

INTERGROUP RELATIONS IN ORGANISATIONS

by

GAIL CYNTHIA WROGEMANN

submitted in part fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of

MASTERS OF ARTS

in the subject

INDUSTRIAL PSYCHOLOGY

at the

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA

SUPERVISOR: PROF P KOORTZEN

JUNE 2002



0001947360

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Acknowledgement and thanks to the following people:

Pieter Koortzen, my supervisor

Frans Cilliers, for informal supervision

Chris and Nan Wrogemann, my parents

Paul Whellock, my partner

The organisation within which the study was conducted

Student number: 613-411-4

I declare that *Intergroup relations in organisations* is my own work and that all the sources that I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references.



SIGNATURE
Miss G C Wrogemann

15 June 2002

DATE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
DECLARATION	ii
LIST OF TABLES	ix
SUMMARY	x
CHAPTER 1: ORIENTATION TO THE RESEARCH	1
1.1 BACKGROUND TO AND MOTIVATION FOR THE RESEARCH	1
1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT	3
1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS	4
1.4 AIM	5
1.4.1 General aim	5
1.4.2 Specific aims	5
1.5 PARADIGM PERSPECTIVE OF THE RESEARCH	6
1.5.1 Disciplinary framework	6
1.5.2 Theoretical approach	7
<i>1.5.2.1 The psychoanalytic perspective and Freudian contributions</i>	8
<i>1.5.2.2 The psychoanalytic perspective and contributions from Klein: the object relations theory</i>	9
<i>1.5.2.3 The open systems theory</i>	10
<i>1.5.2.4 The psychodynamic approach</i>	11
1.5.3 Theoretical model	11
1.5.4 Theoretical terms	13
1.6 RESEARCH DESIGN	15
1.6.1 Research variables	15
<i>1.6.1.1 Boundary management</i>	15
<i>1.6.1.2 Authority</i>	16
<i>1.6.1.3 Projective processes</i>	16
1.6.2 Type of research	16
1.6.3 Unit of analysis	19
1.6.4 Methods to increase reliability and validity	19
1.7 RESEARCH METHOD	20
1.7.1 Phase 1: The literature review	20

1.7.2	Phase 2: The qualitative study	20
1.8	CHAPTER DIVISION	23
1.9	CHAPTER SUMMARY	23
	CHAPTER 2: A PSYCHODYNAMIC PERSPECTIVE ON INTERGROUP RELATIONS IN THE ORGANISATION	24
2.1	BACKGROUND TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE TAVISTOCK MODEL OF GROUP RELATIONS	24
2.1.1	Sigmund Freud's contribution to the development of the psychoanalytic perspective	25
2.1.2	Melanie Klein's object relations theory	27
2.1.2.1	<i>Envy</i>	30
2.1.2.2	<i>Projective identification and countertransference</i>	31
2.1.2.3	<i>Paranoid-schizoid position</i>	31
2.1.2.4	<i>Depressive position</i>	33
2.1.2.5	<i>Reparation</i>	34
2.1.3	The open systems theory	36
2.1.4	Wilfred Bion and the development of the psychodynamic approach	37
2.2	THE TAVISTOCK MODEL OF GROUP RELATIONS	40
2.3	BASIC ASSUMPTIONS OF THE TAVISTOCK MODEL OF GROUP RELATIONS	42
2.3.1	Dependency (baD)	43
2.3.2	Fight/ Flight (baF)	45
2.3.3	Pairing (baP)	46
2.3.4	Oneness and me-ness	46
2.4	EFFECTIVE USE OF THE BASIC ASSUMPTION MENTALITY	48
2.5	BASIC HYPOTHESES OF INTERGROUP RELATIONS WITHIN THE ORGANISATION FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE TAVISTOCK MODEL OF GROUP RELATIONS	51
2.5.1	The fantasy	51
2.5.2	Metaphors	52
2.5.3	The organisation in the mind or relatedness	53
2.6	CHAPTER SUMMARY	55

CHAPTER 3: MANIFESTATIONS OF INTERGROUP RELATIONS IN AN ORGANISATIONAL CONTEXT	56
3.1 BOUNDARY MANAGEMENT	56
3.1.1 Definition and purpose of boundaries	56
3.1.2 Management of boundaries	57
3.1.3 Task and group boundaries	59
3.1.3.1 <i>Task boundaries</i>	59
a <i>Primary task</i>	60
b <i>Task and anti-task</i>	63
3.1.3.2 <i>Group boundaries</i>	65
a <i>Negotiating boundaries within groups</i>	66
b <i>Negotiating boundaries between groups</i>	68
3.2 AUTHORITY, AUTONOMY AND AUTHORISATION	72
3.2.1 Internal authority; authority and power	73
3.2.1.1 <i>Authority from within</i>	73
a <i>Autonomy</i>	74
b <i>Ambivalence towards authority</i>	76
3.2.1.2 <i>Authority and power</i>	78
a <i>Authority</i>	78
b <i>Power</i>	78
c <i>Leadership and followership</i>	80
d <i>Internal dedifferentiation and authorisation</i>	82
3.3 PROJECTIVE PROCESSES	85
3.3.1 Paranoid-schizoid position	86
3.3.1.1 <i>The paranoid-schizoid position in groups</i>	86
3.3.1.2 <i>Possible manifestations of the paranoid-schizoid position</i>	89
3.3.2 Projective identification	90
3.3.2.1 <i>Valency and identification with projection</i>	91
3.3.2.2 <i>Projective identification processes in leadership and followership dynamics in basic assumption groups</i>	93
3.4 CHAPTER SUMMARY	94

CHAPTER 4: THE QUALITATIVE STUDY	96
4.1 A QUALITATIVE INVESTIGATION INTO INTERGROUP RELATIONS	96
4.1.1 The sample	96
4.1.1.1 <i>Length of service at the organisation</i>	97
4.1.1.2 <i>Length of service at the organisation in that role</i>	97
4.1.1.3 <i>Race and gender</i>	97
4.1.1.4 <i>Background working experience</i>	97
4.1.2 The measuring technique used	98
4.1.2.1 <i>Type of measuring technique</i>	99
4.1.2.2 <i>Justification for use of this measuring technique</i>	99
4.1.2.3 <i>Rationale and aim for use of this measuring technique</i>	100
4.1.3 Application of this measuring technique	102
4.1.3.1 <i>Administration of the measuring instrument and collection of data</i>	102
4.1.3.2 <i>Analysis of the results</i>	104
4.1.3.3 <i>Interpretation of the results</i>	106
4.2 RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY OF THE MEASURING TECHNIQUE	107
4.2.1 Reliability of the measuring technique	108
4.2.1.1 <i>Reactivity and control</i>	108
4.2.1.2 <i>Research effects</i>	108
4.2.1.3 <i>Participant effects</i>	110
4.2.1.4 <i>Measuring effects</i>	110
4.2.1.5 <i>Other reliability aspects considered</i>	111
4.2.2 Validity of the measuring technique	111
4.3 CHAPTER SUMMARY	113
CHAPTER 5: RESULTS	114
5.1 PART 1: THE CONTEXT	114
5.2 PART II: THE PROCESS	115
5.3 PART III: THE DYNAMICS	120
5.3.1 Boundary management	120

5.3.1.1	<i>Task boundaries</i>	121
a	<i>Unclear task definition</i>	122
b	<i>Anxiety about unclear task definition</i>	124
c	<i>Integration of the task boundary theme</i>	126
5.3.1.2	<i>Group boundaries and identity</i>	127
a	<i>Exclusion versus inclusion</i>	128
i	<i>Independence versus dependence</i>	129
ii	<i>Basis of inclusion</i>	131
iii	<i>Choosing inclusion and consequences of inclusion</i>	133
iv	<i>Building relationships</i>	136
v	<i>The HR group and the relationship</i>	137
b	<i>Destruction versus incorporation</i>	139
i	<i>The supervisor group's attempts to take over the manager group</i>	140
ii	<i>The manager group's attempts to manipulate the supervisor group by transferring the battle to the partner group</i>	144
c	<i>Integration of group boundary theme</i>	146
5.3.2	Authority	150
5.3.2.1	<i>Autonomy</i>	151
a	<i>Questions on value of supervisor group</i>	151
b	<i>Abdication of responsibility</i>	153
c	<i>Integration of subtheme of autonomy</i>	154
5.3.2.2	<i>Authority and power</i>	155
a	<i>Lines and structure of authority</i>	156
i	<i>Demands of authority</i>	156
ii	<i>The HR group and authority</i>	158
iii	<i>Power and authority of the manager group</i>	158
b	<i>Lack of manager cohesion and internal dedifferentiation</i>	159
c	<i>Integration of the authority and power subtheme</i>	161
5.3.3	Projective processes	163
5.3.3.1	<i>Paranoid-schizoid position</i>	164
a	<i>Rationalisation – split between person and thought</i>	164
b	<i>Split between person and work</i>	165
c	<i>Split between past and present</i>	167
d	<i>Split within manager group</i>	168

<i>e</i>	<i>Split within the supervisor group</i>	169
<i>f</i>	<i>Integration of the paranoid-schizoid position subtheme</i>	170
5.3.3.2	<i>Projective identification</i>	172
<i>a</i>	<i>Externalisation and institutionalisation of hierarchy</i>	173
<i>b</i>	<i>Externalisation of competence</i>	174
<i>c</i>	<i>Projection of hostility onto manager group</i>	176
<i>d</i>	<i>Supervisor group to carry struggle of inclusion and stagnation</i>	178
<i>e</i>	<i>Integration of the subtheme of projective identification</i>	179
5.4	INTEGRATION	181
5.5	CHAPTER SUMMARY	182

**CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS, HYPOTHESES, RECOMMENDATIONS
AND LIMITATIONS** 184

6.1	CONCLUSIONS	184
6.1.1	Conclusions for phase one	184
6.1.2	Conclusion for phase two	188
6.2	HYPOTHESES	190
6.2.1	Boundary Management	191
6.2.2	Authority	193
6.2.3	Projective processes	194
6.3	RECOMMENDATIONS	195
6.3.1	Recommendations for organisations	195
6.3.2	Recommendations for the groups	196
6.3.3	Recommendations for the leadership	196
6.4	LIMITATIONS	198
6.4.1	Limitations of phase one	198
6.4.2	Limitations of phase two	199
6.5	CHAPTER SUMMARY	199

	PAGE
REFERENCE LIST	200
LIST OF TABLES	
TABLE 4.1	
Summary of characteristics of the sample	98

SUMMARY**INTERGROUP RELATIONS IN ORGANISATIONS**

by

GAIL CYNTHIA WROGEMANN**MASTER OF ARTS**

in

INDUSTRIAL PSYCHOLOGY**SUPERVISOR: PROF PIETER KOORTZEN**

The problem statement of this research is, "What is the basis of the intergroup relations that potentially lead to ineffective work behaviour, and how does it manifest in groups within a specific consulting organisation, in terms of the premises of the Tavistock model of group relations?" The psychodynamic approach, psychoanalytic technique, open systems theory and object relations theory were used. The unstructured interview and hermeneutic approach were used for collection of data, and analysis and interpretation.

The results of the research indicate that groups, in interaction with other groups, may install defences against anxieties which could undermine the success of their work efforts. Issues of nonclarity of task, group boundary and identity issues, authority issues and reactions of projection seemed prevalent. Various hypotheses were developed which could be used as a basis for further research.

KEY TERMS: psychodynamics, object relations theory, Tavistock model of group relations, task boundaries, group boundaries, group identity, authority, paranoid-schizoid position, projective identification, projective processes.

CHAPTER 1: ORIENTATION TO THE RESEARCH

This chapter gives an overview of the research. It includes a background to the research, the problem statement and the research questions and aims. The paradigm perspective of the research is outlined in terms of the following: the disciplinary framework, the theoretical approach, the theoretical model and the terms used. This chapter also includes the research design and the research methods used, as well as the chapter divisions.

1.1 BACKGROUND TO AND MOTIVATION FOR THE RESEARCH

According to Wever (1995, p.64), "...changing economic conditions, environmental pressures, and political circumstances challenge the existing structures and institutions that influence how work is carried out and managed". Davis (1995) believes that information technology, knowledge growth and globalisation have led to changes which have required organisations to restructure their internal and external boundaries. Kets de Vries (1991b, p.xiii) states the following: "Increasing international competition and rapid technological change have magnified expectations about organizational performance and adaptation." This new environment is too complex to predict and respond to in a planned way. The author indicates that organisations should prepare for this new environment by instilling in their members the flexibility to sense and respond rapidly to opportunities and environmental changes.

Drucker (1988) suggests that this shift from a traditional sequence of work to a functional team approach be termed "synchrony", since it suggests a more systems and nonlinear sequencing of workflow. He indicates that smaller, self-governing task force teams (eg self-managing teams and interdepartmental teams) will be the basis for important input into future organisations. The speed at which groups need to form and develop into work groups has increased, as has the pressure to achieve specific outputs. Teams such as these are organised in terms of knowledge specialists, rather than according to large, centralised functions. This change to the structure of the work organisation results in a need for a managed interdependency between groups and between individuals within groups. This is essential if individuals or groups are to operate effectively within different and complex group relations. Individuals, therefore, within these groups need to understand their motivations and abilities so that they can fulfil their needs in a constructive and developmental way, especially in

relation to other groups. Individuals also need to understand the different roles they take up in these groups and how they exercise their authority in these roles. As Duncan (1979) indicates, for organisations to be more proactive and responsive to fast changing markets and external environments, it is essential that the individual in his/ her capacity as decision-maker be able to do this. An essential aspect of this is interdependency. It is, therefore, essential that the individual as well as group learn how to be interdependent. Individuals can learn use opportunities effectively so as to learn from the consequences of their actions. They, as groups do, therefore, need to learn to learn (Davis, 1995). Wasdell (1997, p.49) reiterates this when he writes: "Learning to learn is a fraught activity with powerful built-in reactions tending to restore learning behaviour to previously known processes." This research study focuses on the analysis of group behaviour between different groups, and on the interaction between groups as a way of increasing awareness and learning.

This learning process of employees in the work context can be studied from a number of psychological approaches. This research is presented in terms of a psychodynamic approach, and it uses the Tavistock model of group relations as a basis. This school of thought, according to Cilliers and Koortzen (1998), tries to understand organisational and group behaviour from a psychodynamic stance. The relevance of using this perspective within industry lies in the fact that working with these hypotheses "... provides the individual with insights into his / her own functioning intra personally and interpersonally (in the group). It specifically provides an arena where individuals and groups can understand their own behaviour in perceiving that behaviour in others. It also gives the group an opportunity to explore the relationships and potential areas of conflict between themselves (eg in team building activities) and between them and their authority figures" (Cilliers & Koortzen, 1998, p.7). Shaffer and Galinsky (1974, p.200), indicate that increased self-knowledge, self-awareness and insight can be considered a subcategory of learning how to learn and "... learning how to learn about oneself, one's own behaviour and reactions". In the Tavistock model of group relations, this would mean studying or analysing the way individual employees and groups take up roles, determine their boundaries, exercise their authority and take a lead, as well as understanding issues such as projection and projective identification.

The situations occurring in this particular organisation give rise to the following thoughts about the organisational dynamics:

- Employees tend to spend long hours of overtime at client offices.

- There are common area staffroom, which means that staff are required to share desks and space when they are at the office. There are also constant complaints about the "lack of communication" about the specifics of certain projects and about the inadequate time scheduled to carry out certain tasks.
- There seems to be a lack of communication between the two groups chosen for the study in terms of role clarity and job expectations.
- Employees are dissatisfied about aspects of the office situation.

The previous lack of clear organisation strategy and the inability of senior management to set a clear strategy, leads one to question the boundaries that have been set between this organisation and its market and environment. In addition, the human resource department was required to move offices owing to a shortage of space in the "main building", just when this department became involved in assisting with this organisational strategy exercise. The building that the human resource department moved to was a small building (also occupied by other companies) across the road from the "main building". The "authority" of the organisation seems unclear and manifests in an apparent power struggle between authority vested in position and authority vested in technical knowledge and expertise. The boundaries of task, space and time are not clear and the question of how these aspects could be better integrated is uncertain. It seems as though certain groups and/or subsystems of the organisation carry or hold the destructive elements of behaviour and attitude that the organisation does not want to deal with. Certain groups are always "unhappy", certain groups always seem to under perform, while other groups consistently perform to or higher than expectation.

1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

Given the above organisational and market changes and the observed situation in this organisation, it seems that people will need to adjust to constant changes, learn to "... perceive reality in more complex ways..." and "... to negotiate within large, complex role-sets" (Hage, 1995, p.486). In order to make the transition to current and future industrial society, "... people will need complex and creative minds, adaptive and flexible selves, and the capacity to understand symbolic communications" (Hage, 1995, p.487). Given the number of different groups individuals are members of and the number of different roles

individuals carry out, one can see the potential for difficult intergroup relations and the possible destructive methods developed in order to deal with these intergroup interactions. The basic issue, therefore, revolves around the way the group integrates these roles and values, the way they exercise their authority, and the way they use projective processes to deal with anxiety provoking behaviours and situations.

The potential for intergroup conflict is high, because of the global changes taking place, the concurrent changes in industry and the organisation of work, and the emphasis on team and group work. From what the author has observed between groups in this organisation, it seems as if difficult intergroup relations could manifest as a result of a lack of personal authority, an emphasis on technical outputs and demands from external clients. These observations were, however, made in an informal way and require a more in-depth analysis. From this, the following general problem statement and a number of research questions can be formulated. The basic research question is, therefore, as follows: "What is the basis of the intergroup relations that potentially leads to ineffective work behaviour, and how does this ineffective work behaviour manifest in groups within a specific consulting organisation, in terms of the premises of the Tavistock model of group relations?"

1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The four specific research questions for this study are as follows:

- Can group functioning and intergroup relations in organisations be described theoretically from the psychodynamic approach, open systems theory, the psychoanalytic perspective and the Tavistock model of group relations, and working hypotheses generated?
- Can working hypotheses on the possible manifestations of ineffective boundary management, authority issues and projective processes, such as the paranoid-schizoid position and projective identification between groups in a specific organisation, be formulated on the basis of the literature review?
- Can a qualitative investigation and analysis of issues of boundary management,

authority and projective processes, such as the paranoid-schizoid position and projective identification between groups, be done?

- Can hypotheses on these aspects be formulated on the results of the above investigation, analysis and interpretation?

1.4 AIM

The aims of this research are based on the above research questions. The general aim, as well as specific aims, is considered.

1.4.1 General aim

The general aim of this study is to investigate, explore and gain new insights into the phenomenon of intergroup relations in a consulting organisation in terms of boundary management, authority, and projective processes, such as the paranoid-schizoid position and projective identification, and the manifestation thereof in terms of the premises of the Tavistock model of group relations.

1.4.2 Specific aims

There are four specific aims of this study and they are as follows:

- To theoretically describe intergroup functioning and intergroup relations from a psychoanalytic perspective, object relations theory, open systems theory, and a psychodynamic approach, and the Tavistock model of group relations, and to generate working hypotheses.
- To formulate, from the literature, possible explanations for and working hypotheses of manifestations of ineffective boundary management, issues with authority and projective processes, such as the paranoid-schizoid position and projective identification, between groups in an organisation.
- To describe and conduct a qualitative study in order to investigate and explore

boundary management, authority issues and the paranoid-schizoid position and projective identification issues that groups experience and the manifestations of this.

- To formulate conclusions on the manifestation of these aspects, hypotheses for future research, recommendations for future use and to indicate limitations of the research.

1.5 PARADIGM PERSPECTIVE OF THE RESEARCH

The problem statement and the aims are considered within a specific paradigm perspective. This paradigm perspective of the research is now discussed according to the disciplinary framework, the theoretical approach (including the psychoanalytic perspective, object relations theory, open systems theory, and the psychodynamic approach) and the specific theoretical model used in this research. Also included are a number of theoretical terms.

1.5.1 Disciplinary framework

This research is presented within the field of the behavioural sciences, which includes disciplines such as psychology, sociology, social psychology, anthropology and political science (Robbins, 1989). Industrial psychology developed primarily at an individual level of analysis from within the field of psychology, whereas organisation behaviour developed more at a group level of analysis from within the remaining fields. According to Coster, Watkins, Cilliers, and Theron (1987), organisational psychology deals mainly with phenomena, at the psychological level, within the context of work organisations. Robbins (1989, p.4) states that the study of organisational behaviour is a field of study that "...investigates the impacts that individuals, groups, and structure have on behaviour within organisations, for the purpose of applying such knowledge toward improving an organisation's effectiveness".

According to Czander (1993), in order to fully understand work and the organisation from a psychoanalytic perspective, one requires education and training in two disciplines: psychoanalysis and organisational theory. In addition, one also requires knowledge in other areas such as clinical practice, intrapsychic theory and the social psychology of group behaviour, as well as knowledge of organisational theory and the practice of management. According to Kets de Vries (1991), psychoanalytic theory has become increasingly more complex, integrating drive psychology, neurology, ethnology, information theory, child

development, ego psychology, cognition, family systems theory, self-psychology and object relations theory. A more general psychology has thus developed in which these concepts are more widely applied to the social sciences. Linked has been a focus on the application of psychoanalytic concepts and methods to the organisational setting. This requires some integration of what was previously understood as separate theories.

The first obstacle in putting the two disciplines (psychoanalysis and organisational theory) together is that they directly contradict each other in terms of what constitutes a "good" explanation (Czander, 1993). Organisational behaviour relies on a causal mode of explanation, while psychoanalysis relies on an analytic-inference mode of explanation. The application of the casual model leads to the organisation being constructed as a rational system, made up of factors that precipitate a set of behaviours; these factors can also be applied to other situations. It assumes that job satisfaction, for example, can be explained according to dependent and independent variables. The psychoanalytic approach, however, recognises that the behavioural outcome of job satisfaction, for example, is a function of the person in terms of feelings, emotions, past life experiences and expectations, and is in accordance with present day realities.

Mosse (1994, p.1) suggests that institutions "... pursue unconscious tasks alongside their conscious ones, and these affect both their efficiency and degrees of stress experienced by staff". Integrating psychoanalysis and organisational theory, therefore, leads to hypotheses that can heighten awareness of and sensitivity to unconscious processes, as well as methods for integrating this into clear action within a new physical or psychic structure.

1.5.2 Theoretical approach

This research is conducted from a psychodynamic approach and uses the Tavistock model of group relations. This model was founded by Bion (Czander, 1993). This approach developed as a result of the psychoanalytic perspective - of which Sigmund Freud was one of the founders - and integrated aspects of the psychoanalytic perspective, the open systems theory and the object relations theory, as developed by Melanie Klein (Geller & Krantz, 1985). One of the foundations of the psychodynamic approach, therefore, is the psychoanalytic perspective.

1.5.2.1 The psychoanalytic perspective and Freudian contributions

Freud was one of the major theorists of the psychoanalytic perspective. He developed the psychoanalytic technique in order to study the unconscious. Freud believed that many deductions about the state of the unconscious could be made from behaviour. "... the simplest, most accidental aspects of human behaviour could not be ascribed to chance" (Albertyn, 1999, p.337). According to Moller (1995), the basic assumptions of the psychoanalytic perspective are that all behaviour, both normal and abnormal, has a cause that is fundamentally biological and instinctual in nature. According to this theory, the three key aspects of the personality are the three levels of consciousness – namely the conscious, the preconscious and the unconscious - and the three dimensions of personality – the id, the ego and the superego. According to Slipp (1993), the id contains the unconscious instinctual drives, the superego the internalisation of the parent's values, prohibitions and ideals, and the ego the mechanisms of defences. This perspective emphasises that people are in a state of conflict between the expression of the unconscious sexual and aggressive instincts (id), and societal demands (superego). The ego, operating from a reality principle, attempts to find some balance between the two. The conflict takes place in the person's mind, hence the current use of the "...term 'psychodynamic', referring to this constant conflict for control over the person's behaviour" (Albertyn, 1999, p.335). The outcome of the conflict is then released as tension and forms the basis of the motivation for personality. The instincts drive the behaviour to attain satisfaction. According to Jung in Albertyn (1999), the archetypes (universal inherited predispositions) towards certain behaviour is what directs behaviour. The basic motivating force, therefore, resides in the unconscious. Individuals are generally not aware that these causes and unresolved conflicts motivates their behaviour.

According to Albertyn (1999), the central assumptions of the psychoanalytic perspective include the following:

- the unconscious and a dynamic set of processes make up personality
- these processes are sometimes harmonious and sometimes in conflict with each other
- instinctual forces compete for control over the individual's behaviour
- a person's basic drives are aggressive (death instinct) and sexual (life instinct)
- the history and early childhood of an individual are important in determining contemporary behaviour

- defence mechanisms are prevalent in defending the individual from overpowering self-knowledge (eg defences such as projection, regression and displacement)
- mental health is important as an outcome of achieving a balance between these dynamic processes

These drives can be traced in order to help an individual understand his or her own behaviour. Since the causes are unconscious, understanding and awareness will only be attained once these repressed causes are remembered and brought in the conscious mind.

This perspective is thus a valuable approach for studying the unconscious state of the individual in the work environment, as well as the unconscious state of a group, organisation or society itself. Feeling of anxiety, for example, may be a root cause of dysfunctional relationships at work and may be caused by the task structure of the organisation. A particular group may manage its anxiety by deploying social defences and blaming other groups for lack of progress on a particular project. According to Shaffer and Galinsky (1974), this manifestation of resistance operates in the service of the ego as a defence against anxiety. Real learning and development takes place when individuals, groups and organisations stop looking externally for scapegoats.

1.5.2.2 The psychoanalytic perspective and contributions from Klein: the object relations theory

According to Miller (1997), Melanie Klein's work was a further influence in the development of the Tavistock model of group relations. Klein's work is based on theories of infant development and how it continues to influence adult relationships. The infant seeks pleasure and comfort, avoids pain and thus polarised its world accordingly. The maternal breast is seen as both good and bad. These early anxieties, related to splitting, are complicated with the discovery that the good and bad are manifestations of the same person. The defences developed against these intolerable anxieties remain a permanent part of our psychic life as do feelings of guilt, reparation and love. Miller (1997, p.190) writes that the conflicts and complexities of the internal world are dealt with by "... populating our external world with representations of good and evil, friends and foes, and the various other manifestations of 'not-me' or 'not-us' that enable us to hold on to a more consistent self-image". The integration

of this theory with the open systems model led to the notion that organisations function as defences against the unconscious anxieties of their members. In other words, according to Miller (1997), they channel psychic projections.

1.5.2.3 The open systems theory

According to Miller (1997), the biologist, von Bertalanffy, developed the open systems theory, which describes the model of an organism which can exist and survive only through continuous interaction with the environment. This is the source of its intakes and the recipient of its outputs. Kernberg in Wheelan (1994) indicates that the environment is a suprasystem that affects the systems operating within it, and as such, a change in one part of the system affects all other parts as well as the system as a whole. Groups operating within the same system or organisation are, therefore, independent. Miller and Rice (1975) write that any enterprise or organisation, which has characteristics in common with a biological organism can be seen as an open system. An open system exists by exchanging materials with its environment. It imports materials, transforms them, consumes some for internal maintenance and exports the remainder. It exchanges its outputs – directly or indirectly - for further intakes, including further resources to maintain itself. According to von Bertalanffy in Czander (1993), all living systems have boundaries and all living systems are, therefore, defined by their singular boundary.

According to Miller (1997), this theory was easily adopted for use in organisational analysis and change as it underlined the significance of boundaries and the management thereof. Leadership, for example, was seen as a boundary function, mediating between inside and outside. Czander (1993) follows this and writes that as organisations increase in size and complexity, so subsystems multiply; transactions between these subsystems thus become increasingly active. Organisations therefore require specialisation in order to perform more complex and sophisticated tasks. Further, as interdependency is required to increase, boundary management becomes more difficult. Lewin in Wheelan (1994) writes that groups should be studied in their actual settings, because groups cannot be separated from their environment. In order to understand a group's dynamics, therefore, care must be taken to become aware of the forces operating on and in that group at that particular time.

1.5.2.4 The psychodynamic approach

This study will be conducted from a psychodynamic approach. While psychoanalysis was a technique to study the unconscious, the psychodynamic approach is much broader. It developed out of psychoanalysis, using some of the principles and methods, but also incorporating new theories on unconscious processes in groups and organisations. Since the study is conducted within a certain organisational context, the relevance of using this approach as a basis is, in part, the fact that an organisation, as a system, has its own life, both conscious and unconscious, with subsystems relating to and mirroring one another (Cilliers & Koortzen, 1998). According to this approach the following form the basis of the hypotheses about organisational behaviour:

- The worker (micro system) approaches the work situation with unfulfilled and unconscious family needs, which he attempts to fulfil in the work situation.
- The individual, in the role of worker, also brings unconscious and unresolved conflicts (eg with authority) into the work situation.
- The worker unconsciously plays out a need for power within the work situation.

Since the work situation does not necessarily allow these unconscious needs to be fulfilled, the worker can sometimes be left feeling frustrated, anxious and aggressive. These feelings are manifested in different ways.

1.5.3 Theoretical model

The Tavistock model of group relations, developed from within the psychodynamic approach, studies the dynamics of leadership and authority relations in groups (Cilliers & Koortzen, 1996). According to De Loach (1998), concepts from the open systems theory and the field of organisational psychology have been developed and absorbed into the substructure of this model. According to Cilliers and Koortzen (1996), individuals cannot be understood or changed outside the context of the groups within which they live. The Tavistock model is specifically geared towards helping relatively healthy people learn more about group dynamics, especially as they relate to problems of leadership within organisations (Shaffer & Galinsky, 1974). This also involves studying the roles that people take up in groups, as well as the ways in which they exercise their authority in different roles.

According to Miller (1997), it is the understanding of unconscious processes in groups and organisations that is the starting point of Bion's basic assumptions.

- Bion's basic assumptions

The basic premise here is that when individuals become a group, they behave as a system; the primary task of the group is one of survival. Group survival becomes the motivating force for all group members and it provides the framework for investigating and understanding group behaviour.

Shaffer and Galinsky (1974) indicate that Bion thought of any group as operating from two different perspectives at any one time, namely the work group and the basic assumptions group. These two perspectives can be seen as lying on opposite ends of a continuum. Miller (1997) and Rice (1976) also indicate that according to Bion, groups can be seen as simultaneously operating at two levels. No group, therefore, ever operates purely from one perspective or the other Shaffer and Galinsky (1974). The more a group operates from the work group perspective, the more the behaviour is rational and focused on the performance and accomplishment of the task without being swayed by underlying and basic infantile forces. The more the group displays behaviour of the basic assumptions group, the more the displayed behaviour is regressive, focusing on emotional gratification and tension release; the primary task of the group, according to Shaffer and Galinsky (1974), becomes secondary. The point from which a group operates can, therefore, be seen as a reflection of the point from where the individual is operating. The individual needs are expressed directly via the group dynamics and attempts are made to fulfil these needs via the group.

The four basic assumptions of the Tavistock model that are studied in the individual (micro system), the group or department that the individual belongs to (meso system), and the organisation (macro system), are dependency, fight/flight, pairing and oneness/me-ness (Cilliers & Koortzen, 1996). Organisational dynamics are investigated using these assumptions. The assumptions of dependency, fight/flight, pairing and oneness/me-ness are seen as collective projections of the group members; what the group, therefore, projects is equivalent to that which the individual projects. Shaffer and Galinsky (1974, p.178) indicate that "Individual behaviour is invariably seen as an expression of group forces...". They also state that the "...laws of group behaviour are considered to directly embody and continue,

albeit at another level, the same archaically-determined dynamicisms that account for the laws of individual behaviour' (Shaffer & Galinsky 1974, p.182).

Bion's research, therefore, involved the realisation that the dynamics of the person's interactions within his or her small study groups reflect the dynamics that each person plays out in larger groups, and within that person's wider external environment. In this regard, Shaffer and Galinsky (1974) indicate that Bion saw these specific phenomena as examples of broader and universal principles.

1.5.4 Theoretical Terms

A number of theoretical terms which will be used throughout this research need to be defined.

- Organisation

The Tavistock model of group relations studies the individual, group and organisation as reflected in each other and mirroring each other. According to Ivancevich and Matteson (1987), organisations can be seen as open systems which exist in societies and are created in societies. Organisations are, therefore, created and sustained by intra individual and inter individual and group behaviour. According to Stokes (1994b), the term "organisation" and "institution" can be used interchangeably, although a distinction can be made between the two. An organisation can be seen as flexible and changeable, while an institution could be seen as more stable, solid and continuous.

- Relations and relatedness

According to Cilliers and Koortzen (1998), group dynamics or individual dynamics refer to those relationships that individuals or groups may have in direct face-to-face or indirect telephonic or electronic interaction. It refers to the immediate and here-and-now reality of that interaction. Relatedness, in contrast, refers to a more abstract level of interaction where individuals, groups or organisations manifest behaviour in accordance with their perception of their constructed reality of the other. This includes a view of the "organisation in the mind".

- Boundaries

Individuals, groups and organisations, as part of a system, all have boundaries. These are essential in distinguishing the different parts of the system. The purpose of boundary management is to monitor and control what comes in and what goes out of the system and subsystem. It also helps to contain anxiety. Space, time, task and roles are examples of boundaries (Cilliers & Koortzen, 1996). Where boundaries are unclear, less effective interpersonal relations may occur.

- Leadership/followership

Leadership may be vested in a designated leader of a group or someone who the group appoints to act on their behalf. Leadership refers to managing what is inside the boundary and what is outside the boundary (The Tavistock Institute).

- Authority

This refers to an individual's right to make a decision which is binding on others. Authority may be formally delegated by a superior, sanctioned by the group, or it may refer to the personal power that an individual brings to his or her role (The Tavistock Institute).

- Roles

According to Cilliers and Koortzen (2000), taking up a role within an organisation implies managing oneself in that role in the midst of uncertainty and risk. Anxiety within a role can relate to internal anxiety and to real external threats to professional identity.

- Groups

According to Wheelan (1994, p.1), Luft defines a group in the following way:

A living system, self-regulating through shared perception and interaction, sensing and

feedback, and through interchange with the environment. Each group has unique wholeness qualities that become patterned by way of members' thinking, feeling, and communicating, into structured subsystems. The group finds some way to maintain balance while moving through progressive changes, creating its own guidelines and rules, and seeking its own goals through recurring cycles of interdependent behaviour.

According to Cilliers and Koortzen (1996, p.1)), "an aggregate cluster of persons become a group when interaction between members occurs, when members' awareness of their common relationship develops, and when a common group task emerges". The group is, therefore, a living entity that exists beyond individual experience.

1.6 RESEARCH DESIGN

According to Mouton and Marais (1988) the aim of research design is to align the pursuit of a research goal with the practical consideration and limitations of the project. It also helps to plan and structure a given research project in such a manner that the eventual validity of the research findings is maximised. Research variables will be discussed as well the type of research, the unit of analysis used and methods used to increase reliability and validity.

The following variables will be used as an initial basis for the literature review and can be termed hypothesised variables. These are briefly described here.

1.6.1 Research variables

The following research variables are used as a basis for this research. They are defined as follows:

1.6.1.1 Boundary management

Any system has a boundary which separates it from its environment and every part of the organisation or group system operates inside and across boundaries (Cilliers & Koortzen 2000). According to Bexton (1975) and Wasdell (1997), organisations are open systems and are involved in exchanges with their environment. According to Roberts (1994c), boundary

management is crucial to separate and relate to what is inside and outside the organisation. Boundary management can relate to effectively managing task or group identity boundaries.

1.6.1.2 Authority

Authority in this context refers to the manifestation of the structure of decision making and power in organisations. Authority in this research includes authority from within and autonomy, ambivalence toward authority, authority and power issues, as well as authorisation.

1.6.1.3 Projective Processes

Projection is a process of 'putting' the bad onto some other. Projection itself can be seen as the irrational assumption of the existence of one's own experience in others (Redlich & Astrachan, 1975), and are primitive attempts to relieve internal pains by externalising them, by assigning them to or by requiring another to contain aspects of the self (Main, 1985). Projective processes discussed here are the paranoid-schizoid position and projective identification.

The paranoid-schizoid position refers to processes where the perceived "good" and/or perceived "bad" is split away from an individual or group in order to remove recognition and acknowledgement of those aspects of self. These aspects are projected onto another individual or group. Projective identification refers to processes where those projected aspects are accepted, taken on and acted out by a recipient.

1.6.2 Type of research

This is an investigative, exploratory and qualitative study, which initially uses a literature review to explore the concepts underlying intergroup relations, and their manifestations, using the concepts of boundaries, authority as based on the Tavistock model of group relations, the paranoid-schizoid position and projective identification, as based on the object relations theory. The qualitative investigation will take the form of an unstructured interview to investigate and explore intergroup relations experienced, and the manifestation thereof, in terms of the above concepts. The interpretation of the results will be done using the

hermeneutic approach. Conclusions and recommendations are offered as opportunities for further investigation and research.

As indicated by Mouton & Marais (1988), the value of the exploratory design is to generate new hypotheses from the data collected, which lead to insight and comprehension of the phenomena under study. As such, the theoretical statements developed are a result *of* the study, as opposed to being guided by the theoretical statements. According to Alderfer (1980), the purpose is to establish a shared understanding of a system, and based on that understanding, to determine whether an intervention is desirable. According to this author, the system needs to be understood "...on its own terms inductively, rather than [imposing] preconceived analyses or standardized instruments" (Alderfer, 1980, p.464). Mouton and Marais (1988) indicate that the research design should specifically take into account an open and flexible research strategy, compilation of literature reviews and planning of interviews that allow that development. It is important for the researcher be open to new stimuli and to consider all the stimuli provided without allowing preconceived ideas or hypotheses to exercise a determining influence on the direction or nature of the research (Mouton & Marais, 1988).

The hermeneutic approach will be used to interpret the data. Hermeneutics refers to a method of understanding and interpretation (Joseph, 1989). In order to understand human action, the abilities humans have which enable them to relate to others, need to be taken into account. In other words, humans are not closed entities within themselves; they are able to stand outside the self. This transparency of one's own being enables a person to reach far into the depth-dimensions of human life. According to Roffey (1980), hermeneutics includes the systematic study of linguistic interpretation and recognises that no one meaning can be said to hold one truth; and in the same way, not all meanings can be said to incorporate a truth. Language, therefore, includes the act of uncovering phenomena, and interpreting what that language could mean and the multiplicity of what it could represent. There is, therefore, no one correct meaning. The aim of this approach is thus to "...uncover meaning which is not defined in verification" (Roffey, 1980, p.38). The approach cannot, therefore, relate to a confirmation of an existing perspective; it has to relate not only to a deepening of that perspective, but to an attempt to broaden the number of perspectives that are seen (Roffey, 1980). Thus we would be better off using interpretation to open up new perspectives as opposed to using this interpretation to attempt to confirm an existing perspective that we hold (Packer & Addison,

1989a).

Hermeneutics, therefore, becomes an encounter between researcher and participant and involves the participant and the language that they use. This includes involving the participant in the interpretation, and the researcher being able to self-reflect and having some understanding of his or her own viewpoint. Thus, "...when the inquirer seeks to interpret, reflection and self-understanding are essential factors in interpretation" (Roffey, 1980, p.41). It is not a case of simple empathy, where the researcher understands the participant from the point of view of the participant (this could lead to projection), rather, it is a case of the researcher understanding the participant using self-understanding in that encounter as well. Unidirectional empathy could lead to projection and this is not hermeneutics. Therefore, "without reflecting on the self, the therapist is in danger of projecting the self onto the understanding of the client" (Roffey, 1980, p.145). According to Fontana and Frey (1994), in seeking to understand human actions and institutions we could draw on our own experience and cultural knowledge; through that we could reach understanding based on what we share with other human beings.

Hermeneutics is, therefore, the practice of interpretation. Understanding our action relates to a reflection of our experiences of conflict and our conduct on such occasion, in such a way that we notice aspects of our experience which were not apparent before; we uncover new ways of regarding what was already familiar to us and thus raise our understanding of conflict from a practical to a reflective level (Packer 1985). Understanding cannot be separated from self-understanding, and interpretive inquiry is critical of technical approaches that distort our understanding of ourselves (Packer & Addison, 1989). "The study of the human world involves not only the extensive interpretation of texts and verbal utterances but also the treatment of many other social phenomena *as if* they were texts to be interpreted" (Rickman, 1976, p.10). It is thus the search for the meaning behind the texts. The person becomes a unit to be seen as a totality, a psycho-physical unit, conditioned by social, political, cultural and historical conditions. The "whole" human being perceives objects, knows them and uses them to aid or obstruct his or her activities. Hermeneutics, therefore, relates parts to a whole. Absolute starting points, therefore, need to be abandoned and so the process of coming to know reality becomes a question of accommodating facts and hypothetical theories, the limited intellect might gain more insight but never reaches a goal of absolute knowledge (Rickman, 1976).

1.6.3 Unit of analysis

The unit of analysis for this study is the group. According to Mouton and Marais (1988), collectivities of individuals are frequently studied as groups, since groups possess characteristics which are not necessarily applicable to the individual. This research focuses on the behaviour groups exhibit in their relationship to each other. From this, inferences can be made in terms of their relatedness. Using this relatedness in conjunction with the open systems model, inferences could then be made about the relatedness within the organisation. According to Diamond (1991), the study of group processes in complex organisations enhances comprehension of collective human behaviour.

1.6.4 Methods to increase reliability and validity

According to Mouton and Marais (1988), research design sets the parameters within which the research can be contextualised and the theoretical statements applied. The design also has implications for internal and external validity in the application of these findings. Design can thus either emphasise phenomenon studied in terms of its immediate context (ideographic strategy), or emphasised because it is regarded as representative of a large population of similar phenomena (nomothetic strategy). Given the qualitative nature of the research aspects of reliability and validity need attention.

Reliability, according to Mouton and Marais (1988), relates to the requirement that the application of a valid measuring instrument to different groups under different sets of circumstances should lead to the same observations. Validity, according to Kerlinger (1986) refers to the question of whether we are measuring what we think we are measuring. Given this, in order to increase the level of reliability and validity of this research, the objectivity of the researcher is considered primary, as is the planned manner of the interview. Special attention will be paid to the impact the researcher has on the interaction and the range of sources of data that can be used from that interaction. The researcher will need to consult an expert in the field of psychodynamics on the planning of the interview and the interpretation and analysis of the data. More details on these aspects are covered in chapter four.

1.7 RESEARCH METHOD

The method of the study and the chapters will be presented in the following manner. This is broken down for phases one and two.

1.7.1 Phase 1: The literature review

Step one and two will cover a literature review focusing on the theories and concepts relating to this research.

- Step 1: Theoretical literature review

As indicated, the first specific aim of this study is to theoretically describe intergroup functioning and intergroup relations from a psychodynamic approach, the open systems theory, the psychoanalytic perspective and the Tavistock model of group relations. This will be covered in chapter two, "A Psychodynamic Perspective on Intergroup Relations in the Organisation".

- Step 2: Literature review of hypothesised concepts

The second specific aim, covered in chapter three, entitled "Manifestations of Intergroup Relations in an Organisational Context", will cover possible manifestations in the organisation where the study was conducted of ineffective boundary management, issues with authority and projective processes, such as the paranoid-schizoid position and projective identification. Working hypotheses will be generated by using information gained from the literature review and integrating this with the current situation within the organisation. These variables are explored using a psychodynamic approach, including reference to the open systems theory and the psychoanalytic perspective, using the Tavistock model of group relations.

1.7.2 Phase 2: The qualitative study

The next two steps cover the specific methodology to be followed and the results of the

study.

- Steps 1 – 4: Research methodology

Chapter four covers the third specific aim of the qualitative study conducted in order to explore and investigate boundary management, authority issues and the paranoid-schizoid position and projective identification that groups experience and the manifestation of these in terms of the Tavistock model of group relations.

An outline of the qualitative method of the study that will be conducted is as follows:

Step 1: Population and sample

Consult with the leadership of the organisation to gain their support for this research. Draw a random sample from the population of the two subgroups. The population comprises employees from these two subgroups within a specific solution segment within the organisation. The sample will comprise two managers and two supervisors from that solution segment. Telephone each individual, negotiate a date, time and venue, and explain the reason for the research. One research question will be asked. One unstructured interview will be conducted.

Step 2: Measuring technique

An unstructured interview will be used to measure and explore the intergroup dynamics experienced when these two groups interact. The analysis and interpretation will be done using the hermeneutic approach.

Step 3: Data collection

The data will be gathered via an unstructured interview which will last for approximately one hour. The following open-question will be asked: "We have one hour to discuss the relationship between the audit manager group and the audit supervisor group. Where would you like to start?" The interview will be tape recorded and notes made on nonverbal communication.

Step 4: Data processing

Themes will be identified from the transcripts as well as the underlying dynamics manifested. The data will be processed and analysed by identifying uniform themes and grouping themes into clusters. The themes will be interpreted according to the initial hypothesised variables, where appropriate, using the hermeneutic approach.

- Step 5: Results

Chapter five will cover the reporting, analysis and interpretation of the data in terms of integrating the theory, discussed in chapter two, the variables identified in chapter three, and the themes identified from the interview.

- Steps 6 - 9: Conclusions, hypotheses, recommendations and limitations

Chapter six will include the conclusions reached about the research on the manifestations of the boundary management and the authority issues, and the paranoid-schizoid position and projective identification. Hypotheses will also be generated for future research. Recommendations for organisations in general, for the specific groups under study, as well as for the leadership of this organisation will be given. Limitations of the research will also be covered.

Step 6: Conclusions

The conclusion will be structured according to the problem statement and the aims of the research.

Step 7: Hypotheses

This is in line with one of the research objectives which is to generate hypotheses for future research.

Step 8: Recommendations

Recommendations will revolve around the further research that could take place using the hypotheses generated.

Step 9: Limitations

The limitations of this study could be the difficulty in terms of reliability and validity. Since this is a qualitative study, and theoretical statements are generated, no empirical result can be illustrated. The benefit is to provide a groundwork for future research.

1.8 CHAPTER DIVISION

The chapters are entitled as follows:

Chapter 2: A psychodynamic perspective on intergroup relations in the organisation

Chapter 3: Manifestations of intergroup relations in an organisational context

Chapter 4: The qualitative study

Chapter 5: Results

Chapter 6: Conclusions, hypotheses, recommendations and limitations

1.9 CHAPTER SUMMARY

An overview and introduction to the research were given in this chapter. A comprehensive outline of the process to be followed was also covered. This included the problem statement, the research questions, and the aims, as well as explanations of the paradigm perspective of the research, and the research design and method.

CHAPTER 2: A PSYCHODYNAMIC PERSPECTIVE ON INTERGROUP RELATIONS IN THE ORGANISATION

As indicated in chapter one, the aim of this chapter is to theoretically describe intergroup functioning and relations from a psychoanalytic perspective, the object relations theory, the open systems theory and the psychodynamic approach (phase 1, step 1). The model used is the Tavistock model of group relations. The literature review covers the basic assumptions of the Tavistock model as well as the how these basic assumptions could manifest in effective ways. Included are working hypotheses of organisational behaviour from the viewpoint of the Tavistock model.

2.1 BACKGROUND TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE TAVISTOCK MODEL OF GROUP RELATIONS

As the global political climate places increasing emphasis on efficiency, cost-effectiveness and value for money, organisations have responded by placing increasing emphasis on the management structure and on the structure of the organisation. According to Obholzer and Roberts (1994), competent management delineating clearly defined tasks and roles and backed by efficient resources, can go a long way to ensuring a creative institutional work climate. However, organisations are managed by humans, so there must be pockets of behaviour which will undermine work in some ways. Competition between groups, for example, could lead to ineffective intergroup relations.

The key issue in the use of the psychodynamic approach in this context is in the application of psychodynamic and psychoanalytic constructs to formal organisations, so as to "...apply theory to specifics, not to general psychological constructs such as motivation, learning, commitment, perception, and so forth, but more to organizationally relevant issues such as authority, work roles, autonomy and dependency, and the interpersonal issues that arise at work" (Czander, 1993, p.6). According to Krantz and Gilmore (1991), psychoanalysis and the contribution of Freud have led to an important understanding of anxiety and related defences, both to the mental health of the individual and to the functioning of institutions. Psychoanalysis in this way has provided insights into the human personality and object relations, as well as some insight into the significance of the unconscious mind and the role this plays in behaviour, perception and experience. Traditionally then, these approaches

looked at the individual as struggling with issues within himself/herself; the wider context was ignored. A contemporary psychoanalytic theory of work, however, "...must consider the person within the 'world at work' and how the work environment influences conscious and unconscious fantasies" (Czander, 1993, p.27).

The three major theories of psychoanalysis, writes Czander (1993), as they relate to work and the formal organisation are Freud and the classical psychoanalytic theory, Melanie Klein and her object relations theory, and Bion and Miller (a psychodynamic approach), and the Tavistock model of group relations. The theories of Melanie Klein include the persistence of infantile conflicts in our emotional and social life, and the work of Bion includes the link between intrapsychic processes and the experience of group life (Geller & Krantz, 1985, p.1). Melanie Klein and the object-relations school, within the psychoanalytic perspective, was used as the vantage point for Wilfred Bion to develop his ideas of group life. This was the start of the development of the psychodynamic approach. According to these authors, the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations used the integration of psychoanalytic thought and social systems theory to develop theories and methods aimed at the small work group, the organisation as a whole as well as the larger social field.

The following will cover aspects of the development of the psychodynamic approach as related to the work environment and subsequent development of the Tavistock model of group relations using the psychoanalytic perspective (Freud), the object relations theory (Klein) and the open systems theory as starting points.

2.1.1 Sigmund Freud's contribution to the development of the psychoanalytic perspective

Freud developed the psychoanalytic technique within the social context of the Victorian middle class, writes Czander (1993). Instead of concentrating on humankind and his/her relation to the work environment, Freud focused on the existence of the unconscious; he looked for ways to demonstrate its existence, so that individuals could better understand their motives (Halton (1994). Manifestations of the unconscious can be seen via dreams, slips of the tongue, et cetera. As Halton (1994) indicates: "Ideas which have a valid meaning at the conscious level may at the same time carry an unconscious meaning." The psychoanalytic perspective suggests that the "... motivation to control passion and perhaps the wish to

manage or be managed may be the function of a neurotic condition; that is nothing more than an attempt to blunt the 'shadowy' wishes and motivations for human relatedness and fears associated with the creative drive to master and accomplish" (Czander, 1993, p.4).

One aspect that Freud covered in his work of the individual's relation to work was the question of why work can be experienced as a painful activity, that is, one to be avoided. According to Czander (1993), Freud suggested three psychic requirements of work: it requires a renunciation of instincts, it requires that one give up the pleasures associated with childhood and enter into a life ruled by the reality principle, and it requires one to give up the freedoms associated with childhood. If individuals do not do this, according to Cilliers and Koortzen (2000), "... working will be too painful to perform, and will be avoided altogether".

Success in work life is, therefore, a function of "... an employee's acceptance of the frustrations associated with scarcity" (Czander, 1993, p.14). When a person accepts this and the three requirements mentioned above, the pleasure or displeasure associated with work then becomes a function of the quality of the sense of community that an employee experiences within groups at work. Freud indicated that this creation of community within the group and the organisation, serves as a binding function, and within that employees have constructed opportunities for "... psychic discharge that may or may not be available within the actual task system" (Czander, 1993). Organisations need to be aware of the human need to create and, therefore, need to allow opportunities that permit employees to relieve frustrations; that is, they need to take into account how employees seek to gratify subliminal instincts, whether this be via expressing creative urges or via developing a sense of community. When these opportunities are not available, incidents such as the following may occur: high absenteeism, conflicts with authority and the displacement of negative feelings onto other members of the organisation. Group, for example, can displace internal negative feelings, such as fear of failure, onto other groups. If work is seen as a means to reduce tension, assert feelings of adequacy, allow opportunities for creation and achievement, and as a means to sublimate instincts in whatever areas are of primary importance to the individual or group, then of critical importance to consider "... are the opportunities to displace and compromise psychic wishes of drives by using one's role" (Czander, 1993, p.128). "As such the focus needs to be on how engaging in work activities wards off the instincts and how engaging in work prevents neurotic disturbances" (Czander, 1993, p.29).

In terms of identifying with a leader, Freud maintained that relations are established through identification of the follower's ego with the leader. This can lead to group cohesion where "... all members introject the same object into their ego ideal and then identify with each other" (Czander, 1993, p.21). Freud investigated this when he looked at the dynamics associated with leader-follower relations. According to Slipp (1993, p.47), Freud indicated that the unifying bond of the group was "... the libidinal attachment of the members to each other and to the leader. Like an object of love, the leader was perceived in an idealized fashion". In this way, the members identify with the leader who is internalised in the member's ego ideal. This internalisation thus overrides the functioning of the ego and the functioning of the superego, thereby leading members to suspend critical judgement and intellectual functioning. This identification can be based on envy, the development of the superego as an aggressive response against authority or as a way of keeping internal aggressive drives in check, or projection. These dynamics can be seen within intergroup functioning in the idealisation of the group of the leader, or within organisations where entire groups might idealise the leader of the organisation.

Another theory worth considering within the development of psychodynamic theory, is the object relations theory. Melanie Klein was one of the major contributors to the theory of object relations. This theory developed out of Freud's one-person psychology, the libido (drive) theory, into a two-person interpersonal approach (Slipp, 1993).

2.1.2 Melanie Klein's object relations theory

The focus here is not on the infant's need to discharge or control instincts, but on a need to relate to the mother. In order to understand personality as a foundation for understanding social life, it is essential to consider how the individual develops from infancy to maturity (Klein, 1985). According to Klein (1985), emotions of love and hate towards the mother are bound up with the young infant's capacity to project all emotions onto her, making her into a good as well as a dangerous object. The theory focuses on the importance of "...an individual's relations with actual (external) and fantasized (internal) objects" (Czander, 1993, p.44). This theory views sex and aggression, as opposed to innate drives from a psychoanalytic perspective, as one of the many ways in which a person responds to needs of being attached to, related to and being connected to other objects – objects been seen as people, organisations, work (Czander, 1993). According to Colman (1975a), the way in

which the child developed awareness of the world around him or her is reflected in the way the adult develops a group consciousness. For the adult, the "... loss of individuality that is part of profound group experiences is tempered by an awareness of pressure by the group to conform and the loss of the self's ability to respond beyond the limits of the role dictated by the group" (Colman, 1975a, p.39). In intergroup functioning, groups can limit themselves in how they relate to other groups. This can potentially lead to situations where groups either hold onto their identity too rigidly or do not hold onto that identity at all. In this way, the identity is not negotiated; it becomes confirmed and sometimes dictated in relation to other groups.

Klein believed that an individual sees the world in terms of internal concerns; that is, one's experiences in the world reinforce some anxieties and diminish others (Czander, 1993). One of the main perspectives of this theory lies in the approach to work and the capacity to work, which evolves from a child's relationship with his or her parents. In the work environment, an individual can project or displace internal conflicts onto work activities or external conflicts - in an attempt to gain some control over internal anxieties - and feel some degree of relief. This displacement, obviously, serves some purpose and has several advantages for that individual. In a mature individual, however, the ego mediates the relationship between the external and internal worlds of good and bad objects, according to Miller and Rice (1975), and the need for projection is diminished.

According to Miller and Rice (1975) and Klein (1975), the value of the object relations theory within group dynamics lies in the following:

A baby makes no distinction between what is inside himself or herself and what is outside. The ego is yet to develop which will assist him or her to differentiate between his or her feelings and their causes. What he or she feels about an object becomes an attribute of the object itself. He or she "projects" feelings onto it. If the object gratifies, it is liked, if it frustrates or hurts, it is bad and it is hated. In struggling to deal with these contradictory attributes, the object is split into good and bad. This process of dividing feelings into differentiated elements is called splitting (Halton, 1994; Slipp, 1993). "By splitting the emotions, children gain relief from internal conflicts" (Halton, 1994, p.13). Projection often accompanies splitting and it involves locating feelings in others rather than in oneself. By reading about and through play, for example, the sly fox, or the jealous, bad witch, the child

learns to resolve these conflicting feelings (Halton, 1994). In developing, the child learns that the same object may satisfy at times and frustrate at others (Miller, 1976; Miller & Rice, 1975). The introjection and projection processes are bound up in the fantasy life of the infant and all his or her emotions. The internalised objects of good and bad nature, therefore, initiate development of the superego (Klein, 1975). The tendency, though, is for most adults to continue to split the good from the bad in themselves and project their resultant bad feelings onto others. This is one unconscious reason we form and join organisations; organisations allow us - through splitting and projection - to locate, difficult and hated aspects of ourselves in some "other" (Stokes, 1994b). This in itself is a cause of major intergroup and interpersonal conflict - conflict that becomes ineffectual because adults struggle to accept that the "bad" is also in themselves; "...the difficulties of accepting that love and hatred can be felt for the same person are intensified in the relations between managers and members' of the enterprise they manage" (Miller & Rice, 1975, p.54). According to Miller (1976), it is difficult to cling to a mature view that the same object may partly satisfy and partly frustrate. In relations between groups, this splitting can encompass a situation where one group is not able to integrate and work with the "bad" in themselves. They, therefore, project this "bad" onto other groups. These other groups are then treated as though they are this "bad", thus the projecting group dissociates themselves from it.

By projecting oneself or parts of one's impulses and feelings onto another person (projection), an identification with that person is achieved. The emphasis, therefore, is on attributing to the other person some of one's own qualities. According to Klein (1985), by taking an object into the self (introjection), the emphasis lies on acquiring some of the characteristics of this object and on being influenced by them. By attributing part of our feelings to another, we are able to identify with and understand that person. Excessive projection, however, leads to a situation where the person loses himself or herself in others and little objective judgement is possible. If projection is predominately hostile, real empathy and understanding of others is impaired. If groups receive hostile projections, it is difficult for those receiving groups to openly and honestly work with and in that interaction. In response they might become more distinct, more theoretical or even hostile. A space around emotional processes needs to be created, so that a focus on reducing the stresses and enacting change can be actioned (Halton, 1994). The above concepts can be utilised in terms of understanding intergroup relations and unconscious institutional anxieties and the defences against them.

A more detailed explanation of some of the central concepts of this theory is given below. The discussion will focus on the processes of projection and introjection.

2.1.2.1 Envy

According to the object relations theory, when an infant feels hungry or neglected, his or her frustration leads to the fantasy that milk and love are being deliberately withheld (Klein, 1985). Suspicion is the basis of envy, that is, possession of an object is desired and there is an urge to spoil another's enjoyment of the coveted object. Klein (1975) indicates that envy is the angry feeling when another person possess and enjoys something desirable with "... the envious impulse being to take it away or to spoil it" (Klein, 1975, p.181). Remaining envious of those qualities that an individual wants but feels doubtful about attaining, are further ways to attempt to reduce and / or contain internal anxieties, according to Czander (1993). In a current and highly competitive organisational climate, difficulties in collaboration can often come from the sense of being an inevitable loser in a struggle. "Often the survival anxiety of the less successful section stimulates an envious desire to spoil the other's success" (Halton, 1994, p.15). This can manifest in a number of ways, such as withholding necessary information or by actively sabotaging. Groups can undermine each other when trapped in dynamics of envy, and could withhold crucial information, for example, which may lead to situations where other groups under perform due to this sabotage. Groups may also fear, envy and victimise individuals, within the group, who maintain their individuality; thus a fear of being envied might also be prevalent. According to Main (1985), this aspect may lead to a situation of generalisation where everybody collusively seeks similarity others and all are regarded as having identical needs and rights. According to Klein (1985), the capacity to fully enjoy what has been received, and to experience feelings of gratitude towards the person who gives it, strongly influences the character and relations with other people; "the ability to admire another person's achievements is one of the factors making successful team work possible" (Klein, 1985, p.16). Being able to accept that other people have more ability in certain areas, allows a sense of pride and pleasure to be taken in working with those people; this allows different talents to come to the fore when necessary. Where greed and envy are not excessive, an ambitious person can find satisfaction in helping others to make their contribution. This is essential when groups are aiming to work together. This requires an acceptance and respect for the skills and competencies that other groups can bring.

2.1.2.2 Projective identification and countertransference

According to the psychoanalytic view of institutional functioning, an individual's personal unconscious plays a subsidiary role; the main focus being the link between individual behaviour and the institutional dynamics. To explain further, Halton (1994, p.16) states that "...it is often easier to ascribe a staff member's behaviour to personal problems than it is to discover the link with institutional dynamics". The link is essential, however, and can be made using the concept of projective identification, which refers to an unconscious interpersonal interaction in which the recipients of a projection react in such a way that their own feelings are affected. According to Klein (1975), identification by projection implies a combination of splitting off parts of the self and projecting them onto or into another person. The process helps to explain a variety of "emotional" reactions that arise when people work together (Czander, 1993). In the defensive position of projective identification, the person tries not only to enter the object but also to control it by controlling the object's reaction and behaviour. This process leads to the recipient acting out the countertransference derived from the projected feelings. In other words, "...they unconsciously identify with the projected feelings" (Halton, 1994, p.16). This dynamic will often remain until the recipients realise that they are trapped in a countertransference response and take action to reconnect with their real feelings, attitude and behaviours.

This dynamic can also operate through identification of one group on behalf of another in which the one group acts as a "container" for the emotions which the first group does not realise or own. The group becomes a "sponge" for all the feelings that the first group is not ready to own. The group carrying the transference may be used to express or export aspects which allow the first group not to feel themselves (Halton, 1994). Groups could, for example, relate to each other in such a way where one group carries the success of the organisation and another group the failure. Neither group then are ready to own both success and failure; they act as though they can only contribute one or the other.

2.1.2.3 Paranoid-schizoid position

The process of splitting is used as a predominant defence against pain, according to Halton (1994) and Miller (1993). According to Klein (1975), the mechanism of splitting is one of the earliest ego mechanisms and defences against anxiety. Klein referred to this as the paranoid-

schizoid position: any "badness" experienced comes from the outside and this is referred to as the paranoid, while schizoid refers to the process of splitting. According to Klein's research (Klein, 1975), this is a normal stage of development in early childhood and could reoccur during adult years (Halton, 1994). According to Bion (1967), an individual's part-object relationship within himself or herself and with objects that he or she deems are not part of himself or herself can be seen in the use of a phrase such as "it seems". This phrase refers to a feeling that these parts are of himself or herself yet not seen as part of his or her self.

There are some significant areas of this theory which relate to the individual within the work environment, especially in terms of superior-subordinate relations. Splitting, projective identification and idealisation can be precipitated by failure at work, disappointment, regression, insensitive behaviour from others et cetera. These processes involve the splitting of an object into good and bad aspects; the internal "bad" is seen as coming from another or that other individual is seen as "all good" (Czander, 1993). "Paranoid defences involve denial and projection of aggression so that it is experienced as coming from outside oneself in the form of persecutors" (Roberts, 1994a, p.116).

In some cases, the paranoid-schizoid position can manifest in the clients as the originators of projections with staff groups as the recipients (Halton, 1994). The staff members may represent different aspects and possibly conflicting psychological needs of the client. This serves the same purpose as before – to produce a state of illusory goodness and self-idealisation – to contain anxiety by splitting off and projecting outwards parts of the self that are perceived as bad, who can then be criticised (Halton 1994). The client, for example, might take up a paranoid-schizoid position by projecting feeling of doubt and a low perceived value of themselves onto staff. Staff groups are then criticised for being seen as incompetent. Generally these processes are present to a greater or lesser extent; what becomes important is to manage and achieve some balance within these processes. In other cases, the splitting process can occur between groups within the organisation. Structural divisions are effective organisational processes but can lead to projections of negative images. Halton (1994, p.15) states: "the gaps between departments or professions are available to be filled with many different emotions – denigration, competition, hatred, prejudice, paranoia.", and "each group feels that it represents something good and that other groups represent something inferior". Relations between groups then become based on projection, which can lead to attitudes of superiority and inferiority, for example. The behaviours follow these attitudes and thus

groups structure their relations between each other on the basis of these created attitudes. The stereotypes build quickly especially because less contact leads to a greater scope for projection, leading to avoiding of contact, and assumptions and self-idealisation based on these projections are increased, according to Halton (1994). In this position, problems are not stated, and there is little curiosity about causation, according to Roberts (1994a). Until the groups can name the danger, the anxieties will continue to be displaced. This denial as an organisational defence undermines people from thinking and therefore bringing about any change (Cardona, 1994).

The normal maturation shift is from the paranoid-schizoid position, which involves fragmentation and denial of reality, to the depressive position where integration, thought and appropriate responses to reality are possible, according to Obholzer (1994a). At this point, reality is accepting and the nature of anxieties clear, as opposed to defensively blocking the reality.

2.1.2.4 Depressive position

According to Klein in Halton (1994) and Lawrence (1998), the depressive position involves a stage of integration where feelings that were previously separated can be integrated into a whole. Klein (1975) links the onset of depressive anxiety to the beginning of a relation with part objects. "...the basis of depressive anxiety is the synthesis between destructive impulses and feelings of love toward *one* object" (Klein, 1975, p.35). According to Mawson (1994), the feelings shift from a fear of what others are doing to us to what we have done to others. She calls this "depressive", because it means giving up the "... comforting simplicity of self-idealization and facing the complexity of internal and external reality..." (Halton, 1994, p.14). The depressive position may be any stage of the integration process where the individual realises that all emotions can and need to be integrated, and that the complexity of internal and external realities needs to be confronted (Halton, 1994). This process inevitably stirs up feelings of guilt, concern and sadness. According to Czander (1993), the depression results from a feeling that the good object will be lost. Depressive anxiety can relate to ways in which individuals experience change and subsequent loss in an organisational context. Mawson (1994) indicates that feelings of genuine concern, guilt and the realities of our insufficiencies need to be contained. If the individual can tolerate these emotions for long enough and then contain the anxieties that might surface, it may be possible to bring about

change. Bion (1962) also indicates that the ability to recognise the fantasy of projective identification is related to the degree to which a person has the capacity to tolerate frustration. In this position, "...omnipotent fantasy, obsessional ritual and paranoid blaming can give way to thinking; one can seek to know, to learn from experience and to solve problems" (Roberts, 1994a, p.118). In order for this to materialise, the source of the projection needs to become known and the emotions and anxieties need to be contained so that the emotion and anxiety can be worked with (Halton, 1994). The unbearable needs to be made bearable – criticism, for example, needs to be seen as constructive. In order to contain the tendency towards splitting in one group, the other groups "... must be able to hold together the conflicting elements projected into them, discussing and thinking them through instead of being drawn into acting them out" (Halton, 1994, p.18). According to Czander (1993), integrating persecutors and idealised objects will lead to a stronger ego functioning. "If people can contain the idealised object, they will be less afraid of their own aggression and will experience less anxiety; thus the ego will be less likely to split and will be more able to differentiate, that is to see the object as having both good and bad qualities" (Czander, 1993, p.50). If a group, therefore, is seen as an ego identity, possible splits could relate to acting as if the power and authority of the group is contained in other groups. Subsidiaries of organisations, for example, could act as if the power and authority is held in the head office. What would need to be integrated is the power and authority of the subsidiary into that subsidiary so that they could strengthen their own ego functioning and negotiate the boundaries of power and authority.

2.1.2.5 Reparation

Reparation for the potential outcomes of destructive behaviours is also a way to attempt to reduce and/or contain internal anxieties, according to Czander (1993). Guilt stirred up by awareness of integration gives rise to feelings of reparation for injuries caused by previous hatred and aggression, according to Halton (1994); "...it is the drive to effect reparation, partly conscious, but largely unconscious, that is the fundamental impetus to all creative, productive and caring activities" (Roberts, 1994a, p.115). According to Klein (1975), the strong feelings of guilt relate to the fact that aggressive impulses are felt to be directed against the loved object. The experience of depressive feelings, in turn, has the effect of integrating the ego, because it makes for an increased understanding of psychic reality and better perception of the external world, as well as "... for a greater synthesis between inner

and outer situations (Klein, 1975, p.14). Genuine reparation includes an element of facing the damage done with a realisation that it cannot be undone. Manic defences are, however, directed at denying that damage has been done and at a fantasy that repair and reparation will be total, complete with no aftermath or consequences. When manic reparation fails, which it often does because of its impractical approach, the individuals or groups often use obsessional defences to control the anxiety. This leads to a sense of inner deficiency if failure or even limited success is achieved. The hope is that the group or individual has sufficient "internal goodness" to repair damage in others (Roberts, 1994a). Inevitably, this type of "failure" is encountered in any organisation and the way in which groups defend themselves against this is reflective in the "unspoken" rules of right and wrong. The consequences or retaliation of "failure" against individuals or groups, for example, and the fear of the retaliation of failure could lead to a lower risk taking culture.

Intergroup relations, therefore, can be affected by the way in which contact with other groups is sought. Frustration and conflict inherent within these relations cannot always be avoided and internal tension can build specifically when the focus is on attempting to change other groups. These attempts, though, can be impossible especially within hierarchical and bureaucratic organisation (Czander, 1993). Frustration with the failure of these attempts can lead to anger and hostility, destructive behaviour and subsequent withdrawal from these relations or from specific groups. Groups, for example, could focus on trying to change the way other groups work and trying to influence other groups to make changes. Instead, the focus could be on trying to change internally and thereby enacting some shift. In this way, outward behaviour manifestations become a mask or a false self and, in part, can be seen in an attitude of superiority, an attitude of coldness, indifference or awkward gregariousness, which could be a defence against an internal feeling of incompetence. This specifically develops when the real self or group becomes "...detached and atrophied..." (Czander, 1993, p.70) and genuine needs and wishes of that group are not attended to. This aspect of the way groups relate can be seen in examples of falseness and niceties which could be used to cover feelings of insecurity and aggression. Groups might not be experiencing genuine feelings of belonging and adding value to the organisation, which might translate into behaviours of seeking to control and undermining or underplaying the performance of other groups.

The value of incorporating the above two theories with the open systems theory, discussed in the following section, is that it leads to a richer understanding of the possibilities open to the

behaviour of groups in relation to each other. The psychodynamic approach specifically includes system theory in that organisations have a conscious and unconscious life of its own, with subsystems relating to and mirroring one another (Koortzen & Cilliers, 2002). Unresolved conflicts in groups can be denied or repressed, but will continue to reflect in the behaviour of a group and in the relation of that group to others.

2.1.3 The open systems theory

According to Wheelen (1994) and von Bertalanffy (1972), the open systems theory, attributed to von Bertalanffy, is based on the idea that dynamic systems exist through a continuous and dynamic exchange of components. Organisations exchange information and physical and human resources. "These exchanges may explain how groups become more alike over time" (Wheelen, 1994, p.135), and how the same events begin to happen at the same time in different subsystems within an organisation. According to Wheelen (1994), the mental or behavioural characteristics of individuals are influenced by the physical and social conditions operating in their environment. The interrelationships between individuals and their environment affect the psychology of those individuals, the groups within which they operate and the broader social environment. "...the well-being of individuals, groups, and the totality of the social environment are interdependent. A functional, mature group facilitates the effectiveness and maturity of individuals within it, and vice versa" (Wheelen, 1994, p.127).

According to Wheelen (1994), systems work to achieve equilibrium and thus attempt to reduce dissonance and bring basic beliefs, norms and behaviours into alignment. A part of this process is one of developing shared perceptions and assumptions of how other groups or subsystems are operating. This leads to predictable patterns of behaviour and an ability to predict the responses of others. In an organisational context, this allows interacting groups to coordinate activities and to work towards common goals. It also explains why destructive processes, for example, are carried through the organisation and reflected in different groups.

The open systems made it possible to simultaneously look at the relationship between social and technical aspects of work, the relationships between the part and the whole and between the whole and the environment (Miller, 1993). According to Miller (1997), complementary to the open systems model was the development of this socio-technical system, and it drew attention to the informal organisation which sometimes supported and sometimes subverted

the performance of an organisation. Organisational effectiveness thus depends on meeting the needs, both overt and unrecognised, of individuals and groups. Miller (1997) indicates that this influence was literally incorporated into the name of the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations and was certainly the main focus of the first few projects.

2.1.4 Wilfred Bion and the development of the psychodynamic approach

Stokes (1994a) writes that Wilfred Bion was a major contributor to the understanding of unconscious processes in groups. His first work on this theme was when he studies the processes of small groups in the army during World War II. He later continued these studies at the Tavistock Clinic. He developed a framework, based on these studies, for analysing basic and irrational processes within the dynamic of group life. Later, Bion focused specifically on the relationship between the individual and the group. He subsequently worked more with the internal processes within the individual, and provided a foundation for working with the two (the individual and the group) as distinct but "... not mutually incompatible..." entities. (Stokes, 1994a, p.20). According to Miller (1976), both Klein and Bion highlighted the struggle for individualism; "The rational, mature aspects of individuality have constantly to be asserted against a potential alliance between primitive emotions within oneself and external group processes" (Miller, 1976, p.21).

"Our experience of being and working in groups is often powerful and overwhelming. We experience the tension between the wish to join together and the wish to be separate; between the need for togetherness and belonging and the need for an independent identity" (Stokes, 1994a, p.19). According to Astrachan and Redlich in De Loach (1998, p.2), there is a discomfort in the feelings of uncertainty and helplessness, which leads to a consciousness of "the need to belong and the wish to be separate, the danger of being isolated and the panic at being engulfed...". Individuals seem to fear being overwhelmed by the basic assumptions. Rioch (1975b, p.23) indicates the following: "Man seems to be a herd animal who is often in trouble with his herd". Many aspects of group life revolve around this tension, with the group having difficulty in recognising the reality of mutual interdependence. According to these authors, therefore, occasional ineffective and self-contradictory behaviour seem to be common in groups. Eisold (1985, p.45), cites examples where the pressures of group membership indicate how members, if they could interpret behaviour and "... were they granted a moment of objectivity, would recoil in embarrassment from the meanness they

casually uttered out of the security of membership" and where "... membership makes people complacently stupid." Oftentimes the tensions overwhelm the individual and became the "... source of irrational group behaviour" (Halton, 1994, p.18).

Bion focused on how individuals make emotional contact with the group, and on the inherent conflict within the processes of fragmentation and integration. According to Eisold (1985), Bion's research uncovered and structured information about the anxieties associated in joining a group and the subsequent primitive impulses that are unleashed in group settings, such as primitive fantasies, characteristics of the paranoid-schizoid position and fantasies of personal fragmentation and persecution. A regressive process, for example, enables an experience of a loosely assembled collection of vaguely differentiated parts of an entity that has the potential to be whole and integrated. In contrast "...to see the group as a group, consisting of members or part objects rather than separate whole objects, is to regress in our object-relatedness to that point in development prior to the 'depressive position'" (Eisold, 1985, p.39). This duality stems from the continual effort of the ego to integrate its self-image with its ideals and actual behaviour, and to integrate reality with fantasy and impulse, which cannot easily be sustained when the material it has to work with is as disparate as a group setting operating at many different levels. (Eisold, 1985). The anxiety centres around a kind of panic out of a disintegrating self losing its capacity to right itself and can sufficiently account for the degree of restless desperation necessary to produce basic assumption behaviour. Projective processes can then be seen as primitive attempts to relieve internal pains by externalising them. Bion's observations also indicated the ways in which groups create casualties in order to serve their basic assumption needs, according to Hausman (1975). In this way, the behaviour of group members was interpreted as representing an aspect of the group; an aspect which a particular member may be "holding" on behalf of the group.

Bion's motive was to understand behaviour in groups as expressions of collective, shared or parallel fantasies. According to Eisold (1985), he, therefore, focused on interpreting individual behaviour only as it expressed developments of the group as a whole. Bion's focus was to understand how relatively healthy people expressed themselves in groups and on those who wanted to learn more about group dynamics, especially as they related to problems of leadership within bureaucratic organisations. (Shaffer & Galinsky, 1974). According to Miller (1993), understanding how individuals get caught up in their own unconscious

processes allows them to learn how to exercise their own authority and helps them gain greater influence over their environment. According to De Loach (1998), the focus of these studies was to provide opportunities to experience and study group and organisational processes in the context of the interpersonal and intergroup interactions, and to increase understanding of the effects of these processes on the ability to exercise authority and to work effectively on shared group and organisational tasks.

In summary, the psychoanalytic perspective provided a starting point from which to work with groups, taking the irrational and the rational into account. Both Freud and Klein developed insights into understanding the development of the human personality, and how past experience impact current perception. These perceptions translate into dynamics and behaviours which can be observed when individual or groups interact. The value of the open systems theory lies in an awareness of the interrelationship between systems and between parts of the system. The psychodynamic approach started applying the above to group life and more and more to organisational life. The investigation into the shared fantasy of group life and the metaphorical existence of these subconscious dynamics was the beginning of the real value of this approach.

In terms of the groups under study, the following working hypotheses can be generated:

- The dynamics of the interaction between the two specific groups under study can be reflected in the hierarchy of the rest of the organisation, that is, between other junior groups and more senior groups.
- Anxiety about being good enough, achieving enough, and being competent enough can be contained via projective processes (specifically the paranoid-schizoid position and projective identification). Boundary role groups seem to take up some of these projections, and are seen to be not good enough, not achieving enough and not competent enough.
- The subgroups within the organisation seem to idealise the leaders; they uncritically accept the direction of the leadership.
- There seems to be a real reluctance to support real learning in individuals and groups. The emphasis seems to be on encouraging and forcing conformity. The conflict, though, seems to be a concurrent encouragement of new and creative ways of doing things. These messages are covert and this seems to create more confusion. This

seems to lead to a vacillation between the depressive and reparation, and projective processes.

The Tavistock model of group relations as developed within the psychodynamic approach is now discussed.

2.2 THE TAVISTOCK MODEL OF GROUP RELATIONS

The Tavistock model developed out of work done at the Tavistock Clinic, which was founded in 1920. The Clinic was founded by a number of professionals who believed that neurotic disorders labelled as "shellshock" were not only related to the peculiar stresses of war, but were now endemic and pervasive in modern society (Mosse, 1994). The post-war period brought about a refinement of the social focus and attempted to integrate various other theories, such as the psychoanalytic object relations theory, that had proved relevant. In 1947, The Tavistock Institute of Human Relations was formed to focus on research into various group-related projects. These included research into productivity levels, the connection between the subjective relation to work and work outputs, and research into the function of the social systems in the workplace. In this respect, one of the major perspectives incorporated is systems theory. This view sees an institution as "... having boundaries across which inputs are drawn in, processed in accordance with a primary task, and then passed out as outputs" (Mosse, 1994, p.4). The researchers at the Institute, among them AK Rice and Eric Miller, applied the concepts of systems thinking to most work groups in that all groups need to manage boundaries and work to define their primary task.

Thus, the two main perspectives that form the basis of the Tavistock model are drawn from the social sciences and from psychoanalysis. From a social sciences perspective, the thinking is that an organisation is a social system that creates a structure which relates to the execution of its primary task. According to Mosse (1994), the structure and the technology both need to be understood, as does the interface between them. The understanding needs to revolve around what the structure actually is, what is observable, and what it is intended to be. The thinking drawn from the psychoanalysis point of view revolves around the people who make up the organisation. People bring unconscious and nonrational aims and needs to the organisation, but must also service the rational aims of the organisation. The value of studying organisational behaviour from this psychodynamic approach includes the use of the

open systems theory, which demonstrates the interrelation of subsystems with each other and the interrelation between those subsystems and the broader system (Koortzen & Cilliers, 2002). The benefit of bringing these two perspectives together, psychoanalysis and systems, relates to the three-dimensional manifestation of human behaviour and the impact individuals have on groups and the subsequent impact on subdepartments, departments and organisations.

According to Shaffer and Galinsky (1974), Miller (1993) and Wheelen (1994), Bion identified the two main tendencies of group life as work revolving around the primary task – workgroup mentality or sophisticated group – and often unconscious avoidance of this primary task – basic assumption mentality or basic group. These tendencies can be seen as on opposite sides of a continuum and can be thought of "... as the wish to face and work *with* reality and the wish to evade it when it is painful or causes psychological conflict within or between group members" (Stokes, 1994a, p.20). According to Eisold (1985), individuals are part of two groups: the first group to carry out an assigned task, and the second group to feel as if those individuals belong and have an accepted place. In other words, the focus is on the group and the group task. In a workgroup mentality, the focus is on group members who carry out their primary task and want to see the results of their efforts. In the basic assumption mentality, the group's behaviour "... is directed at attempting to meet the unconscious needs of its members by reducing anxiety and internal conflicts" (Stokes, 1994a, p.20). The underlying emotional processes in groups are, therefore, both antagonistic to and essential to the conscious and sophisticated purposes of its individual members (Bion, 1975a). Basic assumption activity requires no training or experience and makes no demands to cooperate, but only depends on a valency toward that particular activity, according to Bion (1975b). Behaviour geared towards emotional needs and anxieties is thus viewed as being rooted in early experiences and having manifestation in unconscious fantasises, according to Gould (1991). Shared assumptions within groups are then seen as regressive, defensive operations used in order "... to cope with psychotic anxieties brought on by the fragmenting, boundary dissolving effects of the group process" (Colman, 1975a).

At different times, groups are dominated by different needs. In terms of the aim of the basic assumption of dependency (baD), the need is to attain security and the members act as if they are inadequate and immature (Rioch, 1975b). The group really wants the leader to take care of it and relieve its feelings of inadequacy and insecurity. In this case, the group relies on one

individual. With the basic assumption of fight/flight (baF), according to Rioch (1975b), the assumption is that the group has met in order to preserve itself and that this can only be done by fighting someone or something, or by running away from someone or something. The leader, who is deemed appropriate, is one who will mobilise the group to attack or lead it in flight. As far as the basic assumption of pairing (baP) is concerned, the assumption is that the group has met for the purposes of reproduction in the hope of bringing forth a new, as yet unborn leader in the future. The three basic assumptions, including the fourth (added by Turquet) are covered in more detail in the next section.

In summary, the value of the Tavistock model lies in some understanding of group life, specifically the tendency of groups to work within the dynamics of "workgroup" and "basic assumption group". In terms of the groups under study, the following can be hypothesised:

- There seems to be a strong tendency to operate on the extremes of this group life behaviour. The groups might be interacting with a strong "workgroup" mentality for a short while and then regressing to strong "basic-assumption" mentality for a while.
- It could be that the seeming inability to work with and resolve issues lies in the lack of awareness the groups have of their dynamics and the impact that these dynamics may have on individuals and groups.

2.3 BASIC ASSUMPTIONS OF THE TAVISTOCK MODEL OF GROUP RELATIONS

According to Cilliers and Koortzen (2000), the worker (a micro system) approaches the work situation with unfulfilled and unconscious family needs which he or she wants to fulfil in the work situation. The worker unconsciously plays out a need for power over colleagues in order to receive these unfulfilled needs from the organisation. These unconscious and unresolved needs lead to the worker experiencing conflicts, because the role of the organisation or leadership does not include relating to the worker as a parent. Since the need cannot be fulfilled in this work situation, confusion, anxiety, anger or aggression can be experienced by the worker, and may manifest in ineffective, basic assumption activity.

This basic assumption activity can be recognised from activities such as discussing apparently trivia as if they were matters of life and death (Stokes, 1994a). There might also

be little capacity to bear frustration and quick solutions are favoured. In such cases, external reality is ignored. "Effective work, which involves tolerating frustration, facing reality, recognizing differences among group members and learning from experience, will be seriously impeded" (Stokes, 1994a, p.23). The group might, for example, close itself off, deny a questioning attitude or ignore new ideas. The group is orientated inward, towards fantasy which is then impulsively and uncritically acted out. According to Turquet (1985), the groups are self-contained, closed systems demonstrating little desire to know. Knowledge might cause embarrassment and disturbance in the internal harmony of such a group. "There is little pausing to consider or to test consequences, little patience with an inquiring attitude, and great insistence upon feeling" (Rioch, 1975b, p.28). The group also seems to embrace this emotional reaction, have poor memories and are disorientated toward time; they tend not to learn or to adapt, but actually resist change - although they may shift from one basic assumption to another. The basic assumption activity is itself unstable and continually shifting (Eisold, 1985). According to Turquet (1985), basic assumption groups come into existence spontaneously with no expectations to be fulfilled. As such, they operate on an "as-if" basis. According to Rioch (1975b), the group does not want to own ideas or statements. "There is a kind of conspiracy of anonymity, which is facilitated by the fact that identities and names get mixed up; statements are attributed falsely or vaguely" (Rioch, 1975b, p.28). The basic assumptions seem to be the disowned part of the individuals and often a person takes on a role within the basic assumption group and then gets fixed in that role which the group uses for its own purposes. Bion in Slipp (1993) indicates that there are three forms of basic assumption groups, with a fourth added later by Turquet. These are now discussed.

2.3.1 Dependency (baD)

The extent to which a group operates from the basic assumption of dependency, is reflected in the way the group lives "...for and through its leader" (Shaffer & Galinsky, 1974, p.180). Here the group creates a leader in order to be nurtured and comforted, according to Eisold (1985). Group members relate little to each other, but seek all need satisfaction through the leader who is seen as omnipotent. According to Koortzen and Cilliers (2002), the assumption is that the worker or group experiences dependency from an imaginative parental figure or system, and like a child, the worker, unconsciously wants to depend on the imaginary parent, leader or system. Groups can, therefore, behave as if its primary task is to provide for the "...satisfaction of the needs and wishes of its members" (Stokes, 1994a, p.21). Bion (1975b)

indicates that the group meets as if the purpose is to be sustained by a leader on whom it depends for nourishment and protection. The expressions of a need for structure and/or attention are projections of the anxiety and insecurity (Cilliers & Koortzen, 2000). According to Rice in Lofgren (1975), the members merge before a leader who is going to take care of the difficulties and by the process of projective identification all skills are located in him and the group becomes progressively deskilled. The leader is expected to look after, protect and sustain the members of the group, that is, to make them feel good, and not lead them to face the demands of the group's real purpose. The expectation is that the leader can solve all difficulties, but that the group cannot. In this way the leader is idealised (Rioch, 1975b). This dynamic can be played out, for example, between groups, and in hierarchical structures between senior groups and junior groups. The relations between the two can sometimes be seen in terms of dependency with a junior group wanting to separate from a senior group, but also wanting to maintain dependency on the senior group. In this way, a junior group might want the senior group to tell them what to do, how to do it and how to be in order to be accepted and included.

The group will often put someone forward who is sick to try to get the leader to take special care of this person. The objective is, however, not to get that person cared for, but to get the leader to relieve the group's feelings of inadequacy and insecurity. The leader can collude with this by not focusing the group on the real purpose, thereby inhibiting the group from growth and development (Rioch, 1975b). Since no-one can really fill this role, the leader can never succeed in fulfilling these expectations. "In failing to be omniscient and omnipotent leader of these people who are presenting themselves as inadequate weaklings, he inevitably arouses their disappointment and hostility" (Rioch, 1975b, p.25). At this point, the group will search for alternative leaders, which is a role many might take up in order to prove that they can do something the previous leader could not. Turquet (1985) indicates that the failure of a leader in a BaD is inevitable, so the process of finding leaders and rejecting them continues. Often there is conflict within the group in competing for a fair share of parental attention. There is also often conflict "... between the desire to express feelings irresponsibility and the desire to be mature and consider consequences" (Rioch, 1975b, p.25). Miller (1993, p.262) indicates the following: "We are ashamed when we discover the dependency we have invested in institutions and frightened when we have to take it back". Rioch (1975c, p.174) writes that the group will try and manipulate the leader to take care of them, while also fighting angrily because they resent their own attitude of helpless dependency.

2.3.2 Fight/ Flight (baF)

Shaffer and Galinsky (1974) indicate that the fight/ flight dynamic would arise from a need for action. The authors describe it as a "...defensive escape into activity for its own sake" (Shaffer & Galinsky 1974, p.180) and according to Stokes (1994a) the members will do either indifferently. The assumption, according to Cilliers and Koortzen (2000), is that the here-and-now of the organisational life is filled with anxiety and, in trying to get away from this, the worker uses fight or flight as a defence mechanism. The fight/ flight assumption operates from a need to preserve the group at all costs, even if some of the members are destroyed in the process. Action is essential whether for fight or flight, and preserving the group is more important than the individual (Rioch, 1975b). Groups need to have developed some cohesiveness and a group identity in order for members to recognise that the group is more than the sum of its parts, and for the preservation of the group to be valued. As such, group survival outweighs the importance of individual member survival; the fantasy element is that if the group dies, so does the individual (Shaffer & Galinsky, 1974).

The group leader is seen to embody either the evil that must be fought or the power needed to fight the evil (Eisold, 1985). Thus, projective identification with the group leader is critical (Lawrence, 1998). The group members look to the leader to decide what to do, wanting only to follow and not to participate in the decision. The leader here is one who is felt appropriate to this kind of group and can mobilise the group to action. He or she should be expected to be a bit paranoid, because it is essential to find an enemy to fight or lead in flight from. This kind of group is anti-intellectual and generally against the idea of self-study or self-knowledge (Rioch, 1975b). Often the kind of stagnation that could be reflected in the relations between two groups can be seen as a manifestation of this basic assumption behaviour. The groups might, for example, continuously ignore the knowledge that is necessary to introduce new approaches or methods, and instead use their energy to fight a perceived enemy or in flight from anxiety. Bion in Rioch (1975b) indicates that covert or overt action can be observed. Covert action can manifest in activities used to circumvent the task, while overt action could manifest as panic, flight and uncontrolled attack; "... panic does not arise in any situation unless it is one that might as easily have given rise to rage. When the rage or fear are not offered as a readily available outlet, frustration arises which in

a basic assumption group cannot be tolerated" (Rioch, 1975b, p.27). Flight offers basic assumption groups an opportunity to meet demands for immediate satisfaction.

2.3.3 Pairing (baP)

The assumption is that in order to cope with anxiety, alienation and loneliness, the group or individual tries to pair with perceived powerful groups or individuals (Cilliers & Koortzen, 2000). The unconscious need is to create and to feel secure. This basic assumptions pairing group, according to Shaffer and Galinsky (1974), is a focusing of the group on a pairing of two group members. The group assumes that this pairing will lead to something better; something will be born out of this partnership that will save the group. The focus is on a future event which will solve the problems of the group. According to Eisold (1985), the group creates this pair in order to establish leaders that will produce a new solution. This obviously allows for a defence against the difficulties of the present. The group lives in hope that things will improve next time (Stokes, 1994a). Shaffer and Galinsky (1974) write that an atmosphere of optimism, attentiveness and expectation indicates that the group has focused on the pair and that this basic assumption is operating. An atmosphere of hopefulness is prevalent (Rioch, 1975b; Bion, 1975b). Shaffer and Galinsky (1974) make it clear, though, that for this assumption to continue operating, the result of this pairing must only exist as a promise and not the actuality of a birth. If this birth does take place, whatever it is that is born will surely be rejected by the group, as this idea of a "saviour" exists only in the fantasy of the group. This basic assumption could also take place in relations between groups; a group, for example, wanting to pair with a perceived more powerful group in order for the first group to feel more secure. Pairing also implies splitting up and can manifest when the group is anxious about diversity, for example. The group then tries to break the group into smaller subgroups in order to feel secure, according to Cilliers and Koortzen (2000).

2.3.4 Oneness and me-ness

A fourth basic assumption added by Pierre Turquet to Bion's initial three, is oneness. Shapiro and Carr (1991) describe oneness as being about the hope that members of a group could join with an omnipotent force and "...surrender the self for passive participation and thereby feel Existence, Well-being and Wholeness" (Turquet as cited in Shapiro & Carr 1991, p.174). As Turquet (1985) writes, the members seek to join in a powerful union with an omnipotent

force which is unobtainably high. The authors make the point that behaviour of reliable interdependency that cannot be managed may regress into a shared fantasy of oneness. This fusion is, however, seen as a deeply irrational sense of loss, against which the individual will simultaneously fight for and fight against.

Me-ness, an additional basic assumption, relates to the dynamic whereby the individual feels pressed into his or her inner reality and does so in order to exclude and deny the perceived disturbing reality of the outer environment (Koortzen & Cilliers, 2002). In this case, the group works as if the only members that can be related to are those present, because the assumption is that the group has no existence and the shared in-the-mind concept of the group is that of an undifferentiated mass. The individual's reality is that of personal boundaries that have to be protected from others. The group is seen as something threatening and persecutory. Intergroup relations between junior and senior groups in a hierarchy, for example, can play out this kind of assumption with members of the junior group struggling to find balance between inclusion in the senior group and their own individuality. The senior group to be joined is seen as threatening, leading to a need to relate with individual members of only that group.

In summary the four basic assumptions activities relate to ways that groups manage anxiety. Groups use group members in order to receive unfulfilled needs from that group or from the organisation. Organisations also use groups to carry aspects that the organisation as a whole cannot. The following working hypotheses can be developed regarding the groups under study:

- The sense of stagnation and a feeling of continuously dealing with the same problem issues, could be related to basic assumption activity of dependency. The stagnation is perhaps related to a sense of a fear of autonomy and of not wanting to take responsibility. This could relate to a sense of feeling responsible without the adequate authority to follow through on those areas. This could lead to the feeling that the leader/s must take care of them.
- It could be that the focus on petty issues, with a perceived disregard for long-term issues, relates to fight/flight basic assumption activity. In this sense, this seems to impact a lack of focus on new ways of working and a fear of taking risks.

- It seems as though the lack of effective teaming and lack of support relates to a basic assumption activity of oneness. It could be that this unrealistic need to join an omnipotent force, translates into fight between groups as to who is worthy of this union.
- It could be that the excessive focus on controls, rules and regulations is an activity focusing on fighting the lack of control the groups feel they have. This could be reflective of the basic assumption activity of fight/flight.

The basic assumption mentality, as described below, can be used effectively.

2.4 EFFECTIVE USE OF THE BASIC ASSUMPTION MENTALITY

One of the realities of organisational constructions is that basic assumptions will operate in all groups at some time to a greater or lesser extent. In this regard, Bion talks about the "... *sophisticated use of basic assumption mentality...*" (Stokes, 1994a, p.25). The theory is that a group may mobilise the emotions of a basic assumption in the pursuit of a primary task. This is termed valency, according to Rioch (1975b), and refers to the individual's readiness to enter into combinations with the group in acting on the basic assumptions. According to Rioch (1975b), everyone has some degree of valency, and using the model can assist in recognising and thinking of useful ways to allow this to manifest constructively. When this mentality is operating at a constructive level, it is valuable to bear in mind that we can never, or we may not want to, eradicate all basic assumptions; the most we can do is to manage the emergence of this mentality. It is, therefore, "...the leader's skill in mobilizing and channelling these emotional forces that most often makes the difference between success and failure in the task" (Shaffer & Galinsky, 1974, p.182).

Managing underlying difficulties by denying and repressing is a disastrous course of action according to Obholzer (1994a). What we can do is gain awareness of "... underlying anxieties and fantasies [which] enable us to manage ourselves and our systems in such a way as to make improved use of resources, both psychological and physical" (Obholzer, 1994a, p.169). The objective is for groups to learn to recognise these unconscious needs and to mobilise the most appropriate one for the task at hand (Rioch, 1975b). According to Obholzer (1994b), it is also important for an organisation to know its own valency in order to be

prepared to manage both the resultant strengths and weakness as manifested in group relations. In this regard, an awareness of these dynamics and manifestations allows the organisation, the group and/or the individual to actively make use of this in order to learn. A distinction, for example, can be made between a helpless dependence that drains real work and effectively using a dependable person to lead.

Individuals are drawn to professions and groups by their unconscious valency or their disposition towards one basic assumption rather than another. A particular work environment then becomes an opportunity to work through unresolved issues. Within groups, the different mentalities that make up a team can be seen as the inevitable psychological clash between the sophisticated use of the three basic assumptions. Each group contributes different values, views, the cure, progress and different perspectives about which process and which basic assumption will best serve the primary task. The conflict arises when the emotional motivations from each group and/or profession differ. This does not mean that there cannot be cooperation, only that the process for clarifying and agreeing on goals, purpose and process needs to operate from this emotional level as well. The difficulties are that once this emotional level is accessed, the slant of the sophisticated use of the basic assumption could change and "...aberrant forms of each emerge" (Stokes, 1994a, p.25). Furthermore, according to Stokes (1994a), each basic assumption in its aberrant form, can produce a particular culture. Aberrant baD, for example, gives rise to a culture of subordination and autocracy, requiring unquestioning obedience. Aberrant baP produces a culture of collusion, supporting pairs of members in avoiding rather than recognising. Aberrant baF results in a culture of paranoia and aggressive competitiveness where the group is preoccupied with the external and internal enemy, requiring the development of rules and regulations to control the "bad" enemy both out there and within. In these cases, the means are explicit, while the ends have become vague. The continuation of the group at all costs becomes an end in itself. Once dominated by continuous basic assumption activity, leaders, members and groups lose their ability to act, think and decide effectively. They tend to become more and more self-involved and concerned with maintaining relatedness to the group or with other groups, rather than focusing on the primary task.

The mature work group, according to Rioch (1975b) and Rice (1975), expect their leaders to mobilise the appropriate assumption for task performance. The primary task needs to be defined in the context of the purpose of each group, taking into account the culture or

sophisticated basic assumption from which they are operating. If the appropriate assumption is dependent, for example, the leader has to be dependable but realistic. If pairing is the assumption, the leadership needs to be powerful and creative, but needs to take into account the limitations of that power. If the assumption is fight, leadership needs to be appropriately aggressive, but not foolhardy; if the basic assumption is flight, the leadership would have to be able to lead the group away from difficult situations, but is not necessarily cowardly. Similarly, groups as a whole can manifest effective use of these basic assumptions. If a junior group (in a hierarchy), for example, wants to learn from a more senior group, the basic assumption could be one of dependency. This could be used either constructively or destructively. The junior group could become completely reliant on the senior group and completely depend on that group to provide for all their needs, as opposed to the learning needs only. In this case, therefore, the senior group would need to be dependable but clear about the boundaries of that dependency. In pairing, for example, the groups might relate in terms of pooling resources in order to achieve something more; in a fight/flight scenario the groups might relate in terms of fighting to change something or actively decide to leave something as it is. In all cases, the balance of the quality of leadership needs to be found within each group and in some situations, one group will need to take on that leadership function and in other cases, the other group will need to.

It is important, therefore, for groups to have insight into their reasons for choosing particular professions, which creates an awareness of blind spots, valency for particular defences, and vulnerability to particular kinds of projective identification. As mentioned, all defences cannot be "corrected", so emphasis on managing these and the manifestation thereof becomes an imperative tool (Roberts, 1994a).

In summary, being aware of inner conflicts and unresolved issues allows development with and from these points. Acknowledging the valency groups have in certain areas, could allow for better management and increased growth. The following hypotheses can be developed regarding the groups under study:

- The focus on what other groups are doing incorrectly could relate to a lack of awareness of the interrelationship and interaction between subgroups within the organisation, and a lack of awareness of the valency and value these aspects could bring.

- The constant focus on facts, figures and detail could relate to a lack of awareness of the valency these groups have to focus on these areas.

2.5 BASIC HYPOTHESES OF INTERGROUP RELATIONS WITHIN THE ORGANISATION FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE TAVISTOCK MODEL OF GROUP RELATIONS

From the viewpoint of exploring intergroup behaviour within organisations there are some aspects that need to be discussed. These are the aspects of fantasy, metaphors and relatedness.

2.5.1 The fantasy

A central theme of psychoanalytic theory is the relation between mental life and fantasy. Social psychologists suggest that, generally speaking, everyone wishes to increase their socioeconomic status; as a rule, this is achieved through work (Czander, 1993). When the gratification of the fantasy is not obtained, this is not given up but stored in the ego ideal. This capacity to keep the fantasy allows an individual to continue to work in spite of the numerous injuries experienced. The ego protects these fantasies from the danger of disillusionment. One way to cope in such an environment is withdrawal, that is, to become detached from the work environment. This theory relies on the separation of the superego from the ego ideal and is an extension of the classical psychoanalytical theory. It can explain employee relationships with other aspects of work such as authority, membership in a social grouping, the capacity to delay gratification (the ego can delay gratification if it is able to avoid the experience of imperfection, which is experienced as injury), work inhibitions (Czander 1993, p.92). This might also explain the individual response of competitiveness to bureaucratic systems made up of pyramid-shaped structures. All these imply that if one succeeds, it is only because someone has failed; guilt, therefore, predominates over shame. In Japanese organisations, for example, shame predominates over guilt, competition is less apparent and individualism is devalued. Intergroup relations can be dominated by this aspect, where the competitiveness between the groups overrides the ability of those groups to feel that they can succeed by their own effort only. Success becomes measured in terms of the fantasy of the other group's failure.

"Like individuals, institutions develop defences against difficult emotions which are too threatening or too painful to acknowledge" (Halton, 1994, p.12). There can be great resistance to assigning influence to the unknown and underplaying the part played by the unconscious. We do not know what it is we do not know and it becomes safer to deal with the more objective work related variables, according to Colman (1975b). Emotions may arise in response to external threats, internal conflicts, the nature of work or social change. One of the main defences is denial and resistance, according to Halton (1994). A complex form of resistance, according to Shaffer and Galinsky (1974), is a form of collusion, whereby groups play a "game" of dependency. Healthy institutional defences enable groups to cope with stress and develop through their work, although some defences can obstruct reality, hinder individual growth and impede the organisation from fulfilling its primary task. Recognising the role of fantasy and the unconscious allows an understanding of how this can be used to work constructively.

2.5.2 Metaphors

The method of analytic inference, as applied by the psychoanalytic approach, includes a crucial aspect of intuitive understanding, which is as "... crucial to 'scientific' knowledge as are facts and laws" (Czander 1993, p.130). It is nothing more, though, than "...drawing from that vast reservoir of material all that one knows but cannot tell" (Czander 1993, p.120). This implicitly becomes a difficult task, because one is constrained by one's own biases, defences and inhibitions which limit the ability to see clearly. "In addition, one often does not trust what is seen or felt, and thus relies on others and so-called more objective things to help deal comfortably with the unknown" (Czander, 1993, p.132). According to Edleson in Czander (1993, p.133), "... a psychoanalytic interpretation is a hypothesis about the situation under investigation...", and use can be made here of symbols as metaphors which allows the investigator to interpret "... that which bonds or stabilizes a group or a collective goal-directed effort" (Czander, 1993, p.133). These metaphors can convey an underlying belief system that keeps employees together, and often is a motivational force which determines when a particular employee joins or departs from an organisation. These metaphors are normally below our cognitive or perceptual threshold and usually express primary processes of our existence. It is, therefore, sometimes seems hard to use our powers of observation or our memories of how things could be done in order to bring about change. What prevents one from doing so can, to a large extent, be found in the perspectives individuals bring to the

work environment, the perspectives they bring to the groups they belong to as well as the organisations they are part of. The inherent question is whether being a part allows individuals to observe or understand that institution while being caught up in the anxieties inherent in the work environment and the institutional defences against those anxieties. According to Mosse (1994), this leads to a shared and habitual way of seeing things; newcomers may see more clearly, but have no licence to comment – by the time they do, they have either forgotten how to see, or have not learnt to. A process of inclusion or merging of group boundaries, for example, can lead to groups surrendering their viewpoint for the express purpose of being seen to conform.

Interpretation of metaphors and investigation into "what is really going on" can reduce defences and open possibilities into new ways of thinking, feeling or judging. "Psychoanalytic change occurs as a result of an improved differentiation between self and others, an increased capacity to function autonomously, the experience of less anxiety when faced with ambiguity, and an increased capacity to move away from the oppression of judgement, evaluation, and subordination, which will eventually permit employees to make decisions with a greater sense of dignity and freedom" (Czander, 1993, p.142). Recognising metaphors and what they mean can be invaluable to assist groups to work together more effectively. If groups could, for example, understand their defences and the reasons for the existence of those defences, they might be far more comfortable to venture into this "unknown" and find new ways of relating and learning.

2.5.3 The organisation in the mind or relatedness

According to Stokes (1994b), Pierre Turquet introduced the idea of the organisation "in the mind" while working with the Tavistock Institute of group relations. This refers to the concept or idea of the organisation which each individual carries with him or her. According to Hutton, Bazalgette and Reed (1997), the organisation-in-the-mind is what the individual perceives in his or her head of how activities and relations are organised and structured. It is an internal model relying on inner experiences which gives rise to outward responses. The authors indicate that individuals take in or introject aspects of what is happening to them from people and events to form internal objects and part objects. In order to face the fears and anxieties of the real world, and for a variety of other reasons, some of these objects will be conscious and others will be suppressed.

Stokes (1994b) indicates that groups from different parts of the organisation may have different ideas about the organisation. "The organization is coherent to the extent that there is also a collective organization-in-the-mind shared by all members" (Stokes, 1994b, p.121). These ideas may contradict each other or they may corroborate each other. Either way, the ideas will influence behaviour and feelings of groups and will tend to affect the way those groups relate to each other and to the organisation. A junior group, for example, might work with a senior group in the same way as they see that senior group working with the organisation. In other words, the junior group seem to carry an idea, about the organisation, in their minds, which they then apply to the senior group. How these ideas or interactions manifest relates to how the primary purpose of the organisation is manifested.

In summary, the themes of fantasy, metaphor and relatedness are central to the psychodynamic approach. One way of dealing with the anxiety of the work environment and group life is to withdraw into fantasy to protect the ego from injury. In this way, "reality" is not dealt with and groups remain stagnant. Groups then keep themselves together by creating and recreating these perspectives and confirming them via experience. Metaphorically this stagnation can be reflected and observed by groups once they see past and wider than their existing group perspectives. Regarding the groups under study, the following can be hypothesised:

- The sense of separation between work and person could perhaps relate to a process of protecting the self from injury and remaining stuck in the fantasy of incompetence and helplessness.
- It seems as though the groups use the metaphors of competitiveness and stagnation to confirm the difficulties of working within this organisation. This seems to translate into a despair of how the groups could effectively work together within this organisation.
- The groups seem to be very powerful in moving together and in confirming the organisation in-the-mind concept which could be of a rigid hierarchy with related rules and regulations.

2.6 CHAPTER SUMMARY

In this chapter, a literature review was conducted in order to start exploring intergroup relations from a psychodynamic perspective, thus answering the first research question and completing step 1 of phase 1 of the research method. Use was made of the contributions of Freud and Klein (psychoanalytic perspective), the open systems theory, and Bion and the Tavistock model of group relations. Basic assumptions of that model were covered as well as valency. Included in the discussion were the central themes of fantasy, metaphors and relatedness. The perspective that intergroup relations are affected by each groups' relation to an object, was discussed and how this relation is transferred in behaviour to relationship with other groups. Groups can either work effectively with this transference or destructively and how they work and learn from these dynamics leads either to an effective or ineffective use of basic assumption behaviour.

The next chapter will cover a literature review of the specified constructs within the framework of the psychodynamic approach and the Tavistock model of group relations.

CHAPTER 3: MANIFESTATIONS OF INTERGROUP RELATIONS IN AN ORGANISATIONAL CONTEXT

As per the objective (research question 2) of this chapter as described in chapter one, this chapter will describe, in more depth, specific concepts within the Tavistock model of group relations that have been identified as possible underlying factors that affect intergroup relations - on a conscious and unconscious level - between two groups within a specific organisation (phase 1, step 2). Working hypotheses will be discussed using these concepts of boundary management, authority and projective processes.

3.1 BOUNDARY MANAGEMENT

All members of an organisation have a need for clarity of task of the organisation, clarity about the authority structure and the opportunity to participate and contribute to the organisation. In addition, those in authority need to be psychologically informed so as to be aware of the risk to workers, to have an openness toward consumers and to have an attitude of taking public accountability according to Obholzer (1994a). In order to contain anxiety, there is a need to have clarity on boundaries, the primary task, clarity on authority structures, clear and open communication, and open forums for effective debate (Obholzer, 1994c).

The following is an outline of the definition and purpose of boundaries and this management of boundaries. Task boundaries, covering primary task and anti-task, and group boundaries, covering negotiating boundaries both within and between groups are discussed in more detail.

3.1.1 Definition and purpose of boundaries

Any system has a boundary which separates it from its environment and thus every part of an organisation or group system operates inside and across boundaries (Cilliers & Koortzen, 2000). Boundaries, therefore, delineate the parts of and processes within those systems (Schneider, 1991). According to Bexton (1975) and Wasdell (1997), since organisations are open systems, they are involved in exchanges with their environment. According to Miller (1993), the boundary across which information flows in and out of the open system, separates this system from and links it to its environment. The boundary then marks a discontinuity between the task of the organisation and the tasks of other systems in the environment with

which it transacts. It also indicates a relatedness between these systems (Miller, 1993) and within these systems (Schneider, 1991). "Because these relationships are never stable and static, because its behaviour and identity are subject to perpetual renegotiation and redefinition, the boundary of an enterprise is best conceived not as a line but as a region" (Miller, 1993, p.11).

Organisational boundaries also have a further purpose and that is to control anxiety in order to make the workplace controllable and pleasant (Cilliers & Koortzen, 2000). As an open system, therefore, information must be allowed to come in and leave across the boundary; the boundary needs to remain functional in this interaction, despite the potential for stress. If the boundary is ruptured, according to Ashback and Schermer in Czander (1993), the organisation's container is "unable to hold" and the employees no longer feel safe. Rules, regulations, roles and structures that provided the security are perceived as fractured. Regressive responses such as wishing for security, control and comfort from an omnipotent leader might result. Another regressive response might be projection of annihilation fears outward against a perceived enemy, which might result in the construction of a belief that the organisation is all powerful and better than anyone else. Boundaries, therefore, need to vary with respect to the degree of openness or closeness they have with their environment (Czander, 1993). In rigid, hierarchical and bureaucratic organisations, for example, boundaries between groups are followed according to rules and regulations. In unusual situations or situations requiring a quick response, those boundaries will need to be negotiated and renegotiated. If, however, groups have not had to learn how to do this, the boundaries can become ruptured as the groups might not have any experience in this negotiation process. Groups might, therefore, feel threatened and anxious, and the regressive reactions might undermine the way the groups can work together.

3.1.2 Management of boundaries

According to Schneider (1991), the managing, establishing and negotiating of boundaries needs to occur at both the intrapersonal and interpersonal levels. Cilliers and Koortzen (2000) indicate that since the individual, group and organisation interact as parts of a total system, they all have boundaries; the boundaries of both the individual and the group, therefore, need to be considered within the organisational context (Miller & Rice, 1975). Lofgren (1975) and Czander (1993), write that an individual develops by establishing the personality system as a

separate entity with a well functioning boundary across which intake and output is possible. As such, personality boundaries can be threatened in the intense interchange with another person. According to Miller (1993), the boundary region can be equated with the ego function – the inner world includes conscious experiences, emotions, attitudes and skills which can be mobilised via the ego function in order to pursue a certain goal. The inner world can also be made of part objects which are the residual representations of earlier experiences of relations with other. The mature ego can differentiate between what is real in the outside world and what it projected onto it from the inside; what could be accepted and incorporated into experience and what could be rejected. "... the mature ego is one that can define the boundary between what is inside and what is outside, and can control the transactions between the one and the other" (Miller & Rice, 1975, p.54). As such, the ability to separate self from others and the external world, and to see objective reality with clarity, leads to optimal functioning (Czander, 1993). The systems theory thus provides for the recognition of the reflection of intra and inter personal, and intra and inter group processes; the recognition that any transaction between any members of the group affects the group as a whole (Redlich & Astrachan, 1975) and recognition of fundamental intragroup processes which reflect other external intergroup processes (Czander, 1993).

Boundary management is crucial, therefore, to separate and relate to what is inside the organisation and what is outside the organisation. Since a complex system may include several identifiable subsystems, all with boundaries, through which the various processes of an organisation are carried out (Miller & Rice, 1975), boundary management must include managing the organisation as a whole as well as managing the different subsystems within that broad structure (Roberts 1994c). If boundaries between groups are not managed, the task or identity of that group may become confused and the focus of effort is undermined by attempts to bring clarity on what the group contributes and what they represent to the organisation. The relations between groups are affected by the fact that each department has an impact and is impacted by each other; activities of each are, therefore, dependent on each other (Czander, 1993). Since boundary management includes managing those boundaries surrounding the systems as well as those surrounding the subsystems, the relationship amongst and between the subsystems makes for either collaboration and health, or imbalance, stress and dysfunction (Czander, 1993).

Boundaries, both physical and social, can emphasise differences with resulting competition and status hierarchies, according to Colman (1975b), and these differentiating boundaries will provide information concerning continuity or discontinuity of intersystem regulation and maintenance (Czander, 1993). "The primary purpose for developing subsystems is to differentiate" (Czander, 1993, p.341), and this differentiation/specialisation increases the ability of the organisation to work effectively and efficiently. Differentiation can be defined as the capacity to cognitively isolate boundaries within organisations which include those around the system, to isolate boundaries that separate subsystems and those that separate work activities and work related relationships (Czander, 1993). Boundaries are often be defined too broadly, thus creating overlap and redundancy, or too rigidly, which leads to excessive differentiation and fragmentation (Schneider, 1991). Boundaries must, therefore, be managed in order to contribute to the effectiveness of each department and also to contribute to the wider goal of the organisation.

The organisation and the individual can thus be seen as open systems engaging in continuous transactions with an environment, each with a boundary region regulating interaction between the inner world and the environment (Rice, 1976; Miller, 1993). The most important aspects of boundaries, namely task and group boundaries, will be discussed in the following sections.

3.1.3 Task and group boundaries

"Everything that can be defined as set apart from the background in time and space must be bounded in some way" (Lofgren, 1975). Examples of basic boundary management include time, space, task, and group identity. Dealt specifically here are task boundaries and group boundaries.

3.1.3.1 Task boundaries

Every organisation must maintain some control of the boundary region if it is to perform its task (Astrachan, Flynn, Geller & Harvey, 1975). Task boundaries within organisations are contained in job descriptions and organigrams, and refer to knowing what the work entails and according to what standard the work should be done, according to Cilliers and Koortzen (2000). Task boundaries, therefore, contain the anxiety about knowing or not knowing what

to do. Miller (1976) indicates that task systems are systems of activities plus the human and physical resources required to perform such activities.

Realistic task definitions increase the capacity to tolerate depressive anxieties, according to Roberts (1994a); coherent thought and the capacity for problem-solving are only possible when depressive anxieties and thus reality can be tolerated. According to Czander (1993), task systems are delineated by boundaries, and dysfunctions in any task system is a function of ambiguity in these boundaries. Clarity on task thus needs to be contextualised within the overall task of the organisation, that is, the primary task of the organisation (Obholzer, 1994a).

"Task constraint is generally apparent when subsystems define their primary task(s) or their work in ways that are different from those of other subsystems, or at odds with the task(s) of these other systems" (Czander, 1993, p.235). One subsystem may constrain the task of another subsystem and can be seen as the inability of a subsystem to be a part of the overall coordinated effort of the organisation; this inability can be viewed as a function of internal dysfunctions (Czander, 1993). Ineffective management of and focus on primary task can, therefore, lead to anti task behaviour. In intergroup relations, for example, one group can undermine the task boundary and therefore the primary task of another group when the groups are involved in anti-task behaviour. Factors such as envy of a group and projection of issues onto another group divert energy away from effective work; energy is then instead used to maintain these unconscious feelings and projections. Primary task and anti-task behaviour are now discussed in more detail.

a Primary Task

Focusing on the primary task can be a valuable starting point for assessing the intergroup relations in place at a particular point in time. Any organisation has a primary task which may shift temporarily in times of crises, or permanently, due to changing conditions. This can affect the "ordering of multiple activities" (Roberts, 1994c, p.30). According to Czander (1993), how the organisation or leadership supports the requirements of each task will also determine the amount of stress and conflict the organisation experiences.

Where there is failure with the definition of primary task, there are likely also to be problems with boundaries, according to Roberts (1994c). Rice in Astrachan et al (1975, p.193), states the following; "While organizations may perform several tasks simultaneously and these tasks may lack a settled order of priority that persists over time, every organization has one task, a *primary* task, that it must perform in order to survive." Unless organisational structure and policies are related to the primary task, the organisation must either collapse or redefine its primary task. When an organisation has limited control of its own boundary and input system, it often finds it necessary to ignore the boundary between itself and its environment, sometimes allowing that area to be controlled administratively (Astrachan et al, 1975). Poor boundary management can lead to a case where this boundary gets transformed into a barrier, in order to pursue its task with relatively limited interference from what is often perceived as an encroaching, manipulating environment. Boundaries can then shift internally, thereby focusing on narrowed areas of task, which could unduly separate that system from the environment. The environment could also constrain the organisations' ability to work on its tasks, and this according to Miller and Rice (1975), may lead to expectations from the environment of the primary task of an organisation which differ from or impose constraints on an organisation's definition of its primary task. The result, therefore, of not defining a primary task leads to a lack of clarity of where and how boundaries need to be maintained. Without an understanding of the context within which tasks must be performed, boundaries can become rigid, ineffective and established for the purpose of managing subsequent anxiety. In intergroup relations, therefore, if groups are not clear about their primary task, they might be unable to understand how their tasks are related to the tasks of other groups. Without this context and this understanding of the "bigger picture", it becomes difficult for groups to work together effectively.

According to Rioch (1975c), an effective working group requires a task or goal which seems accomplishable and about which there is some reasonable consensus on the part of the members. According to Miller and Rice (1975), conflict about how different subsystems or different groups define their primary task may lead to conflict between subsystems. Pursuit of multiple tasks implies intrastaff or intergroup conflict. Stokes (1994b) writes that an organisation may have a publicly stated purpose or mission, but often individual or groups may have different and underlying ideas about or of this purpose. In other words, organisation may be explicit about "this is what we do" which might contradict with "this is what we say we do", but there could also be other levels of "what we really believe we are

doing" as well as "what is actually going on". Often this last level is relatively unconscious and so can affect the materialisation of the organisation's purpose. Miller (1993) indicates that the primary task might be seen as the sophisticated task, but also might encompass other tasks undertaken by the group of which its members are either aware or not aware. The idea of the primary purpose that groups or individuals have, may impact the organisation or groups can work with the primary task (Miller & Rice, 1975). Roberts (1994c) also writes on this. The normative primary task is the official task which is the operationalisation of the broad aims of the organisation. The existential primary task is the task people within that organisation think they are supporting, and the phenomenal primary task is the task that can be inferred from people's behaviour, according to Lawrence in Roberts (1994c). Lawrence (1985) indicates that the tension and conflict within the normative primary task of organisations is often manifested within the phenomenal task – that which is inferred from behaviour. Looking at these differentiations can highlight the "...discrepancies between what the organisation or group says it sets out to do and what is actually happening" (Roberts, 1994c, p.30). This can help to clarify how each subsystem does or does not understand, support and/or actualise the purpose of the organisation; it also highlights the extent to which the subsystems either understand and support or do not understand and support each other. Stokes (1994b) mentions an example from the prison service: three competing views of its purpose highlight contradictions in the manifestation of purpose. These could be containing dangerous criminals, punishing those who have broken the law, or rehabilitating those who operate outside of societal law. These conflicts often manifest as power struggles over theory and highlight the feelings of powerlessness that a group has in fulfilling their purpose externally (with the client), or internally (within the organisation). In intergroup relations, it is thus important that groups constantly check their collective understanding of the task, in order for their actions to be coherent.

Any decision of action (ie materialisation of purpose) needs to take into account the conflicting ideas of purpose and, therefore, the competing roles, according to Stokes (1994b). In terms of the purpose of the organisation, decisions taken on specific aspects can impact different groups in different ways, since they all might have different views on the primary task (Miller & Rice, 1975). If the conflicts are not acknowledged, ineffective stress could result. Often this conflict will lead to a "restructuring" of groups or the organisation as a whole, in the hope that a physical restructuring will restructure the unphysical conflict of primary purpose.

b Task and anti-task

Turquet in Roberts (1994c, p.31) writes that when "... a group does not seek to know its primary task, both by [task] definition and by feasibility, there is likely to emerge either dismemberment of the group, or the emergence of some other primary task unrelated to the one for which it was originally called into being". This *anti-task* is typical of groups under the sway of basic assumptions, as opposed to the primary task which corresponds to the overt work-orientated purpose of Bion's sophisticated work group. Even though he states that "Both are about survival" (Roberts, 1994c, p.31), the basic assumption activity is about facing the demands of the internal environment and anxieties about psychological survival, while the primary task relates to survival being about facing the demands of an external environment. Examples of anti-task behaviour could be a dynamic of competition between groups, feelings of a need to assume power over another group, attempts to generate feelings of dependency of one group on another or projecting feelings of inadequacy onto another group. These kinds of behaviours take energy away from a focus on a clear primary task and allow the focus to fall on this anti-task. This undermines the capacity of groups to find ways to work together effectively.

Different task groups are often set up to deal with certain issues or projects. These groups can either work effectively with the task at hand, or digress into anti-task activity. According to Bolton and Roberts (1994), all groups under stress tend to resist change, to seek "magical" solutions and to collude in fight or flight from their task. "Support groups can help contain the anxieties stirred up by the work, restoring the capacity to face reality, without which effective work is impossible" (Bolton & Roberts, 1994, p.164). It is helpful, though, to thoroughly assess what is necessary before agreeing on the type of group required (Bolton & Roberts, 1994). According to Bolton and Roberts (1994), the different names used for these sorts of meetings or groups can indicate some of the underlying assumptions. A group named "Training Focus Group", for example, would have a different connotation and perhaps operate from different assumptions to a group named "Training Support Group". The name as well as the underlying assumptions would, therefore, affect how that group relates to itself and to other groups.

It is also useful to differentiate between overt aims, that is, those that are conscious or public, and covert aims, that is, those unconscious aims which remain to be discovered. Groups are often thrown off course, that is, off task due to the unconscious or basic assumption mentality. Colman (1975b) writes about covert politics, which is "...the social field of alliances, pressure groups, and power influences operating within the design process in unexamined ways, unrelated to the overtly stated design determinants" (Colman, 1975b, p.313). These influences are not irrational in themselves, because they serve the conscious self-interest of the individual or groups. They are, however, irrational in relation to the task in that they have little to do with the objectives and task-orientated plans of the group. Covert politics, according to Colman (1975b), can be effective only if absolutely dependent on secretive relationships. Covert politics are, therefore, acknowledged but not discussed openly, as opposed to basic assumptions which are unconscious and unacknowledged. If the covert aims are overwhelming and driving an interaction, that interaction could be used as a container, which will allow the underlying covert feelings to disappear once the interaction has ended. It relates, therefore, to seeking to make something bearable, rather than looking for change, according to Bolton and Roberts (1994). An example could be a meeting; the overt aim is to find ways to cope with changes and to find ways to work with new leadership, whilst the covert aims could be to find ways to avoid conflicts over policy in decision-making meetings. A further example from Bolton and Roberts (1994): the overt aim of the support group is to provide a space where staff could discuss difficult feelings in order to regain a sense of direction and purpose, while the covert aim is to have time away from clients. The latter is anti-task activity. In intergroup relations, groups could relate to each other with an overt aim of sharing knowledge and learning, whilst the covert aim could be of establishing and confirming dependency.

The objective of looking at task and anti-task is for groups to recognise unproductive defences, and to question practices, behaviours and attitudes previously taken for granted. It is ineffective, therefore, to divorce the feelings from the practice, according to Bolton and Roberts (1994). The aims of any group thus need to be continually reviewed and the group needs to maintain a reflective attitude towards their feelings and behaviours, and then continuously work toward the overt and constructive task.

3.1.3.2 Group boundaries

Forming of group identities also requires boundaries in order to contain anxiety (Cilliers & Koortzen, 2000). In groups, boundaries define who is in and who is out, and includes a definition of belonging (Colman, 1975b). A group's identity is linked to its primary task and according to Roberts (1994a), this, by definition, must include something about being different to another group, about bringing something that another group cannot. According to Schneider (1991, p.172): "Boundaries in groups needs to be managed for the individual vis-à-vis the group and for the group vis-à-vis other groups." The development and ongoing dynamics of groups, therefore, reveal how boundaries are established and negotiated. When there is a break or disintegration of this boundary or group identity, the boundary of the group can become threatened, leading to anxiety and a lowered ability of the group to work effectively.

"When the system fragments, anxiety increases because of confused boundary maintenance, and discontinuity between subsystems will result in a greater degree of effort to bring about internal regulation and control" (Czander, 1993, p.348). Integration and cooperation between subsystems can be hindered with discontinuity (as opposed to differentiation), because subsystems are established for the purposes of creating an illusion of safety. The author describes this as a cognitive segmentation where the organisation does not "move" in collective agreement. Different attitudes and values could create different and competing subsystem cultures, with the result that each subsystem pursues its own goals often at the expense of the organisational goals. A great deal of energy, therefore, is invested in maintaining an illusion of safety and differences between subsystems. "This results in a 'we versus they' situation" (Czander, 1993, p.348). What needs to happen is that the leadership takes the responsibility of managing the boundaries away from the employees and assumes that responsibility themselves. If this fails, they allow boundaries to become confused or ambiguous, and regression to a dependent position is promoted. Now the work capacities are reduced, because "... they [the employees] must now engage in boundary work" (Czander, 1993, p.349). As Rice (1976) indicates, the effectiveness of every intergroup relationship is determined by the extent to which groups involved have to defend themselves against uncertainty about the integrity of their boundaries. Thus, when groups are focused on maintaining or guarding their boundaries, identity and/or group membership, it becomes almost impossible for those groups to interact with other groups without fear of being

overwhelmed, for example. Intergroup relationships, therefore, carry with it the possibility of a breakdown in authority, the threat of chaos and the fear of disaster. Relations thus need to include an ability to negotiate boundaries within a group and between groups.

a Negotiating boundaries within groups

According to Schneider (1991), early stages of group development revolve around individual boundary and control issues. Group membership includes negotiating individual boundaries, seeing the individual as part of the group and accepting the norms of that group. Negotiation or renegotiation of roles within the group or of that group in relation to other groups, also becomes necessary. If, for example, a group member feels that they can only provide value due to the fact that they are part of a group, it might lead to that member compromising aspects of their work in order to conform to that group.

According to Diamond (1991, p.192), a central aspect in group membership is the ability of the individual to maintain a balance between relative independence (personal identity and self-esteem) and group membership (a sense of belonging and affiliation). "Establishing a separate identity in a group is essential to ego integrity and emotional well-being" and includes a sense of independence and autonomy. An excessive yearning for belonging and for affiliation, can lead to the loss of self-other boundaries. "Group membership can give many feeling of omnipotence – being part of a group gives individuals a sense of being larger, greater, and better than they really are" (Diamond, 1991, p.192). Some individuals, therefore, will go to great lengths to maintain affiliation with a group; sometimes doing things they would not consider doing outside the group. At times, the demands for this affiliation represent a compensatory need for a sense of self and identity that is otherwise lacking. Individual regression could occur when the individual fears rejection from the group and the loss of affiliation that threatens his or her self-identity. According to Wheelen (1994), it is important in groups to be able to disagree without fear of rejection or retribution, as this increases rather than decreases cohesion and trust within groups. If this is not the case, defences that could be observed at the group level of analysis are projection, splitting and denial of internal difference.

Another boundary could also exist, according to Schneider (1991), namely that between fantasy and reality. "Groups could operate according to basic assumptions (fantasies)

regarding the purpose of the group that may not pertain to task performance" (Bion in Schneider, 1991, p.173). These could be fantasies of dependency, persecution or fight/ flight, salvation or pairing. In this way, group boundaries can be strengthened by the group in creating the variable needed in order to act out a particular basic assumption. Boundaries of groups can be strengthened and internal integration facilitated by identifying internal scapegoats or external enemies (Janis in Schneider, 1991), and conflict between groups could then be an indication of a need to enhance internal integration whilst reasserting the group boundary.

A common defence against anxiety is, therefore, to try to strengthen the emotional ties which bind a group of people together. This might include denying any differences which contributes to an indication of difference within the group. According to Mosse and Roberts (1994), this defensive dedifferentiation is an inability to acknowledge and debate internal differences, which makes it impossible for a group to do effective work. According to Diamond (1991, p.212): "Regressive work groups are characterised by an imbalance that favors group membership and affiliation over and above personal identity and autonomy" In this state, a group or team will be almost paralysed from making any decision, especially one involving a new direction or change in approach, because by doing so they would have to acknowledge disagreements about priorities or enter into debate about how work could be carried out. The group can unconsciously remain vague about policy and direction, so as to reduce the need to define and perhaps define differences within the group. For example: "Instead of overt conflict, there was muffled antagonism in the team, which occasionally erupted in the form of personal criticism rather than as debate about the work itself" (Mosse & Roberts, 1994, p.152). This is basic assumption activity. The result of working with this basic assumption mentality, oneness, is a belief that safety lies in the group staying alive, at the expense of individuality and growth. "The group cannot bear separateness, ambivalence, imperfection and other sources of depressive anxieties, nor risk the emergence of envy and rivalry. Hence, there is no room for healthy competitiveness or genuine mutuality, only for friends and foes." (Mosse & Roberts, 1994, p.153). According to Mosse and Roberts (1994), effective work requires differentiation, defining a clear task and allocating work according to skills and resources.

The sociotechnical systems model of Emery and Trist proposes that conflict occurs when the social and technical aspects of a system are not coordinated. The sentient function refers to

the social and emotional bonds among employees and the task function to the work or technical aspect of the system (Czander, 1993). According to Miller (1993), an individual requires group membership to give meaning, to confer status, to confirm a picture or identity of himself or herself and might use the group to express what could be seen as primitive feelings in the areas of dependency, hope and aggression. The individual thus finds supports in these sentient groups which may or may not correspond to the boundaries of the task group. Therefore, according to Czander (1993) the work itself is secondary under conditions of successful sentient functioning. If the employee perceives his or her fellow workers as friendly, supportive and interesting, the organisation will be similarly perceived; the work will thus be experienced as gratifying. The employee relates to his or her work when the sentient systems are merged with the task system. However, these systems are delicately balanced, according to Czander (1993), and most employees are more comfortable dealing with the dynamics resulting from that split as opposed to working with an integration of the two. Intergroup relations can be adversely affected by a struggle to negotiate boundaries within the group. Looking to strengthen group boundaries or identity, or attempting to strengthen internal integration could lead to a projection of anxiety producing aspects to other groups. Whilst groups are fighting to maintain their group identity in this way, less focus and energy is available for effective negotiation with other groups.

b Negotiating boundaries between groups

Each group membership carries a greater or lesser degree of sentience or emotional significance, according to Roberts (1994b). From this significance stems loyalty and commitment to the group aims. Conflicting demands sometimes place pressure on this loyalty; these demands and pressures may also change over time. This author indicates that when a new collaborative group comes together, its members identify themselves mainly with their home-agencies, that is, their home group membership. The home group membership can be defined as the primary reason for membership of an individual. When this is the case, loyalty of members to different homegroups is likely to be competitive, and the collaborative group may fragment. Members may, over time, gradually invest more in the collaborative group as its tasks take on more meaning and importance. Gradually, as the group builds more shared value-systems and personal relationships with other members, they may also become more committed to the aims of the collaborative group as opposed to the home group. This starts to happen when members spend more time in the collaborative

groups. "The effectiveness of collaborative groups depends largely on the members' ability to manage their dual memberships. Excessive commitment to either membership at the expense of the other will inevitably compromise task performance, and lead to problematic intergroup relations" (Roberts, 1994b, p.193). Successful collaboration relates to effectively managing dual memberships, delegating sufficient authority to the collaborative system, whilst not posing threats to the homegroup system (Roberts, 1994b). A meeting or confirmation of how each project will be managed becomes critical in deciding the following:

- the task of the collaborative group (which does not conflict with the primary task of the home group)
- confirming that aims and priorities of this new group do not clash with those of the homegroup
- members are committed to the collaborative group

Roberts (1994b, p.196) indicates that too much cohesiveness can lead to numerous and pointless interactions, to the pursuit of "cohesiveness" at the expense of individual initiative, or to the pursuit of too little cohesiveness which results in insufficient coordination of related activities and high internal strife. A lack of balance here could be a result of anxiety of the fear of becoming just like everyone else. In other words, the question of what differentiates members as this group is primary. Intergroup collaboration denotes harmonious working together, and should refer to a situation where groups of people work together, because their membership in broader groups overlap (Roberts, 1994b). This could become a problem of dual membership where the intergroup relations need to be managed, and according to Schneider (1991), can be problematic when the maintaining of the boundary of the group becomes more important than the task. In an example where one group reports into another group with the intention that, in time, the more junior group will be promoted into and thus become a part of the more senior group, there could be many conflicts about negotiating existing and new group boundaries. The intergroup collaboration needs to be about acknowledging the differences between the groups and the different contributions that both groups make. The group identities are conscious, open and clear and it is, therefore, not necessary to constantly attempt to confirm them. In this example the relations between these groups could be strained with the groups constantly trying to prove the existence of their identity (as if fighting against the possibility that this identity does not exist) as opposed to focusing on their task. This leads to further problems when the groups are attempting to

collaborate and ultimately form a new group together. If past identity and contribution is not acknowledged, it is unlikely that future contribution, as part of a new group, will be acknowledged either.

According to Diamond (1991), groups can respond to external pressures and subsequent potential rejection and loss of affiliation in different ways.

- A work group that is homogenised can respond by withdrawing and developing a schizoid group culture where social denial and ineffective reality testing occurs. The splitting is one of rejecting the "bad" possibly onto other groups and accepting the "good".
- A work group that is institutionalised, produces an externalised social defence system that contains the anxiety by submission to a formal hierarchical structure and impersonal external authority. Diamond (1991, p.202) indicates: "Bureaucratization and ritualization are institutionalized forms of control that promote dependency on rigid and routine impersonal structures." Group members, therefore, rely on the structure to control aggression and destroy anxiety. An illusion of stability, equality and dependability is perpetuated by rigid routines and impersonal office authority. Dependence on rules and regulations, and a reliance on authority leads to a lack of personal responsibility. There would also be an insistence on loyalty and an obsessional control of subordinate behaviour.
- The autocratic work group forfeits independence and separate identity for group membership, and identifies with an all-powerful leader from whom they derive control of their aggression and anxiety. Also reflected could be guilt arising from feelings of ambivalence and hostility toward the idealised object-person. Group members are guilt ridden and submissive. They either turn their aggression back on themselves or project it outside the group boundaries.
- The intentional work group is, according to Diamond (1991), what Bion refers to as the "sophisticated" group. This group is capable of reflection as a learning process, and supports the emotional wellbeing and competence of all group members. The group then uses acts of resistance and defence as opportunities for learning and developmental change.

Boundary management can, therefore, be seen as a dynamic process; it is closely related to issues of autonomy and control (Schneider, 1991, p.175). The way boundaries are established and negotiated, therefore, determines the appropriate levels of differentiation and integration assumed necessary for effective functioning. Boundaries are also necessary in order to encourage a certain level of autonomy; this is necessary for separation and development. Thus, when autonomy is threatened, boundaries are reinforced and made more rigid; there may then be less of a focus on negotiation. The author indicates that the following are necessary:

- Clarify boundaries in terms of roles, structures, function, units and in terms of competence in relation to other groups.
- Clarify a path for integration in terms of links, interdependencies, distribution of power, without a loss of effectiveness and capability.
- Develop structures that facilitate working towards a common organisational goal.
- Clarify boundaries that are appropriate to levels of differentiation and integration.
- Define and redefine boundaries in the face of internal or external pressure and change – this is a leadership role
- Encourage an outlook which sees the organisation and intergroup relations as networks, linked to areas of competence.
- Allow an interpretation of boundaries and allow perceptions of them to be verbalised.

In summary, boundaries can be seen as a region of operation which separates areas between and within systems. Within organisations, task boundaries are necessary in order to contain the activities of groups. When these boundaries are not managed effectively, the primary tasks of those groups can become confused and diffused. Activity could then regress into anti-task or basic assumption behaviour. Group boundaries also require a negotiation between and within groups. Groups need to be able to form quickly with as little ineffective internal conflict as possible. Groups also need to be able to relate effectively with other groups in order to remain focused on the overall and primary task and objective. With a current organisational focus on moving quickly in response to changing market demands, this negotiation needs to lead to more and more effective functioning. Basic assumption activity could lead to a lack of boundary management, leading to frustration and conflict. In terms of the groups under study, the following can be hypothesised:

- It seems that the more junior group work long hours of overtime; they experience feelings of frustration. This frustration could be from a lack of task clarity and focus.
- It also seems as though many individuals from this group leave the organisation at this point. This could stem from a lack of boundary management between the junior and senior groups, with a lack of understanding and awareness of how the groups could work together and eventually merge. (Which will be the case when the junior group is promoted).

3.2 AUTHORITY, AUTONOMY AND AUTHORISATION

A change in the conventional and hierarchical top-down organisations to an authority structure based more on negotiations between subgroups with fewer levels of hierarchy, brings a change in the way authority needs to be managed (Stokes, 1994b). The conventional hierarchy of organisations is being replaced by negotiations between subsystems within organisations with far fewer levels of hierarchy. This is a reflection of a recognition of the "...plurality of our society..." (Stokes, 1994b, p.125), with each group demanding representation and influence. Changes are seen in the acting out of authority, the relating to authority, the patriarchal and matriarchal characterisation of authority (Czander, 1993). These aspects impact how autonomy can be taken up and manifested by individuals and groups, and also how those groups might work with authorisation during the delegation process.

The nature of authority influences the structure the organisation adopts, the relationships between employees and the way in which work is accomplished. The outcome of such a change in focus leads to a necessary renegotiation of the primary task and the method by which this could be achieved (Czander, 1993). This change also necessitates changes in working with processes such as boundary management. According to Czander (1993, p.280), in the ideal, "... organisations are about creating structures designed to use the talents of members to accomplish tasks in ways that are respectful of and concerned about the preservation of one another's sense of self-worth and dignity". In rigid hierarchical structures, authority is often projected at the expense of creativity and innovation, relationships become pathological and destructive, and status is projected at the expense of others. The projection on higher levels of authority is now often redirected and projected onto different members within groups or onto different groups. By necessity, this leads to a need

to focus on how groups and individuals use their own authority and how they relate to the authority of the organisation.

A more in-depth discussion on the interlinked concepts of authority, autonomy and authorisation will follow. Discussed is authority from within, covering autonomy and dependency issues, including authority from below and ambivalence towards authority. Also included is a review on authority and power, issues associated with leadership and followership and internal dedifferentiation.

3.2.1 Internal authority; authority and power

Authority from within relates to how individuals or groups work with their internal authority in terms of their authority-in-the-mind. Authority and power includes a balance between taking up authority and subsequent power issues. A discussion on authority from within now follows.

3.2.1.1 Authority from within

According to Obholzer (1994b), authority from within, or autonomy, refers to a state of "in-the-mind" authority figures and affects to what extent and with what competence external institutional roles are taken up. In this respect, authorisation refers to a confirmation of authority from within individuals. Relations to inner world figures impacts individuals in the way they take up an authoritative role. Two outcomes might result. An authoritarian approach, which refers to a paranoid-schizoid position manifested by a situation of being cut off from the roots of authority and the processes of sanctioning, and by being driven by an omnipotent inner world process, or an authoritative approach which is a depressive state of mind in which the persons managing authority are in touch with themselves and their surroundings and are "... in touch with the roots and sanctioning of their authority, and with their limitations" (Obholzer, 1994b, p.41). A condition of "good enough" authority refers to a state of mind arising from a continuous mix of authorisation from a sponsoring structure, sanctioned from within the organisation and connection with inner world authority figures. Basic assumptions might be displayed when a group is unwilling to take individual responsibility, and defers blindly to a leader, or the group might find that they are unable to acknowledge their own authority in the form of leadership or expertise available within this

group. Authority from within therefore includes autonomy and related fears of separation and dependency, as well as ambivalence towards authority.

a Autonomy

Autonomy refers to the capacity of an employee to function independently, according to Czander (1993). According to Slater in Czander (1993), effective autonomous functioning relates to clarity of boundaries and "boundary awareness". Related to this is the delegation of authority across those boundaries, and how easy or difficult it is for the superior to differentiate from the subordinate. "While organizations seek to promote autonomy and delegate authority, they often create situations in which they use delegation to induce fear in employees" (Czander, 1993, p.343). According to Lawrence (1998), institutions seem to justify the hierarchical structures, with chains of command, because of the belief in the necessity for obedience in institutions. Often this leads to situations where individuals only have dependent roles open to them (Miller, 1993). How organisations, groups and individuals work with autonomy and perhaps the fear of autonomy and subsequent separation within an institutional structure is, therefore, important.

Czander (1993) writes that fear of separation is related to a superior's fear of "giving up" control and a subordinate's fear associated with autonomous functioning. A fantasy of symbiotic attachment as an alternative to autonomy can be managed by splitting. This can lead to situations where wishes associated with individualisation and autonomy are denied and operation exists within a socially created image. The result is a deadening of spontaneity and risk taking is often avoided. Reality is interpreted from a paranoid-schizoid position as opposed to a depressive one, according to Lawrence (1998). This form of splitting, according to Czander (1993), actually increases unconscious motives for dependency, because in giving up the internal wish for autonomy, ego capacities such as creativity and spontaneity are also given up. This in itself reduces the ability to differentiate and stimuli are responded to in a "false self" manner where innermost feelings and fantasies are contained and repressed as they are felt to be fearful and threatening. What is created is a cycle where the superior responds to the subordinate's fear of autonomy with authoritarian approaches which the subordinate unconsciously welcomes. The employee, therefore, retreats from autonomy and projects his or her feelings of powerlessness onto superiors. The superior can react by either structuring the relationship according to a parent-child interaction and attempting to increase

their control, or identifying with the powerlessness. In either case, the superior might respond by becoming "... increasingly 'rules-minded' in response to the limited options for power in their situation..." (Czander, 1993, p.245). Lawrence (1998) concurs and indicates that there is a fear that control is always in danger of being lost in the institution with chaotic results, and so part of the role of leadership, in this case, is to ensure compliance and obedience and, therefore, dependency. Leaders could, therefore, allow employees to develop and so encourage trust in the employees' sense of autonomy.

When managers promote dependency, "... they are reacting to the fear of autonomy; they may fear that employees will leave them, or that they will be devalued in some manner" (Czander, 1993, p.354). A senior group could use their position to psychologically play on the emotional vulnerabilities of a more junior group in order for the senior group to increase their own pathological gratification (Czander, 1993). The junior group's projection of unconscious wishes for dependency could coincide with the senior group's fantasy to be a saviour; situations might, therefore, be created unconsciously by these two groups which promote both wishes. An example is a decision making process which can frequently cause anxiety (Rice, 1975). This includes anxiety about the amount and quality of information available on which the decision has to be based, about taking up authority in making that decision, and about working with the consequences of that decision. The senior group could, therefore, hold back crucial information related to the decision or not allow the junior group space to take the decision. Junior groups might then not take the initiative necessary to make that space. This could lead to a situation where groups believe they are not capable of acting and senior groups believing that their input is central. What is needed is an understanding and awareness of the wider system within which both groups act. This aspect is crucial when considering intergroup relations. Groups that are more senior in terms of a hierarchical structure could have problems with allowing more junior groups to develop and learn, so that these junior groups are able to take up effective autonomous functioning. Unconscious fears could relate to junior groups becoming more competent, challenging senior groups and being seen as more successful. These unconscious fears could be transferred to junior groups in such a way that they start to believe and act as if they are not competent and as if they do not have the potential to be successful.

Thus, there is an interrelatedness here, because no group can extend their authority to manage themselves without a consequential change in managerial roles in the wider system within

which they are a part (Miller, 1993). The author writes of an immature relationship where groups surrender their authority. This leads to "basic assumption" behaviour of dependency on omniscient and omnipotent leaders who are seen to satisfy all needs. In this case, it can become tempting for leaders to fall in with this demand and behave as if they are more knowledgeable or powerful than they actually are; "... a reciprocal relationship is established which confirms the inadequacy of the one party over the superiority of the other" (Miller, 1993, p.227). What is needed is a mature relationship where groups confer with one another in an exchange of skills, and do not surrender their authority by virtue of entering the system.

New members joining a group give some of their personal authority to the system and in that way sanction and confirm the system, according to Obholzer (1994b). Those inside the organisation, therefore, give up or surrender power and prestige to those holding boundary roles (eg leaders). In part, this is essential for effective functioning (Miller, 1993). The problem comes in where this realistic dependency is distorted, when those acting on the boundary go beyond the sanctioned authority for that role. There is, therefore, a reciprocal dependence of the boundary role-holders and those inside the organisation who support the organisation. It is important, therefore, for clarity of understanding and action on authority to be reached. Intergroup relations can be distorted when the idea of interdependency is not worked with, and is instead replaced with this distorted idea of dependency or independency. Whether interdependency can be actively worked with and negotiated depends on an individual's or group's relationship with inner representations of authority, and the way in which individuals or groups work with these inner representations. Awareness or lack of awareness of the impact of these representations either hinder or encourage interdependent functioning.

b Ambivalence towards authority

Typically, subordinates experience dissonance between the characteristics of organisational authority relations and the authority relations the subordinate has experienced in the past. These interactions are often related to experiences of earlier relationships with authority in the subordinate's life (Czander, 1993). According to Miller (1976), an adult encountering a person in a position of authority may not respond simply to the realities of what the other says and does, but also "... to a long-persisting internal representation of authority, which may be benign and dependable or punitive and dangerous" (Miller, 1976, p.21). As figures of

authority, leaders become prime targets for certain reactions, according to Kets de Vries (1991a). The transference occurs when "... the subordinate displaces onto another thoughts, feelings, ideas, or fantasies that originate with figures of authority encountered very early in an individual's life" (Kets de Vries, 1991a, p.124). Authority relations can be emotionally debilitating because of the expectations a subordinate may have (Czander, 1993). The subordinate may become involved in a transference reaction as if superiors were authority figures from, among other areas, family history. A set of expectations evolves, not from the real situation, but from projection. According to Cardino (1994), professional identity can then be from a past work experience, rather than the present role.

Managers (and individuals and groups), therefore, need to balance the potential conflict between care and control, dependency and autonomy, and individuality and conformity (Clulow, 1994). According to Czander (1993), understanding the dynamics associated with the fantasies of authority underlies the work of reducing organisational conflicts. According to Clulow (1994), unresolved conflicts about authority and control lead to a reluctance to take effective authority and either control too vaguely or too specifically on irrelevant detail. Ambivalence toward those in authority could be based on a mistrust of other people and a fear of disclosure of self. Further ambivalence could be based on the conflict between the perceived authority of technical versus managerial skills. The notion that "... supervisors are technical experts who need always possess more knowledge than their supervisees if they are to feel competent in role" (Clulow, 1994, p.185) is unlikely to continue in current changing organisational structures. Understanding of roles of the leader, the technical expert and the validation of both is, therefore, important in resolving this conflict. "Unless the management of organizations is sufficiently stable to provide a clear definition of purpose and a reliable container for the inevitable ambivalent feelings of those they employ towards those in authority, then the organization will express its disorder through individual and interpersonal disorder in its members" (Stokes, 1994b, p.128). Relations between groups, for example, can be affected by how the leadership of the organisation effectively demonstrates working with authority. The balance between dependency and control, for example, that the leadership displays will often be reflected in this same way between groups. If the leadership tends toward control and focuses on irrelevant detail, for example, groups might well display this same approach, that is, attempt to control interaction and becoming sidetracked with detail. It is also important, therefore, that leadership are aware of the impact they have on the relations between groups in the rest of the organisation. Often a focus on positional power can lead to

situations of an abuse of authority and a need to encourage dependency. These aspects are often then reflected throughout the organisation.

3.2.1.2 Authority and power

The balance between authority and power needs to be carefully maintained in order for effective intergroup relations to develop. A review of those concepts as well as a discussion on leadership and followership and internal dedifferentiation will now follow.

a Authority

According to Czander (1993), authority is defined "... as a right given as a result of rank of office occupancy. It is a right to issue commands and to punish violations" (Czander, 1993, p.267). Authority thus refers to the right to make an ultimate decision; in an organisation, this translates into the right to make decisions which are binding on others (Obholzer, 1994b). Authority, therefore, "...is the only legitimate instrument for the promotion and maintenance of obedience and conformity in the organization" (Czander, 1993, p.266).

According to Obholzer (1994b), formal authority is a quality derived from a role in a system and is exercised by an individual on behalf of that system. Kernberg (1985) refers to this delegation of authority by the institution as managerial authority. Authority here is clearly delegated, and according to De Loach (1999) and Obholzer (1994b), can be defined as the subjective and objective reality of having the necessary and legitimately delegated authority to be able to carry out a specified task. Formal authority is clear in hierarchical systems, but can be confusing in systems where different groups may want to have ownership of and over that system, or when reporting to two leaders which could unnecessarily confuse issues (Czander, 1993).

b Power

Power is something that is attributed to another. It exists only within the eyes of another, either the perceiver and/or the perceived. According to Czander (1993), power can be attributed to a person because he or she occupies a role; the characteristics of that role, therefore, influence the perceivers' fantasies of the power contained in that role. A person

occupying a position of authority thus could be perceived by subordinates as having little or great power. According to Obholzer (1994b), power also refers to the ability to act upon others or upon a structure, which can be derived externally in the form of what an individual controls, or internally in the form of an individual's knowledge and experience, their state of mind regarding their role, the strength of their personality, how powerful they feel and how they, therefore, present themselves to others.

A feeling of powerlessness could be a state of mind relating to problems with taking up authority, and/or a perceived lack of adequate external resources that could be used to bolster that power. Being unable to accept power for whatever reason, could lead to a case where power is projected externally or a feeling of having to accept one's relative powerlessness in the presence of external realities. This can lead to an institutionalisation or collusion in accepting a reality as it is (Obholzer, 1994a). Feeling powerless when one feels that one should feel powerful can manifest in flight responses such as illness or absenteeism. A sense of responsibility without adequate authority and power to achieve related outcomes, could lead to work-related stress and to eventual burnout, according to Obholzer (1994b).

Miller (1993) argues that giving power implies dependency and is inherently patronising and disempowering; power cannot be given, only taken, and authority which is detached from rank and status, and attached instead to role and task, can therefore become available to each member of the organisation. This prevents a situation where individuals with great authority can dictate their wishes openly, through blatant use of power, (Colman, 1975b) and situations where those in a role of authority perpetuate false idealisations among subordinates to compensate for the lack of power they experience within the role they occupy (Czander, 1993).

Authority without power can lead to a weakened management, and power without authority to an authoritarian regime (Obholzer, 1994b). A balance between the two leads to an effective on-task management of an organisation, according to Obholzer (1994b), and allows an effective balance to be achieved when taking up the roles of leader and follower. These aspects of authority and power directly impact the relations that groups have. In the example of the intergroup relations between a senior and junior group, if the senior group is not internally comfortable with the value that they bring, their competence or their inner authority, they might use positional authority in an attempt to prove this value, both to

themselves, to the organisation and to the junior group. This can lead to an abuse of the power of their position. Given the fact that they are taking a leadership position in relation to the junior group, the lead that they are in fact giving indicates a dependency on organisational sanction which the junior group might pick up and materialise themselves. This continuous cycle of undermining this junior group does not encourage an effective or progressive working relationship.

c Leadership and followership

Leadership implies followership and leadership of followers applies when an individual or group not necessarily the designated leadership or managerial group, acts or negotiates on behalf of others in the organisation (Cilliers & Koortzen, 2000).

Effective task performance requires that followers take on active participation as much as leaders. Anti-task here reflects a basic assumption of dependency. According to Bion in Eisold (1985), leaders emerge as part of the group members' strategy to stem the regressive process and to defend against anxiety. They serve the purpose of the group and continue to exist only as long as they do. Thus, the leader of a group will remain the leader as long as he or she has the necessary skills and as long as his or her leadership serves the task of the group (Rioch, 1975b). As such, "Relationships of dominance and subordination are highly complex interactions of reciprocity and conflict can be apparent even when followers appear purely passive in the relationship (Czander, 1993, p.270).

It seems, according to Rioch (1975c), that there is a tendency in human beings, which is aggravated when faced with isolation of unfamiliar situations, to find it more difficult and burdensome to exercise their own powers of mind and will. The two extremes of followership include on the one side, a responding to the person of the leader, and on the other, and a responding to the ideas, values, vision or work.

When the leader is followed as a person, followership exists as a "kind of hypnosis", and of "giving over our will to the other and losing thereby that terrible burden which we carry so reluctantly: responsibility for our own acts" (Rioch 1975c, p.164). According to Stokes (1994a), Freud indicates that members of a group follow their leader because he or she personifies certain ideals of their own. The leader shows the group how to act toward its goal.

Simultaneously, the group may project their own capacities for thinking, decision-making and taking authority on to the leader, thereby disabling themselves from acting and taking responsibility. The group becomes pathologically dependent and easily swayed. The leader then occupies the role of superego for the members who are thus freed from the responsibility of making decisions and also the burdens of self-criticism and doubt (Main, 1985). Group members lose individual moral sense and the capacity to think and judge as individuals. Thus, "The power and strength of the leader are based on the weakness and helplessness of the follower" (Rioch, 1975c, p.161).

When the leader is followed as a representation of vision, the follower will continue even after the leader's disappearance. The follower, therefore, would have integrated this vision and made it a part of himself or herself. Effective followership requires exercising own authority to take up a followership role in relation to the task, according to Obholzer (1994b). This requires a recognition of the aspects of one's own authority, a readiness to sanction that of others, and a recognition of the boundaries of the role. Miller (1993) differentiates between a mature dependence which is inherent in this relationship and relates to an exchange of expertise, and an immature almost primitive dependency related to expectations and hope that go beyond what can realistically be achieved.

The leadership of an organisation also affects how departments relate to each other. An aspect to investigate is the unconscious motivations that the leaders have in engaging in these transactions. Often leadership groups become receptacles for the projection of the organisation's feelings and fantasies about relating between various subgroups (Czander, 1993). The leadership can be thought of as representing or embodying the function of the group, especially its major function or primary task" (Rioch, 1975a, p.7). Members of the organisation thus relate to the primary task as represented by this leadership and could react by attempting to fight, destroy, undermine, redefine the task, or compete for the leadership position (Rioch, 1975a)

Often in relation to leadership and followership rivalry, envy and jealousy interfere with the taking up of either role. Envy can result in destructive attacks on the person or group in authority, resulting in an undermining of the work performed and the pursuit of the primary task. If subordinate groups are unable to move close to the group occupying a leadership role, there is a greater tendency on the part of the subordinate group to transfer feelings, fantasies

and wishes on to that leadership group (Rioch, 1975b). Groups can set up individuals, or groups can set up other groups - by means of projective identification - to take on this destructive role. If a group, for example, feels unsure of their inner authority and autonomy, this could lead to feeling of envy of the authority of the organisation. If the authority of the organisation is firmly placed within one group, the most senior group, this might lead to more junior groups feeling separated from that authority and unable to work with that authority. One group in the organisation might carry this envy more than other groups, and be seen to be either very dependent or very independent.

Members of such groups can tend to feel both happy and unhappy. They are happy in that they are not taking responsibility for or guiding any change, and they are unhappy because they are not effectively using their skills, their individuality or their capacity for thought. There could be continual conflict about staying or leaving, with the conflict centering on leaving their disowned parts which they have projected onto other groups. This is very different from a work group where the members would use cooperation and value the different contributions that members make. They would choose a leader or a group whom they trust would work with them to achieve the group's task (Stokes, 1994a).

By focusing on problems of leadership and authority, it is possible to see the patterns of the group emerging with regard to these concepts (Rioch, 1975a). Related to the roles of leader and follower, are the roles of spokesperson and the process of representation.

d Internal dedifferentiation and authorisation

According to Mosse and Roberts (1994), the problem with being unable to differentiate internally within a group is that no one is allowed to speak or act on behalf of that group, since this implies taking up a differentiated role. Negotiation between groups is impossible, because the group cannot delegate sufficient authority to anyone to engage in discussion with others on their behalf. Here the role of "spokesperson" is rarely sanctioned. Who has the authority to speak out for the group and what they need to say become impossible decisions to make. Interteam contact is, therefore, difficult, if not impossible to initiate (Mosse & Roberts, 1994). According to Rice (1976), each intergroup transaction requires the exercise of authority and calls into question the value of and sanction for that authority.

Within subdepartments, relations can also be understood from the perspective of the nature and quality of authority given to each representative of each subdepartment, according to Czander (1993). The effectiveness of representatives in intergroup negotiation depends on their comprehension of the task and on their complete authorisation to carry out the task, according to De Loach (1999). The concept of representation distinguishes between three levels of authorisation (Cilliers & Koortzen, 2000; Rice, 1975; De Loach, 1999). These are being a representative, a delegate or having plenipotentiary authority. Representative authority implies being restricted in giving and sharing information across boundaries. This kind of representation is more concerned with gathering information as opposed to sharing information. Delegated authority implies some freedom in sharing, but with clear boundaries about the contents of what is to be shared. A message or point of view has to be delivered, but the representative has no sanction to vary the message. Plenipotentiary authority implies freedom in the sharing of information according to that person's responsibility in decision making and conduct. This representative has flexible terms of reference and can negotiate on behalf of the group within certain terms of reference. Rice (1976) and Astrachan and Flynn (1976), indicate that important data can be gathered from the extent to which the representative is given authority to commit his or her group and by his or her status within the group. The choice of a representative offers important data about the group attitude towards its task, itself and its environment. According to Astrachan and Flynn (1976), groups often send delegates to intergroup meetings without understanding the purpose of those meetings and without being willing to invest the delegates with any authority. In working toward an understanding of intergroup relations, for example, various members of each group will be speaking out on behalf of their group. These representatives might well be used by their groups to communicate a certain message. A managerial group represented by a more junior manager within that group could, for example, have been used by the group in an attempt to pacify junior groups; such a manager might be seen as more accessible in terms of his or her lower seniority within that group. If the authority of this representative is not clear, the group might exclude the member if promises or inclusions are made that the group actually does not agree with.

Unclear boundaries of authorisation therefore create anxiety which hinders rational decision making and reporting back to colleagues inside the boundary (Cilliers & Koortzen, 2000). Problems for groups and their representatives lie "... in the precision with which

responsibility and authority can be defined and in the certainty with which the group can predict the behaviour of other groups in the environment in relation to itself" (Rice, 1975).

In summary, the concept of authorisation relates in part to authority from within the system, whether this be the individual, the group or the organisation. This must include some insight into autonomy and how groups take this up, and also how the rest of the system responds to the other in acting out this authority. The taking up of autonomy is impacted by the internal representation of authority. Ambivalence toward external authority mirrors this internal struggle. Working with authorisation relates to working with authority and power, and how groups can use these effectively. Working with these two aspects will relate to the relationship that groups have with each other in terms of the roles of leader and follower. Furthermore, authority within groups will include aspects of the role spokesperson and representative. In terms of the groups under study, using the Tavistock model of group relations as a basis, the following working hypotheses can be formulated:

- It seems that there could be conflict between these two groups in terms of who has the authority in interaction. The junior group act as managers and take on managerial duties, yet they are not formally managers within the firm. This conflict could be acted out using positional power from the more senior group, and using the power of skill and manpower from the more junior group. The element of patronisation that seems to be prevalent could also be a reflection of the power play between other groups at different levels of the organisational hierarchy.
- The junior group seems to vacillate between taking up autonomy and falling into a sense of dependency on the senior group. This could be because the senior group encourages a sense of dependency in order to inflate the value of their role.
- The conflict of taking a lead also seems to be part of the interaction between these two groups. This could be because both seem to feel an obligation to act out the hierarchy of the organisation, whilst fighting this due to some knowledge that the sharing of skill and focus on task should be more important.
- In terms of this commitment to the organisational structure, it could be that both groups within and in relation to each other, subsume their personal authority by "sticking with the group" and by attempting to gain more power by keeping their respective groups together.

3.3 PROJECTIVE PROCESSES

Following is an overview of projective processes, specifically the paranoid-schizoid position and projective identification.

Projection is a process of "putting" the bad onto some other. Projection itself can be seen as the irrational assumption of the existence of one's own experience in others (Redlich & Astrachan, 1975), and is a primitive attempt to relieve internal pains by externalising them, by assigning them to or by requiring another to contain aspects of the self (Main, 1985). The projective processes discussed here are the paranoid-schizoid position and projective identification.

According to Mawson (1994), a paranoid-schizoid process is a process of separating or splitting the perceived good and bad, where the fear is of attack and annihilation, blame and punishment, whereas projective identification is a process where another gets pulled into behaving as the other person perceives that to be (Obholzer & Roberts, 1994). According to Hutton et al (1997): "... when our anxieties about the dissonance between the things we love and rely on and those we fear and hate becomes too great and unmanageable, we split them into good and bad object. We then project these splits into the realities of our environment." The authors indicate that Melanie Klein describes this inner emotional state of being as the paranoid/schizoid position. We see our surroundings in polarised terms - some idealised and some despised. The price of projection to the self is high because the self is left less aware of its whole but is also, in the case of projective identification, depleted by the projective loss of important aspects of itself (Main, 1985). Main (1985) writes that a person on the receiving end of projection may notice that he is not being treated as himself but as an aggressive other. Projective identification may be experienced as being forced by the projector to actually feel and own projected aggressive qualities and impulses that are otherwise alien to him. According to Krantz and Gilmore (1991), the process is two-phased. Firstly, the denial and rejection of feeling inherent in a person's unconscious fantasy of a situation occurs. The individual, therefore, alters this uncomfortable situation by imagining that an aspect or part of this aspect is an attribute of someone or something else. Secondly, the recipient of this process feels "...pressured into thinking, feeling, and behaving in a manner congruent with the feelings or thoughts projected by the other" (Krantz & Gilmore, 1991, p.310).

Projective processes such as the paranoid-schizoid position and projective identification as interpersonal concepts have value for the understanding of the behaviour of large unstructured groups as well as for small groups, pairs and individuals (Main, 1985). Furthermore, according to this author, projective processes can be used as relief from intrapersonal conflicts which, in organisational settings, can be powerful factors of major industrial inefficiency and conflict. A more in-depth discussion of these two processes will now follow.

3.3.1 Paranoid-schizoid position

This dynamic is often used by groups to contain anxiety. Due to the nature of the structure of organisations as a system of groups, the paranoid-schizoid position is often prevalent. The organisational system, therefore, seems to sanction the defensive paranoid-schizoid position and penalise the positive depressive position (Obholzer, 1994a). A review of the possible manifestations of the paranoid-schizoid position now follows.

3.3.1.1 The paranoid-schizoid position in groups

No group formation and relatedness, therefore, can take place without identification or projection; unchecked identification and projection can lead to distorted communication and actions of group members. "Groups continuously utilize projections to maintain an inner state of cohesion by projecting bad, hateful, aggressive feelings onto its own members as well as onto objects outside the group" (Czander, 1993, p.241). Projection is used to stop the regressive pull. When projection fails in this way, internal cohesiveness is not obtained and regression will again surface. The group might fragment and members might unconsciously project paranoid affects onto each other in another attempt to reduce the now intensified regressive pull (Czander, 1993). Furthermore, the environment might now be seen as uncertain, unpredictable, uncontrollable and containing exaggerated dangers. Fear of not being accepted into the organisation might, for example, lead to anxiety within a group, which in turn might lead to poor communication with other groups and with the organisation, particularly if those other groups are seen as having been accepted into the organisation.

The point is thus made that a paranoid-schizoid position and a subsequent process of projective is affective only if the organisation is relatively unchanging (Main, 1985). If the organisation enacts constant change, it is difficult for individuals or groups to effectively project onto certain other groups, which would normally provide a sense of reassurance of predictability and familiarity, writes Stokes (1994b). As a result, institutions/organisations are not "... so available for the working out and working through of the ambivalent feelings surround work that each individual has", and "The changeability of organizations means they do not provide such easy targets for projection" (Stokes, 1994b, p.124). Assurances about what an organisation will be doing, or focusing on in a year's time can, therefore, be hard to assess. This in itself can cause anxiety and an increase in interpersonal tension and personal stress within and between subgroups within organisations, as opposed to a previous focus on tensions between "workers" and "management".

On an individual level, while the polarity of splitting and integration is being resolved, the person looks for something which will "hold" the situation and handle the real relation between the split-off bits of that person and the environment. If this holding is possible, the person might be able to understand the splitting, recognise the anxiety, own the bad (the unrealistic negative split off parts) and re-introject them with the good (the unrealistically positive parts) (Stokes, 1994b). Thus, a realistic understanding of the situation can be attained. Within intergroup relations, these dynamics can also materialise. If the context of the organisation is stable, for example, groups can develop and learn by becoming aware of how they try and perhaps do project aspects that create anxiety for them away from and out of their group identity. With an attitude of learning, these split-off parts can be re-introjected into the group and they could then commit to learn.

Institutions can thus provide a sense of emotional and psychological containment which can allow groups to project parts of the self that the group does not want to be aware of, onto other, more distant parts of the organisation. In this way "everything bad" can be projected onto other subsystems or groups within the organisation. According to Stokes (1994b), all groups tend to project parts that they do not want to be aware of onto other, more distant parts of the organisation. In this context, large groups will depersonalise their members, and individuals who use interpersonal recognition and face-to-face contact, might find themselves isolated by the group (Colman, 1975b). Turquet in Miller (1993, p.248) indicates that in small groups, the leader and member roles become relatively easy to establish, whereas in large

groups there is more opportunity for projection; the level of anxiety is increased as the cycle of projection continues into a vast and endless "other". If these subgroups then keep themselves separate, the paranoid-schizoid position disallows effective collaboration (Obholzer, 1994a). According to De Loach (1999), whenever a group is separated psychically or is unaware of information pertinent to the whole system, powerful and psychological processes ensue and tend to establish an environment of distrust and irrationality. "Human organisations inevitably create projection systems; some are rife with them and where they enshrine and perpetuate them they create personal and interpersonal impoverishments and ineffectiveness" (Main, 1985, p.68).

Many of these projections will remain fantasy without reality testing. The simplification of relating to one group or one entity means that members need not relate to any one individual, but can use projective processes to rid himself or herself of unwanted aspects of his or her personality. "'The group' that is somewhere around but not located in any persons thus becomes endowed with unpleasant aspects of the self. It is felt as uncannily alive and dangerous" (Main, 1985, p.57). Few occasions illustrate an awareness of the intricacies and specific skills or processes that might make those other groups powerful. Little reality testing or interaction is encouraged, so that it seems as though the fantasy is protected against this reality. The reality might be that each aspect of the organisation is powerful, and this would mean an acceptance of the competence and potency of the totality of the organisation. This deliberate cutting off depletes each group, each subgroup and each member due to the time taken to defend outwardly irrelevant boundaries. This relates to the loss of personalisation and growth of anonymity that this author refers to. Identities are hidden and personal viewpoints concealed (Main, 1985). The normal process of externalisation and subsequent reality testing that help groups differentiate and maintain themselves come to a stop, and the recognition of talents becomes lost

Individuals, groups or organisations frequently engage in some conflict or perpetuate conflict with an external system "... to defend against some threatening internal conflict or struggle..." (Czander, 1993, p.321). The motivation for creating this type of conflict often relates to using projection to relieve internal anxieties. There could also be pressure on managers to bring into organisations the certainty that the institutions will withstand environmental uncertainty and banish psychotic anxieties (Lawrence, 1998). At this point, the group might turn to the leader to take over a controlling function for them, and to take on the

group feelings of inadequacy, powerlessness and fear. According to Kernberg (1985), paranoid personalities are particularly suitable to take on the leadership of basic-assumptions group in a fight-flight position. The group that they represent become the all good, while the external groups or the general environment become the all bad. While one group is transferring, for example, and not owning their negative aspects, they cannot attempt any internal integration and often remain in situations of stagnation. Since their identity remains rigid, it becomes difficult to relate to other groups in an attempt to integrate and share knowledge or skills.

With reference to this dynamic within the organisation scapegoating, the operation of the paranoid-schizoid position in relation to task and boundary is also of relevance.

3.3.1.2 Possible manifestations of the paranoid-schizoid position

According to Stokes (1994b), when change is driven for the sake of change, it can result in individuals feeling that what they have been doing for the last few years is not only out of date, but that it was never of any use anyway. Change in this sense seems to be a manic attempt to overcome previous difficulties, and feelings of compassion are cut off and projected onto others who are then seen as weak. At this point, the organisation may need someone who can represent that weakness, such as a part-time worker or a member of a minority group. This person or group could be scapegoated and driven out. This reaction is driven by unconscious and unrecognised organisational conflicts and because it is forced down to an individual or group level, it becomes impossible to address, writes Stokes (1994b). Often this leads to a situation of scapegoating. The effect of the operation of the basic assumption mode of group functioning can then become apparent in the disregard or even hatred of the external reality outside the group, according to Roberts (1994a). According to Redlich and Astrachan (1975), scapegoating is the acceptance and rejection of group members or entire groups and is related to the development of inner psychological boundaries. A group member may be rejected but not expelled and so still remain a member of the group. Very often these individuals operate at the boundary of groups, for example, department heads or receptionists. According to Hirschhorn and Young (1991, p.224), splitting is closely related to these processes of projection and scapegoating; "When people feel vulnerable, inadequate, guilty, or inferior, they project these feelings onto some outsider, who is then experienced in just these ways." In intergroup relations, this can manifest when

members of one group who are considered inferior or who are seen as the ones that prohibit effective integration, are driven out of the group and organisation. Often this tends to be the minority members who are different in some way, whether it be in terms of home language, race or religion.

The manifestation of the paranoid-schizoid position can also undermine task and group boundary. In this case, the task pursued by the group primarily meets the internal needs of that group more than the need of the organisation or the reason that the group was created in the first place. The reason is anxiety about survival, and it is characterised by an absence of effective questioning about the primary task of that group, its effectiveness, an inability to think or to learn from experience and a resistance to change. The projection is characterised by the sense that everything that is good is within the group, and everything that is bad, harmful or dangerous is outside the group. The concept of personality system boundaries is applicable in this case. Adequate perception and the ability to deal with incoming material by logical thinking requires a well-functioning boundary. If adequate perception does not take place, the boundaries become disturbed. In this case the person might regress to projection or projective identification in an attempt to locate the quality in another person. Acquiring certain skills will allow the person to retain boundaries even in difficult situations (Lofgren, 1975).

3.3.2 Projective identification

This process can be seen as intrapsychic, interpersonal and intergroup, according to Czander (1993). It can be seen as a defence mechanism, a mode of communication, a type of relatedness or a pathway to psychological change. Various authors, according to Czander (1993), see projective identification as a method of communication, because it firstly requires a capacity on the part of the person projecting to assess the nature of the recipient and his or her readiness to receive, and secondly the projector must have the capacity to induce a feeling in the recipient. According to Ogden in Krantz and Gilmore (1991, p.309): "The process *simultaneously* involves a type of psychological defence against unwanted feelings or fantasies, a mode of communication, and a type of human relationship." Questions remain as to how one gets the object to behave in accordance with the projection. Environmental reinforces such as roles, culture, behaviours and experience may be communicated over time and all impress on the recipient the required feelings and behaviours (Czander, 1993).

Groups, for example, who feel inadequate about certain issues whether it be competence, internal authority or including and working with other groups, might project these feelings of insecurity or fear onto other groups. The groups that will tend to act in accordance with those projections will probably be the ones that feel doubtful about those same aspects. These groups then tend to "carry" these aspects and be seen to epitomise them. An overview of this identification with projection and valency for these projections will follow. Also covered is projective identification processes in leadership and followership dynamics.

3.3.2.1 Valency and identification with projection

The worst attributes of a group are often projected onto other groups, or onto a subgroup of the same group. According to Stokes (1994b), this provides a focus for blame and for frustrations and conflict. This also provides a "role" for individuals or groups who then "act out" this unconscious role. "These [other individuals or groups] not only provide a focus for blame for the frustrations and conflicts inherent in working in the organization, but also 'lock' individuals and groups into unconscious roles" (Stokes, 1994b, p.124). This process ensures that the roles that groups take up and perpetuate are self-confirming. According to Shapiro (1985), the power of these projections with their accompanying unconscious identifications, may push an individual into more extreme role behaviour and into feelings that are very powerful and may be experienced as unreal and bizarre. According to Main (1985), if a group or group member is ill-fitted for an attempted projection, however, the group will withdraw it, because of reality testing and the resistance of this projection.

There is also the hope that recipients of projected distress might be able bear and articulate what a group cannot, and in that way perhaps help the group contain the anxiety and think about what they are projecting. (Mawson, 1994). The basic assumption mentality is often expressed by an individual; there may be a widely shared belief that "... if only that person would leave then everything would be fine" (Obholzer & Roberts, 1994, p.130). By this method, individuals can easily dissociate themselves from that individual and, more specifically, from that aspect of themselves. Parallels can be seen from the individuals who are constantly tardy or who have emotional outbursts. Who acts as this expresser is usually that person who tends to be difficult or loud or less competent. The authors indicate that instead of seeing this as an inevitable hazard of working with other people, we could rather and more usefully regard this behaviour as a response to the unconscious needs of the

organisation. The troublesome individual could though be viewed not as difficult, but "... as an institutional mouthpiece, into whom all the staff have projected their disquiet" (Obholzer & Roberts, 1994, p.131). The process that responds to this is not, "Isn't it terrible how X is behaving", but rather "We all have ambivalent feelings which we need to own, and those that relate to our work in the institution needs to be taken up at work" (Obholzer & Roberts, 1994, p.132). By this, the focus is less on the individual whose behaviour is deemed unacceptable, but rather all individuals within the organisation who need to focus in a different way on the primary task of the organisation. To treat it as only one individual or group problem allows everyone to continue to disown that aspect of themselves, and so the organisation will continue to experience similar problems. However, this is not easy as these unconscious roles tend to be familiar and comfortable.

Certain valences or predispositions on the part of employees may make them more susceptible to certain projections; certain employees may specifically seek projections from others. "In many organizations, projective identification is either a role requirement or a requirement for membership in a department or an informal social group" (Czander, 1993, p.56). The effective management of these individuals or groups can lead to an effective use of their basic assumption mentality (ie the reason they chose that job) as well as the effective use of the organisations' basic assumption mentality, that is, what needs to be projected at that point and why.

Knapp in Czander (1993) indicates that the status and power of the projector will influence the extent to which the projections become accepted as an aspect of one's identity. Bowers in Czander (1993) indicates that the degree of a person's sense of self will determine the extent to which he or she receives projections from others. This presents a problem in organisations where individuals are recruited because of their capacity to receive projections from others, generally their superiors. In intergroup relations, for example, the actual relations between groups might be based on consistent projection and a valency for identifying with those projections. Junior groups might always be seen as incompetent, whereas groups from a certain service line might always be seen as successful.

3.3.2.2 Projective identification processes in leadership and followership dynamics in basic assumption groups

True leadership requires identification of some problem requiring attention and effective action, according to Stokes (1994a). In the basic assumption mentality, there is a collusive interdependence between the leader and those being led, whereby the leader will be followed only as long as he or she fulfils the basic assumption need of the group. If the leader does not fulfil these requirements, the group will look for an alternative leader to do so. A leader who is colluding with basic assumption behaviour will, in all likelihood, experience feelings relating to the unconscious group demands.

In basic assumption dependency, the leader needs to ensure that the members' needs are taken care of (Stokes, 1994a). The leader might experience feelings of heaviness and resistance to change, as well as a preoccupation with status and hierarchy as the basis for decisions. In this case, the group will want the leader to be omnipotent (Rioch, 1975b). In the basic assumption of fight/flight, the leader needs to identify an enemy within or outside of the group and lead that fight or flight. (Stokes, 1994a). The leader will probably feel aggression and suspicion, with a focus on details of rules and procedures, and the group will want the fight leader to be unbeatable, and the flight leader to be uncatchable (Rioch, 1975b). In basic assumption pairing, the leader needs to keep the groups hopes alive that the future will be better, whilst ensuring that actual change does not take place (Stokes, 1994a). Here the leader will tend to feel a preoccupation with alternative futures options, with the group wanting to meet, with some hope, some external authority. The leader here needs to be marvellous, but needs to remain unborn (Rioch, 1975b). Awareness of the above is crucial for effective intergroup functioning to take place. If groups use projection and other groups identify with that projection, an awareness of these dynamics can lead groups to question the basis of their relating.

In summary, projective processes are a way for groups to contain anxiety experienced in organisations. Groups relate to one another and whether this be direct or indirect, it provides opportunities for projection. The structures and dynamics of organisations often lead to situations where projection is not understood or in the field of awareness. The paranoid-schizoid position and dynamic of projective identification leads groups to undermine

themselves and remain in or revert to situations of conflict and stagnation. With regards to the two groups in the study the following working hypotheses can be generated:

- There seems to be a total, if not, extreme commitment to the client. It seems as though the groups within the organisation are desperate "not to be wrong". There also seems to be a high incidence of fee write-offs. It could be that the groups compromise, project their own power and attribute this to the clients. The clients seem to identify with this.
- There seems to be an identification with the client in terms of the structures of those organisations. The internal groups seem to feel that internal dynamics are controlled by these external relations. It could be that the internal groups split-off the feelings of being out of control and controlled by internal bureaucracy onto the clients.
- There seems to be a high occurrence of groups not listening to one another. It could be that there is a fear of listening and really hearing what the other has to say. This could relate again to a fear of being criticised. It could also relate to the lack of self-insight that the groups seem to have in terms of the intergroup relations.
- At some level, it seems as if the audit process is seen as a "necessary evil". It could be that this feeling of debilitation is projected onto other internal groups and groups that hold boundary positions, for example, the human resources groups
- The two groups may be projecting their own fears onto one other. The senior group seem to alternate between a sense of camaraderie and a feeling of distance towards the junior group. It could be that the senior group project their fears of incompetence onto the junior group. The junior group seem to act toward the senior group with a similar feeling of respect and disrespect. It could be that they project their fear of integration onto the senior group.

3.4 CHAPTER SUMMARY

Current changes in the organisation of work, bring about changes in the way organisations relate to each other as well as the way different groups within the organisation relate to each other. Organisations are expected to engage in continuous exchanges among subsystems and this requires that effective use is made of task boundaries and group boundaries. This allows for cooperation and interdependency which is vital in a culture of harmony and learning. It is due to these aspects and through effective interaction of various groups that the goals and objectives of an organisation are accomplished. Yet, organisations continue to be fragmented

with intergroup rivalry and conflict. An investigation into issues, such as authority and autonomy, and authorisation and representation is needed. Furthermore, an understanding of dynamics such as the paranoid-schizoid position and projective identification can allow the type of integration that is needed in order for groups to collaborate effectively.

In this chapter, the three main variables of boundaries, authority and projective processes were discussed. Possible explanations or working hypotheses were generated of these intergroup relations that potentially lead to ineffective work behaviour were generated. This completes step 2 (phase 1) of the research. The next chapter will cover the qualitative study conducted.

4.1.1.1 Length of service at the organisation

The more junior group (the group referred to as "supervisor") had been with the organisation for three years and six months. From the more senior group (the group referred to as "manager"), the more junior manager had been with the organisation for five years and six months. The more senior manager had been with the organisation for ten years and six months. The researcher had been with the organisation for four years and six months.

4.1.1.2 Length of service at the organisation in that role

From the supervisor group, both representatives had been in the role of supervisor for six months. The more junior manager had been in the role of manager for one year and four months. The more senior manager had been in the role of manager for five years and nine months. (This manager was due for promotion to partner in two months from the date of the data collection.) This manager cancelled his attendance the morning of the data collection. The researcher had been in the role of human resource manager for ten months.

4.1.1.3 Race and gender

All four individuals were male, one white and one Indian in both the manager and supervisor group. The Human Resource representative was a white female. The manager who cancelled his attendance was an Indian male.

4.1.1.4 Background working experience

All four representatives had only worked within this organisation and had not had formal or full-time work experience at any other organisation. The researcher had had a variety of work experience in the formal sector in other organisations.

TABLE 4.1
SUMMARY OF CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

	Length of service in the organisation	Length of service in that role	Race	Gender	Background working experience
Supervisor group	3 years, 6 months	6 months	One White One Indian	Male	Only within this organisation
Manager group	5 years, 6 months	1 year, 4 months	White	Male	Only within this organisation
Manager group (senior manager who cancelled)	10 years, 6 months	5 years, 9 months	Indian	Male	Only within this organisation
Researcher	4 years, 6 months	10 months	White	Female	Variety of back working experience

4.1.2 The measuring technique used

In line with the research goal and design of hypothesis generating, exploratory and qualitative, the type of measuring technique, justification for use, rationale and aim for the use of this technique is now discussed.

CHAPTER 4: THE QUALITATIVE STUDY

The objective of this chapter, as per research question 3 and phase 2, steps 1 – 4, is to outline the qualitative research method as proposed in chapter one. This is to describe and conduct a qualitative study in order to investigate and explore the boundary management issues, the authority issues, and the projective processes such as the paranoid-schizoid position and projective identification that groups experience in interaction with each other, and the manifestations of the interaction. The sample, the measuring technique used and the application, in terms of data collection and data processing, of this measuring technique is discussed. Reliability and validity of this technique is also included.

4.1 A QUALITATIVE INVESTIGATION INTO INTERGROUP RELATIONS

Many different psychodynamic concepts can be studied in intergroup relations. The concepts chosen for this research are issues of boundary management, authority and projective processes. In order to investigate the manifestation of these dynamics, a specific sample was chosen and a specific measuring technique used. The application of the technique and the analysis and interpretation of the results is also discussed.

4.1.1 The sample

The subgroup within the organisation from which the two groups were chosen for the sample was determined by the organisation. The two groups chosen for the research were a manager and a supervisor group from within this subgroup. These groups were suggested due to the sometimes unclear boundaries of their work tasks, the overlap of their tasks and the fact that the organisation wanted the supervisor group to start taking on more managerial tasks. The organisation wanted to find out where the boundaries were unclear and how this situation could be improved in order to clarify the situation so that the supervisor group had full opportunity to take up more responsibility. The population of interviewees, therefore, was taken as all members of the manager and supervisor group from this one subgroup within the organisation. A sample was then drawn randomly and two individuals from each of the manager and supervisor group were selected. An overview of the biographical characteristic of the sample is provided.

4.1.2.1 Type of measuring technique

The measuring technique used includes the type of measuring instrument chosen which was the unstructured interview, and the method of analysis and interpretation which was the hermeneutic approach. For this research then, the unstructured interview was used as the primary instrument for highlighting and bringing to the fore the relations between two groups in terms of boundary management, authority and projective processes. The analysis and interpretation was done using the hermeneutic approach in order to gain an understanding of the dynamics from the point of view of the participants. The justification and rationale of this technique is now discussed.

4.1.2.2 Justification for use of this measuring technique

As indicated the aim of this research was to understand and explore the dynamics operating between two groups. The problem statement was: "What is the basis of intergroup relations that potentially lead to ineffective work behaviour, and how does it manifest between these groups in a specific consulting organisation, in terms of the premises of the Tavistock model of group relations?" On the basis of this problem statement various working hypotheses were generated which were used as a starting point. The working hypotheses included aspects such as working ineffectively with issues such as boundary management, authority and projective processes and how these lead to problematic intergroup relations and a reduced ability to work together effectively. Given this the objective of the research was not to directly prove or disprove the above; rather it was to investigate and explore these intergroup relations and to see if the above-mentioned concepts were relevant in terms of the understanding and view of the groups in question.

Given this, as mentioned, two aspects made up the measuring technique: the measuring instrument - an unstructured interview – and the hermeneutic approach - an approach to the analysis and interpretation. Both these aspects comprise a technique which was chosen so that cognisance could be taken of the dynamics that surfaced which were relevant to these two groups. The unstructured interview provided a format for discovering a range of perceptions and understandings from the participants point of view, by virtue of the fact that no preconceived ideas or assumptions were taken into the interview situation by the researcher and no structure from the researcher was given. The use of the hermeneutic approach to the

analysis and interpretation of the results allows for the inclusion and application of the psychodynamic approach with its accompanying perspectives of psychoanalysis and the open systems theory. This approach required an understanding and an exploration to a depth which is beyond the face value of the interaction. In order to structure the interpretation of the results, the Tavistock model of group relations was used, because it allowed integration of the conscious and unconscious dynamics that were displayed between these two groups in their interaction. These dynamics were manifested in verbal and nonverbal communication and other physical and nonphysical indications.

4.1.2.3 Rationale and aim for use of this measuring technique

The aim of using the unstructured interview in this case was to allow as many of the dynamics as possible operating between the two groups to surface. The use of the unstructured interview allows for this exploration to help identify variables and relations between variables, and according to Kerlinger (1986) can be used to suggest hypotheses and to guide other phases of research. It is thus used as an information gathering instrument. According to Fontana and Frey (1994), unstructured interviewing provides a greater depth than other types of interviewing, given its qualitative nature, and is used in an attempt to understand complex behaviours without imposing any prior structure or categorisation that might limit the field of inquiry. As such, the research made use of observation and reflection to interpret and understand the social reality of those dynamics as opposed to predefining hypotheses via a more structured data gathering process.

In line with the hermeneutic approach of this study, the emphasis is on the fact that this perspective relates to an interpretation of the world as a reality that is constituted by each individual's perception of it. Accordingly, there is no objective reality; there are only multiple realities, which can be described subjectively (Hewitt, 1991). Hermeneutics involves a respect for the value and the truth that the expression has for participants and a focus on bringing self-reflection of the researcher into consideration as well. Included is the aspect of interpreting not only what is being said, but what lies behind what is being said. This recognises the conscious and unconscious in expression, as well as the element of suspicion or a "...searching out of the origins or false-consciousness that lie behind the words..." (Roffey, 1980, p.95). The method must, therefore, include a "suspicion" but without a

judgement. In this way, hermeneutics is concerned with the origin of expression and has to include the attitude that a variety of interpretations might all be appropriate.

Packer and Addison (1989a), indicate that practical understanding is not an origin of knowledge, it is a starting place for interpretation. A point of view or perspective is a choice that we use to engage ourselves in an encounter. Interpretative inquiry begins, not from unquestionable data, but from the place of our everyday participatory understanding of people and events. This leads to a circularity of understanding that requires assimilation as well as accommodation, and an increased appreciation of the structure of the interaction. "It is a call to respect the integrity of what is presented rather than distorting it through any predetermined structure" (Roffey, 1980, p.138).

In this regard it is useful for the researcher to use one's self as a measuring instrument as well (McCormick & White, 2000). The unstructured interview allows this approach to be used. This concept started with Freud who applied it to psychoanalysis. This approach has also been applied to groups by Bion, that is, the Tavistock model of group relations. Alderfer (1980) also indicates that people have feelings about data concerning human affairs. According to McCormick and White (2000), the benefits of this approach include the following:

- the widening of the scope of the data collection
- the use that was made to generate initial hypotheses
- the widening of possibilities in terms of these initial hypotheses
- the opportunity to use the feelings to form an overall picture and integrate hypotheses
- to bring a focus on objectivity which was essential in the data collection stages

A model for this process encompasses the following five methods (McCormick & White, 2000):

- Paying attention to emotional reactions to an organisation or situation. In this way these responses can widen the scope of the data collection. In terms of generating hypotheses, these reactions can be hypothesised as representative of a common reaction in the organisation. Feelings from the self could well be shared feelings from the group. It is important, therefore, that the researcher has some insight and clarity on these feelings in order to work with them in terms of the above.

- Noting initial perceptions of the organisation or situation. Important was to note first impressions, whilst still operating in a field of perception that was not yet necessarily merged with the situation.
- Understanding common reaction, prejudices and the potential for countertransference so as to reduce the bias of the interpretation of the researcher. This requires that the researcher has some degree of self-insight in order to reduce these potentials as far as possible.
- Postponing judgements to avoid premature conclusions. This required that the researcher initially listened, observed and did not speculate.
- Paying attention to fantasies and images that occur while gathering information about that system or situation and using these to direct hypotheses. This aspect is closely related to psychoanalysis.

There are also problems with this method, including inaccurate observations and interpretations and questions regarding reliability.

4.1.3 Application of this measuring technique

The application of the measuring technique is now discussed. This includes the administration of the measuring instrument and the use of the hermeneutic approach for the analysis and interpretation of results.

4.1.3.1 Administration of the measuring instrument and collection of data

The administration of the unstructured interview and collection of data was done in the following way.

- The sample was confirmed. See detail on this in 4.2.
- An e-mail was sent to those members of the groups selected as the sample.
- Telephonic confirmation was made to those members including a suggested date, time and venue.
- The set up of the meeting room for the number of members attending was confirmed.
- E-mail confirmation was sent to those members to confirm the time, date and venue.
- Everyone confirmed their attendance.

The morning of the set date for the data collection, one of the members of the manager group (the most senior manager) phoned to cancel his attendance.

Seating was not prearranged and people sat where they wanted. Once everyone had arrived in the meeting room and sat down, the researcher informed everyone that the conversation would be recorded; the researcher checked with that the participants were comfortable with that. Two dictaphones were used for this purpose. Notes were made of nonverbal behaviours, seating, any interruptions and other events that occurred. Note was also made of the order in which these group members arrived, as well as conversation that took place before the interview began formally.

The role of the researcher was also explained to the participants. This was clarified and specifically stated as the researcher role, hopefully taking away some confusion relating to the division the researcher works within, as well as the role the researcher takes, that is, manager in that work situation. The researcher explained that the objective of the interview was for data collection for research.

Confidentiality of the discussion was stated as well as anonymity of participants. Also indicated was the possibility of follow up and support that could take place afterwards; this to work with dynamics expressed that might have a subsequent negative impact on the working relationship of the two groups going forward.

The next step was the introduction to the interview. This took place as follows:

"Thank you for coming and assisting with this.

As you know this is part of the data collection required for my dissertation. I am researching intergroup dynamics, and have chosen the two groups of the audit manager group and the audit supervisor group from this audit group as representative of the study. The population group being all audit managers and all audit supervisors from this group.

This is an unstructured interview. The time we have for this is from now until 5pm, in this room. I really have one question and that is, we have one hour to discuss the relationship

between the audit manager group and the audit supervisor group. Where would you like to start?"

The discussion was unstructured, with no other formal questions being asked. The researcher's input was restricted, in the main, to reflective statements. At the end of the stated time, the researcher stopped the discussion and thanked the participants.

4.1.3.2 Analysis of the results

The results were analysed using the following process:

- A full transcript of the interview discussion was made.
- Common and recurrent themes were extracted. Themes were analysed in the broadest possible sense in order to thoroughly explore the relationship and dynamics between these two groups.
- Given the above themes, focus was kept on possible manifestations of the variables of the study, that is, boundary management, authority and projective processes.
- Note was made of any verbal and nonverbal messages, as well as any physical and nonphysical dynamics that surfaced. Other aspects noted included the physical environment and the researcher's feelings. Again the focus was kept to those that seemed relevant with regard to the variables of the study.
- Hypotheses were then generated integrating the variables, the themes expressed during the interview, which included the nonverbal and nonphysical aspects. An overview and summary of the above was then done.

In order to analyse the results within the context intended, it was important to bear the following in mind. According to Lazarus (1976), human beings move, feel, sense, imagine, think and relate. He indicates that psychological disturbances affect these functions. He writes that the way we move or behave can become adversely influenced by our imagination, cognitions, emotions and sensations, and also by the way people react to us. Furthermore, as we change the way we behave, we change all aspects of this system. He indicates that is important to look at each aspect of the person, in order to gain understanding of the "full picture". His model – the multimodal behaviour therapy – focuses on the following – behaviour, affect, sensation, imagery, cognition, interpersonal, drugs – the acronym spelling

BASIC ID. The value of considering this model for the analysis of this research was the approach of looking beyond what is purely said and taking into account dynamics of behaviour, aspects imagined, thought processes and methods of behaviour dealing with anxiety.

Delving deeper into the psychodynamics of the interaction, use was made of the following six dimensions, presented in the "CIBART" mnemonic (Koortzen & Cilliers, 2002). These include looking at unresolved conflicts between group members, unclear group identity, unclear task, space and time boundaries, problems with authority and authorisation, relationship and relatedness problems, and uncertainty and confusion about the primary task of the group. In the analysis, these aspects were considered an important foundation.

The following aspects were also considered important in the analysis of the results in order to initially allow as many aspects as possible to be considered, and to ensure that the dynamics were investigated from the core of these intergroup relations, as opposed to allowing focus to remain at the superficiality of the interaction. Lyth (1991) indicates that psychoanalytic orientated methods for analysis and exploration that "... tackle the problems at the heart of the matter..." (Lyth, 1991, p.368) are what is necessary. The author emphasises the following aspects which were used by the researcher in the initial analysis:

- Keeping an open mind to avoid prejudice and to allow receptivity to what might emerge; to suspend past experience as the only structure of the present.
- Allowing the process of exploration to evolve in a state of uncertainty and ignorance.
- Not making quick judgements, but allowing the value of the process to be perceived.

During the analysis what was verbalised and how it was verbalised was considered important. The context of the situation and the groups in relation to each other also needed consideration. The dynamics of the social interaction and the impacts the groups had on each other was also taken into account. Given this, the analysis required an exploration into the intergroup relations as they were unfolding in that present moment and allowing this unfolding without judgement or prearranged structure.

4.1.3.3 Interpretation of the results

The interpretation of the results included an attempt to understand the situation as it seemed from within the reality of the participants, as per the hermeneutic approach. Kets de Vries (1991) seems to support this approach when he talks about attempting to understand the "reality" of a situation. He states the following: "To understand what makes for successful organizational performance, it is advisable to pay attention to the quirks and irrational processes that are part and parcel of human behaviour.. it is vital to consider how to deal with processes *outside* the recommended models; to gain insight into both conscious and unconscious behaviour, rational and irrational actions; and to understand better the *real* nature of the interface between individuals and organizations" (Kets de Vries, 1991, p.xiv). Kets de Vries (1991) and Miles and Huberman (1994) indicate that Geertz's approach of looking beyond the obvious and superficial and at deep, underlying structures is a valuable approach. Geertz talks about a "thick" description, which is interpretative, and seeks out the significance of events, and searches for themes that will explain a myriad of facts. The broad dimension of this type of approach range from superficial verbal content interpretation, alertness to underlying themes, meaning behind metaphors, reasons for the selection of certain words and implication of certain activities. According to Hirschhorn and Young (1991), this requires that we stop fixating on "normality", let go and deepen our awareness. The approach, therefore, includes a search for themes in apparently unstructured processes, and includes noting patterns, ideas or sentiments that surface and which explain many underlying themes. Kets de Vries (1991) refers to Freud who indicated the following: "We must look for elements that are not only logically central but that have deep, perhaps unconscious, emotional significance" and, "The emotional components that motivate an organizational text are crucial to its decoding" (Kets de Vries, 1991, p.16). Krantz and Gilmore (1991) also indicate a necessity to listen to the system with the "third ear" and to use interpretative methods to try to piece together data that yield a deeper understanding. This approach to the interpretation was imperative in order to gain a depth of understanding of the intergroup dynamics that were displayed.

In order to reach some understanding, Kets de Vries (1991) indicates that this is a process of discovery and that initial or working hypotheses will need to be tested against a reality as it is perceived by others. If informal predictions on initial insights are made, these then need to be compared to what actually happens. Interpretation is thus a dynamic and interactive process

that may bring insights, but which rarely provides any final solution (Kets de Vries, 1991). According to Gould (1991), our assessments are therefore simply working hypotheses, rather than fixed and neatly integrated diagnostic formulations.

According to Levinson (1991), an analysis that stems from this perspective must, therefore, take into account a range of data sources, including the following: structural data, process data, interpretative data, current organisational functioning, organisational perceptions, knowledge, and language, the emotional atmosphere, organisational action, and attitudes and relationships.

In the interpretation of the results, therefore, the researcher needed to take cognisance of the following:

- the way statements and conversation were verbalised so that the unconscious and underlying meaning could also be extracted
- the dynamics of the situation, for example, who interrupted whom, who deferred to whom, how, and when
- the seating plan and dynamics of the physical situation such as background noise the situation of the meeting room

As indicated, the researcher also used herself as an instrument to gain further insight into underlying dynamics of the interaction. Use was made of emotion, perception and feeling. The research also needed to be aware of the impact that her presence had on that situation. The role played by the researcher in that situation, the role she plays in the "outside" work situation, and the dynamics of interrelationship between her and the groups were also considered and included in the interpretation. The objective was to gain as much of an understanding of the dynamics involved using the above opportunities.

4.2 RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY OF THE MEASURING TECHNIQUE

Given the qualitative nature of the research, special attention needed to be paid to certain aspects of reliability and validity that could undermine the applicability of the results. These two aspects are now discussed.

4.2.1 Reliability of the measuring technique

According to Mouton and Marais (1988, p.79), reliability refers to the process whereby "... the application of a valid measuring instrument to different groups under different sets of circumstances should lead to the same observation". Reliability includes a balance between reactivity and control, considerations such as researcher, participant and measuring instrument effects. Relevant aspects are now dealt in terms of the unstructured interview, and the analysis and interpretation of the results.

4.2.1.1 *Reactivity and control*

A balance needs to be achieved between reactivity and control. These aspects are positively correlated and inevitably involves a compromise. According to Mouton and Marais (1988), reactivity becomes the largest threat to validity of research findings when human behaviour or characteristics are the source of data or information. Reactivity refers to the phenomenon whereby human beings are aware of their participation in the research and tend to react to it. The more controls put in place, the more artificial the situation is made, and the more the participants tend to react. In the case of this research, the situation was kept as unstructured as possible, with the direction of the process and illustration of dynamics being left up to the participants. This will have a lowering effect on the reliability, but a positive effect by virtue of a lowered reactivity. The positioning of the role of the researcher, as researcher, and not as the human resource manager, will, however, influence the reactivity of the participants.

4.2.1.2 *Researcher effects*

The following, according to Mouton and Marais (1988), need to be considered within the parameters of reliability. They are: researcher characteristics of affiliation of the researcher, image of the researcher, and distance between researcher and participant and researcher orientation.

Researcher affiliation or presumed affiliation, according to Mouton and Marais (1988) and Miles and Huberman (1994), can affect the type of responses received from the participants. In this case, the researcher is affiliated to the human resource department, and is classified in the role of manager. This might have had a dual impact in terms of affiliation. Firstly, from

the supervisor group perspective they might have tended to defer to the manager group which included the researcher, although, on the other, hand might tended to affiliate more with the manager group and against the researcher in that the researcher to some extent is "outside" the audit segment. Secondly, from a manager perspective, they might have wanted to affiliate more with the researcher from a manager perspective, but against the researcher from an audit versus human resource division perspective. As indicated, the role the researcher took, as researcher, in the interview process was explained to and understood by participants. Also important was to assure participants of the confidentiality of the process, as well as the support given during the process so that participants spoke as openly and honestly as they might want.

Image of the researcher, according to Mouton and Marais (1988), concerns the perception of the participants towards the researcher. Considerations here could be the suspicion with which the researcher and data might be viewed, as well as a variety of cultural and socioeconomic differences. This also relates to another aspect of reliability, that is, the distance between the researcher and the participant, and establishing rapport between them. Given the close working relationship of the researcher with the participants, these aspects were considered relatively stable. The fact that further studies are respected within the organisation and this division will probably lend more credibility and support to the process. The establishment of rapport with the participants requires a fine balance of coming close enough to encourage open communication, but not assuming complete inclusion in the group, according to Fontana and Frey (1994). It seemed that this balance was kept given the above factors.

Researcher orientation relates to the potential cognitive bias of the researcher, attitude and role expectations. Expectations of cognition and attitude will be reduced by the unstructured nature of the interview. It was important that the researcher did not attempt to interpret comments, but used reflecting and supporting statements such as, "it seems as if" and "um". Role expectations could originate from the researcher in terms of expectations of comments from individuals by virtue of the fact that they belonged to certain groups. Again, an open minded approach from the researcher was imperative in order to allow participants to speak as openly and honestly as possible. According to Fontana & Frey (1994), this process of establishing trust is critical if one wants to encourage honesty and openness in the discussion.

4.2.1.5 *Other reliability aspects considered*

Mouton and Marais (1998) consider the following aspects as methods whereby reliability can be better controlled: triangulation, ensuring anonymity, covert research, control group, training, selection of field workers, reliability of measuring instrument, and constructive replication. Those thought to be relevant to this research have been considered as follows:

Triangulation, which refers to the inclusion of multiple sources of data, was included by virtue of the number of sources of information used. These are:

- perceptions, emotions of researcher
- physicality of the environment
- words of the participants
- nonverbal communication of the participants

Anonymity of the participants was assured, and as a result of the close working relationship of the researcher with the groups, this could be taken as given.

With regard to constructive replication, since this research seems to be relatively new, no attempt was made to replicate previous research with regard to the three variables; the research design and method were specifically chosen in order to initially explore the dynamics between these two groups and develop hypotheses for further research.

4.2.2 **Validity of the measuring technique**

A common definition of validity according to Kerlinger (1986, p.417), is encompassed in the question: "Are we measuring what we think we are measuring?" According to Mouton and Marais (1988) "...one of the major distinguishing characteristics of qualitative research is the fact that the researcher attempts to understand people in terms of their own definition of their world" (Mouton & Marais, 1988, p.70). The focus, therefore, is on an insider-perspective rather than on an outsider-perspective. With regard to the qualitative nature of this study, the aim is, therefore, to adopt a more flexible approach in order to arrive at explicit research hypotheses (Mouton & Marais, 1988). The process of validity here thus revolves around starting with loose definitions of concepts, and empirically operationalising these concepts

only "...after having entered the worlds of interaction that they wish to understand...They include as many behaviours as possible as indications of the concept in question" (Denzin in Mouton & Marais, 1988, p.70).

Given the above theoretical validity will now be discussed.

- Theoretical validity

According to Mouton and Marais (1988), theoretical validity relates to logically arranging or systematising the most important dimensions of meaning of the theoretical constructs. It is, therefore, only "...within the framework of a theory, a model or a typology that the dimensions of meaning - the associations - may be systematised through the process of definition (Mouton & Marais, 1988, p.63). Since qualitative research requires an insider-perspective, care was taken to eliminate interviewer bias, impulsive interpretation, as well as leading questions. Interpretations should not turn out to reflect the prejudices and biases of the interpreter (Packer & Addison, 1989a). The theoretical constructs, as discussed in chapter three will, therefore, provide a framework but not the entire basis for the analysis and interpretation of the data. An important point with this interpretation of themes was to look for confirmation of the same patterns, while remaining open to disconfirming evidence as it appears (Miles & Huberman, 1994). These patterns, therefore, needed to be subjected to scepticism. Interpretations of themes and constructs also needed to be understood and included from the perspective of the participant. According to Mouton and Marais (1988), the concepts of a qualitative nature possess a large degree of construct validity, because they are rooted in the world of their subjects. There are also limiting factors, such as the limited interpretative scope as well as the limited scope for generalisability.

The validity of the analysis and interpretation of the data depended in part on the researcher being as free as possible from projection and assumption. Part of this process was for the researcher to use herself as a measuring instrument and to be aware of expectations and cluttered emotion. In this regard it was useful to use an intuitive approach as a guide for further investigation (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Obviously this is not completely possible, so awareness and objectivity was important in order to interpret the perceptions of the researcher. In order to increase the validity of the study, the original data transcript was also read and commented on by experts in the field of psychodynamics. According to Miles and

4.2.1.3 Participant effects

Participant effects, according to Miles and Huberman (1994), relate to the fact that when human beings are aware that they are being studied they could act differently to how they usually do. Relevant participant characteristics in the framework of this research related to the fact that participants might have felt that they needed to have an answer for everything, and be seen to be capable of dealing with and expressing viewpoints about the research question. Participants might have felt that they needed to change their responses in order to protect their interests. The unstructured nature of the interaction will allow for this effect to come through, although the analysis concerning interpretation of underlying attitudes widens the scope of interpretation beyond manifestations of simple overconfidence.

Participant orientations relate to role selection, level of motivation of participants, and response patterns. As indicated, the selection of participants related to and is explained as by virtue of been a part of a certain subgroup within the organisation. The level of motivation should be acceptable, as further studies are respected within the organisation. Response patterns were kept to a minimum by virtue of the unstructured nature of the interaction.

4.2.1.4 Measuring effects

The most relevant effect to this research relates to context effects, which, according to Mouton and Marais (1988), relates to time and political factors. The time was specifically chosen for the end of the day, when participants would be more relaxed and less tense about the day to come and related deadlines. In a broader context, the research would be taking place when there is already discussion and focus on the supervisor group and how they "fit in" to the organisation in terms of their role. Furthermore, there was a lot of support from the partner in charge to look critically at this role and develop it. Political factors within the organisation that need consideration related to the relatedness of the supervisor and manager group and how and where the supervisor group might defer to the manager group. This aspect was considered by keeping the structure, aim and parameters of the interaction firm and in place.

Huberman (1994), it is also useful to look for negative evidence, as well as to consider if the conclusions are considered accurate by original informants. In this regard during the interview, analysis and interpretation, vigilance was maintained to look out for confirmations and opposing evidence.

4.3 CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter covered the detail of the qualitative study (research question 3, phase 2, steps 1 – 4) and included an explanation of the sample and measuring technique. The detail of the sample was given and the relevance of this to the objective of the research. The type of measuring instrument and rationale for use was given as related to the problem statement of this study. Detail was included on the application of the technique, including the administration, collection of data, analysis and interpretation of results. Detail on aspects of reliability and validity, that were considered relevant to this study in terms of this technique was also included.

The next chapter will cover the results of the research.

CHAPTER 5: RESULTS

The results of the study are reported in the following chapter, as per phase 2, step 5, as explained in chapter one. Various themes have been identified and are discussed.

This chapter is set out in three parts. Part 1 describes the context of the data collection, part 11 the process that took place throughout the interview, and part 111 the dynamics that took place. These dynamics have been described and reported in terms of three themes which have been theoretically described in chapter three.

5.1 PART 1: THE CONTEXT

The group consisted of one manager group representative (male), two supervisor group representatives (both male), and the human resources (HR) representative/ researcher (female). One other manager group representative, who had confirmed that he would attend, phoned and cancelled his attendance due to a work crisis.

The group met in a meeting room on the other side of the building to where this group works. The two supervisors sat on the same side of the table, the HR representative/researcher facing them and the manager on the third side of the table. The supervisor group sat with their backs to the door, and the HR representative/researcher sat facing the door. The table was rectangular in shape and made up of four smaller tables. Each of the three groups sat at the smaller tables.

Although the air conditioning was on, the room got a little warm during the discussion. Nobody pointed this out or volunteered to change this.

Note: The researcher attempted to remain purely in the role of researcher for the purpose of the interview. When analysing and interpreting the interview data, however, it became apparent that the researcher's work role, that of HR manager, played a part in the dynamics between the supervisor and manager group. As such, it was considered important to include this role, given that the representation of the HR group seemed to have some impact on the dynamics of the intergroup relations between the supervisor and manager group. The

researcher is, therefore, referred to as the HR group or HR representative for the remainder of this chapter.

5.2 PART 11: THE PROCESS

The meeting was set for 4pm to 5pm. The HR representative was the first to arrive. On route to the meeting room, one of the supervisors phoned to say he would be late. The telephone call was taken by the receptionist in charge of taking calls for this group.

The one supervisor arrived at 4pm. The other supervisor at 4.10pm. The manager arrived at 4.15pm. The HR representative tried to phone the manager at 4.10pm to find out where he was, but did not speak to him. The data collection, therefore, started at 4.15pm and lasted until 5pm which is 45 minutes as opposed to the confirmed time of one hour.

The conversation with the first supervisor to arrive revolved around near-miss aeroplane crashes. The HR representative spoke about being nervous, which the supervisor seemed surprised at.

The conversation relating to the formal data collection started and continued with much enthusiasm and lively talk. The discussion did not change very much in terms of the dynamic of the group. Not much difference was noted in the way the group interacted, in their attitude or behaviour during the time of the discussion.

The discussion was recorded using two dictaphones. The entire group spoke mainly to the dictaphones, with some body movement toward the other members of the group. The two supervisors had their meeting folders open on the desk. The manager did not have his with him. He arrived with his shirt sleeves rolled up.

There were three incidents during the discussion which need to be mentioned. A woman came to the window of the meeting room and wanted to come in to set up the tea table. She was ignored. Both the manager and the HR representative saw her; the HR representative acknowledged her but did not invite her in. The cell phone of one of the supervisors rang. The tapes for the dictaphones were turned over.

Following is an overview of the interview, focusing on the process as the interview unfolded.

- An overview

The situation opened with discussion and comment about the appropriateness of choosing the supervisor group and the manager group for a study of interaction. The point made was that these two groups do not interact very much. The groups overlap. Rationalisation was verbalised.

A split between the manager group and the supervisor group was indicated, as well as criteria for inclusion; one being the need to perform to be a part. Initial discussion revolved around this split, the need and desire for inclusion, the manager group cohesion and lack of cohesion, the role the supervisor group plays in this split, and how they separate themselves between their person and their work

Lines and structure of authority seemed to play a role within this need for inclusion. What seemed to be played out was an attachment to an authority which was external to both groups, as well as a compromise of autonomy.

The criteria for inclusion became more specific, as time went on in terms of recognising the work the supervisor group needed to do to be included and the competence they perceived they needed to prove. The discussion continued after recognising the split and criteria involved, with a seeming unhappiness at the verbalisation of this. What followed was an expression of belief that the struggle was in the past, and continuing expressions of externalisation of institutions, authority, structures and criteria, competence being a primary criteria of inclusion.

Once competence was mentioned, destruction and battle with the manager group was verbalised. At that point, the manager group indicated that they were split as well, with a need for the members of the manager group present to separate from the rest of the manager group, as represented by the organisation and the authority, and a need to align themselves with the supervisor group. The split between person and work and an externalisation of institution was reiterated.

At that point, the supervisor group acknowledged a split within their group; an attack on the manager group was verbalised but then downplayed. There seemed to be a need to realign with the manager group and make friends with them. At that point there seemed to be a question from the supervisor group as to whether inclusion within the manager group was what they really wanted. This feeling seemed to occur concurrently with the need to attack the manager group. It was as if the supervisor group were hiding this attack behind friendship and seduction. This happened via a separation of person and work, and a perceived acceptance of the rationalisation required for inclusion.

At that point, the HR group entered the discussion; the manager group seemed to want to challenge the HR group. This group seemed to represent some threat, perhaps because the HR group was perceived as holding the person aspect, that which the manager group felt needed to be dismissed.

Here the manager group seemed to sidestep the battle against both groups and indicated that the supervisor group were confused in terms of what they were meant to be doing. The manager group seemed to want to keep the supervisor group confused. The manager group indicated that the exchange was clear, and that in order for the supervisor group to be included, they needed to take on work, responsibility and put in time and energy.

All the issues seemed to come to the fore at once and there seemed to be a confusion and a franticness about verbalising everything. The supervisor group indicated their attempt to destroy the manager group, but couched it in a friendly way. The manager group indicated their internal split, but the battle was indicated as being in the past, the supervisors were requested to carry the responsibility and the supervisor group seemed to toy with their desire to become more autonomous whilst starting to realise that this was in opposition to the criteria for inclusion. The frantic discussion calmed down with the verbalisation of another group that could be focused on – and that was the partner group.

The verbalisation of the seduction of the manager group, the need to stop the battle and clarify the roles, and questioning from the supervisor group as to whether this was what they wanted, took precedence. The anxiety was expressed in administrative issues and in a need to stay in control. The issue of lines of authority was expressed again as well as the issue of externalisation of competence. Once again, as soon as the competence issue was expressed,

the power issues arose and the question of power versus authority was expressed. Here stagnation issues arose, as the supervisor group realised what actually had to be given up, that is, new learning and the person.

The manager group stuck to their point and aligned themselves with the ultimate authority, the partner group. The supervisors are warned that there was to be no compromise here. The supervisor group were not accepting this as it stood and started to indicate their power in the interaction. When the supervisor group seemed to realise the extent of their power, the manager group expressed some jealousy at the so-called good fortune of the supervisor group. When the power was recognised, both groups seemed to split themselves away from it. Focus remained on the exchange, and immediately thereafter the externalisation of the hierarchy and competence.

The manager group indicated that the supervisor group were now joined with the manager group, and so the fight was actually over. This was done with reference to the now joint enemy the partner group. The supervisor group seemed to go along with this and indicated that they liked the manager group and felt honoured that they had been accepted. The manager group also expressed appreciation of this and indicated that they were honoured that there was energy spent on wanting to be included with them. From the manager perspective, this will hopefully stop the supervisor group planning an overthrow. The manager group interrupted the HR group, it seemed to ensure no reminder of the battle remains. If any doubt remained, the manager group indicated that the supervisor group was in the middle, they have no support and that they had better align and quickly with the manager group. "Were they in or are they out", seemed to be the question. The time for doubt and question was over. The manager group asserted their authority in expressing the criteria for inclusion.

The supervisor group seemed to passively agree, but their total commitment was not seen. The manager group seemed to sidestep this and indicated that the partner group was there to fight. The manager group reminded the supervisor group of the criteria. The supervisor group disagreed indicating discomfort with the stagnation that seemed to be inherent in this exchange. Competence was once again externalised and fear of repercussions for not following the rules indicated. The manager group reiterated that the partners could be fought. Confusion and unhappiness seemed to emerge with the supervisor group referred to as

"little". An attempt at containing this anxiety was expressed in the need to have clear cut roles.

The HR group was seen as interfering and was often interrupted. The supervisor group needed to make a stand of who they would choose. The supervisor group sensed that they had no choice in this, and defended and supported the manager group, as well as indicating a split within their group and a reduction in their power. The supervisor group needed to make a decision and were struggling with what this represented. They needed to make a choice between the opposing manager and HR groups. They now doubted that this was what they wanted. They wanted to integrate with the manager group, but they also wanted to integrate their new knowledge. The manager group tried to align with the supervisor group once again and indicated the power that comes with inclusion into the manger ranks. What was also indicated were the rules for inclusion.

The supervisor group wanted this inclusion as well as the advice the manager group represented, especially given the impending power of the partner group. The supervisor group wanted protection here. The HR group tried to indicate that this shift was not for real, but was ignored. A final and huge attempt was made from the supervisor group at the relationship with the manager group, and mentioned the training, mentoring and support that was needed. The manager group felt comfortable with this. The supervisor group felt comfortable with this as well, and felt that they had safely made their crossing. This was expressed as a joke about the meanness of the manager group.

The supervisor realised that their group had now split and a focus on getting the individuals across the bridge was made. The competition between members of the group came to the fore. Those that made it were now comfortably there. The HR group was trying to interrupt this support for the manager group and attempt at inclusion, but it was too late. The hierarchy and seduction of that perceived power was too great. The manager group indicated that the relationship would now hold, and those who did not make it were isolated. The HR group was certainly isolated from this inclusion. The HR group ended the conversation.

In summary, it seemed as if there was an attempt by the supervisor group to change and to bring something new with them into their inclusion with the manager group. It appeared, though, that the rules of authority overrode this attempt, and inclusion seemed apparent on

the terms of the manager group and the organisation. It also appeared that the supervisor group struggled to maintain their group boundary and identity, and compromised on this along with other aspects in order to confirm their inclusion. The HR group seemed to play a mediating role, but seemed ineffective in this, perhaps due to the projections that took place from the two groups onto the HR group. The groups seemed to enact their confusion in a lack of task clarity and projective processes. Overall, it seemed that the entire discussion remained stagnant at a certain level. Nothing much seemed to change and nothing new seemed to surface. It ended as it began.

5.3 PART III: THE DYNAMICS

An investigation into the dynamics of the relations between the supervisor and manager groups will now follow. From the analysis and interpretation of the data, various themes such as boundary management, authority issues and projective processes were found to be consistent and are, therefore, included.

5.3.1 Boundary management

According to the literature review (see 3.1.1), the purpose of organisational boundaries is to control anxiety in order to make the workplace controllable and pleasant. Furthermore, as an open system, information must be allowed to come in and leave across the boundary, which needs to remain functional in this interaction and under this potential for stress. Boundary management, therefore, includes managing boundaries surrounding the systems as well as those surrounding the subsystems (see 3.1.2). This relationship among and between the subsystems can either lead to collaboration and health, or imbalance, stress and dysfunction. Boundaries thus mark a discontinuity between the task of the organisation and the tasks of other systems in the environment with which it relates. It indicates, therefore, a relatedness between these systems. Furthermore, establishing and negotiating boundaries needs to occur at both intrapersonal and interpersonal levels, and since individuals, groups and the organisation are parts of a total system, the boundary of both individual and group need to be considered.

From the interview results it seemed as if the boundaries of task and group of the manager and supervisor groups are not managed effectively. Particularly the task boundary of the

supervisor group task is not managed effectively, and includes an apparent confusion of primary task, a lack of task focus, as well as conflict between the supervisor and manager subsystems. This anxiety seemed to be expressed in anti-task activity. With regards to group boundaries between the two groups, there seemed to be a conflict from the perspective of the supervisor group between wanting to be included in the manager group and staying excluded from the manager group. Also observed was an apparent conflict between wanting incorporation within the manager group and wanting to destroy the manager group. Within both these dynamics, the HR group seemed to play a role. A more detailed discussion will be given on the themes of task and group boundary management, both of which seemed to affect the relatedness between the supervisor and manager groups leading to ineffective work behaviour.

5.3.1.1 Task boundaries

As per the literature review, the purpose of developing subsystems is to increase the ability of the organisation to work effectively and efficiently through the use of differentiation and specialisation (see 3.1.2). Differentiation requires boundaries around systems and around subsystems. Boundaries also need to separate work activities and work-related relationships. These boundaries must, therefore, be managed in order to contribute to the effectiveness of each department and also to contribute to the wider goal of the organisation.

From the interview results, it seemed as though the task boundary of the supervisor group is not clear. There was much discussion around the perception that the supervisor group do and are expected to carry out two different sets of task. It seemed that the task definitions, which are recognised as unrealistic as well as frustrating, lead to uncertainty from both groups as to what they could expect from each other. There was anxiety expressed about this unclear or unrealistic definition. Related to this was a theme of anxiety expressed from the supervisor group about whether they were effectively fulfilling these expectations according to the criteria seemingly defined by the manager group and the organisation. Thus, it seemed as if the boundaries that could be used to effectively increase a capacity to specialise and differentiate, were being used destructively.

Regarding task boundaries, two major subthemes emerged from the results of the interview. These were unclear task definition and an anxiety and confusion about how to manage this. These two subthemes are discussed in more detail.

a Unclear task definition

According to the literature review, realistic task definitions are necessary in order to increase the capacity to tolerate depressive anxieties which lead to an increased capacity for problem solving (see 3.1.3.1). Ambiguous boundaries lead to dysfunction in the task system.

From the interview results it seemed as though both the manager and the supervisor group were confused about the task boundaries of the supervisor role. It seemed as if the task boundary of the supervisor group was defined as an amalgamation of the senior and manager group task boundaries. (The hierarchy of the organisation requires progression from senior, to supervisor to manager role). This was indicated when the supervisor group spoke of their attempts to carry out both sets of tasks - from both senior and manager group task definitions. The manager group confirmed this confusion when they spoke about the expectation of the supervisor group to carry out two sets of tasks which are specifically in conflict in terms of time and responsibility. It seemed that this inability to define the boundaries of task between the supervisor and manager group led to dysfunction in the task system, ineffective problem solving between these two groups and a repetition and continuation of this same problem.

Following this it seems as though the supervisor group were confused about their primary task. Their primary task seemed to be confused and enmeshed in relation to integration with the manager group. The question of purpose of task comes up. Is it to audit, to fight the manager group, to protect their group boundaries and remain a group or is it to be integrated with the manager group and to be seen as successful? This was indicated when the supervisor group spoke of the need to win the respect of colleagues and subordinates by getting involved and not expecting other people to pick up the pieces. There seemed to be an implication that this is not what the manager group does. This question of primary task seemed to be reflected from the manager group as well. In other words, is it to contribute effectively at the client or is it to move up the hierarchy? In this case it seemed as if the primary task of the manager group is to be seen as more successful and that this success can be measured in terms of the job listing they have. In this regard, the manager group spoke of the improvement in their job

listing as compared to a manager three or four years ago. This task confusion also seemed to be reflected at another level of the organisation, that between senior manager and partner. The manager group indicated that a particular senior manager is only taking on partner tasks, because the organisation needed him to do that, even though he is not officially a partner. It seemed that competition between the groups and confusion as to what the primary task was reflected in the emphasis, not on task, but on what fulfilling those tasks represent in terms of the idea of success and progression within the organisation.

In terms of the literature review, when the primary task is not clearly defined, a group will either split or some other primary task will be taken up. If some other primary task is taken up, this can be seen as anti-task behaviour reflecting basic assumption activity. This basic assumption activity is about facing the demands of the internal environment and anxieties about psychological survival, as opposed to Bion's sophisticated work group, which is about survival in facing the demands of an external environment (see 2.2 and 3.1.3.1 b). It seemed, therefore, that lack of clarity on primary task has led to a basic assumption activity, or an anti-task activity of focusing on progressing up the hierarchy of the organisation, to be seen as successful and thus ensuring survival. In this way, the supervisor and manager group do not seem to work together to successfully negotiate tasks which overlap. This was reflected when the manager group spoke of the supervisor group who have not interacted much with them, because they are their own little group, and the fact that the supervisor group is seen as being at different levels. According to the literature review, one subsystem can constrain the task of another subsystem, and by virtue of that or because of that, those efforts are not seen within the context of the efforts of the organisation (see 3.1.3.1 and 3.1.3.1 a). The conflicting ideas of purpose and competition between these two groups seem to lead to a lack of coordination and joint action. The groups seem to be in competition with each other and, therefore, working against each other.

It seemed as if there was much emphasis on the fact that the supervisors do not know what they are meant to be doing. The fact that these words were used rather than, for example, their tasks overlap, seemed to indicate that the manager group are relatively happy that the supervisor group is confused and in fact might work to keep this confusion. In this way, both groups seemed to be involved in anti-task activity. This was confirmed when the manager group spoke about how the manager group uses the supervisor group to take on tasks that perhaps the manager group should be doing. The real conflict or the real battle, as it seemed

to be, could be about a perceived threat from the supervisor group. This aspect remains unspoken (see destruction vs incorporation, sec 5.3.1.2 b). The expression of the fact that the supervisor group does not know what they are meant to be doing, also seemed to be reflected within the manager group in relation to the partner group. The manager group spoke about the fact that they do not know what the partner will look at when reviewing the work of the manager or supervisor or at what level they might leave their review. It seems as if in the relation of the senior groups to the junior groups, the feeling is that the junior groups must not get too clever in case they end up taking over the senior group's tasks and roles.

b Anxiety about unclear task definition

According to the literature review, task boundaries refer to knowing what the work entails and anxiety related to this can be contained in job descriptions (see 3.1.3.1). It seems as if the job description of the supervisor group is not clear and anxiety is expressed in reaction to this.

Anxiety was expressed on a few occasions from the manager group with the need to have the task of the supervisor group more clearly defined in the future. The words used to describe this were "clear cut". The confusion was alluded to when the manager group spoke of the misery that this causes both groups. The supervisor group confirmed this need for clarification when they mentioned that role definition needed to take place. Perhaps this comment was also about ruthlessly leaving behind all the tasks associated with the more junior roles. The lack of task definition of the supervisor group seemed to be providing too many conflicts for both the supervisor and manager groups. The words that were used were "cut off" in illustration of the different tasks of senior, supervisor and manager.

The anxiety expressed could also relate to a consequent anxiety on the part of the supervisor group about doing or not doing a good job. The confusion of primary task and subsequent anxiety of performance assessment of the supervisor group is reflected. The task is not clear, although the expectations of the supervisor group to carry out tasks of both the senior and manager groups seemingly are. This was expressed by the supervisor group when they said that a supervisor in the role of senior is expected to be at the client's premises, and in the role of manager, is expected to manage administration and client meetings. Reflected was the confusion about measuring and assessing when the supervisor group is doing a good job.

Does the manager group measure them in the role of senior or in the role of manager? The manager expressed that the role of senior is fulfilled adequately, yet the role of manager not.

The supervisor group at that point did not comment on their anxiety or feeling that they are measured against the performance of managers who are formally in that role or are measured against a standard of manager performance which is unrealistic given that this group is still taking on tasks of the senior role. It seemed that the manager group also did not want to make this explicit. The few words possibly relating to what the managers actually think of the supervisor group's performance of manager tasks could not be heard. This was indicated when the manager group mentioned the managers think or say something (this could not be heard), and as seniors the supervisor group is doing an excellent job. In this way it seemed that the manager group was not being honest and open about their anxiety and expectations. Open communication between these groups seemed hindered.

The anxiety expressed could also be contained in the focus on administration and detail. According to the literature review, when an organisation has limited control of its own boundary and input system, it often finds it necessary to ignore the boundary between itself and its environment, sometimes allowing that area to be controlled administratively (see 3.1.3.1.a). According to the interview results it seemed as though the anxiety the supervisor group felt about taking on the manager role is contained in the administration that needs to be done by virtue of this role. This was expressed by the supervisor group in the administration that needed to be done as part of the manager tasks. The manager group confirmed this with comment on the assistance they give the supervisor group on administration. In this respect it seemed as if the manager group also contain their anxiety about interacting with the supervisor group by this administrative focus. It seemed that the measure of being seen as competent as a manager lies in making sure that the administration is correct in terms of the organisational definition of what that should look like.

From both groups there seemed to be an element of being expected to take responsibility without adequate authority, which could lead to anxiety and a subsequent sharp focus on the detail and on those aspects that authority will focus on. It seemed that there was some anger in this and in the realisation that perhaps there was some personal compromise happening. The impression was also one of a need to prove this competence. This was reflected in the comment from the manager group about how heavily the partner group relies on them. It

dependent on each, with the supervisor group depending on the manager group to provide a lead, whilst the manager group depends on the supervisor group to pick up aspects of their (the manager group) responsibility. There is perhaps a flight into this administration to defensively escape into activity. Anxiety was also reflected relating to "good" performance. It seemed that a clear task definition would assist the groups to negotiate their working together interdependently as opposed to independently or dependently. This is not the case and this difficulty seemed to be managed by denial and by the paranoid-schizoid position (see 5.3.3.1).

It appeared that the two groups were trying to hold onto feelings of safety and security within each of their groups, by focusing on intragroup purposes as opposed to intergroup purposes. As each group holds onto their own direction, purpose, attitude and value to the exclusion of the organisational direction, purpose, attitude and value, less and less integration and cooperation can take place between these two groups. This seems to directly lead to anti-task behaviour of keeping clear differences between the groups that are in fact ineffective. Perhaps this is the only way the groups can operate with some identity, that is, via anti-task activity as opposed to clear task definition. It seemed, therefore, that the supervisor and manager group do not move together in alignment with the organisational goals. The energy seems to be expended on negotiating the task interaction between these subsystems as opposed to following a common purpose. In this respect, it seemed as if the supervisor and manager group were attempting to carry out a purpose which is in conflict between the outward or publicly stated objectives. In other words, both groups seem to have competing task sets, with the supervisor group trying to be managers and the managers attempting to keep the supervisor group in the supervisor role. Following this, perhaps the managers keep the supervisors "in the dark", attempt to hide the battle and confuse the points of responsibilities. These relations could lead to ineffective work behaviour, as these two groups or subsystems do not seem to work in harmony with one another. The confusion of boundary of task also relates, it seems, to confusion of the group boundaries.

5.3.1.2 Group boundaries and identity

According to the literature review (see 3.1.3.2), a group creates an identity by developing a boundary. This identity and boundary contains anxiety. These boundaries define who is a part of the group and who is not and, therefore, includes a definition of belonging. This boundary

and thus identity is also linked to the primary task of the group and, therefore, includes something about being different to another group, about bringing something that another group cannot. Relations between groups are, therefore, affected by the fact that each has an impact and is impacted by each other, that is, activities of each are dependent on each other. This exchange, therefore, indicates some interdependency. Boundaries used negatively can emphasise differences with resulting competition and status hierarchies.

From the interview results, two major subthemes relating to group boundaries appeared relevant. These were an exclusion versus inclusion theme and a destruction versus incorporation theme. The identities of the two groups do not seem clearly defined; it, therefore, becomes complicated for them to relate to each other effectively. Parts of both these dynamics were reflected in interaction with the HR group, which seemed to make the relation between the supervisor group and manager group more complicated. As per the literature review (see 3.1.3.2), effective intergroup relations is determined by the extent to which groups feel they have to defend the integrity of their boundaries. In this regard, it seemed that much energy was given to defending and attempting to negotiate these group boundaries. A more detailed discussion on these two subthemes, that is, exclusion versus inclusion and destruction versus incorporation is now given.

a Exclusion versus inclusion

According to the literature review (see 3.1.3.2 a), individuals require group membership to give meaning, to confer status and to confirm a picture or identity of themselves, and might use the group to express what could be seen as primitive feelings in the areas of dependency, hope and aggression. Conflict between groups, therefore, could indicate a need to enhance internal integration. Furthermore, group membership includes negotiating individual boundaries within the group and maintaining a balance between personal identity and affiliation. This can affect negotiations between groups and management of dual group membership (see 3.1.3.2 b).

It seemed as though ineffective management of this boundary of group identity related to a struggle with inclusion and exclusion between the supervisor and manager group. It appeared that the manager group initiated and maintains this split, and, therefore, created and supports

this confusion. The split seemed to manifest in a focus on a struggle about negotiating and managing inclusion. The impression was that this was about a fear from the supervisor group about being separate from the manager group, but also an overwhelming need to be a part of the manager group. There seemed to be a strong vacillation between independency and dependency. There appeared to be a primary focus on developing an identity with the manager group, but also a feeling that neither group were prepared to negotiate a new identity together. The supervisor group seemed unclear as to which group they wanted to belong to and this resulted in the exclusion/inclusion dilemma. In this regard, it seemed as if the task focus had become secondary. There was recognition from the supervisor group that in order to be a part of the manager group, they needed to prove themselves according to the terms and conditions of this manager group and the organisation. Within this struggle, the supervisor group acknowledged that they needed the manager group and wanted to build a relationship with this group, although there were consequences of this inclusion. The supervisor group seemed to use the need for support and help from the manager group as the route to building this relationship. The HR group also seemed to be a part of this struggle and seemed to carry some of the conflict. There also seemed to be some battle between the HR group and the manager group as to who the supervisor group was going to align with. Thus, the relatedness between these two groups seems to focus on whether they are one group or two as opposed to how these boundaries could be negotiated. Ineffective management of this aspect seems to reduce the effectiveness of the supervisor and manager group working together. A focus could, therefore, be on determining - by using clearly defined identity boundaries - how much inclusion or separation, or interdependence, there should be between these groups in order for them to work together more effectively. The subtheme of exclusion/inclusion seems to manifest in aspects of independency versus dependency, the basis of inclusion, the consequences of inclusion, building a relationship between these two groups and the relationship of the HR group within this dynamic.

i *Independence versus dependence*

The supervisor and manager group were struggling with the situation of the supervisor group being seen as a part or being seen as apart from the manager group. At times the supervisor group were referred to as being one and the same as the manager group, and at other times,

they were clearly seen and referred to as separate. This was expressed directly and indirectly in a number of ways, as explained below.

The manager group clearly expressed a separation when mentioning that there was a big split between the two groups. From the manager perspective, there are two groups in operation. The supervisor group is clearly apart from the manager group, in part because in the recent months the current supervisor group was even more junior than their current role. It seemed as if the past and the history of the role the supervisor group took on, impacts how they are currently seen. The supervisor group carried out more junior work, as seniors, for the first half of the year, and were required to report to the manager group. At other times, the manager group indicated that the supervisor group were acting as junior managers and what they do was no different to what a manager does. They were one and the same as the manager group. It seemed that the manager group contributes to the confusion by sending double messages to the supervisor group, perhaps creating schizophrenia or splits within the supervisor group.

The struggle seemed to be reflected when the supervisor group indicated, for example, that they did not act as seniors anymore. At that point, the manager group seemed not to hear and indicated that that still might be the case. Again this conflict or contradiction was expressed from the manager group when mention was made of the supervisor group as colleagues doing the same job as the manager group, but reporting to the manager group. In this regard, the manager group seemed to indicate that the supervisor group is obviously not ready for the real work, but that they must still wait, work harder and prove themselves capable before they are included. The inclusion it seemed will not be completed until the supervisor group achieves the title of "manager". This seemed to be expressed when the manager group indicated that the supervisor group would need to learn and in time be recognised as successful by having a good job listing. This aspect also seemed reflected in the seating arrangements of the groups, with all three groups sitting at the separated tables that were joined into one big table. The face value, therefore, seemed to be that the groups were one and wanted to be seen as one, but underneath this there was a clear separation.

At times there seemed to be a need to see the split as over and the groups as one. There was perhaps a need from the manager group to make reparation for treating the supervisor group as less in some way, although the perception of the split was still primary. It seemed that the

manager group felt some need to include while making sure that the supervisor group were clearly seen as the other. This was expressed with use of the words "they" when referring to members of the supervisor group who were present. In this regard, the supervisor group could be seen as a part of the manager group, but now only in terms of what they did and what tasks they carried out. At that point, though, the contact between the two groups needed to be lessened. The feeling was: "You can pretend to be a part of us, but the consequences of this is that we will not be in contact with you. So you cannot really feel a part of us". This was expressed when the manager group indicated that they really have little contact with the supervisor group from a work perspective, especially when they are carrying out manager tasks. It seems again that when interdependence is perhaps needed, the groups revert to working independently.

From the perspective of the supervisor group, there seemed to be some fear that the supervisor group had been seen as a separate group from the manager group. The group seemed to want to hold on to the fact that they are in actual fact part of the manager group, and that this interaction (the interview) was stressful in that they felt that they had been made to be separate. This was expressed, as one of the first comments, when a member of the group mentioned that they were not sure of the rationale for picking these two groups as the supervisor group fulfils manager functions. There seemed, though, to be some fear of what inclusion might mean (see destruction versus incorporation, sec 5.3.1.2 b). There also seemed to be some frustration and anger at the separation that had been brought about by virtue of this interaction. Even though there was a need for the supervisor group to be seen as part of the manager group, they were clearly "smaller" than the real managers. This seemed to be expressed when the supervisor group spoke of fulfilling the manager role on small engagements. It appears that the two groups are not sure when to work together and when to work separately. It seems that in some situations working separately is of value, yet at other times, it is necessary to work together. It would be valuable for the groups to define in which situations it would be effective to work either independently, interdependently or as a unit.

ii *Basis of inclusion*

The basis of the supervisor group's inclusion with the manager group seemed to revolve around improving their levels of skill and experience, their understanding of the manager role and task, as well as proving and demonstrating their competence. This also included the need

to be seen as successful in the eyes of the organisation. The inclusion, therefore, seemed to relate to status and prestige and a need to be a part of management. Both groups seem to be very aware that this needed to happen, although there seemed to be some resentment from the supervisor group that this was necessary and some need from the manager group to downplay the importance of the supervisor group achieving the necessary skills. This would seem to be a very normal situation, that is, for junior staff to develop necessary competence and demonstrate that. It seemed strange, therefore, that this did not seem to be comfortably acknowledged. Following is more detail on this.

The criteria for inclusion based on level of skill and experience of the supervisor group was verbalised from the manager group, when the manager group indicated that the supervisor group are colleagues who still report to the manager group. The supervisor group seemed to agree with this lessened focus on the difference between the groups as it seemed to align with their perception that the difference between the supervisor group and manager group needed to be minimised. At that point, though, there seemed to be an acknowledgement that there was a difference and this difference related to experience. As much as the group wanted to be a part of the manager group, the realisation was that there are other factors at play. This was indicated when the supervisor group expressed the fact that the manager group advised the supervisor group, because the manager group had had so much more experience.

It appeared that the supervisor group felt part of the manager group when they saw themselves as understanding and being able to work with the same things that the manager group works with. Previously the interaction was seen as "us against them". Now the inclusion can be welcomed, because the supervisor group felt that they could speak about the same things as the manager group. The inclusion seemed to be in the realm of cognitive processes only (see also paranoid-schizoid, sec 5.3.3.1). The supervisor group felt more part of the firm once understanding, although not necessarily knowledge, was gained. This was expressed when the supervisor group indicated that they were moving between extremes; in the past they felt that they were against the manager/partner group, but now they felt they could and were understanding how that group thinks because they were included in the manager/partner meetings and understood what aspects of the business they were focusing on.

The basis of inclusion with the manager group also seemed to relate to a performance from the supervisor group of what they needed to show, to demonstrate and to prove. The need to perform was clear from this group. There seemed to be some frustration at this fact. The feeling seemed to be: "Why do we need to prove ourselves again and again? How much more do we need to do to prove that we are a part of the manager group?" This was expressed when the supervisor group indicated that the functions of supervisor and manager group were similar. These sentiments seemed to lead to a situation where destruction was considered (see destruction versus incorporation, sec 5.3.1.2.b). There was repetition of this sentiment of the act or performance that must be performed. The feeling from the manager group seems to be: "You can act like us, but you are not really a part of us." Again reflected was the double bind, and a love/hate attitude toward the supervisor group. Furthermore, this act is the front, the pretence, the show and display of the so-called competence of the supervisor group. This was expressed by the manager group with use of the words of "acting like manager". The use of the word "acting" implied an incongruence between taking on the responsibilities and tasks of manager, while not actually having the authority to carry these out. In this way, the supervisor group could feel disempowered.

The impression was that the manager group splits the supervisor group by including some on the basis of a perception of experience and excluding others on the basis of a perception of lack of experience. Perhaps the process and basis of inclusion could be more structured and clear in order to allow an increased ability to work together effectively. This structure, though, is not used: what is focused on is the consequences of inclusion.

iii Choosing inclusion and consequences of inclusion

It seemed as if there was a clear position explained to the supervisor group of choosing inclusion and deciding which side to join. It appeared the manager group wanted to threaten the supervisor group into joining them, and the manipulation carried out by the manager group seemed essential in order to force the supervisor group to make the decision to join the manager group. The choice seemed to be between the HR group and the management group. This was confusing, because the HR group is also at manager level. In this way, the manager group seemed to dissociate themselves and the organisation from the HR group and what they represent (see the HR group and the relationship, sec 5.3.1.2.a v). The "us versus them" scenario was complex and seemed to be between staff and management, and the HR group

and the organisation. The supervisor group seemed to have a foot in each area. The choice for the supervisor group seemed difficult in this way, as their home group had now started to fragment and they were required to choose quickly. Following is more detail from the interview on the above.

The manager group indicated that the supervisor group needed to take a leap, that is, to choose a side (the manager group or the HR group), or be seen as traitors. In some way it seemed that the same anger was directed at the HR group with regard to possibly tempting the supervisor group away from the manager group. The supervisor group was in the middle. Possibly the manager group was also expressing anger at themselves for being in a similar position in relation to the partner group. The manager group spoke about a significant leap that needed to be taken by the supervisor group to become part of the manager group.

Reference to which group the supervisor must now join was made with specific reference to the differences between the groups. A clear distinction was made between staff and management, and the fact that the supervisor group must now choose a side. As much as the supervisor group needed to know where they fit in, so the manager group wanted some confirmation from the supervisor group as to what their decision would be. There was a clear issue of when are you in and when are you out. The feeling seemed to be that this is now the real world, and the supervisor group will receive no more protection from the manager group. As a consequence of inclusion, the supervisor group needed to take on all aspects of being a part of the manager group. The manager expressed this quite clearly, repeating the jump or leap that needed to be taken by the supervisor group, as well as the fact that the supervisor group needed to manage themselves as being and act as being a part of the authority of the organisation.

In this way, the manager group seemed to be laying down the rules for inclusion to the supervisor group. Here there seemed to be an indication that this inclusion goes beyond skill, competence and understanding. It seemed the manager group were saying: "You are now part of the authority, and you have to support the manager and partner groups." The "us versus them" is repeated. The buy in and commitment, therefore, needed to be total. The person had to commit as well as the work person. At this point, the manager group referred to the partner group as "your" (the supervisor group's) partners, and indicated again that the supervisor group needed to gain the respect of the partner group by supporting them and taking their

side. In this respect, it seemed that taking the side of the partner group meant going against the staff groups. The manager group indicated that the supervisor group needed to stop being "nice" and take a harsher approach.

Given what this inclusion requires, the manager group indicated that the supervisor group must take responsibility for joining the group that made the most sense to them. The consequences of that decision is that they leave the existing group without confirmation that they have another group to join. The manager group agreed that this is hard. The question is then: "What is actually hard?" Perhaps it is about joining a group that does not exist (see lack of manager cohesion and internal dedifferentiation, sec 5.3.2.2.b). The manager group indicated that the supervisor group must feel like traitors for turning against their home group. Perhaps the manager group felt like traitors for encouraging the supervisor group to grow and learn in exchange for something that does not exist. An empty promise seemed to be in the offering.

It seemed that the home group of the supervisor group was no more. The collaborative group, or manager group, is the one the supervisor group needed to completely align to, that is in terms of work and social. It seemed that the supervisor group sensed that their home group was almost lost, and that their group cohesion was also fragmenting. At that point, the manager group indicated that confusion about inclusion comes from the supervisor group and not from the manager group. The supervisor group did not agree completely. Perhaps they were aware that what was being projected was the manager group's doubt about the validity of their contribution and confusion about accepting their own value.

The supervisor group expressed some painful feelings regarding the loss of their home group. This group had been together for approximately four years and had become stronger over time as they progressed up the hierarchical structure. The group got smaller and the challenges increased. It seemed the group were being pushed into a corner and would experience loss as a result of a loss in power and a very real possibility of being overpowered by the manager group. The supervisor group expressed this in the example of going to the canteen and being forced to fit in with another group, the manager group. It also seemed as though the battle against the manager group was fought very much as a group. The supervisor group had to pull together in order to win this one. Now that the end was in sight, however, the supervisor group would disintegrate. At that point the supervisor group began to talk in

the same way and used similar phrases. Again it seemed that the supervisor group had been given an ultimatum, either fit in with the manager group or be excluded. It seemed as if the manager group used this feeling of loss or depression from the supervisor group to their advantage. In a way, the supervisor group was now weakened and disempowered, this was the opportunity that the manager group had to finally convince the supervisor group to commit to them.

Towards the end of the interview, the discussion revolved around the importance of building relationships. The manager group made it clear that now the success of the supervisor group depended on their person and how well they are liked. The criteria for success of this is not explained or clarified. It seemed that acceptance, therefore, is conditional and depends on the person as opposed to the behaviour or performance. The realisation of this process, plus the loss of identity of the supervisor group, probably weakened the supervisor group (as much as it strengthened the manager group), and puts the supervisor group in a position of depression and allows more opportunity for manipulation from the manager group.

iv Building relationships

It seemed as if the supervisor group wanted the confirmation from the manager group that it was possible for them to be included in the manager group on the basis of being liked. The supervisor group also seemed to want confirmation that the manager group would be around to help them. The only confirmation received, though, was an indication from the manager group that the supervisor group needed them. The supervisor group agreed with this. Acknowledgement was given that at that point, the supervisor group did need the manager group's advice and experience. The manager group agreed with the expression that the supervisor group needed the manager group for mentoring and assistance. There was some discussion around the choice of words of training and mentoring. The manager group felt that training, more than mentoring, was what the supervisor group needed, again indicating their importance to the supervisor group, perhaps in the form of a teacher as opposed to a coach. The sense was that if mentoring would be used, it would be in an attempt to get the supervisor group to act and be like the manager group, that is, a type of cloning in order to fit in. This aspect seemed to reiterate the vacillation between negotiating group boundaries and destroying group identity.

These comments also seemed to reflect a feeling that the support was not always actually there. There was constant talk of support, but the sense was that when it might actually count, the support would not be there. This again may leave the supervisor group feeling disempowered. This aspect was repeated with the sense that the supervisor group were being forced to align to a manager group which does not actually exist in the same way, with the same support structures and identity that the supervisor group's home group had. Comments continued with who the supervisor group could identify with, who they liked and who they had worked for. Those were the people the group felt they could approach. The supervisor group seemed to feel that this aspect was a large part of the manager role. Part of these comments also seemed to reiterate the fact that the supervisor group sensed that their home group was fragmenting, especially when reference was made to how other members of the supervisor group might struggle with approaching the manager group for help.

This need for assistance also seemed to be reflected within the manager group who identified with this need and indicated that they would also go to the senior managers for assistance and support. Building relationships and being liked seemed to form the basis of progression here. The manager group also wanted to be included in the senior manager group. It seemed that, in some way, they were saying they were not. It seemed that in this way, the manager group also receives double bind messages from the senior managers. They would like to be included with that group and would like to receive support, but perhaps this support and inclusion is not always there. This seemed reflected in the fact that the senior manager cancelled his attendance to the interview on the morning of the interview, after initially confirming that he would be there.

v *The HR group and the relationship*

The split between the supervisor and manager group seemed to be expressed and carried by the HR group. As mentioned, the last part of the interview discussion revolved around importance of relationships. It seemed as though the supervisor group felt the need to choose between their alignment with the HR group or with the manager group. All three groups supported this dynamic. The choice seemed to be between what the HR group represented - which could be people, change, caring and new insights - and the manager group which seemed to represent stagnation, the need to belong, the need to be correct and the need to gain

approval from the organisation. The manager group and the HR group seemed to fight and argue over which route the supervisor group must follow.

The manager group put forward the criteria for inclusion with them, and that seemed to be building a relationship and being liked. Again it seemed as if there was a lack of understanding about the difference between accepting a person and accepting their behaviour. The HR group seemed to have no argument for their inclusion. The group seemed to be apologetic in the sense that perhaps what was becoming clear was that this was not the honest truth. Being liked was not being able to be real, to risk a new approach, thought or perspective. Being liked was about being the same and keeping things the same. The stagnation seemed to persist. The supervisor group seemed to be aware of this and spoke about establishing a comfort zone with members of the manager group. It seemed as if human resources apologised for the fact that there would be little contact, for the fact that the supervisor group would have been seduced and engulfed in the new manager group and, therefore, would no longer be protected. The integration between the supervisor and the manager group was there, now that the supervisor group were acting as managers. They have won the battle to become managers, but lost the battle to remain a group themselves. Human resources seemed to carry this.

The manager group interrupted the HR group to argue their point. It seemed that when the manager group realised that the supervisor group may align with the HR group, the manager group felt threatened and manipulated and dominated the supervisor group into linking with them. In this way, it seemed as though there was some competition between the manager group and the HR group. This antagonism against the HR group seemed to be confirmed by the manager group, in that this member arrived late for the interview. It seemed that the manager group expressed their aggression against the HR group by not being on time. At that point, the supervisor group confirmed their alignment to the manager group, firstly by teasing the manager group, secondly by reiterating their need for the manager group's support, and thirdly by confirming the crossing that had been made.

The supervisor group seemed quite pleased that they had made this crossing. The second time was easier. (The first crossing was possibly the cross over to supervisor). They seemed to feel that they were on the other side now. The relief was now that they had made it, they can be honest and laugh at the stressful past. They expressed that the manager group was not such

a bad bunch after all. Given that there was a sense that the supervisor group and the HR group had an understanding that there were aspects of the person that had been left out, and perhaps this was why the supervisor group even considered aligning to the HR group. The supervisor group seemed to feel some guilt here; they explained at length why they could now feel comfortable with the manager group and how important this was for them.

The HR group interrupted the supervisor group, seemingly to try to interrupt the commitment of the supervisor group to the manager group; perhaps wanting to keep the supervisor group aware and alive so that they would stay like they had been. In this way, the HR group also seemed to carry stagnation. The supervisor group expressed, emphatically, that it is about a new role. Here, the manager group confirmed that they had won the battle for the supervisor group. Similarity is mentioned, especially between the two groups.

The manager group interrupted the HR group on numerous occasions and seemed to take a patronising view. Relationships were emphasised and the competition about who wins the support of this group (the supervisor group) was mentioned. Parallels were drawn with clients and partners. It seemed that warning again is given to the supervisor group. The feeling was: "You have some way to go, so do not think you can win and step between the manager group and the partner group, like HR tried to step between you and us." In this way it seemed as if the HR group was used by the two groups to work out their relationship between themselves and also used by the supervisor group to make their alignment with the manager group.

In general, it seemed that there was great anxiety with how to manage the interaction between these two groups. There was an attempt to contain this anxiety; at times it seemed that the frustration boiled over and led to feelings of aggression and destruction.

b Destruction versus incorporation

Given the above considerations of inclusion/exclusion, another subtheme of group boundaries the groups displayed was an exploration into whether the supervisor group wanted to be incorporated into the manager group or whether they wanted to destroy the manager group and take over the role that the manager group play. This aspect seemed to be more about compromise, fear and rigidity than about negotiation. It appeared that there was a temptation to destroy and a feeling of compromise surrounding incorporation. It seemed this dynamic

was displayed when the supervisor group became aware of the power they could potentially wield. Once this power was displayed and the manager group became aware of possible destruction, the manager group seemed to want to introduce some sense of doubt to the supervisor group as to whether incorporation is what the supervisor group actually wanted. There was a feeling of distance between these two groups at that point. The supervisor group debated the possibilities of seducing the manager group so that they would become less aware of the power of the supervisor group. It seemed as if primary consideration of this revolved around the exchange. The question seemed to be what the supervisor group would be prepared to compromise.

According to the literature review, group membership carries some degree of emotional significance (see 3.1.3.2 b). From this develops loyalty and commitment to the group aims. Competition for membership can take place when conflicting demands place pressure on group loyalty, and there develops a vacillation between keeping an existing or home group together, or joining a collaborative group and negotiating new boundaries and criteria for membership. Often the effectiveness of collaborative group depends on the members' ability to manage their dual membership. Excessive commitment to either membership at the expense of the other will inevitably compromise task performance, and lead to problematic intergroup relations. In this regard, the supervisor group seemed to be debating the effects of the loss of their home group and whether joining a collaborative group was worth this loss and this effort. Two aspects are discussed as illustration of this subtheme of destruction/incorporation. They are the supervisor group's attempts to take over the manager group and the manager attempts at manipulating the supervisor group.

i The supervisor group's attempts to take over the manager group

It seemed that the supervisor group reacted with anger to the manager group's rules and their attempts at disempowering the supervisor group. The supervisor group seemed to fight against this dependency with a counter dependency of aligning with the HR group, or a threat from them of taking over the manager group. The supervisor group felt somewhat empowered at these options, especially as they started to become more aware of their new position and knowledge. This knowledge was seen as quite dangerous because it seemed to put the manager group, in their role and in their position at a higher level of authority, at risk. The supervisor group became aware of the hostility from the manager group as well as the

consequences of their group (the supervisor group) proving themselves. The potential for attack seemed to be high, and, in reaction, feelings of guilt from the supervisor group. This is dealt with in more detail.

- *Taking over the manager group versus incorporation of supervisor group*

What seemed to be reflected was the sense that the manager group might actually now be lower than the supervisor group in the hierarchy. The feeling was that if the supervisor group really had the knowledge and competence to act out the manager role, then they might take over the manager group; what would then become of this manager group. The sense of fear and guilt expressed by the supervisor group could revolve around this potential destruction of the manager group, and the destruction of the group that has mentored and helped the supervisor group. This was expressed by the supervisor group when speaking about an example of a situation when a member of the supervisor group was working at the headoffice of a client, and a member of the manager group working at a lower subsidiary and having to report in to the supervisor. This theme of potential destruction and perhaps death was also reflected by the supervisor group in the brief discussion held before the formal data collection began. This discussion revolved around near-miss aeroplane crashes. The manager group had not arrived yet and it seemed as if the supervisor group were aware of impending danger. Perhaps they were also looking to the HR group to support them; this by virtue of having this discussion with them. Perhaps this was also about the feeling that new thoughts and ideas might well be destroyed if integration or incorporation went ahead. The HR group seemed to reflect this with reference to being nervous. It thus seemed that the tables were turned and the supervisor group then needed to decide whether the frustration built by the sense of inferiority they felt from the manager group (and also from themselves), would cause them to turn against the manager group.

The supervisor group also seemed to indicate the need to make friends with the manager group. Perhaps this was a strategy to cover up the impending battle and the determination of the supervisor group to make it into the manager group, even if by destruction. This was reflected in the need to draw in the member of the manager group that was present and make friends with him by comparing him to the others, and by indicating that, with this manager, there was no problem with reporting to a member of the supervisor group, but that with other members of the manager group there would be. Also the member of the manager group

present is closer to the supervisor group, that is, more junior in the manager ranks; perhaps the supervisor group were asking him to help their group become part of the manager group. During this comment, the cell phone of the speaker rang. Perhaps this was an indication of the flight away from the anxiety of this battle.

In this way, the supervisor group seemed to attempt to seduce the manager group into ignoring the battle by indicating that they wanted to be with them, be included with them, socialise with them. The supervisor group seemed to feel that the manager group were now their peers, and by this making the statement that they would not be followers to this group anymore. It seemed as if an attempt was made by the supervisor group to get the manager group to accept this. This was adamantly expressed by the supervisor group indicating that they now would not have a problem sitting at the manager group's table in the canteen, whereas before they might have. The sense was that this was not a situation that the supervisor group wanted to remain in. In fact this situation was one that must be destroyed. Reference was made to the manager group as "previous people... who were managers", which seemed to indicate a battle that the supervisor group wanted the manager group to lose.

It seemed as if the supervisor group made their bid to take over the manager group and destroy them. The manager group seemed to fight this bid with the power of the organisation and hierarchy on their side. The supervisor group at times seemed to rethink their bid. In reaction, the discussion surfaced another theme, that of incorporation. If incorporation was an option, there seemed to be some fear of how the supervisor group could be incorporated; the anxiety seemed to be contained in managing the administration boundaries and fighting other groups. The fear was from the supervisor group who seemed to know that, by incorporation, they would be giving up their chance at making a change and incorporating a new approach of any form. This also seemed reflected in the appearance of the tea lady outside the room, whom no-one invited in. The reflection could be of the fact that no new knowledge or nourishment is allowed into this system. This aspect furthermore seemed confirmed when the supervisor group were talking about respect and the need to incorporate a respectful approach into the work situation, and at that point the dictaphone tapes needed to be turned. It seemed that incorporation of respect was a common theme, but one that was not listened to. The destruction then seemed to be either of the supervisor group or the manager group, and if the supervisor group was going to be incorporated, they would need to be destroyed as a group.

The manager group seemed to confirm this with reference to a "cut off" and a clear cut time boundary of the move from taking up supervisor tasks to taking up manager tasks.

- *Guilt about destruction*

The conflict from the supervisor group was expressed as follows: "We want to be a part of the manager group, but are afraid of the potential for attack that is communicated". The perceived attack could also have been seen in terms of how the supervisor group were preparing their own battle. In this regard, they were probably not far wrong to fear an attack, if they were measuring the potential of this from the managers to them. This was reflected in the comment from the supervisor group that when a member of the manager group is working at a lower subsidiary there is some hostility perceived to be coming from that group. This seemed to be confirmed when the speaker turned the pronouns around and referred to the manager as "I" and the supervisor as "he".

Guilt and a need for reparation also seemed to be expressed by the supervisor group. They referred to the manager group, seemingly asking if this was all okay. The question that seemed to be asked was if the manager group were okay with now being the potential victim of the supervisor group. As if to underplay the severity of the attack, the supervisor group then denied their competence and knowledge; suddenly it was safer to not know, and, especially, not to know what they had done. This was expressed by the supervisor group when, after making this kind of comment, they either referred back to the manager group or indicated that they did not know.

The supervisor group kept the question of what aspects are to be engulfed by what and which group engulfed by which group unanswered, and transferred this to the external structures (see paranoid-schizoid position, 5.3.3.1). This was expressed by reference to how the external structure of the client determined the internal structure of the manager/supervisor reporting lines.

ii *The manager group's attempts to manipulate the supervisor group by transferring the battle to the partner group*

Within this theme of potential destruction of the manager group, the manager group seemed to want to align themselves with the supervisor group in order to align themselves against the partner group. In this way, the manager group seemed to find a way to feel strong and powerful again, and the power of the supervisor group was what was acknowledged. There seemed to be a desire for a return of this power. This was expressed when the manager group, at that point, referred to the manager group as members of the supervisor group and the manager group as a third group.

Given this, the manager group seemed to want and, at times, actually did feel powerful again in that they could now provide guidance of another kind to the supervisor group; they felt strong enough to include once again, and perhaps specifically because the manager ranks would be stronger with this inclusion. This aspect, though, remained unsaid and what was picked up on was the fight with the partner group. The need to align with the supervisor group was expressed in the mention of another group, the partner group, against which the manager group might feel they now needed to overthrow. Thus inclusion is emphasised in order, it seemed, to pull together ranks to fight the final authority, the partner group. This was expressed in comments relating to how the supervisor and manager group need to manage the process of the partner group reviewing their work. Direct reference was made, by the manager group, of the supervisor and manager group against the partner group. It is convenient that the lines between the manager and supervisor groups were blurred. This seemed to be done only when it suited the manager group; seducing the supervisor group to join only when they were needed. Comment was made by the manager group of an attack on another group, the partner group, as well as the value of having the supervisors, as juniors, on the side of the manager group.

This theme seemed to be mirrored in the feeling of the supervisor group of only being supervisors because the firm needs them. They could now be a part of the manager group, because the manager group needed them to fight the partner group. The manager group needed the supervisor group, but does not necessarily want them. Mention is made that it is in part due to luck that the supervisor group are able to take up manager tasks.

The power of the supervisor group seemed obvious and something that could not be avoided. There also seemed to be some envy about the good fortune of the supervisor group from the manager group. The fear was expressed from the manager group that the supervisor group was gaining power, threatening the manager group and might take over. Reference was made to the growing job lists of the supervisor group, an aspect that obviously carries high regard. Reference was also made to the high salary of the supervisor group, very close to the manager group's salary. In response the manager group seemed to acknowledge that the supervisor group would not tolerate the manager group in the same way, using the same form of authority as before. The manager group then seemed to try to seduce the supervisor group. There seemed a definite theme of fighting the supervisor group. This could have been reflected in the manager group representative arriving at the interview with his shirt sleeves rolled up – perhaps indicating a preparation to fight if this was what was necessary. In response to this possibility that the fight was a complete win/lose one, the manager group proposed that perhaps the battle could be about making space within the manager group for new members as opposed to a complete takeover. This was reflected in the comment that things are better now, because the supervisor group do not have a manager above them.

It seemed that when the manager group recognised the potential fight against the partner group, the incorporation of the supervisor group became easier and even essential in preparing for the next battle. It was confirmed that the supervisor group could now be a part of the manager group, now that they could get together and talk about the partners. The manager group had found an ally, and maybe that was the reason they actually find that now they could support the supervisor groups' progression. This was reflected in comments about how the supervisor and manager group could now get together and talk about the partner in charge or discuss something this partner said at a manager/ partner meeting. Mention was made of "its hitting that stage", possibly referring to the fighting ring and the fighting which is still partly against the supervisor group, but now aimed more at the partner group. Perhaps this is a continuation of the warning from the manger group to the supervisor group. The statement: "You are still two years behind and you will never catch up," was made and the differences emphasised.

The reflection of the fight between the supervisor group and the manager group could be reflected in the fight to be between the manager group and the partner group. Perhaps the manager group was aware of the need to remember their own power and what they need in

order to make this overthrow materialise. This was expressed with reference to a member of the partner group who needed to report into the manager group's division. It seemed that the division here was also made clear and also recognised was the need to clear this up, perhaps by means of another fight. Again guilt seemed to be reflected about the potential and felt need for this fight. This was expressed in a disjointed comment retracting the impact of the partner group reporting into the manager group. The feeling was that the manager group can though focus on the "problems" of the supervisor group and with relief turn away from their own impending fight.

c Integration of group boundary theme

With respect to the exclusion/inclusion theme, it seemed that even though it was accepted that the supervisor group is junior to the manager group, the groups seemed to want to deemphasise these differences, not acknowledge them, and see the groups as on the same level of authority. This normal development stage seems to be fearful and could be because of competition between the groups - the manager group being fearful of the competence that the supervisor group might bring, the desperate need of the supervisor group to belong somewhere (given that their home group is fragmenting), and a subsequent difficulty on the part of the manager group to manage their authority in relation to the supervisor group.

The supervisor group was seen as junior during the first part of the year, but this is not currently the case. There does not seem to be much interaction now, although the supervisor group does need to ask for advice or clarification on certain issues. In this same way it seemed as if the difference between senior managers, that is, about to make partner and junior managers, were also underplayed. The words seemed to say that there is no difference in the jobs that are done and the responsibilities are the same. The need for inclusion seemed to override a clear boundary between the experience that these two groups bring. Both supervisor and manager group expressed a need to be seen as a step higher in the chain of authority. This need appears to undermine the possibilities of an interdependent working relationship. The impression was that the groups recognised this conflict and the manager group were aware of a need for reparation. The manager group appeared, therefore, to be aware of the double messages they had been giving the supervisor group. Guilt stirred up by this awareness gives rise to feelings of reparation. The manager group seemed to see their

own conflict in wanting to recognise the knowledge that the supervisor group display, and wanting to keep them separate.

The point is made that the supervisor group still need to prove themselves to the manager group in order to be accepted and be included in the manager group boundary. In this case, what the supervisor group might have to prove could be along the lines of what they need to give up and sacrifice. This sacrifice revolves around giving up their sense of cohesion and picking up and doing as many tasks as the manager group give them. The sacrifice also appeared to be along the lines of giving up the person as opposed to changing the behaviour. The supervisor group in this way seemed to feel manipulated and threatened by the manager group.

The relation to the HR group regarding inclusion also seems intricate. The HR group is at manager level as well, and by virtue of the interaction the manager group and the organisation seem to reject what the HR group could bring. In terms of the relation between the supervisor and manager group, there is a clear message here. It seems to be along the lines of an all or nothing relationship. The supervisor group are being told that they cannot join the manager group and, therefore, the organisation if they listen or take what the HR group says into account. If they want to move into the authority of the organisation this is what they must do.

The feeling of the interaction from the perspective of the HR group was one of crossing boundaries into an area and space that was not welcome. The researcher felt some hostility and felt the need to "get things right". This can be deduced from the fact that use was made of two dictaphones tapes, in case one malfunctioned, the need to go into much detail and complexity in the interpretation of the data, the feeling of being overwhelmed by the subtleties and nuances of the interaction, the feeling of being incompetent and not able to entirely structure the interview in the way planned, the need to apologise and try to keep the two groups happy, and not to reflect or point out some of the areas of conflict. This inclusion/exclusion dynamic could probably reflect how the groups deal with other groups whom they consider strangers. It seemed that what the outside could bring was not considered or accepted. This seems to relate to an intense desire to keep everything the same, that is, the process of learning, the process of acceptance, as well as the process of being included. These aspects all seemed to lead to feelings of stagnation.

The supervisor group indicated that inclusion and exclusion is about respect and remembering where you came from. It seemed as if the manager group did not want to work with these concepts, thus the focus on destruction versus incorporation. It seemed, therefore, as if the anxiety of the struggle of exclusion/inclusion translated into this further dynamic of destruction versus incorporation. This expressed need for respect seemed to be a common theme from the supervisor group, something the manager group did not seem to understand. The manager group seemed to interpret this as "doing your time and taking up your load".

The supervisor group seemed to start becoming aware of their power, and were at loss as to how to incorporate this into the organisation. Simultaneously, it seemed as though the organisation did not want to accept their competence or would only consider it on certain terms. The supervisor group seemed to be questioning these terms. It appeared that there was a concern from the supervisor group about the potential danger of what was about to be expressed. Perhaps this questioning was also about the purpose of this whole struggle to make it into the manager group, and questions as to whether the manager group is in fact a group the supervisor group want to join. Furthermore, if the manager group represents the organisation and the behaviour of the organisation on these aspects, is advancing up the hierarchy really worth it?

It seemed as if the manager group felt envious in relation to the supervisor group and also unsure how to incorporate the power that the supervisor group displayed. It seemed that the manager group were attempting to contain their own internal anxieties and wanted to recreate the power play they saw in the supervisor group. The difficulties in collaboration could have come from the sense of being an inevitable loser in a struggle. The manager group seemed to attempt to underplay the power of the supervisor group and their goal by indicating that the value of the manager group role was questionable and perhaps of little value. Since the group identities were not defined, perhaps this led to a position where the supervisor group did not feel safe. In reaction, what seemed to come up was a desire to fight the organisation in part because this organisation did not protect and seemed to set them against that very group that the supervisor group thought would help them. It seemed that there is a lack of trust in this system. The paranoia seemed almost justified in that the supervisor group were not sure whether the manager group were working with them or trying to "set them up". The manager group, it seemed, attempted to sabotage the supervisor group by holding their boundaries and

criteria for inclusion, and not wanting to discuss or negotiate these at all. There seemed to be a fear that if this was done, the manager group will be overwhelmed and destroyed. It seemed, therefore, that the manager and supervisor groups struggled to sort out their identity boundaries and working relationship, and thus reverted to containing the anxiety in mechanistic solutions of organigrams and an attitude of non negotiation.

Clear indication was given of what incorporation into the manager group would mean. The supervisor group were expected to exchange the learning that the manager group passed on to them with their, the supervisor group's time, energy and support – particularly for those aspects that the manager group is avoiding. The price of this learning is high and what is paid is the price of the supervisor group's time and energy into taking on two sets of tasks and the responsibility for those tasks without adequate authority. There seemed to be an aspect of bribery here, - particularly in terms of money - given that the high salary of the supervisor group is referred to here.

Another criterion for incorporation related to respect and specifically respect for knowledge. The supervisor group were at the interview ready to learn, with their meeting folders, while the manager group seemed less concerned about what they could gain. It seemed that clear indication is given that incorporation means bringing no new ways of doing things and no new knowledge into the manager group. Sources of information and knowledge that might be valid to the growth of the manager group appear to be ignored and completely rejected. In this way it seems as if external knowledge is sidelined in the same way as internal knowledge is sidelined. The supervisor group seem to be aware that to attempt to bring new ways will mean exclusion. This seemed to be fearful, confusing and frustration as the supervisor group were attempting to carry out two task sets and in this regard having to trust their own knowledge, but simultaneously and in contradiction not being able to work with their knowledge in interaction with the manager group.

The relatedness of the two groups seems less constructive than it could be due to the fight against each other as opposed to a constructive dependence or interdependence on each other. The desire for inclusion seems to be an unattainable goal, as once the supervisor group is included in the manager group, the next battle seems to be inclusion with the partner group. There seemed to be a need for pairing between the two groups. It seemed that on this aspect the supervisor group wanted to pair with the perceived powerful manager group and that this

will perhaps save them. Perhaps the conflict and vacillation between destruction and incorporation revolves around the questions from the supervisor group about what will be created by virtue of this pairing. They are perhaps unsure as to whether this creation is of any value.

The struggle with this incorporation seemed to relate to the purpose of the existence of the supervisor role. The question arises as to whether the organisation uses this group effectively. It seems that the supervisor role has become enmeshed in containing their boundaries of their role and task to the detriment of focusing on what they could contribute, and how they could add to the organisation's success. It appeared, therefore, that the lack of clarity from the supervisor group on the boundary of where they belong in the organisation leads to a struggle with their own group identity boundary. In this respect, perhaps the organisation could spend more energy on expanding knowledge and including new and better methods of operating as opposed to managing those boundaries and fighting for identity. Perhaps the energy could be shifted from trying to find an identity and trying to establish recognition of competence, to bringing that competence and desire to improve out to the fore. This is, though, where the conflict comes in. Inclusion will not be attained, it seems, where there is a desire to enact change.

5.3.2 Authority

According to the literature review, the nature of authority influences the structure the organisation adopts, the relationships among employees and the way in which work is accomplished (see 3.2). Ideally, structures could be used to optimise the talents of organisational members. Often, though, in rigid hierarchical structures, authority is projected at the expense of creativity and innovation, relationships become pathological and destructive, and status is projected at the expense of others. By necessity, therefore, this needs to lead to a focus on how groups and individuals use their own authority and how they relate to the authority of the organisation.

From the interview results, there appeared to be two major subthemes that emerged in relation to authority. These were autonomy, and authority and power. It seemed that the supervisor group were re-evaluating their relation to the authority of the manager group and to the organisation. The group seemed to want to start taking on more authority, but seemed

to be aware of what the consequences of this was. The group also appeared to be very aware of the relation between authority and power and how the manager group and organisation use the hierarchy and structure of reporting lines to confirm power. The supervisor group were apparently questioning the validity of this use of power, but did not seem to know what to do with that knowledge. A more in-depth discussion of these two subthemes now follows.

5.3.2.1 Autonomy

According to the literature review, a condition of "good enough" authority refers to a state of mind arising from a continuous mix of authorisation from a sponsoring structure, sanctioned from within the organisation and connection with inner world authority figures (see 3.2.1.1). Autonomy, therefore, refers to the capacity of an employee to function independently (see 3.2.1.1a). In order for employees to function autonomously, clarity of boundaries and clarity on delegation across those boundaries is essential. Many organisations create situations where a focus on developing autonomy ends up leading to situations where delegation disempowers as opposed to empowers employees. This could relate to a superior's fear of "giving up" control and a subordinate's fear associated with autonomous functioning. This situation can lead to basic assumption behaviour of splitting, resulting in a deadening of spontaneity, lowering of creativity and risk taking being avoided.

From the interview results, the supervisor group seemed to vacillate between exercising their autonomy and giving it away. The group seemed to want to prove their competence and seemed to want the manager group to acknowledge this. The manager group appeared to support this vacillation and abdication of responsibility. Following is more detail on the above two aspects.

a Questions on value of supervisor group

The discussion started with the supervisor group questioning whether their line of thought and questioning was valid. This was reflected when a member of the supervisor asked if he could ask a question. This was the first comment made in the interview and seemed to reflect a strong sense of doubt that the contribution of this group was of value. The questions that this group seemed to be asking was: "Is it acceptable for us to question? Is this in line with what authority wants and what authority is saying?" There seemed to be a fear then that if the

group did not fall within these parameters they would not be accepted. In this way, the supervisor group seemed to feel disempowered.

At other times during the interview there seemed to be strong expression from the supervisor group that they can, do and will deal with issues. There seemed to be the need to prove their competence. This was expressed by the supervisor group when they said that they would ask the manager group for advice on specific issues, but that they would not report to the manager group or have their work reviewed by them anymore. The supervisor group also mentioned that they had valuable knowledge and that this knowledge was sought by the manager group. In a way, it seemed that the group wanted acknowledgement and confirmation from the manager group that they have this valuable knowledge. There seemed to be some anger in this, in that the supervisor group seemed to want to be independent, but in their efforts seemed to have developed a counter dependent relationship with the manager group.

The feeling was clearly expressed, therefore, that even though the supervisor group still needed advice, they did not have to and did not want to report to the manager group. The sense was that the supervisor group did not need the manager group to look after them, or tell them if they were right or wrong, although there was the feeling that the supervisor group still wanted support and guidance perhaps to cushion them if they were wrong according to the organisational standards. This process seemed to be reflected in the practice of auditing in that there are very definite ways of doing things, although the interpretations and judgements are more dependent on experience. It seemed that the manager group worked with these judgements in a rigid right or wrong fashion, and the supervisor group attempted to measure their judgements by the standards of the organisation. The feeling then was that the supervisor group knew that they needed to establish confidence in their judgements, but this was difficult because the criteria for these judgements seemed to exist outside themselves. There seemed to be a fear, therefore, that if their decisions were not right, there could be no explanation as to why that was the case and how would they justify those decisions. The supervisor group seemed to be clear on the point that there was a gap in experience between the two groups and also expressed a fear that a lesser gap might open this group to attack and a questioning of their judgement. This impression was gained when the supervisor group expressed that now suddenly they are almost managers.

In this regard, it seemed that a fear was expressed by the supervisor group that if they had to express their knowledge, the manager group would think them arrogant and complacent in their new found knowledge. Both groups seemed to measure their success and inclusion with the more senior groups on the same factors. It appeared that knowledge and skill is what is recognised and acknowledged as status within the organisation. Continual mixed messages though seemed to come through in terms of the value of this knowledge and the fact that it is only recognised within people that are seen to be similar to the senior groups and are, therefore, liked.

b Abdication of responsibility

As much as the supervisor group wanted to be a part of the manager group, the realisation was that this might not be as simple as it seems. This realisation seemed to occur when the manager group indicated a parallel between the operation and authority of the supervisor group and the manager group. This could relate to a fear of the supervisor group of "if we are actually a part then we need to know enough to be a part, and is this actually the case". Suddenly the supervisor group seemed not to want to take the responsibility for being completely part of the manager group. This was indicated when the supervisor group kept, it seemed, trying to qualify the statements of their knowledge with a reiteration of the advisory function that the manager group would play, given that they have had so much more experience. There seemed to be a fear, therefore, that if the supervisor group were completely accepted as part of the manager group, then the supervisor group would lose the guidance that they have so far been given. The need was expressed that this guidance was still needed. Consistently there was a feeling of "we need the advice, but do not want it". An example of this was the use of the words "sort of" to describe the advice given. The fear of autonomy seemed to be reflected here, specifically because of what autonomy appeared to mean in this organisation. Autonomy seems to mean to be left alone without assistance. The impression was that if the supervisor group had to take this role, they would be left alone. This was expressed by the manager group, that is, "once you are a manager you will work in isolation". There was a sense that if the supervisor group openly expressed this need for the advisory function, then it might be interpreted as the group not knowing enough, and the consequences of this might be exclusion once again. So there seemed to be a conflict within the supervisor group about needing the manager group on the one hand and not wanting to need and being seen to not need the manager group.

It appeared that there were numerous requests from the supervisor group to an authority to tell them what to do. This appeared to be safer than taking up their own authority and responsibility. These requests seemed to be related to the requests to relieve the anxiety surrounding the unclear task and role descriptions. The authority in this case is the manager group. There was a sense of fear of taking absolute ownership, and a sense of dependency on the manager group. The supervisor group expressed the need to have the task descriptions clearly explained per job, and at that point, the manager interrupted and, it seemed, attempted to "save" the supervisor group from the confusion. In this way, it seemed as if the manager group allowed the supervisor group to remain dependent, and in fact wanted them to remain dependent on the manager group.

c Integration of subtheme of autonomy

The supervisor group seemed to be at a point where they wanted to take on more authority and exercise their autonomy, although there were conflicts with this. There appeared to be consequences for taking autonomy in this organisation which the group is very aware of. This conflict seems to lead to a vacillation between exercising autonomy and giving it away. The manager group seemed to support this vacillation and seemed to mirror this process from within their own group. The face value therefore, appeared to be that the manager group wanted the supervisor group to take more responsibility in order for that group to develop and grow. The supervisor group is enthusiastic in taking these opportunities to develop their knowledge. Superficially, therefore, the relations between these two groups seem to be positive and constructive.

The underlying dynamic, though, seemed to be firstly, a fear from the manager group of another more junior group displaying more knowledge and gaining more sanction from the organisational authority than them, and secondly, a need to feel that they have some value to the organisation via a role of supporting and mentoring the supervisor group. Thus it seemed as if this manager group promoted dependency of the supervisor group on them. In some ways, it seemed that the supervisor group wanted to stay dependent on the manager group, who they saw as representing the ultimate authority. This could be a reciprocal arrangement that suits both groups. The supervisor group want to keep the manager group to protect them

and the manager group want to keep the supervisor group in order to feel valued. The anxiety of this space seems reflected in the expressed need for structure and mentoring.

It seemed then as if the supervisor group were working hard to find their own space. What seemed to be reflected, though, is that there is no new space that will be created. The supervisor group will need to blend in with the manager group. In doing so, the autonomy they seek will be undermined. In this way the hierarchy and strict lines of authority are not open to negotiation. Once they became part of the manager group, they will be "junior managers" and then will have to compete in the same way with the "senior managers". Perhaps that also relates to the focus on right or wrong, that is, there are no new ways of doing things, there is one way only, and that is the right way. There seemed to be a fear from both groups about the consequences of autonomy, in that it seemed that this autonomy equates to being isolated and in this way the organisational dynamic did not seem to support risk taking or learning if it occurs via being "wrong".

The impression was that the theme of dependency versus independency between these two groups is again reflected in terms of autonomy. Perhaps it would be valuable for the groups to learn how to structure their group identity and, therefore, be able to function interdependently. It seemed that inclusion could only be achieved via dependency and autonomy could only be achieved by independency. What perhaps needs to happen is an exploration into how inclusion and independency could be achieved whilst developing autonomy.

5.3.2.2 Authority and power

The second subtheme of authority related to issues of authority and power. It seemed as though the authority lines within the organisation are supported but not necessarily agreed with. The impression was that the groups projected the dynamic of authorisation outside themselves and onto the clients. There seemed to be more of a commitment to the hierarchical role that the group takes on than to the personal authority of the person and of the skills they bring. The manager group seemed to be unsure of their power especially in relation to the new found power of the supervisor group. There seemed to be a sense of wanting to control and own the supervisor group in order for the manager group to feel valued. The manager group, though, seemed to be acting within some sort of conflict in that

the power of their group appeared in some way limited and vague. In this way, there seemed to be a conflict between affiliation of the manager group and supervisor group, and a need to assert power over the supervisor group.

According to the literature review, a feeling of powerlessness could be a state of mind relating to problems with taking up authority, and/or a perceived lack of adequate external resources that could be used to bolster that power (see sec 3.2.1.2b), and can lead to institutionalisation or a collusion in accepting a reality as it is. Authority which is detached from rank and status and attached instead to role and task, therefore, becomes available to each member of the organisation. This prevents situations where individuals compensate for feelings of lack of power by abusing the authority of the rank and status they hold. From the interview results, two aspects seem relevant – lines and structure of authority and the lack of cohesion within the manager group.

a Lines and structure of authority

In terms of the lines and structure of authority, three aspects seemed relevant - the demands of authority, HR and authority, and the power and authority of the manager group. It seemed that the structure of authority within the organisation is confusing and this adversely affects the way the supervisor group and manager group relate to each other.

i Demands of authority

The reporting lines seemed very clear in terms of the organigram in operation within the organisation and between these two groups. The lines of authority are clear in that the supervisors fall below the manager. This was expressed when the manager group indicated that the supervisor group work in part, below the manager group. What is confusing is the fact that it seemed as if the organisation changes the overt reporting lines when it suits them and on an ad hoc basis. This seemed to affect the way these two groups relate to each and appeared to cause some confusion and antagonism. The antagonism seemed to undermine the commitment to the structures that the organisation has put into place. This antagonism seemed to be managed either with a passive buy-in to the hierarchy or a projection of this hierarchy onto outside groups, that is, clients.

seemed that the dynamic between the manager and partner group is also played out between the manager and supervisor group.

c Integration of the task boundary theme

It seems that the relatedness between the manager group and the supervisor group is negatively impacted by a lack of adequate definition of the task boundary of both the supervisor group and of the boundary of task between the two groups. Also reflected was anxiety regarding this confusion. Following is more detail.

It would appear that the task definition of the supervisor group is too broad and unrealistic. It seems that this definition also overlaps with the task definitions of the groups immediately senior and immediately junior to the supervisor group. It also appeared that the primary task of the supervisor group was not clear. Are their tasks those of seniors or managers? It seemed as though it was effective for this confusion to remain, perhaps because of the implied pressures from the manager group. What seemed to be happening is that the supervisor group supports the manager group by taking on certain manager responsibilities when this is convenient for the manager group. The publicly stated purpose for the supervisor group is to start becoming involved in manager responsibilities, to learn more about this role, and eventually take up this role more effectively when actually promoted. What seemed to be happening is an ineffective transference of responsibility and task, to a group that would pick up those unwanted tasks and duties. More and more is then forced onto the supervisor group in direct proportion, it seems, to the resentment from the manager group. This confusion seemed to be reflected within other groups within the organisation with which these groups interact.

It seems then that the organisation is not using this group effectively. It also seems as if the organisation is expecting the supervisor group to carry unwanted tasks and those aspects of responsibility that the organisation is ignoring. It appears, therefore, that the overall picture of the reasoning behind the creation of the supervisor group has been lost.

Also reflected in relation to this unclear task definition was anxiety. This anxiety, frustration and confusion of task definition is probably contained by using administration tasks as opportunities to avoid confronting the above-stated problem. The two groups seem to be

The impression was that there was a need to structure the interaction between the supervisor group and the manager group in the form of a hierarchy and authority which comes externally in the form of a client system of the organisation. There was a feeling of being powerless in the face of what the clients want and need. The demands that the clients put on the manager group and the demands that the manager group accept seem to be seen as normal and a burden to be carried. The dynamic of the perceived pressures from external and other groups seemed to be a common trend, both in terms of what the external clients put on these groups, and from the supervisor group perspective, what the manager group puts on them. The manager group indicated that the reporting line from supervisor group to manager group is applicable, because that is how the structure of the client is set up. It seems that the manager group find it difficult to manage the boundary and be assertive with their clients. That appears to create anxiety which they transfer to the supervisor group.

The supervisor group seemed to think that the structure of authority is amusing and the impression is that the authority of the organisation is not taken seriously. It seemed that the trend of the change over from supervisor to manager, and also from manager to partner is not always clear. The lines of authority are clear, although the task descriptions and roles are not. The groups are expected to take on other roles when it is convenient to the organisation. This was expressed when the supervisor group indicated that a senior manager is expected to take on the tasks of partner, but still needs to take his work to another partner to sign, because the senior manager is not formally a partner. This same dynamic seemed reflected within the supervisor group. In this regard, the reporting structure of the supervisor group was changing to some degree, although again it appeared that the specifics of this was not clear. The manager group spoke for both supervisor group and manager group, when they expressed the fact that the supervisor group will not have to report into the manager group anymore, although they (the supervisor group) will still work "below" the manager group. This situation is seen as an improvement, because the supervisor group now does not have the authority and power from the manager group to contend with. The supervisor group will be reporting directly to the partner group and this seemed to be about reporting to the ultimate authority. The manager group indicated that the responsibility of the supervisor group is now their own, although this is qualified. This responsibility would clearly not be their own, as they will be reporting to the partner group. The demands of authority are there and accepted, but resented.

ii The HR group and authority

The authority of the HR group also seems confused. The manager group seemed to want to challenge and reject the authority of the HR group, and by doing so seemed to reject the authority of the organisation in terms of people. There seemed to be some argument between the HR and manager groups over who had the highest authority in the interaction. It seemed as if this was also a struggle about the person and the work. This split was highlighted in many ways during the discussion. Perhaps there was some arrogance as to which option was right, as opposed to an integration between and an acknowledgement of the two.

The first time the HR group spoke it was about who has authority and when. This was after the supervisor group spoke of the hostility perceived from the manager group. After the comment from the HR group, the manager group spoke about the supervisor group being stuck in the middle of two situations. This, therefore, seemed to be about the authority in the relationship between the manager and the supervisor group, as well as the authority of the relationship between the HR group and both the manager and supervisor group.

The manager group seemed to want to challenge the HR group and interrupted the HR group on numerous occasions. It seemed that this group was expected to play the boundary role between workers and executives, and to take this over from the manager group. It seemed the manager group relinquished this aspect and projected it onto the HR group. By doing, so this group was excluded and the manager group seemingly safely avoided the confrontation of this authority issue.

iii Power and authority of the manager group

There seemed to be a fight against authority, while also a blind following of this. In this respect, it seems as though the manager group had not worked with their personal authority either. There seemed to be an expectation that the positional power should be enough. The manager group appeared to resent the fact that the supervisor group felt that they were able to report directly to the partner group and were comfortable to express this interaction. When the parallels were drawn between the situation of the supervisor group and one of the senior manager who acts as partner, this seemed to allow the supervisor group to feel that they really are managers; the supervisor group felt that they were then reporting to two leaders, both the

manager group and the partner group. In part the supervisor group seemed to be happy with this in that they were fulfilling a role that they had not yet been formally promoted into. The supervisor group indicated that they have carried out the tasks of manager and the senior manager the tasks of partner. The manager group interrupted to indicate that this situation was only a once-off situation. The comment seemed to be undermining and reiterated the fact that the supervisor group were only in that position because the firm needed them. It seemed as if the supervisor group were seen as less in terms of the functions they did. The manager group also reacted with the feeling that they now do not know where they, the manager group, stand. If their role was not to have the supervisor group reporting to them, then what is it that they do and what do they contribute. The fear could be that now the partner group will think that they (the manager group) are less important and, therefore, unnecessary. There was an element of competition and envy. It seemed as if the power that the manager group felt they had was invested in position only, with a sense of lack in the personal power of what they bring.

The partner group was often unnamed. This final authority seemed to be far removed from the frame of reference of these groups. There seemed to be a definite theme to not acknowledge this final authority or look at what that group represented. It could be that the partner group represented something unattainable, and something so removed from what these groups felt they could achieve. Related again was the feeling that maybe the authority that the partner group represented was actually something that these groups did not want to attain. If the confusion of authority between supervisor and manager had now been expressed, the confusion between these groups and the partner group was possibly now also being investigated. In some ways, it seemed as if the manager group measured their power and authority in relation to the supervisor group in the same way that they measured their power and authority in relation to the partner group.

b Lack of manager cohesion and internal dedifferentiation

A common defence against anxiety is to try to strengthen the emotional ties which bind a group of people together. This might include denying any differences which contribute to an indication of difference within the group. This defensive dedifferentiation is an inability to acknowledge and debate internal differences which make it impossible for a group to do effective work (see 3.1.3.2.a). The group can unconsciously remain vague about policy and

direction so as to reduce the need to define and perhaps define differences within the group. The result of working with this basic assumption mentality, oneness, is a belief that safety lies in the group staying alive, at the expense of individuality and growth.

It seemed as though this interaction had highlighted the fact that the manager group was actually very isolated. It seemed that they were now also asking the question about what it means to be a part of this organisation. The underplaying and lack of acknowledgement of the competence of the supervisor group seemed to reflect in the manager group, with continuous underplaying of skill and competence level within the different levels of the manager group. In this respect, it seemed as if the manager group were unsure of their own authority, and in part have reverted to using the power of their position to reaffirm their value. Again this seemed to be about finding the balance between personal power and the power of being part of a group.

The manager group seemed to see the interaction between the supervisor group and manager group as quite small and expressed some regret that this interaction was also small within the manager group. The question which seemed to be raised is whether the manager group felt they had support within their own group. This was again reflected in the fact that one of the senior managers cancelled and did not attend the discussion. The feeling seemed to be that, "I am alone within my group, and I am relieved that the supervisor group, from whom I feel some threat in terms of competence, also feels isolated". In this way, the manager group seemed to trap themselves, their power and their authority in debating internal differences as well as destructively working with the differentiation within their group.

There seemed to be a need for the members of the manager group to prove themselves to the other members of their group and to establish a sense of authority within their group and their sphere of influence and competence. The manager group referred to another manager, a more senior manager, as reporting to him, and the fact that this made no difference. There seemed to be a need to downplay seniority and experience within the manager group. The feeling appeared to be that the manager group wanted to see no difference in the ranks of the managers at that stage, as they did not want to see a difference in the ranks of manager and supervisor. Perhaps if the manager group had to see that difference, then the group would have to acknowledge that there are differing levels of competence and "betterness" within one group. The need to downplay seniority and experience seemed to relate to a need to downplay

the power and authority within this group. The feeling seemed to be that because the manager group did not feel that they are one group, they wanted to downplay any other difference that might be perceived. Reflected in this seems to be a need to see the boundaries between the manager and partner group as fused, so that the differentiation between these two groups was also lessened.

The manager group seemed to want to impress the supervisor group in terms of the level of skill the manager group has, although the manager group seemed to want to make clear that, within their group, they did not have differing levels of abilities, skills and competence. As a junior manager, the speaker indicated that he is the same and as competent as a more senior manager.

c Integration of the authority and power subtheme

It seemed as if authority is not recognised until it is bestowed from above. Until the manager makes partner, for example, he cannot sign off an audit; until the supervisors make manager, they cannot be accepted. The organisation will decide, and on that basis only will power, authority and inclusion be sanctioned. It seemed, though, that this process was dependent on the reality of the number of jobs each group dealt with. The supervisors were required to take on manager responsibilities, because there were and are not enough managers. In the same way, senior managers are required to take on partner responsibilities because there are not enough partners. It seemed as though the structures and the principles behind those structures are accepted and rejected as needs change.

The supervisor group would naturally look to the manager group as a representation of how the organisation operates in terms of authority, and would, therefore, look to the manager group as carrying out a leadership role. How the manager group manages this role, affects the attitudes that the supervisor group would develop in relation to the organisation. What they seem to see is a lack of understanding of the personal authority of the manager group in that role. There seemed to some sense of ownership in terms of authority of the manager group over the supervisor group, whether they were seen as more junior or as a part of the manager group. The supervisor group, on the other hand seemed to want to maintain a dependence on authority in whatever form it was represented. If they, for example, could bypass the manager group, they would and now their leader changes to the partner group.

In this way it seemed as if both groups put their focus on the partner group to lead them out of this confusion. The dependency could well be projections of the anxiety and insecurity they feel about their own "good enough" authority. In this way, neither group seemed to take charge of their own autonomy, but seemed to leave the issue of authority to other groups, such as the partner group. This group is often unnamed and certainly not in the room. It seemed that there was some fantasy that the partner group will suddenly materialise and save them. Parallel to this dynamic seemed to be the sense that they do not actually want the partner group to save them, they want to keep that group away from them so they could fight against them. In this sense, it seemed as if both the manager and supervisor group would like to merge with the partner group. This reflects one of the basic assumptions of oneness, where members seek to join in a powerful union with an omnipotent force which is unobtainably high. This does not allow for a relationship of interdependency, but forces relationships to remain dependent. The loss of this autonomy, though, is felt and the anxiety which surfaces is fought against and projected away.

In terms of authorisation and representation, it seemed as though both the supervisor and manager group had chosen their representatives for the purposes of seducing the other group. The member of the manager group that attended the discussion, was the most junior manager in that group, and seemed to be the one that would be able to pacify the supervisor group, because he was closer to them; closer than some of the senior managers in terms of the hierarchy. The supervisor group were represented by two competent members who were sent, it seemed, to prove to the manager group that they were ready to use this competence, to take on more authority and to be included. It might have been the case that the representatives communicated outside the authorisation of their groups, in which case they might have been excluded or ostracised from their own groups on their return.

The authority seemed to be invested in knowledge and experience with certain clients and in certain situations. The power seemed to be invested in title and tenure of service with the organisation. It appeared, therefore, that the aspect of power was carried very much by the role that the group takes on and the level in the hierarchy that the group occupies. The hostility being dealt with lies in the clash between experience and tenure. Rivalry appeared to undermine effective teaming as experience is resented in those who have been with the

organisation for less time. This dynamic was reflected between the supervisor and manager groups as well as within the manager group.

Common themes seem to be:

- a disrespect of inner authority and high value placed on positional power
- unclear task boundaries and confused boundaries of delegation and responsibility
- inconsistent action from the higher authorities, and inconsistency between words and this action
- a tendency to keep to the confusion with a reaction of a very busy workforce, with a focus on "getting it right"
- keeping boundaries confused on when work is good enough or when performance is up to standard
- a need to encourage groups to "prove themselves" but not to acknowledge this
- allowing the above areas of confusion to perpetuate by reinforcing this from the senior groups

5.3.3 Projective processes

According to the literature review (see 3.3), projection is a process of "putting" the bad onto some other. Projection can be seen as the irrational assumption of the existence of one's own experience in other, and are primitive attempts to relieve internal pains by externalising them, by assigning them to another or by requiring another to contain aspects of the self. Projective processes can be used as relief from intrapersonal conflicts which, in organisational settings, can be powerful factors of major industrial inefficiency and conflict.

It seemed as though the supervisor and manager group were not consciously aware of the conflicts within the organisation and the subsequent impact these conflicts had on the way these two groups work together. Subthemes of projective processes from the interview results are the paranoid-schizoid position and projective identification.

5.3.3.1 *Paranoid-schizoid position*

According to the literature review, the paranoid-schizoid position is a process of splitting the good and bad and leads to processes of projection (see 3.3). Regarding this process within groups, no group formation and thus relatedness can take place without identification or projection, but unchecked identification and projection can lead to distortion of communication and actions of group members (see 3.3.1.1). Frequently, therefore, organisations or groups engage in some conflict or perpetuate conflict with an external system in order to contain and relieve anxiety by using projection.

According to the interview results, it seemed as though the organisation encouraged a process of rationalisation and splitting of person and work. This could result in feelings of hostility and anger at feeling compelled to live this split. Related themes included a need to split away from the frustration of the past and splits within both the supervisor and manager group.

a Rationalisation – split between person and thought

It seemed as if the organisation supports a process of rationalisation, and a subsequent split between person and thought. It seemed that the process of analytical understanding is what the organisation sanctions. The supervisor group indicated that thinking was a primary mode of operation in this organisation. This was indicated when the first words that were spoken in the interview were, "I think". Thinking, therefore, was the starting point of discussion. The thinking was what was respected, and it seemed as if the person was not considered important and was split away. There was some fear, perhaps, that if the person was seen and acknowledged, something else might have to be recognised. It appeared that there was some fear of what this could be. Perhaps this something had to do with acknowledgement of the person and the feelings which relate to that person. A later comment was made starting with "I think", and was then followed with "I feel", perhaps indicating that as people the supervisor group might feel, but as a worker they need to think. The conflict then could be the struggle to integrate these two aspects.

There seemed to be conflict with this focus on cognitive understanding and a feeling from the supervisor group that this focus was actually the enemy. This was expressed when a member of the supervisor group indicated that, in the past, the manager group was seen as the enemy

because the supervisor group could not understand their line of thinking or understand the thinking of the organisation. It appeared that the supervisor group recognised that this thinking was also vital to their inclusion. The manager group emphasised the thinking that was needed in order to be included. It seemed as if the person is excluded from this process.

A disjointed process of thinking was reflected from both groups, with disjointed comments expressed in response to a comment from the HR group on the idea that the junior groups take on the way of thinking from the supervisor group. The thinking is finally defined as a boundary matter and crossing the bridge and boundary which lead to another type of thinking. The us and them was expressed in this, that is, staff versus management. It seemed, therefore, that the split between person and thought leads to creation of boundaries in unnecessary places. It also seemed as though the idea of lack of understanding is continually passed onto other groups. In this way, conflict appeared to be perpetuated in order to relieve the anxieties of both groups.

b Split between person and work

There seemed to be something about the person behind the work that was not acknowledged and not included. As the supervisor group was not yet included in the manager group, and there was a desire for that, so the person was not included in the work, and that desire was expressed as well. This was indicated from the supervisor group when they indicated that they will take on manager tasks from a "pure work side of things". This seemed to indicate that the tasks only are considered work. This split seemed to be reflected in exclusion of the new/junior people. The manager group seemed to express this as well in confirming the split between the work and role the person plays and the rest of the person, by indicating that on a work basis the contact between the groups is very little.

There seemed to be a reserve to express, on the part of the supervisor group as to who the individual was in this interaction. This seemed to be reflected in the use of the word "you" when referring to themselves. The processes and dynamics appeared to put outside the supervisor group. Perhaps the supervisor group was not yet ready to acknowledge how close this process had come to them as people. The feeling was that this was sensitive and there was a fear of what would happen if this group had to put their person into this space. Maybe the fear was that they would be open to personal attack as was the fear that they were open to

an attack on their work. The fear of this personal attack could be even closer now, because the supervisor group were opening themselves up to another measure, one that goes beyond their knowledge and skill, and one that related to their person; this in the sense that inclusion related to being liked. At that point, the sense was that the supervisor group did not want to identify with the potential victim, by referring to themselves in a threatening and hostile situation as "that person". The anger and hostility expressed could, therefore, be a manifestation of deeper feelings of threat, fear, insecurity and uncertainty of self.

There seemed to be something expressed about taking a stand and being assertive in those areas that related to the person. It seemed as if the manager group expressed this when they indicated and repeated that the responsibility that the supervisor group had been given and how much they had been given related to their relationship with the partner group, and that it also depended on luck. The comment seemed to reluctantly include the fact that this might have also depended on the proactivity of the supervisor group. There seemed, therefore, to be some uncertainty about when it was safe and supported to make a stand from the point of the person. Given this, there seemed to be some antagonism from the manager group to those members of the supervisor group who did not seem to be working as hard as others. (The measure of working hard was related to how many job the group member had.) The success of these members was considered at stake because of this. There seemed to be an indication that these members were being passive. Perhaps the manager group were projecting their own passive approach of blindly buying into the manager title onto those members of the supervisor group.

There seemed, therefore, to be a great focus on the title of manager; again indicating a split between person and work. It seemed as if the title "manager" becomes the group's person. This title does not only demarcate a task set, but also the person, the power and the authority. This aspect was expressed by both the supervisor group and the HR group indicating that somebody becomes something when they have that title.

The split between person and work seemed to be contained in hostility that was expressed and experienced by the supervisor group. There was some discussion though as to whether this hostility was actually experienced. The hostility seemed to depend on external structures; the external structures dictating when and where this hostility was felt. The hostility appeared to be split away from the person; a member of the supervisor indicating that personally

animosity had not been experienced. The supervisor group seemed to be debating and fighting within themselves as to whether this hostility actually exists or not, seemingly to change their statements regarding this. The hostility seemed to be something that could not be further explained, and something that the supervisor group did not want to name. At times, the references to the hostility were made indirectly. It could be that the hostility, being based on unnamed criteria, was something uncontrolled and uncontrollable which would swallow both groups. This split also seemed confirmed by the location of the room used for the interview. It was situated on the other side of the building to where these two groups work.

c Split between past and present

There seemed to be a need to focus on this period of difficulty and pain as something that was now in the past. The desire was expressed for this process to be history and belief that this was in fact so. Relief was expressed that the supervisor group did not have to live this pain and battle anymore. Even though there was a fear that the gap between the group was closing, there was a relief expressed that this huge difference was being minimised. The supervisor group expressed this relief, with reference to the difficulties they had experienced in the past.

With that comes the obvious step of going forward, and this seemed to be something about which the supervisor group were quite nervous. The closing of this gap was quite sudden and has arrived shockingly quickly. The supervisor group expressed, on numerous occasions, that taking on manager tasks was sudden - hence, the conflict. The feeling was that perhaps the supervisor group were not quite ready; this has arrived so fast, perhaps too fast for the supervisor group. This feeling was made clear with comments that the supervisor group were not managers yet, and relief seemed to be expressed in that as well. The battle also seemed hard from the manager group perspective, and there was also relief expressed that this had passed.

It seemed that by splitting away the difficulties that were experienced, less learning was taken out of the process than could have been the case. It seemed as if the groups struggled to hold the boundaries of difficult situations and the anxiety experienced, and as such relegated it to something outside and behind them.

d Split within manager group

The manager group appeared to have split various unwanted aspects of this work environment away from themselves. It seemed that they would like to keep the same process that they had worked with over the years. It seemed that they were not aware of how much they had accepted the criteria of inclusion from the organisation, and it seemed they had lived these out without any question that things could be different or that they have the potential and power to make any changes. For them it seemed as if the organisation is the only world, and within this they must stay. Perhaps too much questioning would lead to a situation of being excluded from the organisation. It seemed they had decided that inclusion was worth the personal compromise.

The manager group expressed the split within their own ranks, indicating that some members of the manager group would feel uncomfortable reporting to a member of the supervisor group. They also stated that this feeling of discomfort was only due to the long time those managers had been in their positions. It seemed as though much frustration was expressed about the way the manager group managed the aspect of the relationship between the supervisor and manager group, especially those aspects regarding sharing and allocating responsibilities. The manager group expressed that this was not the right way to do things. The manager group appeared to attempt to contain this anxiety and frustration by splitting this away and focusing on and referring to those members of the supervisor group that the manager group felt were not good workers. This anxiety also seemed to be carried by a senior partner who had now left South Africa. Reference was made to this partner, who had initiated the formation of the supervisor group. The feeling was that if this relationship between the supervisor group and manager group was not working, it was the fault of this senior partner; there was now nothing that the manager group felt they could do. The feeling was, though, that the "false self" and niceties must; the manager group must continue to treat the supervisor group with a polite front. This split seemed to be contained by remaining clear and commenting clearly on how much the supervisor group would benefit from taking on these tasks. These niceties do not always remain though, and are interwoven with other more subtle feelings of jealousy, stagnation, fear of growth and fear of allowing autonomy. This was expressed in comments relating to how much support the supervisor group were getting, and how little the manager group got at that point in their careers.

The manager group indicated that confusion about relating to the manager group is only from within the supervisor group. It seemed that the confusion of the manager group is split and is put on the supervisor group. This is clearly expressed when the manager said that this confusion comes from "you", the supervisor group, it does not come from "us", the manager group. This same confusion, conflict and competition had been expressed within the manager group and against the partner group. Maybe this was categorically transferred to the supervisor group, because of the fear from within the manager group of seeing and accepting this confusion in that they are closer to the final frontier, the partner group. The clear hierarchy is, therefore, pointed out. As part of the comment reference was made to "up" from the supervisor group to the manager group, and "down" from the manager group to the supervisor group. The feeling from the manager group was, "Keep your place, even if you sit with us at the canteen." The stigma, therefore, that the supervisor group was fighting was the same from within their group as from the manager group. The manager group seemed to be saying that this conflict was not "up to us"; they also seemed to be trying to put this back onto the supervisor group. This phrase also seemed to reflect the element of passivity previously mentioned, that is, it is not "up to us".

The manager group appeared in part comfortable with the battle against the partner group, perhaps because it was not present and in the room. The manager and supervisor group could come together safely to discuss the partners. Comment was made about the fact that the supervisor and manager group can talk about the partners, and discuss who is difficult to work for and who is not. Comment is made that this fact is indicative of the bond that the two groups have. It seemed that once the partner group can be seen as the mutual enemy, the splits within the manager and supervisor groups can be overcome and they can build some sort of bond.

e Split within the supervisor group

It seemed that in order to be included in the manager group, the supervisor group had decided to let go of their existing group and put themselves forward to the manager group on the basis of the expressed criteria, that is, competence and being liked. In this regard, they seemed to split away their own knowledge and transfer this to the organisation represented by the partner group. Here the supervisor group perhaps felt that their knowledge was not

acceptable; knowledge will only be acceptable if contained within the known parameters of the partner group.

The supervisor group acknowledged the split within their group, between those that are good, and those that are not good and that this also breaks down the group's identity boundary. Good perhaps also referring to those that will follow the authority of the organisation and those that will not. There was a feeling of competition here as well within the supervisor group, and also an acceptance of the criteria for inclusion as explained by the manager group. This was expressed by the supervisor group when they said that they know that certain members of the manager group feel that some members of the supervisor group are good and thus the partner group give more jobs to those members. The words used indicate that the jobs come in the form of a load, a weight and perhaps a burden.

The supervisor group seemed to focus on the individual members within their group. The element of competition between members came in, that is, who will be accepted and who not. The variable that was used to measure this inclusion was how comfortable the manager groups felt with the members of the supervisor group. The supervisor group expressed the fact that some members of the manager group might share more with certain members of the supervisor group, because they felt more comfortable with those members.

f Integration of the paranoid-schizoid position subtheme

In many cases it seemed as if both group split away aspects of the functioning of the organisation that they do not agree with or cannot manage. In this way, those aspects remained unaddressed and unconscious. The price they pay, therefore, is high because those aspects that it seemed that the groups are unhappy with are allowed to remain.

It seemed as though the rationalisation was a way to contain the anxiety of confusion, unnamed criteria of inclusion and unnamed criteria of good performance. It seemed that there was also a great divide between the person and the work, although there did seem to be some acknowledgement that there was a person, individual or group that is behind the work that is done. In this respect, there seemed to be some questioning around who the individual is, with some realisation that the group and the individual are not a part of this work process. Related was a large focus on the title of manager. Once this title is attained, it seemed that everything

would be okay and all the problems will be sorted out. Both groups, though, seemed to have a vague sense that this was not the case, but this was not verbalised. Perhaps this was not expressed as part of the process of keeping their denial unconscious. Perhaps the vague sense of hostility that was experienced between the two was an outcome of this suppression.

It seemed that there was a solid agreement that the person and the work are not to be integrated. The work that needed to be done needed to be done from a cognitive and analytic standpoint only. The success of progress, though, would depend on whether a person is liked or not. This supposedly related to the person, although the criteria of how that person should be were not specific. It seemed as if the person aspect and confusion of those criteria was projected onto the HR group. This could relate to the feeling of being attacked by the manager group, with a parallel feeling that the person was actually not good enough.

It seems that the splitting that took place, is noted and contained in the splitting perceived from within the groups. Both the supervisor and manager group seemed to contain this anxiety by rejecting their group and identifying with what the organisation seemed to want. In this way new ways of doing things are to be excluded. This process appeared to be mirrored in the way new and junior staff are excluded, and the battles experienced in trying to be included. Taken further, the new or junior staff would possibly bring more creative or risky approaches to doing the work. The impression was that this would be unacceptable.

In this respect it seemed as if the supervisor group picked up this aspect and projected a subsequent hostility as residing in the manager group. It also seemed as if the change over from the roles of senior to supervisor, and currently from supervisor to manager produced anxiety. This anxiety seemed to be contained in the feeling that the problem had passed and had been dealt with. Continuing with the seemingly common processes of splitting away anxiety producing aspects of the work environment to the outside, it seems as though both groups work with these splits by dividing their home groups into good and bad. At points where this is unmanageable, the fight seems to be transferred outside the room, to the partner group. Again that process did not seem to be held in full, and there seemed to be points where the supervisor group felt the need to integrate and remember where they had come from and what they had already learnt. This seemed indicative of the depressive position. There seemed to be an element of wanting to pull through the learning that the supervisor group had gained in the first few years with the organisation. There seemed to be an unhappy feeling

that this learning and this knowledge was not what the organisation wanted and not what was needed to be expressed if inclusion was to be gained. Furthermore, this learning, that is, experiential learning is what seemed to be split away from the groups; learning via degrees and universities seemed supported, while learning gained via experience seemed to be rejected.

The manager group also seemed to feel some resentment toward the supervisor group - that they (the supervisor group) might know more about something than a more senior person or group. The junior managers, as represented by the member of the manager group present, are however, seen as not carrying through this animosity. It seemed, though, that they do support this process and so they continue to put forward the lure for the supervisor group to work hard enough and long enough to finally be accepted into the fold of the manager group. The perception was that the supervisor group had to prove themselves and prove that they could cope in order to work on desired client listings and in order to improve their skills. The fantasy seemed to be that they would finally be accepted and their knowledge acknowledged. In a way, it seemed that the supervisor group knew what they would be giving up, and were aware that this interview might make some of these aspects explicit. The interaction was seen, therefore, as something relatively dangerous, although not fatal. The first person to arrive was one of the audit supervisors. This interaction began with a discussion on near-miss aeroplane crashes, as mentioned.

In terms of the relatedness between the two groups, it seems as the supervisor group is questioning the approach the manager group has adopted in response to the criteria of inclusion from the organisation. The supervisor group could well be spending much time trying to balance the culture of the organisation with what they would like to bring. The manager group did not seem to want to hear anything about this. Perhaps the groups could work more constructively if they were able to discuss some of these hidden facets more openly.

5.3.3.2 Projective identification

According to the literature review, this process can be seen as intrapsychic, interpersonal and intergroup (see 3.3.2) Furthermore, it can be seen as a defence mechanism, a mode of communication, a type of relatedness or a pathway to psychological change. Projective

identification can be seen as a method of communication, because it requires a capacity on the part of the person projecting to assess the nature of the recipient and his/her readiness to receive and the projector must have the capacity to induce a feeling in the recipient.

From the interview results, the following processes of projective identification seemed to take place. It seemed as though the supervisor and manager groups take on the projection of hierarchy from the client and then act this out. It seemed that the groups are not cognisant of the hierarchy that stems from within the organisation, and seem to manage the frustrations of this hierarchy by perceiving it as coming from the client. It seemed the groups work with a similar process in terms of competence. The fear of lack of competence was projected onto other groups and it seemed as if these other groups continuously act this out. The supervisor group also appeared to manage their own hostility by projecting it onto the manager group as well as the organisation. The manager group and the organisation were then seen as acting out this hostility in terms of rigidity and a strict hierarchy, and the various rules and regulations. It is possible that the supervisor group carries much of the confusion of the organisation; they are in the middle, they do not have a clear role, they play the boundary role between staff and management, and they also seem to carry the stagnation and the split between person and work. The following discussion gives more detail on the above.

a Externalisation and institutionalisation of hierarchy

It seemed as if the split of the two groups being part of each other and not being part is seen as stemming from an external institution in the form of the client hierarchy and structure. Both groups seemed to need this structure and seemed to overtly ignore the structure of their own organisation. It appeared as if this was a way of not being honest about the hierarchy and structure of their own organisation. The manager group indicated that the reporting lines between the supervisor and manager group were set according to the structure of the client organisation. Another reference was made to the external structure, and it is this structure that the supervisor group perceived as forcing them apart from the manager group. The impression was that this structure was seen as something to be tolerated and worked within. There was acknowledgement that if this group wanted to be ranked among the manager group, they would have to work within the structure of the client organisation; this also applied to their own home organisation. This was externalised in the form of the perception

of having to follow what the client wants, as they then have to follow what their own organisation wants.

In this respect, there seemed to be a feeling of being tied to unwritten rules which were seen as imposed from the outside. Some of the rules seemed to be that it must be difficult to learn, and to move up the hierarchy within the organisation and this must be stressful and miserable. It seems that both groups buy in to this and act that out.

It appeared as though the outcome of the battle between the supervisor and manager group would depend on these external rules and regulations and so it seemed as if the power of the supervisor group and the talents they bring would not be taken as a factor in determining how well they perform. This seemed to be a passive reaction, and a way of avoiding taking responsibility for the structure that they support. This was expressed by the manager group when they indicated that it all depended on the structure of the client organisation.

It seemed, therefore, the supervisor group as well as the manager group have a certain valency for this punishment, perfection and need to stay within an imposed structure.

b Externalisation of competence

It appeared that in a way the manager group did not really want the supervisor group to develop and grow or to become independent and autonomous. There seemed to be a fear of this growing competence of the supervisor group from the perspective of the manager group. The fear of perhaps losing their (manager group) place and their role seemed to be projected onto the supervisor group. The supervisor group seemed to identify with this fear and by that process cast doubt about their own place, contribution and competence. The implication is that the supervisor group are really not good enough, and the devaluing of what they bring could be a projection on the part of the manager group in the sense that they actually feel devalued and unsure of the value they bring. As soon as the competence of the supervisor group was acknowledged, there seemed, to be a negative reaction from the manager group.

The impression was that the doubt surrounding competence is projected from the organisation and from the manager group onto the supervisor group. The supervisor group seemed to identify with this projection and take it on. This was expressed by the manager group

indicating that the initiation of the structure of the supervisor group was because of a shortage of managers and because people in the more junior position were getting bored, but now the current supervisor group have got more responsibility than the manager group had when they were supervisors. The parallel drawn between the supervisor group being able to take on more responsibility and take on an opportunity for learning, in part because the organisation did not have enough managers, and the senior manager who is taking on partner responsibilities because the organisation does not have enough partners, seemed to reiterate the need to specifically not acknowledge the competence, capability and contribution that these groups bring. The supervisor group seemed to feel that they are in the position by default – an exchange and automatic, a given.

The resentment from the manager group to the supervisor group further created the feeling that the supervisor group cannot prove themselves by their own action. The action they do take could either be accepted or rejected by the manager group, and the terms and criteria for this acceptance or rejection seemed to change without any overt communication. The feeling seemed to be that these criteria could change according to the whims of the manager group. The confusion that the manager group felt in terms of their role within the organisation and in relation to the supervisor group seems to be projected onto the supervisor group. The supervisor group seem to pick up on and act out this confusion.

The manager group seemed to feel that acknowledgement of skill and competence can only occur after a specific time period, because only after that time the competence will be there. It seemed, therefore, that no matter how much competence was actually gained, it would not be acknowledged until a certain time had passed. This time period is decided on by the organisation. Again there was the feeling that the groups needed to act in accordance with this time period and external structures and sanctions. This seemed to create some element of frustration in that the supervisor group felt they could not act until they are sanctioned to do so in terms of time. This sanction they do not attempt to change.

It appeared that there was some exchange; an unsaid exchange. Perhaps the exchange for the supervisor group taking on and holding this doubt of competence is for the supervisor group to take some of the responsibility away from the manager group. The exchange seemed to be offered from the unrepresented and sometimes unnamed partner group. The manager group talks for the partner group here indicating how many jobs the partner group will give the

supervisor group. Via this process, it seemed as if the supervisor group take on responsibilities that the manager group does not want. The aspects of the role that the manager group feels doubtful about seemed to be passed onto the supervisor group. In this way, it seemed as if the manager group could confirm their perceptions that the supervisor group is not good enough. This was expressed when the manager group indicated that some members of the manager group download responsibility to the supervisor group and thereby take less responsibility themselves. The sanction of giving more work to those that work hard also comes from the partner group, the ultimate authority. What seemed to be transferred was the credibility and the power of their own knowledge of the supervisor group from them to the partner group. The supervisor group seemed to transfer these aspects - knowledge and authority/autonomy to a group outside themselves and even outside the room. The partner group would have the valency to take up this aspect in that positional power and knowledge seems to be the basis of their authority.

The discomfort or resentment did not seem to be openly acknowledged, and neither were the reasons for this problem openly communicated. Open communication on this point would indicate a gap within the manager group in terms of their areas of doubt. The sense was that it would be very dangerous to communicate to the supervisor group; dangerous to communicate that there was doubt or weakness within the manager group. The feeling of lack of open communication seemed to be projected onto the supervisor group. The supervisor group seemed to sense this closed approach and silently take it on as a struggle to integrate with the manager group. The manager expressed that there might be some form of discomfort from the manager group if they had to report to some members of the supervisor group.

c Projection of hostility onto manager group

It seemed that there was a fear of the hostility that affected the interaction between the two groups. It seemed as if the supervisor group felt a certain hostility within themselves as a reaction to the projections that they were identifying with. This hostility then seemed to be projected onto the manager group and was seen as coming from the manager group. The supervisor group verbalised that they felt hostility coming from the manager group. It seemed that this hostility was contained by the manager group and contained in a commitment to the so-called normal progression of roles and hierarchy. Perhaps the supervisor group have not

yet acknowledged the hostility coming from themselves, in terms of the pressures that they accepted from the manager group and turned against themselves.

The fear from the supervisor group could be that as the supervisor group treat themselves so others will treat them, and as they turned the hostility onto themselves perhaps that same hostility will be turned on them from others. Perhaps there was a need from the supervisor group to say that they did not want to take this aspect of the manager role on. The feeling could be that "we will never be like them and treat others the way they treated us". The hostility seemed fearful, and if the supervisor group had to acknowledge the extent to which they recognise this hostility, the fear could be that this in itself might create more hostility and more opportunity for them to be attacked.

In this way, it seemed as if part of the value of the manager role was seen as containing the hostility that is seen. The conflict could possibly be about wanting to be a part of this group, but not wanting to take on the hostility. The manager group seemed to agree with this projection and indicated that there was much to be taken on in this role, the details of which are left unsaid. What was claimed was the acceptance of a perception that needed to be continually maintained. It was this perception that the supervisor group indicated that they wanted to change. This was expressed by the manager group when indicating that the supervisor group needed to accept the whole package and change the perception of both junior people and senior people in order to get them to believe that the supervisor group was capable.

In terms of adherence to rules and structure, it seemed as if the manager group aggressively supported this. The supervisor group seemed to attempt to categorise the above expressed fear into the roles of senior, supervisor and manager. The sense was that the hostility was to be accepted as normal, because it was only the roles being expressed. The anxiety is controlled and contained by categorising this unknown fear into a known entity, that is, roles. This was indicated when the supervisor group used the words of the roles to describe the hostility.

d Supervisor group to carry struggle of inclusion and stagnation

It seemed that the supervisor group was required to take up the task of struggling with inclusion and stagnation. It seemed as if the manager group effectively projected this onto the supervisor group who took this up. This was the impression gained when the manager group expressed the fact that the fear of inclusion came from the supervisor group only. The managers seemed to effectively hide the fear that they have of being overwhelmed by the supervisor group. The manager group said that they were being honest, and seemed to project their confusion and fear of being excluded, perhaps from the partner group, onto the supervisor group. The supervisor group took this up. The feeling seemed to be that the manager group would not include the supervisor group, and if they did not, it was the fault and problem of the supervisor group. The manager group also indicated that the exclusion came from the supervisor group and not from them. The exclusion was put outside of the manager group onto the supervisor group. The manager group indicated that the supervisor group needed to start seeing themselves as junior managers. Furthermore, comment was also made about a member of the supervisor group who runs a couple of large jobs.

The manager group expressed the split within their group when indicating that it is the senior managers who did not understand. There was some recognition that things could improve and that things needed to improve, but the feeling was that the manager group cannot improve things. The fear was expressed that things would remain the same, but there did not seem to be an understanding about how the groups could improve this. It seemed as if the junior manager (that member present) indicated that it was the senior managers that were holding them stuck, with the feeling that it was now the firm that was at fault. It seemed that the manager group explained the "this is how things are" to supervisor group by projecting the attitudes that hold everything stagnant onto the senior manager group. The manager group indicated that the senior managers do not understand and it was not considered fair. These feelings of stagnation appeared to be projected onto the supervisor group who act in accordance with it. Stagnation in this regard, seemed to be a common theme and was also reflected by other aspects. The process of the discussion, for example, did not seem to lead to any further insight; it seemed to carry on in circles. Also the fact that the room got warm during the interview, and nobody volunteered to act on this, again seemed to reflect a reluctance to take action.

e Integration of the subtheme of projective identification

It seemed there were many aspects of the relationship between the supervisor and manager group that were distorted from processes of projective identification.

The anxiety about not being good enough could relate to the fact that the partner and manager group did not want the supervisor group to actually prove themselves as capable, because of the fear of competition from this "new group". In this sense, the manager group seemed to fear the competence that the supervisor group might bring, and seemed to project this fear and worth and put it outside of themselves and onto the supervisor group. It seemed that the supervisor group have a valency for this variable and identify with it. The supervisor group subsequently seemed to believe that they were not competent enough to honestly take on a manager role. The group seemed to buy into the attitude that they needed to work harder in order to prove themselves capable. This in itself breaks down the honest communication between the two groups. It seemed valid that the supervisor group needed to prove themselves in order to be promoted to manager, but it seemed as if the motive for this action was misguided. This process seemed to be reflected, in terms of the systems model, throughout the organisation between the different subsystems of staff, supervisor and senior roles.

In this sense, the hierarchical structure of the organisation suits the position taken. The hierarchy and focus on "doing your time" is seen as the limiting factor. This hierarchy is identified with as coming from the organisation of the client. It appeared that the movement from the supervisor group to the manager group was seen as quite difficult. It was seen as difficult to be a part of the manager group and it was up to the supervisor group to make the effort to be included. The manager group seemed not to care who is a part of them and who not, although the shields seemed to remain. The "leap" remained to be taken by the supervisor group. The manager group represented a very powerful group to the supervisor group, and by virtue of this, the impression was that the supervisor group would easily follow this group whom they respect and admire.

The cross over that is spoken about could also be very much about attempting to bridge a perception that the manager group has of this group, that is, the cross over from perceived incompetence to perceived competence. The irony is that this competence will probably

never be externally achieved, as the perceived incompetence is carried throughout the organisation and hierarchy by more junior groups of staff. The attitude of competence had not been internalised. The relationship with the staff group within this seems to be questionable. It seemed as if there is a threat of being pulled back to being seen as part of the staff groups. The perception was that this would be dangerous. The feeling of and fear of incompetence needed to be transferred to staff; it cannot be owned at this level. Perhaps there is a fear that at manager level you had better know it all, otherwise you are out.

All of the groups seem to have a certain valency which allows the projective identification processes and distortion in intergroup relations to operate smoothly. Some of these are now discussed.

It seemed that a group in the position of supervisor has a valency for taking up the aspects that the organisation is not dealing with. This seemed to relate to the fact that people of similar nature are recruited, probably so that the organisation can continue to hold these aspects. Some of these valencies include the following: a focus on time in terms of promotion and subsequent lack acknowledgement of competence until this time has passed. This impacts how autonomy is or is not taken up by this group. The organisation seemed to want to allow this group to be autonomous, but simultaneously does not encourage the power, neither positional nor personal, necessary to assume that attitude. It is this attitude that the supervisor group seem to carry. The role of the manager group had also not been clarified in relation to the supervisor group. Therefore, in relation to the manager group, there is little clarity and this is another aspect the supervisor group seems to carry.

The manager group seemed to have a valency for being relatively passive in the face of an ultimate authority. They seemed to want to shift areas of confrontation, competence, responsibility onto other groups of the organisation. This is an important role in this dynamic in that the manager group is probably at a time of their lives where they have made a major commitment in terms of career. To question now would require a large shift, one that they were perhaps not willing to take. The manager group seemed to be expected to mentor the supervisor group, without a clear path of learning been open to the manager group, that is other than progression to the partner group.

The HR group seemed to be taking on the guilt, doubt and dishonesty of the manager group. The group also seemed to take on the confusion and the person part of the groups. In this respect the group could be playing a boundary role and negotiating the extremes of inclusion and exclusion, person and work, stagnation and change. The frustration with these aspects seem to be projected onto the HR group. It appeared that in many ways this group took up these aspects and behaved in accordance with these conflicts.

5.4 INTEGRATION

It seemed that the three groups, the supervisor, manager and the HR groups came together to discuss the boundaries of task and group, authority and the potential conflict between inner and outer authority and the relation of this to power, as well as the anxiety contained using by projective processes.

It appeared that the relations between the supervisor and manager group could potentially lead to ineffective work behaviour by virtue of the following:

- Confusion about primary task.
- Fight with group identity and inclusion.
- Questions about authority and authorisation, and subsequent questions about autonomy and the balance between authority and power.
- Underlying feelings about the projective processes, and the fight to distance themselves from certain aspects, and the need to see these aspects in others.

In terms of the theory and model used for this research the following can be deduced:

- As per the systems theory, the broader systems and the subsystems within that system are interdependent on each other. The way these groups interact will, therefore, affect the entire system and be affected by it. These dynamics might well stem from confusion from the organisation as a whole and be held by these groups.
- In terms of the object relations theory, it seems as if the groups use the relation between each other as opportunities to hold envy, rationalisation, confusion about learning, doubt of competence, split of person work and stagnation. It seemed they do this using the paranoid-schizoid position and processes of projective identification.

- Relating to the Tavistock model of group relations, it seems as if the groups display basic assumption behaviour and can be described as:
 - Dependency. Both groups seem dependent on each other. It seems that the supervisor group uses the manager group to try to contain their anxiety about authority and their own struggles with autonomy, as well as anxiety about task and acceptance. The manager group seems to be grateful to take on a role that seems important, especially given the questions they seemed to display regarding their role.
 - Fight/ flight. This need for action could be displayed by the process of the supervisor group joining the manager group to fight against the partner group (fight), and the process of burying themselves in the confusion of task and group (flight). In these instances, both groups allow themselves to split as they sacrifice members to preserve the groups.
 - Pairing. It seems as if the supervisor group needs to join with the manager group in order to cope with the anxiety and loneliness especially as their home group is obviously fragmenting. The pairing seems to be needed in order to create something new, something that will save the group from confusion. Some conflict comes in when the supervisor group indicate some need to align or to pair with the partner group. The manager group seeks to destroy this.
 - Oneness. It seems as though the supervisor group would like to join with the organisation as represented by manager or partner group in order to feel part, and to experience wellbeing and wholeness. It seems that the envy from the supervisor group is that they perceive the manager group as already experiencing this inclusion. The aspect of me-ness confuses this from the perspective of the supervisor group as the balance between group inclusion and individuality is struggled with.
- It seems that all three groups have a valency to continue the dynamic of the paranoid-schizoid position and the process of projective identification. It seems that the collective fantasies and ideas of the organisation that are in the mind of each group, drive the continuation of the above.

5.5 CHAPTER SUMMARY

The objective of this chapter was to report the results of the study given the concepts identified and the theories used. This completes step 5 of phase 2 of the research method. It

In this way it seemed as if both groups put their focus on the partner group to lead them out of this confusion. The dependency could well be projections of the anxiety and insecurity they feel about their own "good enough" authority. In this way, neither group seemed to take charge of their own autonomy, but seemed to leave the issue of authority to other groups, such as the partner group. This group is often unnamed and certainly not in the room. It seemed that there was some fantasy that the partner group will suddenly materialise and save them. Parallel to this dynamic seemed to be the sense that they do not actually want the partner group to save them, they want to keep that group away from them so they could fight against them. In this sense, it seemed as if both the manager and supervisor group would like to merge with the partner group. This reflects one of the basic assumptions of oneness, where members seek to join in a powerful union with an omnipotent force which is unobtainably high. This does not allow for a relationship of interdependency, but forces relationships to remain dependent. The loss of this autonomy, though, is felt and the anxiety which surfaces is fought against and projected away.

In terms of authorisation and representation, it seemed as though both the supervisor and manager group had chosen their representatives for the purposes of seducing the other group. The member of the manager group that attended the discussion, was the most junior manager in that group, and seemed to be the one that would be able to pacify the supervisor group, because he was closer to them; closer than some of the senior managers in terms of the hierarchy. The supervisor group were represented by two competent members who were sent, it seemed, to prove to the manager group that they were ready to use this competence, to take on more authority and to be included. It might have been the case that the representatives communicated outside the authorisation of their groups, in which case they might have been excluded or ostracised from their own groups on their return.

The authority seemed to be invested in knowledge and experience with certain clients and in certain situations. The power seemed to be invested in title and tenure of service with the organisation. It appeared, therefore, that the aspect of power was carried very much by the role that the group takes on and the level in the hierarchy that the group occupies. The hostility being dealt with lies in the clash between experience and tenure. Rivalry appeared to undermine effective teaming as experience is resented in those who have been with the

seems that the intergroup relations between the supervisor and manager groups are hindered due to a number of dynamics. Primarily those dynamics appear to revolve around confusion about primary task, a struggle with group boundaries and identity, a questioning of the authority of the manager group and subsequent questioning about the autonomy of the supervisor group. The anxiety created by the above seemed to be contained in projective processes such as the paranoid-schizoid position and projective identification.

The next chapter covers the conclusions, hypotheses and recommendations for future use, as well as the limitations of this study.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS, HYPOTHESES, RECOMMENDATIONS AND LIMITATIONS

The following is a discussion on the conclusions, hypotheses generated, recommendations and limitations of this research. Each are discussed for phases one and two of the research. Also included are hypotheses that have been generated for use in further research. This answers the final research question (research question 4) and completes the final steps of 6 – 9 of phase 2 of this research.

6.1 CONCLUSIONS

Conclusions for phases one and two follow. This is a brief summary of chapters two and chapter three, respectively.

6.1.1 Conclusions for phase one

The first step for phase one (research question 1) was to conduct a literature review to describe intergroup functioning and relations from a psychodynamic approach, drawing on aspects from the psychoanalytic perspective, the object relations theory, and the open systems theory. The model used was the Tavistock model of group relations. The second objective was to formulate possible explanations for the manifestation of intergroup relations, using the above theoretical approaches, in terms of ineffective boundary management, authority issues, and projective processes.

The literature covered the development of the psychodynamic approach (research question 1) and the following perspectives were emphasised.

- The psychoanalytic perspective specifically emphasises the unconscious motives for behaviour, and the struggle and conflicts around the integration of the id, the ego and the superego. This struggle is unconscious, but can be made conscious by attention to dreams, slips of the tongue et cetera. The relation to work revolves around how employees deal with this conflict in an organisational setting.
- The object relations theory, as developed within the psychoanalytic perspective, revolves around the development of the child in relation to the mother. The child

learns about the "good" and the "bad", and depending on circumstances, either integrates these or splits them. Behavioural manifestations of this process can be seen in processes of projection, such as the paranoid-schizoid position and projective identification. Other manifestations could be envy, reparation and the depressive position.

- The open systems theory emphasises the interrelation of parts of the system and the alignment of these parts. It thus illustrates the interdependent impact of the individual, the group, the organisation and the environment.
- The psychodynamic approach draws from all three of the above perspectives and specifically relates these perspectives to groups within organisations. Although psychoanalysis, for example, is a techniques used with individuals, some of the concepts can be used in a group and organisational context. The group then becomes the focus of study and thus the focus on group dynamics as they relate to problems of leadership and taking up of authority in organisational settings.
- The Tavistock model of group relations takes the above approach further and looks at the manifestation of the group dynamics as they relate to work and/or basic assumption activity of dependency, fight/flight, pairing, and oneness/me-ness. Related, therefore, is the valency groups have in acting out particular basic assumptions, as well as the impact of fantasy, metaphor and the organisation-in-the-mind.

Working hypotheses were generated, using the above, on how groups in interaction manifest possible ineffective work behaviours. The theoretical overview brought to light some possibilities on the dynamics of the relations between these groups. The above-mentioned psychoanalytic perspective, object relations theory and the open systems model assisted the researcher to begin to understand the depth with which groups actually relate, and how this relation impacts and is impacted by the rest of the system, whether this be intrapersonal or interpersonal, group or organisation. Relating these theories and the specific problem to the psychodynamic approach and Tavistock model of group relations allowed a partial solving of the problem of the relations between these two groups. In conclusion, it could be that the groups work hard to keep the unconscious, and therefore the conflict, at bay. There could be very rigid boundaries on what is considered acceptable and the anxiety of conforming in accordance to this, while seemingly compromising on some aspects, seems to manifest, via

projective processes. This anxiety could also relate to an adherence to a strict and rigid hierarchy, careful adherence to the ultimate leadership and to an anxiety about being competent enough. These aspects seem to be reflected throughout the system, sometimes manifesting as projection onto other groups or as receiving projections from other group. It could be that the basic assumption activity reflected in this kind of leader/follower situation is dependency and fight/flight. The basic assumptions of oneness/me-ness could be reflected in the seemingly overwhelming need for the groups to join together and to integrate with little understanding about how to negotiate that joining. As much as there was a desire to join, there seemed also to be fear about being overwhelmed by that integration. The basic assumption of pairing, seemed to be reflected in the need for the more junior group to pair with the more senior group, in order for a new approach to manifest. The vacillation with this pairing seemed to relate to the fact that the junior group was not sure if the pairing will actually lead to something new.

Research question 2 in chapter three (phase 1, step 2) covered the generation of working hypotheses on manifestations of ineffective boundary management, issues with authority and projective processes. The following conclusions can be made:

- The literature review on boundary management referred to the purpose of boundaries which is to separate systems and subsystems. By virtue of this separation, a relatedness is implied as well as a management of these boundaries. Covered in more detail were task and group boundaries. Task boundaries included being clear on what to do and referred to knowing what the work entails. Intergroup relations can be explored using primary task as a starting point, and confusion with this primary task can lead to conflict, diffusion of effort, a need for ineffective structure, and conflicting action. Anxiety and an inability to hold this confusion can lead to anti-task or basic assumption activity. The aspect of group boundaries reviewed covered the anxiety relating to boundary management both within and between groups. Conflicts could include managing individual boundaries within the group and balancing the fear of being overwhelmed with the need to belong, denying differences within the group in order to strengthen a feeling of bonding, and the group using members to carry or hold aspects that they cannot integrate. Problems with managing boundaries between groups includes aspects such as managing dual memberships, managing representation, managing external pressures, and managing the inevitable vacillations between work and basic assumption activity. The value of incorporating the review on

boundary management was the clarity obtained around issues of task and group boundary and the extent to which confusion in this area can undermine effective work. Boundary management seemed to be an area with which the groups seemed to struggle and concurrently an area that they worked hard to keep confused. The lack of primary task focus seemed to manifest in continual questions around the actual purpose of the supervisor group, and seemed to lead to a reluctance by the organisation to clearly define the boundary of that group. This impacted negatively on the group identity the supervisor group was able to build, as well as their ability to negotiate these group boundaries in interaction with the manager group.

- Autonomy, authority and authorisation specifically covered autonomy and how individuals or groups take up authority within organisations. According to the literature, this process is impacted by the state of "in-the-mind authority figures" that individuals have. Conflict with this and ambivalence toward authority could lead to processes of projection and basic assumption activity. The taking up of authority and/or power is also impacted by these internal representations and will directly affect relations within the leadership/followership dynamic. It is possible to understand a part of intergroup relations by observing this dynamic. The dynamic of representation between groups and within groups can also be understood from the perspective of the nature and quality of authority given to each representative. These authority issues seemed to continually undermine the ability of these groups to effectively relate to each other. Working with the concepts of power and authority for example, assisted in some understanding of how these issues make the dynamics of the relations between these two groups more complex. The groups seem to confuse positional power with personal power and appear to assert positional power as it is attached to the authority of their rank and status. This makes a cooperative stance between the two groups difficult, and also undermines the ability of the groups to learn from each other and to share in each other's skill and competence base.
- The literature review on projection indicated that these dynamics are used to contain anxiety about integrating the "good" and the "bad". The paranoid-schizoid position involves splitting away the "bad", and the process of projective identification involves the process of splitting this away as well as expecting the other to take up, own and act out the aspect being projected. Both processes seem to be used by groups especially in relation to other groups. The nature of organisations seem to encourage

these processes, and so reality could be interpreted from a paranoid-schizoid position as opposed to a depressive one.

Further working hypotheses were generated regarding the relations between the two groups who took part in the study. It could be that there was confusion regarding boundaries in general, specifically the boundaries of task and primary task, and group identity and group boundaries. The manifestation of this might be the long overtime hours worked, the high turnover of staff from the more junior group, or frustration expressed at a lack of clear focus. Manifestation of problems with group boundaries could be the lack of group integration (between the junior and senior groups), and feelings of uncertainty as to how to become integrated. Further problems with the intergroup relations between these groups could also relate to a lack of clarity on how to use a process of autonomy effectively. It could be that the organisation discourages a sense of autonomy, and the more junior group, therefore, might vacillate between taking this up and dependency. There could also be a sense of unease arising out of the ineffective use of positional power, and the extent to which this undermines a process of teaming. The groups might feel that they must relate to each other in terms of the hierarchy, whilst knowing that they could be relating in terms of skill and competence. The dynamic of projective processes could be used to carry much of the above anxiety in terms of "putting" the uncertainty onto boundary role holders, for example, the human resource group, the partner group and the client groups.

6.1.2 Conclusions for phase two

In terms of research question 3, chapters four and five (steps 1 – 5) covered the study and results of the research which seemed to indicate the following:

- The junior group seemed to indicate a lack of a realistic task definition and related anxiety. The confusion seemed to lead to a struggle to maintain an effective task boundary, while attempting to demonstrate and prove their competence to the more senior group. This seemed to lead to basic assumption activities of dependency and flight. The senior group seemed to project their uncertainty of their own role onto the more junior group.
- The groups seemed to reflect a difficulty in negotiating group boundaries both between and within their groups. This seemed to have a negative impact of their

group identity. There seemed to be fears of integrating (basic assumption of oneness) and simultaneous fears of remaining split. The considerations of inclusion and destruction seemed primary in this discussion. There seemed to be a concern for the criteria of inclusion communicated by the more senior group, and what needed to be compromised or exchanged for this. It seemed that as the more senior group became aware of the potential power of the more junior group and possibility of the destruction of the senior group, that the warning was given to the junior group that there were no other options available. It appeared that a sense of dependency and independency manifested, as opposed to an interdependency. Basic assumption activity of fight seemed to be reflected as the battle was refocused onto the partner group. The human resources group seemed to play a role in negotiating this integration and refocusing, at the expense of their own exclusion. It seemed as if both junior and senior groups used both the paranoid-schizoid positions and projective identification to effectively externalise their distress.

- In terms of authority, it seemed as if the junior group vacillated between taking up autonomy and remaining dependent. In this way, the process seemed to reflect throughout the organisation, with the more senior group seemingly doing the same thing. The senior group appeared to be totally immersed in the dynamic and structure of the organisation in relation to this, and seem to be dependent on and follow without question what the organisation required. Related, therefore, was the conflict between autonomy and power, with the power that is sanctioned residing in the hierarchy and the bureaucracy. In this respect, the more junior group seemed to be in the process of realising what their inclusion meant. This conflict was powerful and again seemed to be projected onto other groups. The more senior group might even be taking a part of this projection on with the verbalisation of splits within their own group.
- Regarding projective processes, the most powerful seemed to be the expressions of the splits between the person and work, as well as between thought and feeling. The sanction of the organisation seemed to be of a cognitive understanding only and this was reflected in the interaction between these two groups. The paranoid-schizoid position seemed to be reflected in the externalisation of competence onto time, the roles, the client and the partner groups. Also split away was this actual process and interaction. On some level, the groups seemed to know that this process will be repeated, (there was some indication of a desire to integrate), but it seemed that they

were not sure how to deal with this. Splits within both junior and senior groups were expressed in terms of conflict, competition, and aspects not under control. An aspect that seemed to be projected onto other groups is hostility. This from the more junior group and was perhaps a reflection of the conflict they felt which they then projected onto the more senior group. The senior group seemed to take this up, and acted this out in a rigid adherence to the organisational parameters. In this way, the junior group seemed to transfer their knowledge (and power) externally to the senior groups. The manager groups seemed to project their fear of being overwhelmed and excluded onto the more junior group. These aspects were taken up by both groups. In general it seemed as if the more junior group played a boundary role in terms of acceptance and not acceptance into the "core" of the organisation. It could be that this is a part of reason for the manifestation of high stress and turnover.

In conclusion, the following seemed to be relevant. Working with tasks can bring up conflicts which have to be dealt with. Every individual, group and organisation have learnt ways to try to manage these conflicts and avoid this anxiety. Individuals, groups and institutions have collectively learned to do this by installing defences against the painful realities of work by arranging task, rules and procedures. It is effective to explore how groups work to ensure that these defences do not undermine the efforts of that group's task behaviour. Within the organisation therefore, it seemed that the intergroup relations between the two groups was characterised by anxiety and conflict about the way to "fit" into the organisation. This seemed to manifest and reflect in the way they related to each other. Issues of nonclarity with task and group boundary and identity issues, vacillation with effective authority and reactions of projection seemed prevalent.

6.2 HYPOTHESES

One of the objectives of this research is to generate hypotheses so that further research can be undertaken to investigate specific areas. Below are some hypotheses that can be used for this purpose. Different and separate hypotheses have been generated and are itemised. They are grouped under the variables of boundary management, authority, and projective processes.

6.2.1 Boundary Management

- Unclear group identity, for whatever reason, creates anxiety which makes it more difficult to relate to other groups, especially if it is seen that other group might endanger this identity.
- If groups are confused about the boundaries within which they belong and add value to an organisation or to the wider system within which they operate, they might divert their focus from effectively working within this system in order to focus on confirming their group identity and group value. This undue focus on intragroup relations takes necessary energy away from working on intergroup relations.
- An inability to define boundaries of task between two groups can lead to a dysfunction in these task systems and ineffective problem solving between those two groups.
- If there is confusion and conflict between two groups or subsystems at different levels within an organisational hierarchy, it is likely that this confusion and conflict will be reflected within the wider system, between other subsystems and throughout the hierarchy.
- A lack of clarity of primary task of a group or between groups will allow other tasks to emerge as primary. These will be basic assumption activities in that they do not support the overt aims of the organisation. In other words, in the absence of a clearly defined primary task, any task will be taken up especially when there is a strong need to achieve and perform.
- Confusion between and within groups can be created and maintained, because it is often easier to deal with this confusion and subsequent splits than the outcomes of an integration. Benefits of confusion and splits can be not wanting and thus not able to take responsibility for the role the groups play. The groups thus undermine their own success by focusing on internal fears such as losing identity, losing their space and their place within the organisation. The outcome of this is that groups might rather

keep to themselves and not integrate their knowledge, task or performance into the rest of the system.

- One part of a system can create confusion in another part of the system in order to undermine that subsystem, and in order to split away anxiety that might be felt. An example is group identity which can be undermined by another group in order for that group to dominate and overpower the first group; in so doing they feel that they now can confirm their own identity.
- In relations between groups at different levels in a hierarchy, the more senior groups might try to be seen as cooperative with a subsequent and ineffective focus on inclusion. This wide and all encompassing inclusion undermines effective boundaries that might need to remain in order to discriminate seniority of task. A balance, therefore, needs to be maintained between effective discrimination of task and group boundary, and intergroup cooperation and inclusion.
- As leaders of themselves, groups need to manage the boundary between what is in and what is outside their group. Senior groups also might need to manage and contain more junior groups in order to contain this anxiety. Faced with little containment this anxiety might lead to a flight reaction which could be an ineffective focus on policy, administration, rules and regulations. Groups could rather manage the anxiety by clearly defining tasks, areas of responsibility and accountability and keeping this consistent at all levels, and at all levels of expression.
- In intergroup relations, a flight reaction from anxiety and conflict, can be seen as an inability to hold the frustration of potential conflict of a negotiation of group and intergroup boundaries. The potential conflict of a negotiation of group boundaries could revolve around a fear of being overwhelmed, of losing group identity, a fear of having to compromise personal values.

6.2.2 Authority

- A need for acknowledgement, acceptance and recognition which is not forthcoming might affect the intensity with which groups hold onto their job titles and positional power.
- The intense need or overwhelming desire to be a part of the management of an organisation, can be a reflection of an internal feeling of incompetence regarding autonomy and the taking up of authority. The internal feeling of being "unauthorised" can lead to the fantasy that external authorisation, in the form of being a part of the management of an organisation, will fulfil this internal need. This need to feel authorised can also be a reflection of the need to integrate past authority figures and experiences.
- In relations between groups, the process of negotiating task and group boundaries, as well as authority issues, can be seen to follow a process beginning with dependency, followed by counter dependency, independency and finally interdependency. The groups in the research seemed to demonstrate dependency, counterdependency, and to some extent independency. However, interaction from the standpoint of interdependency seemed limited. This level of interaction might be what the groups needed to materialise in order to work together more effectively. It would be worthwhile to investigate the reasons for the groups not being able to develop this.
- Groups might find themselves struggling between needs for affiliation with another group, and in contradiction needs for power against and over that group. Needs for power over other groups, leads to competition between these groups and undermines the ability of these groups to affiliate. If the need for power over others, is a reflection of insecurity, then honest affiliation can be impossible. These two basic interpersonal or intergroup needs when in conflict, can lead to heightened anxiety, mistrust and hostility.
- A struggle with establishing a balance between personal power in terms of for example competence, and positional power in terms of for example rank, can lead to a

struggle between fighting both for and against integration of the individual into a group. This dynamic could also be seen between groups, for example, groups fighting to establish credibility as a group, might struggle to balance this with the struggle to be incorporated into more senior ranks within an organisation. The incorporation might be seen as a dissolving and thus undermining of that group. The struggle then revolves around what part of the identity that group has to give up in order to become part of another group.

- A boundary between fantasy and reality needs awareness in order for basic assumption activity to be recognised and worked with. The fantasy needs to be opened up in such a way that unsubstantiated fears can be looked at and resolved.
- Unclear task boundaries and confused boundaries of delegation can lead to groups becoming dependent on each other in their confusion.
- If organisations change and renegotiate their goals in line with changing market and client needs, groups need to maintain, grow and effectively take up their autonomy in order to renegotiate their identity and contribution in line with these changing organisational goals.

6.2.3 Projective processes

- Groups can use other groups to disown aspects of themselves that they are uncomfortable with. Groups can blame other groups or use those groups to explain away uncomfortable situations. In order for intergroup relations to grow and mature, these groups need to take back and own these projections in order for integration and thus effective work (as opposed to basic assumption behaviour) to take place.
- A difficulty in managing boundaries with groups that are seen as more powerful, can lead to these groups transferring that anxiety onto other groups, especially more junior groups. This could be seen as a transference of anxiety, and as a need to reassert personal power.

- Confusion and anxiety could reflect deeper levels of anger, fear and insecurity which is split onto other groups. Other groups are thus seen, described and related to as if they are insecure, fearful or hostile.
- Boundary role holders often end up taking up projective identification dynamics. Confusion, doubt or in fact any areas of weakness of an organisation can be clearly seen and illustrated in those spaces.

6.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are the recommendations relating to this research. Recommendations have been given for the use of the theoretical aspects in terms of a broader understanding of group dynamics and organisations in general, as well as specific recommendations for the groups under study and the leadership of this organisation.

6.3.1 Recommendations for organisations

The use of the psychodynamic concepts and the underlying principles of this approach holds much value for understanding the relations between groups, the relations of these subsystems within and to broader organisational systems, as well as the relation of organisations to the other external systems with which they interact. This approach can be used in the planning and the actualising of various interventions. It is also of value in terms of a general and deeper understanding of how groups interact and thus has value for many day-to-day and longer term operations.

Important would be the training of groups and leaderships within organisations in order to develop awareness and competence in dealing with intergroup relations. These applications could extend from simply managing meetings better to planning long-term and complex projects. This awareness could also assist organisations in understanding how and why many of their goals fail due to a lack of follow through with the underlying dynamics of group interaction. Related would be an increased awareness of the context within which the organisation is placed in terms of market, client, and other external systems. Working with the theoretical concepts and dynamics and then understanding the application of these, has

led the researcher to value the complexity, but also the simplicity of some levels of group interaction. It is felt that this understanding could be well used by individuals, groups and organisations.

6.3.2 Recommendation for the groups

Specific to the two groups under study, it would be effective to repeat this study in the next few months, to assess any changes in the relatedness between these two groups, but also to allow the groups to start learning about the conflicts that they seem to be experiencing. Aspects that would need to be addressed include the behaviour of the manager group as a group, and how they support the dynamics of the organisation, in particular those dynamics they say they do not agree with. Other aspects that need to be addressed from the perspective of the supervisor group include the apparent process they go through of compromising what they consider important in exchange for inclusion.

It would be beneficial for the groups to start actively working with the development of the relations between these two groups. Recommendations include the following:

- Give feedback to the groups on their own behaviour and dynamics as related to the data collection.
- Experiential workshops would then be beneficial in order for the groups to start becoming aware of the dynamics between them, as well as how they play it out and actively support the existing dynamics.
- Content workshops are also suggested in order for the groups to understand and become aware of dynamics in and between groups.
- A final intervention could be learning groups, whereby the groups meet on a regular and longer term basis in order to integrate and put this knowledge into practice.

6.3.3 Recommendations for the leadership

As indicated managing group phenomena is as essential as managing the financial or structure of any organisation, but these aspects are often ignored and more often than not these factors are not taken into account. Reasons indicated could be ignorance or an avoidance of any real decision making focus, and the fact that groups are unconsciously set

up in this way to avoid any real work task. If changes are to be made to the way these two groups relate, changes need to be made about how the organisation relates to itself, and specifically how the leadership relate to the rest of the organisation. It is important, therefore, for the leadership to recognise the way they may actually support the very dynamics they verbally indicate they do not. If conflict is present between the leadership groups, for example, it would not be surprising that conflict is present between groups working under that leadership. In terms of other areas if the leadership, for example, wants to encourage autonomy, the leadership will have to let go of dependency. Similarly, if the leadership want to create a culture of risk taking and teaming, they would have to be less rigid about making mistakes and of being "wrong", and would have to learn and demonstrate a negotiated use of boundaries.

Specific recommendations for the leadership relate to training and the use of workshops to increase the insight and awareness groups have in the way they relate to each. This would also encourage the senior groups to become more aware of the impact of their dynamics on more junior groups within the organisation. Furthermore, the leadership of the organisation would need to be aware of inconsistency in terms of encouraging one path of action, whilst following another. Thus the role of the leadership is critical in actively manifesting the relations within that organisation. An outline of the interventions recommended for the leadership are as follows:

- Content workshops run in order for them to understand the dynamics of group relationships.
- Experiential workshops run in order for the leadership to become aware of the way their behaviour manifests, and how it supports the existing dynamics.
- Discussion based interventions for the leadership to start evaluating the positives and negatives of their behaviour, and for them to evaluate what they want to support and what they do not want to support. In other words, decisions need to be taken in terms of how the leadership would want the rest of the organisation to operate, and then for them to make decisions on how they would need to change their behaviours and attitudes in order to encourage new behaviour from the rest of the organisation. In this regard, it is important for the leadership to have an understanding of the process as well as the dynamics of group relations. It is valuable, therefore, to include education

of aspects of group development in an attempt for the leadership to effectively "pitch" their leadership in order to support the organisation in the best possible way.

- Strategic workshops and discussions for the leadership to assess how they want the organisation to materialise its goals, and if these goals are in fact relevant. The types of intergroup relations seen are often a manifestation of conflicting organisational goals and conflicting underlying beliefs about how some of these goals can manifest. A strong and clear focus on the objective of the organisation and a concurrent clear focus on how these goals can be achieved is important to resolve. Both the objectives and methods need to directly translate into how the organisation wants the groups within the organisation to relate and to work.
- Further interventions might be needed in order for the leadership to ensure that they are acting on common goals. In other words, it is imperative that the leadership sort out any conflict within their group as well.
- One-on-one coaching for the individuals to take responsibility for their own individual behaviour and to start working intrapersonally. Benefits in this realm would then start to reflect in the interpersonal and thus intergroup relations.

6.4 LIMITATIONS

Following are the limitations of this research. These are discussed for both for phase one and two.

6.4.1 Limitations of phase one

Limitations of the literature review could relate to the focus of the study and subsequent bias of the researcher. The focus of the study led to a literature review which only considered past research and writings relating to psychodynamic approaches of investigation. What could be included further are aspects relating to interpersonal dynamics, for example. On a micro level, aspects such as an understanding of intrapersonal and interpersonal dynamics could be included as they relate to intragroup and intergroup dynamics. As such, personal awareness training could be a valuable starting point and models such as Kiesler's Interpersonal Circle could be used in this regard. Perhaps other concepts within the psychodynamic approach

could have been included as well, such as concepts of taking up a role and managing oneself with in role.

6.4.2 Limitations of phase two

Limitations of the qualitative study include:

- The bias of the researcher. As the researcher was a part of the organisation and integrally involved with the two groups, this might have had an impact on the way the researcher focused the interpretation of these results. Even though objectivity was striven for, it is to be expected that some impact would have come through. What was valuable though was the inclusion of the HR group in the data collection as this highlighted and helped explain some of the complexity of the dynamics between the two groups under study. For further studies with these groups though, it might be beneficial to use an external consultant or researcher.
- Related to the actual study, in order to broaden the scope and validity of the data it would be more effective not to draw a sample for the selected groups.

6.5 CHAPTER SUMMARY

In this chapter, the final steps (steps 6 – 9) of phase two of the research method and the final research question of this research were covered. This included conclusions, recommendations and limitations of this research, as well as hypotheses for further research.

Increased awareness with the way institutions are managed and lived can lead to positive consequences in these systems. If organisations continue to work as if emotion and irrational aspects of human behaviour are best managed by denial, splitting and projection, then the accessing of the potential of those who work within those organisations will continue to be undermined. Further, working ineffectively with issues such as task boundary and group identity boundaries as well as with authority issues, undermines the abilities of groups to relate and thus work together effectively. Organisations and thus the groups operating within those organisations need to raise their levels of awareness about the dynamics between groups within their organisations and make careful and in-depth decisions about how to work together more effectively.

REFERENCE LIST

- Albertyn, L. (1999). Psychodynamic perspectives. In Z. Bergh & A. Theron (Eds), *Psychology in the work context* (pp 333-353). Halfway House: International Thomson Publishing.
- Alderfer, C.P. (1980). The methodology of organizational diagnosis. *Professional Psychology, 11* (3), 459-468.
- Astrachan, B.M. & Flynn, H.R. (1976). The intergroup exercise: A paradigm for learning about the development of organizational structure. In E.J. Miller (Ed.), *Task and organization* (pp 47-68). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Astrachan, B.M., Flynn, H.R., Geller, J.D. & Harvey, H.H. (1975). Systems approach to day hospitalization. In A.D. Colman & W.H. Bexton (Eds), *Group Relations Reader 1* (pp 193-206). Jupiter, FL: The A.K. Rice Institute.
- Bexton, W.H. (1975). The architect and planner: Change agent or scapegoat? In A.D. Colman & W.H. Bexton (Eds), *Group Relations Reader 1* (pp 343-358). Jupiter, FL: The A.K. Rice Institute.
- Bion, W.R. (1962). *Learning from experience*. London: Jason Aronson Inc.
- Bion, W.R. (1967). *Second thoughts: Selected papers on psycho-analysis*. London: Maresfield Library.
- Bion, W.R. (1975a). *Experiences in groups*. New York: Ballentine.
- Bion, W.R. (1975b). Selections from: Experiences in Groups. In A.D. Colman & W.H. Bexton (Eds), *Group Relations Reader 1* (pp 11-20). Jupiter, FL: The A.K. Rice Institute.
- Bolton, W. & Roberts, V.Z. (1994). Asking for help: Staff support and sensitivity groups re-

viewed. In A. Obholzer & V.Z. Roberts (Eds), *The Unconscious at work: Individual and organizational stress in the human services* (pp 156-165). London: Routledge.

Cardona, F. (1994). Facing an uncertain future. In A. Obholzer & V.Z. Roberts (Eds), *The unconscious at work: Individual and organizational stress in the human services* (pp 139-146). London: Routledge.

Cilliers, F. & Koortzen, P. (1996). *The psychodynamics of organisations*. Paper presented at 2nd Annual PsySSA Congress, Johannesburg.

Cilliers, F. & Koortzen, P. (1998). The psychodynamics of organisations: Freud is alive and well and living in organisations. *Psychologia*, 25 (2), 8-16.

Cilliers, F. & Koortzen, P. (2000). The psychodynamic view on organizational behaviour. *The Industrial Organizational Psychologist*, 38 (2), 59-67.

Clulow, C. (1994). Balancing care and control: the supervisory relationship as a focus for promoting organizational health. In A. Obholzer & V.Z. Roberts (Eds), *The unconscious at work: Individual and organizational stress in the human services* (pp 179-186). London: Routledge.

Colman, A.D. (1975a). Group consciousness as a developmental phase. In A.D. Colman & W.H. Bexton (Eds), *Group Relations Reader 1* (pp 35-42). Jupiter, FL: The A.K. Rice Institute.

Colman, A.D. (1975b). Irrational aspects of design. In A.D. Colman & W.H. Bexton (Eds), *Group relations reader 1* (pp 313-328). Jupiter, FL: The A.K. Rice Institute.

Coster, E.A., Watkins, M.L., Cilliers, F.V.N. & Theron, A.L. (1987). *Organisational and career psychology. (Only study guide for IPS202-D)*. Pretoria: University of South Africa.

Czander, W.M. (1993). *The psychodynamics of work and organizations*. New York: Guilford Press.

Davis, D.D. (1995). Form, function and boundaryless organizations. In A. Howard (Ed.), *The changing nature of work* (pp 117-134). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

De Loach, S. (1998). *Study group consultancy: Elements of the task*. Retrieved May, 1999 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.continents.com/SGC.htm>.

De Loach, S. (1999). *Intergroup representation and negotiation: Learning from the Tavistock experience*. Retrieved April, 1999 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.continents.com/IGrepresentation.html>.

Diamond, M.A. (1991). Stresses of group membership: Balancing the needs for independence and belonging. In M.F.R. Kets de Vries & Associates (Eds), *Organizations on the couch: Clinical perspectives on organizational behavior and change* (pp 191-214). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Drucker, P.F. (1988). The coming of the new organization. *Harvard Business Review*, Jan-Feb, 45-63.

Duncan, R. (1979). What is the right organisational structure? *Organizational Dynamics*, 7 (3), 59-80.

Eisold, K. (1985). Recovering Bion's contributions to group analysis. In A.D. Colman & M.H. Geller (Eds), *Group Relations Reader 2* (pp 37-48). Jupiter, FL: The A.K. Rice Institute.

Fontana, A. & Frey, J. H. (1994). Interviewing: The art of science. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp 361-376). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Geller, M. H. & Krantz, J. (1985). Part one: Theory. In A. D. Colman & M. H. Geller (Eds), *Group Relations Reader 2* (pp 1-2). Jupiter, FL: The A.K.Rice Institute.

Gould, L.J. (1991). Using psychoanalytic frameworks for organizational analysis. In F.R. Kets de Vries (Ed.), *Organizations on the couch: Handbook of psychoanalysis and*

Management (pp 25–44). New York: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Hage, J. (1995). Post-industrial lives: New demands, new prescriptions. In A. Howard (Ed.), *The changing nature of work* (pp 485-513). San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.

Halton, W. (1994). Some unconscious aspects of organizational life. Contributions from psychoanalysis. In A. Obholzer & V.Z. Roberts (Eds), *The unconscious at work: Individual and organizational stress in the human services* (pp 11-18). London: Routledge.

Hausman, W. (1975). The application of group relations methods and concepts. In A.D. Colman & W.H. Bexton (Eds), *Group Relations Reader 1* (pp 181-184). Jupiter, FL: The A.K. Rice Institute.

Hewitt, J.P. (1991). *Self and society: A symbolic interactionist social psychology* (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Hirschhorn, L. & Young, D.R. (1991). Dealing with the anxiety of working: Social defences as coping strategy. In M.F.R. Kets de Vries & Associates (Eds), *Organizations on the couch: Clinical perspectives on organizational behavior and change* (pp 215-240). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Hutton, J., Bazalgette, J. & Reed, B. (1997). Organisation-in-the-mind. In J.E. Neumann, K. Kellner & A. Dawson-Shepherd (Eds), *Developing organisational consultancy* (pp 113–126). London: Routledge.

Ivancevich, J.M. & Matteson, M.T. (1987). *Organizational behaviour and management* (3rd ed.). Boston: Irwin.

Joseph, I.P.E. (1989). *The hermeneutic of human openness*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Lutheran School of Theology, Chicago, Illinois.

Kerlinger, F.N. (1986). *Foundations of behavioral research* (3rd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Kernberg, O.F. (1985). Regression in organizational leadership. In A.D. Colman & M.H. Geller (Eds), *Group Relations Reader 2* (pp 89–107). Jupiter, FL: The A.K.Rice Institute.

Kets de Vries, M.F.R. (1991). Introduction: Exploding the myth that organizations and executives are rational. In M.F.R. Kets de Vries & Associates (Eds), *Organizations on the couch: Clinical perspectives on organizational behavior and change* (pp 1–21). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kets de Vries, M.F.R. (1991a). On becoming a CEO: Transference and the addictiveness of power. In M.F.R. Kets de Vries & Associates (Eds), *Organizations on the couch: Clinical perspectives on organizational behavior and change* (pp 120-139). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kets de Vries, M.F.R. (1991b). Preface. In M.F.R. Kets de Vries & Associates (Eds), *Organizations on the couch: Clinical perspectives on organizational behavior and change* (pp xiii – xix). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Klein, M. (1975). *Envy and gratitude and other works*. London: Vintage.

Klein, M. (1985). Our adult world and its roots in infancy. In A.D. Colman & M.H. Geller (Eds), *Group Relations Reader 2* (pp 5–19). Jupiter, FL: The A.K.Rice Institute.

Koortzen, P. & Cilliers, F. (2002 In press). The psychoanalytic approach to team development. In R.L. Lowman (Ed.), *Handbook of organizational consulting psychology*.

Krantz, J. & Gilmore, T.N. (1991). Understanding the dynamics between consulting teams and client systems. In M.F.R. Kets de Vries & Associates (Eds), *Organizations on the couch: Clinical perspectives on organizational behavior and change* (pp 307-330). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Lawrence, W.G. (1985). Management development...some ideals, images and realities. In A.D. Colman & M.H. Geller (Eds), *Group Relations Reader 2* (pp 231-240). Jupiter, FL: The A.K. Rice Institute.

Lawrence, W.G. (1998). *Totalitarian states of mind in institutions*. Retrieved August, 1998 from the World Wide Web: <http://human-nature.com/group/chap2.html>.

Lazarus, A.A. (1976). *Multi-modal behaviour therapy*. New York: Springer Publishing Company.

Levinson, H. (1991). Diagnosing organizations systematically. In M.F.R. Kets de Vries & Associates (Eds), *Organizations on the couch: Clinical perspectives on organizational behavior and change* (pp 45–68). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Lofgren, L.B. (1975). Organizational design and therapeutic effect. In A.D. Colman & W.H. Bexton (Eds), *Group Relations Reader 1* (pp 185-192). Jupiter, FL: The A.K. Rice Institute.

Lyth, I.M. (1991). Changing organizations and individuals: Psychoanalytic insights for improving organizational health. In M.F.R. Kets de Vries & Associates (Eds), *Organizations on the couch: Clinical perspectives on organizational behavior and change* (pp 361-378). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Main, T. (1985). Some psychodynamics of large groups. In A.D. Colman & M.H. Geller (Eds), *Group Relations Reader 2* (pp 49–69). Jupiter, FL: The A.K. Rice Institute.

Mawson, C. (1994). Containing anxiety in work with damaged children. In A. Obholzer & V.Z. Roberts (Eds), *The unconscious at work: Individual and organizational stress in the human services* (pp 67-74). London: Routledge.

McCormick, D.W. & White, J. (2000). Using one's self as an instrument for organizational diagnosis. *Organizational Development Journal*, 18 (3), 49-62.

Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: an expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Miller, E.J (1976). Introduction to part 1. In E.J.Miller (Ed.), *Task and organisation* (pp 19-24) New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Miller, E. (1993). *From dependency to autonomy: Studies in organization and change*. London: Free Association Books.

Miller, E. (1997). Effecting organisational change in large complex systems. A collaborative consultancy approach. In J.E. Neumann, K. Kellner & A Dawson-Shepherd (Eds), *Developing organisational consultancy*. (pp 187–212). London: Routledge.

Miller, E.J. & Rice, A.K. (1975). Selections from: Systems of Organization. In A.D. Colman & W.H. Bexton (Eds), *Group Relations Reader 1* (pp 43-68). Jupiter, FL: The A.K. Rice Institute.

Moller, A.T. (1995). *Perspectives on personality*. Durban: Butterworths.

Mosse, J. & Roberts, V.Z. (1994). Finding a voice: Differentiation, representation and empowerment in organizations under threat. In A. Obholzer & V.Z. Roberts (Eds), *The unconscious at work: Individual and organizational stress in the human services* (pp 147-155). London: Routledge.

Mosse, J. (1994). The institutional roots of consulting to institutions. In A. Obholzer & V.Z. Roberts (Eds), *The unconscious at work: Individual and organizational stress in the human services* (pp 1-8). London: Routledge.

Mouton, J. & Marais, H.C. (1988). *Basic concepts in the methodology of the social sciences*. Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council.

Obholzer, A. & Roberts, V.Z. (1994). The troublesome individual and the troubled institution. In A. Obholzer & V.Z. Roberts (Eds), *The unconscious at work: Individual and organizational stress in the human services* (pp 129-138). London: Routledge.

Obholzer, A. (1994a). Managing social anxieties in public sector organizations. In A. Obholzer & V.Z. Roberts (Eds), *The unconscious at work: Individual and organizational stress in the human services* (pp 169-178). London: Routledge.

Obholzer, A. (1994b). Authority, power and leadership: Contributions from group relations

training. In A. Obholzer & V.Z. Roberts (Eds), *The unconscious at work: Individual and organizational stress in the human services* (pp 39-47). London: Routledge.

Obholzer, A. (1994c). Afterword. In A. Obholzer & V.Z. Roberts (Eds), *The unconscious at work: Individual and organizational stress in the human services* (pp 206-210). London: Routledge.

Packer, M.J. (1985). *The structure of moral action: A hermeneutic study of moral conflict*. Basel: Karger.

Packer, M.J. & Addison, R.B. (1989). Introduction. In M.J. Packer & R.B. Addison (Eds), *Entering the circle: hermeneutic investigation in psychology* (pp 13-36). New York: State University of New York Press.

Packer, M. J. & Addison, R. B. (1989a). Evaluating an interpretive account. In M. J. Packer & R. B. Addison (Eds), *Entering the circle: hermeneutic investigation in psychology* (pp 275-292). New York: State University of New York Press.

Redlich F.C. & Astrachan, B.M. (1975). Group dynamics training. In A.D. Colman & W.H. Bexton (Eds), *Group Relations Reader 1* (pp 225-234). Jupiter, FL: The A.K. Rice Institute.

Rice, A.K. (1975). Selections from: Learning for leadership. In A.D. Colman & W.H. Bexton (Eds), *Group Relations Reader 1* (pp 71-158). Jupiter, FL: The A.K. Rice Institute.

Rice, A. K. (1976). Individual, group and intergroup processes. In E. J. Miller (Ed.), *Task and organization* (pp 25-46). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Rickman, H.P. (1976). Introduction. In H.P. Rickman (Ed.), *Dilthey: selected writings* (pp 1-25). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rioch, M.J. (1975a). Group relations: Rationale and technique. In A.D. Colman & W.H. Bexton (Eds), *Group Relations Reader 1* (pp 3 - 9). Jupiter, FL: The A.K. Rice Institute.

Rioch, M.J. (1975b). The work of Wilfred Bion on groups. In A.D. Colman & W.H. Bexton

(Eds), *Group Relations Reader 1* (pp 21-33). Jupiter, FL: The A.K. Rice Institute.

Rioch, M.J. (1975c). "All we like sheep - " (Isaiah 53:6): Followers and leaders. In A.D. Colman & W.H. Bexton (Eds), *Group Relations Reader 1* (pp 159-177). Jupiter, FL: The A.K. Rice Institute.

Robbins, S.P. (1989). *Organizational behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Roberts, V.Z. (1994a). The self-assigned impossible task. In A. Obholzer & V.Z. Roberts (Eds), *The unconscious at work: Individual and organizational stress in the human services* (pp 110-118). London: Routledge.

Roberts, V.Z. (1994b). Conflict and collaboration. Managing intergroup relations. In A. Obholzer & V.Z. Roberts (Eds), *The unconscious at work: Individual and organizational stress in the human services* (pp 187-196). London: Routledge.

Roberts, V.Z. (1994c). The organization of work. In A. Obholzer & V.Z. Roberts (Eds), *The unconscious at work: Individual and organizational stress in the human services* (pp 28-38). London: Routledge.

Roffey, J.W. (1980). *A hermeneutic critique of counselling psychology: Ricoeur and Rogers*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky.

Schneider, S.C. (1991). Managing boundaries in organizations. In M.F.R. Kets de Vries & Associates (Eds), *Organizations on the couch: Clinical perspectives on organizational behavior and change* (pp 169-190). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Shaffer, J.B.P. & Galinsky, M.D. (1974). *Models of group therapy and sensitivity training*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Shapiro, R.L. (1985). Family dynamics and object relations theory: An analytic group-interpretative approach to family therapy. In A.D. Colman & M.H. Geller (Eds), *Group Relations Reader 2* (pp 217-229). Jupiter, FL: The A.K. Rice Institute.

Shapiro, E.R. & Carr, A.W. (1991). *Lost in familiar places: Creating new connections between individual and society*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Slipp, S. (1993). *The technique and practice of object relations family therapy*. New York: Jason Aronson Inc.

Stokes, J. (1994a). The unconscious at work in groups and teams. Contributions from the work of Wilfred Bion. In A. Obholzer & V.Z. Roberts (Eds), *The unconscious at work: Individual and organizational stress in the human services* (pp 19-27). London: Routledge.

Stokes, J. (1994b). Institutional chaos and personal stress. In A. Obholzer & V.Z. Roberts (Eds), *The unconscious at work: Individual and organizational stress in the human services* (pp 121-128). London: Routledge.

The Tavistock Institute. (1995). *Authority, leadership and organisation: The Leicester conference*. London: Author.

Turquet, P.M. (1985). Leadership: The individual and the group. In A.D. Colman & M.H. Geller (Eds), *Group Relations Reader 2* (pp 71– 87). Jupiter, FL: The A.K. Rice Institute.

Von Bertalanffy, L. (1972). General system theory – a critical review. In J. Beishon & G. Peters (Eds), *Systems behaviour* (pp 29-49). London: Harper & Row.

Wasdell, D. (1997). The consulting organisation as an advanced learning system. In J.E. Neumann, K. Kellner & A. Dawson_Shepherd (Eds), *Developing organisational consultancy* (pp 49–70). London: Routledge.

Wheelan, S.A. (1994). *Group Processes: A developmental perspective*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Wever, K.S. (1995). Political economic institutions, labor relations, and work. In A Howard (Ed.), *The changing nature of work* (pp 45-52). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.