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2. QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

2.1 Overview
This appendix presents and analysis the qualitative data obtained from the semi-structured interviews conducted on completion of the questionnaire. Section 2.1, provides an overview of the data collection process and the key aspect of the protocol required to maintain validity. Section 2.2 presents a summary of the data analysed by group-type and Section 2.3 presents an analysis of the respondent’s answers to each question. The full detail of each group’s response is provided at Section 2.4. Section 2.5 contains a table of the groups approached, type of approach and response.

2.1.1 Groups Interviewed
Overall 103 groups in a wide spread of different organisational environments were approached, of these 18 responded providing a total of 100 questionnaires to provide the quantitative data. Each group also undertook a semi-structured interview that provided qualitative data. The groups interviewed varied from individual representatives to collections of 24 people, see Table 2.1 and Sections 2.4, 2.5. Of the 100 questionnaires returned 9 had one or more missing answers, only one had no answers. Non answers by group-type are shown at appendix 3. Two organisations agreed to allow their personnel to be interviewed provided their names were not recorded and one organisation did not want itself named as well. In these cases the names were coded with initials.

2.1.2 Key Aspects of Protocol

2.1.2.1 Context
For every group interviewed the importance of context was explained. Frequently groups wanted to take home the questionnaire rather than complete it in the group setting; however, strong evidence from Social Identity Theory\(^1\) shows that context is important to make the group’s identity salient. Interviewing each group in its environment, such as its place of work, meeting place, office or business area was necessary to invoke the correct identity.

2.1.2.2 Consensus
After the introduction it was explained to the group that while the questionnaire elicited individual answers from the group, the semi-structured interviews were looking for group consensus on the examined subjects. Therefore, the expression “can we agree on an answer” was frequently to be used in eliciting a response during the semi-structured interview, however, it was often the case that individuals had different responses and when this was encountered all answers were recorded.

2.1.2.3 Face-to-Face Approach and Social Exchange
The initial approach to many organisations was made by correspondence, either letter or email; however, this had a very poor success ratio. Thereafter, a face-to-face methodology was tried with greater success. The pilot group had suggested improving this face-to-face methodology with a social exchange. That is, people felt that in filling in the questionnaire they were “doing something for you”. This elicited a feeling that you needed to be “doing something for them”; something that could be seen as a social exchange. The pilot group had suggested that this could be achieved by providing chocolate snacks as people filled in the questionnaire and answered the questions.

2.1.2.4 Order of Proceedings
Since the semi-structured interviews elicited a consensus it was necessary to conduct the questionnaire prior to any discussion to prevent peoples’ answers from being “framed” by the interchange. However, since it was important to set the context for the questionnaire to ensure that the group identity was salient the first five questions (up to “if we are us who is them?”) of the qualitative semi-structured interview were asked before the questionnaire, while the rest were asked on its completion.

2.1.2.5 Clarifying Questions
Despite running a pilot study several questions had to be explained to people as they were completing the questionnaire as it became clear, during the course of the research, that the meaning of the questions were too obscure.

---

2.2 Analysis of Answers by Group-Type

2.2.1 Group Type 1 – Business

All of the *business groups* associated themselves with an identity that had the most *prestige* and gave them the greatest *self-esteem*. When asked about the *social-value* or *prestige* of their group, it was evident that the research subjects were acutely aware of the relationships and the relative social standing of the different aspects of their job, picking the one that put them in the best light. Gp 2, a coffee shop group, believed it had the highest standing as an organisation amongst its rivals and so the individuals of this group discussed its brand name and its place on the high street, while Gps 3 & 5, also coffee shops, but of less standing, were keener to discuss their association with what they saw as a highly regarded profession. Gp 6 was from the more traditional end of the cafe business and was, therefore, unable to use either high standing or profession to derive *prestige*; however, as a ‘single gender group’ they focused on gender to grow *self-esteem* and a sense of *identity*. The *commercial business groups* generally suffered with poor *social-value*. Gp 9 had a serious problem due to social stigma of both its organization and its profession and this had a detrimental effect on the group’s *self-esteem*. Gps 14 and 15 felt that their groups were not valued at all. Gp 15 was in open conflict with its management.

Surprisingly given the poor view of commercialism in the modern world those working in the *business groups* were keen to indicate that they worked to high *ideals*. Their *ideals* differed substantially from the concepts used by other groups, they were unique in using words such as “hard work”, “trustworthy” to describe what they valued, and one group (Gp 14) felt that their “professionalism” stood for high *ideals*.

When asked “who is ‘us’” the groups provided identities that correlated with the *prestige* associations discussed earlier. This was either the brand name of their organisation, i.e. their meta-group (Gp 2, 5, 9), the team that they worked with (Gp 6, 15), or their profession (Gp 3, 5, 14). When it came to defining the *purpose* of their group, two groups named their meta-groups as their *purpose* (Gps 2, 9) while the remainder named their profession or aspects of their profession.

The *salience* of these identities was mixed. The identity that the groups gave was rarely *salient* outside of the workplace except with those groups that had named their identity as their *profession* or in the case of Gp 6, who frequently met socially. Yet, despite having named different sources of identity the *business groups* (Gps 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 14 and 15) nearly all tended to see themselves as a ‘team’, in other words, when asked, the members being interviewed normally said that those present made up “the whole group”. This fitted the fact that these same groups gave a description of *prototypicality* for their ‘work group’ that differed from the *prototypicality* given for their managers; suggesting a lack of cohesion and power sharing within the *meta-group*. This was the case even when they were part of a larger organisation and even when they had named the *meta-group* as their identity. The coffee shop groups tended to identify the *prototypicality* of their groups based on age, while Gps 6 and 14 included gender. Gp 9 was based on the personality trait of “trustworthiness” and Gp 15 was based on profession.

The coffee shop business groups (Gp 2, 3, 5 &6) saw their leader as their local manager or supervisor who was very much seen as part of the group and “one of us”. The other business groups, however, quoted the most senior member of the group (Gp 9, 14), deferring to the organisational ‘workgroup’ leader. The final business group (Gp 15) all spoke out against their leadership and management (Gp 15).

The *business groups* were divided into two distinct sets, namely; those that saw their business competitors (Gps 2, 3, 5, 14) as the *out-group* and those that saw their own management (Gps 6, 9, 15) as the *out-group*. It is possible that more groups would have been found in this category had the high status groups in many of the organisations approached not had control of ‘identity ownership’ and blocked access for research. The coffee shop business groups (Gps 2, 3, 5, 6) used *in-group favouritism* to defined themselves as somehow “better” than their rivals. The conventional business groups (Gps 9, 14, 15) derogated their out-group rivals as “disorganised”, “elitist” and “without values”.

The coffee shop business groups tended to see themselves as isolated teams, and although they sometimes derived *prestige* and *self-esteem* from their parent organisations the need for them to work as a close group overruled other sources of *social value*. The members of those groups that tended to see themselves as ‘teams’ all stated specific areas of work as the source of their *self-value*, such as “I am good with the till”, while in Gp 6, which was a single gender group, the individuals achieved *self-
value more for personality traits, such as “I get on well with everybody”. The conventional business groups (Gp 9, 14, 15) struggled to identify specific areas where they felt valued as individuals.

The business groups had different levels of apparent normative behaviour. Gp 2 was a ‘mature’ group where the normative behaviour appeared to have become established, newcomers to the group reported that "initially getting accepted by the other members was hard". Gp 3, 5 did not provide any evidence of normative behaviour. Gp 6 was hard to assess as the group had a focus on gender to achieve social-value. This meant that they had strong gender norms which made it hard to identify any specific group norms. New joiners reported that they fitted in easily, which would make sense because they would already have been accustomed to the gender norms required. Gp 9 was the group with one of the longest membership times. Members reported that fitting in always took time which would suggest that group norms were evident. Gp 14 again reported difficulty with new joiners suggesting the presence of group norms, while there was little evidence of normative behaviour in Gp 15.

The coffee shop business groups (Gp 2, 3, 5 and 6) appeared very much as hard-working teams that toiled together to achieve the explicit purpose of the organisation. They varied, however, in the degree that they worked as social groups. Gp 2 showed mature normative behaviours and worked together in their role as a coherent team stating that "it's hard work and it gets very busy but we enjoy it". Gp 3, 5 worked together well stating that "we get on well together-we have a great time", while Gp 6 reported that "we all know what we have to do and how to do it". However, these groups also reported higher levels of "gossip" suggesting that there were increased levels of concern over internal activities and some issues with harmony. Two of the commercial business groups (Gp 9, 14) claimed that they worked together well, although they admitted that they did not socialise outside of work. Gp 15 appeared to be in open conflict with its management and did not appear to have any cohesion or coherence. All of the business groups reported that they gossiped about each other's behaviours within the context of the group. Gp 9 stated that "we gossip about each other all the time; promotion, work everything", Gp 14 stated that they gossiped about a "wide range of issues that ranged from social to professional". Gp 15 stated that their gossip consisted of "we whinge a lot".

All of the business groups were very aware of their vulnerability from commercial pressures and the fact that their organisations would cease to be viable if that business failed. Ultimately to determine the closure of these groups the question is whether or not they are dependent or autonomous from their environments. If the social groups are dependent on organisations then when the organisations fail so will the social group. If the groups are autonomous then they will continue when, or if, the organisation fails. Only one of the business groups, namely Gp 6, reported that the group readily met out of work indicating that despite the work environment they still continued as a social group and could possibly maintain their identity no matter what happened to the organisation they were aligned with. Quite a number of the groups, however, identified with their profession rather than their organisation and the question then becomes whether or not their profession is the focus of the closure.

All of the business groups reported that they did not discuss the way forward as a social group and sometimes even as a business group. The reason for this was that the groups interviewed were frequently not part of the management structure which often had ‘exclusive rights’ to planning. This is a fundamental issue in power sharing at the high levels of recursion of the group and significantly impacted on the requisite variety and viability of the groups.

2.2.2 Group Type 2 – Social

Neither of the social groups (Gps 8 and 18) felt that they had much social standing or prestige in the wider social environment; reporting that they were not that "well known or understood" but that they were "respected" by those that knew them. The two groups identified themselves differently, one as the reason they met, the other with a clear meta-group label. Both groups represented all, or nearly all, of the members and saw their purposes as the activities they undertook when they met as a group. Gp 18 appeared to have a strong, well-known identity, however, this identity had not been locally generated and it appeared that the group called on the prestige of its parent organisation to maintain self-esteem. The other social group, Gp 8, was associated with each individual’s personal identity, as the group identity itself was very immature, due to the lack of salience of the group to its members. The salience of the identities varied, for one group (Gp 8) the identity was weak and was not relevant away from the group, while the other (Gp18) had some members who were very active in
the group for whom it had high relevance “a good deal of the time” but the other members reported no relevance at all between meetings saying the group was salient only “when we meet”.

The social groups did not report strong beliefs or ideals, preferring instead to comment about “shared interests”. Gp 8 suggested that its prototypicality was “interest based”, while Gp18 produced an “age, gender and class definition”. Both groups found it hard to answer who their rivals or out-groups were and tended to settle for “not us”.

Members from the social groups (Gp 8, 18) found it hard to find areas where they could achieve something ‘unique’ to develop self-value. There tended to be a few people who ran and organised the activities while the rest only participated at meetings if they wanted to; Gp 8 “they could contribute and have a say if they wanted to”, Gp 18 “no not really we don’t get a chance” or “we just sit and listen most of the time” or ”you have to be prepared to do something special”. Most individuals based their assessment of the value of their self-esteem on a general feeling of well-being to describe their level of benefit of group membership with those from Gp 8 reporting that they did not benefit greatly and those from Gp 18 suggesting that “I like coming here” and “I wouldn’t come if I didn’t like it”.

It was difficult to tell whether these groups were guided by social norms or were developing group norms. Gp 18 members reported having to learn to adapt “when they joined”, but Gp 8 did not appear to identify any conventions. Both appeared to work together with a degree of coherence by using traditional office mechanisms such as meetings and agendas to maintain cohesion, and did not report much ‘gossip’. Gp 18 members reported that there was “good harmony”. They were largely autonomous, that is to say there were no other associated groups or levels of recursion and, being locally-made constructs were insulated from the outside world. Serving no other purpose than for their own members and therefore would appear to achieve system closure if they were viable systems. They both reported varied levels of effort at discussing the future.

2.2.3 Group Type 3 – Religious

The religious groups (Gps 1 &17) were very clear about their identity and named themselves as both sub-group and meta-group, seeing themselves as one entity. Neither group was concerned about the prestige of the group, reporting that they were “not that well known or understood” in society but that they were respected by those that knew them. Prestige did not appear to play a part in the way they chose to define their identity. This was because both groups were founded in strong ideals and beliefs that supported the group. Gp 1 stated that their organisation had “developed and maintained” their ideals over many years, while Gp 17 felt that they were held together by their “strong faith”. Gp 1 had a very strong ethos but at the same time effective power sharing arrangements and no hierarchy, while Gp 17 had a defined hierarchy, clear roles but equitable power sharing arrangements. The members of both groups were very active in running their group and attempting to build individual and a local identity at the same time. Both saw that the purpose of their groups was to conduct the activities that they undertook when they met as a group, in line with their identity. The groups were highly salient to their members, who reported that the ideals and beliefs of the group were relevant to them “in their daily lives” and not just when the group met.

Of the religious groups, Gp 1 represented a good cross section of the local church, while Gp 17 represented only a small set of the full membership; however, this group were the main part of the church hierarchy and so could have been seen to represent a significant sub-group.

The groups were not easily able to recognise out-groups or rivals, although a variety of suggestions were given from “people outside the group” to “other parts of the organisation” but then they were pushed to explain how these individuals were different from them, with the only suggestions being “we have a faith” for the former and “more welcoming”, and “more active” for the latter. Both groups also found it hard to identify a typical member, “we are very open to all”, although when socialised, several standard behaviours emerged. Neither group was able to recognise personalities that were different from this prototypicality within the groups’ hierarchies, Gp 17 reporting of their leaders and management “we are the same” while Gp 1 members stated that “the individuals of the group and the rest of the organisation serve the same purpose, there is no separation between us”.

The individual members of both groups found it hard to find areas where they could make a unique place for themselves in the group to create self-value. It was not determined why this was, whether the groups were simply not active enough, whether people were not interested, or whether the group identity was inherited along with the roles for people to undertake, leaving no room for members to
make a place for themselves. Those in the hierarchy of Gp 17 felt "they [the other members] appreciate that we do all the organizing". In Gp 1 “a sizable proportion felt that they were not recognised for any unique contribution.”

Both groups showed very strong signs of normative behaviour. The groups were very mature and clearly had norms and rituals that directed their activities. New joiners reported that they had trouble “fitting in” but were "guided" in the ways of the organisation.

Gp 1 was unique in having mechanisms to assist coherence. There was also a remarkably high level of trust between individuals, and the members reported little if no “gossip”. Individuals from Gp 17 however, felt that there were "disagreements from time to time mainly over future plans but otherwise the group worked together well". The groups did not see their managers as a ‘leader’ but more as an “elected representative”. Both reported processes for discussing the future of the group.

Gp 1 had no hierarchy and was very insistent on power-sharing arrangements throughout the group’s organisation. A large proportion of the group was seen and no sub-groups were detected. The group behaved as a single entity. Gp 17 was part of a larger structure, although, the members interviewed did not see a difference between the prototypicality of the other parts of the wider group and themselves.

Both groups did not appear to be dependent on any systems in the social environment suggesting that they had achieved system closure and a high degree of viability.

2.2.4 Group Type 4 – Institution

The members from both institutional groups (Gp 4 and 7) were all very aware that they were just a part of a much larger organisation which they did not think had a high social standing, although they felt that they offered a ‘unique service’ and that this was ‘appreciated’ by the public. As a result they tended to categorize themselves by their ‘sub-group’ or team, from which they appeared to gain more self-esteem rather than their organisation which they felt lacked prestige. Both groups claimed that they had guiding ideals and beliefs which focused on their ‘service to the public’. Gp 7 was salient with its members “24/7” while Gp 4 had a very weak scope, stating that the group had no relevance outside of work. When asked to indicate the purpose of their group they stated their individual sub-group functions. Gp 7 appeared to almost distance themselves from their organisational identity and strongly associated with sub-identities as different ‘tribes’. Gp 4 struggled with its identity. The group appeared to get most of its prestige from its purpose as a ‘national service’, locally; however, they were not a strong entity although they appeared united, although resigned, against their national management.

In Gp 7 the sub-groups had clearly different prototypicalities that matched their purpose. These were obvious even to an external observer, for example; individuals from one sub-group came dressed to the interview wearing definite symbols (tattoos, badges, style of dress) in a manner that clearly indicated their sub-group and its purpose. All the members were highly aware of the intra-group differences in prototypicality.

The members from Gp 4 could not identify unique areas where they were appreciated by the rest of their group to develop self-value, while those in Gp 7 had clearly established unique sub-identities and within those had created identities or utilized their personal identities to enable them to be appreciated by their peers. When asked what it was that they were appreciated for, the members of Gp 7 gave very diverse responses that were focused exclusively on personality traits, such as “good with the public”, “realistic” and “understanding people”.

Both groups named their own management as the out-group. They both saw a difference in the prototypicality between themselves and their management indicating a lack of cohesion and coherence in the group. Gp 7 felt that their management were ‘in it for themselves’, while Gp 4 did not identify the out-group character. The members of both groups felt that the individuals in management did not have legitimacy, they did not “follow” anyone as such “the supervisor says what we do”. Gp 7 displayed a difference between the individual members with those in high status positions indicating more self-esteem than those in lower positions.

With the institutional groups, Gp 7 showed very strong signs of normative behaviour within each of the individual ‘tribes’, “there’s a very set way things are done”, “it takes a while to get used to who everybody is”, “you have to tread carefully when you join” - “only the right sort of person can do this
job", however the different sub-groups had different norms, "the ....are different from us" or "they like to....". There were clear signs of different dress codes amongst the different sub-groups. Gp 4 showed very few signs, the members said that they had fitted in but making friends took "awhile". Neither group reported working with cohesion, coherence or harmony. Gp 4 stated that "we are always changing the way we do things" while Gp 7 felt that there was "not a lot of harmony and they did not work together as well as they could stating "we have our differences". Both groups indicated that gossip was "rife" and "we are grumbling and moaning about most things".

At first glance the institutional groups appeared dependent on the social environment and therefore vulnerable to perturbations, they are after all public services. However, if the systems focus is shifted to a high level of recursion, namely that of society, the public services become function providers for the community. That is they are part of societies System 2. Since System 2 is an emergent property of a VSM it is possible that these institutions ‘automatically’ come into existence where society exists (obviously not always in the exact same form). In this argument institutions are not viable systems in themselves but functions of a viable system (while the Recursive System Theorem states that "In a recursive organisational structure, any viable system contains, and is contained in, a viable system.” (Beer 1990 p118) this refers to the System 1s and not every element of a VSM as this would be impossible) this could indicate why the institutions examined in the research appeared to have pathological autopoirosis because they are not threatened and appear to their members to have an inherent right to exist.

Both institutional groups (Gp 4, 7) indicated that they did not discuss the future at all.

2.2.5 Group Type 5 – Charity

The charity groups (Gps 10, 11, 12, 13 &16) all identified themselves by their meta-group name, even when they were just affiliates of a wider network. All reported that they were not that well known or understood in society but that they were respected by those that knew them. The association of the local group with its wider affiliates was seen as an attempt to enhance the prestige of the group. The groups all had very strong identities except for Gp 10, despite not being well known in public, which indicated "what they did" and provided them with their purpose. The lack of a wider acknowledgement did not seem to disturb the members who normally stated “we are appreciated by the people who know us” and “what we do is worthwhile” both of which derived self-esteem and therefore there was little need for external appreciation, for instance Gp 11; “the group was a very small little known charity that was still forming; however the dedication of the members was obvious”. The charity groups all reported that the groups’ ideals “filled their lives” and that they achieved their self-esteem from the social-value of the work they did indicating that it was “worthwhile”, Gp 12 members stated “we all believe in what we are doing - in trying to help people”. Most of the members had also found a ‘unique place’ for themselves with high levels of self-value, interacting as individuals with the group over a wide range of characteristics and activities; Gp 12 members said "yes I feel appreciated - I help with a wide range of jobs - we are a very small team.”, in Gp 13 the members interviewed mainly provided answers that related to people skills "I am good at communications", "I have patience", I am a good listener", "I try to be a problem solver", "I try to bring the clients point of view". One member said "I could earn more at Sainsbury’s if I wanted but what I do here is worthwhile"; nearly all the groups identified a prototype by traits, such as “kind and caring”; Gp 11, however, also identified by gender and activity Each member reported undertaking different functions that they felt they were valued for "I organise the events", "I do the art work".

The groups were not able to readily identify out-group or rivals and found the question hard to answer, giving a wide variety of answers from "the council" to "the clients" to "not us" a Gp 12 member stated “them is the people that make the ‘red tape’ that stops us doing what we need to do”, and also a positive ‘them” “the people that we interact with”. When asked how these groups were different from them they were normally unable to answer, although Gp 13 stated "we are more trustworthy than the clients" and "the logistics group are patronising".

The charity groups were very hard to assess for group norms. Several of the groups (Gp 12, 13) gave indications of interaction with new joiners, in particular; the statement "you have to be a certain type to work here" indicated that there could well have been pre-established norms based around behaviours and attitudes and that these norms tended to cause people to self-select or self- deselect with or from the group. All reported working as close teams with harmony and trust. A member from Gp 13 reported "you have to be very careful when dealing with the clients - they are very diverse so we need to all support each other". "We need to trust and rely on each other". The charities frequently use the word "worthwhile" or "we believe in what we are doing" in their reply to questions, and it was this
purpose, linked to their identity that drove their cohesion and coherence. While several of the groups had a manager none of them had a leader ‘per se’; “we are all accountable to each other” was a typical reply. The groups did not report that they gossiped much. Gp 12 stated that they "gossiped in a positive way".

Examining the closure of the charities was a difficult problem; however, all of them appeared to be in sectors where there was an endless need for their assistance. So as long as they were able to maintain viability there was nothing in the social environment that would cause them to fail. They all reported varied levels of effort at discussing the future.
2.3 Analysis of Answers by Question

2.3.1 Setting Questions

These questions provided the background data for the study and the identification numbers necessary for cross referencing. The names of the groups are not shown here for confidentiality but are available on the researchqualitative.xlsx database.

Coded as:

NAME – Name of group (database only for confidentiality); string value.
APPROACH_ORDER – Approach number ID; sequential number.
GROUP_ID – Group ID number in analysis; sequential number.
GROUP_TYPE - Organisation type; 1 = business, 2 = social group, 3 = religious group, 4 = institution, 5 = charity.
APPROACH_METHOD – Approach method; 1 = letter, 2 = email, 3 = phone call, 4 = face to face.
AGREED – Agreed to be interviewed; yes, no.

2.3.2 VSM Meta-System - Salient Identity (Who is us?)

Question – “Who is us?”

This was a straight forward question that asked the group ‘who’ they identified themselves as. It was considered important to ask this question ‘in situ’ with the group because the saliences of social identities are context sensitive.

Coded as WHOS_US - “Who is us - we are…. ?” string variable

Groups differed widely across a broad spectrum of context as to how they answered this question. Three business groups (Gp 2, 5, 9) categorized themselves as the meta-group, possibly demonstrating a strong corporate identity. The other business groups associated more as work groups (Gp 6, 15) or by their profession (Gp 3, 5, 14). Institutional groups (Gp 4 and 7) tended to categorize themselves by their team rather than their organisation although they found it difficult to answer. The religious groups (Gps 1 &17) were clear and named themselves as both sub-group and meta-group. The two social groups (Gps 8 & 18) labelled themselves differently, one as the reason for meeting, the other with a clear sub-group and meta-group label. Charity groups all identified themselves by their meta-group (Gps 10, 11, 12, 13 &16).

2.3.3 VSM Meta-System - Salient Identity – (When is ‘us’ relevant?)

Question – “When do you associate with this group?”

This question raised the issue of when ‘us’ was, and was not, salient. Of particular interest was if people stated that the group identity was salient away from the group’s area of business or outside the group. This indicated the ‘strength’ and ‘relevance’ of the identity and to some degree its ‘closure’.

Coded as - WHENSALIENT - “When is ‘us’ salient…. ?” string variable

From the data, business groups rarely met outside of their workplace with the exception of Gp 6; however, one business group (Gp 14) claimed that the profession, from which they inherited their identity, was relevant to them outside of their workplace and several said that when asked they would state the profession as their identity. Social groups varied, for one group (Gp 8) the identity of the group, per se, was not relevant away from the group but the identity of the subject area of the group was, while the other (Gp18) had some members who were very active in the group for whom its relevance was apparent “a good deal of the time” while the others report no relevance between meetings at all. The members of the religious groups (Gp 1 & 17) all reported that the ideals and beliefs of the group were relevant to them “in their daily lives”. This was also the case with one of the institutional group (Gp 7) but not the other (Gp 4), for whom there was no relevance outside of work. The charity groups (Gps 10, 11, 12, 13, 16) all reported that the group “filled their lives.”
2.3.4 VSM Meta-System - Level of Recursion of Group – (Is it a sub-group, group or meta-group?)

Question – “Does this group represent the whole of ‘us’ or are you just a part?”

This question sought to identify the level of recursion of the group interviewed by providing an indication as to whether the group associated itself with the meta-system or saw themselves as a sub-group or as individuals. The discussions with groups indicated whether the group was part of a wider social or organisational structure, or was all the members. This question was important for later questions; such as when identifying ‘comparable groups’ in relation to the group being interviewed. It was also important to help identify ‘out-groups’ that were sub-groups of the same group.

Coded as METAGROUP - “Level of recursion of group….?”” string variable

The business groups (Gps 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 14 and 15) tended to see themselves as a team, in other words the members being interviewed normally made up “the whole group”. This was the case even when they were part of a larger organisation; only Gp9 openly stated that they were part of a bigger group. Both social groups represented all, or nearly all, of the members. Of the religious groups, Gp 1 represented a good cross section of the local church, while Gp 17 represented only a small set of the full membership; however, this group were the main part of the church hierarchy and so could have been seen to represent a significant sub-group. The institutional groups were all very aware that they were just a part of larger organisations while the charity groups all saw themselves as affiliates of a wider network.

2.3.5 VSM System 1, 4 – Individual/Group Identity Formation, Group Explicit Purpose – (Self-categorisation collaborative fit, prototypicality)

Question – “What do ‘we’ do?

This question sought to establish the explicit purpose of the group; indicated by the group’s principle activities. This ‘explicit’ purpose was expected to be closely associated with the function of any parent organisation if there was one. Although the research was not examining the organisation but its social groups, it was nevertheless necessary to understand the social group’s environment. It was expected that the parent group’s function would be related to the social group’s explicit purpose – This is important if the social group inherits its prestige from the parent group. A group cannot just do prestige, they must ‘do something’ to gain prestige, therefore, the group’s purpose is the mechanism for its social value.

The explicit purpose was thought, as well, to clarify the individual member’s assumptions about the group identity formation process. The explicit purpose of the group is a ‘purposive’ construct; that is the purpose attributed to it by external agents. It is, therefore, closely associated with the group’s identity and this is a key factor in the self-categorization comparative fit process which uses the principle of meta-contrast. An understanding of a group’ explicit purpose should also provide evidence towards the group’s prototypicality in so much as it provides a description of how the group is seen.

Coded as PURPOSE – “What does the group do….?”” string variable

Three of the coffee shop business groups stated their profession as their purpose (Gps 3, 5, 6), as did two of the more conventional business groups (Gps 14, 15). The remaining groups from both sets (Gps 2, 9) named their organisation as their purpose. The social groups stated the activities they undertook when they met, as did the religious groups (Gps 1, 717) and one institutional group (Gp 4). The members of the other institutional group (Gp 7) stated their individual functions. The charity groups (Gps 10, 11, 12, 13, 16) all provided a purpose of their group.

2.3.6 VSM System 1, 3 – Individual Identity Formation – Degree of Self-Value – (self-value)

Question – “Are you valued by the group for a unique contribution? What is it?”

This question sought to examine whether individuals felt they were valued by the group and how they had self-categorised themselves within the group to achieve a unique place to achieve self-value. It appears to take time for each individual to find an area in a group that they can call their own. What was surprising was how diverse this area was. It was not expected that this would cover such a wide
The interaction of new joiners to the group provided an ideal opportunity to identify how individuals had gone about finding a unique place for themselves. This sometimes involved social conflict but was seen as a System 2 function, specifically social mobility and group resource, to achieve cohesion and harmonise new joiners.

Coded as SOCIALVALUE – “Are you valued and how….?” string variable

The members of the coffee shop business groups (Gps 2, 3, 5) who tended to see themselves as ‘teams’ all stated specific areas of work as the source of their self-value, such as “I am good with the till”, while in Gp 6, which was a single gender group, the individuals felt valued more for personality traits, such as “I get on well with everybody”. The conventional business groups (Gp 9, 14, 15) struggled to identify specific areas where they felt valued as individuals. Members from the social groups (Gp 8, 18) found it hard to find areas where they could achieve something unique as did the members from the religious groups (Gps 1, 17); however, those in Gp 17, who were in the hierarchy of the organisation, were more likely to report that they felt valued for what they did. Personnel in the institutional group, Gp 4, could not identify unique areas, while those in Gp 7 had clearly established unique identities (these could have been their own personal identities, as they scored low for feeling valued for these characteristics. Lastly the charity group (Gps 10, 11, 12, 13, 16) members all reported feeling valued for a wide range of characteristics and activities.

2.3.7 VSM System 1 - Group Identity Formation – Group Distinction by Out-Group Comparison – (in-group favouritism, out-group derogation, distinctiveness)

Question – “If we are ‘us’ who is ‘them’? How do we differ from them?”

This question sought to establish if there was a defined out-group which would indicate that the group was trying to make itself more distinct through identity enhancing behaviours. If there was, the manner in which the out-group differed from “us” could provide an indication as to how the group categorised itself. The levels of in-group favouritism and out-group derogation could indicate the perceived strength of threat from the out-group. This question also provided a key indicator of the power sharing process if the group identified “them” as part of their own organisation. This would indicate the presence of sub-groups.

The answer to the question; ‘who is us’, also suggested whether there was an organisational identity or a separate group’s identity. This led to discussions on whether the group was aligned (coherent) with the organisational identity, was a distinct sub-identity or a separate identity (see ALIGNED below). Of particular interest was if the group defined themselves not by “who they were” but who “they were against” i.e. as an out-group.

Coded as; WHOSTHEM – “Who does the group see as an out-group….?” string variable

Coded as; DIFFTHEM – “How is the group different from them….?” string variable

The business groups were divided into two distinct sets, namely; those that saw their business competitors (Gps 2, 3, 5, 14) as the out-group and those that saw their own management (Gps 6, 9, 15) as the out-group. It is possible that more groups would have been found in this category had the high status groups in many of the organisations approached not had control of ‘identity ownership’ (see ID _OWNERSHIP below) and blocked access for research. Social groups (Gps 8, 18) found the question hard to answer and tended to settle for “not us”, in other words the out-group was everybody not ‘in the group’; however, this did not appear to be highly salient. The religious groups (Gps 1, 17), again found the question hard to answer and a variety of suggestions were given from “people outside the group” to “other parts of the organisation”. The institutional groups (Gps 4, 7) both named their management as the out-group while the members of the charity groups (Gps 10, 11, 12, 13 16), again
found the question hard to answer and gave a wide variety of answers from “the council” to “the clients” to “not us”.

The second question produced some answers from an in-group favouritism perspective and some from an out-group derogation one. The coffee shop business groups (Gps 2, 3, 5, 6) all defined themselves as somehow “better” than their rivals. The conventional business groups (Gps 9, 14, 15) derogated their rivals as “disorganised”, “elitist” and “without values”. The social groups (Gps 8, 18), the religious groups (Gps 1, 17) and the charity groups (Gps 10, 11, 12, 13 16) all found the question hard to answer. The social groups did not find a statement that they could agree to, the religious groups responded with in-group favouritism “we have a faith”, while the charities normally failed to respond. Gp 7 of the institutional groups said that their management “were in it for themselves”.

2.3.8 VSM System 4 - Group Identity Formation - Group Distinction – (prototypicality)

Question – “Is there a typical member of the group – give me an example?”

This question was a collective response from a discussion with the group about individual’s answers to Question 13 in the questionnaire. That asked people to close their eyes and see if they could picture a ‘typical’ member of their group with the aim of determining if the group had established ‘prototypicality’. The discussion with each group about ‘prototypicality’ also provided indications of the system closure of the group.

Coded as; PROTOTYPE – “What is the group prototype....?” string variable

The business groups Gp 2, 3 and 6 identified prototypes based on age while Gps 6 and 14 included gender. Gp 9 was based on the personality trait of “trustworthiness” and Gp 15 was based on profession. The institutional groups focused exclusively on personality traits, such as “good with the public”, “realistic” and “understanding people”. Religious groups found it hard to identify a typical member, although when socialised, several standard behaviours emerged. One social group, Gp 8 suggested it was interest based i.e. “people interested in ....”, however, the other social group, Gp 18 which was single gender, produced an “age, gender and class definition”. With the exception of Gp 11 all the charity groups (Gps 10, 12, 13, 16) identified a group prototype by traits, such as “kind and caring”; Gp 11 identified by gender.

2.3.9 VSM System 5 – Group Identity Formation Process – Assessment of Group Value – Group Implicit Purpose (entitativity, prestige, purposefulness)

Question – “How do others see your group – are you respected or ignored – How is your group unique?” “Do you play a part in the running of the group?”

Social Identity Theory posits that individuals seek high social-value through ‘wilful and purposeful engagement’ with groups and that they will have more chance of finding these if they are part of a ‘unique’ and valued group. This question therefore aims to determine if the members of the group feel that it has high standing in its social environment and whether or not they feel that they contribute to that prestige through the group’s purposefulness.

Coded as GROUPVALUE – “What is the group value....?” string variable

The business groups responded with a wide range of answers. Gp 2, a coffee shop group, reported its believed high standing as an organisation, while Gps 3 & 5, also coffee shops, reported their association with what they saw as a highly regarded profession. Gp 6 was from the more traditional side of the café business and did not benefit from the high prestige associated with the Barista profession. The commercial business groups generally suffered with poor group value; Gp 9 had a serious problem due to social stigma and this had a detrimental effect on the group’s self-esteem. Gps 14 and 15 felt that their groups were not valued at all. The religious groups (Gps 1, 17), the social groups (Gp 8, 18), and the charity groups (Gps 10, 11, 12, 13, 16) all reported that they were not that well known or understood in society but that they were respected by those that knew them. The two institutional groups (Gp 4, 7) felt that they offered a unique service and that this was appreciated by the public.
2.3.10 VSM Meta System - Strength of Identity

Overall the questions on Identity led to a summary of the strength of each group’s Identity at the various levels of recursion.

Coded as; ID_STRENGTH – “Summary of identity strength….?” string variable

The coffee shop business groups tended to see themselves as isolated teams, and although they sometimes derived prestige and self-esteem from their parent organisations the need for them to work as a close group overruled other sources of social value. That said, however, Gp 2 saw itself as the dominant group on the high street and therefore used its brand identity to derive prestige. Gp 3, 5 were unable to compete and therefore used their professional associations as high status ‘baristas’ to derive group value. Gp 6 was from the more traditional end of the cafe business and was therefore unable to use either high standing or profession to derive prestige; however, as a ‘single gender group’ they focused therefore on gender to grow self-esteem and a sense of identity.

The commercial business groups suffered from poor standing in the social environment regardless of any other considerations. Gp 9, as a banking group, suffered from the social stigma associated with the collapse of banking, however, Gp 14 and 15 attempted to use their professional standing as ‘technicians’ to develop prestige and self-esteem.

Of the institutional groups, Gp 4 struggled with its identity. The group appeared to get most of its prestige from its purpose as a ‘national service’, locally; however, they were not a strong entity although they appeared united against their national management. Gp 7 appeared to almost distance themselves from their organisational identity and strongly associated with sub-identities as different ‘tribes’. Gp 18 of the social groups appeared to have a strong well-known identity, however, this was not locally generated and it appeared that the group called on the identity of its parent organisation to maintain prestige. The other social group, Gp 8, was associated with each individual’s personal identity as the group identity itself was very immature due to the lack of salience of the group to its members. Gp 1, a religious group, had a very strong ethos and was a distinct entity; together these aspects appeared to give it a strong overall identity. The roles and the identity of the established religious organisation for Gp 17 appeared very dominant; however, the group seemed to be very active in running their group and attempting to build individual and a local identity at the same time.

The charity groups (Gp 10, 11, 12, 13, 16) had very strong identities focused around their purpose despite not being well known in public. This did not seem to disturb the members who normally stated “we are appreciated by the people who know us”. The group members also appeared to derive self-esteem from doing something worthwhile, and therefore there was little need for appreciation.

2.3.11 VSM System 1, 2 – Group cohesion/coherence process - Group Implicit Purpose – (self-categorisation normative fit – depersonalisation)

Question – “When you joined the group what made you feel uncomfortable? What made you feel like you didn’t fit? Generally do new joiners fit in easily or with difficulty – give me an example?”

This question sought to determine if normative behaviour was evident in the group. During the pilot study it became evident that specific group norms would be difficult to identify as people appeared to adapt to fit the group sub-consciously, additionally the difference between social norms and specific group norms would be difficult to distinguish.

Discussions around these questions were often difficult to get started. People did not always know why they ‘fitted’ with the group, or if the group had beliefs or ideals that were different from social norms. Beliefs were not always openly discussed or evident in some groups while forming the very basis of others; such as the religious groups. It was evident from the discussions that in some groups, where people were working in a difficult environment, they tended to bond in adversity or bond through collective purposeful action. Only one group was based on the ‘big three’ of social stereotyping; that is age, sex and race and that was Gp 18; a female social group.

People did not appear to be readily able to identify the group norms that were distinct to their group or differentiate group norms from social norms (as every group is attached to society ultimately social norms will play a part in their behaviour because of the need to maintain coherence and cohesion with the higher level of recursion). It would appear that development and adjustment to norms was almost a subconscious behaviour and this made data collection difficult. People appeared to have subconscious adjusted to automatically fit in. To identify the System 2 processes within the research
groups individuals were questioned about "when they felt uncomfortable" in the group. Many people found this hard to answer, particularly in a group setting, however, one area where it was very apparent and easily recognisable appeared to be when new people joined the group. The occasions when new joiners felt "uncomfortable" often provided examples of normative behaviour. Asking people to recall these occasions enabled some of the group norms to be identified. From the current members perspective interaction with new joiners also often identified the group norms. For instance; the most common answer to the question "how do you find new joiners" was "they think they know it all". This conflict provided an opportunity to identify two areas of interest. In the first place it identified group norms, in other words "what did the new joiners think they knew" and in the second lowest it's demonstrated the need for newcomers to establish their unique contribution, to achieve Social Value, and the threat that this often posed to established members own "unique contribution". System 2, therefore, has a very difficult task as it has to coordinate the social esteem and social value of all the individuals of a group by finding areas where they can appear to provide a unique contribution to the overall explicit purpose and cohesion of the group, this is often achieved by use of an individual identity. That is a development of their personal identity or concept of self that 'fits' the organisational identity while staying true to their self-concept.

Coded as NORMATIVE - "is there evidence of normative behaviour....?" string variable

The business groups had different levels of apparent normative behaviour. Gp 2 was a mature group where the normative behaviour appears to have become established, newcomers to the group reported that "initially getting accepted by the other members was hard". Gp 3, 5 did not provide any evidence of normative behaviour. Gp 6 was hard to assess as the group had a focus on gender to achieve social-value. This meant that they had strong gender norms which made it hard to identify any specific group norms. New joiners reported that they fitted in easily, which would make sense because they would already have been accustomed to the gender norms required. Gp 9 was the group with one of the longest membership times. Members reported that fitting in always took time which would suggest that group norms were evident. Gp 14 again reported difficulty with new joiners suggesting the presence of group norms, while there was little evidence of normative behaviour in Gp 15. With the institutional groups, Gp 7 showed very strong signs of normative behaviour within each of the individual 'tribes', however, Gp 4 showed very few signs. Both religious groups (Gp 1, 17) showed very strong signs of normative behaviour. The groups were very mature and clearly had norms and rituals that guided their activities and behaviours. New joiners reported that they had trouble "fitting in" but were "guided" in the ways of the organisation. Of the social groups (Gp 8, 18) it was difficult to tell whether these were guided by social norms or were developing group norms. The charity groups were very hard to assess for group norms. Several of the groups (Gp 12, 13) gave indications of interaction with new joiners, in particular; the statement "you have to be a certain type to work here" indicated that there could well have been pre-established norms based around behaviours and attitudes and that these strong norms tended to cause people to leave the self-select or self- deselect with or from the group.

### 2.3.12 VSM System 2, 3, 3* – Group cohesion/coherence process – Group Coherence – (social conflict, depersonalisation, network activity, algedonic signal)

Question – "Do you feel that you are a coherent group that actively works together as one? How much harmony is in the group? Are we aligned with who we are and what we do? Is there transparency and trust?"

This question aimed to identify whether the cohesion/coherence processes within the organisation ultimately produced coherence. That is the alignment of individuals through group norms by System 2, amalgamates into a social group with group synergy that is congruent with its prototypicality (including group attitudes).

Coded as COHERENT – "Are the individuals coherent as a group.....?" string variable

The coffee shop business groups (Gp 2, 3, 5 and 6) appeared very much as hard-working teams that worked together to achieve the explicit purpose of the organisation. They varied, however, in the degree that they worked as social groups. Gp 2 showed mature normative behaviours and work together in their role as a coherent team stating that "it's hard work and it gets very busy but we enjoy it". Gp 3, 5 worked together well stating that "we get on well together-we have a great time", while Gp 6 reported that "we all know what we have to do and how to do it". However, these groups also reported higher levels of "gossip" suggesting that there were increased levels of concern over internal
activities and some issues with harmony. Two of the commercial business groups (Gp 9, 14) claimed that they worked together well, although they admitted that they did not socialise outside of work. Gp 15 appeared to be in open conflict with its management and did not appear to have any cohesion or coherence. Neither of the institutional groups (Gp 4, 7) reported working with cohesion, coherence or harmony. Gp 4 stated that "we are always changing the way we do things" while Gp 7 felt that there was not a lot of harmony and they did not work together as well as they could "we have our differences". Of the religious groups Gp 1 was unique in having mechanisms they used to assist coherence. There was also a remarkably high level of trust between individuals. Gp 17 however, felt that there were "disagreements from time to time mainly over future plans but otherwise the group worked together well". The social groups both appeared to work together with a degree of coherence by using traditional office mechanisms such as meetings and agendas to maintain cohesion. The charity groups (Gps 10, 11, 12, 13, 16) all reported working as close teams with harmony and trust. A member from Gp 13 reported "you have to be very careful when dealing with the clients - they are very diverse so we need to all support each other". "We need to trust and rely on each other".

2.3.13 VSM System 1, 3, 5 - Enhancement of Self Esteem – (self-esteem)

Question – “Does belonging to the group make you feel good about yourself – are you proud of it – give me an example?”

These questions sought to establish the measurement of self-esteem.

Are you a social group after work? Do you get together after the job finishes?

Coded as SELF_ESTEEM – “How much self-esteem is achieved….?” string variable

Most individuals based their assessment of the value of their self-esteem on a general feeling of well-being to describe their level of benefit of group membership (Gp 1, 3, 6, eight, 9, 10, 11, 12, 16, 18) whether it was high or low; an example would be "I enjoy working here". Some individuals used tangible signs, such as the business groups Gp 2, who used 'targets' and other business oriented measures, "we are more efficient" and Gp 5 we are "well-organised". Gp 3 added that they derived their self-esteem from their profession. The institutional group Gp 4 attached their status in the community to their assessment while the other institutional group Gp 7 displayed an interesting difference between the individual members with those in high status positions indicating more self-esteem than those in lower positions. The charity groups indicated their self-esteem by the social value of the work they did indicating that it was "worthwhile".

2.3.14 VSM System 4, 5 – Group Creation/Coherence Process - Beliefs and Ideals – (entitativity, closure, ethos, purposefulness, group attitudes)

Question – “What beliefs and ideals bind you together - what do you believe in - give me an example?”

This question sought to establish how strong the guiding beliefs and ideals were behind each group. The question was difficult because most people did not appear to put a lot of thought into establishing what their beliefs were (beliefs are unexplained or unsubstantiated understandings that individuals have developed through their experience of the world). Clearly some groups, such as religions, put a lot of effort into determining their beliefs and several groups, such as charities, put a lot of effort into determining their ideals.

Coded as IDEAL – “Is there a belief or ideal lying the group together….?” string variable

The religious groups (Gp 1, 17) as expected had strong beliefs and ideals. The charities (Gp 10, 11, 12, 13, 16) frequently use the word "worthwhile" or "we believe in what we are doing" in their reply. The institutional groups (Gp 4, 7) focused on their ‘service to the public’ as an ideal, while the business groups used words such as "hard work", "trustworthy" to describe their ideals, one group (Gp 14) felt that their professionalism stood for high ideals. The social groups did not report strong beliefs or ideals instead commenting about "shared interests". Surprisingly given the poor view of commercialism in the modern world those working in the business groups (Gp 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 14, 15) were keen to indicate that they worked to high ideals. Their ideals differed substantially from the concepts used by other groups; they were unique in using words such as "hard work" and
"trustworthy" to describe what they valued. One group (Gp 14) felt that their “professionalism” stood for high ideals.

2.3.15 VSM Meta System - Group Creation/Coherence Process - Group Leader and Group Symbols – (entitativity, ethos, prestige, symbols)

Question – “Do you follow any one in the group – is there a leader? Are there symbols of leadership or symbols that represent your group – give me an example?”

This question was different from the question on “Who says what happens in this group?” as it examined not leaders but followers. Group identity is often reflected through a leader or symbols. This question sought to determine if there was a leader who reflected the group identity or if the leadership of the group was dominated by a high status group. The question asked not ‘if’ there was a leader but ‘do you follow any one…’, the difference is important and lead to discussions over ‘followship’ and the difference with power and control by other groups or individuals. The question was relevant to discussions about prototypicality.

Coded as; LEADER – “Who or what do you follow....?” string variable

The coffee shop business groups (Gp 2, 3, 5 &6) saw their leader as their local manager or supervisor who was very much seen as part of the group and “one of us”. The other business groups, however, quoted the most senior member of the group (Gp 9, 14), deferring to the organisational ‘workgroup’ leader. The final business group (Gp 15) all spoke out against their leadership and management (Gp 15). The religious and social groups did not see their manager as a ‘leader’ but more as an “elected representative” (GP 1, 4, 8 & 17). Institutions (Gps 4 & 7) found it hard to name a leader at all. The charity groups (Gp 10, 11, 12, 13, 16) tended to state (Gp 12) “we are all accountable to each other”.

Peoples’ response to the question on symbols was interesting and frequently people could only point to the organisational logo. This identified the problem of alignment between social groups and the organisation. Few groups could point to any sign which represented their social group alone with the exception of the religious groups (Gp1 & 17), who were able to identify symbols related to themselves without difficulty, (although it could be argued that the social and organisational aspects of these groups were closely aligned). However, institutional groups provided the most interesting results of all. Individuals from one well established institutional group (Gp 7) clearly came dressed and bore symbols (tattoos, badges, style of dress) in a manner that indicated their sub-group and were highly aware of the differences. It did appear from the research that only well-established groups develop symbols, however, it could be that detecting own-group symbols, like group norms, is very hard to do because it is almost done sub-consciously as part of the group distinctiveness process. In the discussion people often quoted groups like “Hells Angels” or other gangs who clearly had symbols of membership. However, it seems that the outside observer is able to identify group similarities more easily than insiders; this could be because identifying group entitativity is a fundamental part of social cognition.

2.3.16 VSM System 5, 2 – Group Creation/Coherence Process - Group Alignment with Organisational Structure

Question - Follow on from questions of identity.

Overall the questions of identity led to a discussion on the alignment of the membership with other levels of recursion of the group and an assessment of whether the group was coherent at all levels. With organisations made up of numerous organisational subdivisions and also social groups the question is whether or not these social groups align with the subdivisions or do they crosscut the organisational structure with a different categorisation. Is ‘us’ aligned with the organisational function, group or purpose. The simple way of assessing this discovered during the research was to ask if people saw the other parts of the group i.e. other subgroups, including those at different levels of recursion as "the same as them". This identified if people saw these other subgroups with the same prototypicality that they applied to their group. If the prototypicality was different then it implied that there was a difference in their social standing of the two groups. So, whereas a group might appear all the same because they are dressed in the same uniform or appear to have the same traits and internal assessment of prototypicality should identify the different groups and their coherence.

Coded as; ALIGNED - “Is the group coherent with is parent organisation....?” string variable
None of the business groups (Gp 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 14, 15) felt that their management were the "same as them" indicating that there was a difference in the prototypicality of the two groups. The social groups (Gp 8, 18) were autonomous, that is to say there were no other associated groups or levels of recursion. Gp 1, a religious group had no hierarchy and was very insistent on sharing power, although there will almost certainly have been social sub-groups; nevertheless the whole group was seen as a single entity. Gp 17, the other religious group, was part of a larger structure; however, the members interviewed did not see a difference between the prototypicality of the other parts of the wider group and themselves. The institutional groups (Gp 4, 7) both saw a difference in the prototypicality between themselves and their management, Gp 7 as well had very different prototypicality between its many sub-groups. With the charity groups (Gp 10, 11, 12, 13, 16) there was a limited higher level of recursion in some and affiliated groups in others, however, the members were always keen to state that the other parts of the group were "the same as us".

2.3.17 VSM System 5, 4, 3, 2 – Power Sharing Process – Group Identity Ownership – (purposefulness, self-esteem, social conflict, social mobility, group resource coordination)

Questions – “Who says what happens in this group?” Who holds power – who ought to hold power? Why do some have a higher status? Could you become a member of the higher status group? Is it about power sharing or something else – give me an example?” Follow on from the question “If we are ‘us’ who is them? What was the first thought that came into your head? Is the out-group part of the organisation? When ‘they’ visit is there a different atmosphere. Do you feel that ‘they’ dominate and control the organisation?

This question sought to establish who ‘owns’ the group’s identity. In other words it tried to find out if one particular group had taken charge of System 5 or 3. This group would then be able to manage and control the group’s image. The replies ranged from “everybody” to “nobody”, the most common answer was “the management” indicating control by a high status group.

The issue of identity ownership became readily apparent during data collection when access to the organisation to conduct research was frequently denied by the high status group who controlled the image, even after a positive acceptance from sub-groups.

Coded as – ID_OWNERSHIP - “Who owns the group/meta-group identity….?” string variable

Of the five business groups (Gp 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 14, 15,) all of them were authorised by their local manager. The four coffee shop groups all recognised that their management were different from them but considered them legitimate, however, the three commercial business groups had more issues with the legitimacy of their management seeing them as “elitist” (Gp 9), or being in open conflict with them (Gp 15). The religious groups (Gp 1, 17) were very cautious about being interviewed and in both cases the request for an interview was put to the whole group to obtain permission. This demonstrated a very high level of power sharing within these organisations. Neither of these organisations felt that there was any individual or group who held power. Gp 1 appeared to have particular mechanism built into its organisation to prevent this from happening. It also had a highly distributed sense of ownership, so much so in fact that individuals wrote to the researcher after the interview to express concern that he might have gone away with the wrong impression. Their guardianship of their group’s reputation was such that they wanted to clarify their view of the group and the purpose of the research. The institutional groups (Gp 4, 7) had to write for permission to conduct the interview. Both groups were part of a much larger organisations and those groups also felt that the individuals in management were not legitimate, indicating a lack of cohesion and coherence in the group prototypicality. The charity groups (Gp 10, 11, 12, 13, 16) all get permission at a local level and none of them felt that there was any issue with the various subgroups or meta-groups. Lastly, the social groups (Gp 8, 18) were largely autonomous groups with no higher levels of recursion. Both groups readily gave permission to be interviewed and neither group felt that there were issues with the legitimacy of subgroups.

2.3.18 VSM Meta System – System Closure (entitativity, closure, ethos, prestige, depersonalisation, self-categorisation, boundary)

Question – “Is what happens in this group isolated from the real world?”
For any viable system closure is the key point at which it achieves viability with its environment. According to Beer System 5 is the ethos of the group and the point of closure. Beer demonstrates that ‘system ethos’ provides a means of achieving purposefulness within a viable system in keeping with the law of requisite variety. For Beer System 5 is meta-systemic, that is it provides closure on the system. A system that has achieved closure is able to maintain itself despite perturbations in the environment. That is to a degree it becomes a master of its own destiny only connected to its environment to receive energy, information or materials and in the words of Maturana and Varela it has become structurally coupled to its environment. For a social group maintaining closure would mean that the group was free from the influence or disruption from its social environment. At a different level of system focus many of the groups were founded within organisations. Failure of these organisations could mean the failure or dismantlement of the social group which would indicate a lack of closure.

While, in theory, those groups examined in the research that produced evidence of a strong locally created identity and cohesion and coherence throughout the system up to System 5 should have achieved closure it is nevertheless good practice to see if this can be triangulated in any way. Therefore, this question sought to determine if the individual members of the groups felt that their group was insulated from events in the outside world.

Coded as – CLOSURE - “Has the group achieved a degree of closure…?" string variable

All of the business groups were very aware of their vulnerability from commercial pressures and the fact that their organisations would cease to be viable if that business failed. Ultimately to determine the closure of these groups the question is whether or not they are dependent or autonomous to their environment. If the social groups are dependent to say organisations, then when the organisations fail so will the social group. If the groups are autonomous from their organisations then they will continue when or if the organisation fails. Only one of the business groups, namely Gp 6, reported that the group readily met out of work indicating that despite the work environment they still continued as a social group and could possibly maintain their identity no matter what happened to the organisation they were aligned with. Quite a number of the groups, however, identified with their profession rather than their organisation and the question then becomes whether or not their profession is the focus of the viability.

Both social groups (Gp 8, 18) were insulated from the outside world as they were a locally-made constructs serving no other purpose than for their own members and therefore would appear to achieve system closure if they were viable groups. Both religious groups (Gp 1, 17) also appeared to achieve closure in a similar manner although their viability was much higher. Examining the closure of the charities was a more difficult problem; however, all of them appeared to be in sectors where there was an endless need for their assistance so as long as they were able to maintain viability there was nothing in the social environment that would cause them to fail. The institutional groups (Gp 4, 7) at first glance appeared dependent on their social environment and therefore vulnerable to perturbations in the environment, they are after all public services. However, if the systems focus is shifted to a high level of recursion, namely that of society, the public services become function providers for the community. That is they are part of societies System 2. Since System 2 is an emergent property of a VSM it is possible that these institutions ‘automatically’ come into existence where society exists (obviously not always in the exact same form). In this argument institutions are not viable systems in themselves but functions of a viable system (while the Recursive System Theorem states that “In a recursive organisational structure, any viable system contains, and is contained in, a viable system.” (Beer 1990 p118) this refers to the System 1s and not every element of a VSM as this would be impossible) this could indicate why the institutions examined in the research appeared to have pathological autopoiesis because they are not threatened and have an inherent right to exist.

2.3.19 VSM 3, 3* & 2 – Adaptability Processes (closure, model of external environment, planning processes, audit, algedonic signal, adaptation, network activity)

Question – “What do you ‘gossip’ about?” Does your group react and change - Can you think of any way that your group has changed since you joined?”

The realization of a group’s full productivity that is the achievement of its known goals will require it to extend and adapt its model of itself, to change its regulatory behaviour. To examine the ability of groups to adapt the question first examined if there was the mechanism for an algedonic signal in
place. An alert from the *algedonic signal* should cause the system to respond and *adapt*. However, in order to *adapt* it has to be able to change its behaviour by adopting new *norms* and possibly a revised *prototypicality*. While the quantitative data provided evidence of the processes in place some independent assessment was needed of the ability of the organisation to respond to the need for change to triangulate the data. The question was therefore asked of the members of the groups if they were aware of the group’s ability to adapt and if possible to give an example.

This proved to be a very difficult question to answer mainly because it required people to identify where *group norms* had changed and in many of the groups identifying the *group norms* had proved difficult. Many of the examples given related more to organisational change than they did to change in the *social group*. This issue would be better examined with a *longitudinal study* that first mapped the *group norms* and then monitored the ability of the group to respond to events in the *social environment* with a change to these *norms*.

Coded as – ADAPTABILITY - “How well does the group adapt….?” string variable

All of the *business groups* (Gp 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 14, 15) reported that they gossiped about each other’s behaviours within the context of the group. Gp 9 stated that "we gossip about each other all the time; promotion, work everything", Gp 14 stated that they gossiped about a "wide range of issues that ranged from social to professional". Gp 15 stated that their gossip consisted of "we whinge a lot". The *charity groups* (Gp 10, 11, 12, 13, 16) did not report that they gossiped much while one of them Gp 12 stated that they "gossiped in a positive way". Both *institutional groups* (Gp 4, 7) indicated that gossip was "rife" and "were grumbling and moaning about most things". However the *religious groups* (Gp 1, 17) both reported mechanisms for discussion to remove the dangers of malicious gossip while the *social groups* (Gp 8, 18) did not report much gossip.

2.3.20 VSM System 4 – Planning Processes (model of external environment, model of prototypicality, planning processes, group attitudes)

Question – “*Do you discuss the way forward for your group – not just your organisation but your group? Who decides the way forward – give me an example*?”

The main purpose of this question was to examine the group’s entelechy. A group’s *entelechy* is the achievement of its full potential through unknown goals. It requires *innovation* and *learning* to expand the horizons of its belief system but more than that it requires the dreaming of an *ideal state* for its system to indicate its direction. To achieve its entelechy a group will have to judge its actual performance against its possible *capability*, and by using *foresight* it will have to socialize the possible futures and courses of action to achieve its full *potential*. The question therefore set out to determine whether or not the group discussed the way forward.

Coded as – PLANNING - “How well does the group plan ahead….?” string variable

All of the *business groups* (Gp 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 14, 15) reported that they did not discuss the way forward as a social group and sometimes even as a *business group*. The reason for this was that the groups interviewed were frequently not part of the management structure which often had ‘exclusive rights’ to planning the future. This is a fundamental issue in *power sharing* at the high levels of *recursion* of the group and impacted on the *requisite variety* and *viability* of the groups. In contrast, the *charity groups* (Gp 10, 11, 12, 13, 16) the *religious groups* (Gp 1, 17) and the *social groups* (Gp 8, 18) all reported varied levels of effort at discussing the future. Both *institutional groups* (Gp 4, 7) indicated that they did not discuss the future at all.
2.4 Record of Interviews

2.4.1 Group Type 1 – Business

2.4.1.1 Group 2

WHOS US,
The group stated their organisational identity but felt it important to add the area. Very proactive group with generally a strong team ethic and a commitment to the organisation and its ideals by senior members of the group; newer members, however, were not so committed. “I only plan to work here for a short time”

WHENSALIENT,
Members reported that they did not socialize a great deal outside the job but when they were at work the group was “very important” and there was a strong “team spirit”. They said that “we are all in it together”, “we are a really good team” and “we all work hard and know our jobs”.

METAGROUP,
The group saw themselves as a team that worked hard to support each other. Not all were present. The brand name of their organisation was important to them but they did not have much direct day to day contact with senior members of the hierarchy. The main contact was with the area manager who they considered was “one of us” but thereafter the connection with the hierarchy became more obscure.

PURPOSE,
The group responded that they were “the brand name”. The activities of the group were totally managed by the purpose of the organisation. Training was mainly done at work “on the job” but did involve courses at a training centre at supervisor level.

SOCIALVALUE,
Members felt that they were valued for themselves - each provided a unique concept of value that differed from the others. “I am the organiser”, “I work hard”, “I always sort out the problems between the others”; although the group was dominated by the manager and supervisor who had been there for considerably longer than the other two members.

WHOSTHEM,
The group mainly saw “other coffee shops” as ‘them’ although one member suggested that ‘them’ was the public and there was a general agreement that this could be the case.

DIFFTHEM,
With respect to the other coffee shops the group saw themselves as “the original” - “more "professional" and "better quality". With respect to the public the group found it hard to define a difference between ‘them’ and ‘us’ except to say that “we have to stick together”. This was taken to mean that they saw the public as some form of threat or challenge.

PROTOTYPE
The group were dressed in the organisations uniform. They identified a “young and enthusiastic person” as the prototype, someone that was “hard working” and “easy to get on with”.
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GROUPVALUE
When asked what the group was valued for the group felt that they were well respected by the other comparable groups (other coffee shops) they felt that they were the "original" brand. "I have been here for a while and in the past we have always been one of the most successful in the high street". They were not sure that they held a unique place in the high street anymore "there's a lot of competition in the high street". They said that they had a say in the running of the organisation.

ID_STRENGTH
This was a group that at first sign appeared to have a strong meta-identity that matched the brand of the organisation; however, it appeared that the real strength of purpose for the group came from their own need to co-operate as a team to achieve their task.

NORMATIVE
The group was relatively mature in relation to membership time. There was evidence of the development of normative behaviour; comments like "it's just the way we do things here" and "we always do this". The newcomers to the group stated that "initially getting accepted by the other members was hard".

COHERENT
The group appeared to work together in their role as a coherent team and derived pleasure from doing so. "It is hard work and it gets very busy but we enjoy it".

SELF_ESTEEM
The group derived high levels of self-esteem from their group activities. "We achieve our targets" and "we are the best", "we are more efficient"

IDEALS
Some members of the group felt that they had strong guiding beliefs. These were "hard work" and "honest work". However, one member suggested that the "teamwork" within the group represented a strong ideal.

LEADER
The manager of the shop was seen as the leader and the supervisor her deputy. There was a definite hierarchy.

ALIGNED
The group did not associate their management with the same prototype as themselves, although they did feel that they all shared the ideals of the organisation "we all believe in what we do". When asked to describe their managers they said; "they are older" and "they run things";

ID_OWNERSHIP
The permission to undertake research was given by the manager and it was not felt necessary to ask for higher authority; although, this was only on the condition that the names of individuals remained anonymous. This suggested that the identity of the group was in part owned at a local level. All members felt they had a say in the group's decisions but they also felt that there was a definite high status group, although they felt that this group was legitimate. They did not relate to the higher management of the organisation and this suggested that their level of recursion was capped at the local level reducing their potential viability. 

CLOSURE
There was a definite feeling amongst the group that they were a team; an 'us' and this created a sense of closure; an insulation from the world. However, the group were very aware that they were tied to the commercial reality of the real world and the fortunes and risks that that entailed. "We could lose our jobs
tomorrow if we don't work hard". So while they had started to develop system closure as a social group their organisational group was dependent on the commercial environment.

ADAPTABILITY
The group's attitude reflected their team ethos; they felt that they were "dynamic and responsive" to change, although they were only able to identify change in the organisational purpose, they were unable to assess how well they responded as a social group to internal and external threats. There was disagreement over the amount of 'gossip' that the group engaged in although they did agree that they 'gossiped' about each other's behaviours. This suggests that the group was still developing group norms.

PLANNING
The group was not able to provide any evidence that they anticipated the future as a social group rather than an organisational one. They did not actively engage in 'forethought' about group social activities. The higher management structure appeared to provide the solution to organisational problems and anticipate future organisational requirements which left little for the group to do.
2.4.1.2 Group 3

WHOS_US
When asked "who is us" the group define themselves as "baristas". One of them gave his name.

WHEN_SALIENT
The group did not meet outside of work and felt that their identity was only relevant 'at work' although several members said that they would describe themselves as "a barista" when asked.

METAGROUP
The group stated that there were other members of the team who were not present. They did not readily suggest that any of the management were part of 'us'.

PURPOSE
"We are baristas" was the only reply. Training was undertaken "at work" by senior members of the team.

SOCIAL_VALUE
The group appeared to have developed a good working relationship. The relatively low membership time of the entire group seemed to have enabled each member to find his or her footing in the group as there were no established members. The unique contribution from each member focused around the job; "I work hard" was a common answer, also "I am always helpful the others know they can ask me for help". "I know where everything is on the till"

WHOSTHEM
The group saw the other coffee shops as 'them'.

DIFFTHEM
"We are better" was the agreed answer

PROTOTYPE
The group were dressed in the organisations uniform. One member of the group suggested 'students' as the typical member but this was not agreed by all.

GROUP_VALUE
The group thought that they were well respected as 'baristas'. "Everybody wants the job - it's hard to get in". They felt that this function was unique. They all felt that they had a say in the running of the group and that the organisation "listened" to them.

ID_STRENGTH
The group saw themselves as a team in a valued and respected profession.

NORMATIVE
There was no evidence of specific 'normative' behaviour within the group except for usual social norms and the organisational uniform.

COHERENT
The group felt that they worked well as a team most of the time "we have to work well together otherwise we couldn't manage when it gets busy". They also reported that they got on well together "we have a great time". Although they felt that sometimes they were still finding their feet as a group "we have some disagreements"

SELF_ESTEEM
The group generally felt good about themselves "I tell everyone I am a barista"

IDEALS
The group felt that they were professional and business like. "We are very professional - we spend a lot of time being trained"

LEADER
The manager was seen as the leader and "gave the orders" although they generally felt that he did not always have to as they all "got on with the job"

ALIGNED
The group felt that their managers were "business-like" and this was not 'the image' that they had of themselves. When asked they felt that they were "different" from their managers.

ID_OWNERSHIP
The manager gave permission to undertake research and did not consider it necessary to ask for permission from his superiors. This suggests that the ownership of identity was maintained at the local level. The group felt that there was a definite hierarchy within the organisation.

CLOSURE
The group felt that they were very much connected to the real world as they dealt with the public every day. They were very aware of their vulnerability to commercial pressure. "There is a lot of competition"; however two were not concerned with this because "I am only working here for a year or so"

ADAPTABILITY
The group admitted that they gossiped a lot about "what we are all up to and if we are pulling our weight" they agreed that the gossip could at times get "quite bitchy"

PLANNING
The group did not discuss the way forward or anticipate their social requirements.
2.4.1.3 Group 5

WHOS_US
The group answered that they were the brand name of their organisation and stated that they were "really neat [good] baristas"

WHENSALIENT
The group rarely met outside of work and felt that their identity was only relevant 'at work'. Both member said that they would describe themselves as "a barista" when asked what they did for a living.

METAGROUP
The group stated that "the rest of the team were unavailable" it did not occur to them to mention the management or hierarchy of their organisation or include it as part of their description of themselves.

PURPOSE
"We are baristas" was the only reply. Asked about the training involved it was described as mainly "on the job".

SOCIALVALUE
Both members felt that they were valued for aspects of the job - one was "good with customers" and the other was "always keeping things going"

WHOSTHEM
'Them' was considered to be the other coffee shops. Both members of the group were aware of the competition.

DIFFTHEM
The group felt that they were "more of a friendly team", "we make it a nicer place to work"

PROTOTYPE
The group were dressed in the organisations uniform. One member of the group could not suggest a 'typical member' or traits that a typical member might have while the other said that he felt that there was a "certain type who work here" but did not elaborate.

GROUPVALUE
The group said that the job was highly sought after and felt that they were "the best in Chichester - we have more room here and we are a better team - this is a nicer place than the other places, people like to come here." This seemed to suggest that they thought they offered a unique place. However they did admit that they had little say in how their organisation was run, although they felt they all "participated" in local decisions.

ID_STRENGTH
The two members interviewed saw themselves as very much part of 'a team with a unique identity' although this identity did not seem to include the brand name and was more connected with the value of being a barista and part of a 'friendly efficient team'

NORMATIVE
The two members interviewed had joined at the same time 6 months before and did not find it difficult to fit in - "everyone was really friendly"

COHERENT
The group appeared to get on well together the word 'friends' was used several times.
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SELF_ESTEEM
Both stated that they felt very proud to work in the coffee shop and felt that the shop was known to be good, "it’s well organized"

IDEALS
Both members felt that "working hard as a team" was what drove them.

LEADER
The group said that the manager was the key person and that he said what happened in the group. They also said that the brand was "hard to miss"

ALIGNED
The two members interviewed did not see themselves as the ‘same’ as the senior managers in the company; although they felt that the ‘area manager’ who visited regularly was "like them".

ID_OWNERSHIP
The manager gave permission to undertake research and did not consider it necessary to ask for permission from his superiors. This suggests that the ownership of identity was maintained at the local level. The group felt that there was a definite hierarchy

CLOSURE
There were signs of system closure; while the group clearly had a strong team ethic and identity which led to a clear sense of ‘us’ nevertheless the group recognised that it was not isolated from the real world.

ADAPTABILITY
There was a difference in opinion with one member feeling that the group engaged in a lot of gossip about the social group and the other saying that it hardly engaged in any. Neither member could identify any significant change in the social group although both felt that it readily adapted to new members

PLANNING
Neither member could identify any social planning
2.4.1.4 Group 6

WHOS_US
The group defined themselves as the "girls that work at the..."

WHENSALIENT
The group met outside of work whenever they could and stated that they "got on really well together". This implied that the identity was relevant across a broad range of circumstances.

METAGROUP
The group stated that "this was the whole group".

PURPOSE
"We serve the food at ......" One member suggested that "we are baristas" but when asked what training they suggested that it was "not much". It appeared that 'baristas' was a high status categorisation that they liked to apply to themselves but were not really sure that they qualified as such.

SOCIALVALUE
The group members indicated that each of them felt that they were valued by the others for a range of characteristics all related to behaviour; "I get on well with everybody", "I help all the others with the little jobs"

WHOSTHEM
'Them' was the senior management of the organisation. The group were reluctant to name the management until prompted with the words "what was the first thought that came into your head when I asked the question."

DIFFTHEM
The group, when prompted, suggested that they were "better with people" and that they were "more interested in people".

PROTOTYPE
The group was a 'single gender' group and this appeared to have a significant effect on the definition of prototypicality. The group stated that they saw a typical member as "young, single girls"

GROUPVALUE
The group did not feel that they were unique and said that they would struggle to define how they were significantly different from other cafés. They did not feel that they had a say in the running of the organisation but did feel that they had a say in the day to day activities of their group.

ID_STRENGTH
The group appeared to have a reasonably strong identity and struggled to compare themselves to other high prestige coffee shops. However when allowed they categorised themselves more around the social aspects of their union, particularly as a group who took care of one another. "It's hard work most of the time and there is lots of pressure - we 'kind of' look after each other ". From this standpoint they rated themselves highly. The same gender nature of the group was considered relevant

NORMATIVE
The entire group said that they were made to feel very welcome and fitted in easily. There were signs of normative behaviour from several members, "we all know what we have to do and how to do it", "We don't need telling - we get on with it" but the most significant statement was "we have to be for the group all the time" which appeared to suggest that the strong group unity swamped individual identity.

**COHERENT**
"We all know what we have to do and how to do it" suggests that the group was coherent

**SELF_ESTEEEM**
The entire group felt good about being part of the team and rated their self-esteem as 'high' in relation to being a member.

**IDEALS**
The group differed in their opinions over the guiding beliefs of the group. One suggested that it was "about sticking together" while another suggested that they did not really have any ideals "we just come here to work"

**LEADER**
While the group had a manager/supervisor they did not mention this individual when answering the question but preferred to emphasis their 'teamwork'. "We don't need telling - we get on with it"

**ALIGNED**
The members did not see the group's management as the same as themselves, suggesting different prototypicality. The group defined itself in different ways to the parent organisation's intentions. While the organisation saw a need for a manager and workforce the group saw themselves more as a cooperative group who had to work together to survive

**ID_OWNERSHIP**
The manager gave permission to undertake research and did not see the need to ask for permission from her superiors.

**CLOSURE**
There were some weak signs of system closure of the group with a sense of 'us' even though this did not represent the organisational image.

**ADAPTABILITY**
The members claimed that the group was very open to new joiners and that they had all felt welcome when they joined. The members did not feel that they gossiped at all and suggested that they were very open to social change within the group. "We do whatever it takes"

**PLANNING**
The group demonstrated that they anticipated social problems within their group "we worry about when people change or when we get newcomers - if they will fit in". "We arrange a night out when we can so we can have some fun"
2.4.1.5 Group 9

WHOS US,
The group stated their organisational identity "we work for [...]"

WHENSALIENT,
"At Work"

METAGROUP
The members suggested that they were just part of the much larger organisation "no we are just a few"

PURPOSE
The members of the group indicated that their principle activities were the purpose of the parent organisation

SOCIALVALUE
The members felt that they were valued for "what they did" within the overall group

WHOSTHEM
The group felt without a doubt that the higher management was 'them'

DIFFTHEM
They were 'disorganised' and "one member felt that 'they' were 'elitist'"

PROTOTYPE
The members interviewed felt that there was a definite 'type' who belonged to the group "people need to be reliable and trustworthy"

GROUPVALUE
The group commented that "our whole industry has recently taken a serious knock and lost a lot of creditability"; others felt that "people still need us" , "we serve a very real need". However, they did not feel that they had much say in the running of the organisation.

ID_STRENGTH
The group appeared to have a very weak social identity that was largely based on that of the parent organisation.

NORMATIVE
The members reported that they had been with the group for several years and that "fitting in" always took time. The admitted that it was not easy for new joiners to fit in "there are lots of things they have to learn to work here"

COHERENT
The group felt that they worked together well although they admitted that they did not socialise a great deal.

SELF_ESTEEM
The members all said that they did not feel "that great" about belonging to a bank, partly because "bankers were seen in a poor light after the crash" but also because it was an "impersonal" place to work

IDEALS
The members interviewed did not feel that there was an strong set of beliefs or ethos guiding the organisation unless one considered "its commercial focus" an ideal - as one member said "we are a commercial organisation through and through."

LEADER
The members felt that the "management structure" provided the required leadership.

ALIGNED
The organisation and its roles seemed to dominate the members present; however, the group did not feel that they were the 'same' as their senior management.

ID_OWNERSHIP
"The manager"

CLOSURE
The group appeared to have a few signs of closure. "We seem to go on regardless" was one comment. Their was a definite recognition that there was an 'us'. The members commented that they felt that they had a "common purpose that they all worked to achieve."

ADAPTABILITY
The members felt that there was a considerable amount of 'gossip' that covered a wide range of subjects "we gossip about each other all the time; promotion, work everything."

PLANNING
There was no indication from the group that the social aspects were ever anticipated.
2.4.1.6 Group 14

WHOS_US
The group members were a same gender [male] young group who defined themselves by their function "we are technicians"

WHENSALIENT
The group considered that their profession defined them a good deal of the time "when asked I say that I am a technician". The identity as 'a technician' was more relevant than the firm that they worked for.

METAGROUP
This was the whole group. They worked together as a team on a daily basis. The group did not mention the management of the firm.

PURPOSE
Again the group simply linked their main activity to their purpose "we fit exhausts, tyres and stuff". One mentioned that their purpose was safety "it's about making sure the rules about safety are followed."

SOCIALVALUE
Two of the members had been there for several years and one member had recently joined however it did not appear that individuals had established their identities and places in the group "we all do the same job really". Yet at the same time there appeared to be a definite hierarchy

WHOSTHEM
They were "the other groups - the competitors"

DIFFTHEM
The feeling was that "we have values that we have to adhere to" the assumption is that the other groups/competitors do not adhere to values.

PROTOTYPE
The group were dressed in the organisations uniform. The group stated that "we are all blokes [men]" suggesting that the prototype was strongly gender biased.

GROUPVALUE
The members of the group did not feel that their group represented anything unique, "not really" was the reply. They did feel that they had some say in the running of the group.

ID_STRENGTH
The group members appeared to have a reasonable regard for their firm and judged its prestige sensibly; "this is a good little firm" was one reply. Their assessment of their own group entitativity also appears to very realistic; "its normally wholly about work"

NORMATIVE
There was some evidence of normative behaviour "we had a guy join who didn't fit in because he knew it all". "they have to learn to do it the proper way". Both these statements could suggest that an individual who did not accept the norms and the hierarchy was not made welcome. There was some suggestion of single gender normative behaviour.
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COHERENT
The group appeared to work together in their given roles. They did not socialise outside of work.

SELF_ESTEEEM
The group members appeared to have a high prestige. "This is a good little firm". Their self-esteem was focused around their professional skills "we are technicians - we have very high standards"

IDEALS
The group felt that their "professionalism" stood for high ideals.

LEADER
The leading technician was very clearly the leader of their local group and had the most say. The others tended to follow his lead although they appeared free to say what they thought.

ALIGNED
The group confessed that they were not close to the management although they saw them as legitimate and had not issues with them. "they set the safety standards, targets and values that we have to adhere to". They stated that their was a "different atmosphere" when the management came to visit and that they were not the same as them.

ID_OWNERSHIP
While the group readily agreed to talk to the researcher and clearly had no issues they nevertheless appeared to sit in a tightly constructed environment with defined values, purpose and processes albeit that they appeared to readily accept these.

CLOSURE
While the group did not present any evidence for system closure in relation to their group as a social structure they did appear to relate to "us the lads" a degree of male bonding.

ADAPTABILITY
The group felt that they gossiped all the time with member suggesting that they discussed a "wide range of issues" the ranged from social to professional.

PLANNING
There was no indication from the group that the social aspects were ever anticipated.
2.4.1.7 Group 15

WHOS_US
The members of the group were in open conflict with their supervisors and managers. "Us" was the group interviewed - who felt isolated.

WHENSALIENT
The group did not meet outside of work at all.

METAGROUP
"It's only us"

PURPOSE
The members of the group related to their profession "we are technicians". Although one member stated that their main pastime was to "whinge a lot"

SOCIALVALUE
The members had formed some local identities and felt that they each contributed 'something' although they were not able to say what. However, they did not feel that their group had much "social value".

WHOSTHEM
"Them", without any doubt, was the management of the organisation.

DIFFTHEM
There was considerable resentment towards the management but little evidence of team spirit towards their fellow group members. They felt that their opposition to the management clearly defined them all.

PROTOTYPE
The group were dressed in the organisation's uniform. The group was made up of a single gender and this, along with the profession appeared to define the typical member "we are technicians"

GROUPVALUE
The group had little prestige and did not feel that the parent organisation was unique in any way that was important. The members did not feel that they had any say at all in the running of the group.

ID_STRENGTH
This was the only group that was in almost open conflict with its management and as such this both defined and isolated the group's members.

NORMATIVE
There was little evidence of normative behaviour unlike other same sex groups.

COHERENT
While the group was defined by its opposition to the management it did not seem to have drawn the team into a coherent entity. "we stick together mostly but it's hard with the way we have to work" "mostly we complain and grumble"

SELF_ESTEEM
The group members stated that they did not feel good about working for the organisation. Two also stated that while they liked the other members "the atmosphere in the workplace" was one that they wished they could change.

IDEALS
The members of the group differed in their beliefs - two considered that they had high ideals while the third did not consider that they had "any ideals at all", the two who felt that they had high ideals felt that they were "professionals".

LEADER
One member of the group was clearly dominant and tended to interrupt and overrule the other two. However the group did not feel that they had any symbols or leader but admitted that they deliberately adopted dress codes that went against the rules.

ALIGNED
While the group members admitted that they had no choice but to follow the rules there was no social contact with the management "we avoid them" "they are not"

ID_OWNERSHIP
The management gave permission to interview the group but appeared ambivalent to their hostility.

CLOSURE
There was no evidence of system closure. The strong out-group and single gender make up did not seem to provide sufficient emphasis to overcome the dispirited nature of the group.

ADAPTABILITY
The group members stated that there was a significant amount of 'gossip', "we whinge a lot".

PLANNING
There was no indication from the group that the social aspects were ever anticipated.
2.4.2 Group Type 2 – Social

2.4.2.1 Group 8

WHOS_US
We are "[who meet once a month]"

WHENSALIENT
The members reported that while many were active in a '.........' environment where the concepts were relevant they did not often relate to the group while away from it.

METAGROUP
The group represented the only level of recursion of the organisation

PURPOSE
"The group meet once a month, on average, to discuss ........ concepts."

SOCIALVALUE
There was a wide variance with some members feeling that they were only there to listen while several felt that they contributed and were valued significantly

WHOSTHEM
There was no real concept of 'them'. The only suggestion was "those not in the group" "people who are not ........" but this was not a strongly held view.

DIFFTHEM
This was not easily answered and the only answer given was that "we do ........"

PROTOTYPE
The members of the group felt that there was a prototypical member but it was 'interest' and not 'trait' based. In other words "people interested in ........"

GROUPVALUE
The group felt that not many people outside the society knew of their existence, but did feel that they could contribute and have a say if they wanted to.

ID_STRENGTH
There was not a strong identity for the group although many of the people saw "..........." as a definite part of their individual identities

NORMATIVE
Several people reported that the only discomfort they felt was when they first had to speak to the group. Otherwise the normal social conventions applied

COHERENT
The group had some practices with which the group maintained coherence - for instance the agenda and method of managing the meetings.

SELF_ESTEEM
Several members suggested that they did feel good about belonging to the group "it confirms my interest in ........"
IDEALS
Many of the members of the group felt that they shared a "common interest" with the other members

LEADER
Several members did not feel that they "followed anyone in the group" while two suggested that "a few of the members makes all the arrangements and manage the group"

ALIGNED
The group was its own organisation and so represented every level of recursion.

ID OWNERSHIP
The group members differed in their opinion of status within the group. Some thought that there was a hierarchy others felt that there was not.

CLOSURE
There were no signs of system closure such as group norms or the way things were done that were not within normal social routines.

ADAPTABILITY
Some felt that there was a degree of gossip that was concerned with "who tended to dominate" the meetings.

PLANNING
The group discussed its future plans "we arrange the meetings and events" but there was no evidence that it worked at a social level to anticipate social change to the group.
2.4.2.2 Group 18

WHOS_US
"We are the [name of social group]"

WHENSALIENT
For some of the very active members the group was salient for a "good deal of the time" while for others it was only salient "when we meet" once a month.

METAGROUP
By and large most of the group were present. The group therefore represented all levels of recursion or a single level depending on the degree of subdivision in the group

PURPOSE
"We meet regularly to undertake activities and discuss […..] matters"

SOCIALVALUE
Many of the members reported not feeling valued for a unique contribution "no not really we don't get a chance", "we just sit and listen most of the time", "and you have to be prepared to do something special"

WHOSTHEM
The group could not really identify a 'them' [they accepted “not us”]

DIFFTHEM
This was not easily answered

PROTOTYPE
A single gender group, several of the members felt that they shared a "common interest" or "a lot in common" with the other members. Some said "we come from the same backgrounds". Several of the members suggested it fitted by "age, gender and class"

GROUPVALUE
Many of the members felt that they were well known by the public but did not have "a great deal of prestige although people do respect us", "we are well known". The members did feel that the group was unique "this is the only group that does anything like this"

ID_STRENGTH
Overall the group had a strong image but this was not 'locally generated' as it seemed to call on the identity of the parent organisation.

NORMATIVE
Some members reported that they had to "learn to adapt" when they joined and that there were "ways things are done" suggesting that there was some evidence of normative behaviour

COHERENT
The group worked together very coherently. Members reported that there was "good harmony". The group's purpose was defined around its social activities.

SELF_ESTEEM
The members tended to report highly about being part of the group "yes I like coming here", "I wouldn't come if I didn't like it"

**IDEALS**
Many of the members of the group felt that they shared a "common interest" with the other members, however several responded with answers like "we come from the same backgrounds"

**LEADER**
There was a definite hierarchy but most people felt that it was necessary "they do all the organising". However, some people felt that they were "too dominant"

**ALIGNED**
The group tended to act *autonomously* most of the time but the members felt that the members across the whole organisation tend to be "the same".

**ID_OWNERSHIP**
The decision to be interviewed was taken by all the group members. Decisions were made by the whole group

**CLOSURE**
There were signs of system closure. The group had a sense of ‘us’

**ADAPTABILITY**
The group members suggested that there was not a lot of ‘gossip’ in the group and could not identify any social change

**PLANNING**
The group felt that they discussed the make-up of their organisation and its future regularly.


**2.4.3 Group Type 3 – Religious**

**2.4.3.1 Group 1**

**WHOS_US**
Very definite identity associated with the ideals and beliefs of the group. Everybody felt that they had a say in the running of the group - the group was unique in having formalised processes to ensure that decisions were made by the whole group.

**WHENSALIENT**
Many members felt that the group’s values and beliefs were salient most of the time and that these ideals “guided their motivations and actions outside the group in their daily lives.”

**METAGROUP**
Very different answers across full scope of recursion - people identified themselves as a newcomer, a local member, or a general member; however all of them readily identified with the principles of the organisation, also strong evidence of an individualist sentiment with some almost not wishing to be categorised at all.

**PURPOSE**
The group identified the activities of the group that were closely associated with the purpose of the organisation such as “meetings for worship”

**SOCIALVALUE**
Several members reported that they did not always feel valued while at the same time some felt highly valued. A sizable proportion felt that they were not recognised for any unique contribution.

**WHOSTHEM**
No clear answer. Some suggested other groups within the organisation but were not certain; others suggested people outside their religion.

**DIFFTHEM**
For those that suggested that ‘they’ were people outside their religion the main difference was that “we have a faith”. There was also less trust in ‘them’ although this could not be easily defined.

**PROTOTYPE**
Several very clear examples were given of the group prototype; one person described the typical ‘group member ’ when they were routinely going on holiday together. The group agreed that the description applied to all members across the wider group.

**GROUPVALUE**
The group felt that they were well respected within the circles that knew them but they were not well known in the public consciousness and therefore not always understood. They preferred the word ‘respected’ to ‘prestige’ and felt that they served a useful purpose.

**ID_STRENGTH**
Overall the group had a very strong ethos and a distinct entitativity that together made a strong overall identity.

**NORMATIVE**
Several examples of normative behaviour were presented, in particular the mode of ‘worship’, and it was evident that the group had a strong set of norms that were unique to the group and its parent organisation that reflected their beliefs and the prototype

**COHERENT**
The group provided examples of mechanisms they used to assist coherence such as engaging with the ‘spirit’ of a meeting. There was also a remarkably high level of trust between individuals, but not all the group felt that there were high levels of harmony.

**SELF_ESTEEM**
Everybody present felt good about belonging to the group.

**IDEALS**
The group was founded in Christian beliefs and ideals that their organisation had “developed and maintained” over many years.

**LEADER**
The group did not elect a leader ‘per se’ but had a process of electing those individuals who demonstrated that they had the interests of the group at heart into a ‘body of elders’ who provided guidance to the group.

**ALIGNED**
The local identity was coherent with the general identity and there were no members that felt that they belonged to one and not the other. The individuals of the group and the parent organisation served the same purpose. “The individuals of the group and the rest of the organisation serve the same purpose; there is no separation between us”.

**ID_OWNERSHIP**
There was a very strong sense of identity ownership held by the individuals of the group. They questioned the motives of the researcher and expressed concern that when they thought he had been given the wrong impression of the group. Power sharing was distributed to the individuals of the group

**CLOSURE**
There was evidence of system closure by the group. The group showed signs of self-reflection; examining its own processes and motives. There was a clearly understood process for new joiners to be indoctrinated into the group and a strong identity, sense of history and ritual

**ADAPTABILITY**
The group did not feel that they 'gossiped' much as the structure and processes of the group were developed to ensure that concerns were brought out into the open and there was a very equitable power sharing structure that enabled everyone to have a say in the direction of the group.

**PLANNING**
The group was unique in that it was the only one that showed that it did more than ‘anticipate’ potential future social problems that related to the group itself and not just the parent organisation by engaging in 'forethought'. The group played a game called 'boundaries' that was designed to challenge their beliefs and understanding should a range of problems arise.
2.4.3.2 Group 17

WHOS_US
“We are [name of faith]”

WHENSALIENT
For the members present the group was very salient for much of their lives. They all occupied places in the organisation's hierarchy and as such had much to do with the running of the organisation.

METAGROUP
“We are just a part” After discussion it was agreed that the members of the group were only one level of recursion within a multilevel organisation, all of the group interviewed were part of the hierarchy.

PURPOSE
The group identified the activities of the group that were closely associated with the purpose of the organisation.

SOCIALVALUE
The members present felt that they were generally valued by the rest of the organisation "they appreciate that we do all the organizing".

WHOSTHEM
Some members suggested "other parts of the organisation"

DIFFTHEM
The group but found it difficult to identify differences although some felt that they tried to be "more welcoming", and "more active"

PROTOTYPE
The group found it difficult to describe a typical member "we are very open to all"

GROUPVALUE
The group felt that they were sometimes treated as "irrelevant" and had to work at being heard

ID_STRENGTH
The roles and the identity of the established organisation were fairly dominant; however, the group seemed to be very active in running their organisation and attempting to build individual and local identities.

NORMATIVE
The group was very mature and clearly had rituals that guided their activities and behaviours. Members reported that they had no trouble "fitting in" and were made to feel welcome but were "guided" in the ways of the organisation

COHERENT
The group felt that "honestly" there were "disagreements from time to time mainly over future plans". However otherwise the group worked together well. The group's activities were aligned with its purpose

SELF_ESTEEM
The group were unsure and some said that they did not "always" feel good about the group.

IDEALS
The group felt that they were held together by their "strong faith".

LEADER
The group felt that they had strong leadership symbols that reflected their faith and religious history.

ALIGNED
The group was a sub-group of a higher structure and had mechanisms for alignment and coordination. They did not see any difference with between their beliefs, and ideals and those held by those in the higher structure. "We are the same"

ID_OWNERSHIP
The group members said that although we have "leaders" everything is done "very democratically". The high status groups were elected fairly and were considered legitimate.

CLOSURE
The group could not give an example of something that would damage their organisation. Their main concerns were "membership and sustaining our organisation"

ADAPTABILITY
The members interviewed were fairly unanimous that the group talked about the "goings on" within the group all the time. "We talk about who's doing what and what it means."

PLANNING
The group said that they discussed the development of their group from both organisational and social aspects. "We talk about planned events and also how people fit in and who would be best for something."
2.4.4 Group Type 4 – Institution

2.4.4.1 Group 4

WHOS_US
“We work at the ....”

WHENSALIENT
"When we are at work" The group stated that they did not meet much outside work.

METAGROUP
"We are just a part" The members of the group were only one level of recursion within a multilevel organisation

PURPOSE
The group members related to their particular function within the organisation and did not describe the function of the organisation as a whole. "We serve behind the counter"

SOCIALVALUE
The group felt that they were "taken for granted by the general public" but that they "served a very real need"

WHOSTHEM
The group named "the senior management" but were at odds to stress that they did not consider the local management as 'them'.

DIFFTHEM
The group saw the management as "ruthless" and "political", "they look after themselves"

PROTOTYPE
The group felt that there was a typical member and described them as "you have to be good with the public"

GROUPVALUE
The group stated that there was only "one organisation like theirs" and they felt that it was generally "appreciated" by the general public but not the government

ID_STRENGTH
The group struggled with its identity. They appeared to get most of their identity from their purpose and their national image. Locally they were not a strong entity although they appeared united against the national management

NORMATIVE
There was some evidence of specific 'normative' behaviour within the group with except for usual social norms. The members said that they had fitted in but making friends took "awhile".

COHERENT
The group did not feel that they were well organised or that they necessarily worked together effectively. "We are always changing the way we do things." They were aligned with their assigned roles.
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SELF_ESTEEEM
"I do enjoy it but it's mainly a job". "We are quite important for the local people - they couldn't survive without us"

IDEALS
The group showed that they were "quite proud of our service to the public".

LEADER
"The supervisor says what we do" - The group identified the brand symbols of the organisation

ALIGNED
The individual's role activities were in line with the purpose of the parent organisation. There appeared little group social activity

ID_OWNERSHIP
The local manager was able to give permission for the interviews. There was a general feeling that there was no high status group; "we all work as a team" however, that was among those interviewed, when the management was discussed the group felt that there was no easy way to access that group.

CLOSURE
Several of the members felt that the group was strongly influenced by events in the real world and that its fate was outside of their control.

ADAPTABILITY
The group felt that they gossiped a lot. "We're grumbling and moaning about most things". "We have a good chat"

PLANNING
There was no indication from the group that the social aspects were ever anticipated.
2.4.4.2 Group 7

WHOS_US
The group started by identifying the different elements that made up the group around the table and then when prompted for a name for everyone around the table suggested the name of the organisation “Chichester ……”

WHENSALIENT
Most members stated that it was a major part of their life "it’s not just a job its 24/7” although one individual stated that when he left work "he didn’t think about it again"

META
The members suggested that they were just part of the much larger organisation

PURPOSE
The group tended to describe their individual areas of responsibility, or function, rather than say what they did as a collective. "We are ….”

SOCIAL
The members of the group had very different individual identities that they had clearly established. "I see things that others don't", "I make people laugh" however one of the members of the group who was a manager related to her role "I am a good manager"

WHOSTHEM
"The management"

DIFFTHEM
There was a clear indication from the members of the group that they felt the higher management of the organisation was "in it for themselves"

PROTO
The members described traits that an individual had to have - "realistic", "practical" in addition they were all in agreement "you have to be good at understanding people".

GROUP
The group felt that they were well respected by the other comparable groups and also by the general public. The group felt that they were unique through the function that they performed

ID_STRENGTH
The group appeared to almost distance themselves from the organisational identity and felt more strongly associated with sub-identities or different 'tribes'

NORMATIVE
There were strong indications of normative behaviour at the low level "There's a very set way things are done", "it takes a while to get used to who everybody is", "you have to tread carefully when you join" - "only the right sort of person can do this job", however the different sub-groups had different norms, "the ....are different from us" or "they like to....". There were clear signs of different dress codes amongst the different sub-groups

COHERENT
The group felt that there was not a lot of harmony and they did not work together as well as they could. "We have our differences"

SELF_ESTEEEM
The self-esteem appeared to be associated with the status of the individuals with the two managers stating that they "enjoyed the work" while the others were not so enthusiastic

IDEALS
The group felt that they had strong ideals and beliefs that were focused around their purpose, "we provide an important service to the public", we are not like the [name of other institution]"

LEADER
The group had clear distinctions of dress and symbols between their different sub-groups. The leader of the sub-groups were assigned by role as part of the organisation however the members accepted this locally but appeared to have issues with it at higher levels of recursion of the organisation

ALIGNED
The various sub-groups present had different prototypicality that was very evident, both from attitude, dress and behaviour. The group did not feel that they were the same as their managers.

ID_OWNERSHIP
The local manager was able to give permission for the interviews.

CLOSURE
The representatives felt that they were "often more concerned with what was going on inside the organisation than what was going on outside".

ADAPTABILITY
The group reported that "gossip was rife", one member gave an example of news that spread very quickly though the local organisation.

PLANNING
The sub-groups felt that they "rarely discussed or planned for the future"
2.4.5 Group Type 5 - Charity

2.4.5.1 Group 10

WHOS_US
The individual questioned stated the purpose of the organisation "we are a charity that supports ....."

WHENSALIENT
The individual interviewed suggested that the group was very important to the members but they did not socialised and mixed "all the time"

METAGROUP
The individual interviewed said that the organisation was "nationwide"

PURPOSE
The individual interviewed stated that "we are a charity that supports ....."

SOCIALVALUE
The individual interviewed thought that she was highly valued for "my commitment to the charity - I feel that I am doing something"

WHOSTHEM
The individual interviewed thought that "other charities" would be 'them'

DIFFTHEM
The individual interviewed thought that "it is not so much how different we are it's more that we are competing for the same resources"

PROTOTYPE
The individual interviewed did not think that there was a typical member, however when questioned further suggested that they could "tend to be people who are committed" she also stated that "only a few people work here"

GROUPVALUE
The individual interviewed thought that the group was "not that well known except to those that are involved"

ID_STRENGTH
From the information obtained from the individual interviewed the group appeared to have committed members who believed in their cause; however the group was not well known and this caused a loss in identity strength

NORMATIVE
There was some evidence of normative behaviour; however this tended to be along the lines of social norms and not specific to the group.

COHERENT
The individual interviewed stated that “sometimes we disagree but generally we work together well”, "yes we trust each other"

SELF_ESTEEM
The individual interviewed felt that she "enjoyed belonging to the group".
IDEALS
The individual interviewed stated that the group "believed in trying to help the ……..."

LEADER
There were no obvious symbols of leadership. The individual interviewed suggested that the group were "very democratic"

ALIGNED
With only one individual interviewed it was difficult to tell. The individual suggested that there was reasonable contact with the parent organisation and that they "served the same purpose", the individual also saw them as the "same" as herself

ID_OWNERSHIP
The local management were able to give permission for the interview. The individual interviewed suggested that the group was "very democratic" there did not appear to be issues with a 'high status group.'

CLOSURE
The group was not easily assessed for system closure.

ADAPTABILITY
Although the individual interviewed suggested that there was some 'gossip' they also felt that the group was "highly responsive" and able to adapt "we are small and have to be flexible"

PLANNING
There was no indication from the individual interviewed that the social aspects were ever anticipated.
2.4.5.2 Group 11

WHOS_US
The group stated the purpose of the organisation "we are a group that ...." 

WHENSALIENT
The members felt that they were concerned about the group "most of the time"

META GROUP
"We are the main part - there are affiliates in other areas"

PURPOSE
"We try to stop ....and help ....."

SOCIAL VALUE
Each member reported undertaking different functions that they felt they were valued for "I organise the events", "I do the art work "

WHOSTHEM
The group could not identify an out-group 

DIFF THEM
The question was not relevant

PROTOTYPE
The group differed in their opinions - one felt that "yes we tend to be female" while another stated "we have all types"

GROUP VALUE
While the group felt that they were admired at times they also recognised that they were not well known

ID_STRENGTH
The group was a very small little known charity that was still forming; however the dedication of the members was obvious.

NORMATIVE
There was no evidence of set ways of behaviour outside social norms

COHERENT
The group appeared to work together very coherently. Members reported that there was "good harmony". The group's purpose was defined around its charity objective. There were no problems with trust.

SELF Esteem
The group felt very proud of their activities "somebody has to do this"

IDEALS
"This is the right thing to do. We believe in doing the right thing. When asked if they were a religious group "we have Christian ideals I suppose"
LEADER
The leader of the group was also its founder and did most of the work.

ALIGNED
There was no parent organisation

ID_OWNERSHIP
The leader of the group who was also its founder had the most say; however, the group members stated that they were "very democratic"

CLOSURE
The group felt that they would "not be deterred by what happened in the outside world unless if furthered their cause"

ADAPTABILITY
The group felt that they did not 'gossip' and that their group was very willing to change and adapt, giving several examples of changes to their normal activities as a result of lessons learnt

PLANNING
The group felt that they discussed the make-up of their organisation regularly.
2.4.5.3 Group 12

WHOS_US
The individual interviewed stated the purpose of the organisation "we help ....".

WHENSALIENT
The member interviewed said that many of the members were very dedicated and the group was not just a place where they came to work.

METAGROUP
"Just a part"

PURPOSE
"We provide fundraising and care for ...."

SOCIALVALUE
"Yes I feel appreciated - I help with a wide range of jobs - we are a very small team."

WHOSTHEM
"Them" is the people that make the 'red tape' that stops us doing what we need to do. And a positive 'them' the people that we interact with"

DIFFTHEM
not answered

PROTOTYPE
"yes - people have to be dedicated and have the right attitude."

GROUPVALUE
"We are appreciated by those that know us"

ID_STRENGTH
A small organisation with a dedicated membership with a clear purpose

NORMATIVE
The individual interviewed felt that "you have to be a certain type to work here" and if you are its very welcoming

COHERENT
"Yes - we have shared values and weekly we get together for comms meetings where we all contribute and are accountable to each other." "We have a lot of trust"

SELF_ESTEEM
"Yes I like working here much more than my previous job in the forces"

IDEALS
"We all believe in what we are doing - in trying to help people"
APPENDIX 2 - QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

Record of Interviews

LEADER
"We are all accountable to each other"

ALIGNED
The individual interviewed felt that the group was "the same throughout"

ID_OWNERSHIP
"We work together to solve the problems"

CLOSURE
The member interviewed felt that the group "operated in the real world but was able to sustain itself against hardships"

ADAPTABILITY
The member interviewed felt that "the group 'gossips' in a positive way about everything"

PLANNING
The member interviewed felt that the group planned ahead well.
2.4.5.4 Group 13

WHOUS
"We help the ........"

WHENSALIENT
The members felt that they were very dedicated and the work filled their lives "very fully".

METAGROUP
Most of the group at the central location were interviewed however, there were several outstations of the organisation that were not present.

PURPOSE
The group felt that they helped people more than just providing .... Several members stated that they considered that they gave people "life skills" and empowered them to take charge of their own lives.

SOCIALVALUE
The members interviewed mainly provided answers that related to people skills "I am good at communications", "I have patience", I am a good listener", "I try to be a problem solver", "I try to bring the clients point of view". One member said "I could earn more at Sainsbury's if I wanted but what I do here is worthwhile";

WHOHOSTHM
Several of the members reported that 'them' was "the client". Others said there was no 'them' or could not think of any group. One member suggested it was "the Council and the Stakeholders", another member suggested 'them' was the "other part of the organisation that did logistics and held everything up"

DIFFTHEM
"We are more trustworthy than the clients". "The logistics group are patronising"

PROTOTYPE
The members felt that there was a very definite 'prototype' but could not easily provide an image; however, they suggested that the normal person who worked there was "caring, idealistic but practical."

GROUPVALUE
The group felt that they achieved a service that was "unique and very valued" within the local community

ID_STRENGTH
The members had a strong identity that was driven by ideals.

NORMATIVE
There were indications of normative behaviour. "We have definite ways of doing things that are very different from where I used to work".

COHERENT
The members felt "you have to be very careful when dealing with the clients - they are very diverse so we need to all support each other". There seemed to be a good team attitude. "We need to trust and rely on each other"
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SELF_ESTEEM
The members interviewed stated that "it is worthwhile", or "it is doing good" suggesting that they gained self-esteem from their role in the organisation.

IDEALS
The group members felt that they were doing something that was "worthwhile" which suggested that there were strong ideals.

LEADER
The group had a manager/supervisor however they talked more about ‘teamwork’ and being a "team player"

ALIGNED
There was a limited higher level of recursion, however, the manager and stakeholders were seen as "the same as us" by all members except one.

ID_OWNERSHIP
There was a very strong feeling that decisions were shared and that each of the members had a say in what went on. The group had no difficulty with doing the questionnaire and several of the members asked to see the results; suggesting a degree of identity ownership

CLOSURE
The group showed signs of system closure with a clear ethos and group norms but more importantly a strong sense of 'us'. The group was also isolated from world events as its charity function was not likely to disappear.

ADAPTABILITY
The group did not feel that they 'gossiped' or that there were concerns about the organisation.

PLANNING
There was a feeling amongst the members interviewed that the group thought ahead "we are always trying to work out where we are going"
2.4.5.5 Group 16

WHOS_US
"A caring support organisation for ....."

WHENSLAIENT
"For us - all the time"

METAGROUP
"We are just a part"

PURPOSE
"A caring support organisation for ....."

SOCIALVALUE
"I am the oil on troubled waters"; "I feel valued but I couldn't say why"

WHOSTHEM
The members interviewed could not define an out-group

DIFFTHEM
Not answered

PROTOTYPE
One member interviewed felt that there was a clear type of person that joined the group "practical and caring", while another felt that they just had to "be prepared to listen"

GROUPVALUE
The group members interviewed felt that they were well respected as a group in the area concerned

ID_STRENGTH
A small organisation with a dedicated membership driven by ideals

NORMATIVE
There was no strong evidence of normative behaviour. People felt that they were "made to feel very welcome" when they joined

COHERENT
The members felt that there was a "good harmony and trust" in the group

SELF_ESTEEM
Each member felt that they "gained a lot" by being part of the group - "its voluntary so otherwise I wouldn't come"

IDEALS
"We all have good reason to be here and to believe in what we are doing"
LEADER
There were no obvious symbols of leadership. The members felt that they "shared decisions"

ALIGNED
The group were not able to define the parent group's prototype because they felt that "they are no different"

ID_OWNERSHIP
The local group were able to agree to be interviewed

CLOSURE
The group was fairly isolated from events in the world and showed signs of closure. The charity cause was not likely to disappear quickly

ADAPTABILITY
The group felt that they "adapted quickly when we need to"

PLANNING
"We discuss the future for the group a lot"
## 2.5 Groups Approached

Table 2.1 identifies the groups approached for research, the method of approach, the type of group and the response.

### Table 2.1 - List of groups approached for research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach Order</th>
<th>Group ID</th>
<th>Group Type</th>
<th>Approach Method</th>
<th>Agreed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>email, phone</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>letter, phone</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>face to face</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>letter, email</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>face to face</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>face to face, letter, phone</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>face to face, letter, phone</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Approach Method</td>
<td>Contacted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>face to face, letter, phone</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>phone</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>letter</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>face to face</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>face to face</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>face to face</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>letter</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>face to face</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>face to face</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>face to face</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Group Approached

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Contact Method</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>face to face, letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>letter</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>