

Feeling into the Moment: Applying Integral Maps and Processes to Corporate Leadership Training and Trans-disciplinary Education

Jonathan Reams and Anne Caspari

Abstract: The application of more recent developments and experience in integral thought and processes to various domains of human endeavor has been going on for the past decade or so. The evolution of how we (the authors/presenters) use integral frameworks in a more mature manner to support transformative processes at both individual and organizational levels and how these applications have informed the development of our theoretical understanding of integral leadership is the focus of this presentation. Taking as a background our understanding of using construct awareness in such work, we will draw on recent practice and theoretical work focused on two areas; integrity and intuition.

We will focus on two specific applications of this work to illustrate our ideas and reflect on lessons learned. One application is the corporate leadership training environment, where the opportunity to experiment with designing and implementing combinations of activities to stimulate both individual growth and organizational culture change has brought useful insights into how to move beyond telling about models to enacting supportive scaffolding structures. The second application is an ongoing project of supporting a university with the development of a transdisciplinary masters program. This project has gone beyond many existing initial efforts in this direction to include a combination of theoretical foundations with personal development work and group processes to prototype creating a collective platform for developing and conceiving how such a program might look.

Keywords: Construct aware, integral, integrity, intuition, leadership.

Introduction

Feeling into the moment – we find ourselves drawn into situations where we must leave rational plans behind and improvise to meet the calling before us. These situations can be met in many ways, but of interest here is what can an integral consciousness provide in such moments. In particular, what might it be like on the journey of going from being integrally informed to an integral practitioner in specific domains, specifically in the areas of leadership development and process facilitation? In this paper we first explore the

theoretical underpinnings of our approach to developing leadership in various contexts. We then describe some of the specific applications we are involved in, and then briefly discuss what we perceive as the implications for future development of practitioners in this area.

Integral leadership is being presented in various arenas of discourse as an advance on existing frameworks for understanding leadership (Brown, 2011; Reams, 2005; Volckmann, 2010; numerous pieces in <http://integralleadershipreview.com/>). In this article we will not attempt to provide a comprehensive view of what we would consider to be all of the requisite aspects of integral leadership. What we will present is an articulation of the core elements we perceive as having the greatest impact on leaders' capacity to open and hold spaces that enable work to be accomplished.

First, we will begin by presenting a brief summary of biographical and theoretical encounters informing us. Anne's background is a lifelong enthusiasm for and study of all things related to ecology and nature which led to the study of Nature Conservation and Environmental Planning in Germany (MSc). She has also done research in integral theory and practice in the "mechanics" of consciousness training, integrating all this into practical work in management for sustainability and global change projects and in teaching work at various universities. Jonathan's background includes farming before studying the history of western intellectual thought, followed by masters and doctorate degrees in leadership studies. As well, he undertook parallel coursework in the field of consciousness studies before taking up an academic position in Norway. Teaching leadership development from an integral perspective led to work with some Norwegian multi-national corporate clients where he has tested out the utility of integrally informed models, distinctions and practices in high pressure situations.

Theoretical Positions

Together, we have been initially informed by Ken Wilber's AQAL meta-framework/theory (1996, 2000a, 2006), which also included Don Beck's (Beck & Cowan, 1996) development of an integral version of Spiral

Dynamics. Since then, we have gone deeper into specific sources of some of these frameworks, like Kegan (1994), Torbert & Associates (2004) and Cook-Greuter (1999) on adult development, Scharmer (2007) on the U Theory and process, Edwards (2010) on integral meta-theory and Molz (2010) on integral pluralism. We have gone through various learning curves and stages of development in relation to each of these approaches, from the initial excitement that comes from finding a map that better describes the territory of experience, through the adoption of the map and using it to fit all experience into it, to encountering limitations, shadows of the community of practice and reductionistic adoptions/interpretations, to gaining sufficient distance to be able to draw on such maps as appropriate tools in given situations.

The ability to take a perspective on complex maps of an integral nature does not come quickly or easily. These maps *have us* for a long time, (for many, possibly this is the only way they will relate to them), and becoming sufficiently distant to take a perspective on them requires a new kind of cognition. This is not simply an ability to handle ever more detailed complexity, or a kind of additive approach to development. It is more about a qualitatively new relationship to complexity, a more dynamic view (Cook-Greuter, 1999).

Thus we do not position ourselves as “integralists” in the sense of the totalizing impulse that can be critiqued in relation to some strands of Wilberian work (Anderson, 2006). While we recognize that we use a range of such capacities in relation to everyday life situations, our particular interest is in later stage, emerging structures of consciousness. While there are many framings for these, (e.g. Basseches, 1975; Beck and Cowan, 1996; Commons, 2006; Kegan, 1982, 1994; Loevinger, 1976; Torbert & Associates, 2004; Wilber, 2000b), we prefer to draw on two of them; integral consciousness as *aperspectivity* (Gebser, 1985) and *construct aware* (Cook-Greuter, 1999). “Integral reality is the world’s transparency, a perceiving of the world as truth: a mutual perceiving and imparting of truth of the world and of man and all that transluces both” (Gebser, 1985, p. 7). Gidley (2007) describes how “Gebser used the term *integral-aperspectival* to refer to the gradual transformation through awareness, concretion and integration of all the previous structures of

consciousness that we have been exploring—archaic, magic, mythic and mental—into a new structure of consciousness” (p. 106). She also notes that this aperspectival structure of consciousness is also found in more recent literature on post-formal stages of cognitive development.

A more detailed examination of how life is perceived and experienced at this later stage is provided by Cook-Greuter (1999). At what she labels as the construct aware stage, people are “becoming aware of the absurdities to which unbridled complexity and logical arguments can lead” (p. 44). “Now concepts can be seen for what they are: as illusions – as effective but nevertheless arbitrary maps, codifications, representations, or summaries of the flux of sensory and mental data” (p. 46). She describes how individuals using this consciousness move beyond thinking about thinking, to understanding the mechanics of how such constant reflective analysis is working. This can be seen as an early form of the transparency of Gebser’s aperspectival consciousness. As one unfolds into the next, or unitive stage, this takes root more fully and leads to “an entirely new way of perceiving human existence and consciousness” (p. 48). Such people “no longer feel a need to reach after fact and reason” (p. 49) and their self-sense “is fluid, ‘undulating,’ based on people’s trust in the intrinsic value and processes of life” (p. 49). This leads to being able to take rational, representational thought grounded in perspectives, as an object to reflect or take a perspective on, which could be termed *aperspectival* (Gebser, 1985). The relationship to experience shifts from mental processing and representation to immersion “in the immediate, ongoing flow of experience” (Cook-Greuter, 1999. p. 49).

Thus our approach to integral rests on two pillars; the cognitively complex and comprehensive meta-theoretical framing of integral pluralism (often referred to as being “integrally informed”) and the view *from* aperspectival or construct aware consciousness. With this brief cornerstone of the integral part of integral leadership laid out, we now turn to the second half of the term, leadership itself and explore our conceptions in use.

There are almost as many definitions of leadership as there are theorists on the subject (Rost, 1991). Thus it becomes important to be clear about which framing or definition we are drawing on for this article's intended purpose. Both from a theoretical perspective, as well as from practice in working with clients, we have found Heifetz's (1994; Heifetz, Linsky & Grashow, 2009) view of adaptive leadership to be a useful foundation. There are two core aspects of this we find most relevant. One is the distinction between technical problems and adaptive challenges. Technical problems may be very complex and critically important for an organization, but they have clearly defined boundaries and known solutions that can be implemented with current know-how. Their resolution comes through the application of authoritative expertise and draws on an organization's current structures, procedures and ways of doing things.

Adaptive challenges, on the other hand, are more like ill-structured or wicked problems, (Brown, Harris and Russell, 2010) in that they are not able to be defined and understood in terms of existing knowledge. They require learning that is often transdisciplinary and in areas that are often not well understood, and in addition to technical aspects also involve "messy" issues that lie "below the neck" like beliefs, assumptions, loyalties and values. The nature of these challenges is such that we do not "solve" them like we can a technical problem, but are able to make progress on them through learning about the interconnected soft issues and systems that the aspects of the challenge that we encounter are tied to.

What is required to do this is to go beyond the use of expertise and authority to enable people to do the learning, or "work" of examining assumptions, priorities, beliefs, habits, and loyalties. This leads to the second aspect of adaptive leadership we find relevant; that leadership functions by creating a holding environment where this kind of work can be done. A holding environment is a kind of container, a space where sufficient challenge and support (Kegan, 1994) is present to enable growth. The nature of the learning that needs to happen is often of the nature related to taking what we have been subject to and making it an object of reflection. The assumptions, priorities, beliefs, habits, and loyalties that operate below the neck, are

often automatic reflexes that run us. How these holding environments or processes are manifested is what we find to be of particular interest and will explore in detail in what follows.

Presentation of Core View

This leads us to the presentation of our definition of integral leadership as *integrity with a quality of presence that opens spaces for what wants to emerge*. Here we will briefly discuss and explore what is meant by quality of presence and the notion of presencing (Scharmer, 2007), or what wants to emerge. In fleshing these out, we will go into depth about conceptions of integrity and intuition. The above description of later stages of cognitive/ego development and how it relates to these themes will also be woven into our discussion. It is our aim that this presentation of our conceptions involved in integral leadership can open up some further variations in the discourse on this topic.

The core or grounding principle here is the notion of *quality of presence*. One often cited formulation of this comes from Bill O'Brien. He is quoted as saying that the "success of an intervention depends on the interior condition of the intervener" (Scharmer, 2007, p. 7). This notion of the central importance of the interior condition of the intervener is what Scharmer (2002) refers to as the blind spot of leadership, or the lack of recognition that the sources from which we lead have a very high leverage impact on our leadership interventions. Thus this quality of presence occurs in varying degrees in all of us all the time. In its purest forms, "self" or ego is transparent (Cook-Greuter, 1999; Gebser, 1985) and we manifest what is often termed a transpersonal Self (Reams, 2002). At the other end of the spectrum, we encounter totally self-embedded leaders, for whom all activity is designed to reinforce and feed the constructed ego (Carey, 1992). The movement towards greater self-transcendence in relation to leadership can be viewed as a fundamental option (Carey, 1992). In other words, it is more important which direction you are moving than where you are on a given developmental scale. At the same time, your interpretation of experience will be colored by the lens of the developmental level. We propose that there are practices, related to both integrity and

intuition, that can enable us to cultivate the kind of quality of presence that enables us to be totally present with another person or group of people.

States and Integrity

Now we wish to briefly explore some of the blockages to being able to create healthy, open spaces from our quality of presence. Palmer (1993, 2004) describes integrity this in relation to truth, framing truth as a verb rather than a noun, which leads to a view of truth as troth, a living pledge wherein we learn how to live in integrity with the truth of this inner condition. One aspect of this is our *state* of consciousness (Wilber, 1996, 2000b) (in contrast to the stages of cognitive development described earlier). The cultivation of states relevant to aligning with our inner essence can gain us access to subtle energies. From this awareness of subtle energies, it is possible to consciously work with different domains or modes of information. We perceive subtle energies to actually have the potential to have even greater impact on reality than practices and information from gross states. This gives us the potential to access more authentic power, this authenticity being grounded in integrity and alignment we have been describing.

Different wisdom traditions describe these kinds of states in different ways, (Walsh, 1999) for example as 'grace' (Christian) or 'opening up the heart' (Sufi), and all go in the direction of opening up a space to receive. For us it is self-evident that in order to receive, whether we call it energy, information, grace, or vision, that the space held in such a leadership situation should at least be; a) free, e.g. not occupied by old ideas, concepts, paradigms, or maps (downloading in Scharmer's U Theory), b) clean, in this context meaning void of judgments, criticism, cynicism, bias, projections, or blame (Scharmer describes voices of judgment, cynicism and fear), and c) contained, or by a closed group, a geographical space, a room, a structuring method with rules (Torbert & Associates, 2004, describe these as liberating structures). These three principles, if not addressed, create impediments and can derail our good intentions and quality of leadership.

These impediments are basically a deeper level of issues that do not surface until we begin working in the subtle domain.

As well, we can, through a lack of practice or use, lose a connection or integrity with the signals from our essential Self. We all have the capacity to perceive the subtle signals from Self, essence or a field that signals what wants to emerge from the future (Senge et al, 2004, Scharmer, 2007, Reams, 2012) or from any other unconditioned space beyond a given trajectory or perspective. The body system as well as subtle bodies are a powerful instrument for reception and perception, not only on the level of the senses that we are used to. McCraty et al.'s (2009) research indicates that the brain in the heart, or the neurocardiological system, is capable of perceiving subtle electromagnetic fields up to three meters from the body. This gives us a way to show how sensitivity to the states of others can be cultivated with the integration available through psychophysiological coherence. This externally focused capacity to perceive subtle signals can also be directed inward. The integration of the mind with the states available through the heart is key to this. As well, we can see how this inward focus can be experienced through the body.

One of the most important skills to learn is the ability of “generative listening” – a kind of listening that is active in the subtle realm and really opens up a space for a coachee or a group. This kind of listening combines clean or neutral sensing (e.g. not mixed with one’s own concerns, judgments, opinions) with appreciation and compassion while staying neutral to the other’s contents. This very powerful subtle process can be compared to Scharmer’s “open heart” or David Grove’s “clean questions”, (Barner, 2008) but there is something more to it. Levin (1989) calls the transpersonal skill of being present and listening without getting entangled in the ego’s stories and preoccupations “hearkening” - a term borrowed from Heidegger. Harkening requires the disciplined practice of letting go- and letting-be as a mode and style of listening, that requires appreciation and a recovery of experiencing modalities (being able to stay close to any phenomena

arising). This quality of being present and listening is highly generative and can shift people out of their deepest entanglements and stuckness.

The Architecture of Integrity

Another key element we wish to explore in more depth to understand integral leadership is the structure, or architecture of integrity. Integrity, in our opinion, is a key quality for integral leadership. Earlier we outlined some aspects of how we interpret this concept, and now we wish to take apart its mechanisms and its effects in and on human consciousness from another angle (Palmer, 1994, 1997).

The inventor and visionary Buckminster Fuller (1997) described integrity as a capacity of the universe to create a certain pattern reliably. A knot is a knot with whatever material it is made with: a rope, a cable, a string, while a simple loop has no pattern integrity. He waved his hand saying: this is not a hand. With the body's replacing cells every x years, it still remains a hand: It is a "pattern integrity." It is the universe's capacity to create hands. Similar views of order as patterns of self-organizing come from the field of physics, where for instance the holographic metaphor for how the universe is organized has also shown how this kind of pattern integrity can be understood (Bohm, 1980, Bohm & Hiley, 1993; Talbot, 1996). The key point was this reliability and the cohesion of the pattern that defined integrity. "A pattern has integrity independent of the medium by virtue of which you have received the information that it exists. Each of the chemical elements is a pattern integrity. Each individual is a pattern integrity. The pattern integrity of the human individual is evolutionary and not static." (Fuller, 1997, section 505.201).

In this manner we would like to embark on a discussion of integrity as one of the crucial elements for a leader. In this perspective, we are more interested in what effect integrity, as well as non-integrity, has on our leader or intervener. How does it impact his or her inner states and the capacity to create open, clean spaces, to perceive and receive unbiased information?

Integrity is a time tested virtue that is promoted by all great wisdom traditions (Walsh, 1999) and for good reason. Integrity, or its absence, is the key factor in determining the capacity to be *present* to somebody or

something else; to another person, to a group, to an idea, to an emotion or to any other construct that arises in one's own consciousness. In order to be able to keep the access to intuitive guidance stable and reliable, in order to open the space for a group process or a prototyping something new, we perceive integrity as a key condition. As such, we wish to draw on another description of integrity; as a complete absence of triggers or any other interference that could arise in a given situation (Palmer, 1997). Basically, integrity allows being present to the other, individual or collective.

While this perspective on integrity can be useful, to help recognize and make useful distinctions with it, we find it helpful to examine the nature of some of the triggers or interference that create, or result in non-integrity. To do this, we have to consider some of the more subtle mechanisms of consciousness. In the Wilberian integral world, non-integrity is called "shadow material" and refers to all of the parts, identities, sub-personalities (Assagioli, 1971) that have been dis-owned in a person's ego development. Dissociated parts (saying; this is not mine) are often not only not seen as one's own, but projected out and are falsely recognised as somebody else's parts (identities, characteristics, attitudes etc.; "this is yours"). In the integral context, in classical psychotherapy, as well as in the core tenets of most of the great wisdom traditions, there are practices that aim to provide ways to re-own these kinds of dis-associated shadow parts. The prime directive in all of these frameworks is to use tools and, mostly spiritual, practices to become as "whole" as possible, not impaired or projecting undesired feelings out. Integrity is thus restored through addressing these conditions of non-integrity.

Coming back to our question about how integrity or non-integrity impacts inner states and the capacity to create open, clean spaces, to perceive and receive unbiased information, we see that non-integrity as a boundary ownership problem can limit enormously the ability of a person to be present. We have noted that being present to all manner of what arises is an essential capacity for leadership to create and maintain these spaces, or holding environments (Heifetz, 1994). This is especially true if the situation requires getting out of

one's comfort zone, as leaders are quite often challenged to do. As well, as noted above, the ability to receive is important. So our working definition of integrity is the *capacity to stay present to whatever phenomenon is arising* (usually resisted experiences) in real time in a given leadership or training situation. Naturally, the cleaner a leader's own space is the more she can recognize subtle energies in the room and draw information from it (thus a wider choice field). She can also stay with "not knowing" and does not have to push through naturally emerging unknowns and (necessary) gaps with actions arising from other modes of consciousness (such as thinking or reacting). While avoiding the pitfalls of filtering, or biasing the interpretation of information that comes to a leader is critical, in addition to this external aspect, there is an internal dimension of this; intuition.

Intuition

Intuition is a phenomenon that is commonly defined as the ability to acquire knowledge without the interference or the use of reason (Franquemont, 1999). In this sense it is a trans-rational mode of consciousness (Reams, 2002). Senge et al.'s (2004) conception of presencing can be seen as another form of this capacity to perceive, receive, and learn to act upon, knowledge coming from sources other than a rational analysis of external sensory data. Research into the use of intuition as a rigorous method of inquiry has shown that it is possible to hone this capacity and drawn on it in a rigorous manner (Braud & Anderson, 1998). The implications of a well-developed intuitive capacity for leadership appear obvious, but are not very well documented or researched.

In a recent study on conscious leadership for sustainability that did examine intuition, Brown (2011) found that the respondents with late stage action logics, in addition to "traditional sources of knowledge, such as technical or content knowledge" (p. 136), drew upon "intuition and ways of knowing other than rational analysis" (p. 137). Respondents in this study, when talking about the sources of this intuition or how this other way of knowing worked, used terms like; consciousness, heart, cosmic intelligence, higher self,

unnameable mystery, spirit (p. 139). They also described the processes of accessing knowledge in this manner with terms like; put the intention out and let it come, get rid of the ego stuff and then download it, the design designs me, pluck ideas out of the ether; it just comes (p. 139). These results indicate how a specific demographic of leaders, those with late stage cognitive capacities, describe this phenomenon. We also recognize that intuition is experienced by people in general and leaders specifically, independent of stage development. How it is interpreted and used is what we believe will vary in relation to a lens of stage development.

Thus the evidence we have examined suggests differences in the use of intuition that seem to derive from a multitude of different factors. We will list what we perceive as the most important here. First, while every person seems to have a basic potential access to intuition independent of stage of cognitive development, not everybody seems to have a stable access and be able to use it. Second, the access to intuition as a source for knowledge seems to be dependent on different types of people, as documented in for example on the Jungian Myers-Briggs personality type model (Briggs Myers & Myers, 1980). Third, if a person is generally intuitive, the stability of access seems to depend on other factors that can inhibit such intuitive guidance, such as judgements, excessive thinking, or fear (corresponding to Scharmer's voices of judgment, cynicism and fear). For these reasons the access to intuition can greatly benefit from the mental and spiritual practices that will work on keeping thoughts, judgments and fear at bay, such as mindfulness training, will exercises, attention management, or mediation. Any of these practices enhance the skills to stay close to resisted phenomena arising in one's own or the other's space without the natural impulse to push them away behind the boundaries of self. The practice of the capacity for integrity is obviously vital.

Fourth, while we work with the assumption that intuition is a general human capacity that is independent of stage development, the different action logics (Torbert & Associates, 2004) will play a role. The information gained via intuition will usually be interpreted through the value system (Beck & Cowan, 1996)

that a person inhabits. Intuitive guidance would usually be “right” or “true” or “just” in the sense of a “functional and cultural fit” for the person receiving intuitive guidance. In coaching practices, certain tools can be applied to coach a person that is in a stuck situation to remove all psychological material blocking one's intuition (e.g. Kegan & Lahey's (2009) Immunity to Change process, Palmer's (1997) transparent beliefs, releasing fixed attention exercise, etc.). The coachee will have, with a sudden insight, access to his or her next “right thing to do,” that is informed by intuition. “Right” is so only in the meaning making system of the coachee and will generally fit in with the meaning making system of that person and his or her cultural environment. Insights at this level can, with a multitude of smaller “dis-identifications” also pave the way for stage development, or for taking a perspective on the mechanisms that created this particular reality.

Fifth, we can see interference from the process of thinking itself. For example, children operating within a pre-rational developmental stage can be extremely intuitive, as rational, concrete operational thought (Piaget, 1954) has not yet fully taken root. As it does, attention is focused on growing into the full use of the tremendous benefits the rational mind brings. Retaining an ability to also keep open the access to intuitive knowing can be hampered by the powerful dependence on rational thought. To access knowing beyond rational thought, or a trans-rational way of knowing, requires both a suspension of this potential interference from rational thought, as well as not mistaking a pre-rational mode for a trans-rational one (Wilber, 1996, 2000a).

Sixth, while stage development is by no means a prerequisite for intuition, there are implications related to how different stages of cognitive development use intuition and make sense of the information gained through that particular channel. Research suggests a strong correlation between late stage action logics (strategist, alchemists) and their ability to lead effectively (Brown, 2011; Torbert & Associates, 2004; Cook-Greuter, 1999). People at these later stages, in addition to what has been described above, have a different attitude towards intuition and different skills they apply to keep that access open. They have developed a

trans-rational approach towards intuitions and rely easily on intuitive guidance. Their meaning making system is also such that the information gained by intuition can be used to manage complex problems. Brown (2011) identified that they; use that access to tap into collective consciousness, have a regular practice in to keep the access to intuition open, stable and reliable, have a perspective on intuition that allows a discernment on the information gained (e.g. not “hearing voices.” or being filtered by desires, judgments, etc.), and can be in touch with their integrity. We would add to Brown’s list the importance of integrity as a way of keeping access to intuition open and free of blockages or filtering.

Applications

In many years of coaching individuals and groups, we have both independently experienced a widening of perspectives and the maturity of our own meaning making system into construct aware. We found, that while we might differ in the use of individual tools, we have found the same invaluable underlying mechanisms and principles for our work and get similar and reliable successes in the application of our tools and methods. This is why we are interested in discussing those principles to have a clearer understanding what this could mean for integral leadership development and the application in the field.

One area of application for these ideas has come through the opportunity to develop a course for a masters in organizational leadership program that led to applying similar work in corporate settings. The approach taken in these settings has been to begin with the use of “awareness based technologies” to enable leadership development. O’Fallon (2010) points to three dimensions essential to manifest development; stage, state and behavior or skills. Balancing these became an important lens in developing these programs. While many of the ways of addressing this balance are highly inter-related, for the current purposes I (JR) will focus on them in these three categories.

Beginning with states, there are a number of components. In line with the above, the inner condition of the teacher/facilitator is a core component of creating the space or holding environment. This space will have

different levels to it. One will be on the subtle level, picked up by others energetically, impacting the neurocardiology of participants (McCraty et al., 2009). Psychophysiological coherence in the facilitator can be picked up and interpreted by participants in various ways. It can engender trust, risk taking, emotional safety and cognitive spaciousness to enable better quality of reflection. I have observed numerous cases where students or program participants begin with a somewhat guarded demeanor in the beginning of a program or class, and over time feel their way into a more spacious state. This is especially observable in end of class or program “check outs” when participants reflect on their experience and note various ways in which they have come to a more authentic, coherent and even expanded their sense of themselves.

I have also observed how a progressively more subtle and profound state creates a strong holding environment for this work. As participants go through various experiences (like receiving integrally informed 360 feedback, going through the immunity to change process), they are challenged to reflect on their own behaviors, experiences, assumptions etc. in serious ways. Having a strong holding environment is essential to enable this process to work as deeply as possible on participants. The ability to gain new insights on what have previously been either unconscious behaviors or abstract patterns and sit with the strong emotional reactions this can bring up is aided by the state of consciousness provided as a holding environment. It is also observable that as the group moves through this process, “early adopters” take up the invitation to enter into this space and model the process for others, also making it safer for them to venture into it. Various tipping points can be observed in this, and of course not all groups go as far or deep into collective state experiences, but the pattern is clear over working with numbers of groups. I have even noted at times that it appears that a group will act as if they are in a semi-trance state, enabling them to perceive and hold perspectives, experiences and so on that would not normally be accessible.

In terms of stages, there are a number of considerations I have observed. Of course the stage capacity of the teacher/facilitator is important in helping to set the stage for participants to bridge from their own levels

of understanding to a more expansive perspective taking relationship to the ideas in play. I have witnessed in myself an ongoing challenge to learn how to present ideas, but also instructions for reflection experiences in a manner that are not too complex or abstract to follow. (I often make up such exercises in the moment, and then have to translate myself right afterwards to make it clearer). This challenge has contributed to learning how to create better liberating structures (Torbert & Associates, 2004) and appropriate scaffolding (Jordan, 2011) for opening the space for participants' journeys.

Another component of attending to stages related to this is utilizing appropriate activities (theoretical framings, questions for discussion, exercises, 360 feedback) to provide this bridging and scaffolding. Using an integrally informed 360 feedback instrument (The Leadership Circle) to create a "crucible" or opening for deeper reflection and insight, participants are able to "see themselves" in a more refined or sophisticated manner. Their opinions and self-images are filtered through a set of lenses that add power and depth to their self-understandings. From this platform, they are led through the immunity to change process (Kegan and Lahey, 2009) where they are both able to take a perspective on something that they have been subject to, and are able to begin practicing and internalizing a process to facilitate such subject to object work in other domains of their lives. Other scaffolding tools used include Torbert's four parts of speech, Argyris' ladder of inference, and the Arbinger Institute's (2010) collusion maps.

Finally, skills or behaviors are also critically important to enable the leadership development work to take root. Practice, in the sense of both sports training and spiritual practice, is at the heart of skill development. While the awareness based technology work is used to shift behaviors, new behaviors also need practice to develop increased skillful means. Skills in specific areas related to this are often in the domain of communication. Thus in much of the corporate work there is time spent giving participants specific, detailed instructions and time to practice basic communication skills. These are focused on how to take a coaching

orientation to developing employees, tackle pivotal conversations (Joiner & Josephs, 2007) and ask powerful questions. Participants gain a tremendous value from this practice and learn how to link theory with skills.

The most potent approach that I (AC) have found in my praxis for transformative leadership development in working with NGOs, scientists or corporations is not a single tool or method, but a combination thereof that is in constant state of flux and is recalibrated in real time – feeling into the moment with dynamic steering. For cool tools, (like any of those awareness based technologies mentioned so far), to be truly generative in the sense of our inquiry into integral leadership, several conditions need to be in place.

One; for sure due diligence on my part: my own space has to be clear, my capacity for generative listening practiced, my tool box is prepared. Two; if transformative processes are called for, I follow the archetypal pattern of transformation, best described in Scharmer's U process, or in Campbell's (1991) the Hero's Journey. With the background experience of over a decade of intensive coaching, I know where participants in their process stand in respect to their transformation process, what resistance mechanisms they might be caught in and how to help them back on track. Even though this seems obvious, it is important to know at which stage of the transformative process to use what tool with what effect. However, more often than not, the architecture and natural sequence of these processes, even though archetypal, often seems hidden and misunderstood, especially to the people inside the process wishing to transform. For example, in an ongoing project with members of the IPPC in the field of climate change, I often find participants frustrated, because they often try and apply prototyping tools (right leg of the U) and working with systems (LR quadrant), **before** they have de-constructed old paradigm perspectives individually (UL) and collectively (LL), before they went through the layers of mis- and dis-identification spaces (subtle/causal states), found some personal and collective dis-aligning assumptions (see Kegan, Scharmer) and came into a space where completely new perspectives actually seemed possible. For many people in the global change arena this kind of work is crucial.

Three; knowledge about developmental stages and action logics enable me to adapt language and tools that are a functional fit to the participants. Last year I was called in to help readjust a change process in South Africa. The change process was funded by a German NGO, designed as a yearlong U process to help foster climate change leadership in 2 countries, Indonesia and South Africa, with repeated joint sessions in a year program. The well-meaning program, however, was conceived from a pluralistic worldview and did not account for differences and incommensurabilities in developmental stages, world views, and cultural habits. For the second year in a row, the 50 participants were in resistance to the program since their pushback mechanisms were constantly triggered through tools and methods that are fit for a Green (vMeme) mindset, but created indifference, confusion, resistance or even aggression in most of the participants. I designed a workshop for the participants in a way they could experience a transformative shift in accordance with their respective cultural world views without triggering the resistances in the group. At the end it was a small, real U Process without the use of any of the tools provided by the Presencing Institute.

Another good example of the application of transformative tools in a constant, quasi not plan-able flux with dynamic steering was our common assignment at WITS University in Johannesburg, SA, working with a team of representatives from 8 departments on the development of a trans-disciplinary post-graduate curriculum in Global Change. We had both our tool boxes ready and adopted a formal framework inspired by the Immunity to Change process, but we asked our clients to leave room for maneuvering and space for generative processes as we went. We took the participants, individually and collectively to have a closer look at internal change processes and to experiencing effective change and transformation. Sure enough, we encountered the intrinsic pushbacks, resistances and escape mechanisms, but were able to respond in real time with different tools. However, the most decisive, and tricky, ingredient that rendered the WITS project an ongoing success for the participants was what could, if watched from the outside, either go unobserved or even be mistaken for a lack of preparation. More than the application of a given sequence of tools by the

book (*The Immunity to change Process, The U process*), it was the energy with which we held the field for all which allowed us a constant dynamic steering from the information we got from what was emerging. This process included many moments of not knowing the answer, sometimes even not knowing what to do or propose next. It was most important though to be able to hold the space of not knowing and not to try and fill it in with experienced choices coming from a non-intuitive space (logic/thinking) of the seasoned practitioner. The difficult aspect in these spaces is, that one needs to protect that gap of “no action” also against a client CEO with an explicit agenda which is biased towards tangible outcomes and also provide a solid bridge for participants to step on, knowing that all is constructed in that very moment. That holding the quality of presence and letting the answers emerge from the group was what made these gaps most generative. The outcomes in terms of personal transformation, group cohesion, alignment and new ideas were extraordinary.

Conclusion

Having briefly presented some of our conceptions around integral leadership, the core constructs we infuse this with and briefly discussed some of our applications, we will conclude with a few remarks summarizing our inquiry. We presented a definition of integral leadership as *integrity with a quality of presence that opens spaces for what wants to emerge*. We situated this in the context of adaptive leadership and drew explicit links to how many current challenges can best be addressed through leadership that brings a later stage of cognitive development to bear on them. We also highlighted that this alone is insufficient and advocated strongly for the need to bring integrity and intuition to bear on the situation. One of our intentions was also to approach some of the less discussed and not so tangible mechanisms of knowledge creation, meaning making and perception (in relation to intuition and integrity) that are far too often obscured by moral /ethical reflections or subject to pre-trans fallacies.

In this paper we have taken the complex, evolving and dynamic topic of integral leadership and utilized various lenses to enable us to take our focus across specific aspects we feel relevant. In particular, we have noted the dynamic tension between the contribution of later stages of development and the integrity involved in the concept of quality of presence. Integrity can be practiced. Cognitive/ego development can be cultivated and accelerated through various practices designed for those purposes. The combination of these practices can help address the challenges of power. What we note is that in much of the mainstream literature on leadership, there is often an assumption that many of the qualities we have explored here are taken as givens, or not understood in terms of their inter-relationships. Thus the need to better understand them through an integral meta-theoretical view, backed up by application and experience. We believe that this can enable us to better develop new practices for developing integral leadership.

It is in the unpacking of integral leadership through these components that we begin to perceive integral leadership not as something more, or beyond, or special, but as the essence or wholeness of leadership in any form. Leadership is in itself an integral enterprise or activity, as it requires integrity and intuition, with these arising from or contributing to a quality of presence that opens spaces for what wants to emerge. While we also appreciate and note the contribution of how later stages of cognitive development can enable leaders to open and hold even deeper and complex spaces, we do not see this alone as demarking a different kind of leadership, an integral variety. We also note that aspects of our inquiry could point beyond a meta-theoretical approach to what Cook-Greuter (1999) describes as “where there is completely something else.” We hope that the result of our inquiries into this subject, as outlined here, can further the understanding and application of integral leadership as well as leadership as a whole.

References

- Anderson, D. (2006). Of syntheses and surprises: Toward a critical integral theory. *Integral Review: A Transdisciplinary and Transcultural Journal of New Thought, Research and Praxis*, 3, 62-81.
- Assagioli, R. (1971). *Psychosynthesis*. New York: Penguin.
- Barner, R. (2008). The dark tower: Using visual metaphors to facilitate emotional expression during organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 21(1), 120-137.
- Basseches, M. (1975). *Dialectical thinking and adult development*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Beck, D., & Cowan, C. (1996). *Spiral dynamics. Mastering values, leadership and change*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Bohm, D. (1980). *Wholeness and the implicate order*. London: Routledge.
- Bohm, D., & Hiley, B. (1993). *The undivided universe: An ontological interpretation of quantum theory*. New York: Routledge.
- Braud, W., & Anderson, R. (1998). *Transpersonal research methods for the social sciences: Honoring human experience*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Briggs Myers, I., & Myers, P. (1980). *Gifts differing: Understanding personality type*. Mountain View, CA: CPP, Inc.
- Brown, B. (2011). *Conscious leadership for sustainability: How leaders with a late-stage action logic design and engage in sustainability initiatives*. Santa Barbara, CA: Fielding Graduate University/UMI.
- Brown, V., Harris, J., & Russell, J. (2010). *Tackling wicked problems: Through the transdisciplinary imagination*. London: Earthscan.
- Campbell, J., & Cousineau, P. (1991). *The hero's journey*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco.

- Carey, M. (1992). Transformational leadership and the fundamental option for self-transcendence. *Leadership Quarterly*, 3(3), 217-236.
- Commons, M. L. (2006). Measuring an approximate g in animals and people. *Integral Review*(3), 82-99.
- Cook-Greuter, S. (1999). Postautonomous ego development: A study of its nature and measurement. Boston, MA: Unpublished doctoral dissertation.
- Edwards, M. (2010). *Organizational transformation for sustainability. An integral metatheory*. New York: Routledge.
- Franquemont, S. (1999). *You already know what to do. 10 invitations to the intuitive life*. New York: Jeremy P. Tarcher/Putnam.
- Fuller, B. (1997). Synergetics. Explorations in the geometry of thinking. Retrieved March 12, 2012, from <http://www.rwgrayprojects.com/synergetics/synergetics.html>
- Gebser, J. (1985). *The ever-present origin*. (N. Barstad, Trans.) Athens, OH: Ohio University Press.
- Gidley, J. (2007). The Evolution of Consciousness as a Planetary Imperative: An Integration of Integral Views. *Integral Review*, 4-226.
- Heifetz, R. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers*. Boston: Harvard University Press.
- Heifetz, R., Linsky, M., & Grashow, A. (2009). *The practice of adaptive leadership. Tools and tactics for changing your organization and the world*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Joiner, B., & Josephs, S. (2007). *Leadership agility. Mastering core competencies for handling change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Jordan, T. (2011). Skillful engagement with wicked issues. A framework for analysing the meaning-making structures of societal change agents. *Integral Review*, 7(2), 47-91.
- Kegan, R. (1982). *The evolving self. Problem and process in human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Kegan, R. (1994). *In over our heads. The mental demands of modern life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kegan, R., & Lahey, L. (2009). *Immunity to change. How to overcome it and unlock the potential in yourself and your organization*. Boston: Harvard Business Press.
- Levin, D. M. (1989). *The listening self: personal growth, social change and the closure of metaphysics*. London: Routledge.
- Loevinger, J. (1976). *Ego development: Concepts and theories*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- McCraty, R., Atkinson, M., Tommasino, B., & Bradley, R. (2009). The coherent heart: Heart-brain interactions, psychophysiological coherence, and the emergence of system wide order. *Integral Review*, 5(2), 4-107.
- Molz, M. (2010). *Toward an integral pluralism in sociocultural research*. Luxembourg: University of Luxembourg.
- O'Fallon, T. (2010). Grounding integral theory in the field of experience. In S. Esbjörn-Hargens, J. Reams, & O. Gunnlaugson, *Integral education; New directions for higher learning* (pp. 185-192). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Palmer, H. (1994). *Living deliberately: The discovery and development of Avatar*. Altamonte Springs, FL: Star's Edge International.
- Palmer, H. (1997). *Resurfacing: Techniques for exploring consciousness*. Altamonte Springs, FL: Star's End Creations.
- Palmer, P. (1993). *To know as we are known. Education as a spiritual journey*. San Francisco : HarperSanFrancisco.
- Palmer, P. (2004). *A hidden wholeness: The journey toward an undivided life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Piaget, J. (1954). *The construction of reality in the child*. New York: Basic Books.

- Reams, J. (2002). The consciousness of transpersonal leadership. Spokane, WA: Gonzaga University/UMI.
- Reams, J. (2005). What's integral about leadership? A reflection on leadership and integral theory. *Integral Review*, 1, 118-132.
- Reams, J. (2012). Integral leadership. Opening space by leading through the heart. In C. Pearson, *The transforming leader* (pp. 102-109). San Francisco: Berrett Koehler.
- Rost, J. (1991). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Scharmer, C. O. (2002). Illuminating the blind spot. *Leader To Leader Journal*, 11-14.
- Scharmer, C. O. (2007). *Theory U. Leading from the future as it emerges. The social technology of presencing*. Cambridge, MA: The Society for Organizational Learning, Inc.
- Senge, P., Jaworski, J., Scharmer, C. O., & Flowers, B. S. (2004). *Presence: Exploring profound change in people, organizations and society*. Boston: Society for Organizational Learning Inc.
- Talbot, M. (1996). *The holographic universe*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers Ltd.
- The Arbinger Institute. (2010). *Leadership and self-deception* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Berrett Koehler.
- Torbert, W., & Associates. (2004). *Action inquiry. The secret of timely and transforming action*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Volckmann, R. (2010). Integral Leadership Theory. In R. A. Couto (Ed.), *Political and civic leadership. A reference handbook* (pp. 121-127). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Walsh, R. (1999). *Essential spirituality. The 7 central practices to awaken heart and mind*. New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Wilber, K. (1996). *A brief history of everything*. Boston: Shambhala.
- Wilber, K. (2000a). *A theory of everything. An integral vision for business, politics, science and spirituality*. Boston: Shanbhala Publications inc.
- Wilber, K. (2000b). *Integral psychology. Consciousness, spirit, psychology, therapy*. Boston, MA: Shambhala.

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

Bios

Jonathan Reams is an associate professor at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Editor-in-Chief of Integral Review (www.integral-review.org), as well as an organizational consultant and leadership trainer.

Anne Caspari is a coach and consultant for transformational processes in adult development as well as in the global sustainability arena. She is also a private lecturer at universities in different countries on integral sustainability, leadership and change management.