

ERASMUS MOBILITY PROGRAMME

UNIVERSITY OF VILNIUS

THE TAVISTOCK INSTITUTE OF HUMAN RELATIONS

INNOVATION AND AUTHORITY IN ORGANISATIONS

1st – 5th September 2010

Director's Report

Mannie Sher

*Conference Director
and*

*Director, Group Relations Programme
The Tavistock Institute of Human Relations, London*

CONTENTS

	Page
Summary	3
Background	4
The Conference: Innovation & Authority in Organisations	4
Learning by Experience: Methodology of the Programme	6
Membership Statistics	7
Emerging Conference Learning Themes	7
• Why a Tavistock Experiential Group Relations Conference in Lithuania Now?	8
• Academic Elements – Lectures	8
Acknowledgements	10
Appendix I Post-Conference Feedback Responses	11
Appendix II The Programme	13
Appendix III Programme Staff	14
Role of Staff	14
Appendix IV Sponsoring Organisations	15
Appendix V Objectives of Erasmus Mobility Teaching Programme	18
Appendix VI Conference Timetable	20
Appendix VII Explanation of Events	21

SUMMARY

The first-ever 5-day non-residential experiential inductive learning programme in Eastern Europe was conducted at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Vilnius, Lithuania, by the Group Relations Programme of the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations, London. The programme, titled *Innovation and Authority in Organisations* was partially funded by the Erasmus Life Long Learning Mobility Programme of the EU Education & Culture DG. The programme was directed by Mannie Sher and staffed by an international team of 4 group relations consultants. 40 people attended the programme.

The programme had a novel design insofar as it combined academic lectures and experiential group work and application. The lectures covered (i) organisational and systems theory, socio-technical systems theory, leadership theory and psychoanalytic theory as it applies to groups, organisations and society; and (ii) new developments in research and evaluation that emphasised collaborative processes, whole-system thinking, linking policy to context and inter-disciplinary working.

The experiential group work and application part of the programme involved the study of group behaviour and how individuals take up their roles in groups in different contexts and with different tasks. Historical, social and political dynamics pertaining to the Lithuanian cultural context emerged in the programme's events to reveal the unique challenges facing leadership of all types in Lithuania today. These dynamics were shown to be influenced by the nation's demographics, recent struggle for independence and integrating into Western European commercial and market conditions. Individual and group assumptions were challenged leading to new insights into how people manage themselves in their leadership roles in their organisations. These 'discoveries' were not always comfortable but they helped, as one member put it: *"... to find a sense of trust in leadership. By avoiding relationship with leadership, I may have prevented my group and myself from being innovative"*.

The benefit of the programme for participants lay in increasing their sense of emotional literacy, improving their capacities for managing themselves better in their multiple roles necessary for contemporary leadership, understanding and working with resistance to change in themselves and others in the programme and in their own organisations and networks.



Mannie Sher
Programme Director and
Director, Group Relations Programme
The Tavistock Institute of Human Relations, London

September 2010

Background

1. Over 5 years, between 2005 and 2010, The Tavistock Institute of Human Relations and Jolita Buzaityte-Kasalyniene, Associate Professor, Social Work in the Department of Social Work, Faculty of Philosophy at the University of Vilnius, were in communication with each other about delivering an academic and experiential programme of study at the University, based on the well-known research and organisational and leadership development methods and approaches of the Tavistock Institute. Professor Buzaityte-Kasalyniene herself had attended three Tavistock-Leicester Group Relations conferences in the UK over that period and she believed that using 'Tavistock approaches' would be valuable for the development of Lithuania's future leadership. She consequently, sought permission from the University and financial support from the Erasmus Life-Long Learning Mobility Programme of the EU Education & Culture DG to run a 5-day teaching and learning programme in the Faculty of Philosophy. The Tavistock Institute appointed Mannie Sher, Director of the Group Relations Programme, to direct the programme at the University. The programme ran from 1st to 5th September 2010, and the following is his report.

The Conference: *Innovation and Authority in Organisations*

2. The *Innovation and Authority in Organisations* event was set up as a temporary organisation which developed its own dynamics, rituals and ways of working. The structure consisted of a number of events all of which, except for the lectures on theory and method, were experiential.

3. The ethos of the programme can be summed up as:

- The process of learning in itself is an act of authority. Participants were invited into an experience of learning where letting oneself be in a position of a 'learner' is understood as the process of taking up a member's role
- Learning is a social process where individuals and groups are inter-related and their development depends on their capacity to collaborate. Learning can be subverted by structural and unconscious processes
- Participants worked in a range of groups with different learning tasks within the semi-permeable boundaries of the temporary organisation
- This programme was designed to enable participants to discover and use their understanding in exercising leadership within the programme itself, generating new ideas, testing them and then working at implementing them later in the organisations from which they come.

4. Participants worked with a staff group that was invited by the Director of the programme on behalf of two sponsoring organisations of the programme - the University of Vilnius and the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations.

5. The programme drew participants from diverse work settings and roles: university academic lecturers, students, managers, researchers, administrators, professional and technical workers.

6. The programme was designed to be as flexible as possible to provide maximum opportunities to learn about:

- group, organisational and social dynamics
- exercising innovation and authority for oneself and on behalf of others
- the interplay between tradition, innovation and change
- the place of feelings, impressions, expectations, thoughts, fears, likes and dislikes that reverberated in the programme and provided the raw material for understanding relationships and relatedness between individuals, groups, organisations and systems
- taking up the challenge of learning about what is known and what is not known in organisations; where knowledge is based and how it is disseminated through the different systems
- the relationship of organisations to their social, political and economic environments.

7. The focus in the programme was on the relatedness of the individual to role, group, organisation and environment.

8. Participants developed their capacities to:

- manage themselves in the multiple roles necessary for contemporary leadership
- use their emotional literacy to inform their actions
- understand and manage resistance to change in themselves and others
- take up formal and informal leadership and followership roles.

9. The aims, in this programme, therefore, were to:

- bring together understanding of the conscious and hidden, sometimes unconscious, processes of work groups in human systems
- become more effective in working with the underlying dynamics within and between groups and organisations and between these and the wider, global society
- apply roles taken up within the programme to participants' own organisations and networks.

With these aims in mind, THE PRIMARY TASK of the programme was:

to study the exercise of innovation and authority in the taking up of roles through the interpersonal, inter-group and institutional relations that develop within the programme as an organization

Learning by Experience: The Methodology of the Programme

10. The programme was designed to provide opportunities for learning. By examining, interpreting, reflecting and making sense of experiences in this programme and its events, participants developed deeper understanding of their organisations and their roles within them.

11. The programme allowed the participants to explore the changes and developments in organisational culture as a succession of beginnings and endings through a series of group work events in separate systems and then in the programme as a whole.

12. The programme was concerned with issues of structure and task, and also with the need for individuals to use an understanding of themselves in relation to others. Such understanding involved disciplined attention to participants' own experience, openness to the experience of others, tolerance of uncertainty, the readiness to interpret what was happening.

13. Participants were invited to test their interpretations through communication and action. This included being alert to both conscious and unconscious aspects of behaviour and ways in which behaviour is shaped by the broader social, political and economic contexts in which we work and live.

14. The method of learning, apart from the lectures, was experiential – participants were invited to study their own and others behaviour as it happened in the different events. Consultancy by staff was available in each event. The focus was on learning, based on examining what was going on in the 'here and now' of group life. Participants were invited and challenged to take up their own authority to accept what proved useful learning and reject what was not. Through this process, participants were able to reconsider the way that they gained or lost power and exercised their authority in various systems in everyday life.

Pre-conference Administration

15. Professor Jolita Buzaityte-Kasalyniene worked hard in the months leading up to the conference attending to recruitment and administration. She marketed well resulting in conference membership of 40 and even had to turn people away (8) (See table below). She also carried the emotional burden for the conference and its consequences in the Faculty of Philosophy. She was under pressure to get many practical things done alongside managing other people's feelings, expectations and sometimes anger. Some in the Faculty were reluctant to be involved with reflective methods of study and learning; other senior Faculty staff were supportive and met and welcomed the programme staff. The positive fact is that the conference programme took place at the University and many participants were University staff members and students.

16. Overall, preparation for the conference took about 3-4 months from the initial contact between partners to the start of the programme. Interest in Lithuania was strong and maximum numbers were achieved (see below).

Membership Statistics

17. The breakdown of ages and gender is as follows:

Ages	Male	Female	Total
20 - 30	6	17	23
31 - 40	3	12	15
41 - 50		1	1
> 51		1	1
Total	9	31	40

18. The professional profile of the participants was:

Student	10
Academic Staff	10
Social Work	7
Management	7
Psychologist	2
Unemployed	2
Medical	1
Teacher	1
Total	40

19. Participants were drawn from academia (students and staff) and from the helping professions, most of whom it could be assumed had some familiarity with group process and who might influence leadership on the nation's socio-political challenges.

EMERGING CONFERENCE LEARNING THEMES

Why a Tavistock Experiential Group Relations Conference in Lithuania Now?

20. The participants were curious to know the motivations of the Tavistock Institute in bringing a Group Relations conference to Lithuania. They also hoped the conference would bring new understanding to Lithuanian organisations that have spent the past 20 years trying to move out from under foreign domination towards independence. The conference spoke of the dream and struggle for independence which they said was a continuation of long Lithuanian national history of being located and often squeezed between two large neighbouring powers – Poland and Russia, and during the 2nd World War – dominated by a third - Germany. Now that independence had been achieved, the people appear not to know how to handle it. The effects of Soviet domination are still currently evident insofar as people are said to avoid taking responsibility for decisions in case they get it wrong and are blamed. In keeping with this, people tend to highlight their weaknesses and play down their strengths and wait patiently for them to be recognised by others. This applies even more so to women. Women with drive and good ideas will appoint male leaders because they believe that women should not put themselves forward.

21. Another key background Lithuanian demographic feature that concerned participants was that the population was not reproducing; people were not having children because they could not afford them and young people were leaving for better opportunities in Western Europe. The population tended to be an ageing one.

22. On the economic front– after independence Lithuania lost its heavy industry. Markets had been centrally controlled and lay predominantly in East Europe. Lithuania was now having to develop new markets in Western Europe. EU rules influence large parts of the agricultural sector and farmers are paid not to work because of over-production. What are left are jobs, usually of a low grade, in foreign-owned companies. A large part of the population, mostly poor, about 30%, hanker after the ‘good days’ of communism. The government is a conservative liberal coalition.

23. These historical and political factors tend to lead to a culture of passivity – people overtly agree to abide by decisions and then unconsciously undermine them. These processes were evident in the conference and the staff, mostly foreign, had to face the challenge of how to take up issues of senior-subordinate authority and male and female relationships and respond to them without imposing western liberal values on a culture that feels ambivalent about them.

Academic Elements - Lectures

24. Lectures were delivered in the mornings of the first two days. The first lectures introduced the background to the Tavistock Institute’s basic theories and practices - field theory, systems theory, socio-technical systems theory and psychoanalytic theory. The second lecture described the Tavistock Institute’s general approach to research and evaluation that emphasised collaborative

processes; whole-systems thinking; linking policy to local context; and interdisciplinary working.

25. Our past experience suggested that lectures in experiential-based conferences can be used defensively against working with here-and-now dynamics, but the lectures were inserted into the programme to accommodate the academic requirements of the University and the Erasmus programme. They sometimes served to relieve anxiety, but they were also useful as introductions to a process and method that very few of the participants had experienced before.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This conference was the first of its kind to take place in Lithuania, and probably in Eastern Europe. A number of organisations and individuals helped to make this conference a reality and to them I extend my grateful thanks:

1. The Erasmus Mobility Programme, the EU's flagship education and training programme that funded co-operation between Vilnius University and the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations. A special thanks goes to Deimantė Samavičiūtė, Project Manager, Institutional Coordinator for International Placements & Erasmus Staff Visits for her helpful administration of the visit.
2. The Council of Trustees and Dr Eliat Aram, Executive Director of the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations, for their encouragement and support of this project in developing group relations work in Lithuania.
3. doc. dr. Kęstutis Dubnikas, Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Vilnius who made space available in the Faculty that was needed for the conference to take place and the catering needs of the members and the staff.
4. Associate Professor Nijolė Radavičienė, Vice Dean for Studies, Faculty of Philosophy, Vilnius University, who joined the staff for lunch and who with her deep knowledge of the conference theme, gave warm support for the work.
5. Associate Professor Jolita Buzaityte-Kasalyniene, Head of the Social Work Department, Faculty of Philosophy, Vilnius University, without whose foresight, determination and leadership over many years, this conference would not have taken place.
6. Finally, to staff members, Giorgia Iacopini, Arnold Nielson and Danny Sher who donated a week of their valuable time without fee or reimbursement so that the work of group relations could be extended into new venues, untried before.

APPENDIX I

Post-Conference Feedback Responses

Two weeks after the conference I wrote to all the participants asking if they would share with me the learning they achieved in the conference. Here follows my letter to them and a few extracts from their replies.

From Mannie Sher, Director of the ‘Innovation & Authority in Organisations’ conference, 2010

Dear Participant Member,

In experiential learning events, such as group relations conferences, responsibility for evaluating what has and has not been learned and applied must lie ultimately with the participants and with those who nominated them. Methodologically, it is difficult in any case to determine what individual participants may learn from a group relations conference and what effect their experience has on their activities in their organisational roles.

Participants in group relations conferences may, after the event, write notes on their experiences for themselves as part of their "working through" or they may write more formally for their nominating organisations. If you have written, or are preparing to write something, I wonder whether you would consider sending me a copy. Any contribution you might make would form part of my on-going, but informal, evaluation of experiential inductive learning methods with which the Tavistock Institute is associated. You may write anonymously if you wish, but if you should decide to add your name, your material will be treated in the strictest confidence.

With grateful thanks

Mannie Sher

Director

‘Innovation & Authority in Organisations’ Conference, 2010

Replies:

1. *“I really appreciate the great work you and your team of consultants did for us in the conference and gift you gave us. I entered the conference without being fully aware of the conference’s aims. I believed that personal contact and personal relationship was the basis for learning and change, but I have learned a lot about myself, my role in my organization and possible ways of changing it. Previously I perceived my role in my back-home organization as innovative and seeking for changes. Thanks to the conference I now have fewer illusions about my role. I was helped to see that actually I am a conservative risk avoider, a follower of common rules, a task finisher and not an innovator.”*

2. *"I learned that in my back-home organization, I have elaborated rules and participated in a corrupted system of power. I learned from the conference that positive confrontation may at times be necessary and I should not avoid it. Another piece of learning was just how much I distrust authority and consultancy. By avoiding seeking help and consultancy, I prevented my group and myself from being innovative. By concentrating on my own interests and not thinking about the feelings of others in my groups, I prevented conflicts from resolving."*

3. *"Following the conference, I have thought constantly about what I learned and did not learn from it. I now experience myself differently and I am watchful of people who are different, unaccepted or excluded. I realise that by concentrating on myself, I do not see them and their suffering and thus I cannot help them. In my back-home organization, I have started to communicate much more clearly and briefly in meetings. My skills in analyzing communications in real time have increased significantly. I have also acquired a deeper understanding of the implicit culture of my back-home organization."*

4. *"I took the maximum I could from the conference and in doing so I hope I was helpful to others too. I learned that leadership is about protecting the task and the people who are engaged in it."*

5. *"I was always sure that behaviour change happens fast. Now I can see that real change happens slowly."*

6. *"Participation does matter. Otherwise, boredom takes over and one does not get involved in the change one wants to see happen. I acquired a very useful insight that boredom may be a way of 'hiding' anger. Anger is a powerful emotion which ruins everything around it. It makes me ask: "Do I really want this?"*

7. *"In groups the highest authority for myself is me. In other words - my feelings of comfort, motivated actions and challenges. Being comfortable means I can encourage others to reach out and create more effective communication. Groups, to be meaningful, must be able to communicate with group members authentically and not play the roles of others."*

8. *"My usual pattern of behaviour in groups is to search for a middle solution. But if I decide to take action to reach particular goal, I need to focus on that because I learned there will always be obstacles and different opinions. But simply avoiding discussion and agreeing on a middle solution is not always the best way forward."*

9. *"I found it absolutely confusing in the Large Study Group to hear members talk about their dreams (being late for the bus), about their feelings (demons and gods), sharing their strong impressions (Jew boy in snowman), or simply crying (the girl behind me, who spent most of the time trying to hide herself). I don't think I would ever open myself to that extent in front of a large group of people. I am still thinking about this and my motivation for such an action and how to react to it."*

10. *“Thank you so much for your work in the conference. This event was and is really big gift.”*

APPENDIX II

The Programme

Participants engaged in a number of group events that enabled them to study group processes in the variety of settings.

Participants and staff took part in:

Plenaries: The programme opened and closed in plenary session. The opening plenaries furthered the process of crossing the boundary into and joining this temporary programme. The final plenary additionally allowed for studying the process of ending relationships.

Lectures: There were 2 lectures providing theoretical background to the group relations experiences that participants would be having in the afternoons. The lectures were designed as explanatory talks for people who are not familiar with group relations as a means of working with integrated individual, group and organisational relationships and unconscious processes.

The Institutional Event (IE): This event enabled the study of the relationships and relatedness between the programme participants and the staff in the programme as a whole. It focused on the programme as an institution, with its beliefs and ideas about the exercise of authority. Staff were present as management and consultancy was available. The Institutional Event opened and closed in plenary.

Large Study Group (LSG): The Large Study Group comprised the whole conference membership, working with 3 consultants. In contrast to the Small Study Groups, the LSG had more of the qualities of a crowd, in which sub-groups and anti-groups, alliances and anti-alliances, fantasies and myths emerged. The primary task in the LSG was to provide opportunities for members to study the behaviour of the large group as it happened.

Small Study group: 8 – 12 participants; 1 consultant

The focus in this event was on exploration of face-to-face interpersonal relationships within the group. Its primary task was to provide opportunities for participants to study the behaviour of the group as it happened.

Review and Application Groups: 5 - 8 participants with consultancy provided.

In the Review Groups participants had opportunities to reflect on their experiences and the various roles they took within the programme. During the Application Groups, participants related these experiences to the roles they would be resuming in their organisations outside.

APPENDIX III

PROGRAMME STAFF

Programme Director: Mannie Sher, BA., AAPSW., TQAP., FBAP

Director, Group Relations Programme; Principal Social Scientist, Tavistock Institute of Human Relations; Psychotherapist and Fellow, British Association of Psychotherapists.

Associate Programme Director: Jolita Buzaityte-Kasalyniene

Head, Social Work Department; Associate Professor, Faculty of Philosophy, Vilnius University.

The Programme Director and Associate Director, in addition to their consultancy roles, constituted the Programme Directorate.

Consultant Staff:

Giorgia Iacopini, MA., MSc. Researcher and Consultant, Tavistock Institute of Human Relations, London.

Arnold Hjelm Nielsen, BSc (ee). Independent Organisational Consultant, Faroes Islands.

Danny Sher, B.Sc. (Hons) Ost. Osteopath; Chairman, Israeli Osteopathic Association; Member, Israel Association for the Study of Group and Organizational Processes (OFEK). Medical Clown.

The Role of Staff

Staff had specific roles in the programme. The Programme Directorate, comprising the Programme Director and Associate Director, together with the consultant staff, acted collectively as management. Collective management took responsibility and authority to provide the boundary conditions – task, territory and time – in such a way that all participants in the programme, the staff themselves and the participants, could engage with the primary task of the programme.

The programme staff, working in their consultancy roles in the various “here and now” events, informed by their own experiences of the events and working to the primary task of the event and the programme overall, at regular intervals, offered working hypotheses based on their understanding of what was happening.

Programme staff are not observers of the process, but are actively involved in it. It was important, therefore, to be as explicit as possible about their task and roles throughout the programme. The way staff took up their roles was always open to examination.

Working Language: The working language of the programme was English. However, where all the members of a group were Lithuanian, Lithuanian was the language of usage in that group.

APPENDIX IV

SPONSORING ORGANISATIONS

1. The Tavistock Institute of Human Relations

The Tavistock Institute of Human Relations is a not-for-profit organisational consultancy, research and professional development organisation which applies social science to contemporary issues and problems. The Tavistock Institute of Human Relations was formally founded as a not-for-profit company and registered charity in September 1947 although its work had started a decade previously as part of the Tavistock Clinic. The Tavistock Institute and Clinic, which consisted of a multi-disciplinary group of psychiatrists and social scientists (social psychologists, sociologists and anthropologists) introduced and developed significant and innovative practices to deal with post-war problems including the setting up of transitional communities designed to help re-adaptation to civilian life and the invention of the therapeutic community for psychiatric patients in a military hospital.

Currently

The Institute's work today, under the direction of Dr Eliat Aram, is consistent with its original aims. Action research is still a central approach and management of change a universal theme. Its approach to organisational consultancy and development reflects its social science tradition. This takes the professional staff of the Institute into a wide range of issues and organisations, nationally and internationally, e.g. policy-related research for government departments and local authorities; development in industry of new forms of work organisation consistent with new technologies; re-alignment of strategy, structure and culture in institutions for higher education, health and social care services and voluntary bodies; support for partnerships; organisational start-ups; development evaluation of experimental programmes and many others.

The Institute's work with organisations feeds and is fed by the Institute's professional development programmes which taken together form integrated learning pathways for leaders, managers, social scientists and organisational consultants.

The Tavistock Institute and its Associates

The Tavistock Institute of Human Relations is one of a number of institutions which themselves run programmes based on the Tavistock 'Leicester' model. Others with which the Tavistock Institute's Group Relations Programme has collaborative links include:

- AGSLO (Sweden)
- A.K. Rice Institute (USA)
- Bion Institute (India)
- CESMA, Milan (Italy); IL NODO Group, Turin, (Italy)
- Grubb Institute (UK)
- GRA (Australia)
- Group Relations Nederland (The Netherlands)
- ISLA (South Africa)
- Metanoia (Finland)
- MundO (Germany)
- OFEK (Israel)

2. University of Vilnius, Department of Social Work

Vilnius University was the first institution in Lithuania (1992) to develop social work study programs. In 1996, the Department of Social Work was established in the Faculty of Philosophy, as this faculty already had related study programs in the social sciences, such as psychology, sociology, and education.

At present, VU Social Work Department offers three study programs: a bachelor programme of social work; a Masters programme of social work and social policy and 13 programs for continued professional development (CPD).

In 2006, the External Experts' Committee concluded that social work study programs of Vilnius University represent professional social work training at a good European level. The Department puts strong emphasis on the *scientific* research knowledge and development of broad, transferable skills and it is oriented towards knowledge production. On the other hand, by placing a strong value on practice, the Department aims towards *practice research* by trying to improve the connection of knowledge in social work practice and the scientific 'tools' for innovative social research and developments.

The Department has intense and functional international relations with European universities in the form of international projects in the frame of Socrates Erasmus, Leonardo da Vinci and other programmes. It has 15 bilateral agreements with institutions of higher education for exchange of students and teachers; it is a partner of two intensive programs, a partnership developing a European Social Work Masters Programme, and networks of research and doctoral studies. Recently, the Department started having exchanges with non-academic institutions in the frame of the ERASMUS programme. International cooperation creates and provides opportunities equally for teachers and students to broaden understandings, enrich learning experiences and develop personal and professional competencies.

3. Erasmus Mobility Programme

ERASMUS is one out of four sub-programmes of the Life Long Learning programme, which funds projects at different levels of education and training.

ERASMUS is the EU's flagship education and training programme enabling 200 000 students to study and work abroad each year. In addition, it funds co-operation between higher education institutions across Europe. The programme not only supports students, but also professors and business staff who want to teach abroad, as well as helping university staff to receive training. An overriding aim of the programme is to help create a 'European Higher Education Area' and foster innovation throughout Europe.

In addition to exchange actions ('transnational mobility'), ERASMUS helps higher education institutions to work together through intensive programmes, networks and multilateral projects.

Since 2007, the scope of ERASMUS staff 'mobility' initiatives was expanded to non-teaching staff and visiting lecturers from the business sector in order to bring a wider range of experience to campuses.

APPENDIX V

OBJECTIVES of the ERASMUS Mobility Teaching Programme

To deliver an integrated academic and experiential programme of studies on research and consultancy in the social sciences with an emphasis on Tavistock Institute methodologies

TITLE of the Course was:

The initial title of the programme was: "How do we know what we know?" Observation, Cognition and Emotion in Groups and Organisations. Developing new paradigms of organisational and leadership behaviour. This title was later shortened to "Innovation and Authority in Organisations".

OBJECTIVES of the Teaching course were to:

- (i) provide opportunities for participants to increase their knowledge of group and organisational dynamics;
- (ii) increase understanding of leadership roles at work;
- (iii) develop strategies for taking up leadership roles more effectively

CONTENT of the Teaching Course

The teaching course had two distinctive, but integrated, features - (A) academic and (B) experiential. The academic part was delivered on the first two mornings. The experiential part was delivered in the 3rd, 4th and 5th mornings and every afternoon over the five days of the programme.

(A) The morning sessions comprised (i) formal lectures delivered by researchers and consultants of the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations – Mannie Sher and Giorgia Iacopini. (ii) There were opportunities in the programme called Review and Application Sessions in which the participants working in small groups presented their own cases of how they hoped to apply their conference learning to their own organisations after the conference. The Review and Application sessions were facilitated by conference staff.

(B) The three morning and five afternoon sessions over the five days comprised events that were based on the Tavistock Institute Group Relations conference model. This model included (i) Opening and Closing Plenaries, (ii) the Large Study Group Event, (iii) the Small Study Group Event, (iv) the Institutional Event and (v) Review Groups and (vi) Application Groups. (See Programme in Appendix II).

Learning Outcomes

The participants on the programme:

1. Learned in-depth about roles and developed skills in taking them up in their work.
2. Developed capacities for leadership and the exercise of authority in their roles.
3. Developed resilience in their roles and in their management of the socio-psychological and organisational processes at work.
4. Developed the ability to think about the 'below-the-surface' unconscious processes in groups, teams, organisations and society.

5. Developed awareness and understanding of the relationship between roles and boundaries.
6. Gained clearer understanding of their further learning and development needs in relation to work roles in their organisations.

Added Value for the Sending Organisation

The sending organisation, the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations, benefits from its relations with academic institutions in countries around the world through partnership in joint projects. These projects include scientific research and teaching assignments, organisational and social change interventions and professional development courses and programmes. A number of people from the University of Vilnius have attended courses and conferences run by the Tavistock Institute, notably the world-famous annual conference *Authority Role and Organisation* (the Leicester conference). We trust that more Lithuanians would be interested in attending these events in future years.

Added Value for the Contractor

The major benefit to the contractor of the Erasmus Mobility Programme, the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Vilnius, was the introduction to various Tavistock models of social science research and consultancy. The Contractor's thinking about organisations and human systems was enhanced through the deployment of systems psychodynamics theory and practice in the programme. Knowledge of system psychodynamics in Lithuania is restricted to a limited number of people who use it in their work and would like to extend their knowledge to key academic and other personnel in national and local institutions. As a consequence of the programme, increased skills in research and evaluation, monitoring and teaching, systems psychodynamics and organisational and leadership development was passed on to others.

Added Value for the Participant

Participants of the Mobility Programme benefitted from learning about different approaches to understanding individual, group, organisational and systemic thinking and the connecting links between them. Tavistock research and knowledge dissemination through the programme contributed to developing new paradigms of role functioning and leadership skill for the participants. As a result of their attendance on the programme, participants benefitted through changes to their leadership roles.

APPENDIX VI
TIMETABLE/PROGRAMME

INNOVATION AND AUTHORITY IN ORGANISATIONS

	Wednesday 1 st Sept	Thursday 2 nd Sept	Friday 3 rd Sept	Saturday 4 th Sept	Sunday 5 th Sept
9.00 – 10.15	Lecture I: Introduction to Tavistock Models Lecturer: Mannie Sher	Lecture II: Approaches to Social Research Lecturer: Giorgia Iacopini	Large Study Group II	Large Study Group III	Large Study Group IV
10.15 – 10.45	Coffee	Coffee	Coffee	Coffee	Coffee
10.45 – 12.00	Group Relations Conference Opening Plenary	Large Study Group I	Small Study Groups IV	Small Study Groups V	Institutional Event VI (Closes in Plenary)
12.00 – 1.30	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
1.30 – 2.45	Small Study Groups I	Small Study Group III	Institutional Event II	Institutional Event IV	Application Groups II
2.45 – 3.00	Short Break	Short Break	Short Break	Short Break	Short Break
3.00 – 4.15	Small Study Group II	Institutional Event I (Opens in Plenary)	Institutional Event III	Institutional Event V	Group Relations Conference Closing Plenary
4.15 – 4.45	Tea Break	Tea Break	Tea Break	Tea Break	Tea Break
4.45 – 6.00	Review Groups I	Review Groups II	Review Groups III	Application Groups I	Application Groups III

APPENDIX VII

EXPLANATIONS OF THE EVENTS

Membership of the SSGs and the Review Groups will be determined by the Director and Associate Director in consultation with the staff.

1.	Lectures: There will be 2 lectures. Lectures will provide theoretical background to the group relations experiences that participants will be having in the afternoons. They will be designed as explanatory talks for people who are not familiar with group relations objectives and methodology or working with relationships and unconscious processes.
2.	Plenaries: There will be several plenaries which will provide whole-system experiences for the membership. Plenaries at the beginning and end of the Group Relations part of the programme will provide the boundary functions for focusing on the experience of crossing a boundary into and out of an institution and of forming and ending relationships. Plenaries will also occur at the beginning and end of the Institutional Event.
3.	Small Study Groups (SSG): The SSGs will have up to a maximum of 12 people in each working with one consultant and they will meet for 5 sessions. SSGs will provide opportunities for studying the behaviour of small groups in the here-and-now with particular emphasis on the development of group fantasy around the emergence of leadership and followership dynamics.
4.	Large Study group (LSG): The Large Study group comprises the whole conference membership, working with 3 consultants. In contrast to the Small Study Groups, the LSG has more of the qualities of a crowd, in which sub-groups and anti-groups, alliances and anti-alliances, fantasies and myths emerge. The primary task in the LSG is to provide opportunities for members to study the behaviour of the large group as it happens. It is to this task that the consultants will work.
5.	The Institutional Event (IE): The Institutional Event also opens and closes in plenary. The IE event comprises 6 sessions. The primary task of the IE is to provide opportunities for studying leadership roles and inter-group relations within the context of the larger over-arching organisation, and studying the relationships between parts and the whole. A distinguishing aspect of this event is the formation of the staff themselves into two groups – the management group and the consultative group. Both will be available for interactions with the groups formed by the membership. Members will be able to apply to fill one seat in the management group at the beginning of each session of the IE. The consultant staff will circulate among the groups freely and offer consultation where deemed necessary.
6.	Review Groups (RG): The Review Groups will provide opportunities for the membership in very small groups to review their experiences of the roles they have taken during the group relations conference on that and previous days. Consultants will be available in all Review Groups. There will be 3 Review Group Sessions
7.	Application Groups (AG): The Application Groups will provide opportunities for the members to consider the application of their conference learning to their roles and responsibilities in the back-home organisations and their taking up their student roles on the courses they are attending at the University. There will be 3 Application Group Sessions. The composition of the Review and Application Groups will be the same.