"Toto, I've got a feeling we're not in Kansas anymore."

(Wizard of Oz 1939 - film)

Research Questions

Research objective: "Exploring the notion of paradox management as an OD intervention."
The sub questions were:

* "Does paradox actually affect people in organisations and if so how?",
* "Is paradox in organisations recognisable?",
* "Can paradox be managed and if so how?"
* "How might NLP aid in the management of paradox?"

Purpose of Research

The primary research was designed to provide new qualitative data about how people perceive that paradox actually affects them. As far as the author can establish, this had not been done before, as commentary on the affects of paradox on people has previously been from the researcher's perspective (eg. Vince & Broussine 1996, Argyris 1986). The interviews would also provide new data about the participants' perceptions on how they dealt with paradox and paradoxical problems. This should give some personal insights into the manageability of paradox in the workplace.

Defining Paradox (From Literature Review)

There is stark disagreement in terms and definitions of paradox, ranging from the simple: "an apparent contradiction" (Quinn and Cameron, 1988, p290) to a more hard-line approach where paradox necessarily contains self reference, contradiction and vicious circularity (Hughes and Brecht, 1978). This hard-line approach is known as a 'logical paradox', for example: "This statement is untrue". This, as a statement, is self referential, contradictory and goes round in circles because if it is true, it is false, which means it is true etc. Logical paradox is usually linguistic - the philosopher's plaything.

Poole & Van de Ven (1989) suggest that "the paradoxes in management are not, strictly speaking, logical paradoxes… Organisational and management theories involve a special type of paradox – social paradoxes" which "tend to be looser: the opposing terms are often somewhat vague, and instead of logical contradictions, tensions and oppositions between incompatible positions must be considered… This opens the possibility of dealing with social paradoxes not only through logical resolutions, but through taking into account the spatial and temporal nature of the social world." (p564-5)

Ford & Backoff (1988) postulate that combining the spatial and temporal aspects creates four forms of paradox:

Directional Dualities

	Horizontal	Vertical
Synchronic	• same level, same time *(eg. two managers ask a staff member to do two equally important tasks now)*	• different level, same time *(eg. a manager asks a member of staff to do something that contradicts company policy)*
Diachronic	• same level, different time *(eg. a manager changes their mind and says 'no' when they said 'yes' earlier)*	• different level, different time *(eg. a director asks a member of staff to do something that conflicts with what their own manager told them to do earlier)*

(**Time Dualities** labels the left-hand vertical axis)

It would be expected that a problem that has a different level and/or different time duality should be easier to resolve than a problem that sits at the same level and at the same time. The directional and time dualities model is a useful distinction in that it may help to understand the dynamics of a paradox.

From the varying definitions and conditions of paradox given in the literature, the author has extrapolated the following components of paradox:

Poles
: *Poles are the underlying contradiction of a paradox and are conceptual and inert. They can appear as 'digital' (i.e. mutually exclusive) or 'analogue' (i.e. a continuum)*

Splits
: *Splits are active and cause the 'paradoxee' to feel pulled in two or more directions or decisions. It can also feel that whichever option they take, they lose.*

Loops
: *Loops are active and cause the 'paradoxee' to feel like they are going round in circles, either ending up where they started or perhaps having lost a little or gained a little.*

Flips
: *Flips are active and cause the 'paradoxee' to feel like they ended up with the opposite to or negation of what they actually wanted or intended.*

Splits, loops and flips are the active expression of the underlying pole and are how the paradox plays out or is experienced by the 'paradoxee'. In this sense, splits, loops and flips are perceptual as opposed to conceptual. It is also possible that the components will combine, the most common perhaps being a flip-loop, where the 'paradoxee' goes round in circles but keeps getting flipped each time. An organisational example of a flip-loop might be where the leadership is driven by the short-termism of the shareholders to initiate 'profit enhancing' change. The change takes place but needs time for the staff to adapt. Because this doesn't happen quickly enough, the business is driven to change again. This loop continues, but with each change the performance (and hence profits) are inadvertently driven down.

"Dilemmas and Tensions and Binds, Oh My!": Managing Paradoxes in Organisations
Author: Joe Cheal (joe@gwiztraining.com)

Building on these components, table 1 (below) shows some key types of paradox gathered from examples presented by the literature reviewed.

Table 1: Basic typology of paradox

Type of Paradox	Components	What is this?	Example Literature
Polarity	Poles	The conceptual aspect of a paradox, the underlying opposition or contradiction.	Handy (1994) Johnson (1996) Peters (1992)
Double Bind	Splits	No win situations where you are wrong if you do and wrong if you don't (or right if you do and right if you don't).	Wagner (2001) Lawley (2000)
Dilemma	Splits	A difficult decision caused by a tension between two positions or options.	Hampden-Turner (1990)
Self Reference	Loops	Circularity caused by something referring to itself. For example, a tautology, or defining something by using itself.	Ropo & Hunt (1995)
Vicious or Virtuous Circle	Loops	Circularity driven by a series of cause-effect events that loop back to the original cause.	Hampden Turner (1990)
Self Fulfilling Prophecy	Loops	Circularity caused by the 'paradoxee' expecting a certain outcome and hence looking for the evidence of it. Usually contains a hidden double bind where the paradoxee accepts evidence that agrees with expectations and rejects all evidence that does not. The term 'self fulfilling prophecy' was coined by Robert Merton.	Merton (1996)
Knots	Flips	Creating the opposite to what was intended. For example, the 'Peter Principle' where people get promoted to their level of incompetence. Or where technology often increases pressure rather than relieving it.	Peter & Hull (1969) Schwartz (2005)
Unintended Consequences	Flips	Taking action brings about unforeseen (usually negative) result.	Merton (1996) Dorner (1997)
Logical Paradox	Flip-loops	A statement or event that contains apparently simultaneous contradictory concepts. For example, "I am lying" or "be spontaneous". In order for them to be true they need to be false and in order to be false they need to be true.	Dilts & DeLozier (2000b) Watzlawick (1974)

Methodology

Approach: inductive phenomenological interpretive (rather than deductive positivistic).

Disadvantages of approach: This approach could be criticised as being less credible from a scientific perspective as it relies on the values, judgements and interpretations of the author. Also, the findings of the study may be hard to generalise.

Justifications of approach:

1) There is no hypothesis to prove or disprove. The nature of the research was exploration rather than validation; theory would come from the data and for this reason, the approach was inductive as opposed to deductive.

2) The purpose of the research was to explore the notion of paradox management. It is possible that in the positivist's quest for objectivity and truth, the nature of paradox and contradiction would not sit well. According to Saunders et al (2007), within the interpretive paradigm "far from emphasising rationality, it may be that the principal concern… is discovering irrationalities." (p113). This lends itself well to the exploration of paradox. Indeed, FitzPatrick (2005, p959) suggests that "One advantage of the interpretive method over positivism is its compatibility with paradox." In addition, Darmer (2000) argues that the positivistic objective approach actually causes paradoxes in management theory that the subjective approach does not. This is primarily because the terms and theory has to be defined by a person or some people who do not have an objective view. Even if it is argued that the theory is a result of objective analysis, the actors can then only interpret theory from their own personal perspective/situation.

3) The author was keen to explore the role of neuro-linguistic programming (NLP) within paradox management and agreed with Jacobson (1994) that "NLP is not based on theory. It is based on the process of making models" suggesting an inductive as opposed to deductive approach. As a point of interest, Jacobson goes on to suggest that NLP itself "is really an epistemology."

From an ontological perspective, the author took an approach somewhere between subjective and Wilber's 'intersubjective' (eg. Wilber 2000, p.50) - also known as a collective / cultural subjective. Whilst not ruling out the possibility of an objective reality (perhaps with which the intersubjective attempts to reach some kind of verisimilitude), the author argues that we can never know such a 'view from no-where' (Nagel 1986) and hence we can never even know if we are anywhere near it. It is important in the context of this research that the study works with what we *can* know. Also, since an NLP philosophy is ingrained in the author and his perspective, it is worth acknowledging NLP presupposing that perception, experience and knowledge are based on internal representations and are therefore subjective. NLP could indeed be defined as the study of subjective experience (eg. Dilts 1980). Perhaps it is for this reason that NLP has been criticized for its lack of scientific

empirical evidence (eg. Wood 2006, Thompson et al 2002); it does not lend itself well to objective evaluation since, generally, content and process will change depending on the context and no two contexts can ever be the same.

Following the epistemological and ontological approach already discussed, the seeming best fit tradition was phenomenological research, since the focus of the author was on the "the subjective experience of the individuals studied… to understand a particular phenomenon" (Robson 2002, p195); the phenomenon here being 'paradox in organisations'. This also fits with the NLP connection as Dilts & DeLozier (2000b) argue that "NLP is clearly an extension of phenomenology to some degree… it considers a person's sensory experience… to be the basic material from which he or she builds a model of the world." (p951)

Research Method

Figure 1: Handout shown to interviewees at the start of the interview.

Ambiguity	**Groupthink**
Blame	**Indecision**
Competing demands	**Interpersonal conflicts**
Conflicting priorities	**Mixed messages**
Contradictory communication	**Polarised thinking**
Damned if I do, damned if I don't	**Procrastination**
Dilemmas	**Tensions**
Entrenched positions	**Vicious circles/cycles**

The author carried out semi-structured interviews with eighteen junior to senior managers from three organisations in different industries (eg. a charity, a county council and a food manufacturer). Six people were selected from each organisation (by an in-house

HR/Learning & Development manager), three first line managers and three senior managers.

At the start of each interview, the manager was shown a handout with a range of words relating to paradox (see figure 1 above). The manager was asked if they had experienced any of these in the workplace and the interviews were then based on their response.

The interviews were recorded, partially transcribed and subjected to content analysis.

Analysis

The eighteen interviews were equally distributed between first line managers and senior managers in the three organisations. Each of the interviews lasted between 35 to 50 minutes and took place in a secluded meeting room. None of the interviewees objected to being recorded.

Because of the richness of data that came from the interviews, the author presented and analysed the data in sections, looking initially at the key findings from the perspective of management levels and then from the perspective of each organisation. This allowed for some non-statistical cross comparisons. Then, beyond management and organisational perspectives, the author focusing in on:

- solutions and interventions that managers proposed or implemented,
- organisational defences that avoided facing paradox and
- a range of language/thinking patterns linked to paradox.

It is the latter part that may be of particular relevance to NLP

Synthesis (Findings of interest to NLP)

Effects of paradox?

Every one of the eighteen people interviewed was able to give examples that fitted within the paradox framework. Table 2 below gives a sample results table.

Table 2: Sample paradoxes experienced by First Line Managers in each organisation.

Org Type	Paradox Type	Paradox Label	Example	Effects on Individual
Charity	Polarity, Dilemma	Departmental polarities 1	Servicing different departments leads to competing demands.	Stress, can't plan, frustration, feels unfair
Charity	Dilemma	Empowerment (Managing) Paradox 1	When to tell people and when to let them get on with it.	Confusion
Charity	Vicious Circle	Third Party Paradox 2	Third party with specialist knowledge 'invited' in but person already wants specific thing and won't budge on content or process. What person wants doesn't fit the rest of the organisation which is why third party has been 'invited' in.	Frustrating for third party and time consuming.
Charity	Vicious Circle	Workload Paradox 1	Workload increases, so quality suffers. Lack of creativity and innovation. Things not always checked.	Have to stay late… squeezed and uncomfortable.
Charity	Vicious Circle & Knot	Workload Paradox 2	Workload increases, so less time for tasks, some things get done less well or not done at all. There is then more reactive fire fighting enquiries.	
Council	Double Bind	Can of Worms Paradox 1	Open can: Issues and stress. Don't open can: hidden issues and guilt.	Extra workload and/or worry.
Council	Vicious Circle & Knot.	Efficiency Paradox 2	I'm good at what I do, so I get given more work. This continues until I cannot do my job anymore.	Resentment about other people not doing much.
Council	Double Bind and Vicious Circle	Groupthink 2	Situation is not right - want to speak up but fear retribution so don't speak up and situation is not changed.	No-one's brave enough to stand up because they live in fear of what might happen.
Council	Vicious Circle	Management Gap Paradox 2	1) Manager uninformed so can't communicate with him, so I sit on things… 2) So he doesn't input, praise or reward, so I feel more demotivation, so I sit on things…	Frustrating, demotivating, anxiety, anger.
Council	Vicious Circle	Management Gap Paradox 3	1) Manager seen as unsupportive. Staff don't feedback or raise issues so manager stays distant… 2) Manager doesn't feedback information so staff are uninformed, time is wasted and people feel demoralised so manager stays distant.	Frustrating, demotivating, feel isolated.
Manufact.	Vicious Circle	Getting Behind Paradox	Previous shift doesn't finish so it means next shift is delayed. Can't start production until previous stock is moved to packing.	End up 'chasing my tail'
Manufact.	Vicious Circle and Knot	Mixed Message Paradox 2	Staff member goes round in circles as manager changes their mind. Then staff member decides to take no action.	Don't know what to do.
Manufact.	Double Bind	Mixed Message Paradox 3	Briefed by manager to do one thing, so time spent setting up. Then another manager says do something else. Contradictory communication.	Time wasted.
Manufact.	Vicious Circle	Problem Person Paradox 6	'Team' work needs doing. Ask colleague but they won't help because they are same level. So have to do the work ourselves.	Frustrating.
Manufact.	Knot	Qualification Paradox 1	You can't do the job you can do because you haven't been trained.	Cynicism

In terms of the managing of these paradoxes, the results were mixed. Almost half of the 64 total paradoxes identified gave no reported solution or intervention. Those solutions that were reported were situational (i.e. might only work for that specific situation, as opposed to resolving all similar paradoxes) and fell into the categories outlined in Table 3. Some of the solutions are also unlikely to have any long term effect (eg. moaning) and in these cases the interventions are probably really defences.

Table 3: Solutions and interventions (proposed or implemented)

Category of Solution	Solution or intervention proposed or implemented
Personal	• Push the commercial angle. Back it up with facts. • Express point of view. • Communication, pragmatic approach, compromise or stand up for it. • Say 'no. The decision can be 'no'! • Better to say 'no' so the other person knows • Diplomatic skills to keep directors happy. • Take a holiday. • Talk to manager about what can and can't be done. • Talk to line managers first before setting up. • Flag it up to manager. • Escalate to my manager to get info directly. • Communicate with person then escalate if necessary. • Try escalating it but we don't get feedback. • Escalating (which doesn't always work!) • Prioritise (only works to a point). • Speaking to people round the back of the meeting. • Wait for instructions. • Take moral high-ground but avoid sticking head above parapet. • Moan – it gets it off your chest.
Managerial	• Gain confidence over time to make own mind up. • Experience of individual and their needs. Clear targets and objectives. • Carry on, sort it out and talk to other shift manager. • Team building. • Team building, hasn't helped. • Make a judgement call or get advice and then give clear direction. • Need delve to get to the heart of the problem. • Talk to teams. Meet to discuss issues. • Consult and train staff more.
Organisational	• Drive and integration programme to remind them they are part of the same company. • Solutions formed for individual situations. • Compromise. Do customisation without damaging the other side. • Use same system but communicate differently. • Get proactive and support other agencies who can handle new or old issues. • Someone needs to say "we need to share information". Raise that at a lower level at team meetings. • Integrating services. Training staff. • Need more org structure to prioritise. Talk to people from other departments, but this is 'topsy turvey'. • Reframe – sometimes by waiting the outside world makes the decision for us. • Need direction from the top. • Stay rational, be aware of competitor but not try and do everything.

Other findings of relevance to NLP

1) TOTE and the strategies of paradox

When a paradox is in action, it could be said to be running a strategy or process. If this is the case, it could be mapped out using Miller, Galanter and Pribram's TOTE model (Dilts et al 1980). NLP uses the TOTE model (Test-Operate-Test-Exit) to explain the nature of an internal strategy. With paradox, particularly the looping kind (eg. self fulfilling prophecy), the TOTE has no Exit, so the paradox strategy runs TOTOTO etc. A looping TOTE could be called a TOTO, or as O'Connor (1997) calls it, a TOT.

2) Aristotelian logic and 'inverse complex equivalence'

The notion of paradox appears to trace back to Aristotelian logic which, in turn, has influenced Western thinking to the present day. This has become known as 'either/or' thinking (Johnson, 1996) and it creates polarities, for example either right or wrong, either win or lose. In formal logic, this is expressed as either X or not X.

This suggests a form of thinking to add to the meta-model violations: an 'inverse complex equivalent' where X<>Y.

3) The role of negation in the creation of paradox

Negation is the process of 'not'ing. The concept of not, or negation may be at the heart of paradox. Andreas (2006) suggests that "negation is an easy way to create an oversimplified world of 'either/or' categorical opposites, limiting choice to one of the two." (p58). In formal logic, as soon as a position is taken on something, there will be a negation, an opposite, a contradiction and hence a paradox.

The negation of X (i.e. ¬X) can mean an apparently mutually exclusive, specific, logical opposite (eg. on/off), a notional opposite (eg. autocratic/ democratic, manager/leader, option a/option b) or a general opposite which could be *anything* other than X

4) Possible linguistic indicators of paradox

Potential linguistic indicators of paradox that were expressed by interviewees as highlighted in table 4 (below). They have been split into explicit and implied. The explicit indicators give a strong suggestion that there is a paradox being discussed. The implied indicators suggest a possibility that a paradox is being discussed, depending on the context.

It is interesting to note how many words act like the word 'but' (eg. however, nevertheless, on the other hand, though, whereas, whilst) in that they change the 'emotional' direction (positive to negative and negative to positive) of the speaker's content. It is possible using

these language patterns to follow the string of reframes from positive to negative to positive etc. Some words, like 'between' and 'or' act as a splitter, marking out two different sides, whereas other words like 'not' and 'too' act as indicators of polarity, in the sense that they imply that there is an opposing factor. Indeed, it could be argued that any time a position is taken on an issue (eg. "I'm right, you're wrong") this would imply there is an opposing position and hence a tension or paradox.

Table 4: Linguistic Indicators of polarity, tension and paradox

Explicit Polarity/Tension	Example/Notes
❋ Between	"it's between x and y"
• Balance	"strike a balance between x and y"
• Compromise	"compromise between x and y"
• Dichotomy	"dichotomy between x and y"
• Difference	"difference between x and y"
• Divide/Division	"divide between x and y"
• Happy medium	"happy medium between x and y "
❋ Contrary	"what you have to do might be contrary to your values"
❋ Counter	"counter productive", "counter balance"
❋ Either/or	"either x or y"
❋ Versus	"x versus y"
❋ Win/lose	"I win, you lose"

Implied Polarity/Tension	Example/Notes
❋ But	"they will get skills but other people will have to wait"
❋ Don't	"I don't see it as x"
❋ However	"x however y"
❋ Instead	"instead of x, y" (or "if not x, y instead")
❋ Nevertheless	"x nevertheless y" (acts like 'but')
❋ Not x	implies polarity between x and not x
❋ On the other hand	"x, on the other hand, y"
❋ Otherwise	"x, otherwise y"
❋ Ought/Should	implies a mismatch between expectation and reality
❋ Rather than	"x rather than y"
❋ Right	Implies there's a wrong (works for any truth value)
❋ So	"x so y" (problem so need/solution)
❋ Though	"x though y" (acts like 'but')
❋ Too	Implies being at the end of one polarity
❋ Whereas	"x whereas y"
❋ Whilst	"whilst x, y"
❋ Without	"talk a lot without any action"

5) The use of metaphor in the identification and possible resolution of organisational paradoxes

The use of metaphor might be an indicator of problems and possibly paradox. Table 5 shows the metaphors used by the interviewees when talking about problems (usually paradoxical) throughout the interviews. Perhaps metaphor may be a used as a way of expressing difficult or emotive concepts by disassociating.

Table 5: Metaphors used to describe paradoxical issues

✻ Actions speak louder than words	✻ Grass is greener	✻ Scrambled egg (head felt like)
✻ Balloon out of control	✻ Grey areas	✻ Round in circles and end up at square one
✻ Big gamble	✻ Grinding your teeth	
✻ Blue flashing light	✻ Halos and horns	✻ Sailing too close to the wind
✻ Blow up	✻ Hands are tied	
✻ Blow with the wind	✻ Heart trying to do the stomach's job	✻ Same flavour but with less meat on the bones
✻ Bone of contention		✻ Set of hurdles and we may fall at one
✻ Borderline cases	✻ Herd of elephants coming towards you	
✻ Brush it under the carpet	✻ Juggling	✻ Shifting a big rock
✻ Can of worms	✻ Many balls in the air at the same time	✻ Silk glove with the iron fist
✻ Chaos on the streets		
✻ Chase off in different directions	✻ Mix it up like a deck of cards	✻ Silo mentality
✻ Clash of Egos	✻ Move the goalposts	✻ Split the pot
✻ Comparing apples and pears	✻ Nightmare	✻ Spoon feeding
	✻ Old Boys club	✻ Stabbed in the back
✻ Court of the sun king	✻ Old hat on	✻ Sticking ones head above the parapet
✻ Creaky system	✻ On different wavelengths	
✻ Cut any ice	✻ Open the stable door and let the horse bolt	✻ Sweating blood
✻ Different angles		✻ Thin end of the wedge
✻ Double edged sword	✻ Out of its box (an old issue)	✻ Turn a blind eye
✻ Eggs in one basket		✻ Unhappy bunnies
✻ Empire building	✻ Put it on the backburner	✻ War (it's a war out there)
✻ Fingers in ears	✻ Queer the pitch	✻ Wrestling with a difficulty
	✻ Resources are tight	✻ Woolly priorities

Positive, solution focussed metaphors…		
✻ Button it down	✻ Flag it up	✻ Put a ring fence up
✻ Clear the air	✻ Get it off your chest	✻ Show them the ropes
✻ Draw a line in the sand	✻ Play by the book	✻ Squaring the triangle

6) An additional set of presuppositions about problems and problem resolution

- An 'unresolvable' problem will have at least one paradox underlying it.
- A problem is only a problem when it is perceived as a problem.
- Identifying and blowing out a component of a paradox will remove (or change) the problem.
- Solutions are context specific therefore paradox management must be about the process of creating solutions and not about the solutions themselves.
- A nominalization is a pole on a potential polarity paradox

7) The type of thinking that resolves tension – The three logics

With regards to the management of paradox, Ford and Ford (1994) discuss three key approaches: formal logic, dialectics and trialectics. Each of these approaches is a logic which ultimately affects the mindset/thinking model of the individual. For this reason, the difference between these logics is an important distinction to make. Ford and Ford (1994, p758) suggest that: "When a person is 'operating in' a particular logic, he or she takes its rules and boundaries for granted. Logics pose the problems, provide the language for explaining and understanding them, and determine their solutions. Logics give people their 'reality', the truth, the way things are… when people are unaware that they are using a logic, or are 'trapped' in only one, this point of view becomes an unwitting limitation to what might be seen or understood, restricting their observations and offering no really new alternatives."

The three logics are summarised in Table 6 below, with example references that fall within each of these approaches.

Table 6: Paradox Management approaches (adapted from Ford & Ford 1994)

Paradox Management Approaches	What is this?	Example References
Formal Logic	Working in the framework of either/or, maintaining a polarity between two seemingly opposing positions.	Johnson (1996)
Dialectic	Creating a 'third way' or synthesis between the polarities (which are known as thesis and antithesis).	Gademer (1976), Siporin & Gummer (1988)
Trialectic	Shifting outside or beyond the polarity for example by reframing.	Ford & Ford (1994) Carini et al (1995)

8) The connection between reframing, Dilts' Sleight of Mouth patterns and Trialectic logic (and their use in resolving paradox)

According to Ichazo (1982), trialectic logic is about "the change from one material manifestation point to another" (p74) and the movement from one point to another point appears to be that of one frame to another frame. In this sense, 'reframing' captures the

essence of trialectic logic. Reframing taps into a rich source of material and hence provides a useful resource for paradox management. Bolman & Deal (2003) refer to 'frames' as "windows, maps, tools, lenses, orientations, and perspectives" (p12) and use four broad frames (structural, human resource, political and symbolic) through which organisational reframing can take place. Bandler and Grinder (1982) propose two types of reframing: content and context, and these have been further developed by Dilts with the 'Sleight of Mouth' patterns (1999) and also by Hall & Bodenhamer (2005) with the 'Mind Lines' patterns. Table 7 (below) compares Dilts' Sleight of Mouth patterns to paradox management approaches suggested in some of the other literature.

Table 7: Sleight of Mouth Patterns in other literature.

Sleight of Mouth Pattern	Approach	Description of Approach	References
Apply to Self	Reverse the loop	Convert dilemmas into 'virtuous circles'.	Hampden Turner (1990)
	Act paradoxically to the paradox	Go towards rather than away from fear of paradox.	Smith & Berg (1987)
Intention	Paradoxical intention/ Prescribe the symptom	Deliberately carry out the symptom.	Andreas (2006) Siporin & Gummer (1988)
	Positive Intention	Explore the positive intention of a paradox. Use an 'as if' frame.	Dilts & Smith (1999)
Consequences	Handling Symptoms	Resolve the symptom of a paradox when the symptom is perceived as the key issue or is a short term 'sticking plaster' solution is needed.	NA
Another Outcome	Confrontation to compare and contrast	Bring the polarity out into the open, so that differences can be resolved.	Blake & McCanse (1991)
Chunk Up/Down	Second order change	Reframe the proposition at another level of abstraction and analysis.	Mirvis (1988) Hampden-Turner (1990) Watzlawick et al (1974)
	Logical Types	Clarify and separate the levels of the issue and the connections among them.	Dilts (1999) Koestler (1978) Van de Ven et al (1988) Ford et al (1988)
	Hierarchy of ideas	Whole and parts. An organisation is both a whole and a collection of parts. Category and examples of types and components. Chunk up: *what is this an example of?* Chunk down: *what is an example of this?*	James (1988)

Hierarchy of Criteria	Seeking underlying harmony of values	Resolve through new insights and linkages between conflicting demands.	Eisenhardt & Westcott (1988)
Change Frame Size	Reconstruction	Move to different level or temporal distinction	Ford et al (1988)
	Larger Frame	Put a larger frame around a situation, to understand it in many contexts.	Farson (1996)
Map of the World	New perspective	Find a world view that integrates and transcends opposing positions.	Claxton (1998)
Reality Strategy	Change what is measured	Develop effective measures and get rid of a lot of them.	Price Waterhouse (1996)
Analogy	Metaphor	Shift to a metaphor, to help make the paradox more tangible and see the pattern in a different way. Create solution at level of metaphor, then map back.	Bateson (2000) Handy (1994) Lawley (2000) Lawley et al (2003) Cash (1997)
Redefine	Paradoxical frame	Seek the positive of the opposite. Redefine the situation by providing a new meaning that has a positive quality.	Siporin & Gummer (1988)
Counter Example	Elsewhere	Show an example of where the paradox is not a problem, eg. another context, in another organisation.	N/A
Meta	Take meta position	Jump outside the frame and take a systems view.	O'Connor & McDermott (1997)
	Transcending	Take multiple meta positions to disassociate.	Dilts (2003) Quinn (1990)

9) *The connection between nominalisations and paradox… and how might we denominalise paradox?*

From an NLP perspective, paradox could be considered a nominalisation. Not just the word 'paradox', but possibly any nominalisation will be one side of a polarity paradox. When examining a list of polarities in organisations, all of the examples appear to be nominalisations (as in Stroh & Miller 1994, p31, Marsh & Macalpine 1999, p645, Pascale 1990, p53, Peters 1992, p473 and Quinn & Kimberly 1984, p301). A sample list appears below in table 7. Perhaps one thing that distinguishes a nominalisation from a 'non-nominalisation' is that it has a meaningful polar opposite. For example, 'desk' (a 'non-nominalisation') has no meaningful polar opposite, whereas 'empowerment' (a nominalisation) does. A list of values is also a list of nominalisations and "nearly all values

14

have a polar opposite value that is also positive" (Quinn & Cameron, 1988b, p292), for example: spontaneity and predictability.

Table 7: Example list of organisational polarities

Empowerment	----------	Control
Autonomy	----------	Partnership
Internal	----------	External
Decentralisation	----------	Centralisation
Short term	----------	Long term
Stability	----------	Change
Competition	----------	Collaboration

It could be argued that nominalising is akin to Aristotelian/formal logic in that it seeks to create 'things'. It is only by labelling 'things' that the three laws of formal logic can work:

	First Law A=A	Second Law A<>B	Third Law A<>(A+B)
Formal Logic	Law of identity	Law of contradiction	Law of the excluded middle

Denominalising, on the other hand, is akin to trialectic logic. The process of denominalising is usually linked to NLP (eg Dilts & DeLozier 2000b) but is also is referred to by Hampden-Turner (1990) who argues that "by adding ing to…words we convert the noun form to the present participle; not decisiveness but deciding… Once expressed in this way, they are process words… the oppositions are softened and the adversary structure disappears." (p131). Ford & Ford (1994) inform that: "According to trialectics, there are no 'things' in the world other than change, movement or process. Things, such as people, organisations and ideas, are all names given to abstractions of what are identifiable and relatively constant patterns of movement" (p765). Trialectics would therefore imply that paradox is a process and not a thing.

10) *Using a logical level framework as a potential approach to paradox management*

Logical level (or logical type) frameworks can help to separate out the layers of a paradox which in itself can help to resolve a dilemma by shifting away from 'either/or' by allowing 'both/and' to be true.

July 5th 2008