

Integral leadership: Creating and holding space with quality of presence

Jonathan Reams¹, Anne Caspari²

¹Department of Adult Learning and Counselling, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway; ²Mindshift, Basel, Switzerland

This article outlines a view of integral leadership as *integrity with a quality of presence that opens spaces for what wants to emerge*. A focus is on describing Heifetz's notion of adaptive leadership as creating a holding environment for work to be done. This is framed in terms of how integrity, subtle energies and intuition combine with late stage ego development capacities to create a quality of presence that enable requisite spaces to be opened up and held. This view is contextualized in relation to existing discourse in the field and the authors' experience in leadership development work. In addition to laying a foundation for the view of leadership used, the concept of integral is examined in relation to integrity. This forms the basis for quality of presence, while intuition is shown to be an essential function in the author's conception of integral leadership. Intuition is explored in relation to stages of cognitive/ego development, which are also explored in terms of their function and contribution to integral leadership. Future lines of inquiry arising from this conception are presented.

Key words: construct aware, integral, integrity, intuition, leadership

((Deutscher Titel)) - bitte ergänzen

Dieser Artikel beschreibt einen Blick auf integrale Führung als Integrität mit einer Qualität von Präsenz, die Räume für das öffnet, was entstehen will. Ein Schwerpunkt liegt dabei auf der Beschreibung von Heifetz' Begriff der adaptiven Führung, die als die Schaffung einer unterstützenden Umgebung für anstehende Arbeit verstanden wird. Dies wird damit in Beziehung gesetzt, wie Integrität, subtile Energien und Intuition sich mit Fähigkeiten der späten Stadien der Selbst-Entwicklung kombinieren und so eine bestimmte Qualität an Präsenz schaffen, welche die für Führung erforderlichen Räume erschliesst und offen hält. Diese Ansicht wird in den Kontext des bestehenden Diskurses auf diesem Gebiet sowie den der Erfahrungen der Autoren in der Trainingsarbeit mit Führungspersönlichkeiten gestellt. Es wird dargestellt, welche Sicht auf Führung genutzt wird. Zusätzlich wird das Konzept des Integralen in seiner Beziehung zu Integrität untersucht. Diese bildet die Grundlage für die Qualität der Präsenz, und es wird aufgezeigt, dass Intuition eine essentielle Funktion im Konzept der Autoren von integraler Führung hat. Intuition wird in Bezug auf Stufen der kognitiven/ Selbst-Entwicklung erforscht. Diese Stufen werden auch im Hinblick auf ihre Funktion und ihren Beitrag zur integralen Führung analysiert. Zukünftige Untersuchungsrichtungen, die sich aus dieser Konzeption ergeben, werden vorgestellt.

Schlüsselwörter: Konstrukt-bewusst, integral, Integrität, Intuition, Führung

Introduction

Integral leadership is being presented in various arenas of discourse as an advance on existing frameworks for understanding leadership (Reams, 2005; Volckmann, 2010; numerous pieces in <http://integralleadershipreview.com/>). In this article we will not attempt to provide a comprehensive view of what we would consider to be all of the requisite aspects of integral leadership. What we will present is an ar-

ticulation of the core elements we perceive as having the greatest impact on leaders' capacity to open and hold spaces that enable work to be accomplished. We hope to contribute to the discourse in this field by showing how integral leadership is grounded in a quality of presence coming from integrity, utilizing intuition and aided by later stages of cognitive or ego development.

Our approach to this is one of using an integral meta-theoretical method (Edwards, 2010), in

which we draw on data from a number of sources; a range of theoretical lenses relevant to the topic, our personal backgrounds and experiences in relation to evolving our understanding of these theories, as well as reflections on our experience in applying them in various contexts. Thus we will aim to integrate first, second and third person data (Torbert & Associates, 2004) in our presentation of how ideas and experience come together to inform our view of integral leadership.

We will choose a definition of leadership from the myriad available to lay a foundation for the link to what we envision as distinguishing characteristics of integral leadership. We will also explore the role and dynamics of later stages of cognitive development, which will lead into framing our conception of integral from a pluralistic, or meta-theoretical view and focusing on the notion of integral as integrity. (Integrity has the same etymological roots as the word integral: integer in Latin: untouched, whole, complete). The conception of integrity will lead to a discussion of how focusing on a leader's quality of presence addresses a blind spot (Scharmer, 2002) in leadership studies, the interior sources from which leadership emerges. Integrating subtle levels of being is explored through the function of intuition in relation to leadership. The intersection between intuition and cognitive development is also examined, leading to a description of how later stages of cognitive development can contribute to integral leadership. After presenting the data we have gathered on these topics, we will discuss some of the connections and implications we perceive as most relevant for deepening our understanding of integral leadership. First, we will begin by presenting a brief summary of biographical and theoretical encounters informing us.

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

Theoretical positions

Together, we have been initially informed by Ken Wilber's AQAL meta-framework/theory (1996, 2000, 2006), which also included Don Beck's (Beck & Cowan, 1996) development of an integral version of Spiral Dynamics. Since then, we have gone deeper into specific sources of some of these frameworks, like Kegan (1994), Torbert & Associates (2004) and Cook-Greuter (1999) on adult development, Scharmer (2007) on the U Theory and process, Edwards (2010) on integral meta-theory and Molz (2010) on integral pluralism. We have gone through various learning curves and stages of development in relation to each of these approaches, from the initial excitement that comes from finding a map that better describes the territory of experience, through the adoption of the map and using it to fit all experience into it, to encountering limitations, shadows of the community of practice and reductionistic adoptions/interpretations, to gaining sufficient distance to be able to draw on such maps as appropriate tools in given situations. The ability to take a perspective on complex maps of an integral nature does not come quickly or easily. These maps *have us* for a long time, (for many, possibly this is the only way they will relate to them), and becoming sufficiently distant to take a perspective on them requires a new kind of cognition. This is not simply an ability to handle ever more detailed complexity, or a kind of additive approach to development. It is more about a qualitatively new relationship to complexity, a more dynamic view (Cook-Greuter, 1999).

As we have moved through this complexity with an aim towards accessing this more dynamic view, we have found two more recent articulations to be most helpful. Molz's (2010) description of integral pluralism rests on three principles of "intercontextualized diversity, fractal resonance and participatory reflexivity" (p. 77). It aims to bring together the integrative tendency of models that aim to be a "Theory of Everything" (Laszlo, 2007; Wilber, 2000a) with the needs for multiple perspectives and views to offer different lenses at this comprehensive level. In a similar manner, Edwards' (2010) integral meta-theory manages to take a set of integral theories or lenses and weave them into a coherent meta-framework that enables the choice and combination of the most appropriate lenses to understand a phenomenon. These works have contributed to evolving how we are able to relate to conceptions of integral and apply this to leadership development work.

At the same time, it is also important to go beyond using the map this meta-framework provides, to draw attention to the lenses we are looking through as a capacity for perception.

We do not position ourselves as “integralists” in the sense of the totalizing impulse that can be critiqued in relation to some strands of this work (Anderson, 2006). While we recognize that we use a range of such capacities in relation to everyday life situations, our particular interest is in later stage, emerging structures of consciousness. While there are many framings for these, (e.g. Basseches, 1975; Beck and Cowan, 1996; Commons, 2006; Kegan, 1982, 1994; Loevinger, 1976; Torbert & Associates, 2004; Wilber, 2000b), we prefer to draw on two of them; integral consciousness as *aperspectival* (Gebser, 1985) and *construct aware* (Cook-Greuter, 1999). “Integral reality is the world’s transparency, a perceiving of the world as truth: a mutual perceiving and imparting of truth of the world and of man and all that transluces both” (Gebser, 1985, p. 7). Gidley (2007) describes how “Gebser used the term *integral-aperspectival* to refer to the gradual transformation through awareness, concretion and integration of all the previous structures of consciousness that we have been exploring – archaic, magic, mythic and mental – into a new structure of consciousness” (p. 106). She also notes that this *aperspectival* structure of consciousness is also found in more recent literature on post-formal stages of cognitive development.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Presentation of core view

This leads us to the presentation of our definition of integral leadership as *integrity with a quality of presence that opens spaces for what wants to emerge*. In this section we will unpack how we understand these conceptions and present what we mean by the core constructs we use in this definition. This will entail a discussion and exploration of what is meant by quality of presence and the notion of presencing, or what wants to emerge. In fleshing these out, we will also point to how the conception of space fits into this view and go into depth about conceptions of integrity and intuition. The above description of later stages of cognitive/ego development and how it relates to these themes will also be woven into our discussion. It is our aim that this presentation of our conceptions involved in integral leadership can open up some further variations in the discourse on this topic.

The core or grounding principle here is the notion of *quality of presence*. One often cited formulation of this comes from Bill O'Brien, who was involved in the development of concepts and practice around learning organizations (Senge, 1990). He is quoted as saying that the "success of an intervention depends on the interior condition of the intervener" (Scharmer, 2007, p. 7). This notion of the central importance of the interior condition of the intervener is what Scharmer (2002) refers to as the blind spot of leadership, or the lack of recognition that the sources from which we lead have a very high leverage impact on our leadership interventions. It is the nature of these sources that we wish to explore in more depth.

Our conception of quality of presence includes conceiving of integral in relation to being in integrity with the source of this interior condition. For instance, the integration of head, heart and hands (to use one framing, or body, mind and soul as another) requires us to having integrity between our deepest callings (Ray, 2004) and still small voice of moral conscience (The Arbinger Institute, 2010) with our actions. A lack of integrity in this domain leads to self-betrayal and self-justification (Warner, 2001) which can be aided by an over reliance on cognitive complexity to rationalize behavior. All of this contributes to the coloring of this quality of presence. This happens in relation to how we differentiate the undifferentiated source of energy flowing through us, and our mental and emotional and physical structures all con-

tribute to this (Reams, 2002, 2007a). This flow of energy generates subtle or energetic "spaces" around us that can be measured and sensed by others (McCraty et al., 2009). The spaces we create as leaders comingle/connect with existing systems, structures and various other conditions to generate greater or lesser room for other individuals around us to feel able to move, act, decide, think etc. within (Reams, 2007a, 2012). The quality of our energy flow opens up a space for the more subtle aspects of interpersonal relationships, especially in a leadership, coaching, brainstorming, or prototyping situation, where the participants can sense that they can allow a certain vulnerability, go beyond their usual self protective behaviour and allow themselves to come up with new concepts, ideas or viewpoints. They can allow the emergence of new (e.g. not experienced previously) ideas or according to Scharmer (2007) "what wants to emerge."

Thus this quality of presence occurs in varying degrees in all of us all the time. In its purest forms, "self" or ego is transparent (Cook-Greuter, 1999; Gebser, 1985) and we manifest what is often termed a transpersonal Self (Reams, 2002). At the other end of the spectrum, we encounter totally self-embedded leaders, for whom all activity is designed to reinforce and feed the constructed ego (Carey, 1991). For example, if a leader creates an energetic space that is driven/filtered or colored by unmet personal/shadow needs, it can create a toxic work environment that leads to the need for people to cope in psychologically unhealthy ways (Diamond and Allcorn, 2004). It is easy to see how this negatively impacts productivity in many ways, such as by contributing to a lack of trust (Covey, 2006). On the positive side, we can think of leaders who looked more to the needs of others than themselves, i.e. were self-transcending. Gandhi is one of the most commonly cited examples of this kind of self-transcending leadership (Carey, 1991). Here we can see that the space generated by a clearer self enables more options for a similar kind of movement/growth in others, a kind of transformational leadership (Burns, 1978).

The movement towards greater self-transcendence in relation to leadership can be viewed as a fundamental option (Carey, 1991). In other words, it is more important which direction you are moving than where you are on a given developmental scale. At the same time, your interpretation of contents of experience will be colored by the lens of the developmental level. We propose that there are practices, related to both integrity and intuition, that can enable us to cultivate the kind of quality of presence that enables us to be totally present with another person or group of people, and to listen deeply enough (Greenleaf, 1977), both to others and to our deepest sense of Self (Ray, 2004) to

sense or presence what wants to emerge (Scharmer, 2007). This is quite different than projecting patterns of the past, or downloading (Scharmer, 2007) with rational modifications onto an analytically planned future. It is exactly this which we wish to propose is a core element of what comprises integral leadership, a capacity to pre-sense, or presence (Senge, Jaworski, Scharmer and Flowers, 2004) what wants to emerge from the future. Senge et al. define presence as a core capacity that goes beyond the normal notion of being fully conscious and aware in the present moment. They define it as "a deep listening, of being open beyond one's pre-conceptions and historical ways of making sense" (Senge et al. 2004, pg. 13, 14). For them, presence is "leading to a state of 'letting come,' of consciously participating in a larger field for change" (ibid). Thus far we have made a preliminary exploration of our conceptions around quality of presence, some thoughts around being in integrity with it, as well as how it creates spaces around us. Next we wish to briefly explore some of the blockages to being able to create healthy, open spaces from our quality of presence.

States and integrity

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

The linking between subtle and gross states can be viewed through a more recent set of research from McCraty et al. (2009) where they examine the psychophysiological aspects of neurocardiology. Their research revealed four readily generated everyday states measurable in terms of heart rate variability; mental focus, psychophysiological incoherence, relaxation and psychophysiological coherence. They also

identified two states, emotional quiescence and extreme negative emotion, that are generated under more extraordinary life circumstances (p. 28). Their research into how these states impact our functioning shows that the state of psychophysiological coherence has significant benefits in two key areas. They note "that psychophysiological coherence and the associated macro-scale patterns of the temporal organization of the heart's rhythmic activity ... also have an important effect on cognitive processes and intentional behaviour" (p. 42). This and other evidence from this research indicate that these states can enable the deeper essence of the quality of presence to flow more cleanly into the forms and functions we use to engage the world.

Different wisdom traditions describe these kinds of states in different ways, (Walsh, 1999) for example as 'grace' (Christian) or 'opening up the heart' (Sufi), and all go in the direction of opening up a space to receive. If we talk about integral leadership in terms of opening spaces, we also need to examine how the leader, acting from the source of their quality of presence, also must be able to receive (which we perceive as coming from the subtle domain) in order to create. For us it is self-evident that in order to receive, whether we call it energy, information, grace, or vision, that the space held in such a leadership situation should at least be; a) free, e.g. not occupied by old ideas, concepts, paradigms, (downloading in Scharmer's U Theory), b) clean, in this context meaning void of judgments, criticism, cynicism, bias, projections, or blame (Scharmer describes voices of judgment, cynicism and fear), and c) contained, or by a closed group, a geographical space, a room, a structuring method with rules (Torbert et al., describe these as liberating structures). These three principles, if not addressed, create impediments and can derail our good intentions and quality of leadership. These impediments are basically a deeper level of issues that do not surface until we begin working in the subtle domain.

As well, we can, through a lack of practice or use, lose a connection or integrity with the signals from our essential self. We all have the capacity to perceive the subtle signals from Self, essence or a field that signals what wants to emerge from the future (Senge et al, 2004, Scharmer, 2007, Reams, 2012). The body system as well as subtle bodies are a powerful instrument for reception and perception, not only on the level of the senses that we are used to. Again, McCraty et al.'s (2009) research indicates that the brain in the heart, or the neurocardiological system, is capable of perceiving subtle electromagnetic fields up to three meters from the body. This gives us a way to show how sensitivity to the states of others can be cultivated with the integration available through psy-

chophysiological coherence. This externally focused capacity to perceive subtle signals can also be directed inward. The integration of the mind with the states available through the heart is key to this. As well, we can see how this inward focus can be experienced through the body.

The architecture of integrity

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

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

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

Integrity is a time tested virtue that is promoted by all great wisdom traditions (Walsh, 1999) and for good reason. Integrity, or its absence, is the key factor in determining the capacity to be *present* to somebody or something else; to another person, to a group, to an idea, to an emotion or to any other construct that arises in one's own consciousness. In order to be able to keep the access to intuitive guidance stable

and reliable, in order to open the space for a group process or a prototyping something new, we perceive integrity as a key condition. As such, we wish to draw on another description of integrity; as a complete absence of triggers or any other interference that could arise in a given situation (Palmer, 1997). Basically, integrity allows being present to the other, individual or collective.

While this perspective on integrity can be useful, to help recognize and make useful distinctions with it, we find it helpful to examine the nature of some of the triggers or interference that create, or result in non-integrity. To do this, we have to consider some of the more subtle mechanisms of consciousness. In the Wilberian integral world, non-integrity is called "shadow material" and refers to all of the parts, identities, sub-personalities (Assagioli, 1971) that have been dis-owned in a persons' ego development. Dissociated parts (saying; this is not mine) are often not only not seen as one's own, but projected out and are falsely recognised as somebody else's parts (identities, characteristics, attitudes etc.; "this is yours"). In the integral context, in classical psychotherapy, as well as in the core tenets of most of the great wisdom traditions, there are practices that aim to provide ways to re-own these kinds of dis-associated shadow parts. The prime directive in all of these frameworks is to use tools and, mostly spiritual, practices to become as "whole" as possible, not impaired or projecting undesired feelings out. Integrity is thus restored through addressing these conditions of non-integrity. Coming back to our question about how integrity or non-integrity impacts inner states and the capacity to create open, clean spaces, to perceive and receive unbiased information, we see that non-integrity as a boundary ownership problem can limit enormously the ability of a person to be present. We have noted that being present to all manner of what arises is an essential capacity for leadership to create and maintain these spaces, or holding environments (Heifetz, 1994). This is especially true if the situation requires getting out of one's comfort zone, as leaders are quite often challenged to do. As well, as noted above, the ability to receive is important. While avoiding the pitfalls of filtering, or biasing the interpretation of information that comes to a leader is critical, in addition to this external aspect, there is an internal dimension of this; intuition.

Intuition

Intuition is a phenomenon that is commonly defined as the ability to acquire knowledge without the interference or the use of reason (Franquemont, 1999). In this sense it is a trans-rational mode of consciousness (Reams, 2002).

Senge et al.'s (2004) conception of presencing can be seen as another form of this capacity to perceive, receive, and learn to act upon, knowledge coming from sources other than a rational analysis of external sensory data. Research into the use of intuition as a rigorous method of inquiry has shown that it is possible to hone this capacity and draw on it in a rigorous manner (Braud & Anderson, 1998). The implications of a well-developed intuitive capacity for leadership appear obvious, but are not very well documented or researched.

In a recent study on conscious leadership for sustainability that did examine intuition, Brown (2011) found that the respondents with late stage action logics, in addition to "traditional sources of knowledge, such as technical or content knowledge" (p. 136), drew upon "intuition and ways of knowing other than rational analysis" (p. 137). Respondents in this study, when talking about the sources of this intuition or how this other way of knowing worked, used terms like; consciousness, heart, cosmic intelligence, higher self, unnameable mystery, spirit (p. 139). They also described the processes of accessing knowledge in this manner with terms like; put the intention out and let it come, get rid of the ego stuff and then download it, the design designs me, pluck ideas out of the ether; it just comes (p. 139). These results indicate how a specific demographic of leaders, those with late stage cognitive capacities, describe this phenomenon. We also recognize that intuition is experienced by people in general and leaders specifically, independent of stage development. How it is interpreted and used is what we believe will vary in relation to a lens of stage development.

Thus the evidence we have examined suggests differences in the use of intuition that seem to derive from a multitude of different factors. We will list what we perceive as the most important here. First, while every person seems to have a basic potential access to intuition independent of stage of cognitive development, not everybody seems to have a stable access and be able to use it. Second, the access to intuition as a source for knowledge seems to be dependent on different types of people, as documented in for example on the Jungian Myers-Briggs personality type model (Briggs Myers & Myers, 1980). Third, if a person is generally intuitive, the stability of access seems to depend on other factors that can inhibit such intuitive guidance, such as judgements, excessive thinking, or fear (corresponding to Schärmer's voices of judgment, cynicism and fear). For these reasons the access to intuition can greatly benefit from the mental and spiritual practices that will work on keeping thoughts, judgments and fear at bay, such as mindfulness training, will exercises, attention

management, mediation or psychophysiological coherence.

Fourth, while we work with the assumption that intuition is a general human capacity that is independent of stage development, the different action logics (Torbert & Associates, 2004) will play a role. The information gained via intuition will usually be interpreted through the value system (Beck & Cowan, 1996) that a person inhabits. Intuitive guidance would usually be "right" or "true" or "just" in the sense of a "functional and cultural fit" for the person receiving intuitive guidance. In coaching practices, certain tools can be applied to coach a person that is in a stuck situation to remove all psychological material blocking ones intuition (e.g. Kegan & Lahey's (2009) Immunity to Change process, Palmer's (1997) transparent beliefs, releasing fixed attention exercise, etc.). The coachee will have, with a sudden insight, access to his or her next "right thing to do," that is informed by intuition. "Right" is so only in the meaning making system of the coachee and will generally fit in with the meaning making system of that person and his or her cultural environment. Insights at this level can, with a multitude of smaller "dis-identifications" also pave the way for stage development, or for taking a perspective on the mechanisms that created this particular reality.

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

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

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

Discussion

In the above, we have presented perspectives arising from our experience and encounters with theory on the topics of integral, leadership, late stage cognitive/ego development, quality of presence, integrity and intuition. In this section we wish to discuss some of the issues we perceive as arising from our exposure to this set of perspectives. Thus far, we have argued for two fundamental strands as constituting the key stones for integral leadership. One is to foster development of later stage cognition in any way possible (Brown, 2011; Wilber, Patten, Leonard, & Morelli, 2008), while being careful not to fall into harassing everybody up the ladder. However, if one wants more efficiency for ever increasing adaptive challenges, by all means yes, we believe that fostering later stage development is important and there are tools/processes to work with this (Wilber et al. 2008). The other part is the constant striving for integrity (Palmer, 1993, 2004). We have also explored the phenomenon of the state of integrity as a means of opening up towards intuition for gaining access to more subtle layers of energies and information needed for integral leadership. It is our view that the combination of these qualities is what is really paving the landing strip for paradigm shift, from micro-changes toward societal and whole systems' change (Scharmer, 2007). It is our view that an integral leadership best offers the possibility to open the spaces that can enable these kinds of shifts to emerge from the future.

But for us this is only part of the story for integral leadership. As already noted, the interpretive function of what comes from intuition relates to stages of cognitive development. While integrity, intuition and the capacity for opening up spaces are essential components of integral leadership, there are still stage inherent factors. Here, our basic tenet is that the efficiency of meaning making systems, in relation to the complexity of the life conditions (Graves, 1974), is strongly correlated with stages of cog-

nitive or ego development (Brown, 2011; Torbert & Associates, 2004).

The tension between these components – the contribution or impact of later stages of development and the integrity and quality of presence – produces, in our view, some of the challenges we have perceived in understanding integral leadership. Of course we also see how these are inter-related, and together influence each other. Healthy manifestations of later stages of ego development depend on integrity, and the transparency of the ego in later stages can contribute to the quality of presence. Like a good Zen koan, we see that the poles work together to evolve our understanding and capacity to embody integral leadership. Splitting them apart has allowed us to take a closer look at each aspect without the added complexity of discussing their inter-relationships and integration fully.

In relation to the application or embodiment of such concepts and principles, we have noted various challenges. For instance, in our observations of consulting practices, (e.g. corporate leadership training, organizational transformation processes, prototyping transdisciplinary curriculum development), we have seen many change processes with the best of tools and intentions go wrong. This was not because the tool used didn't have pattern integrity in itself, but because it wasn't the right tool or pattern for the given situation. While certain tools and processes can have perfect pattern integrity, they just do not fit the context. A different pattern would be needed. It is argued that later stages of cognitive development have access to another level of perspectives that can discern better which knot is needed for what kind of loose ends. This is related to our discussion on technical problems versus adaptive challenges and the kind of leadership required to address the latter.

The ability to discern what tool to use is of course not exclusive to later stages of cognitive development, but is greatly enhanced with the ability to take perspectives on perspectives (Cook-Greuter, 1999). Sometimes a U-Process (Scharmer, 2007) of dis-identification and prototyping can be used by leaders with a pluralistic world view and can work perfectly well in its own background but can downright detrimental in other contexts, e.g. used in developing countries with different meaning making systems (Beck & Cowan, 1996). An earlier (Reams, 2007b) critique of Scharmer's process raised the issue of the possibility of implicit stage related cognitive demands, on both the facilitator and participants in such a process. While it is acknowledged that a good liberating structure (Torbert & Associates, 2004) as represented by such a process, can "scaffold" people into a higher level of functioning, (as can the use of collective intelligence), the sus-

tainable internalization of capacities claimed to be produced by such processes is not necessarily clear or so easily achieved.

The construct aware stage of development has the potential to add significant advantages to the leadership of such processes. It enables a leader to be aware of constructs while they are happening. By the term constructs we basically mean the assumptions, ideas, lenses, projections and underlying mechanisms, both in detail and as whole systems. It is the ability to see how the participants of a process construct meaning individually and collectively and to respond to these respectively that in real time that enables leadership to be present with one of the qualities that we see as essential to address the hyper complexity of many modern challenges.

However, misconceptions about the construct aware stage are abundant, and there is a kind of strange competition out there that tends to push for its development by trying to leapfrog stages and shortcut development. Cook-Greuter (2010) points out some of the pitfalls at this level. She notes how "idealized descriptions of integral" (p. 303) have created gaps between conceptions and reality in practice. She points out that most of these theories describe these later stages "as some sort of idealized place of self-actualization and life competence. It is proposed that life becomes easier, and that problems can now be solved collaboratively in a timely and wise fashion with only the highest principles as inner guides" (ibid). This conceptual idealization of later stages of cognitive development is then contrasted with data from extensive research into the realities of how people in these stages face their own challenges. For example, at the construct aware stage, she notes that individuals can experience loneliness or have a fear of going insane. They also can fall prey to confusing "cognitive complexity with understanding and ego maturity" (p. 315). Lastly (here only, as she has a much more extensive set of descriptions) construct aware individuals can get hung up on privileging transcendence experiences to the degree that they can no longer find value in everyday pursuits. This has been observed and noted by various scholars as a common trap in many pluralistic spiritual or other postmodern communities, where they project the core of their own meaning making stage onto how higher levels should operate.

In addition to these challenges, we believe that the exponential growth of perspectives (by a couple of orders of magnitude) available through modern technology and necessary to consider, contribute to possibilities for wrong turns at every corner. Truth is no longer limited to a given code of conduct (as in more conventional stages of development) or run by hidden drivers or constructed by society. This puts

everything into question, literally. True north (George & Sims, 2007) reference points that remain reliable are hard to come by. Reality is being questioned and constructed in real time. The complexity this can generate can itself become a trap if addressed in a limited fashion. The hyper-complexity of a purely rational analytical response to this growth of perspectives can create more problems than it solves. We have briefly described how a trans-rational mode of cognition is required to gain sufficient perspective on this. As noted above, at the construct aware stage, people are "becoming aware of the absurdities to which unbridled complexity and logical arguments can lead" (Cook-Greuter, 1999, p. 44). The emergence of this cognitive capacity can contribute to integral leadership, yet as also noted, this development in and of itself is only part of the picture. This brings us back to our starting point for integral leadership: integrity. The practice of integrity as a moment to moment exercise is what is needed to keep the inner reference system clean. It is more like trying to stay on a surf board, where you are bound to fall down over and over and still ride the wave of the emergent edge of reality, cleaning things up behind you and preparing for what is coming.

There is one final aspect of this theme we wish to explore – the lens of power. As discussed previously, at a construct aware stage a leader has access to a multitude of sources of information; language and other constructs, identity, mindset, value patterns of participants, the field itself (as in dialoguing with the system) (Scharmer 2007, Brown 2011), the body system, and most importantly, intuition. Fuller famously called this kind of leadership and personal empowerment "trim tabs."

Something hit me very hard once, thinking about what one little man could do. Think of the Queen Mary – the whole ship goes by and then comes the rudder. And there's a tiny thing at the edge of the rudder called a trim tab.

It's a miniature rudder. Just moving the little trim tab builds a low pressure that pulls the rudder around. Takes almost no effort at all. So I said that the little individual can be a trim tab. Society thinks it's going right by you, that it's left you altogether. But if you're doing dynamic things mentally, the fact is that you can just put your foot out like that and the whole big ship of state is going to go.

So I said, call me Trim Tab. (Fuller, 1972)

Torbert & Associates (2004) describe the strength of strategists as being effective as transformational leaders and attribute to alchemists the strength of being good at leading society wide transformation. This can result in

the execution of real power. Power in this sense is not necessarily defined as in formal authority or even informal authority (Heifetz, 1994), but in a very practical trim tab sort of way that can influence situations in whole systems at any scale. The responsibility that comes with this power is therefore noticeable. Power can corrupt at any level of development, but at this point, the sheer potential for abusing one's power is huge and on the subtle level almost unavoidable without attending to the kinds of principles noted above.

While this brief discussion of power is a different focus than the primary lenses we have been using, in our view it is worth mentioning here. We would also like to point out that most of the time the quality of the legitimate execution of this kind of power is arguably in direct correlation with that leader's integrity.

Conclusion

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

We began by stating that we have taken a meta-theoretical method in approaching this article. This has enabled us to draw on a range of theoretical perspectives as one source of data, while also utilizing reflections on our experiences of applying these ideas in practice and general observations of other practitioners. We would note here that some of the limitations of this method could include a bias towards certain integral lenses over others, leaving out many possibly rich perspectives. Using a meta-theoretical method itself has limited our encounter with empirical data to our own experience, leaving the possibility that our conceptions are not as broadly grounded as we may

wish. One avenue for further research in this area could be to go beyond the narrow limits of two individual's personal application of these ideas to a broader empirical study of such applications. An example of this could be to examine the relationship between late stage action logics and long term impacts of decision making.

In terms of questions we feel worth exploring more, we noted at the end of the discussion how the lens of power can appear at these later stages of cognitive/ego development. Cook-Greuter (2010) notes that one of the traps construct aware individuals can fall into is the fluctuation between feelings of grandiosity and feelings of insignificance. The former can lead to serious arrogance, while the latter can lead to a fear of power. The kind of power discussed above is something we feel important to have further research into. We also recognize that there is a great deal more work that could be done in relation to expanding and deepening the approach to intuition that we have taken here and that this would benefit our understanding of integral leadership. As well, an examination of these action logics in relation to wisdom literature (Sternberg, 2003; Sternberg & Jordan, 2005) could be fruitful.

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

It is in the unpacking of integral leadership through these components that we begin to perceive integral leadership not as something more, or beyond, or special, but as the essence or wholeness of leadership in any form. Leadership is in itself an integral enterprise or activity, as it requires integrity and intuition, with these arising from or contributing to a quality of presence that opens spaces for what wants to emerge. While we also appreciate and note the contribution of how later stages of cognitive

development can enable leaders to open and hold even deeper and complex spaces, we do not see this alone as demarking a different kind of leadership, an integral variety. We hope that the result of our inquiries into this subject, as outlined here, can further the understanding and application of integral leadership as well as leadership as a whole.

References

- Anderson, D. (2006). Of syntheses and surprises: Toward a critical integral theory. *Integral Review: A Transdisciplinary and Transcultural Journal of New Thought, Research and Praxis*, 3, 62-81.
- Assagioli, R. (1971). *Psychosynthesis*. New York: Penguin.
- Basseches, M. (1975). *Dialectical thinking and adult development*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Beck, D. & Cowan, C. (1996). *Spiral dynamics. Mastering values, leadership and change*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Bohm, D. (1980). *Wholeness and the implicate order*. London: Routledge.
- Bohm, D. & Hiley, B. (1993). *The undivided universe: An ontological interpretation of quantum theory*. New York: Routledge.
- Braud, W. & Anderson, R. (1998). *Transpersonal research methods for the social sciences: Honoring human experience*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Briggs Myers, I. & Myers, P. (1980). *Gifts differing: Understanding personality type*. Mountain View, CA: CPP, Inc.
- Brown, B. (2011). *Conscious leadership for sustainability: How leaders with a late-stage action logic design and engage in sustainability initiatives*. Santa Barbara, CA: Fielding Graduate University/UMI.
- Brown, V., Harris, J. & Russell, J. (2010). *Tackling wicked problems: Through the transdisciplinary imagination*. London: Earthscan.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Carey, M. (1992). Transformational leadership and the fundamental option for self-transcendence. *Leadership Quarterly*, 3 (3), 217-236.
- Commons, M. L. (2006). Measuring an approximate g in animals and people. *Integral Review*, (3), 82-99.
- Conger, J. (1994). *The spirit at work: Discovering the spirituality in leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Cook-Greuter, S. (1999). *Postautonomous ego development: A study of its nature and measurement*. Boston, MA: Unpublished doctoral dissertation.
- Cook-Greuter, S. (2010). *Second tier gains and challenges in ego development*. In S. Esbjorn-Hargens (Ed.), *Integral theory in action. Applied, theoretical, and constructive perspectives on the aqal model* (pp. 303-321). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Covey, S. (2006). *The speed of trust: The one thing that changes everything*. London: Simon & Schuster UK Ltd.
- Diamond, M. & Allcorn, S. (2004). Moral violence in organizations: Hierarchic dominance and the absence of potential space. *Organisational and Social Dynamics*, 22-45.
- Edwards, M. (2010). *Organizational transformation for sustainability. An integral metatheory*. New York: Routledge.
- Fairholm, G. (1997). *Capturing the heart of leadership. Spirituality and community in the new American workplace*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Franquemont, S. (1999). *You already know what to do. 10 invitations to the intuitive life*. New York: Jeremy P. Tarcher/Putnam.
- Fuller, B. (1972, February). Call me trim tab. *Playboy*.
- Fuller, B. (1997). *Synergetics. Explorations in the geometry of thinking*. Retrieved March 12, 2012, from <http://www.rwgrayprojects.com/synergetics/synergetics.html>
- Gebser, J. (1985). *The ever-present origin*. (N. Barstad, Trans.) Athens, OH: Ohio University Press.
- George, B. & Sims, P. (2007). *True north. Discover your authentic leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gidley, J. (2007). *The Evolution of Consciousness as a Planetary Imperative: An Integration of Integral Views*. *Integral Review*, 4-226.
- Graves, C. (1974, April). Human nature prepares for a momentous leap. *Futurist*, 8 (2), 72-87.
- Greenleaf, R. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Heifetz, R. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers*. Boston: Harvard University Press.
- Heifetz, R., Linsky, M. & Grashow, A. (2009). *The practice of adaptive leadership. Tools and tactics for changing your organization and the world*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kegan, R. (1982). *The evolving self. Problem and process in human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kegan, R. (1994). *In over our heads. The mental demands of modern life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kegan, R. & Lahey, L. (2009). *Immunity to change. How to overcome it and unlock the potential in yourself and your organization*. Boston: Harvard Business Press.
- Laszlo, E. (2007). *Science and the akashic field. An integral theory of everything (2nd revised ed.)*. Rochester, VT: Inner Traditions.
- Loevinger, J. (1976). *Ego development: Concepts and theories*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- McCraty, R., Atkinson, M., Tomasino, B. & Bradley, R. (2009). *The coherent heart: Heart-brain interactions, psychophysiological coherence, and the emergence of system wide order*. *Integral Review*, 5 (2), 4-107.
- Molz, M. (2010). *Toward an integral pluralism in sociocultural research*. Luxembourg: University of Luxembourg.
- Palmer, H. (1994). *Living deliberately: The discovery and development of Avatar*. Altamonte Springs, FL: Star's Edge International.
- Palmer, H. (1997). *Resurfacing: Techniques for exploring consciousness*. Altamonte Springs, FL: Star's End Creations.
- Palmer, P. (1993). *To know as we are known. Education as a spiritual journey*. San Francisco: Harper-San Francisco.
- Palmer, P. (2004). *A hidden wholeness: The journey toward an undivided life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Piaget, J. (1954). The construction of reality in the child. New York: Basic Books.
- Ray, M. (2004). The highest goal. The secret that sustains you in every moment. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Reams, J. (2002). The consciousness of transpersonal leadership. Spokane, WA: Gonzaga University/UMI.
- Reams, J. (2005). What's integral about leadership? A reflection on leadership and integral theory. *Integral Review*, 1, 118-132.
- Reams, J. (2007a, November). Leadership as Opening Space. *Integral Leadership Review*.
- Reams, J. (2007b). Illuminating the blind spot: An overview and response to Theory U. *Integral Review*, (5), 240-259.
- Reams, J. (2012). Integral leadership. Opening space by leading through the heart. In C. Pearson, *The transforming leader* (pp. 102-109). San Francisco: Berrett Koehler.
- Rost, J. (1991). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Scharmer, C. O. (2002). Illuminating the blind spot. *Leader To Leader Journal*, 11-14.
- Scharmer, C. O. (2007). *Theory U. Leading from the future as it emerges. The social technology of presencing*. Cambridge, MA: The Society for Organizational Learning, Inc.
- Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline. The art & practice of the learning organization*. New York: Random House.
- Senge, P., Jaworski, J., Scharmer, C. O. & Flowers, B. S. (2004). *Presence: Exporing profound change in people, organizations and society*. Boston: Society for Organizational Learning Inc.
- Sternberg, R. (2003). *Wisdom, intelligence, and creativity synthesized*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Sternberg, R. & Jordan, J. (2005). *A handbook of wisdom. Psychological perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Talbot, M. (1996). *The holographic universe*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers Ltd.
- The Arbinger Institute (2010). *Leadership and self-deception* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Berrett Koehler.
- Torbert, W. & Associates. (2004). *Action inquiry. The secret of timely and transforming action*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Volckmann, R. (2010). Integral Leadership Theory. In R. A. Couto (Ed.), *Political and civic leadership. A reference handbook* (pp. 121-127). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Walsh, R. (1999). *Essential spirituality. The 7 central practices to awaken heart and mind*. New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Warner, T. C. (2001). *Bonds that make us free. Healing our relationships, coming to ourselves*. Salt Lake City, UT: Shadow Mountain.
- Wilber, K. (1996). *A brief history of everything*. Boston: Shambhala.
- Wilber, K. (2000a). *A theory of everything. An integral vision for business, politics, science and spirituality*. Boston: Shanbhala Publications inc.
- Wilber, K. (2000b). *Integral psychology. Consciousness, spirit, psychology, therapy*. Boston, MA: Shambhala.
- Wilber, K. (2006). *Integral spirituality: A startling new role for religion in the modern and postmodern world*. Boston: Shambhala.
- Wilber, K., Patten, T., Leonard, A. & Morelli, M. (2008). *Integral life practice. A 21st century blueprint for physical health, emotional balance, mental clarity and spiritual awakening*. Boston: Shambhala Publications, Inc.



PROF. JONATHAN REAMS
Department of Adult Learning and Counselling
Norwegian University of Science and Technology
7491 Trondheim
Norway
jonathan.reams@ntnu.no



ANNE CASPARI
Mindshift
Basel
anne@integral-planning.org
www.scrabelbusiness.com