

ISPSO SYMPOSIUM 25th JUNE – 1st July 2007

Stockholm, Sweden

Potential Space: A Source for Creativity and Terrifying Anxiety. Exploring Possibilities and Limitations in Organizational Work

SPLITS, EXTRUSION AND INTEGRATION

THE IMPACT OF 'POTENTIAL SPACE' FOR GROUP RELATIONS AND
SPONSORING INSTITUTIONS

Mannie Sher

Director, Group Relations Programme and

Principal Researcher and Consultant

The Tavistock Institute, London.

This presentation will discuss historical sources and developmental linkages between Group Relations from the standpoint of four institutional ‘stables’ – research and evaluation, clinical, professional development and spiritual. The argument will be made that (i) these four institutional ‘stables’ have each uniquely influenced the theory and practice of the ‘community of group relations practitioners’; and that (ii) group relations is an object and a source of strong institutional ambivalence in the ‘political spaces’ of sponsoring institutions that positions group relations as a source of creativity and terrifying anxiety.

The presentation will elaborate on the objectives, cultural foundations and values of the four types of institutional ‘stables’ and their bearing on the development of group relations:

(i) The Research and Evaluation ‘Stable’

Research institutions apply research and evaluation methods to fields that vary from social policy, production and delivery systems to role effectiveness and knowledge creation. The research and evaluation core culture is likely to arise from problem-solving, improved effectiveness and efficiency of systems, robust practical and outward-looking and ‘bottom-line’ orientations.

(ii) The Clinical ‘Stable’

In clinical institutions, core influences can be said to be ‘fixing’, identifying and distinguishing normal from abnormal, proposing models of illness and health, pathology, trauma and growth. Treatment models of ‘care and cure’ are more likely.

(iii) The Education/Professional Development (or Training) 'Stable' Educational institutions in the main develop skills and competencies by culling from the knowledge and experience of others – other educators and researchers; learning would be derived from deductive methods and transmissive and situational learning; relying on dependency assumptions of “filling empty vessels” educational models.

(vi) The Spiritual 'Stable'

In faith-based or spiritual organisations, philosophies around engagement with the cosmos, mystery, the experience of being; faith, belief and sustainability are likely to dominate.

Experiences of Splitting

Criticism is often levelled at Group Relations because of its poor record in evidence-based research scientific models and because of its reliance on anecdotal personal narratives as data as the basis for advancing knowledge about Group Relations. (Cytrynbaum, 1993). 'Absence of systematic research on complex group and organisational processes limits our capacity to advance knowledge in Group Relations.' Authorisation by a sponsoring institution is necessary in building a Group Relations facility; so is the impact of the sponsoring institution's culture and environment; and conversely the dogmas and orthodoxies of Group Relations will impact on their sponsoring institutions.

Group Relations has had to find a place within established organisations - the sponsoring organisation. Besides finding a way to bridge the

sponsoring organisation's main purposes and Group Relations' purposes (shared identities and philosophies), ways have had to be found of practically linking – administration, common strategy, marketing and finance. Sponsoring institutions and Group Relations have grappled with the dynamics of mutuality that come from sharing and supporting and contending with issues around the respective played by each.

In 'Experiential Learning and the Unconscious' (Gould, Stapley & Stein, 2004), Mark Stein argues that 'a theory of experiential learning, which focuses principally on processes rather than outcomes, runs against the current tide of fascination for competence, performance, and anything that can be tightly linked to the products of learning.' He examines a variety of approaches to experiential learning and locates group relations or systems psychodynamic approaches within them.

Eric Miller (1993) claims that the source of learning lies in the experience of everyday life and the conceptualisation and reflection on it. The Group Relations approach shifts attention to a more studied focus on people and their connectedness to each other. Learning about such connectedness should be understood as being quite different from learning about objects.

My own Experiences:

When I was appointed Director of the Group Relations Programme of the Tavistock Institute in October 1997, I was tasked with continuing the development of the Group Relations Programme after Eric Miller, who had been the Programme Director for nearly 30 years, stepped down from that role. It was generally acknowledged then that the Group Relations

Programme would never be fully self-financing, and it would have to rely on cross-subsidisation from other related business activity like organisational development consultancy and executive coaching, two areas of work that are closely related to Group Relations practice. Despite improved accounting measures and increased number of Group Relations events and a rise in numbers of attendees at Group Relations conferences, the Group Relations Programme was never to become fully self-financing.

But the Tavistock Institute's commitment to the GRP has been firm on the grounds that the experiential study of group and organisational processes forms an inseparable part of its social science research work; that there is fertile cross-fertilisation of research methods, data extraction methods, and extending knowledge of the role that defences against anxiety plays in social phenomena. Especially relevant is the Group Relations' connection to the Tavistock Institute's historical roots in understanding and working with unconscious processes that is believed necessary for bringing about group, organisational and social change. Influenced by ideas emerging from the Tavistock in the first decades of its existence, and their congruence with other approaches of the social sciences, the early Tavistock pioneers believed that 'learning from experience' methods could be and should be applicable broadly to all kinds of social processes. These beliefs led to the creation of the first Group relations conference in 1957 to study the nature of authority in organisations that underpinned the efforts of organisational leaders. The conference later came to be called the 'Leicester' conference, and this led to the formation of the GR programme that offered a variety of bespoke group relations conferences and events and a training in group relations consultancy.

Many people, after attending a group relations conference, were inspired to introduce this form of learning into their home organisations – universities, clinics - public service organisations in particular. In some places, membership-type organisations like AKRice Institute in the USA, OFEK in Israel, AGSLO in Sweden, MunDo in Germany, IFSI in France, IL NODO in Italy, ISLA in South Africa, AISA in Australia, were established to develop learning-from-experience opportunities for as wide a population as possible. These organisations often aimed to shape and re-shape their societies – politically, culturally, economically and socially. Personal experience of a Group Relations conference often felt ground-shaking, personal learning was profound and led in many cases to dramatic life changes in individuals.

Group Relations as a Force for Change

An issue that troubled me, was how deeply layered is change as a result of attendance at group relations conferences? Changes to the lives of individuals are more easily noticeable – job or career change, divorce, personal therapy, etc. One significant piece of post-conference research in Israel (Ginat, 1999) showed that 50% of conference attendees had changed jobs within six months. But what about changes to back-home organisations that the conferences brochures said might result from conference attendance? Attendees would write after conferences that their deeper understanding of their roles, their intuition, their ability to “read” their organisation’s trends, climate and atmosphere, that came about through their conference participation, made them more efficient in managing themselves in their roles, in carrying out their responsibilities and made them better able to handle difficult situations.

The Group Relations Network

As Director of the Group Relations Programme, I had the opportunity to keep in touch with many Group Relations institutions around the world and I would hear about rivalries and contentions. Were these contentions connected with their personalities? Or were there systemic factors? I wondered about the 'impact' of organisational and cultural factors of the development of Group Relations?

Impact

I am grateful to Tim Dartington for first alerting me to the question of "impact" – the impact of sponsoring organisations on the theory and practice of Group Relations. I am using the term 'sponsoring institution' to refer to established organisations, like universities, clinics, research institutes, training and development organisations, and organisational consultancy businesses, that 'sponsor' Group Relations by establishing units or sections from within which Group Relations conferences are promoted and delivered. In many instances, there were ideological affinities between Group Relations theory and practice and the main business or 'primary task' of the sponsoring organisation that made this possible.

I am also grateful to my friend and colleague, Avi Nutkevitch of OFEK in Israel, with whom I designed and managed the first Belgirate conference on Group Relations Conferences - Reviewing and Exploring Theory, Design, Role-Taking and Application. Both Tim and Avi and the experience of the Belgirate conferences showed how unhelpful it is to regard Group Relations as a single, monolithic body of knowledge or approach that could be

incorporated, packaged or exported without taking into account the many shaping influences of the ‘potential space’ of organisations, professions, countries, cultures, etc.

But I wanted to explore further the differences between philosophies, values and dynamics between sponsoring institutions and Group Relations in order to understand why Group Relations in some places flourished and in others floundered. And I started at home – at the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations - an organisation that is committed to the ‘*integration of the social sciences*’, that places high value on inter- and multi-disciplinary approaches to knowledge-creation, understanding and helping organisations ‘solve’ their problems. The Tavistock Institute’s *raison d’être* is generating, disseminating and utilising ‘knowledge’ gained from research and consultancy. I believe that the combination of the insights of psychoanalysis and the methodological and research instruments of social science are powerful tools for effecting change at the level of the individual and the social. ‘Knowledge’ in our sense is different from ‘fact’ or ‘information’; it is ‘wisdom’, ‘comprehension’, ‘realisation’ and ‘intelligence’ – states of mind and minds of state (organisations) that can be more readily described than measured. So, why I wondered, what difficulties did Group Relations have in finding a place for itself and garnering the requisite resources for its functioning, and sometimes even attracting hostility? To put it in the context of this ISPSO conference: what was the nature of the “potential space” in my sponsoring institutions that facilitated or inhibited Group Relations? How is this ‘potential space’ a source for creativity or anxiety? What are the possibilities and limitations for organisational work?

Research

To help me answer these questions, I devised a questionnaire and asked some colleagues in the Group Relations world to complete it. I also sent the questionnaire to heads of the organisations where my colleagues were employed in order to obtain the perspective of those with a broader institutional overview of the 'potential space' and who have to integrate other sub-systems of the institution into a coherent whole.

Responses to the questionnaires suggests that 'potential space' is located variously in individuals, institutions and society – in literal space and metaphorical space at a number of levels. In today's focussed world many ask what specific learning will they come back with from a group relations conference. Organisers of Group Relations conferences cannot guarantee where the learning will happen, what it will be and how it can be applied. Learning will occur in any number of spaces, potential and real, and the effectiveness of the learning will depend on a combination of circumstances that are beyond the control of any Group Relations conference or event. The organisers can only but provide opportunities for learning.

(i) The Perspective from the Research & Evaluation 'Stable'

From research and evaluation organisations, the view is that group relations conference work is a vital adjunct to their core work. Group Relations is generally supported internally through their management groups, administration and marketing that enables research and evaluation organisations to respond to the demand for Group Relations from the marketplace. But moving Group Relations towards higher growth would require a huge effort (group relations involves high overheads and

operational costs), and this raises questions about the psychological 'task' of group relations for research and evaluation organisations and why Group Relations has so much loaded on to it. This 'loading' may come from both the sponsoring organisation and the Group Relations 'diaspora' for which Group Relations carries an 'authority' dynamic that may stand in contradistinction to the 'spirit of enquiry' inherent in research and evaluation. In other words, Group Relations methods may stand for an authority underpinning explanations of social phenomena that is incongruent with research and evaluation's "spirit of inquiry", despite both methods claiming to adhere to the spirit of the 'spirit of enquiry' which lays claim to experiential learning as a way of engaging with data to explain phenomena. Research and evaluation and group relations may differ on the place of 'interpretation' to understand phenomena. An interpretive stance, it is suggested, resembles a clinical way of thinking and less a 'spirit of inquiry'. By being too strongly interpretive, one may compromise a more traditional objective scientific observer role. Research and evaluation organisations work through action research, organisational development and change consultancy and professional development. Both research and evaluation and group relations agree that knowledge development draws the focus away from individuals and psychopathology onto groups and systems. Both research and evaluation and group relations gather teams from different professions and disciplines in the service of knowledge development; in other words, attempting to understand what constructs people are making cognitively and emotionally of their experiences and their environments. Research and evaluation and Group Relations work contextualises things in relation to change that is pervasive and occurring in all ways and at all times.

But respondents from research and evaluation institutions ranged in their attitudes from Group Relations being 'outside the mainstream', to being full partners in the offerings of sponsoring organisations. Group Relations is considered as carrying institutional heritage. But sometimes unrealistic financial demands may be placed upon Group Relations and sponsoring institutions may not realise that, for Group Relations to flourish, it will always need a degree of support. Internal relatedness to research and evaluation often pulls Group Relations into the financial side of things which is detrimental to the learning and developmental aspect of Group Relations and reduces discussions on the strategy and philosophy of Group Relations – agendas focus on delivery, not learning.

Directors of research and evaluation sponsoring institutions are charged with taking an interest in all elements of their organisations, i.e., the whole, including the Group Relations part.

“It is true that there have been times when Group Relations has been marginalized over conflicts around a disjuncture between skills and approaches relevant to research and evaluation and that which is relevant to group relations. Group Relations is widely considered to have the potential to make a bigger contribution to research than it does. But Group Relations has also marginalised itself! Within Group Relations, it appears that the medical model is more dominant over research models, i.e. holding the view that people will come to Group Relations conferences when they are ready, rather than actively marketing conferences as worthwhile parts of research and evaluation projects. If Group Relations is not better in the world,

Group Relations has only itself to answer. Group Relations needs to do more to make itself known and to be more readily available. My hypothesis about Group Relations is that it experiences a combination of arrogance and shame - arrogance, that group relations should not have to sell itself; and shame that only 40 or 50 people come to conferences. Group Relations does not have grounds to claim a special status. To explain the marginalization of Group Relations, one also has to consider its own propensity for splitting, resulting from “excessive reliance on charismatic leaders, resulting in a sense of inclusiveness and in a potentially destructive orthodoxy” (Cytrynbaum, 1993 ; p.40).

In Group Relations, figures like Bion, Rice, Miller, Bridger, Turquet, Lawrence and others have made lasting and significant contributions to the development of group and systems theory and practice, but their charismatic leadership and orthodoxies also produced an exclusionary culture which deprived the movement of input from other critical sectors. This view may still has relevance today.

(ii) Perspective from the Clinical ‘Stable’

Responses from heads of sponsoring organisations from the ‘clinical stable’ suggested that generally their programmes in clinical work, some of which included organisational development consultancy and research, influence and are influenced by group relations thinking. They stressed the contribution of psychoanalysis on group relations and in their organisational consultancy work. Their clinical, research and organisational training programmes used mixed models of consulting, emphasising integrated

psychoanalytic and general systems theories perspectives and applied group relations work.

But they also acknowledge that Group Relations work, on the whole and with some exceptions, is a valued, but not well-integrated part of their institutions. Councils and Boards rely on the international reputation of Group Relations, but they do not know much about Group Relations and in many instances, are sceptical of it, either because it is too "applied" or because it is too "psychoanalytical".

In some instances, the relationship between Group Relations and clinical institutions, resembles a "boarding house" model in which the parts operate separately, and exist commensally, accepting and tolerating one another, but not thinking much about each other. There is a certain element of disjointedness about their relationships. For clinical institutions, the paradox is that both elements – Group Relations and the sponsoring organisations - are important to each other for their identities. There are other mutual benefits like some cross-referrals and cross-selling. These organisations certainly have an ideological affinity between their different parts insofar as these parts represent connections between the social (and the systemic), the interpersonal and intra-personal traditions. In this sense, there exists a symbiotic relationship in which both parties benefit from the reputation and traditions of the other. These benefits are sometimes consciously acknowledged and sometimes not.

Heads of clinical institutions believe that the future of their partnerships with Group Relations will improve because Group Relations is applied –

developing new knowledge about groups, systems, organisational work and society and taking this knowledge and applying it in novel ways. They think there is a robust future for their partnerships with Group Relations because Group Relations is capable of reorienting itself and inserting itself in modified forms to work with people in different work sectors. For people who do not necessarily appreciate the methodology and language, Group Relations has translated itself into the language of the client system. Group Relations is designed for the application of complex concepts to everyday organisational and social systems. Clinical institutions, on the other hand, on their own cannot easily change. The view is that clinical and single-discipline organisations seem as if they have been designed to remain stuck. They set up to be self-contained institutions. They tend to remain unrelated to universities or to other organisations. They seem helpless to think through what is happening to them. They are subject to splitting and projective mechanisms and overall they seem to be maladaptive. They have difficulty defining their mission and how to develop appropriate leadership for the task in relation to the outside world or marketplace. These difficulties may be another source of ambivalence that organisations from the 'clinical stable' (or indeed from the other 'stables') and Group Relations bear towards one another – that each part serves as a reminder of what the other part is failing at and cannot see. Sponsoring institutions and Group Relations have to find ways of giving leadership to each other on the basis of maintaining high standards of professional work that is relevant to the world at large. It is a feature of the relationship between clinical sponsoring institutions and Group Relations to ask whether they have enough common interest and shared values (studying the unconscious and the 'future of the unconscious') to help them to survive.

(iii) Perspectives from the ‘Education/Professional Development (or Training) ‘Stable’

Professional development organisations, often organised as voluntary or membership organisations, find themselves in greater difficulty because they strongly identify with a model of practice that gets enshrined as “Establishment” or “founding father” and any deviation from that model is considered heretical. In ‘membership’ organisations, Group Relations conferences are developed within established policies and it is expected that programmes will be self-managing, but they often fail to coordinate with their sponsoring institutions’ financial and marketing policies.

Education and training organisations have deeply-embedded cultures in an almost religious commitment to group relations as a philosophy and way of engaging with its task. In so doing, these sponsoring organisations function with an inherent conflict between “market-forces” and their ‘cultures’ leading to financial mismanagement in many instances.

In ‘membership’ sponsoring institutions, Group Relations conferences are usually at the centre of their activities, and their actual delivery of programmes is naturally focussed on the learning needs of their members, e.g. seminars, social dreaming matrices, journal publication, reading groups. Consequently, it can be argued that many ‘membership’ training sponsoring institutions can be described as having a strong dependency culture; religious fervour and a culture of charity that significantly influence the delivery of Group Relations. Conferences are presented in the language of the ‘faithful’ who are loyal to a fantasised psychoanalytic/Tavistock purism with appeal to those who identify with that approach. Marketing is

based on similar identification (i.e. not too 'commercialised'). Most successful marketing is done through word-of-mouth or through personal relationships with potential members. Each conference's marketing activities begin by 'reinventing the wheel', resulting in repeatedly marketing with limited resources, and depending on the goodwill of staff. In these sponsoring institutions, group relations conference staff roles are highly sought after and are a central political focus with considerable competitiveness. Innovations in Group Relations conference work contribute to envious attacks from the 'establishment' and ultimately may threaten the host organisation. Presenting Group Relations work in traditional ways, excluding all other offerings and models, develops a closed system of potential participants. Attempts to include political and organisational dimensions - "to play a socially responsible role, taking up, wherever appropriate and within the scope of the organisation's purpose, current issues in society" have not very successful. The organisations remained inward-looking, attending to the needs of their members.

The future of 'membership' professional development institutions will depend on whether they are able to establish realistic financial infrastructures that engage with pragmatics beyond purist "psychoanalytic/Tavistock Group Relations models". Group Relations in these organisations will be influential if they "help their members extend themselves intellectually and participate in developing new ideas and be stimulated by them" for themselves and for others.

(iv) Perspectives from the ‘Spiritual Stable’

Sponsoring organisations emphasising faith, belief and spirituality seem to take a different view of their relationship to Group Relations. For instance, their managements are prepared to tolerate and supplement financial losses. Group Relations conferences are not required to generate surpluses, they are not “cash cows”. In the spiritual stable, Group Relations is considered an essential part of their work streams and is included in all their courses and conferences, in their ‘applied’ work of research and consultancy and organisational role consultations. Group Relations conferences and courses come together under one management and relate directly to other work streams. Their research and consultancy clients are expected to send their people to their Group Relations conferences. In other words, Group Relations in organisations from the spiritual stable informs everything they do. This high level integration between Group Relations and research and consultancy is evident in their ongoing processes of hypothesis-making and testing that emerges out of their regular research and consultancy work and gets used in formulating the shape of their up-coming conferences. Their annual group relations conferences therefore form a core part of the organisation’s internal learning and the conferences, in turn, explore implications of the rest of its work for the next year.

Because of their belief, faith and spirituality orientations, organisations in the ‘spiritual’ stable wish to energise and equip people “to take action in the world”. This philosophy forms part of their consultancy, experiential learning and research work. The spiritual core of these organisations conceptualises group relations as part of the whole. Their spiritual

philosophy concerns wholeness - the presence of the Divine is considered active in the here-and-now, and this makes for a unique contribution to their work in Group Relations. Sometimes there is tension, for example, if a client decides to terminate a research or consultancy contract as a consequence of conference experience. Spirituality-based organisations realise that this could happen when Faith, Belief and Spirituality are resources for work in Group Relations 'here and now' events. Without naming Faith, Belief and Spirituality, some experiences of people are not accessible. When they are named and worked with, change occurs and it is possible to ask how. These are cross-organisational principles in the 'Spiritual' stable. These organisations take the view that things are not 'right' or 'wrong' – the aim of Group Relations is to understand how people have created what they have created which is a salutary exercise in freedom for people who are expected to manage their own accountability. At the heart of their philosophy is the struggle of working with the tension between freedom and accountability for what people have created themselves.

As spirituality-based organisations have got more confident and open at working with religion, faith and spirituality, so have their conferences become more complex. This is seen as part of their primary task.

Organisations from the 'spiritual' stable are also trading organisations, usually in organisational development consultancy and research. The management of these organisations provide fluid working environments, enabling staff to judge on their ratio of face-to-face work with high and low paying projects. The management does not look at individual targets; there

is no bottom line. These organisations are concerned with surpluses and deficits, but being faith-based, there is a belief that things will balance out. There is financial planning, but it is not essential to earn surpluses. Managements may take salary cuts in order to make ends meet, as an expression of their philosophy of shared responsibility. Earnings are scrutinised weekly and successful work streams are used to support work streams that are not doing well. This is a faith issue at the heart of these organisations. The organisations as totalities decide what they will offer, what projects should be self-financing and what need not be. They recognise that Group Relations supports their core businesses of consultancy and research, and that they will never make surpluses.

Conclusions

In conceptualising 'group relations' – whether it is part of or indistinguishable from its sponsoring organisation - raises questions, issues and challenges around the relatedness of group relations to its host organisation. These issues concern the primary task of both. Evidence from this research often referred to "controversy", "unrest", "political implications", "disagreement and debate", in both group relations and in sponsoring organisations. Responses received described tensions between group relations as primary task on the one hand; and on the other where *group relations is the method by which the sponsoring organisation's primary task is achieved*. For example, in some organisations, the group relations method ("to further the exploration and understanding in conscious and unconscious processes.....etc") is turned into the primary task of the sponsoring organisation, and its aim is then moved to a secondary task, i.e. "to contribute to clients' development and change". Method gets confused

with aim. One respondent wrote “I am not clear where the group relations part of our organisation ends and the rest of our organisation as a whole begins”. Loss of organisational direction and internal controversy seems to have resulted from the conflation the sponsoring organisation as a whole and its group relations part. This conflation leads to the idealisation of group relations conference staff roles and a denigration and subversion of the sponsoring institution’s primary task

Putting it another way – there is a tension between two main categories – the general and the specific. The general category - an ‘imported’ Tavistock Group Relation Programme conference on Authority Leadership and Organisation or similar title, holds a single group relations conference and everyone yearns to be on the staff of that conference. It is doubtful what contribution that conference makes to organisations or to society; an analysis of the delegates who have attended over the past 20 years, shows that they have come for professional development reasons in order to improve their consultancy skills. On the other hand, the category of specific conferences that really do make a contribution to client systems and society - conferences on Abuse in the Family and Children at Risk, Life on the Road, Relationships between Members and Executives of Local Government, German-Israeli conferences, health system conferences, conferences on the Mood of the Nation; the North-South Divide; Art and Society, Authority and Passivity among Unemployed etc., etc. - these conferences are well-funded and well-attended and impact on their sponsoring organisations. In the confusion between primary task and method, people are seduced by fantasies of individual progress up a status

ladder and are less attracted to do the work that “contributes to developments in client systems and society”.

This is the trap I think that group relations and sponsoring institutions fall into – caught between their attachment to the genericisms of group relations conferences and the struggle to find the specifics that relate to the needs of specific client systems.

The following excerpt from a respondent points to the contribution made by the Group Relations ‘diaspora’ to the problems of Group Relations.

“People in the Group Relations ‘diaspora’ tend to see organisations that offer Group Relations conferences and training as doing only group relations, not research, consultancy or anything else. This suggests that people in the Group Relations diaspora tend to have part-object relationships to organisations that provide Group Relations conferences. Because issues of authority lie at the heart of Group Relations, which in turn stimulates transference feelings, fantasies about these organisations are invited, and this prevents people from thinking of them carrying out other activities, like research, organisational consultancy or clinical work. The Group Relations ‘diaspora’ by definition is dispersed. It belongs to neither academia, clinical services, the world of politics, nor the realm of faith and spirituality. Group Relations does not fit neatly into any one of these social domains and does not constitute a domain of its own. So, being part of “the Group Relations brand”, encourages fantasies about organisations that have highly visible Group Relations

businesses and people hope to deal with their own isolation and marginality by ‘possessing’ the Group Relations sponsoring institution as if they have a right to it; as if they can ‘own’ part of it, as if it were a part-object. This accounts for the discomfort some sponsoring institutions feel with Group Relations. Group Relations appears like a large beast with no home that could bring in all kinds of undesirables if it were taken in! How does one make it clear that knowledge generation conferences are not the same thing as ‘mother’s breast’? There is a cultural dissonance in these two perspectives which may affect people’s views and relationship to sponsoring organisations with Group Relations businesses”.

Acknowledgements

This paper appears during the celebrations of the Tavistock Institute’s 60th anniversary and is testimony to the intellectual vigour of the Tavistock Institute which continues to refresh and develop its intellectual traditions. A number of people have contributed to the thinking out of this paper. In particular, I acknowledge the contributions of Fiddy Abraham, Eliat Aram, David Armstrong, Anke Baak, Gaby Braun, Ken Eisold, Amy Fraher, Bob Hinshelwood, Bruce Irvine, Karen Izod, Willem de Jager, Ilana Litvin, Carl Mack, Rose Miller, Jean Neumann, Allan Shafer, Phil Swann, Kathy White, and the continual support and help of the members of the Tavistock Refresh Group.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brunner, L. D., Nutkevitch, A. and Sher, M., (eds.) (2006). *Group Relations Conferences: Reviewing and Exploring Theory, Design, Role-Taking and Application*. Karnac Books, London.

Coleman, A.D. and Bexton W. H. (eds.) (1975). *Group Relations Reader*. The A. K. Rice Institute.

Coleman, A.D. and Geller M.H. (eds.) (1985) *Group Relations Reader II*. The A. K. Rice Institute.

Cytrynbaum, S. (1993) Learning About Leaving: The Lessons of Institutional Splitting. In: Hugg, T.W., Carson, N. M., & Lipgar, R.M. (eds.) *Changing Group relations: The Next Twenty-Five Years in America*. Proceedings of the Ninth Scientific Meeting of the A.K. Rice Institute. Pub. A.K. Rice Institute. Florida.

Cytrynbaum, S. & Noumair, D.A. (eds.). (2004) *Group Dynamics, Organizational Irrationality and Social Complexity: Group Relations Reader 3*. AK Rice Institute for the Study of Social Systems, Florida.

French, R. and Vince, R. (eds.), (1999) *Group Relations, Management and Organisation*. Oxford University Press.

Gould, L, Stapley, L. and Stein, M. (2004). *Experiential Learning in Organisations: Applications the Tavistock Group Relations Approach*. London: Karnac.

Holti, R. (1997). Consulting to organisational implications of technical change. In: J.E. Newmann, K. Kellner, & A. Dawson-Shepherd (eds.), *Developing Organisational Consultancy*. London: Routledge.

Lawrence, W. G. (ed.), (1979). *Exploring Individual and Organisational Boundaries*. Wiley. Reprinted by Karnac Books, 1999.

Lawrence, W. G. (2000), *Tongued with Fire, Groups in Experience*. Karnac Books.

Miller, E. J. (1993). Experiential Learning in Groups I. The Development of the Leicester Model. In: Trist, E. & Murray, H. (eds.) *The Social Engagement of Social Science: A Tavistock Anthology, Vol. I. The Socio-Psychological Perspective.* Free Associations Books.

Miller, E. J. (1983). *Work and Creativity. Occasional Paper No. 6*, Tavistock Institute of Human Relations.

Miller, E.J. (1993). *From Dependency to Autonomy: Studies in Organisation and Change*. Free Association Books.

Miller, E.J. and Rice, A. K., (1967). *Systems of Organisation*. Tavistock Publications.

Rice, A. K. (1963). *The Enterprise and its Environment*. Tavistock Publications.

Sher, M. (2003). From Groups to Group Relations: Bion's contribution to the Tavistock - 'Leicester' conferences. In; Pines, M. & Lipgar, R. (eds.) *Building on Bion: Branches: Contemporary Developments and Applications of Bion's Contributions to Theory and Practice*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

KEY WORDS: Group Relations; Organisational Development and Change; The Tavistock Institute; Splitting