# Fundamental Drives

# Underlying nature of change (UNC)

I have yet to complete the conceptualisation, or start the validatory work on this aspect of the PhD, but have experimentally worked through some examples of common coaching topics within my proposed process with what I have so far to see if there is any evidence to support the approach. Within the approach to coaching that comes from this PhD, I believe that there is reason for optimism.

What can be said to ultimately underly change, structurally speaking, is arbitrary because for each component (a holon) that is a part of some other composite (a holon) or relation, there is yet another subordinate, analytical level and this leaves an infinite regression.

Pragmatically therefore, I am considering a model that takes primary human impulses, instincts and fundamental drives to be the originating dynamic behind the capacity for all sensation, affect, thought and action - these represent the lowest pragmatic level of what "underlying" means and who's presence is ubiquitous in all human experience. The nature of change then can be expressed in terms of these primary drives. The purpose of identifying these is so that when considering change in coaching, both the client and coach have reference points around which to consider whatever aspects of their desired change are involved.

A client wanting to develop confidence in public speaking might for example consider the underlying elements involved in their lived experience of public speaking – say, self consciousness, fear of peer judgement, failure etc. Broken down, into their underlying structures, the drive to individuate, or to acquire or achieve might be revealed as important, while others such as the need for safety might be less involved. This gives a way to analyse the patterns that have brought the client issue to coaching and allows a way for those patterns to be seen in terms of their underlying drives, the composite of which results in the issue with public speaking. Once known, the lawful, repeating patterns that constitute the issue can be brought into awareness and held there with the recent explorations of the issue, emergence then can come from any source, a rational one say, that decides to run an experiment, or perhaps something completely inspired, which appears out of nowhere in which the client completely reconceptualises their public speaking not a threat, but as a way to do something else more important than the need to feel comfortable.

I have gathered structural elements from a large number of diverse sources, examples include: ERG Theory (Alderfer, 1969) "The four Drives" (Lawrence and Nohria, 2002), Affective Neuroscience (Panksepp, 1982), integrative attempts such as (Gu *et al.*, 2019) and others to collate and organise, remove duplicates and arrange into a conceptually sound model. The above are models that lend more to structure than process, but process models are also considered e.g. (Prochaska, Norcross and DiClemente, 1994), (Michie, Atkins and West, 2014) and others.

In addition, I propose cosmological drives, common to all things, that are also ubiquitously present in all occasions of human change (and continuity). These include an ascending current, a natural process in which the lower tends towards subsumption into the higher (speaking in terms of value-free complex order) which is seen in processes like evolution - it is eros, the drive of the lower for the higher, a "reaching upward". This is seen in some schematics as a human drive for ascendence presented in various ways, for example in the spiritual or transcendent drive which some authors register as fundamental in the human experience, or in attributes like the "actualising tendency" in humanistic psychology. The opposite is the descending current, one in which the higher states of order are intrinsically destined to decay - that is entropy, the return of the higher to the lower, involution, simplification. In this process there is a tendency towards deconstruction in which larger wholes are broken down into their constituent parts.

The structural and process references above are all, in my schematic, "formal", that is to say they are known, repeatable patterns, in this sense historical, categorical and available to science. What remains is the emergent aspect of the UNC - for this, I will revert to the philosophy discussion in general and within that, to consciousness in particular. This aspect of the conceptual arrangement of ontology, process and knowledge is not to do with the formal nature of change, but about its creation and embodiment through direct contact with emergence from the nonformal space. This is immediate practice, not historical analytics as is the case with the formal aspects introduced above. In this way, following the philosophy, there is the aspect of form - concept, analytics, description, law etc. - and there is the aspect of direct, conscious contact, or direct experience prior to all things formal in which emergence occurs and whence change originates. This is something that the 4th wave psychotherapies have been based on. E.g. (Peteet, 2018; Haque, Lenfest and Peteet, 2020)

*There is a good deal more to be added conceptually to this description and subsequent discussion. I would like to discuss this as one of several potential areas for emphasis in the PhD.*

Through my critical reading of the formal technical literature in psychology and other disciplines that I have encountered so far, I believe this approach has the potential to organise and explain much of it. As I have stated elsewhere, the purpose of uncovering an underlying nature is to illuminate and inform experience from a lawful perspective, not to try to explain or account for it without remainder, or to provide the basis for its enactment - for that, emergence, a personal or cosmic creative advance must be added. Such a system, where it can provide formal explanations or predictions, will be able to do so only under known and controlled conditions and is therefore a useful instrumental approach but is profoundly limited as a coaching tool if it is the sole approach. What emerges from any given set of components and interactions is not knowable in advance outside of controlled circumstances. 100kg of fundamental particles (quarks and whatnot) could be deconstructed from a rock or a man or a tree of equivalent mass. These piles of quarks would be indistinguishable from one another, precisely because they are "fundamental" and underlie all matter. However, taking only a given 100kg pile of quarks, no rock or man nor tree can be predicted or known in advance. Because of their fundamental nature, these quarks might become water droplets in a cloud or anything else. This provides an important directionality to the understanding of what an underlying nature is, what it can do and what its limitations are. Whatever is underlying (or fundamental) to something else is knowable a posteriori. However, given something fundamental, what it might become in potential is not knowable a priori (outside of other specific, known conditions). So while an underlying nature of something is not and can not be a full account of the thing itself, its presence within the thing remains critically informative. Whatever emerges from this point (of whatever is fundamental or underlying) is reliant on compliance, or backward compatibility with the law of the forms present in those underlying characteristics. e.g. you can't have an atom of hydrogen that is incompatible with the features and laws present within quarks etc. and so on for a molecule of water. While hydrogen is not knowable a priori given only quarks, it is still emergent from them. The law of quarks is not the same as the law of hydrogen, but the law of hydrogen must be backward-compatible with the law of quarks. The law of hydrogen is emergent from - that is, not contained or knowable in advance within - the laws of quarks. The emergence of hydrogen is new law written by evolution.

I stress emergence to this degree because I will argue that too much of coaching research and practice is analytically oriented, historical in nature etc. and while this is always informative, it leaves the client (and the coach) without the technology to directly address in practice, the emergence from which all change will derive. Some advances, such as mindfulness and the use of ACT in coaching, have been made in this direction, but as I point out, these too are caught in the fraught formal paradigm.

A primary instinct for survival, primal within us, provides an impulse to act when it is engaged. Primordial impulses are evolutionary capabilities and responses deep within us that drive much of our behaviour. Physical safety, food, water, shelter, social, reproductive and other drives belong in this category. These drives (drivers) are pre-rational, pre-linguistic, unconscious impulses at their source - present in the (sensory-motor) body as it were - instinctive - arising from below consciousness, but available to immediate experience, which is where coaching can access them. Exciting a response to a survival stimulus, can result in an almost infinite range of responses (as above), that will depend on numerous personal and contextual factors. Again, predictive capabilities are possible but limited to narrowly defined parameters, e.g. (Grossberg and Levine, 1987) but this is not of primary concern to coaching. For coaching, the recognition of the presence of the underlying driver in a session is sufficient, it invites a structured, historically oriented, pointing-out framework in which causal determinism is not the goal even if it is possible, but in which the presence of the driver is recognised within context, identified and brought into awareness for the purposes of emergent learning, experimentation and adaptation whether this is translational e.g. (Cook-Greuter, 2005) or transformational, e.g. The subject-object switch (Kegan, 1982). The "law" of the pattern, that is, its own property of perpetuation. Interaction etc., is recognised and considered and the experience of it, brought into immediate awareness is where integration, learning and change are possible in emergence. This offers the possibility of re-writing the laws associated with the stimulus or driver for the client or the emergence of entirely new form and law in the developmental case.

By way of analogy, the same is true for change in coaching. Whatever is envisioned as somehow "better" and therefore representing change, by a client is not available without remainder within the bounds of what currently exists for the client, or it would not be a goal, it would be a feature of their present circumstance. To enact the change, something new must emerge for the client and it must be based on what is available for use, what can be learned or otherwise gained etc. in order to support its enaction. Whatever is enacted will ultimately have to emerge for the client in a personal way and be compatible in some way with whatever else exists. Whatever exists will be found to comprise these fundamental components, which can be addressed, within both the formal, analytical frame, to derive their known and knowable presence and effects as well as the nonformal conscious frame in which emergence, the personal creative advance becomes possible for the client.

Thus, the underlying nature is informative, and supportive, but insufficient for change alone. For that, a creative advance is needed. Creative advance through emergence happens in coaching, I don’t suggest this is not the case, I do suggest though, that if it is given a shift in meaning and orientation into a primary pathway for practice, that the benefits would be much greater. Furthermore if research were inclined towards this orientation, greater advance in our knowledge base would be anticipated.

# Complex Drives

My characterisation of basic human impulses above as "fundamental" components of change is pragmatically driven. Obviously, more complex drives emerge developmentally from the recombination of more primary ones e.g. (Gu *et al.*, 2019), and from the inclusion in awareness of greater range of sensation, affect and cognition. These are by nature more complex and also tend to be more abstract and available to more perspectives but all retain their primordial constituents. The polar drive-pair of autonomy and community, balancing the need for individuation and acceptance is an example. This drive polarity might be met in one way by a second order mind than by a 4th order mind. Personal power in the former and say, sensitive self-authorship in the latter – but the underlying structure remains and thus provides a guide to coaching across a wide range of contexts and cases.

For the formal aspects, e.g. the mental-emotional representation of these components - the structure and process of the nature and experience of these underlying components I will look to personal construct theory, some aspects of theoretical psychology and network and graph theory to help conceptualise the technical aspects of how these fit together. This part, I am finding extremely complex, running into sophisticated mathematics and philosophy, so what this will eventually become remains unclear to me at this time.

# The Grounded Awareness Model

There are many approaches to enacting change. Some rely on cognitive access and agency, for example CBT. If an "issue", a given thought form or process is not available to intra-personal meta-cognitive structures that enable reflection and facilitate any subsequent intervention at a cognitive level, then it's probably beyond the scope of the "C" in CBT. If the issue can be accessed via noncognitive behavioural normalisation, there may be a systemic-adaptive process in which feedback loops originating in behaviour patterning have an effect on the associated cognition. This would be the effect of the "B" in CBT. If neither of these is possible in a given situation, then CBT is likely not a good approach. Similarly, other approaches will have their strengths and weaknesses, for example some approaches take a directly noncognitive route to change, such as NLP. In many cases, NLP does not rely on cognition per se, as much as it does re-training symbolic representation and associations that result in change without needing to know too much about the nature of a given issue. NLP's approach to a phobia cure is dramatically different to the way in which CBT would approach it.

In the grounded awareness model of enacting change, I will suggest a practical model for change that is ambivalent to any given approach and leaves the emergence of change to sustained awareness without a content-based goal. What I mean is that, the specific form of the outcome is not specified as it would be in CBT (or normal coaching reflexivity) for example, it is left explicitly to emergence as to what the particular form will be. This is an emergent process model of change in which the grounded (in the body) sensation and lived experience of a given issue is located and brought within awareness. Awareness is made conscious in a meditative state. In meditation, the "root" of the issue, felt in the body sensation, is recognised and is given to conscious awareness. Whatever cognitive / affective responses to the issue arise are allowed to arise, but are not engaged with - that is, consciousness is maintained. Instead, the issue is retained in conscious awareness in its pre-interpreted phase and the resulting emergence is merely allowed to happen. A model like this one has important differences to the largely dialogue-based inquiries that are common in coaching. In a case like this, the coach takes the role of a guide to the clients experience in the moment, whatever that is, as opposed to other roles more traditionally accepted by coaches such as being a “process expert”.

# Plan for developing the UNC concept

More work is needed to complete the conceptualisation of this section of the doctorate. Deriving the UNC from the literature was my focus in the initial try at the PhD but became secondary to the philosophy in the second attempt. Ideally I will be able to map out the fundamentals and more complex structures from the literature and present these in a way that is compatible with the philosophy and coaching practice. Once this is complete to some degree, I will attempt to show how the UNC appears in the literature and how it can be used as an organisational tool. The UNC, if it turns out the way that I imagine it turning out, will have a number of implications, some of the more important ones will be for research and practice. With this in mind, I plan to include process models and other supporting aspects that would have a normative function, such as those that could be used in supervision, teaching and in things like measurement of outcomes etc.
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