Childhood Story as a Key to Individual Patterns of Team Behavior

Thesis by Anna Urnova

The Executive Master in Consulting and Coaching for Change

INSEAD

Address: Anna Urnova, Luisenstrasse 49, 10117 Berlin, Germany

Email: aurnova@hotmail.com

I.   Abstract.

In my past experience working as an executive for big organizations, I have experienced challenging situations, where certain group or team dynamics made it difficult for me to be effective personally and professionally. During my study on the "Consulting and coaching for change" program at INSEAD I realized that many of my work challenges were caused or amplified by my own unconscious predisposition to certain team roles and group dynamics, deeply rooted in my childhood experience. The new awareness helped me to become more effective at navigating the team dynamics challenges in future. Now, as a practicing executive coach, I am interested in finding a practical approach for helping others to analyze their family group dynamics and use the new awareness to better inform behavior in workgroups. I have conducted the grounded theory research by asking 10 executives to tell me about their most memorable work team experiences and accompany that by their childhood family story. I looked for parallels and themes in the data in order to establish those areas, where family system dynamics influenced the way my research subjects related to others in work teams. The results are presented in the thesis.

II.   Key words.

group dynamics, individual predisposition, family dynamics, childhood story

III.   Introduction

The main objective of my research is to experiment with a childhood family story as a way, in which a person could become aware of own predisposition to certain patterns of behaving and relating to others in a work team.

Systems psychodynamics assumes that in any group dynamics two parallel types of processes are taking place simultaneously: a rational and an irrational one. While group members are working together on a rational task at hand, they are at the same time engaging in the other, unconscious dynamics at an emotional level. Psychodynamic theories agree that these underlying processes impact the quality of interactions with regards to the rational task and that bringing such processes to group members' conscious awareness is a key requirement for increasing group and individual effectiveness (McLeod and Kettner-Polley, 2004). At the same time rich body of research suggests that the unconscious team dynamics is evolving around our inner patterns of relating to others rooted in our childhood experience of family system. In the framework of psychodynamic perspective Kets De Vries (2012) talks about the "inner theatre" of the individual, which he describes as "a rich tragedy-comedy playing out on our inner stage, with key actors representing the people we have loved, hated, feared, and admired in our lives … As our personality structure depends on our genetic endowment and the developmental outcome of our early environment, to make sense of our behavior, we must explore our interpersonal history, including our original attachment relationships" (p. 19). The idea that we internalize our relations with early caretakers and unconsciously re-enact them in later interpersonal situation made me want to explore a way for people to become aware of such internalized images and patterns of behavior. I believe that by building such self-awareness people could avoid blindly re-enacting their inner scripts of relating to others and thus become more effective in achieving their rational work objectives. However, I

could not find a simple tool, which could help me as a coach to bring such awareness to my clients.

During the "Consulting and Coaching for Change" executive program at INSEAD I significantly increased my self-awareness with regards to my interpersonal and team relationship patterns by writing down my stories of work related challenges and in parallel describing those childhood memories they evoked in me. Only when I put both of my work and family narratives together, I could identify the relationship patterns and themes, which were not apparent to me before. In my research I would like to build on my experience and experiment by asking 10 executives to tell me about their most memorable team experiences at work and in parallel share with me their childhood family stories. By analyzing the emerging parallels and patterns I hope to test potentially a useful coaching method of helping my clients to learn about self in relation to others in a team.

IV. Literature review

Systems psychodynamics perspective, which I am building upon in my research has been developed by the Tavistock Institute and was influenced by psychoanalysis, object relations theory and systems theory.

Sigmund Freud (1920), the founder of psychoanalysis viewed mental development of an individual as a psychodynamic process, in which unconscious forces play a key role. He defined the key stages of psychosexual development of an individual and explained how individual defenses worked to protect the individual from inner conflicts and anxieties at each stage of his development. He also proposed the idea of transference and countertransference

in the therapeutic process, which are very important for my research. Transference and countertransference represent the deep human inner need to repeat and relive in the present time past unresolved conflicts and relationships (usually with early caretakers). Freud's work was developed further by Melanie Klein (1946), who expanded the concept of defense mechanisms and formulated the object relations theory. She suggested that though defense processes such as splitting and projection were taking place in fantasy, they influenced our behavior and relations with others in real life through the process of "projective identification", whereby fantasized, split off parts of the self are projected into others, and as a result are seen as belonging to others and not the self. Klein believed these patterns were deeply rooted and continued to manifest themselves in interpersonal relations throughout human life.

Wilfred Bion (1961) applied fundamental ideas of Freud and Klein to groups. In his theory of group life he differentiated between behaviours directed at rational task performance (the work group) and those directed at dealing with emotional needs and anxieties of the group (the basic assumption group). In Bion's views groups, similarly to individuals, seek to protect themselves from inner conflicts and anxieties by engaging in defense mechanisms rooted in childhood and infancy expereinces. He suggested that in order to deal with anxiety at the unconscious level groups could function under the basic assumption of dependency, fight/flight or pairing. Most important for my research, which focuses less on groups but rather on individual experienes and interaction with and within the group, Bion inroduced idea of individual valency as "the individual's readiness to enter into combination with the group in making and acting on basic assumptions" (1961, p. 103). Bion believed that valency was inherent to human nature and manifested itself to some degree in all human interactions and particularly in a group setting. The idea of valency as the individual predisposition to certain modes of relating to others in the group is at the centre of my research as I look at how modes of relating to others in one's family

could potentially influence one's predisposition to certain roles and group dynamics at work. Individual predisposition to certain relationship patterns has been extensively studied by many researches. For instance, Luborsky (1984) proposed a method he called Core Conflictual Relationship Theme (CCRT), which helped to identify individual's predominant repetitive relationship pattern. He suggested to structure the theme in three components: 1) a wish, 2) expected response from others and 3) own reaction to the received response. Luborsky and various colleagues found that these three components were easily discernible, and that individuals typically struggle with one dominant relationship theme. Multiple studies and instruments look and measure personal predisposition to certain modes of interpersonal communication. For instance, Thomas-Kilman method identifies 5 different personal modes of conflict resolution as a relation between personal orientation towards task (assertiveness) and personal orientation towards people (cooperation) (Kilman and Thomas, 1974). While Brown, Yelsma and Keller (1981) found a correlation between personal conflict management scores and the amount of conflict in one's family of origin: the fewer were the family conflicts in the home in which one was reared, the more effective the individual was in managing conflicts constructively. In my comparison of childhood stories to the work group dynamics stories I tried to integrate some of these research findings and look at recurrent themes around interpersonal conflict and preference for certain modes of communicating.

Another important element of psychodynamics systems approach is the open systems theory. Kurt Lewin (1951) observed that similarly to the physical field, social groups as a whole demonstrate dynamic qualities that are different to qualities of their sub-parts. Later systems approach found its wide use in family therapy, which looked at a family as a system of interrelated elements. Murray Bowen (1977) formulated family systems theory suggesting any individual can only be understood as a part of his/her family. He defined nuclear families as emotional units and systems of interconnected and interdependent individuals, none of

whom can be understood in isolation from the whole family system. In my research I used some of the concepts formulated by Bowen, namely those of relationship triangles, nuclear family emotional systems, differentiation of self and emotional cutoff. Family systems approach has been used by many researches and OD practitioners to analyze work groups, teams and organizations. Though in my work I did not attempt to compare workgroups or organizational systems to family systems, I did look for parallels between the executive's family dynamics as described in his/her childhood story and the dynamics of the workgroup he/she found himself most or least effective in. Lusterman (1989) was implying that organizations and families shared common characteristics and that work unit and family functioning constructs were highly congruent, especially in such dimensions as group climate and leadership. Other researchers also pointed at similarities between work groups and family systems. Thus, organizations could contain subsystems and families also have a number of coexisting subsystems, such as husband–wife, parent–children, and siblings. In both organizations and families, members adopt roles, both have a hierarchy with an established power distribution (Hirschhorn & Gilmore,1980; Morgan, 1986). Managers may take on parental roles while workers may take on sibling roles with their peer coworkers (Morgan, 1986). Brotheridge and Lee (2006) examined the similarity between organizational and family constructs in a systematic fashion and confirmed empirically that family and work organization systems have common functions and themes. They confirmed that consultants using family systems approach to assess and intervene in an organizational system could particularly benefit from attention to such contextual factors as relationships, coalitions, conflict producing triangles, and diffuse or enmeshed boundaries. I did use all of these factors in my analysis of the gathered interview material.

My research was also influenced by works of David Kantor (2012), whose structural dynamics theory originated from both systems theory and family systems therapy. In multiple

studies of interpersonal communications, where they works and especially don't work, Kantor observed married couples, families and later, work teams and organizations. He detected a link between a breakdown in the interpersonal communication and what he called a "deep critical childhood story" of each person involved in the interaction. In his book "Reading the room" (2012) Kantor postulates that such childhood or "identity forming stories" determine much of how we communicate, how we read communications of others and how we relate to others at work and in personal life. He also believes that by helping executives to elicit their personal childhood stories and by facilitating their awareness of the stories' key structural elements, executive coaches and organizational consultants could help to significantly improve communication and team performance at work. Though I came across the works of David Kantor at a time, when I was already halfway through my work and completed all the research interviews, I found his approach very reassuring and relevant to my research topic. Thus, I used some of his core concepts, namely those of three communication domains and three types of operating systems, in my analysis of the interview data.

V. Methodology

The methodology used for my research was grounded theory aimed to derive a conceptual understanding from gathering, analyzing and interpreting the data collected by interviewing group of senior executives. Grounded theory is the theory-generating method of qualitative research developed by Glaser and Strauss (1967), which instead of testing a theory to find out if it is valid or not, explores raw data to discover new patterns (Hylander, 2003). The grounded theory approach requires investigators to approach their data without preconceived ideas about what they will find, so the theory or a hypothesis should emerge more or less

from the data directly (Larsson et al, 2006). I approached the interviews with an expectation and hope that patterns and parallels should present themselves, but I had no idea about what those patterns would be and how exactly they would manifest themselves in the data. In order to collect data pool I interviewed 10 people, asking each of them to tell me 3 stories. First story had to describe the most memorable positive experience of working in the executive team, second story had to be about the most memorable negative experience of the executive team, while third story was about the executive's family of origin. As a result I collected 29 stories since one participant could not recall a negative team experience. All the interviews were tape recorded and afterwards transcribed by me into the text. I proceeded to analyze the data by at first looking for repeated patterns, words, phrases or metaphors within each single narrative, then looking for such patterns across the 3 stories told by the same interviewee. Afterwards I looked for patterns and themes, similarities and differences across all interviewees and all of the 29 stories. I also looked separately at the whole set of 10 stories of positive experiences, at the 9 stories of challenging experiences and at the 10 childhood family stories. I highlighted and coded all the similarities and differences in the texts, while in parallel making notes of my ideas, hints, or initial hypotheses.

I also integrated my interview notes into the analysis. Immediately after each conversation I noted down themes or parallels I noticed across the stories, briefly describing general atmosphere of the interview and noting whether it was hard or easy for me to get the information. I also recorded any special emotions, associations or images coming to me during the interview. All those notes were included by me as separate pieces of data in the analysis.

VI. Description of the research setting

During my attendance and as part of my study on the "Consulting and coaching for change" executive program at INSEAD in 2007 - 2008 I wrote a number of case papers and personal reflections in order to apply the learned clinical paradigm to my organizational and professional experience. Most of my cases were written about the challenging transformational changes I was going through at a time in my professional career. When I re-read those papers in one go, I found out that my main challenges at work had to do with my roles and relationships within the executive team and with my bosses. The papers described at length the tensions, dilemmas and emotional rollercoasters I encountered over the period of 18 months. However, looking at the situation from distance of time I could not at first gather, why the team dynamics had such a deep and painful effect on me and why did I have to describe it in such a detail in my case papers. I also noticed that in parallel to my work related narrative my case papers contained seemingly random stories of my childhood experiences. Those memories of happy and less so times with my family seemed to be coming out of nowhere as free associations at different points in the work related story. Only when I read both narratives together, the work challenges started to make sense to me. The childhood stories illuminated that I struggled at work with the same themes and patterns of relating to others, which I learned in my early family experience and which were very painful and anxiety provoking to me. For instance, I made a rational choice to leave my corporate work and pursue career as an independent coach and consultant, but for a long time I felt stuck and found it hard to let go of my corporate career even though it made me feel flat and demotivated. From the childhood story I wrote in association to this challenge, I realized that my painful emotions had to do with a strong fear of failure and abandonment, which I got as a result of my sudden departure to the boarding school at the age of 9. I spent 5 long years

away from home and never fully understood or accepted the reasons for my departure. As a result I attributed it to my personal failure to fulfill the expectations of my parents, who were themselves very anxious and unsure of themselves. So many years later I found myself at work desperately trying to understand and fulfil the expectations of my boss, who was new in the role and quite unsure about directing the team. The fear of failure and eagerness to live up to the undefined expectations of my boss created a painful and toxic mix, which made it very difficult for me to be effective as a member of the executive team and also to maturely pursue me career aspirations as desired. After gaining the insight I managed to notice the pattern and deal with my emotions in a more constructive way. Later on a new awareness helped me to avoid re-enacting my anxieties in the team setting and thus added to my effectiveness.

I informally talked about the challenging team experiences I had with some of my executive colleagues, who showed interest in the topic. They all admitted to me having at least once a situation in their career, when involvement in a certain team dynamics made them ineffective at the work task and created an unpleasant memory of personal or team failure. Those experiences were described as quite irrational and painful, and all my peers said they hardly ever had a chance to talk about those situations to anyone. Neither did they manage to figure out what could have been done differently in a similar setting. Most said the best course of action would be to avoid having such experiences ever again. When I shared my insights about the childhood family dynamics being a possible source to some of the patterns that may have caused one's entanglement in the irrational team dynamics, I realized that none of my colleagues ever thought of such a possible link. At work we hardly ever talk or think about childhood or our family experiences as most of the time executives work hard to act and present themselves as rational, mature and independent adults. Even if the family memory or association were to enter the mind of an executive at a certain challenging moment at work, he/she would be inclined to wave it off as an irrelevant distraction. I thought

that as a coach I could help people to get insight into their behavioral patterns and "inner theatre" scripts, by listening to their family dynamics stories told in parallel with stories about the team dynamics challenges they faced at work. I believed the awareness gained in such an exercise could help people to become more effective at navigating interpersonal challenges in their work teams. With this in mind I have started to design my research.

Based on my personal experience, I assumed that by asking people to tell me their stories of a difficult team dynamics at work and in parallel by listening to their stories of childhood family dynamics, I would find some interesting patterns and themes. At first, I wanted to ask my subjects to share only the story of a team challenge, but later decided to look for both most challenging and also most rewarding experience in the executive team. I realized the deeper patterns could be found in both negative and positive team experiences. I also expected that irrespective of its positive or less so nature such situations definitely should be accompanied by strong emotions and hence be highly memorable for the participant. So I decided to ask a random sample of executives to tell me their most memorable positive and negative experiences on the executive team and afterwards ask them to describe a system dynamics of their family of origin.

My research took place at the end of 2012 and all the subjects were senior level executives from across different companies and industries in Russia. They all worked in big organizations, some multinational and some Russian, and the teams they described in the interviews also consisted partly out of international executives and partly out of local Russian executives. Most of the experiences described by my subjects in the interviews took place in Russia with one or two taking place abroad. In order to find the volunteers for my research I mobilized my professional network and asked to refer to me people who had a minimum of 3 experiences working in different senior executive teams and would be willing to talk about those experiences. I did not tell my subjects about my interest in the childhood family stories

upfront as I did not want them to come prepared and was interested to hear those family memories that would come to them spontaneously during the interview. Out of all the people referred to me I have invited 20 executives (10 men and 10 women) to take part in my research, since they complied with my criteria and came from different industrial and business backgrounds. I have known some of the people in my research beforehand, while others I met for the first time during the interview. When I completed 10 interviews I felt overwhelmed with all the information and decided I gathered enough research data since some of the stories started to repeat themselves. So I decided not to continue data collection after the 10th interview. Out of the 10 interviewed people 4 were men and 6 were women. Most participants were aged between 35 and 45, whereas 1 person was 33 years old and 2 people were aged between 45 and 50 years. Most of the interviews were conducted face to face while 3 were done over skype. I conducted interviews over skype only with those people, whom I have known well before the research. All the interviews were tape-recorded and later transcribed into text. I coded all the participants using the letter "I" for the word "Interviewee", then indicating the serial number of the given interview and finally using letters "F" or "M" to signify person's gender. So, my first interview was conducted with the female executive I1/F, my second interviewee was the male executive I2/M, and so on.

VII. Data gathering and analysis

All of the interviews lasted between 75 and 95 minutes and were conducted along the same script. At the beginning of the interview I gave a top line description of my research idea and stated some basic rules of our engagement, such as for instance confidentiality of all the information. After the person was ready to proceed, I asked him/her to recall all the experiences working as part of executive teams and tell me how many of such experiences

they could remember. Then I proceeded with the main body of the interview, which was structured in the three parts as outlined below.

1. In the first part I asked an interviewee to describe his/her most effective and positive experience in the executive team. Then I followed the flow of the story and used some or all of the questions below to get the missing information:

   - Please describe your experience on the executive team where you believe you were most effective?

   - What made this experience stand out as the most effective or positive for you?

   - What was the team's task?

   - What was your role?

   - What was the team size and structure?

   - Where there any sub-groups, coalitions, alliances in the team?

   - Did you have any special relationships or conflicts in the team?

   - What made it a success?

   - What was special about this team and this experience?

   - What did it feel like for you to be on this team?

   - What metaphor could you use to describe this team?

   - What metaphor could describe your role in this team?

   - Would you be willing to repeat this experience again?

   - Would you describe this experience as valuable and useful?

2. In the second part I asked an interviewee to describe the experience on the executive team where he/she was least effective? Then I followed the flow of the story and used some or all the questions

- Please describe your experience on the executive team where you believe you were least effective?

- What made this experience stand out as the least effective or negative for you?

- What was the team's task?

- What was your role?

- What was the team size and structure?

- Did you have any special relationships or conflicts in the team?

- What made your experience so ineffective or negative?

- What was special about this team and this experience?

- What did it feel like for you to be on this team?

- What metaphor could you use to describe this team?

- What metaphor could describe your role in this team?

- Would you be willing to repeat this experience again?

- Would you describe this experience as valuable and useful?

3. In the third part I explained to the executive research of group and family dynamics suggests that sometimes roots to our relationship patterns could be found in our early experiences in the family of origin. Then I asked the executive if he/she would be comfortable to describe the family of origin to me. As the person agreed to proceed, I asked to tell me about his/her family and followed the flow of the story by using some or all of the questions below:

- Please tell me about your family of origin – what was it like?

- What made you happy as a child and why?

- What was the family structure?

- Who was part of the family?

- Who was "the boss" in the family?

- How would you describe your role in your family of origin?

- With whom did you have the strongest bond in your family?

- Were there any conflicts in your family? If yes, between whom?

- Metaphorically how would you describe your family and your role in the family?

- Have you ever been reminded of your family in work situations?

- Have you ever seen parallels between your family dynamics and any of the team dynamics at work?

During discussion of the team structure I asked the interviewees to draw an organizational chart of the team they were describing. In the third part I also asked them to draw an organizational chart of their family. It was not the genogram as such as it did not show the genealogical tree of the family, but rather a chart of how they saw the family structure similarly to the work team structures (for instance, one person put one parent as a boss, while the other parent was more of a team peer, or the other participant put one of the grandparents as a dotted-line second boss). At the same time, we did add a genogram type lines to show special connections or conflicts between people both in the family and the work team charts. For the interviews conducted via skype I helped the interviewees to draw the charts based on their description of the team structure and dynamics.

I made sure to ask for metaphors and images in each part of the interview in order to make the people go off the familiar rational path of the narrative and tap into deeper emotional associations and connections. As a result those questions proved to be most challenging to get an answer to and also most revealing during the interviews both to me and also to the participants.

VIII. Findings and discussion

Nuclear family system as a basis for core work sub-team system

The first pattern that became apparent quite early in the data gathering process and revealed itself consistently across all cases without an exception, was a clear parallel between size and constellation of the person's nuclear family and a core work sub-team the person preferred to operate in and focus one's story on. In the positive stories all research subjects, while formally working in the executive teams consisting of 6 to 15 people, mostly operated and strongly attached themselves to smaller sub-teams, which in size and in their basic construct were similar to their nuclear family of origin. One of the most vivid examples of such a parallel was the story of my first research subject I1/F, who was an only child in a full family of three. In both her positive and negative work team stories, she focused on describing the dynamics between three people out of the whole work team and consistently ignored mentioning other members. When probed by me, she did recall the names and roles of other team members, admitting that some of them had a strong role and influence in the team, but still failed to integrate them into her narrative. It seemed to me that the rest of the team remained a silent background for the central triangle of three main characters: herself, her boss and the team's trouble-maker. Interestingly, in her family story her dad also was described as a trouble-maker creating tensions in the family unit. Another research subject, who was an only child in a family of three, told me that his full executive team consisted of 10 people, part of whom were bright, charismatic and pro-actively team oriented, while the other part were from an older generation and more resistant to both organizational changes and team collaboration. When I asked, what was his place in the team he said: "I was among the 3 people, who really pushed the changes".

Strong examples of the same pattern came from stories of research subjects with other nuclear family constellations. Both I2/M and I3/M were younger children in families of four

(other members being mother, father and an older brother). Both, when describing their most rewarding experiences of executive teams told me about the sub-team of four, which existed within a bigger work team and was for them a core operating system. Though not completely ignoring the rest of the team as in the first example, they devoted a considerable part of their narrative to this sub-team and attributed most of their positive experiences to it. This is how one of them described such a sub-team: "We were four, a central team of negotiators, and I was one of them. We were: my boss, me, operations director, who was a woman, and finance director, a new guy. The boss and the female director knew each other well and over a long time, their relationship was close, even familiar. My boss knew how to manage her strong temper and balance her out. The two of them were the older members of our group, me and the other guy where newcomers…" Though the full work team of this research subject consisted of 12-13 people, he focused most of his story on the core group described above. In the other example, I3/M did describe in quite a detail the full executive team of 8 members, but said that most memorable part of the positive team experience was working as part of a smaller sub-team: "We established a team headquarters in a local café, got together every day for breakfast, lunch and dinner, talked, debated, worked out the solutions. We were a team of four: two came from the old executive team and two, including me, were new hires. When I think of the positive experience on that project, I first of all think of the four of us, though the whole team worked hard to achieve the result." Both examples also show that apart from their size, the sub-teams contained other elements similar to that of the participants' nuclear family systems: two older members vs. two younger or newer ones, a man and a woman in a closer and familiar relationship with two junior male members. A female research subject I9/F, who also came from a nuclear family of four, where she was the older of the two daughters, opened up her story with the following description of her work team build up: "All decisions in the team are taken by three people: Managing Director, Corporate Affairs Director and me.

We take all key business decisions. Lately the 4th director has been added to this group, but he is more junior and stands a bit separate from us. There are 8 executives reporting to the Managing Director, but all key business decisions are taken by the three of us." When describing her family, she also talked of herself as being more of a third parent, while her younger sister was an irresponsible junior member, who required to be looked after. Another female executive (I10/F) coming from a family of four, where she was a younger sister, described that the main decisions for her projects were taken by four people, three of which were in a more senior position to herself.

Two of my research subjects (I4/M and I7/F) grew up with stepfathers, whom their mothers married following either the death of a spouse or a divorce. Both people did not have memories of their families before that event. In the case of I4/M, there were no half-siblings born and the stepfather fully integrated into the nuclear family as if replacing the dead father. He was named a "real father" by the research subject, who strongly focused on a sub-team of three people in both his positive and negative work team stories. In the I7/F's example, her mother and stepfather had two more children thus forming a new family unit, to which my interviewee did not see herself belonging as a full member. She could not recall being part of the family before her parents divorced and she did not quite see herself fit into the new family. In her work stories this executive clearly identified "inner" and "outer" sub-systems within the bigger executive team, but associated herself with neither consciously trying to keep her distance to both.

The only research subject, who kept the full big team in focus of her narrative throughout both of her work related stories, came from a big family, where members of four generations lived under one roof and got together daily over big family meals. Though her nuclear family consisted of four people (parents and an older brother), they have never lived separately and she described herself growing as part of "a very big multigenerational and multinational

family", which also included both grandmothers, a grandaunt, great grandparents and a great grandaunt on maternal side. This interviewee described in detail a full executive team without any probing questions from me. She also gave an overview of the shareholding structure, explained how the key shareholders interacted with the ExCo, described how the big team dynamics influenced her work and how she dealt with that proactively and constructively. Unlike most of other research subjects, she did not perceive big team's political undercurrents as hindrances to her work, but rather accepted them as part of any big team experience.

In one case (I5/F) I had difficulty in detecting a clear parallel between nuclear family and core team systems. The interviewee came from a small family of three and was an only child. In her work story she told me at length about herself and the boss, Managing Director, but she never singled out a third person from the rest of the team to complete the triangle. Only when I created a graphic image of her stories I realized that "the rest of the team" was seen by her as a third actor in the triangle. Irrespective of the example she gave, all the other team members were described as having the same role in relation to her, her boss and to the task. I assumed she treated them all as one element of the system, and thus the link between the nuclear family system and core workgroup system remained true for this case as well.

The pattern discussed above was also present in the personal stories about negative team experiences. Those participants, who centered their positive team narratives on the relationship triangle, also identified the main three actors in their negative story, but described one side of the triangle as weak, uncooperative or blocked. Such inactivity or resistance of the third element of the system usually resulted or was itself a consequence of the other two sides being in a strong conflict. In three out of four stories, it was actually the research subject, who found himself in a conflicted relationship, failed to build a coalition with any other members and as a result got excluded from or opted to leave the team. The other side of the conflict in all three cases was the leader of the team. In the forth story there

was no strong conflict, but the leader was asked to leave the team after business results got below expectations. The research subject tried to establish a closer supportive relationship with the boss, but failed to do so. He believed the team may have been more successful, if the boss had accepted his help and advice.

   If we look at the negative stories of those four participants earlier described as effectively functioning in the sub-system of four people, their stories revealed one clear theme. In cases or two such participants, their negative team experiences contained themes of failed alliances and exclusion similar to the previous group. Participant I2/M believed he failed in the team because his boss applied divide and conquer strategy, which was aimed at breaking any inner alliances and singling out scapegoats. As a result the participant found himself in a solo opposition to the boss, ended up in a scapegoat role and was asked to leave the team. Participant I3/M also talked about his failure to timely form a power alliance, but believed his main mistake was hesitance to timely influence the boss to exclude the resistant member from the decision making process. As for the other two participants in this category there was either no negative story given or not enough evidence provided in the negative story to make any valid conclusions.

   The pattern of failed alliances, opposition to the boss and consequent exclusion was also central to negative stories of two remaining participants. In the case of I8/F, she tried to navigate the big team dynamics and establish her relationship to the boss in exactly the same way as she did in her positive team story, but she failed to do so mainly because none of the team members wanted to cooperate in fear of being scapegoated. In the end she had to leave the team. In the case of I7/F, she similarly to her positive experience at first maintained independence from any subgroups and tried to prove her personal value to the business. When her boss excluded her from all communications and stopped inviting her to the Board

meetings, she attempted to enter alliances with other team members, but in the end also had to leave the team.

I conclude hereby that my research subjects clearly demonstrated their preferred model of operating in a big team. In order to be effective they all sought to become part and operate in a smaller sub-team similar in size and make-up to the nuclear family system of their childhood. At times, such a strong preference to work with a smaller group made my research subjects ignore opportunities of involving other team members. At the same time, failure to either find or create such a sub-system within a big team generally made participants less effective in their teamwork and often led to major frustration and exclusion.

Team boundaries and family boundaries

I wanted to look at how the participants viewed team boundaries and acted across them since many researchers in the literature I reviewed pointed at similarities between work group and family boundaries. I noticed earlier on in my research that some participants talked about operating strictly within the team boundaries and hardly mentioned external stakeholders or wider business environment, while others paid more attention to those external elements and even made an effort to integrate them into their system by either involving external stakeholders in decision making or project implementation process or looking up to them in search for sponsorship and protection. Those external elements included business owners, investors or shareholders, superior bosses from the company headquarters or supervisory boards, external consultants and experts, and in one case, teams of direct reports. I noticed that attention to those elements outside the team boundaries was demonstrated mostly by participants, who mentioned active roles of other close relatives, mostly grandparents, in their family dynamics. These participants either spoke of spending summers with the grandparents, or had one grandparent living with the family for some time. Often they spoke about influence or power their grandparents had over both or one of the parents and about the effect

that influence had on the family dynamics. In some cases, as in the stories of I1/F and I2/M the grandmother's close participation in the family life caused tensions and power struggles with one of the parents, while in the cases of I3/M and I10/F the grandmother was seen as a leader of the family positively influencing other members. All of these four executives talked about external influences on their work teams, but while the former two people emphasized challenge and threat coming from corporate headquarters or acquiring company, the latter two, talked about leveraging the superior influence to get things done. Participant I6/M's nuclear family lived separately from both sets of grandparents, but he spent time with them every summer. In his positive team story he attributed a lot of success to the fact that the team leader was related to the key shareholder, while in his negative work story he linked the failure of his team to the fact that team leader became confrontational and lost trust in the eyes of the key shareholder. Research subjects I5/F and I7/F did not have any interaction with their grandparents as children and either did not see external influences in their work stories or admitted they strongly preferred not to deal with external shareholders directly. Participant I4/M did not talk about any other relatives, but was the only one, who mentioned a pet dog in his family story and described how each of the family members exercised different leadership styles in training the dog. In parallel, he happened to be the only one, who in his positive team story paid attention to the way him and his peer executives treated their subordinate teams in order to achieve high business results. The above observations made me think that exposure to bigger family system early in one's life potentially could influence our ability to pay attention to wider stakeholder network at work and prepare us better at operating across the boundaries of our work teams.

Use of Metaphors and Images

During the interview I asked everyone to metaphorically describe their teams, their families and themselves in relation to both. Use of images and metaphors turned out to be a

very interesting and revealing part of my research. I discovered that my research subjects

hardly ever used metaphors or images to describe their team experiences. It did not seem to

be a natural way for the 10 executives in my research to talk about work. Even upon my

direct request most of the research group found it hard to come up with metaphoric images

and some actively resisted or refused doing that. One of the participants mocked my requests

(e.g. by suggesting I implied his family was "an Adam's family"), while another provided

most of her answers by quoting what other people said about her instead of giving me her

own associations (e.g. "others said I entered a team as smoothly as a knife goes into the

butter" or "my boss always said I would be a good minister of foreign affairs"). I could not

help but interpret such behaviors as certain insensitivity to one's feelings or as a resistance to

reveal true emotions with regards to the team or family experience. This hypothesis also

found support in the fact that once the images did come out, they indeed were quite revealing

both to me and to the participants themselves. Such resistant behavior also could be seen as a

defense against being seen as irrational, naïve or foolish. Most participants found it easier to

come up with metaphors after I asked to imagine telling their stories to a child, who did not

understand anything about work. By entering into a more playful and regressive mood they

became less cautious and more able to give me their images.

After I asked each person to come up with the metaphors, I analyzed the data for any

themes and patterns across each person's narratives and also across all the 29 narratives.

Tables 1 and 2 provide overview of all the images and metaphors that came up during the

interviews.

Team Metaphors

First of all, there were a lot of similarities between the team metaphors used by the

participants. There were altogether four main metaphors used in description of the positive

team experiences and I grouped them into 3 categories. 1) Three participants actually used a

family metaphor to describe their team: the image of people gathered around a meal or a bottle of wine, talking, emotionally engaging, feeling good, connected, trusted or loved. The essence of the metaphor to me was in the feeling good and connected. 2) Three of the participants used animal analogy comparing their team to a school of piranhas, a wolf pack or a zoo. The essence of the metaphor to me was in a peer competition and personal growth. To the same group I allocated a metaphor comparing the team to post-graduate studies and competitive academic environment used by one of the participants. 3) Third cluster contained metaphors of teams united in their fight against an external enemy or some natural force. In this category work teams were compared to the national group rebelling against foreign invaders or to boat crews fighting stormy waters.

Metaphors for negative team experiences also revealed common themes. The first theme was that of team's disconnection described as a group of sports stars trying to score individually or as a big ship consisting of smaller individual boats sailing in different directions. One participant described disconnection in his team as a conversation between the deaf and the blind. I noticed that this image was in essence an antipode of the "good and connected" feeling from the previous group as it described the absence or lack of a certain quality. Secondly, there was a theme of fear and impotence described by metaphors of being in a snake pit, being scapegoated or experiencing a nightmare. All participants here described feelings of being trapped, scared and powerless to influence their own or team's destiny. The third category contained metaphors of nonsense and meaningless endeavors such as for instance, being asked to solve unsolvable tasks, being involved in collective mixing of mud or playing in the theatre of the absurd. Finally, there were two metaphors of lack of growth and ambition, for instance, by being isolated from the real world by an overprotective mother chicken. This metaphor also could be seen as an antipode to the one describing competition and personal growth.

Interestingly, analysis of the family stories added no new metaphor categories to those listed above. When I mapped the metaphoric themes against all sets of stories, the emerging pattern showed that in 8 out of 10 cases, positive team experience metaphors either belonged to the same category as the family metaphor or, as in the case of three participants, it described the exact element described by participants as missing from the family experience. Out of five participants describing their positive team experience with images from the feeling good and connected category, two (I8/F and I9/F) were those, who used the same category metaphor to describe their nuclear families, and three were those, who struggled with family metaphors and said there was no real connection in their family. One participant used competition and personal growth metaphor for both positive work team and family experiences, while for two other people family metaphors came from the opposite category, i.e. lack of personal growth. Finally, for participant I1/F both family and positive team experiences provided feeling of unity versus external force.

In other words, the majority of my research subjects associated positive experiences in their work teams with either the same feelings they had experienced and valued most in their families of origin or with the emotional elements they were missing most in their childhood family dynamics. For the two cases, where I could not establish the link between the positive team experience and the family metaphor, I could not do so due to lack of sufficient data as both people struggled or refused to give me an image of their family dynamics.

Metaphors for negative experience almost never came from the same category as the family ones with exception of three case: one subject experienced disconnection in his work team similar to the one he experienced in his family of origin, while metaphors of two other subjects revealed, to their own surprise, that what they disliked and aimed to avoid in their work teams was familiar to them from their childhood experiences with one or both parents. Namely, both felt that their families lacked ambition and did not provide enough challenge

for personal growth. Thus, metaphors of negative team experiences and family dynamics matched only in those cases, where the latter came from so called antipode categories describing lack or absence of something. In other words, participants missed in their negative team experiences the same feelings or emotional elements they felt were missing in their families of origin.

Metaphors for Describing Self and Own Role

I collected all the metaphors used by participants to describe self and own role in teams and in the family (shown in the Table 2 below) and proceeded to look for themes and patterns within this data and also for any correlations with other pieces of information I had. First observation showed that each person used several metaphors to describe own role in teams and in family. At times those metaphors talked about the same or similar roles, e.g. Integrator vs. Translator, Being One the Rowers vs. Being Humble, while in other cases those metaphors indicated different types of roles performed by one person, e.g. Balancer vs. Inspirer, Team Coach vs. Voice of Meaning, Trainee vs. Gardener. Secondly, at times the same roles were named by several participants, for instance, there were 2-3 people, who spoke of being Translators, Integrators, Moderators or Messengers of the team. Third, many of the metaphors for self were connected to the same person's metaphor for describing the team. Thus two participants, who used family metaphor to describe overall team dynamics consequently used family roles to describe themselves in relation to the work team: stepdaughter and sister. Those participants, who spoke of connection in their team metaphors, often saw themselves in the role of Integrators or Moderators. While two participants, who described their teams with images of unity versus external force, described themselves as Inspirer and Catalyst or Energizer. Two participants, who talked about competition and personal growth as a core emotional element in their work teams imagined themselves as being one of the competing predators or as a quick learner. When I proceeded with a more in-

depth analysis of personal metaphors I found several ways in which descriptors for own role in the family could play out versus the metaphors for work team roles. First, some people, especially those who grew as first born or only children in their families of origin, used similar metaphors for describing their family roles and their roles in positive team experiences. I1/F used the image of Balancer for both, while I7/F called herself a stranger in the family and a stepdaughter in the team. In a similar way I10/F saw herself as the youngest child of the family and also as a Trainee or a Newcomer in her executive team. Secondly, several cases revealed similarities between the person's family role and the emotional theme he struggled most with in the negative team experience. For instance, I2/M produced no clear image of his role in a family and said he cut himself off the family very earlier and never had a strong connection to them. In his negative team experience he suffered most from being cast in a scapegoat role and excluded from the team against his will. Participant I3/M spoke of himself as the youngest child in the family, who often got excluded from the family decision making process, he also described himself as a hidden opposition in the family and the only one of the family members, who managed to cut himself off in order to do things his own way. In the story about his negative team experience he spoke of own failure to timely deal with the strong opposition from the youngest and most junior team member. He did not want to cut him off and as a result team decision making took 18 months instead of the planned 6. At the end, the leader of the team had to interfere and take the decision in spite of the disagreement by the junior member. Participant I5/F described herself as a little girl in the family and her most negative team experience made her feel as a little chick. Third observation made me conclude that at times people played in their work teams not their own family roles, but those of one of their parents. Participant I5/F said her parents were treating her as a good and a bad policeman, where her mother took the latter role and always demanded discipline and high academic performance. In her positive team story this

executive clearly described herself playing a role of bad policeman demanding discipline and performance from others in the team. Participant I4/M talked about his mother as being the energizer in the family and used the same metaphor to describe his own role in the positive team dynamics. Participant I8/F said her best role in the team was to be the voice of meaning and common sense, while her family story revealed the same role played by her father, with whom she had a very special bond.

Relationship to leadership and authority in teams and nuclear families

All people in my study paid special attention to describing their team leaders in both positive and negative stories. However, I observed that the intensity of participants' focus on the leader varied from interview to interview and even between the positive and negative stories told by the same person. I differentiated between very strong focus on the leader in cases, where most of the narrative evolved around the description of the boss's profile, his leadership style and relationship with the research subject, to medium or low focus in cases, where subjects described the leader, but devoted equal or larger proportion of time and attention to other relationships within or outside the team. I rated all the stories according to this scale and looked for any emerging patterns. I noticed that all 5 participants in my study, who were the only children in their families of origin, had either strong or very strong focus on their team leaders in both positive and negative work team stories. Four out of five team leaders in the positive team experiences where men, while bosses in the negative experiences were either female (in 3 cases) or described as weak and indecisive men (in 2 cases). Interestingly out of 5 participants in the only child category 3 people said their mothers were clear leaders in the family of origin, while the other two participants said leadership in their families was unclear or absent.

I had one first born participant in my research and her pattern in relation to the team leadership was similar to the only child category: she had a very strong focus on a male

leader in the positive story, while she gave me no negative team story to analyze. In her family narrative she described herself as a leader of the family from a young age of 5.

Four participants in the study were youngest children in the family. All of their positive stories demonstrated medium to low focus on the leader and provided a lot more information about such elements of team dynamics as peer relations, sub-teams and political alliances, external stakeholders and business environment. However, in the negative stories three out of four people in this group demonstrated as strong a focus on describing their relationship to the leader as the other participants in the research. The only exception here was the participant I3/M, who focused his negative team experience story on the most junior team member.

Communication stances and operating systems

In order to analyze patterns of communication and interpersonal interaction within work team systems and family systems I used concepts by David Kantor, who in his book "Reading the room" (2012) suggested differentiation between three domains of communication and three operating systems. Communication domains represent what we pay attention to when interacting with others. It influences the choice of language we make and provides a lens through which we read communications of others. The Affect domain emphasizes feelings and interpersonal connections by using the language of emotion, caring, and nurturance. The Meaning domain emphasizes thinking, understanding and coherent integration of thought by using language of ideas, purpose and information. The Power domain emphasizes achievement, efficacy and a sense of competency by using language of accountability, actions and results. According to Kantor, people could master communication skills in all three domains, but usually one remains naturally dominant. The operating system is defined as the implicit set of rules for how individuals govern boundaries, behavior, and relationships in groups. Kantor differentiates closed, open and

random operating systems. Closed operating systems value order, rules and hierarchy and are oriented towards leader. Open operating systems value participative process and consensus, and are oriented towards shared goals. Random operating systems value autonomy, spontaneity and creativity, while orienting itself towards an individual. In Kantor's view all people have preference for one dominating operating system and for one communication domain, which originates from our families of origin.

My analysis of common patterns across all the stories revealed three findings. First of all, most of the negative experiences (7 out of 9) had power as a prevailing communication domain, which was used in either closed or random operating systems. This pattern looked consistent with the strong focus on the leader revealed as a common theme across all negative stories earlier in my thesis. In other words, when in a work team power was used in a closed or random operating system participants tended to focus strongly on their relationship with the boss and perceived the boss as the main reason for team ineffectiveness and/or their personal failure. Even those people, who described their families either as closed or random systems or as strong in power communication domain (namely I2/M, I4/M, I5/F,I6/M, I10/F) were not always comfortable with one of these factors appearing in their work team. The second finding revealed that the use of power communication in closed or random systems per se was not always a pre-condition for team ineffectiveness and failure. In five positive work team stories power was also used in closed or random operating systems, but it always was complemented by strong communication in the meaning domain. Participants either described the leader as being strong in both power and meaning communication styles, or there was a second leader present ensuring understanding and challenging consistency of strategy and vision, or in several cases it was the participant, who successfully added the meaning element to the style of the leader and the team communication. "The voice of meaning" as one participant put it in her story, seemed to be the key communication

ingredient making a difference between a story of success and failure to half of my research group. This point was true even for those three people out of five, who descried their family as strong in power communication domain. Importance of meaning in communication to my research subjects was also revealed in use of team metaphors I analyzed earlier in my thesis: four participants out of nine described lack of meaning as the core essence of their negative team experience. The third finding revealed that while no single prevailing combination of communication and operating system was found across all the positive stories, still one common pattern was obvious - all positive stories described team or leader's communication style as dominant in the same domain as the one preferred in the participant's family system. In six cases such a preferred domain was power (either on its own or in combination with meaning), while meaning and affect were dominant communication styles in three cases each. So, all the executives in my research operated more effectively in work teams, which communicated in a style similar to the participant's family of origin. However, I could not establish any consistent pattern for the preferred operating systems, which differed a lot from story to story and from participant to participant. Sometimes executives preferred to work in the operating systems similar to those of their families and sometimes they failed in those and instead thrived in operating systems of a different type. Also all three types of operating systems were present in stories of positive as well as negative team experiences across all the participants. I believe more evidence is required to establish a pattern in this area.

IX. Limitations and future research

My research has been conducted on a small sample of 10 executives and was limited to one geographical area of Russia. Due to the sensitive nature of the data I was researching, I believed it was important to personally meet all the subjects and establish a rapport before

conducting the interview. As a result my study was limited to those people I could physically

reach from my location in Moscow and who, as executives came from more or less similar

cultural background and operated in the same corporate environment of Russia. Though

many of the participants worked for multinational organizations, I believe certain cultural and

business norms of the country still applied and could have influenced my findings. As an

opportunity for further research I believe it would be interesting to check if the same themes

and patterns would be relevant to executives from different cultural and business

backgrounds.

As I did not screen participants of my research based on their childhood family size, I

ended up studying research subjects from rather small families and had only one participant,

who grew up with more than one sibling. In Russia families tend to be in average of a smaller

size and thus in order to study people from a bigger family of origin, who would also have a

relevant corporate experience, I would need to specially search them out, which was not in

the scope of the current research. However, for future research I believe it would be

interesting to explore how the patterns I looked at would manifest themselves in team

experiences of people from bigger family backgrounds.

X. Conclusion

My research conducted with 10 executives, who each told me their stories of most

effective and least effective experiences in the teams at work as well as their childhood

family stories, revealed a number of interesting findings. I observed in my research data that

there are indeed parallels between our family of origin experience and our preferences for

certain types of team dynamics at work. Thus, the size and constellation of the family of

origin strongly influenced executive's preference for operating in the similar system within a

bigger executive team. The smaller was the person's family, the less energy and effort the executive was investing in building wide relations with those team members outside the selected sub-team. The executives, who grew up as first born or only children, tended to form stronger attachments to their bosses in the work teams than those executives, who were youngest children in their families. Presence and regular interactions with relatives from outside the nuclear family system in one's childhood made people more effective in working across boundaries of their work teams and also leverage power and influence of stakeholders from outside the team. All participants of my research demonstrated preference for working in communication domains similar to those used in their family of origin and also shared that lack of meaning communication in those team environments strong in power communication often lead to team ineffectiveness and their personal failure. Use of metaphors and images in the stories of my participants revealed that people felt most productive and positive in those team environments, which reminded them of the core emotional theme present in their families or provided the feeling they were lacking in their families as children. I also observed through analysis of personal role metaphors that my research subjects performed in several team roles, most of which their learned in their family of origin either as their own family roles or those played by their parents. In some cases, participants tried to avoid repeating their family roles in the work teams as those led to frustration and even failure.

My research also found that 8 out of 10 participants never thought of parallels between their family and work team experiences and were completely unaware of some of the deeper patterns of relating they learned in the childhood. The lack of awareness caused most of the people in my research to fail at least once in their senior executive roles while not being able to understand the reason for their personal ineffectiveness. Most of the participants noticed some themes and patterns in their stories during the interview, especially when I asked for

use of metaphors and images. All of the people in the study admitted the exercise was valuable to them and were interested to learn the outcomes of the research.

I believe that the observations and findings of this research could potentially help coaches to support their executive clients in using childhood stories as a way of better understanding one's deeper predisposition to certain roles and patterns of behavior in the team dynamics. Such a process would help participants to increase self-awareness of their "inner theatre" and would produce a positive impact on their personal effectiveness and team performance.

Table 1. Team Metaphors

Partici pant code	Team metaphor in the story of positive team experience	Team metaphor in the story of negative team experience	Metaphor used to describe family of origin
I1/F	**Unity vs. external force** "Reply of the Cossacks to the Turkish Sultan" (painting by Ilya Repin, which refers to refusal of the Cossacks to submit to the rule of Ottoman Empire)	**Disconnection** A big boat, which at a closer look turns out to be a collection of individual small boats	**Unity vs. external force** Whole family getting together to solve one family member's external problem at work
I2/M	**Feeling good and connected** The boss's office: a small kitchen he had, a small fridge in it, comfortable place, center of attraction, informal get-togethers over a bottle of wine…	**Fear and impotence** Divide and conquer Scapegoating **Meaningless task** Tasking me with unsolvable problems	Lack of family connection "I really have no image, we did not have family dinners or get-togethers"
I3/M	**Competition** A pack if not of piranhas, then definitely of some predators, who swim in one direction, but also bite each other from time to time **Feeling good and connected** Team of four having breakfasts, lunches and dinners together	**Disconnection** A group of NBA stars, where no one wants to pass the ball and everyone tries to score individually **Meaningless task** Conversation between the blind and the deaf.	**Lack of family connection/ Competition** "It is hard to come up with one family image. I had a great relationship with mum, none or neutral with dad and was in competition with my brother. We went on trips and holidays together, but had no common interests."
I4/M	**Unity vs. external force** "The Perfect Storm" movie starring George Cloony	**Meaningless task** Mixing mud by lifting it up and getting it to run back down through the fingers	**Feeling good and connected** A vague image of a family sitting at a round table, holding hands, all being equal, no clear leader
I5/F	**Competition and personal growth** A pack of wolfs; A kind of animal council, where lion is the king and any newcomer needs to pass a test to be accepted.	**Lack of growth** Being protected under the chicken wing, grow in the incubator isolated from the world and no access to decision making	**Personal growth/ Lack of growth** My parents were a good and a bad policeman. My mother was very demanding of me and no high mark would be enough. While dad loved and protected me.

Participant code	Team metaphor in the story of positive team experience	Team metaphor in the story of negative team experience	Metaphor used to describe family of origin
I6/M	**Unity vs external force** White rafting boat crew, where all work as one, no one seen as a star.	**Disconnection** Football team consisting of glamorous stars and good players, but not working together to its full potential	No image
I7/F	**Feeling good and connected** A big Italian family: very emotional, debating, storming, loving each other.	**Fear and impotence** Snake pit	**Disconnection** "Where are your parents?"
I8/F	**Feeling good and connected** The Zoo with many different colorful animal	**Fear and impotence** Snake pit; Nightmare **Meaningless task** Theatre of the Absurd;	**Feeling good and connected** Big multinational and multigenerational family dinners: eating, talking, debating
I9/F	**Feeling good and connected** A family in a good sense of the word: people open and trusting each other, you feel good	No story	**Feeling good and connected** The sun, it is in the center, it is warm and feels good.
I10/F	**Competition and personal growth** A gym with demanding trainers; Post-graduate studies & competitive academic environment. You either bring the novelty or you are out.	**Lack of growth** A disturbing smell of low expectations, stale depressive feel, no one wants to go extra mile	**Feeling good and connected** Sunday family meals together around the big table, lots of food served. **Lack of growth** My parents lacked courage and had fear of the new, did not have desire to go extra mile.

Table 2. Metaphors for Self and Own Role

Participant code	Metaphor describing self and own role in the story of positive team experience	Metaphor describing self and own role in the story of negative team experience	Metaphor describing self and own role in the family of origin story
I1/F	The Balance or Balancer The Team Integrator The Inspirer	The Nightman (someone, who cleans toilets) The Failed Integrator	The Balancer The Decisive Weight The Mediator
I2/M	The Controller of Costs The External Negotiator	The Opposition The Scapegoat	No image
I3/M	The Moderator One of the Predators	The Translator Between the Deaf and the Blind; Being Deaf and Blind	The Youngest Child The Hidden Opposition The Cutoff
I4/M	The Integrator The Catalyst and Energizer The Translator	The Marginalized Bystander The Active Escapee	The Male Leader The Trainer beating the Dog
I5/F	The Bad Policeman The Messenger of Bad News	The Little Chick	The Perfectionist The Little Girl The Independent One
I6/M	One of the Rowers The Evangelist of Talent The Humble One	The Playmaker The Team Dispatcher	No image
I7/F	The Stepdaughter The Diplomat The One Who Writes up the Rules	The One who Speaks up The Structuring Person The Promoter of Friendship	The Stranger in Own Family The Independent One
I8/F	The Moderator The Team Coach The Voice of Meaning and Wisdom	The Voice of Common Sense The Team Messenger	The Little Girl The Father's Favorite
I9/F	The Translator The Confidant The Team Leader's Sister	No story	The One Taking Care of Others The Independent Child The Favorite Granddaughter
I10/F	The Newcomer and Trainee The Quick Learner The Gardener of Own Garden	The Ambitious One	The Youngest Spoiled Child The Decision Maker

XI. Bibliography

Bion, W. R. (1961) Experiences in groups and other papers. New York: Basic Books.

Bowen, M. (1977). Family systems theory and society. In J.P. Lorio & L. McClenathan (Eds),
Georgetown family symposia, Volume II, (1973–1974): A collection of selected papers.
Washington, DC: Georgetown University Family Center, pp. 182–212.

Brotheridge, C. M., and Lee, R.T. (2006). We are family: Congruity between organizational and
family functioning constructs. Human Relations, 59: 141.

Brown, C. T., Yelsma, P., and Keller, P. W. (1981).Communication-Conflict Predisposition:
Development of a Theory and an Instrument. Human Relations, 34: 1103.

Florent-Treacy, E. (2012). Writing Your Executive Master's Thesis: A Quick-Start Guide. INSEAD
Global Leadership Centre, Fontainebleau, France.

Freud, S. (1920). A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis, Boni & Liveright;

Glaser, B. and Strauss, A. (1967). The Discovery of Grounded Theory. Chicago: Alpine.

Hirschhorn, L. & Gilmore, T. (1980). The application of family therapy concepts to influencing
organizational behavior. Administrative Science Quarterly, 25, 18–37.

Hylander, I. (2003). Toward a grounded theory of the conceptual change process in consultee-
centered consultation. Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 14 (3&4), 263-
280.

Kantor, D. (2012). Reading the Room: Group Dynamics for Coaches and Leaders. San Francisco:
Jossey-Bass.

Kets de Vries, M.F.R. (2012). The Group Coaching Conundrum INSEAD Working Paper,
Fontainebleau, France.

Klein, M. (1946). Notes on some schizoid mechanisms. Journal of Psychotherapy Practice and
Research, 5, 164-179.

Larsson, G., Bartone, P., Bos-Bakx, M., Danielsson, E., Jelusic, L., Johansson, E., Moelker, R.

    (2006). Leader development in natural context: a grounded theory approach to discovering

    how military leaders grow. Military Psychology, 18(suppl.) S69-S81.

Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers in group dynamics: II. Channels of group life; social planning

    and action research. Human Relations, 1, 143-153.

Luborsky, L. (1984). Principles of Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy. New York: Basic Books;

Lusterman, D.D. (1989). School - family intervention and the Circumplex model. In D.H. Olson, C.S.

    Russell & D.H. Sprenkle (Eds), Circumplex model: Systemic assessment and treatment of

    families. New York: The Haworth Press, pp. 267–83.

Mcleod, P. L., and Kettner-Polley, R. B. (2004). Contributions of Psychodynamic Theories to

    Understanding Small Groups. Small Group Research, 35: 333.

Morgan, G. (1986). Images of organizations. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Thomas, K. W., and Kilmann, R. H. (1974).Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument. New

    York: XICOM Inc.