

Ligato: Relationships Based on Honesty

William Bergquist, Ph. D. and Suzanne Brennan Nathan, Psy.D.

We all know that it is best to be honest. Even in the Boy Scout Code there is an emphasis on honesty. It is tied to the first quality of the code: Trustworthy. A Scout is defined as “*Trustworthy. A Scout tells the truth. He keeps his promises. Honesty is part of his code of conduct. People can depend on him.*” This means that honesty is not just a general virtue but a core part of a Scout’s character and reliability. We similarly find an emphasis on honesty in many religious creeds and self-help books (such as Jessica Alba’s *The Honest Life* (Alba, 2013). We also see the matter of honesty – and wide-spread dishonesty—being addressed in the work of Dan Ariely, a noted behavioral economist (Ariely, 2012).

We agree with the scouts and these authors regarding the importance of honesty and find this interpersonal value to be central to the formation and sustaining of an important and constructive relationship. We have identified this forming and sustaining as *Ligato*—Latin for the “binding” of a relationship.

However, we wish to push the usual analysis further than it usually goes by introducing the four-fold model of interpersonal relationships originally offered by Joe Luft and Harrington Ingham in their widely- deployed Johari Window (Luft, 1969; Luft, 1984). It is in each of the four panes of the Johari Window that we find a unique version of honesty.

The Original Johari Window

Joe Luft and Harrington Ingham’s original model contained four quadrants that represented the total person in relation to other people. The following definitions and principles are substantially the same as those presented in both *On Human Interaction* (Luft, 1969) and Luft’s second major book, *Group Processes* (Luft, 1984)

Quadrant 1 (Q1): the open quadrant, refers to behavior, feelings, and motivation known to self and to others. [often called “public self”]

Quadrant 2 (Q2): the blind quadrant, refers to behavior, feelings, and motivation known to others but not to self. [often called “unaware self”]

Quadrant 3 (Q3): the hidden quadrant, refers to behavior, feelings, and motivation known to self but not to others. [often called the “private self”]

Quadrant 4 (Q4): the unknown quadrant, refers to behavior, feelings, and motivation known neither to self nor to others. [often called the “potential self”]

The original model helped to clarify changes in awareness and openness as well as changes in tension, defensiveness, and hostility. Certain universal questions were addressed through the model—questions about the effect of unknowns on human interaction, trust, levels of miscommunication, ancient and primitive leadership patterns, and appropriate disclosure of self.

Figure One:
The Original Johari Window

	KNOWN TO SELF	UNKNOWN TO SELF
KNOWN TO OTHERS	QUADRANT ONE OPEN SELF PUBLIC SELF	QUADRANT TWO BLIND SELF UNAWARE SELF
UNKNOWN TO OTHERS	QUADRANT THREE HIDDEN SELF PRIVATE SELF	QUADRANT FOUR UNKNOWN SELF POTENTIAL SELF

The primary principles of change offered by Luft regarding the Original Johari Model were:

1. A change in any one quadrant will affect all other quadrants.
2. It takes energy to hide, deny, or be blind to behavior that is involved in interaction.
3. Threat tends to decrease awareness; mutual trust tends to increase awareness.
4. Forced awareness (exposure) is undesirable and usually ineffective.
5. Interpersonal learning means a change has taken place so that quadrant 1 is larger, and one or more of the other quadrants has grown smaller.
6. Working with others is facilitated by a large enough area of free activity. It means more of the resources and skills of the people involved can be applied to the task at hand.
7. The smaller the first quadrant, the poorer the communication.
8. There is universal curiosity about the unknown area, but this is held in check by custom, social training, and diverse fears.
9. Sensitivity means appreciating the covert aspects of behavior, in quadrants 2, 3, and 4, and respecting the desire of others to keep them so.
10. Learning about group processes, as they are being experienced, helps to increase awareness

(enlarging quadrant 1) for the group as a whole as well as for individual members.

11. The value system of a group and its membership may be noted in the way unknowns in life of the group are confronted.

Each of these eleven principles apply to the matter of honesty and to the creation of *Ligato*.

Quad One Honesty

First, within quadrant one we find the capacity and willingness of us to be honest with other people regarding our beliefs, perspectives, assumptions and practices. As noted in these principles, it takes energy to hide what we are feeling or thinking (principle one). And our communication with other people fails to be effective (principle seven).

However, we are also taking risks when we disclose everything that resides in our psyche about ourselves or about other people. It is often a struggle to determine what is to be shared and what is to be held in our hidden or private self (quad two). Nevertheless, as noted, this hiding requires energy and often diverts attention from what should be the focus of our attention. It is often a matter of not whether we should be honest; it is more a matter of what should be our focus at anyone point in time. We can easily be distracted by the matter of disclosure and honesty.

Quad Two Honesty

There is also energy being dispensed by other people when they hold off disclosing their reactions to us. They are not being honest, and this leads them often to not pay attention to what we are saying or even how we are relating to them at any one point in time. Luft's third principle suggests that under conditions of threat, the levels of disclosure and honesty tend to decline. Quad Two (Blind Self/Unaware Self) grows larger, at the expense of the other three quadrants (principle one).

It is in this interactive dynamic operating in the Johari Window that we find the complexity of true honesty. It is not just the matter of one of us being honest; it is also the matter of the other person's desire (and ability) to be honest (quad two). It is a matter of mutual trust and willingness to be honest that is key (principle three). Furthermore, this honesty can't be forced (as has often been done in many human relations workshops) (principle four). Enforcement produces threat, which in turn reduces the potential for honesty.

Quad One and Two Honesty

As Joe Luft proposes, honesty is not just an expression of higher order values as the self-help books extoll. Honesty and the expansion of quad one leads to interpersonal learning (principle five). We learn by sharing with others (quad one) and receiving their feedback regarding what we have said and done (quad two). Honesty in quad one also leads to more productive work being done by two people or an entire group (principle six).

Quad Three Honesty

It is in this third quad where we find the most challenging and most intimate of all demands for honesty. The question arising from this quad is: how honest can we be with ourselves? As noted in the first part of Luft's principle nine, there are covert aspects of behavior in quad three (as well as quads two and four). Parts of ourselves are not only disliked by other people; they are also disliked by us. How honest are we all the time about these less desirable aspects of ourselves? What about the least aspects of ourselves (such as our envy of other people's success)? What about those aspects that tend to emerge when we are frightened (such as our retreat from the current scene)? And how do we appraise (and hide) those behaviors in our repertoire that are

reserved for people whom we don't like, whom we fear, or on whom we are overly dependent (such as our lashing out in anger)? There are so many ways in which we want to hide ourselves from ourselves.

We fail to be honest even within the third quadrant. Books have been written about the “intimate enemy” to whom we are married or with whom we have established a long-term intimate relationship (Ruben, xxx). Perhaps a book needed to be written about the even more intimate enemy—this being ourselves. There clearly are parts of ourselves that we don't fully appreciate, and other people may see better than we do. Furthermore, we are likely to project what we don't like in ourselves onto other people. We view the other person as being envious of us (rather than we being envious of them), or as escaping from their responsibility (ignoring the fact that we are the one who is running away).

Most importantly, we are inclined to project our anger onto other people when we are anxious. We view them as always being angry with us, when, in fact, we are the ones expressing our anger toward them. We declare that we should not be the target of this other person's anger and reinforce this declaration by maintaining our anger toward this other person and by always targeting them with our anger. This projection not only blocks our ability to be honest with ourselves (quad three); it also distorts our own view of the other person (our quad two related to them).

There is a related question: how much can we really see ourselves? We like to think that we are insightful about ourselves; however, other people (quad two) may see things about us that we have a much harder time sitting with or even recognizing. The same might be true of a relationship. How much can we really see about the way our relationship with other people is operating. Our view of self within this relationship resides in quadrant three and is often quite distorted, in part because our emotional connection (our binding) with this person distorts our perception of the relationship.

Quad Four Honesty

Finally, there is the matter of the fourth quad in the Johari Window. As Joe Luft mentions, there is “universal curiosity” about this “unknown” area (principle eight). Novels are written about that which escapes our awareness. Songs about “the music of the night” (*Les Miserable*) touch our “soul” and we repeatedly play versions of these songs. Yet we also run away from reducing the size of this quad, by listening to the feedback delivered by other people (quad two). We also run away from our own “honest” appraisal of our personal biases, fears, aspirations and beliefs. We form a “bubble of belief” (Weitz and Bergquist, 2024) that is often reinforced by our affiliation with other “true believers” (Hoffer, 1951). Our trips to the psychotherapy office are cut short because of the painful discoveries that await us. This is another of the important, and unique, contributions to be made by Luft and Ingham. Their Johari Window points to the challenge of being honest not only with other people (quad one) but also being honest with ourselves (quad four).

There is also the matter of interpersonal context that Luft identifies in his final three principles. We must not only avoid forceful exposure of quad two material but must also respect (“appreciate”) the desire of other people to remain private about some of their thoughts and feelings, especially as these relate to ourselves or other members of a group (principle nine). It is often in the overall building of trust among members of a group that we find the emergence of honesty on the part of the group's members (principle ten). It is often the least honest of the group members who set the overall standard (norm) for disclosure and feedback in the group. And it is often in the gradual increase in level of trust and honesty in a group that we find the often-miraculous emergence from quad four of profound insights, deep learning and creativity (principle eleven).

Honesty in Psychotherapy

Honesty in all four panes is prerequisite to binding relationships in all sectors of society. However, it is particularly important in the sector of emotional healing. Both the psychotherapist and client must display honesty in the therapeutic relationship regarding their disclosure (quads one and four), their feedback (quads one and two), and (in depth-based psychotherapy) their exploration of that which is hidden from both of them. When dishonesty is prevalent then successful psychotherapy is challenged.

One of us [SBN] offers a candid example of the dishonesty that was prevalent in one of her most challenging cases. While working with Sally (who is featured later in this book), Suzanne also was treating Sally's partner (we will call him Sam). This is where the trouble began.

I was treating [Sally's] partner, Sam. He said he was going to quit being treated if I didn't see her. That's how desperately he wanted me to see her. And I felt like this isn't normally a good idea. And now, in retrospect, I think there are some insane parts of my decision. Because, first, you're not even supposed to be treating two people who are closely related. Furthermore, he's seven years sober, while his girlfriend's active. He shouldn't even be in a relationship with her. In the A.A. program, they call that 13th stepping. He shouldn't even be dating someone who's not sober.

We see the first indication of dishonesty showing up in Sam's psychic window. It was taking place in his third quadrant. He was not being honest with himself about the risk he was taking in establishing an intimate relationship with someone who was still struggling with her addiction:

Sam should know better than that. It's dangerous for his sobriety. And nobody who's struggling with sobriety is in any place to be able to be in a relationship and be fully present in a relationship with someone who is active. Not only that, the ups and downs of a relationship can precipitate someone relapsing.

At this point we find that Suzanne herself was not being totally honest with Sam. In retrospect, Suzanne realized that should have moved her concerns about Sam's relationship with Sally from her second quadrant to her first, public quadrant:

I should have been saying to him, "I'll see her, but I really think you two need to take a break from this relationship." This up, but it was totally dismissed by him. That's not going to happen. I only have so much power over what people do. But I could have said, "I think it's probably not a good idea for me to be treating your girlfriend."

But things got much worse when Sam was found to often be dishonest in his relationship with Suzanne. There were many features of his own life that he was not moving from quad three to quad one:

There were some things in Sam's relationship with Sally that I didn't see, as well as other aspects of his life that he held back from me. First, he was lying to me about a lot of things. He was distancing himself emotionally from his relationship with Sally but never let me know of this shift. Second, Sam had a big secret. I had helped him get the right to visit his kid. He had no visitation privilege with his child. Later I found out from Sally that he had sexually molested two of his sisters. He never told me or shared anything about it, I would have been much more concerned about visitations with his daughter, even though I honestly don't think he was sexually abusing his daughter.

All of this concerns honesty. I was in treatment with this guy for at least four years. And I don't know these major things about his life that would have influenced decisions that I made. He kept the sexual molestation a secret. Not only that he ended up getting involved with somebody else in the A.A.

program about a year after Sally was seeing me. That was a total secret that accompanied a host of lies. Later he ended up breaking up with Sally. Eventually, Sam married this other woman. It was horrible for Sally, because they were all in the same AA group. And they had the same group of AA friends. He lied and manipulated.

At this point, Suzanne identified an important dynamic operating in Sally's psychic window:

Sam's dishonesty was something everybody but Sally knew in their A.A. group.

Like many of us, when we are in love with another person, Sally was blocking out important information entering her public quad (one) that would move to her second quad (regarding Sam). She "didn't see" what Sam was doing. Or perhaps she did "see" but isolated this perception in her second quad. If this is the case, then Sally is being dishonest in her own window (quad two), just as Sam is being dishonest in his quad one. Dishonesty breeds dishonesty in relationships that are important and dishonest.

Suzanne offers a comment regarding Sam's dishonesty and her ongoing relationship with Sally:

I was glad I was her therapist, because we both felt really betrayed. I felt like he hadn't been honest with me at all about anything happening in his life. So, I wondered, what kind of treatment was I doing with him anyways, because what I was doing with him was all based on a lot of lies. And Sally felt like their relationship was filled with lies, too. So I was very supportive of her. It was like, whoa, who is this person? Who is this person with whom we were both related. We don't know.

As we leave this challenging psychotherapeutic episode, there are multiple insights to be gained about honesty when introducing the dynamics of Joe Luft's Johari Window. We find that dishonesty in quad two leads to an unwillingness to acknowledge what is occurring in the behavior of another person. We are dishonest with ourselves and as a result are vulnerable to the manipulation of this other person. They may not themselves be aware of this manipulation, being dishonest about their own motivations and behavior (quad one).

Underlying this dynamic is a self-escalating pattern: we are dishonest with another person, they are unaware of or unwilling to admit to this dishonesty, and we become increasingly dishonest. We are likely to identify this dishonesty as simply being a "convenience" or as a way not to hurt the other person's feelings. Sam didn't want to hurt Sally by telling her about his emotional disengagement or his relationship with the other members of their A.A. group. He "cared" about Sally by insisting that Suzanne see Sally in therapy. He also "cared" for Sally by not sharing anything important with Suzanne about his relationship with Sally—for Suzanne might have disclosed something to Sally about Sam's shifting feelings, which, in turn, would have wounded Sally. Suzanne admits that she is also drawn into this cluster of dishonesties when reticent to confront Sam with his unwise decision to remain in relationship with Sally.

As is often the case when dishonesty is saturating a set of relationships, the initial motive may reside in a desire to "care for" one another. However, as Joe Luft proposed, it takes energy to hide, deny, or be blind to behavior. We are likely to find, eventually, that our caring behavior is transformed into manipulative behavior, founded on strong feelings of guilt, helplessness and even anger. Eventually we hate ourselves and our relationship with the other person. We turn away from other people, such as Suzanne, who can help us disengage from the dishonesty-saturated relationship. Like Sam, we look for someone else to fulfill our needs and allow us to protect our often-hidden sense of self (quads three and four).

The New Johari Window

We wish to take this analysis of Johari-related honesty one step further. One of us [WB] has created "The New Johari Window" (Bergquist, 2023). This new window has been constructed because the original model does

have so limitations as engaged in our challenging mid-21st century world. The New Johari Window is more dynamic and contextual than original window, for it offers even more finely differentiated panes in Quadrant 2 and 3. Each of these panes can, in turn, portray subtly nuanced interplay amongst actors in an interpersonal drama. The key element in this subtle interplay, however, remains the same and consistent—this key element is trust—which forms the basis for honesty. We begin, therefore, with a visit to the domain of trust and suggest that even this seemingly straight-forward dimension of interpersonal relationships is, in fact, rather complex.

Three Forms of Trust

Some linguists (notably Benjamin Whorf, 1973) believe that you can tell quite a bit about a culture by noting areas in which there is very elaborate and detailed labeling and areas in which labeling is sparse. The many names for snow among the Inuit (Eskimos) and the many words for love among the Greeks are often offered as evidence of this so-called Whorfian hypothesis. Inuit seem to be very interested in snow, hence have many different names to describe different kinds of snow (much as avid snow skiers have multiple labels, such as “corn snow” and “powder snow”). The Greeks similarly seem to be very interested in love and its many different forms (ranging from “eros” to “agape”).

We would like to contribute yet another example. This concerns the word “trust.” For some reason, there is only one word in English for the many different forms that “trust” takes in our society. Does this suggest that “trust” isn’t really valued in our society? At the very least, it means that the concept of “trust” can be very confusing to us. We believe that trust is a critical component in any dynamic model of human interaction; hence, we take the distinctions between different forms of trust quite seriously. Trust is the engine of interpersonal relationships and provides the foundation for honesty. It provides both direction and energy for sustained human interaction. It provides direction by setting goals for virtually any relationship. It provides energy by providing each member of the relationship with motivation to continue engaging in the relationship. It serves as the foundation for honesty, because it increases our capacity to predict how other people will relate to our honest disclosures and honest feedback.

Most of us hope that our interactions with other people will increase levels of trust—even when we are trying to manipulate another person or are at war with this other person. If nothing else, we want them to be clear about our intentions—even if this means that we intend to do them harm. We rarely want other people to leave us with less clarity regarding our relationship or with less interest in engaging us in future relationships. When trust is considered in relationship to the Johari Window, its direction and energy become even more important and apparent. The dynamics of both disclosure and feedback are profoundly influenced by levels of individual and reciprocal trust which lead to reciprocal honesty. It is important, therefore, that we be clear about what the term “trust” means to us. In doing so, we will propose that this term actually has three different (though related) meanings, and that “trust” has a distinctive impact on interpersonal relationships depending on which of these meanings is being engaged.

Specifically, we propose that the first meaning associated with the English word, “trust,” concerns *competence*. The second meaning concerns *intentions*. The third meaning concerns *perspective*. We illustrate each of these three meanings by turning to an exercise—called the “trust fall”—that was very popular in the human growth workshops of the 1960s and was revived during the 1990s as a component of “Ropes” (Survival) courses. One participant is asked to stand in front of the group or (in a “Ropes” program) to step up on a platform, walk to the edge, and turn her back (as if preparing for a back dive into a pool of water). In the old 60s program, someone was asked to stand behind the trust-faller. In the case of the Ropes program, several people are asked to stand in front of the platform. The trust-faller then, as the name implies, falls back into the arms of the person or persons assigned to catch her. This exercise obviously involves the willingness of a person to trust that they will be caught by another person or group of people.

This is a wonderful exercise that often generates rich personal insights; however, the insights it generates can be a bit confusing because of the three different meanings of the word “trust.” On the one hand, the trust-faller can be falling off the platform into the arms of three people who love her and have every good intention to look after her welfare.

Unfortunately, they are the trust-fallers' three young daughters who are not big enough or strong enough to catch her. The trust-faller would probably injure all three of them and herself if she fell backwards off the platform into their arms. The trust-faller trusts the intentions of her daughters, but not their competence.

Conversely, the trust-faller could be falling into the arms of three very strong and competent men. Unfortunately, these three catchers are all men who she rudely dropped during the courtship phase of her life. All three were emotionally wounded by her rejection and have vowed to take vengeance. They would love to see her fall backwards onto the ground, breaking her back ("that heartless #&%@*#&@!!!!"). She trusts their competence but not their intentions.

There is a third alternative. The three gentlemen standing in front of the platform all come from a foreign country and are interested in studying the unusual behaviors of those who participate in "Ropes" programs. They look with great interest as the trust-faller plunges backwards onto the ground, with no one catching her. They help her up and wonder if she will attempt to perform this unusual, self-injuring ritual again. These foreign gentlemen are certainly capable of catching her and they wish her great success in her endeavor.

They simply have a different perspective and do not understand that they are supposed to catch her. Our trust-faller will appropriately refuse to fall backwards until these foreign gentlemen have been fully informed about the nature and purpose of the "trust fall." Before she falls backwards, our trust-faller must trust the intentions, competencies and perspectives of anyone who is supposed to catch her. If she misses any of these three definitions or criteria of trust, she will end up with physical (and psychological) injury to herself and perhaps other participants in the trust-fall process.

We will turn to these three definitions of trust while describing the New Johari Window. One needs to know about the interpersonal intentions, competencies and perspectives of the person with which one is interacting when deciding whether or not, and how to expand or contract any of the panes of the Johari Window. We learn to trust another person and can, in this interpersonal context, find honesty. And in a setting of honesty, we find Ligato—the binding of two people to one another to form a productive, purposeful relationship that may be healing and filled with personal and interpersonal insights.

As already noted, the establishment of trust, honesty and Ligato is not easy. It involves something more than good intentions or something that is now often called "emotional intelligence" (Goleman, 1995). It involves the capacity to live with ambiguity and complexity in our own sense of self, and both complexity and ambivalence in our sense of another person and the best way in which to be of benefit to them. The New Johari Window addresses these challenges. We begin with the nature of what we know about ourselves, based on how other people see us (quad two).

Opaque Rather Than Blind

The New Johari Window uses the word "opaque" rather than "blind" to label the second quadrant (Q2). While Joe Luft occasionally used the word "opaque" to describe Quad Two, we use this word instead of the word "blind" in most instances. The Q2 dynamics of opaque knowledge of self is an important theme and key concept in the new Johari Window. We are usually not "blind" to how other people see us; rather, this knowledge about other people's perceptions of us is opaque—we can see the faint outline or shadow but not the clear detail. At some level we are very much aware of the potential—if not real—image that other people hold about us. That is why we get "defensive" when we are about to receive feedback. That's why we brace ourselves. At some level, we believe that other people really do know us and know our secrets, our mistakes and our weaknesses.

There is an old saying that goes something like this: "Which one of us if told that 'everything has been revealed; you have been found out' wouldn't pack his/her bag and catch the first train out of town!" At some level, all is known by us. Furthermore, every salient feature about us is repeated again and again in our psyche. There is no way we can hide it, not can we be totally oblivious to the fact that other people see these features in us every

day—in our behavior, in our expressed feelings, and regarding the decisions we make about interpersonal relationships. All of this relates, fundamentally, to a concept offered many years ago by Sigmund Freud—signal anxiety. (Freud, 1936/1990). While this concept was replaced years later by Freud in his own evolving concepts of anxiety, the original notion about signal anxiety remains relevant today—especially as we analyze the dynamics of Q2.

Signal Anxiety: in his own analysis, Freud (1936/1990, p. 60) begins by noting that anxiety is not the only unpleasant feeling that we experience—there is “tension, pain or mourning, grief.” The unique characteristic of anxiety is that it “is the reproduction of some experience which contained the necessary conditions for an increase of excitation and a discharge along particular paths, and that from this circumstance the unpleasure of anxiety received its specific character.” Thus, according to Freud, “anxiety arose originally as a reaction to a state of danger—and it is reproduced whenever a state of that kind recurs.” (Freud, 1936/1990, p. 60) Freud concludes that: “we cannot find that anxiety has any function other than that of being a signal for the avoidance of a danger-situation.” (Freud, 1936/1990, p. 64)

Freud’s signal anxiety seemed strange and mysterious at the time. After all, how can we know what we can’t know? Today it is less strange. Chaos theory and, in particular, the phenomenon called “fractals” offer an explanation. Patterns keep repeating themselves at all levels of a system. We have a hint of what is opaque (and frightening) because we see this same pattern repeated at a more conscious—and benign—level. We get a little fear from dropping when we ride a roller coaster. This ride gives us a sense of the big fright that would come from falling to our death. We get a taste of terror when we attend a scary movie. This movie briefly samples the profound feelings that would accompany real life fear associated with the experience of being attacked by a murderous villain or alien monster.

Clearly, we often become anxious in our relationships with other people, especially if the processes of disclosure and feedback are involved. This anxiety in turn serves as a signal that something threatening lies below the surface of this relationship—or something unpredictable or threatening is associated with the context in which this relationship is taking place. In essence, our “psyche” splashes our face (or guts) with painful anxiety to inform us that this relationship or context is to be avoided.

We also might use the metaphor of “inoculation” to describe the signaling properties of anxiety. Ernest Becker (1971, p. 43) uses this metaphor when discussing Freud’s notions about anxiety:

Freud understood this process of the ego taking over anxiety as a sort of “vaccination” of the total organism. As the central perceptual sphere learns what the organism gets anxious about, it uses an awareness of this anxiousness in small doses, to regulate behavior. The growing identity “I” must feel comfortable in its world and the only way it can do this is experimentally to make the anxieties of its world its own.

Signal anxiety doesn’t really hurt us (unless it is long-lasting), but it does wake us up. It lets us know that we need to be vigilant and careful not to proceed further toward the threatening interpersonal relationship or context—or any thoughts, feelings or memories associated with this relationship or context. The paradox is that at some level we are fully aware of the thing that threatens us—otherwise we wouldn’t splash ourselves with the noxious anxiety. We must know or even experience what is threatening to us to decide that we don’t want to know it or experience it. Furthermore, we often know (opaquely) more than we want to know. This knowledge powerfully influences our level of trust, our desire to be honest, and the ways in which we avoid disclosing to other people and avoid or misinterpret feedback from other people.

Becker (1971, p. 55) goes even further by suggesting that this vaccinating signal anxiety becomes the basis for creation of distinctive defensive structures that each of us creates as we mature in a world that is often threatening or at least unpredictable:

[T]he ego grows by putting anxiety under its control, as it finds out what anxiety is for the organism, and then choose to avoid it by building defenses that handle it. . . . [T]he ego “vaccinates itself” with small doses of anxiety; and the “antibodies” that the organism builds up by means of this “vaccination” become its defenses.”

There is a more positive side. The “inoculation” from signal anxiety is preventative in nature, like the inoculations we receive for various physical diseases. We gain insights about ourselves even when there is not a major “meltdown” in our relationship with another person. We learn about ourselves and other people even when we are impacting another person in a manner that evokes only small nonverbal reactions rather than wholesale blurting out of angry (or effusively positive) feedback.

We are “primed” to learn more about ourselves as a result of this opaque knowledge. Initially, we “see through a glass darkly,” but with “faith” (interpersonal trust), we will soon see clearly. Our opaque knowledge of other people’s perceptions of us prepares us for, helps us to interpret and enables us to make use of feedback from other people. We learn about ourselves—our strengths as well as our weaknesses—from this opaque knowledge and gain interpersonal wisdom even without direct and open feedback from other people.

Attribution Error: there is another aspect operating in the acquisition and use of opaque knowledge about self. This third aspect has to do with attribution. We are often only opaquely aware of our consistent patterns of behavior, choosing instead to attribute our behavior to the specific setting(s) in which we find ourselves. We believe that our behavior is primarily a function of context and external forces—while we tend to walk around with a different theory of attribution regarding other people. This alternative theory is based on an assumption that other people operate as they do because of their ingrained personality or “character.” As the attribution researchers, Jones and Nisbett (1972, p. 80) suggest:

. . . the actor’s perceptions of the causes of his behavior are at variance with those held by outside observers. The actor’s view of his behavior emphasizes the role of environmental conditions at the moment of action. The observer’s view emphasizes the causal role of stable dispositional properties of the actor. We wish to argue that there is a pervasive tendency for actors to attribute their actions to situational requirements, whereas observers tend to attribute the same actions to stable personal dispositions.

We are rarely completely “blind.” At some level we “know” what we don’t “know.” Our knowledge is opaque, in part, because we view ourselves from a state or contextual point of view, whereas others tend to view us from a trait or personality perspective. We think we can change (it’s a matter of situation), whereas others don’t think we can change (it’s a matter of personality). This attribution error is not entirely off based. There is just enough error to enable us to discount how other people see us—but just enough truth in the attribution to force us (at least sometimes) to listen to what other people say about our consistent behavior patterns (our “personality”). Our honesty is always a bit contextual and partial.

Protected Rather than Hidden Self

We also tinker a bit with Luft’s labeling and description of the third quadrant. Trust and honesty are often founded on the capacity to be open with other people. However, once again, we propose that openness is always a relative thing. We are never fully open with one another (quad one). We are also never really “hidden” in Q3. We are “leaking” all over the place—nonverbal communication, what we do and don’t say. We make assumptions and try to “hide” these assumptions; however, through our actions we tend to provoke thoughts and actions in other people that confirm these assumptions. These assumptions become “self-fulfilling prophecies.” We can’t talk about any of this with other people and are even unlikely to reflect on these dynamics in our own minds. We are left, as a result, with what Chris Argyris and Don Schön (1974) identify as “self-sealed assumptions”. Given this leakage and these dynamics regarding self-

fulfilling prophecies and self-sealed assumptions, I am inclined to call this quadrant the “protected self” rather than the “hidden self.”

Given these modifications, allow us to present a first version of the New Johari Window – this model being two-dimensional like Luft and Ingham’s original Window.

Figure Two:
The New Johari Window [Two-Dimensional]

	KNOWN TO SELF	UNKNOWN TO SELF
KNOWN TO OTHERS	QUADRANT ONE OPEN SELF	QUADRANT TWO OPAQUE SELF
UNKNOWN TO OTHERS	QUADRANT THREE PROTECTED SELF	QUADRANT FOUR UNKNOWN SELF

Multi-Dimensional Model

Hopefully, this two-dimensional model adds something to the Original Window; however, the New Johari Window moves beyond these two dimensions in the New Johari Window by introducing the dimension of internal world and external world. This enables us to move to a new metaphor regarding the New Johari Window: a *storm window* that comes complete with double panes. A storm window helps to separate the outside world from the inside. It offers a layer of air—a cushion or buffer—between the variable conditions of the external world (extreme temperatures, rain and snow, daylight and dark) and the less variable conditions of the internal world (thermostatically controlled temperature, no precipitation, controlled lighting).

The New Johari Window suggests that we similarly set up conditions in our interpersonal relationships so that we are buffered from the external realities of this interpersonal life. People with whom we interact profoundly influence us; yet we are not simply tossed like a leaf by the exigencies of these relationships. We have the capacity to interpret, distort, and even ignore the messages being delivered intentionally and unintentionally by another person. We also deliver messages to other people that come from both the window we present to the outside world and the window we create inside ourselves. Thus, the New Johari Window has double panes representing both the internal and external worlds in which we live.

To the extent that the gap between these two panes is small, there is substantial congruence between our internal and external worlds. To the extent that the gap is large, there is an incongruent state and the dynamics involved in coping

with this gap can be profound. In many instances, the gap is large because trust has been violated in earlier relationships—there have been violent external, interpersonal storms. Honesty is at a low level. We have therefore built a strong storm window to keep out the turbulent, unpredictable and potentially harmful relational storms. We protect ourselves by increasing the gap in two panes of all four quadrants, just as we install storm windows with large thermal gaps when choosing to live in climates that are turbulent, unpredictable and potentially harmful.

The double-paned Johari model suggests several powerful implications with regard to personal assumptions about internal and external sources of control—particularly regarding interpersonal perceptions and relationships. This interpersonal model also suggests that there are many ways to view interpersonal relationships. We can focus on the external panes or look deeply into the dynamics of the interior life of each participant in an interpersonal relationship. The double-paned window also points to the importance of interpersonal needs and to ways in which we express and fulfill these needs. Interpersonal needs are not simply shown to the external world. We don't simply ask or demand that these needs be met. Rather, these needs may remain "at home" (the internal panes) and may rarely or very subtly be made known outside our home (the external panes) to specific people in specific settings.

We will briefly turn at the matter of internal and external locus of control and then use this matter of control to present the double-paned window in greater detail.

Locus of Control

Many years ago, Sigmund Freud discovered (or did he invent?) the Ego. Freud had already discovered that the human psyche profoundly influences how we view our world—and in particular our relationships with other people. However, Dr. Freud was not satisfied with just examining intrapsychic processes. He also wanted to analyze the relationship between internal and external events. While we are growing up, Freud proposed, we must confront the fact that the external world doesn't always meet our immediate needs.

The wise Viennese doctor suggested that we require some mechanism (which he called the "Ego") to balance off intra-psychic impulses and needs with the realities of life in a demanding and restrictive society (and Vienna society was certainly demanding and restrictive). In recent years, we have come to see that the Ego which each of us has formed often comes with a bias. For some of us, this bias is toward the intra-psychic demands and potentials of life. For others, the external demands and potentials hold great sway. In the former case, we often assume an internal locus of control, while in the latter case we assume an external locus of control.

What exactly do these two terms mean? In brief, an internal locus of control is based on a cluster of assumptions (often untested) that lead us to believe that we are capable of strongly influencing or even controlling our own behavior and the impact which our behavior has on the world in which we live. We are ultimately responsible for the impact of our decisions and our actions in the world. By contrast, an external locus of control is based on a cluster of assumptions (often unacknowledged or unconscious) that suggests our thoughts, feelings and actions are strongly influenced—perhaps even dictated—by external forces over which we have little or no control.

External Locus of Control: We can't be held wholly responsible for our decisions and actions, nor for the consequences of these decisions and actions, for we are the recipients (benefactors) or victims (at least in part) of fate. This external fateful force may be identified as the vicissitudes of life or as God's will. It can be identified, instead, (through use of social-psychological terms) as a powerful stimulus in our environment, a powerful societal force, or an all-determining shift in the economic, political or cultural reality of life. Freud or his sometime colleague, Carl Jung, would remind us that we are influenced or controlled by the physiologically based (Freud) or collective (Jung) thoughts, feelings and images that seem to operate like aliens, occupying forces within our personal psyches.

Internal Locus of Control: we will use a rather simplistic (and perhaps nautically naïve) metaphor to distinguish an internal locus from an external locus. When an internal locus is assumed, we declare that we are captains of our ship. Furthermore, we declare that we are often (if not always) the motor that propels our ship through the water. We are not sailboats that depend on the fickle influence of the wind, nor are we whitewater kayaks that must cooperate with the powerful forces of turbulent water. As captains and ship's motors we power ahead, oblivious to our environment. We expect external forces to capitulate to our will (captain of the ship) and energy (motor of the ship). This compelling, forceful and ultimately optimistic orientation is uniquely American. It rests firmly on the ideology of pragmatism and activism: "All right! What can we do about it! Let's roll up our sleeves and get started!" It also resides firmly on the democratic (and individualist) assumption of free will and personal freedom. Emphasis is always being placed on the right of all citizens to exert an influence over (even determine) the course of their personal lives and the path being taken by their society.

We find that the assumption of internal locus of control resides in many different ideological camps. At one extreme, we find entrepreneurial capitalists who proclaim an internal locus through their emphasis on free markets, dog-eat-dog competition and individual achievement. Several studies [including those cited by Marshall Goldsmith, during a presentation at the Annual Meeting of the Professional Coaching and Mentors Association, Long Beach, California, March 2002] suggest that corporate executives who are highly successful will usually hold an internal focus: they attribute much greater importance to their own role in achieving success than seems warranted. This bias is widely evident in books written by highly visible corporate tycoons who identify "the ten reasons," "five keys" or "seven secrets" that have enabled them to make their company successful—usually ignoring fortuitous marketing conditions, favorable governmental rulings, or independent efforts made by their subordinates and predecessors.

At the other extreme, we find humanists and existentialists. They also are inclined toward an internal locus of control and focus on the isolated and courageous human beings who must acknowledge and live with the consequences of their individual actions and free will. An internal locus for these philosophers, novelists and psychologists translates into something much more profound than that offered by corporate tycoons. Humanists and existentialists honor the dignity and responsibility that accompany free will and relate this engagement of free will to the fundamental processes of thought. Rollo May (1996, pp. 204, 230), for instance, indicates that:

I have had the conviction for a number of years . . . that something more complex and significant is going on in human experience in the realm of will and decision that we have yet taken into our studies. . . . Cognition, or knowing and conation, or willing . . . go together. We could not have one without the other. . . . If I do not will something, I could never know it; and if I do not know something, I would never have any content for my willing. In this sense, it can be said directly that man makes his own meaning.

Humanists, such as Rollo May, see human beings as constructivists, who create their own meaning and purpose in life. In parallel fashion, they identify an internal locus of control as an opportunity (and challenge) to act in an ethical manner. We are architects of our own fate and soul. We can't assign blame to anyone else in the world—past or present. We stand convicted of our own actions and the consequences of our actions.

There are many critics of the internal locus of control, both within and outside American society. An all-consuming arrogance is often associated with the internal locus. It is evident not only in the indifference of many corporate executives to those who work for and with them, but also in disdain for the environment that is evident among many Americans (and non-Americans). An internal locus of control requires that we have access to information from inside ourselves, especially about personal values and life purposes.

People who assume full responsibility for their actions need time for reflection. However, depending on our personal preferences and styles, we may not choose to take time for this reflection. People with an internal locus often are

inclined to “power” ahead in an unreflective manner, assuming that they are in control. They run over other people, other species, and the natural world in which they live. Those of us with an internal locus are inclined to be defiant: we know we are right and force others in the world to come around to our point of view. It’s “man against nature” or “man over nature.” It’s “every man for himself.” Many of our global problems can be attributed in part to rampant individualism and an attendant assumption that we have the right to control or change anything in our world.

There is a second level of criticism regarding internal locus of control. It concerns the existential despair that can accompany individualism and the courage of autonomy and responsibility. Soren Kierkegaard (1980) describes this as sailing alone on a stormy sea, with many fathoms of dark and unknown water beneath us. We ultimately live in isolation from other people and from the assistance of an external benevolent force when we assume an internal locus of control. Kierkegaard was able to find an external, caring God in the midst of his existential analysis. Victor Frankel (1997) similarly found this external divine presence—amid the grotesque, externally dominated experience of the World War II concentration camp. Many other proponents of existentialism can’t find this balancing presence of an external spiritual presence. They sink inevitably into despair or a nihilistic perspective on life that is pure internal locus, but also pure hell.

External Control Options: there are other forces that propel our ship. we must contend with and interact with powerful, external forces that have something to say about our course of travel and our destination. We live on sailboats—not motorized boats. The winds, currents, tides and weather have much to say about the direction and speed of our travel. Our ship has many co-captains. Many external forces move our ship. Someone or something else is pulling us [God/Fate]. We are like the ship coming into the harbor that is being pulled by a tugboat. The tugboat (and its captain) provides both energy and direction. Energy and direction are both derived from external sources.

There is a second option regarding the nature of external forces impacting on our ship. Someone else is coming on board our ship and steering it into the berth. This is the harbor captain (or the parent or mentor). We are dependent on someone else for direction, though we provide the energy. Thus, there is a mixture of internal and external locus of control. A third option concerns the setting in which someone or something else is offering information to us. This person or object operates like a lighthouse. It doesn’t control us or even tell us what to do. It only provides information (that is hopefully accurate). We must decide what to do with this information. We might choose to ignore the information and crash on the rocks. That is our choice. It is up to us to discern and interpret the external information. This is an even more powerful and complex blending of internal and external locus of control. The external world is influencing us, but we are still in charge.

As in the case of an internal locus of control, there are multiple perspectives regarding external locus. One of these perspectives is offered by the behaviorists. From a purely behavioral perspective, one would conclude that our actions are primarily determined by the settings in which we find ourselves and the events in which we participate. A classic and well-reasoned representation of this behavioral perspective is to be found in the work of Walter Mischel (1969), who essentially dismissed individual variances in behavior as trivial compared to the influence exerted by the external setting. Reward systems (state) rather than enduring personality characteristics (trait) predict behavior. Variations among individuals in similar settings are minimal (error-variance): “Show me what is being rewarded and I’ll show you what people are going to do!”

In his widely read book, *The Tipping Point*, Malcolm Gladwell (2000, p. 160) moves this statement further, by pointing out that many of us are vulnerable to the Fundamental Attribution Error that we mentioned above:

... a fancy way of saying that when it comes to interpreting other people’s behavior, human beings invariably make the mistake of overestimating the importance of fundamental character traits and underestimating the importance of the situation and context. We will always reach for a “dispositional” explanation for events, as opposed to a contextual explanation.

While Gladwell's observations are well-taken, we would like to note that he fails to mention the other half of the Fundamental Attribution Error. The second half of the error concerns our tendency to attribute our own personal behavior not to character or disposition, but rather to context. As each of us might declare:

I assume that I act like I do not because of some enduring personality trait, but because of the specific setting in which I am operating and specific role I am asked to play or have chosen to play.

In other words, we are inclined to external locus of control when observing and analyzing our own behavior and to internal locus of control when observing and analyzing the behavior of other people.

Back to the external locus of control. Even when we are captains of our own ship, we need other people to help us operate the vessel—unless it is very small. Furthermore, if we choose to venture very far from port, we must be mindful of winds, tides, currents, changes in the weather and so forth. Only the very foolish mariner will proclaim his independence from the environment into which he is venturing. Unless we will never leave port or choose to remain very isolated and “small,” we must be mindful of our external world—both human and nonhuman. From this vantage point, an external locus of control seems to be very appropriate.

Taken to the extreme, the external locus of control leaves us eternally vulnerable to the exigencies of the world in which we live. As people with an external locus of control, we hunger for information about the outside world. We are consummate readers of newspapers each day—or we look at our daily horoscope. Our ship often seems to lack a rudder or even a compass. The wind, tide or current carries us to an unknown destination. We have very little influence. We are cast adrift and, like Ishmael, are at best the fortunate survivors of great, often tumultuous events (the Moby Dicks in our lives). We survive not because we are competent, but because we are fortunate. We get where we want to go not because we plan ahead of time, but because we seize the opportunity to mount our sails when the wind happens to be blowing in the right direction.

Just as the internal locus of control is very American (a country that has never experienced a successful invasion from an external army), the external locus is prevalent in societies that have often experienced massive, traumatizing invasions—and this includes most non-American societies in our world. Repeated, intrusive life events leave one skeptical about the capacity to influence that which is occurring around us. There is an old saying that life is a bit like “sitting on the edge of the dock, trying to control the flight of the seagulls fluttering around us.”

A colleague of ours, who comes from a country in Eastern Europe which was invaded eight times during the 20th Century, strongly agrees with this saying. He feels like he can control very little in his life. He can't control the people or events who are fluttering (like seagulls) around his head. Our colleague finds it absurd to plan for the future. When asked (soon after the collapse of the Soviet Union) what he hoped his son would do when he grew up, my colleague said that he had “no idea” and no longer even had “hopes” for his son. He knew (or at least assumed) that these hopes would soon be shattered by massive world events over which he (and his son) has no control.

Those of us who live in the United States gained a more intimate sense of this pessimism (or at least a passive perspective on life) after the September 11, 2001 attack on the World Trade Center. We glimpsed a reality which frightened us. We weren't in control. We probably will never again, as a society, feel like we can control either our personal or collective destiny—or at least be certain of our personal and collective security.

The external locus of control, at one level, seems more “realistic” than the internal locus. It is very European and Asian—and is often pessimistic (or at least cautious). We are told to be reflective rather than rash, to observe before plunging in. Instead of declaring the usual American imperative: “Don't just stand there, do something” we are given the opposite instruction: “Don't just do something, stand there!” This counter imperative is usually attributed to Jay Forrester, the MIT system theorist and futurist, who insisted that we must understand the situation before plunging in and trying to change everything.

The widespread European critique of many, unilateral and often poorly conceived US interventions exemplify this perspective. An external locus, however, also evokes a troubling dynamic of “self-fulfillment.” When we are passive and wait for external events to direct us, then, sure enough, the outside world begins to have a profound impact on our lives. We accept a deterministic world view in which everything operates like a finely crafted Swiss Watch. We soon lose any sense of personal agency or personal responsibility.

John Calvin, the monumentally influential Swiss lawyer and theologian, saw the world as just such a finely crafted and divinely created Swiss watch. Like the American behaviorists, he looked primarily to external sources when examining and explaining human behavior. He didn’t look to the environment, however, as did the behaviorists. Rather, Calvin looked to a Protestant God. He believed that each human being was placed on the earth to act out some pre-destined drama. The Calvinist task was (and still is) to discover God’s plan. It would be arrogant, foolish and ultimately sacrilegious to design and enact our own individual plans. We see comparable perspectives on the externally determined human destiny in many Eastern religions and philosophies. Contemporary businessmen in Taipei, Taiwan, for instance, venture from their office buildings at lunchtime to discover something about their fate and future (through the *I-Ching*). Mahatma Gandhi met with his enemy (and childhood friend) every afternoon during a nonviolent strike in India to ensure that each party to the conflict played out his predestined role in this great, pre-ordained historical drama (Erikson, 1993).

The external locus of control situates us on a much larger stage and provides us with assurance that we are not alone. Yet, ultimately, we are alone. We must somehow stand outside the steam of history so that we can feel accountable and engage in the courageous act of seeking to improve the human condition. Despite precedence, dominant mindsets and the powerful societal, political and economic forces of our society, we must exert our free will and do that which is unexpected, brave and transforming.

Internal and External Panes

Given this brief description of these two fundamental perspectives on life, let’s turn to the influence which these two perspectives have on interpersonal behavior and specifically the complex dynamics that operate in our New Johari Window.

Internal (I) Panes

Quad 1-I: Presentational Self

What I wish to convey to the world.

Quad 2-I: Blocked Self

What I choose not to receive from other people.

Quad 3-I: Withheld Self

What I purposefully don’t share with other people.

Quad 4-I: Unexplored Self

What I have not wanted to explore or do not have time or occasion to explore in myself.

Figure Three
Internal Window Panes

	KNOWN TO OTHERS	UNKNOWN TO OTHERS
KNOWN TO SELF	QUADRANT ONE-I PRESENTATIONAL SELF	QUADRANT THREE-I WITHHELD SELF
UNKNOWN TO SELF	QUADRANT TWO-I BLOCKED SELF	QUADRANT FOUR-I UNEXPLORED SELF

External (E) Panes

Quad 1-E: Inadvertent Self

What I share (and know I share) with other people over which I have little or no control.

Quad 2-E: Ignorant Self

What I don't know about myself that other people do know and I don't know that they know.

Quad 3-E: Obtuse Self

That of which I am unaware that other people don't know about me.

Quad 4-E: Discounted Self

Aspects of myself that I don't know are a part of my self.

Figure Four
External Window Panes

	KNOWN TO OTHERS	UNKNOWN TO OTHERS
KNOWN TO SELF	QUADRANT ONE-E INADVERTENT SELF	QUADRANT THREE-E OBTUSE SELF
UNKNOWN TO SELF	QUADRANT TWO-E IGNORENT SELF	QUADRANT FOUR-E DISCOUNTED SELF

Interaction between Internal and External Panes

The gap between internal and external panes is critical. When the gap is large, we find three interrelated problems. First, the behavior of the person with the gap is likely to be unpredictable. Shifts in behavior can be quite dramatic, depending on the specific circumstances in which this person finds herself. She is governed at one moment by her own will and at another moment by someone else's will or by external exigencies.

For example, a woman whom one of us has coached (we will call her Elizabeth) often exhibits nonverbal behavior of which she is aware, but which is discrepant with what she says, particularly regarding her sense of self-confidence.

In her words (Quad One-I), Elizabeth conveys a strong sense of self and presents very clear directions and offers readily understood timelines and criteria for successful completion of her subordinates' tasks.

Yet, in her nonverbal communication (particularly tone of voice and posture), Elizabeth conveys a quite different impression. Through her voice, Elizabeth seems to be apologizing for giving her subordinates any assignments. Furthermore, she sometimes fails to follow up to see if the assignments have been completed, thereby conveying, through her actions, that either she doesn't really care about the completion of these specific assignments, or she doesn't think she is "worthy" of asking her subordinates to complete specific tasks that she has asked them to do. Elizabeth has received ample feedback regarding her nonverbal communication and sporadic lack of follow-up (this is not Quad Two material).

That's why she has a coach. Yet, she feels like her nonverbal behavior is "out of her control" (Quad One-E) and that sometimes she can't assert herself about follow up without coming across as a "demanding boss." Prior to our coaching sessions, the nonverbal communication remained for Elizabeth "out of her control." As a result of the coaching, she began to realize that she was not too demanding—rather she was unpredictable.

This is what frustrated her subordinates. Elizabeth came to see that greater predictability regarding follow-up was critical to her effective leadership and that self-confidence resides not only in what one says, but also in what one does. This increase in compatibility between words (Quad One-I) and actions (Quad One-E) helped Elizabeth to begin speaking in a manner that conveyed more confidence and self-assurance.

The gap between internal and external panes creates yet another problem. The gap often leads to *cognitive dissonance*. The person with the gap finds that his sense of self is filled with contradictions. The person he wants to be and has some control over is not very closely aligned with the person that he is because of external events and forces. This dissonance, in turn, encourages distortion in either his internal panes or his external panes.

One of us [WB] offers an example:

I have consulted to a man (I will call him Daniel) who is quite careful about what he says to other people with whom he works (Quad 1-I). Yet, the people with whom Daniel works have given him feedback that they can "read him like an open book." (Quad 1-E) They can predict how he will react in a specific situation, once they read his nonverbals. Daniel is faced with cognitive dissonance. He holds the self-image of someone who is able to "hold his cards close to his vest," (Quad 3-I) yet apparently does not have a very good "poker face." (Quad 1-E)

Given that Daniel is often negotiating with leaders from other organizations about purchases for his company, this discrepancy is a source of great concern. Sometimes, Daniel tends to over-estimate the power of his ignorant self (Quad 2-E), indicating that he is never able to hold a secret (Quad 1-E) and doesn't even realize that he is giving everything away through his nonverbal communication (Quad 2-E). Daniel often concludes that he can't be trusted with information about his company's financial status when discussing prices and terms with a vendor. He believes that he always "gives away the store," when in fact he often is able to negotiate a fair price for products he purchases for his company.

At other times, Daniel distorts in the opposite direction. He believes that he is being a clever negotiator (Quad 1-I), when, in fact, the furrowing of his brow indicates to vendors that he is holding back financial information and is not yet at the lowest possible price (Quad I-E). Daniel needs a performance coach to help him modulate his sense of self or at least he needs a colleague to join him in the field and give him supportive feedback when he is being effective as a negotiator. This process of distortion based on the effort to resolve cognitive dissonance is an important, and often overlooked, aspect of human relationships.

There is a third problem associated with the internal/external gap. This concerns the ongoing *intra-psychic and interpersonal tensions* that are likely to be precipitated by the gap. These tensions are exacerbated by the unpredictability and distortion we just mentioned; yet the misalignment inevitably creates tensions even without these other two problems. Both Elizabeth and Daniel feel very uncomfortable about their interpersonal relationships at work. Elizabeth has often considered leaving her position as a manager because of the tensions caused by her inconsistent and unpredictable supervision of subordinates. Daniel also feels considerable tension about whether he is letting down his company during the negotiations. This is mostly a conflict within himself. He is considering another career in which he doesn't have to be as "secretive."

Both Elizabeth and Daniel come to dread their work with other people (Elizabeth within her own organization, Daniel with representatives of other organizations). This fear eventually distorts all their interpersonal quadrants, and they are

both left with a growing gap between the interpersonal world they control (or at least influence) and the interpersonal world they do not control (or influence very little).

Elizabeth has received some coaching assistance which has enabled her to more closely align her internal and external panes (especially in Quad One). By contrast, Daniel has received little assistance and believes that he has been left to “fend for himself” in what he perceived to be the “uncaring” and “cut-throat” business of procurement and price negotiations. Like many men and women who experience a widening gap between his internal and external panes, Daniel sees his own powers (internal locus) declining and the forces outside himself (the other parties to the price negotiations) growing in power. No wonder he wants to escape to another line of work.

Disclosure and Feedback

In addition to the challenges that people like Elizabeth and Daniel face in seeking to narrow the gap between the internal and external panes, there are additional challenges associated with the issue of personal awareness. To what extent does each of us see the internal and external forces that interplay with one another in our interpersonal relationships? How aware are we and how much control do we have over what we convey to other people? Both disclosure and feedback are helpful in this regard. Disclosure and feedback do much more than expand Quad 1 (and reduce some of Quad 4).

These two interpersonal processes also reduce the gap between internal and external panes of the window. Disclosure enables us indirectly (if not directly) to get feedback from other people about our external panes. The new double pane Johari Window adds a new level of appreciation regarding the nature and impact of feedback. Using the double pane model, we discover that feedback is meant not only to help us learn something about ourselves that we didn’t know before or knew only opaquely (feedback as *information-about-self*) but also helps us gain a fuller and more complex understanding of ourselves in interaction with other people and our impact on other people (feedback as source of enriched-understanding-of-self).

For example, let’s imagine that one of us has been asked to share our opinion about another person who has authority over us (let’s call him Sam).

I view Sam in an ambivalent manner. I might be inclined initially to offer only a positive perspective about Sam, not wanting to hurt Sam’s feelings or risk my own job (if my ambivalent opinion got back to him). I also might hold back on my negative opinions because I want to appear to be a fair-minded person. My presentational self (Quad 1-I) would thus be filled with positive opinions about Sam. However, I might be sharing my more negative opinion about Sam through my nonverbal channels of communication or through my decline of an invitation to have dinner with Sam (Quad 1-E). I know that I am exhibiting these negative feelings (this is not Quad Three material), but don’t realize how aware other people are of these negative feelings.

At some point, I decide to “fess up” to my colleague, who first asked what I thought about Sam. I point out that I actually have quite mixed feelings about Sam. I admire him in some ways, but don’t trust him or like him very much when he is operating in his “official” role. At this point, my inquiring colleague might feel free to give me some feedback that is very helpful to me as I seek to enrich my own self-understanding (Quad 2-E to Quad 1-E).

My colleague might point out that the nonverbals are very clear and that my decision to turn down the dinner invitation is a clear indication that I am not fully supportive of Sam. This is very important for me to know. My colleague is not telling me something I never knew about myself (that I exhibit some negative feelings regarding Sam); rather, my colleague is telling me about the extent to which this Quad 1-E (Inadvertent Self) communication is obvious to other people.

It is the same with feedback and the double paned Johari Window. Feedback we receive from other people regarding those aspects of ourselves about which we are truly ignorant (Quad 2-E) encourages our own self-insights regarding information about ourselves that we know at some level but block off from self-awareness (Quad 2-I). A man with whom one of us [WB] works (we will call him Harold), for instance, did not realize that he tends to patronize and act in a condescending manner toward younger women with whom he works. One of his colleagues provided him with feedback about shifts in his tone of voice and rate of speech when working with younger women (Quad 2-E to Quad 1-E). Harold's voice goes up and he begins to speak slower, which can easily be interpreted as Harold being condescending to and irritated with his younger female colleague.

When Harold received this feedback, he not only took it to heart, but also to consciousness (Quad 1-E). He became fully aware of his own lingering sense that he appeared to be irritated with virtually all the women with whom he works. With the help of his coach, Harold explored the reasons for this irritation and discovered that the real issue concerned a lingering sense that he was somehow "responsible" for the success of these women. He wanted them to succeed because he thought that women had every right to be in the workplace. He laid too much responsibility on his own shoulders for making this happen and, as a result, was resentful and, frankly, patronizing. Harold's support for women's rights had backfired and he only began to relate his inadvertent self (Quad 1-E) with his ignorant self (Quad 2-E) after receiving the feedback.

Control and Destiny

In general, we don't like to link together our internal and external panes. On the one hand, we don't want to acknowledge that some things are out of our control. We want to believe that we oversee our own self—if not the world around us. It is not just (as Joe Luft noted) that we don't want to believe other people know things about ourselves that we don't know (Quad Two). It is also that we don't want to believe that there are aspects of our public (Quad One) and private self (Quad Three), as well as our potential self (Quad Four), that resides outside our control and even our awareness. We are always tempted to move from external to internal locus so that we can perpetuate a personal myth that we are captains of our psychic ship.

We don't want to believe that there are powerful external forces operating in our lives – that we might even have a destiny. We run away from that which we are "called" to do by events in the world and by settings in which we find ourselves (or in which we have placed ourselves). Abraham Maslow's (1968) *Jonah Complex* vividly and metaphorically describes this condition. Johan runs away from his destiny (external locus), but ends up vomited out on a beach, gasping for air, having resided in the belly of a whale. In many ways this "belly of the whale" relates to the transitional process (called the "neutral zone") that William Bridges (1980, 2001) describes in vivid detail in his books about managing personal and organizational transitions. The whale has brought Jonah back home to face his destiny. It is in the belly of the whale that Jonah's transition occurs. And it is in the whale's belly that a "teachable" (and "coachable") moment has arrived for Jonah. This is his "moment of truth". These moments can be teachable and coachable for each of us.

Conclusions

The resistance to linkage between internal and external panes is not limited to a fear of external destiny and the movement from internal to external. We also avoid moving from external to internal locus of control. We want to stay away from an internal locus because it implies accountability (regarding things we don't want to do). We retain an external locus so that we might run away from our personal responsibilities. We prepare carefully for a major event in our life—yet back off in fulfilling the promise of this event.

We find, for instance, that many men and women who have completed all requirements for a doctoral degree other than their dissertation stop short and never complete this work. In fact, the second highest point of drop out in most doctoral programs (after the first six months) is at the final stage of the program when the dissertation is being written. We run away from the responsibilities and expectations that are embedded in the completion of this academic degree.

Similarly, we run away from commitment in relationships with other people, after working for many months on these relationships, because we are fearful—afraid that the relationship won't be what we hoped it would be, afraid that it will be successful and therefore will consume much of our time, attention and energy, afraid that we have distorted our own perceptions of (or feelings about) the other person so that we might create this committed relationship, and so forth. We run just as quickly away from our personal potential as we do from our destiny. To offer a revision of Maslow's Jonah Complex—we swim close to the beaches of Mecca (rather than being taken there by a whale). We then vacillate about swimming the final mile to actually arrive on the beach and claim our success as a long-distance swimmer.

References

Alba, Jessica (2013) *The Honest Life*, New York: Rodale Books.

Argyris, Chris and Schön, Don (1974) *Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional Effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ariely, Dan (2012) *The (Honest) Truth About Dishonesty*. New York: Harper.

Becker, Ernest (1971) *The Birth and Death of Meaning*. [2nd Edition] New York: Free Press.

Bergquist, William (2023) *The New Johari Window*. Link: <https://libraryofprofessionalcoaching.com/wp-app/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/final.draft-61.062123.pdf>

Bridges, William (1980) *Transitions*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Bridges, William (2001) *The Way of Transition*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus.

Erikson, Erik (1993) *Gandhi's Truth*. New York: Norton.

Frankel, Viktor (1997) *Man's Search for Meaning*. (rev. ed.) New York: Pocket Books.

Freud, Sigmund (1936/1990) *The Problem of Anxiety*. New York: Norton.

Gladwell, Malcolm (2000) *The Tipping Point*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.

Goleman, Daniel (1995) *Emotional Intelligence*. New York: Bantam.

Hoffer, Eric (1951) *The True Believer*. New York: Harper & Row.

Jones, Edward and Nisbett, Richard (1972) "The Actor and the Observer" *Divergent Perceptions of the Causes of Behavior*," In Edward Jones, et al. (Ed), *Attribution: Perceiving the Causes of Behavior*. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

Kierkegaard, Soren (1980) *The Sickness unto Death*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Luft, Joseph, *Of Human Interaction*. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield, 1969.

Luft, Joseph, *Group Process*. (3rd Ed.) Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield, 1984.

Maslow, Abraham (1968) "The Jonah Complex," In Bennis, Warren G and Associates (Eds), *Interpersonal Dynamics: Essays and Readings on Human Interaction*, Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press, pp. 714-720.

May, Rollo. *Love and Will* (1969) New York: Norton.

Mischel, Walter (1969) "Continuity and change in personality," *American Psychologist*, 1969, 24, pp. 1012-1018.

Weitz, Kevin and William Bergquist (2024) *The Crises of Expertise and Belief*. Harpswell ME: Professional Psychology Press.

Whorf, Benjamin (1973) *Language, Thought and Reality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.