



Contents

Preface.....	1
<i>Ilona Świątek-Barylska, Magdalena Opara</i> : Perception of whistleblowing by professionals-to-be. Results of the research / Postrzeganie informowania w dobrej wierze przez przyszłych profesjonalistów. Wyniki badań	2
<i>Katarzyna Bratnicka-Myśliwiec</i> : Creativity and performance. Testing ambidextrous hypotheses in the context of Polish SME's / Twórczość i efektywność. Testując hipotezy obustronności w kontekście polskich małych i średnich przedsiębiorstw	9
<i>Jules van Cleeff, Pieter van Nispen</i> : Organizations, projects and culture / Organizacje, projekty i kultura	16
<i>Lionel F. Stapley</i> : Exploring the meaning of work in the context of organizational culture / Znaczenie pracy w kontekście kultury organizacyjnej	23
<i>Susan Kahn</i> : Eros and Thanatos: A psychoanalytic examination of death in the context of working life / Eros i Tanatos: psychoanalityczna perspektywa śmierci w kontekście miejsca pracy	29
<i>Xavier Eloquin</i> : The tyrant-in-the-mind: influences on worker behaviour in a post-totalitarian organization / Tyran w umyśle: wpływ na zachowanie pracownicze w organizacji posttotalitarnej	41



Preface

The presented papers form an important starting point for academic discussions and show us the diverse spectrum of interesting issues perceived from the perspective of organizational behaviours and organizational culture, enriched with examples of the interpretational possibilities offered by the psychoanalytic understanding of social phenomena. What merits special attention is the fact that half of the articles contributed to the collection present a systemic-psychodynamic approach, still relatively little known in Polish management. This approach is based on psychoanalytic theories and the concepts developed therein.

The exceptional nature of this collection consists in showing the diversity of perspectives regarding both the understanding and the empirical examination of the phenomena and processes which we observe in organizations. It contains six articles that describe from the cognitive-behavioural perspective phenomena as complex as whistleblowing (I. Świątek-Barylska, M. Opara: *Perception of whistleblowing by professionals-to-be. Results of the research*) and organizational creativity and ambidexterity in Polish enterprises (K. Bratnicka: *Creativity and performance. Testing ambidextrous hypotheses in Polish SME's context*). These two articles are based on extensive empirical studies and can form a very good groundwork for further research, and they have a great practical importance for managers, too.

The two subsequent papers present the issue of organizational culture described from the behavioural standpoint (J. van Cleff, and P. van Nispen: *Organisations, Projects and Culture*) and

from the systemic-psychodynamic perspective (L.F. Stapley: *Exploring the Meaning of Work in the Context of Organizational Culture*). Although it might seem that everything has already been said about organizational culture, it is worthwhile to consider the thought expressed by L.F. Stapley that we focus on the identification of symptoms of culture rather than understanding what it really is.

Then, the last two papers reveal the world of organizations through reference to strictly psychoanalytic constructs, such as death drive, mourning and melancholia (S. Kahn: *Eros & Thanatos: A Psychoanalytic Examination of Death in the Context of Working Life*) and the concepts of organization-in-the-mind, narcissism, unconscious, introjective identification (X. Eloquin: *The Tyrant-in-the-mind: Influences on Worker behaviour in a Post-totalitarian Organisation*). These papers, based on psychoanalytic theories, reflect upon and illuminate some of the new contours and shapes, perhaps previously not fully seen or appreciated from others perspectives.

It is my hope that this collection of six papers will form a framework for noticing, exploring, and reflecting upon the forces and processes that exist beneath the surface of our interactions with other people and our changing world. I believe that the submitted publications constitute interesting reading on modern management from the perspective of psychoanalytic and "classic" approaches to management. I hope they will become the source of many inspiring discussions and academic polemics.

Adela Barabaszy



Exploring the meaning of work in the context of organizational culture

Znaczenie pracy w kontekście kultury organizacyjnej

Lionel F. Stapley

University of London, e-mail: lionelstapley@msn.com

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to shed some light on the way that taking a group-as-a-whole approach, encompassing organizational culture, enables us to gain a different understanding of the meaning of work: one which is significantly different from an approach which takes the individual as the object of study. Most importantly, the paper will seek to answer the fundamental questions of how does culture develop, why do we develop a culture, and what is the purpose of a culture? An understanding of culture will serve as the point of departure to apply the hypothesis by showing how the processes of childhood can be linked to adult societal behaviour, and in doing so demonstrate the vital role that culture plays in our everyday lives. The theory will then be applied to two other highly valuable theories that take a group approach to the meaning of work. Namely, 'social systems as a defence against anxiety' [Menzies Lyth 1988; Jaques 1955], and 'sentient groups' [Miller, Rice 1967], where I shall suggest that they are more helpfully regarded as variations of organizational culture, and that when seen in this light they become more meaningful which opens up the possibility of working with these dynamics. The paper will conclude by applying the theory to a series of vignettes which will show that when the meaning of work is considered in the context of organizational culture, we are able to develop a different and deeper appreciation of the dynamics at play.

Keywords: organizational culture, meaning of work, sentient groups, social systems as a defence against anxiety.

Streszczenie

Celem artykułu jest pokazanie sposobu myślenia traktującego grupę jako obiekt całościowy, obejmujący kulturę organizacyjną, co w efekcie pozwala inaczej spojrzeć na znaczenie pracy; jest to podejście odmienne od podejścia, które za obiekt badań obiera jednostkę. Co najważniejsze, w artykule przedstawia się odpowiedzi na fundamentalne z tej perspektywy pytania: jak rozwija się kultura, dlaczego rozwijamy kulturę, co jest celem kultury. Zrozumienie tego, czym jest kultura, jest punktem wyjścia do weryfikacji hipotezy wskazującej na związek okresu dzieciństwa ze społecznymi zachowaniami osób dorosłych. Pozwala to wykazać doniosłą rolę, jaką odgrywa kultura w codziennym życiu. W artykule przedstawiono dwie ważne teorie stosujące podejście grupowe do zagadnienia pracy. Są to systemy społeczne jako obrona przed lękiem [Menzies Lyth 1988; Jaques 1955] oraz koncepcja czującej grupy [Miller, Rice 1967]. Według autora są one bardziej pomocne, gdy są ujmowane jako różne warianty kultury organizacyjnej, takie ich zastosowanie pozwala zaś docenić dynamiczną grę wewnątrzorganizacyjną. Artykuł kończy się przykładami ilustrującymi wykorzystanie prezentowanego podejścia teoretycznego, pokazującymi, że kiedy patrzemy na znaczenie pracy w kontekście kultury organizacyjnej, jesteśmy w stanie rozwinąć różnorodne i głębsze rozumienie dynamiki sił w organizacji.

Słowa kluczowe: kultura organizacyjna, znaczenie pracy, czująca grupa, systemy społeczne jako obrona przed lękiem.

At this early stage we need to be aware that organisational (or societal) culture is something that a society 'is' (as opposed to a mistaken belief held or implied by some that it is something an organisation 'has'). In other words, culture is in the members of an organisation (or society) or put another way, we are culture [Stapley 1996]. The individual is the primary building block in all human activity. It is only the functioning of individual minds which make the human collectively possible. Without human minds, neither language, nor culture nor rules could exist. Consequently, whilst we are referring to a social psychology, we need to understand something of the way the individual makes sense of meaning. I shall, therefore, start with the notion that the self is the organising function within the individual and the function by means of which one human being can relate to another. No matter what the circumstances, we as individuals play the central role in making sense of our experiences. However, it is also important to understand that we are group animals and that from the outset there is no such thing as just an individual [Bion 1961].

I shall start by seeking to provide an answer to that most fundamental of questions concerning how culture develops. In doing so I shall be working from the principle that if we know how it develops then we shall be able to unpack it and therefore know how to influence it. In other words, knowing how a culture develops will provide us with an understanding of the causes of the consistent behaviours that we call culture. We are aware that early development in the maternal holding environment has an immense affect on the development of personality and on the way we behave in adult life (see for example [Winnicott 1971]). I shall therefore start by exploring the process of enculturation of the infant from birth onwards. I use the term enculturation deliberately to distinguish it from the more often used term 'socialisation'. I see enculturation as including social, psychological and emotional processes.

From the early relation of the mother and child in the maternal holding environment, a relationship grows through the ability of both parties to experience and adjust to each other's natures. The constant interaction between the individual and the organisation is fundamental to any study of culture, or for that matter, personality. They are indivisibly linked and consequently it will be necessary to refer to both processes.

Being held in the mother's womb, then being held in the mother's arms is the first boundary within which the infant's personality can develop. The mother's sensitivity to this growth provides the protection of a boundary which helps the child to extend and expand, and within which he or she can include more and more experience of the world.

Starting from a dependent position, the mother provides an environment that we might refer to as a 'trusted framework' that enables the infant to be able to trust and be trusted. This forms the basis in the child for a sense of identity which will later combine a sense of 'being all right' of being oneself, and of becoming what other people trust one will become. To achieve this trusted framework the mother must provide physical and psychological support and most importantly, she must communicate with the infant at an emotional level [Winnicott 1971].

If the relationship with the mother is good enough, the infant is able to return to this for strength and relaxation. It provides him or her with the consistency, confirmation and continuity of being, both in the external world and in his or her mind. Through this, he or she is able to cope with the dramatic changes in his or her life. Development comes about through repeated opportunities for taking in the experience of being held by someone else and being held in the mind, each being important. Through the contact with the mother's capacity for containment of mental states and their transformation into thought, the basis is laid for the development of these same capacities within the infant, by means of internalisation and identification.

As the infant grows (see [Winnicott 1965]; and for a more recent neuroscience view [Schoore 2012]), there then develops the use of transitional objects which lead to the recognition of external objects – of a 'me' and a 'not me'. This psychological change arises once the infant is able to experience the mother and other significant objects as separate. The dawn of the objective world is the consequence of the infant's gradual emergence from embeddedness, or crossing a second boundary. By differentiating them from the world and the world from him or herself, the infant brings into being that which is independent of its own sensing and movement. A self which does its own praising, so to speak, but needs the information that it is correct as confirmation, a self which can store memories, feelings and perceptions. It is not just the physical world that is being conserved but internal experience also. As well as the emergence of a self-concept, there comes a more or less consistent notion of 'me' – the formation of a self-concept.

Gradually there develop several 'not me's in the shape of father, siblings, playmates and other relations. At this stage the infant is capable of introjecting cognitive symbols, and here the holding environment begins to split into an internalised psychological part and an external social part. By 'taking in' (introjecting), 'summoning up' and 'holding in mind' their perceptions as if they were an object, infants feel that they contain within themselves a world of concrete things of at least as much reality as the material world.

Early introjections (the taking in of external objects) since they are virtually all the infant has, are particularly potent, and the inner 'objects' (the mental images) they create are never forgotten. The processes and stages of the interrelatedness of the infant with the mother in the maternal holding environment result in the infant introjecting various objects such as language and the categorization of objects, attitudes and values, the conscience or super ego, and all manner of societal information. It should be stressed that in the first instance the mother is the only source of enculturation and because of his or her attachment needs and dependency the infant will undoubtedly act in ways that please mother.

At a later stage the child simply competes with the parent of the same gender, a competition with a naturally ambivalent outcome. The little boy wants to take the place of his father, but does not want to lose his father's love. Later still, adolescents divorce themselves from obedience to their parents, but none-

theless want the parents to care for them whenever they are in need. To this point, enculturation has come about through the interrelatedness of the child with mother. Now it expands out to include other significant persons and other holding environments. As the infant grows he or she becomes a member of several holding environments: the family, the school, the university, the organisational or work, and, the societal holding ones. Indeed, I will go further than this because I believe it is more accurate to state that there is not only a succession of 'holding environments' but that several 'holding environments' may be available for any one individual at any given time.

In becoming a member of those other holding environments, adolescents all the time widen their circle, embracing the new and stranger phenomena that society throws up. Through school, playgroup, university or early work, the child is exploring one circle after another. During this stage parents are still needed in the facilitation of their children because they can become confused and even scared when progression is too rapid in moving from the limited social circle to the unlimited social circle. At this stage, the child is still dependent on the parents for guidance and containment (see for example [Erikson 1959]).

As the child grows, he or she reaches a stage in adolescence where a further move from embeddedness in the family holding environment and dependence on mother and family begin to be challenged. Gradually, after many false starts, the adolescent becomes not only a potential creator of the world but also able to influence the world with samples of his or her own life. We started from the position where the trusted framework supplied by mother enabled an interrelatedness whereby the mother influenced the infant and the infant influenced the mother. After what can be a considerable struggle and several 'holding and letting go's, the young person is no longer reliant on the maternal or family holding environments and the internal holding now dominates. Now we have gradually reached the position where the trusted framework supplied by societal culture enables an interrelatedness whereby the culture influences the adult and the adult influences the culture.

Maturity of the human being is a term that implies not only personal growth but also enculturation. Because of the development process, the adult is able to identify with society without too great a sacrifice of personal spontaneity or, put the other way round, the adult is able to attend to their own personal needs without being antisocial, and indeed, without a failure to take some responsibility for the maintenance or for the modification of society as it is found. Once these things are established, the child is able to gradually meet the world and all its complexities, because they experience there more and more of what is already present in their own self, that which has been introjected. In ever-widening circles of social life the child is identified with society, because local society is a sample of the self's personal world as well as being a sample of truly external phenomena [Winnicott 1957].

At a point of social transition the young person is accepted by society as an adult, and instead of relying on mother they rely upon the societal culture for their consistency, confirmation

and continuity. They have now become part of the culture and they join other members of that society in interrelating with the culture in a dynamic and changing manner. In effect, while not so obvious as the mother, several holding environments are in being in the shape of the work or university holding environments and in particular the societal holding environment. The young person still has a strong need for attachment and still seeks social approval (as opposed to maternal approval) for the way they behave. By now there is a strong internalized object that we call societal culture or 'the way we do things around here'. To act contrary to this internalized object is to cause great anxiety and discomfort. Thus there gradually emerges a reliance on a societal holding environment, and there gradually evolves the reliance on societal culture in place of the mother.

Such is our need for attachment and for object relating, and such are our memories and emotions attached to mother, that we seek to recreate in the present a holding environment that will provide us with the same sort of psychological social and emotional support experienced in the maternal holding environment. We need the group to provide us with a favourable emotional response as much as we needed mother to do so. The group is to be seen as an artificial creation, it is a mental construct. A mental construct that is hypothesized to come about from our human need to belong and to establish a state of psychological unity with others which represents a covert wish for restoring an earlier state of unconflicted well-being inherent in the exclusive union with mother.

The constant interaction between the individual and culture is fundamental to any study of culture, or for that matter, personality. They are indivisibly linked and consequently it is helpful to bear in mind both processes. So that based on current and past experience conscious and unconscious processes, the internalised multiple experiences result in a construct that is 'the society in the mind'. It is this construct of a society in the mind that members of society interrelate with. This leads to the way that societal culture develops, because, having developed this construct of the 'society in the mind' the members of that society then adopt forms of behaviour that they feel are appropriate to them under the circumstances that they perceive are imposed upon them by their societal holding environment. The resultant behaviour is the societal culture [Stapley 1996].

It may be helpful to explore what we mean by 'society in the mind' [Turquet 1974; Armstrong, Rustin 2015]. As a starting point we may refer to the notion that everything we psychologically consider to be us is part of this mental construct, but it may also help to return to the experience in the maternal holding environment for clarification. At the outset, before integration, the 'mother in the mind', was but a mental construct. The mother was experienced as being part of the baby – part of the self. After integration, mother was identified as a separate object, as a 'not me'. Again, this was a mental construct of mother as perceived (an artificial creation). The original and subsequent 'objects' were both introjected and became part of the infant's inner world 'the mother in the mind'. In a similar manner, both the 'organisation in the mind' and the 'society in the mind' are mental constructs based on our perception of an or-

ganization or society and introjected in the same manner as was mother.

In much the same way that personality develops out of the inter-relatedness of the infant with the mother and later the maternal and family holding environments, so also does culture develop out of the inter-relatedness of the adult members of society with their societal holding environment. The reason we develop a culture is the same as the reason why we develop a personality. We could no more exist in a world that is kaleidoscopic and ever changing, than we could lead a kaleidoscopic personal life. There needs to be a considerable degree of constancy, and this is provided for by both personality and culture. As with mother, members of society develop a culture which is a sort of trusted framework which provides them with containment. The 'object' which is culture evolves as the successor to the object which was the mother.

Taking the argument forward it is suggested that the reason why we develop an organisational (and other) culture is to provide for our consistency, confirmation and continuity. We simply could not exist if we relied upon a kaleidoscopic environment that was constantly changing. Through the process of developing a culture (the way things are done around here), members of a society have a reasonable idea of what to expect in any given circumstances. As with the mother, members of society develop a culture which is a sort of trusted framework which provides them with containment. The object which is 'culture' evolves as the successor to the object that was 'mother'.

We will recall the importance of attachment needs. This need continues throughout our lives and it is the need for a response, and especially a favourable response, which provides individuals with their main stimulus to socially acceptable behaviour. People abide by the mores of their societies quite as much because they desire approval as because they fear punishment.

The purpose of culture is to provide the same sort of trusted framework that mother provided.

Defining, describing, and understanding societal culture is indeed a difficult task. But we can say that societal (or organizational) culture is characterised by the following:

1. It is a psycho-social process.
2. It is evidenced by sameness and continuity to provide for the self-esteem of the members and their sense of reality with others.
3. Being a psychological as well as a social process it is influenced by conscious and unconscious processes.
4. Both the uniqueness of the collective, perceived view of the members of the society and the societal holding environment results in a unique culture in every society and part of a society.
5. Because groups are ongoing structures as opposed to finished ones, it is a dynamic and changing process.
6. The members of a group, organisation or society will produce forms of behaviour which they consider will be psychologically advantageous to them under the conditions they perceive are imposed on them by the environment [Stapley 1996; 2006].

From these we can see the way that group (and organizational) cultures form and how, once a group culture and identity is established, there rapidly develop notions of 'us' and 'them', with all who are 'us' being included and all those who are identified as 'them' excluded. There also develops a psychological boundary around the 'us' and 'them'. Being able to develop multiple identities, individual members of the group (or organization) develop an identity that is in keeping with the culture. This brings a considerable degree of stability and continuity to the group (or organization) which is experienced at both the group and individual level. With culture existing to provide the continuity, consistency and confirmation that we all require, it is important to our existence and it seems unlikely that we will act contrary to it lightly. We can now begin to understand why the deep seated relevance that culture has to all organisations is important in regard to the meaning of work for both individuals and groups.

Cultures exists for a reason, here it is posited that they are a form of social system developed to enable members of an organisation (or society), to act in an appropriate manner under the circumstances imposed on them by the organisational environment. Cultures confirm and maintain a social order which also provides order for the internal worlds of individuals. New modes of looking at the world, new meanings, or just new ways of doing things, all threaten to destroy that shared reality on which social and individual order is felt to depend. Hence anxiety and resistance are evoked, in this respect the notion that when our world begins to crumble we also crumble is highly relevant.

I shall now move on to two known group-as-a-whole perspectives seen in the light of organizational culture: those concerning 'sentient groups' and 'social systems as a defence against anxiety'. Perhaps it is helpful to be aware that culture was even less a consideration in the 1960's and 1970's than it is today. In regard to 'sentience' Miller and Rice [1967], said they had considered many words – commitment, identity, affiliation and cathexis – to denote the groups to which human beings identify themselves. They chose to talk of a sentient group to refer to a group that demands and receives loyalty from its members. Considered from the perspective of organizational culture we might regard all of the words raised as highly relevant.

The world of members of an organization is a continual inter-relatedness with the organisation in the mind that will result in a perception of the conditions that the environment is imposing on them. From this position they will adopt forms of behaviour that they feel are psychologically advantageous to them. In this way each organization (and sometimes part of an organization) develops a unique and distinct culture. Where the organization in the mind results in a perception of an environment that is positive in that it provides consistency, continuity and confirmation (a good enough environment), the members of the organization will strongly identify to the organization and be committed to the organization cognitively, psychologically and emotionally. This will result in what we might refer to as a sentient or task culture.

Seeing task systems and sentient systems as separate and distinct phenomena, as did Miller and Rice, is unhelpful and mi-

sleading. Through a process of external interaction and internal interpretation both task and sentience are combined to develop the organization in the mind. From here, the world of members of an organization is a continual interrelatedness with the organisation in the mind that results in the adoption of forms of behaviour that they feel is psychologically advantageous to them. Interestingly, Miller and Rice refer to the work of Menzies Lyth in terms of groups becoming committed to a system and then being reluctant to engage in change. Seen from a culture perspective, one which provides the consistency, continuity and confirmation, this may not be surprising. There are not two separate phenomena occurring, and seeing sentience as a form of culture enables us to be clearer about what needs to be done to ensure that a culture of sentience pertains.

Moving to 'social systems as a defence against anxiety', here Menzies Lyth [1959] stated that the social system as developed become a part of the culture; when we apply social systems as a defence against anxiety in the context of organizational culture, I believe it is more accurate to state that it is the culture. As has been said, organizational culture develops out of the interrelatedness of the members of the organization with the holding environment and that the holding environment is viewed through the process of developing an organization in the mind. Where significant parts of the task result in unbearable and unthinkable anxiety members of an organization are likely to view the holding environment as not good enough. This may then lead to them adopting forms of behaviour that are a defence against that anxiety. This invariably results in what we might refer to as an intransigent culture, one which in this instance seeks to provide the necessary consistency, continuity and confirmation through the avoidance of pain and anxiety.

Knowing how and why culture develops and the purpose of culture enables us to have a deeper understanding of organizational dynamics. It also provides opportunities for influencing organizational culture. Understanding why a sentient, task supportive culture has developed and exists provides leaders and managers with the opportunity to replicate the conditions and to maintain that culture. Equally, understanding why and how an intransigent, defensive culture develops, and the purpose of that culture, provides organizational leaders and managers with the opportunity to work at the boundary, as opposed to being encultured and to work to bring about necessary transformations in organizations without creating greater intransigence.

In regard to intransigent, defensive cultures we can identify the task or environment as being highly influential in regard to the nature of the culture developed. Being a group-as-a-whole phenomenon it is likely that the culture will include senior managers who will also act in the same way as others in the organization. In other situations the members of the organization may regard the task as benign and it will not have much of an influence on the culture. It does seem that in most circumstances, based on cognitive, psychological and emotional experiences, the perception of the members of the organization around the roles and behaviours of senior managers is a significant factor in determining their perception of the organization in

the mind. It follows therefore, that they may be a significant factor in the development of organizational culture. The following vignettes may support this notion.

British Petroleum (BP): as a global organisation engaged in the field of exploration and development of the recovery of fossil fuels, BP is in a highly competitive industry that is also having to face up to declining global resources at a time of concerns about pollution by their products. At the public interface BP seniors portrayed themselves as having important 'green' credentials: part of that portrayal being the development of a new logo. The experience within the organization was doubtless one of great concern for their ability to develop new resources and meet the needs of shareholders. The bottom line was pre-eminent to their needs. A way of maintaining the bottom line was to reduce costs, including maintenance costs. A consequence is that members of the organisation developed an organization in the mind where maintenance and safety was not important and that rewards went to getting the product out of the ground. Members of BP then adopted forms of behaviour that they felt psychologically appropriate to them under the conditions they perceived were imposed on them by this environment, and an organizational culture developed whereby the way things were done around here was to ignore safety and maintenance and concentrate on getting the product out of the ground. An outcome, which we are all aware of, was the deaths and pollution in the Gulf of Mexico, which cost BP billions of dollars.

Independent Television (ITV): ITV is one of the main commercial terrestrial television providers in the UK. A few years ago they were faced with declining advertising revenues as a result of an operating environment affected by technological change in the world of communications. These were desperate times as other new advertising outlets were seriously impinging on what had been their exclusive territory. The same question as affected BP arose, how do we achieve profits and keep shareholders content. In the television business the practice of fraudulent 'phone-ins' had been prevalent for some while. At this stage, senior managers mobilized programme makers and producers to increase the income streams. One such opportunity was the adoption of the 'scams' around 'phone-ins' whereby millions of pounds were being fraudulently received. No information was supplied to members of society about a cut off time when calls would be invalid. There is no suggestion that senior managers proposed or controlled such activities – they simply ignored them. A culture had developed whereby the organisation in the mind was perceived as demanding revenue and it does not matter how you do it. A (seemingly) mild form of fraudulent behaviour had been adopted to be part of the organizational culture to the extent that one third of all income was now being fraudulently obtained.

The bottom line has also become highly influential in the public sector where the culture is greatly affected by the demands to meet goals. For example, in the UK's National Health Service (NHS), the current organization in the mind is seen as being about meeting objectives as against that of previous times which was about patient care. Thus the members adopt forms of behaviour that they feel are psychologically advantageous to

them and a culture develops that is primarily about meeting goals, such a culture providing them with their needed consistency, continuity and confirmation.

A greater awareness of the way that organizational culture develops will enable a different view of the meaning of work. In the vignettes above, if the senior management concerned had understood the significance of the perception of their roles and behaviours, they might have realized the implications for the organizational culture that was likely to be developed. If they had been aware that their behaviour in extremely anxiety provoking circumstances, and the perception of that behaviour by the members of the organization in formulating their view of the organization in the mind would lead to the development of a culture that would be psychologically advantageous to them, this may well have caused them to reflect on their situation and act in a different manner.

As regards the meaning of work, it will be appreciated that the organizational cultures that were developed in these vignettes were all embracing affecting and controlling the behaviour of all members of the organizations concerned. The way things are done around here is totally and utterly influenced by the organisational culture. This will invariably include senior and other managers who will also be part of the culture and collude with the continuance of the culture that is now providing them with consistency, continuity and confirmation at the social, psychological and emotional levels (turkeys do not vote for Christmas).

An awareness of the way culture develops and the purpose of culture may enable senior managers to stay at the boundary and not be influenced by the culture, while at the same time to be aware of why it is operating in this way and what purpose it is serving for the members of the organization. They may then be able to adopt forms of leadership and management behaviour over those influences that they control that will transform the current 'organisation held in the mind' by members of the organization with a resulting change in the organizational culture. They may also be able to provide an understanding and holding environment while the culture is being transformed.

References

- Armstrong D., Rustin M., 2015, *Social Defences Against Anxiety*, Karnac, London.
- Bion W., 1961, *Experiences in Groups and Other Papers*, Tavistock, London.
- Erikson E., 1959, *Identity and the Life Cycle*, Norton, London.
- Jaques E., 1955, *Social Systems as a Defence Against Persecutory and Depressive Anxiety*, [in:] *New Directions in Psycho-Analysis*, Klein M., Heimann P., Money-Kyrle P.E. (eds.), Tavistock, London.
- Kets De Vries M., Miller D., 1987, *The Neurotic Organisation*, Jossey-Bass, London.
- Menzies Lyth I., 1988, *Containing Anxiety in Institutions: Selected Essays Vol. 1*, Free Association Books, Karnac, London
- Miller E.J., 1976, *Task and Organisation*, John Wiley, London.
- Miller E.J., Rice K., 1967, *Systems of Organisation: Task and Sentient Systems and their Boundary Control*, Tavistock, London.
- Schore A.N., 2012, *The Science of the Art of Psychotherapy*, Norton, New York.
- Stapley L.F., 1996, *The Personality of the Organisation: A Psychodynamic Explanation of Culture and Change*, Free Association Books, London.
- Stapley L.F., 2006, *Individuals, Groups and Organisations Beneath the Surface*, Karnac, London.
- Trist E., 1990, *Culture as a Psycho-social Process*, [in:] *The Social Engagement of Social Science: A Tavistock Anthology*, Trist E., Murray H. (eds.), Free Association Books, London.
- Turquet P., 1974, *Leadership, the Individual and the Group*, [in:] *Analysis of Groups*, Gibbard, Hartmann, Mann (eds.), Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Winnicott D.W., 1957, *The Child and the Outside World*, Tavistock, London.
- Winnicott D.W., 1965, *The Family and Individual Development*, Tavistock, London.
- Winnicott D.W., 1971, *Playing and Reality*, Harmondsworth, Penguin.