



LSP@Systemic Coaching by Ariane Hecker

My motivation to use LSP was to coach very rational people who do not easily connect to their emotions and inner purposes. People who overthink everything and do not trust their intuition, aka unknown known.

There are strong parallels between systemic Coaching and LSP. First: Both – systemic Coach and Facilitator – try to unlock the unknown knowledge to help clients find their own solution for their problem or challenge. In both situations the client needs support to solve that quest.

Facilitating sollutions

Neither systemic Coach nor Facilitator provide solutions. Instead they create a safe space and provide a framework where clients are able to develop an individual solution that matches their needs and restrictions. In both methods we ask humble questions and are empathetic with the clients needs and challenges.

When I explained Robert my approach, he told me that I would have to build alongside with the client. Which meant I have to build, I have to share and be an active part of the process.

Of course a systemic Coach is part of the coaching process, too. But only in providing the safe space for the client to open up and trust in the process and the methods, the coach uses. Feedback or opinions are not part of a classical systemic coaching. A systemic coach gives impulses, nudges in a very subtle, humble way. It's almost as if the systemic coach gets invisible. If the process is working, most of the time the client will not remember the questions asked or the impulses set. The client is in the flow.

That's where systemic coaching connects to LSP again. Clients get into the flow, too, when they are building.

Providing a safe space by building together

To provide the safe space in a one on one coaching session with LSP Robert insisted that the coach has to build, too. The coach has to be a visible part in the process. By also building and sharing the coach supports on the one side the skills building. On the other side the client does not feel watched or judged. By building together both can get into the flow. Building together one on one supports the diving into a condition where the brain is able to connect to the unknown knowledge.

So I developed with Robert a roadmap where I would also build, but not answering identical questions as the client but similar ones. We would start of course with Skills Building and usually I would begin to share, to show how it's done. You can imagine, that that's totally unusual in systemic Coaching where the Coach is leaving the stage for the client.

In Skills Building 3.0 we would slowly bridge as usual to the main topic of the coaching, e.g. building a nightmare situation opposite to the aspired situation or condition.

We would then use AT 1 to build individual models as e.g. aspired attitudes, agents or members of an inner team. I would stop building after the second AT 1 and then leave the building process to the client. Staying at the table I would sustain the safe space for the client, but leave the client in the flow of building and sharing. Of course I actively reflect with the client and ask humble questions.

In the next step we would then use AT 3 to create a landscape where all the models/agents are organized in a defined hierarchy. Of course we would check whether an agent is missing or the position in the landscape does not feel right. The client builds and repositions till the landscape feels complete.

In another coaching we used an AT2 and the client had to destill the essential aspects of the different models to create her aspired job description. And it was interesting to watch the client negotiate with herself to combine the AT2.

The AT 3 is another strong connection to systemic Coaching. I normally describe the systemic coaching process as taking a walk in an inner landscape. I am like a travel companion to provide a safe trip in this new territory. With an AT 3 the Client is building this landscape in 3D and is able to transform it, to wander in it and take different perspectives in that landscape. Besides the client is able to imagine how this inner landscape could change. If we would build a whole complex system we could also try an emerge and an RTS.

Transferring the new knowledge

If the client is confident with the landscape or the shared model, I close the coaching with systemic questions like: So you have the feeling that the landscape/model is the answer to the coaching goal? You think that you can use these findings to make a step towards your goal? You can imagine a specific next step you can do tomorrow or in the near future? That's very similar to the DSS or the SGP and it indicates whether the findings really work and the client is able to transfer the new knowledge to every day life.

Sometimes just putting a topic in form of a model on the table and making it visible, helps. It's not necessary to make a deduction or solve it, the process of understanding starts and

evolves by itself. Sounds magic, well, maybe. But I experienced it with LSP and with systemic coaching, too, but without 3D.

So here's an example: One Client was very fast and detailed in her models. Every model was symmetrical, complementary colours. But then she built a pink and purple, chaotic structure. And even more, she said: "I don't know what it is, but I had to build it." We both knew that this model was very important, but we had to wait some time to find out why. She called me two weeks later and told me, that she now knows, what it meant. She could connect it to a Coaching she had a year ago. That structure was the evolution of an image, she found in that coaching. That model showed her development towards her aspirational goal and helped her overcome her obstacles. So the process started with that irritating model and it took some time till the meaning popped up. But it did.

That's why my SGP is "trust the process". For systemic coaching as well as for LSP.