



Making Projects Critical 15 years on: A Retrospective Reflection (2001-2016)

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Managing Projects in Business</i>
Manuscript ID	IJMPB-10-2015-0105.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Project Management, Critical Management Studies

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Review

The Inception of Making Projects Critical

The emergence of the Making Projects Critical workshops and publications can be traced back to a chance meeting between the authors of this reflective paper, Svetlana Cicmil and Damian Hodgson, at the Critical Management Studies Conference in the grounds of Hulme Hall, Manchester, in the summer of 2001. The conversation revealed our shared interests in a critical examination of projects and their management. Of course, this was not the absolute origin of the ideas behind Making Projects Critical (MPC) – our conversation revolved around our interest in several papers already published in the late 1990s and early 2000s by writers such as Mike Bresnen, Bent Flyvbjerg, Gernot Grabher, Frederic Tell, Christine Raisanen, Jonas Soderlund, David Buchanan, Robyn Fincham, Stuart Green, Nick Marshall, Janice Thomas, Richard Badham, Mats Engwall, Johann Packendorff and Monica Lindgren – Johann and Monica shortly to become co-organisers of the MPC workshops and publications alongside ourselves. What struck us as a missed opportunity was the separation between many of these research outputs – to our mind, there was an implicit conversation to be held between these ideas, but often these were publications in very different fields, some far removed from standard project management research – from construction management to geography, from linguistics to (team and occupational) psychology, from ICT studies to knowledge management and organisational behaviour. Certain connections could, however, be identified; in particular the strong Nordic influence, reflecting what has been described as the Scandinavian School of Project Studies (Sahlin-Anderson and Söderholm, 2002). This school had elevated interest in project management since the publication of Lundin and Söderholm (1995) on projects as temporary organisations, Kristian Kreiner (1995) and Packendorff (1995) on contingent and complex nature of project organising, and Midler (1995) on projectification. The Scandinavian School had undoubtedly pushed the boundaries of project research but had done so without as yet necessarily containing a critical edge, we felt.

In the summer of 2002, therefore, following an extended conversation in the intervening months, we contacted a number of academics whose work on projects had interested us. We described it in our emailed invitations as follows;

“At a number of conferences this year and last year, we met with individuals working in this area using ideas from what might broadly be described as ‘critical management studies’, along with others with a less technicist/managerialist position and a more sociologically-informed interest in the implications of projects for contemporary society. The time seems right to bring together a number of these writers in disparate fields to facilitate productive discussions between researchers working in a variety of sectors and from a range of critical theoretical positions”.

1
2
3 Receiving several enthusiastic replies and suggestions of colleagues who might also be interested,
4 we felt sufficiently reassured that there was enough material interest to organise an event. With the
5 support of Bristol Business School (BBS) and the encouragement of the then BBS Dean, Charles
6 Harvey, the first Making Projects Critical was held in Bristol in April 2003.
7
8

9
10 From the outset, the intention of the workshop was twofold. Firstly, to bridge the gap between
11 project management research, grounded at the time in a very functionalist tradition and worldview
12 inherited from engineering and the more positivist variants of management research, *and* wider
13 social science, with a less pragmatic orientation and an interest in the implications of projects and
14 project-based work beyond the project itself. And secondly, the intention was always to prioritise
15 critical perspectives on projects -those which did not focus exclusively on 'how can we manage
16 projects so that they are more successful' but, instead, considered all of the implications, positive
17 and negative, of project organising and project management.
18
19

20 It was of our particular interest to:
21

- 22 - give voice to issues of morality, equality and ethics in project based work, organising and
23 management and create a dialogue with those more traditional functionalist concerns of
24 project's effectiveness and efficiency,
25
- 26 - challenge the apparent inevitability of projects by drawing attention instead to political and
27 power relations underpinning any 'status quo'.
28
- 29 - open up possibilities for a fairer, more affirmative and caring forms of organising and
30 management (cf .Fournier and Grey, 2000; Alvesson and Deetz, 2000).
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 There was, therefore, an intention from the start to create a space where heterodox understandings
39 of projects and project management could be put forward, discussed and developed. These
40 commitments resulted in tensions, which were often found to be productive, but at the same time,
41 produced particular challenges for us as organisers. More on this below.
42
43
44

45 The Evolution of MPC

46 Between 2003 and 2006, more workshops were held (in Bristol and then in Manchester¹), with some
47 outstanding and innovative work presented by participants which either reframed projects and
48 project management using novel theories or ideas, or challenged established totems of faith in the
49 project management field. It would be invidious to single out contributors, but papers which we
50 recall as having a particular impact on us personally in these early workshops include Alf Rehn's work
51
52
53
54

55
56
57 ¹ <http://www1.uwe.ac.uk/bl/research/bristolleadershipcentre/research/researchprojects/makingprojectscritical/previousmpgevents.aspx>
58
59
60

1
2
3 on projects as excess drawing on Georges Bataille, David Courpasson's discussion of the use of
4 project management to (re)produce corporate elites, Donncha Kavanagh's paper on understanding
5 PM as language and practice from a 'becoming' ontology, and Manuela Nocker's use of Henri
6 Lefebvre to consider projects as social space. Other early themes included improvisation, routines,
7 Actor Network Theory, project ecologies, rhetorics, project ontologies, professionalisation, project
8 management education, heroism, morality and ethics - and a provocative paper on 'Making Sense of
9 Project Management' by Mark Winter which would go on to form the kernel of the 'Rethinking
10 Project Management' movement. No doubt other attendees at those early events will have different
11 papers lodged in their mind, but the quality of conversation and range of themes covered in the
12 workshop itself (and in the restaurant and bar afterwards) were as inspirational as the papers
13 themselves.

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22 Much of this work went on to be published in important project management and social science
23 journals. However, it was not until the publication of the edited collection 'Making Projects Critical'
24 in 2006 (Hodgson and Cicmil, 2006) that the workshop series really delivered on its original aim to
25 not only bring together "these writers in disparate fields" but to extend the conversation to a wider
26 readership than those who had been able to attend the workshops. The book seemed to be well-
27 received, sold well in the UK, Europe, Australia and the US and received a broadly positive review in
28 this journal (Dainty, 2008). Most importantly, the book helped to raise the profile of several of the
29 concerns of the book's contributors in the public domain, supported by other activities such as
30 Svetlana Cicmil's interview in the Sunday Times (March 4 2007). While special issues (ephemera,
31 New Technology, Work and Employment) and offshoot events (a related workshop hosted by the
32 UTS in Sydney in 2007 and a stream at the Critical Management Studies Conference in Naples, 2011²)
33 took place in subsequent years, the core of MPC has remained the ongoing conversation facilitated
34 by the workshops, held in Stockholm in 2008³, Bristol in 2010⁴, Manchester in 2012⁵, Stockholm
35 again in 2014⁶, and next in Newcastle in the north of England in early 2016⁷. Connections with wider
36 debates and fields of work have been forged by the participation of outstanding and often
37 provocative keynote speakers such as Peter Case, Dan Kärreman, David Knights, Martin Parker, Andy
38 Sturdy, Damian O'Doherty, and Davide Nicolini. Equally important have been those researchers who
39 have been almost ever-present in these workshops, again lending a continuity to an interrupted but
40 connected conversation with new participants and new topics at every event – Manuela Nocker, Neil
41 Alderman, Chris Ivory, and Janice Thomas.

42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

² <http://www.organizzazione.unina.it/streams/15.pdf>

³ http://www.eiasm.org/frontoffice/event_announcement.asp?event_id=544

⁴ <http://www1.uwe.ac.uk/bi/research/bristolleadershipcentre/research/currentandrecentprojects/makingprojectscritical.aspx>

⁵ <https://research.mbs.ac.uk/mp3/MPCEVENTS/MPC6Workshop.aspx>

⁶ <https://www.kth.se/en/itm/inst/indek/mpc7>

⁷ <http://www.ncl.ac.uk/nubs/about/events/makingprojectscritical/>

1
2
3 The MPC community has grown over the years to embrace colleagues from North America, Australia
4 and across Europe. Also, new threads of our original work have developed in previously unexpected
5 directions, attracting new participants and forging cross-fertilisation across research communities.
6 The research agenda of the MPC coordinators have also developed in different directions while still
7 being nourished by the conversations at MPC events; for Damian Hodgson, pressing concerns
8 include identity politics within the field, the professionalisation of PM and the implications of
9 projectification in the public sector, particularly healthcare, while Johann and Monica have linked
10 their MPC work to critical studies of leadership and entrepreneurship, while also addressing
11 emotional labour, sustainability and resilience in project-based work. Svetlana's focus has been on
12 critical process-phenomenological theorising and complexity thinking in her studies of PM practice,
13 skills and knowledge.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Tensions and Influence

22
23 A core tension evident throughout the MPC series has been between focus (on critical concerns) and
24 inclusivity. Throughout the workshops, and indeed in the 2006 text, we were keen to support a
25 dialogue between writers with 'critical' concerns and those who were sceptical of the concerns of
26 MPC. Thus, in the book, Peter Morris was invited to 'speak back' to the contents in a summative
27 chapter, offering a thoughtful response calling for constructive rather than subversive critique. In the
28 workshops also, several contributions came from eminent authors in the field of project
29 management such as Harvey Maylor and Rodney Turner, challenging the tone or the mission of MPC.
30 We were very grateful to all for 'entering the lion's den', so to speak, to ensure debates were broad
31 and never complacently critical. We also acknowledge Terry Williams's support in welcoming a more
32 social-constructionist approach to project studies and for encouraging a productive dialogue
33 between MPC and PMI (Project Management Institute). Looking back, many very good papers were
34 submitted to the workshops but not accepted simply on the grounds that they were not, in any
35 sense we could see, 'critical', or else they did not have the potential to engage with critical concerns.
36 At times authors may have been unhappy with this response, but our feeling throughout is that
37 there were many other excellent conferences where such work would fit, including the PMI
38 Research Conference, IRNOP or the European Academy of Management.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 A particularly valuable interaction resulted from the coincidental creation of the 'Rethinking Project
51 Management' programme. 'Rethinking PM' was a network funded by the EPSRC (Engineering and
52 Physical Sciences Research Council), led by Mark Winter of the University of Manchester, which
53 resulted from some ad hoc meetings of researchers in the UK between 2001 and 2003. The focus of
54 this network was to seek to extend the research agenda for the field of project management,
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 drawing on not only academics but equally practitioners (see Winter et al, 2006 for a summary).
4
5 There was a certain amount of cross-fertilisation of ideas from these two movements. On one hand,
6
7 the critical perspective was represented as a key voice in Rethinking PM thanks to the presence of
8
9 several key MPC participants (including ourselves, but also Janice Thomas, Mike Bresnen, and
10
11 Charles Smith). In return, we as MPC organisers took great encouragement from the spirit of
12
13 openness which the Rethinking PM seemed to reflect among established and mainstream PM
14
15 researchers, and also were helpfully reminded of the key role that practitioners could and should
16
17 play in such endeavours. As co-authors of several papers in the 'Rethinking PM' special issue of the
18
19 International Journal of Project Management, we welcomed the opportunity to engage in a dialogue
20
21 with others who were not necessarily 'critical' in orientation; this collaborative process we saw as a
22
23 vital critical performative process, which foreshadowed a second 'tension', discussed below.

24
25 The second tension is one which has preoccupied the field of Critical Management Studies in recent
26
27 years (see also debates on critical performativity, e.g. Spicer, Alvesson and Kärreman 2009; King and
28
29 Learmonth, 2015) – what has been the impact of MPC? As academics, we are well equipped and
30
31 disciplined in the art of tracing the history of ideas; identifying what has been picked up, reused or
32
33 recycled by other academics is the normal practice of understanding the intellectual legacy of
34
35 thought and of thinkers. In this regard, we have been particularly pleased to see the regular
36
37 publication of critical research on projects and project management in mainstream management
38
39 and social science journals, such as Human Relations (Lindgren et al, 2014), Journal of Management
40
41 Studies (Hodgson, 2002; Lindgren and Packendorff, 2006; Hodgson and Cicmil. 2007), Organization
42
43 (Hodgson, 2004), and others. Framing research into projects and project management in a way
44
45 which speaks to wider themes in management and social science, we have found, makes it possible
46
47 to connect this work with a wider academic audience. There is a pragmatic dimension to this also;
48
49 within the PM field as a whole, we are very aware of the challenge for many of publishing outside
50
51 the key project management journals, in an age when an academic career – indeed academic
52
53 survival – can frequently depend upon publication in "3 and 4 star" journals. MPC has sought to
54
55 encourage a richer critical theorisation of projects and their management which we feels enhances
56
57 the importance and impact of research beyond narrower functionalist and rationalist paradigms
58
59 which dominate project management and other fields. We are equally encouraged by the richer
60
61 theorisation of project management in specialist PM journals also, including this journal - whether
62
63 critical or not, this seems essential to 'reconnect' research in this field with broader contemporary
64
65 currents and intellectual traditions.

66
67 The MPC workshops have benefitted throughout from the energy and ideas of committed doctoral
68
69 students and other (at the time) early-career researchers including Viviane Sergi, Marcus Lindahl,
70

1
2
3 Erik Pineiro, Katie Collins, Bradley Rolfe, Karen Smits, Beata Segercrantz, Thomas Lennerfors, Lucia
4 Crevani, Annette Hallin, Markus Hallgren, Niki Vermeulen, Michael Cowen, Ewan Mackenzie, Claire
5 Heron, Mats Fred, and Eamonn O’Laocha⁸ – apologies to any we may have omitted here. Traces of
6 any legacy would be found in the work and writings of these and, indeed, already-established
7 researchers who partook in the conversation.
8
9

10
11 However, to quote one of Marx’s famous aphorisms for a moment; “philosophers have hitherto only
12 interpreted the world, in various ways; the point is to change it.” By challenging functionalist and
13 narrowly pragmatist approaches to projects and project management, was there a risk of failing to
14 influence or inform the thought and practice of those managing projects (or, indeed, those training
15 project managers, or those who manage project managers?) For this reason, recent workshops have
16 focused explicitly on practice or praxis. To quote the most recent call for papers, for MPC8 “In an era
17 of increasing emphasis on relevance and impact, what is the real contribution provided by the
18 adoption of critical perspectives to the practice and lived experience of project managers and others
19 engaged in project-based activities? Can project studies adopt a critical performativity to facilitate
20 pragmatic interventions and provide alternative ways of organising in projects? In short, what do we
21 *do* with critical project studies?” In this regard, we must also acknowledge the vital contributions of
22 practitioners, typically practicing project managers, to our MPC events. The reflexive analyses by
23 Charles Smith (a long-standing MPC participant) and Brad Rolfe whose recent PhD both draws on,
24 and extends the MPC intellectual foundation and, equally importantly, its ‘vision into practice’.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 We have always recognised that our MPC project requires ‘a fundamental reappraisal of many core
36 tenets of project management theory and technique, an undertaking which poses a challenge for
37 many whose careers and indeed livelihoods are intimately connected to project management as it
38 stands’ (Hodgson and Cicmil, 2008, p.148). Both of the authors teach project management to
39 professional, post-experience cohorts, and we find that critical work to be particularly appealing to
40 experienced practitioners who are frequently disenchanted by reductive, rationalist models and who
41 find greater affinity between their lived experience and projects as social and political processes. In
42 that sense, PM education as a field of practice lends itself to possibilities of enacting the vision of
43 MPC and developing a critical pedagogic approaches reflecting the key tenets discussed in the
44 introduction above. As such, it has a potential to articulate and reaffirm pragmatic aspects of critical
45 thought in recognising and encouraging the need for social action, political competence and the
46 development of critical, managerially relevant knowledge and practical understanding that enable
47 change and provide skills for new ways of operating (Alvesson and Deetz, 2000). Linking PM
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56
57
58 ⁸ We would like to acknowledge here the support offered by the Project Management Institute to the last three workshops, in helping to
59 fund the participation of early career researchers.
60

1
2
3 education at business schools with phronetic approach to learning and acting (Flyvbjerg, 2001) is a
4 powerful pedagogic tool in management education alongside other approaches to praxis and lived
5 experience such as those based on existential hermeneutic, phenomenology and participatory
6 pedagogy. The work of Cicmil and Hodgson, 2007, outlining their experiment with such curriculum
7 innovation is one example. Mark Winter's success with programmes at Manchester Business School
8 and elsewhere based on the principles of reflective practice is another (Winter and Szczepanek,
9 2009).

15 The Future for Making Projects Critical

17 Looking ahead, new ideas and new challenges continue to emerge, not least as the phenomenon of
18 projectification expands still further, entering the school curriculum in many countries and
19 throughout the mainstream media, often tied to notions of enterprise and entrepreneurialism. The
20 2016 MPC workshop (MPC8) continues to explore many themes highlighted above; the question of
21 how MPC might further impact practice will persist, drawing on examples of critical performativity
22 from Katie Collins, Steven Segal, Bradley Rolfe and Riku Oksman, and reflections from practitioners
23 such as Charles Smith. The workshop will, we hope, continue to maintain an openness to discussions
24 with other PM academics and practitioners, and to provide a forum for debates with other fields in
25 social science. One such debate relates to the place of projects in the public sector, particularly in
26 times of austerity in many developed economies, and this debate connects with research in the field
27 of government and public policy. In this vein, a separate event has been organised in Malmo,
28 Sweden for April 2016 by Mats Fred and Dalia Mukhtar-Landgren, entitled 'The Projectification of
29 Public Administration'.

31 Personally, we have learned a great deal, about the political process of doing and publishing
32 research when crossing the boundaries which lie between different academic traditions, and
33 between academia and practitioners – boundaries which are now different but still persist and
34 continue to challenge our efforts to link critique and practice. Beyond this, the lesson of the previous
35 fifteen years of MPC is there is little point in speculating too far on what MPC will do next or will
36 become. The MPC movement was formed from and through dialogue, and throughout the last 15
37 years, new directions and ideas have continually emerged in unpredictable ways from this ongoing
38 critical conversation between workshop participants. We look forward with eager anticipation to
39 what this conversation will produce in the future.

References

- Alvesson M and Deetz S (2000) *Doing Critical Management Research* Sage: London
- Cicmil S and Hodgson D (2007) 'Risks of innovation in management education: Introducing a critical management perspective onto a project management MBA elective' IRNOP *XII Conference (International Research Network on Projects)* : *Projects in Innovation, Innovation in Projects*, 19th-21st September 2007, Brighton, UK
- Cicmil S, Hodgson D, Lindgren M and Packendorff J (2009) 'Project management behind the façade' in *ephemera: theory & politics in organization*, <http://www.ephemerajournal.org/issue/project-management-behind-fa%C3%A7ade> Vol.9, No.2 (May 2009) pp.78-92
- Dainty, A. R. J. (2008). "Making Projects Critical (Review)." *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business* 1(1): 140-141.
- Flyvbjerg B (2001) *Making Social Science Matter: Why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed again* (reprinted 2003); Cambridge University Press: Cambridge
- Fournier, V., and Grey, C. (2000). At the critical moment: Conditions and prospects for critical management studies. *Human Relations*, 53(1), 7-32.
- Hodgson, D. E. (2002). "Disciplining the Professional: The case of project management." *Journal of Management Studies* 39(6): 803-821.
- Hodgson, D. E. (2004). "Project Work: The Legacy of Bureaucratic Control in the Post-Bureaucratic Organization." *Organization* 11(1): 81-100.
- Hodgson, D and Cicmil, S (2006) *Making Projects Critical* London: Palgrave
- Hodgson, D. and Cicmil, S. (2007) "The politics of standards in modern management: Making 'the project' a reality." *Journal of Management Studies*, 44 (3). pp. 431-450.
- Hodgson D and Cicmil S (2008) 'The other side of projects: the case for critical project studies' *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, Vol.1 Issue 1, pp: 142 – 152
- King D and Learmonth M (2015) Can critical management studies ever be 'practical'? A case study in engaged scholarship *Human Relations* Vol. 68(3) 353– 375
- Kreiner K (1995) 'In search of relevance: project management in drifting environments' *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, Vol.11, No.4, pp.335-346
- Lindgren, M. & Packendorff, J. (2006) "What's new in new forms of organizing? -On the construction of gender in project-based work". *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol 43, No 4: pp. 841-866.
- Lindgren, M., Packendorff, J & Sergi, V. (2014) "Thrilled by the discourse, suffering through the experience: Emotions in project-based work". *Human Relations*, Vol 67, No 11: pp. 1383-1412.

- 1
2
3 Lundin R and Söderholm A (1995) 'A theory of temporary organisation' *Scandinavian Journal of*
4 *Management*, 11, 437-455
5
6 Midler C (1995) "'Projectification" of the firm: the Renault case' *Scandinavian Journal of*
7 *Management*, 11 (4), 363-73
8
9 Packendorff J (1995) 'Inquiring into the temporary organisation: New directions for project
10 management research' *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, Vol.11, No.4, pp.319-333
11
12 Sahlin-Andersson, K., Soderholm, A., 2002. *Beyond Project Management: New perspectives on the*
13 *temporary-permanent dilemma*. Copenhagen: Liber.
14
15 Smith, C. (2007) *Making Sense of Project Realities: Theory, Practice and the Pursuit of Performance*
16 Aldershot: Gower
17
18 Spicer A, Alvesson M and Kärreman D (2009) 'Critical performativity: The unfinished business of
19 critical management studies', *Human Relations* Volume 62(4): 537-560
20
21 Winter, M., C. Smith, et al. (2006). "Directions for Future Research in Project Management: The main
22 findings of a UK government-funded research network." *International Journal of Project*
23 *Management* 24(8): 638-649.
24
25
26
27 Winter, M. and Szczepanek, T. (2009) *Images of Projects* Farnham: Gower
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60