1. Introduction:

1.1. Purpose of the study:

After having worked as a legal counsellor in different types of jobs, organizations and positions for a total of 14 years, I felt a strong need to make some reflections upon many of my experiences so far. I had worked with many different types of leaders, as well as having been in a leadership position myself. My own experiences with leadership made me develop a strong interest to focus more deeply on leadership and leadership development as such. I grew especially interested in what actually seems to cause leadership development-and if, and how, this could be facilitated.

This interest grew even stronger after I undertook a leadership development course myself while working for many years in an international corporation. I experienced a big gap/discrepanse between both the theory presented along with the actual developmental experiences I had during the course, and the reality I came back to at work after the course was over. I became even more interested in how it could be possible to enable developmental processes for leadership which also could be applied in the real-life frames of the actual working-life.

This personal experience of mine is supported by a recent ph.d.-thesis done by Ingunn Hybertsen Lysø (2009) at NTNU, about whether leadership-courses have an actual impact upon the participants as well as the organizations they work in when they return to their usual jobs after the course is ended. One of her conclusions were that the programs she studied did not produce significant change of practice in the managers' companies. However, the managers perceived individual change from the program in terms of changed vocabulary and identity (Lysø, 2009).

This recent work makes it all the more interesting to inquire into leadership-developmental training. While Lysø found little impact from the courses in the companies themselves, I found a gap between the course I undertook and "real life". My aim with this research project is therefore also to see if a different kind of training can have a different impact.

For my sake, the experience of needing to expand my legal competence with more and different types of competencies, led me to my Master in Organizational Leadership/Master of Management-studies at NTNU. Through my specialization in "Relational leadership: Counselling, motivation and coaching", I have both studied and undertaken myself as a student a specific pedagogical learning-platform, based upon constructive developmental

psychology. I found this approach to be a powerful and developmental process for experiencing actual development in myself in areas I wanted to focus on. Based upon these, within this approach at the University, my aim with this Master-thesis is to see how similar approaches work in a "real-life setting" within a Norwegian organization, as opposed to a University-setting.

The Norwegian Armed Forces Medical Services (hereafter called NAFMS) generously and courageously opened their organization to a pilot ethical program with a leadership development component, which went from February to December 2011. I will focus only on the leadership development component of the program in this thesis, and describe this further in pt.4 below, as well as my own role in it. This program has provided me with the data for this research project, through in-depth interviews with four of the participating leaders.

My interest has been to see whether, and in which ways, the participating leaders experience this particular leadership development course as beneficial for their concrete and daily leadership challenges.

I am positioning this thesis up against the scientific article "*Making Leadership Development Developmental*" in Academic Exchange Quarterly (2010), where Jonathan Reams and Camilla Fikse present research from within the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU)'s Master of Management program, which is the same Master -program I follow. Reams is also my supervisor for this thesis.

In addition, I am positioning this thesis up against the scientific article "*The use of constructive-developmental theory to advance the understanding of leadership*" in The Leadership Quarterly, 2006. Here the authors state that there is almost no research that examines how training, development, or coaching programs impact participants' order of development. They also state another possible limitation to the existing body of research being that the samples in the studies reviewed were culturally homogenious. Given the increased interest in cultural differences in leadership dynamics and on leading across cultures, this is a critical short-coming of the existing body of research"(McCauley et.al, 2006 p.648). When reading this article, my interest grew in being able to contribute to this body of research. Although I will not actually measure development by a qualitative methodological approach in this thesis, I will use a constructive-developmental framing in a quantitative methodology, as well as conduct a study in a Norwegian organization and culture, in contrast to much of the existing research coming from the US.

1.2.   Research questions:

In this Master-thesis I want to examine how a leadership development course can contribute to the participants experience of leadership development.

More specifically I want to inquire into:

1. What is the participants concept of leadership development at the outset of the course?

2. Have the participants experienced that the leadership course-the intervention-has contributed to their leadership development-process? If yes, how?
   I will narrow the wide term"leadership development" by interpreting it through constructive-developmental lenses, as defined in chapter 2 below.

3. If the participants have experienced development-has this happened according to their concepts of what leadership development is-or has the course contributed to changing their concepts of leadership development?

In chapter 2 I will present different theoretical perspectives I will use in this thesis, and in chapter 3 I will describe the methodological framing used. In chapter 4 I will describe the leadership development program itself-the intervention. Chapter 5 will present the empirical data found, with the categories and sub-categories that emerged. In chapter 6 I will discuss and analyze the empirical data. And finally, in chapter 7, follows my concluding thoughts as well as some implications for further research.

2.   Theoretical perspectives:

The theoretical perspectives I will present in this chapter have been chosen inductively through their perceived relevance in relation to the objective of the thesis and on the basis of the empirical findings presented in chapter 5 and discussed and analyzed in chapter 6. As can be seen in the research questions, the participants experience of leadership development will be in focus, as well as how development can be "helped" or facilitated. This chapter thus will focus on different constructive-developmental theories.

First though, I will begin by defining "leadership development" through constructive-developmental lenses. The authors McCauley et al. define constructive developmental theory as a stage theory of adult development that focuses on the growth and elaboration of a person's ways of understanding the self and the world (McCauley et al, 2006).

The theory is "constructive" in the sense that it deals with a person's construals, constructions, and interpretations of an experience, that is, the meaning a person makes of an

experience. It is "developmental" in the sense that it is concerned with how those construals, constructions, and interpretations of an experience grow more complex over time. Constructive developmental theory thus takes as its subject the growth and elaboration of a person's ways of understanding the self and the world(McCauley et al, 2007).

I will start the introduction to my theoretical approaches with presenting a scientific article in Leadership Quarterly from 2006. Then I present another scientific article in Academic Exchange Quarterly from 2010. After that I will refer to three different theoretical approaches within contructive developmental theory, first by Bill Joiner and Stephen Josephs(Joiner et Josephs, 2007), then by Robert Kegan and Lisa Lahey(Kegan et Lahey, 2009) and finally by Bill Torbert(Torbert, 2004). This will be followed by referring to Karen Horneys(1945) influential work about resolving our inner conflicts and our reactive styles. I close this chapter by briefly referring to Jan Spurkeland`s(Spurkeland, 2005) theories about trust.

Scientific articles:

In the scientific article "*The use of constructive-developmental theory to advance the understanding of leadership*", by McCauley et al(2006) in The Leadership Quarterly, the authors give a perspective upon the use of developmental stage theories to inform the design of management education programs. They state that such an approach aims to enable "complicated" understanding in managers, in order to see and understand organizations from multiple perspectives to be able to deal with the complex nature of many of the problems managers face. The potential contribution of developmental theories is in their description of how adults develop more complex and comprehensive ways of making sense of themselves and their experience.

The authors state that although a number of practitioners have used developmental stage theories in designing leadership development interventions, they have seen little in the mainstream management and leadership research literature that makes use of these theories. They ask whether one reason for this may be that adult development has been the purview of schools of education and of counseling programs, while management and leadership belongs to business schools and to social and organizational psychology and political science departments. The authors state:

> " *Leadership is a complex social phenomenon. …Because it deals with an aspect of leadership that may be taken as basic—the generation and development of meaning for individuals and social systems—constructive developmental theory has the potential to act as an integrative framework in the field*"(McCauley et.al., 2006 p. 650).

In another scientific article called "*Making Leadership Development Developmental*" in Academic Exchange Quarterly (2010), Jonathan Reams and Camilla Fikse cite Kegan and Lahey in saying that much of what is done under the name of leadership development is not actually developmental, but rather behavior training (Kegan and Lahey, 2009). They point to a need for attention to the internal aspects, as opposed to the external domain of experience. Reams and Fikse then present research from The Norwegian University of Technology and Science in how to further the effectiveness of leadership development by making it developmental. The particular focus for their research is the question of how to develop processes and learning structures that cultivate a quality of awareness and presence to support leaders' development.

Reams and Fikse begin by looking at the gap between espoused and theories in use. They point to Argyris (2004), who noted learning is needed to overcome the gap between what leaders know they want conceptually, but are not able or ready to embody. They point to both Senge (1990) and Argyris` (2004) theories about how learning organizations can create a culture that can support learning such adaptive behavior. Argyris says the conundrum is that before a company can become a learning organization, it must first solve a dilemma: most people don't know how to learn. He says further that effective learning is not a matter of the right attitudes or motivation, it is a product of *the way people reason about* their own behavior.

To facilitate a change in the way people reason about their own behavior, Reams and Fikse point to the need to suspend the normal habits of attention to allow for new insights to emerge.They point to Bohm's(1996) notion of suspending our thoughts, which does not require destroying our existing mental models of reality – which would be impossible even if we tried – or ignoring them. Rather, it entails what Bohm calls suspension, or hanging our assumptions about reality out in front of us. By doing so, we begin to notice our thoughts and mental models as the workings of our mind. Suspension allows us to "see our seeing" (Bohm p. 29). However, if our thoughts have *us*, the question is how can *we* get around them to see our seeing? For this, Reams and Fikse use Kegan and Lahey`s so-called "Immunity to change"-learning platform. I will describe this in chapter 4.

Constructivist- developmental theory:

Joiner and Josephs(2007):

I will now present some core theories relevant within the field of constructive developmental research. I will start with the theory and research of Bill Joiner and Stephen Josephs. They

describe in their book "*Leadership Agility*"(2007), five distinct levels that leaders move through as they master leadership competencies.

The first stages of leadership agilities are called *pre-conventional*, which mark the progress of growth from infancy through the end of grade school years. Then comes the three conventional stages; which are called *Conformer, Expert and Achiever*. Few adults grow beyond the Achiever stage. However, the theory and research of Joiner and Josephs(2007) identifies further stages of human adult development, called the post-conventional stages of being *Catalyst, Co-Creator and Synergist*. The research found that people at these stages are more welcoming of diverse perspectives, have a greater capacity for resolving differences with other people, are more self-aware, more attuned to their experience, more interested in feedback from others, and better at working through inner conflicts.

Joiner and Josephs(2007) introduce the Leadership Agility Compass as a tool to describe each one of these distinct levels. This consists of Awareness and Intent, Context-setting agility, Stakeholder agility, Creative agility and Self-leadership agility.

They point to research within stage-developmental psychology that shows that, as people develop, they evolve through a series of recognizable stages, in a particular sequence. True adult development- becoming an independent individual begins with the *Expert stage*. They describe the different leadership agilitites at the *Expert* level as follows:

At the Expert level *Awareness and intent*, people develop a strong problem-solving orientation, and the main focus becomes to solve key problems. They want to differentiate themselves from others by developing their own opinions and areas of expertise(Joiner and Josephs, 2007).

The Expert level *Context-setting agility* makes him/her tackle one problem at the time, each as an isolated task., as it is difficult to step back from immediate, urgent tasks and prioritize work. They tend to focus on short-term goals. The Expert level *Stakeholder agility* is not so concerned with key stakeholders, and assumes own perspective is the right one. Joiner and Josephs describe that the Experts power style is based upon expertise and organizational position. The Expert level *Creative agility* sees polarities as mutually exclusice opposites, and represents an either-or mindset-every argument must have it`s winner and looser. The Expert tends to experience own opinions as if they were objective perceptions of reality. He/she often perceive ill-structured problems as if they must have well-established answers just waiting to be remembered or rediscovered.

The Expert level *Self-Leadership Agility*, as in self-awareness, encompasses his/her perception of his/her current role, his/her professional skills and his/her personality traits.

Their tendency to judge him-/herself harshly combined with the need to be right, makes the Expert hesitant to seek feedback from others. As for the developmental motivation, underlying it all is the fact that the Expert`s constant striving is largely motivated by fear-of how he/she would feel about him-/herself if others think he/she is not capable or efficient. The Expert will constantly guard against this danger.

According to Joiner and Josephs(2007), a smaller, but still sizable percentage of people, then grow into *Achiever stage*. One way of describing the differences between leadership at Expert level and Achiever level, is to say that the Expert manages tasks and the Achiever also starts to manage people. Their purpose becomes more strategic, and they achieve a strong outcome orientation. They see that they can achieve their outcomes better when seeking support from key stakeholders. The capacities a leader develop at the Achiever level, gives him/her the mental agility needed to master the tasks classically associated with effective management; strategic planning, resource allocation, and staffing, designing organizational structures and processes, and using information systems to monitor and improve organizational performance Joiner and Josephs(2007) describe the different leadership agilitites at the *Achiever stage* as follows:

The Achiever level *Awareness and intent* allows the leader to step back from the standards and beliefs he/she developed at the Expert level, compare and contrast them, and integrate them into a coherent system of own values and beliefs. The Achiever understands that developing his/her own system of values and beliefs ultimately is a matter of personal choice and responsibility, which Joiner & Josephs refers to as the full relocation of authority within the Self.

The Achiever level *Context-setting* agility enables the leader to analyze the motivations and behaviour of the key players in their immediate environment. Their sense of purpose develops from tactical to strategic. As for the Achiever level *Stakeholder agility,* Joiner and Josephs state that a persons stakeholder understanding always deepens to the level at which you understand yourself. The Achiever level *Creative agility*, develops the ability to hold opposing ideas and experiences in mind, compare them, and, when needed, work out ways to take both into account. The Achiever level *Self-Leadership agility* enables the leader to reflect on his/her life in greater depth and over longer time frames, thus gaining new insights about his/her personal strenghts and limitations, often referred to as a strong sense of identity. The Achiever self is the rational persona. As for the developmental motivation, the Achiever includes long-term career objectives and an explicit or implicit leadership philosophy to his/her remaining primary motivation to succeed in achieving the desired outcomes.

The final leadership agility level I will focus on in this thesis, is the *Catalyst level*. The Catalyst creates an ongoing process of participative descision-making. When both the Expert and the Achiever work from a unilateral intent, the Catalyst has a collaborative intent and seeks joint problem solving.

Joiner & Josephs describe the different agilities on the *Catalyst* level as follows:

As for the Catalyst *Awareness and Intent,* a motivation to develop to the Catalyst level arises when you repeatedly experience the limitations of the after-the-fact awareness of the Achiever level, and begin to bring direct, momentary attention to the current experience. In this way the Catalyst develops an on-the-spot reflective capacity. The Catalyst practises the process of being aware of his/her experience, reflecting on and interpreting the experience, and then taking action by adjusting his/her response accordingly. The Catalyst`s appreciation of diversity increases.

The Catalyst level *Context setting agility* enables the leader to be more attentive to the larger context within which they and their stakeholders operate. At the Catalyst level *Stakeholder agility,* the leader begins to see that his/her image of him-/herself is just that-an image. This enables the Catalyst to develop an attitude towards oneself that`s more accepting of his/her faults and foibles. This attitude towards oneself is mirrored in his/her attitude towards other people. The Catalyst understands that his/her own views and priorities, and those of everyone else, are irreducibly subjective. The Catalyst incorporates two new forms of power, in addition to personal and political power, namely the power of vision and the power of participation. They enjoy creating teams and organizations where people feel empowered to contribute their own unique talents and ideas.

Catalyst level *Creative agility,* deepens the understanding of the relationship between intentions and results. It enables the capacity to "try on" frames of reference that differ from or even conflict with your own by excercising a "willing suspension of disbelief". The Catalyst sees that underlying frames of reference are much more powerful and pervasive than he/she formerly imagined, and so will more easily ask him-/herself: "What assumptions have we made in the way we`ve defined this problem?" The level of awareness enables the Catalyst to experience for him-/herself the famous insight recorded in Talmud: "*We don`t see things as they are. We see things as we are*".

Catalyst level *Self-leadership agility* enables you to detect and letting more go of your own defense mechanisms. The Catalyst discovers that his/her degree of dependence on others approval is a direct function of his/her own level of self-acceptance, which leads him/her to begin to discover the inner dimensions of empowerment. The Catalyst is therefore more able

to meet thoughts, feelings and behaviors that conflict with the way he/she "should" be, with an attitude of curiosity and reflective acceptance. This posture gives the Catalyst more choice and flexibility in responding to a whole range of different situations, as well as accept that him-/herself has mixed feelings and inner conflicts. Personal growth at the Catalyst level is not so much a goal to achieve as an open-ended, ongoing process.

In chapter 6 I will illustrate some of the empirical data with these three stages of Expert, Achiever and Catalyst.

Bill Torbert (2004):

I will now turn to Bill Torbert & Associates and the book "*Action Inquiry-the secret of timely and transforming leadership*"(2004) For the sake of simplifying I will only refer to Torbert. Here he describes a way of simultaneously conducting action and inquiry as a disciplined leadership practice that increases the wider effectiveness of our actions. Action inquiry becomes a moment-to-moment way of living whereby we attune ourselves through inquiry to acting in an increasingly timely and wise fashion for the overall development of the situations in which we participate. Torbert states that the aim of action-inquiry is to generate effectiveness and integrity in ourselves. Integrity is generated, he says, through a more and more dynamic and continual inquiry into the gaps in ourselves. Such gaps may appear between the results we intended and the results our performance generates, or between our planned performance and our actual performance, or between our original intentions and our low state of awareness at the moment of action, causing us to miss an opportunity(Torbert and Associates, 2004).

Torbert then introduces different capacities to learning and digesting information, called single-, double-and triple loop feedback within a persons awareness, or action-logics. *Single-loop feedback* is defined as information that tells a person whether or not her last move advanced the person closer toward the set goal. This type of awareness puts action first and inquiry later, or not at all. Reliable single-loop learning is critical for reaching goals efficiently and effectively. Torbert goes on to explain that most people treat their current action-logic, structure or strategy as their very identity. We will tend to resist to accept different types of feedback, unless and until we allow ourselves to continue to feel ourselves as ourselves even as we try different roles, or masks, or strategies.

Torbert then defines *double-loop feedback*, or action-logic, as a persons need to transform her structure or strategy, not just amend her behavior or actions. *Triple-loop feedback*, Torbert defines as highlighting the present relationship between our effects or outcomes in the outside world and 1) our actions (single-loop feedback/awareness), and 2) our strategy (double-loop

feedback/awareness), and 3) our attention itself. Triple-loop feedback/action-logic makes us present to ourselves now. He defines this ability to accept more and different types of feedback or action-logics as *super-vision*. This also balances goal-oriented action with inquiry about the goal, in such a way as to balance the influence of different participants as well. Torbert advocates that this kind of super-vision, or all action-logics performed at the same time, leads to a kind of transforming power that enhances mutuality(Torbert and Associates, 2004).

When Torbert has established these different types of action-logics, he introduces a framework of a seven-stage model with each stage representing an "action logic," that is, an overall strategy that thoroughly informs an individual's reasoning and behavior(Torbert and Associates, 2004). Individuals at different stages organize their experiences in terms of a particular logic (e.g., norms, craft logic, system effectiveness) with the logics becoming more complex as individuals develop. The logics shape a main focus of attention at each stage. An individual's focus broadens with each successive stage. Torberts fourth, fifth and sixth stages are quite similar to Joiner and Josephs Expert, Achiever and Catalyst, as I have described above, and which I choose to focus on in this thesis.

Kegan and Lahey(2009):

I will now move over to the theories and research developed by Robert Kegan and Lisa Laskow Lahey. In their book "*Immunity to change. How to overcome it and unlock the potential in yourself and your organization*"(2009), they state that leaders increasingly ask people to do things they are not currently able to do, were never prepared to do, and are not yet developmentally well matched to do. They then focus on how to close the gap between what people genuinely *intend* to do and what they are actually *able* to bring about.

Their research showed that some of their adult research subjects were able to evolve whole patterns of increasingly complex and agile ways of apprehending the world. Each new mental plateau gradually overcame the systematic limitations of the prior one. This raised the question whether one could do anything to support these shifts in the expansiveness and complexity of our mindsets-could people actually be helped to grow?

Kegan and Lahey first sought to describe the structure of each way of meaning-making, why it created the reality it did, what changed in a structure when it evolved. Their research shows that it exists qualitatively different, discernibly distinct *levels (plateaus)* of adult development that represent quite different mental complexities or meaning systems. These plateaus of adult mental development can be divided into *the socialized mind, the self-authoring mind and the*

self-transforming mind. These make sense of the world, and operate within it, in profoundly different ways.

Their research found that the driver of increasing mental complexity was moving mental structures from "subject" to "object", from "master" to "tool". The root of any way of knowing (epistemology) is an abstract-sounding thing called the "*subject-object relationship*". Any way of knowing can be described with respect to that which it can look at (object) and that which it looks through (the "filter" or "lens" to which it is subject)(Kegan and Lahey, 2009 p.51). A way of knowing becomes more complex when it is able to *look at* what before it could only *look through*. In other words, our way of knowing becomes more complex when we create a bigger system that incorporates and expands on our previous system. This means that if we want to increase mental complexity, we need to move aspects of our meaning-making from subject to object, to alter our mindset so that a way of knowing or making meaning becomes a kind of a "tool" that *we have* (and can control or use) rather than something that *has us* (and therefore controls and uses us)(Kegan and Lahey, 2009 p.51). Each level of mental complexity incorporates a distinctly different subject-object relationship, a successively more complex way of knowing that is able to *look at* what the prior way of knowing could only *look through*. For example, the *socialized mind* is subject to the values and expectations of her surround. The perceived risks and dangers that arise for such a person have to do with being unaligned, or out of faith, with that mediating surround, being excluded from it and thereby cut off from it`s protections, or being evaluated poorly by those whose regard directly translates into his regard for himself.

At the next level of mental complexity, the *self-authoring mind,* a person is able to distinguish the opinion of others from her self-opinion. She can choose how much, and in what way, to let others influence her. They can take the whole meaning-making category of others`s opinions as a kind of tool, or something they have, rather than something that has them. This way of knowing allows the person to take other`s opinions as object rather than subject. This enables her to be the author of his/her own reality, and to look at oneself as a source of internal authority-hence the "self-authoring" mind. This changes the basis of context from which the specter of risk and danger from psychological life arises(Kegan and Lahey, 2009). They state that if we are able to break through to an even bigger emotional and mental space that can seek out the framework`s current limitations, rather than merely defend the current draft as a finished product and regard all suggestions to the contrary as a blow to the self, we can reach the third mental plateu, *the self-transforming mind*. Thus, these three qualitatively different levels of complexity represent three distinct epistemologies.

This description is also implicit in Joiner and Josephs(2007) model above, as they describe that when adults grow toward realizing their potential, they develop a constellation of mental and emotional capacities. These are simply different ways of saying the same thing.

Kegan and Lahey`s research led them to find a way into the inner dynamics, a sort of "master motive" that keeps us on our current mental plateu. They called this phenomen "the immunity to change", a hidden dynamic that actively prevents us from changing because of it`s devotion to preserving our existing way of making meaning. They describe this resulting in us "having one foot on the gas and one foot on the break"(Kegan and Lahey, 2009). I will describe this further in chapter 4 below.

They point out that when we overcome an immunity to change, we stop making what we have come to see is actually a bad bargain: our immune system has been giving us relief from anxiety while creating a false belief that many things are impossible for us to do-things that in fact are completely possible for us to do!(Kegan and Lahey, 2009 p.50).

They use the distinction made by Ronald Heifetz(1994) between on the one hand personal-change goals that actually require developing our current mindset in order to accomplish them, so-called "*adaptive challenges",* or immunities. On the other hand, "*technical challenges*" are defined on the fact that the skill-set necessary to perform them is within a persons current mindset. An ordinary mistake is to apply technical means to solve adaptive challenges, or mis-diagnose our challenge as a technical one.

Kegan and Lahey therefore has aimed to build a successful "learning platform" that moves from diagnosing immunitites to overcoming them, as well as finding adaptive (non-technical) ways of supporting ourselves and others to meet adaptive challenges. This by intentionally supporting the development of complexity of mind, since all learning and reflection will occur within our existing mindsets.

I will use Kegan and Lahey`s theories to illustrate data-findings in chapter 6 below.

Finally in this chapter, I will present some of the theory and research of Karen Horney. Although her work also can be categorized under the label "constructive", I choose to describe her work in a sub-section of it`s own, since it also differs from the contructive theory I have presented until now.

Reactive styles-Karen Horney (1945):

In Karen Horney`s influental book "*Our inner conflicts. A constructive theory of neurosis*" (1945), she describes neurotic conflicts and attempts at solution. Although her research and theories focused on neuroses, it is used widely also when working with so-called "normal" people, hereunder in the 360-feedback tool we use in this program, "The Leadership Circle

Profile". The lower half of the circle is based upon Horneys work, with the three reactive styles *"moving along"-(complying)*, *"moving against"-controlling* and *"moving away from"-protecting*. I will describe this tool further in chapter 4 below. Horneys research and theory has therefore been essential in working with the leaders and referents in our program. Personally I find Horneys work very moving, and that it speaks directly to me through all the time that has passed since her book came out in 1945, right after the second world war.

Horney starts by pointing out that people have to make different types of choices very often, without being consciously aware of the choices that have to be made. Consequently they do not resolve them by any clear decision.

Horney then states that the more we face our own conflicts and seek out our own solutions, the more inner freedom and strength we will gain. Only when we are willing to bear the brunt can we approximate the ideal of being the captain of our ship.

Horney describes the essential characteristics of a neurotic conflict as showing an incompatibility of conflicting drives and their unconscious and compulsive nature, leading always to the impossibility of deciding between the contradictory issues involved.

It is interesting here to draw a link to Kegan and Lahey`s "Immunity to change"-tool described above, which is used to show a persons anxiety-management system, and how unconscious and countervailing forces makes the person have "one foot on the brake and one on the gas". It is also interesting to draw a parallell to Kegan and Lahey`s *socialized mind,* which also can be seen as made up of our reactive styles.

Horney goes back to what she calls "the basic anxiety", meaning by this the feeling the child has of being isolated and helpless in a potentially hostile world. Despite own weakness and fears he unconsciously shapes his tactics to meet the particular forces operating in the environment. In doing so, he develops not only ad hoc strategies but lasting character trends which become part of his personality(Horney, 1945 p.42).

She then goes on to say that if we want to see how conflicts develop, we must take a panoramic view of the main directions in which a child can and does *move* under these circumstances. She then describes the three essential moves made to cope with the environment- a child can move *towards* people, *against* people, or *away* from people.

When *moving towards* people, the child accepts her own helplessness, and in spite of her estrangement and fears tries to win the affection of others and to lean on them. Only in this way can she feel safe with them. If there are dissenting parties in the family, she will attach herself to the most powerful person or group. By *complying* with them, she gains a feeling of belonging and support which makes her feel less weak and less isolated(Horney, 1945 p.42).

Horney describes moving towards people, or complying, as centering around a desire for human intimacy, a desire for "belonging". She has an insatiable urge to feel safe. She will automatically try to live up to the expectations of others, or to what she believes to be their expectations, often to the extent of losing sight of her own feelings. She becomes undemanding, compliant, over-considerate, and does not consult her own feelings or judgment but gives blindly to others all that she is driven to want from them. She tends to subordinate herself, take second place, leave the limelight to others, appease, etc.(Horney, 1945 p.52). The complying person looks at hes fellow man with the silent question:"Will he like me?"(Horney, 1945 p.80). This reactive style is called *complying* in the tool we use in the program; The Leadership Circle 360 Profile.

When *moving against* people, the child accepts and takes for granted the hostility around her, and determines, consciously or unconsciously, to fight. She implicitly distrusts the feelings and intentions of others towards herself. She rebels in whatever ways are open to her, and wants to be the stronger and defeat them, partly for her own protection, partly for revenge. In our 360-tool, this reactive style is called *controlling.*The controlling person looks upon her fellow man and wants to know:"How strong an adversary is he?"or"Can he be useful to me?"(Horney, 1945 p.80). The primary need becomes one of control over others. Variations in the means of control are infinite. The controlling person needs to excel, to achieve success, prestige, or recognition in any form(Horney, 1945 p.65). Strivings in this direction are partly oriented towards power, inasmuch as success and prestige lend power. But they also make for a subjective feeling of strength through outside affirmation, outside acclaim, and the fact of supremacy. Here as in the compliant type the center of gravity lies outside the person himself, only the kind of affirmation wanted from others differ.

When *moving away* from people, the child wants neither to belong nor to fight, but keeps apart. He feels that he doesn`t have so much in common with the others, they do not understand him anyhow. The child builds up a world of his own. This reactive style is called *protecting* in our 360-tool.

The two former predominant styles, *complying* and *controlling,* are directed towards positive goals: affection, intimacy and love for complying, and survival, domination and success for controlling. In contrast to this*, protecting* has a negative goal, namely not to be involved, not to need anybody, not to allow others to intrude on or influence him(Horney, 1945 p.81). Horney describes that one of the characteristics of this style is a general emphasizing on estrangement from people. What is crucial is their inner need to put emotional distance between themselves and others. More accurately, it is their conscious and unconscious

determination to not get emotionally involved with others in any way, whether in love, fight, co-operation, or competition. They draw around themselves a kind of magic circle which no one may penetrate. The underlying principle is never to become so attached to anybody or anything that he becomes indispensable. That would jeopardize aloofness. Better to have nothing matter much(Horney, 1945 p.75). Another pronounced need is a high need for privacy, he tends to shroud him-/herself in a veil of secrecy.

Horney describes how *protecting* has a very strong need for independence. This can take many different forms, but one can be that advice is felt as domination and meets with resistance even when it coincides with own wishes(Horney, 1945 p.78). Also, Horney stresses the need to feel superior, because of it`s intrinsic association with detachment(Horney, 1945 p.79). The protecting type looks at his fellow man and asks him:"Will he interfere with me?Will he want to influence me or will he leave me alone?"He may take extraordinarly pride in having kept free of leveling influences of environment and is determined to keep on doing so(Horney, 1945 p.80). *Protecting* has the ability to look at themselves with a kind of objective interest, as one would look at a work of art. Perhaps the best way to describe it would be that they have the same "on-looker" attitude towards themselves that they have toward life in general. They are often excellent observers of the processes going on within them(Horney, 1945 p.74).

The more the emotions are checked, the more likely it is that emphasis will be placed upon intelligence. The expectation then will be that everything can be solved by sheer power of reasoning, as if mere knowledge of one`s own problems would be sufficient to cure them (Horney, 1945 p.85).

Often, one of these moves will become the predominant one, and so the one who most strongly determines actual conduct. This basic attitude towards others has created, or a least fostered, the growth of certain needs, qualities, sensitivities, inhibitions, anxieties, and, not last, a particular set of values.

For a normal person, Horney says, the goal is that the three attitudes should not be mutually exclusive. One should be capable of giving in to others, of fighting, and of keeping to oneself. However, these three attitudes do have intrinsic incompatibilities, which a person will attempt to, conscious or unconscious, effect a compromise in-between.

It is interesting here to draw a parallell to Kegan and Lahey`s "*self-authoring mind*", described above, which enables us to have a relationship with our reactive styles. Through this mindset, a person can take other`s opinions as object rather than subject and be the author of his own reality.

I will illustrate some of the empirical data in chapter 6 below with Horney`s theory. Finally, I will move over to briefly present some theory about the phenomenon "trust". I choose to present this both because I find it interesting in terms of leadership development, and in terms of some of the empirical findings.

Trust:

Jan Spurkelan (2005) refers to the so-called "A-factor"of the leader in his book called (in Norwegian:) Relasjonskompetanse. Resultater gjennom samhandling", (English, my translation: Relational competence. Results through interaction) (2005). This is referred to as a superior dimension within relational competence, with the"A" standing for "Acceptance" in the actual situation in which the leader operates. Spurkeland calls trust the main carrying-beam in a relation. He describes it as an emotion which is developed through interpersonal experiences and is built by repetetive mutual trust-building actions, from which trust can be the result. He says that we first and foremost seek human contact and acceptance. First when that is established, the work itself can start.

 I will now move over to chapter 3 and a description of the methodological approaches I have chosen in this thesis.

3. Procedure-methodology:

3.1. Research strategy:

According to Creswell (2007), it is important for the researcher to be open about own frameworks and/or "lenses" that will shape his/her practice of research. My *philosophical assumption* for entering this specific research-project is that I want to study the meaning of the participants experiences as they take part in the leadership development program.

A case-study:

I choose to follow Creswell`s (2007) definition of a *case study* as a qualitative approach in which the investigator explores a bounded system (a case) or multiple bounded systems (cases) over time, through detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information (e.g., observations, interviews, audiovisual material, and documents and reports), and reports a case description and case-based themes. My intent is to understand the specific issue of "leadership development", using the *bounded case* as a illustration (Creswell, 2007). I select the pilot leadership development program described in pt. 4 below for study, making this research project a "*within-site study*"(Creswell, 2007).

My chosen case is distinguished by the *size,* being eight participants in the program, as well as by *time,* as the program consists of a total of six days conducted from February-December 2011, combined with individual follow-up coaching, which makes it also distinguished by *processes.* It is a *single-instrumental* case study, as I focus on the issue "leadership development", and select one bounded case to illustrate this issue (Creswell, 2007). The program is thus in this research-project used as an instrument to inquire into how leadership development can be supported and developed.

Qualitative research method:

I choose to conduct a *qualitative* inquiry within an *interpretive* stance. It is interpretive as I will describe, interpret and theorize on the empirical findings collected through the in-depth interviews (Creswell, 2007). In his book "Qualitative inquiry and research design", Creswell (2007) describes qualitative research as beginning with assumptions, a worldview, the possible use of a theoretical lens, and the study of research problems inquiring into the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem. Qualitative researchers use an emerging qualitative approach to inquiry, the collection of data in a natural setting sensitive to the people and places under study, and data analysis that is inductive and establishes patterns or themes(Creswell, 2007). *Epistemological theory* on how knowledge is constructed is in qualitative research related to the relationship between me as a researcher and that being researched. The researcher looks for the complexity of views rather than narrow the meanings into a few categories or ideas. The goal of the research is to rely as much as possible on the participants views of the situation (Creswell, 2007). I have thus in my case-study gained insight into the participants context by personally conducting interviews about how they perceived their own processes as they followed the leadership development program.

Phenomenology:

This case-study has a significant *phenomenological* approach within it, as the case-the leadership development program- is used to describe how a specific phenomenon-leadership development- is experienced. Aksel Tjora (2009) describes phenomenology as one of four different sociological perspectives which can frame the types of phenomenon we see as existing in society and which we can know something about-also called *ontology.* Tjora also describes how we can develop knowledge about this-epistemology(Tjora, 2009).

According to Creswell (2007), a phenomenological study describes the meaning for several individuals of their lived experiences of a concept or a phenomenon. The ideal with the research project would be that the reader should come away with the feeling that "I understand better what it is like for someone to experience that"(Creswell, 2007). In the analysis of the empirical data in this thesis, I have drawn heavily on the phenomenological approach, but built into a case-study frame, see below.

Advocacy/participatory-action research:

The basic tenet of this worldview, according to Creswell (2007), is that research should contain an action- agenda for reform that may change the lives of participants and the institutions in which they live and work. Besides being a very ambitious goal, this type of research often has been done on marginalized groups or individuals. In this project the participants are in no way marginalized, but on the contrary leaders. Still, many of the criterias appear similar to advocacy/participatory-research: As a researcher I will provide a voice for the participants. There are clear stated goals to the intervention; the leadership development program, in aiming to facilitate the development of consciousness, see chapter 4.1. below. Further the program is focused on bringing about change in practices and helping individuals free themselves from contraints, in for instance work settings(Creswell, 2007).

Pragmatism:

This worldview focuses on the outcomes of research- the actions, situations and consequences of inquiry (Creswell, 2007). There is concern with applications-"what works"-and solutions to problems. Since I will focus on whether the participants are experiencing any actual leadership development, I definately focus on the outcomes and on what seems to be "working" in leadership development training in a "real-life" work- setting.

3.2.Data collection

My empirical data was collected through interviews with four of the participants, conducted in May 2011.

3.2.1.Contact to participants:

I presented my research-project at the outset of the program in February 2011, and said I would come back to asking some of the participants at a later stage if they would be willing to participate. Then I asked four of the participants in March 2011, at the end of the third day in the program, whether they would be willing to let me interview them. I then sent them a participant consent form, which they read and signed, see Appendix B.

3.2.2. Sampling strategy/the interview-objects:

My sampling strategy was to ask those participants who seemed to actually experience developmental changes as the program progressed, and based upon that, hopefully would be able to contribute with interesting and valuable data to this research-project. This makes me use *purposeful sampling*, as the selected respondents (hopefully) purposefully can inform an understanding of the research problem and central phenomenon in the study(Creswell, 20007). This also means that I used a *criterion-based* sampling strategy (Creswell, 2007). Within this criterion, I searched for variations, both in terms of age, gender, education/training and background, which also made me use *maximum variation* -sampling strategy (Creswell, 2007).

The referents I ended up asking consist of three women and one man, in the age of beginning thirties to mid-fourties. They have various leadership-experience, mostly from being employed in the Norwegian military. Two of them have a double-education, consisting of both a military training from one of the Norwegian war-academies as well as a civilian health-education(This is very common in the Norwegian Armed Forces Medical Services). The third has a military training from one of the Norwegian war-academies, and the fourth has a civilian education.

After the third interview I experienced some repetition in terms of the data I got. Based upon this I felt that having four respondents were sufficient to get rich and varied enough empirical data for this thesis. Considering the need of doing time-consuming transcription as well as conducting thorough data anlysis, I feel quite certain that the eventual new types of data I would have gotten from more interviews would not balance the amount of work and time it would have taken.

The question remains whether I would have gotten different types of data if I would have chosen the other four participants in the program. I do believe that the chances are good that I would have gotten data in the end who would in many ways be quite similar to the data I received from my four chosen referents, but that it would have taken more time to "get there", with perhaps more data on what stopped or hindered their experiences of development; their key developmental opportunitites. I base this upon what all eight participants expressed at the end of the course in their anonymous feedback to NMMS of the whole program, which was made available to me.

This makes me quite certain that I have not missed important sources or dimensions of data by the sampling I did. I felt genuinely surprised with the rich, varied and complex data I had received after having conducted all four interviews.

3.2.3.Interviews:

I chose to conduct qualitative in-depth interviews. According to Tjora (2009), it is the most commonly used method for gathering data in qualitative research. The goal of conducting in-depth interviews is mainly to create a situation for having a relatively free conversation focused around some specific themes the researcher first has decided (Tjora, 2009). The purpose is to get the informant to reflect upon own experiences and meanings connected to the theme for the research (Tjora, 2009). I thus used *open-ended, evolving and non-directional* questions(Creswell, 2007), which provided the informant with the possibility of depth where he/she had much to tell. During the interview it is common to allow, and actually wish for, digressions from the informant. Tjora (2009) points out that the aim is to study something subjective, as meanings, assumptions and experiences-that we want the world seen from the informants side. The in-depth interview as a method is taken from the phenomenological approach(Tjora, 2009).

The interview-guide, see appendix A, is a *semistructured interview,* which means that it helped me to structure the interview –conversations and ensure they were having the relevant focus of interest, while at the same time providing great flexibility which enabled me to follow the referents reflections and have a natural progression in the conversation by including follow-up questions and asking for elaborations where this was found to be important. Based upon this, I aimed to provide my referents with as much space as possible, and not asking them any more questions than I experienced as necessary. I consciously aimed to wait and use the silence to see if the referent would come up with any more reflections on his/her own. My wish was to avoid to intrude and influence my interview-objects as much as possible. I consciously tried to not have any codes, categories or preliminary structure in the back of my mind during the interviews. I wanted to wait with that until analysing the data afterwards.

All four interviews were conducted by telephone, due to practical difficulties with meeting in person. I therefore lost the ability to experience the referents body-language as a source of data(Tjora,2009). However, I experienced that the telephone enabled a very focused and concentrated interview, with the ability to notice also such data-sources as the tone of the

voice, the use of pauses and silence, etc., in addition to the actual words being spoken. I asked the referents to place themselves in a room where they would not be disturbed. I started with a general introduction, and then made them aware of when I would start the tape-recorder. I conducted the interview with Pat (all four referents names are fictional, and given for the sake of readability) on May 12th 2012, with Ann on May 13th, Bob was interviewed May 16th, and finally Lynn was interviewed May 18th.

I wrote down my own experience of the interview as soon as it was finished. I will only refer that which will not jeopardize the referents anonymity and which says something about the interview-situatuon itself and therefore can be of value in terms of interpreting the data.

Pat is the youngest of the four referents. After having interviewed her, I wrote that it lasted one hour from start until end, and that I ended up with having to ask all the follow-up questions I had. If not, I was sure that I would not have gotten that much data from her. I perceived her as answering my questions in a short and precise way, but at the same time with contact to new depths and landscapes opening up to her for reflections while providing me with the seemingly short and precise answers.

After the interview with **Ann** I wrote that she talked easily and independently, in a clear, concrete and structured way. "When she was done, she was done." Again, I ended up having to ask all my follow-up questions. Similar to Pat, she "waited" for my questions. When I consciously waited to see if she would come up with more data without me asking, nothing more came.

The interview with **Bob,** being the oldest of the informants**,** turned out to be different in all ways. He needed time and space. But in contrast to both Ann and Pat, he would come up with many more reflections when I provided him with this. He could describe how he was able to "see" himself and the processes he was in from the outside. A couple of times I could not help myself from laughing at something he said, because it came off as so poignant, surprising and impressive to me-I felt I laughed from joy. At these times, we both laughed. I consciously did not comment my laughter, as I was afraid it could influence him-so I was just quiet afterwards and waited until he continued the interview on his own. I have written down (*laughter*) in the statements in chapter 5 and 6 where this happened.

After the final interview with **Lynn**, I commented that she talked easily, in a very structured way, and seemed sort of "done"in the analyses she provided, combined with at the same time

many reflections aorund them. She was the only one who brought up awareness and being present.

The Interview-guide:

Tjora (2009) describes the typicial open questions in a qualitative in-depth interview as "the grand tour-questions"- the researcher invites the informant to take him/her along on "a grand tour" of the chosen open themes. The questions should open up for reflections (Tjora, 2009). The interview-guide is included in appendix A.

The first research-question, "*What is the participants concept of leadership development at the outset of the course*?", is trying to unpack the participants concepts of leadership development at the outset of the program, since I had an assumption that this will influence how the participants will interpret and experience any possible leadership development happening to them. The first follow-up question, "Can you describe your leadership-ideal?", is trying to get the participant to describe what leadership development means to them, personally. The second follow-up question, "Can you describe when-how-in which situations-you experience a good professional self-esteem?" tries to get the referents to reveal something about how they value themselves, as well as what motivates them. I assumed that both factors are important in terms of how they will experience leadership development. The third follow-up question, "Can you describe how you talk to yourself when you evaluate yourself?" tries to get the referents to reveal something about how they assess their progress towards their leadership ideal. All three follow-up questions aim at getting the referents to go even more into detail, or describe in an even deeper, richer and more reflective way, the main question of what their concept of leadership development is.
The second research-question asks the referents whether they have experienced that the program has contributed to their leadership development-process. The follow-up question asked them whether they had seen any opportunities lately to develop in the wanted direction, in order to get the referents to talk as detailed as possible about concrete, actual situations they had been "experimenting" or observing themselves.

The third research-question asked the referents whether any eventual experienced development has happened according to their concepts of what leadership development is, or whether the program has contributed to changing their concepts of leadership development. This is interesting compared to the first inquiry into their concepts at the outset of the program. A follow-up question to this is whether the referent can describe what kind of

expectations he/she has to him-/herself as a leader in the future. By asking this, I hope to have them describe something about how they see themselves in the future, after the program is finished, and through that, hopefully have them describe something about how the program has had an impact on them.

3.2.3. Observations

I did collect observations by taking field-notes through-out the program. When I afterwards compared these observational data with the data from the in-depth interviews, I found the data from the interviews to be much richer and "deeper". There can be many possible explanations for this. One is that the participants seem to have been more reluctant to say profound things, to "go deeper", in a "class-room"-situation with the whole group, where in contrast they would provide rich, deep and very reflective statements when being individually interviewed. Another is that I found it difficult to combine the observer-role of collecting observational data with my action-inquiry role as one of the two teachers in the program. I therefore think it would have been much easier for me to take good field-notes if this research-project would not be action-inquiry, with me being in a teaching-role. Based upon this, I have chosen not to include empirical data from observations and field-notes in this study, but rather aim to use the empirical data from the in-depth interviews in a thorough, rich and detailed way.

3.2.4. Transcription of interviews

I used a tape-recorder while conducting the interviews. Afterwards, I made transcriptions of the entire interviews. This turned out to be a very time-consuming job, and amounted into a total of 20 pages. As for the language, I interviewed in Norwegian and transcribed them into Norwegian, to ensure that it was done as literally as possible. It was at a much later stage during the data-analysis that I translated the data into English, see below.

The transcriptions from the interviews with Ann, Bob and Pat were word-for-word literal transcriptions. I experienced big challenges in doing this while transcribing the interview with Lynn, as she had the habit of phrasing a meaning in possibly five-six alternative ways, with very long sentences and many subordinate clauses. After having struggled for a while with trying to transcribe all of these alternatives, I chose to pick the "clearest" one of her alternative ways of describing what appeared to be the essence of her meaning, and transcribe this. I made an extra effort to compare the whole transcription of her interview when done, with listening to the whole interview on the tape-recorder. I feel sure that I after these procedures was left with empirical data that is correct in terms of the interview she gave.

3.2.5.Me-the researcher:

Creswell points to the need of setting aside the researcher`s personal experiences (which cannot be done entirely) so that the focus can be directed to the participants in the study (Creswell,2007). This is seen as especially important when using a phenomenological approach, as I will describe further below. By doing this, I attempt bracketing myself, in order to further remove the possibility of my own experiences influencing how I for instance interpret the empirical data. However, I recognize that I can not completely remove myself and my interpretations from the situations I describe(Creswell,2007).

As I described in the introduction, I have my own experiences with a leadership position and own leadership development which I have found to be very powerful. It made a big difference for me in my daily, practical life and work-situations to be less reactive and develop more consciousness into my own reactions. The ways I could see these experiences of my own possibly could influence my interpretations of the data, is that I believe strongly in the possibility of developing ourselves in adult life. This might lead to me "hearing"something I think could lead to, or be about, adult development processes, in data that might actually not be about that from the referents side. I have tried to avoid this by conducting a thorough transcript of the interviews as well as a rigid method of analysing the data (see below), to avoid "reading" own interpretations into it.

3.3.Method for analysis:

According to Creswell, the core elements of qualitative data analysis are reducing the data into meaningful segments and assigning names for the segments, combining the codes into broader categories or themes, and displaying and making comparisons in the data(Creswell, 2007). Throughout the whole process of analysing the empirical data I had after the transcriptions of the interviews, the referents were called R1-R4.

I wanted to use a structured method for analysing the empirical data in this thesis. The reason for this is that I draw heavily in the curriculum of the program on quite defined theory, theoretical models, tools and learning-platform, see chapter 4 and appendix C. In addition, being one of the teachers in the program, as well as ending up coaching two of the four referents (even though this was not planned), could easily make me, consciously or unconsciously, want to achieve certain "results" from the participants in the program. Based on this, it was especially important for me to use a method for analysing the data that would "force" me to step back from the data and look at it as objectively and inductively as possible,

without any pre-fixed models or theories in my mind that I would, consciously or unconsciously, try to "fit" the data into. The period of struggling to find a methodological approach in analysing the empirical data that would fit these needs took me the longest time of all the stages in working with this thesis.

I finally chose to adopt the most central steps from the highly structured approach to analysis by Moustakas(1994), which is a detailed form for composing a phenomenologicial study (Creswell, 2007). I adopted the key steps of identifying significant statements, creating meaning units and clustering themes(Moustakas, 1994).

When I started with analysing the empirical data from the four transcripts, I tried to get a sense of the whole database(Creswell, 2007). I read the transcripts over and over, and tried to get a sense of the interviews as a whole before breaking it into parts(Creswell, 2007). According to Creswell it is important to disregard any predetermined questions in order to be able to "hear" what the interviewees are saying(Creswell, 2007), which I consciously aimed to do. While reflecting on the data I started to write short memos of ideas or key concepts in the margins of the transcripts in this initial process of exploring the database. This phase moved continously back and forth between reading, reflecting on the data and writing memos, and describing, classifying and interpreting(Creswell, 2007). After a while of working in this data analysis spiral, some central themes emerged. They were still vague and "fuzzy", but I could sense that at least two central themes in the database were about conditions for development to happen and diverse descriptions of their processes of change. I wanted to avoid starting at this point to use any "prefigured codes or categories", for example from a theoretical model or the literatur (Creswell, 2007), which easily could limit the analysis to the "prefigured" codes rather than opening up the codes to reflect the data in a traditional qualitative way(Creswell, 2007). I therefore switched to starting *identifying significant statements* connected to these initial central themes.

I developed a list of totally 56 initial significant statements. This continued as my database to work on "condensing" further. I worked to develop a list of nonrepetitive, nonoverlapping statements (Creswell, 2007), which turned out to be very time-consuming. I could then take the reduced list of significant statements, included in appendix D, and group them into larger units of information, which I called "categories". In this process, three main categories emerged; *Conditions, Developmental motivation and Change*. For the category "*Developmental motivation*" three sub-categories emerged: "*Leadership ideals/constructs*

prior to the program", " *Emotional tone you use when you assess your progress towards your leadership ideal*" and "*Primary source of professional satisfaction and self-esteem*". For the category "Change", two sub-categories emerged: "*self-awareness*" and "*future goals*". A schematic overview of the categories and sub-categories is included in Appendic E.

It was first at this point that I translated the significant statements from Norwegian into English. This turned out to be difficult, as well as raising many questions. I have tried to be careful not to move too far away from the respondents "own voices". This easily happens, since English and Norwegian are so different languages in many aspects. I have actively chosen to stay closer to the respondents own way of speaking, than to achieve "good English", although I have tried to make it into an "acceptable" English. The result is that I still can "feel" the different voices with their special characteristics. It was first at this stage that my four referents were given their fictional names Ann, Bob, Lynn and Pat.

3.4. Validating the quality of the empirical findings:

 I asked all four referents in October 2011 if they wanted to read their significant statements. Ann, Pat and Lynn said that they did not feel the need to read through them to accept them. Bob wanted to validate his significant statements. He therefore read them, and said that they were OK.

3.5. Ethical considerations:

Tjora points to the fact that social research must put high demands on good ethics (Tjora, 2009). For one, the research may intrude on peoples different arenas, and second, the results are made public. In qualitative research, the researcher often gets close to those who are object for the research, for example through conducting in-depth interviews (Tjora, 2009). For instance, I do feel an obligation to portray the significant statements in such an objective and correct way that my four informants will recognize themas "their", and that their anonymity is taken care of.

In addition to these "normal" demands on ethical research, I have experienced the need to focus extra strongly on ethics here since I actually have triple–roles in this action-research project; being a teacher in the leadership development course as well as a coach to two of my referents, in addition to being the researcher interviewing four of the participants. This situation made me choose a rigid methodological approach for analysing the data, as I have described above, to be able to look at the given data free of my own impressions as an active intervener in the project.

It has also been important to keep all four interview-objects anonymous throughout the program, both to the other participants as well as to the employer. This especially since NMMS agreed to participate openly, which makes it even more important to secure the anonymity of the interview-objects.

I have aimed to describe my own different roles as well as my possible interests in this action-research project. As well, Tjora (2009) points to the need of describing how the researcher may influence the empirical data that will appear and the possible effects on the validation of the empirical data.

Tjora(2009) points to the fact that the interview can be seen as a situation where the informant portrays him-/herself under influence of the concrete interactive context which is being played out . The interview can, based upon this, be seen as a play or a performance, where we have to ask ourselves whether the informant speaks "the truth"(Tjora, 2009). As a researcher, I have to address the fact that my informants may try to answer me in a "right" way, as in a way that makes them appear in a positive framing in terms of what they assume is my research- project (Tjora, 2009). As described above, there is a special need to address this in this particular project.

There are especially two ways I have tried to adress this particular challenge. I started each interview by approaching this challenge openly, and point out the danger of them answering me in a way they thought "I would like", since I was a teacher in the program. I made an especially strong point of this to the two referents I also had been coaching. I pointed out that this was going to be a research project, and that their contributions could be important in terms of getting valid data from a Norwegian organization. I stressed the fact that the more honest data they would be able to provide, the better chance would it have to become interesting empirical data.I also underlined that everything would be kept anonymous, and that their employer would not be made known with who the referents were. I stressed that I would let "their own voice" shine through.

The other way is through the fact that I met with the referents up to 11 different times throughout 2012; in six days of the program plus up to five times of coaching as for the two referents I coached myself. These meetings affirmed what the referents had provided as data through the interviews.

I will now move over to describe the case further-the leadership development course:

4.   The Leadership Development Program-the Intervention:

In this chapter I will describe more in detail the *case* in this thesis, or the intervention in form of the leadership development program. I will start by describing some of the background for the curriculum used in the program. Then I will describe more in detail what happened. The setting for the program was the locales of the Norwegian Armed Forces Medical Services (hereafter called NAFMS) at Sessvollmoen Military camp, Norway.

4.1. The background for the curriculum:

Jonathan Reams has, in his doctoral dissertation of May 2002, described a "curriculum on transpersonal leadership"(Reams, 2002). The goal of the curriculum was to facilitate the development of consciousness. When describing this particular curriculum, Reams explains that he sought to find a way to create a curriculum that engages participants in more than just an intellectual study of ideas. If the mind can understand some of the markers and signposts of how things will look and operate at this new level of consciousness, Reams says, it will be less resistant to such transformation(Reams, 2002).

This was also the aim in the program of this thesis, and led to the use of periods of silent reflection, small groups to relate the concepts with participants lived experience, having plenty of "open space" for attention to be given to what emerges from participants, as well as grounding theory in experience. The pace of the program was designed to give participants time to process and integrate both experience and theory, and to allow for fresh insights to emerge. We also sat in a circle and "checked in" at the beginning of every day. The aim of this was to let go of the worries of everyday life, to remove possible distractions and prepare participants to be focused on the process at hand. We aimed for the participants to start to go beyond their usual everyday roles, and focus on being present, as well as starting to form an experience of being part of a group. As well, we "checked out" at the end of every day. The aim of this was to try to have the participants experience the group and the room we are in as a type of a laboratory, or a safe place, before they re-enter their ordinary world.

4.2. The teachers-my role in the program:

On the *first day* I was one of two teachers. The other teacher was the employed chaplain in the Norwegian Armed Forces Medical Services, Hanna H. Brow. My role was to focus on the leadership development component of the program, through leading the case-work (see pt. 4.3. below), presenting the chosen theoretical approaches, as well as prepare for the participants to take the feedback-tool The Leadership Circle 360 profile. In other words, my role was very active the first day.

The *second and half the third day*, Jonathan Reams was hired to conduct the so-called "Immunity to change"-process, see a description in appendix C. My role was quite passive and observing these days, as I also aimed to take field-notes, see pt. 3.2.3 above. The other teacher, Hanna H.Brow, was a participant during these days.

The last three days of the program, in October and December 2011, I was again in a very active teaching-role.

4.3. The concept-what happened:

I conducted the in-depth interviews, which provided this thesis with the empirical data, in May 2011 after the third day of the program. In appendix C I will describe the program in detail up to this point. The following is a summary of the highlights of relevant activities:

Day 1:

We took on a case for the participants to "try on" different types of leadership excerted from an Expert-, an Achiever-, and a Catalyst-mindset(see chapter 2, Joiner and Josephs(2007)). The case was then illustrated by some central developmental theory to support and ground the participants own experiences, based upon the theory of Joiner and Josephs(2007), Torbert(2004) and Kegan and Lahey(2009), as described in chapter 3 above. We ended day one with setting them up for taking TLCP 360.

The Leadership Circle Profile 360 (TLCP):

In the program we used The Leadership Circle Profile (TLCP). This 360-degrees instrument brings to the surface key opportunities for developmental growth. It focuses on the dimensions that reveal the relationship between internal motivating assumptions and patterns of action. This gives the leader a clear picture of the gaps between their self- perception and how others experience them. TLCP measures the two primary leadership domains –reactive tendencies and creative competencies, which are linked to Kegan's (2009) socialized and selfauthoring structures of consciousness, as well as Horneys (1945) theory about our reactive selves, se chapter 3. The data from TLCP provides snapshots which gives us and the leaders a picture of their strengths and challenges.

Day 2 and 3:

One month later, in March 2011, we presented both TLCP as an instrument in more detail, as well as some more theory on the reactive styles of their profiles, according to Horney (1945). We then had them identify one core issue from this they would like to work on. This led into "*the immunity to change process*." This is further described in appendix C.

Individual coaching:

In the program the participants received invididual coaching. The aim of this coaching was on the one hand to insure the coachee`s understanding of the actual feedback from TLCP, as well as having them work with wanted changes. In addition, we included the learning platform of the "Immunity to change"-process, as described in appendic C. The coaching was done as follows:

My initial intention was to avoid coaching the participants that I would later interview, to lower the possibility of me influencing my referents as much as possible. We therefore planned to have two other coaches having the referents that I initially thought would be most likely to interview. However, it was first a while into the program (by April 2011) that I was able to actually choose my four referents, based upon whom I at this stage into the program perceived experienced processes of change, and therefore hopefully would have interesting and/or valuable data to deliver to this research project (see pt. 3.2 above, sampling strategy). Two of these, Ann and Pat, turned out to be my own coachees, despite my intentions to avoid this. The other two referents, Bob and Lynn, had been coached individually by other coaches than me. Ann and Pat had each received 1,5 hour of individual debriefing of their profiles with me, in the second day of the module in March. They then received one hour each of individual coaching with me on March 28th. The two other referents, Bob and Lynn, had received the same individually from their coaches.

After the interviews were conducted in May 2011, we had two more gatherings of totally 3 days, in October 2011 and December 2011. In addition we had three more individual follow-up coaching-sessions. Since this last part of the program was conducted after the collection of the empirical data in this thesis, I will not describe this last half of the program in any further detail.

5.   Data findings-Presentation of Empirical Data:

My data for this research project was gathered from the four in-depth interviews, see chapter 3.2.3. I will start by presenting the categories and sub-categories that emerged through the data-analysis, as described in chapter 3.3 and appendix E.

5.1. Presentation of Categories and Sub-categories:

The significant statements that emerged proved to be so many that due to the restrictions of lenght for this thesis, the whole list of significant statements that I ended up using in the discussion in chapter 6 is included in appendix D. I therefore choose to present just the categories and sub-categories that emerged in this chapter, by the quotations that I find most representative of them. In other words, I present the quotations that I find to be most typical, or the best example, of the specific category/sub-category. In chapter 6 the significant statements will be presented as a whole, together with the discussions for each statement. I choose to begin with the category"conditions:

5.1.1. The category "Conditions":

The empirical data in this category was not a result of research-questions I asked. I choose to show the statements anyway, since I believe it is important information from the referents about creating the right foundation for development to be able to happen at all. In other words, the participants are saying something about which conditions that are beneficial-or the contrary-for them to experience an actual change, which is necessary to experience leadership development.

The most typical statements in this category is for instance when Ann describes how she has experienced previous leadership-programs attended, and how she had expectations of this program being different:

Ann*: In aspect of me having expectations about that we should be able to work with not only "that`s how it is, that`s the facts", but also get the possibility to go into oneself, to find out what it is that makes me score high on for example "controlling" , I think the course has met my expectations.*

Ann also describes how her present jobsituation is beneficial in terms of working with developing herself in the wanted direction:

Ann:I don`t have to fight all the time to prove that I`m good, which I strongly felt like I had to in my previous job- ….. There are nobody else who are sitting and aiming at my job and waiting for me to fail, so they can take over.

Bob gives a concrete example of how problematic issues at the work-place has made him change plans of working with own development in terms of experimenting and lower barriers:

Bob:.Parts of that has been turbulent just lately, and then one does not want to discuss anything at all, on the contrary. Then one just has to outlast it.

When Ann is asked how she can work with own wanted development in the future, she says:

Ann: …I think the possibilities are there everyday, but it`s about being conscious about the possibilities instead of falling into the old pattern all the time

5.1.2. The category "Leadership Ideals":

As I worked through the empirical data, I found significant statements about the participants own leadership ideals, or own constructs about what a good leader is-or is not- to them. I found it interesting to try to "unpack" these constructs during the interviews, as I had an assumption that their constructs about what a good leader is, will have an impact on what they actually experience in their own personal developmental process. Based upon this, I had a specific follow-up question, see appendix A. Due to limitations of length of this thesis, I have chosen to just show Bob`s statement in this category.

Bob talks about how a leader should build trust, and how this is important in both military as well as civilian situations:

Bob: The underlying trust one then achieves, enables …….that one doesn`t need to have a discussion or a dialogue, because one then accepts something that must go fast.

5.1.3. The category "Developmental motivation":

I found a number of significant statements about the participants motivation to develop and experience change. I was particularly interested in inquiring into this by having possible follow-up questions to my main research-question nr. 2, see appendix A. The empirical data turned out rich both in terms of the participants saying something about their developmental motivation, as well as their own leadership ideals-their construcs of what leadership development is to them. The participants also described how they talked to themselves when they assessed their progress towards their leadership ideals. I also found statements about their own sources of professional satisfaction and self-esteem. In this rich data, a main category turned out to be "Developmental motivation". Two sub-categories emerged; "Primary Source of Professional Satisfaction and Self-esteem"and "Emotional Tone used when Assessing Progress towards their Leadership ideal".

I will begin with providing some typical statements in the two sub-categories, with " Primary Source of Professional Satisfaction and Self-esteem" first and " Emotional Tone used when Assessing Progress towards their Leadership ideal" second. The main category, "Developmental motivation", emerged more as a summary-category of these two sub-categories, and will be discussed in chapter 6.2.3. below.

5.1.4. The sub-category "Primary source of professional satisfaction and self-esteem":

In this sub-category the referents describe something about "what makes them tick"-their inner motivation behind their actions.

Typical statements in this category is for instance when Pat is asked the question of when she experiences a good professional self-esteem and/or satisfaction, and says:

Pat: *When I carry through tasks that are both demanding and stressing and I master them in a really good way. …..It is in connection with me achieving something or another, I think. A task…or…that it goes well….that I get a good enough result.*

When Lynn is asked the same question as above, she says the following:

Lynn: *…To have dared to set a goal, and maybe a little higher goal, and feel that "this time I will take it one step further". Actually get it done, and feel the co-operation and solidarity while doing it, and actually be able to suceed with it.*

5.1.5. The sub-category "Emotional Tone used when Assessing own Progress":

In the next sub-category that emerged, Ann, Bob and Lynn describe how they talk to themselves when assessing their own progress towards their own leadership-ideals. Typical statements in this sub-category is for instance when Bob is asked to describe how he talks to himself when evaluating himself, and says:

Bob: *I have on several occasions used a lot of time to look at what I have done wrong.*

When asked to give examples of how he talks to himself in these situations, Bob describes:

Bob: *Oh-it`s words like "Oh help! Have I misunderstood this so fatally? Have I forgotten to think about that? Have I not read/thought about…oh. Like this: "I have thought this through, and I`m completely convinced that I am right-what in the world have I missed, because this did not go well".*

Lynn describes several situations she experiences as possibilities to develop herself. When asked the question of why she saw these situations as such possibilitites, Lynn describes the following:

Lynn: *It has to do with consciousness- …It is something about recognizing the situation, to feel that "now I`m about to repeat that action-pattern-but STOP-I actually don`t need to do this.*

5.1.6. Change- the core-category:

The next category that emerged, is by far the one with the richest and most empirical data, and is therefore my core category. Here the referents describe their own actual experiences and processes of change. The number of significant statements here, originally a total of 42, was so rich that there emerged two sub-categories; "Self-awareness" and "Future goals".

I will begin by describing some typical statements about the processes of change. After that, I will give examples of typical statements in the two sub-categories.

When Lynn is asked if she has seen any opportunities lately to develop in the wanted direction, Lynn says:

Lynn: .....in the profile I scored very high on "perfect" and "the clever-girl-syndrom". ...But I have become more aware of, through this program, that this is something which can block other characteristics/qualities.......

 Bob explains:

Bob: I can think about my test. I asked a collegue concretely after about one and a half month into the program:"Do you think I have become better at listening than the last time we spoke together?"And then he took a break, and then he said:"Do you know what; I think that you have." Then I had been, on several occations, completely conscious upon not following what I know is this impulse-thing I have.

Lynn summarizes:

Lynn: I can feel that I have adapted some action-patterns which are unsuitable, and eventually I don`t know why I do it. So one can ask oneself:"Why do I do this?" And if one does not get a good answer, one actually can just stop doing it.

5.1.7. Change-The Sub-category "Self-awareness":

The next category which emerged, exists of statements from Bob, Lynn and Pat about their own consciousness or self-awareness.

When Bob describes the tests he has performed, he is asked whether it has happened a change within during these processes of performing the tests. Bob then says:

Bob: *....But I think it has happened an actual change already....(long pause). And it has not disappeared. But the consciousness has actually remained-and it is there constantly.*

When Lynn is asked to describe how she talks to herself when evaluating herself, Lynn summarizes as follows:

Lynn: I think it is about daring to recognize that "well, well, what I did there was not optimale, it was not the best way of solving it." Dare to see that there exist several options for handling it, and not simply justify to oneself what one did. And to make a good consideration of "I will try to do it better next time".

When Lynn is asked why she saw the situations she describes as developmental possibilities, Lynn says:

Lynn: After a while it will turn into a more automatic reflex-I will not have to think about it every time and remain conscious-it will become a part of me and my actions.

When Pat is asked what kind of expectations she has to herself as a leader in the future, Pat says the following:

Pat: I feel that the root of developing in a good way is to make myself more conscious, where I am strong, and where I can be better. And if I can adress those things, I can become better all the time

5.1.8. Change- Sub-category "Future goals":

The last sub-category that emerged, includes statements from Ann and Pat about how they see themselves as leaders in the future. I had a specific follow-up question about this, see appendix A.

When asked how Ann sees the possibilities in the future for developing in the wanted direction, Ann summarizes:

Ann: Possibilities are here everyday. I have to be conscious about me wanting to change and develop, and then it`s about using it in the daily.

When Pat is asked whether the program has eventually led to a different type of development than what she expected, Pat says the following:

Pat: I feel that I am still just in the beginning. ..I have a longer way to go in terms of development, but this will take time. Now I am taking one thing at a time and working on that. After a while I can begin to adress different issues in addition.

After having introduced the categories and sub-categories that emerged, I will now move over to the discussion and analysis of the empirical data.

6. Discussion and analysis of the empirical data:

In this chapter the empirical findings, represented by the presented categories and sub-categories in chapter 5, will be discussed and analysed in relation to the theoretical perspectives presented in chapter 3 above. I will try to make sense of the data, by stepping back and form larger meanings of what is going on in the situations (Creswell, 2007). My interpretations will be tentative, inconclusive, and questioning.

6.1. Discussion of the category "Conditions":

The purpose of this study was to examine how a leadership development course can contribute to the participants experience of leadership development. In the category "conditions", the participants say something about which conditions are beneficial-or the oppsosite-for them in order to experience a development.

Ann describes how she has experienced previous leadership-programs attended, and how she had expectations of this program being different:

Ann: Usually, when I have been to other leadership-programs, there has not been any focus on why things are as they are, you get the paper and "that`s it", "that`s the facts, now you know", and then nothing more happens…….. In aspect of me having expectations about that we should be able to work with not only "that`s how it is, that`s the facts", but also get the possibility to go into oneself, to find out what it is that makes me score high on for example "controlling", I think the course has met my expectations.

Ann`s statement actually meets with the aim of this leadership development program. We use TLCP 360 to brings to the surface key opportunities for developmental growth. TLCP focuses on the dimensions that reveal the relationship between internal motivating assumptions and patterns of action. This gives the leader a clear picture of the gaps between their self-perception and how others experience them. In addition we use the Immunity to change-learning platform in the program as well as in the individual coaching, to address change by trying to unlock our mental immune system's grip on our perception so we have an opportunity to see it in action(Kegan and Lahey, 2009), see chapter 4 and appendix C. We use these tools in order to be able to actually work with changes that the participants want-not only state the present situation and leave it with that.

Ann then goes on to describe how her present jobsituation is beneficial in terms of lowering her guard and be more vulnerable, when working with developing herself in the wanted direction:

Ann: In my present job I feel that I am safe and good. I don`t have to fight all the time to prove that I`m good, which I strongly felt like I had to in my previous job-… There are nobody else who are sitting and aiming at my job and waiting for me to fail, so they can take over. I felt very much like that in my last job.

What Ann describes about feeling "*safe and good*" is a necessary condition in order to start to experiment with testing the assumptions revealed in action, as is described in the Immunity to change-process and appendix C. If Ann feels that the people surrounding her are *waiting for me to fail , so they can take over*, she likely won`t feel like experimenting at all.

Bob expresses somewhat the same in the following:

Bob:At the same time, there has been some issues from older times which has reappeared again the last month. This time I have been completely conscious about:"No, I think that time for development has to be next month"(laughter). The difference is that it was a conscious thought I had (more laughter). That the month to experiment and lower barriers and those sort of things were absolutely not present-on the contrary (more laughter)…….Parts of that

have been turbulent just lately, and then one does not want to discuss anything at all, on the contrary. Then one just has to outlast it.

Bob expresses clearly that *time for development* as well as experimenting *and lower barriers* does not go together with his experience of issues being turbulent.

When Ann is asked how she can work with own wanted development in the future, she says:

Ann: …I think the possibilities are there everyday, but it`s about being conscious about the possibilities instead of falling into the old pattern all the time.

Ann`s statement also meets with the aim of the leadership development program, in wanting to relate the intellectual or theoretical concepts with participants lived experience, as well as grounding and supporting the participants own experiences, see chapter 4. Ann expresses this so articulate when she says that the possibilities of developing are *there everyday,* but that she has to consciously experience them as such.

Lynn says somewhat the same when asked in which ways the program eventually has met her expectations to own leadership development:

Lynn: None of us can develop you for you. You have to do it yourself. I expected to get a possibility to develop myself. And I got that. I received a good tool which enabled me, if I want, to get information and tools which can provide a development for me. So that was fulfilled by joining the leadership program.

This statement also says that if the leadership development program is able to provide her with ways of using her everyday experiences for development, she will do it herself. The tools can *provide a development* for her.

When Pat is asked what kind of expectations she has for herself as a future leader, she says the following about using these tools that she has now gotten:

Pat: That I can use the evaluation I have gotten, and run more tests, to disconfirm or confirm how I can develop. I wish to adress those challenges I have to enforce the creative half-circle, to become an even better leader. I picture that I can use the system. I have gotten a great opportunity now, with these tools, and the theory we received. ….. it is really worth it, considering what I have experienced the two times I have been running tests.

6.2. Discussion of the category "Leadership ideals":

When Bob is asked the follow-up question of whether he can describe his leadership ideals, he talks about how a leader should build trust, and how this is important in both military as well as in civilian situations. He then says:

Bob: The underlying trust one then achieves, enables …….that one doesn`t need to have a discussion or a dialogue, because one then accepts something that must go fast.

Bob`s statement can be illustrated by Spurkelands theories about trust and the so-called "A-factor" as a superior dimension within relational competence, with the"A" standing for "Acceptance" in the actual situation in which the leader operates. Spurkeland calls trust the main carrying- beam in a relation. He describes it as an emotion which is developed through interpersonal experiences and is built by repetetive mutual trust-building actions, from which trust can be the result. This fits well with Bob`s description of how a good leader in his experience has successfully been able to achieve *underlying trust.* Bob describes typically military emergency-situations where the company needs to act fast, and there is no time "*to have a discussion or a dialogue*". If the leader has been able to achieve underlying trust, Bob says, it enables these situations to go well, as the subordinates accepts "*something that must go fast*". This description fits well with Spurkelands statement that we first and foremost seek human contact and acceptance. First when that is established, the work itself can start (Spurkeland, 2005).

6.3. Discussion of the category"Developmental Motivation" and the sub-categories "Primary Source of Professional Satisfaction and Self-Esteem" and "Emotional Tone Used when Assessing own Progress":

When analyzing this category and sub-categories, I experienced the empirical data in these three as strongly connected. I therefore choose to discuss these together. I will start with the two sub-categories, and illustrate the main category "Developmental Motivation" as more of a summary of the two sub-categories discussed first.

6.3.1. The sub-category: "Primary Source of Professional Satisfaction and Self-esteem":

I will illustrate Pat`s and Lynn`s statements about this sub-category by using Joiner and Josephs(2007) theory about leadership agility correlating with a particular stage of personal development. Joiner and Josephs(2007) point to research within stage-developmental psychology that shows that, as people develop, they evolve through a series of recognizable stages, in a particular sequence.

To illustrate this, we can start with Pat`s statement about when she experiences a good professional self-esteem and/or satisfaction:

Pat: *When I carry through tasks that are both demanding and stressing and I master them in a really good way. Then I get a feeling of mastery and self-esteem.….It is in connection with me achieving something or another, I think. A task…or…that it goes well….that I get a good enough result. If you can solve a task with some challenges along the way, and achieve it in a good way, it is real fun!*

If we interpret Pat`s *Awareness and intent*, we can see that she expresses a strong problem-solving orientation, the main focus being to solve key problems. We can read into her statement her wish to differentiate herself from others by developing her own opinions and areas of expertise. All of this is typical for the *Expert* stage of leadership agility. It is also easy to interpret Pat`s *Context-setting agility* as making her tackle one problem at the time, each as an isolated task, and that she will tend to focus on short-term goals. As for Pat`s *Creative agility,* it is easy to interpret that Pat has an underlying assumption that problems must have well-established answers just waiting to be remembered or rediscovered. Based upon her statement, Pat`s *Self-Leadership Agility*, as in self-awareness, encompasses her perception of her current role and her professional skills. She clearly connects achieving a *good enough result* with a feeling of mastery, self –esteem and fun! It seems important for her self-esteem that others think she is capable and efficient.

All of this is typical descriptions of *Expert* leadership agility.

This can also be illustrated by Kegan and Lahey`s description of *the socialized mind*, which is subject to the values and expectations of her surround(Kegan and Lahey, 2009).

When Lynn is asked the same question as Pat, she adds something else to what Pat describes above:

Lynn: …To have dared to set a goal, and maybe a little higher goal, and feel that "this time I will take it one step further"…. Actually get it done, and feel the co-operation and solidarity while doing it, and actually be able to succeed with it. And that actually also has to do with showing that you know your specific discipline underlying what you shall do and receiving feedback like "this you actually could do" and achieving the goal.

Clearly, Lynn expresses much of the same as Pat does, in getting it done, being able to succeed with it, showing that you know your discipline, receiving feedback and achieving the goal. This expresses the Expert leadership agility as good as Pat does above. However, a significant difference lies in Lynns statement about "*feel the co-operation and solidarity while doing it*". With this statement, Lynn shows that she starts to manage <u>people</u>, in addition to tasks at the Expert-level.

Pat also says something about this when asked what kind of expectations she has to herself as a future leader,when talking about using the tools and the theory of the program, and then says the following:

Pat: ……And use this as a part of my development, and maybe also contribute to developing others around me.

In Lynns statement above, her context-setting agility, as in sense of purpose, seems to have developed from tactical to more strategic, in saying "to have dared to set a goal". It also seems that her focus on objectives has a time-frame longer than just short-term. She expresses a strong outcome orientation, in saying *actually be able to succeed with it.*" Lynn sees that she can achieve her outcomes better when seeking support from key stakeholders. These capacities illustrate *Achiever* level agility.

Lynn describes more about achieving a good, professional satisfaction:

Lynn: I can also achieve a good professional satisfaction from doing a good job for other people. …..If I am going to look at my own developmental perspective, or if I shall think at the big, important lines. And it is both.

It is interesting that Lynn distinguishes between "own developmental perspective" and "the big, important lines". The Achiever-level *Awareness and Intent* enables the leader to understand that developing her own system of values and beliefs ultimately is a matter of personal choice and responsibility, which Joiner and Josephs (2007) refers to as the full relocation of authority within the Self.

The Achiever level *Self-Leadership agility* enables the leader to reflect on her life in greater depth and over longer time frames, thus gaining new insights about her personal strenghts and limitations, often referred to as a strong sense of identity. It is clear that Lynn reflects upon this, as she refers to her own developmental perspective. As for the *developmental motivation*, the Achiever includes long-term career objectives and an explicit or implicit leadership philosophy to her remaining primary motivation to succeed in achieving the desired outcomes.

Lynn also has a statement that points to the next leadership agility level when she is asked the question of how she talks to herself when evaluating herself:

Lynn: …..And the next time one comes in a situation where I feel that this has happened to me before-here I actually have to prepare in a different way. And not go into self-defence-but actually remain open to what comes. Instead of answering too quickly, rather consider. Those times I have felt that it has gone like that, it is because one becomes too concerned with thinking just of oneself, and shall defend oneself as opposed to being more laidback, letting others voice their frustration because it is important to them then and there.

In this statement, Lynn gives an example of the next leadership agility level, namely *Catalyst.* As for the Catalyst *Awareness and Intent,* Lynn describes how she brings direct, momentary attention to the current experience, an on-the-spot reflective capacity. The Catalyst practises the process of being aware of her experience, reflecting on and interpreting the experience,

and then taking action by adjusting her response accordingly. The Catalyst`s appreciation of diversity increases, and she develops an interest in understanding other ways of life from the inside out. It is an example of this when Lynn describes letting other voice their frustration because it is important to them then and there.

She also describes Catalyst *Stakeholder agility,* which enables her to develop an attitude towards oneself that`s more accepting of her faults and foibles. This is mirrored in her attitude towards other people, when she describes her goal to be more laidback, and *not go into self-defence-but actually remain open to what comes.* As for Catalyst level *Creative agility,* it enables Lynns capacity to "try on" frames of reference that differ from or even conflict with her own by excercising a "willing suspension of disbelief". The Catalyst can temporarily drop her own frame and adopt one with alternative assumptions and priorities long enough to understand what a situation looks like from a new perspective.

This also provides a good example of what Bohm calls suspension, or hanging our assumptions about reality out in front of us. By doing so, we begin to notice our thoughts and mental models as the workings of our mind. Suspension allows us to "see our seeing"(Bohm, 1996).

It also proves a good example of Kegan and Laheys theory about moving from subject to object, in respect to that which Lynn can look at (object) and that which Lynn looks through (the "filter" or "lens" to which she is subject)(Kegan and Lahey,2009 p.51). A way of knowing for Lynn becomes more complex when she is able to *look at* what before she could only *look through*. In other words, when she creates a bigger system that incorporates and expands on her previous system, and moves aspects of her meaning-making from subject to object . In this way a way of knowing or making meaning becomes a kind of a "tool" that *she has* (and can control or use), as when she refers to *consider rather than answer too quickly*, rather than something that *has her* (and therefore controls and uses her), as when she refers to *go into self-defence*(Kegan and Lahey, 2009 p.51).

So this provides a good example of how these different theories actually say the same thing in different ways. Lynn also describes Catalyst level *Context setting agility,* in enabling her to be more attentive to the larger context within which she and her stakeholders operate.When both the Expert and the Achiever work from a unilateral intent, the Catalyst has a collaborative intent and seeks joint problem solving-as Lynn describes when she *remains open to what comes.*

6.3.2. Discussion of the sub-category "Emotional Tone Used when Assessing own Progress"

I had a specific follow-up question to inquire into this, see follow-up question to research-question nr.2, appendix A. In this sub-category, Ann, Bob and Lynn describe how they talk to themselves when assessing their own progress towards their leadership-ideals.

When asked the question of whether there has been any possibilities lately for developing into the wanted direction, Ann describes the following:

Ann:There was a situation recently in which I could have shown externally that I was irritated…. The first thing I thought when I felt that I was starting to wind myself up was "No...! This here we are going to work with!" Then I thought "now you have the chance to show that you have some ice in your stomach, and that this here will work out."

Ann`s statement can be illustrated by Kegan and Laheys theories(2009) about moving from the *socialized mind* to the *self-authoring mind.* When Ann earlier, in these types of situations, was in the socialized mind, she was subject to the values and perceived expectations of her surroundings, and reacted accordingly to these. When she in this specific situation was able to distinguish the opinion of others from her self-opinion, she could choose how much, and in what way, to let others influence her. This way of knowing allowed Ann to take other`s opinions as object rather than subject, and enabled her to be the author of her own reality, and to look at herself as a source of internal authority-hence the "*self-authoring*" mind. This changes the basis of context from which the specter of risk and danger from psychological life arises, and from which she reacts(Kegan and Lahey, 2009).

When Bob is asked to describe how he talks to himself when evaluating himself, Bob says:

Bob: I have on several occasions used a lot of time to look at what I have done wrong. And it is probably too much time to look at what I have done wrong and perform a self-search.

Bob here describes a typical way an *Expert* talks to himself. The Expert- level *Creative agility* sees polarities as mutually exclusice opposites, and represents an either-or mindset. Every argument must have it`s winner and looser, therefore Bob says "*what I have done wrong*".

The Expert level *Self-Leadership Agility*, as in self-awareness, often has a tendency to judge himself harshly combined with the need to be right. As for the developmental motivation, underlying it all is the fact that the Expert`s constant striving is largely motivated by fear-of how he would feel about himself if others think he is not capable or efficient. The Expert will constantly guard against this danger.

Bob illustrates more when asked to give examples of how he talks to himself in these situations:

Bob: Oh-it`s words like "Oh help! Have I misunderstood this so fatally? Have I forgotten to think about that? Have I not read/thought about…oh. …Like this: "I have thought this

through, and I`m completely convinced that I am right-what in the world have I missed, because this did not go well"(laughter). It is this type of thinking.

Bob also describes that own reactions have been stronger than expected, giving the following example:

Bob: With a couple of the pieces I was more irritated than I thought I should become. ….Own reaction and feeling were stronger than I had thought out beforehand-there it was a difference.

Bob refers to feedback from his referents when describing "*with a couple of the pieces*". It is easy to understand how feedback can be difficult to take for an Expert-agility, since he will be largely motivated by fear of others not experiencing him as capable. To not automatically continue to constantly guard against this, but on the contrary actually open up to feedback, as Bob courageously did in our program, takes a conscious and active choice from Bob to do.

When Lynn is asked the question how she talks to herself when evaluating herself, she describes the following, using an example of a situation that did not turn out so well:

Lynn: …..I think it is about recognizing what actually did not go well, and then go into and look at why I chose to do that. Could I have chosen differently.

This statement is easily illustrated by Torbert`s(2004) theory about action-inquiry. Lynn is using *Single-loop feedback* as information that tells her whether or not her last move advanced her closer toward the set goal, and in this case she concludes that it "*…actually did not go well*". Lynn then uses *double-loop feedback*, or action-logic, when she states a need to transform her structure or strategy, not just amend her behavior or actions, in saying "*look at why I chose to do that. Could I have chosen differently*".

Lynn then describes several situations she experiences as possibilities to develop herself. When asked the question of why she saw these situations as such possibilities,Lynn describes the following:

Lynn: It has to do with consciousness-to think that now I am about to do something that I don`t need to do…..It is something about recognizing the situation, to feel that "now I`m about to repeat that action-pattern-but STOP-I actually don`t need to do this. …And then just let it pass, and experience the following day that the day went along after all, if you understand what I mean.

In this, Lynn expresses t*riple-loop feedback*, by highlighting the present relationship between her effects or outcomes in the outside world and 1) her actions (single-loop feedback/awareness), and 2) her strategy (double-loop feedback/awareness), and 3) her attention itself. Triple-loop feedback/action-logic makes her present to herself in the moment.

6.3.3. Developmental motivation-a short summary so far:

If I at this point should try to summarize what the respondents actually are describing about their developmental motivation-what are they saying?

It`s obvious that the Expert-agility has a different primary source of professional satisfaction and self-esteem than the Achiver, or the Catalyst, and that they conduct inner conversations in different ways accordingly. We can see that one main point of leverage is when the leader begins to notice their own thoughts and mental models as the workings of their mind, or "suspension"/ hanging their assumptions about reality out in front of them, according to Bohm(Bohm,1996). Or as Torbert describes it, that the leader is able to bring moment-to moment awareness to his sensemaking and experiences(Torbert, 2004). Another way of generalizing the processes the leaders are describing, is that they are moving different aspects from being subject to being object to them, as Kegan and Lahey describe(Kegan and Lahey, 2009). In other words, the leaders are able to create a bigger system that incorporates and expands on their previous system.

I will now move on to try to describe these processes of change in further detail, by discussing the next category, "the Process of Change".

6.4. Discussion of the core-category "The Process of Change":

I will divide the discussion of this category into two separate parts. First, I will discuss what the respondents say that can be linked to recognizing or consciously become aware of their reactive styles, or inner conflicts. This will be the first part of the process of change. Then I will discuss what the respondents actually do in order to try to change their reactive patterns they have become aware of-the second part of the process of change.

6.4.1. The Process of Change-our Reactive Styles or Inner Conflicts:

Some of the statements about the processes of change can be illustrated by the research and theories of Horney(1945), in terms of our inner conflicts and reactive patterns.

We begin with hearing what Pat says, when describing a test she undertook while leading a group. Pat noticed that the other members saw her in a different way, and reflected upon what she had done that made them perceive her differently than before. Pat explains:

Pat: What I noticed, was that I focused more on the right things, that I was maybe more calm, and that when I adressed issues was strong and clear. .....because earlier they had perceived me as a little weak. ….What has been enforced by what I did, was that they became more clear of my way of leading, or something like that?

Horney describes *moving towards people, or complying*, as centering aorund a desire for human intimacy, a desire for "belonging". He has an insatiable urge to feel safe, and will

automatically try to live up to the expectations of others, or to what he believes to be their expectations, often to the extent of losing sight of his own feelings. He becomes undemanding, compliant, over- considerate, and does not consult his own feelings or judgment but gives blindly to others all that he is driven to want from them. He tends to subordinate himself, take second place, leave the limelight to others, appease, etc(Horney, 1945 p.52).

When we know that the profile of Pat reveals high scores in complying, both from respondents as well as own score, we can somehow imagine how she has come across to others earlier. It is no wonder that she will receive strong reactions from others when she suddently, in her test, focuses more, addresses issues strong and clear, and enforces her way of leading . It is also easy to use Horneys "moving along"-complying to illustrate why this represented a developmental change for her in her leadership role.(For the sake of anonymity and confidentiality, Pat`s actual profile is not included as an appendix in this thesis).

However, Pat also scores high, both others scores as well as own score, on the reactive style "*moving away from"-protecting*. When Pat is asked if she has had any opportunities lately to develop in the wanted direction, Pat describes the following:

Pat: Yes, in the 360-evaluation I had some challenges in terms of being distanced, in the Reactive half-circle (of TLCP). Based upon that, I carried through a test, and received really good response, and did it actually again now recently. ….And feel that this is part of the developmental process which I`m in. I feel that I have gotten confirmed that by becoming more honest and direct, I am being seen in a different way, which again makes me more visible, which again makes my leadership more visible. And that provides consequences also for the Creative half-circle (of TLCP).

Horney describes that one of the characteristics of the reactive style *moving away from-protecting* is a general emphasizing on estrangement from people. What is crucial is their inner need to put emotional distance between themselves and others. More accurately, it is their conscious and unconscious determination to not get emotionally involved with others in any way, whether in love, fight, co-operation, or competition. They draw around themselves a kind of magic circle which no one may penetrate. Better to have nothing matter much (Horney,1945 p.75). Another pronounced need is a high need for privacy, she tends to shroud herself in a veil of secrecy.

It will be a developmental opportunity for Pat to gain consciousness on in which situations *complying* is her preferred reactive style, and in which situations *protecting* is her preferred reactive style. Only then can she start to make conscious choices about which actions she

believes will be most efficient in the specific situation she is currently in. We can also suspect several underlying conflicts in her, between the two reactive styles of complying and protecting. For instance, Horney points out, *complying* wishes to share experiences for human intimacy based on a desire for belonging(Horney,1945 p.50), while the need of *protecting* is for utter indepence, and makes her dislike sharing any experience

We can see how this represents a conflict showing an incompatibility of conflicting drives, as Horney defines. According to her, the task will be to analyze the underlying conflicts. The goal of wholeheartedness can be approximated only after these have been resolved.

When Pat gains consciousness about these two conflicting drives, it will be possible for her to arrive at a feasible decision even though it may be hard on her and require a renunciation of some kind(Horney, 1945). It is also easy to understand why Pat gets so strong reactions from her surroundings, when she consciously changes her behaviour from being distanced to *"becoming more honest and direct"* and is therefore seen in a different way, which again makes her more visible, which *"again makes my leadership more visible"*.

Bob makes another statement that can also illustrate *moving away from"-or protecting.* As he also scores high on protecting, both in self-assessment and from respondents, he describes a particular test he undertook. This is the test that is described in appendix C.

Bob explains why this test represented a developmental challenge for him:

Bob: It was in response to many of the comments that came (in the profile), and how they talked about it. It is about the amount of space one takes up in different contexts. And then seeks to use-to try to influence so that one takes up less space and still achieves what one is after. And then it is this about listening and being silent.

Horney describes how protecting has a very strong need for independence. This can take many different forms, but one can be that advice is felt as domination and meets with resistance even when it coincides with own wishes(Horney, 1945 p.78). Also, Horney stresses the need to feel superior, because of it`s intrinsic association with detachment (Horney,1945 p.79). The protecting type looks at his fellow man and asks him:"Will he interfere with me?Will he want to influence me or will he leave me alone?"He may take extraordinarly pride in having kept free of leveling influences of environment and is determined to keep on doing so(Horney,1945 p.80). It is easy to imagine how this can hinder Bob in listening to others. Here he explains this further:

Bob: It is a developmental opportunity for me with impulse-control in various settings. It is probably a combination of others getting more space and then feeling more comfortable, and that I have a bigger opportunity, in fact, to think before I talk and also getting a chance to

achieve a better information-foundation for myself. ...But I have to be a little conscious about it. And one has a tendency to become somewhat engaged in some contexts. That is not always as good.

When asked if he can describe more about what goes on inside when he holds back, Bob describes:

Bob: In the beginning it was connected with a degree of irritation. I`m sitting and "shaking a little". Or that a point another one makes is completely obvious, it`s just about getting to it. It is a little negative that one. But irritation-yes.

This indicates that he is out of his comfort-zone, and is experimenting with new behavior. When Bob is asked if the program has led to an eventual development in line with his concepts or expectations, Bob summarizes:

Bob: ...If there was anything different than what I expected, it was probably that I reacted stronger than I had thought myself.

According to Horney, *protecting* has the ability to look at themselves with a kind of objective interest, as one would look at a work of art. Perhaps the best way to describe it would be that they have the same "on-looker" attitude towards themselves that they have toward life in general. They are often excellent observers of the processes going on within them(Horney, 1945 p.74). This can explain Bob saying:

Bob: The case itself I had already been able to resonnate upon myself- but not my own reaction.

According to Horney, the more the emotions are checked, the more likely it is that emphasis will be placed upon intelligence. The expectation then will be that everything can be solved by sheer power of reasoning, as if mere knowledge of one`s own problems would be sufficient to cure them(Horney,1945 p.85). This can illustrate why Bob already had observed some of his own patterns in a rational way-without taking emotions into consideration. When Bob experienced that emotions were a central part of his behavioral patterns of protecting himself, he experienced very strong emotions and was surprised by the force of them.

It is also easy to expect an underlying conflict in Bob, between how his reactive protecting style interferes with his listening-abilities, and how Bob describes his ideals in terms of when he experiences a good professional self-esteem or satisfaction:

Bob: It is when several of us deliver something which is good and proper. ....there has to be several people to achieve it-it provides a professional satisfaction........I have a thing in me that at least all military work -is a team-sport. And I think that is applicable to other settings as well. One gets executed individual tasks and processes in a whole different way in co-

operation with several others than any single indidivual can achieve alone. ......No matter how good an individual is, it will be better if put into a larger system

Bob here describes a typical *Catalyst* Stakeholder-agility in terms of incorporating the power of participation. The Catalyst enjoys creating teams and organizations where people feel empowered to contribute their own unique talents and ideas (Joiner & Josephs, 2007). We can easily see how it represents an important *adaptive* (Heifetz, 1998) challenge for Bob to gain more consciousness into his reactive protecting style and how it influences his listening abilities, in order to enable him to actually lead more like a Catalyst. This also proves a good example of why it probably would not have worked for Bob to adress his challenge of listening more in a purely *technical* way, for instance by just deciding to use willpower to start to listen more.

When describing the third face of the basic conflict, *moving against or controlling*, we can see what Lynn answers when asked if she has seen any opportunities lately to develop in the wanted direction:

Lynn:.....in the profile I scored very high on "perfect" and "the clever-girl-syndrom". This is nothing new or surprising, I know these sides of myself pretty good. But I have become more aware of, through this program, that this is something which can block other characteristics/qualities.......

According to Horney, the primary need for the predominant controlling type becomes one of control over others. Variations in the means of control are infinite.The approach may be by the intellect, implying a belief that by foresight everything can be managed. The controlling person needs to excel, to achieve success, prestige, or recognition in any form (Horney,1945 p.65). Strivings in this direction are partly oriented towards power, inasmuch as success and prestige lend power. But they also make for a subjective feeling of strength through outside affirmation, outside acclaim, and the fact of supremacy. This may give some more backgroound to why Lynn scores high in the dimension "perfect", which is one of the dimensions in the reactive style controlling in the profile.

Pat describes this in a different way, when she is asked when she experiences a good professional self-esteem and/or satisfaction:

Pat: *When I carry through tasks that are both demanding and stressing and I master them in a really good way. Then I get a feeling of mastery and self-esteem.....It is in connection with me achieving something or another, I think.*

6.4.2. The Process of Change-what can we actually do in order to change our reactive patterns or inner conflicts?

OK, so what happens when we actually have been able to see our own reactive styles or inner conflicts-what can we actually do about it in order to change in the directions we want? Ann describes this as follows:

Ann: The other times when I have joined a leadership course, it has not been any specific focus on why things are as they are, you get the paper and then it`s "that`s how it is", "that`s the facts, now you know", and then nothing more happens.

According to Horney(1945), there is only one way we can resolve our conflicts, and that is by changing those conditions within the personality that brought them into being(Horney,1945 p.217). On the other hand, Kegan and Lahey(2009) have a somewhat more practical approach when they state that it is absolutely possible to close the gap between what people genuinely *intend* to do and what they are actually *able* to bring about, by evolving whole patterns of increasingly complex and agile ways of apprehending the world.

We can see how Bob and Lynn describe their own processes of change, and begin with Bob when he is asked if he has seen any opportunities lately to develop in the wanted direction:

Bob: Those pieces that I have thought about using, I have probably been able to use along the way, both home and at work, but one has defined oneself down, so that one becomes very selective at what one attempts or not. I define the box down to something that can be handled. And in some circumstances it is then down to"OK, with a couple of individuals I will try this, and try this consciously, and this will be that arena".

As discussed above, Bob scores high on *protecting*, so for him to start experimenting with new behaviors in terms of "*those pieces I have thought about using*", demands that he defines some frames that he can feel comfortable and safe in while experimenting. Or else, we can easily imagine that his anxiety-management system, as described by Kegan & Lahey, will prevent him from such actions(Kegan and Lahey,2009). It is therefore an essential choice Bob makes when he describes that he has "*defined oneself down, so that one becomes very selective at what one attempts or not. I define the box down to something that can be handled*". This statement is to me impressively insightful, and also provides an example of Bob`s protecting reactive style enabling him to observe his own processes, as well as intellectually foresee his own reactions.

Bob goes on to explain:

Bob: I can think about my test. I asked a collegue concretely after about one and a half month into the program:"Do you think I have become better at listening than the last time we spoke together?"And then he took a break, and then he said:"Do you know what; I think that you

have."And that was quite interesting, that was quite exciting. Then I had been, on several occasions, completely conscious upon not following what I know is this impulse-thing I have.

It is important and beneficial that Bob experiences positive feedback from his collague at this point. We can read his excitement and joy when he experiences that he is <u>actually able to change</u> in the wanted direction!

Lynn goes on to describe how she started to work, after having defined that she wanted to focus on her high scores on controlling:

Lynn: And so I set up a concrete test for a period of two weeks, where I decided that "now I will not be the one who takes responsibility to create systems and structure and ensure that everything is delivered and all is being done and is OK all the time. Now I`m going to be more laidback. ….After those two weeks where I ran a very conscious test on myself, I have been in many situations where I have felt "here I could easily go in and take responsibility to make sure this goes well, or this document I could write better", but consciously left it to save that energy and time to do other things.

Lynn describes in a clear way how she consciously looks at her patterns of how she focuses and performs her work, and decides to take different approaches. It can easily be illustrated by what Kegan and Lahey(2009) say about overcoming an immunity to change- we stop making what we have come to see is actually a bad bargain: our immune system has been giving us relief from anxiety while creating a false belief that many things are impossible for us to do- things that in fact are completely possible for us to do(Kegan and Lahey, 2009).

When asked why she saw this situation as a possibility to develop in the wanted direction, Lynn explains further:

Lynn: When a situation appears where I feel that "now I want to ….or override others or develop a schema or something else, I have to think "is this something that will make a difference?"If I feel that, yes, it actually is, it will enable tomorrows activites to be more efficient, then maybe I shall do it. But if I feel that "no, this is something that is just estethical, or that this actually just influences me and nobody else", then maybe I shall not do it. I have to become better at recognizing those situations, and take a moment to breathe, and think about to what extent I shall spend my time on it. And then arrive at "no, I am actually not going to do that".

In a concrete way, Lynn here describes how her reactive controlling style changes and turns into a kind of a "tool" that *she has* (and can control or use) rather than something that *has her* (and therefore controls and uses her)(Kegan and Lahey, 2009 p.51).

Lynn then summarizes:

Lynn: I can feel that I have adapted some action-patterns which are unsuitable, and eventually I don`t know why I do it. So one can ask oneself:"Why do I do this?" And if one does not get a good answer, one actually can just stop doing it.

It sounds so easy, doesn`t it! However, for Lynn this represented an adaptive challenge(Heifetz, 1994), and so took an adaptive approach to be able to address. It also took work over time for her to gain consciousness into her reactive controlling pattern, and her own specific Immunity to change-system.

6.5. Discussion of the sub-category "Self-Awareness":

In this category, Bob, Lynn and Pat say something about their own self-awareness in terms of their change-processes.

When Bob describes the tests he has performed, (see Bob`s statements above in "the processes of change"), he is asked whether it has happened a change within during these processes of performing the tests. Bob then says:

Bob: *….But I think it has happened an actual change already….(long pause). And it has not disappeared. But the consciousness has actually remained-and it is there constantly. And I can say that quite categorically. Yes. Also on those occasions where I have to do with that setting where I have a strong wish to just build a higher wall (laughter). So the consciousness, at least, is there just as good (laughter).*

It is interesting to hear how Bob describes that his consciousness *has actually remained-and it is there constantly.* This meets well with our aim in the program, of enabling a development of a greater awareness and sensitivity to the full range of levels of consciousness available to the participants, see appendix C.We use some central developmental theory to support and ground the participants own experiences, based upon the theory of Joiner and Josephs, Torbert (2004) and Kegan(2009), as described in chapter 3.

Lynn says something related when she is asked why she saw the situations she describes as developmental possibilities:

Lynn: After a while it will turn into a more automatic reflex-I will not have to think about it every time and remain conscious-it will become a part of me and my actions. I have to hold on to these things, and maybe not take on so many things at the same time, but actually become conscious about the fact that just this specific characteristic might be something that demands time and energy, which hinders me at developing along other dimensions which I might find even more important.

Spurkeland says something about trust as a fundamental building-instrument in relations with others(Spurkeland, 2005). However, Lynns statement above can also be interpreted as

describing another form of trust, namely trust in oneself. Lynn describes a fundamental trust in that the processes of change that she is in, *"will turn into a more automatic reflex",* so that she *"will not have to think about it every time and remain conscious-it will become part of me and my actions.* This development fits well with Horneys statement that the more we face our own conflicts and seek out our own solutions, the more inner freedom and strength we will gain. Only when we are willing to bear the brunt can we approximate the ideal of being the captain of our ship(Horney,1945). Lynn`s description is also a good illustration of Kegan & Lahey`s statement that adults actually are able to evolve whole patterns of increasingly complex and agile ways of apprehending the world, and that each new mental plateu gradually overcomes the systematic limitations of the prior one(Kegan and Lahey,2009)

When Lynn is asked to describe how she talks to herself when evaluating herself, Lynn summarizes as follows:

Lynn: I think it is about daring to recognize that "well, well, what I did there was not optimal, it was not the best way of solving it." Dare to see that there exist several options for handling it, and not simply justify to oneself what one did. And to make a good consideration of "I will try to do it better next time".

Lynns statement can be illustrated by Joiner and Josephs description of Catalyst level *Self-leadership agility.* This enables Lynn to detect and letting more go of her own defense mechanisms, as she describes by "*daring to recognize*". The Catalyst discovers that her degree of dependence on others approval is a direct function of her own level of self-acceptance, which leads her to begin to discover the inner dimensions of empowerment, which Lynn illustrates by seeing that "*there exist several options for handling it*". The Catalyst is therefore more able to meet thoughts, feelings and behaviors that conflict with the way she "should" be, with an attitude of curiosity and reflective acceptance. This posture gives the Catalyst more choice and flexibility in responding to a whole range of different situations, as well as accept that she has mixed feelings and inner conflicts(Joiner and Josephs, 2007)

When Pat is asked what kind of expectations she has to herself as a leader in the future, Pat says the following:

Pat: I feel that the root of developing in a good way is to make myself more conscious, where I am strong, and where I can be better. And if I can address those things, I can become better all the time. ......Leadership development is about becoming more conscious and being able and willing to do something about what has been presented. I have gotten a great opportunity to develop through this program. I can choose to do something about it or not.

Pat`s statement can be illustrated by Joiner eand Josephs Catalyst *Awareness and Intent,* as they describe that a motivation to develop to the Catalyst level arises when you repeatedly experience the limitations of the after-the-fact awareness of the Achiever level, and begin to bring direct, momentary attention to the current experience(Joiner eand Josephs,2007). In this way the Catalyst develops an on-the-spot reflective capacity. Pat describes this clearly when she says that "*the root of developing in a good way is to make myself more conscious*". The Catalyst practises the process of being aware of her experience, reflecting on and interpreting the experience, and then taking action by adjusting her response accordingly. Again, Pat describes this by saying "*leadership development is about becoming more conscious and being able and willing to do something about what has been presented.*"

6.6. Discussion of the sub-category "Future Goals":

Finally, after having participated in a leadership development program like ours, it is very interesting to hear what the participants say about how they see themselves as leaders in the future. Ann and Pat have statements about this:

When asked how she sees the possibilities in the future for developing in the wanted direction, Ann summarizes like this:

Ann: Possibilities are here everyday. I have to be conscious about me wanting to change and develop, and then it`s about using it in the daily life... It is just about seeing them and be conscious about them. I have to keep working with my profile and the different dimensions there, and eventually I hope things will go more by itself. At least the development will be there when I don`t have to think about it anymore. It is demanding, of course. It is not something that is done in a couple of weeks, it can take years.

It is interesting to hear Ann describing that "*possibilities are here everyday*". Her statement can easily be read as her developing her action-inquiry-skills, by conducting action and inquiry as a disciplined leadership practice that increases the wider effectiveness of her actions(Torbert, 2004). Action inquiry becomes a moment-to-moment way of living whereby she attunes herself through inquiry to acting in an increasingly timely and wise fashion for the overall development of the situations in which she participates, as when she says " *I have to be conscious about me wanting to change and develop, and then it`s about using it in the daily.*"

When Pat is asked whether the program has eventually led to a different type of development than what she expected, Pat says:

Pat: I feel that I am still just in the beginning. I have gotten a hold on some things, but there are many other issues in that 360-degree feedback(The Leadership Circle Profile). I have a

longer way to go in terms of development, but this will take time. Now I am taking one thing at a time and work on that. After a while I can begin to adress different issues in addition.
Pat`s statement sounds so optimistic and encouraging to me. She feels that she is able to work in a methodological way with her wanted development, by saying "*now I am taking one thing at a time and work on that. After a while I can begin to address different issues in addition*". She expresses faith in that she will be able to develop in the wanted directions in this way, over time. And that, to me, illustrates Kegan and Lahey`s theories about evolving from the socialized mind to the self-authoring mind, by enabling her to be the author of her own reality, and to look at herself as a source of internal authority(Kegan and Lahey,2009). And this represents an interesting development for Pat from the socialized mind that she seemed to represent more through her statement in pt. 6.3.1.above.

7. Brief summary of findings-implications for further research:
In the introduction, I pointed to Lysø`s(2009) findings about whether leadership-courses have an actual impact upon the participants as well as the organizations they work in when they return to their usual jobs after the course is ended(Lysø, 2009). Although I have not studied the organizational variable in this thesis, but focused on the individually subjective variables of my four referents, I think a significant finding in this thesis lies in what Ann says about how she has experienced previous leadership-programs attended, and how she had expectations of this program being different:
Ann*: In aspect of me having expectations about that we should be able to work with not only "that`s how it is, that`s the facts", but also get the possibility to go into oneself, to find out what it is that makes me score high on for example "controlling" , I think the course has met my expectations.*
In the program that constitutes the case in this thesis, we use different tools to address exactly what Ann points to, namely to actually work with changes that the participants want-not only state the present situation and leave it with that. One tool is the 360 feedback profile, to bring to the *surface key opportunities for developmental growth*, se chapter 4. This focuses on the dimensions that reveal the relationship between *internal motivating assumptions* and *patterns of action*. This gives the leader a clear picture of the gaps between their self- perception and how others experience them. Other central tools we use are the Immunity to change-learning platform in the program as well as in the individual coaching, to address change by trying to *unlock our mental immune system's grip on our perception* so we have an opportunity to see it in action(Kegan and Lahey, 2009), se chapter 4 and appendix C. Our aim in the program is

to enable a *development of a greater awareness and sensitivity to the full range of levels of consciousness* available to the participants, see appendix C.We also focus on taking an *adaptive* approach to *adaptive* challenges(Heifetz,1994), as well as enabling the participants to gain consciousness into their *reactive* patterns(Horney,1945).

Obviously there can be used different types of tools for these purposes.

I think that another significant finding in this thesis lies in what Ann says when asked how she can work with own wanted development in the future:

Ann: …I think the possibilities are there everyday, but it`s about being conscious about the possibilities instead of falling into the old pattern all the time.

The aim of this program has been to relate the intellectual or theoretical concepts with participants lived experience, as well as grounding and supporting the participants own experiences, see chapter 4. When a person experiences that possibilitites of development are here everyday, Lynn goes on to say: *None of us can develop you for you. You have to do it yourself. I expected to get a possibility to develop myself. And I got that. I received a good tool which enabled me, if I want, to get information and tools which can provide a development for me.* This statement also says that if the leadership development program is able to provide the participant with ways of using their everyday experiences for development, they will do it themselves. The tools can *enable a development* for them.

Pat frazes this another way by saying:

Pat: I feel that the root of developing in a good way is to make myself more conscious, where I am strong, and where I can be better. And if I can address those things, I can become better all the time. Pat feels that she is able to work in a methodological way with her wanted development, by saying "*now I am taking one thing at a time and work on that. After a while I can begin to address different issues in addition*". She expresses faith in that she will be able to develop in the wanted directions in this way, over time.

If I should end this thesis by suggesting something about the implications for further research; I would first point to the need of conducting more empirical research on the various types of tools that can be used when working with developmental processes. Here I point to McCauley et al(2006) who say that it is rare with studies that measure features of the holding environment and assess the extent to which these features stimulate developmental movement for individuals at different developmental programs. It would be very interesting to read an integral study, combining both for instance quantitative and qualitative approaches, to examine this further. I would be especially interested in seeing empirical research on how coaching as a tool can stimulate developmental processes for the coachees.

Appendix:

Appendix A-The Interview guide.

Appendix B-Consent form.

Appendix C-The intervention-the leadership development program.

Appendix D-Significant statements.

Appendix E-A schematic overview of categories and sub-categories

References:

Argyris, C. (2004). *Teaching smart people how to learn*. Harvard Business Review on Developing Leaders, pp. 83-110.

Bohm, D. (1996). *On dialogue.* London: Routledge.

Creswell, John W (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design, Choosing among five approaches.* Sage Publications, Inc.

Heifetz, Ronald.(1994). *Leadership without easy answers.*Cambridge, MA: Harvard University press.

Horney, Karen (1945). *Our inner conflicts. A constructive theory on neurosis*. W.W. Norton & Company.

Joiner, Bill & Josephs, Stephen (2007). *Leadership Agility, Five levels of Mastery for anticipating and initiating change.* San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kegan, Robert and Lahey, Lisa Laskow (2009). *Immunity to change-how to overcome it and unlock the potential in yourself and your organization.* San Fransisco, CA:Jossey-Bass.

Lysø, Ingunn Hybertsen (2009). *Managerial learning as co-reflective practice : management development programs : don't use it if you don't mean it* , Ph.d. NTNU/The Norwegian University of Science and Technology.

McCauley, Drath, Palus, O'Connor and Baker (2006). *The use of constructive-developmental theory to advance the understanding of leadership.* Center for Creative Leadership, The Leadership Quarterly 17 (2006) 634–653).

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks,CA:Sage.

Reams, J.& Fikse, C. (2010, Winter). *Making leadership development developmental.* Academic Exchange Quarterly. 14(4), 197-201.

Reams, Jonathan (2002). *The consciousness of transpersonal leadership. A Dissertation Submitted to the faculty of the School of Professional Studies and Graduate School of Gonzaga University.*May 2002

Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline. The art & practice of the learning organization.* New York: Random House.

Spurkeland, Jan (2005). *Relational competence-results through interaction (my translation)/Relasjonskompetanse-resultater gjennom samhandling.* Universtitetsforlaget.

Tjora, Aksel (2010). *Kvalitative forskningsmetoder i praksis.* Gyldendal Akademiske.

Torbert, Bill & Associates (2004). *Action Inquiry-the secret of timely and transforming leadership*. San Fransisco, CA:Berrett-Koehler.