Fostering Ethical Practice in HRD: Towards an Ethic of the Inner Voice

John M. Dirkx
Michigan State University

> Recent development and dissemination of ethical standards for AHRD help focus attention on the ethical and moral foundations of the field. Attention to explicit standards, however, reflects an enduring commitment to an overarching ethic of rationality that denies or minimizes the dynamics, complexities, and depths of the human and organizational psyche. I call for a more holistic approach to ethical practice and a stronger commitment to an ethic of the inner voice in our academic programs, research, and practice.

Keywords: Ethics, Learning, Training and development

Within the field of HRD, considerable attention has been devoted over the last several years to an elaboration of an ethical framework for the field (Argon & Hatcher, 2001). Explored within the rubric of "ethics and integrity," this effort has sought to establish a set of guiding principles through which the field may assess its underlying and ongoing commitment to ethical and moral standards of practice (Burns, Dean, Hatcher, Preskill, & Ruiss-Eft, 1999). According to Argon and Hatcher (2001), these standards give guidance to HRD practitioners:

> Engaged in practice, research, consulting, and instruction/facilitation/teaching.…they provide standards of conduct and set forth a common set of values for HRD professionals…The primary goal of these standards is to define more clearly a holistic balance among individuals, groups, organizations, communities, and societies whenever conflicting needs arise. (p. 7)

Establishment of this area of inquiry within the relatively new field of academic HRD represents an importance advance. The *AHRD Standards on Ethics and Integrity* (Burns et. al., 1999) provide curricular and pedagogical guidance to academic programs that prepare practitioners. They also help academics and practitioners approach their work in a more thoughtful and moral way, especially in areas in which this work involves competing and potentially conflicting interests.

As Graham (2002) suggests, however, the work has only just begun. Recent misconduct in many different organizational contexts indicates that moral and ethical conduct requires more than awareness of codes, guidelines, or standards. Ethical and criminal problems in major corporations such as Enron, WorldCom, ImClone, and Martha Stewart Living, as well as in governmental agencies and religious organizations should give us pause as to the efficacy of relying primarily on a set of explicit standards to foster ethical practice. In an interview on 60 minutes, Sam Waksel, the former head of Imclone, was asked what was on his mind as he committed crimes that also jeopardized the welfare of his daughter and aging father. He replied, "I could sit there…thinking I was the most honest CEO that ever lived [and] at the same time…glibly do something [wrong] and rationalize it" (quoted in Palmer, 2004, pp. 9-10). Recent brawls at professional and collegiate sporting events have demonstrated the propensity for athletes and fans alike to engage in repulsive and repugnant behaviors, despite clear, explicit rules against such actions and the potential for severe consequences.

Purpose and Statement of the Problem

Despite its importance for the field, the set of *Standards* developed by the Academy fails to account for the deep source of ethical conduct within people. As an explicit framework of ethics and integrity, this set of standards demonstrates an essentially rationalistic understanding of human beings, in which ethical conduct is understood to arise fundamentally from a rational, essentially philosophical analysis of what is good and desirable (Chalofsky, 2000), and that integrity reflects conduct consistent with that analysis. A rationalist perspective tends to minimize or even ignore the power and influence of the irrational or extra-rational in our daily lives (Gabriel, 1999; Hirschorn, 1988; Kets de Vries & Associates, 1991; LaBier, 1986; Smith & Berg, 1987; Stein & Horowitz, 1992). Furthermore, it fails to capture the complexity of the notion of integrity, of how our sense of integrity is rooted within and connected to a deeper meaning in our inner lives (Beebe, 1995; Palmer, 1998).

Although the ethical breaches described above do not directly involve the field of HRD, they none-the-less demonstrate the need for an understanding of ethics and integrity in practice that extends beyond the development of an explicit set of rules of conduct. These examples suggest the need for a deeper understanding, one that is rooted in a coherent and systematic theory of the person that helps us account for moral and ethical conduct of individuals and collectives. As Palmer (2004) suggests, "in a culture like ours – which devalues or dismisses the reality and power of the inner life – ethics too often becomes an external code of conduct, an objective set of rules we are told to

follow, a moral exeoskeleton we put on hoping to prop ourselves up" (p. 8). Unrecognized, the dynamics of the inner life often lead to personal pathology that eventually undermines our relations with others as well as ourselves.

In contrast to the rationalistic view of human nature that dominates much of educational and training practice, a theory of the person grounded in an understanding of the inner life suggests that ethical conduct and our sense of integrity arises from the relationship that we maintain with the unconscious and irrational dynamics of our being. This ongoing relationship reflects the psyche's desire for wholeness. As recent events suggest, no explicit code of conduct or set of ethical standards alone can constrain the powerful energies associated with such unconscious dynamics. While our cultural biases tend to pathologize the irrational and marginalize it within our daily practice, work in depth psychology suggests that the unconscious and extra-rational dimensions of our being – the so-called irrational aspects of our lives – are actually fundamental and powerful sources for meaning, creativity, and overall general well being (Briskin, 1996; Hillman, 1976; Moore, 1992; Neumann, 1990; Stein & Horowitz, 1992). Scholars informed by a depth psychology refer to the extra-rational and unconscious dimensions of our being as the inner life, Their presence in our lives represents the "hidden" dimensions of potential wholeness (Merton, 1989).

The purpose of this paper is to contribute to a deeper understanding of ethics and integrity in the practice of HRD. The field's interest in ethics and integrity extends appropriately across several different threads of activity (Burns et. al., 1999). In this paper, however, I focus primarily on developing a deeper understanding of ethical practice as it relates to the process of facilitating workplace learning; i.e., teaching and facilitating (Argon & Hatcher, 2001). I challenge our dominant reliance on rationalist understandings of integrity and ethical practice, and encourage a more holistic conception of the learner as the basis for the development of what I call an "ethic of the inner voice." I suggest that an appreciation of the inner voice raises important challenges for the practice of HRD and reframes the meaning of ethics and integrity for the field. When HRD is guided by such an ethic, it implies a commitment to integrating the inner life of both practitioners and learners. That is, the inner life of the learners, that aspect of one's life that reflects spiritual and emotional engagement with the world and one's self, is integrated with and connected to the reality demands and instrumental needs of the workplace.

I am not attempting to argue here that attention and commitment to explicit standards of ethics, such as the *AHRD Standards on Ethics and Integrity* (Burns et. al., 1999) are not of value to the field. Quite the contrary, they provide a collective sense of the field's grasp on that which in practice is right and good. But such standards reflect a continued reliance in the field on an ethic that elevates consciousness and rationality and minimizes and even ignores unconscious dimensions of individual and collective life. An ethic of the inner voice suggests that the teaching and learning that occur within the workplace are shaped by both conscious and unconscious processes, rational and irrational dimensions of our being. The ethical practice of HRD is derived from both our awareness of rules of conduct and conscious attention to these unconscious and irrational aspects of our being. Thus, by suggesting that the field of HRD develop a commitment to an ethic of the inner voice, I argue for attention by academics and practitioners to the psychodynamic and spiritual dimensions of individuals and organizations.

Theoretical framework

The analysis developed here revolves around the central proposition that to consistently act in an ethical manner involves learning to listen to one's inner voice. This analysis and the term "inner voice" are inspired by the work of Eric Neumann (1990), a Jungian scholar who has contributed significantly to our understanding of the relationship between the individual and the collective, and what this relationship means for ethical conduct. My thinking about the ethic of the inner voice, however, as a guide to ethical conduct in practice reflects the influence of depth psychology more broadly, including psychoanalytic, Jungian, and post-Jungian schools of thought (Davis, 2003). From this perspective, the nature of the psyche plays a critical role in the conduct of human affairs. Ethical conduct and integrity are intimately linked within our lives, reflecting our relationship with the unconscious and irrational dimensions of our being. Thus, a commitment to the inner life, whether at the individual or collective levels, involves expanding and enlarging one's consciousness through a dialogical relationship with contents of the unconscious (Beebe, 1995; Neumann, 1990; Stein & Hollwitz, 1992). That is, fostering ethical conduct requires an explicit relationship between our conscious selves and the unconscious. We become aware of the presence and influence of the unconscious in our lives through its manifestation in our feelings, distinct patterns of behavior, and emotion-laden images and symbols that come to populate our conscious awareness (Briskin, 1996; Hillman, 1976; Moore, 1992; Neumann, 1990).

Although relatively few studies from this theoretical perspective are published in mainstream HRD journals or presented at HRD conferences, a rich organizational literature exists that focuses on the organization in depth (Briskin, 1996; Gabriel, 1999; Hirschorn, 1988; Hirschorn & Barnett, 1993; Kets de Vries & Associates, 1991; Kets de Vries & Miller, 1984; LaBier, 1986; Maccoby, 1976; Stein & Hollwitz, 1992). A depth psychology perspective

of organizations concentrates on nonrational and unconscious dimensions of worklife, such as emotions, conflict, symbolism, creativity, and aesthetics (Gabriel, 1999; Stein & Hollwitz, 1992). Depth psychology, especially Jungian and post-Jungian scholarship also reflects a reliance on spiritual perspectives. A spiritual point of view raises questions regarding overarching meaning and purpose of our lives and work. In contrast to most of the spirituality of workplace literature (English, Fenwick, and Parsons, 2001), Jungian and post-Jungian approaches to spirituality openly confront and address questions of good and evil within our lives, as well as questions of overarching meaning and purpose.

The Old Ethic

The argument I make here suggests that our current approach to defining ethics and integrity in the practice of HRD is based on two inter-related assumptions: 1) That ethical conduct can be discerned largely through rational analysis, an assumption that is grounded in an essential rationalist understanding of the human person; and 2) That which is negative or undesirable is simply split off and rejected as a part of who we are individually and collectively.

First, the field's approach to the notions of integrity and ethics is grounded largely in a rationalistic understanding of ethical behavior and, ultimately, the person. This firm commitment to rationality is evident, for example, in Chalofsky's (2000) argument for attention to professional morality and integrity in the field. He states,

> Without a philosophical foundation to guide professional moral behavior, HRD professionals are rather like the Tin Man in the *Wizard of Oz* who thought he had no heart: the lack of a sense of purpose about how to practice HRD, at whatever level or context…One's professional morality is based on one's moral orientation, which is defined as the level of philosophically based perception of right and wrong (as opposed to good and evil) that one subscribes to. Moral orientation influences personal values – the standards of importance used in making judgments about beliefs…These personal values and beliefs in turn affect how an individual perceives the purpose of the profession and the moral imperatives used to guide the practice of that profession. These, then determine a person's ethical positions: the standards of importance (worth, goodness, rightness) used in making judgments about one's behaviors and actions. (p. 28)

In Chalofsky's argument, there is much to be commended. He appropriately draws attention to the important connection between one's conduct in practice and the overarching set of assumptions and beliefs that comprise a person's moral orientation. He also suggests that such an orientation provides a lens by which we perceive and come to understand the world around us. Furthermore, he points to the ways in which this moral orientation plays out not only at the level of the individual practitioner but at the group and organizational levels as well.

With all of this I am in full agreement. If one reads this passage from Chalofsky with eyes half closed, however, and listens to the tone of the argument, we are left wondering where, indeed, is the Tin Man's heart. Chalofsky's morality here is a heady morality. It starts and ends within rational conceptions of one's self and the world. One might imagine that Sam Waksel knew and understood Chalofsky's argument and perhaps even openly subscribed to such a vision of workplace morality. Yet, as it turns out, Waksel and many of us, in less dramatic and publicized situations, find ourselves at the mercy of powers that seem beyond our control. Anyone who has tried to engage in discussions with others about the right and good knows only too well how passionate, heated, and emotional such explorations can become, how often we say things "in the heat of battle" that "we don't mean." Many years ago, I used to facilitate groups of drivers "sentenced" to attend 24 hours of alcohol education classes. Participants in these groups often admitted to obnoxious and often immoral and even illegal behavior when under the influence of alcohol. They would refuse to accept responsibility for such conduct because, as they were fond of saying, "That's not me. I'm not like that." My response to them was usually, "If it was not you acting, then who was it?"

The observation of our propensity to see certain behaviors as "not me" demonstrates a continued reliance in Western society to repress or suppress parts of individual and collective selves that we perceive as undesirable. Rationalist conceptions of ethics and integrity reflect a commitment to the ideal of perfection and a desire to eliminate those qualities within our lives that are not compatible with this view of perfection (Neumann, 1990). We simply refuse to take ownership for qualities that surface whenever conscious control of our behavior is, for whatever reason, reduced or compromised. We do not accept these behaviors as aspects of part of ourselves. Our sense of who we are – the "I" – is so tightly identified with the conscious self, we tend to marginalize or pathologize these other expressions of ourselves. They are just dreams, fantasies, drunken stupors, or products of stress. However they are regarded, they are not normal, not "me."

From a depth psychology perspective, however, these situations reflect examples of how one's unconscious will at times swamp and over-ride rationality and ego consciousness. We are often witness to the manifestation of the unconscious in our everyday lives. These parts of ourselves are evoked and activated by certain environmental

conditions or relationships, such as stress, anxiety, or other emotionally-laden situations. How many times during any given day are we surprised at what we said in casual conversation or how we acted in a heated interaction with a fellow worker or supervisor? How many times during a workday is our consciousness flooded with feelings of anger, envy, jealousy, fear, or shame, feelings for which we have little sense of where they are coming from? In these situations, the boundaries the ego erects to keep contents of the unconscious suppressed or repressed become much less effective (Neumann, 1990). We are less able to suppress unconscious and irrational content and our everyday awareness may be overwhelmed by the force of their expression in our lives. In such situations, we are more likely to "act out" the unconscious forces that surface to consciousness and, in so doing, engage in conduct that may not reflect the moral and ethical standards we expect of ourselves.

With its emphasis on fostering learning and development of individuals and organizations, the field of HRD clearly needs a commitment to an ethic that honors and give voice to the unconscious and irrational dimensions of our being. We need to be able to foster such a commitment in ourselves as academics, in those we prepare to work in the field, and in the clients to whom the field directs its energies. In the next section, I explore what it means for the inner voice to serve as the foundation for such a commitment.

A New Ethic

An ethic of the inner voice suggests that ethical conduct and our sense of integrity arise from a deeper, more complex sense of our being. I want to unpack this notion of the ethic of the inner voice by first fleshing out a bit more what I mean by the inner voice. Then I will address what is intended by the ethic of the inner voice.
The Inner Voice
The idea of the inner voice reflects not only the presence of the unconscious and irrational within our lives but also its relatively autonomous nature (Beebe, 1995; Hillman, 1976; Moore, 1992; Watkins, 1984). That is, it is as if our lives are made up of two primary tracks. On one track runs the day-to-day conscious awareness that most of us know and regard as our realities and who we are. This is the rational view of the human, discussed in the previous section. On another track, however, operates another set of powerful psychological energies that seem to have their agendas, apart from our conscious will. This second track is variously referred to by different scholars as the irrational, unconscious, heart, or soul. For purposes of discussion here, I follow Neumann's (1990) lead and refer to this track within our being as the "inner voice."

The inner voice refers to that part of the human person that is normally not seen by normal waking consciousness, that dimension of the human being that remains invisible yet presses forcefully for expression within our lives. We give voice to this aspect of our being in multiple ways, such as dreams, fantasies, emotional-laden images and behavior, and creative works. It gains expression in our lives, whether we want it to or not and whether or not we consciously participate in its expression. The inner voice often manifests itself through what is referred to as our "shadow," those qualities that we are prone to associate with the other but to minimize within ourselves (Whitmont, 1969). These qualities might consist of such feelings as jealousy or envy that we might be loath to own. But the shadow might also reflect more positive qualities as well, such as imagination or other talents that we might devalue in ourselves. The inner voice reflects our deep sense of integrity (Beebe, 1995; Palmer, 1998). That is, it serves to remind us of those parts of ourselves that we are either unwilling or unable to fully recognize and accept. The inner voice reflects the need to attend to who we are or are intended to be. Anxiety and other emotions that we might experience within particular contexts are often indications of a departure from or lack of attention to this deep sense of integrity (Beebe, 1995).

Seeing aspects of our behavior as "not me" is a way of not owning hidden dimensions of ourselves. This process is known psychologically as "splitting" the world into "good" and "bad," superior and inferior (Beebe, 1995; Neumann, 1990). In splitting, we fail to take ownership for those aspects of ourselves we might sense as undesirable and project them onto an other. Furthermore, we often do not even appreciate their presence in our lives because we tend to define what is relevant by the rational and instrumental frameworks in which are culture is so deeply embedded. For example, we might find ourselves bored to death with a training program. Rather than taking seriously the feelings associated with being bored, we either blame the trainer as not being very effective or the organization for putting us in this situation in the first place. As a trainer, we might find ourselves irritated by a learner in the session and we will tend to blame the person for his or her inappropriate behavior rather than seeking to embrace and more fully understand our emotional reactions to the behavior.
An Ethic of the Inner Voice
When we commit to an ethic of the inner voice, we foster conscious relationships with the unconscious and learn from it. It is a process of listening for and attending to the emotions, feelings, images, and behaviors that are expressive of one's inner voice. From the perspective of depth psychology, we interpret these emotional reactions as

messages from our inner selves, attempts of the unconscious to express deeper threads of meaning in our lives (Beebe, 1995; Moore, 1992; Stein & Horotitz, 1992; Watkins, 1984). Often, these messages reveal what Neumann (1990) refers to as the dark side of our personality or what Beebe (1995) refers as the "shadow." As Gerhard Adler suggests, in the forward to Neumann's (1990) book, "This side has only too often and too easily been seen in, "projected" into, the other person – one way of satisfying the well-known need to find a scapegoat for one's own shortcomings" (p. 8). Attention to the inner voice implies a willingness to recognize these projected images as aspects of ourselves and a desire to integrate them more fully within our own conscious awareness.

We can now see how explicit awareness of ethical codes of conduct does little to restrain these inner demons and how unconscious forces can obliterate one's moral orientation in the world. The threat to ethical practice, and to society at large for that matter, rests not with our inability to define and articulate the assumptions and beliefs that comprise our "moral orientation." Rather, the threat resides in that which is excluded from consciousness by reliance on an overly rational conception of our being in the world (Beebe, 1995; Neumann, 1990). As my drunk drivers, a slew of high-level corporate criminals, and any of us who have experienced severe stress or other overwhelming emotions have painfully discovered, you do not contain the contents of the unconscious. It strives for a voice and will leap at most any chance it is given to do so. Seeking to constrain this inner voice through rational constraints or use of ego consciousness serves only to potentially enrage a force that, if recognized and accepted, might serve a powerfully constructive, creative and energizing force within our lives (Neumann, 1990; Palmer, 2004).

When we assume such an attitude to the emotional and affect-laden images and behaviors in our lives, we begin to appreciate the "hidden" parts of ourselves that we unconsciously recognize is needed to feel whole (Beebe, 1995; Palmer, 2004). When we experience anger at a boring trainer, for example, we might recognize that we are seeking in the "other" a reason for why we feel the way we do. Then we can own our feelings and see them as undesired aspects of ourselves that need and want acceptance within our sense of who are are. If participants in our programs challenge our authority and we feel ourselves becoming annoyed with their behavior, we can understand these feelings as, in part, aspects of ourselves and not entirely the fault of the participant.

Paradoxically, however, perceiving our inner voice recognizes that there is, so to speak, more to ourselves than meets the eye. The self is actually not a single entity at all. Rather, it is quite pluralistic in nature (Clark & Dirkx, 2000; Hillman, 1976; Moore, 1992; Samuels, 1989), made up of multiple selves or parts of the self that seem relatively autonomous and independent of one another. Feeling whole involves recognizing and accepting these various troubling, sometimes conflicting dimensions of ourselves, such as perhaps ugly or undesirable aspects that surface under the influence of alcohol, stress, fatigue, or boredom. Recognizing the many parts of who we are reflects the deep work of integrity (Beebe, 1995; Palmer, 1998) and represents commitment to a new ethic grounded in the inner voice.

For Neumann (1990), then, developing awareness of both the positive and negative forces in individual and collective life is the basis for a new ethical attitude. In order to achieve an ethical attitude towards others who are outside of us, we must come to accept these darker, unseen aspects of ourselves. In Adler's words, "[T]he decisive ethical authority no longer rests with collective values of good and evil and with a conventional "conscience" but with an inner "Voice" (Neumann, 1990, p. 8). Thus, the inner self carries a moral authority. It must be listened to, attended to. In one way or another, it will be heard through any one of its myriad of voices. To avoid acting out the powerful feelings and emotions that come with their expression, we are compelled to develop a conscious relationship with these voices, to come to know them as if they were our daily companions. In a very real sense, they are, often showing up when we are least expecting them.

So what do these inner voices want? Why is it so important that the field of HRD be informed by an ethic of the inner voice? It is to these questions that I now turn.

Relevance of the Inner Voice to Workplace Learning and the Practice of HRD

Work represents for many individuals a critical dimension of their overall well-being. Freud was once asked what he thought were the keys to happiness. He replied simply, "to love and to work." In a study of adulthood, Merriam and Clark (1991) identified three key themes among their participants: loving, working, and learning. A growing body of literature that has evolved around the problem of meaning in work (Pauchant & Associates,) and the spirituality of work (English, Fenwick, & Parson, 2003) provides additional, powerful evidence to the importance that work plays in our individual and collective lives.

Within the last twenty to thirty years, considerable research has focused on workplace learning at both the individual and organizational levels (Beirema, 1996; Billett, 2001; Garrick, 1998; Marsick & Neaman, 1996; Marsick & Watkins, 1990; Watkins, 1996; Welton, 1991; West, 2001). This research suggests that far more is involved than relatively passive individuals engaged in receiving and mastering prescribed specific bodies of

knowledge and skill (Britzman, 1998; Fenwick, 2000). While workplace learning clearly relates to the behaviors and performances in which one engages in the context of work, it is also reflects processes of meaning-making, self-awareness (West, 2001) and self-identity (Welton, 1991; Wenger, 1998) among individuals and groups in the workplace. Workplace learning is now understood as a process of meaning-making that is inherently social, situated, collaborative, and interactive.

Taken collectively, the research on the meaning of work, spirituality of work, and workplace learning suggests that one's life, one's work and its context, and the ongoing learning in which one engages to continue to do this work are all inextricably intertwined (Brockman, 2004; Welton, 1991). In other words, workplace learning represents a potential location in which one's inner voice may be evoked and find expression. HRD practitioners, whether they are conscious of it or not, as facilitators of workplace learning and development become involved in facilitating or impeding the expression of the inner voice of individuals and collectives.

An ethic of the inner voice, then, in workplace learning suggests a commitment by HRD practitioners to a deeper understanding of its complexities. Workplace learning represents a potential medium for the expression of the inner voice, in the form of desires, fantasy, unconscious resistances to learning, defense mechanisms, and dynamics of the group-as-a-whole. (Britzman, 1998; Hart, 2001; Smith & Berg, 1987; Todd, 1997). Rather than reactions or obstacles, these emotional dynamics often manifest the voice of deep learning and change, a kind of language of the soul (Moore, 1992) or expressions of one's inner voice (Beebe, 1995; Neumann, 1990). Attention to the inner voice involves honoring the emotional dynamics and contexts of learning. This emotional context represents a location for the expression of the inner voice of the individual and the collective. As we take seriously the experience of workers and their role in meaning and knowledge construction, we invite more of themselves into the process of learning and knowledge production. If, in the process, they receive signals that this context is not open to the inner life or to expression of the inner voice, it creates, as Palmer (2004) suggests the possibility for a sense of a divided life and the pathology that often accompanies such a sense of self.

Thus, the emotional dimensions of workplace learning represent a critical location for the expression of one's inner voice. The process of making sense of life experiences is often manifest symbolically by emotionally-laden fantasies (Person, 1995) or images (Watkins, 1984) that provide important expressions about the self in relation to itself, to others in the work environment, to the work itself, and to the context in which that work is performed (West, 2001). Examples of the way such images might be expressed among worker-learners might include things like, "I am always last in these things;" "Those that have seem to get even more!" and "They're making us attend this training because they want to show us how stupid we are!" The critically important emotional issues behind these comments, however, are often wrapped in or masked by attention to what seem to be task-related issues within the work environment. As HRD practitioners, we can easily loose site of their importance and significance to the learning process. An ethic of the inner voice calls for commitment to understanding the language of these inner voices and integrating them more fully within the process of workplace learning. Such an ethic promotes a kind of workplace learning that involves coming to grips with and becoming more conscious of unconscious content, of the shadow within one's own life as well as the life of learners and the collective (Briskin, 1996; Noschis, 1992). Ethical conduct requires awareness of these unconscious dynamics and how they are manifest in our lives.

This process, however, of placing one's conscious self in relation to the unconscious is difficult for both the individual and the collective. It is within an appreciation of this relationship that we realize the complexity of acting ethically in one's work, and as an HRD practitioner. Framing workplace learning within a depth psychology perspective allows us to more fully understand the dangers of ignoring one's inner life but also the difficulties as well as the promise of embracing the inner voice as a new ethic (Neumann, 1990). Jungian scholars, such as Neuman (1990), Stein and Hollwitz (1992) and others, draw our attention to the importance of the shadow side of individual and collective life and the ways in which this dimension of our being often becomes manifest in everyday life. Post-Jungians, such as Hillman (1976), Moore (1992), and Briskin (1996) help us appreciate the importance of recognizing and accepting previously rejected aspects of ourselves. This recognition and acceptance of the "other" or "others" within ourselves represents a fundamental dimension of inner work and the inner life.

Implications for HRD

An ethic of the inner voice recognizes the work site and workplace learning as locations that deeply engage the self and consequently the inner lives of all those who participate. Developing explicit sets of values and rules as guidelines for conduct within these settings represent a public acknowledgement of what is expected. Such efforts, however, do little to address the powerful unconscious energies and emotions associated with our inner lives, the energies associated with our shadow side. We have seen how easily these energies surface to consciousness and some of the consequences as a result of the ego being overwhelmed. When this happens, individuals are likely to act

out these emotions, splitting off these feelings from the self and seeking to disown the actions associated with their conscious expression. One's shadow is projected onto the "other." This process poses a potential source of threat to our sense of integrity and to individual and collective ethical behavior, and a sense of a divided life. Commitment to an ethic of the inner voice recognizes the relationship of our shadow sides and works to develop more conscious relationship with this dark, largely unknown part of ourselves, and towards a more undivided life (Palmer, 2004).

Such a commitment holds implications for the field of HRD at multiple levels: the ways we prepare HRD practitioners, the curricular, pedagogical, and training programs designed for workers, and the ways these programs are delivered. Making these changes will not be easy. They amount to a fundamental paradigm shift in the way the field views both preparation and practice. The field of HRD reflects the broader organizational and social cultures in their dominant reliance on a rational understanding of the person and of ethical conduct of people. This culture values highly instrumental, functionalist, and utilitarian approaches to learning and marginalizes emotions, the unconscious, and irrationality in education and training, as well in other areas of life. Fortunately, however, a relatively rich foundation for this work already exists, as I have tried to argue in this article. Numerous scholars have provided challenging accounts from a depth psychology perspective of work and the workplace, and we are beginning to appreciate the psychodynamic complexity of learning as well. The burgeoning literature around "emotional intelligence" at work, although uneven and not all consistent with the view being advocated here, is nonetheless moving the topic of emotions from the margins (Caruso, 2004; Cherniss & Adler, 2000; Goleman & Boyatzis, 2003). Attention to the spirituality of work (English, Fenwick & Parson, 2003) is identifying ways in which practitioners can attend their inner lives. A number of scholars have taken up the practical challenges associated with this foundational work. Their scholarship is contributing to a reframing of teaching and learning in the workplace, such as the work of Peppers and Briskin (2000) on connecting with soul in the context of everyday work, or the strategies for fostering transformation of consciousness suggested by Kegan and Lahey (2001).

References

Argon, S. R., & Hatcher, T. (Eds.). (2001). *Ethics and integrity in HRD: Case studies in research and practice*. Advances in Developing Human Resources, *3*(1).

Beebe, J. (1995). *Integrity in depth*. New York: Fromm International Publishing.

Billett, S. (2001). *Learning in the workplace*. Crows Nest, Australia: Allen and Unwind.

Bierema, L. L. (1996). Development of the individual leads to more productive workplaces. In R. W. Rowden (Ed.), *Workplace learning: Debating five critical questions and theory of practice* (pp. 21-28). New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education , Number 72. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Briskin, A. (1996). *The stirring of soul in the workplace*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Britzman, D. B. (1998). *Lost subjects, contested objects: Toward a psychoanalytic inquiry of learning*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Brockman, J. B. (2004). *Problem solving of machine operators within the context of everyday work: Learning through relationship and community*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.

Burns, J. Z., Dean, P. J., Hatcher, T., Otte, F. L. Preskill, H., & Russ-Eft, D. (1999). *Standards on ethics and integrity* (1st ed.). Baton Rouge, LA: Academy of Human Resource Development.

Caruso, D. R & Salovey, P. (2004). *The emotionally intelligent manager: How to develop and use the four emotional skills of leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chalofsky, N. (2000). Professional morality and integrity: Helping the tin man find his heart. In W. E. A. Ruona & G. Roth (Eds.), *Philosophical foundations of human resource development practice*. Advances in Developing Human Resources, No. 7. Baton Rouge, LA and San Francisco: The Academy of Human Resource Development & Berrett-Koehler.

Cherniss, C., & Adler, M. (2000). *Promoting emotional intelligence in organizations: Making training in emotional intelligence effective*. Alexandria, VA: ASTD.

Clark, M. C., & Dirkx, J. M. (2000). Moving beyond a unitary self: A reflective dialogue. In A. L. Wilson & E. R. Hayes (Eds.), *Handbook of adult and continuing education (new edition)* (101-116). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Davis, R. H. (2003). *Jung, Freud, and Hillman: Three depth psychologies in context*. Westport, CN: Praeger.

English, L. M., Fenwick, T. J., & Parsons, J. (2003). *Spirituality in adult education and training*. Malabar, FL: Krieger.

Fenwick, T. J. (2000). Expanding conceptions of experiential learning: A review of the five contemporary perspectives on cognition. *Adult Education Quarterly, 50*(4), 243-272.

Gabriel, Y. (1999). *Organizations in depth: The psychoanalysis of organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Garrick, J. (1998). *Informal learning in the workplace*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Goleman, D. & Boyatzis, R. (2002). *Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School.

Graham, P. G. (2002). Perspectives on the ethical stands of the Academy. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 13*(2), 227-230.

Hillman, J. (1976). *Re-visioning psychology*. New York: Harper & Row.

Hirschorn, L. (1988). *The workplace within: Psychodynamics of organizational life*. Cambridge, MA: MIT.

Hirschorn, L., & Barnett, C. K. (1993). *The psychodynamics of organizations*. Philadelphia: Temple.

Kegan, R., & Lahey, L. L. (2001). *How the way we talk can change the way we work: Seven languages for transformation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kets de Vries, M. F. R., & Associates (1991). *Organizations on the couch: Clinical perspectives of organizational behavior and change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kets de Vries, M. F. R., & Miller, D. (1984). *The neurotic organization*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

LaBier, D. (1986). *Modern Madness: The emotional fallout of success*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Maccoby, M. (1976). *The gamesman: The new corporate leaders*. New York: Simon and Schuster

Marsick, V. J., & Neamn, P. G. (1996). Individuals who learn create organizations that learn. In R. W. Rowden (Ed.), *Workplace learning: Debating five critical questions and theory of practice* 97-104. New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education , Number 72. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Marsick, V. J., & Watkins, K. E. (1990). *Informal and incidental learning in the workplace*. London: Routledge.

Merriam, S. B., & Clark, M. C. (1991). *Lifelines: Patterns of work, love, and learning in adulthood*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merton, T. (1989). Hagia Sophia, In T. P. McDonnell (Ed.). *A Thomas Merton reader*, (p. 506). New York: Image/Doubleday.

Moore, T. (1992). *Care of the soul: A guide for cultivating depth and sacredness in everyday life*. New York: HarperCollins.

Neumann, E. (1990). *Depth psychology and a new ethic*. Boston: Shambala.

Noschis, K (1992). Dealing with an organization's shadow aspects. In M. Stein & J. Hollwitz (Eds.), *Psyche at work: Workplace applications of Jungian analytical psychology* (pp. 118-1345. Wilmette, IL: Chiron.

Palmer, P. J. (2004). *A hidden wholeness: The journey toward an undivided life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Palmer, P. J. (1998). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pauchant, T.C., & Associates (1995). *In search of meaning: Managing for the health of our organizations, our communities and the natural world.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Peppers, C., & Briskin, A. (2000). *Bringing your soul to work: An everyday practice*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Person, E. S. (1995). *By force of fantasy: How we make our lives*. New York: Penguin.

Samuels, A. (1989). *The plural psyche: Personality, morality and the father*. New York: Routledge.

Senge, P. (1994). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday.

Smith, K., & Berg, D. (1987). *Paradoxes of group life: Understanding conflict, paralysis and Movement in Group Dynamics.* San Francisco, CA: The Lexington Press.

Stein, M, & Howwitz, J. (Eds.). (1992). *Psyche at work: Workplace applications of Jungian analytical psychology*. Wilmette, IL: Chiron.

Todd, S. (Ed.). (1997). *Learning desire: Perspectives on pedagogy, culture, and the unsaid*. New York: Routledge.

Watkins, K. E. (1996). Of course organizations can learn! In R. W. Rowden (Ed.), *Workplace learning: Debating five critical questions and theory of practice* (pp. 89-96). New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education , Number 72. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Watkins, M. (1984). *Waking dreams (Third Edition)*. Woodstock, CN: Spring.

Welton, M. (1991). *Toward development work: The workplace as a learning environment*. Geelong: Deakin

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

West, L. (2001). *Doctors on the edge: General practitioners, health and learning in the inner-city*. London: Free Association.