

Date: 09/26/96
To: Ronald Heifetz
From: Vladimir Petit Medina (mc-mpa)
Subject: Group Study Questionnaire (Form I)

Group____ Week: 1st.

1) What was the purpose and what was the task of the consultation group session?

Basically, *the purpose of the consultation group was to analyze a case brought out by the presenter and in studying the said personal experience, we were supposed to learn about leadership and its related concepts.* This week Darney Taveras had the opportunity to present a case and we, as a group, had to analyze it and to recommend solutions.

2) What was the initial event of the group session?

In the first few minutes we started by introducing ourselves in order to get to know each other, setting the operational rules and reinforcing, in some way, the given authority of the chairperson. *It was really interesting because we suddenly found ourselves discussing about the potential damage each one could get at the time of presenting the subsequent cases. However, everybody stated that there was no room neither for fear nor for defensive reactions.* Finally, when the presenter came into the room, she introduced herself and began to present her case.

3) Was there any difference between what the case presenter identified as the problem in the case and your own interpretation of the problem in the case?. If so, what?

Yes, because the presenter identified the problem itself as...*"related to other people's behavior which finally affected.."* her ,causing her failure, and we identified it as a wrong adaptive work, at the very beginning of the presentation. Also, she focused on the social aspect of the case, and we tried to get the important point: the inappropriate assessment of the context and the negative behave which made the adaptive work impossible.

4)What was the primary hidden issue of your consultation group session?

The presenter made *a great effort to be sincere* and *she didn't have any defensive reaction*. However there were some missing information and we immediately noticed it. So, we started the logical search for the hidden values and issues. I think there were two key hidden issues: a) *The non admitted political ambition* which led her to join the campaign and to have many expectations of the role she was about to play in the organization (this might cause the distortion of the reality). b) *Prejudicial thoughts* as elements that influenced the analysis and the adaptive work itself(she didn't want to admit it at the beginning, but the real reason of the wrong analysis was the false impression of the person she was competing with)

5) Did the initial event provide a clue for identifying the primary hidden issue of the group session? If so, what was the connection?

Yes. It was obvious that we needed more conclusive information to analyze the case. In the first minutes we concluded that there was no problem to discuss unless the missing connections were hidden. *The clue was the incoherence itself*. Also, the presenter started getting nervous as long as we demanded more information about the things she neglected.

6)Did the hidden issue of the meeting have an impact on the group dynamics as the group worked on the task? If so, what was the impact?

Yes. We decided to clarify the case and to get straight to the point. *That was a therapeutical research*, because we knew we could not recommend anything unless we got to know the real problem and its psychological roots. We deliberated forced her to say what she really was thinking.

7)Was there any way that the hidden issue of your group session resembled the underlying problem or dynamic in the case?

No. The situation was quite different and *we did not act as competitors but as therapists.*

8) Identify two key words from the group session and discuss the relevance of their etymologies to the hidden issue?

- **Prejudice**: from the Latin *praejudicium*, prejudicial the adjective. Related to a preconceived idea. In this case, a prejudicial impression distorted the analysis of the situation and made the adaptive work impossible. It also deviated the attention from the real key elements. *Pre* from previous and *judicium* as related to the act of judging or making a judgment is a noun that reveals the essence of a distortion in viewing or in capturing a fact even before the fact itself gets started. A prejudice became a real impediment to the correct appreciation of the context and, thus, of the challenge itself.
- **Ambition**: from the Latin *ambitio*, a going around for votes or influence. A hidden ambition was the real origin of the action and the decisive component of the presenter's will. That is what lawyers usually call. "*the efficient cause of a given action*". In the case, ambition, in general, and political ambition in particular, became the non-admitted cause of the presenter's action. A real going around for power determined the dispute itself.

9) Has there been any difference between your capacity to contribute in the consultation group and the large class? What issues are embodied in the group that might account for this difference.

There is a huge difference: in the consultation group one could appreciate order and respect. We, in the group, were trying to help the presenter to improve herself as a human being and as a potential or acting leader and I think that it was the difference itself.

Chairperson? No.

Case Presenter? No.

