

**INTEGRALLY-INFORMED APPROACHES
TO TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT**

Alain Gauthier & Marilyn Fowler

Conference Paper

**Integral Theory in Action:
Serving Self, Community and Kosmos**

August 7-10, 2008

INTEGRALLY-INFORMED APPROACHES TO TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

Alain Gauthier & Marilyn Fowler

Abstract

This paper summarizes the key findings, interpretations and questions that result from a nine-month exploratory study of the emerging field of ‘generative change leader development’, and presents key components of an integrally-informed approach to developing deep-capacity leaders able to effect transformational change at organizational and societal levels.

The study was based on interviews with observers of the field and program directors on five continents, as well as on analyses of websites, articles, and books. It benefits from the extensive experience that the research team gathered in decades of founding and leading diverse leadership networks as well as educational and training programs. While keeping in mind the larger leadership development field, we focused our exploration on medium to long-term development programs for what we call ‘generative’ change leaders who work in and across the public, business and civil society sectors. We used two additional criteria for selecting programs: they must integrate the personal, interpersonal and systemic dimensions of change, and do so in service of individual, organizational and societal transformation to effectively address humanity’s increasingly complex economic, political, social and environmental challenges.

The leadership development approach presented in this paper is framed from a

consciousness perspective based on the work of prominent integral theorists, including Bill Torbert, Robert Kegan, Susanne Cook-Greuter and Ken Wilber, and informed by our ten years of experience and research working with this kind of educational content at John F. Kennedy University. It examines key characteristics and capacities of generative leaders in terms of conventional and post-conventional stage development, and offers specific consciousness-based approaches and practices that can accelerate the process of leadership development to post-conventional stages.

The paper is structured in two parts that reflect the two perspectives adopted in this paper. After a brief review of the objectives, context, and scope of the study, as well as of the forces affecting the field, Part I summarizes some of the core views on leadership development shared by the directors of selected programs, lists a number of common characteristics of these programs, and presents some of the questions and unmet needs that could be addressed by an ongoing community of learning and action. It concludes with a few next steps that we are undertaking to further develop the usefulness of the research, its translation into action, and the expansion of our network of interested program directors and facilitators in this emerging field. Part II begins with a review of the key characteristics and capacities of leaders who operate at post-conventional stages of development and discusses the correlation between post-conventional development stages and consciousness development, using Ken Wilber's AQAL model and Steve McIntosh's integral philosophy

as a frame. It follows with the author's understanding of the key components of consciousness-based leadership education, then concludes by addressing the question of the conditions needed to develop the field and ideas on how to implement consciousness-based leadership development.

PART I: GLOBAL EXPLORATION OF GENERATIVE CHANGE LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the exploratory study—which started in the field in July 2007—were to: (1) globally search for innovative and successful education, training, and development programs for generative leaders, social entrepreneurs, and other change agents; (2) identify societal change agent development needs that are not currently addressed; and (3) identify program directors who would be interested in being connected through a learning and collaborative network.

Being generative in this context includes becoming more creative and compassionate, wiser and responsible for the whole, capable of transcending widely-accepted worldviews and behaviors that stand in the way of aligning ourselves with personal, social and environmental sustainability. Generative change leaders are willing and able to shift the inner and interpersonal perspective from which they operate. They also enable others to accept personal responsibility for changing their own attitudes and actions. And they help to transform the culture of their organizations and the larger systems in which they play an active role.

The focus has been on programs for leaders who come from diverse sectors (private, public, and civil society) – as well as for “change process

practitioners” (educators, facilitators, consultants, and coaches) – committed to bringing about a more humane, just, and sustainable world.

1.2 Context

The nine-month global study was co-led by Alain Gauthier, as Project Coordinator, and Thais Corral and Walter Link who are co-founders and co-chairs of the Global Leadership Network (GLN). GLN supports the continuation of this research process, following the publication of the collective book *Leadership is Global* (2006).

The Stewardship Group of the project was composed of additional global leadership experts from four continents. An overview paper and a directory of selected programs will be available in September on the website of the Global Leadership Network ([HYPERLINK "http://globalleadershipnetwork.net/" http://globalleadershipnetwork.net/](http://globalleadershipnetwork.net/)).

1.3 Forces Affecting the Field

A number of enhancing and constraining forces are impacting the size and growth of the field of generative change leader development.

A. Enhancing forces

1. Growing emphasis on developing ‘human capital’, individual and collective creativity, and attracting and retaining talent across all sectors.
2. Adoption of the UN Global Compact’s principles for responsible management education by more 100 business schools world-wide by the end of 2008.
3. Growing number and influence of civil society organizations in many countries.

4. Growing number and impact of social entrepreneurs, connected and supported by international networks (e.g. *Ashoka*, *Skoll*).
5. Growing emphasis on collaborative leadership and particularly on multi-sector partnerships as key vehicles for development.
6. Movement toward co-generational and international leadership networks.
7. Increasing virtual networking and educational possibilities.
8. Growing proportion of 'cultural creatives' and of 'post-conventional' leaders, particularly in younger generations.
9. Beginning of a shift from a 'domination' to a 'partnership paradigm', especially with the growing influence of women.
10. Growing interest in meditation and other spiritual practices as a key to greater creativity and well being in some organizations and domains such as health care.

B. Constraining forces

1. Emphasis on short-term performance improvement.
2. Increasing time pressures on leaders and other change agents (little time for reflection).
3. Majority of business schools emphasizing financial and quantitative approaches in last two decades.
4. Limited number and enrollment of existing programs that truly integrate all levels of change agent development work.
5. Limited number of change practitioners/educators capable of guiding generative change development and work.
6. Few generative leadership development programs available to or affordable by social entrepreneurs.
7. Few leadership development programs focused on the development of collective leadership and collective intelligence.
8. Increasing fragmentation of society and growing individualism and materialism.
9. Growing fundamentalism in some societies.
10. 'Domination paradigm' still firmly entrenched, particularly among middle-aged and older men.

1.4 Scope of the Study

The scope of the survey was intentionally global, with an emphasis on exploring both the diversity of regional/cultural approaches and identifying potentially universal principles and practices. This approach is core to the Global Leadership Network, which attempts to counterbalance the fact that most internationally known and applied processes and programs, books and audio-visual materials originate from the US and a few countries in Western Europe. By contrast, little is known (except locally) about leading-edge programs on other continents.

Given the large size of the leadership development field, we focused our study on the programs that met most of the following criteria:

1. The primary audiences of the program are leaders, social entrepreneurs, and change practitioners who work across sectors.
2. There is a substantial degree of integration among the personal, interpersonal, and systemic components of the program.
3. The design has some innovative features that differentiate it from traditional leadership development programs.
4. The profile and experience of the designers and facilitators of the program indicate a deep understanding and practice of the integration between personal, interpersonal and systemic change.
5. The curriculum is at least 4 months long to facilitate meaningful transformative outcomes.
6. Post-program evaluation results are available.

Through literature review, website analysis, and individual interviews of field observers and program directors, we have identified a preliminary list of 25

programs in the world that meet most of these criteria (see Appendix 1). The selected programs take place on five continents and cover a wide range along dimensions of leadership development: from four months to two years in length; from MBA, Executive MBA and PhD programs (hosted by well-known universities) to independent programs designed for social change agents; from programs for industrialized countries to programs adapted to the needs of developing countries; from self-sustaining programs (based on tuition) to programs dependent on foundation grants; and from formal programs with a degree or certificate to organic ‘learning by doing’ approaches (see diagram in Appendix 2).

2. KEY FINDINGS

The selected programs focus on developing integrally-informed approaches that put equal emphasis on the ‘interior’ dimensions of both individual and collective development (intention, worldview, purpose, vision, values and cultural norms) and on its ‘exterior’ or visible dimensions (behaviors, organizational structures and processes), and how shifts or interventions in these domains must be coherent for change to be both deep and sustainable. They also pay attention to developmental levels in these dimensions, and to the dynamic relationship between individual and collective transformation (McIntosh, 2007).

These programs share certain views on leadership development as well as a number of characteristics, and their directors are pondering some similar questions and unmet

needs.

2.1 Shared Views on Leadership Development

The program directors and designers tend to share the following views on leadership development:

1. Addressing humanity's complex challenges (such as climate change, poverty, social inequity or HIV/AIDS) requires the skilled, creative and collaborative interventions of 'post-heroic' change leaders or 'social artists' at many levels and across boundaries (Kahane, 2006; Parks, 2005; Houston, nd). It also calls for new organizational forms such as 'living networks' where individual and collective leadership enables the emergence of collective intelligence (Kuenkel, 2007).
2. Exercising leadership in cross-sector or multi-stakeholder contexts requires a higher level of both inner and interpersonal skills to deal effectively with the diversity of worldviews, values, assumptions, languages and experiences; developing leadership in such contexts will help accelerate the growth of leaders from any sector.
3. Developing this new type of co-leadership requires both a congruent mix of integral methodologies and leadership development professionals (facilitators, mentors, and coaches) who 'walk their talk' in addressing both 'interior' and 'exterior' dimensions of change, from a post-conventional stage of development.
4. Combining a variety of developmental models, methods and tools which were primarily codified in the West —along with Eastern and local practices of inner and community development— is key to both effectiveness and cultural

appropriateness; in the case of international programs, identifying and developing local facilitators and coaches ensures both local relevance and program sustainability (Hochachka, 2006).

2.2 Common Characteristics

Although the programs we surveyed occupy diverse leadership development

‘niches’, many of them share several characteristics:

1. Over a period of four months to two years, they alternate short intensive retreats and months of fieldwork, with periodic individual coaching and/or mentoring by people who know the program well.
2. Their cohorts range from 15 to 25 people, to allow both large group dialogue and individual coaching by faculty members.
3. An attentive selection of candidates ensures both good fit and good timing, with the help of ‘alumni’ who become nominators and/or mentors.
4. They emphasize action learning, offer multiple conceptual frameworks, approaches and practices as possible entry points, and combine inner work, peer learning, individual and team coaching, action-learning projects and community building.
5. There is a strong commitment to values and corresponding behavior patterns throughout the program (Kofman, 2006).

6. Innovative learning processes include various forms of group and individual practices (Part II refers to a number of these practices as well as many others):

Self-reflection practices such as action inquiry, journaling, meditation, silent nature retreats

Analysis of films and other artwork

Artistic expression, body movements, improvisation

Circle rituals and other forms of deep dialogue

Peer shadowing

Learning journeys

Hands-on ‘prototyping’ and experimentation

7. Program design and activities evolve over time, based on the evaluation of each

retreat and of the overall program by faculty and participants, as well as on participants' initiatives within the program.

2.3 Questions and Unmet Needs

Interviews with directors, designers, and observers of integral development

programs surfaced a number of questions and unmet needs:

1. How can program length or time demands be reduced to make it more accessible to busy leaders, while devoting enough time to supportive practices that enable transformation?
2. How to scale up programs that currently have cohorts of only 15-25 participants?
3. If the program is designed to mostly attract individual participants, how could it be supplemented with group capacity development within their organization?
4. How to build a community of practice among various cohorts of 'graduates', especially when the program serves a specific region or community, in order to reach a critical mass of change agents?
5. How to better evaluate the program's impact on participants and their organization/community beyond self-evaluation at the end of the program, and after one or two years?
6. How to promote a more integral leadership education in mainstream business schools and corporate programs?
7. How to increase the number of programs that attract emerging or confirmed leaders from multiple sectors?
8. How to develop instructors, facilitators and coaches capable of guiding participants in the development and integration of inner practices in their professional life?
9. How can programs be made accessible to leaders who do not have a higher education, speak only a local language or dialect, and/or want to relate what is advocated in the program to their faith or their indigenous practices?
10. What new funding models are needed to make programs financially accessible to all potential participants while keeping them viable over the years?

The directors and designers of integral development programs could benefit from joining a global learning network that would cross the current boundaries of this emerging field. They could be inspired by the diversity of methods already used by their colleagues, and possibly collaborate in addressing some of the questions and unmet needs in the field.

3. NEXT STEPS

We are in the process of presenting, discussing, and deepening the key findings and questions of this exploratory study at several international leadership conferences, including the Society for Organizational Learning Global Forum, the Integral Theory in Action Conference at John F. Kennedy University, the European Academy for Business and Society Colloquium, and the International Leadership Association Annual Meeting.

We seek dialogue and interactions with individuals who have a strong interest and experience in this emerging leadership development field. The intended outcomes of these contacts and sessions are to:

1. Connect with other change practitioners and program developers who share similar interests and might want to learn from each other and collaborate in the future.
2. Identify, refine, and build on the characteristics and learning practices that are being used by the most innovative leadership development programs around the world.
3. Become more aware of the degree of personal maturity and of the competencies required to design and facilitate such capability-building programs.

Inspire existing educational institutions to modify or expand their curriculum in order to enhance change leaders' integral ability to address humanity's complex global and local challenges.

PART II: KEY COMPONENTS OF AN INTEGRAL APPROACH TO DEVELOP POST-CONVENTIONAL LEADERSHIP

1. INTRODUCTION

The Global Leadership Study presented in Part I of this paper identified a number of common characteristics of innovative and effective leadership programs that are crucial to developing generative leaders, change agents, and social entrepreneurs throughout the world. Among the key findings, results from the study indicate that such leadership development programs provide an integration of personal, interpersonal and systemic components, including action learning, multiple conceptual frameworks and approaches, inner- and outer-directed work and innovative forms of individual and group practices.

Part II of this paper will examine key characteristics and capacities of generative, post-conventional stage leaders using the deeper perspective of consciousness development. We will discuss leadership capacity building in terms of structure-stage development, and offer specific approaches and practices using multiple perspectives that can accelerate the process of leadership development to post-conventional stages. The focus of this part of the paper is to show the link at the later stages between consciousness development and leadership development. It is our premise that late-stage leadership development is a function of *consciousness* development—by which we mean the process of broadening one’s capacities to make sense of reality using the

multiple perspectives of emotional intelligence, values understanding, somatic attunement and spiritual awareness, in addition to cognitive development and scientific intelligence. The synthesis of these capacities is, we believe, the portal to late-stage leadership development.

1.1 *Generative Leaders and Change Agents*

Findings of the Global Leadership study indicate that leaders and change agents who are seen as *generative* possess an enhanced ability to

- Influence others' attitudes and behavior through their increased capacity to shift their inner and interpersonal perspectives.
- Move beyond popularly accepted worldviews and behaviors that stand in the way of long-term, sustainable outcomes.
- Effect change through creative, compassionate, and wise action.
- Transform the culture of their organizations as well as the larger systems in which those organizations are embedded.

Much has been written in the leadership development literature about deep-capacity leaders who are able to move beyond conventional knowledge to actively cultivate post-conventional wisdom. Using the pioneering work of Jean Piaget (1977) and others, current theorists Bill Torbert (1994, 1998, 2004, 2005), Susanne Cook-Greuter (1999, 2002, 2004), Robert Kegan (1994), and Ken Wilber (1996, 1997, 2000, 2006) have all adapted structure-stage models that show how the perspectives of leaders change as they progress through specific, delineated stages of growth and development. At each stage, leaders' understanding of themselves,

others and the world shifts. They adopt a new lens through which they view reality.

As Torbert, Cook-Greuter, Kegan and Wilber have written, this developmental process involves individuals progressing from one stage to the next—without skipping stages—in a sequential, lower-to-higher movement. As Cook-Greuter (2002) describes it

Human development in general can be looked at as a progression of different ways of making sense of reality or different action logics. The action logics follow each other, alternating between those that emphasize, on balance, differentiation over integration and those favoring integration over differentiation. This pattern of differentiation to integration can be observed both overall and from action logic to action logic. (p. 3)

To provide a more concrete understanding of this developmental process, Bill Torbert's (2004) Action Logics model provides a helpful frame.

1.2 Torbert's Action Logics

The Action Logics model, developed by Bill Torbert and further enhanced with the collaboration of psychologist Susanne Cook-Greuter, maps nine general stages of leadership development, grouped into three general operational frameworks—*pre-conventional* power and control, *conventional* reasoning and knowledge and *post-conventional* understanding and wisdom. Briefly, as Torbert (2005) and Cook-Greuter (2002) describe them, these action logics are:

Action Logic

Characteristics

Pre-conventional

Impulsive

Impulsive; opportunistic; “me, mine”

Governed by desires. Wants immediate gratification, competing for goods, space, dominance, power.

Opportunist

Wins any way possible. Self oriented, manipulative; “might makes right.”

Conventional

Diplomat

Rules and laws; social programming; linear reasoning

Avoids overt conflict. Wants to belong, obeys group norms; rarely rocks the boat.

Expert

Rules by logic and expertise. Seeks rational efficiency.

Achiever

Meets strategic goals. Effectively achieves goals through teams; juggles managerial duties and demands; employs rational ‘in-the-

market

box’ thinking.

Post-conventional

Individualist

Systems view; larger self-identity; meta-cognition

Stands outside the system. Aware of paradox; desires unique personal accomplishments; distrusts conventional wisdom, rules, roles.

Strategist

transformations.

Generates organizational and personal

interconnected systems of relationships and processes;

Sees

exercises the power of mutual inquiry and vulnerability; committed to self-determination and self-actualization.

Alchemist and Ironist

Generates social transformations. Aware of the constructed nature of reality; recognizes

underlying

assumptions;

sees fundamental unity underlying chaos.

Torbert (2004) describes the action logics as a path of Self-transformation toward fully and regularly enacting the values of integrity, mutuality and sustainability [where] each major step... can be described as developing a new action-logic: an overall strategy that so thoroughly informs our experience that we cannot see it” (p. 65-66).

As Torbert suggests here, each action logic provides the foundation for the next.

But the transition from the conventional to the post-conventional stage is truly a paradigm shift. Not until individuals reach the post-conventional stages are they able to see the systems and processes within which they have been operating.

Beginning with the Strategist stage, they are not only able to see the inter-connected nature of these systems and processes but use them to create transformational change within themselves and their organizations. At the late Alchemist and Ironist stages, rare leaders—Ghandi, Martin Luther King, Pope John XXIII as examples—are able to produce social transformation by seeing the unity underlying chaos (Rooke and Torbert, 2005).

1.3 Differences between Conventional and Post-Conventional Stage Leaders

Extensive research by Rooke and Torbert (2005) using Cook-Greuter’s Leadership Development Profile, a sentence-completion assessment tool, indicates that leaders operating at pre-conventional stages account for only about five percent of current managers and professionals, but leaders at conventional stages account for approximately 80 percent of the current managerial and professional workforce.

In a typical pattern of leadership development, newer leaders often start at earlier action logics, then, as their experience and perspectives broaden, progress to later stages. However, as Rooke and Torbert (2005) and Cook-Greuter (2002) have documented, most leaders remain within the conventional developmental stages. They do not make the transition to post-conventional understanding.

To understand why so few leaders move into post-conventional stages, it is useful to examine more closely some of the key differences in the perspectives and practices of leaders who operate at conventional and post-conventional stages.

According to Cook-Greuter (2002), characteristics of leaders at conventional stages include:

- Strong desire for knowledge acquisition: knowing more and doing more.
- Tendency towards increasing differentiation: determining how one is different from or better than others.
- High conformity to social norms and expectations: acting according to the way things “should” be done.
- Linear cognitive processes: valuing rational prediction, quantitative measurement and logical explanation of facts and phenomena.

Leaders at the post-conventional stages—which Rooke and Torbert (1998) count as only 15 percent of current managers but more often working in senior management and CEO positions—operate with a different set of characteristics. Cook-Greuter (2002) explains that leaders with later post-conventional action logics are better able to

- See the dynamic, interdependent nature of systems.
- Recognize underlying assumptions in their own and others' thinking.
- Value commonality and collaboration with others.
- Operate from multiple perspectives of awareness simultaneously.
- Navigate increasing levels of complexity and paradox more comfortably.
- Transcend polarities to see underlying unity within chaos.
- Engage in creative, non-linear thinking to solve problems.
- Use their power in mutually-enhancing, empowering ways that generate positive transformation.

How is it that post-conventional leaders are able to operate with such advanced capacities? Robert Kegan (1994) and Susanne Cook-Greuter (1999) have both explored the internal dimensions of post-conventional development and found that a key difference in these later action logics lies in these leaders' level of ego development.

Described as

fifth-order consciousness by Kegan (1994) and post-autonomous ego-development

by Cook-Greuter (1999), the internal development of these leaders is such that they

- Hold a more fluid, process-oriented self-identity, dis-identified with ego.
- Are aware of the relative nature of meaning as a construct.
- Have an understanding of knowledge that integrates intuitive and non-representational ways of knowing with rational, cognitive intelligence.
- See the underlying principles that govern their own and others' 'way of knowing.'

1.4 Outcomes of Leaders at Conventional and Post-Conventional Stages

As we see from these characteristics, leaders operating at post-conventional stages are more able to transcend their own egocentric perspectives and linear thinking patterns to see issues in a broader context. They are also able to use more creative, intuitive, and collaborative means to solve problems. But how do these differences translate to the applied world of organizations? Are these deep-capacity leaders able to achieve any better operational results than their conventional-stage peers?

Torbert (2004) has been collecting results over the span of his 25-plus years of research and is now beginning to see some important differences in outcomes achieved by leaders operating within these two different paradigms. “Research has begun to confirm that people who hold later action logics do indeed tend to be more effective managers and more transformational leaders” (Torbert, 2004, p. 109). In studies involving thousands of corporate and professional managers in the US and Europe, Torbert (2005, p. 2) found

- Managers at pre-conventional and early conventional stages are more often associated with below-average corporate performance.
- Managers at later action logics tended to redefine problems and to propose collaborative rather than unilateral action in responding to problems.
- Managers at post-conventional stages showed the consistent capacity to innovate and to successfully transform their organizations.

The implications of these findings are highly significant as we consider the

enormous global issues facing us at this moment in history. It is a sobering fact that many of the pressing economic, political, social and environmental challenges in the world today are rooted in the conventional thinking and practices of first-world government and business leaders. Our very survival may depend on developing the capacity of leaders at all levels to move beyond conventional ways of being and acting in the world—to see the systemic nature of these global challenges, recognize our commonality as planetary neighbors, collaborate across sectors to redefine our common problems and devise innovative, creative solutions on a global scale.

2. DEVELOPING POST-CONVENTIONAL STAGE LEADERS

2.1 Expanding Leadership Consciousness

It is clear that the global challenges we are facing today require leaders with post-conventional stage capacities. Let us now turn to the more important question of *how* to develop these kinds of leaders. To begin the discussion, Ken Wilber's Four-Quadrant model (2006) serves as a useful frame.

The Four Quadrant model provides a comprehensive developmental view of four dimensions of consciousness, easily recognized in this well-known graphic format.

As Wilber (1997) explains, the two ‘Right Hand’ quadrants represent realities that can be apprehended externally through the senses.

They are all empirical phenomena; they exist in the sensorimotor worldspace. They are, in other words, objective and inter-objective realities; they are what individual and communal holons look like from the outside, in an exterior and objectifying fashion” (Wilber, 1997, p.75).

The two ‘Left Hand’ quadrants represent realities that are apprehended internally through subjective experience. As Wilber notes, “Every exterior has an interior” (1997, p.75).

In most Western business schools and leadership programs today, leadership development has been framed largely in terms of the ‘Right Hand’ path—teaching objective, empirical, and behavioral ways of knowing. This is what Torbert and Cook-Greuter would term *conventional*-stage leadership development approaches.

From an integral perspective, however, developing leaders capable of operating beyond the conventional action logics must also include the ‘Left Hand’ path—the Interior “I” of the Upper Left quadrant and the Intersubjective “We” space of the Lower Left quadrant. Developing post-conventional stage capacities starts by

acknowledging interior realities as well as exterior realities.

Integral theorist Steve McIntosh (2007) describes this shift towards including interior as well as exterior realities as a way of changing our consciousness about what development means—away from the narrow interpretation of development as increasing cognitive intelligence to a fuller understanding of development as *expanding consciousness* among three primary lines—*cognitive* intelligence (IQ), *emotional* intelligence (EQ) and *values* intelligence (VQ). He describes these three intelligences

as follows:

- *Cognitive* intelligence (IQ): developing theoretical reasoning, scientific intelligence.
- *Emotional* intelligence (EQ): developing emotional sensitivity, empathy, intuition.
- *Values* intelligence (VQ): developing one's worldview and moral center of gravity.

McIntosh (2007) makes the strong point that developing deep-capacity consciousness — what Torbert and Cook-Greuter call developing post-conventional stage action logics—requires a *synthesis* of all three of these intelligences. Understood in terms of integral theory, unifying all three of these primary lines of development integrates the exterior 'Right Hand' path with the interior 'Left Hand' path to move toward a truly integral consciousness. As McIntosh asserts, "Integral consciousness provides not only a new

way of seeing things, but also a new way of arriving at creative solutions—a new epistemological capacity” (McIntosh, 2007, p. 82).

2.2 Consciousness-Based Educational Approaches to Accelerate Development

We agree with McIntosh’s assertion that expanding consciousness by synthesizing different intelligences and exploring new epistemologies is what is needed to transform individuals from conventional ‘do-ers’ to post-conventional ‘agents of change.’ This has been our experience over the last ten years in the Integral Studies programs offered within the School of Holistic Studies (SHS) at John F. Kennedy University and is the focus of the emerging Integral Leadership specialization now being developed there.

Integral Studies, which comprises three inter-related Master of Arts programs, *Consciousness and Transformative Studies*, *Integral Psychology* and *Integral Theory*,

considers one of its main purposes to be facilitating transformative change among its students. While each program accomplishes this goal in a different way, they share a number of elements that we have found very effective in producing deep change in our students’ sense of self-identity and way of being in the world.

As a typical profile, individuals who enter these masters-level graduate programs

are adults between the ages of 25 and 55 years of age who describe themselves as

intuitive and spiritually (or Kosmos) aware. About half are, or have been, managers or professionals working in mainstream occupations or in entrepreneurial businesses. Individuals in these programs take an average of 24 to 36 months to complete their studies. Facilitating deep change in our students involves a process of developing their internal awareness over time. To accomplish this we use a mix of didactic and experiential activities. We have noticed that deep learning requires both approaches—in fact, we have seen that the deepest learning occurs in the experiential learning components, as students apply the concepts to their own life. These experiential activities use what Torbert (2004) calls *action inquiry*. Students' own experiences provide the feedback for their learning.

We have also found it essential to use multiple learning modes to deepen the learning experience. Providing a variety of learning sources offers multiple channels for students to gain knowledge and access their own wisdom. Our experience has shown that deep change is shaped as much by the learning *process* as by the

learning content. Among the learning modes we find important are:

- *Self-inquiry*: Deep questions that require extensive personal reflection to allow access to one's structure of experience or internal wisdom.
- *Peer learning*: Discussions and sharing of experiences among students that can provide powerful examples of personal applications of the learning.
- *Mirroring and coaching*: Use of powerful questions and reflective inquiry by instructors that can help students examine their structure of interpretation.

Embedded within the content of each curriculum are six different dimensions of

internal development that, in our experience, are essential for developing individuals who have the capacity to become agents of transformative change. Below is a synopsis of the core content and examples of experiential elements in these six learning dimensions that we believe crucial in building post-conventional stage leadership capacities.

2.3 Consciousness Components in Post-Conventional Stage Leadership Education

- Systems View
 - ~ Perceiving the interdependent nature of systems, especially living systems, and their dynamic, self-organizing properties.
 - ~ Seeing the increasingly larger ‘nest’ of individual, societal, cultural and global systems in which we are embedded
 - ~ Understanding sustainable systems: personal, collective and planetary perspectives

Experiential Learning Activities (Examples)

- ~ Awareness practice: Systems from a first person perspective
 - ~ Field practice: Living systems exploration
 - ~ Personal experience: Sustainability practices
- Paradigm Understanding
 - ~ Recognizing paradigms as worldviews: traditional, modern, post-modern, holistic and integral views
 - ~ Developing the capacity to take cross-paradigmatic perspectives
 - ~ Developing meta-perspectives: understanding the nature of paradox and evolutionary reality

Experiential Learning Activities (Examples)

- ~ Self inquiry: Paradigms as a lived experience
 - ~ Personal practice: Paradox and current reality
 - ~ Awareness practice: Developing a global focus
- Philosophical, Psychological, Spiritual Knowledge (East/West/Indigenous)
 - ~ Understanding ourselves as part of the Web of Life

- ~ Accessing subtle states of consciousness: creativity and the imaginal realm
- ~ Developing intuition and internal guidance
- ~ Moving beyond ego-identity to Self-identity
- ~ Exploring personal mythology and shadow material
- ~ Developing presence and working from Essence
- ~ Being with what is, mindfulness, detached awareness, natural action

Experiential Learning Activities (Examples)

- ~ Meditation and mindfulness practices
- ~ Personal myth and dream work
- ~ Shadow work
- ~ Art and poetry
- ~ Spiritual direction and ontological coaching
- ~ Solo nature retreats

- Intersubjective and Relational Awareness

- ~ Understanding emotional dynamics
- ~ Enhancing skillful, empathic communications
- ~ Increasing awareness of one's own process and its impact on others
- ~ Developing more astute and compassionate understanding of others
- ~ Building authentic, collaborative relationships with others
- ~ Generating planetary relationships; respecting all sentient beings

Experiential Learning Activities (Examples)

- ~ Emotional intelligence training
- ~ Non-violent communication practices
- ~ Conflict transformation practices
- ~ Self-assessment instruments, such as the MBTI and Enneagram
- ~ Group dream work
- ~ Eco-psychology practices
- ~ Process coaching

- Somatic Awareness

- ~ Understanding the body-mind connection
- ~ Enhancing subliminal awareness and bodily knowledge

- ~ Working with sensations and ‘felt sense’
- ~ Accessing somatic intelligence to aid creativity and problem solving
- ~ Using kinesthetic wisdom to move beyond blocks

Experiential Learning Activities (Examples)

- ~ Somatic awareness breathing practices
- ~ Authentic movement practices
- ~ Focusing practices
- ~ Diamond approach training

- Cosmic and Evolutionary Understanding

- ~ Understanding quantum reality: non-locality, subjectivity, particle-wave interaction
- ~ Unpacking the constructed nature of thought, cognition and reality
- ~ Relativity and the illusion of three-dimensional time and space
- ~ Increasing awareness of the universal cycles of creation, destruction, recreation

Experiential Learning Activities (Examples)

- ~ Personal inquiry: Psi phenomena and quantum reality
- ~ Personal practice: archetypal and collective symbols
- ~ Holotropic breathing practices

2.4 Qualitative Outcomes of Consciousness Education

The six dimensions of learning outlined above have been used for over ten years to effect transformational change in our students. Our ongoing qualitative research continues

to show predictable patterns of internal development among our students. Among

the most commonly reported changes are the following:

- A larger sense of self-identity, less identified with ego.
- Greater sense of personal presence and spiritual awareness in their lives.
- Deeper, more authentic communications with others.

- Greater ability to collaborate and develop community with others.
- Greater trust in internal wisdom and guidance for decision-making and problem- solving.
- Increased sense of creativity and innovative thinking in their lives and in their work.

3. SUMMARY OF PART II : KEY COMPONENTS OF AN INTEGRAL APPROACH

The premise of this part of the paper has been to show the direct link between consciousness development and leadership development at later post-conventional stages.

We have used Torbert’s Action Logics model to define the different characteristics, capacities and outcomes that distinguish leaders operating at post-conventional stages from their peers at conventional stages. We have also examined integral theory using Wilber’s Four-Quadrant model to demonstrate the importance of the interior, subjective and intersubjective domains of consciousness in developing an integral perspective of leadership development. Additionally, we have used McIntosh’s work to describe three primary developmental lines—“IQ,” cognitive intelligence, “EQ,” emotional intelligence, and “VQ,” values or moral intelligence—as key determiners of consciousness development. Finally, we have presented our own work and research on six dimensions of consciousness development as a frame for post-conventional stage leadership development. Through this discussion, we have

endeavored to show the essential role that consciousness expansion plays in developing leaders capable of transforming themselves, their organizations and their global societies.

4. CONCLUSION: CONDITIONS NEEDED TO DEVELOP THE FIELD

While we are confident that consciousness development is an effective means to build leadership capacity at the post-conventional stages, several larger questions remain. How do we replicate this kind of education for busy leaders while they are working in the field? How do we implement this training on a global scale? And, even more important, how do we develop educators and coaches capable of teaching these concepts and practices to others?

As indicated in the Global Leadership study discussed in Part I of this paper, the program directors and observers interviewed in the study do not have yet clear answers to these questions. As a start, however, it is evident that capacity-building must start by placing greater value on the 'Left-Hand' path of subjective and intersubjective knowledge and understanding. The deeper capacities that consciousness development offers must be more widely acknowledged and cultivated in our business, professional and educational institutions.

We believe that with an adequate cadre of trained educators and coaches, leadership development could be implemented through a series of consciousness-based leadership 'intensives' of relatively short duration. Following each intensive, leaders

back at work would be supported in real-world practice through peer learning, mentoring, and coaching. Aspects of this model—particularly mentoring and peer learning—are currently being used quite effectively with traditional part-time leadership development programs at leading universities. We believe the same can be done with programs involving consciousness development, with the added component of coaching, which has shown to be crucial for personal practice development. This is an area that will bear closer scrutiny as we move forward in the future.

REFERENCES

Part I: Global Exploration of Generative Change Leadership Development Programs

Link, W., Corral, T., Gerzon, M. (2006). *Leadership is global: co-creating a more humane and sustainable world*. Global Leadership Network.

McIntosh, S. (2007). *Integral consciousness and the future of evolution*. St. Paul, Minnesota: Paragon House.

Kahane, A. (2006). *Solving tough problems: an open way of talking, listening and creating new realities*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Parks, S. (2005). *Leadership Can be Taught*. Cambridge: Harvard Business School Press.

Houston, J. (nd). *HYPERLINK "<http://www.jeanhouston.org/socialartistry-whatitis-new.cfm>"Social artistry*. Retrieved from <http://jeanhouston.org/socialartistry/>

Kuenkel, P. (2007). *Mind and heart: mapping your personal journey towards leadership for sustainability*. Retrieved from <http://www.collectiveleadership.com/>

Hochachka, Gail (2006). *HYPERLINK "<http://www.drishti.ca/pdfs/>*

[GailCaseStudyBooks/IIDBook1_UNDP.pdf](http://www.drishti.ca/pdfs/GailCaseStudyBooks/IIDBook1_UNDP-1.pdf)"*Developing leadership from within*. Retrieved from HYPERLINK "http://www.drishti.ca/pdfs/GailCaseStudyBooks/IIDBook1_UNDP-1.pdf" http://www.drishti.ca/pdfs/GailCaseStudyBooks/IIDBook1_UNDP-1.pdf.

Kofman, F. (2006). *Conscious business: how to build value through values*. Sounds True, Inc.

Part II: Global Exploration of Generative Change Leadership Development Programs

Cook-Greuter, S. (2002). *The development of action logics in detail*. HYPERLINK "<http://www.cook-greuter.com>" www.cook-greuter.com. 7.2002.

Cook-Greuter, S. (1999). *Postautonomous ego development: its nature and measurement*. Doctoral dissertation. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Graduate School of Education. UMI Dissertation Information Services UMI #9933122.

Kegan, R. (1994). *In over our heads*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kohlberg, L., Levine, C. and Hewer, A. (1983). *Moral stages: a current formulation and response to critics*. Basel, NY: Karger Press.

McIntosh, S. (2007). *Integral consciousness and the future of evolution*. St. Paul, Minnesota: Paragon House.

Piaget, J. (1977). *The essential Piaget*. Ed. by Howard E. Gruber and J. Jaques Voneche. New York: Basic Books.

Rooke, D. and Torbert, W. (2005). "Seven transformations of Leadership." In *Harvard Business Review*, April, 2005.

Rooke, D. and Torbert, W. (1998). "Organizational transformation as a function of CEOs' developmental stage." In *Organization Development Journal*, 16, 1, 11-28.

Torbert, W., Cook-Greuter, S., et al. (2004). *Action inquiry: the secret of timely and transforming leadership*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Wilber, K. (2006). *Integral spirituality: a startling new role for religion in the modern and postmodern world*. Boston, MA: Integral Books.

Wilber, K. (1999-2000). *The collected works of Ken Wilber*. Boston: Shambhala.

Wilber, K. (1997). "An integral theory of consciousness." In *The Journal of Consciousness Studies*, **4** (1), February 1997, pp. 71-92.

Wilber, K. (1996). *A brief history of everything*. Boston, MA: Shambala Books.

Appendix 1

PRELIMINARY LIST OF PROGRAMS SURVEYED IN THE GLOBAL EXPLORATORY STUDY

Hosting Institution	Country	Name of Program
African Leadership Academy	South Africa	African Leadership Academy
Art of Hosting	Worldwide	Learning the Art of Hosting
Asian Institute of Management University of Bath Sustainability Business	Philippines UK	Bridging Leadership Fellows Action Research and MSc in Responsibility and
Boston College California Institute of Integral Leadership	USA USA	Leadership for Change MA in Transformative Studies (CIIS)
University of Cape Town GSB Erasmus University (RSM) Stakeholder	South Africa The Netherlands	Emerging Leaders Program MSc in Global Business and Management
Global Leaders Academy Program	NL, UK	Global Leadership Academy
Harvard University-JFK School Mobilizing Resources	USA	Exercising Leadership: Group
Integral Africa and	Sierra Leone	Transformative Leadership Change
McKinsey and Company	World-wide	Facilitator Development

Program

Naropa University

USA

Authentic Leadership

PROGRAMS SURVEYED, continued

Hosting Institution	Country	Name of Program
Notre Dame University	USA	Notre Dame Executive MBA
Oxford University	UK	Social Entrepreneurship MBA
Pacific Integral Change	USA	Generating Transformative
Presencing Institute & Innovation MIT Leadership Center	USA	Emerging Leaders for Across Sectors (ELIAS)
Rockwood Leadership Program	USA	Leading from the Inside Out
Saybrook Graduate School Program	USA	Organizational Systems
SHIFT Foundation	Australia	Global Leadership Program
SIOO - Inter-university Center Management	The Netherlands	Executive Change
UNDP HIV/AIDS Group University for Peace Development	World-wide Costa Rica	Leadership For Results MA in Natural Resources and Sustainable
Wageningen International	The Netherlands	Multi-Stakeholder Processes

PAGE 32

APPROACHES TO TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT
PAGE 2

APPROACHES TO TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT
PAGE 31

Upper Left	Upper Right	<i>Subjective Interior</i>	<i>Objective Exterior</i>
“I”	“It”		
Lower Left	Lower Right	<i>Intersubjective</i>	<i>Interobjective</i>
<i>Collective Interior</i>	<i>Collective Exterior</i>		
“We”	“Its”		

