

A SYSTEMS PSYCHO-DYNAMIC INTERPRETATION OF COACHING EXPERIENCES

Frans Cilliers
Department of Industrial & Organisational Psychology, UNISA
(W) 012-429-8355 (C) 083-709-8776 (E) cillifvn@unisa.ac.za

ABSTRACT

The aim of this research was to offer a depth psychological understanding of the experience of coaching. The Integrated Experiential Learning Coaching model was used in sessions during an official coaching programme in an international IT organisation's South African head office. Seven participants were asked to write essays portraying their experiences working with the same coach. A qualitative research design was used to ascertain the learning themes manifesting during this experience. The data was analysed and interpreted from the systems psycho-dynamic consulting stance. The manifesting themes were: experiential learning facilitates the working through of defences; fight and flight inhibit owning and learning; interdependency facilitates taking responsibility for the self; transcending splits and defences stimulate motivation; moving from the paranoid-schizoid to the depressive position and valuing all parts of the self; and self authorisation.

Introduction

Coaching as a special form of staff development can be traced back to the 1940s (Lowman, 2002) and is becoming increasingly popular in international and South African organisations. It is even called the new management tool for the third millennium (Price, 2003). Many different types of coaching exists in practice as well as in literature, ranging from a special focus on the client - such as executive coaching (Hillary, 2003), to a special focus on the technique used - such as neurosemantic coaching (Hall & Duval, 2004). Whatever the focus, the similarity between the different types of coaching is a special type of helping relationship between a consultant (with specific training and skills) and a consultee (who is in search for growth in a specific work related area or behaviour) (Tönsing, 2003).

Kampa and White (in Lowman, 2002) defines coaching as a form of consultation, namely a formal, ongoing relationship between (1) an individual or team having managerial authority and responsibility in an organisation, and (2) a consultant who possesses knowledge of behaviour change and organisational functioning. The underlying process involves the facilitation of change such as self-awareness, self-esteem and increased quality in communication with peers and subordinates. The techniques involves giving direct behavioural based feedback and its impact on others, both within and outside of the organisation, thus creating opportunities for change and demanding accountability with the outcome. The measurable behavioural change in the individual or team will result in increased performance on the individual, team and organisational levels.

Many research studies have been conducted on the efficacy of coaching (Hall & Duval, 2004; Hillary, 2003; Lowman, 2002; Tönsing, 2003) including quantitative and qualitative designs. On the macro level it is hypothesised that the participant's behavioural change will lead to increased morale, productivity and profits for the organisation - unfortunately few research studies have given evidence for this behavioural change. On the micro and individual level the evidence suggests that (1) the consultee finds the experience beneficial and believes he/she are receiving a high return on investment, and (2) that various types of coaching approaches do impact on job performance and productivity, learning, self-awareness and development, as well as leadership effectiveness.

According to Kampa and White (in Lowman, 2002), coaching efficacy depends on three variables, namely the consultee's growth, the consultant's skills and the quality of the relationship between them.

* The consultee's growth is described in most of the coaching literature as self-efficacy, referring to the Bandura (1997; Wood & Bandura, 1989) concept from behaviourism, and defined as having the belief that one has the capabilities to mobilise the motivational and cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to meet given situation-demands.

* The consultant's skills is described in most of the coaching literature as a special kind of communication style, including active listening as the necessary core quality to facilitate learning in and for the consultee (Kampa & White, in Lowman, 2002).

* The quality of the relationship between the two roles is described as the most critical component of the learning process. In almost all the coaching literature reference is made to aspects of client-centered facilitation (Cilliers, 1991; 1992; 1995; 1996; 2000). In this approach Rogers conceptualised and

operationalised ways of active listening, supported by the core dimensions of realness, openness, honesty, respect and empathy, leading to a real experiential encounter of the other (Rogers, 1982; Sanford, 2002). It is unfortunate that the intensity and the power of active listening as researched by Rogers and others (such as Carkhuff, Ivey, Egan - see Cilliers, 2000), are not explored deeper in the coaching literature and practice. Rogers (1982) indicated that the task of such an endeavor should be well thought through and the responsible facilitators should seriously question their motives in doing this kind of work. They should also continuously develop their own level of self-actualisation as well as their skills in providing a trusting and respectful environment for participants to experience the freedom to learn. Rogers (in Schneider, Bugental & Pierson, 2001) cautioned that his work should not be trivialized in organizational applications. For example, Kramer (1995) illustrated how active listening is easily forced into a tool to enhance productivity (rather than a skill to build relationships) and Cilliers (1991; 1992; 1995) illustrated how the concepts of empathy and facilitation are used superficially in training, management and organisational development (OD). Maybe this is also happening in coaching where people not necessarily trained in the psychology of facilitating personal growth opportunities, are acting as coaches for other's learning.

The above definition and efficacy variables, describes coaching in the realm of behaviouristic (for example self-efficacy) and humanistic psychology (for example client-centered facilitation). This is theoretically and professionally congruent to what the relatively new positive psychology paradigm (Lopez & Snyder, 2003; Sheldon & King, 2001; Snyder & Lopez, 2002), defines as the scientific study of ordinary, positive, subjective human strengths, virtues, experience and functioning (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000; Sheldon & King, 2001). This paradigm studies behavioural constructs such as self-actualisation, sense of coherence, hardiness, potency, self-efficacy, learned resourcefulness, internal locus of control (Strümpfer, 1990), coping, well-being, creativity, resilience, emotional intelligence, engagement, happiness, flow, humour, positive affect, courage, gratitude, faith and optimism (Cilliers & Kossuth, 2004). Although the last six years have seen many of these constructs been applied in South African organisational scenarios such as counselling, individual and organisational development (Breed, 1997; Cilliers, 2001; Cilliers, 2002; Cilliers & Coetzee, 2003; Cilliers & Kossuth, 2002; Coetzee & Cilliers, 2001; Kossuth, 1998; Kossuth & Cilliers, 2002; Rothmann, 2000; Viviers, 1996), nothing as yet has been reported in terms of coaching.

Apart from the above references to behaviourism and humanism, coaching has not been researched from any of the other main psychological paradigms. This research project endeavoured to study the depth and unconscious psychology playing a role in coaching. It was hypothesised that by using a systems psychodynamic stance in studying the coaching experience, one could start understanding the underlying behavioural psychodynamics playing out in the relationship and its relatedness.

The Integrated Experiential Learning Coaching model

This model, designed by Chapman (2004) was used in this research. It defines coaching as the facilitation of self-organised learning in adults through experiential learning conversations in order to grow and improve performance. The technique of self-organised learning is the conversational construction, reconstruction and exchange of personally significant, relevant and viable meaning with awareness and controlled purposiveness. (Thus, coaching is not the same as therapy, although some of the experiences may be similar.) On the meta level it consists of a combination of the Wilber Integrative (interior / exterior and individual / collective) and Kolb Experiential Learning models (monologue / dialogue I / we / it). Additionally it integrates the hierarchical evolution of consciousness. This is applied to the one-on-one coaching situation including strategy formulation, implementation via the balance scorecard from an architectural approach, organisational complexity and Jaques' Leadership Competency model - including cognitive processes and power, knowledge and skills, personality, temperament and style. It distinguishes between the styles of the master, the dabbler, the obsessive and the hacker.

The systems psychodynamic perspective

The conceptual origins of the systems psycho-dynamic perspective stems from classic psychoanalysis (Freud, 1921), group relations theory and open systems theory (De Board, 1978; French & Vince, 1999; Hirschhorn, 1993; Miller, 1993; Obholzer & Roberts, 1994). The central tenet of the systems psychodynamic perspective is contained in the conjunction of its two terms (Miller & Rice, 1976; Neumann, Kellner & Dawson-Shepherd, 1997; Rice, 1965; Stapley, 1996).

The 'systems' designation refers to the open systems concepts that provide the dominant framing perspective for understanding the structural aspects of an organisational system. The organisation as an external reality, comparatively independent of the individual, affect the individual in significant emotional and psychological ways. In terms of consulting to organisations, it is believed that learning from the personal

experience is of fundamental concern to facilitate development, insight, understanding and 'deep' change (Bion, 2003). The 'psychodynamic' designation refers to psychoanalytic perspectives on individual experiences and mental processes (such as transference, resistance, object relations and fantasy) as well as on the experience of unconscious group and social processes, which are simultaneously both a source and a consequence of unresolved and unrecognised organisational difficulties. A central feature of this view posits the existence of primitive anxieties - of a prosecutory and depressive nature - and the mobilisation of social defence mechanisms against them. The operations of such defences are conceptualised as either impeding or facilitating task performance and responses to and readiness for change and new learning.

Bion's (1961; 2003; Lipgar & Pines, 2003) three basic assumptions are seen as the cornerstones for studying relationships in organisational systems (Kets de Vries, 1991; López-Corvo, 2003; Miller, 1993; Rice, 1965; Rioch, 1970). These are dependency (the group's unconscious projection for attention and help onto an authority figure as parental object); fight / flight (as defence mechanisms in trying to cope with discomfort, again involving the authority figure for example management or leadership); and pairing (with perceived powerful others such as the manager or leader, or splitting the authority figure(s) as an individual or as a pair in order to be able to identify with one part as a saviour). Later, two additional basic assumptions were added, namely one-ness (also referred to as me-ness by Turquet, 1974) (representing the individual's escape into his/her own fantasy and inner safe, comfortable and good world, whilst denying the presence of the group, seen as the disturbing and bad part); and we-ness (Lawrence, Bain & Gould, 1996) (the opposite of me-ness, where group members join into a powerful union with and absorption into an omnipotent force, surrendering the self for passive participation). Basic group functioning refers to 'getting stuck' in these assumption behaviours, whereas work group functioning refers to insight into and taking responsibility for own human relationships.

Conflict and anxiety (primitive anxiety of the prosecutory and depressive nature) are accepted as the basic concepts in this model (Koortzen & Cilliers, 2002). Added to these, the following concepts are relevant to the understanding of EE practices in this research.

* Defence mechanisms are used unconsciously by the system to act against anxiety in order to stay emotionally uninvolved and in control, to avoid pain and discomfort, and to gain a sense of safety, security and acceptance (Gabelnick & Carr, 1989; Neumann et al., 1997). Examples are rationalisation, intellectualisation, regression and denial. In projection, the bad or unwanted parts of the self are put **onto** someone or something else - this does not change the behaviour of the receiver of the projection.

* Projective identification is an inter system, object relational, anxiety reducing process where one part of the system (as subject) projects material **into** the other part (as object), who identifies with the projection (taking it into its own system), whereby both parts are changed (Coleman & Geller, 1985; Czander, 1993; Kets de Vries, 1991; Obholzer & Roberts, 1994).

* Counter transference refers to the state of mind in which other people's feelings are experienced as one's own (Miller, 1993; Neumann et al., 1997). Projective identification frequently leads to the recipient's acting out the counter transference deriving from the projected feelings.

* Valence refers to the system's tendency-cum-unconscious-vulnerability or predisposition to being drawn into one or other basic assumption type of functioning (Bion, 1961). Thus one part of the system may always receive projections and experience feelings around anger, guilt, shame, envy or satisfaction, or act out a role such as the fighter, spokesperson, the peace maker on behalf of the larger system (French & Vince, 1999).

* The paranoid-schizoid position manifests in a young or immature system. Paranoid refers to badness being experienced as coming from outside the self, and schizoid refers to splitting off (Colman & Bexton, 1975; Colman & Geller, 1985). Schizoid splitting refers to the splitting off and projecting outwards of those parts of the self perceived as bad, thereby creating external figures who are both hated and feared. Splitting and projection exploits the natural boundary between insiders and outsiders in the system. The projection of feelings of badness to the outside of the self is used to simplify psychic complexities and to produce a state of illusionary goodness and self-idealisation. This often leads to fragmentation because contact was lost between parts of the system which belong together inside its boundary. If no contact or dialogue takes place between the system's conflicting parts or points of view, change, development and growth are inhibited and frustrated, thus creating a rigid culture (Czander, 1993; Miller, 1993; Shapiro & Carr, 1991).

* The depressive position follows on the paranoid-schizoid, once the system is mature enough to recognise that its painful feelings come from its own projections. Then these feelings can be returned to their source in saying: 'These are your feelings, not mine'. Firstly, this gives rise to blaming and the ricocheting of projections back and forth. However, if the system can tolerate the feelings long enough to reflect on them, and contain the anxieties they stir up, it may be possible to bring about change (Bion, 1970). When the timing is right and some of the projections can be re-owned, splitting decreases and there is a reduction in the polarisation and antagonism. This reparation promotes integration and co-operation within the system

and a shift (from the paranoid-schizoid to the depressive position). When the group is functioning in the depressive position, more points of view will be valued and a full range of emotional responses will be available to explore. For example, a group or team may be more able to encompass the emotional complexity of the work in which they all share, and no one member will be left to carry his/her fragment in isolation. However, the depressive position is never attained once and for all - when survival or self-esteem are threatened, there is a tendency to return to paranoid-schizoid functioning (Czander, 1993; Miller, 1993; Shapiro & Carr, 1991).

* Boundaries refer to the physical and psychological borders around and spaces between parts of the system. Its function is to contain anxiety, thus making life controllable, safe and contained (Cytrynbaum & Lee, 1993; Hirschhorn, 1993; Kets de Vries, 1991).

* Authorisation. This concept refers to empowering a part of the system to act on behalf of another in a specific role, carrying either observational, representative, negotiational or plenipotentiary authority (Czander, 1993; Obholzer & Roberts, 1994).

* Representation refers to acting on behalf of a system in negotiating the crossing, resisting or erecting of a boundary. A clear level of authority carried by the negotiator contributes to the success of the interaction, but if these boundaries are unclear, the high level of anxiety may lead to immobilisation and dis-empowerment (Kets de Vries, 1991; Obholzer & Roberts, 1994).

* Relationship refers to any type of face-to-face interaction, as it happens in the here-and-now. Relatedness refers to the ever existing relationship in the mind (Gabelnick & Carr, 1989; Neumann et al., 1997; Shapiro & Carr, 1991).

* Containment refers to putting a boundary around an experience or emotion - it could be experienced or avoided, managed or denied, kept in or passed on, so that its effects are either mitigated or amplified. In order to cope with discomfort, the system unconsciously needs something or someone to contain the anxiety on its behalf (Menzies, 1993). Bion's (1970) container-contained model identifies and describes a basic dimension of human experience, namely the relationship between emotion and its containment - the container (1) can absorb, filter or manage difficult or threatening emotions or ideas (the contained) so that they can be worked with, or (2) it can become a rigid frame or shell that restricts and blocks. The contained, whether emotion, idea or person, can therefore be experienced as an overwhelming threat or as the welcome messiah.

* Role refers to the conscious and unconscious boundary around the way to behave. Miller (1993; Obholzer & Roberts, 1994) referred to three types of roles, namely (1) the existential or normative role (as ascribed to the individual / system by the organisation - what must be done), (2) the phenomenological role (what the individual / system fulfills as seen by others) and (3) the experiential role (as seen by the incumbent). Congruence between the three types enables taking up the role and incongruence leads to anxiety within, between systems and less effectiveness.

* Task refers to what needs to be done. Primary task refers to the overruling activity being supported by secondary task. Work related task fulfills and anti-task opposes the primary task (French & Vince, 1999).

* Group-as-a-whole refers to systems operating as collectives, such as pairs and groups, forming the psychodynamic relations, relatedness and interconnectedness (Neumann, 1999). It is also assumed that a part of the system acts and contains emotional energy, on behalf of the total. This implies that no event happens in isolation and that there is no co-incidence, but rather synchronicity (Wells, 1980).

The systems psychodynamic consulting stance

The systems psychodynamic consultancy stance (alternatively called the psychoanalytically informed consultancy stance - De Jager, 2003) is a developmentally focussed, psycho-educational process for the understanding of the deep and covert behaviour in the system. Its primary task is formulated as pushing the boundaries of awareness to better understand the deeper and covert meaning of organisational behaviour, including the challenges of management and leadership (Koortzen & Cilliers, 2002; Miller & Rice, 1976).

The systems psychodynamic consultant engages in an analysis of the interrelationships of some or all of the following: boundaries, roles and role configurations, structure, organisational design, work culture and group process (Miller, 1993; Neumann et al., 1997). The consultant is alert to and interprets the covert and dynamic aspects of the organisation and the work group that comprise it, with the focus on relatedness and how authority is psychologically distributed, exercised and enacted, in contrast to how it is formally invested. This work includes a consideration of attitudes, beliefs, fantasies, core anxieties, social defences, patterns of relationships and collaboration, and how these in turn may influence task performance, how unwanted feelings and experiences are split off and projected onto particular parts (individuals or groups) that carry them on behalf of the system (their process roles as distinct from their formally sanctioned roles), and how work roles are taken up. Menzies (1993) emphasised the analysis of social defence aspects of structure and its relationship to task and process, thus trying to understand how unconscious anxieties are reflected in

organisational structures and design (which function to defend against them).

Aim and research design

The aim of this research was to offer a depth psychological understanding of coaching experiences amongst a group of IT specialists. The research design was explorative and qualitative in nature (Mouton, 1996), using case studies and interviews (Camic, Rhodes & Yardley, 2003; Kerlinger & Lee, 2000). The above discussed systems psychodynamic perspective on organisational consulting (Czander, 1993; Hirschhorn, 1993) was used to interpret the manifesting coaching themes.

METHOD

Participants

The research was done in one information technology organisation, the South African division of an international organisation with its head office in Midrand. A coaching programme for IT specialists was introduced in 2001 to which many employees were invited to participate. The convenient sample consisted of seven participants, working with the same coach who used the Integrated Experiential Learning Coaching Model (Chapman, 2004).

Data collection

The participants were asked to "write an essay of about 5 pages on your experiences of the coaching and the coaching relationship".

Data processing

The social phenomenological approach was used (Higgs & Smith, 2003). This entails that the researcher will not be intimidated by social power or status, and be concerned with the relevant values and ethics. The researcher asks the question, 'what is actually happening', while exploring, 'looking again' and then reflecting in ruthless honesty. Thus, the researcher attempts "to penetrate the illusion in order to get to the reality underlying the illusion" (Higgs & Smith, 2003:67).

More specifically, the essays were content analysed (Strauss & Corbin, 1990), defined as a process of breaking down, examining, comparing, conceptualising and categorising of data. The procedure comprised firstly, of reading through of all responses a couple of times for familiarisation. Secondly, the responses were read through again according to Schafer's (1970) systems psychodynamic interpretive stance. Thirdly, examples of the above mentioned basic assumptions were extracted from the data to understand how conflict and anxiety manifested (Menzies, 1993; Neumann, Kellner & Dawson-Shepherd, 1997). Fourthly, the different examples were clustered (Clarkson & Nuttall, 2000) which indicated the existence of certain prominent themes. Fifthly, common themes were created by means of phenomenological analysis (Higgs & Smith, 2003; Marton, 1994). Lastly, trustworthiness was ensured (De Vos, 2002) by having the results examined by a psychologist, to whom this approach and stance were well known.

RESULTS

The following themes manifested in this research.

*** Experiential learning facilitates the working through of defences**

Initially, participants experienced a lot of conscious and unconscious conflict and anxiety because of not being instructed and taught by the coach. This led to many types of defences, such as intellectualisation (where they tried to keep their learning on the cognitive level and not make contact with difficult feelings), rationalisation (giving intellectual explanations for their behaviour), denial (not wanting to work with the difficulty of introspection and "sole searching"), regression (referring to childhood experiences suggesting that the coach represented a parental figure) and projection (of incompetence onto the coach for "not helping" them). The experiential nature of the coaching model made an appeal on the participant's ego strength to stay with the difficult and exploratory nature of the learning and to work through their own neurotic agendas of moaning and blaming, towards owning the feelings and the learning.

*** Fight and flight inhibit owning and learning**

Fight and flight as defence mechanisms were used initially in trying to cope with the discomfort of the experiential and limited structural nature of the coaching model. Fighting manifested in participants resisting the behavioural evidence in the sessions, where the coach worked with their here-and-now behaviour serving as evidence of their out-there behaviour. The psychodynamic view that no event or behaviour

happens co-incidently and that all aspects of a system are unconsciously connected and related to another, was rejected and found ridiculous to the rationally inclined participants. They wanted to see and portray themselves as intellectually strong future managers of the organisation. Flight manifested in participants not staying in the content of the discussion and the related feelings, but rather move to past and out there events and situations. These fight and flight reactions became less as the sessions progressed and the participants got used to the relationship as non threatening and helping. Thus they could let go of their defences and become more real towards the coach, as well as themselves. When this happened, the learning became more personalised and owed as if the participant had to go through some kind of psychological birth process in trusting the coach as an outsider looking inside their environments, situations and personal experiences. Thus, the trusting relationship was a result of the holding environment facilitated by the coach, characterised by nurture, trust and respect.

* Interdependency facilitates taking responsibility for the self

Many participants were initially dependent on the coach as an authority and parental figure as well as experienced expert of their growth and direction of their development. The expectation was that he will take charge of their learning and inform them about "what to do" in order to become more successful as individuals and to grow in the organisation. The projection was that he was the focus as well as the object of evaluation and knowledge about what they need to do and learn, having to give guidance, direction and leadership in their development. He did not give in to this seduction and stayed in role through difficult moments of trying to "get him on my side. This projection of the anxiety onto the coach and his giving back of it constantly to the participant to even work on the dynamics of dependency, lead to the next step, namely the counter dependency, where participants got (at least unconsciously) angry at him for not taking up the projection and its seductive content. Being a selected group functioning on a high level of intellectual ability and emotionally maturity, and because of the individual nature of these coaching sessions, most of the participants did not stay in this contra productive position for long periods. All participants then moved to and only some stayed in the independent position for a relatively long period of time, where they played out their independence and showing off their strength and power. The group as a whole then moved towards a position of interdependence where they could work with their own behaviour manifesting in the here-and-now and using the coach's facilitation to investigate the meaning of their own experiences without projecting their own big issues any longer.

* Transcending splits and defences stimulate motivation

Psychodynamic splits manifested in many incongruences between what the participants apparently experienced and felt, versus what they verbally communicated. It was difficult for them to trust and therefore be honest and open in their experience of themselves. This may be seen as natural during the forming phases of the relationship. The question is whether the role players recognise its manifestation and are willing to work on it consciously.

* Moving from the paranoid-schizoid to the depressive position and valuing all parts of the self

During the initial and immature relationship between the participant and coach, many schizoid splits occurred. For example, participants tried to split off and project the parts of themselves perceived as bad, such as their fears, managers they do not along with, people in the organisation seen as dangerous or strict, their incompetence and non-coping with specific organisational demands. In many occasions the participants used the coach to carry these issues on their behalf. Thus external figures were created who are both hated and feared, in order for the insider (the participant) to feel safe and secure. As such the projection of feelings of badness to the outside of the self was used to simplify psychic complexities in the organisation and to produce a state of illusory goodness and self-idealisation. This led to fragmentation because contact was lost between parts of the self which need to connect in order to act as a whole person. The coaching relationship and specifically the discussions about these dynamics lead to the opening up of more learning opportunities where the participants could discuss their fears and conflicts which again lead to insight, understanding, change, development and growth. This is called the depressive position indicating the system's maturity to recognise that its painful feelings come from its own projections. This was followed by being brave enough to return the projected feelings to its source, saying for example, 'these are your feelings, not mine'. Some participants were busy with this kind of ricocheting of projections back and forth for quite a while, during which the coach respectfully reflected and interpreted the behaviour, until there was enough evidence to let go of the feelings and to reflect on them. The maturity aspect in this action lies in the re-owning of parts of the self which lead to decreased splitting, polarisation and antagonism. Many participants reported on having this sense of integration and co-operation within the system which represented a shift in their experiences of themselves. Many reported on valuing their different parts, and experiencing and exploring a fuller range of emotional responses. Some reported on how organisational

complexities became less of a threat and more of a challenge.

* Self authorisation

Many participants ended their essays referring to how the experience has authorised them to take up their organisational leadership roles with more understanding of their role, its demands on the self as well as on others. They also reported on having more effective interpersonal and supervisory communication with colleagues and followers, as well as being recognised by their superiors as someone who has a valuable place in the larger organisational system.

DISCUSSION

The results indicated how the coaching relationship has empowered and authorised the participants in taking up their organisational leadership roles. The evidence suggests that they have started the sessions with being dependent on a 'guru' whilst projecting their own insecurities and incompetence on him with the unconscious expectation that he will teach them something and help them carry the psychological burden. Through the discovering, experiential learning process, they realised that this position of dependence with all its accompanying immature splits, is actually withholding them from moving towards maturity and interdependent functioning. The individual process of growth seems to be filled with effort and difficult learning - yet the result seems to be successful in empowering organisational citizens with opportunities to work through their personal issues of defending, towards owning own behaviour.

The results showed how coaching resembles the family dynamic of children acting towards parental figures and using them as objects for projections and projective identification. This showed the need for coaches to contain anxiety on behalf of the participant for at least some initial phase of the contract and/or relationship. This seems to be where trust develops in order for the participant to experience more deeply and change more towards what he/she needs to be.

CONCLUSION

It is concluded that this coaching model of integrated systems learning, facilitated psychodynamic insight and wisdom in individual consultees. They understood and owned some very significant behavioural dynamics inside of themselves as well as between themselves and other significant colleagues. This underlines the possibilities of coaching as a staff development intervention to facilitate self authorisation by working through own unconscious and dynamic behavioural issues. It is hypothesised that coaching presented from this model empowers individual employees to work towards their own cognitive insight, the experience of emotional meaningfulness and taking of responsibility for their own growth and career development.

REFERENCES

- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Bion, WR. (2003). *Learning from experience*. London: Karnac.
- Bion, WR. (1961). *Experiences in groups*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Bion, WR. (1970). *Attention and interpretation*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Breed, M. (1997). *Bepalende persoonlikheidskenmerke in die Salutogeniese paradigma*. Doctorate thesis. Pretoria: University of South Africa.
- Camic, PM., Rhodes, J.E. & Yardley, L. (2003). *Qualitative research in Psychology*. Washington: APA.
- Chapman, L. (2004). An exploration of executive coaching as an experiential learning process. Paper presented at 7th Industrial Psychology Conference, SIOPSA, Pretoria, 25 June.
- Cilliers, F. (1991). Facilitating: making a process available. *Human Resource Management*, 7(2), February.
- Cilliers, F. (1992). The (ir)relevance of empathy as concept in management. *Human Resource Management*, 8(3), April.
- Cilliers, F. (1995). Facilitator training. *Journal for Industrial Psychology*, 21(3), 7-11.
- Cilliers, F. (1996). Facilitator training in South Africa. In R Hutterer, G Pawlowsky, PF Schmid & R Stipsits. (Eds.). *Client Centred and Experiential Psychotherapy*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Cilliers, F. (2000). Facilitation skills for trainers. *Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 26(3), 21-26.
- Cilliers, F. (2001). The role of sense of coherence in group relations training. *Journal of Industrial Psychology* 27(3):13-18.
- Cilliers, F. (2002). Salutogenic coping with burnout among nurses: A qualitative study. *SA Journal of Labour Relations* 26(4):61-85.
- Cilliers, F & Coetzee, SC. (2003). The theoretical-empirical fit between three psychological wellness

- constructs: Sense of coherence, learned resourcefulness and self-actualisation. *South African Journal of Labour Relations* 27(1):4-24.
- Cilliers, F & Kossuth, S. (2002). The relationship between organisational climate and salutogenic functioning. *Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 28(1), 8-13.
- Cilliers, F & Kossuth S.P. (2004). The reliability and factor structure of three measures of salutogenic functioning. *South African Journal of Labour Relations*, in press.
- Clarkson, P & Nuttall, J. (2000). Working with countertransference. *Psychodynamic Counselling*, 6, 359-379.
- Coetzee, S & Cilliers, F. (2001). Psychofortology: Explaining coping behaviour in organisations. *The Industrial-Organisational Psychologist*, 38(4), 62-68.
- Colman, AD & Bexton, WH. (1975). *Groups Relations Reader 1*. Jupiter, FL: A.K. Rice Institute.
- Colman, AD & Geller, MH. (1985). *Group Relations Reader 2*. Jupiter, FL: The A.K. Rice Institute.
- Cytrynbaum, S & Lee, SA. (1993). *Transformations in global and organizational systems*. Jupiter, FL: A.K. Rice Institute.
- Czander, WM. (1993). *The psychodynamics of work and organisations*. New York: Guilford Press.
- De Board, R. (1978). *The psychoanalysis of organisations*. London: Routledge.
- De Jager, W. (2003). *Leadership development from a systems psychodynamic consultancy stance*. Johannesburg (Doctorate thesis (PHD) - Rand Afrikaans University).
- De Vos, AS. (2002). *Research at grass roots*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- French, R & Vince, R. (1999). *Group relations, management, and organization*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Freud, F. (1921). *Group psychology and the analysis of the ego*. *Complete works of Sigmund Freud*. London: Hogarth.
- Gabelnick, F & Carr, A.W. (1989). *Contributions to social and political science*. Jupiter, FL: A.K. Rice Institute.
- Hall LM & Duval, M. (2004). Neurosemantic coaching. *HR Future*, 4-7, January.
- Higgs, P & Smith J. (2003). *Rethinking truth*. Landsdown: Juta.
- Hillary, D. (2003). Executive coaching. *HR Future*, 10-11, October.
- Hirschhorn, L. (1993). *The workplace within: Psychodynamics of organizational life*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kerlinger, FN & Lee, HB. (2000). *Foundations of behavioral research*. Fort Worth: Harcourt College Publications.
- Kets De Vries, MFR. (1991). *Organizations on the couch: Handbook of psychoanalysis and management*. New York: Jossey-Bass.
- Koortzen, P & Cilliers, F. (2002). The psychoanalytical approach to team development. In R.L. Lowman (Ed). *Handbook of organizational consulting psychology*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kossuth, SP. (1998). *Teambuilding and salutogenic orientations contextualised in a performance model*. Doctorate thesis. Pretoria: University of South Africa.
- Kossuth, SP & Cilliers, F. (2002). The relationship between leadership dimensions, cultural beliefs and salutogenic functioning. *SA Journal of Labour Relations* 26(1):65-95.
- Kramer, R. (1995). Carl Rogers meets Otto Rank: The discovery of relationship. In T. Pauchant & Associates (Eds.), *In search of meaning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lawrence, WG, Bain, A & Gould, L. (1996). *The fifth basic assumption*. London: Occasional paper.
- Lipgar, RM & Pines, M. (2003). *Building on Bion: Branches*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Lopez, SJ & Snyder, CR. (2003). *Positive psychology assessment. A handbook of models and measures*. Washington: APA.
- López-Corvo, RE. (2003). *The dictionary of the work of WR Bion*. London: Karnac.
- Lowman, RL. (2002). *The handbook of organizational consulting Psychology*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Marton, F. (1994). *Phenomenography*. In *The International Encyclopaedia of Education*. Vol. 8 (pp. 4424-4429). Retrieved February 6, 2003 from: <http://www.ped.gu.se/biorn/phgraph/civil/main/1res.appr.html>
- Menzies, IEP. (1993). *The functioning of social systems as a defence against anxiety*. London: Tavistock Institute of Human Relations.
- Miller, EJ. (1989). *The "Leicester" Model: Experiential study of group and organisational processes*. *Occasional Paper No. 10*. London: Tavistock Institute of Human Relations.
- Miller, EJ & Rice, AK. (1976). *Systems of organisation*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Miller, EJ. (1993). *From dependency to autonomy: Studies in organization and change*. London: Free Association Books.
- Mouton, J. (1996). *Understanding social research*. Pretoria: JL Van Schaik.
- Neumann, JE, Kellner, K. & Dawson-Shepherd, A. (1997). *Developing organisational consultancy*. London: Routledge.

- Obholzer, A & Roberts, VZ. (1994). *The unconscious at work*. London: Routledge.
- Price, B. (2003). Coaching: Critical for the new demands of business. *Management Today*, 19(4), 34-36
- Rice, AK. (1965). *Learning for leadership*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Rioch, MJ. (1970). Group relations: Rationale and technique. *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy*, 20, 340-355.
- Rogers, CR. (1982). *Freedom to learn for the 80's*. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill.
- Rothmann, S. (2000). Sense of coherence, locus of control, self-efficacy and job satisfaction. *Paper presented at the 28th conference of psychology*. Stockholm, Sweden.
- Sanford, R. (2002). What are the distinguishing characteristics of the group facilitator in a person-centered way of being? *Renaissance*, Summer and Fall, 37-38.
- Schneider, KJ, Bugental, JFT & Pierson, JF. (2001). *The handbook of humanistic psychology. Leading edges in theory, research and practice*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Seligman, MEP & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). *American Psychologist* 55(1):5-14.
- Shapiro, ER & Carr, AW. (1991). *Lost in familiar places: Creating new connections between the individual and society*. London: Yale University Press.
- Sheldon, KM & King, L. (2001). Why positive psychology is necessary. *American Psychologist*, 56(3):216-217.
- Snyder, CR & Lopez, SJ. (2002). *Handbook of positive psychology*. Oxford: Oxford.
- Stapley, LF. (1996). *The personality of the organisation*. London: Free Association Books.
- Strauss, A & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory. Procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Strümpfer, DJW. (1990). Salutogenesis: A new paradigm. *South African Journal of Psychology* 20(4):265-276.
- Tönsing, T. (2003). Coaching skills training. *HR Future*, 26-29, April
- Turquet, PM. (1974). Leadership - the individual in the group. In GS Gibbard, JJ Hartman & RD Mann (Eds.), *Analysis of groups*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Viviers, AM. (1996). *Salutogenese in organisatoriese konteks*. Doctorate thesis. Pretoria: University of South Africa.
- Wells, L. (1980). The group-as-a-whole: A systemic socio-analytical perspective on interpersonal and group relations. In CP Alderfer & CL Cooper (Eds). *Advances in experiential social processes*, 2, 165-198.
- Wood, R & Bandura, A. (1989). Social cognitive theory of organizational management. *Academy of Management Review* 14 (3), 361-384.