CHAPTER 6

NEGOTIATING AND SELLING AN INTERVENTION-RESEARCH PROJECT WITHOUT THE SUPPORT OF A WELL-STRUCTURED RESEARCH LABORATORY

Thierry Nobre

Negotiation is a fundamental phase of an intervention-research (IR) project (see Chapters 2, 4, & 5). As in many other human activities, the first contact and exchange with the client firm leave an imprint that strongly influences latter stages. Thus, the researcher in the negotiating phase of an intervention-research project must be fully aware of the stakes of this phase of reciprocal discovery. It requires researchers to clearly define the objectives of the intervention as well as communicate the difficulties and pitfalls that are likely to be encountered, which can undermine a primary purpose—the production of knowledge. The objective of this chapter is to reflect on the lessons of IR negotiations in various contexts ranging from

Intervention Research, pages 111–128

small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) to international organizations—from the perspective of a lone researcher without the support of a strong research team as discussed in Chapter 5.

These lessons favor a praxeological perspective on negotiating this type of research as well as reflect critical issues that any intervener-researcher has to face during the negotiation phase. In a complementary approach to Chapter 5, the discussion proposes lines of actions and devices devoted to an individual researcher who is not in a position to apply the normative process of negotiation as followed by a well-established center such as ISEOR. Indeed, many interveners who want to undertake this type of research are not members of an experimented team and have to build up the selling as well as implementation of their research process on a more adhoc basis. In other words, drawing on a military strategy metaphor, this chapter focuses on the IR negotiation process carried out in a more restricted configuration of the "commando" or "light cavalry" rather than a project conducted with well-organized troops dedicated to this type of approach.

To reach these goals, the chapter illustrates the various questions, findings, and proposals raised by case studies clarify the context and different stakes involved in the negotiating processes selected. This teleological posture explains both the systematic use of negotiation case studies and the focus on the academic process to shed light on the link between the intervention itself and publication. In particular, the chapter examines such questions as: "What constitutes an adhoc negotiation process?"; "What parameters should be taken into account in this context?"; "What is the appropriate behavior of the researcher to successfully negotiate an IR process, focused on reaching managerial *and* scientific and managerial objectives that characterize intervention-research?"

To answer these questions, this chapter is organized in three parts. First, since negotiation is the initiating phase of every IR engagement, it is necessary to reconsider the articulation between research, knowledge, and publication. Clarifying and identifying the stakes of this initial phase—the negotiation with the scientific observation area (SOA)—are crucial since this primary stage constitutes the launching pad that defines the future trajectory of the project and creates the foundations for cooperation and coproduction between the researchers and actors.

Second, the dynamic dimensions of the negotiation process itself is examined in detail. It is necessary to identify and deepen the various key mechanisms and evolutions at work during this stage, emphasizing the interactions between the different categories of actors involved. Finally, the content of the negotiation is discussed in detail, focusing on the elements that are negotiated and the formalized agreements that emerge.

ISSUES AND CONTEXT IN THE NEGOTIATION OF AN INTERVENTION-RESEARCH PROJECT

To describe the negotiation stage of an IR project, it is necessary to insist on a basic finality of any intervention-research—the production of knowledge. To preserve this outcome, there are a number of actions the researcher must undertake—within the context of the different forms of knowledge that an IR project seeks to create as a way of appropriately diversity during the negotiation process.

Second, IR negotiation involves interactions between the researcher and the actors from the SOA that are neither spontaneous nor frequent. Thus there are a number of actions that must be taken into account by the researcher to define a negotiation strategy. Third, intervention-research has a specific chronobiological dimension and the issue of time management has to be taken into account so the researcher can reconcile scientific production objectives with the constraints of agreement in the project.

An Intervention-Research Project as a Source of Multifaceted and Complementary Knowledge

The creation of knowledge is typically the primary goal of the researcher. Thus it is important to highlight the different forms that knowledge that can be developed in an IR project as a way of clarifying the modalities for creating knowledge that the researcher should keep in mind during the negotiation phase.

Publication Is Not Research

A basic clarification concerns the link between research and publication. In an academic context where the pressure to publish is often intense, it is necessary to remember that publication is not research. The publication process is an academic exercise of formalizing and communicating research for peer review. In other words, research is not reducible to publication, but the latter is indispensable to the former. As a matter of fact, prior to a good publication, methodologies have been developed that involve data collection, analysis, and processing activities to address issues that contribute to the creation of knowledge.

Because researchers have different channels to disseminate their knowledge, they should clarify a strategy to create a portfolio of publications. This range of contributions is now institutionalized at the international level—for example, the U.S.-based Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business International (AACSB) accredits the best business schools by capturing three types of intellectual contributions: theoretical, practice, and pedagogical. Thus, researchers have different avenues of expression they are encouraged to utilize, enabling them to choose the most appropriate modality and audience for the knowledge they have generated.

In this chapter, we will mainly focus on academic journals, books, and pedagogical case studies. We have excluded papers for congresses and conferences from our field of analysis, although they are an important part of the process to prepare a journal submission, being a well-suited preliminary stage to these latter methods of dissemination.

Analysis using a sports metaphor would classify academic journals in the universe of stringent tests imposed within a detailed codification of the rules of the game, while books might be characterized as "free agents." As a matter of fact, provided book authors have the support of their publisher, they have considerable freedom to present their research as they see fit. Pedagogical publications such as case studies also make it possible to develop research to ensure the link between scientific and educational activities.

Intervention-research, through the privileged link it develops between researchers and SOAs, allows interveners to play with these different types of outlet, enabling them to take advantage of a broad range of publication possibilities. This diversity of possible publication options should be kept in mind throughout the research process and especially during the negotiation phase. Indeed, the nature of the publications targeted by the researcher at the beginning of an IR project is decisive for the subsequent production of knowledge. Consequently, the preliminary, negotiation stage of an IR project is very important to define the effective conditions for mobilization, use, valorization, and communication of the different elements of this intervention (e.g., observations, documentation, interviews.). It ultimately constitutes a "GO/NO GO" filter, which justifies treating this phase with all the seriousness and attention it requires.

Negotiation Context

Basically, the negotiation phase of an IR project is based on a series of meetings with the actors who, at best, do not know each other and, at worst, may initially denigrate each other. As a matter of fact, the negotiation phase of an IR engagement involves, in general, actors who are not accustomed to meet each other on a regular basis—academics and practitioners. The perception of the latter is largely conditioned by the traditional branding of academics whose research is often considered as being too theoretical and too far removed from the concerns of practitioners in the field.

This context may generate a lack of reliance over academics on behalf of practitioners, who might have difficulties taking academics too seriously. Thus the credibility of the researcher is not typically acquired *a priori* during an IR project, and often depends on the researcher's professionalism during initial stages of negotiation. The behavior of the intervener during this phase (e.g., punctuality/delay, listening/talking, opening/self-centering) is crucial to build confidence with the SOA. Consequently, while remaining self-confidant about one's method and expertise, researcher should be humble—even with an impressive publication record

It is important that researchers are clear and transparent with the client, ensuring that they plans, requests, and expectations are fully understood. For researchers working on their own, without the benefit and support of a well-structured research team, this interaction is that much more important as the researcher can count only on him or herself as the focal point of the questions and doubts from the client firm.

Various authors interested in intervention-research particularly emphasize the concept of "coproduction," which they regard as one of the fundamental mechanisms in progress during an IR project (Argyris et al, 1985; Buono & Savall, 2015; Cappelletti & Baker, 2010; Chanal, 1997; David, 2000; Hatchuel, 1994; Moisdon, 1984,). Nevertheless, some of these authors are mainly concerned with carrying out an IR project without necessarily taking into account its initial negotiation phase that leads to the agreement. Drawing on our experience with intervention-research, it is important to stress that coproduction should be agreed upon early on, from very beginning of an IR project. Indeed, coproduction between the researcher and client practitioner helps to build, through incremental interactions, actions that help to guarantee both the implementation of the means of investigation wanted by the researcher and the treatment of the problem expressed by the client.

As IR projects often induce a peak confrontation with reality, it may be fused with sudden surprises for the intervener due to the unpredictable nature of the ground. Thus, a significant objective of the negotiation is, among other things, to master, as best as possible, this unpredictability through rigor and methodological clarity (as explained in Chapter 5, particularly the role of the OMSP tool—objectives methods services products). Consequently, the researcher may be confronted with evolutions that could challenge and even rock the sustainability of the IR project. One of the causes of this unpredictability is the gap between the representation of the functioning of their organization that the actors involved in the negotiation process have in mind and the actual functioning that the intervener will ultimately face. Another cause may stem from the turnover during the IR project that at times involves some of the actors in the negotiation phase. In fact, given the longitudinal nature of many IR engagements, it is not uncommon that those who have played a leading role during the negotiation of the IR project and its agreement (e.g., CEO, CFO, CHRO, project manager, department head) may have changed position or even left the organization. Therefore, during the negotiation phase, the researcher should address the possibility of turnover among key actors, attempting to forecast

IR devices that may ensure, as far as possible, the continuity and sustainability of the project.

There are two major consequences for the researcher that stem from the unpredictable nature of the ground. First, researchers must be aware of and accept this risk; second, they have to realize that this risk may lead to the failure of that particular intervention, factoring that possibility in arbitrations in different projects that are being carried out at the same time. It means that the researcher must be able both to adapt solutions allowing the project to be carried out and to design an appropriate solution of retreat if things would turn wrong to pursue his other research activities.

The Intervener's Time Management From Negotiation to Publication

Intervention-research requires a significant presence on the ground, making it a time-consuming endeavor. Therefore the researcher has to deal with an issue that may seem paradoxical—as an academic, researchers are subject to strong pressures to publish rapidly, but intervention-research requires substantial presence in the field. To cope with this dilemma, researchers do have some levers of action they can draw on.

The first tactic is to rigorously schedule the three steps of the IR process—illustrated by the acronym IREV:

- *Identification* of potential projects and plans for their negotiation. In this stage, the researcher searches for opportunities (or may be solicited to take on a client), converting potential interventions into formalized and agreed upon projects.
- *Realization* of the IR project, implementing the IR tools and devices that have been agreed upon during the negotiation, cooperating with the actors on the ground.
- *Valorization*—the researcher creates a publication in a form that appears to be the most appropriate according to one's own portfolio of knowledge products, professional career goals, and the nature of the results obtained.

Thus researchers should lay out a global vision of their activity to manage the three IREV steps of the IR. Obviously, in order to ensure a steady publication stream, researchers will have to simultaneously conduct these three stages in different projects to generate an ongoing flow of intellectual contribution.

A second lever is that of *collective actions*. Given the energy to be deployed and the time spent, it is difficult for researchers to carry out these tasks by themselves. Beyond methodological and epistemological requirements, a critical aspect of empirical feasibility requires an individual to work with colleagues. Even if a researcher may be isolated from others, that individual should still seek out collaborative relationships when possible that will facilitate project development. Different approaches should be considered, ranging from internal cooperation within the academic field, partnerships with colleagues on site or from other institutions, involvement of doctoral students, or even external solutions, including cooperation with external consultants.

NEGOTIATION TACTICS FOR LONE RESEARCHERS

Moving on from the discussion in Chapter 5, which focused on negotiation as part of a well-developed team, there are specific challenges when a lone individual proposes an IR project. This section of the chapter focuses on the genesis of the negotiation, with specific emphasis on the individual intervener-researcher as the center of our attention—reflecting on the challenge of balancing dual outcomes between academics and actors, with the former driven by scientific objectives and the latter with practice-based expectations.

Key Ideas in the Theory of IR Negotiation

Generally, theories of IR negotiation place the negotiation on a continuum ranging from confrontation to cooperation where different actors, through an incremental approach, try to reach an agreement about a future coproduction. The actors aim at reaching a goal coherent with their own sphere of action—or world in the sense of Boltanski and Thevenot (1991). Practitioners seek solutions to resolve the concrete problems they are confronted with, while intervener-researchers help practitioners solve their problem(s) with the added goal of contributing to the development of knowledge in the management sciences. This confrontation/cooperation dialectic spreads out in a sociopolitical context with human actors, complete with their desires, objectives, fears, and contradictions. Although they belong to the same organization, they may have divergence views, confrontations, and even conflicts. Moreover, the internal actors participating in the negotiation can bring only their own representations of the organization by associating their own strategy in relation to a project that is never neutral for the evolution of their organization. As a result, the intervener-researcher who goes through a negotiation phase typically only meets a few actors of the client firm among many others who are not represented, which *de facto* creates allies and internal opponents for the future project.

Thus, negotiation goes beyond the technical and engineering dimensions of management, which consists of changing management practices, tool, and devices. It imposes *ipso facto* negotiating researchers to position themselves between Casanova and Machiavelli, combining seduction and political maneuvering to succeed in overcoming the divergences to which they may be confronted in carrying out an IR project. The complexity of the internal relations within organizations suggests that there is not a sole way of negotiation but different approaches that require the researcher to scan these internal characteristics. On this condition, the researcher can not only propose the appropriate content but also adopt the adapted behavior allowing one to transform opportunities into feasible projects. It should also be stressed that these preliminary steps, which are full of negotiating maneuvers, create interesting opportunities for collecting information that enable the researcher to be in step with the concerns of client companies and organizations. Thus, they constitute a real outcome derived from the IR project. Then, even if the intervention-research does not succeed—which sometimes does happen—the researcher will have collected a lot of information enabling him or her to reflect on the experience, drawing out new insights in the process.

Generating Requests and Opportunities for Initiating a Negotiation Process

Intervention-research requires the researcher to be in direct contact with companies and organizations. In order to develop the research, the intervener must initially penetrate the organization and then stay there in order to observe relevant managerial phenomena. When intervener-researchers are unable to rely on a structured approach, they must come up with an approach in line with their own skills and capabilities to initiate contacts with possible client companies and organizations, given that one's academic publications merely offer some visibility.

To get in touch with organizations and stimulate an IR request on their behalf, the researcher has three main possibilities:

- A pro-active approach of prospecting, where the researcher organizes meetings with potential partners.
- Solicitations resulting from the researcher's publications (from articles and conferences, to round tables and internet postings). In this case, the work serves as a harbinger of what the client should expect given the themes that have been addressed.

- Solicitations stemming from the word of mouth of previous IR clients. In this case, prospective clients are attracted by previous IR achievements that they have become aware of and that have been recommended to them by companies that have participated in these projects.

Table 6.1 includes illustrative examples of these approaches. Our observations show that a researcher's visibility is directly related to the power of attraction they have in generating a negotiation process and successfully initiating an IR project.

The diversity of approaches for generating an IR negotiation requires the researcher to be able to identify them and convert them into concrete projects. In this vein, some epistemologists like Feyerabend (1975) consider that because research may take many forms the researcher must always be available and attentive to weak opportunity signals. In other words, for Feyerabend, everything can be good for initiating an IR negotiation. Like Girin (1981), who evoked what he called "methodical opportunism," researchers must develop an opportunistic watch that allows them to elicit different situations, engage with these opportunities, and capture information that will enable them to identify possible collaborative opportunities. The range at the disposal of the researcher is very wide (see Table 6.2), from meetings with representatives of companies during the supervision of thesis, to more institutionalized situations like being chair of a conference, roundtable, or panels with managers.

TABLE 6.1 Examples of Different Ways to Generate a Negotiation Phase
• As a doctoral student, I wanted to apply the socioeconomic intervention method in very small post-creation/pre-development businesses. Finding the first client required intense canvassing and a bit of luck. The second client was due to a recommendation of the first client. The knowledge accumulated during these first two IR projects made it easier to secure negotiations with the other five cases studied in my thesis. Indeed, the lessons learned from the first two experimentations provided decisive and contextualized arguments to trigger the agreement of the leaders for the negotiation of the last five cases. Obviously, the directors were surprised that a junior researcher knew their context, their difficulties, and their managerial needs (Nobre, 1995).
• Presentation of the results of the research during the thesis defense was made with guests of healthcare institutions. It aroused the interest of managers of several companies in the healthcare sector who wished to propose new ways of collaboration through IR projects within their institutions (Nobre & Haouet, 2011).
• The quality manager of a hospital having been informed of a previous IR project conducted in the central pharmacy department of the same establishment contacted the researcher, which led to a new IR project focused on the reorganization of his department (Nobre & Merdinger, 2011).

TABLE 6.2 Examples of Capturing Opportunities

From an informal meeting . . . • An IR project led in a higher education institution (a school of architecture) was initiated through a discussion during a friendly meeting where the academic director of the institution told a circle of friends about his strategic constraints. The researcher was present by chance at this meeting without belonging to this circle of friends. This discussion was the initiation of a contact that subsequently led to a negotiation process.
. . . to a proactive diversion. • Interested by the results of a research project in which they had participated by hosting researchers for interviews, the directors of a medium-sized company asked the researchers if they knew any consultants who could carry out a strategic management mission. After analyzing the demand, the researchers wrote a proposal that initiated the negotiation process, which resulted in a successful IR engagement with high publication potential (Granclaude & Nobre, 2017).

Key Points in Leading a Negotiation in a Nonstructured Context

In addition to the contributions of Chapter 5 that addressed the key elements of an IR negotiation in the context of a well-structured researcher center, this discussion will turn to some crucial points for researchers who practice intervention-research in a less structured context.

The first point is related to the scientific objectives of the researcher. Based on our experience, we advise intervener-researchers to keep in mind during a negotiation phase the scientific potential of the discussed project and to think about converting the proposed data collection into research problems. The richness of the ground quickly raises significant concerns for the intervener, especially in terms of defining a problem and choosing among those that emerge, which also means excluding others. This decision is often the most difficult to make for the researcher given the interest of the problems arising from the field. Indeed, our experience shows that the creativity observed within the ground often goes beyond human imagination.

Second, it is essential to consider the temporality of the sequences of the negotiation. There is a wide spectrum of negotiations where the different sequences can be linked quickly, while in other cases a “sown seed” can take a long time before germinating, arising and reappearing without any warning signs, weeks or even months after the first steps. Similarly, given the context, particularly in the public sector and especially in the healthcare sector, there are generally slowdowns and accelerations that can be very brutal. In general, the starting phase of making contact and defining an intervention takes place precipitously, but projects often get stuck in the different strata of decision-making. Yet, when a project reappears it must be executed quickly. This reinforces the need for researchers to have a global view of their activities and rigorous time management tools in order to use downtime for production and to anticipate the ways in which, in particular through collective action, these chronobiology IR hazards can be dealt with in a timely manner.

Considering the diversity of potential problems that may justify the demand for an IR project, researchers must also be clear regarding their own knowledge and capabilities, understanding their own limitations in terms of what they can and cannot successfully accomplish. It is essential for researchers to continually define and redefine their own competency grids to fully understand what they are capable of producing. In other worlds, a good intervener-researcher needs to apply Aristotle's philosophical precept—first, know yourself! One of the key competencies for negotiation is for the researcher to know how to listen to the client. Listening is the fundamental mechanism that allows the researcher to initiate the different stages of a negotiation and successfully conclude it with an agreement.

Obviously, reformulating a request or proposal, which is essential to test the mutual understanding of reciprocal expectations, implies three qualities—listening, listening, and listening. This skill of active listening, which calls for capturing a conversation and testing for understanding, is not necessarily innate for researchers who are generally accustomed to delivering knowledge. It is all the more difficult to adopt such an active approach because it must be accompanied by appropriate behavior limiting nonverbal communication so as not to disturb the transmission of messages. In short, during a negotiation phase, researchers who are accustomed to be in the role of the "knowing person" must reverse this traditional relationship to the other by putting themselves in a receptive position rather than one of emission, which *de facto* imposes a form of humility.

Another key point concerns who should actually participate in the negotiation phase. From an academic point of view, given the need to understand and reformulate the client's initial request, it is clearly preferable not to be alone. Also given the asymmetry of information during this phase, where the external stakeholder typically has ideas on many subjects, from the reality and seriousness of the demand, to the credibility and legitimacy of the actors involved in the negotiation process, to technical concerns and depth of the subjects to be examined. *Contradictory intersubjectivity* is a principle that allows the negotiating researchers to avoid the pitfalls of misunderstanding or missing fundamental elements. It focuses on the exchanges between researchers during and after the phases of interactions with the clients that make this "step back" necessary. We advise the lone researcher to search for partners to carry out a negotiation. That said, because temporal constraints show that negotiation under imperfect conditions is always better than no negotiation at all, if it is not possible, go ahead individually.

TABLE 6.3 Example of a Transition From Substantive to Legal Issues
In the case of the negotiation of an IR project in a Belgian university hospital, after having agreed on the various elements of the research—objectives, methods, benefits, duration and timetable, financial conditions, perimeter, relevant and key actors (project manager, internal relay)—the manager of the university hospital entrusted the project to his legal department, which established the intervention-research agreement according to Belgian legislation. In this instance, the researcher had neither the skills nor the resources for making this legal editing. The confidence created during the negotiation process lead to the formalization of the project, which was then subject to final legal review.

With regard to the actors on the ground, it is necessary to have access to the strategic actors of the targeted company. There is always a risk for intervener-researchers of interacting with actors who give the impression that they have more importance than they actually do and/or do not have the power to make decisions. Therefore, negotiation involves a preliminary step of identifying and validating the key actors that should be formally included in the negotiation process. Otherwise, the negotiation could simply be a waste of time. The production of a proposal is not the beginning of the process but the fruit of different stages. Each of them aims to reveal a set of information that enables progression toward a mutual understanding of the expectations and contributions of each of the parties. In the end, legal concerns tend not to be decisive issues. Once the parties have agreed on what they expect from each other during an IR project, any legal issues can be relatively easily resolved (see Table 6.3 as an example).

The Researcher's Posture During the Negotiation Phase

The IR projects that we have conducted with field actors show that two factors are decisive for activating the virtuous circle between negotiation and IR-based knowledge production. They both concern the ways that researchers should position themselves during the negotiation phase in relation to the actors on the ground.

The first point may seem obvious, but it is important to remember that initiating an IR negotiation imposes some preliminary actions. First of all, it is necessary and indispensable to meet the actors of the field—success in proposing an IR project without any physical meeting with the client seems impossible to us. It is also critical to be empathetic in order to understand their difficulties. Likewise, this means collaborating with them to contribute to the coproduction of effective and actionable solutions. This form of research not only targets the production of knowledge but also aims to transform the organization and its managerial practices. For instance, this awareness took a tangible form in a doctoral workshop when a PhD candidate said, "I do not want to go in the field and meet real people. I prefer to stay in my office to do my research." It is clear that not every researcher has the appropriate appetite to be in the field.

Our second, related point, is that an appetite for the field is a prerequisite but it is not sufficient. When researchers intervene with practitioners they can be quickly confronted with stereotypes about academicians and academic life. While they may be credited with certain recognized qualities of the academic world, they can also be characterized by the supposed traits that go with it. Ethical transparency requires interveners to act "with an open face," presenting their objective of helping them while seeking publication and the production of knowledge (see Table 6.4). The potential confrontation of different representations forces researchers to adopt a posture that simultaneously banishes the arrogance of the "one who knows" while also being aware of everything they know. In particular, researchers must necessarily master the actionable knowledge that can be implemented in an IR project. Of course, the intervener-researcher must adapt their expertise to the environment that they navigates, taking into account the codes and conventions on the ground. Thus, the researcher in this initial stage of negotiation is a "knowing listener" who identifies opportunities and potential compatibility by arbitrating between doubt and confidence, initiating the cooperative behavior that will enable them to achieve their scientific objectives while meeting the managerial expectations of the client.

The presentation of the content of the negotiation makes it possible to detail the various elements that must be explicitly formalized in order to confirm the agreement between the two parties. Transparency is critical here, an openness that constitutes one of the pillars of the confidence necessary for continuation of a project. Finally, transparency facilitates clarification of the following key questions: what, who, when, how, and how much? Within this context, it is necessary to further enrich this analysis of the content formalized by two supplements. The first concerns the relationship

TABLE 6.4 Presenting Oneself During an IR Negotiation

Research in the management sciences is not necessarily identified as a resource by companies and organizations. Intervener-researchers must therefore be diplomatic and earnest in order to position themselves among possible options. For example, the status of an associate professor in a university is not well-known or recognized in a small- and medium-sized enterprise (SME), so it is not a decisive argument for negotiation. On the contrary, in a hospital this status was a decisive factor for the CEO in accepting the researcher. For him, it provided the basis for his argument to make his heads of departments—who were also professors in a university—to accept the intervener-researcher as a peer, an outside stakeholder who would work with them on the change project. Researchers should therefore be aware of the possible discrepancy between signs of recognition one might enjoy in their environment and the permanent questioning to which they are subjected to by intervening on the ground.

between the field project and the goal of knowledge production. The second refers to elements that, although not formalized, must be integrated into the negotiation process.

Managing Field-Based Projects and Knowledge Production Objectives

Intervention-research is based on the dialectic between the production of knowledge and finding solutions to managerial problems. Different types of relationships may exist between the explicit reasons for entering the company or organization that determine the deliverables to be produced for the field and the problem(s) that will be selected, processed, and valued in publication. There is a continuum between these two outcomes. Ideally, there is a perfect alignment between field objectives and academic goals, in essence, when the problems on the ground become the focus of publication. This was the case, for example, for an experimentation of management tools in a hospital through the implementation of the "Balanced Scorecard" (Nobre, 2001) and activity-based costing (Nobre 2004, 2006). At the other extreme, there may be a significant gap between the two. In this case, the researcher has to deploy what might be thought of as a "Trojan horse strategy." In this instance, the intervention allows the researcher to enter the organization by paying the equivalent of an entrance fee based on the mission being performed and the deliverables produced. These services are the means of observing *in situ* and in real time a management problem that is of interest to the intervener but may not be of interest to the client company. For example, we used this tactic to study the relations of power and governance in a group of hospitals (Nobre, 1998), although it was not at all the formal demand of the client group.

Given the richness of the data collected during an IR project and the inherent unpredictability of the phenomena that may emerge on the ground, the researcher can be surprised by problems relevant to emerging management sciences. These "unexpected observations" may occupy an intermediate place between the objectives of the field and that of the researcher. They result from the opportunist strategy of the researcher. Therefore, the researcher during the negotiation of an IR project should be aware of deploying the devices are necessary to reach one's scientific objectives while serving the needs of the client, being transparent and sufficiently vigilant to seize opportunities that may emerge.

Convergence of Negotiation Processes

The constitutive elements of the negotiation process are widely discussed in Chapter 5. The elements presented here are intended to emphasize a few points relating to the context of the lone researcher or with an unstructured team. Even in a position of a lone researcher or acting in a small team of research, the formalization of the OMSP tool—objective products, methods products, and services products—described Chapter 5 can help to ensure a mutual understanding of expectations and reciprocal commitments. It guarantees an explanation of the reformulation of demand in its strategic and operational dimensions. It is all the more necessary because the researcher acting alone or with a limited team does not have the back office capabilities that can be relied on during the execution of an IR project. The visibility of the intervention for the company or the organization requires the intervener-researcher to explicitly specify from the outset the interveners involved and the deadlines in which the project will be carried out. This transparency is the foundation of the trust that is essential to the successful realization of the intervention.

Another point of convergence deals with the rewards from the intervention. Any task that creates value—in this instance, the IR intervention—deserves incentives whatever the size of the team of interveners. The companies and organizations benefiting from this type of service should be aware of the value created and ready to make a financial contribution. The question of price is then raised as part of the negotiation. As it has been explained in Chapter 5, the proposed cost should be between the market price and the cost of the resources consumed, knowing that a main resource is naturally the time of the researchers involved in the project. The financial transaction is decisive because it requires companies not to take the project lightly, credibilizes the researcher, and engages both parties in a reciprocal obligation of effective engagement.

In addition to the price of the intervention, in order to be able to mobilize the data and elements collected during the IR process, the researcher must include the conditions for their subsequent use in the intervention agreement. Intervener-researchers must agree with their partner(s) on the modalities (anonymity or not, type of data, publication process) for future productions. The researcher may be confronted with very different situations ranging from the company that requires complete anonymity to one that wants to spread information about the project as widely as possible, to the point of even using it as an internal and/or external communication tool. The formalization of this point imposes exchanges on this topic and thus avoids any further problems for the researcher, who at worst would be unable to mobilize an intervention-research for publication.

The Non-Formalized Content

Similar to the psychological contract, there is also an informal context for the conduct of intervention-research, which is primarily the ethics of the

TABLE 6.5 Example of the Refusal of an Intervention
At the request of the board of a large European organization, an IR project was aimed at establishing the organizational diagnosis of an entity carrying out support functions and employing around 500 people. The diagnosis showed the need for significant change. The CEO wished to see this entity, and in particular its director, accompanied by interveners to make this change. Given the status in this type of European organization governed by international agreements, the situation of the director, who was a few years from retirement and well-known for his resistance to change, it was obvious that the situation would be essentially frozen until his departure. Thus, the project did not allow the creation of a satisfactory IR plan, even though it would have been easy to accept the engagement. The researchers therefore declined to intervene in a second stage, although the financial proposal was rather favorable because a fundamental principle was not respected for this type of project, namely the support of the management for effective transformation.

researcher. Although researchers aim to produce knowledge, they should refuse an intervention that they believe will not fulfill necessary moral and/or strategic expectations (see Table 6.5 as an example).

CONCLUSION

The objective of the researcher practicing intervention-research is multifaceted, a combination of aspiring to reach the long-term goal of creating scientific knowledge and helping to resolve short-term managerial issues. This is why, for negotiating and then carrying out an IR project, intervener-researchers need robust techniques and principles, especially when they are carrying out the project by themselves. By choosing an approach that involves coproduction with field actors and the transformation of the organization, methodological conditions and postures have to be applied from the initial contacts on the ground throughout all stages of the negotiation phase. The reference to actual cases of negotiation presented in the chapter was used to identify general principles and guidelines to successfully carry out this initial stage of coproduction, foreshadowing and defining the objectives, and the form and background of the cooperation between the researchers and the SOA. Ability to listen, willingness to cooperate, adaptability, methodological rigor, and so forth are among the key factors of success to entering organizations and remain there by creating legitimacy, which is the guarantee of reciprocal satisfaction. Looking at these different cases and principles, it should be clear that there are several ways to lead IR negotiations, drawing on convergent principals and various tools as appropriate. Researchers, either working along or on a large team, who are comfortable with these convergent principals and tools will be able to adapt their expertise and methodology to different contexts and the characteristics of the organization in which they want to develop an IR project.

REFERENCES

Buono, A. F., & Savall, H. (Eds.) (2015). *The socio-economic approach to management revisited: The evolving nature of SEAM in the 21st century.* Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Boltanski, L., & Thévenot, L. (1991). *De la justification. Les économies de la grandeur.* (From justification. The economies of scale). Paris, France: Gallimard.

Cappelletti, L., & Baker, R. C, (2010). Measuring and developing human capital through a pragmatic action research: A French case study. *Action Research, 8*(2), 211–232.

Chanal, V., Lesca, H., & Martinet, A. C. (1997). Vers une ingénierie de la recherche en gestion (Towards an Engineering of Research in Management Sciences). *Revue Française de Gestion, 116,* 41–51.

David, A. (2000). La recherche-intervention, cadre général pour la recherche en management [Intervention-research, a general framework for research in management sciences). In A. David, A. Hatchuel, & R. Laufer (Eds), *Les nouvelles fondations des sciences de gestion: éléments d'épistémologie de la recherche en management* (pp. 250–268). Paris, France: Vuibert.

Feyerabend, P. (1975). *Contre la méthode: Esquisse d'une théorie anarchiste de la connaissance* [Against the method: Project of an anarchiste theory of knowledge]. Paris, France: Point Sciences.

Girin, J. (1981). *L'opportunisme méthodique dans les recherches sur la gestion des organisations* [Methodic opportunism in research in organizational sciences]. Paris, France: Ecole Polytechnique.

Grandclaude, D., & Nobre, T. (2017). L'innovation participative en stratégie: Innovation, illusion ou révolution managériale ? [The participative innovation in strategy: Innovation, illusion or managerial revolution?]. In *Workshop: Journées de l'innovation Abbé Grégoire,* Paris, France.

Hatchuel, A. (1994). Les savoirs de l'intervention en entreprise [The knowledge of Intervention Within Companies]. *Entreprise et Histoire, 7,* 59–75.

Moisdon, J. C. (2015). Recherche en gestion et intervention [Management sciences and intervention]. *Revue Française de Gestion, 253,* 21–39.

Nobre, T. (1995). Le processus de structuration dans la petite entreprise [The process of structuration within small entreprises]. *Revue internationale des PME, 8*(3), 121–144.

Nobre, T. (2004). L'ABC à l'hôpital: Le cas de la chirurgie infantile [ABC in hospital: A case study in the childhood surgery sector). *Finance Contrôle Stratégie, 5*(2), 85–105.

Nobre, T. (2006). L'introduction de nouveaux outils de contrôle de gestion dans les services cliniques: Le cas de l'expérimentation de l'ABC dans un service de pédiatrie [Introducing new management control tools in the health care sector: Results from the implementation of ABC in a pediatric service]. *Journal de Gestion et d'Economie Médicale, 24*(3–4), 56–71.

Nobre, T. (2001). Management hospitalier: Du contrôle externe au pilotage, apport et adaptabilité du Tableau de Bord Prospectif [Management in hospitals: From external control to internal management control, outcomes provided by the balanced scorecard]. *Comptabilité Contrôle Audit, 2*(7), 125–146.

Nobre, T., & Haouet, I. (2011). Le cas d´un balanced-scorecard en contexte hospitalier: Eluder la carte stratégique pour privilégier la performance organisationnelle [The balanced scorecard at hospital: From strategy mapping to organizational Performance]. *Revue Française de Gestion, 211,* 103–118.

Nobre, T., & Merdinger-Rumpler, C. (2011). Architecture et changement organisationnel: Le cas du déménagement d'un service de consultation externe au sein d'un nouvel hôpital [Architecture and organizational change: The case of a service in a new hospital]. *Journal de Gestion et d'Economie Médicale, 29*(4), 154–169.

Savall, H., & Zardet, V. (2011). *The qualimetrics approach: Observing the complex object.* Charlotte, NC: Information Age.