

Organisational & Social Dynamics 7(1) 131–145 (2007)

BOOK REVIEWS

Please
supply the
ISBN
number.

On Freud's 'Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego', Ethel Spector Person (ed.), London, The Analytic Press, 2001. ISBN:

Reviewed by John Bird*

It is important, in order to contextualize this review, to say something of my biography. I am trained as a sociologist and social anthropologist and came to look at psychoanalytic ideas to see how they might provide something lacking in traditional social sciences, that is, an account of affect and emotion. I am now committed to something that is called psycho-social studies which, as the name is meant to suggest, tries to link the social and the psychoanalytic without any desire to reduce the one to the other.

The question that dominates Freud's various works on groups is a simple one: what ties individuals into groups? If we want to summarize what Freud was attempting in *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*, it is to show the extent to which individual psychology and group psychology are inextricably intertwined but with the individual psychology as the bedrock for group psychology. The book reviewed here – one in the series Contemporary Freud: Turning Points and Critical Issues – provides a number of approaches to Freud's work, in the main from practising analysts.

The contributors provide what is, in effect, a genealogy of psychoanalytic approach to small and larger groups, tracing a developmental line from Freud's engagement with, for example, Le Bon's analysis of crowd behaviour, to a more fully developed approach to groups in Bion, Foulkes, Rickman, and others. In brief, John Kerr provides a detailed reading of Freud's text from the point of view of the clinician. Didier Anxieu discusses the historical background to the work – including the idea that what stimulated Freud's interest in groups was the psychoanalytic movement itself – and goes on to discuss later developments in the psychoanalysis of groups. He argues, for example, that Bion's idea of basic assumptions is, at the level of the group, the equivalent to dreams at the level of the individual.

Robert Caper discusses the difference between unorganized and

*Address for correspondence: John Bird, Reader in Sociology, Centre for Psycho-Social Studies, University of the West of England, Bristol, BS6 6AX.
E-mail: john.bird@uwe.ac.uk

organized groups and argues that psychoanalysis itself is an example of what he describes as a specialist work group with all the potential for primitive acts that such groups generate. Abraham Zaleznik discusses work groups and distinguishes between primary and artificial groups. A major focus of his chapter is the study of leadership and the potential within leadership for high levels of self-satisfaction and narcissism that get in the way of groups performing their tasks. Andre Haynal discusses basic assumption groups, how groups make us all into potential fanatics and what it is that turns that potential into a reality.

Yolanda Gampel seeks to demonstrate the relevance of Freud's ideas to the study of irrationality and fanaticism in general and to ethnic violence in particular. She identifies a particular type of identification with groups – radioactive identification – which plays a crucial part in the generation of fanaticism. Finally, Claudio Eizirik traces the development of approaches to group psychology, going from Freud to Bion, Jaques, Chasseguet-Smirgel, and Kernberg, and argues that the psychoanalytical movement itself is an artificially structured group, much like a church or an army, which serves to manage and reduce the paranoid anxieties typical of all groups. Crucially, he argues that now, in a postmodern world with the rejection of master narratives, 'psychoanalysis requires . . . a permanent dialogue with other disciplines' (p. 170).

The key for Freud is the idea that what holds groups together is affect, especially love. Love holds groups together and individuals give up their distinctiveness, their individuality, through love, often through love of the leader. Libidinal ties link members to each other and to the group leader. People come to identify with the group and with the leader. Subsequent developments in psychoanalytic approach to groups have sought to elaborate on Freud's views and have provided us with a variety of types of group – organized and unorganized groups, work and basic assumption groups, small and large groups, sophisticated groups and primitive groups, artificial groups. The diversity of types of group is, itself, problematic, as is the uneasy tension between what is effectively a psychoanalytic approach to groups and a more sociological approach.

What the sociologist might well ask is why we need ideas about libidinal attachment to analyse 'groupiness'. It is by no means clear – and this is implicit in the works of Durkheim – that sociologists ignore affect as an element in groups and group formation. Durkheim's analyses of ritual and of religion (Durkheim, 1897; Durkheim and Mauss, 1903), make it clear that religious rituals generate forms emotional attachment to a group and its values and that

group identity is, in part, made possible by these attachments. These attachments also become part of what distinguishes one group from another, suggesting that there is a powerful element of antipathy between groups. It is unclear what the idea, for example, of small and large groups adds to this. Nor is it clear in the psychoanalytic literature on groups precisely what is the threshold between group and non-group or between different sizes of group.

The problems with a psycho-social perspective – one which begins to meet Eizirik's desire for a dialogue between psychoanalysis and other disciplines – are several and they are all, in one way or another, implicit in Freud's original insights into groups and the subsequent developments of those insights. First, there is the issue of using concepts and theories generated in the clinical setting, outside that setting. How far are psychoanalytic concepts usable outside the clinical setting and how far are social scientists correct in applying those same concepts in non-clinical settings?

Second, and best exemplified in the work of Ian Suttie (1935), is the idea that Freud should have abandoned the attempt to construct what became speculative histories of groups and group formation. Suttie suggests that ideas about the primal horde and the primal crime, essential for Freud in developing an approach to groups, should be abandoned as entirely speculative.

Third, there is an issue of how to work with the dichotomy of 'psycho' and 'social'. The difficulty is summed up in the 'and'. The 'and' is a way of putting the two sides of the dichotomy together which may serve to hide the extent to which of the two is dominant. The dichotomy of psycho and social becomes part of the problem not part of the solution and does not help us to develop a way of thinking outside the box of individual/social.

In summary, my concern with this book of essays is how far the various authors, coming as they do from within the clinic, are able to avoid what becomes a form of reductionism through which, in effect, the group is reduced to the workings of the individuals who make up those groups.

References

- Durkheim, E. (1897) *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1952.
- Durkheim, E. and Mauss, M. (1903) *Primitive Classification*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1963.
- Suttie, I. D. (1935) *The Origins of Love and Hate*. London: Free Association, 1988.

Individuals, Groups and Organizations Beneath the Surface: An Introduction, Lionel F. Stapley¹, London, Karnac, 2006. ISBN: 1-85575-319-7

Reviewed by Stanley Gold*

Freud, in his paper 'The resistances to psychoanalysis' (1925e) commented: 'the source of this unpleasure is the demand made upon the mind by anything that is new, the psychical expenditure that it requires, the uncertainty, mounting up to anxious expectancy, which it brings along with it' (p. 213). This resistance, of course, does not apply merely to psychoanalytic explanations of individual behaviour but also to group and organizational contexts. Bion, in his first set of *Brazilian Lectures* (1973), in discussing the fallacy of the Euclidian geometry, both convincing and misleading, contrasts this with the artist who enables the viewer to ignore the piece of canvas and the smell of paint to see better an avenue of trees and a pond. He suggests that objects are either visual, comprehensible, and wrong, or accurate and incomprehensible (pp. 20–21). This defence of the unseeable is contrasted with some later advice to the analyst that he should be talking about real life: 'No interpretation is any good unless it is reminiscent of real life' (p. 24). While he seemingly supports those who will use psychoanalysis in their own way, he also says, 'I would like to know what the people who are going to get control of psychoanalysis mean to use it for, and how they are going to use this extraordinary invention of human speech' (p. 49). In his lectures in New York and Sao Paulo (1980), Bion suggests, in answer to a question, that instead of writing a book called *The Interpretation of Dreams* someone should write a book called 'The Interpretation of Facts', translating them into dream language not just as a perverse exercise, but in order to open up two-way traffic. He seems to be saying that the mental domain cannot be contained within the framework of psychoanalytic theory since it is not a 'container' but a 'probe' (Bion, 1970, pp. 72 and 73). I mention these sources to underline the difficulty and challenge to those who would translate fact into dreams or conscious into unconscious, in fields other than strict and orthodox individual psychoanalytic experience.

So, is 'Popularizer' a dirty word in the human sciences? Certainly Freud was concerned about wild analysis and expressed the concern very cogently. 'The pure gold of analysis should not be alloyed with the copper of suggestion.' Bion also placed the role of individual

Brazilian Lectures have the date of 1974 in Refs. Please check.

*Address for correspondence: E-mail: stanleygold@bigpond.com

analysis and the Institutes that support it in the premier position with respect to research in psychoanalysis. It was a hope that many feel has been unfulfilled, replaced by a structure, or perhaps some might say stricture, often at war with itself. Kirsner, in his aptly titled *Unfree Associations* (2000) and Eisold in a number of papers (e.g., 1994, 1998), have aptly and appropriately underlined this disappointment. Adam Phillips, a recent Popularizer, also claims that Freud's recent loss of cachet is due to the insularity of recent psychoanalytic writing, advocating that, 'Psycho-analysis needs to cease being a cult interested only in talking to its own members . . . if there is a thing called "Psychology", it is about ordinary life' (Naparstek, 2006).

What, then, to do with psychoanalytic insights if they are not to remain only in the domain of individual experience? Even within the psychotherapeutic clinical area, the free use of psychoanalytic concepts in understanding underlying personal psychopathology has raised concerns as to how best to employ such concepts without over-psychologizing without any real depth of understanding. In the field of organization consultancy there have been previous attempts to tackle this issue, notably in such excellent books as *The Workplace Within* (Hirschhorn, 1988), *The Unconscious at Work* (Obholzer and Roberts, 1994), and more recently, *Group Relations, Management, and Organization* (French and Vince, 1999), *Experiential Learning in Organizations* (Gould, Stapley and Stein, 2004), and *Coaching in Depth* (Newton, Long and Sievers, 2006). It will be noted that Lionel Stapley was the co-editor of one such volume.

These books, although carrying some very basic psychoanalytic concepts into the workplace experience, I feel are aimed, for the most part, at the practising consultant with a declared interest in working from a psychoanalytic perspective. Although readable by almost anyone interested in the area, they have mostly been taken up by individuals with some experience of the experiential and unconscious components of human behaviour. The current book, with its subtitle *An Introduction*, appears to be directed towards a different audience: those involved in a variety of organizational activities, but who may not to this point have entertained the possibility that unconscious process might influence the individual and group behaviours of which they are observers or in which they may be participants. In this context Stapley has cleverly constructed his book avoiding academic terminology, or clearly linking instances of it with everyday descriptions.

He has divided the book into three sections, with an Afterword, followed by recommended reading and a guide to existing group

Hirschhorn
1988 not
in refs.
Please
check my
entry for
accuracy

relations organizations. Each section has as its underpinning a belief in the power and influence of unconscious process on individual and group behaviour.

SECTION 1, titled 'Individuals', after its introduction and a section on classification, deals with such everyday concepts as 'boundaries, conflict, attitudes, values, and emotions'. It is only subsequently that he introduces the more standard terminology such as 'repression, splitting, projection, introjection, and displacement'. In the final chapter in this section, 'Towards relationships', he intertwines all that has preceded into a tangible and workable whole.

SECTION 2, titled 'Relationships', again after an introduction, uses headings such as 'Politics', 'The politics of identity', and 'Power and authority'. These manifestations of both conscious and unconscious conflict, representing as they do attempts at resolution, constructive and destructive, will certainly be familiar to all those who work within organizational settings.

SECTION 3 emerges seamlessly from what has preceded it. Titled 'Groups', in this Stapley covers the group as a whole, culture, social systems, and basic assumption behaviour.

Approaching the book from the vertex of my clinical background I have no difficulty in accepting Stapley's definitions and descriptions as valid. For example, he dissects such terms as power, authority, leadership, and authoritarianism in an exacting but illuminating manner, giving much food for thought for those responsible for the optimal management of organizations (pp. 113–115). A particularly useful section, the notion of the holding environment (pp. 169–172), is extremely helpful in clarifying the process of action research projects in organizations and captures the kind of problems that arise when the environment does not hold or contain those who function within it. There is a clear description of defence mechanisms then set in motion, making an understandable link between early maternal holding and the role and function of the system itself in mitigating or exaggerating primary or basic life experience. The development of these concepts and his description of Sentient Groups, 'a group where the emotions and feelings are complementary to the task of the group' (p. 176), provides a useful and logically sound concept centring on systemic issues but grounded in personal developmental psychology. However, how someone from management or consulting would experience these is hard to predict, particularly because of Stapley's excellent capacity to simplify even complex psychological concepts. One can almost hear a certain kind of reader responding with 'I always knew that', dismissing too early the very deep insights that Stapley proposes.

Is this the correct spelling of McAuly's name?

Overall I agree with the back cover comments of Professors McAuly and Noumair that the book is beautifully crafted and constitutes an essential resource book for students of organizational behaviour.

If I have one reservation, it is only stylistic, in that the message that we also require an understanding of beneath the surface phenomenon is repetitious and overplayed, perhaps in response to Stapley's many clinical experiences and the difficulty encountered in encouraging thoughtfulness. Those who buy and read this book are likely to be convinced of its thesis, but may feel they are being preached at.

Finally, after reflecting on his own convictions, his Afterword seems rather optimistic to me, either preaching to the converted or slipping into the style of self-help books that purport to show how to do it (p. 221). However, his list of references and organizations through which experience can be obtained is extremely helpful.

Note

1. Lionel Stapley is the Director of OPUS, and an organizational consultant, and has worked as a staff member of several Group Relations conferences. He is Chair of the Editorial Management Committee of the OPUS International *Journal of Organisational and Social Dynamics* and is a Member of the International Society for the Psycho-analytic Study of Organisations (ISPSO).

References

Is this the correct spelling of the publisher's name?

Brunning is not cited in the text.

- Bion, W. R. (1970) *Attention and Interpretation*. London: Tavistock.
- Bion, W. R. (1974) *Bion's Brazilian Lectures*. Rio de Janeiro: IIMAGO Editora.
- Bion, W. R. (1980) *Bion in New York and Sao Paulo*. Reading: B. Roland Harris Education Trust.
- Brunning, H. (2006) *Executive Coaching*. London: Karnac.
- Eisold K. (1994) 'The intolerance of diversity in psycho-analytic institutes', *International Journal of Psycho-analysis*, 75(4): 785–800.
- Eisold, K. (1998) 'The splitting of the New York Society and the construction of psycho-analytic authority', *International Journal of Psycho-analysis*, 79(5): 871–875.
- French R. and Vince R. (1999) *Group Relations, Management, and Organization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Freud, S. (1925e) 'The resistances to psychoanalysis', *Standard Edition of the Complete Works of Sigmund Freud*, 19. London: Hogarth.

- Gould, L. J., Stapley L. F. and Stein, M. (2004) *Experiential Learning in Organizations: Applications of the Tavistock Group Relations Approach*. London: Karnac.
- Hirschhorn, L. (1988) *The Workplace Within: Psychodynamics of Organizational Life*. Cambridge, MA: MIT.
- Kirsner, D. (2000) *Unfree Associations*. London: Process Press.
- Naparstek, B. (2006) *Relishing Freud on the Fringes*. Interview with Adam Phillips, *Age*, Melbourne, 16 October.
- Newton, J., Long, S. and Sievers, B. (2006) *Coaching in Depth*. London: Karnac.
- Obholzer, A. and Roberts, E. Z. (1994) *The Unconscious at Work*. London: Routledge.

City and publisher's name, and ISBN number, please.

Organization in the Mind: Psychoanalysis, Group Relations and Organizational Consultancy, by David Armstrong, edited by Robert French

Reviewed by Amy L. Fraher*

I was recently asked by a junior colleague, eager to expand his knowledge of group study, for a list of references which are, in my opinion, 'indispensable for group relations work' and consultancy; my 'Top 10 list', to quote the comedian David Letterman. I pondered. The social historian in me quickly listed historical mainstays in the field such as Bion's (1961) *Experiences in Groups*, Rice's (1965) *Learning for Leadership*, and Menzies Lyth's (1959) *The Functioning of Social Systems as a Defence Against Anxiety*. My application orientation guided him toward Hirschhorn's (1988) *The Workplace Within*, Miller's (1993) *From Dependency to Autonomy*, and Obholzer and Roberts' (1994) *The Unconscious at Work*. When I stepped back to review my recommendation list, I wondered what texts published in the last decade I could suggest. One answer immediately became clear, David Armstrong's (2005) *Organization in the Mind: Psychoanalysis, Group Relations and Organizational Consultancy*.

I highly recommend this book to anyone interested in the study of organizations and groups, from beginners to experienced professionals. It is enjoyable to read, highly informative, and easily

*Address for correspondence: 4704 Miracle Drive, San Diego CA 92115, USA. E-mail: amyfraher@cox.net

accessible for all experience levels. One reason this collection of essays is so compelling is the range of experience of the author himself. A scion in the field, Armstrong joined the staff of the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations fresh out of Cambridge in 1959, working with Eric Trist, among others, at the height of the Institute's influence in the 1960s. He subsequently joined the staff of The Grubb Institute of Behavioural Studies, helped to found the Tavistock Consultancy Service, and served on staff at numerous group relations events worldwide. The breadth of his experience, reflected in this book, is immense.

Although steeped in tradition, the attraction of Armstrong's essays remains their innovation and ready applicability, factors not often found together in scholarly works. Armstrong can explain Bion in ways Bion himself was unable to access. Yet, he is not stymied by the brilliance of others' work. For instance, in Chapter Ten Armstrong succinctly identifies areas Bion left open for others to elaborate upon, observing 'The concept of the basic assumptions has been a continued focus of attention, curiosity, and puzzlement' yet that of the 'work group' has been 'taken for granted, as if it were quite evident and unproblematic. Or as if its role were simply to get the much more intriguing theme of basic-assumption functioning off the ground. I believe this neglect to be a mistake' (p. 140). This bold observation has deep and exciting implications for the group relations field and those individuals courageous enough to join with him, for Armstrong has voiced an *unthought known* (Bollas, 1987).

This is not surprising. Armstrong has a knack for bringing into view something *known* on an emotional level, although not yet embraced in a conscious way, and his book unpacks this phenomenon through a number of case studies. He notes that surfacing these *knowns* discloses meaning, paradoxically creating a '*difference that makes a difference*' to how every decision policy, action is understood' (p. 51). This 'disclosure sets a new agenda' and indeed Armstrong has done so with the contribution of this book.

As the title reflects, Armstrong's use of the metaphor 'organization-in-the mind', which he attributes to Pierre Turquet but was subsequently developed as 'part of the *lingua franca*' at The Grubb Institute (p. 3), opens up new ways of working that nearly anyone, novice to expert, can relate to. This consultancy stance focuses on teasing out both the conscious and unconscious mental constructs or internal mental models that inform people's perceptions and behaviours in organizational life, something intrinsic to the organization as one socio-psychic field. The advantage of this perspective, Armstrong explains, is that it provides 'a means for framing a practice of

Bollas
1987 is
not refer-
enced.
Please
complete
the entry |
have
begun.

organizational consultancy, informed by insights and methods of psychoanalysis and group relations but that had its own distinctive integrity as a field of observation' (p. 5). The reader often actually *feels* Armstrong tussling with his own 'organization-in-the mind', for example, when he relates his experience of being in small group with Bion in Chapter Two, or describes his sense of vulnerability in Chapter Four.

Another endearing aspect of Armstrong's writing is the honesty, humility and respect – the 'emotional reality' (p. 47) to coin one of Armstrong's own terms – that wafts from the pages. He readily ascribes consultancy projects, collegial conversations, and other scholars' work as roots to his ideas, taking pleasure at experiencing these learning opportunities and gratitude to others for assistance in helping him make links in his work.

The insightful contributions of this book solidify Armstrong as a *mover-and-shaker* in the field. A mover, because he never rests on the familiar, continuing to question what he 'knows' while encouraging others to do the same, and a shaker because Armstrong moves in disconcerting ways 'which leave us wondering and puzzling about how they got there' (p. 116). It is not that Armstrong's writing is dense or his theories obtuse, quite the contrary. The disconcerting wonder and puzzlement comes from observing what seems to be an innate ability to make constructive use of emotional experience on such an honest, accessible level. I highly recommend you experience this phenomenon yourself and read this book.

As I have created the reference section myself, please check the entries for accuracy.

References

- Bion, W. E. (1961) *Experiences in Groups and Other Papers*. London: Tavistock.
- Bollas, C. (1987) [\[\[PLEASE COMPLETE WITH FULL DETAILS\]\]](#)
- Hirschhorn, L. (1988) *The Workplace Within. Psychodynamics of Organizational Life*. Cambridge, MA: MIT.
- Menzies Lyth, I. (1959) *The Functioning of Social Systems as a Defence Against Anxiety. A Report on the Study of the Nursing Service of a General Hospital*. London: Tavistock.
- Miller, E. (1993) *From Dependency to Autonomy: Studies in Organisation and Change*. London: Free Association.
- Obholzer, A. and Roberts, E. Z. (1994) *The Unconscious at Work*. London: Routledge.
- Rice, A. K. (1965) *Learning for Leadership: Interpersonal and Intergroup Relations*. London: Tavistock.

Working Across the Gap. The Practice of Social Science in Organizations, by Lisl Klein, London, Karnac, 2005. ISBN: 1-85575-382-0

Reviewed by Stefan Jern*

To many a student of organizations, Lisl Klein may be known only as the person who joined Esso Petroleum in 1965 as an internal consultant and who was ushered out five years later when the Americans arrived, and who wrote a book about it. But she is so much more and she has contributed so much more! To say that Lisl Klein has been active and influential as a researcher and consultant in industry for nearly fifty years is an understatement. She has, in her own words in *Working Across the Gap*, had 'a life-long love affair with industry' and other kinds of organizations and she has had 'a life-long fascination, not to say obsession, with the question of work satisfaction' (p. 9). This collection of sixteen edited papers, most of them published earlier in the period from 1965 until 2001, which she now brings us, spans all her working years and gives a comprehensive picture of a remarkable career as a researcher and consultant as well as insights and criticisms of great value.

The main thread of the volume is the two-way traffic across the gap between the world of social science and the world of organizations. How do research, practice, and policy link up and interact? To begin, we are presented with a historical introduction, mainly from a British perspective, but also with Klein's personal background. Even if it is just personal in nature, it mirrors very well the general developments from after the Second World War to the end of the millennium. The young researcher's realization in the 1950s that social research always entails some form of influence and intervention and that this calls for especially high demands on the researcher's ethical awareness appears to be typical of the times. Here, we also find a belief in prediction typical of the period that we may miss in today's postmodern constructivist world of non-linear systems and complexity theory. Klein's first case study during these years sets two frames of reference for her later work: empirical findings in research as well as methods and concepts can be made use of, and involvement in organizational work brings with it dynamics that have to be addressed.

In 1957, she attended the first Leicester Conference and 'went there 95% sceptical and came away 90% sceptical', but did not give

*Address for correspondence: Department of Psychology, Lund University, P.O. Box 213, S-221 00 Lund, Sweden. E-mail: stefan.jern@psychology.lu.se

up group relations work. So, group dynamics and group relations entered the scene as tools for the practitioner, and issues relating to the interdependencies between structure and behaviour came to the fore in the Conditional Aid projects. This is another 'gap' that will follow Lisl Klein in her future work. It is also in this project that the cornerstones of what was later to be named the contingency approach were laid out by her, Joan Woodward, Tom Burns, and George Stalker. Usefulness and theoretical development could be reconciled!

In the mid-1960s, optimism surged about the importance and value for industry of research in social sciences. The Heyworth Report on the organization of social science and the supply of researchers resulted in the setting up of a Social Science Research Council and, at Loughborough University, a Centre for the Utilization of Social Science Research was set up under Albert Cherns. At this time, Lisl Klein entered a period of formal training in behavioural sciences and moved from research to practice. Influenced by Jaques' work at the Glacier Metal Company in the late 1940s, but sceptical of so-called landmark studies, she was recruited by Esso Petroleum UK in 1965 as a social science adviser or internal consultant, which resulted in her minor classic *A Social Scientist in Industry* (Klein, 1976). The late 1960s turned out to be an era of fads and fashions in industrial consultancy. The prefix 'psycho' and concepts such as 'behaviour', 'training', and 'action', in all possible combinations, were the buzzwords of the day, all indicating, as Klein puts it, an 'approach that takes personal behaviour as the independent variable' (p. 73). At the same time, research moved away from practice, and applied work was considered suspect in academe. The gap was widening towards a split between industry and the social sciences, but the former was still open for collaboration and turned to the increasing numbers of consultants. Klein concludes that these consultants, often American, did not come from a research base but offered 'packages', mainly for influencing people's behaviour rather than striving for an appropriate structure or fit between structure and behaviour, which is her ideal. Esso chose to follow this path and Esso UK was visited by a team from the Institute of Social Research in Michigan with the aim of changing the behavioural styles of managers. The social science operation at Esso did not recover from this, and Klein left for the Tavistock, where she was to remain from 1971 to 1989. Her consultant and guide in this transition was Harold Bridger, with whom she had had a serious and honest encounter during the 1957 Leicester conference. In 1990, she founded the Bayswater Institute, which she

headed until 2003 and where she is still active with, among so much more, transitional interventions and writing.

The book is divided into five thematic sections, which are not chronologically ordered. The contents are too rich to be quoted here. I will restrict myself to a few highlights from each section of the issues Klein has been grappling with.

The first section, 'Organisation research and diagnosis', mirrors the young research assistant's early journey from research into practice, emphasizes the importance of control systems for organizational behaviour, and presents Klein's model for diagnosis. This covers four interacting levels: personal, interpersonal/group, situation and structure/contingency, and may help us both to 'stay with madness' and to move on by selecting appropriate points of entry for organizational diagnosis. Two concrete examples illustrate the usefulness of the model and Klein concludes: 'It will be clear that, when the material is rich and complex, and in the absence of strong indications otherwise, I tend to look for structural aspects to help understand what is happening at other levels. It does not matter where one begins, as long as all three levels in the model, as well as their interaction, eventually features in the diagnosis' (p. 62).

The following three papers in the second section, 'Some activities in the field', are all about knowledge-into-use or moving into the field. They are also about when such knowledge is, and is not, integrated with the dynamics of action. Here, we meet with the Esso story in a shorter version, but this is not the place to recount that well-known story, which emerges in several papers in this book. Suffice to say that the clash was not only about whether change should be initiated from the shopfloor upwards or from management downwards. Klein expands on the crucial issues later in a separate paper in the following, third, section 'Bouncing against the context'. From this, it is clear that in organizational development 'American style' of that time, 'behaviour' was almost everything, whereas Klein, and other Europeans, with a Marxist sociological or Smithian economical background, would stress 'structure'. The structure/behaviour controversy, thus, is central to Klein's thinking, and here she brings to the fore an interesting dilemma of OD in those days. Participative management was propagated 'with missionary zeal' by consultants, according to Klein's interpretation, in order to 'compensate people for what working in organizations does to them' (p. 96) and 'in the 1950s, the McCarthy era, to demonstrate that democracy is efficient' (p. 96). The theme and paradox of introducing democracy with authoritarian means is well known in history, from Athens' attempts to impose democracy on her allies, via

post Second World War Germany under the Allied administration to the USA in present-day Iraq.

In this context, Klein touches on ideological differences between the social scientists of those days, specifically 'the difference between wanting first to reform and wanting first to understand' (p. 97). She defines three different role orientations in this respect: understanding, reforming, and healing. The conditions for and consequences of these different stances are discussed in depth and add greatly to our understanding of what applied work in organizations may be. These ideological divides are still with us and they still carry deep moral dilemmas. Only when ignored do they cause harm.

Section three, 'Concepts, reflections, methods', appears to me as highly thought provoking and up-to-date in its critical views and can be recommended to any student, practitioner, researcher, and client in the organizational field. Here, the experiences of the earlier chapters are placed in a combined framework of knowledge-in-use and dynamics-of-action for the application of social science in organizations. Through the cumulative use of the case studies published with Ken Eason in *Putting Social Science to Work* (Klein and Eason, 1991), Klein summarizes learning in a seven-point recommendation ranging from open, non-prescriptive exploration, via hypothesis-testing, permission to express and reflect, to recommendations on how to design transitional systems. In the concluding chapter of this section, we are offered three examples of transitional interventions, which clarify this concept in excellent ways. It is a joy to meet the transitional object/fictitious patient 'Poor Old Henry', when hospital staff play around with him in a safe and secure environment in order to design their new information system!

The two concluding papers in section five, 'Relating scientific and professional development', are more autobiographical than the rest, and are intended to lay bare Lisl Klein's long professional journey to becoming a reflective practitioner by working across the gap. The first paper, 'On the use of psychoanalytic concepts in organisational social science: two sides of a coin', brings us Klein's experiences of what may be useful in the two worlds. In psychoanalysis she has found useful the concepts of splitting, transference, the use of self, countertransference and transitional dynamics, but seems convinced that there may be more to integrate. Of greater interest, and importance, may be the other side of the coin: what do (note the prescriptive turn!) psychoanalytically orientated consultants, used to working with individual patients, need to take on board from organization studies? Klein enumerates and elaborates three aspects. Take *evidence* seriously! Intuition is important and valuable, but

has to be corroborated by evidence in order not to result in wild interpretations. Look carefully at *the differences between individuals and collectives!* For example, individuals learn, whereas collectives as such do not. Bodies of knowledge are always vulnerable to new generations' wishes to learn and develop in their own ways. Furthermore, in organizations it is not possible to maintain the conditions for transference phenomena, as you have to maintain 'normal relations'. This places strict limits on what you can do with transference. Another issue in this realm is the differences between the individual and the collective in interpretation. Here, Klein points to the value of Robert Merton's (1957) differentiation between manifest and latent functions. 'For once, a sociological concept was as immediately and directly useful to practitioners as it was to theorists. It is easy to explain to clients the latent as well as the manifest functions of some institutional arrangement; but that does not necessarily imply purpose' (p. 232). Finally, Klein acknowledges that some psychoanalysts pay more attention to context than used to be the case. Irrespective of purpose, when working with organizations, you cannot ignore *the importance of context* for individuals and groups within them: 'An organisation simply does not have an inner life that is unconnected with tasks and circumstances' (p. 233).

Lisl Klein's key message is a simple, but demanding, one, in her own words: 'It is, however, vital: one needs to be both researcher and consultant – each one by itself will not do' (p. 22). She has found this task, which is to work across the gap, 'difficult, infuriating and fascinating' and hopes that her collection of papers 'can make the task a little easier for others who want to see the social sciences put to use' (p. 22). My impression is that she has more than succeeded in this. Social science put to work has become increasingly professionalized during the more than fifty years that have passed since Lisl Klein became a research assistant in the Human Implications of Work Study project. Practising consultants may have become even more relativistic in their views of social science than in the 1960s. Still, the topics she covers in this volume are still with us and will have to be addressed over and over again.

References

- Klein, L. (1976) *A Social Scientist in Industry*. London: Gower Press.
Klein, L. and Eason, K. (1991) *Putting Social Science to Work: The Ground between Theory and Use Explored through Case Studies in Organizations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Merton, R. K. (1957) *Social Theory and Social Structure* (revised and enlarged edition). New York: Free Press.