Jung, archetypes and mirroring in organizational change management
Lessons from a longitudinal case study

Adrian Carr

University of Western Sydney, Sydney, Australia

Abstract *Jung's discussion of archetypes and the psychodynamics of mirroring is applied to the results of a ten-year longitudinal case study. Empirical evidence of such psychodynamics and insights into how these psychodynamics are related to the management of change are presented. Directions for further research are also discussed.*

Introduction

The Swiss psychiatrist Carl Gustav Jung (1875-1961) is a person perhaps best remembered for his ideas about a collective unconscious and those ancestral experiences he believed were registered in the brain as *archetypes*. Perhaps, equally, he is remembered for being what many viewed as the son in a love-hate relationship with the father-figure[1] – Sigmund Freud. Jung had been a disciple of Freud from 1906 to 1914, when the two parted company over professional and personal differences. One of the tragedies, and legacies, of the split between Freud and Jung was the creation of separate "camps" of followers who were, and continue to be, reluctant to acknowledge any parallels between Freudian and Jungian concepts.

The intellectual standoff between these two groups of thought has resulted in a "them" and "us" mentality. While there are significant differences between these groups of thought, they do, however, and somewhat ironically, fail to acknowledge the psychodynamics that are also at work in this intellectual standoff. In psychoanalytic terms, there has been a good measure of the process called *splitting*. Briefly stated, this is a regressive reactive process where, as a form of primitive, unconscious, psychological defense, individuals dichotomize the world into "good" and "bad" objects – idealizing the good and, through projection, demonizing the bad. The world gets divided into "us" and "them". For example, Breger (2000) has suggested that after the two parted company, the Freudian camp "demonized" the Jungians, and "anything associated with Jung or his ideas was branded as mystical and taboo" (Breger, 2000, p. 232)[2]. It is in the face of unpleasant and fundamentally different views that the hallmarks of splitting are displayed: generalization, dichotomizing, distortion, concealment, manipulation, exaggeration of differences, and domonization of the "other."

In this paper an outline of Jung's ideas of archetypes and the process of mirroring will be briefly outlined. It will then be shown how these ideas have a resonance with some of the ideas of both Freud and Erich Fromm. In the case of Freud, his description of the psychodynamics involved in the development of an ego-ideal is particularly significant. It is from this analysis that the concepts of archetypes, mirroring, and the ego-ideal are revealed as being significant psychodynamic processes that occur in the workplace. To illustrate the relevance of these psychodynamic processes in the workplace and, in particular, the relevance to the issue of organization change, the results of a ten-year longitudinal case study will be discussed. Let us first direct our attention to the Jungian notions of archetypes and mirroring.

Archetypes and mirroring

The word *archetype*, now part of our everyday vocabulary, is central to the work of Jung. Indeed, it is so much so that many in the arena of psychology prefer the terminology "*archetypal psychology*" as a more apt description of the Jungian school of psychology than the terminology of "analytical psychology" – which was coined by Jung to both capture the intent of his approach and differentiate it from Freud's psychoanalysis. To use the term "archetype" in the true Jungian sense is to invoke, at one and the same time, his theory of the *collective unconscious*, for it is archetypes that comprise the collective unconscious.

The notion of the unconscious was one developed by Freud. He suggested that the realm of the unconscious was one inhabited by previous experiences, memories, feelings and urges, of which the individual was not actively aware due to defensive mechanisms or processes – the major defensive mechanism being that of repression. This subterranean stratum of the psyche, that was not open to the direct conscious scrutiny of the individual, was responsible for a broad range of dynamic effects on conscious processes. For Freud (1905/1977 ed., p. 107) it was the "tools" of psychoanalysis, such as free association and dream analysis, that rendered conscious that which was previously unconscious and in so doing could potentially "free" the patient from a compulsion or behavior that had arisen from the unconscious psychical material.

Jung suggested that Freud's conception of the unconscious refers to the personal part or "layer" of the unconscious and that there is a "deeper" layer, which Jung called the collective unconscious: that which is shared and in common with all humans. The collective unconscious, Jung claimed, contains primordial images and ideas that have emotions and symbolism "attached". These images and ideas become manifest in fantasies, dreams, myths, and emotional responses to the world around us. It is these common patterns of psychic perception that Jung called archetypes. Unfortunately, his view of archetype is often thought of as merely a common image. This very reductionist view does a disservice to the subtlety of Jung's conception.

Jung (1935/1969 ed.) argued that the archetypes are "categories analogous to the logical categories which are always and everywhere present as the basic postulates of reason", akin to Plato's ideal forms, except they are "categories of the imagination" (pp. 517-18). Archetypes are neither inherited (or innate) ideas nor common images, but rather are typical modes of apprehension (Jung, 1916/1969 ed.). An archetype "is determined as to its content only when it has become conscious and is therefore filled out with the material of conscious experience" (Jung, 1938/1968 ed., p. 79). This "content" is an image: archetypes merely hold the possibility of an image. Confusion between the archetype itself and the content of the archetype is in many ways understandable as specific archetypes are often referred to by their symbolic or imaginal manifestations. For example, Jung (1912/1969 ed., p. 419) talks of the "Jonah-and-the-whale" image and says it has "any number of variants, for instance the witch who eats children, the wolf, the ogre, the dragon, and so on". These images are all variants on the theme of being psychologically engulfed: an experience of being devoured or swallowed. Thus, as one writer notes, "the archetype is an abstract theme (engulfment), and the archetypal images (whale, witch, ogre, dragon, etc.) are concrete variations on that theme" (Adams, 1997, pp. 102-3).

Jung described a number of archetypes whose content was anthropomorphic: for example, the anima, the divine child, the great mother, the wise old man, the trickster, and the kore or maiden. The personification was seen as necessary to bring the theme or pattern into our consciousness and thereby enhance our awareness of the existence of the theme of the archetype. There are other archetypes whose content is not so personalized, for example the archetype of rebirth and of wholeness, which Jung called archetypes of transformation in that they are "typical situations, places, ways and means, that symbolize the kind of transformation in question" (Jung, 1959/1969 ed., p. 38). Additionally, it should be noted that as early as 1914 Freud (1918/1990 ed.) also recognized the existence of archetypes, calling them phylogenetic "schemata" and "phylogenetic experience" (p. 317), although earlier still in the *Interpretation of Dreams* he took seriously Nietzsche's view that dreams were a "primeval relic of humanity" and suggested that "dreams and neuroses seem to have preserved more mental antiquities than we could have imagined possible" (Freud, 1900/1988 ed., p. 700). Although Freud seems to allude to the existence of archetypes, Jung (1976/1977 ed.) says of Freud that the Oedipus complex "was the first archetype Freud discovered, the first and only one" (p. 288). Freud (1918/1990 ed.) himself states that the Oedipus complex is one of the phylogenetic schemata, specifically:

> . . . the phylogenetically inherited schemata . . . I am inclined to take the view that they are precipitates from the history of human civilization. The Oedipus complex . . . is one of them – is, in fact, the best known member of the class (p. 363).

Both Freud and Jung were very Lamarckian and neo-Kantian in the manner in which they perceived the architecture of the unconscious. Both these forms of depth psychology envisage aspects of the psyche operating within Kantian

categories of time, space, and causality. In the history of philosophy, these categories bring into focus what is referred to as the transcendental ego, the *reasoned* notion that we adhere to and participate in a communal realm of an ego. Kant argued that the nature and function of understanding is such that it comes equipped with a priori concepts or categories that relate to both substance and causality. The built-in-machinery for interpreting experience is presumed, in order that we make sense of the perceptual excitations to which we are exposed on an everyday basis. It is not that they are innate in the Platonic or Cartesian sense, but that we have organizing principles that help order and recognize cause and effect. They are transcendental in the sense that they correspond to no object in our experience, but are the product of pure reason alone that is prompted by our experience. It was Jung, however, who placed particular emphasis upon these "logical categories" and the collective unconscious. In contrast, Freud continued to assert the prime importance of the personal unconscious. Jung held the conviction that personal growth was significantly a matter of bringing the content of the archetypes into conscious awareness and being in touch with this level of human existence. The archetypes themselves are, in many senses, neither positive nor negative, good nor evil, for they represent ways of organizing and understanding human experience, which, when read through specific experiences, all have a "light" and "dark" side.

Jung and Freud both developed a fairly complex view of human nature and the development of personality. Some have argued, incorrectly in my view, that "according to Freudian theory the character of a person was more or less completely formed at the age of seven or eight and hence fundamental changes in later years were supposed to be virtually impossible" (Fromm, 1982, p. 66). Jungian thinking, on the other hand, suggests that character and identity are in a process of continual development, in part through the process of "mirroring", in which figures (such as the mother) reflect back to the infant the appropriateness of the infant's own identity and actions and, in so doing, provide an emotional basis for the infant's identity and development (Jung, 1940/1969 ed.). This process of mirroring is not merely confined to the early period of development, but is an ongoing dynamic of seeking out others and environments that confirm this self-identity. The unfolding awareness of the unconscious dimensions of oneself can be anxiety producing. The concept of mirroring as an ongoing process has been further elaborated and developed by others – perhaps most notably Heinz Kohut (1971; see also Jacoby, 1993),who viewed mirroring as one of two narcissistically invested transference reactions (the other was idealizing transference). On the one hand, the infant seeks the approval of the parent in an act of both recognition and confirmation. On the other hand, the infant seeks to be like the parent in a sense of the parent being the perfect and omnipotent "other". Thus, development of self involves these entwined dynamics. Freud's views, too, are not far away from these dynamics.

In his second theory of the mind, Freud (1926/1983 ed., 1933/1988 ed., 1940/1986 ed.) posited a topography of the now famous realms or provinces he

dubbed the id, ego, and superego. This topography, presented in his "unassuming sketch" (Freud, 1933/1988 ed., p. 11), was not meant to be taken as a literal pictorial representation, as he insisted that psychical processes have an intangible quality (Freud, 1933/1988 ed., p. 112). The metaphorical fiction called the mind, and its fictive constructs, gave Freud an imagery to capture what he believed to be specific and interactive processes. The ego is, according to Freud, that realm of the mind that uses logic, memory, and judgment to *appropriately* seek to satisfy the unconscious biological urges, drives, or instincts of the id. The ego must resolve whether to satisfy the demands of the id, postpone satisfaction, or suppress the demands. In making such a decision one aspect that needs to be considered by the ego is the social acceptability and constraints involved in carrying through the demands of the id. These societal "rules" are part of the realm of the superego. The superego takes on the rules of conduct that are demanded by parents (through the Oedipus or Electra complex) and other significant authority figures. Through the process of identification the superego gains its script, which guides the ego in its functioning in both a positive and negative manner. Badcock captures this important dynamic when he says:

> The superego provides a sense of moral and aesthetic self-judgement (conscience and values, in other words), both in a positive sense as acting as an *ego-ideal* and in the negative one in performing the role of censor of the ego's wishes … Failure to meet the demands of the superego creates feelings of moral anxiety (Badcock, 1988, p. 122, original emphasis).

(See also Carr, 1994, p. 211; English and English, 1958, p. 535; Laplanche and Pontalis, 1988, p. 145.)

Freud viewed the ego-ideal as being generated in an individual to try to recover some of the narcissistic perfection enjoyed in childhood. "What he projects before him as his ideal is the substitute for the lost narcissism of his childhood in which he was his own ideal" (Freud, 1914/1984 ed., p. 88). It is by a process of identification that this ego-ideal is formed and re-formed. Laplanche and Pontalis define the term identification as a "psychological process whereby the subject assimilates an aspect, property or attribute of the other and is transformed, wholly or partially, after the model the other provides. *It is by means of a series of identifications that the personality is constituted and specified*" (Laplanche and Pontalis, 1988, p. 205, emphasis added). The individual's identity emerges from the integration of such identifications in what is, largely, an unconscious process.

The notion of the ego-ideal being continually reformed is somewhat parallel to Jung's ongoing dynamic of mirroring and its purposes. The dynamics of idealization are also apparent in this model of identity development. The "engine" in these approaches is virtually the same: the search for recognition/ affirmation from "powerful" others. Capable of occurring in virtually any setting, these psychological processes are particularly relevant in contexts where power dynamics are played out. In this way, we should expect to see identification, mirroring, and splitting in organizational settings. It will be from this discussion of the work setting that the results of a ten-year longitudinal

case study of organization change will then be discussed and, again, the relevance of these psychodynamic processes will be highlighted.

Archetypes, character types and mirroring processes in the work setting

The work organization is an important setting in the psychodynamics of identity formation and development. Western cultures have, in large measure, encouraged individuals to gauge their self-worth, and view their identity, in terms of their employment status. The leaders in work organizations, through their command of symbolic and material rewards, encourage organizational members to adopt behaviors, attitudes and values that mirror those of the organisation. A degree of compliance ensues, in part, in order to receive narcissistic gratification and, in part, to avoid punative behavior for non-compliance. This mirroring behavior substitutes the ego-ideal with an *organization ideal* (Carr, 1994, 1998; Schwartz, 1987). The ideal that the organisation wishes the employees to mirror can be thought of as encouraging a character type (Maccoby, 1976).

In a pioneering study of organization-related character types, Michael Maccoby (1976) looked at managers in high technology organizations. In his book, *The Gamesman* (1976, p. 173), he describes the different character types that seem to be required at different levels of these organizations:

> Any organization of work . . . can be described as a psychostructure that selects and moulds character . . . those traits that are useful to the work are stimulated and reinforced while others that are unnecessary or that impede work are frustrated, suppressed, or unused and gradually weaken.

Maccoby identified four main psychological types in the corporate structure that were "distinct from one another in terms of the individual member's overall orientation to work, values and self-identity" (Maccoby, 1976, p. 45). These character types he dubbed: the craftsman; the jungle fighter; the company man; and, the most successful in the organizations he studied, the gamesman, to whom work was seen as a game. This gamesman used "head" qualities (intelligence, systems thinking, etc.), thrived on competition, and gained pleasure in controlling the play. The "heart" qualities (feelings, generosity, compassion, idealism, capacity to love) were not encouraged in these corporations and, accordingly, these qualities were not well developed in this major character type.

In this way, individuals assimilate their identity such that they *mirror* that which the organisation seeks as an ideal-type, or perhaps even an "archetypal" image within the organization. One is left to speculate whether what Maccoby has described as character types are in fact imaginal manifestations of what Jung originally described as "categories of the imagination", i.e. archetypes (1935/1969 ed., pp. 517-18). A meta-analysis to explore to what degree these character types do indeed reflect archetypal images has yet to be undertaken. The field of organizational studies, and those under this umbrella such as organizational behavior and organizational psychology, have yet to embrace

the pioneering work of Maccoby to the degree that it becomes part of the conventional wisdom. There has been no critical analysis of Maccoby's work that calls into question his findings, possibly due to the neglect of and resistance to psychodynamic theory in organizational studies discourse. A recently completed longitudinal research study, by the author of this paper, provides evidence of these psychodynamics as well as a deeper appreciation of the management of change. It is to the results of this study I now wish to now direct our attention.

A longitudinal case study of mirroring in the context of organizational change

In the year 2000, the last part of a ten-year research study was completed. The initial aim of the study was to understand the nature and extent of work-related stress amongst school principals, employed in state government schools in Australia, during a period of organizational change. The school principal was called on to become responsible for managing the total financial aspects of the school, as well as engaging in greater levels of management of the school, in general. Thus the role of the principal would have a greater emphasis upon management than educational/pedagogical leadership. The results of this case study, of organizational change, provide very clear evidence of the psychodynamics that have been discussed in this paper. The case study also provide some valuable clues as to how, by appreciating these psychodynamics, the management of the change process could be more effective.

In early 1990, from a stratified sample of 100 principals employed in public schools in South Australia, 94 completed a clinical analysis questionnaire (CAQ). Psychologists administer the CAQ to their clients in order to gain information about some 28 personality and clinical traits. The CAQ responses are "scored" and placed on a scale ranging from zero to ten. Scored against the general population, a score of 4.5 to 6.5 is considered average. "Normal" personality traits, clinical factors and "second order" factors, including depression and anxiety, are scaled accordingly. This scale has a mean of 5.5, with scores of 4.5 to 6.5 considered average, and scores that are above and below this average are considered significant in the manner depicted in Table I. Of the 94 (i.e. 37 percent), who completed a valid CAQ, 35 appeared to have a high level of anxiety and/or depression

Although the intention was to use the CAQ clinical scales to reveal those who were experiencing high levels of anxiety and depression, the personality profiles for individuals in this cohort proved to be more interesting. It was expected that the personality profiles would be different for each individual as there are for any general population. What the results of this study found was that the personality profile of the overall sample of principals was clustered in the "average" range. The immediate conclusion might be that this was a simple artifact of people of a certain personality type being attracted to this form of employment. To investigate this further, a CAQ was administered to a sample of 100 teachers employed in the same schools. The profiles of these teachers

Factor	Description	
	Low score <——————— Average ——————> High score	
Warmth	Reserved, detached, aloof	Warm, personable, engaging
Intelligence	Concrete thinking	Abstract thinking
Emotional stability	Easily upset	Emotionally stable, calm
Dominance	Submissive, accommodating	Dominant, assertive, competitive
Boldness	Shy, timid	Bold, venturesome
Sensitivity	Tough minded, insensitive	Sensitive, tender minded
Imagination	Practical, down-to-earth	Imaginative, absent minded
Insecurity	Confident, self-satisfied	Insecure, apprehensive
Radicalism	Conservative, traditional	Experimenting, innovative

Source: Adapted from Krug and Catell (1980)

also revealed a clustering or common profile. However, the teachers' profile was different to that of the principals. Teachers revealed high levels of caring and nurturing, abstract thinking, boldness, sensitivity and imagination – the common stereotypical images we might have of teachers. The problem here is to explain how the profiles of the principals, who had been teachers in this same system, came to change. Thus, the fact that there was a common profile required explanation, as did the nature of the profile itself.

In the progressive process of mirroring, principals suppressed the warmth, sensitivity, imagination and innovative characteristics of teachers and came to identify with an ideal that was differently specified, implicitly and explicitly, by the employing state government authority. The ideal that the state education department was seeking to impart to school principals was one that cast them into the role of managers. At the same time, the authorities discouraged principals from seeing themselves as professional educators. The paradox in the culture that the state authority sought to impart was that these principals had been promoted through the system on the basis of their teaching expertise and pedagogical criteria. The role of manager, which has concern for technical efficiency and managerial issues (as defined by the education department), was perceived to often conflict with their core values as educational leaders. A different ideal, one which suppressed the traditional caring and nurturing traits of the principals' former roles, was being imposed by the employer. Principals were thus torn between the values and behaviors associated with the role of providing educational leadership and those associated with the need to strive for efficiency gains. Anxiety and depression were found to be the resulting *emotional fall-out*.

Ten years on
The psychodynamics that we have outlined in this paper – the process of mirroring and the identification with an organization ideal – seem to explain the anxiety and depression. Confirming evidence arises from the most recent

tracking of the initial respondents. In October/November of 1999, successful contact was made with 20 of the original group of 35 respondents. Each was asked to retake the CAQ and to participate in a one-on-one interview. The CAQ component was completed in late 1999 or early 2000. Two major findings emerged from those data. The first finding was that, with two exceptions, the level of anxiety and/or depression had abated to now be in the normal range or below. The second major finding was that the clustering of personality traits that was noted back in 1990 was no longer present in either the individual or the group as a whole. The previously detected profile (or in Maccoby terminology, "psychostructure") was no more and in its place was an array of distribution that would be expected in any generalized population. Why the change? The answer to this was to be found in the second component of the study that involved a semi-structured, taped interview. The semi-structured interview targeted changes in the lives of these individuals in the last ten years. Questions included the following:

- What action did you take over the diagnosis of the high level of personal stress back in 1990?

- If you reported your stress to the education department, what was their response?

- What has changed in your life since 1990, particularly in relation to your work situation?

- Under what circumstances did you cease employment with the education department?

- In a word or phrase, how would you describe your feelings toward to education department?

- What kind of dreams do you now have? Could you recount three dreams you have had in the last week or so?

Almost half of the principals reported that, as a result of that initial diagnosis, they consulted their medical practitioner and, in many cases, proceeded on workers' compensation or some other form of leave. Those principals who reported their stress to the department generally found them less than helpful, not sympathetic. The initiative for some therapeutic action seemed to rest with the stressed individual. One of the principals reported speaking to the superintendent who responded by saying: "if you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen!"

Many of the principals in this study reported accepting a retirement "package" in 1994, or soon thereafter. The early retirement package represented quite a large sum of money at the time. In addition, most had access to a pension that was for the rest of their lives. One might have thought that those in this study who received these packages would be grateful for the gesture. They were not. Their lack of "gratitude" is significant and critical to the process of mirroring. Most of the principals in the study reported feeling, as one

principal put it, "abandoned, and at the convenience of the department". All who took the packages viewed themselves as being prematurely retired. During the interview some of their feelings became clearer.

When asked to describe feelings toward the education department, the most positive response was from the principal who replied: "I have no complaints". Other comments were much less positive:

> I was glad to go (c.f. sad to go); cynical; they crucified me; anger for their lack of support; disappointed; department acted toward me *like a disinterested parent*; the buggers do not care a damn about people; disappointed in their lack of integrity; acted toward me in a manner best described as bestiality or brutality; I had served my master and father well, but it seemed I was to be railroaded out of the ED; they abandoned me; discarded me; disillusioned; treated me like a brick in the wall; I have been treated like a naughty child for getting sick – an illness that they induced; and, made to feel that I was troublesome.

Comments about the department acting like a disinterested parent resonated with other metaphors in the stories of these principals. It was as though many of them had "grown-up" in the department for the whole of their working lives and thought the department, like a parent, would look after their welfare. The package represented a severance of that relationship in addition to a perceived lack of care and loss of the organization ideal.

Discussion

This paper commenced with a discussion of Jung's notion of archetypes and mirroring and then proceeded to show how the psychodynamics of mirroring, in particular, have a parallel in the work of Freud. It is clear that the workplace is a potent influence in the ongoing processes of people seeking to gain recognition and confirmation, as "good" employees, wanting to become like the idealized "other" in a process of being encouraged to mirror certain behavior and values. The results of the longitudinal study reported in this paper provide evidence of mirroring. From this evidence, a number of issues arise.

The work organization, through its reward and punitive systems, may encourage a mirroring and strong identification with certain behaviors and values – an organization ideal. It is clear from the case study that organizational norms supporting certain character types leave a psychological fingerprint on individuals in the organization. By becoming aware of the psychological import of various work practices, the organization might gain an understanding of the symbols and practices that have contributed to the cultural messages that are being given to employees. If through its reward "schemes", for example, the organization encourages identification with individualism, competitiveness, ambition, power seeking, etc., the shadow side might be lack of team work, lack of information sharing, politicking, subversion of others, psychological withdrawal, stress, etc. The evidence of these extremes is found in the psychological profile that is produced. Further, these profiles also reveal the neglected and underdeveloped aspects of the individual's personality. A psychological audit of an organization would thus appear to have considerable merit.

The advocacy of psychological audits must not be construed as merely another battery of psychological tests for the employee. Notions of mirroring and identification inherently conceive of the employee in an *interactive relationship* with the leadership and organization structures and processes. In this context, a psychological audit needs to include a psychological appraisal of the leaders of the organization, for, in another facet of the identification dynamic, there is a significant amount of accumulated evidence that organization structure and processes may be simply an extension of the "self" of the leader(s) (see Kets de Vries and Miller (1991) for an appraisal of this literature). The leaders themselves maybe engaged in a pathological or exaggerated form of narcissism that is really an over compensation for neglect earlier in life and a lack of being valued as a person in their own right rather than as a surrogate for their parents' (or significant others') ambitions. Leadership positions may afford an individual the very opportunity to over self-indulge and self-aggrandize. Bearing in mind the age of many CEOs, it should also be stated that this earlier-in-life-neglect, when coupled with mid-life crises, is a particularly potent mixture. In this context we may find the individual trying to cope with feelings of insecurity, vulnerability and mortality while exuding self-confidence – surely a recipe for character instability. In a work environment the display of charm by a leader may be wrapped in a motivation for self, but in private a certain emptiness is evident – i.e. a schizoid character that is an outcome of pathological narcissism (see Kohut, 1971: also Alford, 1988). It is in this context that an audit of work practices linked to subordinate-superordinate relationships would appear desirable.

We are all too familiar with the battery of psychological tests used for recruitment and selection. We are also all too familiar with the notion of industrial inspectors and alike to ensure that a workplace is ergonomically and physically a safe place to work and punitive measures that can be taken at law if the workplace is "unsafe" or has contributed to an "injury" to a worker. In a similar vein, one might also suggest that organizations have an ethical obligation to undertake psychological audits and make the results public and available to potential employees, for it is not only the individual employees but also wider society who bear the burden of the consequences of psychological ill-health that comes from inappropriate values promoted in the workplace.

The other psychological process described in the beginning of this article is that of splitting. Just as some of the loyal followers of Jung and those of Freud have been prone to projecting all negative qualities onto the other, so, too, did the principals and the state blame the other for all their troubles. This is not (in the author's view, particularly in the case of the principals) to suggest that the blame was not justified in part, or in full. However, the lack of empathy on the part of the state toward its former employees, and the general hostility between groups show that splitting, too, is an important psychodynamic process in the workplace, even today, and needs to be recognized in any organizational analysis.

Concluding comments

The psychodynamics described in this paper have many other implications for work organizations and the management of change. However, there is one further issue that should be highlighted. There are certain character types that seem to be able to be coined in a term or phrase and have some resonance, or they seem instantly recognizable. To this point, there has been very little effort in the organization discourse to explore the degree to which such character types are, as was noted earlier, imaginal manifestations (of what Jung originally described as "categories of the imagination"), i.e. archetypes (1935/ 1969 ed., pp. 517-18). The work of Jung, on the notion of the collective unconscious, does demonstrate that myths and tales show a remarkable pattern of similarity irrespective of the culture. The degree to which the archetypal images are manifest in work-related character types might be a useful area of research in a context of understanding and predicting behavior in a period of change. Examining under what conditions certain archetypal images emerge and their relationship to other images will surely help to enhance understanding of behavior in work organizations.

Notes

1. On 16 April 1909 Freud wrote a letter to Jung in which in the opening paragraphs he says:

   It is strange that on the very same evening when I adopted you as eldest son and anointed you – *in partibus infidelium* ("in the lands of the unbelievers") – as my successor and crown prince, you should have divested me of my paternal dignity, which divesting seems to have given you as much pleasure as I, on the contrary, derived from the investiture of your person. Now I am afraid of falling back into the father role with you if I tell you how I feel about the poltergeist business (McGuire, 1979, p. 144).

   The father-son language is apparent in their correspondence, but the extent of father-son relationship remains a point of some dispute (for example, see McGuire, 1979, pp. 8-35).

2. To ensure that the public and his followers did not misunderstand the "secessionist" movements founded by both Jung and Adler, Freud wrote a fairly polemical work entitled *On the History of the Psycho-analytic Movement*, in which he insisted that both the "heretics . . . cease to describe their theories as 'psychoanalysis' " (Freud, 1914/1984 ed., p. 237; see also Noland, 1999, pp. 39-98).

References

Adams, M. (1997), "The archetypal school", in Young-Eisendrath, P. and Dawson, T. (Eds), *The Cambridge Companion to Jung*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 101-18.

Alford, C. (1988), *Narcissism: Socrates, the Frankfurt School, and Psychoanalytic Theory*, Yale University, New Haven, CT.

Badcock, C. (1988), *Essential Freud*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.

Breger, L. (2000), *Freud, Darkness in the Midst of Vision*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY.

Carr, A. (1994), "For self or others? The quest for narcissism and the ego-ideal in work organisations", *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 208-22.

Carr, A. (1998), "Identity, compliance and dissent in organizations: a psychoanalytic perspective", *Organization*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 81-99.

English, H. and English, A. (1958), *A Comprehensive Dictionary of Psychological and Psychoanalytical Terms*, David McKay, New York, NY.

Freud, S. (1977), "Three essays on the theory of sexuality", *On Sexuality*, Vol. 7, pp. 33-169, Pelican Freud Library, Harmondsworth (original work published 1905).

Freud, S. (1983), "Inhibitions, symptoms and anxiety", *On Psychopathology*, Vol. 10, pp. 229-333, Pelican Freud Library, Harmondsworth (original work published 1926).

Freud, S. (1984), *Historical and Expository Works on Psychoanalysis*, Vol. 15, Pelican Freud Library, Harmondsworth (original work published 1914).

Freud, S. (1986), "An outline of psychoanalysis', *Historical and Expository Works on Psychoanalysis*, Vol. 15, pp. 371-443, Pelican Freud Library, Harmondsworth (original work published 1940).

Freud, S. (1988), *Interpretation of Dreams*, Vol. 4, Pelican Freud Library, Harmondsworth (original work published 1900).

Freud, S. (1988), *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*, Vol. 2, Pelican Freud Library, Harmondsworth (original work published 1933).

Freud, S. (1990), "From the history of an infantile neurosis (the 'wolf man')", *Case Histories II*, Vol. 9, pp. 227-366, Pelican Freud Library, Harmondsworth (original work published 1918).

Fromm, E. (1982), *Greatness and Limitations of Freud's Thought*, Abacus/Sphere, London.

Jacoby, M. (1993), *Individuation and Narcissism: The Psychology of the Self in Jung and Kohut*, Routledge, London.

Jung, C. (1968), "Psychological aspects of the mother archetype", in *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung, The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, 2nd ed., Vol. 9 Part 1, pp. 75-110, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ (original work published 1938).

Jung, C. (1969), *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung, Symbols of Transformation*, 2nd ed., Vol. 5, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ (original work published 1912).

Jung, C. (1969), "The transcendent function", in *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung, The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche,* 2nd ed., Vol. 8, pp. 67-91, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ (original work published 1916).

Jung, C. (1969), "Psychological commentary on *The Tibetan Book of the Dead*", in *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung, Psychology and Religion, West and East*, 2nd ed., Vol. 11, pp. 509-26, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ (original work published 1935).

Jung, C. (1969), "The psychology of the child archetype', *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung, The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, 2nd ed., Vol. 9 Part 1, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ (original work published 1940)

Jung, C. (1969), *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung, The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* (2nd ed., Vol. 9, Parts 1 & 11), Princeton University, Princeton, NJ (original work published 1959).

Jung, C. (1977), "The Houston films", in McGuire, W. and Hull, R. (Eds), *C.G. Jung Speaking: Interviews and Encounters*, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ (original work published 1976).

Kets de Vries, M. and Miller, D. (1991), "Leadership styles and organizational cultures: the shaping of neurotic organizations", in Kets de Vries, M. (Ed.), *Organizations on the Couch*, pp. 243-63, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.

Kohut, H. (1971), *The Analysis of the Self*, International Universities, New York, NY.

Krug, S. and Cattell, R. (1980), *Clinical Analysis Questionnaire Manual*, Institute for Personality and Ability Testing Inc., Champaign, IL.

McGuire, W. (Ed.) (1979), *The Freud/Jung Letters*, Penguin, Harmondsworth.

Maccoby, M. (1976), *The Gamesman*, Simon & Schuster, New York, NY.

Noland, R. (1999), *Sigmund Freud Revisited*, Twanyne, New York, NY.

Schwartz, H. (1987), "Anti-social actions of committed organizational participants: an existential psychoanalytic perspective", *Organization Studies*, Vol. 8 No. 4, pp. 327-40.