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Interview with Jack Wood

Conducted by William Bergquist and Michael Sanson

Jack Wood is a distinguished professor, therapist, consultant and coach, living in Switzerland and working throughout the world. In this interview with Bergquist and Sanson, Wood explores the interplay between unconscious life and coaching, as well as reflecting on the training of coaches in a manner that takes into account this dynamic interplay.

Bill: Jack here's what I was thinking we could do, and I'm sure our conversation will take on a life of its own. Michael corrected the title of this issue, it was originally Coaching to the Unconscious, and he rightfully changed it to Coaching and the Unconscious, reflecting the dynamic interplay between the two. So what I wanted to do was to first deal with the more general issue about your own sense of what the unconscious is. My sense is that you don't see unconscious processes as primarily a source of obstruction but rather see these processes as a source of richness and vitality. Then I wanted to go in more specifically to coaching and the implications for coaches of a number of themes that you work with and bring up. I was hoping we would end up looking at some of the issues around leadership development and leadership training and the implications of your ideas for people who do coaching.

THE NATURE OF UNCONSCIOUS PROCESSES

Jack: That sounds fine. I think the distinction is a helpful one, actually, that you picked up Michael—Coaching to the Unconscious and Coaching and the Unconscious—because the difference puts in place two very different domains. Coaching to the Unconscious implies that there's a consciousness of what one is doing with respect to the unconscious and I'm not sure that that's altogether true much of the time. It sounds somewhat presumptuous—coaching to the unconscious—as if one's conscious was going to give the unconscious a lecture. Coaching and the Unconscious seems to me a larger circumference on the material and can include inadvertent as well as explicit dynamics. Does that make any sense?

Bill: It does make sense. Some of the neuroscientists seem to be talking about the interplay between conscious and unconscious processes. Often unconscious processes are speaking to ones that are so-called conscious and helping to actually correct them or helping to at least keep us from going too far off base. So I very much like the direction you're going with this.

Jack: Okay so I'll follow your lead.
Bill: If you were to be my guide into the underworld, into the unconscious, if this were a little bit of Dante, tell me about what are some of the characteristics, or the kind of the domains, of the unconscious that you tend to work in, or what are some of the aspects of it? You talk quite a bit about defensive structures, about anxiety, about how the Tavistockian ways in organizational leadership interplays with unconscious processes. What are the components of the unconscious life?

Jack: Well I guess it depends from what kind of school one draws one's frameworks. So I guess the way I would look at it is: the unconscious is ultimately unknowable and what one has are conceptual lenses with which one can view or attempt to view more clearly things that are not particularly obvious or particularly available for study. So the differences, I think it was an article I read when I was in high school by Freud on the unconscious—the ego and the id and the superego. He described the id something like, this is paraphrasing, a seething cauldron of discontent, selfish illogical wants, and irrational drives—something like that—which sounds like a very unfriendly place. And I think the Tavistock tradition, drawing on Melanie Klein as well as the Freudians, picked up a lot of that aspect of the unconscious, so it's largely power drives and replications of infantile relations with one's mother and so on and so forth at a group level. And I guess those are helpful lenses at times, but I feel as though they are a little bit limited. The Jungian approach to the unconscious might be, rather than a seething cauldron of discontent, maybe sort of an ocean floor or a sea, where there's sunken treasure, there's fish, there's wildlife, there are things with which we're not familiar—we haven't seen before. There are all kinds of marvelous and frightening forms and stuff occurring there together, and if one sort of approaches even the group dynamics kinds of things that way or leadership that way, then you don't approach it with a pathological bias. You just approach it with maybe a sort of respect or humility—this is the source of creativity for good and evil, and leadership for good and evil. So when you study as a Jungian analyst you spend time looking at comparative religions, dreams, myths, fairy tales, picture interpretations, all kinds of different ways to approach the symbolic, which is one way to access the material of the Unconscious.

Bill: I was thinking about the unconscious life related to organizational life. I had this image: as we're swimming under water we see Atlantis in the distance. That is, in the Unconscious there resides a whole image of other organizations, other societies, other lives. It struck me what you were saying—that there's an Atlantis or probably several different kinds of cities under the sea that may relate to our dreams for the ideal organization or nostalgia for what we think organizations were in the past or some image of future utopias that live under the sea.
Jack: The way I would understand your metaphor is this: if you have an organization with 560 people in it you'd probably get 560 different versions of Atlantis buried in the Unconscious of these people—each version conveying something about what that organization should be like or could be like or may be like in a wonderful way or a terrible way. This makes it extremely complex to bring about a common vision of what the organization should be like. So the operational narratives that organizations end up building are largely determined by some sort of overt economic imperatives. In addition, they are built on covert private imperatives to gain power and influence and status for the wellbeing of oneself or one's family as well as for not such shiny motives. This makes it a very complex kind of field of study, on the one hand. On the other hand, when you're working in a small group within an organizational context you can get a lot closer to where the collective fantasies drift and what kinds of images are operating in people's minds. It's as if there's a text and a subtext. This is the way I think of organizational life. The text is the kinds of things that are on the mission statements and value statements: we value people and blah blah blah. All the mission and value statements end up sounding the same. But the covert subtext is actually what gets done and how it gets done. And there's usually a significant discrepancy between text and subtext. That's why things like the cartoon “Dilbert” are a source of humor—that particular cartoon reveals or uncovers what the subtext really is.

Bill: You seem to be saying that there's a pull towards two subtexts. One of these subtexts is based around fear, based around management of anxiety (the Isabel Menzies model) or based on discouragement regarding past attempts at change or improvement. You are also talking, however, about subtexts that are based on hope. There's an attraction to that underworld sea or the Atlantis which is about hope.

Jack: It's both. Take Menzies' Organizational Structures as a Defense Against Anxiety. I think anxiety is always present in some form at some level in human beings. It's part of being human. Whether it becomes high enough that you have to start putting structures in place to protect yourself from that anxiety is another question. You're working in a group or in a team where there's some shared—I'm reluctant to use the word “vision”—shared vision regarding some of the possibilities. It's much less persuasive that the whole thing is a defense against anxiety and much more persuasive that there's a teleological [goal directed] element. It's not just defensive. It's a teleological element that's driving one forward towards some kind of vision. Of course there's a fine line between a vision and a hallucination, and in many organizations or countries at different times you can see the line crossed. You don't have to go to 1939 and Nazi Germany to see collective delusions start playing themselves out at a national level.
Bill: What you have suggested is quite powerful. You seem to be saying that whereas we can engage the model offered by Menzies and can look at culture being formed as a defense against anxiety, we can also begin from another perspective, assuming that organizational culture is forged around teleology.

Jack: There are probably defensive and teleological elements in any organization or in any ideology. There's a sort of utopian element with any ideology, whether it's religious or secular or political. There will be the thousand year Reich, there will be the Communist utopia, or there will be the capitalist ideal—there will always be something like that. So there's always a sort of pull. Barak Obama was inspired by, I think, his Reverend Wright—to think in terms of “the audacity of hope!” His is a teleological inspiration. The degree to which the pull is a delusion, however, is I suppose a measure of its departure from reality. By that I mean people's unawareness of how far their vision can stray from the basic sources of life and reality. Life has one complex reality—and reality principles one can ignore only for a short time before they come back and rectify the situation. Collective delusions can only last for so long before reality has a way of pulling things back into place. The financial markets are an example.

LEADERSHIP AND COLLECTIVE DELUSIONS

Bill: How might this relate to Bion in terms of the pairing function and the role of leadership (a visionary model of leadership)? In your mind are those connected in some ways—both the positive part and the potential movement toward a fantastic future rather than one based at all in reality? Is there a link?

Jack: My understanding of Bion and his articulation of the basic assumptions in group dynamics is that there is a fluid movement between these basic assumption groups—modes into and out of which groups shift—and which are basically collective delusions. Every once in a while, a group passes through “basic assumption work” and actually gets the job done. The group has elements that get drawn into periods where collective fantasy is directing things a bit more than it might otherwise do. That's easiest to see in small to medium sized groups. When you see it with whole organizations or countries I think other dynamics are involved. The French have a telling phrase: logic de guerre. It means the kind of inevitable dynamics that can get constellated and then lead up to events like the first Gulf War. There is a logic that takes on a life of its own and starts leading people collectively in a particular direction—a direction that basically draws on some kind of collective energy and amplifies unconscious collective delusion. Then people follow each other blindly, and sometimes over the cliff.

Bill: We have a good example of that right now in the United States. Sarah Palin is warning of death panels—the idea that somehow in America with a new health care plan, we're going
to have panels of bureaucrats determining who stays alive and who is murdered. It's an extraordinary kind of frightening and hellish delusion.

**Jack:** There are a couple of things going on here. One is that the image resonates with the people because it's an archetypal thing. It's a Kafka-esque kind of image. Kafka had this short story about a sort of impersonal judicial system that one can never quite access—one becomes paralyzed and held hostage by this impersonal system. Palin's is a sort of paranoid delusion, and is being manipulated by political interests basically trying to get money allocated in a particular direction and aren't particularly interested in change. So there's a cynical element to it: because the genius of this approach is that the word [death panel] is one that articulates something which resonates with people's unconscious—there's a reservoir of fear into which human beings can tap. Then you give them a form that that fear can take on, an image that that fear can attach itself to, and you can keep this stuff going for a long period of time. I mean before the last election we had eight years—basically after 9/11—of seeing that fear being constellated, leveraged and amplified in the minds of people for cynical reasons. So that the word terrorist came up almost any time the administration talked about anything. The word terrorist came in just to capitalize, literally, on people's fear. I mean, seriously, Cheney had been CEO of Halliburton and then Halliburton ends up as the major “contractor” for the Iraq war. I live in Europe. You think the rest of the world can't see this kind of thing clearly?

**Bill:** And terrorism was being defined as a war.

**Jack:** Right. Whether they believed it or not—the degree to which the former administration believed it or not—I don't know. Or the degree to which it was just a cynical manipulation—I don't know. I expect on the part of some it was simply a cynical manipulation, on the part of others they probably believed what they were saying—or convinced themselves that they did.

**Bill:** Though I would think—and this would be relevant even in more mundane cases of an organization—I would think that whether or not it may have begun as a cynical manipulation, the dynamic and the power of the unconscious life is such that eventually the people themselves begin to believe it.

**Jack:** Right.

**Bill:** So what may start out as cynicism and an attempt to control through cynical manipulation eventually, in many ways, undergoes change. The unconscious dynamic wins out and people actually believe their own rhetoric.

**Jack:** I actually think that's true. Some do. You can find examples in everyday life where somebody starts a bit of a rumor. Pretty
soon the rumor comes back to them from other people and then they start getting scared: “Gee, maybe this really is true.” Then they start to believe it themselves and they start to get infected. So you get a psychic infection.

**Bill:** Kind of an echo back of their own thoughts and fears.

**Jack:** The kernel is your own fear—and maybe you first initiate the expression of that fear as a doubt. But then you hear it from someone else and the kernel has popped and the fear takes on a more concrete and autonomous form—and that fear gets projected outside at others, who become the formal objects of one’s fear.

**COACHING AND THE UNCONSCIOUS**

**Bill:** We might want to switch now to coaching. There are several people I know who have a very strong Tavistockian (psychoanalytic) background. As I talked to them about how they use this background in their coaching they generally say: “Well I can’t really use it in my coaching. What I do is use this background when I process myself what has occurred in my own role as a coach and as I think about the transference onto me or the dynamics that have occurred in the group which I am coaching. But I can’t ever actually bring this stuff up with my clients or I would no longer have a client.” This statement (or confession) is disappointing to me. So, I would ask you how do these processes, how does your own understanding of what’s going on, how does this impact on your coaching—not just your reflection on your coaching. How does this perspective impact on the way in which you actually do coaching?

**Jack:** Well, I come at coaching a bit more from a therapeutic background, I suppose, than from a group relations background. Even though my group relations work antecedent my therapeutic training, I probably work more in an interpersonal/group systems way and in that context I have to make a decision: is this individual coaching or is this team leadership coaching (which is more like what used to be called group process consultation kind of work). So with my individual clients, whether they’re coaching or therapy clients, I don’t feel that things like transference and counter transference and feelings and misunderstandings are off the table for discussion or for including in the work, I don’t feel it is inappropriate to focus on these matters. In fact, it’s integral. I actually feel that part of the art of doing coaching is to be able to bring in these elements. Basically, I try to be as honest and straightforward as I can be and as sensitive I can be—so that when the material is brought in it's introduced in such a way and timed in such a way that it can be digested and worked within the client system framework.

I don't think it's particularly helpful to say, “Well okay, I have this specialized technical knowledge and I can't use it in my real work except in an informative way in my own mind.” I think

**There's a fine line between a vision and a hallucination, and in many organizations or countries at different times you can see the line crossed.**
if that happens then that's an indication that one is in a sense been captured by one's framework. One doesn't have a means to bridge between the lenses that one uses and the reality of the encounter with the person in front of one. Their “knowledge” is not integrated in the coach or in the therapist if they feel as though they can't actually use the things that they know in the dialogue that they're having with their client.

My experience of an effective coach or an effective therapist is just that. Whatever lens they have—and I think I tend to work eclectically with transactional analysis, with classic psychoanalytic images, with a more Jungian approach or a more Gestalt approach depending upon the conversation at a particular point in time—whichever lens helps us see things more clearly or helps one connect with the person with whom one's coaching, that's the thing to bring forward.

QUALITIES OF EFFECTIVE COACHING

Bill: There seems to be some powerful implications in terms of what would qualify to be a coach. What kind of training or background should one have before going into coaching?

Jack: Well, yeah. It's a little like when I talk to potential analysands and they ask a question about whom to work with. During our training sessions at the Jung Institute in Zurich we were expected to work with a male analyst and a female analyst as part of our training. And the question comes up when you're talking to a prospective analysand, “Should I work with a man or a woman?” Sometimes they'll add: “Well, I prefer working with a man,” or “I prefer working with a woman.” My experience has been that it's usually less important whether it's a man or a woman than that the man or the woman with whom an analysand is working has the capacity to work in a deep way with the individual in front of them. To a priori go one way or the other way feels to me a little bit more defensive than it needs to be—the choice is driven, perhaps too much, by the individual's complexes. And the same is true of different schools: “Well, what [theoretical] school is the best one?” The research I ran across when in grad school confirmed this: it's less important what form of psychotherapy one visits than that the individual psychotherapist has the capacity to work well with you. So whether one's a Gestalt or Kleinian or Jungian or Freudian is less important, really, than the quality of the individual therapist in the session with the analysand. There is the importance of training, of course, but oftentimes there's a period in which one’s training gets

in the way because people take it too literally or they take their model too concretely and try to apply it too mechanically. They take things concretely and that tends to inhibit the actual process of development because then they use the theory in a defensive way: “Well, okay, I learned some jargon so now I’m gonna throw it on my analysand or on my client.”

Bill: But you seem to be saying that in preparation for being a coach one needs to or should have some sort of period of personal reflection. That is, it’s important for one to have access to the dynamics, the things that are going on in one’s own body and mind and heart and all. If we’re going to bring everything fully present to them in that interaction with the client, then we have to understand what it is we’re bringing.

Jack: Yes. I understand the push toward cognitive behavioral therapy and concrete schools. There’s a protection of turf and one’s own model: “Our model’s better than your model!” But I actually think there’s a natural ability or capacity for individuals to do this work that precedes their training. If there’s a normal distribution you can probably take someone in the middle of the distribution and train them so they can get in the top quartile. But if you take people who are naturally in the top quartile, then the question isn’t so much what kind of training program one does but more what kind of a mentoring relationship is established. I’m not even sure I like the word mentoring. In former times in guilds, artisans used an apprenticeship model, where you learn the art—intimately practicing side by side with a master. No one sets out to have a particular school of painters. It’s just that the painter paints and then some of the people work with him. They start picking up followers and then they start building on those particular sensibilities to create a school of painting. It’s not like an a priori strategy to become a master or an intentional mechanical industrial construct into which people fit and are trained. It’s more like the way in which one learns to work with brushes and oil. In Air Force pilot training we learned this because there was a difference between “procedure” and “technique”—the procedures were the more or less mechanical things you had to do, but the “technique” was the measure of what kind of pilot you really were.

Bill: Would there not also be a role for the “sounding board.” The coach may need someone off whom they can bounce their own ideas. A shadow coach or consultant is someone who can essentially be a coach to the coach in terms of helping the coach explore their own dynamics and what’s going on with their client, much like a training analyst.

Jack: Yes. I think that’s necessary. A training analyst is around when one is training and then oftentimes when you get your degree and you get your license you’re sort of on your own. I think that’s where supervision and intervision groups are helpful with analysts who are already practicing. It’s a corrective—one can bounce one’s
ideas off other people. All of the group consultant/coaches with whom I work in a group leadership context are expected to do some personal work and Group Relations conferences on their own. We do this so that they all have their own therapist and their own place to experiment in a group setting. You can do any kind of personal work you want: Gestalt or T.A. or anything. The idea is that this gives you a place of your own where you can make sense of your experiences and apply it to working in the staff group. The staff group, in turn, helps you make sense of your experience in working with participant groups. So you're covered both individually and as a member of various collectives. To some degree, the staff group falls into its own pathologies, which is natural enough from time to time. Fortunately, you still have your own therapist with whom you can bounce off your ideas and your feelings. And so that you don't end up colluding with your own therapist, you still have the [staff peer] group with which you can work. Peer group members will say: “Wait a minute. That's not the way we see or experience you at this moment in this group working with these particular clients.” It's a layered approach.

Bill: That's wonderful. It's not just layered—it's triangulation in some way. You have your own personal experience with your client and their own feedback to you and that interplay. Plus, you have your individual therapist with whom you're working, plus your work within the staff group. All three triangulate in a way that enables you to do better work as a coach. In addition, you're gaining personally from these three different kinds of interaction.

Jack: That's true. Furthermore, the professionalization of the group of coaches—behavioral consultant/coaches—that we work with is probably the piece that is the most helpful. Individuals working through the staff group have a chance to do their own therapy. They also have a requirement to attend a group relations conference on their own, so they don't get captured by the staff group. But the staff group seems to be the place where it's most alive and most straight because the more skilled the people on staff become the better the work in the staff group and then the better the work with the client groups.

THE FRAME OF COACHING

Michael: Jack I was wondering how you felt about the frame of coaching over the years because I know when we first started out coaching was not easily accepted in the staff group. Now coaching seems to be used more easily as a concept. How have you found it helpful and not so helpful in the work with organizational clients?

Jack: I guess over the last 15 years or so as the industry of coaching has broadened, some of the stumbling we have encountered in our work as a staff group has been because of the emerging consciousness of the importance of different roles—between being in the role of a group “consultant” and being the role of a “coach.” The words consultant and coach represent two different—though
related—roles that one can occupy and it’s helpful to be conscious of which role one is in at any particular time.

The word consultant and the word coach also carry different connotations in the field of management education. The word “consultant” can easily conjure up something like “expert advice giving” and brings to mind images of slick consultants from “big-five” business consulting firms recommending off-the-shelf models as solutions to complex personal or corporate problems. But that’s not what we are talking about. We’re talking about behavioral group consulting. A colleague of mine who is presently at Insead in France, Gianpiero Petriglieri, and I wrote a piece several years ago on the differences between coaches, counselors, facilitators and behavioral consultants that drew on our experiences working as management school professors, therapists, and business consultants. We settled on the word “behavioral consultant” to suggest working within a group in a collaborative clinical approach, relying on one’s own and the client’s immediate experience to explore and understand what is happening in the individuals and the larger social systems at both overt and covert levels. Whereas coaches, counselors, facilitators and behavioral consultants are all concerned with the success of their clients, their definition of success is very different.

When I began doing the leadership work with managers some twenty-two years ago, the word coach was just beginning to be used in a management context, and it carried the freight of its origins. Etymologically, the word “coach” derives from a 16th century Hungarian word meaning protective horse-drawn carriage—like Cinderella’s coach. In the mid-1800’s it took on the analogous meaning of a railway carriage, along with the American meaning of a sort of athletic manager and trainer. At the same time, in England, the word became Oxford slang for a tutor who prepared or “carried” a student through an exam. These are interesting origins for the meaning of coach and include the idea of both protecting and carrying one’s client from a starting place, though some intermediate stage, to a specific destination. In the Oxford and sporting cases, the destination is clearly performance based—carrying someone towards the accomplishment of some external athletic or academic achievement. There is a hidden problem here, though. The specific aim is adaption to a particular socially prescribed goal. Collective social achievement and satisfactory professional performance are not the same metric for one’s life as are striving towards psychological integration and personal development. In my work with executives, these two demands are all too frequently in direct conflict. If done well, the work of coaching becomes not adaptation to a specific organizational context but the creation of a new frame where the individual psychological integration and personal and professional development can proceed. This may be with their present employer or their development may require that they leave their employer and walk along a different pathway.

Somebody starts a bit of a rumor. Pretty soon the rumor comes back to them from other people and then they start getting scared: “Gee, maybe this really is true.” Then they start to believe it themselves and they start to get infected.
As the word coach has been broadened and generally accepted in management education over the past decades, it has become an omnibus phrase to include almost any interpersonal organizational work, and the question arises: does it presently include too much? The role of coach has gotten so inflated that almost anything can fit inside it. This popularization of coaching has not always been helpful. From my perspective, coaching can become so broad a field that helpful distinctions in role are lost. As coaching becomes more popular in management, it becomes more procedural and organizational—and less grounded in the deeper currents of the psychology of human behavior. Coaching then becomes a social framework in which coaches meet and network and pass off clients, and the clients expect to get advice on how to get ahead in the corporate game. All too often, executive coaches work with prescribed models and tools to indoctrinate clients in ‘appropriate’ behaviours to get ahead—a sort of “engineering” rather than a “clinical” approach to behaviour. So there is an instrumental element to the emerging field with which I’m somewhat uncomfortable. Not that coaching isn’t getting professionalized—professionalization is the helpful part. The professionalization, however, sometimes feels opportunistic and commercial to me. I am reminded of the lines attributed to Winston Churchill: "We make a living by what we get but we make a life by what we give." Networking and getting clients and helping them to get ahead may be developing a career, but it may not be developing a life.

I suppose then you have to ask: what is the client talking about when the client talks about coaching? In the context of management and leadership development at IMD for example, if you get five different executives participating in five different programs run by five different professors with five different pools of coaches—and you listen to the executives talking about working with their coach—a world of difference becomes apparent. The capacity of coaches to work deeply with clients depends upon their inherent capacity to work with unconscious material—first their own and then others’. Not all can easily do so. Not all are even aware that there is unconscious material with which to work. So those who work with some familiarity and comfort with the unconscious can approach things in a very different way than those who work as an “advice giver.” It's almost as if it's not even the same kind of work—if that makes any sense—even though everyone is talking about “coaching” and even though that is in what appears to be the same organizational and professional context.

The term “clinical behavioral group consultant/coach” is a bit unwieldy, but it does encompass the several different roles that one must master to work in depth. Taken together, they represent a different kind of coaching—more akin to a group therapist’s clinical consultation as applied to a whole social system. Working with
executives in groups requires a different set of skills than working with an individual alone. Whereas most coaching, counseling and even therapy are individually and interpersonally oriented—the focus is on one’s relationship with a boss, one’s relationship with an assistant, with one’s spouse or child, or improving one’s performance as defined by the organizational competency report-card—“clinical behavioral group consultation/coaching” also focuses on the subtle complexity of unconscious group and organizational dynamics, for example, team decision-making, interdepartmental conflict, headquarters-subsidiary problems, and so on.

I have found that “coaching” a group to operate smoothly, or working to maximize the group’s immediate performance on some given task, or increasing the group’s feeling of self-satisfaction can inadvertently do a great disservice to the individual’s and the group’s learning and development. So while a conventionally oriented coach who works interpersonally might attempt to reduce discomfort and smooth over controversy in coaching a group, one who works within a clinical behavioral group consulting/coaching framework might do just the opposite if it serves the goal of learning and development—they might expose existing, though covert, tensions, and then invite the individuals and the whole group to look at the tensions, provide hypotheses to help understand them, and finally support individual, group, and organizational efforts to explore what might be done about them. This encompasses a set of skills that few business school faculty members, business consultants, freelance coaches, or even individually-oriented therapists possess. It includes an aptitude for working with subtle psychological variables within a systems perspective that is enhanced by rigorous professional training and serious personal work. Such behavioral professionals do not avoid the uncomfortable nature of their work.

**THE INTERDISCIPLINARY NATURE OF COACHING**

**Bill:** Jack I wanted to link to Linda Page, one of our colleagues. She talks about the need to move past a primary concern with the profession of coaching—which in most cases has to do with marketing and certification—to really look at the interdisciplinary foundations of coaching. That is, we need to look at what is the conceptual, theoretical, and experiential base for high quality coaching. You seem to be talking in a similar way: what we need to focus on is that knowledge—self knowledge, theoretical knowledge, a structure that people need. Walking into the field of coaching is much more than looking at certification, marketing and the economics of coaching.

**Jack:** Yes—although I’d make a distinction between knowledge and actual experience. If I’ve acquired some knowledge, it’s rational and logical. I would distinguish that from actual experience, which isn’t just a question of knowledge, it’s a question of feelings too. And that’s a bit different. I don’t even know how to articulate this. I could imagine it might be extremely difficult even to begin to articulate this distinction to an audience of coaches because

*These are interesting origins for the meaning of coach and include the idea of both protecting and carrying one’s client from a starting place, though some intermediate stage, to a specific destination.*
“knowledge” is a central piece of one’s professional identity. The idea of working with the unconscious—it’s only recently that the unconscious has been sort of resurrected and gotten some respectability through brain work, even though the unconscious always been at play—is by definition “not-only-rational-knowledge.”

**COACHING TO LEADERS IN GROUP SETTINGS**

**Bill:** You were talking about the use of coaching in a group setting when you're working with leadership development or working with teams. And it's interesting that practitioners, such as Mary Beth O’Neill, who come out of a strong OD background and strong process consultation background do a lot of work with coaching in a group setting. Is that what we're talking about here? How does your own appreciation, feelings and thoughts regarding—your own appreciation of—unconscious life impact on your coaching with teams?

**Jack:** My background in graduate school at Yale was a combination of a Tavistock [Group Relations] approach, and the T-Group approach used by the National Training Labs [NTL] which is more aligned with process consultation. Then my training over here [in Switzerland] was as a Jungian analyst. Before all that I was in the military as an Air Force officer and fighter pilot. So the way I've come to understand leadership (in myself for instance) is much less about the traits of an individual person or the qualities that a head of an organization has or a president or prime minister or CEO or General. It is much more a practical way to think about leadership. That is to say, leadership is a collective endeavor. It's always done in a group, with another person at least, but with three for the sort of “first sized” group (the triad). So leadership is always exercised in a small group. There are ceremonial aspects to leadership; presidents and prime ministers and CEOs and CFOs make speeches at the annual convention or present their annual reports. In fact, however, most of the work gets done in a small group. Presidents have their cabinets, CEOs have their executive committees, the chairman of the board has the board to work with, and so on. So leadership is largely a small group endeavor.

This perspective gives you access to understand the dynamics of the small group and leadership within the context of the small group. It's not exactly just process consultation, but it does look at formal roles and informal roles as they emerge in a group. How does leadership actually get done—which is to get the group organized and heading in a particular direction to achieve a particular task.

**LEADERSHIP AND AUTHORITY**

**Bill:** I think training at Yale (and Harvard) has been unique. Both universities combine NTL and Tavistock—both the American [NTL] and the British [Tavistock] schools. There is a third school which is sometimes called the Continental school which is a

---

*I am reminded of the lines attributed to Winston Churchill: "We make a living by what we get but we make a life by what we give."*
neo-Marxist analysis—looking at power dynamics and deferential authority. Foucault, Adorno, and a little Kafka, I guess, are built into this school. Do you find that the third school is relevant? Do you ever walk into a setting just being a tough neo-Marxist and looking at what's going on?

**Jack:** Well the French Group Relations guys seem to work a bit more like that for sure and some of my colleagues have been in different French Group Relations conferences. There's an acutely ideological element to that. Power, for sure, is one of the covert or even overt dynamics that's going on in a group. Power is often an issue which one has with authority in a group. My experience, for instance, in my initial group dynamics work at Yale concerned the role of the professor. The professor played one role—the formal authority—within the group, but the relationships among the participants, among the other group members, were just as important. It's a little bit like your relationship with your mother and father. These are certainly important relationships in the family constellation, but your relationships with your sisters and brothers are oftentimes just as determinant of your growth and development—or just as inhibiting to your growth and development—as your relationship with your parents. I think these considerations get lost in an interpretation relying on a traditionally conceived power dynamic where power is thought to be invested in the formal role only, because this “power” kind of analysis tends to be captured by an ideological position, and ideological positions are inherently limited.

**Bill:** This would speak very powerfully to what you're talking about regarding the role of coaching in groups. Because when you just do individual coaching with the formal leadership in a group, one is beginning with the assumption that all the important expression of authority is occurring in the interactions with the formal leader. You are indicating that the other dynamics in the group—the brother and sister dynamics in the group—are equally as important and you often have to deal with these dynamics in a group setting.

**Jack:** Absolutely. I sometimes draw an organizational chart when I am teaching. I ask the class: “What is this?” And they say: “Well that's an organigram.” And I say: “Right, but that is only the formal structure—there is an informal structure as well.” If you're consulting to an executive committee or something like that and you contract with them. How are you going to do the consultation? You say something like, “I'll be coming around to each one of you and the material I'll collect will be of course be confidential and I'll feed back to you things that I hear two or three times though I won't identify the speakers and so on.” So then you go around and you do your first interview. You say: “Well, how do things work around here. If I'm going be helpful I need to know how things work.” And then they oftentimes pull out something like an organigram and say: “Well, this is

**So those who work with some familiarity and comfort with the unconscious can approach things in a very different way than those who work as an “advice giver.” It's almost as if it's not even the same kind of work.**
the team.” And you say: “Well that's helpful but you can keep it. Actually I'd like to know how things really work.” And they look at you quizzically and say: “What do you mean?” And you say: “Well, here, take different colored pens and pencils and draw how your group really works.” Then they end up doing some kind of a sociogram, where the size of the boxes is a lot different than it is on the formal org chart. So maybe the managing director's box is just a very tiny one and the secretary's is very large. She blocks information from the guy over here in the States and the guy over here in Europe doesn't get along with the guy in Singapore, but he does get along with the guy in India, who hates the guy in the States. So they draw this very complex organic structure. That's the way things really work, and that's different than the way the formal structure is presented. If you're working psychologically with a team you can't just take the formal organizational chart or the rational presentation about things like who makes decisions at face value. You have to understand how the group really works. It's like families. You know you can look at a telephone book and all the addresses and names and numbers look about the same. But when you go to an address to visit a family for dinner you see very different dynamics. The formal structure of a family (mother, father, kids) looks like it's the same when drawn as an org chart, but in fact families all operate very differently.

Bill: It seems to me that your comments relate to the issue of complexity. Complex systems tend to be non-hierarchical in the way they really operate. In some sense, you're bringing in the Santa Fe Institute's observation that systems initially look hierarchical. However, when they're really in operation they tend to be non-hierarchical and very dynamic.

Jack: Yes. I'd agree that they're dynamic. However, I'd say there are hierarchies. It's a little bit like our instincts. We have a plethora of instincts, but if you can't breathe then that gets the attention. Then it goes down from there to drinking water and eating food and sleeping. So it's a fluid hierarchy.

Bill: That's what's interesting. The neurobiologists say we don't actually have central core processing in our brain. Cortical processing is very fluid and priorities shift from moment to moment. We live with the illusion that there's someone in control. But...

Jack: But there is some kind of processing and there is some kind of control so it really is a servo-mechanism. But there are different elements in there. So it's not a strict hierarchy like a ladder, but it is one in which if you're hungry and you eat then you're no longer hungry and something else pops up—you get tired or something like that. But there still is a hierarchy even though it's a plastic one—plastic in the other sense of “plastic” as in a fluid or a malleable kind of thing.

Bill: What could you then say if we go back to the structure of the unconscious? We can think of that as a very plastic fluid. It would
have kind of temporary hierarchies. The unconscious would be very dynamic. In many ways it would be non-hierarchical.

**Jack:** Well, quasi-hierarchical. Freud thought the unconscious was a singular area containing a collection of instinctual drives and repressed contents. Jung thought that it had two principal layers—a personal layer of repressed and forgotten material, and a deeper collective domain with archetypal material. I’d say that it is hierarchical in the sense that different complexes would take precedence at a particular time and start running the show. So if you hit a hot button on somebody then that’s the discussion that you’re going to have—because you’ve hit the hot button and it’s taken up so much space. So it wouldn’t be non-hierarchical. It would be sort of like a fluidly-shifting hierarchy.

**Bill:** Kind of a situational hierarchy?

**Jack:** Yes, something like that.

**COACHING TO THE UNCONSCIOUS IN GROUPS**

**Bill:** Back to the group. You, as a coach, work with a team and bring in your own appreciation and understanding of unconscious dynamics in the groups. What are some of the things you’re likely to do as a coach that might be different if you came in without that understanding and appreciation of unconscious processes? Are there certain kinds of observations or even interpretations you might make as a coach regarding an interaction within that team that you might not do without that understanding and appreciation. For instance, what would you do as a coach to a team versus you as a group therapist?

**Jack:** As the coach to a team, I would still use my capacity as a group therapist, but I would try to be conscious of what was most helpful at the time for them to understand or to clarify the dynamics that are going on. I would provide my comments in colloquial English. So you don’t start throwing buzz words at them because that just confuses everyone including yourself. You try to articulate what you sense is going on. If you have the capacity to work at that level then you do. If you don’t have the capacity to work at that level, you don’t. You might not even know that there’s a level to work at. I mean, it’s a little bit like someone who’s got a very strict and particular kind of background or schooling in a particular way of doing therapy. They might not even know that you can actually work with unconscious processes in a group. Or the teacher who teaches at an outstanding institute but doesn’t know anything about psychology. This person won’t be able to articulate what the dynamics of a class are at a particular time.

**Bill:** If we shift even more toward leadership, I would assume that one of the things that will occur is that you may have a formal leader of a group who lives with the belief and the myth that they
have a great deal of power and that the success or failure of the team is dependent on their good will, knowledge, motivation. I would assume there must be some loss of innocence as you work with them and they begin to realize that leadership emerges and is dynamic at all different levels in the organization and team. Is that something you deal with at all? Their own loss of hubris?

**Jack:** Well, I don't think some of them lose the hubris. They can remain deluded for a long period of time. While recognition of what really is involved in exercising leadership can make one more self-reflective, actually to be not self-reflective is a help for exercising leadership in a particular way. We did a study with a group of MBAs. It was a group peer review where they rate themselves and rate each other and select two people from their group of eight whom they consider to have been exemplary leaders or who exercised leadership in an exemplary manner (whatever they meant by that). We found out that self-awareness was actually inversely correlated with the number of leadership nominations. The greatest number of leadership nominations was given to people who weren't particular self-aware. So at first look, that could be extremely disappointing to a teacher or coach who wants to believe that self-awareness is helpful. But to a social scientist, the results presented an intriguing opportunity to understand things more deeply. I still thought that self-awareness was helpful, but I tried to understand what was going on. Then I realized that the MBA program is a system where you're under extreme stress. It's an emergency system where there are imminent crises all the time. Students stay up till 11:00 or 12:00 at night for weeks at a time, meeting all kinds of deadlines, having to be in class at 8:00.

It's a stressful situation. So the kind of leadership that you would acknowledge or look to is one that defines and provides you with simple answers and is reassuring: “Okay, this is what we have to do and we have to do it now.” “Strong” leadership actually diminishes the anxiety a group has. And if you have someone who's extremely self-reflective under those circumstances, then this person doesn't readily provide the assurance or reassurance the rest of the people in the group are seeking. So the group will then go and look for the person who is dominant and has a strong opinion and the group will then authorize them to lead. Dominance and having a strong opinion sort of carry the day and are perceived to be leadership. But dominance isn't leadership. Or perhaps dominance is rather a rudimentary kind of leadership—in a crisis situation or in a stressful situation, that's the kind of behavior that gets characterized as leadership. It's a bit like the two boys exercising leadership in Golding's *Lord of the Flies*—Jack (dominant) and Ralph (self-reflective). As things fell apart, Ralph started losing support amongst the other boys. The boys were looking for certainty, and Ralph was too thoughtful for certainty. So Jack began getting more power.
Bill: In some sense we’re back to the organizational analyses done by Isabel Menzies. She did her work in hospitals where clearly there are high levels of anxiety and stress. It’s not life and death for students in a graduate program, but it probably feels like life or death. It sounds like the defensive structures against anxiety as they show up in leadership are alive and well in graduate schools.

Jack: Well yes, because certain kinds of environments elicit certain kinds of behaviors. It’s a bit like some of the research on life transitions. If you have a significant change in your life (like a promotion, move to another part of the world, a change in companies) how long does it take you before you metabolize and incorporate that change? It takes about three years to integrate all the new things. Between the beginning of that tenure and the three year point you feel less competent than you do after you’ve gotten your arms around the job. So your behavior will be different. You will be more anxious and you will be more controlling. It’s not necessarily a pathological trait. It’s adaptive—unless the need for control becomes habitual. It’s a function of your situation at that particular point in your life.

Bill: One of my doctoral students did her dissertation on mature adults who return to school and the regression that tends to occur for them. What you’re talking about seems to relate to this regressive phenomenon. I would think there are important implications for a coach—a learning coach if you will—who is working with these graduate students. These coaches and the students should fully understand what’s going on. These students must cut themselves some slack—knowing that it’s very understandable as they go through that transition that there’s going to be some regression and rich learning can occur in this setting.

Jack: That’s extremely helpful. At IMD we make a point to tell students: “This is a little bit like junior high school, for you and for the faculty, so this is why we start behaving this way.” It’s a little bit like the Zimbardo experiments and the Milgram experiments. We must give the students a framework or a way to understand their behavior. This allows them to have more conscious control in managing the situation and not feel so helpless.

Bill: I would assume this may also apply when coaching in a corporate leadership development program. There’s no reason to think that the people who participate in leadership development won’t themselves experience that kind of regression you’re talking about—if this development is encouraging some real change.

Jack: Yes. We regress. I suppose if we’re honest we can hear ourselves regress off-and-on every day. This will occur as a function of a specific conversation or a particular faculty meeting...

What’s helpful is that the gestation period takes place. If it’s just a one shot deal like a two week intensive leadership program then oftentimes the gestation period passes or the incubation period passes.
or particular talk with the dean or boss or student. You can feel yourself regress. You can also feel the constraints of your role, mostly from the projections that you're getting from other people—whether they're colleagues or students or supervisors.

**Michael:** We’ve talked a lot about the role of a coach and I was thinking of your role as a teacher, as a faculty member. I wonder how you've experienced that in the work with the class of 90 MBA students. What have been some of your key learnings there?

**Jack:** That's a large question Michael. It's hard to disentangle the experience of being in a system like this and the different roles, though there are a couple of things I noticed. For instance, in the MBA program I have responsibility for the year-long leadership stream, but during the last two years I taught and managed the considerable admin but I didn't take a group and I didn't take any analysands. As a result, I could sense a much different reaction from the class to me, or more correctly, to my role. Some of it was undoubtedly me because I didn't feel as close to them because the role was just a classroom role and an occasional conversation over a cup of coffee or something like that. But then I took my own group this year and started up with analysands again—so I feel much more implicated in the system. I don't know the extent to which it's because I feel more relaxed, but I feel as though I have access to them in a less stilted way. They may also feel they have access to me in a less stilted way. Or it is some combination of the two. But that's a distinct difference. I feel much more connected to this class than I have the last couple of classes. It's easier to tease them in class or out of class or just walking by them on the campus and stuff, so there's a bit more familiarity, it's a little less stiff.

**Michael:** You've spoken quite a bit about the MBA which is a year long program. I get to compare your program to other leadership development pieces—those where we meet clients just once or in the role of program director maybe over a few weeks. I'm thinking aloud myself as I'm asking the question, about the challenge of working shorter term versus longer term.

**Jack:** Regarding the specific programs at IMD: If it's a one shot deal, whether it's a Mobilizing People (MP) kind of program or an in-company kind of program like Sara Lee where it's an intense two week period focusing on leadership then you get fairly deep with participants. But then they disappear. That differs from the MBAs or Building on Talent (BOT) programs. BOT is a two-module programme, each module is two weeks long, and there is three months in between. They do a between-module project and return in module two and you get to pick up the same people for another go. That differs from MP. The MBA program is long-term too. I was surprised after I took over BOT to experience the significantly deeper developmental pattern of the multi-module
design. You can talk to the coaches too—they also mentioned it—having done two modules with the same people in the same group allows one to notice how much they change and how much they grow. I think with the MBAs it feels like they wear down over the year—which can be developmental, though isn’t necessarily easy for them. The BOTs don’t wear down—they’re here for two weeks and they go back home and then they come back three months later and they have shifted in between. They report that their colleagues and family back home say they have really changed. They come back to IMD with questions, and then they can pick up where they left off, or maybe they take two steps forward during the first module, one step back between modules, but then they can take two or three steps forward again in the second module and that gets them much further than just the one shot program.

**INCUBATION, GESTATION AND THE PROCESSES OF LEARNING AND COACHING**

**Bill:** You seem to have described the role played by incubation—which is an important dynamic operating in the life of the unconscious. You host a distributed education program where the people go through an intense program and then there’s a period of time when they’re back home, back at work. They come back to your institution again for more instruction. I suspect there’s a considerable amount of incubation taking place. There’s a lot of unconscious processing of what’s happened in your program that later reappears as new insights.

**Jack:** Yes. I think that’s true. And what’s helpful is that the gestation period takes place. Then the opportunity to learn and a sophisticated program design can be delivered in a comprehensible way, whereas if it’s just a one shot deal like a two week intensive leadership program then oftentimes the gestation period passes or the incubation period passes. Then something pops out back home but they don’t know what to do with it because they don’t have a framework to deal with this newly conscious learning.

**Bill:** Even if it’s a one shot program, there can be follow-up coaching. So when the gestation or incubation occurs and it pops up, there’s at least a coach they can talk to. I think it’s better if they can come back to a program. And as you’ve said about supervision, it’s better if you can deal with it not only with your individual coach but also in a group setting. A team setting is invaluable, where you can process these new insights. But having a coach I assume is helpful.

**Jack:** I think that a coach can be helpful. People who change most are the most vulnerable to learning—they come from a place where maybe their family background is such or their experience is such that they’re ready for some kind of change. So they’re a little bit wobbly or a little bit shaky, and then they come

*What is the role of hope? That was the last thing that popped out of Pandora's box, wasn't it?*
to the program, they open up and some of their persona starts falling away. Then they're in a vulnerable position. You hand them off to someone who can work with them when they go back to their home country—someone who can work in the same kind of way that you've worked with them. I try to hand them back to those who work with the unconscious in a friendly way, which tends to be those with Jungian training, so your student accesses the unconscious material as well as the conscious material in the same kind of way. In this way you can keep the material alive. If they go back and they end up talking to someone who is totally in their heads and gives them engineering solutions and models, and who doesn't have a feel for their experience of emotions and unconscious processes, then the students probably close down or are disappointed greatly.

**Bill:** This goes back to the point you've made repeatedly that it's not just acquisition of knowledge. It's really the much broader and deeper appreciation of awareness that includes feelings. The incubation or gestation often brings these together. Then a coaching session or a follow up session with the team enables or at least encourages that integration of feelings or thoughts. Furthermore, this integration can more readily be articulated and sustained.

**Jack:** Yes, that's right.

**HOPE, MATURATION AND THE PROCESSES OF RIPENING**

**Bill:** Back to the first part of this interview—when you talked about hope—what is the role of hope? In some sense you've talked about it—both the good and the bad—in terms of unconscious life and the implications for coaching.

**Jack:** Let's see, what is the role of hope? That was the last thing that popped out of Pandora's box, wasn't it? Specifically with regard to coaching, I suppose it's less important whether one calls it coaching or therapy or something. What's important is that it is a developmental process that's working with currents that are running deeply in one's self. Does that makes sense? It's not a topical buzz word kind of thing, because actually it results in a deep movement and development. A ripening of the personality. One of the best descriptions of therapy that I ran across when I was training is that therapy tends to accelerate the process of psychic maturation. In other words, it doesn't transform an orange into an apple or a bicycle into a car. It's not something mechanical. It's much more organic. But what it does do is accelerate the process of maturation. You can think organically. It is something like the ripening of fruit. A cherry takes something like four to five months to deepen from this little flower and nodule until it's ripe and ready to fall. That's an incremental organic process. One of the things with any developmental process like this concerns the limits of pushing too hard for instanta-
neous change. There are limits to how much you can compress this ripening process. It's not a total mechanical change in the structure of the thing; rather, there is a ripening and a deepening and a fullness that takes place. And I suppose any process that can facilitate that maturation or help this ripening in the course of one's life and development is hopeful.

**Bill:** So, if one comes to this process assuming that coaching will change a person, then there are not very good reasons to be hopeful. If we conceive of our work as a process of assisting in the ripening (as you've said), then it's a process that essentially builds on those capacities, those strengths and those aspirations that one already possesses. If this is the approach that one engages as a coach, then there's good cause to be hopeful and this helps accelerate the maturation rather than moving one in new directions.

**Jack:** Right—ripening and deepening. The word “change” strikes me as a bit skeletal. People talk about change all the time, but the growth of a plant, it isn't really about change. The orange doesn't really change. I mean it changes size or it changes color, it deepens or something. But it's not just a change. It works along different dimensions. When I think about change, I think about changing your clothes or changing your shoes. You change cars. You change your spouse. That's a sort of mechanical thing, but I don't think that change adequately captures the process of growth.

**Bill:** You seem to be distinguishing between the engineering and clinical approach. The engineering approach is more mechanical. It focuses on the processes of change, and clearly requires either ignorance or denial of unconscious life. The clinical approach is about the processes of deepening and maturing—the unconscious clearly plays a central role in these processes.

**Jack:** Yes, I agree with that. The engineering approach to change produces a model of leadership that emphasizes change. Well, some changes are helpful and some changes are a disaster. And it's good to recognize which changes are for the better and which changes are absolutely the worst things you can do. Political and business history is littered with enthusiastic leaders implementing disastrous changes. If you look around at the technology, some of the change is very helpful—no question about it. But some of the technological changes are very toxic and it's helpful to recognize that too. And how does one recognize that? It's not from the accumulation of knowledge. It's from the attainment of some kind of wisdom, and that is a different quality. Knowledge is not behavior and knowledge is not wisdom. Knowledge is the accumulation of a bunch of factoids or information—but it's not wisdom. And wisdom isn't something one learns, and it isn't only experience. There are some other kinds of dimensions to it.

*It is something like the ripening of fruit.*

*A cherry takes something like four to five months to deepen from this little flower and nodule until it's ripe and ready to fall. That's an incremental organic process.*
I sometimes use the example in class about Solomon and the two women who were fighting over a baby. One woman says it's my baby! The other counters, no it's my baby! And this dispute is brought before King Solomon. Solomon says, bring me a sword and we’ll cut the baby in half and you each can have half. And then the one whose baby it isn't says, okay bring the sword and cut the baby in half. And the one whose baby it is says, no give it to the other woman! Then Solomon says to the second woman, “It's yours!” because he could sense whose baby it was by seeing which woman wanted to save the baby's life. Solomon didn't learn that in King's school. There was no template for that decision-making process. It was not Harvard Business School case #1403. And it hadn't happened before. It was something that came from somewhere else. It came up from the depth of Solomon's intuition and his unconscious—and that's a different dimension.

Bill: Or his own self insight to say, if I was the parent what would I do? So it's self insight.

Jack: Yes, it's awareness, maybe, not only of self but of universality. But “self” is a slightly different take on the process because self psychology often gets confused and is really more like “ego” psychology. It’s about “I” and “me” and “my” conscious identity. But there is more. There is the unconscious. We are more than our conscious egos. The Jungians are actually pretty good with the concept of self because for them, the self is the central orienting principle in one's being. Self is not the same as one's ego; it's the deeper center that organizes and moves one towards health and development—sometimes with the ego kicking and screaming and wanting to stay less developed or less mature.

CONCLUSIONS

Bill: Jack, I leave this interview kicking and screaming. I want it to go on indefinitely. What you've done is not just pick up issues regarding the landscape of the unconscious and its relationship to coaching but have traced out many implications for the field of coaching: what's needed for coaches to do the work of leadership development, the relationship of coaching to leadership development, the nature of leadership itself, the interplay or relationship between coaching to individuals and coaching in teams. There is substantial material here for all of us as readers of IJCO to contemplate. Michael and I greatly appreciate your contributions in this interview. Thank you.

Michael: My pleasure.

Bill: Jack, thank you very much. This was a wonderful engagement.

Jack: Thanks a lot.
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