Sara Elvekrok Agerup

”It is all about lifting it to a level of an empathic attitude, a heartily friendly attitude”

A qualitative study of experiences with facilitating teamwork processes in organizations

Master thesis in Counseling

Trondheim, June 2014

Supervisor: Jonathan Reams

Norwegian University of Science and Technology in Trondheim
Faculty of Social Science and Technology Management
Department of Adult Learning and Counseling

NTNU
Norwegian University of
Science and Technology

Abstract

This study explores experiences with facilitating teamwork processes in organizations. An external partner can help with the facilitation of these processes. The data has been gathered through transcriptions of qualitative interviews. The informants are three consultants that have broad experience with facilitating teamwork processes. *The constant comparative method* has been used for analyzing the data.

The research led to three main categories that capture the essence of the informants' experiences: *Leading with presence and improvisation, Self-as-instrument* and *Holistic attitude towards development.*

- A main finding is that the facilitators don't follow a concrete structure when meeting a team, but on the contrary lead with *presence and improvisation.* By being open and aware in the situation the facilitators can understand what's going on in the team. The facilitators' development of tacit knowledge, which also includes different extents of intuition, gives them information about the situation. Based on this information, they can improvise what actions to take in the process.
- The facilitators' use themselves *as instruments* to a great extent. To be able to balance being good helpers and taking care of themselves in their work, they constantly reflect upon and work on their own process. By becoming grounded in themselves, they can manage this balance.
- *Holistic attitude towards development* is connected to how the facilitators see the team in connection to the organization they are a part of, and are therefore mindful of this in their work. Their holistic attitude is also connected to their view on *the whole* person, consisting of thoughts, feelings and body. Creating a space where the members can learn about themselves and share with each other, contributes to their ability to work together as a team.

A central finding that can be connected to all the categories is the facilitators' emphatic attitude towards the team.

Acknowledgments

The research process is going towards the end and I must say; this has been an adventure! The people that I've met, the things that I've learned, the conversations that I've had and the experiences I've gained have all contributed to this. Like many adventures mine started with excitement, but also uncertainty and fear. Not seeing the end of it, not always being sure where I was headed, made the process chaotic at times. The people around me have been essential being able to "stand" in this chaos.

Thank you to my three informants that have been sharing your experiences with me. Without you I wouldn't be able to explore this theme, which I find so interesting. It has been inspiring to meet you all!
Thank you to my fellow classmates for the long lunches we've had sharing our concerns, joys and reflections on the small and big aspects of life. You all have a special place in my heart.
Thank you to my supervisor Jonathan Reams for everything that you have shared with me. I always walk out of your office energized, inspired and full of reflections around my thesis (and life in general).
Thank you to all my friends in Trondheim and Oslo for the fun we've had in between the writing. It has been crucial! A special *thank you* to Caroline, Karina and Yngvild for help, long conversations and always having faith in me.
Thank you to mamma, pappa and Lilly for always loving me, believing in me, pushing me and giving me advice (even though I don't always seem to appreciate the last one).
Thank you Andreas, for bringing laughter to my life everyday.

This has been a great adventure, and ends with happiness, as all great adventures should.

Sara Elvekrok Agerup
June, 2014

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT III

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS V

1. INTRODUCTION 1

1.1 Conceptual clarification 1

1.2 Structure of the thesis 3

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND 5

2.1 New thoughts around organizational work and development 5

2.2 The helping relationship 8
2.2.1 Awareness in the process: Understanding one self and others 9

2.3 Facilitation of teams 12
2.3.1 Creating a holding environment 14

3. METHOD 17

3.1 Qualitative method 17
3.1.1 Phenomenology 18

3.2. Selecting research participants 18

3.3. Interview guide and pilot interview 20

3.4 Gathering data through qualitative interview 21
3.4.1 Transcriptions 22

3.5 The analyzing process 24

3.6 Quality in the study 27

3.7 Ethical considerations 28

3.8 Me as a researcher 29

4. ANALYSIS 31

4. 1 Main category 1: Leading with presence and improvisation 31
4.1.1 Being here and now: Openness and awareness 32
4.1.2 Lifting the awareness in the team: An opportunity to see themselves 33
4.1.3 Empathic attitude towards others 34

4.2 Main category 2: Self-as-instrument 35
4.2.1 Own process and development 35
4.2.2 "Only human" 36

4.3 Main category 3: Holistic attitude towards development **38**
4.3.1 The whole person 39
4.3.2 From "I" to "us" 40

5. DISCUSSION **43**

5.1. Leading with presence and improvisation **43**
5.1.1. Tacit knowledge and intuition 45

5.2. Self-as-instrument: Balancing helping and taking care of one's self as a helper **47**
5.2.1. To manage the balance 48

5.3. Holistic attitude towards development: Creating a holding environment **49**
5.3.1. Creating space for learning and sharing 50
5.3.2. Including each other 51
5.3.3. Leading through the heart 52

6. CONCLUSION **55**
6.1 Limitations and further study 57

7. LITERATURE **59**

APPENDIX .... **I**

Appendix 1: Informed consent from research participants .... **i**

Appendix 2: Interview guide .... **iii**

Appendix 3: Approval from NSD .... **v**

1. Introduction

Through my counseling studies, and especially courses I have had about group processes, I have developed a great interest in teamwork processes and facilitation of these. By working in a group with five fellow students through a semester, solving different tasks as a team while focusing on the personal process going on between us and within us, I have experienced how valuable this way of working together can be both for the outcome of the teamwork, the team development and the self-development of each individual. I also experienced how challenging this is, giving each other feedback, having the courage to be open, working through conflict and respecting and tolerating each other's ways of being and the different needs that exists in a group. Because this way of working in a group or team is complex and challenging I see the value of having a person outside the group helping with these processes.

I started doing research on where work with group processes actually happens in practice in the work life. I met different people working with teams in organizations and that's how I got the idea to write about external process consultants. By talking to different process consultants (PC) and reading literature about it I realized that being hired as an external part to help the organizations develop in different ways is complex and consists of many different aspects. With my interest for teamwork I chose to focus on the process consultant in meeting with a small team working to help the team create something together. Like Edgar Schein (1987) states in his book about process consultation, people have a hard time understanding what process consultants actually *do*, so this thesis is inspired by getting an in-depth understanding of what PC's do when working with teams. This led to my research question: *What experiences do three process consultants have with facilitating teamwork processes in organizations?*

1.1 Conceptual clarification

A description of *teamwork processes*, *process consulting* and *facilitation* will be presented in the following. In this thesis teamwork processes are the context of where the process consultants work are happening. It is their experiences with facilitating these processes that are the focal point of the research.

To understand what is meant with *teamwork processes*, the term *team* is important to clarify, as there are many definitions. Hjertø (2013) presents a research-based description of what teams are:

> *A team is a relatively autonomous workgroup consisting of at least 3 people, that to a great extent work being interdependent of each other over time, that are mutual responsible to complete the group's goal, and where the team members relations are the groups basic ingredient (p. 32, my translation).*

Hackman (2002, in Hjertø, 2013) writes that teams that exceed 10 members will have a problem functioning. Based on this I have chosen that teams that the facilitators share their experience facilitating from, doesn't consist of more than 10 members. The term process is defined by Schein (1999) as a focus on *how* things are done rather than *what* is done. Teamwork processes will in this context mean any process, short or long, where a team as defined above gathers to work together. I find this definition well fitted for my thesis, it being broad enough to capture the work with different kind of teams in an organization. At the same time it is sufficiently context specific to go in-depth in the experiences working with teams from this definition. The literature used in the theory chapter uses both of the terms, groups and teams, and I will use both terms accordingly. I have chosen to write about group theory that fits with the description of the term given above, or state it if otherwise.

There are different terms describing a person that works with teams in organization helping the team to become more effective by both focusing on the goal they are reaching and the relationship between the members. I use Edgar Schein's (1987, 1988, 1999) writings about *process consulting,* describing process consultants as a an external party, that through a set of activities help the client see, understand and take action to improve situations that occur in the client's environment. Schein looks at organizations as a network of human relationships, and therefore to focus on these relational aspects as fundamental when working with organizational improvement. This emphasis on the relational aspects in the team makes his theory interesting in understanding how, with this focus, organizations and teams work.

The informants use different terms describing their job title when working with organizational development and teamwork processes. Process consulting, as described above, captures the work with organizations at large. I have chosen to use the word *facilitator* in this context, when focusing on the work the informants do with teams in organizations, as I see the need to stick to one definition for the sake of making it clear for the reader. The core competencies of a facilitator are defined by the International Association of Facilitators as creation of collaborative client relationships, to plan group processes, create and sustain an environment for participation and guiding groups to achieve their wanted outcomes. Building and maintaining professional knowledge in facilitation, and be a model for positive and professional attitude, is also a part of their work as facilitators (Baker & Fraser, 2005). This fits with the way the informants explain their work.

1.2 Structure of the thesis

The introduction has presented fundamental understanding around the background for choosing the research question. Important conceptual clarifications have also been described. Chapter two will continue with a theoretical background in understanding the context of the thesis with *new thoughts around organizational work and development, the helping relationship* and *facilitation of teams* as the main themes. In Chapter three the method used for the thesis and my research process will be described creating an understanding of what I have done and why. This is followed by a presentation of the central findings of the research in Chapter four, through a display of categories found through the analysis of transcriptions of interviews conducted. In Chapter five I will discuss these findings with the theory presented in Chapter two. In Chapter six the discussion will be summarized and a conclusion to the research question will be presented.

2. Theoretical background

Several relevant theories are presented in this chapter, giving a background to understand organizational work and development, teamwork processes and how to work with these processes as a professional helper. The existential-humanistic tradition in counseling and psychotherapy, with Carl Rogers (1902-1987) as a main figure, is widespread at the counseling institute where I have studied and is also an influence for this thesis. The tradition brings an empathic view on the individual, and sees relationships as fundamental in a person's life. People are viewed as empowered and capable of creating the life they want (Ivey, D'Andrea & Ivey, 2012). With my interest in including the relational aspect into the field of team- and organizational development, the theories that I present is chosen based on this.

New thoughts on organizational work and development will first be explored, as the context of the research is teamwork in organizations. Teamwork has also become a common way of structuring organizations and is therefore a big part of organizational work (Senge, 2006). Theory about teamwork will then be described in particular. To understand the work of external process consultants in organization, the theory chapter will introduce the term *helping relationship* (Schein, 1988, 1999; Rogers, 1961). I see the helping relationship as fundamental for people that work with teams in organizations, with developing awareness to understand one self and other people as a main prerequisite. The facilitation of teams will then be presented followed with the importance of *creating a holding environment* (Heifetz, 1994) as a sub theme.

2.1 New thoughts around organizational work and development

We tried for many years to avoid the messiness and complexity of being human, and now that denial is coming back to haunt us. We keep failing to create the outcomes and changes we need in organizations because we continue to deny that "the human element" is anything but a "soft" and not-to-be-taken-seriously minor distraction. (Wheatley, 2006, p. 164)

Theory U: leading from the future at is emerges (Scharmer, 2007), *Leadership without easy answers* (Heifetz, 1994), *The fifth discipline: the art and practice of the learning organization* (Senge, 2006) and *Leadership and the new science* (Wheatley,

2006) are all theories introducing new ways of thinking about work and leadership in organizations to be successful in today's constantly changing conditions and to manage the challenges and complexity that this brings. They come in different packages, but introduce the same fundamental thoughts on how to work in better ways.

Scharmer (2007) writes how the crises of our time with environmental challenges, poverty, health, conflict etc. won't get solved by doing the same as one has done before. The traditional ways of thinking about and working with organizations have, according to Wheatley (2006), been influenced by Newtonian theory about the world, separating everything into different parts, make plans expecting the world to be predictable and searching for methods to understand the world objectively. Influenced by more recently science from physics and biology she writes how the world is chaotic and uncertain, and how organizations have to work differently handling the complex issues that one today faces.

Heifetz (1994) introduces *adaptive work* as a way of mobilizing people to cope with tough challenges and change. To be able to work under the chaotic conditions one must learn to "stand in chaos", and as a leader or PC, lead others in this chaos. What he calls *adaptive challenges* do not get solved by technical solutions and one "right answer" offered by the leader, which has been the tradition in many organizations. Instead of removing the feelings of stress and chaos by presenting a solution for every problem, creating an environment for the people in the organization to deal with these issues themselves is seen as important.

Senge (2006) writes how organizations must be looked at as one coherent whole and not different parts that has nothing to do with each other. He calls this *system thinking* and integrates *personal mastery, mental models, building a shared vision and learning in teams*. System thinking is also a part in itself, *"the fifth discipline",* that connects the other four. Scharmer (2007) introduces a new social grammar and way of relating with one another, in teams, organizations and larger systems.

The similarities in these theories are that they all value the relationships among people, how learning by discovery (and not being "told the right answer") can create development, the wholeness and how people and systems are connected, the ability to "stand" in chaos/uncertainty and how understanding what "is", or being present in the situation, becomes important when creating development within people, teams, organizations and the world at large. People being in dialogue for learning and development to happen is valued in several of the theories and will be further described in 2.3.1.

2.1.1. Teamwork in organizations

Kvalsund & Meyer (2005), Senge, (2006) and McClure (2005) connect the fundamental thoughts presented above with teamwork in organizations. The theories emphasize how focusing both on reaching the goal and the process going on between the members in a team can contribute to make the outcome of the teamwork more successful. It can also give the team an opportunity to learn about themselves and each other.

Kvalsund & Meyer (2005) connect Martin Buber's (1958) writings on the I-Thou-relationship and MacMurray's (1961) thoughts around being persons-in-relation to counseling and group theory. They write, among other things, about learning and resource development in teams. With this background they introduce the fundamental thought of how people develop by being in contact with other people. In a team context one must make room for each individual and give him/her an opportunity to understand him/herself. The person must also exceed him/herself and include others into his/her existence. When being persons-in-relation there is room for both the individual and "the other".

Senge (2006) also writes about learning as essential in a team with the notion that almost all important decisions in an organization are made in teams. Learning insights and skills together in a team can also create a standard for learning together that effect the rest of the organization. This can be connected to Kvalsund & Meyer (2005) and how they write that when a person becomes a part of a larger team, the team can become a part of the organization, the system and the universe. McClure (2005) views groups as living systems with the ability to self-organize and learn, develop and change. McClure calls work groups that are brought together by external and planned forces working on a common task which require cooperation between the members *concocted groups*. This can be linked to the term team used for this thesis from Hjertø (2013).

Senge (2006) writes how team learning starts with dialogue where the members open up to each other and think together, rather than holding on to their own assumptions. The members in the team don't sacrifice their visions, but build on each other's visions, creating a shared one. As mentioned in the introduction, teamwork is in this thesis the context of where the facilitator's work happens. The theories presented here will be further explored through facilitation of teamwork processes in 2.3.

2.2 The helping relationship

Schein (1988, 1999) looks at the work of a process consultant as a philosophy on how to take a certain kind of attitude toward the relationship. The helping relationships is a fundamental wish of actually wanting to help, rather than something that can be explained by some examples and a simple definition. The famous therapist and theorist Carl Rogers (1961) describes *a helping relationship* as a relationship where one of the parties involved has the intention of endorsing growth, development, maturity and improved functioning within a person or a group. He too has found that the more genuine the helping relationship is, the more helpful it will be.

Many organizations have realized the importance of the people in the organization working well together if they want to be successful (Schein, 1999; Kvalsund & Meyer, 2005). With the needs for help from an expert in the field, many organizations and managers hire an external person that can focus on the relational aspect that goes on between the people in the organization when working with different types of organizational development (Schein, 1988). The process consultant is in a helping relationship to the organization as a whole and also to different individuals in the organization and the teams they are in contact with.

Acceptance of the other person, unconditional positive regard and empathy are fundamental in Rogers' theory about the attitude a helper should have towards the client. The positive regard is in this way not something that comes from the client behaving or doing what the helper wants, it's unconditional no matter who the client is, what he says or what he needs. Rogers writes: *"When these conditions are* *achieved, I become a companion to my client, accompanying him in the frightening search of himself, which he now feels free to undertake"* (p. 34). By having this attitude towards the other part in the helping relationship the other will according to Rogers get a better understanding of himself and function better in his life and with other people by understanding and accepting them in a better way. Rogers' term self-actualization can be defined as "experiencing one's fullest humanity" (Ivey, D'Andrea & Ivey, 2012 p. 370). When the helper meets the client in this way he can start meeting himself in the same way, and in turn meet other people with the same attitude.

It's important to be strong enough as a helper to meet a person in an empathic way, but still be able to separate oneself from the client and not be "drawn" into their process (Rogers, 1961). The job of a PC is not to take the clients problems on to oneself or to create solutions for the problem which one actually is not in, since it's the client who owns the problem and the solution (Schein, 1999).

So how can one as a PC create growth within another person or a team? Schein (1988, 1999), Cheung-Judge (2012), Allgood & Kvalsund (2005), Rogers (1961) and Reams & Caspari (2012) all empathize how one must work to be aware of what happens within one self and with the people one are working with, thus the sub theme *awareness in the process.*

2.2.1 Awareness in the process: Understanding one self and others

2.2.1.1. Understanding one self

Being real, or congruent, as a therapist is one of the main fundaments of Rogers (1961) theory. Getting to know yourself as a helper is therefore essential. In Kvalsund & Allgood (2005), knowing one self and working on one's own growth and development as a guide, counselor or therapist, is described as *"absolutely necessary"* (p. 137). Kvalsund & Meyer (2005) write about their attitude towards development and learning in groups and how the road to this is through awareness and understanding what *"is"*. To understand "what is" the senses must be sharpened (Scharmer, 2007) and one must "dare" to stand in it, even though it can be unpleasant (Heifetz, 1994). To discover "what is" one must develop senses, awareness, consciousness and self-knowledge (Kvalsund & Meyer, 2005).

In their writings about process consulting, Cheung-Judge (2012) and Schein (1987, 1988) describe the PC as the main instrument in creating effective process consulting. Two important ways of using one's self as an instrument is by owning and refining one's instrumentality. Owning one's instrumentality means to develop self-knowledge and find out who you are. Refining ones instrumentality means to work on one's own development. By working on life-long learning habits, working through issues of power (manage other's power dynamics, setting boundaries, knowing one's values), building emotional and intuitive self-awareness and committing to self-care, a process consultant can develop in his or hers work (Cheung-Judge, 2012). With life-long learning habits the consultant sees every situation, positive or negative, as an opportunity to learn about himself/herself and the client (Schein, 1999).

Jordan (2002) describes self-awareness as a person's awareness of what is going on in their inner processes; behavioral habits, emotions, desires, thoughts and images that occur in people's interior. The process of becoming aware opens the possibility to reflect upon our way of being, thinking and feeling. With meta-awareness one can look at awareness itself as an object to study. When people become skillful in noticing and observing their intersubjective experiences something he calls *the witnessing-self* becomes stronger. This happens when one is being able to relate to these inner processes, without being "had" by them. When you have started to notice and improved your observation of these processes you can after a while start to relate actively to the different emotions, thoughts and impulses that occur and choose how you want to relate to them. Rogers (1961) has found through his research and practice that to be psychological mature as a helper is important to be able to help others.

Reams & Caspari (2012) write about integrity, subtle energies and intuition in combination with a late stage of cognitive development and how that can create a *quality of presence*. Integrity is about becoming a whole person. We can meet another person openly by being aware of our self and what we consist of. We can also listen to our own inner self when in contact with others. Integrity is described as *acting in alignment with our highest calling* and is viewed as the key factor to be present to someone/somebody else (a person, a group, an emotion, an idea etc.). With later cognitive development one can make decisions on which kind of tools to use in different settings in a better way. This can be connected to how Schein (1999) write that being aware of who one is and what one brings into a meeting with other people, one can avoid being led by assumptions and expectations.

In connection with this Reams & Caspari (2012) write how it's more important that one as a leader is developing towards this, rather than where the person is in his/her development at a certain point. Cook-Greuter (2010, in Reams & Caspari, 2012) writes about challenges when developing into later stages of cognitive development. Loneliness, fear of going insane and the loss of value in everyday actions are mentioned as some of them. To meet these challenges Reams & Caspari (2012) write that integrity is *"a moment to moment exercise to keep the inner system clean"* (p. 42).

2.2.1.2. Understanding others

Schein (1999) writes how being aware of the current reality and what's going on in the situation is essential in process consulting. By building trust and be able to discover what is happening in the organization the PC gets a chance to discover and also share this discovery with the client (Schein, 1988). The timing of interventions are crucial, and the timing of when different interventions are done, can have very different outcomes. Being aware of when the client is most open for learning the PC can consider when the client is ready for a new input (Schein, 1999). With a higher level of cognitive development, Cook-Greuter (1999, in Reams & Caspari, 2012) writes that one can go from mental processing of information to having the ability to be in *"the immediate, ongoing flow of experience"* (p.49).

To understand how a helper can be aware in the situation and time his or hers interventions, Reams & Caspari's (2012) writings about integrity is interesting. The state of integrity opens up for intuition and gives access to subtle layers of energies and information. They write a definition of intuition from Franquemont (1999) as the ability to acquire knowledge without the interference or the use of reason.

Reams & Caspari (2012) connect their writings partly to Scharmer (2007) and his term *presencing.* The term is put together by the words presence and sensing. When presencing, groups and larger systems have the chance to create new ways of being and creating together by *"operating from the emerging future".* That means to be able to learn from the future as it arises before us, and not only do the same as before. He writes that one can look at the creation of all things from different angles; something that the creation leads to, the process of its creation, or the source that the creation unfolds from. We have to pay attention to both our visible and invisible way of being by looking at what we say, see and do, and the inner place of the way we operate. Reams & Caspari (2012) connect integrity to Scharmer (2007) and *the blind spot of leadership* where we ignore the inner source of which we operate. By being aware of our inner sources we can create "spaces" around us that can be sensed by others.

The importance of looking into one self to be able to create growth in other people can also be seen in Fikse (2013) and her research on effective leadership for the 21st century. She argues that to be able to deal with the complexity and challenges leaders meet today, there is need for leadership that goes through self-actualization to co-actualization and co-creation. Co-actualization is a further development of Rogers' term self-actualization and describes a process where people actualize their potential when being in relationship with one another, meeting each other with empathy, congruency and unconditional positive regard (Ivey, D'Andrea & Ivey, 2012). Leadership that goes from the inside and out, starting with the leaders' interior, is found to be an important necessity for leading to facilitate co-creation (Fikse, 2013).

2.3 Facilitation of teams

A consultant or facilitator from outside the organization is hired to be a resource in team processes. Many managers don't know how to lead and work to develop teams and therefore hire an external consultant to help with this (Schein, 1987, 1988). Schein (1987, 1988), Senge (2006), McClure (2005) and Kvalsund & Meyer (2005) all see the importance of creating ownership of the team process and outcome of the work within the team. Focusing on the relationships within the team and building a safe environment for them to unfold and work can help the team become self-organizing (McClure, 2005). Following the flow that the client has is important, and after a while the PC can be a part of this flow (Schein, 1999). Senge (2006) also writes how the facilitators role becomes more as a part of the team as the team develops.

Senge (2006) describes how the facilitator helps the members to take ownership of the team process and the outcome of their work, keeps the dialogue moving and becomes a role model in demonstrating dialogue by being a part of the process. Kvalsund & Meyer (2005) see the work of a guidance/counselor (veileder) to create conditions for the members in a team to meet in mutuality around their cooperation and their ways of relating to each other. They view guidance/counseling as the skill to intervene in processes to create experiences that leads to learning.

The importance of having the skill to intervene is also seen in McClure's (2005) theory. He writes how the basic of good leadership of groups is to recognize the situations when facilitating can lead to change. With knowledge of group dynamics, knowing one self, and the ability to notice patterns in the group and sensitivity to nuance, the group leader can learn to act intuitively**.** The development of intuition can be explored through Dreyfus (1981, in Lester, 2005) and Dreyfus & Dreyfus (1984, in Lester, 2005) model on the development from novice to expert. A novice has minimal knowledge and has to follow rigid plans to use this knowledge in practice. Through the developmental stages *advanced beginner, competent* and *proficient* one can in the end become an expert. The expert doesn't rely on rules or guidelines, but has deep tacit understanding thus an intuitive understanding of situations. The expert can move between analytical and intuitive approaches.

The source of intuitive processes has to do with aspects of the leaders quality of presence. The impacts the facilitators have on other people don't come from skill or activity alone. It comes from their beingness. In this context Reams (2012) writes that leaders can *open space by leading through the heart.* Based on their research on the heart, McCraty, Atkinson, Tomasino & Bradley (2009) write how *"the heart generates by far the most powerful and most extensive rhythmic electromagnetic field produced in the body"* (p.55). Leading through the heart can thus create space where people can sense each other's presence and emotions in a larger sense than by only using the brain. By paying attention the heart, one can develop its capacity (Reams, 2012).

The ability to create a space where the team can work together and unfold will further be explored through the concept of *creating a holding environment.*

2.3.1 Creating a holding environment

Heifetz (1994) uses the term *holding environment* as *"any relationships in which one party has the power to hold the attention of another party and facilitate adaptive work"* (Heifetz, 1994 p. 105). A holding environment has the ability to hold conflict, chaos and confusion when complex issues are being worked on and gives a group identity (Heifetz, 1994). McClure (2005) calls this function *"containment"* and describes it as a psychological touch that makes room for emotional growth through the creation of an environment where the unpredictable and the dialogue can unfold. If the group becomes too safe on the other hand it needs a "push" to evolve further, and that's what perturbation is about. This balance can also be seen in how Senge (2006) writes that a learning team needs both dialogue and discussion to move forward, and how a learning team must master this balance. Bohm (1996, in Senge, 2006) writes how there has to be a facilitator to work on holding the context where dialogue can happen. A facilitator can also help the members get in dialogue by demonstrating it (ibid).

Kvalsund & Meyer (2005) write that when working with a group one must make room for the dialogue among the group members and contribute to relational exchange. The dialogue creates real changes and creativity "there and then" and is a tool that gives individuals an opportunity to meet in mutuality as "persons-in-relation". To make use of all the different resources in a group the differences among the members have to be tolerated and appreciated. By looking at each other as subjects with own perspectives, values and needs that have to be taken seriously and respected the members in a group can meet each other in an I-You relationship (Buber, 1965 in Kvalsund & Allgood, 2008). Seeing another person as an object, with Buber's notion of "I" in relation to "it" will prevent them the opportunity to ever understand and engage with each other as human beings. By being in dialogue people in groups can both find a common understanding of their different views and also learn new things by being able to look through the eyes of others. *"Dialogue that is grounded in reflection and inquiry skills is likely more reliable and less dependent on* *particulars of circumstances, such as the chemistry among the team members"* (Senge, 2006, p. 232).

To be in dialogue the members must "suspend" their assumptions without being "had" by them (Bohm, 1996, in Senge, 2006). This can be connected to Jordan (2002) and the witness self that bases his work on (among others) Kegan (1982, 1994). The ability of holding a position, rather than being "held" by it, can be seen in Kegan's (1982, in Jordan, 2002) writings about psychological development and how people make meaning of situations. He writes how it's important for a helper to know how clients make meaning out of situations, to make sure that the helper makes connection that they don't understand because they are at another level of how they make meaning (Kegan, 1994).

The same thoughts around how to relate to each other can also be seen in Scharmer (2007) and how he separates conversation into four ways of relating to others. When downloading one speaks from what one thinks the others want to hear by "talking nice" and the "I" is in relation to "me". With debate one speaks from one's own assumptions by "talking tough" and the "I" is in "it". When in dialogue one speaks from seeing oneself as part of a larger whole with reflective inquiry and the "I" is in "you". When presencing one speaks from what moves through in the now in generative flow where the "I" is in "now". When an entire group of people open their minds, hearts and will within themselves and towards others, presencing can happen.

3. Method

The method chapter will describe the method used for this research project and important methodical choices that has been taken. The chapter will start with explaining the choice of qualitative method with a phenomenological approach. Then there will be given an explanation on the process of selecting research participants and who they are. This will be followed by writings about the interview guide and the conduct of a pilot interview. The chapter will further give a description of how the data from three interviews have been gathered and analyzed. In the end there will be presented writings about the quality of the study, the ethical aspect and my role in it as a researcher.

The researcher makes a lot of choices and takes different kinds of actions from the start of the process by deciding what one wants to write about until the process is done. It's important to be transparent about how and why these choices were made (Postholm, 2010; Thagaard, 2013). Thus the method chapter becomes an important part of the thesis.

3.1 Qualitative method

Qualitative method gives the researcher an opportunity to immerse in different social phenomenon by being in close contact with the participants of the research (Thagaard, 2013; Postholm, 2010; Dalen, 2010). Qualitative methods aim at going in-depth in a few people experiences (Thagaard, 2013). I was interested in getting an in-depth understanding of experiences working with teamwork processes by being in close contact with people who had experience with the phenomenon. Based on this, qualitative method became a well-fitted approach for my research project.

Qualitative method is inductive, emerging and influenced by the researchers' experience when obtaining and analyzing the data (Creswell, 2007). It's therefore important that one knows what one brings into the process as a researcher when doing qualitative research (Creswell, 2007; Postholm, 2010; Thagaard, 2013). My role as a researcher will be further explained in 3.6.

Interviews and observations are the most used methods within qualitative research. Interviews are a good way to understand how people understand their situation, while observation is a good way to understand how people relate to each other (Thagaard, 2013). Having met different process consultants and seen them “in action”, I got curious in understanding what they were actually doing. With this starting point I considered a mixed method with both interview and observation. It was hard to find arenas where I could observe processes with several informants in the time frame that I had. Thus I decided on a phenomenological approach with qualitative interviews.

3.1.1 Phenomenology

Interpretation plays an important part in qualitative studies. Phenomenology is one direction that one can base the interpretation on (Thagaard, 2013), as I have done in this study. Phenomenology has strong philosophical roots, starting with Edmund Husserl, and has developed into a range of different perspectives (Creswell, 2007). Qualitative studies with a phenomenological approach attempts to understand social phenomenon from the informants’ perspectives. This is based on the belief of how reality comes from how people perceive it (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). *Epoche*, or *bracketing*, is a term from Husserl’s theory where the researcher tries putting away their experience as much as possible to be able to see the phenomenon with “fresh eyes” (Moustakas, 1994 in Creswell, 2007). Phenomenological studies aim at finding the meaning of a phenomenon for several individuals. By comparing the individuals’ meanings, the essence of how a certain phenomenon is experienced can be found (Creswell, 2007; Thagaard, 2013).

3.2. Selecting research participants

When first starting to do pre-research on the subject about process consultants and their work I talked to 10 different people that had experience with the phenomenon in different ways. Every time I had talked to someone I got a new idea of a possible focus for my research question. At some point I had to make a choice and decided to focus on teamwork in organization. This was based on my interest in the theme and my impression that teamwork was an important part of process consultants’ work from reading theory about it and talking to people. I chose to interview three process consultants that were concerned with not only the task at hand in their work but also the relational aspect of people within an organization, making it relevant for my counseling studies and what I am inspired by. By talking to the informants I got an understanding that this was something that they balanced in their work.

Purposeful sampling is a term describing how to select individuals from the base that they have information about, and can therefore create an understanding of the phenomenon that is being studied (Creswell, 2007; Thagaard, 2013). I had ongoing contact with two of the informants and met them in person, e-mailed and talked on the phone making sure they were the right ones to interview for my research question. The third one I met in another context, but understood after having a conversation with the person about his/her work that that he/she would be a fitted informant. The distance between the researcher and the interviewer can be reduced by the researcher being present in the person's environment for a time (Thagaard, 2013) and I felt that my relationship with them had started to develop before conducting the interviews.

The number of informants shouldn't be too big, because of the time it takes to conduct interviews and analyze them. At the same time it should be big enough to be able to have enough data for analyzing (Dalen, 2010). Kvale & Brinkmann (2009) write how one should conduct interviews until new interviews wouldn't add more information. Polkinghorne (1989, in Postholm, 2010) suggest from 3-25 participants and Dukes (1984, in Postholm, 2010) suggests 3-10 participants in phenomenological research. In a smaller research process Postholm (2010) writes how it's smart to choose the lowest number of participants. Doing this, one can still be able to find similarities between them and the essence of the research question within the time frame. I sat three informants as minimum criteria and thought I could wait and see what I got from those three interviews before deciding on whether I should conduct another one or not. When finishing the three interviews I was convinced that I had sufficient data to answer the research question.

The three informants have experience working with teams and organizations in different ways. *Lars* has worked as a consultant for 7 years, and independent for 2. He gets hired for different processes, both longer and shorter, in organizations and teams with IT, leadership -and team development. *Katrine* has her background from psychology and leadership. She has worked as an independent consultant for 18 years, with both longer and shorter organizational and team development processes. *Tone* has 15 years of experience working with organizational development, move -and change processes working with teams as a part of this. She also has another educational background that she balances with facilitating.

What is similar about the facilitators is how they have experience working with teams that are gathered to create something, who are interdependent in their task, where the team see themselves and are seen by others as a social unity in a larger social system. The entire team is responsible for the outcome of the collaboration and they manage their relationship across organizational boundaries. The facilitators balance the focus on the specific teamwork that a team is working on with the relational aspects that goes on within a team.

3.3. Interview guide and pilot interview

An interview guide is created to cover the central aspects of what the research is about by creating themes and questions one thinks is relevant to ask the informants (Dalen, 2011; Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). It's important that the researcher has written down some topics before meeting with an informant so that similarities, the "essence" of the phenomenon, can be found (Postholm, 2010). I created a semi-structured interview guide with broad questions and more specific follow-up questions (see appendix 2). The broader questions covered a description of the work the informant does, what he/she would like to achieve when working with a team, what he/she is aware of when in contact with a team and what he/she thinks the team takes with them after the teamwork process. To ask about descriptions are often good questions (Dalen, 2010) and I started the interviews by asking the informants how they would describe their work with a team, as I saw this as an essential question to ask. Kvale & Brinkmann (2009) write how it's important to get *specific* descriptions of situations or actions, and I was focused on asking about this when conducting the interviews.

It's important to ask questions that the informant feels is relevant (Postholm, 2010), so talking to them beforehand was important to make sure they could relate to the questions. It's important to be able to ask good follow-up questions. To be able to do this the researcher must have knowledge on the theme. I chose to ask broad questions because I wanted the informants to fill in their thoughts, descriptions and perspectives and not be primed by questions where I might have already laid meaning to them. Follow-up questions are created to be able to go more in-depth in the themes (Postholm, 2010), so they were suggestions of questions that I could ask if the informant didn't give in-depth descriptions themselves.

Interviewing is a skill that takes time to master (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009) and conducting a pilot interview became important for me to get more experience with the skill. With the pilot interview I got to test the questions from my interview guide and practiced conducting an interview, which is important in preparing for an interview (Dalen, 2010). It can be a challenge for an interviewer to balance following the informant and making sure that the topic is in focus (Postholm, 2010). I felt that I was able to follow the informant from what she/he brought up, and got feedback from him/her that it enabled him/her to talk freely. I also experienced the challenge of this way of conducting an interview, realizing that there was one very important question, *What do you do when working with a team* that I didn't ask. To make sure I got findings that related directly to the focus of my thesis, working with teams, I was reminded on the importance to ask my main questions. I also learned how debriefing after an interview was important for the informant to be able to share thoughts on how it had been, to finish the interview in a good way for both me as a researcher and the informant. Kvale & Brinkmann (2009) write how it's important with a debriefing after an interview because the informants might be anxious because they have shared a lot about themselves. Some ethical aspects that I had not thought about previously aroused during the interviews and I shared those with the regarded informants.

3.4 Gathering data through qualitative interview

By conducting interviews the goal is to get thick-descriptions about the informants' experiences, perspectives and thoughts with a certain phenomenon (Thagaard, 2013). The knowledge that comes from an interview is produced socially through an interaction between the interviewer and the interviewee. It is therefore important as an interviewer to listen to the informant, be interested and show respect from the very moment one first meets (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009).

I gathered data by conducting three interviews over a period of 8 days in the end of February-beginning of March 2014. I had told the informants beforehand to prepare for about two hours in total, and all the interviews ended after about 1.5 hours had passed. I used a tape recorder and took notes during the interview with permission from the informants. Using a voice recorder makes sure that everything that is being said in the interview is captured and gives more thick-descriptions than when using notes (Thagaard, 2013; Dalen, 2010). I used the notes mostly for my own sake during the interview to be able to write down things they said when speaking, which I could ask about later on. By doing that I felt that I could listen to what they were telling me, and at the same time be able to ask about specific things that stood out to me if the timing wasn't right for the questions while they were talking. I also used notes to write down things I noticed that a tape recorder couldn't capture, e.g. body language.

When conducting interviews one should avoid getting disrupted (Postholm, 2010) and I conducted the interviews in privacy where the informants lived or private meeting rooms where they worked. It also made it easier for them when they didn't have to go somewhere to be interviewed. I started the interview with some informal chat to create an atmosphere where both the informants and I could relax, which can be of importance of how the interview goes and how much the informants feel comfortable sharing (Postholm, 2010; Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009).

It's important to know what one want's to find out more about (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). Before starting the interview I reminded the informants again on how the focus was on their experiences with teamwork processes in organizations and read them the definition of teamwork once more. It's important to ask questions that are relevant for the informants' situation (Postholm, 2010). I started with some introductory questions to understand their background and ways of working better, making sure that we were on "the same page" when continuing the interviews. I had a conversation with the informants after the interviews were completed to ask if they had any questions, something they had been thinking of etc. Being aware of the risk of hurting the informant is important (Ingierd, 2012; Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009) so even though there were no direct risk for that, making sure that I left them feeling OK was important to me.

3.4.1 Transcriptions

By listening to the interviews after each one is conducted, there is a chance of learning something that can be brought into the next interview (Thagaard, 2013; Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). I transferred the interviews from the voice recorder to my computer right after the interviews were done and listened to them. I didn't have time to transcribe the whole interviews in between the different interviews, so I listened to them in order to learn something for the next. It's important to write down how the interview went right after the interview before forgetting it (Thagaard, 2013). I wrote down my immediate reflections around how the interview went, my thoughts and feelings, and what I had experienced.

To transcribe means to transform from spoken language to written language (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). Transcribing right after the interviews are conducted is a way of making sure that the transcriptions actually capture what the informants said, when also remembering the interview (Dalen, 2010). The first thing I did after all three interviews were conducted was to start transcribing one interview at a time. I chose to do the transcription myself. That the researcher is transcribing the interviews gives him/her an opportunity to starting the process of getting to know the data (Dalen, 2010). According to Atkinson & Heritage (1984, in Postholm, 2010) transcribing is "a research activity" and by doing this the researcher can discover something new about the interviews. During the transcriptions I wrote down themes, similarities and differences that came to my mind. I also highlighted sentences that I though was of special interest in answering my research question.

The interviews were done in Norwegian and I also transcribed them in the same language. When I was finished with the analysis I translated the quotes that are presented in chapter four to English. I had to change some parts in the quotes to make it understandable in English, which might have changed some of the informants' actual meaning. Because of this I sent the informants the analysis chapter so they would be able to comment on it. I have also been very aware of how I wanted to keep the quotes as close to what the informants had said as possible. If I had changed them more they would "flow" better in English, but than there would be a chance of loosing the informants' voice in it. Expressions as "ehh" and "mmm" have been removed in the quotes presented in the analysis. Kvale & Brinkmann (2009) mentions that expressions like these sometimes can contribute strengthen the informants' answers. As there were many of these I chose to leave them out to make the analysis easier to read. The facilitator's quotes will be presented in *italic* in the analysis. When the quotes don't start at the beginning of the actual sentence that was said, skip something in the middle, or don't end where it did in the interview, it will be marked with (…).

3.5 The analyzing process

The analyzing of data material is an ongoing process throughout the research period from finding the research question (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Postholm, 2010). When starting a more focused analysis, I was aware of the importance of having a structured analyzing process, and therefore tried to suspend the thoughts and reflections I had gotten to this point to not be primed by them.

When I was done transcribing, a structured analysis process began, where I was inspired by the *constant comparative method* for analyzing research data. This method for analyzing has its background from the methodical approach *grounded theory*. The study isn't grounded theory, but using the constant comparative method for analyzing is well suited for phenomenological studies (Postholm, 2010). Grounded theory was developed by Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss (1967) as a method to create theory that was "grounded" in the data. With grounded theory the researcher puts away his or hers own understanding and opens up for the data to be analyzed without the researcher being a subject for theories and own perspectives (Moustakas, 1994 in Postholm, 2010). Eventually Strauss went in another direction, emphasizing an interaction between the researcher and the data (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, 1998 in Postholm, 2010).

This new direction represented by Corbin & Strauss (2008) views objectivity in qualitative research as impossible because researchers always bring with them subjectivity into the research process. What is important, is to be aware of this and try opening up and understanding the interviewee. By being sensitive the researcher is working to get into the research by trying to take the role of the other when immersing in the data (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). The term epoche, or bracketing, described in 3.1.1. also focuses on the importance of this. With an introduction to the research one can "bracket out" one's already existing thoughts to the reader before describing the experiences others have (Creswell, 2007), which the introduction and theory chapter has aimed at. Corbin & Strauss (2008) write how it's impossible to know what kind of relevant literature and concepts that will come from the data. So it's important to know enough to be able to understand the basics of what one is looking at, but as Becker (1986b, in Corbin & Strauss, 2008) puts it: Use the literature but don’t let it use you. I had some general understanding of process consulting and teamwork through the conversations I had had with the informants before hand and theory I had read, but I didn’t know how they were going to describe the work that they did in a more in-depth way.

Coding and categorizing is essential in the constant comparative method for analyzing with open, axial and selective coding. Coding means to find the best concept that explains what the data is about according to the researcher and categorizing is connecting the codes into broader themes (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Corbin & Strauss (2008) explain how open and axial coding go hand in hand in terms on how a researcher in a analyzing process pulls data apart but also puts them back together again. Being inspired by beginning with the open coding process I read through the transcription of the first interview and pulled out the essence of each “sentence” connecting a word or sentence to it. I ended up with a lot of keywords. I did the same thing with the other transcriptions, which gave me three pages with words and sentences. I drew three pictures, one for each interview, which made me end up with three drawings of words. I had the three drawings in front of me on a table and started noticing patterns and differences in what they had talked about. This gave me a starting point to start answering the question “what is it all about?”. I started noticing that the informants had talked about many similar things.

It’s important to differentiate higher-level concepts with lower-level concepts in the beginning of the analyzing (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Within higher-level concepts there are lower-level concepts that fill out the understanding of the broader ones. I had found the lower-level concepts through the process described above, and continued finding the higher-level concepts. I started reading through the transcriptions again, one at a time. I started with transcription 1 and looked at one quote at a time and wrote keywords in the column about what I understood the quotes to address (code). After doing this with all three transcriptions I went through them and wrote down everything they were talking about, and got a long list of words. E.g. “view on themselves”, “view on others”, “goals”, “challenges” etc. In the next step of my coding process I asked myself “what is their view on themselves?” and “what is their view on others?” etc. from the codes that I had found, and by connecting the lower-level concepts I had found in the previous process I started to answer these questions.

Inspired by continuing with the selective coding process I looked at the themes of higher and lower-level concepts from the open coding and combined the ones who were similar into a broader theme/category. Broader categories started to develop and I ended up with four categories; *eclectic way of leading, inner sources of operating, creating a common ground* and *holistic attitude towards development.* Analysis is a dynamic process with constant evaluation of the data before reaching a conclusion (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). When I had found my categories I went back to the transcriptions and codes and started to see if the categories matched with the data I had. It often takes many different attempts before the findings feel right to the researcher. It is a "gut feeling" that the researcher follows until he/she has a feeling of having found representations of the essence of the data material (Corbin & Strauss, 2008).

Starting filling out the different categories it became clearer how much I actually had to write about under the different categories. This process made me realize that some of the categories weren't "spot on" concerning what the informants had talked about. After working with the transcriptions for a long time and going through the analyzing process I saw things that I hadn't seen before, I had gotten to know my data better and I saw other aspects. The most important thing for me was to try showing the informant's voices, and what their voices was telling me, and I had to stay true to that even though it meant changing the main categories. Eventually I ended up with three main categories; *Leading with presence and improvisation*, *self-as-instrument* and *holistic attitude towards development.*

Focusing on a context is important in analyzing, because one cannot gather different statements to "prove a point", but has to be aware of the context that the statements are said so that it is accurate and clear (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). The informants worked with both larger and smaller processes, with larger and smaller teams and with organizational development at large. It was therefore important that I thought about the context of my research question *Working with smaller teams* and being aware of when they were talking about working with a team and when they were talking about larger organizational processes. Since all of the facilitators did talk about the context of the teamwork connecting it to the larger context of the organizational work, the category "holistic attitude towards change" created a place for their view without it creating confusion about what was said about the specific team contexts, and what was said about larger change processes in organizations. I have also been aware of writing in what context their statements has been mentioned in the analysis.

3.6 Quality in the study

Based on Corbin & Strauss (2008) and Silverman (2011) among others, Thagaard (2013) writes about reliability, validity and transferability when discussing the quality of a qualitative study. *Reliability* is presented as an assessment of whether the research has been conducted in a trustworthy way. How the data has been developed throughout the research project considering how good the data actually is, gives an understanding of the research's reliability. Silverman (2011, in Thagaard, 2013) argues that the research can become reliable if the researcher is transparent about the research process, giving the reader an opportunity to follow the process. Throughout this thesis I have tried to show my process. Especially in the introduction and the method chapter I give the reader an opportunity to understand what I have brought into this research and reasons for making the choices that I have. It is also important to be transparent about the relationships one has made with the research participants. This is described in 3.2.

Validity is linked to the interpretation of the data conducted (Thagaard, 2013). As a researcher one should reflect on own interpretations and where they come from and make it visible where own interpretations are presented. To consider if the research answers the research question is also a way of considering the validity of a study, which will be shown in chapter six when I write a conclusion. Member checking is a way to ensure the quality of the analysis by asking the informants if they recognize themselves in the writings and is viewed by Lincoln & Guba (1985, in Postholm, 2010) as the most important procedure to create a valid study. I sent the analysis to the three informants giving them this choice. I got feedback from one, while the two others chose not to comment on it.

Transferability considers if the research is relevant in other circumstances than in the specific context where the research is conducted. In qualitative studies the interpretation of the data, and not the data in itself, can be considered as transferable. The researcher is the one arguing for the research being relevant in other contexts (Thagaard, 2013). Nielsen (1994, in Thagaard, 2013) argues that the degree to which the readers recognize their own experience in the text, can tell something about a thesis' transferability. Postholm (2010) describes this as *naturalistic generalization*. This will be further explored through 6.1 *Limitations and further research.*

3.7 Ethical considerations

A researcher should work to make sure that the research project is conducted in an ethical way throughout the process (Thagaard, 2013; Creswell, 2007; Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). "The national research ethical guidelines" in Norway (NESH) contributes with different norms one should follow as a researcher. In qualitative interviews, where the researcher and the informant are in close contact, the data includes personal information about the informants. It's important that personal information, that can identify the research participants, doesn't become accessible to others than the researcher (Thagaard, 2013; Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). Working with personal information, confidentiality and informed consent has been relevant for this study (Ingierd, 2012; Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). This research project included working with personal information and is therefore captured under the Norwegian personal data act. I therefore sent in an application for my research to the Norwegian social science computer service NSD. I got my research project approved January 21st (see appendix 3).

It's important that the research participants know what they agree to being a part of (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). I sent the informants an e-mail with information about the study (see appendix 1) explaining the research study and their role in it. They all approved being an informant after reading through it. Before starting the interview I explained to them that what they said was confidential and that they would get pseudonyms and be anonymous in the thesis. One of the informants was found through the "snowball method" and for that reason I had a conversation with that person concerning that there was one other person who knew his/hers identity. The informant was aware of this and had no objections. I explained informed consent again and how they at any time could withdraw from the study.

I gave the informants pseudonyms from the start. The ethical aspect in research also includes protecting other people the informant brings up (Ingierd, 2012), so organizations and people that were mentioned in the interview also got pseudonyms in the transcriptions and I was aware of how I presented the analysis with this in mind. The interviews were transferred to my personal computer, which only I have access to because it is password protected, and the interviews were deleted from the tape recorder. A challenge was to know how much I had to tell about the informants' background for it being understandable to the reader, and at the same time protect the informants and people/organizations they were talking about from recognition.

3.8 Me as a researcher

In phenomenological research the researcher is the number one most important tool (Postholm, 2010; Thagaard, 2013; Dalen, 2010). The researcher's integrity (knowledge, experience, honesty, justice) is crucial when it comes to the quality of the empirical knowledge and the ethical aspects of the research (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). Being transparent, open, about own research process is therefore essential (ibid).

As a researcher one also brings one's own subjectivity into the analyzing process, and to the research process in general. It's important to make this subjectivity visible for the reader (Postholm, 2010). Describing interests and educational background can help give the reader an understanding of the researcher and what he/she brings into the research process (Postholm, 2010). Being a counseling student it was important for me that the research was directly connected to my study. I have been open around how the informants had to have a focus on the relational aspect that goes on in a team in their work, has been one of my criteria and interests.

Deliberate naivety points at how the researcher should try to be unprejudiced and open up for new and unexpected phenomenon in the interview (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). The complexity of the theme, not really knowing so much about the facilitators work with teams because they have had a hard time explaining it, is what got me interested in answering my research question in the first place, but also what has brought insecurity to this process. Many times it has not been good to "stand in" the ambiguity of the process, so it has been important to trust the process and trust myself, as my supervisor has reminded me. In a way not knowing too much about the theme, even if I sometimes wanted to, helped me to be open and not too caught up with own assumptions.

The book *The I in Science* (Brown, 1996) emphasizes the researcher's role in all research and points at the importance of knowing our self since it plays an important part when trying to create knowledge. Being self-aware, open, self-reflective, accept ambiguity and to think and act in a holistic way are important parts of the researchers self. These key words have been vital in my research as well, which makes me feel that this process really has been a holistic process and in a way I have been "living" what I have been writing about. In the process of writing my master thesis I have reflected around my own process and learned a lot about myself as a person and as a researcher.

4. Analysis

In this chapter the results from central findings in the data material are presented through three main categories found in the analyzing process. The three main categories represent broader themes and the sub categories give a deeper understanding of the different categories. With the research question *What experiences do three process consultants have with facilitating teamwork processes in organizations* three main categories were found*; Leading with presence and improvisation, Self-as-instrument* and *Holistic attitude towards development.* The categories are linked to each other but presented separately for the sake of the structure of the thesis to make it easier to read. Some of the categories and sub categories were easy to place and connect and some were harder because they could fit several places. The sub categories under "leading with presence and improvisation" could also be placed under how the facilitators use themselves as instrument (4.2), but I chose to present them connecting it to how the facilitators describe the work that they do with a team.

4. 1 Main category 1: Leading with presence and improvisation

This main category addresses the facilitators' attitude towards their way of leading work processes with teams in organizations. How they lead with presence is linked to how they open up to the team and work on being aware to understand what the team needs at all times. The facilitators have their thoughts and understanding of what they are going to work with and a set of tools they can use. The improvisation is linked to how they improvise what to actually use and do in contact with the team from what they evaluate as best for the process. Tone explains this attitude: *"So it becomes a good, organic development process where I pull it forward, that is my responsibility".* Katrine says how her job is *"to create good conditions for giving people an ability to develop, in the team or individually, I feel that my job is to facilitate the development"*. Lars shares the same attitude when asked about how he works with the statement *"your job is, the way I see it, there and then to ensure that a development happens, not that you should be in the center of the development."*

The facilitators let go of a strict plan. This way they can balance the necessary preparation with the ability to be aware of what's happening in the situation. They do this to meet the team in the best possible way. Lars explains the balancing of the two aspects: "*If you prepare the process and follow it to the letter it becomes a rigid process. And if you don't think about what you would like to achieve you can risk creating chaos.*"

Katrine expresses this attitude by saying that *"If I think that "yes we can just turn the stack over and do the same program for the next team" it won't be good".* She shares a reflection around this way of facilitating teamwork processes and how it's *easier* to follow a concrete structure for the teamwork. This way she would have been able to show what they have done and accomplished. Nevertheless she says how this way of working would be destructive because how it doesn't give her the chance to understand what *they* need. Lars says how he thinks that he has to have the goal in mind and works to find the best way to reach that goal: "*So it depends on what the goal is and what you would like to achieve, and the method must be looked at according to that.*"

4.1.1 Being here and now: Openness and awareness

Being open and aware stood out as important when working with presence and improvisation. Tone explains how she works when first meeting a team:

> *I put myself, in a way, I calibrate myself every time, depending on who I'm working with, what type of group it is, what their needs are, what it is that I should orient myself around, what is important this time. It's always new for every group.*

The facilitators constantly work on being aware when meeting a team and Lars explains how he has a focus on this by saying that *"to be able to catch myself, if I slip the awareness in my presence. How can you at all times ensure that it's with you."* This can also be seen in Katrine's statement, talking about how she can get out of her "flow" when she is stressed or pressured. She says how she *"constantly works on getting into that, and it's a lot about having enough time for preparation and not take too easy on things, go in it with my whole self".* Tone explains how she constantly works to be aware to be able to follow the team:

> *That means constantly try following where are they now, where are they now, where are they now. In the amazing highlights with super good production and new ideas and all the good phases, and in the bottom phase where you feel that "this is such a big problem, we have no idea what to do about it".*

The facilitators explain how the future and the past is also something that becomes a part of the present. Katrine explains this:

> *I'm concerned with being here and now, but it is in a context. So I work towards the future, and what we have with us into the here and now, to put it like that, and what we are going to work with in the future. So you can say that the here-and-now perspective holds more than just being present here and now.*

4.1.2 Lifting the awareness in the team: An opportunity to see themselves

The facilitators try lifting the awareness in the team when they are working together by articulating what they see, hear and sense in the teamwork. Katrine calls it *"mirror it back, so they can see it themselves",* Tone says that she *"articulates the feelings she can sense in the team"* and Lars describes how *"he enters a role of making the patterns visible"*. In this way of working the facilitators draw out the essence of how they experience the teamwork and give the team an opportunity to see themselves from their eyes. Lars adds how *"sometimes I feel that I manage to do it and sometimes I feel that I don't. And sometimes you are, you see it clearer than others times."* Katrine explains how she works to make what she notices understandable:

> *Working in an organization, working in a team, so it doesn't become too overwhelming and complicated in a way. So for me it is to find the core and essence of that teams challenge or ways of working with whatever it is, and make it visible.*

Tone explains how the team feels seen and met when she articulates what she senses. She gives an example of how she can share an observation:

> *Well, I can say "now we have, the way I sense it, two processes going" for example. "On one side we are eager to decide on what we are in questioning about here, and the other thing is that I sense a conflict around that and that theme", for example. That's how I can say it. So I articulate what I see in the greatest extent possible without provoking.*

Lars uses the metaphor "dancing" several times during the interview describing his work with a team. Connecting it to creating awareness in the team he says how he *"invites them to dance"* by sharing an assumption with them. He continues with: "*And dependent on how you do it you will either get the assumptions you have* *confirmed or denied, if it's not experienced in the same way from their side for example."*

Lars' thoughts around it also show how he lets the team be able to consider whether they agree with his observations or not. Tone also shares an attitude of how it's important that what happens in the team belongs to them: *"So if you have a difficult person or a difficult theme or something determining, you look at it as a subject for everyone. And then I withdraw it so everyone is able to notice it."*

4.1.3 Empathic attitude towards others

Through examples and talking about what they did when meeting a team and the members, the empathic feelings they had towards other people became clear. Getting behind how they describe what they do, and understanding the attitude they had towards the people they were working with, became an important sub category to understand their way of working with presence and improvisation. This attitude towards others also included challenging them. Tone meets people with the philosophy that everyone operates from a need for contact. She explains her attitude towards others in the following way:

> *(...) It's a deep attitude that is people are valuable, people are important, and it is all about lifting it to a level of an empathic attitude, a heartily friendly attitude. And not necessarily, I can be sharp and draw the line if something is too much or doesn't work or, it's not that it doesn't have that in it, but I don't grow conflicts, I don't make polarities stronger, I do the opposite (...)*

Lars explains the same attitude towards others in the context of talking about challenges he has when working with teams: "*One of my demons is that I want people to be well. And that's maybe what preventing them from being well, sometimes (...) No, maybe I'm not confronting enough, for example, in some situations."*

Katrine shares her attitude through telling a story about a longer change process in an organization and with different teams. She says how she saw the importance of using time, caring for the people and opening her heart. She also talks about the importance of taking risks when working with a team to create growth, which can be viewed as a way of challenging the team:

So I think I can be quite risk-averse sometimes, that I can do things that take courage (...) I think that is an important prerequisite for that work, that you have the courage to do different things that you are not always as comfortable doing.

4.2 Main category 2: Self-as-instrument

The main category *self-as-instrument* describes how the facilitators use themselves when working with a team. They use themselves as an instrument in their way of leading with presence and improvisation, and this category will be a further in-depth understanding of how they see the importance of working on themselves to develop and refine their "instrumentality". Tone shares how she has a hard time describing what she does as a facilitator when people ask her about it, but reflected upon how she thinks it's connected to how she works with giving the people she meets contact and trying to meet them where they want to be met: *"They call it that I'm good at seeing things, or meet them, or solve problems, or, I think they feel both seen and met and heard."* She continues explaining how she uses herself in her work:

(...) And when I invite people both creatively, visually and cooperatively, and especially to come forward with what they feel and mean and think, then I invite them to break their own boundaries. And then I have to stand there and show that I have broken these boundaries a long time ago, and that I am comfortable with it.

Katrine also expresses how she uses herself to create a good climate for the teamwork:

And then it becomes, I only have my own, myself, as a tool really in that work, even though I use different methods to build up under it, it is me that in a way contributes to make a good climate for it or not.

4.2.1 Own process and development

The facilitators own development was mentioned several times by the facilitators as an important part of their work for all of them to be able to lead teamwork processes. Lars shares how he thinks about this:

And to be able to lead good processes I think that you have to be aware of your own process and what you bring into it, and the more you manage to become aware of that the more open and unprejudiced you can meet the clients you work with.

Katrine also expressed that it is important for her to be aware of her own process in her work. She connects it to being authentic in her work:

> *But I have to stay true to myself as far as possible, in that work. And that means constantly working on my own intellectual life and my own emotional life and my own life of will, to be able to meet people where they have the need to be met.*

Lars also explains how he becomes more "whole" as a person both as a facilitator and a person. He separates work and private life less and becomes himself as a person whether he is at home or at work. Reflecting around his ability to be aware of his own process Lars says how:

> *Sometimes I'm good at it and sometimes you are more in operating mode and the focus is on delivering from day to day and family life and little sleep and stressing everyday life and the clock is ticking and those things.*

He explains how he is a part of a forum for leadership development and other arenas for him to reflect around himself and his practice, and how that has been helpful. Tone also shares that she uses others for help:

> *I always have a supervisor to go to or I always have someone that helps me, if you know what I mean. Every six months, just to make sure I have that channel, where… simply that I don't stand all alone. So the next step in it, what would be to develop it for my part, that would be, I have tried it sometimes, but that would be to be in a process development team.*

Katrine shared some of the same attitude by pointing of the importance of having "a way out", which was said after a description of a longer process in an organization:

> *At the same time I always have to make sure to have that connection out of it as well. Because if you are in the middle of something you can lose the perspective, so I constantly have to hold on and know that I am not a part of it, I'm outside of it. But I think being able to go in and out of it, is a strength to have.*

4.2.2 "Only human"

The facilitators point at factors like stress, pressure, being up against power, personal feelings and unexpected outcomes of their work as things they had to deal with and work with to take care of themselves in their work. They can use a lot of energy in the processes so taking time to reflect upon this stands out as important for them. Lars explains how he feels that leading shorter processes in teams is a *"grateful job"* and that people are easily satisfied, but that *"it's a little worse if you are in more development projects that goes over time"*.

Katrine and Tone share that they use a lot of energy in the processes. Katrine says how she *"become so engaged so I'm in it with my entire body, so I can become extremely tired."* and Tone how she *"gives everything in projects like these with the wish to lift others, and at some point it is about not going too far that way"*. Katrine is also saying that *"but I think it's the only way of working actually, or the best way working."* Tone shares her thoughts around this:

> *I think it's the same way like with a therapist who gets used to reading signals on the body of the other person, but the other is to listen emotionally and sense the other person. In a way that you can feel the feelings the other person has. You notice it on your own body and can because of that work good as a therapist.*

The under category "only a human" comes from a quote from Katrine after describing a process that had been tough to lead:

> *After all I am only a human. So even though I have some ideals in ways of being I sometimes react in an emotional way. And that is in a way OK, but I have to know that it effects my way of being towards that person the next time around (...).*

Tone shares stories of when she has been up against powerful men when working with teams and organizations and how their ways of being *"capture"* her and she gets personally affected and has to use all the energy she has. She adds how: *(...) it was more before, but because I have worked so much with it I have learned to stand good in my own (...)* Lars shares that he can use a lot of energy on worrying about receiving criticism that he could have used on solving other things. He adds: "*the more you become aware of it, the less of a problem it becomes. And all the time try to notice when it happens and try to learn something from the specific situation."*

To be able to meet these different challenges Tone shares that being strong is important as a process facilitator to be able to be responsible for unexpected outcomes or situations that can happen when a team or organization makes powerful decisions because *"their gaze becomes sharper"* or *"skeletons fall out of the closet".* She explains that as a process supervisor you have to admit that you don't have full control:

> *(...) I don't have total control, I have a template, a program and experience with that it turns out fine, but I come to the extreme of my personality in many situations during a process, because I'm on thin ice with them. And the art is to hold the centering and knowing that it goes in the direction without being assured that it goes ok. Together we can do more than I can alone. And I have trust in that.*

4.3 Main category 3: Holistic attitude towards development

This main category addresses that the facilitators see development as something that best is done by including the whole person, the whole team and the whole organization when they are working. When working with teams that are gathered to create something together, this is linked to how the team is a part of a larger context (the organization). A part of their holistic attitude is shown in how they work with the organization to understand what they want, and matching how "in-depth" they go in the teamwork process according to the organizations wants and needs, as preparation before each longer or smaller process.

The facilitators spend time understanding the organization the team is a part of and has this bigger picture in mind when working with them. Lars explains that it's challenging to work with organizations that doesn't have this wholeness in mind: "*When you order a service, you who order don't always see what you should have ordered. So you order, you can say, a consultant service, or facilitator service from the reality picture you carry. And that is challenging."* Katrine explains her holistic attitude through her view on the team as part of an organization:

> *They are a part of the organization, they are here for someone. We have to see everything connected. So they don't become a satellite team that run around on their own, but that there is a connection between what the rest of the organization does for example.*

Lars wants more opportunities working with organizations on a larger scale and shares that the broader and more complex he has the ability to grasp, the more he can lift it and create a positive effect. He explains this: *"So it doesn't become leader* *development or team development or IT-development or working with organizational development as such, but lift the entire system. The system and what that system is a part of."*

4.3.1 The whole person

The facilitators express that they see the need to make room for more intuitive, creative processes to give the members in the team different entrances to the teamwork. They say that this gives the team members an opportunity to learn from more than only their cognition by getting straight into "to-do" mode. These different accesses to learning are linked to their view on the whole person with thoughts, feelings and bodily experiences as equally important to integrate in teamwork. Kristine and Tone are very clear on how they focus on integrating all parts of the human when working with them. Katrine explains her view on integrating this:

> *Not only, you can say, imagination and values and pictures that the thought represents but also the emotional life both within individuals but also in an organization. And of course also what is more on movement and action. That there is a certain balance between these three aspects in an organization and in a team, especially.*

Lars explains that he balances the different ways of learning depending on what the goal of the teamwork is and not necessarily something he integrates to a great extent every time. It depends on the people he is meeting, but says that he tries implement it to some extent every time. He gives an example of a team process where he used a more open process to start with where one person painted something which gave him new learning. Lars shares that this person than was able to articulate his needs to the others in the team in a different way that he would have been able to before. He explains this with the following attitude:

> *The good thoughts you might get when you stand in the shower or you sit on the bus or reduce the tempo and get the slow theta waves in the brain in action. Than you open up for new links and it might make things clearer.*

Lars explains how he thinks it's important to focus both on the relationships between people and the individuals with themselves. He explains how he focuses on the individual within themselves with the following statement:

> *In a process it is about at some point to open up and have a space to display the structure of meaning. It is more intuitive and connects a little more to each individuals' situation and gets it up in a way.*

Tone also work with the team members to "be well" in themselves. She says that she *"makes them talk and tell and give them experience with coming forward with deep desires and feelings and express them."* She explains this further:

> *That means; where are you now, what motivation do you have to get into this, what do you feel that you can contribute with, what do you want out of it, and so on. (...) I train them in some body- and consciousness exercises (...). And by doing that you help people get in contact with themselves. More into their body, more into "ok, now I'm here, now I'm standing here, I'm getting used to this room, I'm no longer caught up with my drive to work".*

That creating this space also leads in a direction was important to all of the facilitators. Katrine puts it this way:

> *And of course it's important to steer a process even though it's intuitive, it's important that you don't let it flout completely out. So you have to tighten it and see "what is the need now", sometimes it's a need to open up and sometimes it is the need for closing in. But if I can be in that then I do the best possible job.*

4.3.2 From "I" to "us"

Starting with the individual, Tone explains that this creates a better cooperation between the individuals: "*And it's absolutely incredible to see how it makes people want to cooperate when they feel that they are seen, met and heard."* When asked about what he would like to achieve in a teamwork process Lars explains that *"it's hard to say, but I hope that it will create a bigger awareness about what each individual wishes to stand for and contribute to a more authentic dialogue between them".* He explains how he often uses the team process of more intuitive work for learning which in turn leads to the operationalization of the specific goal they are working to achieve. He's explaining what happened after starting a process with more intuitive, individual work:

> *And how the connection between what you want to stand for and what you do is linked to each other, so you got to create a continued course in a different way than what you would get if you worked the same way as from the start. So then they have learned something, a change in how you relate to things.*

The facilitators share how they use different tools and exercises when working with a team. These are implemented to give the members of the team, and the team as a whole, a way into understanding themselves and what they want. To work on creating an identity in the team Katrine gives an example of how she can start a process with different tools to look at ”what the team is going to do” creating a common understanding. She shares an example that can be linked to that the members have to start with themselves:

> *It can be to use pictures, photo cards or something like that when associating things; ”what is a good team for you”. That could be an example. And people pick cards, find cards that they associate with a good team, how we want it.*

She explains that after she has worked with a team it generally contributes to a strengthening of the team's identity: *"That they become more a team than 6-7 individuals. So that is something that can be notices both internal and external, that they become more a team than function as a team more than they did before."* Tone says that what she calls a flow-experience is the highlight for her when she works with a team:

> *The flow-situations in teams where my role and each individual's role disappear a little bit. Even who we are as individuals disappears a little bit (...) A state of consciousness that occurs in a kind of collective consciousness that occurs in a group with several individuals where it's not I and me and mine and my wishes, than all the I-es are met clearly and properly and everyone has delivered in and everyone… So you can let go and go into a higher state of consciousness which is, yes… a feeling of being part of something bigger. (...) And it's totally irrelevant what you work with (...) It must be high level of "I have deep acceptance for you", but when everyone has that and is there with their resources and their competencies, you can get into these flow-zones. When you have experienced that you don't forget it. And that place is an incredibly rich place, it's a place where, yes, you want to do something good for other people. (...) And that's incredibly good for the project.*

I'm ending the analysis with Tone's statement. The essence of the data conducted through the interviews has now been presented, where I have tried to convey the voice of the informants. During the process of analyzing and writing this chapter reflections around the facilitators ways of working have emerged. In the next chapter these findings will be interpreted and discussed in connection to theory from chapter two.

5. Discussion

Throughout the research process thoughts and reflections have developed around what the informants shared about their experiences with teamwork processes in organizations. The process of creating the discussion has led to three main themes; *Leading with presence and improvisation, Self-as-instrument*: *Balancing helping and taking care of one self as a helper* and *Holistic attitude towards development: Creating a holding environment.* The main themes are presented in the same order as in the analysis with approximately the same names. Some of the sub categories are presented under different themes than in the analysis, according to what I find most appropriate to include under each theme.

5.1. Leading with presence and improvisation

Leading with presence and improvisation stands out as important from my findings when the facilitators work with teamwork processes in organizations. By being present in the situation the facilitators can get an understanding of what the needs in the team are. The improvisation is linked to how the facilitators can choose what actions to take according to the information that they receive in the situation.

The facilitators work to meet the team as open as possible, letting go of their own assumptions and thoughts of "what is best" for the team. Schein (1999) mentions in his work that it is important to understand yourself to let go of assumptions and expectations when meeting a client. Reams & Caspari (2012) also write about the importance of being aware of one self to be able to meet others openly. How the facilitators work on themselves to meet the team openly will be further explored in the next main theme *self-as-instrument.*

The analysis show that being open and aware also gives the facilitators the ability to lift the awareness in the team by articulating what they see, hear and sense. Tone explains that she always *"calibrates",* based on her experience that there are always different needs in different teams and thus different ways she has to work. Schein (1999) writes how being aware in the current situation is essential as a process consultant, to be able to discover what's going on and share the discovery with the client. The same thoughts of leading group work can be seen in McClure (2005) and Kvalsund & Meyer (2005). They mention the importance of recognizing situations where facilitating can lead to change in the groups. All the facilitators say how their job is to create *development* in the team. Their role is to *"pull it forward"*, *"giving people the ability"* and *"ensure that it happens"*. Looking at the analysis it can seem like the facilitators have experience with how being present and noticing what's going on can give them the information they need to improvise what they should do to create this development. Schein (1999) writes how following the client's flow is important, and it seems like the facilitators try to follow the teams flow by understanding where the team members are in their process.

Tone says she doesn't have a concrete structure and therefore can't *know* that the team will reach their goal. She points out that she is *"on thin ice with them".* Katrine says that she balances "opening up" and "closing in" when talking about an intuitive process. She says that she can do a good job if she can be in *that. That* can be seen as the ability to balance opening up for intuition and learning, and closing in to "collect" what they have learned and steer the process forward. Lars says that it is important to balance preparing and being aware in the moment for not creating chaos, or on the other side create a rigid process. The facilitators statements can be seen as how "leading with presence and improvisation" include being able to stand in "the chaos" (Heifetz, 1994) of a process with a team. Tone saying that she is on thin ice with them can be seen as a way of standing in this chaos and also being able to lead others through chaos, which Heifetz (1994) points at as important when doing adaptive work.

Reflecting around this I see how it can be connected to the balance of reaching the goal and focusing on the relationships in a team. The theories presented in chapter two explain the importance to balance the goal and the process going on between the members in the teamwork. It will make the outcome of the teamwork more successful and give the team an opportunity to learn about themselves (Kvalsund & Meyer, 2005; Senge, 2006; McClure, 2005). If the facilitators didn't care about the relationships in the team, it would probably be easier to follow a rigid structure to reach a specific goal. But as the facilitators are concerned with the people in the team as well, that way of working wouldn't emphasize the importance of this balance.

Connecting this to Heifetz (1994) it becomes clear how the facilitators don't look at facilitating teamwork processes as something that can be solved by technical solutions. How the facilitators work can in turn be connected to their view on teamwork as an adaptive challenge that doesn't have "one right answer" that should be offered by "an expert". Instead they see the importance of having people and the relationships in mind and creating a process based on this. If they had a structured and rigid plan before meeting a team on what they thought was the best way of working, it would be implicit that they viewed teamwork as something to be "solved" with a technical solution.

Katrine says it's easier to follow a concrete structure and in the end of a process being able to show what she has done and the steps she has taken to reach the specific goal. As mentioned in the introduction of this thesis Schein (1988) writes that many process consultants have a hard time explaining the work they do, and Katrine's statement can be seen as a confirmation of this because she doesn't have a structured plan to "show" to clients. Dreyfus' model of cognitive development shows how an expert doesn't rely on rigid rules and guidelines, but has deep tacit understanding of the situation. A novice would have a concrete structure to show, because that's the only way they are able to work. A novice doesn't pay attention to context and their work is unlikely to become successful (Dreyfus, 1981; Dreyfus & Dreyfus, 1984 in Lester, 2005). Reflecting around these findings it can seem like even though it's harder to explain and talk about their work, the facilitators stay true to their attitude of it being the best way of working.

5.1.1. Tacit knowledge and intuition

Different statements from the interviews came back to me as I was reflecting around McClure's (2005) writings about groups. When a group leader has knowledge of group dynamics, knows one self, has an ability to notice patterns in the group and a sensitivity to nuance, he/she can learn to act intuitively. The informants mentioned how it was difficult to describe some of the work they did. I chose to not focus too much on it in the analysis since I wanted to actually get an understanding of that they worked. When thinking about it again when doing the discussion, I became aware that some of their statements can be linked to the development of tacit knowledge and intuition, and therefore add it here. If these statements were a part of the analysis they would be presented in the sub category *openness and awareness.* With tacit knowledge and intuition it can seem like the facilitators let go of reason to different extents, when trying to understand a situation.

Tone shared that the training and courses she has taken and all the experience she has with processes and different people has given her a lot of tacit knowledge. She says that the more she learn the bigger everything gets and the less she knows. When asked about if he always is aware and considers how to intervene with the team Lars answers: "*Sometimes I do it, and sometimes I forget it and then I just do it on the spinal cord."* In Dreyfus' model the development towards expertise can help people understand what actions to take in the present with the development of tacit knowledge. This can also be seen in Cook-Greuter's (2009, in Reams & Caspari, 2012) writings about how later stages of cognitive development give people the ability to immerse "in the immediate, ongoing flow of experience". Having internalized processes that allow them to bypass rational analysis can help the facilitators in their search for appropriate actions to take in the situation.

On the other hand Lars says how *"sometimes I feel that I manage to do it and sometimes I feel that I don't. And sometimes you are, you see it clearer than others times"* when talking about his ability to lift the awareness in a team. Looking at Lars' quote in connection with how Reams & Caspari (2012) write that the main importance is which direction you are developing and not where you "are", it can seem like all the facilitators are moving towards a higher level of cognitive development.

With the development of tacit knowledge one can get an intuitive way of understanding situations (Dreyfus, 1981; Dreyfus & Dreyfus, 1984, in Lester, 2005). Reams & Caspari (2012) give a definition of intuition from Franquemont (1999) as the ability to acquire knowledge without the interference or the use of reason. When Katrine shares a story about an exercise where one person was skeptical to it she says *"she had to do it".* When asked about where that feeling of having to do things came from, she explains: "*It's not something that I can put my finger on, but there is a very strong intuition. That builds on experience; what is it that works."* With all her experience, and 25 years of doing meditation, Tone feels she is very perceptually present in situations. She can notice other people's feelings, what's happening between people and energy that people have. From the theory this can be connected to how intuition gives access to subtle layers of energies and information (Reams & Caspari, 2012).

Looking at the findings and the theories it can seem like the facilitators development of tacit knowledge, which also includes different extents of intuition, gives them the opportunity to create processes for the team in the situation, by improvising what they do.

5.2. Self-as-instrument: Balancing helping and taking care of one's self as a helper

I have been reflecting around the category *self-as-instrument.* Something that has followed me from when I first conducted the interviews is how the facilitators balance using themselves to the extent that they do, and also taking care of themselves in this work. This balance stands out as challenging, but necessary to be able to do their work as good as possible, while also being able to take care of themselves in their work.

A question that arises in me is if it's possible to balance helping and taking care of one's self as a helper in a healthy way for the facilitators, which still can create good processes for the client? And if so, how? This is partly connected to how they use awareness/intuition to the extent that is described in 5.1.1. Tone reflects around that she sometimes goes too far, with the wish to lift others. Katrine says that she is *"in it with her whole self".* Both Tone and Katrine is convinced that this is the best way to work. This is what gives them the ability work good as helpers, but on the other hand what can take a lot of energy. Rogers (1961) writes that it's important to meet the client in an empathic way but at the same time not being "drawn" into their process. So how do the facilitators work and not loose themselves in the process?

With the development of a later stage of cognition, Cook-Greuter (2010, in Reams & Caspari, 2012) writes that challenges with this development can be the feeling of loneliness and the fear of going insane. Tone and Lars share how they talk to other people about their own development process. Tone says that it has been important to *"not stand in it alone"*. Lars talks more about it in the direction to how it is important to know one's self to be able to do a good job. At the same time, sharing that he can use a lot of energy on worrying about receiving criticism, it can seem like the forum he is a part of opens up for the ability to share negative aspects of the work with someone. Katrine says that it's important for her to hold on to the thought that she is not in it, but has one foot outside. At the same time she shares how she can get very engaged and dragged into her work when there are difficult "cases". The importance they place in being *in it* to the extent that they describe, but at the same time being outside of it, stands out as difficult in their work.

5.2.1. To manage the balance

The facilitators are very aware that they must work to know what "they bring into the process". It's clear how they constantly work on their own process and development before, during and after meeting a team. The analysis show how stress, pressure, being up against power, personal feelings and unexpected outcomes of their work were things they had to deal and work with to take care of themselves. This can be connected to Cheung-Judge (2012) and what she writes about the importance of working on life-long learning habits, working through issues of power, building emotional and intuitive self-awareness and committing to self care.

Katrine doesn't mention a specific forum she is a part of to discuss her process with others, but shares that she uses a lot of time reflecting around each process she is a part of. Tone also adds a solution for her in order to balance taking care of herself as a helper and being in a helping relationship: "*So the next step in it, what would be to develop it for my part, that would be, I have tried it sometimes, but that would be to be in a process development team. "*

In the analysis the sub category "only human" points at how the facilitators sometimes react to things differently than they would like to. Linking this to Jordan's (2002) theory about self-awareness it can seem like the ability to notice inner processes without being "had" by them sometimes is difficult. Tone shares that she used to get "captured" by being up against powerful men, but that it's not so problematic anymore because she now has learned to stand good in her own person. Lars' statement is also an example of by reflecting on one's own process he can learn from it: "*the more you become aware of it, the less of a problem it becomes. And all the time try to notice when it happens and try to learn something from the specific situation."* By constantly reflecting around situations that occur it can seem like the facilitators develop their ability to cope with the stressors they meet. This can be linked to what Jordan (2002) writes about when a person that has become good at noticing when this happens can relate actively to different emotions, thoughts and impulses. Reams & Caspari (2012) connect the ability to do this with integrity as an ongoing activity to keep the inner system clean.

Katrine says that she thinks that one must have courage to do things one is not always as comfortable doing as a process consultant. Tone also says that one has to be strong as a PC's to take responsibility of unexpected outcomes that a process can lead to. By working on themselves it can seem like the facilitators become, or hope to become, safer in their role and about themselves. This can also be seen in connection to what Katrine and Lars share that they work to be authentic in their work situation. Being real, or congruent, as a therapist is one of the main fundaments of the Rogers' (1961) theory by being aware of and accepting ones feelings. Congruency can also be linked to the term integrity from Reams & Caspari's (2012) writings. By getting to know yourself you can develop integrity and become more whole as a person. This can in turn make you safe enough in yourself to be able to meet others openly and at the same time not "loose" yourself (Reams & Caspari, 2012).

5.3. Holistic attitude towards development: Creating a holding environment

The term holistic is broad and can mean a lot of different things. In the analysis the facilitators' way of working in a holistic way can be seen in how they look at the organization at large when working with teamwork processes. The theories presented in 2.1. *new ways of leading,* all see the importance on viweing different parts of an organization as connected (Senge, 2006; Wheatley, 2006; Heifetz, 1994; Scharmer, 2007), and it seems like the facilitators share this attitude. Their holistic attitude is also seen in how they use tools that integrate thoughts, emotions and body when working with a team, and how they work to create conditions for the team to develop into a team and not just a gathering of individuals.

A holding environment has the ability to hold conflict, chaos and confusion when complex issues are being worked on. It gives people the ability to create their own solutions (Heifetz, 1994). I have connected the concept of "creating a holding environment" from the theory (Heifetz, 1994) and the theme from the analysis in chapter four on *holistic attitude towards development.* This connection is based on how the facilitators create a space (a holding environment) for the holistic work. Their holistic attitude includes; the relationships that go on between the members, learning through discovery and not being told "the right answer", the ability to "stand" in chaos/uncertanty and lead others through this, and being present in the situatuon in order to create growth and development in a person, a team and an organization (Senge, 2006; Heifetz, 1994; McClure, 2005; Kvalsund & Meyer, 2005; Scharmer, 2007).

Looking at the analysis in connection with theory, three sub themes have emerged trying to explore how the facilitators work to create development in a team by creating a holding environment where this can happen. This will be explored through the two sub themes *creating a space for learning and sharing* and *opening up for each other.* How the facilitators use themselves more explicitly to contribute to the team's development is shown through their empathic attitude towards the people they are working with. This will be explored through the sub theme *leading through the heart.* These two aspects of their work are of course closely linked to each other, but will be written about separately.

5.3.1. Creating space for learning and sharing

The facilitators spend time letting each individual in the team get a chance to learn about themselves and what they want from the teamwork. Creating common awareness in a group is essential in Kvalsund & Meyer's (2005) view on teamwork, by both focusing on each individual and the team as a whole. From the analysis this can be seen in the sub category "the whole person". Using different tools the facilitators give the members an opportunity to get more in contact with their "whole" self through their thoughts, emotions and body. Creating this space for the individual it's clear that they are eager to create an understanding of where *they* are, and how *they* see and think about things. Kegan (1994) writes about the importance of understanding how people make meaning of problems to be able to help them. That the facilitators make this room for each individual can be connected to how they can create a continued process when understanding how team members make meaning of their situation.

The analysis shows how the facilitators try lifting the awareness in the team by sharing what they sense. At the same time they are concerned with how everything belongs to the team. Lars says how *"he invites them to dance"*. How everything should belong to the team is seen in the theory from what Schein (1999) and Heifetz (1994) write. They write how one should help people to create their own solutions instead of giving them one. The importance of creating ownership in the process and the teamwork can also be seen in Kvalsund & Meyer (2005), Senge (2006) and McClure (2005). The client having his/her own solutions and the ability to "create the life they want" is important in the existentialistic-humanistic attitude towards what creates growth within a person. Looking at these theories according to the findings there is reason to believe that through making space for each individual and viewing the team as "experts", the facilitators give them the opportunity to create their own process.

The facilitator's also work to get each individuals thoughts "out" to the rest of the team. Lars says that he wish that creating this space will help each individual get more in contact with what he or she wants to stand for. He also says how he hopes that this in turn can create a more authentic dialogue between the members. Senge (2006) writes that team learning starts with dialogue where the members of the team open up to each other and think together, rather than holding on to their own assumptions. This can also be connected to what Kvalsund & Meyer (2005) write about that by being persons-in-relation it is room for both the person and "the other". The individual is in the relationship but by exceeding him/herself the person can include another in his/her existents. It's clear that the facilitators make room for "the individual" within a team.

5.3.2. Including each other

Creating conditions for a team to be in dialogue is pointed at as important in teamwork in different theories (Bohm, 1996 in Senge, 2006; Kvalsund & Meyer, 2005; McClure, 2005; Scharmer, 2007). A guidance/counselor working with groups should create conditions for the members in a team to meet in mutuality around their cooperation and their ways of relating to each other (Kvalsund & Meyer, 2005). According to Reams & Caspari (2012) understanding one's self, and becoming a whole person, can help with our ability to meet someone else openly. By being aware of our inner sources of operating we can create "spaces" around us and include others (Reams & Caspari, 2012; Scharmer, 2007). This has been explored earlier through "self-as-instrument". In this context we can look at it connected to how the facilitators help the members in the team get to know themselves better, thus creating a possibility that they will be more open for other people. In the analysis this is shown in the sub category *from I to Us.*

Talking about what she calls a flow-experience Tone says that all the "I's", the members are met and have contributed to the teamwork. By doing this she says how the members can let go and become part of something bigger. Looking at the theory in connecting with the findings it can seem like by giving the members of the team a chance to open up within themselves, they can in turn open up to others.

Giving people an ability to share their thoughts, wishes, feelings, motivation etc. with each other can contribute to the members' ability to meet each other in an I-Thou (Buber, 1965 in Kvalsund & Allgood, 2008) or I-in-you relationship (Scharmer, 2007). When the members in the team listen to each other while sharing these different aspects about themselves in connection to the teamwork they might get an opportunity to understand each other better. Hearing how the other members in the team have different needs, they might have easier access to see each other as subjects with own perspectives, values and needs that has to be respected and appreciated (Kvalsund & Allgood, 2008). When the members are getting the chance to "learn and share" within a team context, there are reasons to believe that the team members will have easier access to getting into dialogue.

5.3.3. Leading through the heart

Schein (1988) writes that the helping relationship is more an attitude the PC has towards the client with a true wish to help. In the analysis, the facilitator's attitude towards others is shown through the sub category *empathic attitude towards others.* An example of the empathic attitude can be seen in Tone's description of it: *"(...) It's* *a deep attitude that people are valuable, people are important, and it is all about lifting it to a level of an empathic attitude, a heartily friendly attitude."* Katrine also gives an example of a situation when she saw the importance of caring for the people and opening her heart. The facilitators also work on their own development to be able to meet the team without being concerned with only their own point of view. Senge (2006) writes how demonstrating dialogue as a facilitator is one way of creating dialogue between the members. The attitude that the facilitators have towards the team and its members can be linked to how *dialogue* is described in the literature.

The empathic attitude can be connected to what Reams (2012) writes around how a leader can open space (for adaptive work to happen) by *leading through the heart.* The heart has a powerful electromagnetic field and gives people an opportunity to sense other people's emotions and presense (McCraty et.al, 2009). This can be linked to Tone's decription from 5.1.1 *tacit knowledge and intuition* and her ability to sense other people. In this context the theory can be looked at according to what "space" the facilitators create when they meet people with an empathic attitude. Cultivating and using the heart can create a space of being present to each other to a greater extent than what can be achieved through the use of logic alone (Reams, 2012). An example of how the empathic attitude towards individuals in turn can change the way the team members relate to each other can be seen in what Tone says about her ability to "meet" the members where they have the need to be met. She continues saying "*And it's absolutely incredible to see how it makes people want to cooperate when they feel that they are seen, met and heard."*

Rogers (1961) writes that through acceptance of the other person and unconditional positive regard, the client can develop a better understanding of himself and therefore function better. By meeting a person with this attitude Rogers (1961) writes how he becomes a companion for the client in *"the frightening search of himself, which he now feels free to undertake"* (p.34). Tone says she invites the team to break their own boundaries creatively, visual, cooperation-like and by sharing what they mean and think. She says that it is important that she can show them that she has broken these boundaries a long time ago and is comfortable with that. When the helper meets the client in this way, the client can start meeting himself in the same way, and in turn meet other people with the same attitude. This can also be seen in the term co-actualization when people actualize their potential by being in relationship with one another meeting each other with empathy, congruency and unconditional positive regard (Ivey, D'Andrea & Ivey, 2012). Fikse (2013) discuss that leadership should go through self-actualization to co-actualization and co-creating. The importance is leading from the inside and out, to be able to create conditions for people to co-actualize and co-create. Looking at these theories in connection with the findings it can seem like the facilitators attitude towards the team members is an important part of being able to create conditions for the team to learn and develop.

Tone explains the flow-situation as a highlight for her working with teams. She says how everyone is present with his or her resources, and have deep acceptance for each other. How Tone explains the flow situation can be connected to the term presencing; when an entire group of people open their minds, hearts and will within themselves and towards others and the I is in the "now", the ongoing flow of experience (Scharmer, 2007). Tone says how when one first has experienced a flow-situation "it's hard to forget". Senge (2006) writes: *"dialogue that is grounded in reflection and inquiry skills is likely more reliable and less dependent on particulars of circumstances, such as the chemistry among the team members"* (p. 232). Giving the members an opportunity to "learn and share" might give them reflection and inquiry skills that they can use in contact with other people. Getting an experience with this through the processes, they might have easier access to it and thus create learning that they can bring with them after the facilitation is over and the process consultant no longer is there.

6. Conclusion

In this chapter I will summarize the central findings of the research and connect the themes together. Personal reflections around the research process and the findings will also be presented. In the end, limitations in the study and thoughts around further research will be explored.

I began this research process with an interest in getting an in-depth understanding of the work of process consultants through the research question *What experiences do three process consultants have with facilitating teamwork processes in organizations?* In response to the research question I have found that by being present, improvising and developing tacit knowledge (and intuition to different extent), the facilitators use this competence to generate processes that they consider to facilitate development within the team. They work on themselves to be authentic in their work and become whole as persons. This helps them meet the team openly, gives them the opportunity to understand what's going on in the team and share their observations with them. It also helps the facilitators to take care of themselves as helpers. By using tools and their own self, they create "spaces" that help members in the team learn about themselves, making them feel met and seen. This can in turn lead to members in the team opening up to each other.

When starting the research I made a choice to not define what the "goal" of the teamwork process needed to be. After conducting the interviews I reflected around how this might create a problem for my research. Are they talking about the same thing? When the whole focus is on "becoming a good team" the process might be very different than if the team is working towards creating a product. When finishing the analysis I saw how working with teams became more in the background in the context of this thesis, and how the facilitators worked became in the foreground. Thus the different types of teamwork became more as a *background to be able to do this work that they describe.* I experience that I have found the basis of how they work, no matter what kind of team they are meeting or what kind of process they are going through. This captures my main interest for choosing this theme; to get an understanding of the work that the facilitators do.

All the facilitators' experience and reflection have given them a lot of tacit knowledge that makes their work hard to explain. When the informants first talked about that it was hard for them to describe the work that they did and mentioned intuition and tacit knowledge I didn't pay that much attention to it. As an interviewer first hearing about their work, I wondered how I would be able to actually convey the experiences the facilitators had when it was so context-specific. Now I think this shows the essence of their experiences with facilitating teamwork processes. Scharmer (2007) writes that we have to pay attention to both our visible and invisible ways of being by looking at what we say, see and do, and the inner place from which we operate. Through this thesis I think that asking about what the facilitators say, see and do when working with a team I have found the "invisible" and inner place from which the informants operate. The facilitators' empathic attitude towards the people they meet stands out as a central finding that can be seen in all the categories. Tone's statement inspired the title of this thesis: *"People are valuable, people are important, and it is all about lifting it to a level of an empathic attitude, a heartily friendly attitude."* I feel her statement captures the essence of the experiences the facilitators have with facilitating teamwork processes.

I have reflected around how the facilitators can be able to explain the work that they do to their clients in an easy way. Kvalsund & Meyer (2005) write that learning happens in relation to other people. Based on this I have thought about how working in facilitating teams might give the facilitators an opportunity to observe each other and discuss what they do and what their work leads to. The facilitator's tacit knowledge might be easier to spot and explain if facilitators are observing each other and can discuss it. This thought is influenced by Tone when she is talking about the balance of taking care of herself in her work and do a good job as a helper. She mentions "process development teams" as a possible solution. Working in teams might make it easier to work as a facilitator, having the ability to share reflections with someone that has been through the same process. It also might make their work easier to explain, when being able to discuss it with someone who has been an equal part of the process.

As an ending reflection I have though about how the facilitators go far in their wish to help others. It is their profession and therefore their job to do this. At the same time I think people in organizations, teams, larger systems and the world could benefit from working towards this attitude that the facilitator express and show. By meeting each other as person-in-relations (Kvalsund & Meyer, 2005; Kvalsund & Allgood, 2008), where we open our mind, heart and will (Reams, 2012; Reams & Caspari, 2012; Scharmer, 2007) we can *presence,* be together "here and now", and create development to a greater extent than the facilitators can do alone. One of Tone's statements from shown in the analysis is *"Together we can do more than I can alone. And I have to trust in that".* At the end of the process I must say that I trust in this, and I see how the facilitators are a very important part in the process of demonstrating this attitude.

6.1 Limitations and further study

When doing qualitative interviews there is a possibility that there is a gap between how the informants describe their work, and what they actually *do* in action. With my impression of the informants being informed by literature, a limitation of the study is that I can't know for sure if they express attitudes of ideal ways of working or if it's actually how they work. In connection to this I have though how it would be interesting to observe these processes "in action". Observation could give an understanding of what's going on in in the team, and between the facilitator and the team. I think this would have given a further in-depth understanding of facilitation of teamwork processes.

Based on these findings there are many interesting aspects that could be explored further. One theme that I think would be interesting to explore is how team members experience these kinds of processes. How the facilitators meet them and create a space for them to learn about themselves and share their learning with each other. What experiences do the members have with integrating their "whole self" in a process? What is their experience with how this affects the teamwork? To change the focus from the facilitators to the team could give valuable knowledge about what facilitation can lead to.

I hope people in helping relationships in general can find this thesis interesting to read, because the thesis captures a broader understanding of how one can work with different groups of people as a helper. My wish is that everyone who works with people and development in different ways, e.g. process consultants, facilitators, counselors, coaches, leaders and teachers, can be inspired and reflect around their own practice by reading the thesis.

7. Literature

Allgood, E., & Kvalsund, R. (2005). *Learning and discovery for professional educators: Guides, counselors, teachers. An interactive experiential approach to practice and research.* Trondheim: Tapir Academic Press.

Baker, L.K., & Fraser, C. (2005). Facilitator core competencies as defined by the international association of facilitators. In Schuman, S. (Eds.) *The IAF Handbook of Group Facilitation* (p. 459-471). San Fransisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Brown, J.R. (1996). *The I in science.* Oslo: Scandinavian University Press.

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research.* (3th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design. Choosing among five approaches.* (2th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage-Publications.

Dalen, M. (2011). *Intervju som forskningsmetode. En kvalitativ tilnærming.* Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Fikse, C. (2013). *From self-actualization to co-actualization and co-creating within leadership.* (Doctoral thesis). Faculty of social science and technology managment, Norwegian university of science and technology, Trondheim.

Glaser, B., & Anselm, S. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory. Strategies for a qualitative research.* Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Heifetz. R.A. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hjertø, K. (2013). *Team.* Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.

Ingierd, H. (2012). *Humaniora, samfunnsfag, juss og teologi.* Retrieved June 4th 2014 from https://www.etikkom.no/FBIB/Introduksjon/Innforing-i-forskningsetikk/Humaniora-samfunnsfag-juss-og-teologi/

Ivey, A.E., D'Andrea, M.J., & Ivey, M.B. (2012). *Theories of counseling and psychotherapy. A multicultural perspective.* (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications.

Jordan, T. (2002). *Self-awareness, meta-awareness and the witness self.* Retrieved June 4th 2014 from http://perspectus.se/tjordan/

Kegan, R. (1994). *In over our heads. The mental demands of modern life.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univeristy Press.

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Det kvalitative forskningsintervju.* (2th ed.). Oslo, Norway: Gyldendal akademisk.

Kvalsund, R., & Allgood, E. (2008). Persons-in-relation. Dialogue as transformative learning in counselling. In *Santykis ir Pokytis* (185-206). Vilnius: Universiteto Leidykla.

Kvalsund, R., & Meyer, K. (2005). *Gruppeveiledning, læring og ressursutvikling.* Trondheim: Tapir akademiske forlag.

Lester, S. (2005). *Novice to Expert: the Dreyfus model of skill acquisition.* Downloaded June 4th from http://www.sld.demon.co.uk/dreyfus.pdf

McClure, B.A. (2005). *Putting a new spin on groups. The science of chaos* (2th ed.). New York: Psychology Press.

McCraty, R., Atkinson, M., Tomasino, D., & Bradley, R.T. (2009). The coherent heart. Heart–brain interactions, psychophysiological coherence, and the emergence of system-wide order. *Integral review, 5(2), 4-107.*

Mee-Yan Cheung-Judge (2012). The Self as An instrument: A cornerstone to the future of OD. *OD Practitioner*, 44 (2), 42-47.

Postholm, M.B. (2010). *Kvalitativ metode. En innføring med fokus på fenomenologi, etnografi og kasusstudier* (2th ed.). Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Reams, J. (2012). Integral leadership. Opening space by leading through the heart. I Pearson, C.S. (Eds.) *The transforming leader. New approaches to leadership for the twenty-first century* (p. 102-109). San Fransisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Reams, J., & Caspari, A. (2012). Integral leadership. Generating space for emergence through quality of presence. *Wirtschaftspsychologie heft*, 14(3), 34-45.

Rogers, C.R. (1961). *On becoming a person. A therapist's view of psychotherapy.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Scharmer, C.O. (2007). *Theory U. Leading from the future as it emerges. The social technology of presencing.* Cambridge, MA: The Society for Organizational Learning, Inc.

Schein, E.H. (1988). *Process Consultation. Volume 1. Its role in organization development.* (2th ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Schein, E.H. (1987). *Process Consultation. Volume 2. Lessons for managers and Consultants.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Schein, E. (1999). Process consultation revisited. Building the helping relationship. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Senge, P. (2006). *The fifth discipline. The art & practice of the learning organization.* London: Random House Business Books.

Thagaard, T. (2013). *Systematikk og innlevelse. En innføring i kvalitativ metode* (4th ed.). Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.

Wheatley, M.J. (2006). *Leadership and the new science. Discovering order in a chaotic world.* (3th ed.) San-Fransisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Appendix

Appendix 1: Informed consent from research participants

Forespørsel om deltakelse i forskningsprosjektet
”Prosessveiledelse av team i organisasjoner”

Bakgrunn og formål
Formålet med studien er å undersøke hvordan fire eksterne prosessveiledere arbeider med å lede prosesser med team i en organisasjon. Problemstillingen er foreløpig; *” Hvilke erfaringer finnes omkring arbeidet med teamarbeidsprosesser i organisasjoner?”* Prosjektet er en masteroppgave ved institutt for voksnes læring og rådgivningsvitenskap ved NTNU. Utvalget er trukket ved å vurdere hvem det er mest hensiktsmessig å ha som informanter og jeg forespør deg om å delta fordi du er en prosessveileder som jeg gjennom samtale vurderer som en med nyttig og verdifull erfaring i å lede ulike teamprosesser i organisasjoner.

Hva innebærer deltakelse i studien?
Studien vil undersøke prosessveiledning og erfaringer tre prosessveiledere har knyttet til dette arbeidet. Deltakelse i studien innebærer å stille opp på et dybdeintervju angående erfaringer knyttet til prosessveiledelse på omtrent 1 time hvor jeg utformer en intervjuguide på forhånd. Spørsmålene vil omhandle hva du opplever som viktig i en slik prosess, hvordan du arbeider, og eventuelle eksempler du har som kan belyse svarene. Intervjuene vil tas opp via lydopptak.

Hva skjer med informasjonen om deg?
Alle personopplysninger vil bli behandlet konfidensielt og kun jeg og min veileder har kjennskap til din identitet. Intervjuene vil bli tatt opp via båndopptaker for å kunne skrive ned intervjuene i etterkant. Intervjuet vil bli lagt over på en datamaskin og slettet fra båndopptakeren snarest. Lydfilene vil slettes fra datamaskinen så fort de er blitt transkribert og i transkripsjonen vil du være anonymisert.

Om jeg i ettertid skriver en artikkel fra forskningsresultatene og får den publisert vil deltakerne ikke kunne gjenkjennes i dette.

Prosjektet skal etter planen avsluttes ved innlevering av masteroppgaven i slutten av mai 2014. Oppgaven vil gjøres tilgjengelig for alle, men dere vil være anonymisert slik at det ikke blir mulig å spore uttalelser tilbake til dere.

Frivillig deltakelse
Det er frivillig å delta i studien, og du kan når som helst trekke ditt samtykke uten å oppgi noen grunn. Dersom du ønsker å delta eller har spørsmål til studien, ta kontakt med Sara Agerup på tlf. 92631608 eller min veileder Jonathan Reams på tlf. 73591651.

Studien er meldt til Personvernombudet for forskning, Norsk samfunnsvitenskapelig datatjeneste AS.

Samtykke til deltakelse i studien

Jeg har mottatt informasjon om studien, og er villig til å delta

----
(Signert av prosjektdeltaker, dato)

☐ ***Jeg samtykker til å delta i intervju***

Appendix 2: Interview guide

Introduksjonsspørsmål

1. Hva er din utdannings –og arbeidsbakgrunn?
2. Hvor lenge har du jobbet med organisasjoner som en ekstern konsulent?
3. Hva fikk deg til å starte med dette arbeidet?
4. Hva slags prosesser blir du ansatt til å jobbe med?

- Hvordan får du oppdrag?
- Hvordan ser en typisk bestilling fra en organisasjon ut?

5. Kan du *kort* beskrive hvordan en prosess utformes fra du først blir kontaktet av en organisasjon og fram til prosessens slutt?

Hovedspørsmål

1. Hvordan vil du beskrive arbeidet du gjør?
    - Hvordan arbeider du med det?
    - Har du en historie eller et eksempel som kan illustrere det?
    - Hvordan vil du beskrive din rolle? Hvordan beskriver du den for teamet?
    - Hvordan forbereder du deg før du møter et team? Til å begynne med og underveis.
    - Har du en spesiell filosofi, metodologi eller spesielle verdier som du baserer arbeidet ditt på? Har det alltid vært dette?

2. Hva ønsker du å oppnå med arbeidet i et team?
    - Hvordan arbeider du for å oppnå det?
    - Har du noen historier eller eksempler på en gang dette har kommet til syne i teamet?
    - Hva må til for at du skal kunne arbeide med teamet på den måten du ønsker?
    - Er det *noe* du ønsker å trekke frem som utfordrende ved dette arbeidet?

3. Hva er du oppmerksom på når du er i kontakt med teamet?
    - Hva er du oppmerksom på ved deg selv? Indre/ytre
    - Hvordan tror du dette virker på teamet?

- Hva er du oppmerksom på av det som foregår i teamet?
- De ulike medlemmene og teamet som helhet?
- Hvordan bruker du denne informasjonen?
- Er det andre ting du er oppmerksom på?

4. Hva tror du blir tatt med videre etter du har arbeidet med et team?
    - Hva tror du den enkelte tar med seg?
    - Teamet?
    - Har du fått høre noen eksempler eller historier om dette i ettertid?
    - Har du noe evalueringssystem knyttet til dette?
    - Organisasjonen/ledere? → vurdere dette spørsmålet til slutt

Avslutning:

- Noe jeg ikke har spurt om som du kunne tenkt deg å si noe om?
- Kan jeg kontakte deg i etterkant av intervjuet hvis det er noe jeg kommer på eller ønsker å få klargjort hvis det er et utsagn jeg for eksempel er usikker på?
- Andre ting som du lurer på nå?

Appendix 3: Approval from NSD

Norsk samfunnsvitenskapelig datatjeneste AS
NORWEGIAN SOCIAL SCIENCE DATA SERVICES

NSD

Harald Hårfagres gate 29
N-5007 Bergen
Norway
Tel: +47-55 58 21 17
Fax: +47-55 58 96 50
nsd@nsd.uib.no
www.nsd.uib.no
Org.nr. 985 321 884

Jonathan Reams
Institutt for voksnes læring og rådgivningsvitenskap NTNU

7491 TRONDHEIM

Vår dato: 20.01.2014 Vår ref: 36889 / 2 / HIT Deres dato: Deres ref:

TILBAKEMELDING PÅ MELDING OM BEHANDLING AV PERSONOPPLYSNINGER

Vi viser til melding om behandling av personopplysninger, mottatt 03.01.2014. Meldingen gjelder prosjektet:

36889	*Prosessveiledelse*
Behandlingsansvarlig	*NTNU, ved institusjonens øverste leder*
Daglig ansvarlig	*Jonathan Reams*
Student	*Sara Agerup*

Personvernombudet har vurdert prosjektet og finner at behandlingen av personopplysninger er meldepliktig i henhold til personopplysningsloven § 31. Behandlingen tilfredsstiller kravene i personopplysningsloven.

Personvernombudets vurdering forutsetter at prosjektet gjennomføres i tråd med opplysningene gitt i meldeskjemaet, korrespondanse med ombudet, ombudets kommentarer samt personopplysningsloven og helseregisterloven med forskrifter. Behandlingen av personopplysninger kan settes i gang.

Det gjøres oppmerksom på at det skal gis ny melding dersom behandlingen endres i forhold til de opplysninger som ligger til grunn for personvernombudets vurdering. Endringsmeldinger gis via et eget skjema, http://www.nsd.uib.no/personvern/meldeplikt/skjema.html. Det skal også gis melding etter tre år dersom prosjektet fortsatt pågår. Meldinger skal skje skriftlig til ombudet.

Personvernombudet har lagt ut opplysninger om prosjektet i en offentlig database, http://pvo.nsd.no/prosjekt.

Personvernombudet vil ved prosjektets avslutning, 01.06.2014, rette en henvendelse angående status for behandlingen av personopplysninger.

Vennlig hilsen

Vigdis Namtvedt Kvalheim

Hildur Thorarensen

Kontaktperson: Hildur Thorarensen tlf: 55 58 26 54
Vedlegg: Prosjektvurdering
Kopi: Sara Agerup sara.agerup@gmail.com

Dokumentet er elektronisk produsert og godkjent ved NSDs rutiner for elektronisk godkjenning.

Avdelingskontorer / *District Offices*:
OSLO: NSD. Universitetet i Oslo, Postboks 1055 Blindern, 0316 Oslo. Tel: +47-22 85 52 11. nsd@uio.no
TRONDHEIM: NSD. Norges teknisk-naturvitenskapelige universitet, 7491 Trondheim. Tel: +47-73 59 19 07. kyrre.svarva@svt.ntnu.no
TROMSØ: NSD. SVF, Universitetet i Tromsø, 9037 Tromsø. Tel: +47-77 64 43 36. nsdmaa@sv.uit.no

Personvernombudet for forskning

Prosjektvurdering - Kommentar

Prosjektnr: 36889

Ifølge prosjektmeldingen skal det innhentes skriftlig samtykke basert på skriftlig informasjon om prosjektet og behandling av personopplysninger. Personvernombudet finner informasjonsskrivet tilfredsstillende utformet i henhold til personopplysningslovens vilkår.

Innsamlede opplysninger registreres på privat pc. Personvernombudet legger til grunn at veileder og student setter seg inn i og etterfølger NTNU sine interne rutiner for datasikkerhet, spesielt med tanke på bruk av privat pc til oppbevaring av personidentifiserende data.

Prosjektet skal avsluttes 01.06.2014 og innsamlede opplysninger skal da anonymiseres og lydopptak slettes. Anonymisering innebærer at direkte personidentifiserende opplysninger som navn/koblingsnøkkel slettes, og at indirekte personidentifiserende opplysninger (sammenstilling av bakgrunnsopplysninger som f.eks. yrke, alder, kjønn) fjernes eller grovkategoriseres slik at ingen enkeltpersoner kan gjenkjennes i materialet.