely as an inability to find adequate ways to deal with the situation. Such a one-sided internalization of the problem might indeed be considered a de-emancipating of the manager, as the manager and not the company is expected to make the changes. Workload, hours, staff shortages, deadlines or targets are not adjusted; the manager must simply learn to cope with them. For example, when Julia, at the beginning of the session, recounts the insufficient support she received from her company, along with the high workload and the difficult clients, the reaction of the coach is to validate Julia's reaction, but to place the problem in the realm of her emotional difficulties:

127b  C: Yes, and the problem is / that's a really important question, right,
128     yes, / because from your head you know, yes, ahm, actually it’s, it’s
129     totally normal, but emotionally it's different, right. Yes, Yes.

This technique of steering attention away from the external conditions has been critiqued as far back as Karl Jaspers (Jaspers, 1950) and later, by the Frankfurt School (Adorno, 1952) who were utilizing Freudian Psychoanalysis. Recently Furedi (2004) has argued that psychotherapy in general, if not aware of its tendency to exclude external conditions, makes people more ‘vulnerable’. Furedi is saying that by describing people as psychologically
vulnerable, they become more vulnerable, as they simply accept the constraints of their lives without taking actions against them. In other words, it might be concluded that the internalization of the problem keeps corporate structures unquestioned and simply teaches the manager to find better ways to bear and take upon themselves the imposed constraints.

This interpretation does not mean to say that the internalization of problems is not legitimate or helpful. Quite on the contrary — it can be a helpful perspective for the manager to further explore the possibilities of emancipation. Yet, if this is the sole interpretation offered by the coach, the chosen discourse might propagate a more rigid self-control without reflecting on the properties of the system; a theme that links to the self-management of emotions and can indeed be considered an effect of the psycho-managerial complex.

5.6.2. Applying Psychotherapeutic Practices

The second empirical step analyzes the positioning practices used by the coach (see Table 18). This analysis shows a number of typical positioning practices (operationalized through Discursive Devices) and further yields the interpretation that three different levels of positioning practices can be distinguished. ‘Interpreting Backwards’ summarizes the discursive devices which the coach uses to interpret the narrations of (past) experiences of the manager. ‘Interpreting Forward’ DDs are used by the coach to steer the conversation into a specific direction. Finally, the category of ‘setting interpreting’ DDs is used to formulate and fix the ground assumptions of the session, including the ‘rights and duties’ (Davies & Harré, 1990) of the agents in the conversation.

The interpretations found here can be linked to findings in pragmatic linguistics (c.f. Labov and Fanshel, 1977; Lakoff; 1982; Coupland, Sarangi & Candlin, 2001) and psychotherapy process research (Ferrara, 1994) where similar linguistic actions used in psychotherapy conversations are found. Even although these studies use a variety of different conceptualizations, such as ‘linguistic devices’ or ‘discursive practices’ and are informed by different discourse traditions, I suggest that the principal similarities between management coaching and psychotherapy are palpable. To make this point accessible to the reader (without engaging in a full analysis — something that might constitute an additional publication or research) I outline some examples of the relationship between coaching and psychotherapeutic textual discursive practices.

A recent summary by Pawelczyk (2011) has drawn together the findings of 30 years of research on the linguistics of psychotherapy and how psychotherapy can be distinguished from ordinary talk. On the basis of previous conceptualizations and findings, Pawelczyk
analyzes a corpus of psychotherapy sessions. Her study outlines a number of defining characteristics of the speech event of psychotherapy, which can be summarized as follows:

- Use of linguistic actions that establish ‘transparency of meaning’: the patient is ‘pressed to present (traumatic) facts that the therapist, in turn, helps him/her to comprehend’ (p. 126). The therapist directly interprets meanings and behaviors, using questions to probe the narration of the client and reinforce the desired narration of the client by using continuers (linguistic tokens like ‘right‘ ‘yes’ or ‘go on’ ) which ‘clearly manifests that their function is to press the client to continue his/her disclosive talk’ (ibid, p. 101)

- Use of linguistic actions that promote ‘self-disclosure of the patient’: the therapist steers the conversation into an intimate mode by fishing for self-disclosure, which ‘highly encourages self-reflection through the revelation of personal yet painful experiences’ (p. 126). This enforces information-eliciting tellings, reformulating the narrations and using repetition as a means to signal empathy.

- Overall the therapeutic situation encourages the ‘communication of emotion’: the therapist focuses on ‘feeling-talk’, continuously evaluating emotions. For example, by pointing out that some emotional reactions are not socially accepted — and by allowing the client to express emotions, such as crying.

Comparing these findings to my own we find that management coaching conversations and psychotherapy conversation make use of similar discursive practices. While my own analysis differentiates between linguistic actions (positioning practice) and the thematic enactments around discourse-based positions (problem constructions), Pawelczyk’s draws these two notions together. Still, it is possible to illustrate some of the parallels. I give three brief examples (in full awareness that this theme could well be expanded into a larger research project). Firstly, Pawelczyk’s findings that therapists regularly comment on the non-verbal communications of the client, is represented in my ‘noticing’ DD. ‘Noticing’ in my terms are statements which comment on non-verbal or paraverbal aspects of (emotional) communication. Secondly, there is an obvious parallel between Pawelczyk’s finding that the therapist commonly reformulates the patient’s narrations and what I have likewise called ‘reformulating’ the version of events, which (apparently) follows directly from the other person’s own account, but introduces a transformation. Finally, Pawelczyk mentions that the therapist focuses on the communication of emotions by encouraging ‘feeling-talk’. In my understanding, this insight frames the directionality of all the ‘backwards’ interpreting
discursive practices towards the internalizing / emotionalizing positions that the coach uses. Talk about emotionalized narrations, as the focus of the manager towards internalizing positions, is also a central characteristic of management coaching sessions (Graf, 2012).

Even if the question of how much psychotherapy is in management coaching cannot be concluded here, I would suggest that Pawelczyk’s and my own research indicate many parallels. This leads to what I would consider a strong, empirically-based hypothesis that states the two interventions are, on the level of discursive textual practices, indeed congruent; a finding that underlines the suggestion that psychotherapeutic practices are indeed applied in current forms of HRM practices and more specifically in management coaching.

5.6.3. Interacting through Empathetic Persuasion

The last analytical step of the study is based on the interpretations of the former two analytical steps (analyzing the problem constructions and positioning practices). While the first two steps were ‘static’ and did not consider the temporal nor the relational dynamic of the conversation, this third step additionally considers two processual aspects: how the use of discursive positions shifts over the course of the sessions, and how the relational communication between coach and manager unfolds. Both questions are discussed by contrasting the three cases.

I have called the first processual aspect an exploration of the ‘process-as-change’, because it considers the shift of positions over the course of the session. The processes described here help us to understand what changes over the course of the session and where it changes to. This study argues that ‘change’ can be understood as the shift of how agents enact their narrations (by internalizing or externalizing the problem). In the two prototypical cases with Joseph and Julia, the managers take on the interpretative scheme of the coach. Julia and Joseph shift from externalizing to internalizing narrations. This form of shifting interpretative patterns does not always occur. For example, Richard resists the coach’s attempts and does not modify his narrations.

The second processual consideration focuses on the question of how the dialogic interaction unfolds. I call this ‘process-as-relational-dynamic’, because the ongoing, relational interplay between coach and manager is accentuated. My analysis suggests that the coach uses different levels of positioning practices based on the reactions of the managers. This can be summarized as follows:

The coach uses the ‘Setting Interpreting’ DDs to establish her authority and solidify their interpretative dominance. If the manager accepts the authority of the coach, these DDs
move to the background (as is the case with Joseph and Julia). Yet, if the manager does not accept the interpretations and proposed course of the session, the ‘setting interpreting’ DDs will stay active (as the case with Richard). The ‘forward interpreting’ DDs are used by the coach to turn the attention to self-disclosing narrations (and through the use of hypno-exercises) and once the manager begins to narrate, these narrations are interpreted with the ‘backwards interpreting’ DDs. These considerations suggest that the coach strategically uses positioning practices in relation to the reactions of the manager.

Following the interpretation of the two processes (process as change and process as relational dynamic) I suggest that the coach intentionally steers the manager in a specific direction (to internalize the problem) by means of what I call ‘empathetic persuasion’. The notion of empathetic persuasion means to grasp the demonstrated complexity of the coach’s actions in the interactional process, where the coach attempts to induce the manager to foreground favored discourses. On the one hand, empathetic persuasion reflects that the coach tunes into the narrations of the manager in a passionate and affective way (the German term ‘ein-fühlen’ more adequately describes the action taken). On the other hand, empathetic persuasion demonstrates that the coach consistently promotes their favored discourses and preset agenda. In the interactions the empathetic and persuasive qualities of the positioning practices shift, depending on how willing the manager is to take on the coach’s favored discourses. This last analytical step thus offers an interpretation to the question of which ‘precise machinery of productive processes’ (Bjerg & Staunaes, 2011, p. 139) enact the psycho-managerial complex at work.

5.7. Conclusion
The present study has enabled us to disclose the dynamics of the textual discursive practices of management coaching. The analytical steps build on each other and intensify the depth of understanding of the relational and processual dynamic of coaching conversations. The interpretations of the materials suggests that the coach stringently uses internalizing and emotionalizing interpretations and applies linguistic practices commonly found in psychotherapy through which she steers the manager towards the favored interpretations by means of ‘empathetic persuasion’. It is suggested that these dynamics reflect the concrete enactment of the psycho-managerial complex.

Furthermore, there are a number of secondary theoretical and empirical connections this study makes. The present study has attempted to address the three problematizations (lack of alternative conceptualizations, little insight into the concrete practices and absence of critical voices). The framework conceptualizes management coaching as a one-to-one
conversation between coach and manager and gives attention to the immediate enactment of the intervention. This, in the terminology of Deetz (1996; see figure 2) applies a scheme of research that is more oriented towards the ‘local / emergent’ dimension. Presenting management coaching as a conversation helps focus on the dialogic dynamic that unfolds over time between the two agents and offers an alternative, more contextualized approach which helps overcome the psy-based ‘manager-centrism’ predominant in current studies on coaching. Moreover, the critical edge to the discussion of the materials adds an alternate voice to the evaluation of the effects of management coaching.

Taking yet an even wider frame of reference the study relates back to the discussions it has drawn upon to construct the theoretical framework. Towards the literatures on problem based conversations (Miller & Silverman, 2005; Coupland, Brown, Daniels, & Humphreys, 2008; Cooren, Matte, Taylor, & Vasquez, 2007) it offers an illustration of the effects of internal vs. external problem constructions and suggests ‘empathetic persuasion’ as a mode of interaction in psy-based conversations. For scholars interested in the study of language at work through discourse approaches (Langley & Tsoukas, 2011; ) the multi-step analysis might show a possible path ‘to connect feasible empirical studies to the complex reflections on the ontological and epistemological role of discourse and provide new explanations of organizational structures and processes’ (Grant & Hardy, 2004, p. 9). Finally, the study of positioning processes might find resonance in the community of scholars interested in further developing positioning theory within discursive psychology (Mueller & Whittle, 2011; Potter & Hepburn, 2008; Wiggins & Potter, 2008).

5.7.1. Practical Considerations

There are number of practical implications I see arising from the present analysis. Firstly, companies might become aware of the effects their use of management coaching might have and on this basis choose more carefully their application of the intervention. Secondly, coaches might come to realize that they possess a great amount of interpretative power and might more carefully negotiate ‘the problem’ with the managers, also considering that their own perspective might not be the most helpful for the client. Specifically, the distinction between externalizing and internalizing positions might be a simple heuristic to reflect whether the coach also considers non-psychological, social elements in the analysis of the problem. Thirdly, the overview of different positioning practices, as well as the notion of empathetic persuasion, might bring coaching practitioners to the awareness of operating with and through discourse which might lead to a greater awareness of the power structures in these conversations. As stated above, the notion of curiosity might be a way to keep the
tendency to impose ideologically charged interpretations at bay. Finally, this work might also lead to more informed recipients and organizers of management coaching, which will ask coaches to undergo more open negations of the aims of the session.

5.7.2. Limitations and Outlook

There are of course a number of limitations to this analysis. First of all, the present analysis relies on a specific form of coaching, namely ‘Emotional Intelligence Coaching’. This form of coaching uses specific practices towards specific aims. It places emotions at the center of interest and has strong ties to psychoanalytic theories. The study cannot, therefore, make assumptions about all forms of management coaching and about the positioning processes that take place in these interventions. Further studies might look into alternative forms of coaching. Furthermore, the use of this form of management coaching took place in large stock-listed German and Swiss companies, and there is thus a certain cultural context to be considered. The study of alternative contexts would therefore be worthwhile. Moreover, the sessions all took place with one coach and there are possibly variations in the ways in which other coaches might position self and managers. Furthermore, the whole coaching session might have been analyzed to understand better how the whole process is shaped and plays out. These latter limitations suggest that more data might have been analyzed as a basis for interpretation, but also other methods and different interpretations might have been made towards the presented set of data.

Finally, the data does not account for the ways in which management coaching is discursively constituted in the organizational setting; a question I will look into in the second empirical study.
6. TRANSLATING PSYCHOTHERAPEUTIC PRACTICES INTO THE WORK REALM: A STUDY OF STAKEHOLDERS’ ACCOUNTS OF MANAGEMENT COACHING

The second empirical study explores management coaching as an organizational intervention. By exploring how management coaching is enacted through organizational discursive practices — the way agents construct the use of management coaching in the organizational realm — this second empirical study helps us to understand how the intervention is legitimized and accounted for. In doing so the study supplements the first empirical analysis by taking specific interest in how the psycho-managerial complex emerges at the organizational level. It brings into the open the complex maneuvers through which psychotherapy and managerial discourses are related in the ‘talk about management coaching’. To be able to study these complex relational processes I make use of the notion of ‘translation’ as this allows me to trace the movements of the organizational discursive practices.

The study presented in the following focuses on the accounts about management coaching given by coaches, managers with coaching experience, and HR managers, and further discusses the effects which these discursive maneuvers yield. The empirical analysis will show that the intervention is accounted for by use of four discourses: Controlling Performance, Steering Development, Restraining Symptoms and Nurturing the Psyche. In showing the historical anchorage of these discourses I align controlling performance and steering development to the management discipline, while aligning restraining symptoms and nurturing the psyche to psychotherapy. By further conceptualizing management coaching as a ‘site’ of ongoing translation between the two historically institutionalized discursive scapes, I explore, in a second analytical step, the processual patterns between psychotherapy and management by showing the relational dynamics and their distinctive effects in the forms of assimilation, unfolding and countering translative moves. This analysis thus documents the rendezvous of psychotherapy and management and how management coaching, through complex discursive maneuvers, allows for the transformation of the work realm so that intimacy and productivity are espoused. Overall, this empirical study shows how managerial and psychotherapeutic discourses rendezvous in management coaching.
6.1. The Unstable Constructions of Management Coaching: An Opportunity for the Exploration of the Psycho-Managerial Complex

As argued in section 2.3., management coaching is not a stabilized professional practice, and thus I examine the ongoing use of discourses and the various constructive translative processes. I consider this unsettled representation of coaching as an expression of ‘that which is involved in translation — be it knowledge, people, or things — [it] has an uncertain identity’ (Czarniawska, 2009, p. 424). In understanding the discursive construction of coaching through translation, my argument is that coaching, even if it might appear new, is the effect of connections between the contemporary discourses of psychotherapy and managerial discourses. Through my analysis I do not wish to suggest that the practices used in management coaching and psychotherapy are (always) identical. On the contrary, the analysis documents how psychotherapeutic and managerial discourses are modified through translative moves that install differences, or diminish the visibility of specific discourses. Even if it has become apparent that the therapeutic has established itself as a dominant point of reference for management coaching, the research question is to understand how it is modified, layered with additional meanings and altered as it becomes played out in the managerial realm. In other words, my interest is directed towards the complex maneuvers involved in the translation between psychotherapy and management on the organizational site. The overall research question of this second empirical study is orientated towards examining these movements and asks: how is management coaching, as an organizational intervention, discursively constituted through translative processes? This analysis thus aims to understand better how management coaching is formed through translative processes in which therapeutic and managerial discourses have become related and by doing so gain insight into how management coaching as a new form of HRM intervention has been able to proliferate.

6.2. Theoretical Framework: Management Coaching as a Site of Discursive Translations

To be able to understand how the organizational discursive practices of management coaching constitute the intervention I make use of the notion of translation. Theorizing by means of translation allows organizational scholars a path to understand the processes of organizing and organizational change. The notion of translation allows us to trace how ‘management ideas are translated into objects (models, books, transparencies), are sent to other places than those where they emerged, translated into new kind of objects, and then sometimes into actions, which, if repeated, might stabilize into institutions, which in turn
could be described and summarized through abstract ideas, and so on and so forth’ (Czarniawska, 2009, p. 425). This is achieved by tracing how ideas, practices and discourses move through time and space and how these are modified during this traveling (Czarniawska & Sevón, 2005; Czarniawska-Joerges & Sevón, 1996). The notion of translation encompasses Greimasian semiotics and Michel Serres’s concept of translation as these have informed actor-network-theory (Latour, 2005; Callon, 1986) yet also draws upon linguistic translation as developed in translation studies (Janssens, Lambert, & Steyaert, 2004) and translation theory (Chávez, 2009). This makes the notion of translation itself a hybrid exponent of translation. My theoretical premise is to understand translation as an open-ended process that is more than simple transportation; translation involves steps of assimilation, contextualization and innovation, implying that meanings are not static, and new meanings are consistently accreted or, likewise, existing ones transformed (Latour, 1996). As Czarniawska and Sevón (1996) have described: ‘On its trajectory from an idea to an object, to an institution, to an action and to an idea again, ideas go through many transformations and necessary passage points in the course of subsequent translations’ (Czarniawska and Sevón, 1996: p.4).

This conceptual premise of this study follows Chávez’ dictum that translation can be analyzed by focusing on how discourses are altered and modified, and that we should decenter the assumption that culture, period and linguistic structure remain the same and inquire into the polysemous character of texts and accounts. Chávez indicates that the unit of analysis should be discourse, and thus that ‘the translator must have an understanding of the discourse out of which a text emerges because the discourse is what provides the meaning for both the source and target texts’ (Chávez, 2009, p. 24). In such an understanding, translation is a dynamic social process that affects both the initial source texts as well as the target, in their respective contexts. Discourses that have developed in specific socio-historic contexts and build coherent figures are what Chávez (2009) has called ‘historical translative scapes’. I thus suggest that discourses, in their movement across time and social realms, are continuously translated, modified and adapted into the contextual settings in which they appear and manifest themselves. These discourses may become institutionalized within specific contexts to form relatively stable translative scapes that manifest themselves in routinized discursive practices. While I do not doubt the importance of bodily and material practices (see Reckwitz, 2002; Czarniawska, 2009) my take on these translative scapes is to accent the workings of the discursive practices.

Furthermore, giving credibility to the assumption that translation is a dynamic process and will, most probably, produce multiple arrangements of fore-ground/back-
ground figures rather than static conditions, I introduce the concept of ‘translative moves’. Translative moves are the relational maneuvers in which different institutionalized discourses become arranged. This notion thus gives attention to the multiplicity of ongoing translation processes of management coaching and allows us to look for variations in the ways translative processes specifically unfold in the accounts of the intervention.

6.3. Research Design and Analytical Questions

The first analytical step aims to trace the discourses used in accounts of coaching, and I thus address the question: by which interpretative repertoires is management coaching legitimized and accounted for? My second analytical step then builds on this first analysis and asks: how are the interpretative repertoires of management coaching assembled into relational patterns? This second question promotes the opportunity to study how the organizational discursive practices are arranged in configuring foreground-background figures that connect the therapeutic repertoires with the managerial ones. Through such a detailed analysis I aim to highlight how management coaching is formed through the processual translation of discourses by moving between and relating to different social worlds. Also, by mapping the discursive moves and their effects, I hope to add texture and analytical understanding to the translation processes that lead to ‘new’ psy-based practices in management.

The present study is grounded on 31 semi-structured interviews, which produced texts of how management coaching is legitimized and accounted for. While I have also examined other forms of data, such as documents and websites, as well as the session transcripts used in the first study, the analysis for this second study relies solely on the interview transcripts. The reason for this is that the materials from websites and documents offered only general accounts of management coaching, resulting in overly coherent images, while, on the other hand, the transcripts were too detailed and revealed how people talk in coaching sessions, but hardly addressed how they accounted for and legitimized the practice in the managerial realm.

While having extensive training in interview methodologies as well as practical experience due to my participation in several interview-based research studies, I conducted several pre-study interviews with coaches to become familiar with the specific interview dynamic and gain a better understanding of the field. These interviews helped me to crystallize the area of interest and experience the habitus of freelance coaches. Individual interviews were set up in a semi-structured, narrative format and lasted between forty-five
and ninety minutes. For the purpose of the interviews I personally visited the HR-managers and coaches at their working spaces. HR-managers were generally in the corporate headquarters from which they coordinated, among other matters, the coaching activities of the company. Interviews with the coaches took place at their work spaces. Four of the interviews with the coached managers took place via telephone as these managers had shifted position since the coaching and worked at different locations across Europe. The other coached managers I visited at their office spaces. For all three populations confidentiality was a crucial issue and I experienced that it was important to let people talk about the setting first before coming to the content to give them the possibility to ‘warm up’. Moreover, coaches in my impression were quite attracted to learn more about my affiliation at the University of St. Gallen and how my research could be linked to their activities. The interviews with coaches tended to be longer, while company employees were on a tight time schedule, resulting in shorter interviews. Interviews aimed to gain insight into how coaching for managers was experienced, understood and organized. The interviewees were asked a number of pre-scripted questions and encouraged to narrate their coaching experiences, but were also given time to talk freely about what they thought was important about coaching. Overall, interviews were aimed at better understanding the interview partners’ account of coaching and how the intervention was concretely organized and experienced. All interviews were tape-recorded and transcribed.

Several strategies were used to find relevant interview partners; for example, a call for participation in coaching newsletters, mailing lists and journals, as well as personal acquisition at coaching related conferences or workshops. The call for participation in the study reached approximately 5000 subscribers, yet only a few coaches reacted to these calls. Also, while those coaches readily offered to participate in the study, field access to HR-managers and coached managers proved to be even more difficult. This was primarily due to confidentiality issues. I therefore asked the coaches, in the sense of a snowball system, to refer me to their contact partners within their organizations (Brace-Govan, 2004) from which a number of contacts resulted. Finally, I also activated personal networks to gain access to the group of HR-managers and coaches, which proved to be the most effective strategy.

I identified three basic groups of agents in the organization of the coaching intervention: the coach as facilitator of the intervention and contracted professional change agent, the coached manager as recipient of the intervention, and the HR manager as the organizer of the intervention. I expected these agents to contribute actively to the discursive construction of the coaching intervention in companies. By engaging different protagonists
involved in the coaching process, I aimed to give a balanced perspective by retrieving a multiplicity of accounts. Other subjects, like line-managers, colleagues, or subordinates may also play a part in the construction of coaching interventions, but have been excluded from this analysis due to a lack of field access. This corresponds with the experiences other academics (attempting similar studies) have encountered (personal communication with Monika Wastian and Yasmin Aksu). Hearing these additional voices, especially of the line-managers to the coached managers, would have surely been insightful, but I suggest that much of the dynamic of other agents can be reconstructed from the narratives of the three studied groups.

Interview data was collected in Switzerland and Germany between the summer of 2009 and spring 2011. A total of forty-seven interviews were conducted with nine HR-managers, nine coached managers and nineteen freelance coaches. All interviews with HR and coached managers were integrated into the study. From the existing 19 interviews with coaches, a selection of 13 interviews were made. Coaches were excluded from analysis if they were not regularly contracted for coaching by large companies (drop-out = 3), or if the coach primarily did clinical supervision with mental health staff (drop-out = 1) or life coaching (drop-out = 2). This exclusion also helped to balance the overall research population. The study population is gender biased, as coaches and managers were mostly men, while HR-managers were more often women; a bias that roughly mirrors the ratio of men to women working in these roles. HR-managers and coached managers all worked in large, multi-national organizations in the finance, insurance, or crisis relief sectors. These companies set up, contracted, and funded the management coaching intervention, making management coaching into a business investment. The selected 13 freelance coaches had an average of eleven years of experience as freelancers and were regularly contracted by companies for their services. Six coaches had studied Psychology, five Business and one Cultural Studies. See Tables 20–22 for a further disclosure of the study population.
Table 20: Overview of interviews with coaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Sectors of primary coaching activity</th>
<th>Date of interview</th>
<th>Initial training</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01_C</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>04.03.2009</td>
<td>Business studies</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02_C</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Service</td>
<td>18.05.2009</td>
<td>Business studies</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03_C</td>
<td>Health &amp; Finance</td>
<td>18.02.2010</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04_C</td>
<td>Production &amp; Finance</td>
<td>05.01.2010</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05_C</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>13.09.2010</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06_C</td>
<td>IT &amp; Finance</td>
<td>16.03.2010</td>
<td>Business studies</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07_C</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>04.03.2010</td>
<td>Business studies</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08_C</td>
<td>Education &amp; Service</td>
<td>05.01.2010</td>
<td>Pedagogic</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09_C</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>22.03.2010</td>
<td>Business studies</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10_C</td>
<td>Unspecific</td>
<td>11.01.2010</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11_C</td>
<td>Unspecific</td>
<td>31.03.2010</td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12_C</td>
<td>Production &amp; Health</td>
<td>05.01.2010</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13_C</td>
<td>Education &amp; Finance</td>
<td>15.03.2010</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14_C</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>13.10.2010</td>
<td>Cultural studies</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15_C</td>
<td>Unspecific</td>
<td>28.01.2010</td>
<td>Business studies</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16_C</td>
<td>Production &amp; IT</td>
<td>19.05.2010</td>
<td>Business studies</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17_C</td>
<td>Unspecific</td>
<td>10.03.2010</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18_C</td>
<td>Health &amp; Production</td>
<td>11.01.2010</td>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19_C</td>
<td>Banking &amp; Finance</td>
<td>13.09.2010</td>
<td>Business studies</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21: Characteristics of interviewed coachees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Date of interview</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31_CM</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>02.11.2010</td>
<td>Coached Manager</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32_CM</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>18.09.2010</td>
<td>Coached Manager</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33_CM</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>24.07.2010</td>
<td>Coached Manager</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34_CM</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>24.07.2010</td>
<td>Coached Manager</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35_CM</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>26.07.2010</td>
<td>Coached Manager</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36_CM</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>27.07.2010</td>
<td>Coached Manager</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37_CM</td>
<td>Relief</td>
<td>07.12.2010</td>
<td>Coached Manager</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38_CM</td>
<td>Relief</td>
<td>07.12.2010</td>
<td>Coached Manager</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39_CM</td>
<td>Relief</td>
<td>02.12.2010</td>
<td>Coached Manager</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22: Overview of HR-Managers interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Date of interview</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21_HRM</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>29.03.2010</td>
<td>HR Manager</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22_HRM</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>21.05.2010</td>
<td>HR Manager</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24_HRM</td>
<td>Relief</td>
<td>29.11.2010</td>
<td>HR Manager</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25_HRM</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>15.02.2011</td>
<td>HR Manager</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26_HRM</td>
<td>Relief</td>
<td>29.11.2010</td>
<td>HR Manager</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27_HRM</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>19.01.2011</td>
<td>HR Manager</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28_HRM</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>21.2.2011</td>
<td>HR Manager</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29_HRM</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>14.03.2011</td>
<td>HR Manager</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30_HRM</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>25.5.2011</td>
<td>HR Manager</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4. The Data Analysis Procedure

In the analysis I operationalize accounts of coaching through use of interpretative repertoires analysis in the tradition of discursive psychology (Potter & Wetherell, 1987; Wiggins & Potter, 2008; Potter & Hepburn, 2008). Discursive psychology fits well into the overall framework of this thesis as it assumes that discourse is both constructed and constructive as well as action-oriented. Furthermore, it assumes that discourse is always situated within a set of interacting conditions and that to understand discourse better, one must examine it \textit{in situ} as it transpires within its situational context. Moreover, scholars of discourse psychology advocate that the construction of discourse happens via various types of linguistic building blocks, a proposition which makes the following analysis feasible. Adapted to the following analysis, I thus concur that the discourse on management coaching, the linguistic representation of management coaching, is constructed with the help of interpretative repertoires.

However, the scholarly definitions of interpretive repertoires are not completely consistent (see Potter & Wetherell, 1987; Potter & Hepburn 2008; Mueller & Whittle 2011). Interpretative repertoires are sometimes referred to as ‘broader elements’ in comparison with ‘words and grammatical structures’ (Potter & Hepburn 2008) or as ‘clusters of terms organized around a central metaphor, often used with grammatical regularity’ (Wiggins & Potter, 2008, p. 74). This analysis focuses on organizational discursive practices, as opposed to the micro-linguistic positioning strategies that have recently been more precisely theorized through discursive devices in discursive psychology (Mueller & Whittle, 2011). My analysis is specifically oriented towards the tracing of a multiplicity of interpretative repertoire (IRs) (Wiggins and Potter 2008: p.74). In an attempt to find categories that would allow variation and coherence of interviewee accounts, I moved through a number of ‘models of categorization’, which were validated, tested and reworked by analyzing and reanalyzing my empirical material until I felt confident that I could sufficiently summarize the interviewees’ accounts of coaching to one or more of the built repertoires. My analysis of the over 800 pages of interview transcripts was undertaken using AtlasTi, a multi-level text program called Scrivener with paper-textmarker-scissor-pinboard methods for a visual overview. Figure 3 demonstrates one of the analytical steps in which multiple colors were used in the text to code the appearance of different IRs.
The presented categorizations are the extremely condensed outcome of two years of analysis and validation discussions. During this time two data reports were presented and discussed with colleagues. Moreover, the ongoing research project was presented and discussed at the Standing Conference of Organizational Symbolism 2010 and at the symposium of the European Group for Organization Studies 2011. The materials in their current forms have been reworked at least six times due to various feedback loops. The acquired reviews helped focus and calibrate the interpretation of the materials as well as align the overall argument of the paper.

6.5. Accounts of Management Coaching

Following the first analytical question, this section examines the Interpretative Repertoires that are drawn upon to give meaning to coaching experiences and account for the installment of the intervention in the company. The analysis has identified four interpretative repertoires that agents used to legitimize the use of management coaching. Agents draw upon these repertoires to describe the change process, to legitimize and make sense of coaching and to attribute specific assigned subject positions to the figures of the coach, the coached manager and the HR-manager. An overview of the basic constituents of each repertoire is given in Table 23.
Table 23: A summary of positions of coach and coached manager, a representation of the coaching process, aims of the intervention, and potential organizational effects of each repertoire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Controlling Performance</th>
<th>Steering development</th>
<th>Restraining symptoms</th>
<th>Nurturing the psyche</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject position:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coach</td>
<td>Assesses gap and yields change techniques</td>
<td>Facilitates reflection</td>
<td>Assesses symptoms - yields healing techniques</td>
<td>Creates intimate setting for conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coated manager</td>
<td>Has gap, needs to be optimized or repaired</td>
<td>Searching for clarity in an ever-faster moving world</td>
<td>Patient needs to be liberated from symptoms</td>
<td>Self-disclosing conversation partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theory of change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear learning models: classical behaviorism</td>
<td>Open-ended reflection of conflicts and roles: systemic models</td>
<td>Medical model: classical psychiatry and psychoanalysis</td>
<td>Dialogical model: contemporary psychotherapy models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aims of intervention</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving performance of employee</td>
<td>Creating autonomous employees</td>
<td>Healing and preventing psychological symptoms</td>
<td>Resolving tensions in personal narrations and increasing spaces of possibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metaphorical representation for coaching process</strong></td>
<td>Improving resources</td>
<td>Sparring fight</td>
<td>Medical treatment</td>
<td>Equitable healing partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Used as means of governance and as disciplinary practice</td>
<td>Increase of self-surveillance and self management</td>
<td>Individualization of organizational symptoms</td>
<td>Emancipation against dominant discourse of performativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Possible political effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.5.1. Controlling Performance

The first repertoire I called ‘controlling performance’, as coaching is predominantly described as ‘coaching-for-performance’ (Whitmore, 2002), or as one HR-manager stated, ‘Coaching is the instrument to get people functioning in an individualized, fast and uncomplicated way’ (male HR manager at bank: #22). This repertoire’s approach to change is aligned to the linear model of rationality with the aim to bring about controllable, anticipated outcomes. Recounting how the coaching process started, a coached manager explained:

‘You get scanned from the HR-department of [BANK] concerning your strengths and weaknesses, especially concerning your leadership behavior. As a result of my scan, during a management review it was asserted that I had a deficit in my leadership
experience, respectively behavior. (...) As an appropriate measurement, the responsible HR department thought that, in my case, a coaching would indeed create improvements’ (Interview #23).

Consequently, the intervention is scripted through a firm alliance between the assessment of deficits (e.g. lack of skills and knowledge, dysfunctional work/ social behavior or insufficient work performance) and the use of corrective behavior techniques. The coach becomes a change-maker, an expert who is able to shape the client through the use of selected socio-behavioral technologies. I report two variations of this IR, a ‘repair mode’ and an ‘optimizing mode’, exemplified in the following statement of a freelance coach, who I asked to describe his understanding of coaching:

‘It's about development and improvement of people, self-decided or externally suggested — I’ll put it like this — and this development can be “resolving deficits” or “becoming turbo”. Well, resolving deficit is actually instrumental: you are not supposed to make certain mistakes [anymore]. And turbo is, “He is already in the force track but should not make mistakes”, so support (male coach: #1).

In the optimization mode of this repertoire, managers are described as needing only a finishing touch to ‘make the jump into excellence’ (male manager: #14). At the same time they are tagged with characteristics, such as high potentials, future leaders or top shots. In contrast, managers who fall into the repair mode are perceived to show signs of weak performance and/or dysfunctional social behaviors; they are described as low performers or incompetent. In the latter variation, in the case of an unsatisfactory coaching outcome, managers are prone to negative sanctions, a situation that led a coach to the following comparison:

‘And that sometimes means: “When coaching doesn’t produce changes, then we have to part.” Well, Damocles’s sword hangs over it - much depends on it’ (female coach: #3).

Another example is the narration of one HR manager in an insurance company who stated that in eighty percent of cases in his organization, coaching had been initiated due to performance deficits or the dysfunctional behavior of employees (my field notes, 13.12.2010). Considering some of the more critical effects of this repertoire, I conclude that
next to the unquestionable improvement of a employee’s performance, the use of coaching can take the form of a disciplinary practice (Foucault, 1979; Barratt, 2003; Deetz, 2003) or sometimes even become a covert maneuver to legitimize the layoff of an employee. Asked about the coaching culture at his company, a HR manager recapitulated:

‘The motto used to be: “Coach, coached, go.” That means that only those people who got their last chance before being thrown out received coaching. That had a very bad reputation. And always when someone got a coaching you knew that they want to get rid of him’ (Interview #22).

This is similarly expressed by one of the coaches:

‘Usually it's like this: “I don’t get along with an employee. I have no methods and tools to develop him. And now we’ll try coaching, and if that also does not work, then we have to part. Well, we don’t have to necessarily throw him out, but displace, somewhere.” That can also happen’ (Interview #7).

This repertoire relates to classical human resource management theory in which ‘[t]he individual is the basic unit [...], that is, an essential human subject whose nature is to be discovered or uncovered, and who is to be motivated through exercise of correct procedures of recruitment, appraisal, development, and compensation’ (Townley, 1993: p.522). This repertoire of coaching shows itself as a highly normative discursive practice, which subscribes to the managerial belief of rational control, as represented in the body of HRM discourses (Maravelias, 2003).

6.5.2. Steering Development

The second repertoire, ‘steering development’, shares its overall goals with the first repertoire, namely to produce better organizational performance through the modification of an individual's abilities. However, it differs in its conceptualization of change, as it breaks away from linear learning models and assumes that organizational life is multifaceted and needs to be interpreted rather than controlled. Taking on a developmental stance, quality of performance is guaranteed through the improvement of a manager's knowledge of leadership, motivation, self-management and emotional skills. The virtues of this repertoire of coaching are expressed in the next quote from a HR manager:
‘... through the striking rise of complexity and the acceleration of the corporate world, people have to increasingly, .... if you imagine a Chinese plate spinner: nowadays people have to turn more and more plates. So, nowadays those who don’t have a coach have a problem. In former times you had a problem if you had a coach, and now it's the other way around, because the coach is used as a sparring-partner, especially to bring things to an end. Also, I can purchase time and a space for reflection’ (male HR manager: #25).

This repertoire is legitimized by the belief that managers live in an ever faster spinning world and are in need of help to unravel its complexities, to make sense of things and keep the upper hand on events. The repertoire can be connected to the shift in organizational theory from a quasi-Taylorist stance towards the idea that managers need to become autonomous, innovative, and able to capture the heart of their employees in order to guarantee the survival of the company. The following quote by a middle manager illustrates this:

‘Coaching is pressed ahead very strongly, even in the division I work in. And that is really also because the mission statement is to produce autonomous managers’ (Coached middle manager in a bank, interview #14).

This shift can also be described as a movement from a static form of control and resistance to a relational dynamic that emphasizes autonomy and self-management. Fittingly, the central metaphor of this repertoire to coaching, is that of ‘sparring’, a term that denotes training fighters in martial arts and boxing.

‘What has always been the same or has even become more important in coaching is this sparring. And the most important thing in coaching, and that's what those notice who also take advantage of coaching, well, it's helpful for sorting things out. Well, everything that has to do with sorting, with closure and getting in a new perspective from someone else. Top-managers just notice that they can’t take out their own kidney, like a doctor, he can’t do that either. This has to be done by someone from the outside who is not caught up in the system and who can ask questions so you can get a change of perspectives or an expansion of perspectives. (...) In combination with self-coaching and coaching, people are, as mentioned, more productive in a shorter span of time’ (Interview #22).
This repertoire can be related to current human resource development frameworks, which themselves are informed by systemic, complexity and narrative theories (see also Marshak & Grant, 2008). While Hamlin, Ellinger and Beattie (2008), who have extensively looked at the overlap between coaching and HRD, conclude that the ‘intended purposes and processes associated with both fields of practice are virtually the same’ (p. 287). I suggest that this is only one perspective of coaching with specific effects on the organization of the intervention; the most important effect being that through its developmental stance, behavior is seen as a consequence of motivations, perceptions, available skills, and the use of available resources. Coaching is packaged in such a way that the manager, by free will, wants to learn to improve his or her self-management, professional role performance, and leadership behavior/people management (Fogde, 2011; Hancock & Tyler, 2004).

6.5.3. Restraining Symptoms

The third repertoire is called ‘restraining symptoms’, as it describes coaching as a treatment method for psychological symptoms and essentially explores the functional-medical representation of change. The use of a symptom-based terminology legitimizes coaching: burnout, stress, a bad work-life balance, but also descriptions of depression or anxiety disorders may surface in the texts. Coaching becomes a measurement to prevent or overcome (work related) psychic symptoms, which is argued by a HR-manager:

‘Personally, I think it’s great when line-managers contact me and say: “I have this employee who I think has a real burn-out going on or he is getting into some form of pathological symptomatic. I have already talked to him and proposed, I could clarify how a coaching could work.” So, the initiative comes from the line-manager, who takes his responsibility as a leader seriously’ (female HR manager at an insurance company: #28).

The subject position of the coached manager becomes equivalent to the position of a patient, the bearer of a (potential) psychological symptom, someone who needs to be taken care of. In this representation of management coaching, the coaches becomes the yielders of specialized health-constituting techniques and knowledge that legitimizes their position to attempt to overcome the symptoms. Linguistically this repertoire avails itself of the classical ‘psy-language’ (Rose, 1998) and often of the nomenclature of symptoms, for example, as set out in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (American Psychiatric
Association, 1994). An evident effect of this repertoire is that the manager is almost entirely absorbed by the well-known script of the patient. Also, the next quote, from a coach, demonstrates the individualization of organizational dynamics/symptoms:

‘Let's put it like this, in Germany, the audit department said: “We need coaching for our people, they are overburdened, they have stress, they need a coaching now and then.” And then they implemented the method so that everyone who had the feeling he needed support could get a coach.’ (Interview #1).

While the nurturing intention of the coaching intervention is evident, its other effect is that symptoms are individualized, thus passing up the chance to reflect upon them in relation to the organizational context and the dominant discursive practices of performance.

6.5.4. Nurturing the Psyche

The fourth repertoire is called ‘nurturing the psyche’, as it constructs coaching as a form of self-reflective conversation that aims to resolve issues around the personal biography and psyche of the manager. Given the personal character of the intervention, its contents need to be kept confidential so that coached managers are able to talk freely about intimate and emotionally charged topics, a setting well known from psychotherapy. This intimacy is described by one female coach as follows:

‘And coaching ultimately has something of a psychotherapeutic intervention. I think coaching and therapy share a long border. And the possibilities you have with coaching, due to the setting, to be together with a person, to be close to someone, not in his office et cetera, et cetera, well everything that is needed ... for one of the most far reaching interventions.’ (female coach: #7).

The theories of change applied in this repertoire stand in the tradition of psychotherapeutic models, which suggest that unconscious needs, thoughts, behaviors and feelings need to be made explicit (Pawelczyk, 2011) so that they can be reflected upon and modified. As the same coach as in the last quote states:

‘My role is always to go beyond the pure phenomenological level, so I always try to - if it's okay for the coachee, but generally there has never been any problems with this – I always try to look where the behavior comes from. So: “Where does the behavior
you show in the company come from? With what patterns, that come from somewhere totally different, could this be connected?” Well, such a foundation, sort of in the biography and then to have access points to see what he has to recollect out of this script to be able to reflect about it. If I don’t reflect this script, where this comes from, like from his upbringing or through some sort of experiences in whatever time, then we will not be able to change this script for the future’ (female coach: #7).

Overall, this repertoire places feelings, personal needs, relationships and autobiographic narratives center stage, which is reinforced by an executive manager:

‘... it was really important that [the coach] got to know my personal role. At the beginning we somewhat went into the psychological and explored my insecurities and my weaknesses. Of great importance was the individual coach-coachee relationship where you can really talk about everything’ (Interview 34).

The quote reflects the central belief of the therapeutic discourse; that change can be obtained through an intense self-reflective process, which implies the self-disclosure of the client towards the professional counterpart (Bordin, 1979).

6.5.5. Discussion of the Accounts of Management Coaching
In the first analytical step I asked how management coaching was legitimized and accounted for by the use of specific interpretative repertoires. The analysis, as summarized in Table 23, suggests that the IRs (‘controlling performance’, ‘steering development’, ‘restraining symptoms’, and ‘nurturing the psyche’) were mainly used to explain this intervention and its workings in organizations.

Furthermore, I suggest that these four accounts of coaching can be arranged in two dimensions. The ‘controlling performance’ and ‘steering development’ IRs, while unequal in their assumptions on change, are essentially in line with a general managerial mindset that holds the view that coaching should aim to improve a ‘leader’s capability to achieve short and long-term organizational goals’ (Ennis, Goodman & Stern, 2003, p. 20). Moreover, the ‘restraining symptoms’ and ‘nurturing the psyche’ IRs both have the individual’s well-being in mind; while the first is organized around the symptoms, the latter stresses the dialogical conversation as a means to edit biographic narratives. These two IRs have their common denominator in the psy-practices (Rose, 1990), which places feelings, personal needs, psychological symptoms, relationships, and autobiographic experiences center stage. The
first dimension thus divides the managerial from the psychological repertoires, as the aims of management are in favor of organizational well being while psychological interventions are directed at improving individuals’ well-being. The second dimension is informed by the suggestion that HRM (Marshak and Grant, 2008) and psychotherapy (Sutherland, 2007; Tarragona & Lebow, 2008, McNamee & Gergen, 1992) have begun to adopt poststructural ideas by moving away from linear models to models of change, which seek to increase the possibilities of action of an individual or system through reflection. The second dimension distinguishes how strongly the account of coaching scripts change as an adaptation to a norm or as the increase of spaces of possibilities.

Figure 4: A two-dimensional analysis of the four accounts of coaching

Taking this thought a step further we might then link these empirically-based repertoires to the mindsets of the general professional disciplines which have institutionalized these discourses. Turning back to the discussion of different models in management the ‘Controlling Performance’ IR can be related to classical, functional human resource management models due to its understanding of management coaching as a mechanism to extract (externally) better performance. As has been argued in the introduction, this is indeed the mindset of the more classical models of employee
management. The ‘Steering Development’ IR then relates to newer human resource management models that more explicitly emphasize development of the soft priorities and highlight the need to help people develop themselves (e.g. Marshak & Grant, 2008). On the other hand ‘Restraining Symptoms’ converges towards the medicalized, psychiatry-inspired older versions of psychotherapy (e.g. traditional psychoanalysis of behavioral therapy), while ‘Nurturing the Psyche’ attunes to revised and modern forms of psychotherapy (e.g. family and systemic therapies, cognitive behavioral therapy and new schools of psychoanalysis). Taking a broader general perspective, I then suggest that management coaching draws upon two more generally known apparatuses that have historically developed in different contexts, management and psychotherapy, which I suggest be interpreted with Chávez’ (2009) ‘historical translative scapes’ of management coaching. These historic scapes align to the routinized application of specific (organizational) discursive practices which appear relatively stable and coherent. Yet when these discourses are translated into new contexts and related to other scapes they become less stable as they are then re-assembled and re-arranged. It is this process of undergoing new connections to other discourses that describes what have been called translative moves.

6.6. The Translative Moves of Management Coaching

To further investigate the translative processes through which the accounts of management coaching are arranged into relational patterns, I present a second analysis of the materials. This successive analytical step makes use of the findings in the first analysis (presented above) to consider how the two historical translative scapes ‘management’ and ‘psychotherapy’ play out in the form of translative moves. To recap: this analysis is grounded on the idea that one scape does not fully push back another thus creating a new immutable discourse; rather the ‘repertoires’ co-exist in a polyphony and are forced to relate to each other. It is these translative processes that constitute management coaching as an organizational intervention.

I present my interpretation of the second analysis and illustrate the three translative moves, which reflect specific foreground-background figures of the psychotherapeutic towards the managerial discourses. The three translative moves are: an assimilating move in which the managerial takes the foreground and incorporates the psychotherapeutic, thus instrumentalizing the psychotherapeutic towards managerial aims; an unfolding move, which openly negotiates the rift between the two historic scapes by addressing their incompatible base assumptions; and finally a countering move which produces an awareness of the tension that lies between the aims of the managerial perspective and the
psychotherapeutic tradition, but also emphasizes the therapeutic agenda in relation to the managerial, thus openly questioning the managerial in the light of personal needs, desires and passions.

6.6.1. Assimilating

In this first translative move the two psy-based repertoires are pulled into the logics of the managerial repertoires. For example, the psyche is nurtured, but turned towards the end of achieving better productivity. As one coached manager comments:

[coaching] ‘brings the organization an added value because [the coached manager] can then concentrate better, is more motivated, whenever he operates in his work environment.’ (female coached manager, #32).

A good example of how the assimilative move discursively unfolds is illustrated by the next quote. Here a HR-manager describes why her organization funds the management coachings.

‘Do you know this (--) do you know this neologism “Cooption”? Well, cooperation and competition. There are two necessities of behavior. It is a competitive orientation towards the INSIDE and towards the OUTSIDE. At the same time performance is brought within a team and only then are they good, also beyond their specified field. It is then ahm, demanded, ahm, really demanded that to stimulate their use a bit of elbow, assertiveness, develop of the person’s profile. But also to deliver, support, be present when others need me. Maybe also to support when others are passing me in their career. That is, well that is emotionally exhausting. I would say that is really one aspect that decides if someone is able to manage this’ (Female HR-manager #25).

This narration legitimizes management coaching as a means to develop the soft priorities of the manager so s/he can become more caring, supportive but also self-conscious. Moreover, coaching is scripted as an intervention that is to help the person steer through emotionally stressful times. I suggest that these indeed represent the psychotherapeutic (or at least psychological) notions of self-care and development. Yet, the all-embracing agenda of the coaching intervention is to produce a manager that produces opportunities and success for the company; in this way the discursive practices of psychotherapy are merged into those of the managerial.
Moreover, the therapeutic virtues of self-disclosure, emotional involvement, and a relationship founded on confidentiality and trust, are seen as key factors for the intervention, while simultaneously, the ‘soft’ therapeutic discourse is displaced by a functionalist, performance-driven managerial framework. One middle manager described how coaching allowed him to professionalize his behaviors by means of better managing his emotions. He also recounted how ‘almost psychoanalytical’ exploration coaching helped him to lead ‘low-performing’ employees to better performance, and to handle ‘difficult’ subordinates and strategically optimize his behavior towards his boss:

‘…intellectually interpreting the behaviors of myself and others gave me an incredible value, because maybe I normally am too emotional and also react too emotional and through this I get a kind of meta-perspective on the dimensions of my own life, concerning the here-and-now, my career, the involved people, the strategy and the content I produce’ (male coached manager: #14).

The same manager also stated that through coaching, the company ‘gets a leader they would have otherwise not have had’. Therefore, going through the motions of the therapeutic enables the management of the ‘soft-realm’ (e.g. negative emotions, difficult relationships or identity issues).

The working of the assimilating move is further illustrated through the fact that job applicants are increasingly listing their coaching experiences in their CVs. A HR-manager who reported this commented why he thinks this happens:

‘To be able to show “I have worked hard on myself, I am willing to do that (--) and important (--) I have also learned important things.” I think that is the motivation behind that’ (female coached manager #36).

In a second variation of the assimilating move, the manager is scripted as a symptom-bearing quasi-patient and disqualified as a professional. In a drastic form this is illustrated in a statement by a HR-manager:

‘Coaching is still commonly put in the corner of therapy, thus suggesting: “He can’t cope with the situation, he needs a coaching, he is a milksop”’ (male HR-manager #26).
This variation of the assimilating move implies that managers who show symptoms or bad performance need to be mended through psy-interventions. The managers are regarded as unstable, weak and incompetent, all characteristics that contradict the image of the heroic, successful manager. Coaching is then constructed ‘as an instrument in the sense of “We will manipulate him into the right direction”’ (Interview #21) and used as a corrective/disciplinary practice for insufficiently performing as well as symptom-struck, which almost becomes an equivalent to insufficiently performing employees. In the following example I asked a coach if he could recount a case in which he thought he had done a good job. He tells the following narration:

‘I once coached a manager and ahm, he was sent from his superior after the yearly evaluation: “Optimize” - I will condense it a bit – “optimize your behavior towards colleagues and superiors”. And this person came into coaching and we found out that he had an attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. This person resisted change, in his own way of being. And the person always put down the solutions we came up with and connects that were worked out and said: “No, if I do this I will change and become unfaithful to myself and lose my identity”. But I stayed on it and mirrored his behavior and showed connections and made suggestions what he could change so that change could become bearable for him. That took a long while. It took a lot of time. But I had the impression I brought the person forward. And from the work environment of the person I heard that his behavior and that the person is no longer rebellious (male coach #25).

To recap: the manager is sent into coaching by his superior to optimize his performance, which clearly signals the gesture of the managerial discourse. The manager is then assessed in the coaching sessions as a psychic unstable person and diagnosed with ‘attention deficit hyperactivity disorder’ due to his rebellious behavior towards colleagues and superiors. The coach works intensively with the manager, makes suggestions and shows connections (presumably to the childhood experiences of the manager). While the manager initially resists this, the coach manages to persuade the manager into changing and indeed the company feedback to the coach is that the coaching was successful. This narration shows how the psychotherapeutic discourse through the use of the psy-diagnose and the idea of intensive self-work has been assimilated into the managerial agenda. Moreover, the case also shows how resistance to change is sidestepped through this form of intervention. It can
be assumed (in relation to the first study) that the intensity of the conversations and the well-rehearsed linguistic practices of the coach indeed persuaded the manager in the end.

Overall, this move presents itself as unstable and conflicting, as descriptions of coaching through managerial terminologies stay vague, as the techniques and change processes can no longer be accounted for, a circumstance that is also reflected in the academic literature, where the question of ‘Coaching versus Psychotherapy’ (Hart, Blattner & Leipsic, 2001) has become a major debate (see e.g. Passmore and Gibbes, 2007). This is demonstrated by the next remark from a coach.

‘I think the boundary between psychotherapy and coaching is very clear when I notice that someone does not go to a doctor. I already had several clients that visited a psychotherapist parallel, we try to differentiate the topics, even though it doesn’t work of course (laughs) Still, it partly works very, very well, because I am not a psychologist and especially not a therapist from my basic education’ (male coach #19).

What the comment brings to the foreground is that in the assimilating move the psychotherapeutic influences retain a central part through which the intervention is scripted, while at the same time agents try to gain as much distance as possible from psychotherapeutic discourse by, for example, noting that the coach does not have a training as a psychotherapist.

6.6.2. Unfolding
The second translative move openly addresses the tension that results when psychotherapeutic and managerial discourses are fused in the construction of management coaching. The tensions arise as the psychotherapeutic discourses define management coaching as a space in which managers work intensively on their ‘issues’ and in which confidentiality and intimacy are important. At the same time the managerial logics push into this space and attempt to define the agenda of coaching. As one HR-manager put it:

‘There is this absolute classic, to put it bluntly and oversimplified: “The successful managers are those that have a father complex.”. And the question is then, if you want to amplify this or help the person overcome this issue. From the therapeutic side it’s the latter and from the organizational side it's about reinforcing what is already dominant. [She later goes on to say:] Fundamentally [coaching] has two aspects for me: the first is about self-development and that is more the therapeutic side and the
other is very strongly about functioning — this sounds awful — functioning in the organization and that's where I'm in a dilemma’ (female HR-manager at bank: #21).

This translatable move also becomes apparent when the intervention is perceived as an act of disciplining from the manager, which triggers a form of open resistance. A coach recalls that sometimes:

‘... the coached managers come and ask “Hey, what's going on here? Now the company has put you onto me as a watchdog!”’ (male coach #4).

Agents sensible of the power dynamics within management coaching and prone to the unfolding move then try to work around this tension by bringing them into the open. One of the coaches put it as follows:

‘At the end of the day, the clarification of the assignment is attached to the budget: Who has the authority over the budget? If it’s the manager’s supervisor then I think its a good thing to have a three-way conversation, explicitly a three way conversation so both of them can write on cards what are the expectations of the coaching. And what the manager thinks the supervisor expects of him. (...) It’s important to bring clarity into the situation because it has to be clear that I do not report details of the conversation to the supervisor’ (male coach #10).

Embedded in this comment is the psychotherapeutic logic that the contents of the management coaching conversation needs to stay protected from the superiors. At the same time the power structures into which the coach is bound — as s/he is paid by the organization — are also addressed. In this way the quote shows how the logics of the psychotherapeutic and managerial discourses repel each other, a tension that is not resolved and calls for specific forms of negotiation.

Overall, the unfolding move shows the cracks within management coaching caused by the combative aspects between psychotherapeutic and the managerial. This is not least reflected by the ways agents narrate their understanding of the term ‘coaching’. As one coach put it:

‘The term coaching is commonly used, simply because it comes out of sports, which is the biggest demonstration of performance in our society [laughs]. And I think that it's
just inside people's heads, it's less the fact that people are coached in organizations but more that people are coached in sports’ (male coach #9).

The humor shown in this quote also shows the friction embedded in the term ‘management coaching’. On the one hand it is associated with sports and linked to performance (as the representative of the managerial discourse). On the other hand the coach suggests that the metaphor of sports coaching does not really fit what is being done in organizations.

The arbitrary nature of management coaching and the struggles over interpretative dominance of the two discourses reflect the dynamic of the unfolding move. This also becomes visible in issues of resistance, which hint towards (covert) power struggles inlaid in the intervention. I have seldom found this move in the data, supposedly because the dissonances are brought to light, and the dilemma stands unresolved.

6.6.3. Countering

In this third translative move, the managerial discourses are countered by the therapeutic discourses, which call for the transgression of alternative voices along the lines of desires, needs, dreams, and emotions. Through the installment of these openings, the managerial discourse is critically challenged and a momentum of emancipation, which seeks alternative ways of organizing, is prioritized. A middle manager (female coached manager: #29), for example, said that coaching was a way for her ‘to protect [her] identity within the organization’ as she feared having to deform her personality in order to fit into the managerial norms. She made an attempt at ‘finding a balance among the different pressures or the different inputs you can receive, especially when you start growing in the career path’ (ibid). The tension between organizational and individual motives show in this move, such as through protecting one's identity from a threatening degree of over-conformity, the insight that work has absorbed oneself and that personal relationships are at the brink of collapse. One of the HR-managers brings this to the point in his following statement:

‘The managers get very narrow objectives, very high goals they have to fulfill. On the other hand this person might desperately need some space for himself and a better work-life balance (- -) and he is so under pressure that he does not have the time to deal with his private things so that pressure begins to build up in his family because he is not there for them so that the tension builds up even more. He would desperately need a time out, but how can he do that? He has his goals to fulfill. That’s a real balancing act. A manager that comes into coaching (- - -) on the one hand there is the
ten-hour-rule ( - - ) from the work council. His employees are not allowed to work more than ten hours maximum. And on the other side the goals are so high that the manager has no clue how he can stem the workload if his employees don’t work at least eleven hours. Right? That just doesn’t fit together. And then, in coaching, to bring the manager to realize ‘You have to take responsibility for yourself and your employees and drum up the courage to say: “No”‘. That’s not easy in times of high unemployment and lack of jobs, and so on and so on’ (female HR-manager # 12).

In this statement the coach clearly takes the context of the manager into consideration and weighs the constraints and options against each other. The effects of a system which takes advantage of the entire resourcefulness of the employee are critically reflected and the collapse of the manager’s well-being and his/her social situation are discussed. Taking such a stance on coaching the coach indicates that the intervention can encourage managers to stand up for their own and their employees’ needs and oppose the exaggerated expectations of the company.

Another aspect of this move is what might be considered a veiled form of resistance. Take for example the next explanation, again from a coach:

‘Quite often in management coaching, that is strongly formalized, you make the contract and the goals and blablabla with the company. So, the coaching goals ( - - ) who is responsible and who pays, there you often get one goal. And then, after the first conversation, if the person has gained some trust in you they say: “Yes, well I have a bit of a different issue also“ [laughs] and they come with another problem that they do not want the company to know about, to protect himself or because he does not want to stay in the company anymore. So there’s a totally new dynamic that often comes into play then’ (male coach #1).

The coach suggests that normally the goals of the coaching sessions are set in a rather formalized and narrow way through the company (those who pay) but that, over the course of the coaching sessions, the managers sometimes bring in their own agenda. This second agenda is not to be made public to the company. In this way the manager can discuss issues that do not match the company interests such as how they can protect their personal integrity or even initiate steps to leave the company.
Finally, directly relating to the installment of emotional norms at work that disapprove of the display of ‘unprofessional feelings’ one coach states that she tries to encourage employees to resist such protocols:

‘Well, there is this topic, “Don’t be so emotional”, which is always brought up in companies as a criticism. [...] Then I get rebellious impulses to say “Be emotional, more than ever!”’ (female coach: #7).

Overall, this translative move is notable, as it contrasts and challenges the dominant managerial logic with a sense for personnel well-being and health that results in the ability to disrupt the dominant prevailing discourses at work.

6.6.4. Discussion of the Translative Moves
The second analytical step deepens the understanding of how management coaching is constituted through translative processes. It shows the ongoing discursive actions involved in their discursive becoming, and the multiplicity of how it is accounted for, but also considers some of the social effects involved in these discursive processes.

Management Coaching as a Translation in the Making
Management coaching has been shown to be a practice that is in translation, and thus in a state of uncertainty; it reveals rivaling, multi-faceted transitive arrangements. The analysis further suggests that the translative process does not take place in a linear manner in which discourses stay unmodified, but leads to a multifaceted assemblage of translative moves, forming relations between discourses, in which the ‘texts’ merge, reject each other or try to gain dominance. Thus, the translation processes might be understood more as an ongoing chain of translations in which stable coherent endpoints of institutionalization are not necessarily the norm: as long as one scape is not able to pull others coherently into its trajectory, thus itself becoming a ‘new’ discourse, repertoires co-exist in form of different translative moves that produce variable effects and images, a state that is reflected in the current polyphony identified as surrounding the term coaching.

Recapitulating the Translative Moves
In the first move, the general managerial discourse has gained interpretative authority over the imitated therapeutic discursive practices. Here the managerial texts have successfully ‘assimilated’ the therapeutic discourse in such a way that the managerial ground assumptions need not be further modified. In the second translative move attention is placed
on the incompatible elements of the translative scapes. The conflicting aims that derive out of their initial contextualization (in different historical scapes) are ‘unfolded’ and made explicit. Ambivalence, rather than conformity, becomes the ordering discursive device. Finally, the last move I describe as ‘countering’, as it attempts to affirm the effects of one psychotherapeutic scape while reducing those of the managerial scape by subscribing to a therapeutic-emancipatory element that is oriented around the individual's well-being. Together, these forms of translative moves have created various kinds of hybrid texts in different ways, where self-disclosure and self-development are fused with professionalism and productivity.

The translative moves were by no means used in the interviews equally often. While the ‘countering’ and ‘unfolding’ moves were used only occasionally, the ‘assimilation’ move dominated the accounts of coaching in all three groups of agents. The assimilating move is, in other words, the most common form of discursive arrangement adapting psychotherapeutic discourses into a managerial logic.

6.7. Chapter Discussion
In the following section I discuss how this second study responds to the three problematizations (lack of non-psychotherapeutic concepts and contextualization, lack of knowledge of the used practices and their processes, lack of critical voices) of management coaching as well as how it adds to a wider discussion in Organization Studies on the translation of discourses. Furthermore, I suggest some practical implications of the findings as well as limitations and possibilities for future research.

6.7.1. Management Coaching as a Site of Translation
In the present chapter I have conceptualized management coaching as an organizational HRM intervention situated within the realm of work life. My key understanding is that when people talk about management coaching they construct the intervention; in this way it is enacted as an organizational discursive practice. Furthermore, agents draw upon a limited number of discourses which can be uncovered by investigating how people make sense of and legitimize the use of the intervention. Looking into these accounts answers to the first problematization of management coaching: the lack of non-psychological conceptualizations and contextualization of the intervention as it fathoms the organizational embeddedness of the intervention.

Furthermore, the notion of ‘translation’ — informed by translation studies (Janssens, Lambert, & Steyaert, 2004), translation theory (Chávez, 2009), and the sociology of
translation (Czarniawska & Sevón, 2005; Czarniawska-Joerges & Sevón, 1996; Latour, 2005; Callon, 1986) — has allowed us to discuss management coaching as a field of ongoing discursive translations. It has been the demarcation of translative historic scapes (the historically formed organizational discursive practices) and the translative moves that have offered an entry point to understanding the ongoing constitution nature of the discourses that shape management coaching.

Understanding management coaching as a site of translation is a novel way of conceptualizing the intervention; it moves the intervention into the organizational context and gives importance to the relational and processual dynamics through which the intervention is constructed. I further suggest that the framework I have used to direct discourse analysis into a processual direction can be situated more generally in organization studies. The presented framework answers to recent calls to engage in theoretical and empirically based discussions which use the notion of translation in relation to discourse and the study of change (e.g. forthcoming special issue ‘Discourse, Translation and Change’ in the Journal for Change Management; Call for papers for the 4th International Symposium in Process Organization Studies (2012) titled ‘Language and Communication @ Work: Discourse, Narrativity and Organizing’). The framework, which has been developed in close proximity to the empirical analysis, might stimulate similar analysis of social phenomena in the making, such as the increasing use of religious practices (c.f. Zaidman, Goldstein-Gidoni, & Nehemya, 2009; McGuire, 2009) or the proliferation of interventions such as supervision or mentoring.

6.7.2. The Organizational Discourse of Management Coaching
Empirically, the study has first shown how management coaching is constructed through the use of a limited number of discourses and secondly how these discourses are arranged towards each other. With this I answer the second problematization of management coaching: the lack of empirical studies which study how the intervention is specifically enacted, which discursive practices it uses, and how these practices are processually arranged.

First analytical step: Discursive representations of management coaching
The first analytical step has set out to understand better how the intervention is discursively constructed in agents’ accounts. Four representations of management coaching dominated the accounts of agents, titled ‘controlling performance’, ‘steering development’, ‘restraining symptoms’ and ‘nurturing the psyche’. As I have argued, these four representations produce
specific logics that shape the aims of the intervention and the theories of change used therein (see Table 23). The application of these specific discursive representations (operationalized through interpretative repertoires) of management coaching install organizational ‘realities’ and define what is important and what is not for the coaching intervention. Through the empirical examples I have been able to determine that management coaching is actually a multifaceted organizational discursive practice.

The four representations I have further aligned to two historically situated discourses: the first two to management and the latter two to psychotherapy. It is here that I have suggested that psychotherapy and management are translative historic scapes, which are drawn upon as basic material for the construction of management coaching. The variation in the managerial and the psychotherapeutic scapes seems to be due to the modifications that these discourses underwent over time. Management has incorporated post-modern ideas and psychotherapy has moved away from psychopathological to more relational models, which keeps some aspects of the more traditional discourses, but also develops new discursive representations. Yet, even though the characteristics of the two psychotherapeutic and the two managerial discourses show alternative forms, the underlying basic profiles stay intact: the two managerial IRs highlight the control and improvement of productivity, while the psychotherapeutic models adhere to the importance of psychic well-being.

These first findings stand in opposition to the position paper by Barner & Higgins (2007) which suggests that coaching is commonly constructed through four (psy-based) models of change. While my findings also speak for a strong use of psychological theories of change, I add that management logics do indeed play a very important role in the construction of management coaching.

This first analytic step offers an in-depth understanding of the multiple discursive elements that management coaching is constructed of, but has little explanatory power concerning the question of how these are used in practice. To answer this question a second analytical step is needed.

**Second Analytical Step: ‘Translative Moves’**

The second analysis reveals how the two translative scapes, psychotherapy and management, are assembled into confluent junctions as translative moves, which define and shape coaching into specific foreground-background figures. By understanding that the discourses used to construct management coaching are themselves in transition I have been able to look into the ongoing processes that constitute management coaching. It is through translation that discourses move through time and space.
To recap: the ways in which the historic scapes are arranged is not arbitrary, and specific processual patterns are recognizable. By analyzing these patterns, defined as translative moves, I suggested three patterns; assimilating, unfolding, and countering. The presented translative processes do not all fuse management and psychotherapy. In the ‘unfolding’ move the incompatibility and the tensions between the two are openly visible. Likewise, the ‘countering’ move works around the tension between the aims of the managerial and the psychotherapeutic. Here, the psychotherapeutic tries to override and challenge the performative logics of the managerial discourse. Yet, it is in the most dominant ‘assimilating’ move that the ambiguities of the two discourses are flattened and arranged in such a way that psychotherapy becomes employed as a practice of management. I thus speak of a rendezvous between management and psychotherapy, since the assimilating mode relates two different discourses into one practice.

I suggest that these findings bring a new perspective into ongoing debates in the management coaching literature. Currently it seems that two positions predominate the debate around the question, ‘What are the key practices of management coaching?’ A first position suggests that management coaching is not psychotherapy because it does not use the language of psychopathology and adds to the productivity of the organization (e.g. Hart, Blattner, & Leipsic, 2001; Wales, 2003). On the other hand there are a number of studies that propose coaching is psychotherapy due to the practices it uses (Gray, 2006; Sherin & Caiger, 2004). My interpretation of coaching as a site of translation offers a third position which states that in management coaching psychotherapeutic discursive practices have undergone a translation which has enabled them to alter their outlines and be infused with the managerial DNA. Rather than suggesting that management coaching is psychotherapy I show the historical connections to psychotherapy but also the ways in which it has been altered. From this empirically based ‘third’ position I suggest that the effects of management coaching need to be thought of in a new manner and cannot be equalized with those of psychotherapy. On the other hand, the suggestion that management coaching ‘simply’ makes people more productive by means of reflection and training might be given more depth through this perspective as the influence of psychotherapy has become too evident to overlook.

6.7.3. The Power of Management Coaching

In response to the third problematization of management coaching (the lack of critical voices) I suggest that the analysis also illustrates the highly political nature of the intervention. The ways in which performance is managed, how the intervention is used
intentionally as a disciplinary measurement, and how different aims are played out by different agents, clearly underlines the political nature of management coaching. I argue that management coaching is not innocent in terms of power and politics and should be understood as taking part in larger organizational power dynamics.

This I illustrate with two short vignettes. Assuming for example a division manager who follows the trajectory of absorbing the restraining symptoms IR into a HRM framework, we might find that he sends one of his subordinate managers into coaching after repeated arguments over the coordination of a project. During one of the arguments the senior manager diagnoses his subordinate as being ‘agitated’ and ‘getting on people’s nerves’. The coaching is then initiated with the sentence, ‘You should really do something for yourself!’ (Interview with manager #31). This form of disciplining the manager by means of the intervention, so it appears, has so far not been considered in the literature on management coaching.

In another instance, a manager felt the need to reflect upon his ‘work-life balance’ and asked the HR-department to fund a coaching. Here coaching appears as an intervention which follows primarily the nurturing the psyche IR, aiming to resist the dominant managerial discourse. While he communicated to the outside that he was working on his leadership behavior, he understood coaching as a means to distance himself from the strong, almost ideological, performance culture in his company with which he felt overly absorbed. The manager also used the coaching to prepare his application for a job at a different company (Interview #14). The central tension both vignettes describe can be summarized as follows: on the one hand, the organization translates its needs into performance targets, and, on the other, the subject has the opportunity to express his or her own needs and make the organization responsible for fulfilling them.

What becomes evident through these two vignettes is the institutional triangulation of management coaching. The aims of the intervention need to be negotiated between the organization and its representatives (HR-managers, supervisory), the coach and the coachees-to-be. The vignettes further illustrate that these aims are not always openly addressed or negotiated and, due to the multiple representations of the intervention and the used translative moves, different parties might have different understandings of the intervention. Especially when company representatives frame the intervention (in the background), the intervention might be seen as a way to reproduce the institutional power structures. For the field of management coaching these critical implications might lead to a greater awareness of the political dimensions of the intervention and a discussion of how companies use the intervention to outsource their control procedure to the external coach.
6.7.4. Practical Considerations

There are three practical considerations arising out of this study of organizational discursive practices of management coaching. First, practitioners, HR-managers and coached managers might better understand that management coaching is a multifaceted intervention that relates psychotherapeutic and managerial discourses. Understanding the multivocality of the intervention also points to the necessity to make explicit and negotiate the different understandings of management coaching. Secondly, the provided figure 5 might offer the possibility of distinguishing the different representations of agents involved in framing the coaching intervention (such as managers, HR-managers and coaches). The figure might be used as a grid along which the similarities and differences in positions might be contrasted. Finally, for management coaching clients, the presented interpretations might be an invitation to reflect for themselves what their aims are (instead of automatically buying into the direction the coach or the HR-manager pre-script) and possibly to use the intervention as a means to emancipate themselves.

6.7.5. Limitations and Outlook

There are, of course, some limitations to this study. I have excluded some important voices from my analysis, for example those of line managers, who take an important part in defining coaching's use in the managerial realm. Also, by focusing on discourse analysis I have stressed the importance of language, while defocusing the materiality of the translation process. The findings can also take no claim to be generalizable as our data is situated within unique contexts: coaching with German and Swiss managers in multi-national corporations performed by a senior group of coaches. Finally, although I have tried to do a thorough data analysis with different steps of discussion, we represent an interpretative position, which might also have been assembled differently.

There are a number of ways this perspective on management coaching might be further worked out. While this study intentionally looked at a wide variety of work contexts further empirical research might consider a case analysis of how management coaching is enacted in specific sectors or companies. A second line of research might be to explore how line-managers construct and use the intervention. Finally, research might further consider how ‘involuntary coaching’ is used as a means of disciplining employees.
This discussion aims to delineate the workings of the psycho-managerial complex in management coaching from a broader social perspective. In the following discussion I draw the two analytical studies of management coaching into a larger context and thus reflect on management coaching as part of a socio-historical development in which managerial capitalism drifts towards soft / emotional capitalism. This perspective accents that discourses, as social practices, are historically developed ideological formations that need to be continuously reproduced and enacted through concrete textual and organizational discursive practices. Based on this general assumption this chapter takes specific interest in how management coaching both reflects and constitutes a unique variation of the psycho-managerial complex and thus how it fuses intimacy and emotional self-management towards productivity and professionalism. This chapter thus comes full round and connects to the initial reflections of the introductory chapters. Yet, this discussion does more than echo these arguments. It adds an additional (more abstract) layer of interpretation to the two empirical studies. At the same time the discussion also illustrates how the psycho-managerial complex plays out.

The first section of this chapter discusses the effects of the management coaching conversations in relation to the wider social context. It suggests that management coaching conversations can be seen as a form of confessional talk through which hegemonic discourses are inscribed into the managers. Moreover, I argue that these conversations manifest a therapeutic habitus in which a therapeutic agenda is aligned to managerial interests.

The second section then reflects on the effects of management coaching as an organizational practice. It argues that as the psychotherapeutic has been translated in
relation to the managerial, the term ‘therapy’ has been dropped and replaced by the term ‘coaching’.
This has allowed management coaching to transport the discursive practices deep into the realm of management while veiling their origin. Also, this maneuver has situated a mechanism of socio-ideological control that comes in the form of the new HRM intervention management coaching.

The final section of this chapter summarizes the steps taken in this thesis and attempts to relate the exploration of the practices at the different sites of management coaching. Overall, I suggest that through my zooming in and out of the different enactments the workings of the psycho-managerial complex has become visible at different temporal and spatial scales of the social.

7.1. Inscribing the Therapeutic Habitus through Coaching Conversations

This section considers how the psycho-managerial complex becomes manifest in the coaching conversations. I suggest — grounding on Foucault’s notion of ‘confession’— that management coaching can be understood as a form of confessional talk through which individuals are governed by inscribing them into a specific set of hegemonic discourses. These hegemonic discourses advocate that the individual should become more professional — and therefore also more productive — by engaging in continuous self-work and by increasing his/her abilities to regulate and control emotions. It can thus be argued that management coaching installs a therapeutic habitus by relating psychotherapeutic and managerial discourses.

7.1.1. Management coaching as confessional talk

‘talk, talk, talk, for in talking is the cure’ (Caputo, 2004, p. 124).

Foucault has made the point that ‘confession’ has become a central practice of the self in modern life. While Foucault initially defined confession as ‘all those procedures by which the subject is incited to produce a discourse of truth about his sexuality which is capable of having effects on the subject himself’ (Foucault 1978, p. 215; cited in Besley, 2005), he describes in a genealogy of confessional practices that these have moved out from the realm of religion to medicine, therapy pedagogy and now colonize many realms of life. He has gone so far as to state that when confessions are not ‘spontaneous or dictated by some internal imperative, the confession is wrung from a person by violence or threat…Western man has become a confessing animal’ (Foucault, 1978, p. 59). What the notion of
confession enables us to see — and this is its usefulness for this thesis — is the link between coaching conversations and paradigm-type macro discourses. The notion of confession is an entry point that can help us to understand how the conversations are embedded in a larger socio-historic context. Confession is bound to the installment of technologies of the self, those operations through which individuals perform operations on their ‘bodies and souls, thoughts, conduct and way of being, so as to transform themselves in order to attain a certain state of happiness, purity, wisdom, perfection or immortality’ (Foucault, 1988, p. 18, cited in Starkey & McKinlay, 1997, p. 200). By means of confession individuals are colonized with specific discourses as they are expected to open themselves up, reflect on and modify their actions along representations of the world that are loaded with moral assumptions. In this way confessional talk has played an important part in establishing hegemonic power relations due to their ability to inscribe moral and ideological discourses into individuals. Management coaching might be understood as a confessional practice that has strayed into the realm of work. My first point is then that management coaching conversations are a prototypical form of confessional practice which elicits self-disclosure and aims to interpret the intimate narrations of the manager.

To underline the confessional character of the conversations a few empirical illustrations seem useful. The following extract shows the introductory sequence in Joseph’s session where the coach suggests looking at emotionally significant situations (see extract 1.1).

Extract 1.1

In this sequence the coach frames the intentions of the coaching session and defines the actions the manager should take therein. She explicitly pronounces that he should supply narrations of emotionally difficult situations, which can be dissected. Their deeper lying
‘truth’ can be brought to light so that the manager can engage in intensive ‘mindful’ self-reflection. Through this form of self-work he can then modify his experiences. Furthermore, when the coach, for example, asks Julia to disclose very wounded or tender parts of her self this can be understood to be an invitation to confess her deepest fear and worries.

Extract 2.4.1

246  C:  we will naturally have a lot to do with emotions
247  So, we will deal with some kind of (-2-) hurt emotions or some parts of your
248  personality which are very wounded or very tender

Indeed, the narrations the managers perform are intimate and confessional in nature. They tell of intense, emotional experiences in both their private and work lives. These narrations might even be so personal that they are not shared with people close to the manager.

To understand the full dynamic of this form of conversation it is also necessary to understand the role of the coach. The following extract illustrates how the coach defines her own rights and duties in the conversation towards Julia:

Extract 2.4.2

229  C:  I will support you to get into better contact with that what
230  dominates inside of you. In full awareness that the answers to these questions
231  are, are naturally inside of you, emotionally very close. So, ahm (1s) I
232  can help you go there, with these questions in mind, yes, to discover
233  and also to feel more. {Hm} My experience is, that the answers, the answer is,
234  is in here [points to herself]. Yes.

The coach indeed scripts herself as the elicitor and listener to the intimate narrations of the manager. What is important to note here is that the discovery of the truth that lies deep within Julia is itself an action that is bound to discourses. As the empirical study of the conversations has suggested, the coach follows a specific and routinized scheme: she stringently attempts to bring the managers to internalize the problems and emotionalize their narrations and suggests techniques for learning to control their emotions better. In the terms of Foucault this might be interpreted as a shaping of the managers’ technologies of the self: the coach issues, through her use of psy-talk and the problem constructions, a morally charged goal that the managers should achieve. The coach also instructs the managers in
how to reach this goal; through a better control of their emotions and by ‘working through’ their emotional experiences and distancing themselves from ‘hurting’, ‘infantile’ emotional reactions. In other words, the ‘truths’ that are ‘discovered’ are talked into being and constructed, yet it seems as if the coach merely brings something to the surface that was always there. As Foucault notes: ‘the obligation to confess is now relayed through so many different points, is so deeply ingrained in us, that we no longer perceive it as the effect of a power that constrains us; on the contrary, it seems to us that truth, lodged in our most secret nature, “demands” only to surface’ (Foucault, 1978, p. 60). Grounding on this thought, I want to make a second point which involves the idea that confessional talks, and especially psy talk, can be understood as a mechanism for social/organizational control.

7.1.2. The inscription of the therapeutic habitus through management coaching

The argument here is that through confessional talk — such as management coaching — hegemonic discourses can be inscribed into the manager. It is by means of what I have called ‘empathetic persuasion’ and the evaluation of the intimate narrations of the manager that a change in the self-understanding of the manager is aspired to. The manager is bound to the coach’s interpretations and (at least in the cases of Julia and Joseph) believes in them because they propose a path to salvation. The point here is that the interpretations are layered with moral judgments that draw from larger social discourses. The subjects of confessional talk are bound into hegemonic discourses that affect the way they feel, think and act. The question is then: what kind of discourses are the managers inscripted with? I suggest that the answer to this question has already been given quite unmistakably through the analysis of the conversations. I have suggested that the interpretations of the coach give primacy to the idea that intensive self-work of the intimate and the control of emotions is the key to personal salvation. It is here that I also come back to the notion of the ‘therapeutic habitus’ (Costea, Crump and Amiridis, (2007, 2008), which, in my understanding, implicitly extends the notion of confession. To briefly recap, ‘habitus’ is not to be understood here in Bourdieu’s sense but as the ‘complex discursive horizon through which the “self” is exhorted to project its potentialities not merely in the static manner of routines of self-maintenance, but as a dynamic through which the subject ought to continuously work upon itself to become a better ‘human resource’ (ibid, p. 676f.). Moreover, the ‘therapeutic’ offers itself as a ‘supposedly caring, sharing ethos’ (Thrift, 2005, p. 11); it is understood as the idea that the self will find by ‘problematizing oneself according to the values of normality and pathology, diagnosing one’s pleasures and misfortunes in psy terms, seeking to rectify or improve one’s quotidian existence through
intervening upon an “inner world”’ (Rose, 1998, p. 192). The therapeutic habitus thus brings to the point the observation that people have been familiarized with the aim of continuous self-maintenance towards the appraisal that the ideals of the (psycho) therapeutic have ‘triumphed’ (Illouz, 2008). The notion of therapeutic habitus makes comprehensible how the ideals of a new form of managerialism (continuous self work and professionalization of emotions) have vacuumed up the discourse of the therapeutic. This, I argue, is a concrete enactment of the psycho-managerial complex in which managerial discourses incorporate psychotherapeutic ideals towards the aims of greater flexibility, productivity, and performance of the worker.

A good illustration of this unfolds in the conversation with Julia, and the following extract, in which Julia has already transitioned to the internalizing mode of narrating, can illustrate this.

**Extract 2.3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Conversation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>M: [my boss] asked me how I was doing and I thought to myself: ‘For heavens sake, if I stay in here any longer I will begin to dissolve in front of him and that’s something I would like to avoid’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>C: I’ll put it a bit differently, what I hear is that the good fellow asked so you could work a bit on it with him. Because what it is that sounds like as if it is really almost something traumatic, very existential in any case. Your really shaken to the core.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>M: Yes, exactly. And I don’t really know why yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>C: Why? Exactly!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>M: Because it is there is actually no reason for that. Projects sometime go wrong and at the end of the day it was not that dramatically bad, but it can {Yes} go wrong, it wasn’t my fault. How can I manage to simply forget about that so that it doesn’t bother me anymore?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 127  | C: Yes, and the problem is that’s a really important question, right,
I suggest that this episode indeed reflects the logics of the therapeutic habitus in action. Julia herself brings in the idea that her emotional reactions need to be avoided as they are unprofessional and do not match the objective work conditions. The coach confirms this and adds a normative, psy-based evaluation by stating that her reactions give the impression of being traumatic and mirror some sort of existential struggle that cannot be logically understood but has to be explored in its emotional depth. As I have already pointed out, this of course draws away the attention from the organizational conditions and places the sole responsibility for the emotional breakdown onto Julia. Moreover, what I want to stress here is how the coach operates with specific normative evaluations which impose (or at least, as in Julia's case, reinforce) a form of reality which I would suggest closely knits psy-discourses to the new managerial understanding of professionalism. As Illouz (2008) has stated, professionalism today no longer only means to be efficient and productive. An emotional flavor has been added so that ‘being unprofessional’ now means to be overly emotional (or in psy terms even hysterical) while professionalism also includes unleashing ‘positive energy’ (Bruch & Ghoshal, 2003) at work. As Sieben and Wettergren (2010) have brought it to the point:

The new emotional regime ‘renders explicit the display and embrace of ‘positive’ emotions – such as trust, love, enthusiasm, niceness, happiness, self-confidence, self-love and self-enhancement – while it requires the control and management of ‘negative’ ones (anger, jealousy, envy, resentment, disappointment, sadness, ironic or disengaged distance). The contemporary focus on emotions is not equal to ‘letting emotions out’, rather it recognizes their existence and value while simultaneously demanding their use in accordance with norms of an ‘intelligent’ management of emotions. (Sieben & Wettergren, 2010, p. 4)

It is exactly this form of professionalism, I argue, that companies wish to cultivate through management coaching. It is here that we need to take a step back as we cannot reduce this intervention to a mere one-to-one conversation but must zoom out and take both the organizational and social context in which this HR intervention is situated into account. Once again it is important to note that the framing of this specific form of ‘confessional
talk’ is staged in a very specific context; the coach is a paid agent of the company and by proxy acts on behalf of the company. While the organization has no direct influence on the course of the conversation, they do buy in a very specific form of conversation which, as our portrayal of the three cases proposes, is highly coherent in the use of its interpretative regime and linguistic positioning practices. I thus come to the assumption that management coaching, on behalf of the companies, attempts to shape employees’ behaviors by controlling their intimate constructions of self. Julia, for example, almost starts crying in her boss’s office due to the stress she is under (and presumably due to the lack of felt support from her supervisor — something she says repeatedly over the course of the session). Her boss reacts by sending her into management coaching. A critical mind might interpret this as an outsourcing of unpleasant emotional conditions: Julia's emotional breakdown is removed from the office space and packed into a professionalized space in which, paradoxically, emotions are extracted but for the purpose of isolating them from work. It is then the coach’s function to work on the emotions with Julia and to ensure the above-suggested form of professionalism. This utilization of management coaching as described above can be seen to reflect the movement towards the psycho-managerial complex. Management coaching might then be seen as an intervention that inscribes the logics of the psycho-managerial complex into the manager and thus constitutes it at the level of discourse as textual practice.

To supplement these considerations and to deepen our understanding of how the psycho-managerial complex has become institutionalized through the management coaching intervention I now turn to the second empirical study, which considers the discursive practices through which management coaching is constructed through talk in the organizational realm.

**7.2. Management Coaching: Where Psychotherapy and Management Rendezvous**

In this section I consider how the psycho-managerial complex has been able to become institutionalized through management coaching as an organizational intervention. I will make two points in this section. First, that management coaching has been able to translate psychotherapeutic practices into the work realm by using the ambiguous term ‘coaching’ which — through its association with sports — allows the discursive practices that the intervention employs to be kept concealed. Secondly I suggest that the corpus of HRM, which significantly colonizes everyday work life, has received an additional socio-ideological method of control that directly aims to shape the emotional and intimate
experiences of the workforce, and thus institutionalizes a specific form of psycho-
managerial complex.

7.2.1. Management coaching as isopraxism

The translation processes I have shown in the second empirical study (assimilation,
unfolding and countering) attest towards the multiple and unstable constructions of
management coaching as an organizational practice. I would hypothesize that these
transitory legitimations, the opportunity to construct coaching along the lines of various
translative moves, have been a crucial factor in the sweeping spread of management
coaching. In other words, coaching has been so successful because it can mean different
things for different people. As unambiguous accounts are amiss, the hard edges of control
and governance as well as subversive movements can stay hidden in the confidentiality of
the coaching conversation. From this position I argue that the notion of ‘coaching’ has made
it possible to transport the psycho-therapeutic discourse into work life due to the positive
connotations the term itself evokes (while the term therapy has been dropped). As Peltier
(2001) puts it, ‘The main reason that coaching is called “coaching” and not executive
counseling or workplace psychotherapy is that hard-charging corporate types, especially
men, are likely to be happy to have a coach, but unwilling to enter therapy. Most identify
with sport and would love to see themselves as athletes, or at least, high performers’ (p.
170). This interpretation means that coaching resembles what Erlingsdottir and Lindberg
(2005) have termed an ‘isopraxism’, a practice that travels relatively unchanged but is
renamed in the translation process.

Hence, my suggestion is that management coaching transports the psychotherapeutic
discourse deeper into the management realm but with considerable modifications to its
linguistic surface which both hide the soft realm and underline organizational performance,
progress, and profit. This relates to a larger movement in the Western world, which Nicolas
Rose has brought to the point when he states:

‘We have witnessed the birth of a new form of expertise, an expertise of
subjectivity. A whole family of new professional groups has propagated itself,
each asserting its virtuosity in respect of the self, in classifying and measuring
the psyche, in predicting its vicissitudes, in diagnosing the causes of its troubles
and prescribing remedies. Not just psychologists - clinical, occupational,
educational - but also social workers, personnel managers, probation officers,
counsellors and therapists of different schools and allegiances have based their claim to social authority upon their capacity to understand the psychological aspects of the person and to act upon them, or to advise others what to do’ (Rose, 1990, p. 2).

To this I would add that management coaching is indeed the newest development in this tendency. Moreover, management coaching fuses managerial interests and psychotherapeutic discourses in a way that is novel.

7.2.2. Management Coaching as a Form of Socio-ideological Control

My second point therefore concerns the effects of this translation process. My interpretation of the empirical materials suggests that the assimilating move is most dominant in the interview materials and I therefore discuss this move more prominently. I suggest that when coaching is used alongside the assimilating move it installs a mode of socio-ideological control (Kärreman & Alvesson, 2004), which promotes continuous self-work and more intense modes of emotional management. Paradoxically, this is also the case when the traditional/modern IRs (controlling performance and restraining symptoms) are related, even if at first this may seem as a form of technocratic control because managers are forced into the coaching process. Yet, once managers begin to converse with the coach, the intervention — as the first study illustrates — aims to transform the manager from the inside via self-disclosure and self-work. When the psychotherapeutic IRs are assimilated in the managerial IRs a logic is produced which suggests that only when a person learns to intensify his/her performance in all areas of life is the full potential of human resourcefulness unleashed and only then can corporate performance reach its maximum. It is in the fusion of productivity and the private self, which addresses the desires and beliefs, that, in this specific historical context, shape the momentum of management coaching as a fashion. Further, I propose that the specific set-up of the historical translative scapes I present in the second empirical analysis are in line with a larger socio-cultural movement towards what I have termed the psycho-managerial complex, a tendency in which subjectivity is seized and made governable by the dominant performativity discourse in society. When the therapeutic is assimilated, coaching becomes a practice that organizes the emotional, motivational, and behavioral systems of employees as a governing structure and ‘promotes the super-exploitation of both managers (who are expected to commit their whole being to the organization) and workers (who are now expected to commit their embodied knowledge to the organization's epistemological resources as well)’ (Thrift, 1997: 50). In
this way it fits perfectly into the agenda of current HRM interventions of which Costea, Crump and Amiridis have suggested that:

‘ideological and technical apparatus of HRM performs nowadays the function of legitimating the utilization of subjectivity as the key resource for productivity and competitiveness. Moreover, the discourses of HRM imply that it does not simply serve the strategic purpose of organizations, but that it also serves the strategic purpose of a meaningful working life for the members of organizations’ (Costea, Crump, & Amiridis, 2008, p. 671).

In such a framing management coaching as a new form of HRM intervention produces a strengthening of the relationship between the emotional and the managerial, made most evident in the organization of the intimacy towards managerial aims — an amalgam Eva Illouz (2008) has termed ‘cold intimacies’ and which I consider the heart of the psycho-managerial complex.

7.3. The Entwinement of the Discursive Practices of Management Coaching

Taking a step back I would like to recap the relations between the different sites and how they supplement our understanding of specific ways the psycho-managerial complex plays out in management coaching. My suggestion — corresponding to Cooren, Matte, Taylor, & Vasquez’ (2007) notion that paradigm-type discourses ‘must be embodied, materialized or even incarnated in [text-based] discourses’ (ibid., p. 155) — is to understand the portrayed dynamics as interrelated. Each site produces a unique enactment of management coaching as its discursive practices have a unique temporal and spatial scale. In other words we might understand that the sites of management coaching (management coaching as conversation, management coaching as organizational intervention and management coaching as socio-historic phenomenon) are entwined. Figure 5 illustrates how this matryoshka principle, in which the sites are woven into each other’s social fabric, might be understood.
Figure 5 attempts to emphasize that the sites flow into each other; their borders are fuzzy and cannot be seen as disconnected. At the same time they show different shades of management coaching. Notice also how the intensity of grey decreases with the zooming out onto larger areas. Over the course of this work I have attempted to zoom into these different sites of management by ‘switching theoretical lenses and re-positioning in the field, so that certain aspects of the practice are fore-grounded while others are bracketed’ (Nicolini, 2009, p. 1391). The farther in I have zoomed the more detailed the analysis has been and the richer the description of the relational dynamics. The farther out I have zoomed the more abstract and deductive the argument, which applies especially to the discussion of management coaching as a socio-historic phenomenon. While these zoomings cannot claim to elucidate management coaching in its vast complexity, I argue that some aspects of its dynamics have become more lucid and I would like to recap the arguments in relation to the different sites in the following.
7.3.1. The Site of Management Coaching as Conversation

The conversations are the most concrete (in the sense of micro) realizations of management coaching. By studying the textual discursive practices that unfold in these conversations we gain insight into what happens when coach and managers converse. It allows us to grasp the unfolding of the relational processes and their immediate effects on the managers. Based on the study of these conversations I have suggested that problem constructions are a central element of these conversations as they define the flow of attention and influence the interpretation of the managers’ experiences. Of the five reoccurring forms of problem constructions (hauntings of the past, unconscious motives, incomplete development, organizational pressures and personal entanglements) the first three might be understood as internalizations of the problem and the last two as externalizations of the problem. While the managers initially externalize the problem it has been suggested that the coach, through her consistent use of the internalizing problem constructions, steers the managers into doing the same. Further I have argued that the coach employs a number of linguistic actions that very much resemble those used in psychotherapy. The coach’s modus of interaction along these linguistic actions can be summarized in what I have termed ‘empathetic persuasion’: the coach stays in close proximity to the manager’s narrations but through continuous signaling of the importance to work on intimate and emotional topics the coach stays persuasive. Moreover, I have argued that a comparison between the different coaching cases reveals a standardized routine in which the coach (despite variation in the managers’ agenda and reactions) attempts to push out her interpretative regime. This interpretative regime puts forward a normatively charged understanding of professionalism which stresses the necessity to learn to regulate one’s emotions better through intensive self-work. This analysis has hinted at the problematics of the internalization of problems as they individualize collective responsibility. It has also made it evident that the relationship between coach and manager is not equal as the coach makes strong use of her interpretative authority. Zooming into the conversations has allowed us to explore the fine-tuned interactions between coach and manager, the ways in which the conversations are steered in a routinized fashion towards a regime of emotional management. Yet, this perspective also leaves aspects of the dynamic in the background.

7.3.2. The Site of Management Coaching as Organizational Intervention

It is only through zooming into the organizational discursive practices and the level of management coaching as an organizational intervention that it becomes visible that several agents take an interest in and frame management coaching; an insight that somewhat
contradicts the intimate aura the conversation is veiled in. Moreover, the exploration of this site of management coaching also acknowledges that the intervention is funded and organized by the HRM departments of the managers’ host companies. The study of managers’, coaches’ and HR-managers’ accounts therefore allows us to trace the multiple ways in which agents construct the intervention. It is argued that through these constructions management coaching acquires its legitimacy in the organizational realm and sets into motion the processes of its manifestation. My interpretation of the interview materials indicates that four representations are commonly used to account for the management coaching: ‘controlling performance’, ‘steering development’, ‘restraining symptoms’ and ‘nurturing the psyche’. The first two of the dominant representations can be further aligned to the general management discourse and the latter two to general psychotherapeutic discourse. It is thus suggested that managerial and psychotherapeutic discourses function as translatable historic scapes (historically institutionalized enactments of these discourses) that agents draw upon to legitimize the use of management coaching. Moreover, an analysis of how these historic scapes, ‘management’ and ‘psychotherapy’ are dynamically related gives insight into the ongoing translatable process and suggests that they are related in the form of three translatable moves: assimilating, in which the managerial discourse absorbs the psychotherapeutic; unfolding, in which the incompatibility of the two discourses is brought into the open; and countering, in which the psychotherapeutic discourse challenges the managerial. The siting of the interviews further suggests that the assimilating move dominates the accounts of management coaching. The exploration of the organizational discursive practices of management coaching thus concludes that the psychotherapeutic discourses are commonly absorbed into the managerial discourse, thus aligning intimacy and emotions towards professionalism and productivity. The exploration of this site of management coaching makes evident that the intervention is bound to issues of organizational power and politics. The ways in which the intervention is framed defines how the relation between psychotherapy and management is played out and thus the concrete enactment of the psycho-managerial complex.

7.3.3. Embedding Management Coaching in the Socio-Historic Context

Taking yet another step back and considering that management coaching is bound into a web of historically charged movements supplements the understanding of the two empirically studied sites of management coaching. It is through this perspective that the two empirically explored sites of management coaching can be further contextualized and related to the ongoing translations of capitalism towards the managerialization of emotions.
and the spread of a therapeutic culture. Considering management coaching as a social discursive practice allows us to discuss how the intervention constitutes and is constituted by the psycho-managerial complex. Here it is suggested that management is a form of confessional talk (Foucault, 1988) through which employees are obliged to open their intimate self to normative evaluations; this allows organizations to colonize individuals with hegemonic, managerial discourses. Management coaching thus establishes the therapeutic habitus which expects employees to undergo continuous self-work, thus extracting their full human resourcefulness (Costea, Crump, & Amiridis, 2007). The discussion also suggests that management coaching has been able to translate psychotherapeutic discourses into the realm of management due to the arbitrary associations the term ‘coaching’ evokes; making it an ‘isopraxism’ (Erlingsdottir & Lindberg, 2005), a practice that stays relatively unchanged in the translation process but changes its name. Finally, I suggest that the use of psychotherapeutic practices to enhance human resourcefulness reflects the management trend to invest in socio-ideological interventions that seek to govern individuals from the inside. This contextualization of management coaching into the shifts in capitalism allows us to see that management coaching, as a new form of HRM intervention, is not at all a single phenomenon. On the contrary, it might be seen as just the next step in a long stride that has taken Western societies from the technocratic organization of work to the modus of soft / emotional capitalism.

Overall, the exploration of the three sites of management coaching and the attached variation of scope has made it possible to look into the movements through which management coaching is constituted and to reflect on these processes. The thesis deepens the understanding of the effects of management coaching practices by empirically studying how the intervention is enacted in the one-to-one conversations as well as through accounts and legitimations given by managers, HR-managers and coaches. Moreover, the thesis broadens the understanding of management coaching by placing it into relation with discussions on the emotionalization of work, the place it takes as a new form of HRM intervention, and the way it reflects current transformations of late capitalism. In doing so the thesis makes visible the psycho-managerial complex at work.
8. RESUMÉ AND OUTLOOK

After the train rolls out of the last stop before Munich it is only a little while before we reach our final destination. The atmosphere shifts and the anticipation of the near arrival becomes noticeable as people stop what they are doing to orientate themselves; they shut down their laptops, begin slowly to pack their things, pay their bills, and call home to announce that they will turn up in due time. In these last moments of travel one might look back and think about the distance covered, as one might look forward and contemplate what will happen once things come to a halt. Related to this thesis it is then time for a résumé and an outlook.

8.1 Résumé

The thesis has foremost attempted to take seriously the invitation to investigate the concrete practices which promote the management of emotions through psychotherapeutic practices (Staunaes, 2011; Watson, 2004), as well as to ‘expose and connect different assumptions and to open up new ways of thinking’ (Janssens & Steyaert, 2009, p 152) in the field of HRM. The main concern has been to come to a more differentiated understanding of how the shifting relationship between psychotherapeutic and managerial practices plays out through management coaching. To realize this endeavor I have made several connections on my way. This has enabled the unraveling of a phenomenon that is in the making through empirically informed interpretation. The path I have traveled in this work has taken me from the transformations of capitalism (those forces that can not be directly approached and only become perceptible when peering from the present into the past), to concerns about the increasing use of mechanisms of socio-ideological control that attempt to seize the intimate and emotional realms, to the prominent role human resource management has played in promoting this new modus of employee government, to the tangible fabrics of management coaching into which the translucent momentum of this larger social dynamics is weaved ... and back again. The thesis has taken the liberty to link together these concepts and theories in its attempt to bring out the concrete workings of the psycho-managerial complex at the sites of management coaching. Yet, the connections I have made are diaphanous: they inform this thesis but the findings made throughout this thesis may also be bound back into these discussions.
Obviously, management coaching has been the point of crystallization around which this thesis is organized. The work can thus be read as a response to the general calls to broaden and deepen the understanding of coaching (Ely et al., 2010; Passmore & Fillery-Travis, 2011): I have presented a feasible definition of management coaching (understanding it as a company-organized intervention), have illustrated the relational processes of the one-to-one conversation and have identified the main discursive resources people draw upon to construct the intervention in the organizational realm. This has become possible through the rich spectrum of use of a discursive theory which I argue can significantly enrich coaching research by offering alternative frameworks. The advocated discursive approaches in this thesis have allowed us to contextualize management coaching at three ‘sites’ of its enactment (management coaching as conversation, management coaching as organizational intervention, and management coaching as socio-historic phenomenon). Moreover, the use of discourse theory has been essential for the exploration of the concrete (discursive) practices and, based on the analysis of these practices, adds a much needed critical voice to the debate on the effects of the intervention.

From yet another point of view, this thesis might be read as an illustration of how emotional management is put into practice and which kind of normative programs are installed to ensure adequate, professional emotional behavior. The discourses on emotions that management coaching draws upon have also been spotted elsewhere and discussed in relation to the rise of management trends like emotional intelligence (Fambrough & Hart, 2008), positive organizational studies (Fineman, 2006), or under the heading of new forms of emotional labor (Hochschild, 2012). What this thesis can add to these discussions is the assumption that discourses on emotional management are less stable and coherent in everyday interaction. Their effects unfold through patterns of oscillation and produce variations in form of multiple movements.

Finally, the theoretical frameworks tailored for the two empirical studies may supplement current advances in discourse theory and process thinking. The deepening of the relational and temporal movements of discourse by use of the notions of ‘positioning’ and ‘translation’ might be understood as a step towards a proposed (Cooren, Matte, Taylor, & Vasquez, 2007; Blaschke, Schoeneborn, & Seidl, 2012) processual orientation of discourse analysis. These frameworks have helped unwrap the complex discursive processes of management coaching in this work but might be further developed and applied to the study of other organizational phenomena.
Looking back onto the overall path this thesis has traveled I argue that the answers to some of the questions that have been posed in the introduction have become more lucid. The work illustrates why companies are interested in management coaching (to be able to manage employees through teaching them to manage themselves and their emotions), why people use the term coaching instead of therapy (to hide the circumstance that psychotherapy practices are a central resource and to be able to relate these practices to managerial discourses), and how issues of power and politics shape coaching (it can be used to instate hegemonic discourses and may even de-emancipate employees by delegitimizing their legitimate concerns about the contexts they work in). Moreover, the thesis has ventured into the ongoing dynamics of the psycho-managerial complex. It illustrates the small details of conversation through which interpretations steer attention and can connect or disconnect people to their context; how psychotherapeutic practices are made digestible for the work context by recoding their surface; how intimacy is seized and capitalism now governs the workforce from the inside.

8.2 Outlook

‘Psychotherapy is a rickety, ultimately impossible bridge, but it is one of the few dialogic opportunities available to us. Perhaps, as our bridge sways to and fro below the stars above the abyss, we can stop fighting the inevitable, take up our moral and political role, and enjoy the ride in the in the winds of time.’ (Cushman, 1995, p. 356)

Looking ahead, there are a number of questions that stay unanswered, despite their relevance. For example: what are the larger organizational effects of coaching and how does a coaching process unfold from the first moments of its initiation (by whomsoever) until after the last conversations? How are the outlines of coaching gendered and how does it reinforce specific gender stereotypes? Yet, one question strikes out and seems especially relevant: how can coaching emancipate employees and take the organizational context into account? The critical discussions presented in this work might indeed be seen as a foundation for the further development of this intervention into an organizational reflective practice (Reynolds & Vince, 2004, Schön, 1983). This would mean a more careful balancing between psychotherapeutic and managerial practices and allowing the emergence of an intervention that is aware of the part it plays in establishing organizational power and politics, that allows us to challenge hegemonic discourses, and that works towards the
emancipation of individuals within the given contexts. Management coaching as a reflexive practice might then be proved to sustain a genuine dialogical agenda that obtains the need to orient and reflect on one’s actions in an ever faster spinning world. While the countering moves the second study has portrayed hints that such a form of management coaching is already being practiced its profile has to be made more explicit. It seems that management coaching is here to stay and the movements through which psychotherapeutic and managerial practices are entangled into a complex nexus cannot be undone; its surge, however, might be more reflectively dispatched. So, maybe one day I will move through the train and overhear a manager recount her experiences of how management coaching provided her with an integrative understanding of how organizational tensions shape her everyday life, and encouraged her to stand up for her moral integrity and to guard her personal boundaries for the sake of her health and close relationships.
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## APPENDIX

Table 24: Example of exclusion criteria of coaching literature review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exclusion criteria</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E) Coaching played no significant part in the paper</td>
<td>Ceridian Performance Partners provides workplace effectiveness services, including employee assistance and work-life programs, as well as training, coaching, and consulting. Their services are provided to seven million employees and their family members in private corporations, government, and educational environments throughout the United States, Canada, Puerto Rico, and the United Kingdom. Adkins, J. A. (2000). Ceridian Performance Partners’ President Linda Hall Whitman on navigating work and life. Academy of Management Executive, 14(2), 28-33.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) Papers that describe single session job interview trainings</td>
<td>This study was conducted in conjunction with promotional procedures within the police and fire departments in a large city in the United States. Applicants for promotion first took a content-valid job knowledge test, and if they scored high enough, they proceeded to a content-valid structured situational panel interview. When they exited their interviews, they went to a post-interview room where they were given a survey to complete that measured several of the variables addressed in this study. They had not yet received their interview scores. Interview coaching sessions were offered before the interview. Therefore, the sequence of events was written test → interview coaching → interview → response to survey. (Maurer, Andrews, Salamon, &amp; Troxel, 2001, p. 710)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G) Coaching as a routine leadership activity</td>
<td>Team coaching is an act of leadership (...). Leaders vary in how they allocate their time and attention across these activities, depending on their own preferences; what they believe the team most needs; and the team’s own level of authority, initiative, and maturity. Only the last two sets of activities (helping individual members strengthen personal contributions and working with the team to help use resources well) are coaching behaviors, however; focusing respectively on individual team members and on the team as a whole. (Hackman &amp; Wageman, 2005, p. 269).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25: List of excluded literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exclusion criteria</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) Book review</td>
<td>Arvisais, 2004; Axelrod, 2004; Bailey, 2006; Biegun, 2003; García, 2004; Meisel, 2004; Safferstone, 2000; Subramanian, 2004</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Editorial</td>
<td>Armandi, 2004; Bailey, 2008; Beyer, Chanove, &amp; Fox, 1995</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) Coaching played no significant part in the paper</td>
<td>Adkins, 2000; Bakker, Demerouti, &amp; Schaufeli, 2003; Bing et al., 2007; Brannick, Michaels, &amp; Baker, 1989; Burke &amp; Baldwin, 1999; Cherniss, Grimm, &amp; Liautaud, 2010; Frese et al., 2007; Gray, 2007; Howard, 2006; Levy, Cober, &amp; Miller, 2002; Lidewey van der Sluis-den Dikken &amp; Ludwig H. Hoeksema, 2001; Posner, 2008; Saam, 2010; Szkudlarek, 2009; Tams, 2008; Vinnicombe &amp; Singh, 2003; Vleesberghs, Pepermans, &amp; Thielemans, 2005; Volckmann, 2005; Ya-Ting Teng, Bonik, &amp; Kyong-Jee Kim, 2009; Zaleska &amp; de Menezes, 2007; Zickar &amp; Robbie, 1999</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) Papers evaluate interview trainings</td>
<td>Maurer, Andrews, Solamon, &amp; Troxtel, 2001; Maurer, Andrews, Solamon, &amp; Troxtel, 2001; Maurer, Solamon, &amp; Lippstreu, 2008</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26: Organization Studies Journals included in the Literature Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academy of Management Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy of Management Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy of Management Learning &amp; Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy of Management Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Science Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advances in Developing Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology of Work Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation &amp; Benefits Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture &amp; Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic and Industrial Democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ephemera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Journal of Industrial Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Management Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum: Qualitative Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group &amp; Organization Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Development International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Development Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Cross Cultural Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Human Resource Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Small Business Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies of Management &amp; Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Applied Behavioral Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Applied Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Applied Social Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Change Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Human Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Industrial Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Leadership &amp; Organizational Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Management Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Management Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Management Inquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Management Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Organizational Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Organizational Change Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Service Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership and Organization Development Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Communication Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT Sloan Management Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative Inquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavian Journal of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Management Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27: Transcription rules derived from Mergenthaler & Stinson (1992)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Transcription nomenclature</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anonymization</td>
<td>Johanna → Bettina</td>
<td>Names and places should be replaced by anonymous names and places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zürich → Bern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Google → IT organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper and lower case</td>
<td>I was born in Switzerland and work for Google.</td>
<td>Conventional use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>punctuation</td>
<td>, . . . ! ?</td>
<td>Conventional use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauses</td>
<td>(-) (-) (-3-)</td>
<td>For short pause, for longer pause, possibly with duration in seconds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal action</td>
<td>No, no it’s rarely easy (smiles and nods)</td>
<td>Simple brackets indicate a non-verbal action by the current speaker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotation</td>
<td>And then he said: ‘Why are you so angry?’</td>
<td>Use quotation marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small speaker turn</td>
<td>And I, I founded the theater company myself with two other {oh really?} people ten years ago.</td>
<td>Curly brackets indicate a short change of speaker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simultaneous talk</td>
<td>Yeah. And he was very conscious of how he managed {»to do that} to do that«</td>
<td>» and ‘ indicate beginning and end of simultaneous talk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomprehensible text passages</td>
<td>It all got started by me being overwhelmed by the [//] that I had</td>
<td>Each slash indicates one missing word.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansions</td>
<td>vaaaarrious</td>
<td>Syllable is extended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accentuation</td>
<td>word</td>
<td>Word said slowly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WORD</td>
<td>Word said fast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIGnificant</td>
<td>Loudly pronounced word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accented syllable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6: Illustration of HIAT transcription as well as an example of the commenting done during the second close reading of the transcripts.
Figure 7: Example of analytical step in which transcripts were analyzed, commented on and coded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Quotes</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>IRs</th>
<th>DDs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>337-338</td>
<td>Sie kennen das Phänomen, ne! (((1s))) Aber Sie kommen nich raus.</td>
<td>Highlighting of intensity of emotional experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>339-360</td>
<td>Narren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>die hat sich so richtig eingebrannt, ja?</td>
<td>Emotions as expressions of past episodes need to be worked on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>365-368</td>
<td>Situation is described as initial „trauma“</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>369-378</td>
<td>Narren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>Thema Macht (((ea)) Macht • (((Unverst.)))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>paraphrasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>379-381</td>
<td>Narren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>381-383</td>
<td>Und auf einmal hat man nicht mehr die Macht, auf einmal • • ist man machtlos.</td>
<td>helplessness</td>
<td></td>
<td>emotional labeling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28: Illustration of how problem constructions found in the sessions were also used in the interviews in Study 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRS</th>
<th>Exemplary Interview Episode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hauntings of the Past</strong></td>
<td>And at a certain point she suddenly realized that she needs to take care of that on a deeper level: her state of being including her psychic wounds and her rebellious behavior which came out of her youth; that she needs to work on that and make her own biographical situation into a topic. (Interview 04_C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unconscious Motives</strong></td>
<td>[Coaching] gives you opportunity to really know yourself. (yeah) ahm, that is something that is not always (mhm) so easy, to definitely (mhm), because, the importance of knowing yourself, I think, is not always understood of how important it is actually. (Interview 35_CM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incomplete Development</strong></td>
<td>Well, what we asserted that he is very associated, and in such emotional, in situations that are emotionally-laden for him he can’t dissociate. And he can’t get onto a meta-level. There he is associated and he can’t get out of it. This would be the next step he would need to practice. From his stage of development, if I may say so, he has something childish&lt;&lt; (Interview 14_C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Pressure</strong></td>
<td>What is the price that I’m able to pay for sacrificing myself, in terms of time or freedom to speak - for sure also diplomacy? (Interview 33_C).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Entanglements</strong></td>
<td>After 20 minutes it became clear to me and the whole thing was on the table: His family had exploded, yeah, and then I was more therapist and lawyer to get him out of that where he totally went wrong because his wife became a beast, up for every trick (…). That was very complicated, but it was only the ongoing private context - business was almost never, along the way (Interview 01_C)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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