Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research
2016, Vol. 68, No. 2, 157–176

1065-9293/16/$12.00 http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/cpb0000062

MODEL AGILITY: COACHING EFFECTIVENESS AND FOUR PERSPECTIVES ON A CASE STUDY

Carol Kauffman
Harvard Medical School

William H. Hodgetts
Fidelity Investments, Boston, Massachusetts

The effectiveness of coaching can be enhanced if coaches are familiar with multiple psychological models, can hold these in mind simultaneously, and are able to apply them as appropriate to their clients—a capacity we refer to as *model agility*. To illustrate this capacity we first explore some of its ramifications and parallels to the challenges of leaders as well as leadership coaches. Then, using 4 well-known psychological models (cognitive behavioral, psychoanalytic, positive psychology, and adult development), we present an annotated transcript of a coaching session to show how agility translates into different questions and formulations of the coaching engagement. We conclude with a discussion of the value of this approach to coaching. Implicit in our perspective is the idea that the psychological models and their applications to coaching differ from therapy but still can usefully inform how a coach frames the engagement. It also assumes these do not form a complete approach, because organizational-dynamics, cultural, and other factors also create a context within which the coach and client operate.

Keywords: executive coaching, agility, psychological models, frameworks

The effectiveness of coaching can be enhanced if coaches are familiar with multiple psychological models, can hold these in mind simultaneously, and are able to apply them as appropriate to their clients. We call this capacity *model agility*.

Such agility can help clients widen the repertoire of choices they might employ in the midst of a current challenge or crisis instead of reverting to simpler mindsets or simply repeating past patterns that are not working. This is especially important for leaders today, who must operate in a world of volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity—conditions often referred to with the acronym VUCA (Stiehm & Townsend, 2002, p. 6). In addition, these and other organizational and cultural dynamics create an ever-shifting context that further informs the coaching. In this article, we concentrate on psychological models as they impact the individual coach–coachee interaction.

Carol Kauffman, Institute of Coaching, Harvard Medical School; William H. Hodgetts, Fidelity Investments, Boston, Massachusetts.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to William H. Hodgetts, Fidelity Investments, 245 Summer Street, MZ: V2D, Boston, MA 02110. E-mail: bill.hodgetts@fmr.com

To illustrate model agility, we first explore some of its ramifications for leadership coaches and next examine implications for leaders. Then, using four well-known psychological models (cognitive behavioral, psychoanalytic, positive psychology, and adult development), we present an annotated transcript of a coaching session to show how agility translates into different questions and formulations of the coaching engagement. We conclude with a discussion of the value of this approach to coaching and coach-training programs. Throughout our discussion we assume that effective coaching is evidence-based.

We are hardly the first authors to discuss how multiple models can be used to enhance psychological practice. For example, Lazarus' work on multimodal therapy is applicable to coaching. Palmer and Gyllensten (2008) spoke directly to this issue, as well as to how psychotherapeutic techniques need to be adapted to a coaching context. They identified 21 different approaches coaches employ (as in Whybrow & Palmer, 2006). Ducharme (2004) also explored how cognitive–behavioral coaching is best for some issues, while psychodynamic-based coaching is best for others. There are numerous coaching psychology texts that outline how multiple approaches are used in coaching (Cox, Bachkirova, & Clutterbuck, 2014; Palmer & Whybrow, 2014; Peltier, 2011). The current article is unique in that it illustrates what model agility looks like in practice by bringing the reader "into the mind" of a coach as four possible models are employed, each coming from a different theoretical perspective, during a specific coaching situation.

Development of Coaching and Coaches

Most coaches have been trained to use a dominant psychological model, or framework, to understand their clients, and this guides their practice. The model determines what one focuses on, listens for, what questions are asked, and how the coaching relationship is understood. It affects how coaches make sense of the client's challenges, context, and actions, including what is the problem, what led to it, possible solutions, and what would be positive change for this individual. Like a good map, a coach's dominant model identifies the topography and territory that will be traversed with the client. It can help the coach find the way and can keep him or her from feeling (and getting) lost. But what if the wrong map is used?

It is has been over 20 years since coaching first emerged as a profession. There are parallels to the professionalization of psychotherapy, because therapists first tended to be trained and to adhere to one psychological model of treatment. Just as studies of the professional growth of clinicians over time have shown that mature, effective practitioners transcend the approaches they originally used (Skovholt & Ronnestad, 1992), so coaches who develop model agility are more likely to harness the capacity for critical thinking and self-authorship that moves beyond simple acceptance of the coaching frameworks they were taught early in their practices. Thus, the profession of coaching is evolving as client needs become more varied and complex.

What Is Model Agility and Why Is It Important?

Model agility is the capacity to apply multiple conceptual frameworks to a given coaching situation as needed. Doing this effectively requires a deep knowledge of a number of coaching frameworks and knowing how and when to apply them appropriately. That in turn requires the ability to use the right model with the right person at the right time to create the ideal environment for the client solving the right problem.

To be good at model agility, a coach needs an internal decision tree for choices based on knowledge, experience, and pattern recognition in order to sense which model is of greatest service in a given situation. Often this is an iterative process. One model may first stimulate a question or hypothesis. Then, the client's response can inform the coach about whether to switch to another and notice whether the next questions resonate more fully and move the process forward more effectively.

We believe that model agility can lead to better coaching outcomes because it expands the repertoire of interventions a coach can call upon in any given moment. In contrast, coaches who

operate from a single, dominant model are effectively limited to a single toolbox of interventions. Although this can be sufficient, it can also lead to blind spots or accidental rigidity, as in the adage, "If you only have a hammer everything looks like a nail." By expanding to multiple models, the coach can widen the scope of what can be seen both in the client and in him- or herself.

Coaches who have developed model agility have multiple toolboxes. Drawing from multiple models allows for a broader range of interventions and multiple pathways to approach potential problems and issues that a client might want to explore. There may be different model–client match-ups, because one individual may resonate more with one line of questioning than another because of life stage, personality, or cultural background.

In addition, developing model agility can benefit the coach's professional development. This effort can stretch cognitive complexity, observing ego, and capacity to develop different sets of strengths—all of which encourage a shift to a higher stage of adult development (Kegan, 1994).

What are the limits or boundaries of model agility? First, some clients may be best served with a consistent thoughtful approach. Some issues may also be best served within one framework. Our argument would be that adhering to one model is a conscious choice. Second, model agility is not true integration of theory, a much more complex process. This approach is similar to what Lazarus (1992) calls "technical eclecticism," in reference to his work on multimodal therapy and the work of Richard (1999) on executive coaching. In essence, simply pulling interventions from whatever theoretical model we believe will lead to better coaching outcomes.

Four Models

We have chosen four different psychological models to illustrate how each leads to alternate ways of framing a coaching situation, choosing coaching goals, asking questions, coaching interventions, and creating types of coach–client relationships. The four models are cognitive–behavioral, psychoanalytic, positive psychology, and adult development. We use these four perspectives because all are commonly used by psychologist coaches.

Cognitive Behavioral

The cognitive–behavioral model, drawn from cognitive–behavioral therapy (CBT), is a product of our understanding of how we process information. This approach originally focused on how each person has a unique cognitive style. Coaching from a CBT perspective examines a client's assumptions and core beliefs and how these inform perceptions of the world and the stream of automatic thoughts that ensue. Emotions are seen to stem from thoughts. However, as the field has evolved and expanded, a more complex appreciation of the reciprocal effects of cognitions, emotions, and subsequent actions and how these actions in turn cycle back to inform cognitions and emotions has emerged. These are all highly affected by the physiological state of both individuals and the social contexts within which all of these elements occur. The acronym SPACE (social context, physiology, action, cognition, and emotion; Edgerton & Palmer, 2005) is helpful for remembering these various factors so that they can be used as springboards for powerful questions in coaching.

Therefore, in coaching based on cognitive behavior the focus is to step back in order to reevaluate the interactions of the SPACE factors to help the coachee appreciate how these influence one's inner and interpersonal experience. A common beginning intervention is to identify cognitive distortions such as personalization, catastrophizing, or black-and-white thinking and help the client reassess the validity of how they process information and reach conclusions. This is done often through exercises to restructure one's thoughts (Beck, Rush, Shaw, & Emory, 1979) and through designing life experiments to test beliefs (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000) and examine how one constructs cause-and-effect sequences (Kelley & Michela, 1980). What matters is to help clients think about *how* they are thinking, feeling, and acting and help them to have a greater amount of choice in the way they then respond. As a result, the client builds self-efficacy, better decision making, increased capacity for problem solving (Ducharme, 2004), and an inner dialogue that allows for higher performance.

Coaching from a cognitive–behavioral perspective moves beyond the content of what the client is thinking to the patterns of thinking, the person's cognitive style, and explores whether the match between style and challenge is effective. For example, if a person is logical and deductive, a coach might ask if his or her thinking is lean and flexible enough to become facile with the kind of inductive thinking that is often necessary to navigate emergent process. In the corporate environment, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and other popular instruments try to provide a useful guide to compare thinking preferences, such as broad or precise thinking, hands-on thinking, and abstract thinking. Kahneman's (2011) work on fast and slow thinking and Kanter's (2011) work on zooming in and zooming out have a common emphasis on flexibility. For leaders, the question is, are they able to have a repertoire of choices in how to process information or do they default to one way of thinking? Can they also truly appreciate how others think and take that into account when making key decisions?

When a coach uses the cognitive–behavioral model, it helps the client focus on the accuracy of the content of his or her thinking and assumptions as well as on style and flexibility, considering how he or she processes information for optimal personal and organizational performance.

Psychoanalytic

Coaching with a psychodynamic model draws on a different set of concepts about how people operate and what helps them change. It assumes people are driven by deep emotions that emerge from earliest experiences during one's formative years. These become embedded into one's core patterns of relating to self and others that pervade adult life. To manage distressing emotions and keep one's equilibrium, it is natural to develop defensive structures and coping mechanisms. These coping skills and defenses range from outright denial to suppression, repression, reaction formation, and sublimation (Valliant, 1977). From this perspective, many behaviors are not consciously chosen, and the work of coaching is to bring these into conscious awareness.

A core aspect of this is the client understanding the phenomena of transference and countertransference, which are often central to the coaching (Kets de Vries, 1991; Kets de Vries, Korotov, & Florent-Treacy, 2007). In transference, the client's expectations or needs from the past are transferred to the coach and inform the leader's experience of the coach. Countertransference refers to the coach's response to the client. As a result of the pull from the past, clients can accidentally recreate relational dynamics that embody early conflicts. These can result in repetition compulsion and other unconscious interpersonal dynamics.

Coaching from a psychoanalytic perspective aims to increase client self-awareness by helping these dynamics become more conscious, understandable, and manageable (Kilburg, 2004). The coach might explore how patterns in the present could be tapping into experiences of the past. Those in power are lightning rods for eliciting transference responses from others. Knowing these dynamics helps the client understand their impact and how to step back when hit with complicated interpersonal challenges. The coachee's understanding of countertransference is equally important. Related concepts that apply to understanding complex relationships include projective identification and identification with the aggressor.

Working with the psychoanalytic model leads to a different use of the coach–client relationship. Noticing and exploring patterns within the relationship can illuminate important information on how the client relates to others. Connecting around what is happening "in the room," although not unique to psychoanalytic coaching, is certainly a powerful approach to increasing awareness of self and others. Despite, or perhaps because of, the power and potential usefulness of this approach, Kilburg (2004) has also examined the dangers and pitfalls of psychodynamic coaching, and he proposed useful guidelines for its use.

Positive Psychology

Positive psychology is defined as the study of what is right with people and institutions (Peterson, 2006; Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000), and applied positive psychology is "the study of the conditions and processes that contribute to the flourishing or optimal functioning of people, groups,

and institutions" (Gable & Haidt, 2005). The use of a positive psychology model for coaching assumes that focusing on strengths (Peterson & Seligman, 2004), applying appreciative inquiry into what has been done or gone well (Cooperrider, Whitney, Stavros, & Fry, 2003), and developing positive emotions, relationships, and a sense of meaning will enhance well-being and performance in life, sport, and work. An emerging body of work (Fredrickson, 2001) indicates that positive emotions increase one's thought-action repertoire by broadening skills, building resources, and increasing interpersonal openness. These allow access to more positive experience and can result in a "positive upward spiral." However, being overly positive lowers performance. The ideal ratio of positive to negative varies from 5:1 (Gottman, Coan, Carrere, & Swanson, 1998) to 3:1 (Waugh & Fredrickson, 2006).

To help clients increase energy, engagement, and goal attainment, many coaches who employ the positive psychology model will design interventions around identifying and building positive emotions, strengths, access to flow states, and a sense of meaning. In doing this the coach aims to "unpack the positive" with the same specificity and rigor that one unpacks dysfunctional behavior and events (Kauffman, 2006). A coach might anchor positive experiences by making an appreciative inquiry (Cooperrider et al., 2003) into what the individual, team, or organization has done right. Boyatzis, Smith, and Blaize (2006) and Passarelli (2015) found that functional MRI (fMRI) revealed that vision-oriented coaching questions activated different parts of the brain than evaluation (compliance). A practical application is to begin interventions, particularly 360s, with an authentic emphasis on the positive.

Finding and fostering strengths (Kauffman & Silberman, 2009; Seligman, Steen, Park, & Peterson, 2005) is used by coaches to assist clients to recognize, appreciate, and harvest internal resources. Peterson and Seligman's Signature Strengths Survey is one of a growing number of assessments of top strengths. In Peterson's research, using a strength in a new way for a week was associated with increased well-being and decreased depression 6 months later (Seligman et al., 2005). By extension, one can identify and use strengths in new ways to overcome challenges and find ways to work around weaknesses. A different application is to "re-craft" how one works, or aspects of the job, to align strengths and tasks to find ways to increase intrinsic motivation. This, in tandem with finding the ideal balance of skill and challenge, can help clients access flow states. This work can also be used to help a client get closer to finding his or her sense of purpose and meaning.

Adult Development

The adult developmental (AD) model is grounded in the belief that all individuals have the potential to grow through predictable stages of increasing mental complexity and emotional maturity throughout their lives (Kegan, 1983; Lewis, 2007). These stages describe how a person constructs a sense of self and relates to authority; they also indicate one's level of self-awareness and ability to take others' perspectives, plus the degree to which the person identifies with and is therefore blind to assumptions about self, others, and the world around him or her (Hodgetts, 1994). Central to this theory is the idea that adults actively construct their own meaning-making systems and that the developmental level of those internal systems can either be in or out of sync with their social surround. When the organization or culture we are operating in demands more of us than our current stage allows for, we experience the feeling of "being in over our heads" (Kegan, 1994). Although uncomfortable, such situations invite adults to evolve to more complex ways of being in the world.

By the time most people in developed societies reach adulthood, they have evolved to the "socialized" stage, in which "Who I am is how others see me." At this stage, the person assumes there is one truth/reality and grants the authorities the power to define it. Once a person evolves to the next, "self-authoring," stage, he or she has developed independent inner values, assumptions, and standards by which to judge self and others. Although a clear achievement over the previous stage, self-authoring individuals have not yet begun to examine their deepest assumptions. At this stage, the person sees through his or her assumptive lenses and yet is blind to them. At the next, "self-transformational," stage, the individual's assumptions come into clearer focus and truth begins to look more conditional (Berger, 2012).

Coaches who follow the AD model are sensitive to how clients view them as their coach because this provides clues to a client's developmental level. Socialized stage: Does this person see me (or others) as an authority who will give him or her the truth and right answers? Self-authoring stage: Has the coachee already evolved to the point of having well-established inner values, standards, and personally chosen goals, so that he or she is viewing me (the coach) more as a peer or colleague who can help better achieve an agenda? Or has my client begun to evolve beyond the self-authoring stage to the point that he or she is questioning some long-held assumptions about people and the world? Determining the rough developmental level of a coachee is important for the coach taking an AD perspective, because a primary goal of AD coaching is to the help the client move beyond his or her current level of functioning to the next developmental stage.

Summary of the Four Approaches

The cognitive–behavioral model assumes that the neocortex rules, that what a person thinks is primary, and that effective interventions flow from shifting thought patterns. The psychoanalytic model takes an opposite approach, focusing on transference and how early family patterns and trauma influence current functioning and effectiveness. The positive psychology model rests on the assumption that focusing on client strengths, while acknowledging adversity, negativity, and challenge, will best lead to effective leadership and coaching. And the AD model assumes that more complex and sophisticated ways of making meaning lead to greater effectiveness, and therefore seeks to help individuals grow to higher stages of cognitive and emotional complexity. All four approaches to coaching share the goal of helping the client become more effective in his or her current life and work, but each attempt to achieve this goal from a very different perspective. In highlighting the basic assumptions of these four models, we do not mean to imply that these are the only ones used in coaching today—far from it. We mean only that these are common approaches and useful in making our case for model agility.

Case Study: Karen and Ellen

To help explore how model agility works in actual practice, we will present a case study and examine it with the four coaching models described above. While identifying information is changed, this is an abbreviated transcript from an actual session. We show what the coach actually did, said, and thought, and we present the model that was employed, as well as explore how the use of alternative models might have led to different interactions and to potentially different outcomes. (Note that the authors have received permission from the client and colleague described in the case study to reproduce the transcripts and notes from all coaching sessions with the client.)

The case we have chosen is of an organizational leader (Karen) faced with the experience of being personally and professionally betrayed by a colleague (Ellen), who is also Karen's close friend. Ellen has been key to the creation of a high-profile project on domestic violence and has engaged in actions that jeopardize the program. Upon Karen's consultation with her superior she is informed that Ellen's actions are even more egregious because of circumstances of which Karen was unaware. Karen's mandate is to resolve the situation that day or fire her close friend and colleague. In addition, if Ellen does not comply, Karen must inform her that she may no longer identify herself as affiliated with the project or their academic institution.

However, it should be noted that this program, while affiliated with a law school, is an independent entity with its own administration and is not subject to the more complex issues that would surface if it were directly part of the university. Karen's professional career was not in jeopardy because of these events, and the program would not be compromised unless she was not willing to engage in the confrontation with her colleague. If this was not the case, and if the coach was not sensitive to the potential quagmire of Karen's multiple key stakeholders, the coach should consider declining the engagement as the challenges might go beyond his expertise. In a complex

system, HR, legal, and administrative stakeholders might have conflicting agendas, and ignorance of these might be destructive to Karen's capacity to survive this crisis professionally.[1]

Although this case may seem extreme, we believe many leaders at some point in their careers will face a similar experience that evokes feelings of professional betrayal, often at times when the stakes are very high. To resolve such an adaptive challenge (Heifetz, 1994), new strengths and personal growth are required.

Case Transcript and Commentary

John: Hi, Karen. You said on the phone that you needed to talk and I'm glad we're able to meet this morning. What's been happening? [I'm glad I am able to meet with Karen this morning after she called me. She sounded pretty upset. I wonder what is going on with her?]

Karen: Well, I thought things were going great. Yesterday Ellen sent me an e-mail telling me she'd been keeping a secret for 6 months. She is planning to sign a book contract today to publish material related to our project. Not just that, she picked a coauthor, Peter, who has nothing to do with the program!

John: [Wow. No wonder Karen is upset. I would be too.]

Karen: I was so stunned I went numb. I called her immediately and heard myself congratulating her! When I hung up I was still standing and the enormity of it hit me. It's a small world, and really? She's writing about my work with someone else? It will look bizarre and have everyone question the entire program.

Commentary: *At this point in the dialog, John is already likely to begin trying on conceptual lenses to help make sense of the situation and guide how he will respond. Below we suggest how the four different models might lead him to ask different questions about this situation. (Throughout we will use the following abbreviations: CB for cognitive behavioral, PsA for psychoanalytic, PP for positive psychology, and AD for adult developmental.)*

CB: Karen seems in the grip of her emotions. I wonder if this is an example of personalization? We could explore her core assumptions and see whether her perceptions are correct.

PsA: I wonder what might have gone on in Karen's relational history that may have led her into this situation. What defense mechanisms might be operating here? Is there some kind of transference happening between Karen and Ellen? Between Karen and her boss?

PP: Karen is clearly a strong woman who is in touch with her emotions. She must be quite intelligent to have accomplished so much so young. Considering the potential impact of her discovery, I think Karen's reaction of anger makes a lot of sense. Her natural strength of prudence is helping her to see the potential longer term ramifications of this event.

AD: I wonder what about this situation is most problematic and troubling for Karen? How is she making sense of this? What is the crux of the issue for her and what level of adult meaning-making (ego stage) does she seem to be operating at? How is she viewing me as her coach? Does she view me as an authority who will give her the answer? Or as an equal thinking partner?

Karen: Peter is a lawyer, but preventing domestic violence isn't anywhere near his specialty! What could Ellen have been thinking? How odd will that look to have a

[1] It is also worth pointing out that although this is a complex case complicated by the coachee potentially having multiple dual relationships, this does not necessarily pose an ethical dilemma for the coach. Specifically, one reviewer of this paper pointed out the conflicting relationships as a reason why the coach should probably have declined the work. The APA's Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct, in Section 3.05 on Multiple Relationships, does warn against multiple dual relationships for the psychologist coach and states that the psychologist must be free of such relationships if they "could reasonably be expected to impair the psychologist's objectivity, competency, or effectiveness." However, there is no stipulation that the *client* be free from multiple dual relationships. And, in fact, with senior executives these multiple dual relationships are not at all uncommon, and one of the benefits a psychologist coach or consultant can provide is help in sorting out these tricky connections.

book come from my program, coauthored by someone from our section of the law school, but with no history in the topic, which is my specialty. Anyone related in any way to the school would do a double take.

John: [Karen seems completely blindsided by Ellen's action. I wonder what might have led to her not seeing this coming? Could she have seen this coming? Not sure. I wonder if there are ways Karen might have contributed to this outcome?]

Commentary: *As more details begin to emerge in the conversation, each model leads to different questions and different ways of interpreting what Karen says.*

CB: I bet if she "zoomed out" she'd have a more grounded perspective. . . . It's hard to believe she isn't catastrophizing.

PsA: She's talking about people doing a double take. . . . Is there fear of exposure and could that be related to shame? Has anything similar to this happened in her past?

PP: Could Karen be overusing her strength of prudence and not balancing it with some of her other strengths?

AD: How Karen is perceived by others seems important to her. Is this revealing a socialized (stage-three) self? But her concern about people negatively viewing her could also be violating her own sense of authorship (stage-four self). Wonder which it is?

John: Why didn't she ask you?

Karen: [Totally involved, seems intent on John getting how awful the situation is.] Well, the publishing group she'd go with are people who have contacted me a few times to do a book with them. I do not think its business model is in the best interest of a published writer. So I turned them down, and the last time they called I didn't call back. When they found Ellen, she first suggested me but they were interested in her. They informed her that if she wanted to work with them, she couldn't tell me about it. She then *agreed* to do just that and decided to not even hint to me that she was developing the idea and the concept. We have been together nearly every day for 6 months; how could she have kept this a secret? Essentially she's been lying to me, every single day.

John: That must have really hurt. Did it feel like a betrayal?

Karen: Yes it did. But it gets much, much worse than that. Because she kept her book contract a secret, the issue of Peter never came up; and what I know about him is confidential. I couldn't tell her that working with Peter will destroy the program's reputation. It would also compromise our relationship with the university and our funding.

Commentary: *While each of our four models might lead John to interpret Karen's story differently, they may also help to focus on similar themes emerging in the dialog, framed in each model's language. In the comments below, each model seems attuned to ways Karen may be distorting the situation or not seeing clearly.*

CB: This seems like catastrophizing or black-and-white thinking. I need more information to be sure but it does not seem she is thinking clearly.

PsA: Does Karen have a negative transference to Peter? What might he represent to her? Is she being overly dramatic? I wonder what the real story is?

PP: When she is asked about her emotional state, she gets much more authentic and clear. She seems to be genuinely more concerned about the program than herself and ready to fight for it.

AD: What does Peter mean to her? Her sense of personal integrity seems rocked by this. She's invested meaning in this program and it is being threatened.

Karen: I've been at the law school 30 years and know a lot of privileged information. Peter is in the process of being disbarred and asked to resign! It's outrageous. He slept with two of his clients when they were in very vulnerable states and then lied about it. He could afford great representation and this was settled out of

court for a lot of money, and, of course, there's a gag order. Ellen doesn't know it, but Peter does, as do I and our funders. They will assume both Ellen and I made this agreement with Peter with full knowledge of all this.

I was beyond shocked last night; it was surreal. Then I got so angry I could explode. I know when I'm angry I can overreact, so I called the dean for a reality check.

John: What did the dean say?

Karen: She said, "It isn't as bad as you think. It's worse." There is even more that I didn't know. It's very rare for the dean to go into command-and-control mode, but she told me in no uncertain terms I had three choices: Get Ellen to revoke the contract; take over the book as coauthor; or fire Ellen effective immediately. If she did sign the contract, I had to tell Ellen she could not publically mention any affiliation with our program or the university. There's no way I'd work with Peter, so really there are only two choices here.

I cannot believe it. If she had told me anything. . . . Trusted me *at all* this wouldn't have happened. How could she be so dishonest! I am beside myself.

Commentary: *Karen's recounting of her conversation with her dean disconfirms much of the earlier hypothesizing our four models suggested about ways she might be exaggerating or distorting the situation. At this point each perspective in its own way shifts the goal of the coaching from helping Karen uncover any distortions in the way she is framing the situation to helping her problem-solve and deal with a very challenging, real situation.*

CB: Unbelievable! Usually catastrophizing isn't correct. What a terrible position this puts Karen in. How is she going to assimilate and accommodate this news? She'll need help to figure out how to take the next steps.

PsA: At first I felt that Karen must be mistaken but I quickly saw the vicarious denial and parallel process. I see what a fundamental challenge this situation is to Karen's ego strength; I'll wait and see where she goes next.

PP: This is a real crucible experience, but I can sense she's got what it takes. I do not envy her at all. She is going to need to pull on every single strength she possesses to get through this one.

AD: This is a really tough predicament. She isn't going to be able to escape this situation without making a significant developmental shift. Any part of her that is in socialized self will be really challenged.

John: How did you find out about this?

Karen: Ellen finally told me. She said how guilty she's been feeling. I may treat her as a partner, but on paper she's my direct report. You cannot do something like this to your boss, and she finally couldn't bring herself to sign without telling me.

I cannot believe she has done something to put the future of the entire program in jeopardy, right as we are getting national attention and have introduced a new law! I'm also shocked that Ellen had the poor judgment to associate with this guy at all! And without telling me! What could she have been thinking?

John: Have you talked to Ellen about this?

Karen: I called her last night and told her there is a serious problem and we had to meet this morning. Then I called you, and am so glad you could meet me for breakfast. Just talking has relieved some of the intensity.

Commentary: *Notice how each of our models, while shifting focus to helping Karen begin preparing for her next conversation with Ellen, still uses its own conceptual lens to frame how to coach her through this. The CB model focuses on thinking clearly and defusing emotional triggers that can disrupt rational thought and action. The PsA model focuses on abandonment anxiety and thinking about ways to bolster Karen's ego strength. The PP model similarly seeks ways to focus*

on and heighten her strength, whereas the AD model sees this situation as a crucible and potential catalyst for ego-stage shift.

CB: Karen will need to think clearly to manage this challenge and talk successfully with Ellen. How can I help her defuse any emotional triggers that might pull her away from being clear and rational?

PsA: Probably there was some abandonment anxiety triggered by the betrayal and the promise of an alternate trusted relationship could help alleviate the toxic affect. I hope I've created a holding environment to help strengthen her ego; this could possibly reduce or contain the dread, which was experienced as stress.

PP: I'll need to remind Karen of her many strengths and past success in dealing with similar situations. Also, Karen understandably hasn't talked much about Ellen's strengths. That might be helpful here and useful in her upcoming conversation.

AD: Karen seems to feel safe enough to really talk with me. I'm glad we've created a holding environment where she can feel less stressed. I hope the way I've been listening to her has helped her feel deeply heard and connected. Perhaps, she can now try out some alternative ways of making sense of this complex set of challenges.

How might we explain Karen's expressed sense of relief here? One answer might be that the coach has added his own ego strength to the situation; Karen feels she is not alone in facing this but instead is connected to additional resources.

John: [Smiles and nods.] What would be most helpful for you right now?

Karen: I think for you to help me sort out my feelings and reactions to all this and figure out how I am going to respond. I want to be effective, not to lose control.

John: What makes you think you might?

Karen: Other than that I'm ready to start screaming and tell her that if she doesn't get out of this deal this effing minute she's fired and I never want to see her face again?

John: [Smiles, listens intently.]

Karen: [Pauses, the black humor seems to have released something.] The hurt and rage are overwhelming, and if I'm honest in part I'm triggered by a bad experience I had a couple of years ago. [She recounts the story of friend who kept a secret from her for a year, and 25 years later suddenly terminated the relationship after a minor conflict.] I should have known that someone who could hide something this major is someone who is fundamentally incapable of a true relationship. So now that I see Ellen has done this, I feel very shaken about her and do not know if I can recover. But . . .

John: Okay. So just to make sure we are on the same page, it sounds as if it might be helpful first to sort out your past feelings of being rejected and abandoned by your best friend from this current work experience, and second to see if I can help you get clearer about what you want to say to Ellen this morning when you see her. Does that make sense?

Karen: Yeah. That would be great.

Commentary: *At this point in the conversation, John clarifies and proposes two concrete things he could do with Karen to help her prepare for her meeting with Ellen. Again, each of our models might lead him to come at this task from a slightly different perspective.*

CB: Sounds like Karen could be experiencing some distortions based on her emotional reaction to Ellen's keeping a major secret from her. I can help her identify and disentangle past from present.

PsA: Karen seems to be describing a kind of triggered, autonomic reaction based on an earlier experience. She needs to strengthen her observing ego.

PP: The fact that Karen has seen this connection between her situation with a friend and this situation is evidence of her maturity. She is using her strength of clarity and self-insight here.

AD: The fact that Karen is able to begin separating from an emotional part of herself that got stirred up by this incident bodes well for a positive outcome. She is at a high enough stage of mental complexity that she can acknowledge and observe multiple parts of herself in potential conflict.

John: So let's start with the feelings of betrayal. Tell me more about that.

Karen: [Slows down her pace.] Well, there is certainly the sense of personal betrayal, as I said. I thought we were friends and had an honest and open relationship. . . . I could never have done that to her—ever!

John: And you said that was similar to what you experienced when your best friend abandoned the relationship.

Karen: Yeah. Very similar. The same kind of feelings—hurt, betrayal, and anger. It's clear that I have this hot button around rejection and betrayal, and I see how those feelings could have gotten evoked in this situation. I think I can manage that, I hope.

John: [Very present, he listens, smiles, and nods.]

Karen: As I talk about this I am realizing that there is another layer. This is also a business betrayal—how could she make a clear strategic decision to pick another person from our department, someone not even in our specialty area, describe work that is 100% aligned with what we do, and put it on a national platform without discussing it with the business partner who is her liaison to the university? Was she just carried away by ambition? What could she have been thinking? I cannot believe she would make such a poor business decision. [Pauses.] Actually I hadn't thought of it this way. It's a useful distinction.

John: I'm glad. What in particular is helpful about it?

Karen: It's helpful for me to sort out the personal part from the professional/business part. . . . I do not want to flip out at Ellen because I feel personally betrayed or am reacting from my past situations. I think I can deal with the personal stuff—but I am not sure how to deal with the professional business part. So I feel this is helping me identify where I need to focus.

Commentary: *At this point in the conversation, we really get the feeling that Karen is engaged in productive thinking with John. She is at an edge and beginning to make new distinctions and have new insights. Each of our models, except perhaps for the PsA, recognizes this in its own way:*

CB: Karen is clearly engaging in metacognition here, coming to some important new insights.

PsA: This sounds good, but is Karen's talk of professional betrayal a defense mechanism?

PP: Karen seems to be emerging from the muck. She is gaining perspective and seeing things more clearly. She is demonstrating emotional intelligence.

AD: Glad I seem to have created a safe holding environment where Karen can begin trying on different ways to think about this situation. Her ability to identify parts of herself and knowledge of how her historical experience could emotionally cloud this situation shows in increased complexity of thought. This will help her.

John: I'm glad it's helpful. Good! You know, I'm looking at the time and see we have about 15 min before I'll need to leave and I want to make sure we take some time to think through what you want to say to Ellen when you meet with her later this morning since you said that was important.

Karen: Yeah. Good. Let's talk about that.

John: [Knowing that what he wants to share now is a risk, he also wants to see how she responds.] You know, there is one other thing I'm hearing in all this, Karen, that I want to share. And maybe it's a good segue way to thinking about your meeting with Ellen today.

What I am going to say is not at all to negate your feelings of hurt, anger, whatever, because they all make sense to me. But I also need to let you know that I am hearing a lot of *you* in all this. It's all real and true and completely understandable *and* I am wondering if there is another part of you, a bigger part, that you might also draw on in dealing with this and figuring out how you are going to respond to Ellen.

Commentary: *This is an interesting move by John. He seems to be suggesting that, in addition to the parts of herself that Karen has identified, that there could also be an additional part, a kind of higher or best self, that she may not yet be aware of but that she can draw on for strength and inspiration when she talks with Ellen later that day. John seems to be sensing what is close to but just beyond Karen's conscious awareness—naming a possibility that is "experience near" for her.*

Karen: [First looks wary, then somehow looks steadier.] That is so interesting that you would say that. I've been sensing there is more to this, on some level, but didn't have the words.

John: So let me ask you this: If you were able to operate at your highest level of integrity, from that highest place in yourself, and think about what would serve the most powerful and largest purpose you and Ellen have in your work together—how would that change the conversation with Ellen later today?

Karen: That's a great question! I've really got to think about that . . . [Pause.]

John: Where does that take you?

Karen: It's hard to describe. I just suddenly feel like I have a bigger reservoir of strength to pull from. Like, maybe I can do this. Maybe we could get to a place of honesty.

I want to find out if we can continue to work together. I guess I want to hear her side of the story. I'm not sure I'll be able to, or want to, work with her going forward, but I want to be open at least to her side of things without shortchanging my own.

John: Can you imagine what she might say that would make things okay again?

Karen: No, I cannot—I can only think we have to start the conversation. We have to sort this out, get to the bottom of what was going on. I guess I want to figure out if we can move forward together, or not. All I can do is walk her through what all this means and how she can make it right.

John: That sounds good. Very clear. And if you are coming from that highest level in yourself, how will you be different? What will that look like in practice?

Karen: I will be more centered, listening more, certainly at first, and demanding less, and asking more questions to try to understand and get to the truth.

John: Sounds like a good start, Karen. I need to leave but I really want you to let me know how the conversation goes. And feel free to call or e-mail me if you need to!

Karen: Thanks, John. I actually feel better and more like I can have this conversation and maybe it will not be a disaster.

Commentary: *What is interesting here is that John's question about Karen's highest self reveals some core assumptions of his own coaching perspective—that we all have higher or best selves that*

we can draw on and that we are often much more effective when we do. But his question also could be asked from any of the four models we have discussed in this paper.

Our CB model might lead to this question: If you were operating from a completely rational place, with no distortions and clear about your goals and principles, what would you say or do?

The PsA model could frame this same question in terms of ego-ideal or mature superego.

The PP model might appeal to one's highest self, values, and principles, in an invitation to more authentic leadership.

Finally, our AD model might lead the coach to invite Karen to step into a higher level of mental and cognitive complexity.

In a sense John has integrated key elements of each of these psychological models and thus demonstrated the very capacity for model agility we argue for in this paper.

After the Session

Although the interaction Karen and Ellen had immediately after this meeting was difficult, Karen felt she both kept her truth and her temper and communicated her difficult message. Keeping clarity on their larger purpose was described by her as pivotal to the successful resolution. At first, Ellen had difficulty believing the coauthor's behavior was that egregious. Ellen postponed the contract for 1 week, then informed the publisher she would not be moving forward. Karen and Ellen had a number of discussions, and while the professional trust was reestablished fairly quickly, it took a year before Karen felt the personal aspects were resolved. Since this time, the program has grown; Karen and Ellen continue to work together and are starting a for-profit company.

Discussion

The effectiveness of coaching will be enhanced by model agility, when coaches become familiar with and can use multiple psychological models in working with their clients. We also believe a similar kind of cognitive agility is increasingly necessary for effective leadership in a complex, global world. Although little empirical research exists in this area to date, we suspect that coaches who use model agility in coaching leaders are more likely to help their clients develop a kind of cognitive leadership agility.

Model Agility for Coaches

How can coaches actively expand their capacity for model agility? We suggest a simple five-step process:

First, become aware of the model or models you currently use in your coaching practice.

Second, familiarize yourself with one or several additional coaching models that you think might expand your coaching repertoire. We reviewed four common frameworks in this article, but many others exist as well.

Third, review recent coaching you have done and conduct thought experiments applying other frameworks.

Fourth, practice applying these new frameworks to your coaching by always asking if there is another way of framing a given coaching situation and, if so, what kind of questions would that lead you to ask.

Fifth, reflect on what you've learned in this article. We have included general coaching questions for each of the four perspectives used in our case discussion in an appendix. Consider which of these questions you might add to your repertoire.

Our goal here is to develop the capacity to hold our hypotheses lightly and not prematurely commit to a particular explanation or point of view. To possess model agility you need to be clear on what you think and not very clear if it is correct or if it is the best way to frame a given situation. The goal is to follow the client and to be as open to his or her world as possible, allowing your models to inform but not control you.

A different way of saying this is that, as a coaches, you want to mindfully know and choose what model and assumptions you are using and why—as opposed to reflexively operating from a fixed

model with assumptions you are only partially aware of (if at all). Remember: As a coach, you might think you know what assumptions you use when coaching, and why, but you must be careful to question this assumption as well! Over 35 years ago, Chris Argyris and Donald Schön (1974) showed that espoused theory (what we think we do and why) often differs greatly from theory-in-use (what we *actually* do and why). Argyris developed a simple process for discovering our theories-in-use that we still think is very relevant for coaches today; we invite you to use in it your own self-discovery. His process was to capture an actual transcript of a consulting or coaching dialog and then, using left-hand/right-hand column format, write down not only what you said but also what you didn't say, what you thought and felt. By analyzing such case transcripts, it is possible to uncover our actual theories-in-use. It may be useful to consider how to include multiple frameworks into coach training in order to embed this kind of thinking early in a coach's career.

Good coaches rarely end a coaching session without asking their clients what small steps they could take based on the session to begin making incremental changes. We would like to do the same here and suggest that one small step toward expanding your own model agility might be to ask yourself the following questions about the case presented previously:

Given that an additional level of agility is understanding the culture and context of your client, how might your understanding of Karen and Ellen shift if Karen was from a dominant culture and Ellen a minority, or the reverse?

What if both these individuals were men, or gay, or transgender?

What if Karen and Ellen came from cultures in conflict—perhaps Rachel or Moshe taking the role of Karen and Fatima or Ahmed taking the role of Ellen? Or vice versa?

How might your experience of the central characters in the case and their relational tension change given these various permutations, and how might that affect how you framed the situation as a coach?

What additional questions might you create yourself about this case to expand your model agility?

Model Agility for Leaders

There is an important parallel between model agility for coaches and the cognitive and emotional agility many scholars and practitioners argue is now necessary for leaders to meet the adaptive challenges of a VUCA world. Leaders today need to hold the assumptive lenses lightly and be able to view leadership and business challenges from multiple perspectives. By doing this, they widen the repertoire of choices they might employ in the midst of a current challenge or crisis instead of reverting to simpler mindsets or simply repeating past patterns that are not working. They need to move beyond reflexive responses, step back, and mindfully consider the known and perhaps unknown or emergent alternatives.

As coaches we have the opportunity to model this same capacity for mindful self-awareness and agility in the very practice of our coaching craft. Under the pressure of being of service to a leader, we also need to step into different pathways of conceptualizing our clients, which in turn has ramifications for the relationships we construct, possible interventions, and our assumptions about change.

A Caveat

While the benefits of model agility seem clear, as noted above, not all coaching situations require coaches who have developed this capacity. For some clients with a strong need for structure and consistency, a variety of tentative interventions or forays (Dym, 1995) by their coach might feel chaotic and off-putting. Also, some coaching issues and challenges are ideally resolved with just one or two coaching tools—in those situations knowledge of multiple models and toolboxes is unnecessary. The point is not that all coaching clients and situations require model agility. Rather, because coaches who have developed model agility can mindfully consider a range of choices, we believe they are likely to more often choose the approach best suited for a particular client and situation.

References

Argyris, C., & Schön, D. (1974). *Theory in practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Beck, A. T., Rush, J., Shaw, B., & Emory, G. (1979). *Cognitive therapy of depression*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Berger, J. G. (2012). *Changing on the job: Developing leaders for a complex world*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Boyatzis, R. E., Smith, M. L., & Blaize, N. (2006). Developing sustainable leaders through coaching and compassion. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 5,* 8–24. http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMLE.2006.20388381

Cooperrider, D., Whitney, D., Stavros, J., & Fry, R. (2003). *Appreciative inquiry handbook*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Cox, E., Bachkirova, T., & Clutterbuck, D. A. (Eds.). (2014). *The complete handbook of coaching*. London, England: Sage.

Ducharme, M. J. (2004). The Cognitive-behavioral approach to executive coaching. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 56,* 214–224. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1065-9293.56.4.214

Dym, B. (1995). *Readiness and change in couple therapy*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Edgerton, N., & Palmer, S. (2005). SPACE: A psychological model for use within cognitive behavioural coaching, therapy and stress management. *The Coaching Psychologist, 1,* 25–31.

Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology. The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist, 56,* 218–226. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.218

Gable, S., & Haidt, J. (2005). What (and why) is positive psychology? *Review of General Psychology, 9,* 103–110. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.9.2.103

Gottman, J. M., Coan, J., Carrere, S., & Swanson, C. (1998). Predicting marital happiness and stability from newlywed interactions. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 60,* 5–22. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/353438

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

Hodgetts, W. (1994). *Coming of age: How male and female managers transform relationships with authority at midlife* (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.

Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.

Kanter, R. M. (2011). Zoom in, zoom out. *Harvard Business Review, 89,* 112–116.

Kauffman, C. (2006). Positive psychology: The science at the heart of coaching. In D. R. Stober & A. M. Grant (Eds.), *Evidence based coaching handbook: Putting best practices to work for your clients* (pp. 219–253). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Kauffman, C., & Silberman, J. (2009). Finding and fostering the positive in relationships: Positive interventions in couples therapy. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 65,* 520–531. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jclp.20594

Kegan, R. (1983). *The evolving self: Problem and process in human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

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

Kelley, H. H., & Michela, J. L. (1980). Attribution theory and research. *Annual Review of Psychology, 31,* 457–501. http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ps.31.020180.002325

Kets de Vries, M. F. R. (Ed.). (1991). On becoming a CEO: The transference and the addictiveness of power. *Organizations on the couch: Clinical perspectives on organizational behavior and change* (pp. 120–139). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kets de Vries, M. F. R., Korotov, K., & Florent-Treacy, E. (2007). *Coach and couch: The psychology of making better leaders*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kilburg, R. R. (2004). When shadows fall: Using psychodynamic approaches in executive coaching. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 56,* 246–268.

Lazarus, A. A. (1992). Multimodal therapy. In J. C. Norcross & M. R. Goldfried (Eds.), *Handbook of psychotherapy integration* (pp. 105–120). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Lewis, P. M. (2007). *The discerning heart: The developmental psychology of Robert Kegan*. Author.

Palmer, S., & Gyllensten, K. (2008). How cognitive behavioural, rational emotive behavioural or multimodal coaching could prevent mental health problems, enhance performance and reduce work-related stress. *Journal of Rational-Emotive & Cognitive-Behavior Therapy, 26,* 38–52. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10942-007-0069-y

Palmer, S., & Whybrow, A. (Eds.). (2014). *Handbook of coaching psychology: A guide for practitioners*. Hove, East Sussex: Routledge.

Passarelli, A. M. (2015). Vision-based coaching: Optimizing resources for leader development. *Frontiers in Psychology, 6,* 412. http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00412

Peltier, B. (2011). *The psychology of executive coaching: Theory and application*. Hove, East Sussex: Routlege.

Peterson, C. (2006). *A primer in positive psychology*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2004). *Character strengths and virtues: A handbook and classification*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Richard, J. T. (1999). Multimodal therapy: A useful model for the executive coach. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 51,* 24–30. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1061-4087.51.1.24

Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist, 55,* 5–14. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.5

Seligman, M. E. P., Steen, T. A., Park, N., & Peterson, C. (2005, July–August). Positive psychology progress: Empirical validation of interventions. *American Psychologist, 60,* 410–421. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.60.5.410

Skovholt, T. M., & Ronnestad, M. H. (1992). *The evolving professional self: Stages and themes in therapist and counselor development*. West Sussex, United Kingdom: Wiley.

Stiehm, J. H., & Townsend, N. W. (2002). *The U.S. Army War College: Military education in a democracy*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Valliant, G. E. (1977). *Adaptation to life*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.

Waugh, C. E., & Fredrickson, B. L. (2006). Nice to know you: Positive emotions, self-other overlap, and complex understanding in the formation of a new relationship. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 1,* 93–106. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17439760500510569

Whybrow, A., & Palmer, S. (2006). Taking stock: A survey of coaching psychologists' practice and perspectives. *International Coaching Psychology Review, 1,* 56–70.

Appendix

Orienting Observations and Questions for Leadership-Coaching Clients

Cognitive–Behavioral Model

- Cognitive behaviors: How does the client process information about a challenge?
  - Are cognitive distortions impacting his experience and is his thinking clear?
  - What is her inner dialogue like? Is she aware of her automatic thoughts and assumptions?
  - Does he need to restructure some of his perceptions?
  - Can she step back and look at how her thinking is impacting emotions, and then how her emotions then impact her thinking?

- Cognitive style: What is the client's preferred style and rhythm in processing information?
  - Does he look at things with a highly precise or more impressionistic lense?
  - Is she quick to pick up new things or more methodical?
  - Is his typical style to take in information objectively or subjectively?
  - How does she absorb new information best, through teaching moments, story, space for individual reflection, or conversation?
  - How does he think about his organization?

- Cognitive flexibility: How flexible and complete is the client's cognitive processing?
  - Can she take the perspective of the other, keep her own, and use this to develop an effective plan?
  - How effectively does he process different kinds of information?
  - Can she balance her first take on the situation and incorporate more information as it arises and then and adjust her perspective or plans?
  - Are cognitive biases, blind spots, or hot spots interfering with how he manages people?

- Possible coaching questions:
  - What would it take to have more clarity?
  - If you were to develop another perspective on the situation, what else might you see?

Psychoanalytic Model

- Intrapsychic dynamics: What is going on under the surface?
  - What parental or sibling dynamics might be in play that could interfere with the assessment that the client and colleagues make of individuals or teams?
  - How might defensive or character issues influence what the client and colleagues are willing to share or able to see in themselves or others?

(*Appendix continues*)

- What ego ideals does the client hold? Can these be harnessed to help her navigate tricky personal and organizational challenges?
- How mature are his defenses? Can he recognize, metabolize, and manage his emotions to access more choices?

- Interpersonal dynamics: What forces influence the client's experience of relationships?
  - How might defensive or character issues influence how she relates to others?
  - Can his sense of his ego ideal be harnessed to navigate dilemmas?
  - How mature is her capacity to recover from interpersonal disappointments, conflicts, or betrayals?
  - Does he appreciate their impact on gaps between his perceptions and those of stakeholders?

- Person of the coach: How is the client able to utilize the coaching relationship, and can the coach use self-experience to serve the coaching and be more effective?
  - How do different clients make the coach feel, and how can the coach use this?
  - How is the coach affected by projective identification issues, and how can the coach use that to understand the client's experience?
  - What kind of transference/countertransference dynamics might be in play and how can this be used to help the client understand her responses to and impact on others?
  - What stance can the coach take to keep an ideal alliance and create a safe holding environment for the client to manage his experience and to learn and grow?

- Possible coaching questions:
  - What feels the most raw about this experience?
  - How much of this feels as if it primarily pulls on the present and not the past?

Positive Psychology Model

- Approach to self: What can be done to build personal resources and resilience?
  - How can the client raise the bar on one of her top strengths (e.g., curiosity) to use it in new way to help her move forward?
  - Can the client imagine a year from now? He and his colleagues have forged ahead more than they had imagined. Looking back, what was done to make that happen?
  - Can you invite the client to look inside a moment for what inner resources she has that haven't been used to their fullest?
  - If the client scans back over what he's loved and accomplished, can he truly take that in and use it to empower himself?

(*Appendix continues*)

- Approach to the other: What positive interventions could help the client's relationships?
  - Without diminishing the seriousness of a relational challenge with another person, can she also think of three instances where that person went beyond the call of duty and helped her?
  - Are there strengths or values that he overuses that create difficult connections; are there additional ones that he could use to build the relationship back?
  - Are there ways to draw upon how she has successfully managed conflict in the past?
  - What crucible experiences has he lived through that have helped him become a better leader?

- Approach to the situation: What positive attributes can help the client navigate dilemmas?
  - What helps her access and maintain peak-performance flow states?
  - Can he see what is right with himself and with others, can he see challenges as well as what is wrong, and can he "fail well"?
  - Are there any overlooked internal or external resources she could tap into?
  - Can he come up with four different pathways to resolution?

- Possible coaching questions:
  - How can you use one of your strengths in a new way to master this challenge?
  - What would resilience look like for you right now?

Adult Development Model

- Approach to the situation: How does the client describe/view the problem he or she brings to the coach?
  - What is the crux of her challenge?
  - Why is it a problem?
  - Who has defined this as a problem? Others? The client?
  - Does his description reveal anything about his ability to take the perspective of others, including those identified as the source of the problem?

- Approach to self: How self-aware is the client?
  - What is she aware of within herself? (What is "object" to her?)
  - What is he unaware of within himself? (What is he still "subject to" internally?)
  - What assumptions, if any, does she seem to be unaware of?
  - Is he able to identify and talk about conflicting parts of himself? Or is he likely to externalize conflicting parts of himself in others?

- Approach to coaching: How is the client viewing/constructing the coach and others in his or her life?
  - Does she see the coach as an authority who knows the right answer?
  - Does he see the coach as a peer/colleague who can help him solve his problems?
  - Does she see the coach as a kind of fellow explorer?
  - What kind of help is he really looking for from the coach?

(*Appendix continues*)

- Are there any clues yet about the client's developmental level?
  - Can she take the developmental level of others into account?
  - What is lowest level he could be, given what he is saying to the coach?
  - What is highest level she could be?
  - What is the coach's best guess about level, and why?

- Is there anything that suggests that the client may be ready for a developmental shift?
  - Is he talking about new ways of experiencing or making sense of things that are just emerging or have not yet become completely clear?
  - Is she talking about old ways of experiencing or making sense of things that just do not seem to be working anymore?
  - Is there a particular dilemma he is struggling with that cannot be resolved from his current developmental level?
  - What is the nature of the developmental shift she seems to be moving into?

- Possible coaching questions:
  - How can I be most helpful to you as a coach?
  - Tell me about something you are currently struggling with that if resolved would make things better for you.

Note. We have alternated gender for the pronouns in this appendix.

Received October 7, 2015
Latest revision received February 3, 2016
Accepted February 4, 2016 ■