

Date: 12/02/96  
To: Ronald Heifetz  
From: Vladimir Petit Medina (mc-mpa)  
Subject: Group Study Questionnaire (Form III)  
Group: F Week: 10th

---

1.-At what level of abstraction did your personal interests diverge from the dominant interests of the group---at the level of orienting values, general purposes, specific objectives or concrete tasks? What were these interests, yours and the group's?

In the last questionnaire I mentioned the two existing factions within the group but in the last session there was at least three factions. One was represented by Francisco ( who was the case presenter ), Darnes, Bruce, Andrea and Mark. A second faction was Kent himself and the third one was composed by Sarah and me. I think my personal interests diverged from the other people's interests at the level of general purposes and concrete tasks. My interest was to consult to Francisco who happened to be the case presenter this week and in doing that, I wanted to learn about leadership and authority. Kent's interest was only to listen to the rest of the group not as a measure to get some specific lessons but as an action to meet the requirement of the course. The first faction wanted, again, to implement a sort of collective therapy and a special kind of search for leadership, or at least, for what they call leadership.

2.-Each member of the group has probably begun to take a particular role for the group. In keeping with those roles, what perspective on the case did each member of your group represent? Please include a paragraph description of the case.

I think Francisco represented himself again. He used his authoritative manners and tried to conduct us as an orchestra. The point is that we are no musicians. Then he acted in the same way he directed the group of the case.

Kent resembled one of those guys who did not want to give authority to anyone just because he does not believe in what we have been doing so far. Kent acted as many of the 20 members of the group who decided to stay apart even when they were present. He definitely was holding back.

Mark, Andrea, Bruce and Darnes resembled the behavior of those who decided to stay in Francisco's group and thought that he did not make any serious mistake.

Sarah represented a sort of woman with a sensitive perception of the reality but who decided to hold steady for a while as some of the twenty original members of Francisco's group.

And I became an opposing part, who did not like the way of acting that Francisco assumed and who definitely did not like to follow orders, either. I became the challenger of his authority. Just as the co-chair of the group was.

3.-Sometimes, work avoidance mechanisms are easier to identify than the issue being avoided. Indeed, the timing and nature of the work avoidance mechanism often provide a clue to a hidden issue. What issue was being discussed at the time when the group generated a work avoidance mechanism? What was the work avoidance mechanism? Did anyone intervene to re-direct the group's attention to the issue?

Again, Darnes was the main actor of the work avoidance. When we were approaching to a very important systemic analysis and she was also doing a great job, she got upset with Kent and decided to argue with him in such a way that the rest of the meeting was used to try to restore equilibrium. The irrelevant became the most important thing one more time. She made the same kind of comments she did the last week but this time there was no politician before her but an officer : Kent. And he responded to her. Undoubtedly, Darnes was scapegoating Kent. Then Bruce jumped and started doing the same. Kent responded again. When I finally restored the equilibrium, Francisco's case was far away from our attention. I tried to redirect the attention but then Darnes started again. After this argument, the whole affair became a side issue and we got disconnected from the case.

4.-Identify the most productive moment of the meeting. What made it productive?

There was a moment in which the whole group was moving forward and the consultation work was in progress. The people who decided to ask did it with no limitations and after a while we were participating in an intensive way. Also Kent intervened twice. The analysis was working and we were directing attention to very ripening issues. Suddenly, Darnes destroyed everything in one second.

5.-In thinking about your interventions this week, was there any difference between what you intended and the outcomes they produced? Did your interventions generate work or work avoidance?

I chaired the meeting this week and my interventions were made in order to direct the attention and to promote the proper use of the new skills. I took real care of meeting the task and I succeeded in redirecting the attention to the case at least three times.

I think my interventions generated work and it was my intention in order to meet the task. Some of the members of the groups thought that I was avoiding the ripening issues, as Andrea said, but I was trying to manage the meeting and trying to consult to the case presenter. What they wanted was a side fight which did not represent the task.

6.-Give an example of an intervention that generated work.

I identified the adaptive challenge in Francisco's case and I asked him to elaborate on it. He spoke a lot about his authoritarian channels and some of the insights he received later on. Then Kent asked him about some abuse in the exercise of the authority and Darnes began to criticize. We were working on the three main hidden issues: authority competition, authoritarian manners and envy. At the same time, We were focusing on the task: we were consulting to Francisco and he was getting some feedback.

7.-Give an example of an intervention that generated work avoidance or no response at all.

Darnes intervention when she told Kent: I am trying to get to the point and you piss me off every time you criticize Heifetz and says that you do not believe in this kind of work.

I do not care about what she thinks of Heifetz and the way she personally reacts to Kent's way of being, because that is not relevant to the consultation but to their personal relationship.

8.- Identify one moment when you thought you had something worthwhile to say and you held yourself back. What made you do so?

There was not such moment. Just because I was the chairperson and I was very active along the discussion. I held steady for a while but never back.

9.-Identify one moment when you experienced holding steady as distinct from holding back?

After the said discussion with Darnes, I decided to hold steady for a while in order to let the whole system move forward and observe it again . I was there, active in the reflection, deeply concentrated and very aware of the details and looking for a successful intervention but I was not leading actively the discussion. If I had been thinking about something else and truly disconnected from the core of the task I would have held back for a while.

I was the chairperson.

