



**Performative seduction: How management consultants influence practices of leadership.**

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Public Leadership</i>
Manuscript ID	IJPL-07-2020-0062.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Talent Management, Judith Butler, Management Consultants, Performative seduction, NHS Leadership

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

## **Title: Performative seduction: How management consultants influence practices of leadership**

### **Abstract**

#### **Purpose**

This paper tracks how a policy recommended by management consultants becomes embedded as an integral part of leadership practice. It explores the launch of the concept of 'talent management' by McKinsey & Company and how it becomes adopted as part of expected leadership practices in the English National Health Service. The use of Management Consultants globally has increased exponentially, and the paper considers this phenomenon and the ways in which management consultant advice influences public sector leadership and practice at local level.

#### **Design/methodology/approach**

A case study approach is adopted, focussing on the introduction of the concept of talent management into the English NHS, following the wider emergence of the concept through influential reports published by McKinsey & Company in the late 1990's. An analysis of the emergence of the concept is conducted drawing on this series of reports and the adoption of talent management policies and practices by the English government's Department of Health.

#### **Findings**

These influential reports by the management consultancy firm, McKinsey & Company, constituted an urgent need for this newly identified concept of talent management and the secrecy surrounding its reception. It is this mystery surrounding the decisions about a talent management strategy in the NHS and the concealment of decisions behind closed doors, that leads us to offer a theory of management consultants' influence on leaders as one of performative seduction.

#### **Originality**

Management consultancy is a vast business whose influence reaches deeply into public and private sector organisations around the world. Understanding of the variegated policies and practices that constitute contemporary modes of governance therefore requires comprehension of management consultants' role within those policies and practices. This paper argues that management consultants influence public sector leadership through insertion of their products into definitions of, and performative constitution of, local level leadership.

#### **Keywords:**

Talent Management; Judith Butler; Management Consultants; Performative seduction.

## Introduction

Management consultancy is a vast business whose influence reaches deeply into public and private sector organisations globally. Understanding the constitution of contemporary modes of governance therefore requires understanding of management consultants' (MCs) role within those policies and practices. This paper argues that MCs influence public sector leadership through insertion of their products into the performative constitution of local level leadership. That is, they influence leadership not only as practice or process, but also the individuals who exert power as leaders. We use a case study approach, focusing on one particular aspect of leadership, talent management. Although now ubiquitous in organisations as a major aspect of human resource management responsibilities (Alziari, 2017; Boudreau and Rice, 2015; CIPD, 2020), talent management was unknown in organisations before the late 1990s. It is now integral to leadership in two ways: as a task (good leadership involves nurturing followers' talents) and as a descriptor (good leaders are talented). Given that this key aspect of leaders' responsibilities emerged and became institutionalised within public sector organisations in less than 25 years (Galardo-Galardo *et al.*, 2020; Meyers *et al.*, 2020; McDonnell *et al.*, 2017; Sparrow, 2019), it lends itself to understanding MCs as important, but secretive, constitutors of public sector leadership and governance. We analyse its emergence in reports published by McKinsey & Company, its growth in the first decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, and secrecy surrounding its reception by the English government's Department of Health. We develop a theory of performative seduction to explain their influence.

## Management Consultants

Originating in the USA before World War Two, management consultancy is now a global industry (Clark, 1995; Clark and Salaman, 1996; Kirkpatrick *et al.*, 2019; O'Mahoney, 2010). Its income grew by 10,000 per cent between 1980 and 2008, from circa \$3bn to \$330bn (O'Mahoney, 2010, p.2). Between 1998-2007 European turnover tripled from 24.7 to 82.9 billion euros (Mohe and Seidl, 2011), continuing to rise through the 2008 recession (FEACO, 2010). Demand for MC advice by public sector organizations (Kirkpatrick *et al.*, 2019; O'Mahoney, 2010; Suddaby and Greenwood, 2001) and governments (O'Mahoney, 2010) has grown exponentially (Kirkpatrick *et al.*, 2019). The UK's MC industry grew by 7% in 2018, exceeding £10 billion for the first time (<https://www.consultancy.uk/news/21867/uk-management-consulting-industry-grows-7-to-106-billion>), with NHS yearly expenditure on MCs increasing from £313m in 2010 to £640m in 2014 (Oliver, 2016). The UK public sector is a major consumer, with Defence, Central Government and the NHS respectively accounting for 28%, 26% and 14% of total consulting fees in the UK (MCA, 2016). In the US MC is the fastest growing occupation. Staff numbers were projected to increase by 24% between 2008-18 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2010-11), and a further 14% from 2018-2028 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2019, <https://www.bls.gov/OOH/business-and-financial/management-analysts.htm>). There is

1  
2  
3 concern, in 2020, at the current government's reliance on MCs to advise on and deliver  
4  
5 services during the Covid-19 pandemic.<sup>1</sup>  
6

7  
8 Despite MCs' considerable influence (Abrahamson, 1991; Abrahamson, 1996;  
9  
10 Abrahamson and Eisenman, 2001; Huczynski, 1993; Kirkpatrick *et al.*, 2019; Saint-  
11  
12 Martin, 2004; Sturdy, 2009), there is a paucity of empirical studies into their work  
13  
14 (Heusinkveld *et al.*, 2011; Saint-Martin, 2012; Kirkpatrick *et al.*, 2019), and little evidence,  
15  
16 beyond MCs' own rhetoric, of their impact (Alvesson, 1993; Benders and Van Veen, 2001;  
17  
18 Fincham and Roslender, 2004; Suddaby and Greenwood, 2001). Controversy surrounds  
19  
20 MC's influence (Kirkpatrick *et al.*, 2019). Their integrity (O'Mahoney, 2010) and  
21  
22 effectiveness is questioned, with varied levels of reported success from multi-billion dollar  
23  
24 contracts (Saint-Martin, 2004; 2012)<sup>2</sup>, and they are blamed for the failure of the UK's Test  
25  
26 and Trace activities during the 2020 global pandemic. There is no statistical association  
27  
28 between expenditure on MCs and improvements in efficiency in the NHS more  
29  
30 generally (Kirkpatrick *et al.*, 2019: 90). Despite longstanding concerns about their escalating  
31  
32 costs (NAO, 2006; Oliver, 2016) they seem impervious to critique. Efforts to reduce their  
33  
34 influence in the UK public sector between 2000-2010 failed: they continued to win major  
35  
36 contracts, many of them shrouded in secrecy, practices that continue in the Covid-19 crisis.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

---

50  
51 <sup>1</sup><https://www.theguardian.com/business/2020/sep/29/a-56m-bill-and-rising-the-cost-of-covid-consultancy-contracts>

52  
53 <sup>2</sup> <https://twitter.com/stimmopaul1/status/1314222318433042432?s=27>

1  
2  
3 Studies suggest irrational factors make MCs' services irresistible. They provide a sense of  
4 security to senior managers that over-rides failure to improve performance (Clark and  
5 Salaman, 1998) and have been described as like 'missionaries, charged not with religious  
6 but with corporate fervour' (O'Mahoney, 2010, p. 4), influencing beliefs rather than  
7 practices. Abrahamson's seminal paper (1996, p. 257) identified MCs as major actors in  
8 promoting management fashions, depicted as 'relatively transitory collective belief[s]'.  
9 There appears little that is rational or logical about MCs' work (Abrahamson, 1996; Clark,  
10 1995; Clark and Salaman, 1996; Collins, 2000; Collins, 2004; Kieser, 1997; Kieser, 2002;  
11 Newell et al, 2001; O'Shea and Madigan, 1997. See also Kirkpatrick *et al.*, 2019).

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24 This paper explores why, despite such evidence, MCs thrive. We argue they achieve what  
25 we call 'seductive performativity'. In brief MCs devise a topic that can be turned into a  
26 product; they seduce senior management; senior management requires middle management  
27 to turn abstract concept into material practice.

28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34 Our theoretical location is Judith Butler's theory of performativity that illuminates how  
35 words not only describe but also construct or constitute meaning, identities and practices  
36 (Butler, 1990; 1993). Where J.L.Austin had influentially argued that words 'do things',  
37 such as the statement in court 'I pronounce you guilty and sentence you to jail' sends a  
38 criminal into custody, Butler (1997, p.28) argues that 'the subject who speaks is also  
39 constituted by the language that she or he speaks, [so] language is the condition of  
40 possibility for the speaking subject, and not merely its instrument of expression' (Butler,  
41 1997: 28). Put very simply, the judge is constituted as judge through pronouncement of  
42 judgement. We extend Butler's arguments to explore the seductive allure of rhetorical

practices, studying the process of seductive performativity through two stages: constitution of the product and translation into practice.

This study's methodology uses discourse analysis (Wetherell, Taylor and Yates, 2001). That is, we undertook a line-by-line analysis of the language within a series of reports on talent management published by McKinsey & Co. Methodologically, this study involved in-depth sentence-by-sentence analysis of the language in those reports. We analysed the metaphors used, the binary opposites that make certain concepts sayable, and how language was used to constitute talent management as a product that managers should purchase. The texts analysed are those on talent management published by staff of McKinsey & Co., primarily Chambers et al (1998); Axelrod, Handfield-Jones and Welsh (2001); Michaels et al (2001), and Guthridge, Lawson and Komm (2008).

This analysis led to recognition of two stages in the constitution of talent management as a leadership function: forming the product and seducing the purchaser.

### **Stage One: the performative constitution of the product**

In 1998 *The McKinsey Quarterly* published a paper by a team of its consultants entitled 'The War for Talent' (Chambers et al, 1998). At this time talent was not equated with management but with arts and sport. Although the word 'talent' was widely used from 1800, the term 'talent management' does not seem to exist until the very late 1990s and then, as Table I shows, the usage rises exponentially as the term quickly becomes popularised.

-----INSERT TABLE I HERE-----

1  
2  
3 By 2009 one-third (36%) of the UK's larger organisations (5000+ employees) had some  
4 talent development activities (CIPD, 2009), and by 2020 over half of CEOs prioritised it  
5  
6 (CIPD, 2020). The term 'Talent' has become understood as the person who possesses  
7  
8 talents rather than the skills and abilities they excel in. In relation to managerial positions,  
9  
10 talent has been presented as: 'A code for the most effective leaders and managers at all  
11  
12 levels who can help a company fulfil its aspirations and drive its performance.  
13  
14 Managerial talent is some combination of a sharp strategic mind, leadership ability,  
15  
16 emotional maturity, communications skills, the ability to attract and inspire other talented  
17  
18 people, entrepreneurial instincts, functional skills, and the ability to deliver results'  
19  
20 (Michaels, et al, 2001, p. xiii). So 'talent' can be seen to refer to those limited number of  
21  
22 people who possess the highest quality of managerial and leadership skills.  
23  
24 Talent management refers to ensuring that these people are identified or recruited,  
25  
26 developed, and retained, in such a way that their outstanding contribution can be fully  
27  
28 achieved. It has been defined as: '...the systematic attraction, identification,  
29  
30 development, engagement/retention and deployment of those individuals with high  
31  
32 potential who are of particular value to an organisation' (CIPD, 2008: 7)  
33  
34  
35 Now, some writers refer to talent management as a fad, as the latest set of management  
36  
37 buzzwords, and dismiss the concepts. Others, more in line with the thinking of the  
38  
39 Department of Health (as we explore later in the paper), accept David Guest's argument  
40  
41 (cited in Warren, 2006: 29) that talent management is 'an idea that has been around for a  
42  
43 long time. It has been relabelled and that enables wise organisations to review what they  
44  
45 are doing. It integrates some old ideas and gives them a freshness and that is good'.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 Some of the older ideas that have been incorporated into notions of talent include  
4  
5 elements from recruitment and retention strategies through to career development,  
6  
7 workforce planning, succession planning and leadership development initiatives (Ford,  
8  
9 Harding and Stoyanova, 2010). What is significant in these debates on talent is that its  
10  
11 increasing use by practitioners and academics has surfaced following the publication of  
12  
13 the McKinsey & Company reports.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 How did a series of reports by McKinsey & Company cause such a rapid rise of a  
20  
21 concept? Firstly, the rhetoric of the McKinsey reports is performative. It was launched  
22  
23 into a managerial milieu in 1998 in a paper (Chambers *et al*, 1998) that claimed empirical  
24  
25 evidence of a ‘war for talent’ involving aggressive competition between companies to  
26  
27 recruit and retain the most talented. Talent was defined very differently from its use in  
28  
29 arts and sports, as ‘some combination of a sharp strategic mind, leadership ability,  
30  
31 emotional maturity, communication skills, the ability to attract and inspire other talented  
32  
33 people, entrepreneurial instincts, functional skills and the ability to deliver results’  
34  
35 (Michaels *et al*, 2001 p. xiii, a book published by McKinsey staff in 2001). However, the  
36  
37 book’s preface was less certain in its definition, acknowledging that: ‘A certain part of  
38  
39 talent eludes description: you simply know it when you see it’ (p. xii).  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 ‘*The War for Talent*’ (Chambers *et al.*, 1998) repays close textual reading. It begins ‘Better  
45  
46 talent is worth fighting for’ (p. 45): note metaphors of battle here and in its title. Such  
47  
48 metaphors recur throughout, issuing an urgent call to arms. This statement is followed (p.  
49  
50 46) with a description of the enormous study on which this conclusion is based: warfare is  
51  
52 joined by science. Readers are told that 77 of the USA’s major corporations, involving 359  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 respondents, were surveyed. Their ‘top 200 staff’ were ‘talked to’, i.e. 5,679 staff. A  
4  
5 further 72 ‘senior HR executives’ were questioned, 12 academics interviewed and 20 case  
6  
7 studies undertaken. To an academic readership the lack of information about research  
8  
9 methods is concerning. A non-academic audience however is presented with a simulacrum  
10  
11 of a major study, assuring readers that the ‘war for talent’ is based on scientifically sound  
12  
13 evidence from ‘major’ corporations.  
14  
15

16  
17  
18 The rhetoric shifts from science back to warfare. Note how, in this opening section, the  
19  
20 report instils a sense of weakness. The study’s findings:  
21  
22

23  
24 ‘should be a call to arms for corporate America. Companies are about to be  
25  
26 engaged in a war for senior executive talent that will remain a defining  
27  
28 characteristic of their competitive landscape for decades to come. Yet most are ill-  
29  
30 prepared, and even the best are vulnerable’  
31  
32

33  
34 (Chambers *et al.*, 1998, p. 46).  
35  
36

37 Research methods are not discussed but there are hints that a survey using a Likert-type  
38  
39 scale was used: ‘Thirty-one per cent of HR directors at top quintile companies strongly  
40  
41 agree that they are always looking for great talent and bring it in whenever they find it,  
42  
43 compared to 9 per cent at mid-quintile companies’ (Chambers *et al.*, 1998, p. 54). This  
44  
45 implies participants were commenting on a question that asked ‘How much do you agree  
46  
47 with the following question: “This company is always looking for great talent and brings  
48  
49 it in whenever it finds it’ Strongly agree, agree, disagree”’. There are three problems here.  
50  
51 First, the survey seems to set out to prove what it wants to prove. Secondly, the study itself  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 introduces the concept of ‘talent’ to organisations. Notice, thirdly, an immediate reification  
4  
5 - living, breathing human beings become an object, ‘the talent’.  
6  
7

8  
9 There are many direct quotes from named chief executives and senior managers. For  
10  
11 example, ‘Leaders with a talent mindset share AlliedSignal CEO Larry Bossidy’s  
12  
13 conviction that “At the end of the day, we bet on people, not strategies”’ (p. 48). This both  
14  
15 introduces a new capability - possession of ‘a talent mindset’ - and elides it with a  
16  
17 seemingly unrelated quotation. It is often difficult to find which parts of the research lead  
18  
19 to the different results reported. The report is thus a curious mix of aspirations to scientific  
20  
21 status (the numbers involved in the study), fear-inducing rhetoric, cosy, home-spun  
22  
23 wisdom, and the construction of a new skill (the ability to recruit ‘the talent’). This rhetoric  
24  
25 encourages a strong reaction in readers.  
26  
27  
28  
29

30  
31 Three years later Axelrod *et al.* (2001) up-dated the 1998 study and reported that the ‘war  
32  
33 for talent’ was ‘escalating’ (p. 9). Note the urgency of such rhetoric. It is easier now to see  
34  
35 use of a Likert-type scale. Participants rated statements about how an underperforming boss  
36  
37 had affected them. Statements include ‘prevented me from learning’ (76% somewhat or  
38  
39 strongly agree); ‘hurt my career development’ (81%); ‘prevented me from making a larger  
40  
41 contribution to the bottom line’ (82%); and ‘made me want to leave the company’ (86%)  
42  
43 (Axelrod *et al.*, 2001, p. 11). Look at how these forced-choice questions again set out to  
44  
45 prove what the authors require proved.  
46  
47  
48

49  
50 A related book (Michaels *et al.*, 2001) claimed that 13,000 managers at 112 large US  
51  
52 corporations had been surveyed. The study, up-dated again in 2006 and 2007, argued the  
53  
54 shortage of talent ‘remains acute - and if anything has become worse’ with talent shortage  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 now 'a global trend' (Guthridge *et al.*, 2008, p. 53). Again note how the rhetoric escalates  
4  
5 feelings of urgency but also of weakness – this issue is now gargantuan, so how can an  
6  
7 individual corporation tackle it without support and guidance? Metaphors of warfare and  
8  
9 science are augmented with those of Cold War imaginings. The 'enemy' is 'within' (p.  
10  
11 53), i.e. both within corporations' poor management practices, and within people: "Habits  
12  
13 of mind are the real barriers to talent management" one financial services executive  
14  
15 confided' (p. 53). Note the anonymity of this quote.  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 Close reading of the language used in this series of publications illuminates how MCs can  
21  
22 *create those very issues for which they claim to possess the solution:*  
23  
24

- 25 - A topic is identified whose credibility in other domains allows its transfer to  
26  
27 organizations;
- 28  
29 - Research is carried out that, to the untrained eye, may appear highly impressive;  
30  
31  
32  
33 - The research contains questions to which the only rational response is agreement –  
34  
35  
36 which companies would not be often looking for the best staff available?  
37  
38  
39 - Discursive sleights of hand intervene: without deep thought as to the precise  
40  
41  
42 meaning of the term, the sort of thinking not typically carried out when completing  
43  
44 surveys (Mishler, 1991; Galasiński and Kosłowska, 2010) respondents would tick  
45  
46 the 'agree' or 'strongly agree' boxes;
- 47  
48  
49 - not only are the survey questions slanted, the quality of the research more generally  
50  
51  
52 is suspect;  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- However, unless read with a judgemental eye, these problems would be glossed over by casual readers who might not recognise how spurious are the claims to scientific foundations;
- The new concept can appear credible because ‘science’ has shown it is something already existing within corporations.

In sum, use of the word ‘talent’ in questionnaires designed ostensibly to gauge levels of concern about ‘talent’ has performative effects: ‘talent’ becomes meaningful as an organizational concept. The publications’ *rhetoric* has a libidinal energy (Stiegler, 2011) that arouses fear (metaphors of warfare and vulnerability) and transfers it from the domain of battle to leadership. Proof of the rhetoric’s persuasiveness is seen in the exponential growth of references to ‘talent management’. Through performativity’s power (words are not merely descriptive but causative): (a) an abstract concept takes on material presence (leaders become ‘the talent’) that (b) is vitally important and (c) in short supply. The reports’ casual readers, seduced by (spurious) claims to scientific credibility and ensnared by overheated language rich in metaphors of battle and danger, would find invoked in themselves a panicked response: something must be done.

The reports then calm the disturbed reader: a highly logical, rational and (seemingly) easy to implement solution exists - talent management, on which MCs can advise.

The success of these tactics is undoubted. They introduced terminology now ubiquitous in organizations, thus instigating the very thing they were warning about: organizations competing for ‘the talent’ that is in short supply.

1  
2  
3 The next stage in the seductive performativity of talent management was its legitimisation  
4  
5 by academic support.  
6  
7

8  
9 *Academic legitimising of talent management*

10  
11 A brief hiatus followed publication of *'The War for Talent'* in 1997 before academic  
12  
13 interest grew, but publications mushroomed from around 2005. Table II shows results of  
14  
15 a Scopus search using the search term 'talent' AND 'management', limited to 'articles', on  
16  
17 26<sup>th</sup> June 2020. This shows how the concept became 'seeded' and grew in academia.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 -----INSERT TABLE II HERE-----  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 There was a particularly marked increase in 2018 and 2019: 738 papers were published in  
32  
33 these two years, compared with the 775 published in the 54 years from 1950-2004.  
34  
35

36 Academic journal papers in the first decade of the century attempted to define talent (e.g.  
37  
38 Barlow, 2006; Cairns, 2009; Garrow and Hirsh, 2009; Hirsh, 2009; Tansley *et al.*, 2006),  
39  
40 and then prescribe how talent management should be practised (Cappelli, 2008). It was  
41  
42 argued that it required a strategy and accompanying set of practices (Cook and Macaulay,  
43  
44 2009) that should be future oriented, integrated and have measurable outcomes (Haskins  
45  
46 and Shaffer, 2010). It should be a major HR responsibility, incorporating recruitment,  
47  
48 selection, performance management, succession planning, professional development,  
49  
50 diversity and culture (Cairns, 2009). The boundaries between HR and talent management  
51  
52 blurred (Hirsh, 2009; Garrow and Hirsh, 2009). It should be future focussed (Hirsh, 2009)  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 and look simultaneously at micro (individual) and meso (organisation) levels. By the  
4  
5 decade's end two contrasting approaches had developed: exclusive, focusing on small  
6  
7 numbers of the most talented staff; and inclusive, aiming to bring out the talents of all staff.  
8  
9 Most companies preferred the former, more exclusive approach (CIPD, 2009). When  
10  
11 organisations refer to talent in this more exclusive sense, they tend to refer to those staff  
12  
13 with leadership potential who are marked out for career progression and further investment  
14  
15 through leadership development initiatives, many of which have more recently been  
16  
17 rebranded as talent development programmes (Ford, Harding and Stoyanova, 2010).  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 The quality of the research, largely based upon basic, single case study descriptions (Cairns,  
23  
24 2009; CIPD, 2008; Clake and Winkler, 2006; McCartney, 2009; Tansley *et al*, 2007;  
25  
26 Williams-Lee, 2008) was questioned. Concerns about lack of credibility (Lewis and  
27  
28 Heckman, 2006) went largely ignored in this decade. The mushrooming academic literature  
29  
30 often relied uncritically on MCs' reports and poor quality studies (see, for example, an  
31  
32 early special edition of *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*  
33  
34 (Barron, 2008; Baum, 2008; Hughes and Rog, 2008; and Watson, 2008).  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 Regardless of such limitations, growing academic interest achieved the task, we argue, of  
40  
41 *legitimising* talent management as a leadership function. The mere fact of its being studied  
42  
43 by social scientists provides a veneer of science through universities' power to define  
44  
45 'knowledge' (Foucault, 2002). Indeed, researchers can reify abstract managerial practices.  
46  
47 That is, they/we look at the vastly complex and multifarious arena of innumerable material  
48  
49 and discursive organisational practices, carve a slice through them and impose a  
50  
51 name/meaning on what we have carved out (Chia, 1994). Business school research enacts  
52  
53 ontological inception through its privileged possession of epistemological credibility.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 In summary, the first stage of the seductive performativity of the term ‘talent management’  
4 involved transfer by MCs of a concept from its customary domains of arts and sport into  
5 leadership practices, an infusion of libidinal energy that transferred the energetic adrenalin  
6 of fear to the prosaic world of leadership; and legitimisation of the concept by academia.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

### 13 **Stage Two: seductive performativity**

14  
15

16 It remains to explore how this new category of practice becomes inserted into leadership  
17 and governance practices within public sector organisations. We focus on England’s NHS.  
18 In the first decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the period of interest for this study, the NHS  
19 employed 1,431,996 staff (2009 figures) and was and still is one of the largest organizations  
20 in the world. At the time talent management was introduced, the NHS was split into 14  
21 regional health authorities, each divided into district health authorities, each led by a chief  
22 executive officer and senior management team (see Figure I, below, for its organisational  
23 structure). Although leadership is devolved throughout the NHS it rests, ultimately, with  
24 government and the Secretary of State for Health.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 -----INSERT FIGURE I HERE-----  
39  
40

41 Since the 1980s UK governments have been convinced that private sector business  
42 management is superior to public management. MCs, seeking to influence political agendas  
43 and spending strategies, successfully fostered relationships with politicians and senior  
44 public officials (Craig and Brookes, 2006; O’Mahoney, 2010). UK government spending  
45 on MCs rose by 1,000 percent in the decade following publication of *The War for Talent*  
46 (IPSOS/MORI, 2007), with estimated spend on their services across the UK public sector  
47 increasing by 33% between 2003-2004 and 2005-2006, to £2.8bn, largely due to increased  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 spending by the NHS (National Audit Office, 2006). Their recommendations cost  
4  
5 governments hundreds of billions of pounds but levels of success were variable (Saint-  
6  
7 Martin, 2004; Saint-Martin, 2005). McKinsey & Company had influence within the walls  
8  
9 of the Department of Health in the decade in question, having been paid more than £9.2  
10  
11 millions (\$14.57 millions) in fees by the Department of Health in 2009/10, more than  
12  
13 double that paid to any other MC firm (Guardian newspaper, 15<sup>th</sup> September 2010). In 2011  
14  
15 NHS London was criticised for paying more than £1,250,000 (\$1,979,100) each to three  
16  
17 consultancy firms, including McKinsey & Company, to train doctors in management skills  
18  
19 that, critics argued, already existed in the NHS (Guardian Newspaper, 12<sup>th</sup> January 2012).  
20  
21  
22  
23

24  
25 There is no evidence of whether or not these fees included advice on talent management  
26  
27 because, and this is important to the arguments of this paper, what goes on between civil  
28  
29 service mandarins and MC firms remains secret. A powerful governmental committee, the  
30  
31 House of Commons Health Committee, tried to find out, but was unable to peer behind this  
32  
33 particular curtain (House of Commons, 4<sup>th</sup> June 2009).  
34  
35  
36

37  
38 So, MCs' influence on governance in the UK public sector was growing exponentially as  
39  
40 McKinsey & Company was developing talent management, a concept soon taken up by  
41  
42 other MCs. Suddenly, it seems, for there appears to have been no prior consultation, in  
43  
44 October 2004 a team was established to address leadership challenges and promote a talent  
45  
46 management culture in the NHS (Clake and Winkler, 2006, pp. 8-10). The aims were to  
47  
48 "establish an executive talent pipeline that identifies, tracks, develops, positions and retains  
49  
50 critical leadership talent within the service" (ibid, p. 8). The Department of Health wrote  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 to Strategic Health Authorities in November 2004<sup>3</sup> and published national guidelines on  
4  
5 ‘talent and leadership planning’. They charged Strategic Health Authorities and Trust  
6  
7  
8 Boards with developing talent and leadership across the NHS in England<sup>4</sup>.  
9

10  
11 In previous papers we have shown the mixed reaction to the strategy by regional and local  
12  
13 level senior leaders (Authors, 2014; 2017): some voiced resistance, others were beguiled.  
14  
15 Resistance often took the form of relabeling pre-existing programmes as ‘talent  
16  
17 management’ so the term entered NHS leadership discourses. It continues to resonate<sup>1</sup>.  
18  
19 Theories of language’s performativity (Butler, 1990; 1993) demonstrate how a term’s entry  
20  
21 into everyday discourse will actively constitute that of which it speaks. In other words, the  
22  
23 NHS became an organization in which talent management was core to its HR objectives,  
24  
25 with energy expended on identifying, developing and retaining ‘the talent’. Leaders now  
26  
27 have to be talented and able to identify others as ‘the talent’.  
28  
29  
30  
31

32  
33 There is a mystery at the core of this process, for what is *not* known is how and why the  
34  
35 Department of Health (DoH) was persuaded of the value of a talent management strategy  
36  
37 – this remains utterly opaque. Evidence regarding McKinsey & Company’s influence is  
38  
39 circumstantial – the firm was a major source of management consultancy advice to the  
40  
41  
42

---

43  
44 3

45 [https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20120503182850/http://www.dh.gov.uk/prod\\_consum\\_dh/groups/dh\\_digitalassets/@dh/@en/documents/digitalasset/dh\\_4095597.pdf](https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20120503182850/http://www.dh.gov.uk/prod_consum_dh/groups/dh_digitalassets/@dh/@en/documents/digitalasset/dh_4095597.pdf)

49  
50 4

51 [https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130124045141/http://www.dh.gov.uk/prod\\_consum\\_dh/groups/dh\\_digitalassets/documents/digitalasset/dh\\_093407.pdf](https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130124045141/http://www.dh.gov.uk/prod_consum_dh/groups/dh_digitalassets/documents/digitalasset/dh_093407.pdf)

1  
2  
3 DoH at the time, but it cannot be said for certain that they introduced the policy. Nothing  
4  
5 is known about what fees, if any, were paid for advice about talent management, only that  
6  
7 very large sums of money flowed from the DoH to McKinsey & Company between 2000  
8  
9 and 2010. As noted above, even a powerful House of Commons Select Committee could  
10  
11 not discover what happens between MCs, elected representatives and civil servants behind  
12  
13 closed doors. But *The War for Talent* and subsequent reports, we suggest, hold the secret  
14  
15 to what went on behind those doors: a process of seduction.  
16  
17  
18

### 19 20 **Discussion: the seductive performativity of MCs' nostrums**

21  
22  
23 Wikipedia defines seduction as 'the process of deliberately enticing a person to engage in  
24  
25 a relationship, to lead astray, as from duty, rectitude, or the like ...<sup>5</sup>. In other words, the  
26  
27 seductor gains power over the seduced who then submits to the seductor's desires.  
28  
29 Seduction has been used in management theory to help distinguish between rational  
30  
31 persuasion and a seemingly irrational succumbing to temptation. An influential paper  
32  
33 (Deighton and Grayson, 1995), for example, shows how consumers are persuaded through  
34  
35 seductive techniques that 'transform the consumer's initial resistance to a course of action  
36  
37 into willing, even avid, compliance' (p. 666).  
38  
39  
40

41  
42 Consider how *The War for Talent* and related reports 'work'. They use a rhetoric of warfare  
43  
44 and vulnerability to evoke a desire for urgent action. If that rhetoric is transferred from the  
45  
46 written page to MCs' sales techniques, then face-to-face with clients they will firstly evoke  
47  
48 concern and secondly will persuasively argue the need to resolve the problematic issues –  
49  
50 that is, a process akin to seduction. This requires a third step: satisfaction of that desire,  
51  
52  
53

---

54  
55 <sup>5</sup> <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Seduction>. Accessed 26th June 2020.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 what we may call a *coup de Casanova*. Satisfaction comes in the form of solutions to the  
4  
5 (now urgent) problem. This is what we suggest, extrapolating from *The War for Talent*,  
6  
7 went on behind closed doors in London, in meetings with government officials and senior  
8  
9 civil servants.  
10

11  
12  
13 That is, when marketing their services behind closed doors MCs position themselves within  
14  
15 a dominant seductor position, placing officials and civil servants as seductees. This requires  
16  
17 a complex and tricky manoeuvre. Calas and Smircich (1991, p. 568) write that leadership's  
18  
19 power is predicated upon the seductive ability 'to attract and stimulate, to overcome'. It  
20  
21 concerns domination and servitude and, most importantly, its power is hidden beneath the  
22  
23 surface. MCs must recognise that power and appeal to it, they must at the same time  
24  
25 dismantle seductees' identities as successful leaders if they are to seduce them. This  
26  
27 requires a complex positioning of clients as weak and powerful, vulnerable but capable, if  
28  
29 they are to be seduced by techniques, deducible in *The War for Talent*, to dominate  
30  
31 potential clients without their clients being aware of that domination. They must arouse the  
32  
33 libidinal energy of senior leaders' image of themselves as leaders (see Authors, 2017). This  
34  
35 image, as Ford (2019) has argued, is paradoxical because leadership not only confers power  
36  
37 and an important identity upon 'the leader', it also *creates* insecurity, anxiety and  
38  
39 ambiguity in leaders. That is, leadership identity is constituted within desires for both  
40  
41 domination and subordination, of seduction and being seduced. The rhetoric of *The War*  
42  
43 *for Talent* connects with those desires.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 Thus, behind those closed doors where MCs meet with their very senior clients, we imagine  
52  
53 a seductive dance in which MCs disarm potential clients through tapping into (conscious  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 and unconscious) feelings of vulnerability and power. In this dance, MCs both invoke the  
4  
5 narcissistic wounds of leadership and salve them with the balm of their own services.  
6  
7

8  
9 The next stage in implementation involves not seduction but power. Regional and local  
10  
11 level CEOs and senior managers were ordered to implement a talent management strategy.  
12  
13 They did not need to be seduced because of their lower position in the organisational  
14  
15 hierarchy – they had to obey. The use of the term ‘talent management’, even if it held little  
16  
17 appeal to regional and district CEOs, would, through the power of the performative,  
18  
19 actively constitute it as ‘reality,’ and MC’ prognostications then become organizational  
20  
21 realities.  
22  
23

24  
25 This is why we suggest MCs influence public sector leadership through seductive  
26  
27 performativity: seduction occurs behind closed doors at the most senior levels, and the  
28  
29 orders that follow from those most senior of leaders introduce the concepts at other levels,  
30  
31 thus turning abstract, immaterial MC products into concrete, material everyday actions.  
32  
33  
34

### 35 **Concluding thoughts**

36  
37  
38 **Management consultancy is a vast business whose influence reaches deeply into public and**  
39  
40 **private sector organisations around the world. Understanding of the variegated policies and**  
41  
42 **practices that constitute contemporary modes of governance therefore requires**  
43  
44 **comprehension of management consultants’ role within those policies and practices. This**  
45  
46 **paper argued that management consultants influence public sector leadership through**  
47  
48 **insertion of their products into definitions of, and performative constitution of, local level**  
49  
50 **leadership.**  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 These influential reports by the management consultancy firm, McKinsey & Company,  
4  
5 constituted an urgent need for the newly identified concept of talent management and the  
6  
7 secrecy surrounding its reception. It is this mystery surrounding the decisions about a talent  
8  
9 management strategy in the NHS and the concealment of decisions behind closed doors,  
10  
11 that leads us to offer a theory of management consultants' influence on leaders as one of  
12  
13 performative seduction.  
14  
15

16  
17 Whilst talent management and its adoption by senior leaders in the NHS is the focus of this  
18  
19 paper, it is worth reflecting on the extent to which the seductive processes outlined here  
20  
21 are witnessed more widely when management consultants engage with clients. There is  
22  
23 clearly an emerging research agenda that considers further the ways through which the  
24  
25 seduction process is institutionalised, with such processes being used not only by  
26  
27 McKinsey & Company but also more widely within the management consultancy  
28  
29 community. Given the secrecy that we encountered, together with the increasing reliance  
30  
31 of organisations on management consultancy advice and their lack of accountability –  
32  
33 especially when they are being used so extensively by governments and the public sector  
34  
35 – this all suggests an urgent case of more in-depth exploration of management consultants  
36  
37 in all organisations across public and private sectors.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

## 46 References

- 47  
48  
49  
50 Abrahamson, E. (1991), 'Managerial Fads and Fashions: The Diffusion and Rejection of  
51 Innovations', *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 16 No. 3, pp.586-612.  
52  
53  
54 Abrahamson, E. (1996), 'Management Fashion', *Academy of Management Review*, Vol.  
55 21 No. 1, pp.254-285.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Abrahamson, E. and Eisenman, M. (2001), 'Why management scholars must intervene  
4 strategically in the management knowledge market', *Human Relations*, Vol. 54 No. 1,  
5 pp.67-75.  
6

7  
8  
9 Alvesson, M. (1993), 'Organizations as rhetoric: knowledge-intensive firms and the  
10 struggle with ambiguity', *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 30 No. 6, pp.997-1015.  
11

12  
13 Alziari, L. (2017), 'A chief HR officer's perspective on talent management', *Journal of*  
14 *Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, Vol. 4 No. 4, pp.379-383  
15

16  
17 Axelrod, E. Handfield-Jones, H. and Welsh, T. (2001), The war for talent, part two. *The*  
18 *McKinsey Quarterly*, Vol. 2 No. 2, pp.9-12.  
19

20  
21 Barlow, L. 2006. 'Talent Development: the New Imperative?' *Development and Learning*  
22 *in Organizations* Vol. 20, pp. 6-9.  
23

24  
25 Barron, P. (2008) 'Education and talent management: Implications for the hospitality  
26 industry', *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 20 No.  
27 7, pp.730-742.

28  
29 Baum, T. (2008) 'Implications of hospitality and tourism labour markets for talent  
30 management strategies', *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality*  
31 *Management*, Vol. 20 No. 7, pp.720-729.  
32

33  
34 Benders, J. and Van Veen, K. (2001), 'What's in a Fashion? Interpretative Viability and  
35 Management Fashions', *Organization*, Vol. 8 No. 1, pp.33-53  
36

37  
38 Boudreau, J. and Rice, S. (2015), "Bright, shiny objects and the future of HR", *Harvard*  
39 *Business Review*, Vol. 93 No. 7, pp.72-78.  
40

41  
42 Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York:  
43 Routledge.  
44

45  
46 Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter*. New York: Routledge.  
47

48  
49 Butler J. (1997) *Excitable Speech. A Politics of the Performative*. Routledge.  
50

51  
52 Cairns, T. 2009, 'Talent Management at Homeland Security: a corporate model suggests a  
53 recipe for success'. *Employment relations today*, Fall 2009, pp.19-26.  
54

55  
56 Calas, M. and Smircich, L. (1991), Voicing seduction to silence leadership. *Organization*  
57 *Studies*, Vol. 12 No. 4, pp.567-602.  
58  
59  
60

Chambers, G., Foulon, M., Handfield-Jones, H., Hankin, S. and Michaels III, E. (1998), 'The War for Talent'. *The McKinsey Quarterly* Vol. 3, pp.44-57.

Chia, R. (1994) The concept of decision: a deconstructive analysis. *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol 31 No. 6, pp.781-806. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6486.1994.tb00639.x

CIPD (2008). 'Talent management: design, implementation and evaluation' *CIPD online practical tool*. London: CIPD.

CIPD (2009). 'Annual Survey Report Learning and Development'. London: CIPD.

CIPD (2020) 'Talent management: understanding the changing context and benefits of talent management, and the key features of a talent management strategy', Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD), London.

Clark, T. (1995) *Managing Consultants*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

Clark, T and Salaman, G (1996) 'The management guru as organizational witchdoctor', *Organization*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp. 85-107.

Clark, T and Salaman, G (1998) Telling tales: Management gurus' narratives and the construction of managerial identity. *Journal of Management Studies* Vol. 35 No. 2, pp. 138–61.

Clake, R. and V. Winkler (2006) *The Change Agenda: Reflections on talent management*, Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD), London.

Collins, D. (2000) *Management Fads and Buzzwords: Critical-Practical Perspectives*, London: Routledge.

Collins, D (2004) The machinations of change: BEEPEEARR, debunking and the 'in-between'. *Organization* Vol. 11 No. 5, pp.671–688.

Craig, D. and Brooks, C. (2006) *Plundering the public sector*, London: Constable.

Deighton, J. and Grayson, K. (1995) Marketing and seduction: building exchange relationships by managing social consensus. *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol 21, pp. 660-676.

Fincham, R. and Roslender, R. (2004) 'Rethinking the Dissemination of Management Fashion: Accounting for Intellectual Capital in UK Case Firms'. *Management Learning*, Vol. 35 No. 3, pp. 321-336.

Ford, J. (2019) 'Rethinking relational leadership: recognising the mutual dynamic between leaders and led,' in Carroll, B Wilson, S and Firth, J, *After Leadership*, London: Routledge, pp. 157-174.



- 1  
2  
3 Ford, J. Harding, N. Gilmore, S and Richardson, S. (2017) 'Becoming the leader:  
4 Leadership as material presence', *Organization Studies*. Vol. 38 No. 11, pp. 1553-1571.  
5 DOI: 10.1177/0170840616677633.  
6  
7  
8 Foucault, M. (2002) *Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge.  
9  
10 Galasiński, D and Kosłowska, O. (2010) Questionnaires and Lived Experience: Strategies  
11 of Coping with a Quantitative Frame. *Qualitative Inquiry*, Vol. 16 No. 4, pp. 271-284.  
12  
13 Gallardo-Gallardo, E., Thunnissen, M. and Scullion, H. 2020. Talent management:  
14 context matters. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. Vol. 31 No. 4,  
15 pp. 457-473.  
16  
17 Garrow, V. and Hirsh, W. 2009. 'Talent Management: Issues of Focus and Fit.' Brighton:  
18 Institute for Employment Studies.  
19  
20 Guthridge, M., Komm, A. and Lawson, E. 2008. 'Making Talent a Strategic Priority'. *The*  
21 *McKinsey Quarterly* 1, pp. 49-59.  
22  
23 Heusinkveld, S., Sturdy, A and Werr, A.(2011) The co-consumption of management ideas  
24 and practices *Management Learning* Vol. 42 No. 2, pp. 139–147  
25  
26  
27 Hirsh, W. 2009. 'Talent Management: Practical Issues in Implementation'. Brighton: The  
28 Institute for Employment Studies.  
29  
30  
31 House of Commons Health Committee. (2009) The use of management consultants by  
32 the NHS and the Department of Health. Fifth Report of Session 2008-09. London. The  
33 Stationery Office Limited.  
34  
35  
36 Huczynski, A. (1993) *Management gurus: What makes them and how to become one*,  
37 London: Routledge.  
38  
39 Hughes, J.C and Rog, E. (2007) Talent management: A strategy for improving employee  
40 recruitment, retention and engagement within hospitality organizations. *International Jo.*  
41 *of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 20 No. 7, pp.743-757.  
42  
43  
44 Kieser, A. (1997) 'Myth and rhetoric in management fashion', *Organization*, Vol. 4 No.  
45 1, pp. 40-74.  
46  
47  
48 Kieser, A. (2002) 'On communication barriers between management science,  
49 consultancies and business companies', in T. Clark and R. Fincham (eds) *Critical*  
50 *Consulting: New Perspectives on the Management Advice Industry*, pp. 206–27. Oxford:  
51 Blackwell.  
52  
53 Kirkpatrick, I. Sturdy, A. Alvarado, N. Blanco-Oliver, A. and Veronesi, G. (2019) 'The  
54 impact of management consultants on public service efficiency', *Policy and Politics*, Vol  
55 47 No. 1, pp.77-95. doi.org/10.1332/030557318X15167881150799  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Lewis, R. and Heckman, R. 2006. 'Talent Management: A Critical Review'. *Human*  
4 *Resource Management Review* Vol. 16, pp.139-154.  
5  
6 McCartney, C. (2009) 'The War on Talent? Talent Management Under Threat in  
7 Uncertain Times. Part 1' *Hot topics*. London: CIPD.  
8  
9  
10 McDonnell, A., Collings, D. G., Mellahi, K., & Schuler, R. (2017). Talent management:  
11 A systematic review and future prospects. *European Journal of International*  
12 *Management*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp.86–128. doi:[10.1504/EJIM.2017.081253](https://doi.org/10.1504/EJIM.2017.081253)  
13  
14 MCA (Management Consultancies Association) (2016) UK consulting industry statistics  
15 2016, London: MCA.  
16  
17  
18 Meyers, van Woerkom, Paauwe, & Dries. (2020). HR managers' talent philosophies:  
19 Prevalence and relationships with perceived talent management practices. *International*  
20 *Journal of Human Resource Management*. Vol. 31 No.4, pp. 562-588.  
21  
22  
23 Michaels, E., Handfield-Jones, H., Axelrod, B. (2001) *The war for talent*, Harvard:  
24 Harvard Business Press.  
25  
26 Mishler, E.G. (1991) *Research interviewing: Context and narrative*. Cambridge, MA:  
27 Harvard U.P.  
28  
29  
30 Mohe, M and Seidl, D. (2011), 'Theorizing the client–consultant relationship from the  
31 perspective of social-systems theory' *Organization*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 3–22.  
32  
33 NAO (2006) *Central government's use of consultants*, 15 December 2006, London: The  
34 Stationery Office  
35  
36 Newell, S, Swan, J and Kautz, K (2001) The role of funding bodies in the creation and  
37 diffusion of management fads and fashions. *Organization* Vol. 8 No. 1, pp. 97–120.  
38  
39  
40 Oliver, D. (2016) David Oliver: Awkward questions about NHS management  
41 consultancy, *British Medical Journal*, Vol. 355 pp.1–2.  
42  
43 O'Mahoney, J. (2010) *Management Consultancy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
44  
45 O'Shea, J. and Madigan, C. (1998) *Dangerous Company*. New York: Penguin.  
46  
47 Saint-Martin, D. (2004) *Building the New Managerialist State: Consultants and the*  
48 *Politics of Public Sector Reform in Comparative Perspective 2<sup>nd</sup> edition*, Oxford/New  
49 York: Oxford University Press.  
50  
51 Saint-Martin, D. (2005) 'Management Consultancy' in Ferlie, E., Lynn, L and Pollitt, C.  
52 *The Oxford Handbook of Public Management*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 671-  
53 694.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Saint-Martin, D. (2012) Governments and management consultants: Supply, demand and  
4 effectiveness, in T. Clark, M. Kipping (eds) *The Oxford handbook of management*  
5 consulting, Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
6

7  
8 Sparrow, P. (2019). A historical analysis of critiques in the talent management debate.  
9 *Business Research Quarterly*. Vol. 22 No. 3, pp.160–170 doi:[10.1016/j.brq.2019.05.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brq.2019.05.001)  
10

11 Stiegler, B., 2011. Pharmacology of desire: Drive-based capitalism and libidinal dis-  
12 economy. *New Formations*, Vol. 72, pp.150-161.  
13

14 Sturdy, A (2009) Popular critiques of consultancy and a politics of management learning?  
15 *Management Learning*, Vol. 40 No. 4, pp. 457–463.  
16

17 Suddaby, R and Greenwood, R. (2001) Colonizing knowledge: Commodification as a  
18 dynamic of jurisdictional expansion in professional service firms, *Human Relations*, Vol.  
19 54 No. 7, pp. 933–953.  
20

21 Watson, S. (2007) 'Where are we now? A review of management development issues in  
22 the hospitality sector, implications for talent management'. *International Jo. of*  
23 *Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 20 No. 7, pp. 758-780.  
24  
25

26 Wetherell, M; Taylor, S and Yates, S (2001) *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader*,  
27 London: Sage.  
28

29 Williams-Lee, A. 2008. 'Accelerated leadership development tops the talent management  
30 menu at McDonald's'. *Global Business and Organizational Excellence* May/June: 15-3  
31  
32

---

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
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

**Table I: Google Ngram on talent management**

Google Ngram showing increasing use of the term 'talent management'	
Time period	Number
1980-1989	44
1990-1999	254
2000-2009	7220
2010-2020	19100

International Journal of Public Leadership

Table II: Articles on 'talent management' published between 1950 and 2019

Date range	No. of articles
1950-1979	104
1980 - 1984	60
1985-1989	74
1990 - 1994	91
1995-1999	136
2000-2004	310
2005-2009	656
2010-2014	1050
2015-2019	1509

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
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

Figure I: Structure of the English NHS at time of study (2009)

