RELATION BETWEEN EGO STATES AND TEAM ROLES ON TEACHER'S SAMPLE: CAN DOMINANT EGO STATE PREDICT PREFERRED TEAM ROLE?
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Abstract: The aim of this research was to examine relation between ego states and team roles on elementary and secondary school teacher's sample. Concept of team roles is a concept given by Meridith Belbin (1981). Belbin defined an ideal team as a group of individuals who are capable to fulfill eight team roles he had identified. Ego states are a concept derived from Transactional Analysis, founded by Eric Bern. Ego states are defined as „coherent systems of thoughts, feelings, manifested by corresponding patterns of behavior“ (Bern, 1972).

Two instruments were used in this study, Ego State Questionnaire-Revised (ESQ-R) (Loffredo at al., 2004) and The Belbin Team Inventory (1981). The the Ego State Questionnaire-Revised (ESQ-R) with five measuring subjects, measuring three main ego states (Adult, Parent and Child) in detail by separation into independent measuring subject positive and negative part of Parent and Child ego states. Those five measuring subject are: Nurturing Parent, Critical Parent, Adult, Free Child and Adapted Child. The second instrument used in this research was Belbin Team Inventory, which has eight measuring subject regarding eight team roles: Plants, Monitor Evaluator, Completer Finisher, Team worker, Chairman, Shaper, Company worker, Resource Investigator. Both instruments has a satisfactory level of reliability and adequate factor validity.

The sample was convenient and it consisted of 186 respondents in total, both sexes (M=80; F=106) age range from 23 to 64 (M=38.48). Data was analyzed through correlation and linear regression analysis.

Results show that correlation exist between some of the team roles and some of the ego states. Team role Team Worker has a statistically significant and negative correlation with Adult ego state and statistically significant but positive correlation with Critical Parent ego state. Team role Company Worker has a statistically significant and positive correlation with ego state Free Child. When it comes to regression analysis result show following: team role Plants can be predicted by Adult (β=-.513) ego state; and team role Team Worker can be predicted by Free Child ego state (β=.269).

Only two team roles were predicted by some of the ego states: Plants and Team Worker. Following team roles were not predicted by any of the ego States: Monitor Evaluator, Resource investigator, Chairman, Shaper, Company worker, Completer Finisher. It is possible that ego States are not important for team roles in question, but there is also one other possibility, that team roles in question do not appear in their pure form in teachers work environment. Further research should be done in order to determine if one of possibilities in question is correct, and if some third option exist, presumably on population not consisted only of teacher but also of employees in other fields of work.
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INTRODUCTION

It is well known that Transactional Analysis has found its way into Management, Marketing and Work Psychology, and one of concepts that is often used in these field are ego states. In this paper we tried to find relation between this concept and concept of team roles. This concept is a very famous one and very useful in Management practice.

People are often chosen to be members of teams on the basis of their functional roles (Senior, 1997). In teams, every person has his or hers own strengths. Taking that into account some authors have proposed the notion of team roles as team-player styles (Belbin, 1981, 1993; Davis, Millburn, Murphy & Woodhouse, 1992; Margerison & McCann, 1990; Parker, 1990; Spencer & Pruss; 1992; Woodcock, 1989). The identification of team roles is sometimes based on different personality characteristics (e.g. Margerison & McCann, 1990; Parker, 1990). However, all authors of the team role concept claim to have observed the behaviors typical of each team role, in a wide variety of occupational teams in many different types of organizations.

Concept of team roles comes from Meridith Belbin. Belbin (1981) described ideal team as a group of individuals who could fulfill the eight, and later (Belbin, 1993), nine team roles which he had identified. In this paper questionnaire assessing the original eight team roles was used because the original team roles concept has
more widespread use in industry and practice. Those roles are following: Plants - Tends to be highly creative and good at solving problems in unconventional ways (Cukic, 2004; Belbin team roles, 2017); Belbin, 1981; Fisher, Hunter & Macrosson, 2010). Monitor Evaluator - Provides a logical eye, making impartial judgments where required and weighs up the team's options in a dispassionate way (Cukic, 2004; Belbin team roles; Belbin, 1981; Fisher, Hunter & Macrosson, 2010). Resource Investigator - Uses their inquisitive nature to find ideas to bring back to the team (Cukic, 2004; Belbin team roles, 2017; Belbin, 1981; Fisher, Hunter & Macrosson, 2010). Team worker - Helps the team to gel, using their versatility to identify the work required and complete it on behalf of the team (Cukic, 2004; Belbin team roles, 2017; Belbin, 1981; Fisher, Hunter & Macrosson, 2010). Chairman - Needed to focus on the team's objectives, draw out team members and delegate work appropriately (Cukic, 2004, Belbin team roles, 2017; Belbin, 1981; Fisher, Hunter & Macrosson, 2010). Shaper - Provides the necessary drive to ensure that the team keeps moving and does not lose focus or momentum (Cukic, 2004, Belbin team roles; Belbin, 1981; Fisher, Hunter & Macrosson, 2010). Company worker - needed to plan a workable strategy and carry it out as efficiently as possible (Cukic, 2004, Belbin team roles, 2017; Belbin, 1981; Fisher, Hunter & Macrosson, 2010). Completer Finisher - Most effectively used at the end of tasks to polish the work for errors, subjecting it to the highest standards of quality control (Cukic, 2004; Belbin team roles, 2017; Belbin, 1981; Fisher, Hunter & Macrosson, 2010).

Belbin (1981) suggested that some team roles are complementary and counterbalancing, for example the roles of chairman and shaper, and the plant and resource investigator. Data of later studies confirms this (Fisher, Hunter & Macrosson, 1998).

Transactional analysis can be divided into five theoretical and practical clusters, according to Stainer (2003). Those clusters are: The ego states and transactions cluster, The strokes cluster, The scripts and games cluster, The Ok cluster, and The Transactional Theory of change cluster. The ego states and transactions cluster it the first cluster, and the one we are interested in is this research. Bern defines ego state as „coherent systems of thought, feeling, manifested by corresponding patterns of behavior” (Bern, 1972). H. H. Watkins proposed (1993, according to Wade & Wade, 2001) that an ego state may be defined as an organized system of behavior and experience whose elements are bound together by some common principle. When one of these states is invested with ego energy, it becomes “the self” in the here and now. Eric Berne, the founder of Transactional Analysis, observed that individuals manifest three certain sets of thoughts, feelings and behaviors at different moments of time, he called these sets ego States: Child, Adult and Parent (Bern, 1970). Later, Dusay (1972) indicated that ego States divide as follows: Critical Parent and Nurturing Parent, Adapted Child and Natural Child. Adult ego state does not divide. There are five criteria by which one could diagnose an Ego State: words used, tone of voice, gesture, posture, and facial expression (Steiner et al., 2003)

As said earlier, there are three ego main ego states: The Child Ego State - The Child Ego State represents all one’s life events from their childhood filtered through his/hers subjective experience. The Child Ego State is the source of feelings, intuition, needs, creativity, creation, procreation and life energy (Wadsworth and Divincenti, 2003; Radulovic, 1998). Child Ego State is than divided into Natural Child and Adapted Child. Both Natural and Adapted Child have their positive and negative parts. (Kehler, 2008 according to Ciucur, 2012); The Adult Ego State - This Ego State is the so called “computer” part of ourselves. When in the Adult Ego State, an individual offers and asks for information from other ego States and from external environment, and based on the data this Ego Stated makes decisions. The function of the Adult is a fact-based one. When in the Adult Ego State the person uses logical thinking to solve problems, being also an mediator between the Child Ego State and the Parent Ego State (Stewart & Joines, 2007; Radulovic, 1998); and The Parent Ego State - The Parent Ego state is a “set of feeling, attitudes, and behavior patterns which resemble those of a parental figure” (Bern, 1961). This Ego State is a collection of rules, codes, norms, prejudices, assessments, taken from the individual’s parents or significant persons from early childhood. The function of the Parent is a value-based one. This Ego State can also be divided into two separate ego States: Nurturing Parent and Critical Parent (Nelson – Jones, 2011; Radulovic, 1998). Parent ego state also has a positive and negative part (Kehler, 2008, according to Ciucur, 2012).

Each person has a “favourite” Ego State which the person shows the most, or energizes the most.

People have need for stimuli, structure, and relationship (Berne, 1963). That structure can be found in roles people take in a team. Structure being defined as a “…drive to organize the experience…” (Erskine, 1995/ 1997d).
Some authors found connection between personality and team roles (Cattell, Eber, & Tatsuoka, 1970; Saville, Holdsworth, Nyfield, Cramp & Mabey, 1992; Dulewicz, 1995). Taking into account that Transactional analysis is also a theory of personality, in this paper we wanted to examine relation between ego states, as concept from one personality theory, and team roles. Also, as said earlier, many concepts from TA found their way into Management, one of them being ego states. No earlier studies regarding relation between these two constructs were found.

**METHODOLOGY**

**Aim of the study**
The aim of this study was to examine the relation between ego states and team roles, and to determine if ego states can predict team roles a person takes in his or hers working environment.

**Instruments**
Two instruments were used in this study, Ego State Questionnaire-Revised (ESQ-R) (Loffredo et al., 2004) and The Belbin Team Inventory (1981). The Ego State Questionnaire-Revised (ESQ-R) has five measuring subjects: Nurturing Parent, Critical Parent, Adult, Free Child and Adapted Child. All of those were described in the introduction section. The Belbin Team Inventory (1981) has eight measuring subjects which refer to roles an individual has in a team. Those roles are: Plants, Monitor Evaluator, Resource Investigator, Teamworker, Coordinator, Shaper, Completer Finisher and Implementer. All nine team roles were also described in the introduction section.

Psychometric properties of these two instruments were adequate.

**Sample**
The sample was a convenience sample, consisted of 186 respondents in total. All respondents were teachers from elementary schools and secondary schools. The sample consisted of 80 male and 106 female respondents, age range from 23 to 64 (M=38.48).

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**
The collected data was analyzed using method of linear regression, whereas predictors were ego states and criterion variables were Team roles of the respondents in the sample.

Table 1 – correlation between team roles and ego states

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Plants</th>
<th>Monitor Evaluator</th>
<th>Resource investigator</th>
<th>Team worker</th>
<th>Chairman</th>
<th>Shaper</th>
<th>Company worker</th>
<th>Completer Finisher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>-.434**</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Parent</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.321*</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurturing Parent</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>-.126</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapted child</td>
<td>-.118</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>-.149</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>-.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free child</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.272*</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ** - Statistically significant on level of 0.001
* - Statistically significant on level of 0.05

From the table above it can be seen that there are three statistically significant correlations. The first one is between team role Team Worker and Adult ego state, negative correlation exist between these two variables. The second correlation can be seen between team role Team Worker and ego state Critical Parent, in this case the positive correlation. The third correlation can be seen between team role Company Worker and ego state Free Child.

Table 2 – Regression analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Plants</th>
<th>Monitor Evaluator</th>
<th>Resource investigator</th>
<th>Team worker</th>
<th>Chairman</th>
<th>Shaper</th>
<th>Company worker</th>
<th>Completer Finisher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictors</td>
<td>β p</td>
<td>β P</td>
<td>β p</td>
<td>β p</td>
<td>β p</td>
<td>β p</td>
<td>β p</td>
<td>β p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>-.513</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.170</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the table above it can be seen that there are only two statistically significant predictors for only two out of nine team roles.

The first team role in question is team role Plants. And the statistically significant predictor for this team role is Adult ego state, with negative correlation. The negative correlation can be explained by the fact that ideas, in terms of ego states, come from Free Child ego state, ego state which is described by its spontaneity. On the other hand, Adult ego state is stable and rational one.

The next team role with statistically significant predictor is team role Team worker, person who helps team to reach its goal. Statistically significant predictor for this team role is a Free Child ego state, the state which is characterized by spontaneity and creativity, the characteristics probably very needed for primary purpose of persons taking this team role, in order to achieve goal stated by the team.

CONCLUSION
The aim of this study was to examine the relation between ego states and team roles, and to determine if ego states can predict team roles a person takes in his or hers working environment.

From the results it can be seen that only two ego states were singled out as statistically significant predictors of person’s team role, Adult ego state and Free Child ego state. This could led to conclusion that only persons rational decisions and feelings, as well as persons spontaneity and creativity are important for team roles that person takes.

Only two team roles were predicted by some of the ego states: Plants and Team Worker. Following team roles were not predicted by any of the ego states: Monitor Evaluator, Resource investigator, Chairman, Shaper, Company worker, Completer Finisher. It is possible that ego states are not important for team roles in question, but there is also one other possibility, that team roles in question do not appear in teachers work environment. Further research should be done in order to determine if one of possibilities in question is correct, presumably on population not consisted only of teacher but also of employees in other fields of work.
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