



Looking for Development in Leadership Development: Impacts of Experiential and Constructivist Methods on Graduate Students and Graduate Schools

Citation

O'Brien, Timothy J. 2016. Looking for Development in Leadership Development: Impacts of Experiential and Constructivist Methods on Graduate Students and Graduate Schools. Doctoral dissertation, Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Permanent link

<http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:27112706>

Terms of Use

This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Other Posted Material, as set forth at <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#LAA>

Share Your Story

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.
Please share how this access benefits you. [Submit a story](#).

[Accessibility](#)

Looking for Development in Leadership Development:
Impacts of Experiential and Constructivist Methods
on Graduate Students and Graduate Schools

Timothy J. O'Brien

Richard Elmore
Robert Kegan
Gianpiero Petriglieri

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of the Graduate School of Education of Harvard University
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Education

2016

©2016
Timothy J. O'Brien
All Rights Reserved

To Carrie

Acknowledgments

I am incredibly grateful to all the support that was so critical to the completion this dissertation ...

To Richard Elmore for his judicious dosage of support to the challenge he let me get myself into;

To Robert Kegan for sharing his work, supporting my interest in it, and propelling me down a path for which I will be forever grateful;

To Gianpiero Petriglieri for pushing me into my writing and showing me how to ask a question and get work done;

To Ronald Heifetz for opening up his classroom and sharing his practice;

To Scott Snook for his generosity and support;

To the archivists at Yale Manuscripts and Archives for their exceptional service and support in identifying every relevant and accessible document;

To Jal Mehta and Julie Reuben for their research design and methods courses where I developed and refined my questions and study design for this dissertation;

To Monica Higgins and the ‘Breakfast Club’ for feedback on early versions of these questions;

And finally, to my parents and family who maintain the supportive “holding environments” that allow me to challenge myself and pursue challenging work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	v
LIST OF FIGURES	vii
ABSTRACT.....	viii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER	
1 EXPERIENTIAL AND CONSTRUCTIVIST LEADERSHIP LEARNING: A DEVELOPMENTAL INVESTIGATION	6
Abstract.....	6
Introduction.....	6
Literature Review	7
Methods	16
Findings	25
Compensatory Informational Learning for the Fully Self- Authorized Developmental Stage.....	42
Self-Authorized to Self-Transformational Developmental Experiences	52
Discussion	56
References	68
Appendix 1A: Characteristics of CDT	75
Appendix 1B: Description of Dominantly Socialized Stages and Substages as They Relate to Leadership.....	76
Appendix 1D: Excerpt From the <i>MLD-201, Exercising Leadership</i> Syllabus.....	78
Appendix 1E: Excerpts From Weekly Course Questionnaires.....	79
Appendix 1F: <i>12 Angry Men</i> Film Questionnaire	80
Appendix 1G: Subject/Object Interview Protocol	82
Appendix 1H: Semistructured Interview Questions.....	83
2 EXPLORING DEVELOPMENT IN ADAPTIVE AND AUTHENTIC LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT	84
Abstract.....	84
Introduction.....	84
Literature Review	87
Site Selection and Description	96
Methods	102
Findings	106
Analysis of Courses	123
Discussion	139

	References	146
	Appendix 2A: Subject/Object Interview Protocol	153
	Appendix 2B: Semistructured Interview Questions.....	154
	Appendix 2C: Description of Dominantly Socialized Stages and Substages as They Relate to Leadership.....	155
	Appendix 2D: Description of Dominantly Self-Authorized Stages and Substages as They Relate to Leadership	156
3	THE CHALLENGE AND RISK OF INTEGRATING EXPERIENTIAL AND CONSTRUCTIVIST LEADERSHIP LEARNING INTO THE MANAGEMENT CURRICULUM	157
	Abstract.....	157
	Introduction.....	157
	Literature Review	161
	Methods	168
	Findings	184
	Interpretive Analysis	248
	Discussion	276
	Selected Bibliography.....	285
VITA.....		293

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1.1 Time 1 → Time 2 SOI Results (Exercising Leadership)	26
1.2 Learning Themes Organized by LoC and Developmental Experience (Exercising Leadership)	29
1.3 Dominant Socialized LoC Learning Themes (Exercising Leadership): Exemplary Quotes on Observing the Limitations of One's Meaning Making System	32
1.4 Dominant Socialized LoC to Dominant Self-Authorized LoC Learning Themes (Exercising Leadership): Exemplary Quotes on Engaging Frontier of One's Meaning Making System	38
1.5 Self-Authorized Learning Themes (Exercising Leadership): Exemplary Quotes on Expansion of Meaning Making and Compensational Learning	46
1.6 Self-Authorized to Self-Transformational Learning Themes (Exercising Leadership): Exemplary Quotes on Observing the Limitations of One's Meaning Making System.....	53
2.1 Time 1 → Time 2 SOI Results (Exercising Leadership)	107
2.2 Learning Themes Organized by LoC and Developmental Experience (Exercising Leadership)	108
2.3 Time 1 → Time 2 SOI Results Arranged by Demonstration of Stasis or Growth (Authentic Leadership)	110
2.4 Time 1 → Time 2 SOI Results Arranged by Time 1 LoC Regardless of Growth (Authentic Leadership)	111
2.5 Dominant Socialized LoC Learning Themes (Exercising Leadership): Exemplary Quotes on Observing the Limitations of One's Meaning Making System	113
2.6 Dominant Socialized LoC to Dominant Self-Authorized LoC Learning Themes (Exercising Leadership): Exemplary Quotes on Engaging Frontier of One's Meaning Making System	114
2.7 Self-Authorized Learning Themes (Exercising Leadership): Exemplary Quotes on Expansion of One's Meaning Making and Compensational Learning.....	115

2.8	Self-Authorized to Self-Transformational Learning Themes (Exercising Leadership): Exemplary Quotes on Observing the Limitations of One's Meaning Making System.....	117
2.9	Coded Learning Across LoCs in Authentic Leadership	118
2.10	Intra- and Interpersonal Learning in Authentic Leadership	120
2.11	Dominant Self-Authorized Empathy Themes	122
3.1	Primary Source Totals.....	177
3.2	Coding Scheme of Descriptive Data from Primary Sources.....	180
3.3	Methodological, Ideological and Pedagogical Differences.....	272
3.4	Timeline of Events at SOM.....	284

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1.1 Course tasks and interpretive framework.....	17

ABSTRACT

Nearly every graduate school, especially professional schools, claims to train, educate, and develop leaders. However, the leader-development literature offers little evidence of how a graduate level leader-development course might actually do that. Developmental theory informing experiential and constructivist leader-development methods suggest that those methods might be useful in promoting development, and one's capacity to lead, however there is little empirical evidence of impact. This dissertation is comprised of three studies. The first two used a constructive-developmental lens to explore the interaction between participant's stage of development and two different leader-development courses that deploy experiential and constructivist pedagogies: Adaptive Leadership and Authentic Leadership. These studies collected participant stage of development at the beginning and end of each course in addition to interview questions about participant learning in each course.

The first study focused on Adaptive Leadership. Findings from this study suggest that experiential and constructivist methods that bring dominantly socialized levels of consciousness to the limit of their meaning making provoked developmental growth for those participants. Dominantly self-authorized participants did not demonstrate developmental growth, but did demonstrate compensational learning—learning that uniquely compensates for the limitations of the dominantly self-authorized stage. Study two compared findings from the first study against findings from an Authentic Leadership course. That comparison revealed a very statistically significant correlation between the Adaptive Leadership course and developmental growth among dominantly

socialized participants. An analysis of the tasks used in each course suggested that dialectical tasks are correlated with development over dialogical tasks.

The third study focused on efforts at the professional school to integrate the experiential and constructivist methods I examined in studies one and two into the management curriculum. For that study, I organized and analyzed documentation regarding the establishment of Yale's School of Organization and Management in 1973 and the school's restructuring in 1988. That restructuring effort eliminated the experiential and constructivist methods the school was established upon in 1973. I found that the school was not strategic about the purpose of experiential and constructivist methods and generated a divided learning experience for students, which fueled a dynamic that subsequently split faculty along ideological lines.

INTRODUCTION

Professional schools, business schools particularly, all claim to train our next generation of leaders, but management education scholars write of how those schools have consistently failed at their task (Bennis & O'Toole, 2005; Ghoshal, 2005; Khurana, 2007). A lack people-centered courses that develop soft-skills is a primary culprit (Navarro, 2008; Rubin & Dierdorff, 2008). Experiential, constructivist, and dialogue-based courses that focus on student interaction are considered the remedy (Berkovich, 2014; Clegg & Smith, 2003; Grey, 2003; Kayes, 2002; Kolb & Kolb, 2005; Schyns, Kiefer, Kerschreiter, and Tymon, 2011). However, those who write about these remedies not only overlook the fact that we know very little about the learning such courses provoke, but that we have tried and failed to integrate such courses into our management programs.

The following dissertation investigates the interaction and impact of experiential and constructivist leadership learning on graduate students and graduate schools in three chapters. In this introduction I will, 1) define what I mean by experiential and constructivist leadership learning; 2) describe how this study considers and investigates the interaction and impact of that learning on graduate and professional students; and 3) describe how this study investigates the interaction and impact of that learning on graduate and professional schools.

Experiential learning, as it used here, represents more than simply learning-by-doing or learning how to accomplish tasks through experience with those tasks. Experiential learning, in this dissertation, represents opportunities for people to learn how to learn (Hackman & Wageman, 2007). Constructivist learning prioritizes and honors the

learner's meaning making and construction of reality over the instructor's (Rogers, 1965). Experiential and constructivist leadership learning, then, strives to help people learn about leadership on their own in settings that provide experiences to learn how to learn and "own and value their experience" (Kolb & Kolb, 2005: p.207). In this model of leadership learning, the students' interpretation of her experience takes priority over best practices (Akrivou & Bradbury-Huang, 2015). Experiential and constructivist leadership learning methods foster interpersonal experience and when these methods are facilitated effectively they "help students uncover and learn to work with (rather than be worked up by) the psychological and social dynamics that sustain or hinder their emergence and effectiveness as leaders" (Petriglieri & Petriglieri, 2015, p.637). These methods create opportunities to explore "provisional selves" and experiment with one's identity in relation to others (Ibarra, 1999).

To investigate the impact of courses with experiential and constructivist design features I examine the interaction between such courses and students' level of consciousness (LoC). Kegan's constructive-developmental theory (CDT) is used as a frame for articulating one's LoC and as a way of articulating how developmental growth to higher a LoC can serve as a desirable outcome of leader-development interventions.

Chapter One provides an in-depth investigation of the interaction between an experiential and constructivist leadership course, *Exercising Leadership: The Politics of Change*, rooted in the adaptive leadership framework (Heifetz, 1994; Heifetz, Grashow & Linsky, 2009; Heifetz & Linsky, 2002). I find that participants representing a dominantly socialized LoC demonstrate developmental growth connected to learning in the course.

Participants representing a dominantly self-authorizing LoC do not demonstrate developmental growth, but do demonstrate “compensational” learning.

Chapter Two considers Chapter One findings while also investigating the interaction between LoC a another leadership course with constructivist design features, *Authentic Leadership Development*. Students in *Authentic Leadership* reflect on life experiences through the lens of the authentic leadership framework (George & Sims, 2007). This study is not a comparative design, but I do find a very statistically significant correlation for developmental growth among dominantly socialized LoCs enrolled in the adaptive leadership based *Exercising Leadership*. Participants in *Authentic Leadership* do not demonstrate consistent or predictable patterns of growth, but do uniformly report similar learning themes representing a deeper appreciation and value for reflection and vulnerability. The difference between courses is found in the course tasks. *Exercising Leadership* course tasks are dialectical in nature and generate dialectical processes. I claim that these dialectical processes are responsible for participant demonstrations of developmental growth. *Authentic Leadership* course tasks are dialogical in nature and do not require students to synthesize conflicting perspectives the same way dialectical processes do.

In chapter 3 I shift the focus and look at the impact constructivist and experiential courses have on the professional school as an organization. This investigation examines the case of Yale’s School of Organization and Management (SOM), which featured the course *Individual and Group Behavior (IGB)*, an experiential and constructivist leadership learning course. IGB was central to the school’s curriculum when the first cohort of management students was accepted in 1974. However, all experiential and

constructivist courses were cut from the curriculum in 1988 when the school unexpectedly restructured. A primary decision in that restructuring was the elimination of the organizational behavior department responsible for teaching those courses. Students and alumni protested the loss of these courses for years, considering them the “soul of the school,” and pledging to withhold contributions to the school until the courses and OB faculty positions were restored. The new dean, installed to oversee the restructuring, held the perspective that it was not the school’s responsibility to teach experience.

A document analysis of 700+ publically available articles, memos, meeting minutes, program handbooks and letters documenting the establishment of SOM in 1973 through its restructuring in 1988 reveal how the decision to restructure at SOM was at the expense of the school’s most valued and prized strengths. The school’s restructuring, which focused on the discontinuation of experiential coursework and the termination of OB faculty not only destroyed the school’s highly regarded student community and culture (the school’s most applauded feature in the first business school ranking). These changes alienated an alumni community known for the highest rate of giving among business school alumni, generated bad press across the nation, instigated the first ever faculty investigation into a Yale president’s decision due to the autocratic nature of the event and ultimately reduced enrollment among women and minority students. I find that SOM, in its attempt to offer a Master in Public and Private Management, was conflicted about its purpose and that students found the school’s purpose was largely represented by IGB, which taught how to lead humanely through experiential and constructivist methods. Faculty found themselves irreconcilably split over the role of experiential coursework and the internecine conflict required an administrative intervention strong

enough to eliminate one side of that split. I use a systems psychodynamic framework to interpret the “function of dysfunction” (Ashforth & Reingen, 2014) and posit that in its attempt to train and educate practitioners through experiential courses, Yale’s elite academic status was threatened and the school needed to restore a more favorable academic identity at the cost of what seemed to actually work well for students.

Scholars keep calling for more course work emphasizing interpersonal skills. SOM was a leader, praised for its more humane and holistic emphasis on these skills – this investigation focuses on the risk and challenge of integrating these courses into our management curriculums. This study suggests that the challenge is in articulating the role experiential and constructivist leadership learning play in achieving the school’s purpose and in creating conditions that can contain, manage and learn from the distress and disorientation generated by that learning. The risks lie in a school’s inability to contain debate about the role of these courses. The uncontained debate will generate ideological rifts between faculty and between students and faculty. This tension between the professional graduate school and experiential and constructivist leadership learning must be understood if we are to make progress integrating courses like *Exercising Leadership*, and their promising outcomes, into the management curriculum.

This dissertation is an attempt to demonstrate how we can learn more. We can actually look into our classrooms and learn more about the instructional tasks that generate the leadership learning we want to see. And we can study our resistance to integrating practices we criticize ourselves for not integrating.

CHAPTER 1

EXPERIENTIAL AND CONSTRUCTIVIST LEADERSHIP LEARNING: A DEVELOPMENTAL INVESTIGATION

Abstract

This longitudinal study examines the interaction between experiential and constructivist, case-in-point, leadership learning and level of consciousness (LoC) by measuring the developmental stage of participants before and after a graduate level adaptive leadership course. Findings reveal that the course facilitates interaction between and among participants representing different LoCs and that interaction, combined with the course's adaptive leadership framework for interpreting experience in and out of the course, facilitates developmental growth among dominantly socialized LoCs. The course also facilitates a specific form of informational learning identified as compensational learning among dominantly self-authorized LoCs.

Introduction

This study is premised on the idea that the leader-development field needs to focus more on educating leaders to learn how to learn (Hackman & Wageman, 2007). Helping leaders learn how to learn means helping them learn for themselves how to reflect on and leverage challenging interpersonal experiences and ambiguous or open-ended work projects. Developing these muscles can be difficult within the dominant paradigm of individually focused leader-development interventions that emphasize knowledge, skill and ability acquisition (DeRue and Myers, 2014). DeRue and Myers (2014) observe that leadership scholars and practitioners are too narrowly focused on this individual leader-development orientation, and overlook leadership development oriented towards group and organizational processes.

To advance our ability to educate for leadership and help leaders learn how to learn, more must be understood about how people experience leader-development interventions designed to do just that. This requires insight into how people make meaning of their experiences and how one's meaning making system interacts with leadership development interventions.¹

In this study, I apply the lens of constructive developmental theory (CDT; Kegan, 1982) to participant experiences in an experiential, adaptive leadership course at a graduate school. CDT demonstrates how participants interpret and experience such an intervention differently based on one's stage of development or level of consciousness (LoC). One's ability to learn for one's self how to learn—so that one is prepared to continue learning from interpersonal and ambiguous adaptive challenges—requires understanding how one's LoC interacts with and makes meaning of leadership development interventions (see Appendix 1A for more detailed characteristics of CDT).

Literature Review

Baldwin sparked study in the development of infants, children and adolescents and the systematic stages or phases they sequentially pass through with *Handbook of Psychology* (1890) and *Elements of Psychology* (1893). The work of Vygotsky (1926) and Piaget (1948, 1953, 1957) continued this line of inquiry, but focused entirely on the child.

¹ For the purpose of clarity, “interact” will be used to represent how any distinct level of consciousness experiences, makes meaning of, makes sense of, changes as a result of, and/or is activated by the examined intervention.

Neo-Piagetian scholars, Kohlberg (1969), Loevinger (1976), Kegan (1982) and Torbert (2004) extended Piaget's (1954) "genetic-epistemology" beyond adolescents and into adulthood and organizational life (McCauley, Drath, Palus, O'Connor, & Baker, 2006). They have each proposed stages of emotional, cognitive, and ego development that vary in number, name and description, but overlap into a coherent and generalized theory of developmental psychology (McCauley et al., 2006; Wilber, 2000).

Nearly 30 years ago, Bartunek, Gordon and Weathersby were among the first to advocate for an adult development lens regarding leader education in "Developing 'Complicated' Understanding in Administrators" (1983). Suggesting that leaders require a "complicated" understanding, Bartunek and colleagues saw adult development theory as a powerful avenue for examining the characteristics of effective leaders and leader-development programs.

Constructive Developmental Theory and Leader Development

Bartunek et al.'s (1983) call for a developmental perspective on leader-development built on Weick's (1979) work that describes the need for a more complicated understanding among managers and leaders who must be able to see that organizational problems have multiple causes. Bartunek et al. (1983) suggest that cognitively complex leaders are better suited to honor these multiple perspectives and that structural developmental psychology can help illuminate the developmental dimensions of cognitive complexity. Leadership researchers gravitate towards the third, fourth, and fifth stages of Kegan's theory (Kegan, 1982; 1994). Stages one and two apply mostly to childhood and early adolescence (see Appendix 1B and Appendix 1C for

detailed descriptions of stages three and four and their relationship to the exercise of leadership).

Kuhnert and Lewis (1987) built on Bartunek et al.'s theory by connecting CDT to Burns' transactional and transformational leadership distinction (1978). Transactional leadership is focused on responding to the needs of followers; transformational leaders motivate followers to unite and join them in their vision. Kuhnert and Lewis (1987) align Kegan's 2nd and 3rd stages of development with behaviors indicative of transactional leadership and reserve Kegan's 4th stage of development for behaviors indicative of transformational leadership. Their work builds on Bartunek et al.'s (1983) theory that the most effective leaders inhabit later, more complex, stages of development.

The correlation between leader effectiveness and more complex stages of development has been found in a variety of studies. Bartone, Snook, Forsythe, Lewis, & Bullis (2007) found that peer, supervisor, and subordinate ratings of military cadets were predictive of a cadet's developmental stage. Harris and Kuhnert (2007) and Strang and Kuhnert (2009) found that LoC was predictive of performance on 360-degree feedback. They also correlated aptitude on other measures, such as leading change, managing performance and creating a compelling vision, with later developmental stages. Developmental stage of organizational development consultants is found to be a positive predictor of effectiveness ratings by peers (Bushe & Gibbs, 2009). That work also compared Myers-Briggs scores with developmental stage scores; developmental stages were far more predictive than personality types with regards to peer evaluations.

Hasegawa (2003) found that teachers representing Kegan's 4th stage of development were more comfortable with complexity than teachers representing Kegan's

3rd stage; those teachers could not maintain authority in stressful situations and were uncomfortable with conflict. Using Kohlberg's stages of moral reasoning, Dukerich, Nichols, Elm, & Vollrath (1990) found that a leader's level of moral reasoning impacts group performance. Rooke and Torbert (1998) also discovered that a CEO's stage of development has a positive or negative impact on organizations and their efficacy; late stage leaders helped organizations succeed while early stage leaders suffered higher incidences of financial loss and organizational disorder.

Despite strong evidence correlating higher developmental stages with leader ability or capacity, little is known about what actually promotes development or how participants representing different developmental stages interact with leader-development interventions. The empirical research on what promotes developmental growth is limited, but theorists share similar recommendations on how to address this gap. Bartunek et al. (1983) advocate for engaging participants in long-term immersion courses that feature personally relevant, complex, and interdependent challenges featuring multiple stakeholders and perspectives. Kolb and Fry (1975) recommend complex learning environments featuring multiple student experiences and reflection opportunities. Loevinger (1976) wrote of developmental growth as the consequence of immersion in interpersonal environments more demanding or complex than one's developmental stage. Mezirow (1991; 1995; 2009) concurs, suggesting one must confront a "disorienting dilemma" that exposes the frontier of meaning making. Rooke and Torbert (2005) clarify how that might happen, suggesting developmental growth flows from: internal changes that push one to seek new perspectives, external changes like a job change that require one to expand one's capacity, other changes to one's professional practice or workplace

and deliberate and intentional coaching or educative experiences that are constructed developmentally. Kegan (1982; 1994) claims that development is the result of repeated and persistent conflict between the levels of complexity and the psychological demands put on someone and their inability to meet those demands. Facilitating that development requires a developmental bridge “anchored” at one end in a person’s current level of meaning making and at the next developmental stage at the other end. He calls for an equal, yet flexible, combination of challenge and support.

A small stream of research examines how deliberate interventions might promote developmental stage growth. Based on their theory that developmental growth results from challenging events that are interpersonal, personally salient, emotionally engaging and disequilibrating (Manners & Durkin, 2000), Manners, Durkin and Nesdale (2004) studied participants in an intervention specifically designed to advance development. Their study is noteworthy in that developmental growth was found, a control group was used, and growth was maintained four months after the intervention, though the specifics of that instructional design is unknown as the authors declined to share design details beyond what they revealed in the study (Pfaffenberger, 2005).

Smith’s (1999) examination of participant experiences in a teacher development program is one of the few explorations showing how leader-development interventions can deliberately promote development by offering consistent opportunities to “critically reflect” (Brookfield, 1995) on how one comes to know what one knows in a supportive, interpersonal environment.

Petriglieri and Petriglieri (2010, 2011) approach leader development through the lens of identity formation. They hypothesize that MBA programs are increasingly serving

as ‘identity workspaces’—holding environments for helping management students understand who they are in addition to what they need to know (Petriglieri & Petriglieri, 2010). Petriglieri, Wood and Petriglieri (2011) demonstrate how management education paired with psychotherapy boosts personal learning, experimentation and identity growth as part of the MBA experience. Such personalization within the program enhances “students’ ongoing development and practice of leadership” (Petriglieri, Wood, & Petriglieri, 2011, p. 430).

The above literature offers some guidance for creating transformative leadership learning experiences in the classroom. However, nearly nothing is known about what actually works to promote developmental growth. To learn more we must understand how different LoCs interact with leader-development interventions that are designed to promote developmental growth and/or advocate leadership practices that require a more evolved LoC than participants arrive with. The transformational learning theories about what promotes developmental growth also merit rigorous exploration. Specifically, how do participants representing different developmental stages experience and make sense of leader development courses? Piaget described the quest to determine his theory’s efficacy for the sake of intentionally promoting development as “the American question” (Pulaski, 1980, p. 202). This study is a deliberate effort to pull back and look at how different LoCs *interact* with an intervention.

There is no established line of research about what kind of interventions best work for participants based on their differing developmental levels (Pfaffenberger, 2005). This is despite leadership educators’ interest in how a participant’s LoC might influence his or her receptiveness to and understanding of leader-development interventions

(Bushe, 1990; Manners et al., 2004). Silver and Josselson (2010) and McCallum (2008) are the exceptions; their studies are the only precedent for using a CDT lens to explore how participants of different stages make sense of an experiential leader-development intervention designed using transformational learning principles. Those studies focus on self-analytic Group Relations Conferences in the Tavistock tradition and confirm what one might expect, that “participants largely make meaning of conferences at the level of meaning-making with which they enter the conference” (Silver & Josselson 2010, p. 175). Those studies are not longitudinal and the interventions they examine are short 2- to 5-day events. Although those interventions are rooted in experiential leadership learning methods (Rice, 1965) they do not emphasize a specific framework for interpreting experience or problem solving.

Experiential Leadership Learning

Kolb (2015) draws on Dewey, Piaget and Lewin to describe his theory of development through experiential learning. Succinctly summarizing the connection to leadership development, McCall states, “The primary source of learning to lead, to the extent that leadership can be learned, is experience” (2004). To emphasize this observation, DeRue and Myers (2014) review the literature and show that novel, lived experiences that require people to manage change across boundaries and among diverse groups of people, fuels leader development. In his deconstruction and review of Kolb’s experiential learning theory and its utility to management education, Kayes (2004) emphasizes the role of language and conversation rooted in a social vocabulary in developing individuals. Kayes suggests that such a conversation forces participants to refine their thinking as they confront dilemmas and engage the limits of their thinking,

thus encouraging their development. Berkovich (2014) focuses on dialogical pedagogy as a powerful interpersonal method to deepen and make more effective current trends in authentic leadership development. His eight components of a strong dialogical pedagogy (self-exposure, open-mindedness, empathy, care, respect, critical thinking, contact and mutuality) challenge participants to connect with each other while developing their potential.

To meet the expectation of Hackman and Wageman's (2007) ideal, experiential learning should help a participant learn how to learn on one's own—not just learn how to accomplish tasks through experience with them.

Constructivist leadership education features significant overlap with experiential leadership design. Brought to higher education and the management learning field by Carl Rogers and Fritz Roethlisberger (Rogers & Roethlisberger, 1952; Rogers, 1961), the focus of constructivist methods is on the learner's own construction of understanding and the learning that emerges from that construction (Rogers, 1965). Constructivist methods aim to help students learn for one's self and allow students to “own and value their experience” (Kolb & Kolb, 2005, p. 207). How one interprets an experience takes priority over best practices (Akrivou & Bradbury-Huang, 2015). Deployed effectively, these methods “help students uncover and learn to work with (rather than be worked up by) the psychological and social dynamics that sustain or hinder their emergence and effectiveness as leaders” through a process of personalization and contextualization (Petriglieri & Petriglieri, 2015, p. 637). Experiential and constructivist leadership learning allows one to explore provisional selves and experiment with who one is and what one can be in relation to others (Ibarra, 1999).

Organizations identify leader-development as a top priority connected to their competitive advantage (Day, Harrison, & Halpin, 2009); and, one quarter of the 50 billion dollars spent by U.S. organizations on learning and development annually focuses on leadership (O'Leonard, 2010). However, in all fields of leadership study, scholars know the least about developing leaders and leadership capacity (Avolio, 2007; Day, 2000; Day, Harrison, & Halpin, 2009). Piaget, who hoped for more experimentation and analysis to test the applicability of his theories before they were actually applied, found it “scarcely believable that in a field so accessible to experiment . . . the pedagogue has not organized sustained and methodical experiments” (Piaget, 1970, p. 7).

This study strives to generate a shift away from ‘what’ to learn towards ‘how’ to learn (Hackman & Wagemen, 2007). CDT provides a useful lens for that examination. The theory reveals how one’s LoC, or developmental stage, informs his or her experience and provides a theory for how one develops beyond that LoC. I developed this study to examine the different ways participants representing different LoCs, experience and make sense of an experiential leadership learning method. I also aim to discover what instructional features support and/or challenge students at different stages of development to learn more about how to make the shift from teaching “what” leaders should learn to “how” leaders should learn. This is not a study about what promotes developmental growth; it is an analysis of how different developmental stages interact with an experiential and constructivist intervention. That interaction may generate developmental experiences of stasis or growth, but this is not a search for “what works.” This is a quest to understand what is happening. What can we learn about promising leader-development methods from that interaction?

Methods

Site Selection

To explore the interaction between different stages of development and an experiential and constructivist leadership learning intervention, I selected the course *Exercising Leadership: The Politics of Change*, offered at the Harvard Kennedy School. The pedagogy employed in this leadership development course is experiential and constructivist. It is experiential in the sense that students are tasked with learning about the functions of authority and leadership from the dynamics that emerge within the authority vacuum created in the classroom when the instructor defies expectations to teach or lecture. It is constructivist in the sense that students construct their own understanding of the authority and group dynamics from their experiences in the classroom. The authority, group, intergroup and interpersonal dynamics that emerge between participants and the instructors in the classroom serve as a primary “text” to be learned from. The case-in-point method illuminates those dynamics as they unfold in the classroom. Described in the book *Leadership Can Be Taught* (Parks, 2005; Dass, 2005), the course has endured for 30-plus years as the most popular course for students and the most impactful for alumni. Parks (2005) describes the case-in-point method as spotlighting interpersonal dynamics as they unfold in the classroom, outlines the course design and analyzes the course’s development. Other studies have focused on the impact of case-in-point pedagogy (Guilleux, 2010; Heifetz, Sinder, Jones Hodge, & Rowley, 1989) and similar experiential “here-and-now” methods, which ask participants to observe and interpret group behavior in the moment (Silver & Josselson 2010, McCallum, 2008). However, those studies look at one moment in time, do not consider

change within individuals over the period of the course, and thus reveal little about the interaction between the course and students' LoC.

Exercising Leadership combines interpersonal and experiential tasks with reflective tasks (see Appendix 1D for a course description from the syllabus). All tasks are buttressed by an interpretive framework that supports interpretation and sense-making of experience while interrogating traditional conceptualizations of leadership and the purpose and work of leaders vis-à-vis authorities.

Experiential Tasks	Analytical / Diagnostic Tasks	Reflective / Interpretive Tasks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Large group authority & leadership dynamics (2x week) - Small group consultation dynamics (1x week) - Music & poetry performance (3x semester) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Large group case diagnosis & analysis (1x week) - Small group case diagnosis & analysis (1x week) (<i>all classes are 90 minutes</i>) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Three page reflection (1x week): - Observed small group dynamics - Small group consultation process - Observed large group dynamics - Behavior & role in large & small groups - Leadership failure presentation - Film analysis & reflection (3x semester) - Final paper
Interpretive Framework / Theory for Leadership (<i>that interrogates implicit leadership theories</i>)		
<u>Interpreting Experience</u> Dance floor / Balcony distinction (Action / Reflection) Dependence on authority Formal and informal authority		<u>Interpreting Leadership</u> Technical and adaptive Giving work back Manage losses

Figure 1.1. Course tasks and interpretive framework. This figure breaks down course tasks and concepts from the course's interpretive framework.

Interpersonal and experiential tasks. Discussing and learning from the authority, group, and interpersonal dynamics that unfold in the large classroom between the instructor, teaching team, and students is a primary task of the course. Students are challenged to interrogate their expectations of the instructor, and in doing so, explore the distinction between authority services and leadership services. Case-in-point methods illuminate students' desire for direction, clarity and teaching from the instructor over the ambiguity of learning from and amongst each other. Three music and poetry events ask

students to connect to the group and each other through a series of exercises focused on developing presence and poise, and holding and communicating sentiment through words and sound.

Analytical and diagnostic tasks. Student cases of ‘leadership failure’ are the other primary source of raw educational material for the class. Each student presents a personal case of leadership failure to his or her small group for consultation. Students apply the course’s interpretive framework and insights from their own learning in the course to analyze and diagnose the case. Integral to the course’s analytic and interpretive framework is *Leadership Without Easy Answers* by Heifetz (1994), which distinguishes between technical and adaptive challenges, leadership and authority, formal and informal authority, and stresses the importance of a holding environment for adaptive leadership work. Supplementary texts like *Real Leadership* by Williams (2000), distinguishes between quick fixes that do not endure and lasting durable changes by outlining problem definitions for diagnosing different leadership challenges. Strategies for case consultations include: distinguishing the case presenter’s problem from the larger systemic challenge, identifying stakeholder groups and factions in the case, identifying different perspectives of those factions on the work (perspective taking and seeking), distinguishing technical and adaptive components of the challenge at the center of the case, identifying options for leadership based on the case presenter’s placement in their organization or system and level of formal and informal authority among the different factions. Cases are consulted twice a week—in small groups of approximately eight students—and once more in the large classroom with guidance from the instructor.

Analytical and diagnostic tasks are experiential in nature. The case consultation process is a challenging interpersonal task often drawn from the messy and ambiguous narrative frame of the presenter's disorienting experience with a leadership failure. The objective of these consultations is to help the presenter "see more" and for the group to apply its developing diagnostic skills and analytic ability to generate learning about the exercise of leadership in systemic contexts with no clear answer.

Reflective and interpretive tasks. Reflecting on experience in real-time during all tasks is encouraged. For instance, that a consultation group might be deferring to the expertise of one member is an observation that can be made about the group's authority dynamics, consultation process or parallel processes, as well as "mirroring" or enacting of the dynamics they are discussing in the case. Reflecting on the systemic nature of leadership and repeatedly contextualizing experience in group contexts pushes participant thinking beyond traditional hierarchical, individualistic, one-directional and de-contextualized (DeRue, 2011) notions that dominate common understandings of leadership work.

Weekly evolving questionnaires ask students to reflect on and interpret what they observe in the class and in their group such as: the work and progress they observe in the small and large groups, preoccupations within the groups that distract from work or serve as clues, their interpretation of events, their role and ability to intervene productively in both groups, and the interventions and roles of their peers (see Appendix 1E for example questions). Questions also push students to interpret systemic behavior and unconscious processes. Students also watch films, such as *12 Angry Men* (Fonda, Rose & Lumet, 1957) *Lean On Me* (Twain & Avildsen, 1989) and *Gate of Heavenly Peace* (Gordon &

Hinton, 1995), and respond to questionnaires meant to illuminate the different functions of authority and leadership roles (see Appendix 1F for examples of film questionnaire questions). These reflections are analyzed and commented on by the teaching team, who return the weekly assignments with feedback and observations meant to facilitate deeper reflection on subsequent questionnaires.

Developing reflective and interpretive skills in action is core to the participant experience. One interpretive concept that surfaces throughout the duration of the course is the balcony/dance floor distinction (Heifetz et al., 1989; Heifetz & Laurie, 1998; Parks, 2005). This refers to the practice of observing the dynamics one is participating in while participating class processes. Students in the course are encouraged to ‘go to the balcony’ and see themselves in action.

The course’s adaptive leadership framework challenges conventional notions of the work of leadership and its purposes and offers a shared vocabulary for reflection, interpretation and sense-making among students in the course (Heifetz, 1998; Heifetz & Linsky, 2002; Heifetz, Linsky & Grashow, 2009; Heifetz & Laurie 1998; Heifetz & Laurie, 1999). Participants carry implicit leadership theories (DeRue & Myers, 2014) that may not resonate with new or different leadership theories. Interrogating implicit theories and understanding the context from which they arise is an important process for students of leadership (Schyns, Kiefer, Kerschrieter & Tymon, 2010).

In his seminal and widely cited works on professional reflection, Schon (1983, 1987) emphasizes the importance of reflective practice for professional growth. Persistent reflection and perspective taking are the key ingredients for transformational learning and developmental growth (Kegan & Lahey, 2009; Mezirow, 1991, 2009).

Additionally, Manners and Durkin (2000) describe developmental growth as the result of conditions that are interpersonal in nature, personally salient, emotionally engaging and disequilibrating. *Exercising Leadership* features each of these conditions; interpersonal dynamics serve as a primary ‘text’, the presentation of leadership failures and reflection on one’s behavior in groups provides personal saliency, and the examination of failure combined with the absence of guided teaching creates conditions for “disorienting dilemmas” (Mezirow, 1995, p. 50). The emotions generated by those dilemmas and the subsequent reactions that emerge in the class allow for the examination of emotionally engaging and disequilibrating experiences. The course is ideal for exploring the interaction between experiential and constructivist pedagogical practices, on the one hand and participant’s LoC, on the other.

All course tasks are experiential and constructivist in nature. The course instructor and teaching assistants provide guidance, but there is no single best way to proceed with course tasks. Students are encouraged to experiment with intervening in large and small groups and student groups are expected to learn together how to best manage case consultation processes. Reflective exercises encourage students to own and value their experience (Kolb & Kolb, 2005, p. 207) and learning experiences are designed to emphasize a humanistic perspective over an instrumental one (Petriglieri & Petriglieri, 2015).

Sample and Data Collection

Participants. I invited thirty-five students enrolled in *Exercising Leadership* to participate in interviews at the beginning and end of the course (I was not a faculty member or instructor in the course). Ten students participated in Year 1 and 25 students

participated in Year 2. Invitations were randomly sent to half of enrolled students and those who expressed a willingness to participate were invited to two interviews, one at the start of the course and another after its completion. Availability for interviews was the primary determinant in the selection process. All participants completed a pre- and postcourse interview. One hundred twelve students are registered in the course each semester. Students represented three different degree programs, a 2-year Masters in Public Policy or Administration and a 1-year Midcareer Master's degree in policy. Students enrolled in the midcareer program cleared a prerequisite of at least 7 years of professional work experience for admission into the program.

Interview methods. Subject-Object Interviews (SOI) were conducted at the start and end of the course (see Appendix 1G for SOI protocol). The protocol requires participants to discuss meaningful and relevant events or emotions in their lives. As these events or emotions are shared, the interviewer has the flexibility to probe the participant's understanding by asking questions that reveal the upper and lower limits of a participant's meaning-making. These responses are analyzed and scored according to Kegan's stage development theory (Lahey, Souvaine, Kegan & Felix, 1988). Supplemental questions about how participants define leadership were added to all pre- and post-SOIs. Interviews at the end of the course also probed for key learning in the course.

Interview process. The first 60 minutes of the postcourse interviews were identical to precourse interviews in that they both followed the SOI protocol; but the second interview also elicited information on the students' learning experience in the course (see Appendix 1H for example questions). In addition to the developmental

assessments conducted at the start and finish of each course, semistructured interviews provided qualitative data designed to illuminate students' experience of the course. Participants were asked what features of the course they found supportive, challenging, useful, and not useful to uncover *how* participants learned and through what process. When participants shared a moment of learning in either portion of the interview I probed for connections between that learning and the course. Both forms of interview questions elicited responses that informed the purpose of each other. All interviews were confidential, digitally recorded, and professionally transcribed.

Validity. Precedent for using the SOI as a measure first for development and second for leadership capacity is well established. The SOI, which determines a score indicating a position on Kegan's continuum of stages of development, was chosen for its interrater reliability, test-retest reliability, and construct validity (Stein & Heikkinen, 2009). The SOI also provides a unique window into the connection between an individual's developmental stage and leadership performance by generating "rich qualitative data" which reveals a "much larger, more nuanced picture of how an individual is making sense of his or her experiences" (Helsing & Howell, 2013, p. 201). The SOI was particularly useful for this investigation because it elicits *why* a participant responds as they do.

Data Analysis

Data was analyzed in two phases. The first focused on scoring the SOIs. The second focused on analyzing the interviews for learnings affiliated with the course.

SOI scoring. Interviews were scored in accordance with the protocols for scoring the SOI (Lahey et al., 1988; see Appendix 1B and Appendix 1C for a description of

scores). I am trained in the CDT tradition and practiced in the scoring of SOIs. SOIs were also blindly validated by a CDT scholar and certified trainer. Sixteen Time 1 and Time 2 interviews corresponding to eight participants—23% of the sample—were randomly selected from groups of interviews representing different developmental stages to validate scoring across the range of stages participants represented, and to validate incidences of growth where it was detected. That process produced 100% agreement between the primary researcher and the external scorer.

Coding. Coding was an iterative process where I repeatedly compared my unfolding analysis of the interviews with the literature on both constructive-developmental theory and experiential leadership learning (Miles & Huberman, 1994). There were three stages of coding. First, pairs of participant interviews (Time 1 and Time 2) were grouped by developmental scores according to Kegan's developmental trajectory; (a) dominant socialized orders of mind that demonstrated substage growth, for example from 3 and 3(4) at Time 1 to 3(4) and 3/4, respectively at Time 2 (see Appendix 1B and Appendix C for descriptions of stages and substages); (b) dominant socialized orders of mind that demonstrated substage growth into a dominant self-authorizing order of mind, for example 3/4 at Time 1 to 4/3 at Time 2; (c) dominant self-authorizing orders of mind that did not demonstrate growth at a full 4, for example from 4(3) at Time 1 to 4(3) at Time 2 or from 4/3 at Time 1 to 4/3 at Time 2; and (d) and two participants who demonstrated one substage of growth from a fully dominant self-authorizing order of mind toward the self-transforming mind, for example from 4 at Time 1 to 4(5) at Time 2.

In the second stage of coding, Time 2 interviews conducted after course completion were coded for data related to learning in the course by group. The

instructional practices associated with that learning were also coded. In this stage, all instances of learning, and corresponding instructional practices connected to the course were identified and recorded on a contact sheet. Each instance was organized by theme according to its group. For example, descriptions by participants learning to examine for the first time how strongly they reacted to, or were triggered by, comments or events in the course were organized under the theme “observe default reactions.”

The final stage focused on categorizing the themes that emerged in each group. This final stage employed methods of constant comparison (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) that facilitated consolidation of themes and informed categorization. For instance, themes representing a dominant socialized LoC were referenced with Kegan’s original conceptualization of CDT (Kegan, 1982), distinctions between substages (Lahey et al., 1988) and subsequent extrapolations of the theory which further articulate the nuance of each LoC and transitional LoCs (Drago-Severson, 2004; Garvey-Berger, 2013; Ghosh, Haynes & Kram, 2013; McGowan, Stone, & Kegan, 2007). I completed coding with 20 of the 35 transcripts representing all groups and then applied the coding scheme to all remaining transcripts to validate the scheme’s representation of each transcript.

Findings

Findings Overview

Quantitative findings from SOI scores (see Table 1.1) reveal a pattern where all dominantly socialized LoCs demonstrate one substage of growth at Time 2. Dominantly self-authorizing LoCs, on the other hand, demonstrate a static developmental experience at Time 2. Thus, participants representing different LoCs at the start of the course *Exercising Leadership* experienced the intervention differently. Specifically, participants

Table 1.1

Time 1 → Time 2 SOI Results (Exercising Leadership)

Dominant instrumental LoC at Time 1		Stage socialized LoCs at Time 1		Dominant self-authorized LoCs at Time 1	
<i>Dominant 2 growth</i>	<i>Dominant 3 static</i>	<i>Dominant 3 growth</i>	<i>Dominant 3 → Dominant 4 growth</i>	<i>Dominant 4 static</i>	<i>Dominant 4 growth</i>
#17\ 2 → 2(3)	#19\ 3(4) → 3(4)	#AA\ 3 → 3(4)	#07\ 3(4) → 4/3 ^a	#02\ 4(3) → 4(3)	#FF\ 4(3) → 4
		#01\ 3 → 3(4)	#CC\ 3/4 → 4/3	#EE\ 4/3 → 4/3	#12\ 4/3 → 4 ^a
		#05\ 3 → 3(4)	#DD\ 3/4 → 4/3	#GG\ 4 → 4	#JJ\ 4 → 4(5)
		#20\ 3 → 3(4)	#04\ 3/4 → 4/3	#HH\ 4 → 4	#13\ 4 → 4(5)
		#10\ 3(4) → 3/4	#21\ 3/4 → 4/3	#II\ 4 → 4	
		#14\ 3(4) → 3/4	#22\ 3/4 → 4/3	#03\ 4 → 4	
		#15\ 3(4) → 3/4	#23\ 3/4 → 4/3	#08\ 4 → 4	
		#18\ 3(4) → 3/4	#28\ 3/4 → 4/3	#09\ 4 → 4	
		#26\ 3(4) → 3/4	#11\ 3/4 → 4(3) ^a	#16\ 4 → 4	
				#25\ 4 → 4	
				#29\ 4 → 4	

representing a dominant socialized order of mind entering the course had a transformational learning experience. Participants entering at a full 3 or 3(4) each grew one substage to 3(4) and 3/4 respectively. These participants underwent a transformative process of self-understanding where they criticized the dependence they have on other people's perspectives of them—to a measurable degree. Participants entering at the cusp of a dominantly self-authorizing LoC, 3/4, transitioned to a dominantly self-authorizing LoC at 4/3. This transformation is characterized by a prioritization of one's own perspective over others. Participants representing this specific transformation described sharing a perspective that they would have worried was too controversial at the start of the course as the balance of concern had shifted—their perspective was more important than external perspectives. Participants representing a dominant, self-authorizing LoC of 4/3, 4(3), or 4 did not demonstrate developmental growth. These findings point to distinct developmental experiences between dominant socialized and self-authorizing participants.

No study participant moved from a more complex to a less complex stage during the course, a confirmation of a theoretical tenet—stage growth is an evolution towards greater complexity (Kegan, 1982).

The finding that students of different LoCs had different learning experiences in the course has implications for all experiential and constructivist learning interventions, and raises interesting questions about the differentiation of leader-development interventions of all kinds in higher education.

Learning codes, the qualitative findings from SOI interviews (see Table 1.2), reveal a pattern that explains those differences between growth and static experiences and

show how LoC is associated with distinct kinds of learning experiences. While all participants reported learning more about their internal understanding of their self and their external understanding of their environment, what they learned varied by LoC and explains the different growth and static experiences. The $3 \rightarrow 3(4)$ and $3(4) \rightarrow 3/4$ transformation is characterized by the participant's observation of the limits of their meaning making. The $3/4 \rightarrow 4/3$ transformation into a dominant self-authorizing LoC is characterized by the participant's behavioral engagement with the frontier of their meaning making. Dominantly self-authorizing participants who score at $4/3$, $4(3)$ and 4 at Time 1 and Time 2 report a learning I identify as "compensational" learning. That learning is uniquely suited to compensate for the limits of a self-authorized LoC—suggesting that these participants do indeed learn new strategies for operating in the course that do not require developmental growth or transformation.

Consistency between grouped learning themes and specific instructional practices was not found. The range of instructional practices deployed in the course are experienced differently, and with different intensity by each participant and no single instructional practice consistently corresponded to any specific learning theme. Participants refer to the entire range of instructional practices as supporting their learning.

Table 1.2

Learning Themes Organized by LoC and Developmental Experience (Exercising Leadership)

	Dominant 3 growth	Dominant 3 → 4 growth	Dominant 4 static	Dominant 4 growth
	<i>Observe limitations of meaning making</i>	<i>Engage frontier of meaning making</i>	<i>Expansion of meaning making</i>	<i>Observe limitations of meaning making</i>
Self / Internal	Observe Self's responses Observe growth edge Observe default reactions Observe emotional reactions—be less emotional	Tune Into Self Tune into desire / purpose Set limits for self See limits of created reality Emotions are data Slow down reactions / responses	Compensation Manage / consider impact Think politically / inclusively Be patient / listen Decrease crusade Reframe success for self Connect to emotion	Laments Oversights in Thinking Observe limits, gaps and oversights in sense making
29 System / External	Distinguish Self & System Distinguish self from system Emotions are data / clues about others	Distance Self From System & Others Depersonalize See the system Distance from others Increased empathy “Balcony” analysis Increased focus on “work” Increased tolerance for ambiguity	Compensation Monitor others / system Focus on the work Reframe success for system Disequilibrium is generative	Connect to Power of Systemic Forces & Other's Vulnerability Sense of superordinate systemic forces Appreciation for vulnerability and role of opponents

Developmental Growth Within Dominantly Socialized Substages

Participants representing this group demonstrated a level of consciousness at stages 3 or 3(4) at the start of the course. These individuals demonstrated developmental growth of one substage to 3(4) and 3/4, respectively. This transition indicates movement away from a fully socialized LoC towards a more expansive self-authorizing LoC.

One's sense of self at the fully stage 3 LoC is solidly composed of the perspectives of others or those one feels affiliated with. One is unaware that they depend on these external perspectives to determine who they are and what they stand for. At the 3(4) LoC one can begin to see and observe how they do indeed outsource their meaning making system and rely on affiliations and their external opinions and perspective for guidance.

At the completion of the course participants representing this group described seeing for the first time or seeing even more clearly how the way they make sense of the world is limiting and inadequate. The following examples demonstrate how participants who transitioned from 3(4) → 3/4 can reflect on and observe the limits of their LoC:

I think in the past I would have just been worried that people would have a negative opinion of me. . . . Previously, I was much more concerned about what people thought of me. (Participant X)

Historically, I think even when they didn't say anything, if I imagined that they were upset about it; I'd be wavering the whole time—maybe I should go see them, I think they're really upset at me for not doing this. . . . Then I'm just like I'm allowed to have my own preferences. Whereas in the past nothing was more unbearable to me than thinking that someone was mad at me or didn't like me in some way. (Participant X)

Distinctions in learning between the two substages represented in this group could not be made. Participants representing 3 → 3(4) or 3(4) → 3/4 transitions reported similar and indistinguishable learning experiences. These participants described observing the

limitations of their meaning making at two levels: (a) how they respond or react to situations and others and (b) in their distinction between themselves and others or between themselves and a greater systemic dynamic.

Observing the self's responses. The left-hand column of Table 1.3 features exemplary quotes demonstrating how participants observed their own growth edge, default reactions, and emotional reactions.

Table 1.3

Dominant Socialized LoC Learning Themes (Exercising Leadership): Exemplary Quotes on Observing the Limitations of One's Meaning Making System

<i>Observing the self's responses</i>	<i>Distinguishing between self and system</i>
<p>Observing growth edge “For me it’s very helpful not to personalize problems because I used to do that very much—very often. It’s not helpful at all. . . . I didn’t know to ask better questions before. I was always focusing on the personal side, or the motives or the intentions.”</p> <p>“[intervening in class] made me less afraid of the things that I felt embarrassed about.”</p> <p>“Traditionally, I have not had a stomach for conflict or disequilibrium.”</p> <p>Observing default reactions “I would feel a range, I was so angry sometimes, I got irrationally angry at people because they said a stupid comment, like why would you say such a stupid thing. What is wrong with <i>me</i> (emphasis from recording)? I’m not that person, but I was just irrationally angry.”</p> <p>“I felt pretty consistently during the [course] frustration. I was so frustrated we just couldn’t seemingly get where we needed to be in order to learn. . . . You would think that it would spur me to sort of find the right answers and I did, I was looking for the right answers, but mostly I just wanted it to stop.”</p> <p>Observing emotional reactions “I shut down a lot of my emotions during the [course]. . . . Which I think is what I do in a lot of situations I guess. I just kind of pull back which was a lesson itself.”</p>	<p>Distinguishing between self & system “That’s definitely a result at least in part to [the] class—not taking things personally and knowing that some people are going to react positively or some people can act negatively . . . setting some boundaries and being a little more independent.”</p> <p>“At one point I shared my view and three people yelled back at me and I was able to be like, “All right.” Everyone is disagreeing with everyone; there will always be people who agree and people who disagree. You can’t please everyone. I was able to be a little more positive about it.”</p> <p>“I can understand that [someone else’s] decision making process has much less to do with me and much more to do with all of these things that are outside of my control.”</p> <p>“[I can be more} analytical, more confident and/or decisive because I’m not trying to figure out myself in relations to other people in the same way, in the same emotionally charged way.”</p> <p>Emotions are data / clues about others “I don’t think I would have been able to, on my own, answer the question of why the hell are you still anxious without being very comfortable being confused and asking questions about it instead of running away from it.”</p> <p>“Using my emotions as data was a huge piece of that because I have a lot of emotions and would. . . . I was very good at psychoanalysis instead of systems analysis. I think I still try and psycho-analyze people, but I’m a little better on the [systems] side of the spectrum than that.”</p>

Observing growth edge. Participants described observing for the first time, or confirming earlier observations about, their growth edge. The 3(4) LoC is one in which the self can begin to observe the limitations of a fully socialized LoC. Metaphorically speaking, the 3/4 LoC is one in which the socialized software overrides any of the present self-authorizing code, regardless of one's desire to be more self-authorizing. Participants observed the growth edge of their 3 or 3(4) LoC when contemplating an expected or desired behavior generated an internal conflict or awareness. For example, one may realize how his or her preoccupation with what others think of them prevents them from participating or one may become aware of how they are made less nervous by conflict, but still find it challenging to participate in a contentious discussion.

Observing default reactions. Participants in this group also describe observing and criticizing their default reactions. Participants observed how these behaviors were neither helpful nor desirable, yet dominated their experience and behavior.

Observing emotional reactions. Participants in this group also observed their internal emotional world. These participants describe observing two things, the situations in which their emotions are activated, and their inclination to suppress and ignore those emotions. The developmental achievement of observing default reactions and emotions and how they are generated or influenced by one's context, group, or situation is in not being completely subject to these reactions and emotions.

Distinguishing between self and system. The right-hand column of Table 1.3 features exemplary quotes demonstrating how participants began distinguishing their self from systemic forces or others and began to read their own emotions as data, or clues about others.

Distinguishing between self and system. Participants described observing for the first time, or confirming earlier distinctions between their self and others or a system of others. The 3(4) LoC is one in which the self can begin to observe a distinction between itself and others. These participants observed the influence of other's thoughts and behaviors on their own thoughts and behaviors. The fully socialized LoC is entirely subject to the thoughts and behaviors of others as their sense of self is externally sourced. Observing this influence is the first step to distinguishing one's self from his or her surroundings and observing how one would like to or would behave and contribute differently despite his or her preoccupation with conformity.

Emotions are data and clues about others. Participants in this group also report reading their emotions as data about others. Instead of being subject to emotions and allowing them to define their selves, these participants also distinguish between themselves and the system in which they are located by learning to read their internal world as activated or generated by their external world.

Instructional practices. The learning in the course that participants referenced as most important was correlated to data demonstrating developmental growth. However, distinct connections between specific instructional practices and these developmental transitions could not be made as students credited a range of instructional practices with the learning captured in these interviews. Practices that push a dominantly socialized LoC to observe the limits of its meaning making create conditions that render that LoC insufficient for accomplishing course tasks. Students encounter conflict as they strive to create direction and order and complete tasks. Participants representing a 3 and 3(4) LoC would continually search for orientation outside of themselves as result. These practices

align with the theory on what promotes development, where demands of the course exceed the capacity of the 3 and 3(4) LoC (Loevinger, 1976). Participants experience and observe a “disorienting dilemma” (Mezirow, 1995, p. 50) where their reactions and behaviors are in conflict with course expectations. The instructor intentionally violates expectations of dominant socialized LoCs when he fails to exercise his authority in a predictable way, e.g., provide a lecture, call on students with raised hands, respond to questions with clear answers.

Reflective writing exercises and case-in-point observations provide supports where these participants can reflect on what makes this environment challenging for them and provides a way for them to begin to observe and criticize the limitations of their LoC. Brookfield (1995) emphasizes the importance of consistent critical reflection to developmental growth.

Evidence of the course’s interpretive framework was found in all reported learning. Opportunities for experimentation and reflection in the course are always framed by the course’s interpretive framework. At these dominantly socialized stages, this framework provides a horizon to strive for and “handholds” for climbing towards that horizon by providing tools and concepts for developing a new psychological construction of reality. Concepts from the adaptive leadership framework provide these interpretive “handholds” for understanding the classroom experience: stomaching disequilibrium, depersonalization, using emotions as data. “Holding steady” is a concept that provides participants at this stage with a way to objectify their reactive behavior. The “balcony/dance floor” distinction provides a conceptual tool for observing when and how one is swept up by external demands and expectations.

Implications for Authority Roles and the Exercise of Leadership

Positions of authority, or the exercise of leadership, can be challenging for individuals at a 3 or 3(4) LoC as one is likely to be concerned with how their decisions will be perceived and image management can trump the most beneficial possible outcome (Kegan, 1994; Kegan & Lahey, 2001). The socialized order of mind is not necessarily a pushover. Leaders at this level can indeed hold a firm position and confidently make decisions despite differences. However, they cannot easily call those beliefs into question, their sense of judgment suffers if they are uncertain about how their external source of authority would make sense of a new situation, and competing expectations from equally valued external sources can be destabilizing. Preoccupied with external sources of validation, it can be challenging to hold a position of authority where one is expected to manage competing opinions and agendas or exercise leadership, which often requires confronting people with a difficult reality (Heifetz, 1994).

Developmental Growth Experience From Dominantly Socialized to Self-Authorized Substages

Participants representing this group demonstrated a dominant socialized LoC of 3/4 at Time 1 and demonstrated one substage of growth to 4/3 at Time 2. This transition marks a shift from a mostly socialized LoC to a mostly self-authorizing LoC. I describe the 3/4 LoC as a combination of at least 51% socialized and 49% self-authorizing. These participants describe a shift in this balance where they are at least 51% self-authorizing at posttest.

Participants entering the course at this level already see how they are limiting themselves, but curb their engagement of those limitations. At the conclusion of the

course these participants described engaging the frontier of their meaning making and transitioning from being vulnerable to group dynamics to a more self-authorizing way of being:

I'm feeling less of an impulse to force myself into situations that meet certain criteria. So in other words I don't feel the impulse [to jump].

I think it plucked my strings, using the language of the course, and I should not let this kind of emotion control and dominate me because actually [the emotions] don't reflect reality.

Participants representing 3/4 LoC at pretest went beyond observing the limits of their LoC, a capacity they already had upon beginning the course, and engaged the frontier of their meaning making by more deliberately acting on, experimenting with, and behaving in accordance with a self-authorized LoC.

Tuning Into One's Self

Participants describe tuning into their selves, by tuning into their own purpose, setting limits for themselves, observing the limits of their created reality, using their emotions as data and slowing down their reactions and responses. The left-hand column of Table 1.4 offers exemplarily quotes representing these themes.

Table 1.4

*Dominant Socialized LoC to Dominant Self-Authorized LoC Learning Themes
(Exercising Leadership): Exemplary Quotes on Engaging Frontier of One's Meaning
Making System*

<i>Tuning into one's self</i>	<i>Distance self from system and others</i>
<p>Tune into desire / purpose & Set limits for self “I think what I became more comfortable with in [the course] is that I have this burden of optimization. As soon as I got to [grad school] I must figure out, how to do the most total social good in the world. . . . And realizing that I think I have had this sense of obligation or burden that I must use my life to do the most possible good things, which is a great sentiment, but . . .”</p> <p>See limits of created reality “I was always in the silent faction. I wouldn't talk because I was thinking that if I need to speak up it has to be something perfect. I cannot just speak up for the sake of speaking up. I'm thinking of everybody [in the class] and that put some pressures on me.”</p> <p>Emotions are data “The problem is when the topic is something that touches you, something that you are involved with, how to make a step back, take a perspective and say, “Okay, my thoughts should not be dominated by emotional reactions.”</p> <p>Slow down reactions / responses “This is not functional, this doesn't help. This is not going to solve anything, it's just going to make me perform worse. I'm not going to deal with a misunderstanding by being angry. I'm just going to react in a way that may not be productive. It's better to take some perspective, understand the situation and take an action that helps you to move the system from point A to point B.”</p> <p>“I've become more rational somehow. I was more on the emotional side and I think I didn't take a leadership stance yet. But I changed somehow. My outlook is different—the way I look at things, the way I rationalize.”</p>	<p>Depersonalize “Some of the feedback that I got from [the course] was that my interventions were very personal in the context of the class.”</p> <p>“Not taking things personally is really important to me, There is some shift there. The thing about seeing how your interventions are taken or not taken was a big thing—the depersonalizing.”</p> <p>Distance from others “One thing that I got out of the class, was something about how to view other people and another level of awareness of my reactions to other people.”</p> <p>Increased empathy “I noticed that I am very sensitive to when white men and South Asian men speak because of the assertive nature of how they say thing and my tendency was always to be no really listen to what they had to say. I was caught up in this ‘aggressive male’ or ‘symbol of colonial power’ thing. I wasn't interested in that this person actually has something valuable to contribute. I really should listen. I sort of heard my own voices in my head rather than what they had to say.”</p> <p>“I realized that this person was also dealing with a vulnerability or tension. It basically made them more human and less in the role that I had put them [in].”</p> <p>“Balcony” analysis & Seeing the system “It helped me step out and look at things a lot more intellectually and be able to work through the organization and their dynamics, and understand better what was going on and what would go on. Just be a little clear about thinking that through, like not see them as individual personalities but more see how the whole was coming together and make a choice based on that.”</p> <p>Increased tolerance for ambiguity “It links back to not being very tolerant of situations where I don't feel comfortable or I don't know what I'm building. Trying to build tolerance with those situations Rather than just saying I don't want to be in that situation or with that person. Just trying to see why is that and what am I reacting to. I think that is something useful.”</p>

Emotions are data. Rather than observing their emotional reactions, participants in this group described responding to their emotions and using them as a source of data to understand how their surroundings are influencing their internal world. By engaging with their emotions in this way, participants were able to slow down their reactions and responses.

Slow down reactions/responses. More than observing how their reactions and responses are undesirable, participants who transitioned to a dominant self-authorizing LoC report being able to react and respond in a way they have come to know as more useful and preferable. These participants are now less vulnerable to their reactions and more able to deliberately drive their responses.

Distance From System and Other

By system, I mean the collective momentum of group and authority dynamics generated in classroom. Participants describe distancing themselves from the system and others by depersonalizing, creating a psychological distance away from others they find liberating, increasing their empathy, analyzing the system they are located in, and developing an increased tolerance for ambiguity. The right-hand column of Table 1.4 offers exemplar quotes representing these themes.

Depersonalize. Participants representing the group that transitioned from 3/4 → 4/3 described depersonalizing on two levels. Blaming others less for undesirable outcomes and taking less personally comments directed towards themselves. Both behaviors are aligned with a 4/3 LoC whose construction of reality is less influenced by their external world and more influenced by their own meaning making.

Distance from others. Depersonalizing interpersonal dynamics is made possible by distancing oneself from others. By tuning into oneself, one emphasizes his or her own expectations for their self over externally sourced expectations.

Increased empathy. Depersonalizing and distancing allows one –less preoccupied with how he or she is perceived or their limited construction of reality—to observe, see, listen and empathize with or for others. Having mostly dis-embedded itself from its preoccupations and surroundings, the 4/3 LoC can more objectively interpret the behavior of others.

“Balcony” analysis and seeing the system. Mostly dis-embedded and mostly internally oriented, the 4/3 LoC is able to observe the systemic dynamics it was once subject to. Participants representing this LoC, more able to depersonalize, are newly able “to see the forest for the trees.”

Increased tolerance for ambiguity. Having developed a more internally located sense of self, less dependent on its surroundings for orientation and guidance, the 4/3 LoC has a greater tolerance for ambiguity. Mostly dis-embedded from their surroundings, participants report being less vulnerable to the conflicting perspectives, confusion and ambiguity of their tasks as their internally constructed interpretation of reality is more reliable.

Instructional Practices

Again, participants from this group did report learning that aligns with the developmental transition they demonstrate from Time 1 to Time 2; however, connections between specific instructional practices and these developmental transitions could not be

made, as students credited a range of instructional practices with the learning captured in these interviews.

Challenging class sessions and ambiguous authority dynamics reinforce what the 3/4 LoC is already aware of—externally sourcing its meaning making system serves as an insufficient strategy for navigating uncertainty or completing course tasks. Participants representing a 3/4 LoC transition from a mostly socialized mindset to a new mostly self-authorizing 4/3 LoC when course conditions demand the emergence of self-authorizing capacities they knew were more desirable, but did not regularly deploy. Theory that illuminates the interaction between LoC and the course for the dominantly socialized experience also shows that interaction for participants demonstrating a 3/4 → 4/3 shift. However, since participants entering the course at a 3/4 LoC can already observe the frontier of their meaning making at Time 1, they engage the frontier of their meaning making system rather than simply observe it.

The demands of the course also exceed the capacity of the 3/4 LoC (Loevinger, 1976) and interpersonal large and small group tasks also pose disorienting dilemmas (Mezirow, 1995) for the 3/4 LoC, which struggles to know how to proceed amidst ambiguity. Despite this, entering the course at a 3/4 LoC allows for a more expansive consciousness upon which that LoC is able to critically reflect (Brookfield, 1995). The handholds offered by the interpretive, adaptive leadership framework (Heifetz, 1994) throughout the course experience provide the 3/4 LoC with behavioral alternatives to internal conflict. Thus, the 3/4 LoC can engage the limits of its meaning making with self-authorizing habits of mind and behaviors such as depersonalizing the behaviors of others and interpreting and managing one's own reactions.

Evidence of the course's interpretive framework is found in all reported learning. However, while those concepts do not evolve, participant understanding and use of them does. At this developmental transition the framework provides behavioral options for engaging the frontier of one's meaning making.

Implications for Authority Roles and Exercising Leadership

The 3/4 → 4/3 transition is a pivotal one in terms of leadership development. Individuals inhabiting a 4/3 LoC who are in authority positions or attempting to exercise leadership are more able to manage ambiguity. They can more easily reference their values and purpose before acting. Able to dis-embed themselves from the system in which they operate, this LoC is more likely than the dominant socialized LoC to do what it thinks is best versus being more inclined to serve external demands and expectations. However, individuals inhabiting a 4/3 LoC are still quite vulnerable to their context as the self-authorizing capacity is new and their construction of reality still features multiple socialized constructs.

Compensatory Informational Learning for the Fully Self-Authorized Developmental Stage

Participants representing a fully self-authorizing LoC did not demonstrate developmental growth, but reported as many incidents of internally and externally focused learning from the course as participants from other groups. The learning reported by participants at a dominant self-authorizing LoC is interesting as it compensates for the limitations of a dominant or fully self-authorizing LoC. While the evolution of preoccupations is evident in other groups in this sample, the preoccupations of this group do not evolve. However, their awareness of their preoccupations does indeed grow horizontally, not vertically.

Growth toward a self-authorizing LoC is a desirable outcome of leader-development interventions. The elusiveness and low percentage of Kegan's fifth self-transforming stage of development, and limited knowledge on how to promote such postconventional stages (Baron & Cayer, 2011) makes self-authorship an important goal for leadership development. Approximately only 20% of adults achieve a self-authorizing LoC and only 1% achieve a self-transforming LoC (Kegan, 1994).² Kuhnert and Lewis (1987) associate Kegan's third socialized stage of development with transactional leadership, a reciprocal exchange between superiors and dependents, and associate a self-authorizing LoC with a more evolved transformational leadership because one is free from the mutual dependency of transaction and able to draw direction and purpose from their values and perspectives. Thus, those authors see Kegan's fourth stage of development as an important developmental achievement for leadership development.

However, the strengths of self-authorship are not without their weaknesses. Leaders representing this level of consciousness can be wedded to their perspective and dismissive of alternative perspectives. Others can experience the self-authorizing LoC as stubborn, brazen, bullish, frustrating or inattentive in its pursuit to achieve its vision. The self-authorizing mind uses new opinions or perspectives that it encounters to fuel its own arguments or beliefs—which it has come to know as correct. Stage 5, the self-transforming mind, evolves beyond this epistemology by reevaluating current perspectives and considering new perspectives or beliefs as opportunities to revamp, expand, or improve upon its way of knowing.

² These figures may not be representative of the greater population as the academic settings from which these data are sourced may be over represented by higher developmental stages.

Participants entering the course at a dominant or fully self-authorizing LoC demonstrate no developmental growth as measured by the SOI at Time 2. Piaget (1948) described this difference as assimilation and accommodation to distinguish between new information that can be easily imported and new information that requires one to reevaluate what they know. However, I find that the informational learning described here is more than just assimilated information, in the Piagetian sense (1948). The learning these participants describe uniquely compensates for the limits of the self-authorizing LoC. Mezirow distinguishes between transformational and informational learning by distinguishing between learning that transforms how one makes meaning and learning that adds to what one can already see (1991).

These participants “expand”—or make more useful—their current meaning making system by learning strategies that compensate for its limits. Hypothetically, this helps leaders at this stage be less frustrating to others and more effective by virtue of being more aware of others, and thus more political in their interventions. Participants in this group describe learning the importance of managing their behavior and their impact on others at both interpersonal and systemic levels. They also describe the importance of greater systemic awareness. For example,

I learned to let go of things. . . . I used to micromanage everything. So that’s a big change.

I realized that I had a mindset and when things didn’t fit into that mindset neatly, I would be annoyed . . . but it was my M.O. that I was putting on people. That’s when I realized maybe I have an issue because all the people are fine and it’s me that’s not fine with it.

These fully self-authorized participants describe compensating for behaviors that limit their capacity, and behaviors that limit the effectiveness of their interaction with others.

Compensating for the Self

The left-hand column of Table 1.5 features an example of how the self-authorizing LoC learned to be more patient, listen and connect to his or her emotions.

Be patient / listen. Participants inhabiting Kegan's fourth LoC describe being patient and listening in situations in which they would normally intervene more quickly. Often eager to advance its agenda and purpose, this patience and listening serves as a compensatory strategy that makes room for learning and understanding when this LoC might be prone to intervening and advocating for its perspective.

Connect to emotion. Increased capacity for patience and listening is rooted in an increased awareness of one's emotional world. These participants describe using their emotions as data about what is triggering them to react.

Compensating Systemically and With Others

The right-hand column of Table 1.5 features examples of how the self-authorized LoC learned to monitor others and their system, manage and consider their impact, decrease their crusade and think politically or inclusively.

Monitor others and system. Participants in this group describe observing and reading the behavior of others more than they usually would.

Manage and consider impact. These participants describe paying more attention to their impact on others. They do this in class with their peers and, in retrospect, in reference to the leadership failure case they bring to their peers for analysis. This increased awareness of their impact compensates for the self-authorizing LoC's tendency to promote its perspective regardless of how others might receive it.

Table 1.5

Self-Authorized Learning Themes (Exercising Leadership): Exemplary Quotes on Expansion of Meaning Making and Compensational Learning

<i>Compensating for the self</i>	<i>Compensating systemically and with others</i>
<p>Be patient / listen</p> <p>“I’ve lost a little bit of spontaneity. . . . [I’ve] been very aware of what’s going on around [me]. I feel that in my relationships with others I’m observing a bit more as opposed to being in the game, I’m going a bit quicker out of it. Observing and coming back as opposed to before when I was speaking and animating more.”</p> <p>“I talked with my former boss and he likes to talk and he said things that I could push back on, but I didn’t do it. I just stayed silent and I kept listening and said to myself, ‘No, I’m not going to push back right now. I think it’s not the moment for it.’”</p> <p>Connect to emotion</p> <p>“I had this urge to lash out and say, ‘Can we move on.’ I just had this urge to lash out and say ‘This is a waste of time.’ And I thought about the last time I lashed out was in this class. It gave me just a split second long enough to sit back and say, ‘OK, so my emotions are telling me something about this room. What are they telling me? That I’m impatient. They’re telling me we’re not actually being productive. So what are we trying to accomplish? Here’s the task we’re supposed to be accomplishing that we’ve gone way fra away from. So how can I get us back to that work?’ Instead of lashing out and saying, you guys are missing the point, or being negative, I had just enough time to stop myself and then say, ‘I have a feeling, because I’m impatient, that I’m not sure what we’re doing right now and I’m wondering if we’re missing the work that we’re supposed to doing.’”</p> <p>“The connections were so vividly clear. My emotional triggers were in the way of the work I did [passing that bill] and those emotional triggers ended up causing me to be blind to what I was actually doing and causing me to actually fail what I was doing.”</p> <p>“My anxiety is super high. And I literally found myself saying, ‘OK I am anxious. My stomach is churning. What is that telling me?’ It’s telling me I have a hundred things to do, and I don’t know what</p>	<p>Monitor others / system</p> <p>“I analyze the behavior of people. This person is really on the dance floor—he could step back a bit.”</p> <p>Manage / consider impact</p> <p>“I reflect and say I shouldn’t have said that. I could be more soft on this or more humble on this.”</p> <p>“How could [my words] be received by this person? I’m thinking about what’s his situation and how will he receive that information”</p> <p>“What I [wrote here] for ‘change’ was hopefully pulling up the ability to pause or slow down before I react out of whatever my reactions are telling me to do.”</p> <p>“But now when I look at it, I see this loss—they were scared that they would be next on the investigation because they had [insufficient reporting] and they were also angry because they’d lost face. I had done 10 years of service and I was reporting someone who had done 25 years of service and I was putting people behind bards who had done 15 and 27 years of service, but I was not reporting to them—so I can understand that loss in terms of loss of face.”</p> <p>Decrease crusade</p> <p>“If I challenge that and I’m putting them in a really bad situation, what are they going to do—lash out or whatever? I’ve already started to think about how they have nothing to gain—they can only lose by me pushing back hard on this . . . that would open a black box.”</p> <p>“I learned to let go of things. . . . I used to micromanage everything. So that’s a big change”</p> <p>“I realized that I had a mindset and when things didn’t fit into that mindset neatly, I would be annoyed . . . but it was my MO that I was putting on people. That’s when I realized maybe I have an issue because all the people are fine and it’s me that not fine with it.”</p> <p>Think politically / inclusively</p>

<i>Compensating for the self</i>	<i>Compensating systemically and with others</i>
<p>I'm doing or I don't know who is assigned to them yet... So trying to use that emotional, physical reactions as data... Because I always thought of my emotions are just sort of this primitive relic of being a primate that you have to ignore." [Laughter].</p> <p>"Seeing your emotional reactions to things as a data point, and to think about my emotional reaction to the fear. That's data that I don't have everything I need in place to do it right, that I would need to adapt in certain ways."</p>	<p>"I think it could be helpful because he can perceive me as a person that he can tell things to, so in the end I can as well do what I wanted to do."</p> <p>"What I actually was trying to say was, this conversation is not very inclusive of a faction in this room. And can we figure out a way around the conversation? Or can I bring in a different perspective? That would have been an effective intervention. But instead my chord was plucked, and I reacted. And I was so angry at him, so that is why I lashed out at him, but then I was angry at myself for not getting on the balcony and figuring out how to be [less reactive]."</p>

Decrease crusade. The ability to manage one's impact allows participants at this stage to decrease crusading tendencies. Driven by what it has determined to be right, correct and just, the self-authorizing LoC can find itself on a crusade for what it believes to be right, unwittingly sabotaging its own goals.

Think politically and inclusively. By decreasing their crusade, these self-authorizing participants are more able to think politically, in service of their purpose and agenda, and consider the power of more inclusive politics over the exclusion that a crusade can generate.

This compensational learning is less easily split by an internal or external focus, but that framing does illuminate how participants compensated for the limitations of their LoC and the way they think about their challenges, interactions and interventions. Whereas a stage 5 LoC listens to learn how it might transform its thinking, these stage 4 LoCs describe listening, instead of inserting their perspective, as important for understanding the situation they are in and maintaining useful relationships. These participants connect to emotion for similar reasons—not to revise or update the way they see a situation, but to see how their emotions are overriding their potential to intervene thoughtfully, effectively or productively. The self-authorizing LoC is preoccupied with what it believes is correct or most effective. These dominantly self-authorizing participants do not reevaluate their “product” but do pay more attention to “process” if that will help them achieve their outcome. These participants assimilate practices that allow them to monitor others, manage their impact, decrease their crusade and think more politically and inclusively. These practices compensate for tendencies at this stage by tempering those characteristics that get in its own way.

Instructional Practices

As with all groups of participants in this study, direct connections between this compensational learning and specific instructional practices could not be made as participants credited a range of instructional practices with their learning in the course. I hypothesize that the demands of the course experience do not exceed the capacity of the self-authorizing LoC (Loevinger, 1976), nor do they provide a dilemma disorienting enough (Mezirow, 1995) to warrant a developmental upgrade. However, the course has all the features theory suggests would spur development: long-term immersion featuring personally relevant, complex, and interdependent challenges with multiple stakeholders and perspectives (Bartunek et al, 1983) combined with multiple learning environments, student experiences, and consistent opportunities for reflection (Kolb & Fry, 1975; Brookfield, 1995).

The course is challenging enough for the fully self-authorizing LoC that it considers alternatives to normal operating procedure, but not challenging enough that it must recognize the limitations of its operating system. The adaptive leadership framework provides alternative options that compensate for behaviors common to self-authorship. These concepts and skills can be accessed and assimilated by a stage 4 LoC without requiring it to begin transitioning into the next stage of development. The outcome is a self-authorizing LoC less prone to crusading and promoting its agenda at the cost of that agenda, and more able to manage its impact, and think politically and inclusively.

The course's interpretive framework is the major source of knowledge that informs reported compensational learning. For dominantly socialized LoCs, the concept

of “holding steady” serves primarily as an observational tool that helps one observe their behavior and also provides an alternative to otherwise default behaviors. For the self-authorizing LoC, the same concept provides a useful strategy that can be assimilated by that structure. “Compensation” then is a downloadable app that makes the whole operating system more powerful without requiring an upgrade to that operating system. At socialized stages, the concept of connecting to emotion serves mostly as a tool for observing how one is affected by their situation. At self-authorizing stages connecting to emotion is also a strategy for collecting more data about a situation.

Implications for Positions of Authority and Exercising Leadership

The implications of this compensational learning for self-authorizing LoCs in positions of authority or exercising leadership are significant. Kuhnert and Lewis’s claim that the “hallmark of stage 4 leaders is their capacity to take a perspective on interpersonal relationships and to achieve a self-determined sense of identity,” resolve conflict based on internal standards, act on values despite loyalties, “convert followers to their way of thinking,” and “motivate followers to accept and accomplish difficult goals that followers would normally not pursue” (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987, p. 653). However, these authors advocate for self-authorship without asking “At what expense?” The compensational learning demonstrated here reduces the possible costs. Those who strive to develop leadership capacity are right to want to promote developmental growth among dominantly or slightly socialized LoCs in an effort to help those individuals achieve full potential and efficacy. But those who strive to develop those inhabiting a self-authorizing LoC should consider the compensational learning that can boost efficacy at that level. Such learning can make for a more patient, attentive, political, and inclusive operator able

to manage their impact on their work. This well-rounded stage 4 LoC may even be preferable to a more evolved stage 5 LoC, who may lose important constituents or reevaluate an otherwise important goal all together.

Development at Self-Authorship

Not only is very little understood about how different LoCs respond to or interact with different leader interventions (Bushe, 1990; Manners et al., 2004; Pfaffenberger, 2005), there are no empirical findings on practices that promote postconventional development beyond self-authorship (Baron & Cayer, 2011). A ceiling effect in the course design or pedagogy may explain the static experience of dominantly 4 LoCs in this study. These participants demonstrate compensational learning in lieu of transformational learning because the course experience does not exceed the capacity of the self-authorizing LoC and require it to at least observe the limitations of its meaning making. Growth beyond the dominantly self-authorizing LoC may be impossible without a self-transforming LoC to serve as a model. There are few models of self-transforming LoCs to serve as mentors to self-authorizing leaders (Kegan, 1994). Despite theoretical arguments for more self-transforming or postmodern LoCs – organizations embedded in our modern world may not require, or know they require, this perspective. They may not appreciate, or even come to resent a self-transforming perspective which can honor multiple interpretations of a challenge and hesitate to provide the direction constituents of lower LoCs crave—direction and clarity that a self-authorizing LoC is primed to offer.

Developmentalists note that learning and development are an intertwined and interdependent process. Developmental growth is impossible without knowledge and learning. Fischer and Bidell's (1998) dynamic skill theory offers a more fine-grained

measurement of skill development that is more nuanced than Kegan's large-grain ego-development. The compensational learning identified in this sample's self-authorizing participants could represent one subset of developing skills that add up to measurable growth in LoC. Dawson (2011) demonstrates how development within discrete knowledge streams can be measured in relation to structural stage development. More must be done to examine the role compensational learning plays in the discrete knowledge streams required for growth into a self-transforming LoC.

Self-Authorized to Self-Transformational Developmental Experiences

Two participants did demonstrate development growth one substage beyond the fully self-authorizing stage from 4 → 4(5). A sample too small to draw many inferences from, learning themes from these transcripts are consistent with the experience of those who transition from 3 → 3(4) in that they do indeed describe observing, or seeing for the first time, the limitations of their way of making meaning. They lament oversights in their own thinking and connect to the power of systemic forces while observing the vulnerability of the other.

I can't just fall into the same old way of doing business. I've got to stop and I got to react differently. I need to think differently. I got to get whatever information I need to get differently.

Observing Limits, Gaps, and Oversights in Sense Making

Quotes in the left-hand column of Table 1.6 reveal how participants representing a 4(5) LoC at Time 2 describe recognizing that they have simplified situations to accommodate their understanding. They prescribed their own narrow frame to what now appear to them to be very complicated and nuanced scenarios. These participants

simultaneously lament losing the ease and comfort of this former way of seeing and hypothesize that understanding these limits offers new potential for making progress.

Table 1.6

Self-Authorized to Self-Transformational Learning Themes (Exercising Leadership): Exemplary Quotes on Observing the Limitations of One's Meaning Making System

<i>Observe limits, gaps and oversights in sense making</i>	<i>Appreciation of superordinate systemic forces</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “There are losses, because I think it’s much harder to look at people and think that they have something valid to say and to consider it as valid as opposed to just dismiss it. So your world gets bigger which is good, but it’s also I think harder, because you have to take a lot of other things into account. So one of the losses is just that it does sort of complicate things. Not that it complicates things in a bad way, but it does complicate things, because it’s just not so easy to write people off and be so sure you are right.” ▪ “I feel that I have a much better chance at actually trying to tackle some of the things I want to tackle. Whereas before I just looked at things through a very narrow box and I thought that the only way that you can change something is to trick people and to do this and to do that. So I guess what has changed most in me is that I think it kind of comes to hope, which sounds so trite, but really that maybe there is a chance that if I’m more hopeful that things can change because they should be in this value as opposed to being able to do it just by falsely convincing people of something.” ▪ “I thought I knew how the world worked and how people operated. I thought I knew a lot. This has been a humbling experience. I’m talking about the class. I don’t know a lot. . . . after taking this class I can think of things a little more in the context of there being a lot more going on than just me and what I can see—that there is more happening as far as the mindsets that people bring to the table. I’m more considerate of that.” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “What aspect [of the course] did I find most valuable? Being in the big group and realizing that we can make progress without consensus. I think realizing that you were never going to have consensus. That not everybody was going to agree on exactly what do to, but that even despite that the group could still make progress.” ▪ “I’m still used to doing things my way where I can compel it towards working out. Where I can stay in complete control. It’s not only that I’ve seen a better way to view problems—it’s that in addition to that I need to work on things that indirectly help the problem. It’s not so much about do this, this, and this. But how can I assist this person—say the right thing to this person and then not even try to control everything, but create an environment where the right solution is organically espoused. That’s not easy.” ▪ “Just realizing that this view of black and white and good and bad and I’m better than other people or smarter than other people is just wrong. Because actually they believe everything that we believe and their espoused values are really exactly at the highest level of exactly what ours are.”

Appreciation of Superordinate Systemic Forces

Participants in this group also express an appreciation for what is common among individuals despite differences and that those differences do not need to be reconciled to make progress. Quotes in the right-hand column of Table 1.6 serve as examples of this observation.

The two participants representing a fully dominant self-authorizing LoC at the start of the course and demonstrated one substage of growth to a 4(5) LoC, observe the limitations of their meaning making system and develop an appreciation for a more expansive meaning making system. However, they do not fully inhabit a stage 5 LoC, nor are they necessarily aware of its existence and potential for them. These participants can only criticize the self-authorizing LoC they inhabit.

Instructional Practices

Like all other participants in this study, these two participants also credit a range of instructional practices to their learning, however both of these participants describe large group sessions as the most valuable aspect of the course for their learning. I hypothesize that, of all the instructional practices employed by the course, the large group case-in-point sessions offer the greatest likelihood of serving as a context more demanding than the self-authorizing LoC (Loevinger, 1976) and is disorienting enough to pose a dilemma that generates and warrants a critical examination of the limitations of that LoC. The large group case-in-point sessions is where course instructors have the opportunity to expose limited systemic understanding, illuminate possible unconscious group forces, and call attention to the ways one might contribute to the problems they hope to resolve. A self-authorizing LoC committed to its perspective may find these

observations persistent enough to reveal gaps in their own thinking and honor the power of superordinate systemic forces.

As with participants transitioning from full 3 → 3(4), the same interpretive framework provides concepts for observing the limits of one's meaning making framework while providing insight into dynamics one must be able to consider to exercise leadership effectively.

Implications for Positions of Authority and Exercising Leadership

A glimmer of self-transformation offers considerable leverage to an otherwise fully dominant self-authorizing LoC. The 4(5) LoC is more likely to criticize its choices and at least recognize that its perspective may be limited. The 4(5) LoC is also more able to consider that larger superordinate and systemic forces influence all behavior in their system, maybe even their own, and are thus more able to consider systemic influences over dynamics of personalizing and scapegoating.

Also evident in data from this pair is an emphasis on process and progress over a specific agenda. For instance, regarding managerial control, one participant states, “then not even try to control everything, but create an environment where the right solution is organically espoused.” Additionally, data from this pair illuminate why development beyond self-authorship is an important pursuit. The following quote illuminates the transformational quality or breadth of observation found beyond the self-authorizing LoC, “after taking this class I can think of things a little more in the context of there being a lot more going on than just me and what I can see—that there is more happening as far as the mindsets that people bring to the table. I’m more considerate of that.”

Discussion

I set out to explore how different stages of development, abbreviated here as levels of consciousness (LoC), measured by the Subject-Object Interview (Lahey et al., 1988) interact with an experiential and constructivist leadership learning course. I discovered that different LoCs do indeed interact with the course differently. Dominantly socialized LoC all grow one substage by Time 2 interviews, but for different reasons depending on their substage at Time 1. Dominantly self-authorizing LoCs do not demonstrate growth, but do demonstrate compensational learning, a kind of horizontal or information learning that uniquely compensates for the limitations of the dominant self-authorizing LoC. The course creates the conditions, or holding environment, for these experiences.

Summary of Findings

Time 1 and Time 2 test results organize participants by demonstrations of developmental growth or stasis. All participants entering the course at a dominantly socialized LoC demonstrated one substage of growth at posttest. Participants representing a 3 and 3(4) LoC at pretest grew to 3(4) and 3/4 respectively by posttest, while those representing a 3/4 LoC transitioned to a dominantly self-authorizing 4/3 LoC. All but two self-authorizing LoCs demonstrated a static developmental experience at posttest. Outliers in that group demonstrated growth from 4 to 4(5) by Time 2.

A content analysis of learning experienced in the course by participants shows trends in how different learning themes are correlated to different developmental experiences. For participants who demonstrated growth, the reported learning from the course reinforces what theory suggests is the necessary learning required for

developmental growth. For participants who demonstrated a static developmental experience, their reported learning from the course reinforces what theory suggests their LoC is capable of assimilating. These distinctions illuminate how the course interacts with different LoCs differently. Dominantly socialized LoCs at 3 and 3(4), which demonstrated growth to 3(4) and 3/4 respectively, shared similar learning themes unique to that group of participants and in alignment with the theory on those specific transitions. This group reported observing the limitations of their LoC, specifically; observing their growth edge and distinguishing themselves from others.

Dominantly socialized participants on the cusp of a dominant self-authorizing LoC demonstrated growth from 3/4 at pretest to 4/3 at posttest and also reported learning themes unique to participants demonstrating that same transition. Those themes also align with theory on that specific transition. Participants that transitioned to a dominant self-authorizing LoC engaged the frontier of their meaning making by tuning into their values and purpose and distancing themselves from others and their system.

Participants entering the course at a fully self-authorizing LoC at pretest did not demonstrate development growth at posttest. However, those participants reported learning that is unique to their group and also compensates for the limitations, described by the theory, of their LoC. I develop the term “compensational learning” to describe a kind of informational learning that compensates for the limitations of an LoC—in this case, the stubbornness or persistent commitment affiliated with the self-authorizing LoC. These participants reported an increased capacity to listen, be patient, manage their impact and think politically and inclusively.

Two participants demonstrated growth beyond a full 4 LoC to 4(5)—exhibiting a glimmer of a self-transformational LoC. This pair also reported learning themes unique to their group that align with the theory on their developmental transition. Participants who transition to 4(5) reported observing the limits and oversights of their LoC and an appreciation for superordinate and systemic forces.

Each group reported a range of instructional practices from the course as important to their learning, however; connections can be made between the tasks and exercises offered by the course to theory on what promotes developmental growth. Each group also reveals evidence to the role the adaptive leadership framework plays in helping people interpret experience, failure, and behavior while also offering cognitive and behavioral options.

Contribution to the Adult Development and Leadership Development Literatures

The findings reported here build on the small stream of research trying to move beyond what to teach in leader-development to how to teach leaders how to learn (Hackman & Wageman, 2007). To advance our knowledge of how to help leaders learn how to learn I use a CDT lens to explore how different stages of development as measured by the SOI (Lahey et al., 1988) interact with an experiential and constructivist leadership learning course. Such a course was chosen because experiential learning has been identified as the powerful source of leader-development (DeRue & Myers, 2014; Kolb, 2015) and constructivist methods put the learners at the center of their own learning (Rogers, 1961), helping students learn for themselves and “own and value their experience” (Kolb & Kolb, 2005, p.207), a process important for understanding more about how to help leaders learn how to learn (Hackman & Wageman, 2007).

Developmental growth. There is no reliable set of research about what works for participants in leader-development interventions based on their developmental level (Pfaffenberger, 2005), and only limited understanding of how a participant's LoC might influence his or her receptiveness to and understanding of leader-development interventions (Bushe, 1990; Manners et al., 2004).

McCallum (2008) and Silver and Josselson (2010) use CDT methods to explore how participants of programs that use here-and-now methods similar to case-in-point make sense of their experience. The interventions in the study are short 2- to 5-day events, the data is not longitudinal, and findings confirm what could be hypothesized from theory—one's LoC does indeed impact how they experience the intervention. My study advances our understanding by showing the different ways different LoCs interact with such an intervention. Participants representing 3 and 3(4) LoC observe the limits of their meaning making and develop one substage to 3(4) and 3/4, respectively, while participants representing a 3/4 LoC engage the limits of their meaning making and develop one substage to a dominantly self-authorizing 4/3 LoC.

These different experiences point to an overlooked variable in the leader-development literature that has implications for the efficacy of an intervention. Participant stage of development is a powerful variable that influences how one experiences and makes sense of an intervention. Developmental stages add a layer to the other variables found to have an impact on leader-development efforts, such as implicit leadership theories beyond life experience (Keller, 2003), cultural background (House, Javidan, Hanges, & Dorfman, 2002), or media influence (Holmberg & Akerblom, 2001).

The developmental growth observed between Time 1 and Time 2 is noteworthy as it adds to our understanding of what can be expected from graduate students enrolled in semester-long courses. However, it is impossible to control for the confounders that the graduate school experience poses for all participants in this study. These results, found over a four-month semester, potentially outpace results of participants in a similar sample over two years who are not known to have participated in a similar intervention. (Kegan, 1994, p. 189). These findings also suggest that a recipe of demands that exceed the capacity of one's LoC (Loevinger, 1976), and pose disorienting dilemmas (Mezirow, 1995), through a long-term immersion program featuring personally relevant and complex interdependent challenges with multiple stakeholders and perspectives (Bartunek, et al., 1983) that are personally salient, disequilibrating, emotionally engaging (Manners & Nesdale, 2000); and multiple learning environments offering a range of experiences and consistent opportunities for reflection (Kolb & Fry, 1975; Brookfield, 1995) interact with dominantly socialized LoC in such a way as to promote either observation or engagement of the limits of that LoC.

Additionally, these findings also show that the recipe for what promotes development at stages 3 to 3/4 may not promote development for dominant self-authorizing stages. In this study, 2 of the 15 dominant self-authorizing participants did demonstrate growth from 4 to 4(5) at posttest. These findings suggest that the course, *Exercising Leadership*, does not offer the right combination of interpersonal, personally salient, emotionally engaging and disequilibrating learning experiences for self-authorizing participants and fails to generate disorienting dilemmas that cannot be resolved through assimilated knowledge and strategies.

Interpretive framework. The leadership literature on what promotes development overlooks the role of interpretation and an interpretive framework. The course, *Exercising Leadership*, is built upon the adaptive leadership framework (Heifetz, 1998; Heifetz & Linsky, 2002; Heifetz, Linsky & Grashow, 2009; Heifetz & Laurie 1998; Heifetz & Laurie, 1999), a framework I describe as useful for interpreting experience and behavior. Evidence of that framework is found throughout students' reported learning. Basseches and Mascolo's (2010) exploration of how psychotherapeutic processes facilitate developmental growth highlight attentional support, interpretation, and enactment as core practices to any therapeutic resource that also serve as core catalysts to developmental growth. *Exercising Leadership* features all three practices: (a) attentional support is provided through a review of each student's leadership failures, peer and instructional staff consultations to those cases, and weekly reflection exercises about one's experience participating in small and large group tasks; (b) the adaptive leadership framework offers interpretation by organizing and explaining experience in terms of leadership work and by offering alternative construals of past and present experience and providing potentially unexplored options for future action; (c) enactment offers practices of immediacy, like case-in-point teaching, spotlights behaviors, dynamics and novel experiences between the instructor and students, teaching team and students, between individual students, factions of students, and among the group-as-a-whole that are generalizable beyond the course experience..

The leadership development literature does not yet address the role of an interpretive framework like the adaptive leadership framework in promoting

developmental growth, nor is the literature specific about the role that attentional support or enactment practices play in leader development.

Compensational learning. These findings add “compensational learning”—learning that uniquely compensates for the limitations of a specific LoC, in this case the self-authorizing level, without promoting development beyond that LoC—to the literature on informational and transformational learning (Mezirow, 1991, 2009). Compensational learning contributes to this literature by describing a kind of informational learning that is, in Piaget’s terms, assimilated by one’s LoC, but also uniquely compensates for the limitations of that LoC. I describe this compensation only at the self-authorizing LoC as it is not observed at the socialized LoC. However, the same course design and interpretive framework that advanced developmental growth among dominantly socialized participants generated compensational learning for dominantly self-authorizing participants. McCauley et al. (2006) identify Kegan’s 3rd, 4th and 5th stages as dependent, independent, and interdependent and find that research focuses mainly on the independent achievement and that the correlation between LoC and leader effectiveness is not watertight. The independent/self-authorizing stage of development is not without its drawbacks, which are encapsulated in the titles themselves. This LoC is subject to prioritizing its own perspective over others, dismissing perspectives that do not fuel its agenda and suffering from tunnel vision and a lack of patience. Compensating for these drawbacks and developing a more effective dominantly self-authorizing LoC offers an important and overlooked alternative to promoting the self-authorizing to self-transforming evolution—an evolution that is rarely observed or empirically understood (Kegan, 1994; McCauley et al., 2006). Social context will always have significant

influence on the socialized/dependent LoC. A more considerate, patient, perspective-taking and -seeking self-authorizing LoC can shape environmental contexts more inclusive of a range of LoCs—hypothetically bringing out and leveraging the best of lower and higher LoCs.

Leadership development. This exploration also makes an important contribution to the distinction between leader and leadership development and supports Day's hypothesis that individual leader development should be an outcome of group or organization leadership development (2000). The findings reported here are outcomes of a leadership process oriented course, not an individual development oriented course. The adaptive leadership framework emphasizes a leadership process that is deliberate about replacing key characters and personalities with a challenge diagnosis and the subsequent actions that need to be orchestrated to make progress on that challenge. While my findings, found through a measurement of ego, add to the emphasis on individual development in the leadership literature (DeRue, 2011; DeRue & Myers, 2014), they are found within the context of an intervention focused on leadership development and the mutual, interdependent processes between multiple actors and factions in service of making progress on important challenges.

The leader-development literature consistently calls for interventions that feature diverse groups and are interpersonal in nature (Bartunek et al, 1983; DeRue & Wellman, 2004; Manners, Durkin & Nesdale, 2004). While the emphasis of this paper is on the interaction between LoC and the course, a fundamental interaction to the outcomes examined here is the interaction between individual LoCs and groups of LoCs. The course generates processes, through challenging and often ambiguous, semistructured

small and large group tasks that require different LoCs, and their different constructions of reality, to work together.

One learns how to learn in *Exercising Leadership* because the challenge of how to resolve or make progress on the tasks of learning from experience and case consultations in unstructured large and small groups among different perspectives fueled by different LoCs renders one's mettle and LoC inadequate. No easy solution can be formulated and one is confronted by the limitations and frontier of their meaning making structure. This challenge is paired with a supportive interpretive framework and a case-in-point pedagogy that offers alternative interpretations for otherwise disorienting dynamics. These practices provide a support for difficult dialectical learning, helping participants see what they were subject to, or consider behaviors and options they would not otherwise consider.

Contribution to Practice

This work makes several contributions to practice. By highlighting the range of LoCs represented in one leadership course and the range of experiences generated by that single intervention, this investigation demonstrates the importance of understanding the LoC of our students at the start of leader-development courses. Such an understanding may generate insight into how to differentiate and meet each represented LoC and inform the appropriate bridge building.

Leader-development interventions concerned with one's ability to effectively manage a position of authority, or exercise leadership from any position, should strive to transition the 3 and 3(4) LoC to the next more complex sub-stage of 3(4) or 3/4. This transition will help individuals at least observe and criticize their own reactions and

behavior and distinguish between themselves and the system they wish to serve or influence, rather than be vulnerable to or consumed by external demands.

The importance of an interpretive framework for experiential and constructivist leadership learning aimed at helping participants make that transformation is emphasized by this work. Other experiential leadership learning efforts, such as group relations, encounter groups, or outdoor field experiences also strive to illuminate lessons about leadership through challenging interpersonal tasks, but none offer a coherent and comprehensive framework for interpreting that experience. The framework buttressing the course examined here, adaptive leadership (Heifetz, 1998; Heifetz & Linsky, 2002; Heifetz, Linsky & Grashow, 2009; Heifetz & Laurie, 1998; Heifetz & Laurie, 1999), facilitates sense making of experiential, analytical, diagnostic, and reflective tasks. Unique to the course *Exercising Leadership* is the framework's synergy with the instructional method. Such a framework, and the interpretive work it supports, may be essential in helping leaders learn how to learn on their own.

Leader-development practitioners tasked with promoting developmental evolution can also consider compensational learning as an alternative to development from a self-authorizing to a self-transforming LoC. Practitioners know the least about such a transition as there are so few examples available for study (Kegan, 1994). Despite theory that such an interdependent, self-transforming LoC is ideally suited for the demands of a postmodern world there is little evidence of effectiveness (McCauley et al., 2006). Leader development practitioners should consider the advantages of a more effective and inclusive dominant self-authorizing LoC and understand that interaction with socialized LoCs in that development is a key ingredient in developing compensational learning. The

hard edges of this LoC may be essential in certain competitive environments. The socialized LoCs that inevitably populate our environments and organizations will respond to the clarity of a self-authorizing LoC. The self-transforming LoC, in its effort to honor all meaning making systems, is less-directive, possibly favoring a more humanistic approach to management over a functionalist one (Petriglieri and Petriglieri, 2015).

Limitations and Future Directions

This investigation has obvious limitations. My study does not feature a comparison group and I rely on one metric, the SOI, for my measurement of LoC. Additionally, the phenomena observed and theory developed here is drawn from a single sample and a unique course. These findings will not be representative of all experiential and constructivist leadership development interventions, though several features of these findings do apply to leader and leadership development interventions. It is my hope that subsequent mixed method and quantitative work will test the validity of compensational learning. My research here generates several open-ended avenues for future research.

Regarding development: What features of the course are required for development of dominantly socialized LoCs? What practices would promote development for dominantly self-authorizing LoCs? How can developmental bridges be built within the same course for a range of LoCs? Regarding compensational learning: What does compensational learning look like at developmental stages other than self-authorizing and how is compensational learning generated at those different stages?

This research was designed to learn more about how different levels of consciousness interact with an experiential and constructivist leadership learning intervention in order learn more about how leadership development interventions can

help participants learn how to learn (Hackman & Wageman, 2007). Developmental growth and compensational learning outcomes are correlated to participant LoC at the start of the intervention and point to new directions in research with practical applications for leadership development interventions.

References

- Akrivou, K., & Bradbury-Huang, H. (2015). Educating integrated catalysts: Transforming business schools toward ethics and sustainability. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 14, 220–242.
- Avolio, B. J. (2007). Promoting more integrative strategies for leadership theory building. *American Psychologist*, 62, 25–33.
- Baldwin, J. M. (1890). *Handbook of psychology: Senses and intellect*. New York, NY: H. Holt.
- Baldwin, J. M. (1893). *Elements of psychology*. New York, NY: H Holt.
- Baron, C., & Cayer, M. (2011). Fostering post-conventional consciousness in leaders: Why and how? *Journal of Management Development*, 30, 344–365.
- Bartone, P. T., Snook, S. A., Forsythe, G. B., Lewis, P., & Bullis, R. C. (2007). Psychosocial development and leader performance of military officer cadets. *Leadership Quarterly*, 18, 490–504.
- Bartunek, J. M., Gordon, J. R., & Weathersby, R. P. (1983). Developing “complicated ” understanding in administrators. *Academy of Management Review*, 8, 273–284.
- Basseches, M., & Mascolo, M. F., (2010). *Psychotherapy as a developmental process*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Berkovich, I. (2014). Between person and person: Dialogical pedagogy in authentic leadership development. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 9, 119–131.
- Brookfield, S. (1995). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Bushe, G. R., & Gibbs, B. W. (1990). Predicting Organization Development Consulting Competence from the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and Stage of Ego Development. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 26, 337–357.
- Dass, Ted K. (2006). Leadership Can Be Taught: A Bold Approach for a Complex World, by Sharon Daloz Parks. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press, 2005. *Academy of Management Review*, 4, 493–495.
- Dawson-Tunik, T. L. (2006). The meaning and measurement of conceptual development in adulthood. In C. Hoare (Ed.), *Oxford handbook of adult development and learning*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. 433–454.

- Day, D. V. (2000). Leadership development: A review in context. *Leadership Quarterly*, 11, 581–613.
- Day, D. V., Harrison, M. M., & Halpin, S. M. (2009). *An integrative approach to leader development: Connecting adult development, identity, and expertise*. New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- DeRue, D. S. (2011). Adaptive leadership theory: Leading and following as a complex adaptive process. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 31, 125–150.
- DeRue, S., & Myers, C. G. 2014. Leadership development: A review and agenda for future research. In D. V. Day (Ed.), *Oxford handbook of leadership and organizations*, 832–855. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Drago-Severson, E. (2004). *Becoming adult learners: Principles and practices for effective development*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Drath, W. H. (2001). *The deep blue sea: Rethinking the source of leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Dukerich, J. M., Nichols, M. L., Elm, D. R., & Vollrath, D. A. (1990). Moral Reasoning in Groups: Leaders Make a Difference. *Human Relations*, 43, 473–493.
- Eigel, K. M. (1998). *Leader effectiveness: A constructive-developmental view and investigation*. Athens: University of Georgia.
- Fischer, K. W., & Bidell, T. R. (1998). Dynamic development of action and thought. In W. Damon & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Theoretical models of human development* (5 ed., pp. 467–561). New York, NY: Wiley & Sons.
- Fonda, H., Rose, R. (Producers), & Lumet, S. (Director). (1957). *12 Angry Men* [Motion picture]. United States: MGM Studios.
- Garvey-Berger, J. (2013). *Changing on the Job: Developing Leaders for a Complex World*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Gordon, R., Hinton, C., Long Bow Group., WGBH (Television station: Boston, Mass.), Independent Television Service., National Asian American Telecommunications Association., & CrossCurrent Media. (1996). *The Gate of Heavenly Peace*. San Francisco, CA: Distributed by NAATA/CrossCurrent Media.
- Ghosh, R., Haynes, R. K., & Kram, K. E. (2013). Developmental networks at work: Holding environments for leader development. *Career Development International*, 18, 232–256.

- Guilleux, F. (2010). *A developmental perspective on leadership education of aspiring principals* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3471901)
- Hasegawa, B. A. (2003). *The teacher leader role shift: A constructive-developmental study of teacher leaders' experiences of role transition and authority relationships* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3100144)
- Hackman, J. R., & Wageman, R. 2007. Asking the right questions about leadership: Discussion and conclusion. *The American Psychologist*, 62, 43–47.
- Harris, L. S., & Kuhnert, K. W. (2007). Looking through the lens of leadership: A constructive developmental approach. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 29, 47–67.
- Heifetz, R. A. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University.
- Heifetz, R. A. (2011). *Exercising leadership: The politics of change* [Syllabus]. Cambridge, MA: Management, Leadership, Decision Sciences, Harvard Kennedy School of Government.
- Heifetz, R. A., Sinder, R. M., Jones, A., Hodge, L. M., & Rowley, K. A. (1989). Teaching and assessing leadership courses at the John F. Kennedy School of Government. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 8, 536–562.
- Heifetz, R., Grashow, A., & Linsky, M. (2009). *The practice of adaptive leadership*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Heifetz, R., & Laurie, D. (1998). Work of leadership. *Harvard Business Review*, 3, 171-198.
- Heifetz, R. A., & Laurie, D. L. (1999). Mobilizing adaptive work: Beyond visionary leadership. In J. A. Conger, G. M. Spreitzer, & E. E. Lawler (Eds.) *The leader's change handbook* (pp. 55–86). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Heifetz, R. A., & Linsky, M. (2002). *Leadership on the line: Staying alive through the dangers of leading*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Helsing, D., & Howell, A. (2013). Understanding leadership from the inside out: Assessing leadership potential using constructive-developmental theory. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 23, 186–204.
- Holmberg, I., & Akerblom, S. (2001). The production of outstanding leadership: An analysis of leadership images expressed in Swedish media. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 1, 67–85.

- House, R., Javidan, M., Hanges, P., & Dorfman, P. (2002). Understanding cultures and implicit leadership theories across the globe: An introduction to project GLOBE. *Journal of World Business*, 37, 3–10.
- Ibarra, H. (1999). Provisional selves: Experimenting with image and identity in professional adaptation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44, 764–791.
- Joiner, B., & Josephs, S. (2007). *Leadership agility: Five levels of mastery for anticipating and initiating change*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley.
- Kayes, C. D. (2002). Experiential learning and its critics: Preserving the role of experience in management learning and education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 1, 137–149.
- Kegan, R. (1982). *The evolving self*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Kegan, R. (1994). *In over our heads*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Kegan, R., & Lahey, L. L. (2009). *Immunity to change: How to overcome it and unlock the potential in yourself and your organization*. Cambridge: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kohlberg, L. (1969). *Stage and sequence: The cognitive-developmental approach to socialization*. San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.
- Kolb, D. A. (2015). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development* (2nd ed). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Kolb, A. Y., & Kolb, D. A. (2005). Learning styles and learning spaces: Enhancing experiential learning in higher education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 4, 193–212.
- Kolb, D. A., & Fry, R. (1975). Towards an applied theory of experiential learning. In C. Cooper (Ed.), *Theories of group processes*. New York, NY: Wiley, 33–58.
- Lahey, L. L., Souvaine, E., Kegan, R., Goodman, R., & Felix, S. (1988). *A guide to the subject-object interview: Its administration and interpretation*. Cambridge: Harvard Graduate School of Education.
- Loevinger, J. (1976). *Ego Development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- McCall, M. W. (2004). Leadership development through experience. *Academy of Management Executive*, 18, 127–130.
- McCallum, D. C. (2008). *Exploring the implications of a hidden diversity in Group Relations Conference learning: A developmental perspective* (Doctoral

- dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database
Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3327080)
- McCauley, C. D., Drath, W. H., Palus, C. J., O'Connor, P. M. G., & Baker, B. A. (2006). The use of constructive-developmental theory to advance the understanding of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 634–653.
- McGowan, E. M., Stone, E. M., & Kegan, R. (2007). A constructive-developmental approach to mentoring relationships. In B. R. Rose & K. E. Kram (Eds.), *The handbook of mentoring at work: Theory, research, and practice*. (pp. 401–425). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Manners, J., & Durkin, K. (2000). Processes involved in adult ego development: A conceptual framework. *Developmental Review*, 20, 475–513.
- Manners, J., Durkin, K., & Nesdale, A. (2004). Promoting advanced ego development among adults. *Journal of Adult Development*, 11, 19–27.
- Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mezirow, J. (1995). Transformation theory of adult learning. In M. R. Welton (Ed.), *In Defense of the Lifeworld* (pp. 39–70). New York, NY: SUNY Press.
- Mezirow, J. (2009). Transformative learning theory. In J. Mezirow & E. W. Taylor (Eds.), *Transformative learning in practice: Insights from community, workplace and higher education* (pp. 18–31). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded source book*. New York, NY: Sage.
- O'Brien, T. (2013). *Student development and learning in the case-in-point classroom: Who learns what and how in the here-and-now?* Qualifying paper. Harvard Graduate School of Education.
- Parks, S. D. (2005). *Leadership can be taught*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Pearce, C. L., & Conger, J. A. (Eds.). (2003). *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Petriglieri, G., & Petriglieri, J. L. (2010). Identity workspaces: The case of business schools. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 9, 44–60.
- Petriglieri, G., & Petriglieri, J. L. (2015). Can business schools humanize leadership? *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 14, 625–647.

- Petriglieri, G., Wood, J. D., & Petriglieri, J. L. (2011). Up close and personal: Building foundations for leaders' development through the personalization of management learning. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10, 430–450.
- Pfaffenberger, a. H. (2005). Optimal adult development: An inquiry into the dynamics of growth. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 45(3), 279–301.
- Piaget, J. (1948). *The moral judgement of the child*. Glencoe: Free Press
- Piaget, J. (1953). *The origins of intelligence in the child*. London, England: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Piaget, J. (1957). *Logic and psychology*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Piaget, Jean. (1970). *Science of education and the psychology of the child*. New York, NY: Orion Press.
- Pulaski, M. A. S. (1980). *Understanding Piaget* (Rev. ed.). New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Rice, A. K., (1965). *Learning for leadership*. London, England: Tavistock.
- Rogers, C. (1961). *On becoming a person: A therapist's view of psychotherapy*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Rogers, C. (1965). *Client centered therapy*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Rogers, C. R., & Roethlisberger, F. J. (1952). Barriers and gateways to communication *Harvard Business Review*.
- Rooke, D., & Torbert, W. R. (1998). Organizational transformation as a function of CEO's developmental stage. *Organizational Development Journal*, 16, 11–28.
- Schon, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. Basic Books.
- Schon, D. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.
- Schyns, B., Kiefer, T., Kerschrieter, R., & Tymon, A. (2010). Teaching implicit leadership theories to develop leaders and leadership: How and why it can make a difference. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10, 397–408.
- Shapiro, E. R., & Carr, A. W. (1991). *Lost in familiar places*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Silver, J., & Josselson, R. (2010). Epistemological lenses and group relations learning. *Organisational & Social Dynamics*, 10, 155–179.

- Smith, B. J. (1999). *Transformative professional development: Discovering teachers' concepts of politicized classroom practice* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9933154)
- Stein, Z., & Heikkinen, K. (2009). Models, metrics, and measurement in developmental psychology. *Integral Review*, 5, 4–24.
- Strang, S. E., & Kuhnert, K. W. (2009). Personality and leadership development levels as predictors of leader performance. *Leadership Quarterly*, 20, 421–433.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Torbert, B., & Associates. (2004). *Action inquiry: The secret of timely and transforming leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Kohler.
- Twain, Norman (Producer), & Avildsen, John G. (Director). (1989). *Lean on Me* [Motion picture]. United States: Warner Bros.
- Valcea, S., Hamdani, M. R., Buckley, M. R., & Novicevic, M. M. (2011). Exploring the developmental potential of leader-follower interactions: A constructive-developmental approach. *Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 604–615.
- Van Velsor, E., & Drath, W. H. (2004). A lifelong developmental perspective on leader development. In C. D. McCauley & E. Van Velsor (Eds.), *The center for creative leadership handbook of leadership development* (pp. 383–414). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1997). *Educational Psychology*. (Robert Silverman, Trans.). Boca Raton: St. Lucia Press. (Original work published 1926).
- Weick. (1979). *The social psychology of organizing* (2nd ed.). Reading: Addison-Wesley.
- Williams, D. (2005). *Real leadership: Helping people and organizations face their toughest challenges*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Wilber, K. (2000). *Integral Psychology*. Boston, MA: Shambhala.
- Winnicott, D. W. (1965). *The maturational process and the facilitating environment*. New York, NY: International Universities Press.

Appendix 1A: Characteristics of CDT

There are four characteristics useful for understanding developmental stage theories like CDT: Stages are sequential, stages are liminal, stage growth transcends and includes previous stages, higher stages afford greater “bandwidth” for complexity.

1: Stages are sequential

Stages are sequential. One cannot fully enter any stage without fully passing through the stage before it. And the rate at which any individual passes through any given stage is dependent on a variety of variables: culture, experiences, disposition. (Kegan, 1982; Wilber, 2000).

2: Stages are liminal—There are transitional stages

Stages are liminal; there are substages and research suggests that many adults inhabit those transitional spaces between the socialized and self-authorizing mind (Kegan & Lahey, 2009). While Kegan’s theory presents five distinct stages of development, there is a total of 21 distinct and measurable stages representing the waxing and waning of levels of consciousness (Lahey et al., 1988; see Table 1.1 and Table 1.2 for descriptions of relevant stages and substages).

3: Stage growth transcends and includes previous stages

Stages transcend and include previous stages. Transitioning from one stage to another requires one to do more than buy a new software application to process their data, but to upgrade their bandwidth so that their computer can accommodate more and different types of data. This bandwidth upgrade represents a newly expansive and spacious mind, which can now make new interpretations of older data (Kegan, 1982; Wilber, 2000). One who represents the self-transforming stage has a mind that incorporates and includes all the previous stages they have inhabited. As a result, one characteristic of the self-transforming mind is that, having passed through and experienced the costs and benefits of each level of consciousness, it is more considerate and aware of the experiences of others as a result of its collected experiences (Kegan, 1982).

4: Higher stages afford greater “bandwidth” for complexity

Individuals representing “higher” or more “developed” stages of development are not qualitatively better than others; every stage of development has disadvantages. However, one’s capacity for making sense of and navigating complex challenges with multiple stakeholders and perspective is increased with each stage of development. Those at later stages provide more perspective for having experienced the pros and cons of previous ways of knowing. At later, self-transforming stages one is afforded a greater awareness of the difficulties others have at those previous levels of meaning making (Kegan, 1982).

Appendix 1B: Description of Dominantly Socialized Stages and Substages as They Relate to Leadership

<p>Kegan's third stage of development is known as the socialized mind. People who inhabit this level of consciousness depend on the judgments of others for their sense of self, developing their sense of self by consulting others' reflections of them. Adults at this stage ask themselves: "Do the people, affiliations and organizations I value, value and like me?" "Do they approve of me?" "Do they think I am a good person?" Adults characteristic of this stage of development are threatened by disagreement, difference, criticism or conflict. When others are disappointed in them, they feel personally responsible and they are inclined to hold others responsible for their own feelings, for their sense of self is dependent on the attributes assigned to them by others (O'Brien, 2013; Kegan, 1994; Kegan & Lahey, 2001).</p> <p>Stage three implications for leadership. Leadership at this level of consciousness can be challenging as one is likely to be concerned with how their decisions will be perceived and image management can trump the most beneficial possible outcome (Kegan, 1994; Kegan & Lahey, 2001). The socialized order of mind is not necessarily a pushover. Leaders at this level can indeed hold a firm position and confidently make decisions despite differences. However, they cannot call those beliefs into question, their sense of judgment suffers if they are uncertain about how their external source of authority would make sense of a new situation, and competing expectations from equally valued external sources can be destabilizing. Leaders and managers representing the socialized mind who are loyal to their organizations and people, however, may also be rewarded for their tendency to maintain the status quo, skirt or suppress conflict and represent the best interests of their organization. Though normally conflict avoidant, these leaders, fueled by the support of those who believe in them, may also feel compelled to represent the interests of groups they identify with and vice versa (O'Brien, 2013).</p> <p>Adapted from Lahey et al., 1988.</p>	3/2	This Level of Consciousness (LoC) is at least 51% Socialized and 49% Instrumental. At this LoC the perspective and desire of the Instrumental mind are present, but are trumped by the perspective and desire of the Socialized LoC.
	3(2)	This LoC is characterized as Socialized with a residual or waning Instrumental LoC. The perspectives and desires of the Instrumental mind are background concerns to a much more dominant Socialized LoC.
	3	A solid Socialized LoC. Any residual Instrumental characteristics are all but lost. The sense of self is solidly composed of the perspectives, judgments from and affiliation with others.
	3(4)	This LoC is characterized as Socialized with a new, emerging glimmer of Self-Authorized. The perspectives and desires of the Self-Authorized mind are newly present. These perspectives and desires may be detected in thoughts, but are unlikely to manifest in behaviors.
	3/4	This LoC is at a minimum 51% Socialized and 49% Self-Authorized. At this LoC the perspective and desire of the Self-Authorized mind are present, but are trumped by the perspective and desire of the Socialized LoC.

Appendix 1C: Description of Dominantly Self-Authorized Stages and Substages as They Relate to Leadership

<p>Kegan's fourth stage of development is known as the self-authoring mind. People who inhabit this order of mind depend on an internal compass and their own values for their sense of self. Their sense of identity is composed by the values they deem important. Adults inhabiting the self-authorized mind orient themselves to an internal authority composed of values and opinions they have decided upon or imported as their own. Adults at this stage ask themselves: "Am I the person I want to be and think I am?" "Am I living up to my own expectations and values?" "What criteria can I establish to determine that I am doing a good job?"</p> <p>Individuals at this stage of development are not as threatened by disagreement, difference, criticism or conflict; they may see them as occasions to be managed or learning opportunities. When others are disappointed in them they compare that external disappointment to their own internal standards. They will not feel responsible for another's disappointment if that disappointment does not align with their internal values (Kegan, 1994; Kegan & Lahey, 2001, O'Brien, 2013).</p> <p>Stage four implications for leadership. Leaders at this level of consciousness are more equipped to make difficult decisions for they are not as preoccupied with how others perceive them; rather, they are concerned with doing what they see as the best course of action connected to their personal values and assumptions. Individuals at this level of consciousness see the collision of multiple perspectives as inevitable and necessary to generate the best ideas and solutions. However, others can find those at the self-authoring stage frustrating for their prioritization of internal values over the perspectives of others. The self-authoring mind tends to ignore perspectives that don't serve their agenda well and can possibly suffer from 'tunnel-vision' in their relentless pursuit of what they deem the best possible outcome. Helsing and Howell (2013) cite multiple developmental perspectives to articulate the connection between self-authorship and leadership, "Leaders in the modern world may need to be operating predominately from the self-authoring stage, if they are to fulfill the many complex demands of their roles" (Eigel, 1998; Joiner & Josephs, 2007; Kegan, 1994, McCauley et al., 2006; Torbert, 2004; Van Velsor & Drath, 2004).</p> <p>Adapted from Lahey et al., 1988.</p>	4/3	This LoC is at a minimum 51% Self-Authorized and 49% Socialized. At this LoC the perspectives and desires of the Socialized mind are present, but are trumped by the perspectives and desires of the Self-Authorized mind.
	4(3)	This LoC is characterized as Self-Authorized with a residual or waning Socialized LoC. The perspectives and desires of the Socialized mind are background concerns to a much more dominant Self-Authorized LoC.
	4	A solid Socialized LoC. Any residual Socialized characteristics are all but lost. The sense of self is solidly composed of the values and beliefs that the mind has imported over time and made its own.
	4(5)	This LoC is characterized as Self-Authorized with a new, emerging glimmer of Self-Transforming. The perspectives and desires of the Self-Transforming mind are newly present. These perspectives and desires may be detected in thoughts, but are unlikely to manifest in behaviors.

Appendix 1D: Excerpt From the MLD-201, *Exercising Leadership* Syllabus

In addition to the traditional methods of lectures, readings, and films, the course uses three more innovative teaching methods: student cases, “case-in-point” learning, and structured exercises. First, the course devotes a majority of its time to analyzing the past professional experiences that students bring from around the world and across sectors -- each student works on a personal case study of leadership throughout the term. Second, students analyze the social and political dynamics common to many organizations and societies facing critical challenges by analyzing the evolving dynamics of the class itself as a case-in-point. Third, through structured exercises of both reflection and action, some of which involve poetry and music, students learn a variety of authoritative, creative, and communication skills integral to the practice of leadership (Heifetz, 2011).

Appendix 1E: Excerpts From Weekly Course Questionnaires

- What factions emerged in the different ways that your small group approached working on the case?
- Have some members gotten stuck in particular roles in the group, limiting their capacity to contribute?
- In thinking about your interventions this week, were there differences between what you intended and the outcomes they produced?
- Which of your interventions generated work, work avoidance, some combination of the two, or went nowhere?
- Did any of your past interventions that seemed to generate work avoidance or go nowhere turn out to “plant seeds” for work by the group that later became apparent?
- Give an example of an intervention by someone else in the group that generated productive work.
- What made that intervention effective? Had that person built up informal authority (credibility) so that others would listen?
- Did the intervention help the person gain or lose informal authority?
- Give an example of an intervention by someone else in the group that generated work avoidance or no response at all. What made that intervention ineffective?

Appendix 1F: *12 Angry Men* Film Questionnaire

- In one or two sentences, answer the following:
 - What is the purpose of the 12-person jury?
 - What is the key task that flows from this purpose?
- Evaluating evidence might often be technical work. In this case, what makes it both technical and adaptive?
- Groups often struggle with adaptive work and engage in avoidance behavior. What work avoidance patterns of behavior did you see emerge in the group?
- What were some of the underlying preoccupations that group members brought to the meeting? How did these underlying preoccupations influence the group's ability to do its work? Give one example of how these preoccupations were surfaced and resolved by the group.
- Describe 4 of the 12 Jury members:
 - First focus on the personal level: In terms of their personal characteristics (loudmouth, shy, insecure, rational, etc.), what clue do these personal characteristics give to the role they play in the group?
 - Now step back and focus on the systemic level: What clues do their personal histories provide to the perspective each juror brings to the work? What societal faction might each juror represent?
 - What factions emerged in the jury?
- Analyze the placement and actions of Juror# 8 (Played by Henry Fonda).

- Placement:
 - As a juror, what formal and informal authority did Juror #8 (played by Henry Fonda) possess?
 - Did his formal authority change during the jury deliberations?
 - Did his informal authority change during the jury deliberations?
- Actions:
 - Choose three pivotal moments when his interventions changed the deliberative process and explain why you think each of his actions worked.
 - In each of these actions, did he rely on his formal authority to lead, his informal authority to lead, or neither?
- If Juror #8 had been the Jury Foreman, would his leadership have been easier to practice? In what ways did Juror #1 (the Foreman) fail to exercise his authority effectively?

Appendix 1G: Subject/Object Interview Protocol

The goal of this interview protocol is to determine how the participant makes sense of their own experience and thinks about things. Participants are encouraged to freely share their experiences, but share only what they wish.

PART I: Generating Content:

The participant received ten index cards identified by the following words:

1) Angry; 2) Anxious and/or nervous; 3) Success; 4) Strong stand and/or conviction; 5) Sad; 6) Torn; 7) Moved and/or touched; 8) Lost something; 9) Change; 10) Important to me

Participants are asked to record a recent experience that resonates with each word on the card for ten minutes. Participants keep the cards; they are not collected. This process primes the participant for sharing information that reveals developmental stage construction.

PART II: Sharing Content

The interviewer has no predetermined list of questions for the participants. The participant is encouraged to share what they recorded on the cards and are encouraged to start with any card they choose. Interviewer questions are variations on “Why?” “What is most/worst important about that?” and “What is the best/worst outcome in that scenario?”

Appendix 1H: Semistructured Interview Questions

Interviews administered after the course featured additional open-ended questions about the student learning experience in graduate school and the leadership course. The questions are flexible and allow for probing.

Regarding graduate school:

- What would you describe as your most valuable learning from all of graduate school?
- What graduate school learning do you think will have the biggest impact on your work and life?

Regarding leadership course:

- What aspect of the course did you find most challenging?
- Did that help or hinder your learning?
- What aspect of the course did you find most supportive?
- What would you say was the overall effect of the course on you?
- Were emotions connected to your learning in the course?
- What does leadership mean to you?
- Would you describe yourself as a leader?

CHAPTER 2

EXPLORING DEVELOPMENT IN ADAPTIVE AND AUTHENTIC LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

Abstract

This longitudinal study examines the interaction between level of consciousness (LoC) and two leadership courses, *Authentic Leadership Development* and *Exercising Leadership*. Participant experience serves as the central “text” to be examined in each course and participants are asked to construct their own meaning by applying either the authentic or adaptive leadership framework to their experience. Findings reveal a significant correlation between the more process oriented adaptive leadership course and developmental growth for the socialized LoC. Participants in the authentic leadership course uniformly report an increased appreciation for reflection and vulnerability, but do not demonstrate uniform or predictable patterns of developmental growth.

Introduction

Look at the mission, vision or purpose of any professional graduate school, particularly business or government schools, and one is likely to read that those schools strive to develop the next generation of leaders (Kellerman, 2012; Snook 2007). Organizations of all sorts are also identifying leader-development as a top priority connected to their competitive advantage (Day, Harrison, & Halpin, 2009). One quarter of the \$50 billion spent by U.S. organizations on learning and development annually, is spent on leadership (O’Leonard, 2010).

These leader-development efforts emphasize the individual/intrapersonal domain—striving to boost the capacity and efficacy of individuals. However, experts in leader and leadership research remind us that leadership is not necessarily a person or a

position, but a process. Hollander & Julian (1969 in Day, 2014) suggested decades ago a greater emphasis on leadership process was needed. The research in leader-development, though, has remained focused on individual leader-development and “the process by which organizations develop leadership relationships and collective leadership structures remains an open question” (DeRue & Myers, 2014, p. 849). The leadership development research needs to move beyond the current emphasis on individuals. Moving beyond this emphasis means examining relationships, processes and collective effort in groups and organizations. Day (2000) distinguishes the former from the latter as leader-development (which strives to develop capacity and efficacy within individuals) and *leadership* development (which strives to develop capacity and efficacy within a collective). Researchers and practitioners interested only in individual development should consider a broader interest in more collective *leadership* development efforts. It is likely that leader- and leadership development are interdependent efforts where leadership development transcends and includes leader-development (Day, 2000). More simply, leader-development is a likely outcome of leadership development.

To learn more about the actual development instigated by leader- and leadership development efforts, I examine the developmental experience of graduate students enrolled in a popular leader-development course based on George and Sims’ *True North* (2007), and a popular leadership development course based on Heifetz’s adaptive leadership framework (Heifetz, 1994; Heifetz, Grashow, & Linsky, 2009; Heifetz & Linsky, 2002). The authentic leader course focuses on individual development. The adaptive leadership course emphasizes a diagnostic process for generating leadership on unique and novel adaptive challenges for which there is no known solution. Despite their

different orientations to leadership, both courses are similar in that they are constructivist—the learner’s construction of his or her experience is central to learning in the course. Exercises from the *Finding Your True North* workbook ask students to reflect on difficult life experiences, values, goals and purpose, and to share their reflections with a self-facilitated group of students from the course (George, McLean, & Craig, 2008). The adaptive leadership course asks self-facilitated groups of students to consult on each other’s leadership failure cases. Student present a case of leadership failure to their group and the group engages in a consultative process to help the presenter learn from their failure and to learn themselves about the challenges of leadership.

I apply a constructive-developmental theory (CDT) lens to these experience-based and constructivist courses to illuminate how participants’ level of consciousness (LoC) interacts with the demands of those courses. A CDT lens, not applied at all in the literature on authentic leadership, is useful for understanding how that curriculum interacts with different LoCs. I apply a CDT lens in my investigation of the same adaptive leadership course in chapter 1 of this dissertation for the same reason.³ CDT provides a coherent theory for articulating the demands of a leader-development intervention and one’s capacity to meet those demands.

The findings presented in this chapter suggest that there is indeed a range of ways different LoCs interact with each course. The interaction between a dominantly socialized LoC and the adaptive leadership course, *Exercising Leadership*, is one significantly

³ As in Chapter One, “interact” will be used to represent how any distinct LoC experiences, makes meaning of, makes sense of, changes as a result of, and/or is activated by the leadership development course *Exercising Leadership*

correlated with development growth. Learning themes reported by those participants reinforce this growth experience. I find no evidence that the authentic leadership course, *Authentic Leadership*, is correlated with developmental growth. The interaction between LoC and *Authentic Leadership* is a uniform one—all study participants from that course, regardless of LoC, reported the same learning themes. I link these findings to the demands of each course, specifically, the tasks students are required to engage in. I identify how dialogical tasks allow perspectives to coexist without scrutiny, while dialectical tasks, which require synthesizing new information, generate developmental growth and fuel a “collaborative stamina”—a capacity that helps individuals and groups endure through depleting and taxing tasks.

Literature Review

Authentic Leadership

Authentic leadership, popularized by Bill George’s book *True North* (George & Sims, 2007) and subsequent follow-up publications (George, McLean, & Craig, 2008; George & Baker, 2011) has gained significant interest among leadership scholars and industry practitioners (Avolio & Walumbwa, 2014). *True North* (George & Sims, 2007) focuses on five dimensions of authentic leadership: pursuing purpose with passion, connecting to and demonstrating one’s values, empathy, strong relationships and self-discipline. Avolio and Walumbwa (2014) note the consistency between this practitioner-oriented dimension of authentic leadership to constructs developed by scholars: awareness, unbiased processing, exhibiting authentic behavior and one’s relational orientation (Kernis, 2003; Kernis & Goldman, 2006).

Authentic leadership scholars pursue their research under the premise that “authenticity, which is represented in one’s ability to remain true to one’s values and ideals, should be highly valued by followers and indeed emulated in that followers would come to identify with and trust authentic leaders to a greater extent” (Avolio & Walumbwa, 2014 p. 339). However, a single definition of authentic leadership is not easily agreed upon and the notion of deliberately or intentionally being authentic is an inherently paradoxical one (Caza & Jackson, 2011). Current research in authentic leadership focuses on identifying and measuring its constructs. Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing and Peterson (2008) have identified and validated four constructs of authentic leadership: self-awareness, transparency, balanced processing, and moral perspective. Their work aligns with and is confirmed by subsequent research from a range of fields and cultures, orienting all scholarship in the authentic leadership domain (Moriano, Molero, & Mangin, 2011; Avolio & Walumbwa, 2014).

A review of authentic leadership research conducted by Gardner, Coglisier, Davis and Dickens in 2011 found that nearly two thirds of 91 scholarly publications debate the actual meaning of ‘authentic leadership’ and focused on theory. However, Avolio and Walumbwa (2014) reveal how momentum for authentic leadership research is generated from findings that correlate authentic leadership with positive identification to supervisors (Walumbwa et al., 2010), follower job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Jensen & Luthans, 2006), knowledge sharing, communication climate and group creativity (Walumbwa et al., 2011b), and team and overall firm performance (Hannah et al 2011b; Hmieleski et al 2011).

Adaptive Leadership

Like authentic leadership, there are several interpretations of adaptive leadership. In their review of the literature on contingency theory, Yukl and Mahsud (2010) find that flexible and adaptive leaders are expected to: diagnose situations and deploy the appropriate behavior, learn and use multiple behaviors, and proactively create environments and teams that do not require close supervision. Complexity leadership theory suggests that complex adaptive systems, as opposed to top-down bureaucracies, require framing “leadership as a complex interactive dynamic from which adaptive outcomes (e.g., learning, innovation, and adaptability) emerge” (Uhl-Bien, Marion, & McKelevey, 2007, p. 289). That work distinguishes adaptive leadership from administrative leadership and enabling leadership, and draws on Heifetz’s (1994) distinction between those who fill “leadership” roles and leaders as any individual who acts in ways to influence outcomes. Uhl-Bien, Marion and McKelevey (2007) go on to define adaptive as the “leadership that occurs in emergent, informal, adaptive dynamics throughout the organization (p. 300).”

This present study focuses on adaptive leadership as originally proposed and taught by Ronald Heifetz (1994) at the Harvard Kennedy School and expanded upon with subsequent coauthors (Heifetz & Laurie, 1998; Heifetz & Laurie, 1999; Heifetz & Linsky, 2002; Heifetz, Grashow and Linsky, 2009). Heifetz’s adaptive leadership framework rests upon the diagnostic distinction between technical problems and adaptive challenges, and suggests that most leadership failures are diagnostic ones where known solutions for technical problems are applied by authorities and experts to misdiagnosed adaptive challenges. Adaptive challenges are challenges that are not entirely understood

and for which no known solution exists. The work of leadership, then, is mobilizing constituents connected to the challenge to more fully understand its complexity and take and seek multiple perspectives that might generate diagnostic learning (Heifetz, 1994; Heifetz & Linksy, 2002; Heifetz, et al., 2009). Compared to authentic leadership, Heifetz's adaptive leadership framework emphasizes the kind of dynamic and emergent leadership process described above over individual leader-development. The course, *Exercising Leadership: The Politics of Change*, associated with Heifetz's, framework is described by Parks (2005) in *Leadership Can Be Taught*. The course illuminates authority dynamics in real time as they unfold between students, course assistants and the instructor through an experiential and constructivist case-in-point pedagogy examined in chapter 1 of this dissertation.

Developing Authentic and Adaptive Leadership: Review of the Literature

In all fields of leadership study, despite their expertise in specific leadership theories, scholars know the least about how to develop leader and leadership capacity (Avolio, 2007; Day, 2000; Day, Harrison & Halpin, 2009). This applies to the authentic and adaptive leadership frameworks. Building from Bennis and Thomas's (2002) interviews with successful leaders and Avolio's (2005) theory on how life experience makes one a leader, the "crucible experience" has risen as a core focus of authentic leadership development. Reflecting on crucible experiences as part one's life story is a key component of George's *True North* (2007). Shamir and Eilam (2005) also recommend a life-stories approach for authentic leadership development. However, no research has examined the impact of a life-story designed authentic leadership intervention or course. Berkovich (2014) suggests that such a narrative focus is

insufficient for authentic leadership development and suggests a theory for a dialogical communication pedagogy approach that makes up for the limits of self-inquiry by putting participants in dialogue with eight components: self-exposure, open-mindedness, empathy, care, respect, critical thinking, contact and mutuality. *Finding Your True North: A Personal Guide* (George et al., 2008) offers reflective exercises aimed at helping one discover his or her authentic leadership. *True North Groups* (George & Baker, 2011) offers suggestions and topics for establishing and maintaining a group dedicated to developing authentic leadership. That text offers advice on the phases of group development and facilitation; however, no work has been published about the impact of authentic leadership courses and there are no guidelines on the instructional practices that foster authentic leadership development.

A small stream of research has empirically explored the case-in-point instruction used to illuminate the dynamic interdependent processes core to adaptive leadership theory which are described by Parks (2005). The first study of the pedagogy indicates that participants find the adaptive leadership framework useful and relevant and case-in-point methods reinforce student understanding (Heifetz, Sinder, Jones, Hodge & Rowley, 1989). Guilleux (2010) found that case-in-point methods support more complex perspective taking by generating an iterative process of encountering different perspectives and reflection.

Other studies focus on self-analytic groups in the Tavistock tradition (Rice, 1965). Silver and Josselson (2010) and McCallum (2008) explore how participants at different stages of adult development make sense of self-analytic interventions, but those efforts do not reveal the impact of that work, they confirm that “participants largely make

meaning of conferences at the level of meaning-making with which they enter the conference (Silver & Josselson 2010 p. 175).” Martynowych (2006) used similar methods in similar self-analytic groups and suggested strategies to assist learners at “socialized levels” of development, according to Kegan’s framework (Kegan, 1994).

Constructive Developmental Theory and Leadership Development

Despite the limited range of findings in the previous four studies, they flow from a larger stream of research using constructive-developmental theory (CDT; Kegan, 1982), which serves as a metric and goalpost for leader- and leadership development interventions. McCauley and colleagues summarize how development scholars Kohlberg (1969), Loevinger (1976), Kegan (1982) and Torbert (2004) proposed stages of emotional, cognitive, and ego development beyond childhood and adolescence and into adulthood (McCauley, Drath, Palus, O’Connor, & Baker, 2006). Those scholars are described as neo-Piagetian, as they extend Piaget’s (1954) genetic-epistemology beyond childhood and into adulthood. Their theories demonstrate how one’s worldview evolves through more complex levels of consciousness. There is a moderate stream of leader- and leadership development literature with a CDT focus. Leadership scholars have used CDT as a goalpost to suggest that certain developmental achievements are necessary for different and more evolved forms of leadership. For example, Bartunek, Gordon and Weathersby (1983) claimed that higher stages of consciousness correlate with cognitive complexity, a requirement for managing multiple points of view. Khunert and Lewis (1987) theorized that Kegan’s second “instrumental” and third “socialized” stages of development represented a developmental capacity suited for transactional leadership

while Kegan's fourth "self-authorized" stage of development was required for a more complex transformational leadership.⁴

Researchers have used CDT in concert with other measures to measure leader effectiveness and the outcomes of leader/ship development programs designed to promote development. Several studies positively correlate stages of development with peer, supervisor and subordinate ratings (Bartone, Snook, Forsythe, Lewis, & Bullis, 2007), 360 feedback results (Harris & Kuhnert, 2007), ratings of effectiveness (Bushe & Gibbs, 1990), tolerance for conflict (Hasegawa, 2003), group management and performance (Dukerich, Nichols, Elm, & Vollrath, 1990), and organizational success (Rooke & Torbert, 1998). Other studies use CDT to measure the efficacy of interventions. Manners, Durkin and Nesdale (2004) found that interventions designed to be interpersonal, personally salient, emotionally engaging and disequilibrating did indeed promote development for participants. Smith (1999) measured how leader development programs that emphasize critical reflection (Brookfield, 1995) promote developmental growth.

CDT is a useful lens for exploring authentic and adaptive leadership courses for this study because it offers a coherent articulation of the demands of each framework. For example, authentic leadership requires one to connect with her values and purpose, understand her motivations and empower others. Kegan's theory of development illuminates how these demands are likely beyond the capacity of most adults. Most adults

⁴ While useful for illuminating the connection between leader capacity and developmental stage, this correlation ignores Kegan's 5th self-transforming stage. More complicated and easily misunderstood, this fifth stage is actually better suited for *transformational* leadership, as the name suggests. The fourth self-authorizing stage can manifest itself as stubborn and inflexible, characteristics incompatible with transformation and sometimes perfectly suited for self-interested transaction.

represent Kegan's third LoC, the socialized mind. The inner world of adults at this stage relies on affiliations and perspectives of others to determine the values one should orient herself by. The socialized LoC is dependent on authorities and leaders to provide conventional direction and orientation. Seen through a developmental lens, efforts to develop authentic leadership should strive to move people towards a more self-authorized LoC where one looks more to her accumulation of experience to inform her values, purpose and direction. Not until one has "graduated" to self-authorship can she truly connect to *her* values and purpose, understand *her* motivations and empower others to do the same.

The demands of Hefeitz's adaptive leadership framework are also most likely met with a self-authorizing consciousness. That framework demands one to mobilize others to confront a difficult reality, generate disequilibrium and learning among constituents, orchestrate conflict and act in the absence of leaders taking conventional directive roles. Such actions may seem impossible to one inhabiting a dominantly socialized LoC and preoccupied with what others might be thinking of them. A self-authorizing self, confident in its purpose and perspective, less influenced by how she is perceived, is more suitable for confrontation, generating disorientation and orchestrating the subsequent learning and conflict that emerges.

Chapter 1 of this dissertation focused on the adaptive leadership course, *Exercising Leadership*, and hopes to contribute to the leader/ship development literature for several reasons. Those findings demonstrate that participants representing different LOCs do indeed experience the same intervention differently due to the differences in their meaning making—a former oversight in the developmental psychology leadership

literature (Pfaffenberger 2005). Chapter 1 findings also demonstrate that developmental growth is not necessarily an outcome of participation in the course for each LoC. Dominantly socialized LoCs demonstrated growth, while dominantly self-authorizing LoCs did not. I credit these differences to elements of the first finding; the course experience did not provoke dominant self-authorizing LoCs to see, make object, the limitations of their meaning making system, while it may do a strikingly good job help dominantly socialized LoCs to do exactly that.

Scholars suggest that most leader-development will happen at work sites (Boyce, Zaccaro & Wisecarver, 2010; Walmbwa et al 2011). But schools of management and public policy are already perfectly suited to promote the development required of those whose work will require them to meet the demands outlined by the adaptive and authentic leadership frameworks. Petriglieri and Petriglieri (2010) hypothesize and Petriglieri, Wood, and Petriglieri (2011) demonstrate how the MBA serves as an identity workspace for identity development. My findings in chapter 1 demonstrate how the course *Exercising Leadership* built from the adaptive leadership framework (Heifetz, 1994) and using case-in-point instructional methods (Parks, 2005) can also serve as a workspace for consciousness development.

In this chapter I examine those chapter 1 findings alongside findings from an authentic leadership course. The study design is identical to chapter 1's. While this investigation is vulnerable to what Piaget derided as the "American question" to determine what promotes development (Pulaski, 1980), the primary interest remains in how different LoCs interact with each intervention. That interaction may generate developmental experiences of stasis or growth, but this is not a search for "what works."

This is a quest to understand what is happening. What can we learn about efforts to develop authentic and adaptive leadership from that interaction, particularly since both frameworks advocate for capabilities beyond the abilities of the socialized LoC.

Site Selection and Description

To better understand how developmental stages interact with courses designed to develop authentic and adaptive leadership, I conducted longitudinal Subject-Object Interviews (SOI) and semistructured interviews with participants enrolled in the two leadership courses. In both courses, the students themselves, their experiences and their reflections on those experiences, serve as the primary “text” to be studied. Course pedagogies rely heavily on student interaction and reflective exercises. This dissertation focuses on experiential and constructivist leadership learning. Both courses are constructivist, as they require students to construct their own interpretation of their experiences. However, the courses are not experiential in the same way. *Exercising Leadership* generates in-class experiences that students reflect and learn from. *Authentic Leadership* draws on preclass or off-line experiences as material to reflect on and learn from.

The expectations of both courses and their corresponding frameworks require a LoC of at least self-authorship in practice. The adaptive leadership framework requires one to orchestrate conflict, think systemically and not be preoccupied by the perspectives of others, but to observe and analyze them. The authentic leadership framework requires one to identify her principles and values and source her motivation intrinsically, not extrinsically.

To honor the richness of each leadership framework, the uniqueness of their corresponding courses, and the relationship between the developmental demands of each students' LoC, I provide detailed descriptions of each intervention here before moving into the study's methods.

Authentic Leadership Development Course Description

Authentic Leadership is based on Bill George's *True North* books (George & Sims, 2007; George, McLean, & Craig, 2008; George & Baker, 2011). Authentic leadership courses are increasingly popular at business schools and are one of the biggest and fastest growing trends in leadership development. Participants interviewed for this study were MBA students enrolled in *Authentic Leadership Development* at Harvard Business School.

Course purpose and objectives in authentic leadership. The *Authentic Leadership* syllabus describes the course's purpose as enabling students to prepare themselves to do two things: (a) lead organizations and (b) begin a personal leadership journey. The course's objectives include: reflecting on life experiences and crucibles, fully participating in "intimate" discussions about those reflections, connecting to one's values, understanding one's extrinsic and intrinsic motivations, building support teams and integrated lives, and creating a personal leadership plan that will guide students throughout their lives.

Content and concepts in authentic leadership. George's *True North* series (George & Sims, 2007; George, McLean, & Craig, 2008; George & Baker, 2011) is built on three principles—leadership is a journey, one's authentic leadership needs to be

discovered to navigate that journey and one should empower others to lead along the way.

Concepts important to these principles include, but are not limited to: finding one's authentic self, practicing one's values and principles, understanding one's motivations, creating one's own support structures, the role of purpose and passion in leadership and empowering others to take leadership themselves.

Design and pedagogy in authentic leadership.⁵ Whole class events meet for approximately 80 minutes once a week for approximately 12 weeks. These sessions mainly reinforce weekly themes through stories, video, lecture, and discussion exercises. Leadership discussion groups meet for approximately two hours once a week for 12 weeks. These sessions feature six students. Each student takes the role of facilitator twice during the semester. The goal of these student groups is open and vulnerable discussion about each member's reaction and response to the weekly theme.

Tasks. The primary tasks of *Authentic Leadership* are reflective writing assignments that ask students to reflect on difficult life challenges, the impact they would like to make in the world, the achievements they would like to accomplish, their personal metrics for success and crucible stories.

Sharing and discussing these reflections with peers in small discussion groups is fundamental to the course's pedagogy. A final paper requires students to identify the purpose of their leadership, and their values and principles as well as generate a plan for

⁵ Andragogy is a more accurate term for the method of educating adults, however; for the purpose of clarity and the familiarity of the word I have chosen to use 'pedagogy' for the purpose of representing a teaching process regardless of learning age.

their continued authentic leadership development. The instructional focus is intrapersonal leader-development, as opposed to leadership development emphasizing collective processes (Day, 2000).

***Exercising Leadership* Course Description**

The second course, *Exercising Leadership: The Politics of Change*, is unique to the Harvard Kennedy School of Government and based on Ronald Heifetz' framework for adaptive leadership (Heifetz, 1994; Heifetz, Grashow & Linsky, 2009; Heifetz & Linsky, 2002).

Course purpose and objectives in *Exercising Leadership*. The purpose of *Exercising Leadership* is “to increase one’s capacity to lead with and without authority, across boundaries, and from any political or organizational position.” The course’s objectives include: analyzing the complexity of change in social systems, and analyzing strategies for action such as using authority and power wisely, mobilizing within and across boundaries, managing attention, generating innovation and trust, orchestrating conflict, regulating learning and disequilibrium and building cultures of adaptability.

Content and concepts in *Exercising Leadership*. Heifetz’s framework for adaptive leadership is built on two primary distinctions— authority as distinct from leadership, and problem-diagnosis as distinct from problem-solving where technical problems with known solutions are distinct from adaptive challenges, which require learning.

Concepts important to these principles include, but are not limited to: the uses and functions of authority, problem diagnosis and definition, mapping stakeholder

perspectives, giving work back to constituencies, and building and managing a holding environment.

Design and pedagogy in *Exercising Leadership*. Whole class events meet for approximately 80 minutes twice a week. The first of these weekly sessions focuses on the relational and authority dynamics that unfold in the classroom among and between students, teaching assistants and the instructor. Case-in-point instruction, described in detail by Parks (2005), illuminates concepts from the adaptive leadership framework which interpret these dynamics as they unfold in real time in the classroom.

The second of these weekly sessions focuses on a student case diagnosis and analysis where students present a leadership failure case from their own experience for the instructor and students to diagnose and analyze using the adaptive leadership framework.

Small groups of eight students meet once a week for approximately 80 minutes. Students conduct an identical case diagnosis and analysis of each other's leadership failures as they do in the second weekly section described above. Each student prepares and presents a leadership failure case and also serves as facilitator of the case consultation process once in the semester.

Tasks in *Exercising Leadership*. The preparation, presentation of one's own, and weekly diagnosis and analysis of peer cases is the primary task of the of the *Exercising Leadership* course. These failure autopsies are the task for two of three weekly sessions—once in a small group and again in the large class. Learning about the exercise of leadership, the functions of authority, interpersonal and intragroup dynamics from

experience is the focus of the first of two weekly sessions. This here-and-now, self-analytic group task is facilitated by case-in-point practices.

Weekly reflection exercises ask students to reflect on their experiences in both their small group and the large class. Questions evolve as the course progresses, prompting students to consider their role in each group, the range of perspectives that surfaced in the consultation process, perspectives that remained hidden, and interventions that generated progress. Questions are intra- and interpersonal in nature. A final paper requires students to review the diagnosis and analysis of their leadership failure and incorporate new insights into that diagnosis and analysis.

Three films, *Twelve Angry Men* (Fonda & Rose, 1957), *Lean on Me* (Twain & Avildsen, 1989) and *Gate of Heavenly Peace* (Gordon & Hinton, 1995) and corresponding assignments are used to reinforce the adaptive leadership framework. Three additional extended course sessions use musical exercises to illuminate the challenge of inspiring, connecting, and holding groups.

Study participants. Students enrolled in the *Exercising Leadership* and *Authentic Leadership* courses were recruited by invitation randomly sent to participants in each class. Most respondents able to participate were invited to two interviews—one at the start of the course and another after its completion. Availability and scheduling were the key determinants in the selection process. Twenty-two MBA students from *Authentic Leadership Development* were recruited during the same semester at Harvard Business School. 35 students were recruited from *Exercising Leadership* at the Harvard Kennedy School over two semesters—ten from a pilot study in Year 1 of the study and 25 in Year 2 of the study. Those students represented three different Masters programs, a 2-year

Masters in Public Policy or Administration and a 1-year Midcareer Masters in Public Administration. Midcareer participants cleared a prerequisite of at least 7 years of professional work experience for admission into the program. The range in age and experience of the participants can be correlated to, but not predictive of, the range of developmental stages participants represented at the beginning of the course (Kegan, 1994).

Methods

Interview Methods

Just as in chapter 1 of this dissertation, Subject-Object Interviews (SOI) were conducted at the start and end of the course (see Appendix 2A for a description of the SOI process). The SOI was selected for this study as it was designed specifically to identify an individual's LoC according to Kegan's constructive-developmental theory. Constructive-developmental theory is an appropriate frame for this investigation as it articulates one's capacity for self-management, goal setting and exercising leadership with or without formal authorization to do so. Both the authentic leadership framework and the adaptive leadership frameworks, and their affiliated courses, investigated in this present study, require behaviors synonymous with Kegan's fourth LoC, the self-authorized mind. The protocol asks participants to share meaningful and relevant events or emotions connected to recent experiences. The interviewer has the flexibility to probe participant understanding by asking questions that reveal the upper and lower limits of a participant's meaning-making. These responses are analyzed and scored according to Kegan's stage development theory using the *Guide to the Subject-Object Interview: Its Administration and Interpretation* (Lahey et al., 1988).

Additional questions about participants' understanding of leadership and their learning expectations and experience were added to all Time 1 and Time 2 SOIs (Appendix 2B).

Validity. Precedence for using the SOI as a measure for ego-development and leadership capacity is substantial. The measure demonstrates interrater reliability, test-retest reliability, and construct validity (Stein & Heikkinen, 2009). The SOI also provides a unique window into the connection between an individual's developmental stage and leadership capacity by revealing and illuminating "rich qualitative data" which provides a "much larger, more nuanced picture of how an individual is making sense of his or her experiences" (Helsing & Howell, 2013 pg. 16). The protocol requires participants to discuss meaningful and relevant events or emotions in their lives. As these events or emotions are shared, the interviewer has the flexibility to probe the participants' understanding by asking questions that reveal the upper and lower limits of participants' meaning-making. These responses are analyzed and scored according to Kegan's stage development theory (Lahey, et al., 1988). The SOI is particularly useful for this investigation because it elicits *why* a participant responds as they do.

Process. Time 1 and Time 2 postcourse interviews both featured identical processes for facilitating the SOI, but questions about students' expectations and experiences in the course changed between pre- and postinterviews (Appendix 2B). These semistructured interviews provided qualitative data designed to illuminate students' experience of the course. The ten students interviewed for *Exercising Leadership* in the pilot study of this effort were not asked about their expectations and experience, but those SOIs were indeed semistructured in that I probed students for

incidents of learning. Participants were asked to determine features of each course that they found supportive, challenging, useful, or not useful to their learning. When participants revealed a moment of learning or an experience connected to the course in either portion of the interview I probed for connections between that learning and their experience in the course. Both forms of interview questions elicited responses that informed the purpose of the other. All interviews were confidential, digitally recorded and professionally transcribed.

Data Analysis

Data was analyzed in four stages. The first focused on scoring the SOIs. The second stage focused on analyzing the interviews for learning affiliated with the course. I looked for correlations between developmental stage and learning experiences in the third stage and compared course experiences in the final stage.

SOI scoring. Interviews were scored in accordance with the protocols for scoring the SOI (Lahey et al., 1988; see Appendix 2C and Appendix 2D for a description of stages, scores and their alignment to the demands of leadership). I am trained in the facilitation and the scoring of SOIs. SOIs were also blindly validated by a CDT scholar and certified trainer. Sixteen Time 1 and Time 2 interviews corresponding to eight participants, 14% of the sample, were randomly selected from groups of interviews representing different developmental stages to validate scoring across the range of stages participants represented and to validate incidences of growth where it was detected. Validation process revealed 100% agreement between researcher and external scorer on 16 SOIs representing eight participants.

Coding. Four distinct steps were taken in the coding process; however, the process was an iterative one. I repeatedly compared my unfolding analysis of the interviews with the literature on both constructive-developmental theory and leader development (Miles & Huberman, 1994). First, participants were grouped by the first indicator of their course experience—evidence or lack of evidence of developmental growth. The second step in the coding process focused on student reports of learning in the course. These incidents were either deliberately provoked in the second semistructured interview or simply surfaced through the SOI when students were asked about recent experiences. In the third step I looked for correlations between developmental stage and learning experiences—a process that also involved comparing experience by developmental stage between courses. In the fourth and final step, findings were transferred to and organized on a contact sheet.

That fourth step focused on categorizing the themes that emerged in each course by LoC and developmental experience—participants demonstrating developmental growth or a static experience. This final stage employed methods of constant comparison (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) and helped me consolidate and categorize themes. For example, themes common to a dominant socialized order of mind were referenced with Kegan's original conceptualization of CDT (Kegan, 1982) measurable distinctions between substages (Lahey et al., 1988), and subsequent extrapolations of Kegan's theory which further articulate the nuance of each LoC and transitional LoCs (Drago-Severson, 2004; Garvey-Berger, 2013; Ghosh, Haynes & Kram, 2013; McGowan, Stone, & Kegan, 2007).

Findings

I found distinct differences in how participant LoCs interacted with each course. The developmental and learning experience demonstrated and reported by participants enrolled in *Exercising Leadership*, as reported in chapter 1 of this dissertation, reveal a uniform experience where participants grouped by similar LoC demonstrated identical patterns of growth and reported similar learning themes.

Findings from the *Authentic Leadership* course reveal a less uniform interaction between LoC and the course. LoC was not a determinant/predictor of participant experience. All participants, regardless of LoC, reported similar learning experiences with no correlation to static or growth experiences. All participants demonstrated increased intra- and interpersonal reflection. Only participants representing a dominant self-authorizing LoC at Time 2 reported increased empathy—a capacity they may have entered the course with.

Exercising Leadership Findings Summary

My chapter 1 examination of the interaction between participant LoC and the *Exercising Leadership* course revealed rather uniform experiences according to stage of development. Learning themes were unique to each group of similar LoCs—reinforcing theory on how those specific LoCs construct their experiences. These chapter 1 findings are shared again here. Table 2.1 features SOI results and Table 2.2 features learning themes organized by LoC and developmental experience.

Table 2.1

Time 1 → Time 2 SOI Results (Exercising Leadership)

Dominant instrumental LoC at Time 1		Stage socialized LoCs at Time 1		Dominant self-authorized LoCs at Time 1	
<i>Dominant 2 growth</i>	<i>Dominant 3 static</i>	<i>Dominant 3 growth</i>	<i>Dominant 3 → Dominant 4 growth</i>	<i>Dominant 4 static</i>	<i>Dominant 4 growth</i>
#17\ 2 → 2(3)	#19\ 3(4) → 3(4)	#AA\ 3 → 3(4)	#07\ 3(4) → 4/3 ^a	#02\ 4(3) → 4(3)	#FF\ 4(3) → 4
		#01\ 3 → 3(4)	#CC\ 3/4 → 4/3	#EE\ 4/3 → 4/3	#12\ 4/3 → 4 ^a
		#05\ 3 → 3(4)	#DD\ 3/4 → 4/3	#GG\ 4 → 4	#JJ\ 4 → 4(5)
		#20\ 3 → 3(4)	#04\ 3/4 → 4/3	#HH\ 4 → 4	#13\ 4 → 4(5)
		#10\ 3(4) → 3/4	#21\ 3/4 → 4/3	#II\ 4 → 4	
		#14\ 3(4) → 3/4	#22\ 3/4 → 4/3	#03\ 4 → 4	
		#15\ 3(4) → 3/4	#23\ 3/4 → 4/3	#08\ 4 → 4	
		#18\ 3(4) → 3/4	#28\ 3/4 → 4/3	#09\ 4 → 4	
		#26\ 3(4) → 3/4	#11\ 3/4 → 4(3) ^a	#16\ 4 → 4	
				#25\ 4 → 4	
				#29\ 4 → 4	

Table 2.2

Learning Themes Organized by LoC and Developmental Experience (Exercising Leadership)

	Dominant 3 growth	Dominant 3 → 4 growth	Dominant 4 static	Dominant 4 growth
	<i>Observe limitations of meaning making</i>	<i>Engage frontier of meaning making</i>	<i>Expansion of meaning making</i>	<i>Observe limitations of meaning making</i>
Self / Internal	Observe Self's responses Observe growth edge Observe default reactions Observe emotional reactions—be less emotional	Tune Into Self Tune into desire / purpose Set limits for self See limits of created reality Emotions are data Slow down reactions / responses	Compensation Manage / consider impact Think politically / inclusively Be patient / listen Decrease crusade Reframe success for self Connect to emotion	Laments Oversights in Thinking Observe limits, gaps and oversights in sense making
System / External	Distinguish Self & System Distinguish self from system Emotions are data / clues about others	Distance Self From System & Others Depersonalize See the system Distance from others Increased empathy “Balcony” analysis Increased focus on “work” Increased tolerance for ambiguity	Compensation Monitor others / system Focus on the work Reframe success for system Disequilibrium is generative	Connect to Power of Systemic Forces & Other's Vulnerability Sense of superordinate systemic forces Appreciation for vulnerability and role of opponents

In that study, fully dominant socialized LoCs at stages 3 and 3(4) observed the limitations of their meaning making by observing their self's responses and distinguishing between their self and the system they inhabit. The course experience facilitated this observation through exercises that encouraged participants to observe their growth edge, default reactions, and read their emotions as data and distinguish themselves from a larger group.

Mostly dominant socialized LoCs at stage 3/4 engaged the frontier of their meaning making by tuning into their self and distancing their self from the system and others. The course experience encouraged participants at this LoC to tune into their purpose, see the limits of their created reality, slow down their reactions, depersonalize motives, increase their empathic capacity and increase their tolerance for ambiguity. In both cases, participants at fully and mostly dominant socialized LoCs demonstrated one substage of developmental growth.

Fully dominant self-authorized LoCs representing stage 4(3) or 4 demonstrated an expansion of their meaning making system where they compensated for the limits of that developmental stage without any affiliated developmental growth.

Two participants demonstrated growth from a fully dominant self-authorized LoC one substage to 4(5), a capacity that allows that LoC to observe the limitations of its meaning making system and connect to the power of systemic forces and other's vulnerability.

Authentic Leadership Findings Summary

SOI results do not organize by LoC or demonstrated experiences of growth or stasis. Static and growth experiences as measured by the SOI and represented by LoC are

distributed throughout the sample regardless of LoC at the start of the intervention. Thus, developmental experiences of stasis or growth do not reveal data about the interaction between LoC and the *Authentic Leadership* course. In short, the findings are not consistent or revealing of any trends related to participant's LoC and their learning. Some participants demonstrated developmental growth, others did not. Reported learning themes do not explain these differences as is the case for participant experience in *Exercising Leadership*.

Table 2.3 organizes SOI results from the *Authentic Leadership* course by demonstrations of stasis and growth. Table 2.4 organizes the same findings by LoC. These findings suggest that the interaction between developmental stage and the course is not a consistent one. Participants representing similar LoCs do not seem to share the same developmental experience—or have similar interaction with the course.

Table 2.3

Time 1 → Time 2 SOI Results Arranged by Demonstration of Stasis or Growth (Authentic Leadership)

Static Scores ($n = 12$)		Demonstrations of developmental growth ($n = 10$)		
<i>Range of static scores</i>		<i>Dominant 3 Growth</i>	<i>Dominant 3 → dominant 4</i>	<i>Dominant 4 growth</i>
#6b\ 2/3 → 2/3		#15b\ 2/3 → 3/2	#1b\ 3/4 → 4/3	#21b\ 4/3 → 4(3)
#23b\ 3(2) → 3(2)		#22b\ 3/2 → 3(2)	#24b\ 3/4 → 4/3	#19b\ 4/3 → 4
#10b\ 3(4) → 3(4)		#16b\ 3(4) → 3/4		
#11b\ 3(4) → 3(4)		#9b\ 3 → 3(4)		
#4b\ 3 → 3		#17b\ 3 → 3(4)		
#20b\ 3 → 3		#2b\ 3 → 3/4		
#5b\ 3/4 → 3/4				
#14b\ 3/4 → 3/4				
#12b\ 4/3 → 4/3				
#18b\ 4/3 → 4/3				
#7b\ 4 → 4				
#13b\ 4(3) → 3/4				

Table 2.4

Time 1 → Time 2 SOI Results Arranged by Time 1 LoC Regardless of Growth (Authentic Leadership)

<i>Dominant 2 to 3 LoC (n = 15)</i>		<i>Dominant 4 LoC (n = 7)</i>	
#6b\	2/3 → 2/3	#12b\	4/3 → 4/3
#23b\	3(2) → 3(2)	#18b\	4/3 → 4/3
#10b\	3(4) → 3(4)	#7b\	4 → 4
#11b\	3(4) → 3(4)	#1b\	3/4 → 4/3 ^a
#4b\	3 → 3	#24b\	3/4 → 4/3 ^a
#20b\	3 → 3	#21b\	4/3 → 4(3) ^a
#5b\	3/4 → 3/4	#19b\	4/3 → 4*
#14b\	3/4 → 3/4		
#13b\	4(3) → 3/4		
#15b\	2/3 → 3/2 ^a		
#22b\	3/2 → 3(2) ^a		
#16b\	3(4) → 3/4 ^a		
#9b\	3 → 3(4) ^a		
#17b\	3 → 3(4) ^a		
#2b\	3 → 3/4 ^a		

^a Represents demonstrations of developmental growth.

Quantitative Comparison

The most striking comparison between courses is between participants who enter the course at a dominantly socialized LoC. Fifteen participants entered *Authentic Leadership* at stages 3 thru 3/4; seven demonstrate developmental growth at Time 2. Twenty participants entered *Exercising Leadership* at stages 3 thru 3/4; 19 demonstrate developmental growth at Time 2. A Fisher's Exact test reveals that the difference between the courses and their outcomes is very statistically significant, yielding a two-tailed *p* value of 0.0019. This result suggests a very significant growth correlation for dominantly socialized participants enrolled in *Exercising Leadership*.

Reported learning themes from participants explain and reinforce these findings. Chapter 1 outlines how participants in *Exercising Leadership* reported learning consistent with their demonstrated growth. Those learning themes align with theory on what promotes developmental growth for those distinct LoCs. Those chapter 1 findings from

Exercising Leadership are repeated in this chapter: Table 2.5 features learning themes from the dominant socialized LoCs which demonstrated growth from 3 to 3(4) or 3(4) to 3/4, Table 2.6 features learning themes from participants who transition to a dominantly self-authorized LoC from 3/4 to 4/3, Table 2.7 features the compensational learning themes reported by the dominantly self-authorized LoCs that did not demonstrate developmental growth, and Table 2.8 features learning themes from the two participants that demonstrated growth beyond self-authorization to 5(4).

Table 2.5

Dominant Socialized LoC Learning Themes (Exercising Leadership): Exemplary Quotes on Observing the Limitations of One's Meaning Making System

<i>Observing the self's responses</i>	<i>Distinguishing between self & system</i>
<p>Observing growth edge</p> <p>"For me it's very helpful not to personalize problems because I used to do that very much—very often. It's not helpful at all. . . . I didn't know to ask better questions before. I was always focusing on the personal side, or the motives or the intentions."</p> <p>[intervening in class] made me less afraid of the things that I felt embarrassed about."</p> <p>"Traditionally, I have not had a stomach for conflict or disequilibrium."</p> <p>Observing default reactions</p> <p>"I would feel a range, I was so angry sometimes, I got irrationally angry at people because they said a stupid comment, like why would you say such a stupid thing. What is wrong with <i>me</i> (emphasis from recording)? I'm not that person, but I was just irrationally angry."</p> <p>"I felt pretty consistently during the [course] frustration. I was so frustrated we just couldn't seemingly get where we needed to be in order to learn... You would think that it would spur me to sort of find the right answers and I did, I was looking for the right answers, but mostly I just wanted it to stop."</p> <p>Observing emotional reactions</p> <p>"I shut down a lot of my emotions during the [course] . . . which I think is what I do in a lot of situations I guess. I just kind of pull back which was a lesson itself."</p>	<p>Distinguishing between self and system</p> <p>"That's definitely a result at least in part to [the] class – not taking things personally and knowing that some people are going to react positively or some people can act negatively . . . setting some boundaries and being a little more independent."</p> <p>"At one point I shared my view and three people yelled back at me and I was able to be like, "All right." Everyone is disagreeing with everyone; there will always be people who agree and people who disagree. You can't please everyone. I was able to be a little more positive about it."</p> <p>"I can understand that [someone else's] decision making process has much less to do with me and much more to do with all of these things that are outside of my control."</p> <p>"[I can be more} analytical, more confident and/or decisive because I'm not trying to figure out myself in relations to other people in the same way, in the same emotionally charged way."</p> <p>Emotions are data / clues about others</p> <p>"I don't think I would have been able to, on my own, answer the question of why the hell are you still anxious without being very comfortable being confused and asking questions about it instead of running away from it."</p> <p>"Using my emotions as data was a huge piece of that because I have a lot of emotions and would... I was very good at psychoanalysis instead of systems analysis. I think I still try and psycho-analyze people, but I'm a little better on the [systems] side of the spectrum than that."</p>

Table 2.6

*Dominant Socialized LoC to Dominant Self-Authorized LoC Learning Themes
(Exercising Leadership): Exemplary Quotes on Engaging Frontier of One's Meaning
Making System*

<i>Tuning into one's self</i>	<i>Distance self from system and others</i>
<p>Tune into desire / purpose & Set limits for self “I think what I became more comfortable with in [the course] is that I have this burden of optimization. As soon as I got to [grad school] I must figure out, how to do the most total social good in the world. . . . And realizing that I think I have had this sense of obligation or burden that I must use my life to do the most possible good things, which is a great sentiment, but . . .”</p> <p>See limits of created reality “I was always in the silent faction. I wouldn't talk because I was thinking that if I need to speak up it has to be something perfect. I cannot just speak up for the sake of speaking up. I'm thinking of everybody [in the class] and that put some pressures on me.”</p> <p>Emotions are data “The problem is when the topic is something that touches you, something that you are involved with, how to make a step back, take a perspective and say, “Okay, my thoughts should not be dominated by emotional reactions.”</p> <p>Slow down reactions / responses “This is not functional, this doesn't help. This is not going to solve anything, it's just going to make me perform worse. I'm not going to deal with a misunderstanding by being angry. I'm just going to react in a way that may not be productive. It's better to take some perspective, understand the situation and take an action that helps you to move the system from point A to point B.”</p> <p>“I've become more rational somehow. I was more on the emotional side and I think I didn't take a leadership stance yet. But I changed somehow. My outlook is different—the way I look at things, the way I rationalize.”</p>	<p>Depersonalize “Some of the feedback that I got from [the course] was that my interventions were very personal in the context of the class.”</p> <p>“Not taking things personally is really important to me, There is some shift there. The thing about seeing how your interventions are taken or not taken was a big thing—the depersonalizing.”</p> <p>Distance from others “One thing that I got out of the class, was something about how to view other people and another level of awareness of my reactions to other people.”</p> <p>Increased empathy “I noticed that I am very sensitive to when white men and South Asian men speak because of the assertive nature of how they say thing and my tendency was always to be no really listen to what they had to say. I was caught up in this ‘aggressive male’ or ‘symbol of colonial power’ thing. I wasn't interested in that this person actually has something valuable to contribute. I really should listen. I sort of heard my own voices in my head rather than what they had to say.”</p> <p>“I realized that this person was also dealing with a vulnerability or tension. It basically made them more human and less in the role that I had put them [in].”</p> <p>“Balcony” analysis & Seeing the system “It helped me step out and look at things a lot more intellectually and be able to work through the organization and their dynamics, and understand better what was going on and what would go on. Just be a little clear about thinking that through, like not see them as individual personalities but more see how the whole was coming together and make a choice based on that.”</p> <p>Increased tolerance for ambiguity “It links back to not being very tolerant of situations where I don't feel comfortable or I don't know what I'm building. Trying to build tolerance with those situations Rather than just saying I don't want to be in that situation or with that person. Just trying to see why is that and what am I reacting to. I think that is something useful.”</p>

Table 2.7

Self-Authorized Learning Themes (Exercising Leadership): Exemplary Quotes on Expansion of One's Meaning Making and Compensational Learning

<i>Compensating for the self</i>	<i>Compensating systemically and with others</i>
<p>Be patient / listen</p> <p>"I've lost a little bit of spontaneity. . . . [I've] been very aware of what's going on around [me]. I feel that in my relationships with others I'm observing a bit more as opposed to being in the game, I'm going a bit quicker out of it. Observing and coming back as opposed to before when I was speaking and animating more."</p> <p>"I talked with my former boss and he likes to talk and he said things that I could push back on, but I didn't do it. I just stayed silent and I kept listening and said to myself, 'No, I'm not going to push back right now. I think it's not the moment for it.'"</p> <p>Connect to emotion</p> <p>"I had this urge to lash out and say, 'Can we move on.' I just had this urge to lash out and say 'This is a waste of time.' And I thought about the last time I lashed out was in this class. It gave me just a split second long enough to sit back and say, 'OK, so my emotions are telling me something about this room. What are they telling me? That I'm impatient. They're telling me we're not actually being productive. So what are we trying to accomplish? Here's the task we're supposed to be accomplishing that we've gone way fra away from. So how can I get us back to that work?' Instead of lashing out and saying, you guys are missing the point, or being negative, I had just enough time to stop myself and then say, 'I have a feeling, because I'm impatient, that I'm not sure what we're doing right now and I'm wondering if we're missing the work that we're supposed to doing.'"</p> <p>"The connections were so vividly clear. My emotional triggers were in the way of the work I did [passing that bill] and those emotional triggers ended up causing me to be blind to what I was actually doing and causing me to actually fail what I was doing."</p> <p>"My anxiety is super high. And I literally found myself saying, 'OK I am anxious. My stomach is churning. What is that telling me?' It's telling me I have a hundred things to do, and I don't know what</p>	<p>Monitor others / system</p> <p>"I analyze the behavior of people. This person is really on the dance floor—he could step back a bit."</p> <p>Manage / consider impact</p> <p>"I reflect and say I shouldn't have said that. I could be more soft on this or more humble on this."</p> <p>"How could [my words] be received by this person? I'm thinking about what's his situation and how will he receive that information"</p> <p>"What I [wrote here] for 'change' was hopefully pulling up the ability to pause or slow down before I react out of whatever my reactions are telling me to do."</p> <p>"But now when I look at it, I see this loss—they were scared that they would be next on the investigation because they had [insufficient reporting] and they were also angry because they'd lost face. I had done 10 years of service and I was reporting someone who had done 25 years of service and I was putting people behind bards who had done 15 and 27 years of service, but I was not reporting to them—so I can understand that loss in terms of loss of face."</p> <p>Decrease crusade</p> <p>"If I challenge that and I'm putting them in a really bad situation, what are they going to do—lash out or whatever? I've already started to think about how they have nothing to gain—they can only lose by me pushing back hard on this . . . that would open a black box."</p> <p>"I learned to let go of things. . . . I used to micromanage everything. So that's a big change"</p> <p>"I realized that I had a mindset and when things didn't fit into that mindset neatly, I would be annoyed . . . but it was my MO that I was putting on people. That's when I realized maybe I have an issue because all the people are fine and it's me that not fine with it."</p>

<i>Compensating for the self</i>	<i>Compensating systemically and with others</i>
<p>I'm doing or I don't know who is assigned to them yet... So trying to use that emotional, physical reactions as data... Because I always thought of my emotions are just sort of this primitive relic of being a primate that you have to ignore." [Laughter].</p> <p>"Seeing your emotional reactions to things as a data point, and to think about my emotional reaction to the fear. That's data that I don't have everything I need in place to do it right, that I would need to adapt in certain ways."</p>	<p>Think politically / inclusively</p> <p>"I think it could be helpful because he can perceive me as a person that he can tell things to, so in the end I can as well do what I wanted to do."</p> <p>"What I actually was trying to say was, this conversation is not very inclusive of a faction in this room. And can we figure out a way around the conversation? Or can I bring in a different perspective? That would have been an effective intervention. But instead my chord was plucked, and I reacted. And I was so angry at him, so that is why I lashed out at him, but then I was angry at myself for not getting on the balcony and figuring out how to be [less reactive]."</p>

Table 2.8

*Self-Authorized to Self-Transformational Learning Themes (Exercising Leadership):
Exemplary Quotes on Observing the Limitations of One's Meaning Making System*

<i>Observe limits, gaps and oversights in sense making</i>	<i>Appreciation of superordinate systemic forces</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “There are losses, because I think it’s much harder to look at people and think that they have something valid to say and to consider it as valid as opposed to just dismiss it. So your world gets bigger which is good, but it’s also I think harder, because you have to take a lot of other things into account. So one of the losses is just that it does sort of complicate things. Not that it complicates things in a bad way, but it does complicate things, because it’s just not so easy to write people off and be so sure you are right.” ▪ “I feel that I have a much better chance at actually trying to tackle some of the things I want to tackle. Whereas before I just looked at things through a very narrow box and I thought that the only way that you can change something is to trick people and to do this and to do that. So I guess what has changed most in me is that I think it kind of comes to hope, which sounds so trite, but really that maybe there is a chance that if I’m more hopeful that things can change because they should be in this value as opposed to being able to do it just by falsely convincing people of something.” ▪ “I thought I knew how the world worked and how people operated. I thought I knew a lot. This has been a humbling experience. I’m talking about the class. I don’t know a lot. . . . after taking this class I can think of things a little more in the context of there being a lot more going on than just me and what I can see—that there is more happening as far as the mindsets that people bring to the table. I’m more considerate of that.” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “What aspect [of the course] did I find most valuable? Being in the big group and realizing that we can make progress without consensus. I think realizing that you were never going to have consensus. That not everybody was going to agree on exactly what do to, but that even despite that the group could still make progress.” ▪ “I’m still used to doing things my way where I can compel it towards working out. Where I can stay in complete control. It’s not only that I’ve seen a better way to view problems—it’s that in addition to that I need to work on things that indirectly help the problem. It’s not so much about do this, this, and this. But how can I assist this person—say the right thing to this person and then not even try to control everything, but create an environment where the right solution is organically espoused. That’s not easy.” ▪ “Just realizing that this view of black and white and good and bad and I’m better than other people or smarter than other people is just wrong. Because actually they believe everything that we believe and their espoused values are really exactly at the highest level of exactly what ours are.”

Reported learning themes from *Authentic Leadership* participants also align with these quantitative results. Those learning themes are uniform for all participants regardless of LoC and do not explain demonstrations of growth or stasis.

Qualitative Analysis of *Authentic Leadership*

Analysis of reported learning in *Authentic Leadership* illuminates participant experience in the course and contextualizes the quantitative results. Qualitative analysis followed an identical process to the chapter 1 study: posttest transcripts were coded for and organized by instances of learning connected to the course experience. I found that all participants, regardless of LoC or demonstrations of static or growth experiences, reported the same learning—increased intra- and interpersonal reflection. Increased empathic awareness or an increased value of empathy were observable only in participants representing a dominant self-authorized LoC at Time 2. This is the primary observable difference in how the course interacts differently with different LoCs. Table 2.9 provides an overview of those findings.

Table 2.9

Coded Learning Across LoCs in Authentic Leadership

<i>Dominant 2 to 3 LoC</i> <i>Increased intra- and interpersonal reflection</i>		<i>Dominant 4 LoC</i> <i>Increased intra- and interpersonal reflection and empathy</i>
Intrapersonal	Introspection Increased reflection Value of reflection Increased self awareness Increased consideration of purpose Increased awareness of motivations: intrinsic vs. extrinsic	Empathy Value of multiple perspectives Understanding others
Interpersonal	Interpersonal Awareness Increased value of relationship Value of vulnerability Communicating feeling	

Increased introspection or increased value of introspection were coded as: increased reflection, value of reflection, increased self-awareness, increased consideration of purpose, and increased awareness of motivations as intrinsic or extrinsic. Interpersonal awareness was coded as: increased value of relationship, increased value of vulnerability and awareness of the importance of communicating feeling. Table 2.10 provides exemplary quotes demonstrating the codes and categories.

These demonstrations of learning reflect the *Authentic Leadership* course content. George and his colleagues (George & Sims, 2007; George, McLean, & Craig, 2008; George & Baker, 2011) aim to cultivate an appreciation for the importance of reflection and awareness about one's self. That appreciation does indeed seem to be cultivated and is central to the student experience; however, these findings suggest that the learning is mostly "informational" in nature, as opposed to "transformational." That distinction, made by Kegan (2000), builds on Piaget's distinction between being able to assimilate learning or needing to expand one's meaning making system to accommodate learning (1948, 1953). Regardless of LoC at Time 1 or Time 2, or a growth or static developmental experience, the same learning is reported by all participants and thus assimilated by all participants.

Empathy codes (Table 2.11) were unique to the four dominantly self-authorizing participants, two represented a static developmental experience and two represented a developmental growth experience at Time 2. Empathy was coded as an increased value of multiple perspectives and an appreciation for the value of understanding others.

Table 2.10

Intra- and Interpersonal Learning in Authentic Leadership

<i>Intrapersonal Awareness / Introspection</i>	<i>Interpersonal Awareness</i>
<p>Increased reflection “Authentic Leadership kind of put me into this frame of mind and triggered me to think about certain things and so I almost kind of seek out these experiences to kind of reinforce this reflection on learning.”</p> <p>“[The course has] given me clarity and purpose. It’s made me more reflective. It’s made me more deliberate which I like. “</p> <p>Value of reflection “...if you [reflect] regularly, it becomes a habit and it becomes... something very important... this is self-improvement stuff so I definitely now think about how I can incorporate that into my life.”</p> <p>Increased self-awareness “I think Authentic Leadership forced that reconciliation of the verbalizing, what was going on in my head. I think I have these blind spots.... Having people give me feedback on what they were hearing me verbalize alerted me to the blind spots I was having.”</p> <p>“I learned that I’m super emotional and quick to judgment but you know the point of the course is that by the end you are writing a paper about like personal values and motivational traps. So I feel like it was at least good to put pen to paper and say ‘this is what I know about myself empirically.’ I hold these certain values and these principles and that could lead to XYZ but I have identified that... “</p> <p>Increased consideration of purpose “...what I liked about [Authentic Leadership] was like, I never really thought about having a purpose, it sounds silly when I say it now, but I just never processed it that way. I was like how much money am I going to make? Do I like the people I am going to work with? And that was pretty much my two decision criteria for most decisions I was making.”</p> <p>“Would I try to please everyone? Would that be better for me? Would that be better for my performance? I think Authentic Leadership has made me feel that I need to know who I am and I need to kind of be more vocal of how I feel and maybe set</p>	<p>Increased value of relationship “I think [the course] made me a lot more aware of the kind of investment that I need to put into my personal relationships. I’m still not clear what the path forward is but at least the needs are clear. So [the course] has helped develop those. It has also helped me understand my own motivations.”</p> <p>Value of vulnerability “...one of the biggest things I learned in Authentic Leadership was the power of being vulnerable and just putting yourself out there in front of people and</p> <p>“[The course forced me] to do more self-reflection and talk about it and also hear other people reflections and talk about it with them, like go over these issues with them. I think increasingly I do realize the importance of being open and I guess maybe depended on being emotionally vulnerable with people that you work with or associate with because this love is a reciprocity thing you know...</p> <p>After taking Authentic Leadership I feel it makes me feel better or stronger in a weird way by exposing how vulnerable I am. ...but I think just generally being more self-aware is better. And I need to talk to people about my fears, my conflict and my insecurities.”</p> <p>Communicating feeling “I think as far as things have changed with me at least with respect to the emotional stuff, it has forced me to become a better communicator about how I feel. I think that’s definitely something interesting.”</p>

boundaries and then understand there are some boundaries I wouldn't cross... what are my boundaries when I go to work, would I be comfortable if someone asked me to present misleading information to other people? I guess Authentic Leadership was valuable for us to think about what are your values and what are your boundaries? And what are the things you're willing to compromise or trade off and what are the things that you know feel wrong?"

Increased awareness of motivations

"...it's important to be really honest with yourself about who you are and what you want and what really makes you happy versus what others think will potentially make you happy... I think I used to weigh other people's opinions of what I should or should not do a lot more... It's very external focused and now I need to figure out what I want and I don't think I know what that is very clearly yet."

Table 2.11

Dominant Self-Authorized Empathy Themes

<i>Empathy</i>
<p>Value of multiple perspectives</p> <p>“I think for me, particularly me, its hearing different points of view, different people thinking about problems.”</p> <p>“I think [the discussion group] gave me a little more perspective on not only that situation... but also what I experience and what others see and whether I’m being fully transparent with emotions or whether I’m being fully open in family or close friend relationships. So that would be an example of when that extra perspective actually changes not only my memory and reflections upon one event but also potentially how I would handle the next similar circumstance.”</p> <p>Understanding others</p> <p>“I’ve learned that empathizing with people has helped me get closer to the them and I would like to be more and more empathetic. That is a development need for me and I’m trying to understand more about how to get there... Because the more empathetic I get the more I feel connected to people, and the more I enjoy their company.”</p> <p>“I think also the course has generally made me more empathetic I guess because those profound conversations when people share their deep stories and you know truths and would not, you suddenly see that other people have a lot of baggage as well.”</p> <p>“We have to be aware that even the simplest things that you say may have a very different effect on the people that you’re interacting with because they’re shaped by their past.”</p>

Empathy codes apply to a small subset of the sample, representing only four participants at the dominant self-authorizing LoC at Time 2. That those participants represent growth and static experiences suggests that empathy is a capacity more related to the dominant self-authorizing LoC than any experience generated within the course.

There is no evidence that experiences that generated empathy among the two participants who grew from a dominantly socialized (3/4) LoC to dominantly self-authorizing (4/3) LoC were sparked in the course or that the course is responsible for their developmental growth.

Qualitative Data Comparison

A comparison of learning themes reported by participants in each course reveals stark differences in how participant LoC interacted with the two different courses.

Findings from chapter 1 of this dissertation show how *Exercising Leadership* participants, organized by LoC and their developmental experience of growth or stasis, reported learning themes unique to their LoC group. Reported learning themes are tightly coupled with LoC and demonstrations of growth or stasis; the interaction between LoC and *Exercising Leadership* is a consistent and predictable one.

Authentic Leadership participants learn an appreciation for reflection and vulnerability and value new understanding and behavior that participants demonstrated can be assimilated by any represented LoC regardless of demonstrations of growth or stasis. However, these findings do not reveal consistent or predictable interactions between LoC and the course.

Analysis of Courses

I set out to explore the interaction between participant LoC and two distinct leadership development courses. The findings of that exploration reveal two very distinct learning experiences, with *Exercising Leadership* demonstrating a very statistically significant correlation with developmental growth for dominantly socialized LoCs. Both courses advocate theories of leadership that demand greater self-authorship. These findings merit a deeper exploration of discrete course tasks and practices to better understand more about the interaction between LoC and the courses. The difference between the two courses is more than time spent on tasks; it is the nature of their tasks. I find that tasks predict performance (City, Elmore, Fiarman & Teitel, 2009), and LoCs mediate performance.

Didactic and Dialogical Versus Dialectical Tasks

The tasks of both courses appear to meet three of four criteria established by Manners et al. (2004) for promoting developmental growth: personal salience (participants chose the courses on their own), emotional engagement (cognitively and affectively engaging exercises connected to the taught material), interpersonal in nature (engage others in exercises with implications for current relationships; p.22). However, only *Exercising Leadership* requires students of a dominantly socialized LoC to engage in structurally disequilibrating tasks—such tasks are more complex than one’s LoC, cannot be assimilated by one’s LoC, and require that LoC to accommodate or transform its construction of reality to effectively engage in the task (Manners & Durkin, 2000; Manners et al., 2004). Dialectical tasks generate disequilibrating experiences. Unless one’s LoC is disequilibrated, he or she will find no reason to reevaluate their construction of reality and move beyond it.

Didactic and dialogical tasks in *Authentic Leadership*. Berkovich’s (2014) analysis of authentic leadership courses is the only one to analyze the tasks of those courses and make recommendations to address what he describes as three functionalist shortcomings of common authentic leadership development approaches: (a) the notion that authentic leaders share common, objectively observable and identifiable features; (b) that an individual can discover and develop his or her potential by oneself through self-awareness and self-narration practices; and (c) the presumption that the expression of one’s true self positively implicates leader-follower relationships (p. 246).

Berkovich (2014) observes that the demands common to most authentic leadership development are didactic, focusing on identity narrative processing—creating

and clarifying the meaning of past or present experience in a deductive manner to create a coherent self (Benstock, 1988). To compensate for these shortcomings, Berkovich recommends more dialogical, authentic leadership pedagogy to address limited didactic approaches. A dialogical approach would include: self-exposure, open-mindedness, empathy, care, respect, critical thinking, contact, mutuality and symmetrical and asymmetrical mentoring (Berkovich, 2014). Reported learning themes from students in *Authentic Leadership* suggest that the course did feature some of these more dialogical tasks. For instance, students identified an increased value of relationship, vulnerability, the communication of feeling and understanding of other and multiple perspectives as important learning from the course.

The authentic leadership framework shows students the benefits of a more self-authorized LoC by illuminating how behaviors aligned with a self-authorizing LoC (knowing your authentic self, practicing your values and principles, knowing your motivations, integrating your life, leading with purpose and passion, empowering others) improve one's exercise of leadership. *Authentic Leadership* creates space for students to consider "trying on" a more self-authorizing LoC through group discussions that ask students to share crucible experiences, their purpose and passion, their values and principles, and so forth. However, such tasks do not require students to observe, criticize and move beyond the limits of their current LoC. Such tasks would be disequilibrating. The fundamental difference between courses is the absence of disequilibrating tasks that would require such an observation. I find that the source of disequilibrium in *Exercising Leadership* is in dialectical tasks.

Dialectical tasks in exercising leadership. Dialectical processes are the core of subject/object transitions and CDT (Kegan, 1982). A capacity for dialectical thinking is shown to require at least a postformal, self-transformational organization of mind (Basseches, 1980; 1984). However, one's capacity for dialectical processes, is and can be built, at each LoC. *Exercising Leadership* engages students in two recurring tasks that generate dialectical process, experiential self-analytic processes and case consultations. Both tasks generate dialectical process because they are ambiguous and open-ended in that no exact solution or conclusion can be come to. These tasks render participants' initial perspective (thesis); incompatible with competing perspectives (anti-thesis), requiring a reevaluation of understanding and developing or "trying on" of a new interpretation (synthesis; Basseches, 1980; 1984).⁶ The ways in which students are subject to their meaning making are exposed over time and that former meaning making structure becomes object.

Ambiguous and open-ended tasks in large and small groups foster dialectical learning. Learning about the functions of authority and leadership by observing, participating in, and analyzing large group dynamics as they emerge is disorienting and disequilibrating for the socialized LoC, which looks outside itself for orientation, particularly when the instructor does not satisfy the expected functions of authority as is the case in *Exercising Leadership*. Finding itself submerged in uncertainty, the socialized LoC is compromised and ultimately required to observe or engage the limits of its structure to remain effective in such uncertainty.

⁶ Hegel (1976) is credited with introducing a dialectical logic in his *Phenomenology of Spirit*, but never used the terms thesis, anti-thesis and synthesis to describe dialectical processes.

Consulting to peer cases of leadership failure in large and small groups is also disequilibrating. Multiple competing and often irreconcilable perspectives on the case are generated by the group, which make a conclusion or resolution often impossible to draw.

Interpretation and developmental bridges. Challenge, in the form of ambiguous and open-ended tasks that out-strip the capacity of one's LoC, by itself does not promote developmental growth. Kegan (1994) emphasizes the importance of building a bridge that is anchored in one's meaning making and that supports and facilitates movement to the next meaning making structure.

Basseches and Mascolo's (2010) "Developmental Analysis of Psychotherapy Process" method, which distills the core components of psychotherapeutic processes that contribute to development, illuminates how *Exercising Leadership's* recipe of case-in-point pedagogy, case presentations and consultations and interpretive framework create the developmental bridge Kegan calls for by providing attentional support, interpretation and enactment.

Attentional support. Attentional support is a process where (a) clients provide their reflections on past and present experience and the meaning they make of those experience; (b) the therapist simultaneously focuses clients' attention on their own actions, reactions, experiences and reflections; and (c) the client attends to and reflects on these observations to make sense of past and present experience. The focus here is on the client's constructive process (Basseches & Mascolo, 2010, p. 117).

Modified for the *Exercising Leadership* classroom, students themselves do the attending to and reflecting upon in a space facilitated by an instructor. Attentional support is provided to participants through tasks that facilitate the attending to and reflecting

upon past and present experiences. Leadership failure case presentations and a final paper allow attention to and reflection on past experiences before the course. Weekly written reflections, office hours with the teaching staff and case-in-point pedagogy facilitate attention to and reflection on past and present experience generated within the course.

The *Authentic Leadership* course also reflects on past experiences. There is a difference, however, between crucible experiences and leadership failures. Crucible experiences are events that featured great pressure, stress and adversity. The primary task for students is to reflect on, write about and share such a story. The leadership failures students share in *Exercising Leadership* are events that represent one's failure to generate progress on a difficult challenge. In addition to reflecting on, writing about and sharing that failure, student groups consult to the failure. In addition to the ways in which the class structures and case-in-point pedagogy provide attentional support, case consultation process offers attentional support through analyzing the presenter's misunderstanding of their own case, and highlighting oversights in the presenter's attempts to exercise leadership and the ways his or her own actions and behaviors contributed to the failure. Thus, the case consultation process provides all the aspects of attentional support. The recollection, sharing and discussion of one's crucible story does not offer the entire attentional support process.

Interpretation. Interpretation is a process where the therapist offers her own interpretation of the client's actions, experiences and reflections. The client reconciles this interpretation with his or her own understanding and appropriates, uses, modifies, or rejects the interpretation. Modified for the *Exercising Leadership* classroom, interpretation is provided by the teaching team through case-in-point observations.

Students are free to offer their own interpretation throughout the course, and it is the instructors' interpretation, and the interpretations of other students which contributes to the dialectic process and ultimately, novel synthesis.

The application of the course's interpretative framework is fundamental to all course tasks and its core concepts generate a dialectical dilemma for many students who find their implicit leadership theory is limited to their social and cultural construction (Schyns, Kiefer, Kerschreiter & Tymon, 2011). The adaptive leadership framework, then, is a challenge to conventional constructions of leadership and an interpretive tool for making sense of past and present experiences of leadership which students are required to apply in course tasks. The interpretive framework facilitates dialectical processes for students by providing novel interpretations (anti-thesis) to their original understanding of past and present experiences (thesis). It is disembedding and buoying, provoking and supporting dialectical processes.

The *Authentic Leadership* course does not create the conditions for interpreting interpersonal dynamics as they unfold in the classroom. As a result, learning experientially in the here-and-now does not occur. Additionally, crucible stories or reflections shared about one's self in their discussion group are not expected to be interpreted by fellow students in such a way as to challenge each other's understanding of their own story.

Enactment. Enactment is a process where the instructor and teaching team join students in generating novel experiences, which are generalizable to experiences beyond the classroom. In the case of *Exercising Leadership*, these experiences are specifically

applicable to contexts featuring authority and leadership dynamics. Basseches and Mascolo (2010, p. 117) describe the process:

Through interactions, guided novel experience, and reflection on such experience (rather than reflection on existing patterns of experience), the dyad creates novel skills, meanings, or experiences that may then be further generalized within the client's daily experience and integrated with the client's prior repertoire.

In this process the therapist directs and induces conditions that generate novel experiences and opportunities for skill building while the client participates in these novel experiences with the support of the therapist and/or other clients. Such enactment is core to experiential and constructivist leadership learning and is a difficult, and likely inappropriate, practice for classrooms built on didactic and dialogical pedagogies such as *Authentic Leadership*.

Joining students. Basseches (2005) suggests how higher education can play an important role in facilitating the development of dialectical thinking by demonstrating how “multiple conflicting frames of reference and multiple points of view must be presented to students as facts of life and as crucial moments in dialectical processes” (p. 60). The attentional support, interpretation and enactment practices of *Exercising Leadership* anchor a developmental bridge in the dominantly socialized experience by honoring the distress and disorientation generated by ambiguous and open-ended tasks that raise more questions than answers and ask students to let go “of a world where every question has a right answer and either authorities or logic can be counted on to provide the correct answers, to slowly build a world where the only answers one will have are those one has struggled for” (Basseches, 2005, p. 60). Such exercises require the instructor to join students “in the costs of growth” (Perry, 1978, p. 267). In their essay on rehumanizing leadership development, Petriglieri and Petriglieri (2016) emphasize the

importance of instructional practices that allow the instructor to work through an interpretive lens over a functionalist one, and join students as an active participant in the learning by exploring his or her role in the group and modeling reflective engagement.

This acknowledgement of the distress and disorientation of ambiguous and open-ended tasks that generate dialectical processes is crucial for development within and beyond the socialized LoC. This is because the greater challenge of development is not in stepping into a more expansive LoC, it is the loss of a familiar one (Kegan, 1982, 1994).

The process of joining students and acknowledging their distress and disorientation is a fundamental difference between courses. *Authentic Leadership* uses a modeling approach that illuminates how course instructors and/or individuals seen as successful leaders overcame pressure, stress and adversity in their own life and work. The findings presented in this study show how this individual focused leader-development modeling, combined with reflective exercises and discussion group activities, develops an appreciation in students for the value of introspection and reflection in their own life. Modeling and examples also prompt students to think differently about their motivations and purpose. By contrast, *Exercising Leadership's* leadership development design, which emphasizes collective processes over individual development, implicates instructors and students in learning about the behaviors they enact in the classroom, thus actually creating the conditions for student's developmental growth.

Cooperative Versus Collaborative Tasks

My comparative analysis of learning themes and course tasks between the two courses exposes a difference in what participants learned how to do in each course. I find that the didactic and dialogical demands of *Authentic Leadership's* group tasks are

cooperative in nature, while the dialectical demands of *Exercising Leadership* are collaborative in nature. Sullivan describes this difference between *cooperating* and *collaboring* (emphasis mine). Sullivan describes cooperation as an involvement with others to enhance one's self and describes collaboration as an evolution of that involvement with others that considers their enhancement (Sullivan, 1953).

Authentic Leadership students are required to share with and acknowledge each other. Members are encouraged to be vulnerable with each other and encourage vulnerability from each other and to cooperate in that process. If there are conflicting perspectives, they may remain in *dialogue* with each other.

The large class and small groups in *Exercising Leadership* are asked to complete a consultative task of working through a leadership failure/dilemma and collaborate together. In this process, conflicting perspectives must be reconciled and participants must build upon, transform, and disprove each other's perspective. The cooperative/collaborative distinction is useful in understanding the role that students play in promoting developmental growth and compensational learning in the *Exercising Leadership* course where students must publically learn in-the-moment from their experience. Their thinking and actions are made transparent and serve as examples and models for each other's learning.

Collaborating on dialectical tasks is taxing and depleting work as it inevitably exposes the limits of one's thinking (the case for all students and potentially even the instructor), the limits of one's meaning making (as is the case with the dominantly socialized LoC, which upgrades its operating system to participate effectively) and the limitations of one's behavior (as is the case with the dominantly self-authorizing LoC—

which metaphorically downloads apps that compensates for its limitations to more effectively participate). Normal operating procedure proves insufficient for all LoCs involved. Ambiguous, open-ended dialectical tasks invite multiple competing and conflicting perspectives where no correct solution is available and the quality of any contribution to the process is questionable. Interpersonal dynamics and the disturbing affect they generate are confronted and learned from through case-in-point pedagogy instead of avoided. Dominantly socialized participants report paralyzing preoccupations, while self-authorizing participants report frustration with not achieving their purpose. Even withdrawing from participation is an exposing action. The entire group process is constantly analyzed and nonparticipation is interpreted for the purpose of understanding the group.

The learning themes reported by participants in *Exercising Leadership* reveal an increased capacity for collaboration regardless of LoC or demonstrations of growth or stasis. Learning themes reported by dominantly socialized LoCs illustrate how capacities such as observing default reactions and seeing the reactions of others as data, not criticism, helps students representing socialized LoCs move towards a less vulnerable self-authorizing LoC more capable of withstanding the ambiguity, multiple frames of reference and multiple perspectives that surface in open-ended dialectical tasks. Compensational learning allows the self-authorized LoC to sustain itself through dialectical ambiguity, better navigate the generated distress, learn from it and “hold” themselves and others through it. The adaptive leadership framework’s emphasis on developing collective processes where adaptive leaders are expected to diagnose situations and deploy appropriate behavior, proactively creates environments and teams

that do not require close supervision (Yukl & Mahsud, 2010). Complex adaptive systems require framing leadership as an interactive dynamic with unpredictable outcomes in emergent dynamics (Uhl-Bien, Marion, & McKelevey, 2007). *Exercising Leadership's* process orientation is a leadership development orientation. *Authentic Leadership's* leader development orientation does not require collaborating through a leadership process; that course's focus is on individuals cooperating with each other on their individual leader-development journey. *Authentic Leadership* does not focus on the systemic challenge of advancing work in an interactive dynamic. Thus, the dialectical work tasks of *Exercising Leadership* seem to account for the markedly different nature of student performance outcomes in that course—developmental growth for socialized LoCs and compensational learning for self-authorizing LoCs. These outcomes demonstrate Day's assertion that leadership development interventions that emphasize collective processes include individual leader-development as outcomes (2000).

Collaborative Stamina

I hypothesize that to keep up with the demands of recurring dialectical tasks, which are depleting and taxing, the class-as-a-whole, and individual students participating in *Exercising Leadership* developed a collaborative stamina. Collaborative stamina allows an individual and a group to sustain themselves through dialectical tasks and manage the range of perspectives and worldviews informed by the different LoCs participating in those tasks. I hypothesize that if collective leadership development interventions are to integrate individual leader-development outcomes those interventions must develop and maintain collaborative stamina at the group level.

Inputs, outcomes and process. *Inputs.* Sustained collaborative work that requires learning, in a group that features a range of LoCs, is essential for the development of collaborative stamina. Such an environment requires a balance of supports and challenges. The challenges are ambiguous authority dynamics, experiential large and small group learning environments, case-in-point instruction highlighting systemic dynamics in real time, peer-facilitated small group sessions, systemically consulting to leadership failure cases, and consistent encouragement of systemic thinking in all large and small group class sessions and assignments. The supports are reflective exercises, a facilitative leadership team with a theory of learning experientially in groups, bounded meeting times for group tasks, an interpretive framework for making sense of experience (such as Heifetz's (1994) adaptive leadership theory), office hours/consultation, and the development of the group's own lateral bonds.

Outcomes. Individual-level outcomes of collaborative stamina are developmental growth or compensational learning. The developmental growth experienced by participants in this study is notable for two reasons: (a) instances of participant learning are correlated with instances of developmental growth as measured by the SOI and (b) the developmental growth observed in this semester long course outpaces growth found among graduate students in a four year program (Kegan, 1994, p. 189). The dominant self-authorizing LoCs that did not demonstrate growth reported compensational learning. Both developmental growth and compensational learning boost an individual's capacity for sustained collaboration. Distributing this capacity throughout all participants strengthens the group's collaborative stamina and capacity for diverse multiple perspectives, thus generating an overall stamina for collaborating on dialectical tasks.

Process. The identified outcomes are the product of a dialectical process where no single “answer” or response can be reconciled, for different LoCs interpret tasks and problems differently. Thus, all participants are required to interrogate their LoC. When any LoC does indeed grow or compensate it does so because it was challenged in such a way that it had to upgrade its “operating system,” or “download applications” to its current operating system to compensate for its limitations. Both growth and compensation require learning. The course facilitates this learning through the sum of dialectical challenges and supports which either facilitate an operating system upgrade (developmental growth) or application download (compensation). Developmental growth for the dominant socialized LoC and compensational learning for the fully self-authorizing LoC boosts the whole group’s capacity for collaboration on dialectical tasks. This process is cyclical as the increased capacity of the group to contain multiple competing perspectives spurs individual bandwidth for complexity through growth, or management of complexity through compensation.

Developing and maintaining collaborative stamina. The data collected in this study show how learners across stages of development increase their ability to: be present and participate, recognize how they are getting in their own way, elicit others’ perspectives in order to collect more data and ultimately do things that ask more of their LoC or do things that compensate for the limits of their LoC. Participants were able to compare the difference in their behavior at the end of the course to the start of the course and observe these changes.

Petriglieri & Petriglieri (2010) extend Winnicott’s original conceptualization of a holding environment to the work of management schools, defining a holding environment

as “a social context that reduces disturbing affect and facilitates sense making” (p. 50). They build on Shapiro and Carr’s (1991) description as a space for containment and interpretation. The course *Exercising Leadership* creates a holding environment that challenges participant’s LoCs and supports development and compensational learning through reflective exercises and an interpretive framework that reduces disturbing affect and facilitates sense making. The range of LoCs and the challenge and support they provide each other within this holding environment is critical to the development of collaborative stamina. By participating in this environment participants are exposing the limits of their LoC to each other. As a result, higher and lower LoCs are frustrating and challenging LoCs above and below them. Individual vertical growth and lateral compensational learning are the outcomes, which in turn boost the whole group’s capacity for containment and interpretation.

In this holding environment, other individuals with different LoCs who are initially challenging and frustrating, become essential for one’s own growth and learning. Diversity of LoCs and the perspectives they generate, and the continuous collision of those perspectives is essential for the development of collaborative stamina at group and individual levels.

A group’s ability to cohere and hold together, take and seek multiple perspectives, reflect on how it is getting in its own way instead of balkanizing, despite distress and disorientation, is a representation of the group’s collaborative stamina. Collaborative stamina allows a group to push through challenges and develop new capacities of patience, inclusion, problem solving, and systemic analysis. This is the collective

leadership development process required for generating leader-development—the group process that provokes individual developmental growth.

Collaborative stamina represents a group's ability to do more than tolerate or endure differences and diversity. Ibarra and Hansen (2011) observe that when people are left to collaborate on their own, they gravitate towards people they know well or see as familiar. This self-selection has negative consequences for innovation and efficacy. Kegan (1982, 1994) makes the same observation about individuals representing similar LoCs. They find comfort in others with a similar worldview. Ibarra and Hansen (2011) argue that collaborative leadership is required for a thriving organization and such leadership is deliberate about fostering collaboration across dispersed work groups with employees from all levels, particularly when work tasks are ambiguous and require creativity. My findings illuminate the capacities that need developing for individuals of different LoCs in environments that aim to deploy collaborative leadership.

Such an effort would need to be deliberate. Ely and Thomas (2001) show how organizations that are deliberate about using diversity initiatives for purposes of integration and learning enhanced group functioning over organizations that perceived diversity as important for access and legitimacy or for reasons of fairness. Similarly, the course *Exercising Leadership* advocates for an increased valuation of diverse and dissenting perspectives through its conceptual framework and pedagogy because it posits that the work of leadership requires learning from diverse and dissenting perspectives. The outcomes of that deliberate diversity, fueled by dialectical tasks described here and in chapter 1 of this dissertation, are significant and important.

Discussion

I set out to understand the interaction between students' LoC and two distinct leadership courses. Each course is built on its own leadership framework and has its own corresponding pedagogy for teaching that framework. My findings reveal that the course *Exercising Leadership*, rooted in adaptive leadership theory, demonstrated a very significant correlation with developmental growth for students representing a dominantly socialized LoC and that this developmental growth is reinforced by the self-reported learning that aligns with theory on developmental growth for each distinct LoC represented in that sample. I also found that self-authorizing participants in that same intervention developed compensational learning to compensate for the limitations of that LoC. I hypothesized that the combined developmental growth and compensational learning contributed to a collective and individual collaborative stamina. *Authentic Leadership* clearly fosters important learning in its students, but did not generate consistent developmental growth experiences among participants. Nor were demonstrations of developmental growth or stasis connected to student learning in the course. However, all participants representing a range of LoCs reported a new or heightened interpersonal awareness aligned with that course's authentic leadership framework.

I attribute these findings to the nature of the tasks students are engaged in. While *True North* (George, 2007) advocates for a more self-authorizing ontology, the didactic and dialogical tasks of the *Authentic Leadership* course do not expose participants to the limitations and frontier of their meaning making and thus do not interact with participant LoC in such a way that might promote development towards that self-authorizing

ontology if not already present. The dialectical tasks of *Exercising Leadership* do expose the limits and frontiers of the dominantly socialized LoC in such a way that they demand developmental growth. Instructional practices that provide attentional support, interpretation and enactment support that developmental transition. Self-authorizing participants expand their operational repertoire by compensating for the limits of their meaning making and demonstrating a more inclusive and political orientation.

Contributions to literature. In their review of the last 25 years of leadership development literature, Day, Fleenor, Atwater, Sturm, and McKee (2013) suggest an emphasis on longitudinal research that aims to capture leadership development processes and a focus on constructive-developmental theory (CDT) as a relevant variable with broad applicability. This investigation uses a longitudinal design and CDT methods to explore leadership development processes and seeks to contribute to a field preoccupied with knowledge, skills and ability acquisition (DeRue & Myers, 2014; Mumford, Campion & Morgeson, 2007).

This work fills gaps in the CDT and leader-development literature on how different LoCs interact with leader-development interventions. Little has been understood about how one's stage of development interacts with interventions or what promotes development for different LoCs (Bushe & Gibbs, 1990; Manners et al., 2004; Pfaffenberger, 2005). This effort reveals data about how different LoCs interact with the experiential and dialectical tasks of *Exercising Leadership*, but also shows how a range of stages responded identically to the *Authentic Leadership* intervention. These findings suggest that without dialectical tasks and the intrapsychic conflict they generate and practices which support sense-making of that conflict (Basseches, 1984; Basseches &

Mascolo, 2010), which expose the limits of ones LoC, it will be difficult to know how that stage will interact with the intervention.

The roles of attentional support, interpretation, and enactment practices, outlined by Basseches and Mascolo (2010), in *Exercising Leadership*, and its developmental outcomes for dominantly socialized LoCs contributes to the literature on what promotes development (Loevinger, 1976; Bartunek et al., 1983; Kegan, 1982, 1994; Mezirow, 1991; Manners, Durkin & Nesdale, 2004). *Exercising Leadership* is built on instructional practices aligned with attentional support (leadership failure case, weekly written reflections on class experiences, office hours, and case-in-point), interpretation (interpretive adaptive leadership framework applied in large and small group case consultations, weekly written reflections on class experiences, and reinforced through case-in-point), and enactment (generation and analysis of novel experiences generalizable beyond the classroom; Basseches & Mascolo, 2010, p. 117). These practices serve to explain and make sense of the conflict generated by interpersonal dialectical processes which support synthetic learning.

Authentic Leadership, where demonstrations of developmental growth are not correlated with the course experience, and where reported learning themes do not articulate different interactions by LoC, offers attentional support, but does not engage students in dialectical processes nor illuminate the conflict generated by those processes through interpretation or enactment.

These findings also raise critical questions about developing authentic leadership. Algra & Lips-Wiersma (2012) note that authentic leadership development efforts have abandoned a concern for the complexity and paradox of authenticity and that the concept

is at risk of becoming a functional management strategy. I suggest that the didactic and dialogic tasks core to course activity do not require one to truly be vulnerable, nor authentic. While students enrolled in *Authentic Leadership* reported an increased appreciation for vulnerability, the actual vulnerability was demonstrated by the dominantly socialized students in *Exercising Leadership* who learned publically by exposing the limits of their mettle in collaborative and dialectical work tasks. The demands of participating in adaptive processes are what actually require vulnerability and the subsequent revealing of one's authentic self. Such a process is what Algera and Lips-Wiersma (2012) propose as necessary to truly cultivate authenticity.

The concept of collaborative stamina builds on the individualized leader development and social capital leadership development distinction (Day, 2001) and suggests that leader- and leadership development are synonymous in the sense that leadership development includes leader-development, but the reverse is not necessarily true. The concept of collaborative stamina may be a useful contribution to the distinction between leader and leadership development and points to what leadership development programs that hope to transcend and integrate leader-development should strive to cultivate. This finding builds on shared or distributed leadership concepts, where collaborative stamina serves as an example of what the actual collective achievement of social interaction can be (Pearce & Conger, 2003).

These findings also leave provocative questions for the *Exercising Leadership* and its practitioners: What would it take for that course to be as successful promoting growth beyond the self-authoring LoC as it currently is in promoting growth beyond the socialized LoC? Would changes to the course tasks aimed at provoking development

from a self-authorizing to self-transforming LoC reduce or sabotage developmental efficacy for dominantly socialized LoCs? Is an entirely different course, featuring mostly self-authorizing participants required to provoke development for that LoC?

Additionally, these findings add to Drath's (2001) hypothesis that collective/social leadership requires changes in the meaning making structures of all participants. Compensational learning may serve as a substitute for developmental growth at the dominant self-authorizing LoC, particularly if there exists no LoC above self-authorizing to model or provoke development beyond that stage. Day et al. (2013) suggest future research should focus on the collective aspects of leadership. Collaborative stamina offers a new frame of reference for describing what a more integrative ontology of leadership might look like (Drath, McCauley, Palus, Velsor, O'Connor and McGuire, 2008) and what can be collectively developed and observed and measured.

Contributions to practice. Day (2000) recommends leadership development processes that transcend and integrate leader-development efforts. This work reinforces the notion that the path to individual leader-development is indeed through collective process and a leadership development design. Leadership development programs aiming to promote individual developmental growth or compensational learning for self-authorized participants should not only consider what the literature has to say about promoting growth (Loevinger, 1976; Bartunek et al., 1983; Kegan, 1982, 1994; Mezirow, 1991; Manners, Durkin & Nesdale, 2004), but integrate dialectical tasks paired with attentional growth, interpretation and enactment processes (Basseches, 1984; Basseches & Mascolow, 2010).

Sinclair (2007) writes about the challenge of teaching experientially and dialectically in a systems psychodynamic tradition that does indeed deploy practices outlined by Basseches and Mascolo (2010). Her essay points to the ‘highs’ and ‘lows’ of that experience and the strain of holding the group and providing interpretation. These findings suggest that a leadership framework like the adaptive leadership framework (Heifetz, 1994; Heifetz, Grashow & Linsky, 2009; Heifetz & Linsky, 2002) can facilitate interpretative practices and distribute responsibility for interpretation throughout students in the class, providing students a resource for sustaining themselves through interpersonal and intrapsychic conflict.

Sutherland, Gosling and Jelinek (2015) note that Heifetz’s course on adaptive leadership has thrived at a school of government for many years, but similar courses that analyze power dynamics are not offered at business schools and that courses that focus on and examine power are mostly absent at business schools altogether (Chapter Three of this dissertation examines that curious dynamic). The challenge to one’s authenticity as he or she advances through increasingly powerful roles of authority is best understood through experience and that experience is a political one regardless of your organization’s funding source. Authentic leadership development practitioners should consider collaborative, experiential and dialectical work tasks if they are interested in truly fostering a self-authorizing ontology among students representing dominant socialized LoCs.

Limitations and Future Directions

This study has four limitations. This comparison of courses does not feature a third control group. The study design is quasi-longitudinal; data collection midway

through the intervention or at a point beyond the intervention would reveal more about the interaction between LoCs and the course and the endurance of developmental outcomes detected at Time 2. Additionally, these findings rely on a single metric for measuring LoC, the SOI. As there is no single way to teach adaptive or authentic leadership, these findings may not be generalizable to courses that feature different design elements.

These findings have implications for scholars straddling adult and leader development disciplines and leadership and organizational development disciplines. Leader and adult development scholars should examine the role participants representing other LoCs have on the development of each other's development (Valcea, Hamdani, Buckley & Novicevic, 2011) and how such leader-follower dyads might generate compensational learning for self-authorized participants. Leadership and organizational development scholars can build on these findings to further identify the inputs and outputs of collaborative stamina, a phenomena found in this investigation that may be easier to detect using methods that are less individually focused.

In all cases, scholars studying leader- or leadership development should pay more attention to the demands of the tasks fundamental to our interventions. This investigation suggests that tasks are a greater predictor of performance than content (City, et al., 2009).

References

- Algera, P. M., & Lips-Wiersma, M. (2012). Radical authentic leadership: Co-creating the conditions under which all members of the organization can be authentic. *Leadership Quarterly*, 23, 118–131.
- Avolio, B. J. (2005). *Leadership development in balance: Made/Born*. NJ: Erlbaum.
- Avolio, B. J. (2007). Promoting more integrative strategies for leadership theory building. *American Psychologist*, 62, 25–33.
- Avolio, B., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2014). Authentic leadership theory, research and practice: Steps taken and steps that remain. *Oxford Handbook of Leadership and Organizations* (Ed. David V. Day) Oxford University Press
- Bartone, P. T., Snook, S. A., Forsythe, G. B., Lewis, P., & Bullis, R. C. (2007). Psychosocial development and leader performance of military officer cadets. *Leadership Quarterly*, 18, 490–504.
- Bartunek, J. M., Gordon, J. R., & Weathersby, R. P. (1983). Developing “complicated” understanding in administrators. *Academy of Management Review*, 8, 273–284.
- Basseches, M. (1980). Dialectical schemata: A framework for the empirical study of the development of dialectical thinking. *Human Development*, 23, 400–421.
- Basseches, M. (1980). *Dialectical thinking and adult development*. Norwood: Ablex Corporation.
- Basseches, M. (2005). The development of dialectical thinking as an approach to integration. *Integral Review*, 1, 47–63.
- Basseches, M., & Mascolo, M. (2010). *Psychotherapy as a developmental process*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bennis, W. G., & Thomas, R. J. (2002). *Geeks and geezers: How era, values and defining moments shape leaders*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School.
- Benstock, S. 1988. Authorizing the autobiographical. In S. Benstock (Ed.), *The private self: Theory and practice of women’s autobiographical writings* (pp. 10–33). Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina.
- Berkovich, I. (2014). Between person and person: Dialogical pedagogy in authentic leadership development. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 9, 119–131.

- Boyce, L. A., Zaccaro, S. J., & Wisecarver, M. Z. (2010). Popeness for self-development of leadership attributes: Understanding, predicting, and supporting performance of leader self-development. *Leadership Quarterly*, 21, 159–178.
- Brookfield, S. (1995). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Burke, M. J., & Day, R. R. (1986). A cumulative study of the effectiveness of managerial training, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 232–245.
- Bushe, G. R., & Gibbs, B. W. (1990). Predicting organization development consulting competence from the myers-briggs type indicator and stage of ego development. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 26, 337–357.
- Caza, A., & Jackson, B. (2011). Authentic leadership. In A. Bryman, D. Collinson, K. Grint, B. Jackson & M. Uhl-Bien (Eds.), *Sage handbook of leadership* (pp. 350 – 362). CA: Thousand Oaks.
- City, L., Elmore, R., Fiarman, S., & Teitel, L. (2009). *Instructional rounds in education*. Cambridge: Harvard Education Press.
- Collins, D. B., & Holton, E. F. (2004). The effectiveness of managerial leadership development programs: A meta-analysis of studies from 1982 to 2001. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 15, 217–248.
- Day, D. V. (2000). Leadership development: A review in context. *Leadership Quarterly*, 11, 581–613.
- Day, D. V. (2014). The future of leadership: Challenges and prospects. In David V. Day (Ed.), *Oxford handbook of leadership and organizations* (pp. 859–867). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Day, D. V., Harrison, M. M., & Halpin, S. M. (2009). *An integrative approach to leader development: Connecting adult development, identity, and expertise*. New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Day, D. V., Fleenor, J. W., Atwater, L. E., Sturm, R. E., & McKee, R. A. (2013). Advances in leader and leadership development: A review of 25 years of research and theory. *Leadership Quarterly*, 25, 63–82.
- DeRue, S., & Myers, C. G. 2014. Leadership development: A review and agenda for future research. In D. V. Day (Ed.), *Oxford handbook of leadership and organizations* (pp. 832–855). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Drath, W. H., McCauley, C. D., Palus, C. J., Van Velsor, E., O'Connor, P. M. G., & McGuire, J. B., (2008). Direction, alignment, commitment: Toward a more integrative ontology of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 635–653.

- Dukerich, J. M., Nichols, M. L., Elm, D. R., & Vollrath, D. A. (1990). Moral reasoning in groups: Leaders make a difference. *Human Relations*, 43, 473–493.
- Fonda, H., Rose, R. (Producers), & Lumet, S. (Director). (1957). *12 Angry Men* [Motion picture]. United States: MGM Studios.
- Gardner, W. L., Cogliser, C. C., Davis, K. M., & Dickens, M. (2011). Authentic leadership: A review of the literature and research agenda. *Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 1120–1145.
- Garvey-Berger, J. (2013). *Changing on the job: Developing leaders for a complex world*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- George, B., & Sims, P. (2007). *True north: Discover your authentic leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- George, B., McLean, A., & Craig, N. (2008). *Finding your true north: A personal guide*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- George, B., & Baker, D. (2011). *True north groups: A powerful path to personal and leadership development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Ghosh, R., Haynes, R. K., & Kram, K. E. (2013). Developmental networks at work: Holding environments for leader development. *Career Development International*, 18, 232–256.
- Gordon, R., Hinton, C., Long Bow Group., WGBH (Television station: Boston, Mass.), Independent Television Service., National Asian American Telecommunications Association., & CrossCurrent Media. (1996). *The gate of Heavenly peace*. San Francisco, CA: Distributed by NAATA/CrossCurrent Media.
- Guilleux, F. (2010). *A developmental perspective on leadership education of aspiring principals* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3471901)
- Hasegawa, B. A. (2003). *The teacher leader role shift: A constructive-developmental study of teacher leaders' experiences of role transition and authority relationships* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3100144)
- Hannah, S. T., Walumbwa, F. O., & Fry, J. (2011). Leadership in action teams: Team leader and members' authenticity, authenticity strength, and performance outcomes. *Personnel Psychology*, 64, 771–801.
- Harris, L. S., & Kuhnert, K. W. (2007). Looking through the lens of leadership: A constructive developmental approach. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 29, 47–67.

- Hegel, G. W. F. (1976). *Phenomenology of spirit*. (A. V. Miller, Trans.). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1807).
- Heifetz, R. A. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University.
- Heifetz, R. A., Sinder, R. M., Jones, A., Hodge, L. M., & Rowley, K. A. (1989). Teaching and assessing leadership courses at the John F. Kennedy School of Government. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 8, 536–562.
- Heifetz, R., Grashow, A., & Linsky, M. (2009). *The practice of adaptive leadership*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Heifetz, R., & Laurie, D. (1998). Work of leadership. *Harvard Business Review*, 3, 171–198.
- Heifetz, R. A., & Laurie, D. L. (1999). Mobilizing adaptive work: Beyond visionary leadership. In J. A. Conger, G. M. Spreitzer, & E. E. Lawler (Eds.) *The leader's change handbook* (pp. 55–86). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Heifetz, R. A., & Linsky, M. (2002). *Leadership on the line: Staying alive through the dangers of leading*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Helsing, D., & Howell, A. (2013). Understanding leadership from the inside out: Assessing leadership potential using constructive-developmental theory. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 23, 186–204.
- Hollander, E. P., & Julian, J. W. (1969). Contemporary trends in the analysis of leadership processes. *Psychological Bulletin*, 71, 387–397.
- Hmieleski, K. M., Cole, M. S., & Baron, R. A. (2012). Shared authentic leadership and new venture performance. *Journal of Management*, 38, 1476–1499.
- Jensen, S. M., & Luthans, F. (2006). Entrepreneurs as authentic leaders: Impact on employees' attitudes. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 27, 646–666.
- Kegan, R. (1982). *The evolving self*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Kegan, R. (1994). *In over our heads*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Kegan, R., & Lahey, L. L. (2009). *Immunity to change: How to overcome it and unlock the potential in yourself and your organization*. Cambridge: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kellerman, B. (2012). *The end of leadership*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.

- Kernis, M. H. (2003). Toward a conceptualization of optimal self-esteem. *Psychological Inquiry*, 14, 1–26.
- Kernis, M. H., Goldman, B. M., (2005). From thought and experience to behavior and interpersonal relationships: A multicomponent conceptualization of authenticity. In A. Tesser, J. V. Wood & D. Stapel (Eds.), *On building defending and regulating the self: A psychological perspective* (pp. 31–52). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Kohlberg, L. (1969). *Stage and sequence: The cognitive-developmental approach to socialization*. San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.
- Lahey, L. L., Souvaine, E., Kegan, R., Goodman, R., & Felix, S. (1988). *A guide to the subject-object interview: Its administration and interpretation*. Cambridge: Harvard Graduate School of Education.
- Loevinger, J. (1976). *Ego development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- McCauley, C. D., Drath, W. H., Palus, C. J., O'Connor, P. M. G., & Baker, B. A. (2006). The use of constructive-developmental theory to advance the understanding of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 634–653.
- McGowan, E. M., Stone, E. M., & Kegan, R. (2007). A constructive-developmental approach to mentoring relationships. In B. R. Rose & K. E. Kram (Eds.), *The handbook of mentoring at work: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 401–425). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Manners, J., Durkin, K., & Nesdale, A. (2004). Promoting advanced ego development among adults. *Journal of Adult Development*, 11, 19–27.
- Martynwych, P. J. (2006). *Revisiting self-analytic groups* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded source book*. New York, NY: Sage.
- Moriano, J. A., Molero, F., & Mangin, J. P. L., (2011). Authentic leadership: Concept and validation of the ALQ in Spain. *Psicothema*, 23, 336–341.
- Mumford, T. V., Campion, M. A., & Morgeson, F. P. (2007). The leadership skills strataplex: Leadership skills for a changing world: Solving complex social problems. *Leadership Quarterly*, 18, 154–166.

- O'Leonard, K. (2010). *The corporate learning factbook 2009: Benchmarks, trends and analysis of the U.S. Training Market*. Oakland: Bersin & Associates.
- Parks, S. D. (2005). *Leadership can be taught*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Perry, W. G. (1978). Sharing in the costs of growth. In C. A. Parker (Ed.), *Encouraging development in college students*. (pp. 267–273). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Petriglieri, G., & Petriglieri, J. L. (2010). Identity workspaces: The case of business schools. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 9, 44–60.
- Petriglieri, G., & Petriglieri, J. L. (2015). Can business schools humanize leadership? *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 14, 625–647.
- Petriglieri, G., Wood, J. D., & Petriglieri, J. L. (2011). Up close and personal: Building foundations for leaders' development through the personalization of management learning. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10, 430–450.
- Pfaffenberger, a. H. (2005). Optimal adult development: An inquiry into the dynamics of growth. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 45, 279–301.
- Pulaski, M. A. S. (1980). *Understanding Piaget* (Rev. ed.). New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Rice, A. K. (1965). *Learning for leadership*. London, England: Tavistock.
- Rooke, D., & Torbert, W. R. (1998). Organizational transformation as a function of CEO's developmental stage. *Organizational Development Journal*, 16, 11–28.
- Schyns, B., Kiefer, T., Kerschreiter, R., & Tymon, A. (2011). Teaching implicit leadership theories to develop leaders and leadership: How and why it can make a difference. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10, 397–408.
- Shamir, B. (2011). Leadership takes time: Some implications of (not) taking time seriously in leadership research. *Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 307–315.
- Sinclair, A. (2007). Teaching leadership critically to MBAs: Experiences from heaven and hell. *Management Learning*, 38, 458–472.
- Silver, J., & Josselson, R. (2010). Epistemological lenses and group relations learning. *Organisational & Social Dynamics*, 10, 155–179.

- Smith, B. J. (1999). *Transformative professional development: Discovering teachers' concepts of politicized classroom practice* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9933154)
- Snook, S. A. (2008). Leader(ship) development. Harvard Business School Case 408-064, October 2007. (Revised June 2008.)
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Sullivan, H. S. (1953). *The interpersonal theory of psychiatry*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Torbert, B., & Associates. (2004). *Action inquiry: The secret of timely and transforming leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Kohler.
- Twain, Norman (Producer), & Avildsen, John G. (Director). (1989). *Lean on me* [Motion picture]. United States: Warner Bros.
- Uhl-Bien, M., Marion, R., & McKelvey, B. (2007). Complexity leadership theory: Shifting leadership from the industrial age to the knowledge era. *Leadership Quarterly*, 18, 298–318.
- Valcea, S., Hamdani, M. R., Buckley, M. R., Novicevic, M. M. (2011). Exploring the developmental potential of leader-follower interactions: A constructive-developmental approach. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 604–615.
- Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S., & Peterson, S. J., (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of Management*, 34, 89–126.
- Walumbwa, F. O., Christensen, A. L., & Hailey, F. (2011). Authentic leadership and the knowledge economy: Sustaining motivation and trust among knowledge workers. *Organizational Dynamics*, 40, 110–118.
- Walumbwa, F. O., Hartnerll, A. L., Aryee, S., & Christensen, C. A. (2011). *Fostering creativity in work groups: Authentic leadership, communication climate and knowledge sharing*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Annual Meetings. San Antonio, TX.
- Walumbwa, F. O., Wang, P., Wang, H., Schaubroeck, J., & Avolio, B. J. (2010). Psychological processes linking authentic leadership and follower behavior. *Leadership Quarterly*, 21, 901–914.
- Yukl, G., & Mahsud, R. (2010). Why flexible and adaptive leadership is essential. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 62, 81–93.

Appendix 2A: Subject/Object Interview Protocol

The goal of this interview protocol is to determine how the participant makes sense of their own experience and thinks about things. Participants are encouraged to freely share their experiences, but share only what they wish.

PART I: Generating Content:

The participant received ten index cards identified by the following words:

1) Angry; 2) Anxious and/or nervous; 3) Success; 4) Strong stand and/or conviction; 5) Sad; 6) Torn; 7) Moved and/or touched; 8) Lost something; 9) Change; 10) Important to me

Participants are asked to record a recent experience that resonates with each word on the card for ten minutes. Participants keep the cards; they are not collected. This process primes the participant for sharing information that reveals developmental stage construction.

PART II: Sharing Content

The interviewer has no predetermined list of questions for the participants. The participant is encouraged to share what they recorded on the cards and are encouraged to start with any card they choose. Interviewer questions are variations on “Why?” “What is most/worst important about that?” and “What is the best/worst outcome in that scenario?”

Appendix 2B: Semistructured Interview Questions

Interviews administered after the course featured additional open-ended questions about the student learning experience in graduate school and the leadership course. The questions are flexible and allow for probing.

Regarding graduate school:

- What would you describe as your most valuable learning from all of graduate school?
- What graduate school learning do you think will have the biggest impact on your work and life?

Regarding leadership course:

- What aspect of the course did you find most challenging?
- Did that help or hinder your learning?
- What aspect of the course did you find most supportive?
- What would you say was the overall effect of the course on you?
- Were emotions connected to your learning in the course?
- What does leadership mean to you?
- Would you describe yourself as a leader?

Appendix 2C: Description of Dominantly Socialized Stages and Substages as They Relate to Leadership

<p>Kegan's third stage of development is known as the socialized mind. People who inhabit this level of consciousness depend on the judgments of others for their sense of self, developing their sense of self by consulting others' reflections of them. Adults at this stage ask themselves: "Do the people, affiliations and organizations I value, value and like me?" "Do they approve of me?" "Do they think I am a good person?" Adults characteristic of this stage of development are threatened by disagreement, difference, criticism or conflict. When others are disappointed in them, they feel personally responsible and they are inclined to hold others responsible for their own feelings, for their sense of self is dependent on the attributes assigned to them by others (O'Brien, 2013; Kegan, 1994; Kegan & Lahey, 2001).</p> <p>Stage three implications for leadership. Leadership at this level of consciousness can be challenging as one is likely to be concerned with how their decisions will be perceived and image management can trump the most beneficial possible outcome (Kegan, 1994; Kegan & Lahey, 2001). The socialized order of mind is not necessarily a pushover. Leaders at this level can indeed hold a firm position and confidently make decisions despite differences. However, they cannot call those beliefs into question, their sense of judgment suffers if they are uncertain about how their external source of authority would make sense of a new situation, and competing expectations from equally valued external sources can be destabilizing. Leaders and managers representing the socialized mind who are loyal to their organizations and people, however, may also be rewarded for their tendency to maintain the status quo, skirt or suppress conflict and represent the best interests of their organization. Though normally conflict avoidant, these leaders, fueled by the support of those who believe in them, may also feel compelled to represent the interests of groups they identify with and vice versa (O'Brien, 2013).</p> <p>Adapted from Lahey et al., 1988.</p>	3/2	This Level of Consciousness (LoC) is at least 51% Socialized and 49% Instrumental. At this LoC the perspective and desire of the Instrumental mind are present, but are trumped by the perspective and desire of the Socialized LoC.
	3(2)	This LoC is characterized as Socialized with a residual or waning Instrumental LoC. The perspectives and desires of the Instrumental mind are background concerns to a much more dominant Socialized LoC.
	3	A solid Socialized LoC. Any residual Instrumental characteristics are all but lost. The sense of self is solidly composed of the perspectives, judgments from and affiliation with others.
	3(4)	This LoC is characterized as Socialized with a new, emerging glimmer of Self-Authorized. The perspectives and desires of the Self-Authorized mind are newly present. These perspectives and desires may be detected in thoughts, but are unlikely to manifest in behaviors.
	3/4	This LoC is at a minimum 51% Socialized and 49% Self-Authorized. At this LoC the perspective and desire of the Self-Authorized mind are present, but are trumped by the perspective and desire of the Socialized LoC.

Appendix 2D: Description of Dominantly Self-Authorized Stages and Substages as They Relate to Leadership

<p>Kegan's fourth stage of development is known as the self-authoring mind. People who inhabit this order of mind depend on an internal compass and their own values for their sense of self. Their sense of identity is composed by the values they deem important. Adults inhabiting the self-authorized mind orient themselves to an internal authority composed of values and opinions they have decided upon or imported as their own. Adults at this stage ask themselves: "Am I the person I want to be and think I am?" "Am I living up to my own expectations and values?" "What criteria can I establish to determine that I am doing a good job?"</p> <p>Individuals at this stage of development are not as threatened by disagreement, difference, criticism or conflict; they may see them as occasions to be managed or learning opportunities. When others are disappointed in them they compare that external disappointment to their own internal standards. They will not feel responsible for another's disappointment if that disappointment does not align with their internal values (Kegan, 1994; Kegan & Lahey, 2001, O'Brien, 2013).</p> <p>Stage four implications for leadership. Leaders at this level of consciousness are more equipped to make difficult decisions for they are not as preoccupied with how others perceive them; rather, they are concerned with doing what they see as the best course of action connected to their personal values and assumptions. Individuals at this level of consciousness see the collision of multiple perspectives as inevitable and necessary to generate the best ideas and solutions. However, others can find those at the self-authoring stage frustrating for their prioritization of internal values over the perspectives of others. The self-authoring mind tends to ignore perspectives that don't serve their agenda well and can possibly suffer from 'tunnel-vision' in their relentless pursuit of what they deem the best possible outcome. Helsing and Howell (2013) cite multiple developmental perspectives to articulate the connection between self-authorship and leadership, "Leaders in the modern world may need to be operating predominately from the self-authoring stage, if they are to fulfill the many complex demands of their roles" (Eigel, 1998; Joiner & Josephs, 2007; Kegan, 1994, McCauley et al., 2006; Torbert, 2004; Van Velsor & Drath, 2004).</p> <p>Adapted from Lahey et al., 1988.</p>	4/3	This LoC is at a minimum 51% Self-Authorized and 49% Socialized. At this LoC the perspectives and desires of the Socialized mind are present, but are trumped by the perspectives and desires of the Self-Authorized mind.
	4(3)	This LoC is characterized as Self-Authorized with a residual or waning Socialized LoC. The perspectives and desires of the Socialized mind are background concerns to a much more dominant Self-Authorized LoC.
	4	A solid Socialized LoC. Any residual Socialized characteristics are all but lost. The sense of self is solidly composed of the values and beliefs that the mind has imported over time and made its own.
	4(5)	This LoC is characterized as Self-Authorized with a new, emerging glimmer of Self-Transforming. The perspectives and desires of the Self-Transforming mind are newly present. These perspectives and desires may be detected in thoughts, but are unlikely to manifest in behaviors.

CHAPTER 3

THE CHALLENGE AND RISK OF INTEGRATING EXPERIENTIAL AND CONSTRUCTIVIST LEADERSHIP LEARNING INTO THE MANAGEMENT CURRICULUM

Abstract

This third study focuses on efforts at the professional school to integrate the experiential and constructivist methods I examined in Chapters One and Two into the management curriculum. For this study, I organized and analyzed documentation regarding the establishment of Yale's School of Organization and Management in 1973 and the school's restructuring in 1988. That restructuring effort eliminated the experiential and constructivist methods the school was established upon in 1973. I found that the school was not strategic about the purpose of experiential and constructivist methods and generated a divided learning experience for students, which fueled a dynamic that subsequently split faculty along ideological lines.

Introduction

The public outcry for more and better leadership is getting onerous. We repeatedly lament the lack of leadership we need from the leaders we have and keep looking for better and wiser people to fill leadership positions when they are vacant. And we are repeatedly writing about the problem—looking to our universities, colleges and business schools in particular to redirect our efforts for training the next wave of leadership.⁷ Scholars urge those organizations to amplify their focus on ethics, moral

7. Lyman W. Porter and Lawrence E. McKibbin, *Management Education and Development*, (New York: McGraw Hill, 1988); Jeffery Pfeffer and Christina T. Fong, "The End of Business Schools? Less Success than Meets the Eye," *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 1 (2002): 78-95; Warren G. Bennis and James O'Toole, "How Business Schools Lost Their Way," *Harvard Business Review* 83 (2005): 96-104; Rakesh Khurana, *From Higher Aims to Hired Hands*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007); Henry Mintzberg, *Managers Not MBAs: A Hard Look at the Soft Practice of Managing and*

reasoning, interpersonal-skills, and holistic approaches to achieving organizational missions while also doing no harm.

Business school critics in particular, who claim there is an urgent need to disrupt and innovate, write as though a more humanizing approach to teaching leadership has never existed. However, humanizing approaches to management and leader education have existed for some time. Humanistic management education is defined here as an orientation to management education that is experiential and constructivist. Such methods encourage questions about management leadership and honor individual experiences and ambiguity as critical components of a self-construal process where one determines for one's self, with the assistance of theory and best practices, how he or she can best take up management leadership roles. Programs that incorporate such methods emphasize self-mastery, leading of one's self, and emotional intelligence as important outcomes. These methods stand opposed to the dominant functionalist orientation to management education, which explains how management and leadership works and provides strategies, practices and tools for managing and leading effectively. One robust effort to humanize management education, which received national attention for some time, is the case of Yale's School of Organization and Management (SOM). Experiential and constructivist courses designed to illuminate individual and group behavior were considered foundational to the school's mission of humanizing management practices in public and private bureaucracies and organizations. However, the school was suddenly

Management Development, (San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler, 2004); Graduate Management Admissions Council, *Disrupt or be Disrupted: A Blueprint for Change in Management Education*, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2013); Gianpiero Petriglieri and Jennifer Louise Petriglieri, "Can Business Schools Humanize Leadership?" *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 14 (2015): 625-647.

restructured in 1988 and the OB program, which offered such classes, was ultimately terminated. Junior faculty contracts were not renewed and experiential courses were phased out. Student and alumni protests focusing on the value of those experiential and constructivist courses were large and enduring. However, Yale's decision stuck and sent signals throughout academia about the perceived value of experiential and constructivist leadership courses.

The purpose of this study is to present a scholarly analysis of that case, illustrating the challenge and risks that those who strive to integrate humanizing approaches to management and leader education face in a Western academic environment of higher education. The historical investigation presented here does not describe a failure to establish courses or a pedagogical practice that meets the demands of a more rigorous and holistic humanistic management and leadership preparation. The study illuminates a story of the failure to integrate these courses into the professional management school and management degree curriculum despite a vision and a plan to do exactly that—create a more holistic and humane management and leadership degree with equivalent social capital, but distinguished from what was, and remains, an increasingly inadequate and ubiquitous MBA.

This study reinforces suggestions that those interested in truly changing the MBA experience need to do more than add additional “clinical” courses to the curriculum as electives for self-selective students.⁸ They need to (a) focus on their school's capacity to contain debate about the purpose of the organization and its theories of learning, (b)

8. Gianpiero Petriglieri, Jack Denfield Wood, Jennifer Louise Petriglieri, “Up Close and Personal: Building Foundations for Leaders' Development Through the Personalization of Management Learning,” *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 10 (2011).

maintain internal coherence despite pressure from the external status quo, (c) and foster true integration of humanistic management courses within the curriculum by being explicit about the advantages and limitations of the epistemologies, disciplines and methods that inform pedagogical practices.⁹

I reviewed archival and journalistic documentation regarding Yale SOM to make sense of the establishment and eventual demise of the experiential course work considered by students and alum as the “soul” of their program and the foundation of the school’s humanistic orientation and instruction. The narrative I uncover, built from publically available archival data, reveals a story of ideological and disciplinary rifts, exposed by a vague mission and purpose, and the ways that pedagogical practices emanating from opposing sides of that rift contributed to elimination of the OB program and the experiential learning considered foundational to the school’s unique degree and humanistic orientation.

Through this analysis I am able to disrupt current discourse around the need to innovate and revise management programs and curricula to be more humanistic toward one that considers the risks of honoring such curricula. Recommendations, then, focus not on what course work should look like or include, but on *what the necessary internal conditions might be* for professional schools interested in truly integrating humanistic and experiential curricula into their management programs.

I begin with a review of the management education and leadership development literature and an explanation of my data collection and analysis. I use a systems

9. JC Spender and Rakesh Khurana, “Intellectual Signatures: Impact on Relevance and Doctoral Programs,” in *Disrupt or Be Disrupted: A Blueprint for Change in Management Education*, ed. Graduate Management Admission Council (Hoboken: Wiley & Sons, 2013), 95-130.

psychodynamic lens to analyze the story that emerges from the collected archival data. I interpret that analysis by articulating the effect experiential and constructivist teaching has first on the students, then the instructors and finally, the impact on the institution. My discussion moves to one of organizational conditions and the internal coherence required for true integration of a humanistic curriculum at the management school.

Literature Review

Professional Management School Literature

Despite the promise of management education, scholars have continually illuminated the inability of business schools and their MBA programs to generate the leaders and managers we crave. Khurana provides the most detailed documentation of the MBA's history and trajectory, determining that the business school and the MBA have mostly failed at achieving their purpose of professionalizing management.¹⁰ Dierdorff & Holtom acknowledge in the Graduate Management Admission Council's collection on the current condition of the MBA, that the current status quo is quickly becoming irrelevant.¹¹ That collection reinforces Pfeffer and Fong's observation that there is no correlation between MBA course work and career success and that there is no evidence the research generated by business schools impact organizations.¹² Bennis & O'Toole's stinging narrative that an imbalanced business school faculty composed mainly of

10. Rakesh Khurana, *From Higher Aims to Hired Hands*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007).

11. Brooks C. Holtom and Lyman W. Porter, "Introduction: The Change Imperative," in *Disrupt or Be Disrupted: A Blueprint for Change in Management Education*, ed. Graduate Management Admission Council (Hoboken: Wiley & Sons, 2013), 1-20.

12. Jeffery Pfeffer and Christina T. Fong, "The End of Business Schools? Less Success than Meets the Eye," *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 1 (2002).

positivist researchers consistently generate empirical findings that do not resonate in the real world and that MBA curricula overvalue theory and financial analysis.¹³

Ghoshal identifies how an exclusive application of a scientific model on human behavior by business schools has “freed students from any sense of moral responsibility.”¹⁴ Ghoshal’s analysis implicates business schools for generating and disseminating bad theory, which negatively impacts management practice.¹⁵ Petriglieri and Petriglieri reinforce the notion that business schools are complicit, not only in their irrelevance, but in their reduction of management and leadership to a set of skills while elevating the notion of leadership to a virtuous ‘je ne sais quoi.’¹⁶ Those authors go on to maintain that business schools help fuel a growing disconnect between leaders, their supposed followers and the organizations they are meant to serve.

The status quo, however, is powerful and the external forces put on business schools hinder their ability to innovate, or even achieve their own purpose. Nonsensical ranking has pulled schools from their purpose¹⁷ - putting them on a path to irrelevance.¹⁸

13. Bennis and James O'Toole, “How Business Schools Lost Their Way,” *Harvard Business Review* 83 (2005).

14. Sumantra Ghoshal, “Bad Management Theories are Destroying Good Management Practice,” *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 4 (2005), 76.

15. Sumantra Ghoshal, “Bad Management Theories are Destroying Good Management Practice,” *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 4 (2005).

16. Gianpiero Petriglieri and Jennifer Louise Petriglieri, “Can Business Schools Humanize Leadership?” *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 14 (2015).

17. Nancy J. Adler and Anne-Wil Harzing, “When Knowledge Wins: Transcending the Sense and Nonsense of Academic Rankings. *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 8, (2009).

18. Erich C. Dierdorff and Brooks C. Holtom, “Epilogue,” in *Disrupt or Be Disrupted: A Blueprint for Change in Management Education*, ed. Graduate Management Admission Council (Hoboken: Wiley & Sons, 2013): 370-371.

Rankings establish external expectations that schools inevitably embrace over their own purpose.¹⁹

Rankings serve as one tyrannical master, positivism another. Spender and Khurana reveal how positivist methods dominate the research landscape.²⁰ They show how doctoral programs, and MBA programs by proxy, struggle to maintain an academic identity that drives their inquiry. The power of positivist research orients schools toward the methodology—not the questions they strive to ask and answer.

Leader Development Literature

While one stream of literature identifies the problem of management and business schools—another zooms into classrooms to uncover what is going wrong, striving to determine how a more humanistic and less functional leader-development curriculum or course might look.

Bennis and O'Toole succinctly summarize the problem, an emphasis on positivist findings and theory have resulted in a dearth of people-centered soft-skills training in the MBA.²¹ The most important predictor of business success is management effectiveness, but the skills for management effectiveness—interpersonal skills, leadership, communication, self-regulation are missing from the MBA.²² The diagnosis is clear, soft

19. Dennis A. Gioia and Kevin G. Corley, “Being Good Versus Looking Good: Business School Rankings and the Circean Transformation from Substance to Image,” *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 1 (2002).

20. JC Spender and Rakesh Khurana, “Intellectual Signatures: Impact on Relevance and Doctoral Programs,” in *Disrupt or Be Disrupted: A Blueprint for Change in Management Education*, ed. Graduate Management Admission Council (Hoboken: Wiley & Sons, 2013), 95-130.

21. Bennis and James O'Toole, “How Business Schools Lost Their Way,” *Harvard Business Review* 83 (2005).

22. AACSB, “Management Education at Risk: Report of the Management Education Task Force to the AACSB International Board of Directors,”

skills are missing from the curriculum.²³ Rubin and Dierdorff find that human capital management is simply not taught. They acknowledge the challenge of teaching such skills in a traditional classroom, but counter that the foundations for teaching these skills, which can be taught in traditional classroom setting are not even taught.²⁴

Experiential learning and dialogue emerge as promising pedagogical technologies for developing the skills we want to see. Kayes' review of Kolb's Experiential Learning Theory determines that it is vital for management learning and education despite critiques.²⁵ He goes on to suggest that to keep Experiential Learning Theory relevant there should be even greater emphasis on language, conversation and reflection. Smith and Clegg highlight the importance of emphasizing questions over answers with students in real dialogue that is akin to real life.²⁶ Grey advocates for lived experience as a more realistic approach to management education even though that learning requires a "messiness" traditional class structures do not facilitate.²⁷ The emphasis on dialogue between students is reiterated by Arkivou and Bradbury Huang. They propose that management training, which actually addresses concerns of sustainability practices, requires genuine dialogue for the purpose of creating "integrated catalysts" prepared to

<http://www.aacsb.edu/~media/AACSB/Publications/research-reports/management-education-at-risk.ashx>.

23. Peter Navarro, "The MBA Core Curricula of Top-Ranked U.S. Business Schools: A Study in Failure?" *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 7 (2008): 110.

24. Robert S. Rubin and Erich C. Dierdorff, "How Relevant is the MBA? Assessing the Alignment of Required Curricula and Required Managerial Competencies," *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 8 (2009): 218.

25. D. Christopher Kayes, "Experiential Learning and its Critics: Preserving the Role of Experience in Management Learning and Education," *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 1 (2002).

26. Stewart R. Clegg and Anne Ross-Smith, "Revising the Boundaries: Management Education and Learning in a Postpositivist World," *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 2 (2003): 85.

27. Christopher Grey, "Reinventing Business School: The Contribution of Critical Management Education," *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 3 (2004): 183.

address the complexity of sustainability.²⁸ Schyns et al. reinforce the importance of genuine dialogue suggesting that the teaching of leadership requires questioning and examining implicit theories of leadership among students.²⁹ To facilitate this kind of dialogue Kolb and Kolb suggest schools of higher education be deliberate about creating learning spaces which are learner-centered, continually research and inquire into the learning process, and become a learning organization through continuous stakeholder conversation.³⁰

Experience and dialogue are important because they provide opportunities for ego development and self-construal. An emerging stream of research emphasizes the critical role of opportunities for self-construal in ego development for the purposes of leader development. Ibarra, Wittman, Petriglieri and Day illuminate the importance of a process in leader-development interventions where one can come to see oneself, and be seen by others as a leader.³¹ DeRue and Ashforth describe the process as taking action to assert leadership, getting feedback from others on those actions, and amplifying or dampening those actions and experimenting with those actions differently again.³² Self-construal and

28. Kleio Akrivou and Hilary Bradbury-Huang, "Educating Integrated Catalysts: Transforming Business Schools Towards Ethics and Sustainability," *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 14 (2015): 222.

29. Birgit Schyns, Tina Kiefer, Rudolf Kerschreiter, and Alex Tymon, "Teaching Implicit Leadership Theories to Develop Leaders and Leadership: How and Why it Can Make a Difference," *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 10 (2011).

30. Alice Y. Kolb and David A. Kolb, "Learning Styles and Learning Spaces: Enhancing Experiential Learning in Higher Education," *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 4 (2005).

31. Herminia Ibarra, Sarah Wittman, Gianpiero Petriglieri and David V. Day, "Leadership and Identity: An Examination of Three Theories and New Research Directions," in *The Oxford Handbook of Leadership and Organizations*, ed. David V. Day (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 297.

32. D. Scott DeRue and Susan J. Ashford, "Who Will Lead and Who Will Follow? A Social Process of Leadership Identity Construction in Organizations," *Academy of Management Review* 35 (2010): 633-635.

the notion of experimenting with one's identity and one's notion of one's self as critical for leader development was first emphasized by Ibarra in the management literature.³³ Ibarra & Barbulescu reinforce the concept, adding that the leader identity process is introspective and social and that the leader identity that endures jives with an individual's experience and vision for self, connects with cultural context, and is affirmed by *and in* social interactions.³⁴ To be deliberate about leveraging identity development in the service of leader development, schools can create identity workspaces. Petriglieri & Petriglieri define identity workspaces as spaces that are deliberate about facilitating identity work by: providing a social context that reduces disturbing affect, facilitates sense making, eases transition to new identity, and consolidates existing identity.³⁵ Petriglieri, Wood and Petriglieri determine that without opportunities for sense-making of the MBA experience, the MBA experience can actually be a regressive one, limiting the leadership capacity of students instead of enhancing it.³⁶ To function effectively schools cannot tell students what leadership is, students must determine how their identity will integrate with the demands of leadership.³⁷ Petriglieri & Petriglieri offer examples of what a humanizing curriculum based on identity development looks like in their essay,

33. Herminia Ibarra, "Provisional Selves: Experimenting with Image and Identity in Professional Adaptation," *Administrative Science Quarterly* 44 (1999).

34. Herminia Ibarra and Roxana Barbulescu, "Identity as Narrative: Prevalence, Effectiveness and Consequences of Narrative Identity Work in Macro Work Role Transitions," *Academy of Management Review* 35 (2010): 145.

35. Gianpiero Petriglieri and Jennifer Louise Petriglieri, "Identity Workspaces: The Case of Business Schools," *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 9 (2010): 44-60.

36. Gianpiero Petriglieri, et al., "Up Close and Personal: Building Foundations for Leaders' Development Through the Personalization of Management Learning," *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 10 (2011).

37. Gianpiero Petriglieri, "Identity Workspaces for Leadership Development," in *The Handbook for Teaching Leadership: Knowing, Doing, and Being*, eds. Scott Snook et al. (Los Angeles: Sage, 2012).

“Can Business Schools Humanize Leadership?”³⁸ They suggest such programs should emphasize learning to make sense of and work with the experiences that unfold within the course or program.

Implementing experiential and/or dialogical courses is not without concerns. Berkovich notes that such methods can activate “destructive behavior on the part of participants who have not identified or embraced the humanistic spirit of dialogical philosophy.”³⁹ Heifetz, Sinder, Jones, Hodge and Rowley found this to be true with 3 to 4% of students enrolled in experiential leadership courses featuring case-in-point methods that explore dynamics as they unfold in group discussion. These students remained upset by a method that allows for conflict to emerge between students and in conversations about racism, sexism, inequalities and personal failures.⁴⁰ That study also noted that mistakes by an instructor trying to contain such conversations can also contribute to student distress. That skill and supply is limited is not lost on scholars; few instructors are trained to develop the skills and sensitivity required to facilitate experiential and/or dialogical methods.⁴¹ The appropriate training in principles of human

38. Gianpiero Petriglieri and Jennifer Louise Petriglieri, “Can Business Schools Humanize Leadership?” *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 14 (2016).

39. Izhak Berkovich, “Between Person and Person: Dialogical Pedagogy in Authentic Leadership Development,” *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 13 (2014): 259.

40. Ronald A. Heifetz, Riley M. Sinder, Alice Jones, Lynn M. Hodge, and Keith A Rowley, “Teaching and Assessing Leadership Courses at the John F. Kennedy School of Government,” *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 8 (1989): 557.

41. Kenneth G. Brown, J. Ben Arbaugh, George Hrivnak, and Amy Kenworthy, “Overlooked and Unappreciated: What Research Tells Us About How Teaching Must Change,” in *Disrupt or Be Disrupted: A Blueprint for Change in Management Education*, ed. Graduate Management Admission Council (Hoboken: Wiley & Sons, 2013): 244-251.

functioning, group dynamics, short-term dynamic psychotherapy and paradoxical intervention is not the norm among business school faculty.⁴²

Scholars writing about leadership training in management schools agree on the experiential and constructivist methods we need more of; and they agree that our schools are not providing these opportunities. However, these scholars overlook the fact that there is a rich tradition in experiential leadership learning. This effort seeks to understand why there continues to be a vacuum. Specifically, what is the challenge and risk of integrating experiential learning into the management curriculum?

Methods

Site Selection

To learn more about the challenges and risks of integrating a more humanistic and experiential leadership training into a professional school management curriculum I examined Yale's School of Organization and Management for two reasons: (a) Yale SOM made a very deliberate and concentrated effort to offer a management degree that emphasized humanistic approaches to managing large bureaucracies (an effort deliberately distinct from business school at the time, which Yale administrators and professors disparaged as vocational business training) and; (b) 12 years into SOM's operation, the Organizational Behavior department, which offered experiential and constructivist courses designed to foster a more humanistic management training, was eventually eliminated from the school—six of eight OB faculty were fired, the doctoral

42. Manfred F. R. Kets de Vries and Konstantin Korotov, "Transformational Leadership Development Programs: Creating Long-Term Sustainable Change," in *The Handbook for Teaching Leadership: Knowing, Doing, and Being*, ed. Scott Snook, Nitin Nohria, and Rakesh Khurana (Los Angeles: Sage, 2012): 263-282, 275.

program was shut down and all sections of the experiential courses, *Individual and Group Behavior* and *Group Dynamics*, were pushed from the core curriculum and phased out completely four years later. Thus, SOM serves as a perfect site to explore the *challenge* and *risk* to faculty and institutions attempting to truly integrate, going beyond the addition of electives to a course catalogue, experiential and constructivist management training into their professional management school.

Established in 1974, and admitting its first cohort in 1976, the Yale School of Organization and Management made a point of eschewing the traditional MBA and pioneered a Masters of Public and Private Management (MPPM). SOM's founders were deliberate about focusing on public and private management. They were also deliberate about not being a business school, but a management school with an emphasis on ethical leadership and public value in a deliberate effort to “teach what it is like to remain human and humane in a large organization.”⁴³

Yale president Kingman Brewster, a lawyer, “was interested in government, economics, and the development of public policy. He sought a role for Yale in helping to make [the] system work better.”⁴⁴ He believed Yale needed “to do more in the social sciences” and had a “mission to educate future leaders in, among other fields, management.”⁴⁵ Brewster was not interested in business development. Yale alum

43. Mead Treadwell, “Yates Moves into Graduate Position,” *Yale Daily News*, November 11, 1975, Retrieved from Yale University Library Digital Collections (YULDC), (<http://digital.library.yale.edu>) 1.

44. William S. Beineke, *The Birth of the School: Reflections on the Founding of the Yale School of Management Delivered to the Charter Class of 1978*. (New Haven: Yale University, 1978), 4.

45. William S. Beineke, *The Birth of the School: Reflections on the Founding of the Yale School of Management Delivered to the Charter Class of 1978*. (New Haven: Yale University, 1978), 4.

William Beineke, the primary benefactor of SOM expressed Brewster's original vision in his "Birth of a School" at SOM's first commencement:

His focus really was on institutions—especially the large, bureaucratic organizations which increasingly dominate American society. Fortune 500 corporations, of course, but also federal regulatory agencies, municipal school systems, hospitals, universities, centers for the arts, and so on. Though their goals differ, in their need for capable and far-seeing management, large institutions of every kind are much alike. It is important to society that this need be met—and an opportunity and an obligation for Yale to educate men and women to meet it.⁴⁶

Core to the MPPM curriculum development effort that would educate these new stewards of humane institutions were faculty from Yale University's Administrative Sciences department. Five of the 11 committee members, including the committee chair tasked with developing a degree and curriculum for SOM were affiliated with Administrative Sciences.⁴⁷ In 1974 that department was renamed Organization Behavior and moved from Arts and Sciences to SOM along with Operations Research as the first two full-time departments at SOM. OB brought a tradition rooted in the work and teaching of Chris Argyris. Christopher Argyris developed much of his seminal work and teaching in organizational behavior at Yale from 1951-71. The Administrative Sciences faculty that moved to SOM three years after Argyris left Yale were steeped in two experiential teaching methods: (a) Group Relations Conferences which are primarily affiliated with the work of A.K. Rice and Wilfred Bion and traditionally hosted by the Tavistock Institute in the UK and its American partner the A.K. Rice Institute (AKRI) and (b)

46. William S. Beineke, *The Birth of the School: Reflections on the Founding of the Yale School of Management Delivered to the Charter Class of 1978*. (New Haven: Yale University, 1978), 5.

47. Interim Report of MPPM Committee, 1 February 1974, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, RU 11, Location LSF, Series II, Box No. 305, Folder No. 1, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library (MAYUL).

Encounter Groups, T-Groups or training groups which are primarily affiliated with the work of Kurt Lewin and traditionally hosted by National Training Laboratories (NTL).⁴⁸

Two of the courses developed by the OB department at SOM rooted in these humanistic and experiential methods and traditions were *Individual and Group Behavior* and *Group Dynamics*. Course objectives for those courses represent what scholars are now repeatedly claiming we need more of: “The basic objective of [Individual and Group Behavior] will be the development of competence in working effectively with other people in organized human behavior.” Both courses were described as focused on human needs, personal and career development, individual-organizational interaction, processes of influence, intergroup relationships, and leadership styles. Both courses deploy the kind of experiential, dialogue based pedagogy today’s scholars note as necessary for leadership development. Course descriptions note that “The pedagogical approach will be inductive and experiential,” and that course objectives are accomplished through “an examination of processes and relationships which evolve in the classroom itself.”⁴⁹

These courses, though, despite their popularity among students, were dismissed as “touchy feely” and ultimately eliminated from the curriculum when the OB department at SOM was terminated.⁵⁰ The new dean at SOM, Michael Levine said his goal for SOM was to maintain its unique emphasis on public and private management, but “focus on

48. The integration of these traditions at Yale’s School of Medicine in the 1960s by Dean Frederich Redlich is explored later.

49. Yale School of Organization and Management, *MPPM Academic Program Handbook 1978-1979*, Yjp65 M66+ Oversize, (MAYUL).

50. Kiele Neas, "SOM Conflict Draws Attention to Basic Question: Should Schools Teach Students to Manage Money or to Manage People?" *Yale Daily News Review*, December 16, 1988, YULDC, 5.

traditional teaching methods.”⁵¹ SOM has maintained its distinctive socioeconomic/policy-choice signature,⁵² but courses that made the school unique were eliminated, and the MPPM degree was replaced by an MBA. Upon restructuring, SOM joined the catalogue of business schools without a curriculum that truly integrates experiential leadership courses meant to humanize our institutions and the work of leading and managing others.

The sudden and turbulent changes generated months of protests and national coverage that questioned the wisdom of the decision and direction of SOM. The *New York Times* reported that “The changes include not renewing the contracts of six nontenured professors in the organizational behavior department, which is considered the soul of the school,” by students and alumni.⁵³ *Newsweek* suggested “students held what may have been the best run protest in the history of higher education.”⁵⁴ Courses taught by OB faculty informed how students protested; they used their self-study groups’ structure to organize themselves and discuss their perspectives on the changes.⁵⁵ SOM students were also alarmed by the authoritarian nature of the new dean, Michael Levine,

51. “Class Conflict: A Shake-up Stirs Outrage at Yale’s Humanistic Business School,” *Business Week*, November 14, 1988, 50.

52. JC Spender and Rakesh Khurana, “Intellectual Signatures: Impact on Relevance and Doctoral Programs,” in *Disrupt or Be Disrupted: A Blueprint for Change in Management Education*, ed. Graduate Management Admission Council (Hoboken: Wiley & Sons, 2013), 152 – 153.

53. Constance L. Hayes, “Views Collide Over Changes at Yale,” *New York Times*, November 9, 1988,

54. John Schwartz, “Gods and Managers at Yale: A Businesslike Protest,” *Newsweek*, November 14, 1988.

55. Constance L. Hayes, “Views Collide Over Changes at Yale,” *New York Times*, November 9, 1988,

installed without consensus by a fairly new Yale president, Benno Schmidt, saying they were worried by the exercise of such “extreme power.”⁵⁶ The entire Yale organization was shaken, representatives of the Graduate and Professional Alumni expressed “concern over the School of Organization and Management leadership changes and the moral, legal, and governance issues which it raises for all disciplines in the Yale academic community, especially because of the dangerous precedent it creates.”⁵⁷

The SOM case is an important story to interrogate. We already have the humanistic educational practices and experiential and constructivist methods available to us; but, the literature on management schools continually laments the failure to prepare leaders and apply these methods. Thus, the question I attempt to answer is—What is the challenge and risk for our institutions and faculty who attempt to truly integrate experiential and constructivist leadership learning into their school’s curricula?

Data Collection

To learn more about the challenge and risk of integrating humanistic and experiential leadership courses into the management school's degree curriculum I conducted an archival research and document analysis of public press, internal memos and publications through three chronological stages: the establishment of the Yale School of Organization and Management 1973 to 1978; the operation of the school from 1978 to

56. Constance L. Hayes, “Views Collide Over Changes at Yale,” *New York Times*, November 9, 1988,

57. Resolution Passed by Law, Forestry, and Divinity School G&P Meeting (SOM Alumnae Abstaining), April 19, 1989, Bergman Records 1990-1992, RU 914, YRG 30-G, ACCN 2003-A-029, Box 1, MAYUL.

1988; and the restructuring and subsequent sense-making and realignment of the school after October 1988.

Secondary sources. The search process began with secondary sources: popular media (i.e. *New York Times*, *NewsWeek*, *Business Week*) and management education books featuring SOM's story (i.e. David Berg's *Keeping the Faith*⁵⁸; Spender & Khurana's, "Intellectual Signatures"⁵⁹) found online and through my university library system that reference the changes at Yale SOM in 1988. Secondary source searches were designed to collect as much descriptive and anecdotal data as possible about events at SOM, a story that received significant press, but is not empirically documented.

Primary sources. Primary source searches were more strategic and designed to illuminate a story that reveals what led to the elimination of experiential teaching methods from SOM. That search focused on three phases of the school's evolution: the establishment of the school and the MPPM from years 1973 to 1978 when the first cohort graduated; the operations and maintenance of the school and the MPPM degree from 1978 to 1988; and the changes made in October 1988 and subsequent fall-out, sense-making and recovery through the mid- 1990s.

Online searches. Primary sources were first collected from Yale University Library Digital Collections. Digitized archives of *The Yale Daily News* available online were explored using keyword searches for: "School of Organization and Management";

58. David N. Berg, ed., *Keeping the Faith: The Clinical Tradition in Organizational Behavior at Yale, 1962 – 1988*. (Woodbridge CT: The Berg Group, 1992).

59. JC Spender and Rakesh Khurana, "Intellectual Signatures: Impact on Relevance and Doctoral Programs," in *Disrupt or Be Disrupted: A Blueprint for Change in Management Education*, ed. Graduate Management Admission Council (Hoboken: Wiley & Sons, 2013), 95-130.

“organization”; “management”; “SOM”; and “MPPM.” That search yielded 153 issues featuring 174 articles pertaining to: the establishment of the school; school development; degree and curriculum development; school mission and vision; experiential learning; faculty appointments; events; and the aftermath of restructuring in 1988.

Archival searches. That same keyword search was used for the online portal at Yale University Manuscripts and Archives at the Sterling Library. Results were shared and consulted on with archivists at the Sterling Library to ensure all available materials were found. Archival searches revealed three kinds of sources: catalogued boxes (featuring internal memos, internal letters, reports, news clippings, and brochures), catalogued texts (Yale and Yale SOM course catalogues and student handbooks), and collected but not yet catalogued campus reporting (specifically *The SOM Exchange* student weekly). Nine collections totaling 15 boxes containing multiple folders of material were accessible for research. Materials in five collections remain restricted. The earliest accessible material will become accessible in 2018 while other materials are restricted until 2032. One collection, featuring student information, is restricted until 2084. Archivists at Manuscripts and Archives at Yale University Library did make accessible certain folders within restricted collections. A petition to the University Secretary to view restricted materials resulted in access to specific materials and folders in six of the boxes.

Catalogued texts. Catalogued texts included individual Yale University, Yale School of Medicine, and Yale SOM course catalogues and MPPM Handbooks. Reviewed texts date between 1963 and 1991.

Collected and not yet catalogued campus reporting. SOM's weekly, *The Exchange*, is collected at Yale's archive, but not yet cataloged. This collection featured volumes one through five of SOM's *The Exchange*. January 1987 (the publication's first issue) through May 1991 are available for review. That collection yielded 66 issues featuring 214 articles connected to: school development; degree and curriculum development; school mission and vision; experiential learning; faculty appointments; events and aftermath of decision in 1988.

Data categories. The 15 archived boxes, un-catalogued SOM campus reporting, and electronically archived Yale University reporting yielded five categories of primary source documents:

1. Yale administrative documents and reports that are available to the public and generated by Yale administration regarding the establishment of the SOM and the hiring of deans, faculty and personnel for the school
 - a. Internal documents
 - i. Reports
 - ii. Correspondences/Letters
 - iii. Memos
 - iv. Meeting agendas
 - b. Yale community and SOM announcements
2. SOM Program Documents which describe the school's mission, vision, program and course offering
 - a. MPPM program handbooks
 - b. Course catalogues

- c. Program brochures
 - d. Program Pamphlets
- 3. Campus Reporting
 - a. SOM Exchange—collected editions
 - b. Yale Daily News—electronically archived editions
- 4. General Reporting
 - a. Found in archived collections
 - b. Found through generalized online searches
- 5. Archived student and alumni opinion pieces

Table 3.1

Primary Source Totals

Source	Document totals
<i>Yale Daily News</i>	165 docs featuring 186 articles
SOM Exchange	66 docs featuring 214 articles
- Campus Reporting Total	-219 docs featuring 388 articles
Media/Press/Books - Berg, Splendor	31 secondary sources
Yale SOM Comms, Docs, Memos... 1973 to 88	232 (Primary docs - approximate)
Curriculum Docs	20 (Primary docs)
Student/Alumni Reflections	26 (primary sources—one doc)
Total	702 distinct primary sources

Data Organization

Data was first categorized by date and type. That categorization yielded data representing three periods of SOM's evolution: the establishment of the school and the MPPM from years 1973 to 1978 when the first cohort graduated; the operations and maintenance of the school and the MPPM from 1978 to 1988; and the changes made in

October 1988 and subsequent fall-out, sense-making and recovery through the mid-1990s.

Data Categorization and Analysis

All documents were captured by a document camera, converted to pdf files, titled according to their call number and contents and organized by date and type in Evernote, a document management computer application. After organizing documents by date and type, document analysis proceeded in two additional phases.

In the first phase I worked through the different types of data representing each era of the SOM story under investigation. This phase of in-depth open coding⁶⁰ was designed to group and categorize the data by theme—identifying themes and their categories. This process unfolded through two stages. In stage one, documents representing the following were coded by specific incident: frustration and discontent about the inability of the Dean’s Search Committee to find qualified candidates for dean; President Brewster’s reluctance to appoint many of the most qualified candidates for dean; faculty describing the search as a “painful process;” and frustration that the official search committee operated a public and participatory search process that was undermined by the president’s private and exclusive search process. Originally coded as individual themes representing distinct dynamics, these themes became data groups representing a more comprehensive theme, Delayed Leadership Search and Ambiguity, for instance.

In the second phase I categorized themes into categories that not only illuminate the elimination of experiential and humanistic methods at SOM but inform theory on the

60. Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. 1990. *Basics of qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

challenge and risk of integrating these practices and methods into the management curriculum at any institution.

My analysis culminated in a month long “walk” through every collected manuscript, copying relevant text and organizing that text according to my theoretical model. This not only reinforced and strengthened my analysis, but also tested for weaknesses as each datum was used to test the reliability of the analysis. Throughout this process I returned to the literature on organizational splitting to ensure my analysis accurately reflected my data while building on existing theory.

Member Check

After completing my analysis I conducted member checks with ten informants representing the OB department, other academic disciplines, and MPPM and PhD students who were SOM community members during the three eras of SOM’s development that I explored. Some informants represented the OB department and PhD program, others represented non-OB faculty, and others were MPPM degree students. I asked all informants to react to my organization and categorization of my collected data. All informants agreed I had captured a representative description of those three eras. I also tested my interpretations of those events with informants. Informants representing academic disciplines other than OB did not challenge my interpretations, but did offer useful insight on university and school dynamics that did not emerge as robust findings in the data collection. Those insights are identified in my interpretation of these events at the end of this paper.

Table 3.2

Coding Scheme of Descriptive Data from Primary Sources

Theoretical Dimensions	Categories	Themes
Inchoate Mission/Purpose	Historic Resistance & Confusion Regarding Purpose of the School	Establishment (1973–’78) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - History of Yale resistance to a ‘trade school for businessmen’ and conflict with Yale’s liberal arts tradition - University capital campaign influence & confusion: the development of a “business” school would help raise money for Yale through alumni donations like its Ivy League peers; however; Yale resists the traditional MBA and proposes the MPPM
	Ambiguous Leadership Search and Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chicken and egg dynamic: unclear if school should develop a mission then find a dean to fit that mission or find the right dean to develop a mission - Prolonged dean search due to President Brewster’s indecision and pickiness “infuriated” founding faculty - Opening date pushed back by one year / SOM’s endowment threatened with continued inactivity - Dean search committee head steps down - Dean search committee not included in Brewster’s talks / Two search committees emerge - Months before opening, the final dean selection was made by Brewster without initial search committee - Brewster’s selection of Donaldson is praised and criticized
	Curriculum & Faculty Development Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of faculty with public sector experience despite being deliberate about putting ‘Public’ before ‘Private’ - Lack of experienced practitioners on faculty despite explicit mission to train practitioners, not academics - Desire for a research agenda to determine how to teach policy - Build-as-we-go approach explicitly adopted to compensate for tumultuous start

Theoretical Dimensions	Categories	Themes
Expertise Vacuum Generates Dependency	Amplified OB Role in SOM's Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Original OB and OR faculty heavily represented on curriculum design team - 5 of 11 founding faculty from OB; OB professor Vic Vroom served as head of degree committee; OB professor Clay Alderfer served as director of professional studies - OB faculty only SOM faculty with appointments at Yale College and SOM / OB & OR offer only Ph.D. at SOM - Student introduction to SOM is through OB facilitated 'Community Day' events which generate the small study groups used to organize OB courses - Community Day groups inform Liaison Teams—Liaison Teams serve as official platform for the inclusion of student voice in the school
	First 10 Years (1978–Oct '88)	
	Continuing Inchoate Mission/Purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Students bemoan lack of public-oriented course offerings -Faculty hires do not address student requests -Students claim the school has strayed mission -Professor MacAvoy leaves school in 1983 for more traditional curriculum at Rochester
	Uncertain Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SOM's 3rd Dean, Burt Malkiel (1981-'87), resigns / Merton Peck (1987-'88) serves two years as acting dean - Dean search process led by Yale President Benno Schmidt delayed / Faculty waiting longer than expected - Fall 1988 school year begins with Acting Dean Peck in his second year
	Emerging Faculty/Epistemological Splitting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - OB faculty torn by high demand and multiple responsibilities - Community Day and IGB groups inform student work groups throughout their degree - Learning to work in groups considered core to student experience
	Resource Allocation & Tenure Decisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Students activated by OB professor David Berg's tenure denial and complain about SOM's failure to promote OB faculty - Popular OB professors Walter Powell, Ivan Lansberg also denied tenure - Economics and finance hires increase over time - Malkiel uses Berg as bargaining chip—Will accept offer to stay if Berg can be offered a new deal - OB representation on Board of Presiding Officers (BPO) drops from 3 of 15 to 2 of 25

Theoretical Dimensions	Categories	Themes
	Fraught Faculty Relations & Deteriorating Campus Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Students write about tension between departments—specifically OB and Economics - Students claim tenured faculty, specifically the Board of Presiding Officers (BPO) want to diminish student voice/involvement in school operations - Students and professors see OB as under assault
Peak Turmoil and Resolution (Oct 1988–Spring '95)		
Conflict Over Increasingly Inchoate Mission/Purpose	Administrative Decisions Unilaterally Favor One Side of the Split	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yale President Schmidt and SOM Dean Levine announce OB programming will be phased out over five years. - OB courses removed from the MPPM core - OR moved back to the university, but without a clearly identified destination
	Heightened Student & Alumni Discontent w/ Direction and Purpose of the School	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Students and alumni claim the school has strayed mission - Students rank IGB, the course most threatened by changes, as the most important learning experience at SOM for students and alumni - Students stage multiple protests
	Rankings Debate	-Ranking seen as an influence on decisions by President and board
Faculty/Epistemological Splitting	Amplified Role of OB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Poll identifies IGB as core to the school - OB considered the “soul” of SOM - Student protest organized in IGB groups
	Dismissal of experiential/clinical work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - OB / IGB dismissed as “touchy feely” and “excessively psychological” - New dean announces plans to use more traditional teaching methods
	Micro to Macro OB	- Clinically focused micro OB program to be replaced with more interdisciplinary macro OB
Self-Sabotage and Severed Relations	Autocratic tactics threat to Yale relations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Autocratic appointment of Levine alarmed greater Yale community - Autocratic elimination of OB program alarmed greater Yale community - Autocratic decision to relocate Operations Management despite not securing a place to relocate them - Unilateral decision making process generated investigation into President’s decisions - Decisions seen as unethical

Theoretical Dimensions	Categories	Themes
Mission / Purpose & Epistemological Realignment	Sabotaged strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Decisions threaten SOM's positive ranking for school community and teamwork - Restructuring eroded faculty and student diversity - The enrollment of women at SOM dropped by half after restructuring
	Sabotage public relations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Negative press dominated events of 1988 - SOM dropped from the rankings for years to come
	Sabotaged support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Enraged" alumni claim the school has strayed from mission and is "doomed" - Alumni withdraw funding support - Alumni redirect donations to to "save" the school - Alumni stop referring candidates
	Mission / Purpose & Epistemological Realignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Struggle to rebuild OB - Builds robust finance department - SOM falls off and reappears in rankings - School of Organization & Management changed to School of Management - New mission statement correlates with rebranding effort - The MPPM is changed to an MBA

Findings

Descriptive Findings Overview

I set out to learn more about the challenge and risk of integrating experiential and constructivist teaching and learning into the management school curriculum. The descriptive findings that follow reveal a story about a school never quite certain about its mission and purpose aside from *not* being another MBA program. This inability to determine its mission and purpose informs organizational and systemic dynamics that ultimately become self-destructive. After revealing those dynamics in this section, I move on to my analysis where I apply a systems psychodynamics lens as a way to reveal the “function of dysfunction” and understand why control mechanisms at SOM were activated in such a way as to eliminate what students and alumni considered the “soul” of the school, the OB program. The decision sparked months of protest and organized divestment, eliminated features of SOM’s unique student community—the highest ranked feature of the school, and generated an investigation into the president’s actions, sabotaging the administration’s relations with its own community.

Establishment of SOM (1973–1978)

The establishment of SOM is documented from Yale president Kingman Brewster’s official establishment of the school in 1973 through the graduation of the inaugural class in 1978. This era is documented from internal memos and letters from the office of the president, school brochures, student handbooks, course catalogues and *The Yale Daily News*. This era is characterized by an inchoate mission/purpose and an expertise vacuum that generated dependency mainly on OB, but also OR (Operations Research) faculty.

Inchoate mission and purpose. Three distinct themes emerged from the data that illuminate SOM's undeveloped and inchoate mission and purpose: (a) historic resistance and confusion regarding the purpose of the school, (b) ambiguous leadership search with unclear processes, and (c) challenges developing a curriculum and faculty.

Historic resistance and confusion regarding the purpose and intention of the school. William Beinecke, a Yale alum and the primary benefactor and advocate for a management program at Yale, referenced the university's resistance to what former Yale president Griswold described as a 'trade school for businessmen.'⁶¹ Yale's chaplain was also vocal about how a management school would not have been established without major resistance only five years earlier.⁶² However, Griswold's successor, Kingman Brewster wondered if Yale should "make a disproportionately large impact not only on the art and science and critical thought of the world ahead, but also upon its direction, on its public and private executive leadership?"⁶³ Brewster thought that "programs must be devised beyond the baccalaureate for the training of potential leaders capable of assuming executive positions of public responsibility."⁶⁴

61. William S. Beinecke, *The Birth of the School: Reflections on the Founding of the Yale School of Management Delivered to the Charter Class of 1978*. (New Haven: Yale University, 1978), 4-5.

62. John Harris, "Old Warrior: Coffin in Perspective," *Yale Daily News Magazine* No. 21, December 10, 1975, 16, YULDC.

63. Background for the Establishment of the New School of Organization and Management, June 5, 1971, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, RU 11, Location: LSF, Series II, Box No. 305, Folder No. 1, MAYUL, 4.

64. Background for the Establishment of the New School of Organization and Management, June 5, 1971, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, RU 11, Location: LSF, Series II, Box No. 305, Folder No. 1, MAYUL, 5.

Brewster's perspective on the connection between the social sciences and management education was originally accommodated in a new management wing at Yale's Institute for Social and Policy Studies (ISPS) with a vision for that new wing to eventually grow into its own school.⁶⁵ In its first feature on the school, *Yale Daily News* announced "Yale 'Business' School to Debut This Summer"⁶⁶ and the school's founders and early administrators began what was to become the ongoing challenge of articulating how SOM would be different from other business schools.⁶⁷ Much of that articulation focused on what the school would not be, particularly in comparison to Harvard. Founders claimed SOM would be better than Harvard Business School and The Kennedy School of Government at Harvard "because it not only prepares students for "operation positions," but trains them for "educational, private, and community work."⁶⁸ SOM's first associate dean "referred to other "nameless" management schools as "competent" but with no vision adding that "[SOM] will not be detached from the rest of the university in the manner of his alma matter, HBS."⁶⁹ "The school will be physically and intellectually in the heart of the university."⁷⁰ In a rather prescient letter to Brewster, advisor Henry

65. Meeting of the Graduate School Faculty - Minutes of the Meeting of March 2, 1973, April 13, 1973, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, RU 11, Location: LSF, Series II, Box No. 305, Folder No. 2, MAYUL; William S. Beineke, *The Birth of the School: Reflections on the Founding of the Yale School of Management Delivered to the Charter Class of 1978*. (New Haven: Yale University, 1978).

66. Jem Winer, "Yale 'Business' School to Debut this Summer," *Yale Daily News*, February 7, 1974, YULDC, 1.

67. Victor H. Vroom, "Letters to the Editor: New School," *Yale Daily News*, February 2, 1974, YULDC, 2.

68. Jem Winer, "Yale 'Business' School to Debut this Summer," *Yale Daily News*, February 7, 1974, YULDC, 1.

69. Mead Treadwell, "Yates Moves into Graduate Position," *Yale Daily News*, November 11, 1975, YULDC, 1.

70. Mead Treadwell, "Yates Moves into Graduate Position," *Yale Daily News*, November 11,

Schacht was worried about comparisons and wondered if early manifestations of SOM's mission were actually very similar to Harvard and Stanford.⁷¹

Contention over the purpose and uniqueness of SOM ran in parallel to another tension about the intention of a management school established at a time when the university was struggling financially and establishing its largest capital campaign.⁷² The connection, which overlooked SOM's proposed emphasis on public leadership, was explicit: "[SOM] was opened in the middle of a budget crisis because it has now, and more important, will have in the future, sources of money enough not only to pay for itself but also bail out the rest of us."⁷³ The school's role in that campaign was one of a stereo-typical profit-oriented business school which would "spur corporate contributions"⁷⁴ and help Yale "play catch-up with those universities that have long-established business schools" by hopefully generating "\$5 million a year in corporate gifts."⁷⁵ The multiple expectations of SOM are connected to the multiple roles of John Perry Miller, the former director of SOM's original home at ISPS⁷⁶ and Chair of SOM's

1975, YULDC, 1.

71. Henry Schacht to John Perry Miller, Letter regarding establishment of school, April 6, 1974, RU 11, Location: LSF, Series II, Box No.305, Folder No. 1, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, records, MAYUL.

72. Pam King, "Alumni Launch \$370 Million Campaign," *Yale Daily News*, April 8, 1974, YULDC, 1.

73. Perry Dane, "Cutting Back with Candor," *Yale Daily News*, January 27, 1977, YULDC, 2.

74. Ruth Marcus, "Officials Confident as Campaign Hits \$165 Million," *Yale Daily News*, October 15, 1975, YULDC, 16.

75. Jefferson Morley, "Office Attempts to Spur Corporate Donations: Yale Seeks More Business Gifts," *Yale Daily News*, October 10, 1978, YULDC, 5.

76. Jem Winer, "Yale 'Business' School to Debut this Summer," *Yale Daily News*, February 7, 1974, YULDC, 1.

Dean Search Committee⁷⁷ was also chief executive officer of Yale's capital campaign.⁷⁸

Miller was concerned that a prolonged dean search and delayed inauguration at SOM would sabotage its credible contribution to the capital campaign.⁷⁹

Ambiguous leadership search with unclear processes. A formal Dean Search Committee was established in May 1973.⁸⁰ Brewster hoped a dean would be found to commence in the fall of 1974.⁸¹ By June 1975, SOM faculty favored "expediency" over qualifications as the search dragged on.⁸² The delayed dean search requires SOM to push back its start date and inform candidates that "the program will not commence as previously anticipated."⁸³ Exactly one year before admitting its first cohort, Brewster appoints William Donaldson in September 1975.⁸⁴

77. Kingman Brewster, Jr. to Members of the Selection Committee for the Dean of the School of Organization and Management, Memorandum on changes to search committee, February 7, 1974, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, RU 11, Location: LSF, Series II, Box No. 305, Folder No.1, MAYUL.

78. Pam King, "Alumni Launch \$370 Million Campaign," *Yale Daily News*, April 8, 1974, YULDC, 1.

79. John Perry Miller to Kingman Brewster, Jr., Letter on the Deanship for the School of Organization and Management, April 17, 1974, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, RU 11, Location: LSF, Series II, Box No. 305, Folder No.1, MAYUL.

80. John Perry Miller to Kingman Brewster, Jr., May 16, 1973, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, RU 11, Location: LSF, Series II, Box No. 305, Folder No.1, MAYUL.

81. Kingman Brewster, Jr. to Members of the Selection Committee for the Dean of the School of Organization and Management, Memorandum on changes to search committee, February 7, 1974, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, RU 11, Location: LSF, Series II, Box No. 305, Folder No.1, MAYUL.

82. Robert C. Wilhem to Kingman Brewster, Jr., Letter regarding Charles Holt for dean, June 24, 1975, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, RU 11, Location: LSF, Series III, Box No. 349, Folder No. 23, MAYUL.

83. Victor H. Vroom to Kingman Brewster, Jr., Letter regarding dean search, July 31, 1974, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, RU 11, Location: LSF, Series II, Box No. 305, Folder No.1, MAYUL.

84. Kingman Brewster, Jr., Telegram announcing William H. Donaldson deanship, September 29,

The search for the school's first dean is described as "a painful process"⁸⁵ by faculty and as generating "intense feelings of helplessness and frustration" among committee members.⁸⁶ Dominating memos regarding the dean search is a circular process of trying to establish the school's mission and purpose while simultaneously looking for someone who can represent and build SOM's mission and purpose. This process was neatly explained by one committee member as a "chicken-and-egg" problem and that "it may be desirable to leave goals a little loose for a first-rate dean to refine."⁸⁷ Another worried "that in a desire to 'get on with it' we run the risk of accepting a mission definition that will not stand the test of time in terms of excellence and/or uniqueness."⁸⁸

In search for that first-rate dean, however, Brewster was described as "looking for someone who can walk on water."⁸⁹ The process for selecting the dean was a confusing and contentious one. Two committees operated simultaneously⁹⁰ and high-level full

1975, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, RU 11, Location: LSF, Series III, Box No. 349, Folder No. 21, MAYUL.

85. John Tabor, "Dean Search Delays Management School," *Yale Daily News*, September 8, 1975, YULDC, 1.

86. Robert B. Fetter to Kingman Brewster, Jr., Letter regarding resignation as dean search committee chair, June 30, 1975, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, RU 11, Location: LSF, Series III, Box No. 349, Folder No. 23, MAYUL.

87. Thaddeus R. Beal to Kingman Brewster, Jr., Letter regarding dean search, April 8, 1974, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, RU 11, Location: LSF, Series II, Box No. 305, Folder No. 1, MAYUL.

88. Henry Schacht to John Perry Miller, Letter regarding establishment of school, April 6, 1974, RU 11, Location: LSF, Series II, Box No. 305, Folder No. 1, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, records, MAYUL.

89. John Tabor, "Dean Search Delays Management School," *Yale Daily News*, September 8, 1975, YULDC, 1.

90. Victor H. Vroom to Kingman Brewster, Jr., Letter regarding dean search, July 31, 1974, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, RU 11, Location: LSF, Series II, Box No. 305, Folder No. 1, MAYUL.

faculty complained to Brewster about not being invited to meet potential candidates visiting campus.⁹¹ In his resignation as head of the search committee, Robert Fetter is “appalled at the cavalier and irrelevant manner in which candidate after candidate is praised or condemned” and complains that by alienating and ignoring SOM faculty in the search process and in his evaluation of candidates Brewster acted inappropriately. The criticism is a harbinger for what would come—a faculty split by and from appointment processes and subsequent unilateral decision making from the president.

Challenges developing a curriculum and faculty. When a dean was appointed, national reporting exposes SOM’s predicament in *The New York Times*. President Brewster’s recruit, William Donaldson shared, “The details are a little fuzzy right now . . . We have to come up with a faculty, a format and a curriculum that will attract the top people. Once we get that, we’ll take off fast from there.”⁹² Donaldson, a successful investment banker and public servant, immediately ruffles feathers by claiming that SOM wanted to recruit for a “whole new kind of manager” who wants “to make a lot of money and still have diversity in their career.” He also added that SOM will have “just a sprinkling of academic types.”⁹³ Donaldson’s words captured the tension inherent in the “dual purpose” of SOM and the young school’s struggle to find its academic footing.

91. Martin Shubik to Kingman Brewster, Jr., Letter regarding dean search, April 17, 1974, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, RU 11, Location: LSF, Series II, Box No. 305, Folder No.1, MAYUL.

92. Michael Knight, “Yale Sets Up School of Administration with Dual Purpose,” *New York Times*, October 1, 1975, 57.

93. Michael Knight, “Yale Sets Up School of Administration with Dual Purpose,” *New York Times*, October 1, 1975, 57.

Brewster was criticized for his choice and for how the new dean's "inept" "wheeler dealer" approach represented Yale.⁹⁴

Criticism was sent directly to Brewster by school advisor Donald Stone, a federal planner for Truman and Roosevelt and professor at Carnegie-Mellon's School of Public Affairs, for his ignorance in public policy curriculum, overlooking standards and requisites developed by The National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration and for not leveraging the expertise of Yale's own public administration professor James Fesler,⁹⁵ whose extensive federal experience began in the Roosevelt administration. Stone scolded Brewster for inviting to SOM the same "birds of passage" that want to fly between the public and private spheres he saw as responsible for eroding the public office.⁹⁶

Business executive Henry Schacht, another advisor to Brewster on SOM, noted that "we know very little about organization and management in the public sector," and that, "if we don't know much about it how can we legitimately teach anything?"⁹⁷ Wharton economist, and potential candidate for dean, Oliver Williamson asks to be withdrawn from candidacy because he believes the school needs a PhD program in policy

94. Howard M. Holtzmann to Kingman Brewster, Jr., Letter regarding Donaldson deanship, October 6, 1975, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, RU 11, Location: LSF, Series III, Box No. 349, Folder No. 21, MAYUL.

95. Donald C. Stone to Kingman Brewster, Jr., Letter regarding Donaldson deanship, November 4, 1975, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, RU 11, Location: LSF, Series III, Box No. 349, Folder No. 21, MAYUL.

96. Donald C. Stone to Kingman Brewster, Jr., Letter regarding Donaldson deanship, November 4, 1975, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, RU 11, Location: LSF, Series III, Box No. 349, Folder No. 21, MAYUL.

97. Henry Schacht to John Perry Miller, Letter regarding establishment of school, April 6, 1974, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, RU 11, Location: LSF, Series II, Box No.305, Folder No. 1, MAYUL.

analysis for a successful masters program to orient itself around.⁹⁸ However, the school's research agenda was not very flexible, as it was built around the Administrative Sciences department, another situation Schacht presciently described as a "dilemma for Yale."⁹⁹

These criticisms however conflicted with original visions for the school. The memo 'Background for the Establishment of the New School of Organization and Management' concludes "that if the program is to be effective, faculty must be recruited who are committed to the teaching of students whose objectives are not academic careers but rather operating positions" and that "faculty must include people who have had experience in such positions themselves, and others who, through their research and consulting, are familiar with the opportunities and problems faced by those positions."¹⁰⁰ Donaldson's sentiment about the number of "academic types" was in concert with Brewster's vision for SOM and Donaldson represented the high-level experience SOM had hoped for its students.

Developing a curriculum and admitting students ultimately trumped the development of a research agenda and a build-as-you-go approach was rationalized by founders and advisors: "The advantage of having people with experience attend the school would be to study them for insights into what kind of training and education

98. Oliver E. Williamson to Kingman Brewster, Jr., Letter regarding dean candidacy, October 16, 1974, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, RU 11, Location: LSF, Series II, Box No. 305, Folder No.1, MAYUL.

99. Henry Schacht to John Perry Miller, Letter regarding establishment of school, April 6, 1974, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, RU 11, Location: LSF, Series II, Box No.305, Folder No. 1, MAYUL, 3.

100. Background for the Establishment of the New School of Organization and Management, June 5, 1971, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, RU 11, Location: LSF, Series II, Box No. 305, Folder No. 1, MAYUL, 6-7.

would make sense.”¹⁰¹ John Perry Miller, a strong advocate for the school, predicted students would need to be “risk-taking pioneers” who could join faculty in the curriculum’s development.¹⁰² Ten months before accepting its first cohort, the Associate Dean of SOM announced that “a plan for the curriculum will soon emerge.”¹⁰³ Nine months before accepting its first cohort a 17 member advisory board representing public and private sectors and featuring Nelson Rockefeller and Henry Ford II was convened to “provide insight and guidance into the structuring of the school’s curriculum” and it was confirmed that the “first students will be influential in the construction of the school’s curriculum.”¹⁰⁴ Two years into SOM’s operation, Dean Donaldson reveals that the plane is still being built as they fly: “We’re trying to develop the physical facilities, the administration and the curriculum all at once . . . but it’s like that little plane. It’s a struggle to hold it all together, and so every move is a major action.”¹⁰⁵ Gaps in the school’s public sector emphasis soon emerged: “Some students feel that the public sector portion of the program needs to be more rigorously defined and a balance has to be struck between public and private.”¹⁰⁶

101. Thaddeus R. Beal to Kingman Brewster, Jr., Letter regarding dean search, April 8, 1974, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, RU 11, Location: LSF, Series II, Box No. 305, Folder No.1, MAYUL.

102. John A. Miller to Stanley E. McCaffrey, Letter regarding establishment of school, December 1, 1975, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, RU 11, Location: LSF, Series III, Box No. 349, Folder No. 21, MAYUL, 2.

103. Mead Treadwell, “Yates Moves into Graduate Position,” *Yale Daily News*, November 11, 1975, YULDC, 1.

104. Mead Treadwell, “Yates Moves into Graduate Position,” *Yale Daily News*, November 11, 1975, YULDC, 1.

105. Hoil Kim, “Yale’s Newest School: Busier Than Thou,” *Yale Daily News Magazine*, September 9, 1978, YULDC, 8.

106. Hoil Kim, “Yale’s Newest School: Busier Than Thou,” *Yale Daily News*

Expertise vacuum generates dependency. *Administrative Sciences and Organizational Behavior played an amplified role in SOM's development.* The Administrative Sciences department was always in the background of SOM's development. As the search for a dean was extended and SOM's mission evolved without a research agenda, advisor Henry Schacht worried that unless SOM took a more research oriented approach to its work "it could fall into the trap of being a captive of the existing faculty resources in administrative sciences."¹⁰⁷ Schacht was quite accurate.

At this time, OB and OR each represented one half of Yale's Administrative Sciences (Ad. Sci.) department.¹⁰⁸ In March 1973 the Yale Graduate School faculty moved Ad. Sci. into the university's Institute for Social and Policy Studies (ISPS) with the intention to eventually name the new entity the School of Organization and Management.¹⁰⁹ However, ISPS's research emphasis and Ad Sci.'s educational emphasis were considered too distinct and "the separation of the two [was] a logical evolution."¹¹⁰ When SOM was built upon the Ad. Sci. program, OB and OR represented a large share of the MPPM faculty and fully represented SOM's two other degree offerings: the

Magazine, September 9, 1978, YULDC, 8.

107. Thaddeus R. Beal to Kingman Brewster, Jr., Letter regarding dean search, April 8, 1974, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, RU 11, Location: LSF, Series II, Box No. 305, Folder No.1, MAYUL.

108. SOM faculty consulted for this paper consistently described Ad. Sci. as an "unholy marriage" between mathematicians and psychological behaviorists.

109. Meeting of the Graduate School Faculty - Minutes of the Meeting of March 2, 1973, April 13, 1973, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, RU 11, Location: LSF, Series II, Box No. 305, Folder No. 2, MAYUL.

110. Jem Winer, "Yale 'Business' School to Debut this Summer," *Yale Daily News*, February 7, 1974, YULDC, 4.

undergraduate major and the PhD in Administrative Sciences. Ad. Sci. was seen as important connective tissue between SOM and Yale where the “Creation of the new school will greatly strengthen the undergraduate Administrative Sciences major, explained [Victor] Vroom,” the department chairman.¹¹¹

Ad. Sci. faculty were heavily represented in the early stages of SOM. Victor Vroom had several roles as chair of the Ad. Sci. faculty. He was an early candidate for SOM dean who withdrew himself from the running to focus on his work,¹¹² served as an original member of the Dean’s Search Committee¹¹³ and was considered as possible chair for that committee.¹¹⁴ Additionally, 5 of 11 faculty members on a MPPM curriculum development committee were from Ad. Sci. To support their proposed curriculum the committee requested a faculty of 29, 17 of whom would represent Ad. Sci. and ten designated specifically to OB.¹¹⁵ Ad. Sci. was also seen as shouldering the work of

111. Jem Winer, “Yale ‘Business’ School to Debut this Summer,” *Yale Daily News*, February 7, 1974, YULDC, 1.

112. Victor H. Vroom to Kingman Brewster, Jr., Letter regarding resignation from dean search committee, May 22, 1973, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, RU 11, Location: LSF, Series II, Box No. 305, Folder No. 1, MAYUL.

113. Search Committee for the Dean of the School of Organization and Management, February 4, 1974, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, RU 11, Location: LSF, Series II, Box No. 305, Folder No. 2, MAYUL.

114. John Perry Miller to Kingman Brewster, Jr., Letter regarding initiation of dean search committee, May 16, 1973, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, RU 11, Location: LSF, Series II, Box No. 305, Folder No. 1, MAYUL.

115. Interim Report of the MPPM Committee, February 1, 1974, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, RU 11, Location: LSF, Series II, Box No. 305, Folder No. 1, MAYUL.

developing the school¹¹⁶ and delays in the dean search and postponement of SOM's first cohort was "costly to faculty identification with the School and its mission."¹¹⁷

As SOM was established, the monolithic 'Ad. Sci.' title was phased out and OB and OR are identified as individual programs at SOM. Both featured prominently in SOM's opening, but OB's role at SOM was particularly amplified. In addition to commanding undergrad and PhD programming affiliated with SOM, OB professor Clayton Alderfer had a leadership role as director for professional programming, but was unable to teach his doctoral courses¹¹⁸ amid concerns that "the school's new [MPPM] programming will strain undergraduate and doctoral programs."¹¹⁹ Course demand was met through "quite a number of visiting professors" and half or more of ten new professors brought to SOM taught in the program.¹²⁰

OB played many important roles for the developing SOM and was valued for several reasons: (a) The same educational emphasis that made the department a poor fit at ISPS (and presumably in FAS as subsequent data will suggest) was fundamental to the new professional school; (b) OB's role in the undergraduate curriculum represented

116. John Perry Miller to Kingman Brewster, Jr., Letter regarding dean search, April 17, 1974, 1, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, RU 11, Location: LSF, Series II, Box No. 305, Folder No. 1, MAYUL.

117. Victor H. Vroom to Kingman Brewster, Jr., Letter regarding dean search, May 2, 1974, 1, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, RU 11, Location: LSF, Series II, Box No. 305, Folder No. 1, MAYUL.

118. Mead Treadwell, "More Faculty Sought as New SOM Opens," *Yale Daily News*, September 13, 1976, YULDC, 1.

119. Mead Treadwell, "More Faculty Sought as New SOM Opens," *Yale Daily News*, September 13, 1976, YULDC, 1.

120. Mead Treadwell, "More Faculty Sought as New SOM Opens," *Yale Daily News*, September 13, 1976, YULDC, 1.

important ties to the college; and (c) OB and OR were the only PhD granting programs at SOM. These last two roles meant that the programs represented Yale's aspirations for SOM to stay connected to the university, unlike Harvard Business School. Additionally OB scholarship, focused on group dynamics, team dynamics, intergroup relations, and individual and group behavior themes was directly applicable to SOM's goal of training stewards of humane organizations.¹²¹ Demand for OB faculty exceeded supply and OB struggled to fill the vacuum. During SOM's first two years OB faculty were overextended and the program's research was interrupted as OB doctoral students "feel they are suffering with visiting professors." Unable to teach in the doctoral program, Alderfer claimed, "That's a problem for me and a problem for the doctoral program."¹²² One year after opening, SOM searched for five or six professors for its professional program and four or five for its OB and OR programs for the 1977-78 school year.¹²³

First Ten Years (1978–1988)

The first ten years of SOM's operation, from the first fall after graduating its inaugural class in 1978 through the fall of 1988 just before the OB department was eliminated from SOM, is documented primarily through reporting in *The Yale Daily News*, SOM's nascent campus weekly, *The Exchange*, and school brochures, student

121. David N. Berg, ed., *Keeping the Faith: The Clinical Tradition in Organizational Behavior at Yale, 1962 – 1988*. (Woodbridge CT: The Berg Group, 1992).

122. Mead Treadwell, "More Faculty Sought as New SOM Opens," *Yale Daily News*, September 13, 1976, YULDC, 1.

123. Chip Cowell, "SOM Will Add 10 Professors, Plans Eventual Increase to 40," *Yale Daily News*, February 2, 1977, YULDC, 3.

handbooks and course catalogues. A continuing inchoate mission/purpose and an emerging split among faculty along epistemological lines characterizes this era.

Continuing inchoate mission/purpose. SOM's inchoate mission/purpose, a trend that continues into its second era, is characterized by discontent with the curriculum and continuing uncertainty in the school's leadership.

Discontent with the curriculum. Students continually bemoaned the lack of emphasis on public sector management through the 1980s¹²⁴ and faculty joined in criticism of the school for not developing public sector content despite a \$625,000 Mellon Grant to do exactly that, while also acknowledging that many faculty "feel uncomfortable dealing with public material in their courses."¹²⁵ Students worried that SOM "is moving away from teaching public policy and toward traditional business school curriculum."¹²⁶ Complaints about the school drifting towards a more traditional business school curriculum emphasizing finance and accounting courses¹²⁷ rose along with criticism that only 12% of students moved into the public sector after graduation.¹²⁸ A harbinger for its poor performance on future rankings, SOM was ranked 21 of 21 top

124. John McQuaid, "Malkiel Appointed New Dean of SOM: Problems Beset School," *Yale Daily News*, March 23, 1981, YULDC, 1; John Newsom, "SOM Strives to Create 'New Type of Leader,'" *Yale Daily News*, November 14, 1986, YULDC, 7.

125. Roger Pollack, "The Mellon Grant's Mixed Record," *The Exchange*, April 1, 1987, MAYUL, 6.

126. John McQuaid, "Malkiel Appointed New Dean of SOM: Problems Beset School," *Yale Daily News*, March 23, 1981, YULDC, 1.

127. Don More, "SOM Dean Malkiel Responds to Criticism: Focuses on Faculty, Budget," *Yale Daily News*, November 18, 1985, YULDC, 1.

128. Don More, "SOM Dean Malkiel Responds to Criticism: Focuses on Faculty, Budget," *Yale Daily News*, November 18, 1985, YULDC, 1.

business schools in a *Wall Street Journal* report. The authors of the reports suggested there was a “lack of precision or clarity” in the school’s program, and wondered if “[There is] probably some confusion whether Yale will stick to its original goals.”¹²⁹ One anonymous faculty did not think SOM pushed its students hard enough and another who taught at SOM and Harvard suggested that there was a “tremendous lack of discipline” and that “much of the work was undirected and pretty spacey.”¹³⁰ Highlighting discrepancies in what SOM says it does and what graduates actually do, *Business Week* reported that only 15% of graduates entered the public sector, earning an average annual salary of approximately \$30,000, while 25% entered investment banking to earn approximately \$50,000 and another 16% entered consulting for an average annual salary of \$58,000.¹³¹

Uncertain leadership. Uncertain leadership contributed to the challenge of SOM developing its curriculum and clarifying its mission. Despite encouragement to stay, Dean Donaldson left at the end of his five year term.¹³² Burton Malkiel, Princeton economist and author of the seminal investment book, *A Random Walk Down Wall Street*¹³³, was recruited to serve as dean in 1980,¹³⁴ but law professor Geoffrey Hazard

129. Chris Sheridan, “After its First Ten Years, SOM’s Stock is Still Rising in the Financial, Academic Communities,” *Yale Daily News*, November 14, 1986, YULDC, 4.

130. “Yale B-School Struggles to Make the Grade: Is its Experimental Program Living Up to its Promise?” *Business Week*, November 23, 1987, 86.

131. “Yale B-School Struggles to Make the Grade: Is its Experimental Program Living Up to its Promise?” *Business Week*, November 23, 1987, 86.

132. Mark Werksman, “SOM Dean to Quit at End of Year,” *Yale Daily News*, September 11, 1979, YULDC, 1.

133. Burton G. Malkiel, *A Random Walk Down Wall Street*, (New York, Norton, 1973).

134. Chris Cummings, “Malkeal May be SOM Dean,” *Yale Daily News*, February 8, 1980,

took an interim appointment until Malkiel accepted the position a year later.¹³⁵ Malkiel was seen as inheriting an increasingly problematic school¹³⁶ that needed leadership and direction from Yale University's next president.¹³⁷ To accommodate a growing student population, two associate deans were appointed for the first time at SOM just one year before Malkiel leaves for sabbatical. Economics Professor Merton J. Peck stepped in as interim dean in 1987.¹³⁸ Uncertainty around leadership spikes when Malkiel stepped down as dean during his sabbatical; Peck subsequently continued to serve as acting dean for nearly two years.¹³⁹

The lack of leadership raised questions about the school's ability to "fight the perennial pressure to conform to Harvard and Stanford Business School norms"¹⁴⁰ while Yale president Benno Schmidt, who chaired the dean search committee, called the search an opportunity to assess the school's mission.¹⁴¹ As the search is delayed beyond

YULDC, 1.

135. Judith Sullivan and Eric Rubin, "Hazard Named Acting SOM Dean; Search Committee Approves Choice," *Yale Daily News*, YULDC, 4.

136. John McQuaid, "Malkiel Appointed New Dean of SOM: Problems Beset School," *Yale Daily News*, March 23, 1981, YULDC, 1.

137. Jonathan Zasloff and Mike Daneker, "Who Can it Be Now?: Beginning Our Search," *Yale Daily News*, December 4, 1985, YULDC, 4.

138. David Mills, "SOM Chooses Two Professors as Associate Deans," *Yale Daily News*, April 18, 1986, YULDC, 5; David Wyshner, "Yale Names Peck Acting SOM Dean," *Yale Daily News*, September 4, 1987, YULDC, 3.

139. Dana Milbank, "Former SOM Dean Malkiel Expected to Leave Yale," *Yale Daily News*, April 13, 1988, YULDC, 1; Judy Train and David M. Halbfinger, "Search for New Dean for SOM Nears End," *Yale Daily News*, September 21, 1988, YULDC, 5.

140. "Dear Joe: A Letter to the Dean," *The Exchange*, September 9, 1987, MAYUL, 2.

141. Jennifer Curtis, "President Schmidt Discusses Dean Search and Budget," *The Exchange*, October 21, MAYUL, 6.

expectation,¹⁴² OR professor Ludo Van der Heyden lamented that his “greatest disappointment is that there is no discussion of what the place should be,” but also conceded that “any direction, even if you disagreed with it, would be better than none.”¹⁴³ Associate Dean Stan Garstka, after discovering that the search is delayed, reported that, “Extreme disappointment and frustration would characterize the faculty’s feelings, generally,” and “I don’t think anyone on the faculty is happy with this resolution. Everyone wants direction, and the faculty want to know as much as students do about where we are going.”¹⁴⁴ Acting Dean Peck said his job was to keep SOM competitive and attract the highest quality faculty and defend against “raids” on SOM faculty by other management/business schools.¹⁴⁵ A student editorial summarized campus morale:

Without a Dean, there is no one with a vision leading the way and managing the school’s growth and development. The BPO [Board of Presiding Officers] has exploited this vacuum and now rules with an iron fist. Many young faculty are demoralized and looking to leave (or have already left!). And the educational quality of our institution suffers as the school is torn apart by a divided faculty, a reduced emphasis on teaching (versus research) ability and an ambivalence about our real goals.¹⁴⁶

142. Christopher Pope, “Peck to Continue Second Term as Dean Search Continues,” *The Exchange*, April 27, 1987, MAYUL, 1.

143. Patty Nolan, “The BPO: As it Goes, So Goes SOM,” *The Exchange*, April 6, 1988, MAYUL, 6.

144. Christopher Pope, “Peck to Continue Second Term as Dean Search Continues,” *The Exchange*, April 27, 1987, MAYUL, 8.

145. Christopher Pope, “Peck to Continue Second Term as Dean Search Continues,” *The Exchange*, April 27, 1987, MAYUL, 8.

146. Whitney Magruder and Randy Siegel, “Viewpoint: Open Letter to the First Year Class,” *The Exchange*, April 27, 1988, MAYUL, 3.

Composed of tenured professors, the BPO served as the SOM ruling faculty body and did not discuss tenure decisions.¹⁴⁷ The BPO's primary role was explained as filling appointments for openings determined by the dean.¹⁴⁸ Majority votes by secret ballot determined appointments.¹⁴⁹

Regarding the challenging stretch without a dean, Economics Professor Sharon Oster reported, "It's inevitable that a period of time will go by [in which the Search Committee does not hear any news], but perhaps this has been longer than would be optimal."¹⁵⁰

Emerging faculty/epistemological splitting. An emerging split among faculty along epistemological lines is marked by a continuation of OB's amplified role in the school, plus conflict over resources and tenure decisions and a deteriorating campus community, which exacerbated increasingly fraught faculty relations.

Amplified OB role at Yale and SOM. OB played an increasingly large role at Yale and SOM. The Ad. Sci. program at the college closed in 1981; the program had been neglected, developed a poor reputation and was the only undergrad major offered by a graduate school.¹⁵¹ The undergraduate Ad. Sci. program had come to be considered a

147. "Berg Tenure Loss Stirs SOM: Raising Concerns About the Future of Yale SOM's OB Program," *The Exchange*, January 14, 1987, MAYUL, 6.

148. Patty Nolan, "The BPO: As it Goes, So Goes SOM," *The Exchange*, April 6, 1988, MAYUL, 1.

149. Aimee Bavaris, "New Rules, New Game for Faculty Appointments," *The Exchange*, February 1, 1989, MAYUL, 1-6.

150. Anne Schechter, "Dean Search Process in Disarray," *The Exchange*, October 5, 1988, MAYUL, 8.

151. Chris Cummings, "Ad Sci Major Faces Revision Next Year: Majors Meet Monday," *Yale Daily News*, April 22, 1980, YULDC, 1.

“weak major” and had difficulty attracting faculty; Ad. Sci. courses were replaced by “Organization and Management” courses taught by SOM OB faculty.¹⁵² The decision continued a trend of eroding Ad. Sci.’s status in the college and SOM’s OB faculty were now the sole representatives of their work at Yale.

OB also played an amplified role in student life at SOM. Student groups and collaborative group work dominated the student experience at SOM and OB programing generated those groups and informed how those groups would work from the very first day. A preclass event for new first year students called “Community Building” divided students into groups of six or eight for interpersonal group exercises. Although the popular OB course, *Individual & Group Behavior (IGB)*, was an elective—nearly all students took the course and “Community Building” groups informed small group composition for that course.¹⁵³ IGB groups served as a “study support mechanism” and friendships that formed in these groups endured throughout the degree.¹⁵⁴ Criticism of IGB groups described Community Day as IGB “intake day” and that group mixing beyond IGB groups was difficult.¹⁵⁵ Supporters claimed that IGB and “other OB classes that foster an SOM environment” attracted top candidates and provided SOM with an excellent reputation with employers.¹⁵⁶ The emphasis on “understanding how a group

152. Austen Furse, “SOM Replaces Faulty Ad. Sci Major with New Undergraduate Program,” *Yale Daily News*, September 15, 1981, YULDC, 1.

153. Paul Botts, “SOM Focuses on Behavior in Business: SOM Students Role-Play,” *Yale Daily News*, October 23, 1983, YULDC, 1.

154. Vivian Hsieh, “SOM Progresses Toward Fulfilling Goals of Founders,” *Yale Daily News*, November 14, 1986, YULDC, 6.

155. David Gzesh, “The Emperor’s New Cloths,” *The Exchange*, November 11, 1987, MAYUL, 3.

156. “OB at the Heart of SOM’s Success,” *The Exchange*, February 17, MAYUL, 2.

works and how you work,”¹⁵⁷ was seen as an advantage SOM had with recruiters interested in graduates who were “more oriented to working in groups” and were “better at it” which made SOM “unique.”¹⁵⁸ The following description of Community Day by OB professor Vic Vroom for *The New Republic* summarized its depth and influence:

Community-building is to the Yale School of Management what the first night holding hands around the campfire is to an Outward Bound program, or the first shared prayer to a religious retreat. It certainly sets the place apart from conventional schools. All new students meet in a room. Vroom asks them to pair off with someone they don’t know, and to learn about each other. He then confronts the pair and challenges them to dig down deep. “This person is a living, breathing human being,” he says. “You have one minute to think of a way to find out more about him than superficial fact.”

Community-building occurs as the newly acquainted pair finds another pair. Then the foursome finds another foursome. Eight people form a group that then makes itself even more uncomfortable. For example, Vroom asks all members of the group to relate their honest first impressions of everyone else, and to say which person makes them most and least comfortable. The group then takes an OB course called Individual & Group Behavior together. “Years later at reunions you see the groups reassemble,” says Vroom. “It is a tremendously powerful bonding exercise.”¹⁵⁹

Core to SOM’s unique collaborative culture were Liaison Meetings, open discussions held every Wednesday for faculty, staff and students to discuss concerns “as mundane as the replacement of light bulbs and as crucial as the mission of the school.”¹⁶⁰ “Liaisons” represented all the different IGB groups and minutes were prepared for the

157. Vivian Hsieh, “SOM Progresses Toward Fulfilling Goals of Founders,” *Yale Daily News*, November 14, 1986, YULDC, 6.

158. Debbie Klosky, “SOM Takes New Approach to Business School: Expands Curriculum to Include Public Sector,” *Yale Daily News*, December 5, 1984, YULDC, 4.

159. Michael M. Lewis, “Bulldog Bull: Yale’s feel-good School of Management,” *The New Republic*, May 23, 1988, 25.

160. Don More, “SOM Considers Current Aims, Status,” *Yale Daily News*, December 3, 1985, YULDC, 1.

entire SOM community. The MPPM grading system, student workload, and faculty searches were all legitimate topics.¹⁶¹ The following explanation of Community Day's connection to and influence on IGB and Liaison Meetings illuminates the penetration of these OB organized structures into the school and the student experience:

As part of Community Building, which takes place during orientation week, first year students go through a series of group building exercises led by members of the faculty. The purpose of the group building is to form work teams that are an important element in the learning process in the Individual and Group Behavior (IGB) course. Even if you choose not to take IBG, these groups are often a source of support and help during the year, and they also expose students to the crucial tasks of managing groups and working in them.

The IGB groups serve a variety of other functions and are an important aspect of SOM life. The advising system is built around these groups. In addition, the IGB groups or parts of them may be used for group-based assignments in the first year Marketing class. Students are under no obligation to use these groups in other courses. The extent to which student work with members of their group on assignments from other courses is entirely a matter of choice.

Finally, these groups are the primary units from which first year students send representatives to liaison meetings.¹⁶²

Though they represented the value and process fostered in OB courses, Liaison Meetings were also seen as a “safety valve for students to let off steam”¹⁶³ and came to be considered “gripe sessions” and “a sham.”¹⁶⁴ Differences in the value of these meetings emerged during peak uncertainty about the school's leadership and direction.

161. Yale School of Organization and Management, *MPPM Academic Program Handbook 1978-1979*, Yjp65 M66+ Oversize, MAYUL.

162. Yale School of Organization and Management, *MPPM Academic Program: Guidelines, Courses, Policies 1982-83*, Yjp65 M66+ Oversize, MAYUL, 17.

163. Don More, “SOM Considers Current Aims, Status,” *Yale Daily News*, December 3, 1985, YULDC, 1.

164. Lisa Stapleton, “Taking a Look at Liaison,” *The Exchange*, December 8, 1987, MAYUL, 6.

Administrators began censoring student perspectives from Liaison Meeting minutes regarding changes to the accounting curriculum.¹⁶⁵

Conflict over allocation and tenure decisions. Substantial student journalism, and the first issue of SOM's student newspaper, *The Exchange*, was inspired by tenure decisions regarding OB faculty. Debate focused on David Berg in particular, a popular OB professor who was denied tenure.¹⁶⁶ The reaction was strong; 225 students immediately signed a petition calling for the BPO to reconsider the decision, and Malkiel listed a renegotiated agreement for Berg at SOM as his first of five requirements if the school wanted to renew his deanship.¹⁶⁷ OB Professor Walter Powell followed in the spring¹⁶⁸ and OB Assistant Professor Ivan Lansberg was also not promoted for a nontenure promotion, one of the very few professors in the history of SOM to be denied after his review.¹⁶⁹ Berg was eventually able to stay at SOM under a five-year contract as "Professor in the Practice of . . ." but concern about the direction of OB at SOM was high.¹⁷⁰ The four undergraduate OB courses taught by SOM faculty were moved to the Sociology Department. These events coincided with the Yale Graduate School of Arts

165. Brad Bortner, "Communication at SOM," *The Exchange*, December 8, 1987, 3, "Accounting: To Discuss and Not to Discuss, That is Our Right – and Our Responsibility," *The Exchange*, November 11, 1987, MAYUL, 2.

166. "Berg Tenure Loss Stirs SOM: Raising Concerns About the Future of Yale SOM's OB Program," *The Exchange*, January 14, 1987, MAYUL, 6.

167. "Malkiel on Malkiel," *The Exchange*, April 29, 1987, MAYUL, 1.

168. "Wippern Resigns, Powell Denied Tenure," *The Exchange*, April 29, 1987, MAYUL, 7.

169. Christopher Pope, "Core OB Curriculum in Peril," *The Exchange*, February 17, 1988, MAYUL, 8.

170. Christopher Pope, "Berg Wins Contract as Professor in the Practice of," *The Exchange*, September 9, 1987, MAYUL, 5.

and Science's official review of the OB PhD program at SOM.¹⁷¹ 339 SOM community members, mostly students, "signed a petition voicing the central role of OB to the SOM education, and protesting the continuing possibility that key OB core courses at SOM might be terminated."¹⁷² OB graduate students were required to serve as teaching assistants in IGB and students worried that moving the PhD program would eliminate IGB, *Group Dynamics*, and *Organizational Diagnosis* courses.¹⁷³ Commenting on OB's standing at SOM, Professor Adlerfer reported that, "OB has never not been under assault at SOM," and that, "I can now say that OB is in greater jeopardy than it has been since 1981."¹⁷⁴

Fraught faculty relations and deteriorating campus community. Uncertain leadership, an inchoate mission, the amplification of OB influences in the student experience and marginalization of OB faculty parallel trends in increasingly fraught faculty relations and a deteriorating campus community. Berg's tenure decision was seen as highlighting "an often unspoken tension . . . between leaders of the OB community and the administration regarding the future of OB at Yale."¹⁷⁵ Malkiel publicly praised SOM's clinical methods and traditions, and used a renewed contract for Berg as a

171. Christopher Pope, "Core OB Curriculum in Peril," *The Exchange*, February 17, 1988, MAYUL, 1.

172. Christopher Pope, "SOM Awaiting OB Decision," *The Exchange*, March 9, MAYUL, 5.

173. Christopher Pope, "SOM Awaiting OB Decision," *The Exchange*, March 9, MAYUL, 5.

174. Christopher Pope, "Core OB Curriculum in Peril," *The Exchange*, February 17, 1988, MAYUL, 1.

175. "Berg Tenure Loss Stirs SOM: Raising Concerns About the Future of Yale SOM's OB Program," *The Exchange*, January 14, 1987, MAYUL, 1 and 6.

bargaining chip in renewing his tenure as dean, while the BPO was seen as actively eroding OB.¹⁷⁶

In addition to OB faculty, practitioners of any discipline were seen as under assault even though students rated them highly as educators. Adjunct Professors William Lyons, whose *Corporate Valuation* course was one of the most oversubscribed, and Arthur Haut, who taught tax and valuation, are not reappointed for full terms. Management professor and SOM's Director of Professional Studies, Art Swersy, and Finance professor and Associate Dean Stan Gartska, described the decision as the end of an era that valued practitioners at SOM.¹⁷⁷ The BPO, which made all appointment and tenure decisions, was seen as mysterious, polarizing and one-sided. The different camps on the BPO manifested themselves through "years at the school, one's view of the importance of teaching compared to research, and the size of one's discipline."¹⁷⁸ The changing membership were also striking. OB once represented 3 of 15 chairs on the BPO, but held only 2 of 25 chairs by 1988—another symptom of OB's marginalization or erosion at Yale in general.¹⁷⁹ Alderfer described "several years of increasing polarization among the BPO regarding the role of OB at the school,"¹⁸⁰ and one faculty member

176. "Berg Tenure Loss Stirs SOM: Raising Concerns About the Future of Yale SOM's OB Program," *The Exchange*, January 14, 1987, MAYUL, 6.

177. Alex Moss, "Future Grim for Practitioners at SOM," *The Exchange*, April 27, MAYUL, 1.

178. Patty Nolan, "The BPO: As it Goes, So Goes SOM," *The Exchange*, April 6, 1988, MAYUL, 6.

179. Patty Nolan, "The BPO: As it Goes, So Goes SOM," *The Exchange*, April 6, 1988, MAYUL, 6.

180. Christopher Pope, "Core OB Curriculum in Peril," *The Exchange*, February 17, 1988, MAYUL, 1.

revealed that nine economists, joined by then Public Policy Professor, and next dean, Michael Levine tended to vote together.¹⁸¹ Ven der Heyden explained that dialogue was not established between departments and “that one of the problems was the apparent relative isolation of the OB group in comparison with the other academic departments.”¹⁸²

Funding was another factor: “Despite a dramatic expansion of research faculty who do not teach, research support which averaged \$250,000-\$350,000 over the last five years has declined to less than \$100,000.”¹⁸³ *Business Week* offered a succinct summary of SOM’s finances. In an article titled, “Yale B-School Struggles to Make the Grade,” the magazine reported that, “despite a \$56 million endowment, the school’s \$11 million budget is perennially in the red, while many of its rivals such as the Harvard and Wharton business schools, are cash cows.”¹⁸⁴

Professors also began to leave SOM under their own steam. Finance Professor Ronald Wipperfurth explained his resignation as due to, “The distance from the original mission . . . the intellectual, political and behavioral foundations of that mission have grown too great over the past five years for me to wish to continue to be a senior faculty

181. Patty Nolan, “The BPO: As it Goes, So Goes SOM,” *The Exchange*, April 6, 1988, MAYUL, 6.

182. Christopher Pope, “Core OB Curriculum in Peril,” *The Exchange*, February 17, 1988, MAYUL, 8.

183. Patty Nolan, “The BPO: As it Goes, So Goes SOM,” *The Exchange*, April 6, 1988, MAYUL, 6.

184. “Yale B-School Struggles to Make the Grade: Is its Experimental Program Living Up to its Promise?” *Business Week*, November 23, 1987, 86.

member of the school.”¹⁸⁵ Higher profile business schools also began poaching faculty¹⁸⁶ and founding professor Vroom thought “massive defections may be required to change SOM.”¹⁸⁷ Dean Malkiel recruited renowned economic and finance scholars, but by 1987 these professors looked for less conflicted campuses. Oliver Williamson (who won a Nobel in 2009), Paul Milgrom and Doug Diamond are notable economists who left campus.¹⁸⁸

Acting Dean Peck claimed that by engaging in fewer faculty hires he would reduce “resentment and anger between certain faculty subgroups,”¹⁸⁹ and student editorials suggested that a new dean would need to reduce tensions within the “highly factionalized faculty.”¹⁹⁰ Finance Professor Steve Ross said of the situation that it was a “dangerous time,” and described the climate as a “boiling cauldron,” “unnerving,” and “debilitating,” adding that the school was at “a critical juncture” and that several senior and junior faculty were leaving, with more “on the fence.”¹⁹¹ Days before the announcement that Michael Levine would serve as dean and that OB programming would

185. “Wippen Resigns, Powell Denied Tenure,” *The Exchange*, April 29, 1987, MAYUL, 7.

186. “Yale B-School Struggles to Make the Grade: Is its Experimental Program Living Up to its Promise?” *Business Week*, November 23, 1987, 86.

187. Patty Nolan, “The BPO: As it Goes, So Goes SOM,” *The Exchange*, April 6, 1988, MAYUL, 6.

188. Gerald Griffin, “Restructuring and Revolt,” *Yale Daily News Magazine*, November 14, 1988, YULDC, 19.

189. Christopher Pope, “Peck: Back-to-Basics in ’87-’88,” *The Exchange*, September 9, MAYUL, 1.

190. “In Search of the Dean Search,” *The Exchange*, March 9, 1988, MAYUL, 2.

191. Patty Nolan, “The BPO: As it Goes, So Goes SOM,” *The Exchange*, April 6, 1988, MAYUL, 6.

be terminated, students described their “burn out” and malaise as “the eye of the hurricane,” which they attributed to “the vacuum of leadership and direction at the school.”¹⁹² Ross summarized the split among faculty: “SOM should be a pluralistic institution where we value lots of different types. I see us moving away from that, and I think that’s a great loss.”¹⁹³

Findings on this era in SOM’s history were summarized in a memo from a 10th anniversary event: SOM’s Contribution to Management Education—An Alum Perspective. That memo summarized conversations between alumni and students where it is revealed that a great number of students were choosing to examine the mission of SOM in their courses *Managing Organizational Systems* and *Competitive Strategies*.¹⁹⁴ Themes the participants discuss included:

The concept of “the mission” is a powerful inspirational force in the life of SOM. While there is a shared “sense” of what the mission is, there is not an explicit or commonly agreed upon articulation of the mission. Many members of the community have well-developed and sometimes divergent concepts of what the mission means to them. The healthy tensions between these divergent opinions have at times disintegrated into unhealthy polarities. The embeddedness of SOM within the larger university context has a profound impact on the way in which the school pursues its mission. The conversation revealed a disturbing lack of understanding and even respect between faculty and students.¹⁹⁵

192. “Eye of the Hurricane,” *The Exchange*, October 26, 1988, MAYUL, 2.

193. Alex Moss, “Future Grim for Practitioners at SOM,” *The Exchange*, April 27, MAYUL, 8.

194. Mike Allison et al. to Class of ’88, Faculty, Staff, and Administration, Memorandum titled “Recommendations in Followup [sic] to Student Conversations with Faculty, Staff and Alumni about SOM’s Contribution to Management Education,” June 1, 1987, Bergman Records 1990-1992, RU 914, YRG 30-G, ACCN 2003-A-029, Box 1, MAYUL, 1.

195. Mike Allison et al. to Class of ’88, Faculty, Staff, and Administration, Memorandum titled “Recommendations in Followup [sic] to Student Conversations with Faculty, Staff and Alumni about SOM’s Contribution to Management Education,” June 1, 1987, Bergman Records 1990-1992, RU 914, YRG 30-G, ACCN 2003-A-029, Box 1, MAYUL, 1-2.

The meeting's structure and design was based on large and small group practices from IGB—and offered a glimpse of how IGB and the culture of OB served as surrogate structures in the vacuum created by the institution's incoherence around its mission. Recommendations from the meeting called for more organized dialogue and articulation of SOM's mission. One prescient reporter observed that the next dean's real job was “to reclaim the school from the students, who wield heavy influence on the curriculum.”¹⁹⁶ The notion was not lost on Vroom. In an interview with *The New Republic* Vroom admitted that the easiest way to destroy OB, and presumably its influence, would be to destroy Community Building Day, described as the basis for student relationships, IGB, Liaison, SOM's culture and OB's influence.¹⁹⁷

Peak Turmoil and Resolution (Oct, 1988–Spring 1995)

Peak turmoil and resolution at SOM was primarily documented through reporting in *The Yale Daily News*, SOM's campus weekly, *The Exchange*, letters from the dean, internal memos, student handbooks, course catalogues, and student memorials. The majority of documentation from this era focused on the 1988-89 academic year. Documentation for subsequent academic years thins each year beyond '89. The events at SOM in October of 1988 resulted in a spike of university and campus reporting, and national reporting, and generated internal university investigations and reports regarding the sudden appointment of Michael Levine as dean of SOM and the subsequent student protests. This era is categorized by: (a) Increasingly inchoate mission/purpose; (b)

196. “Yale B-School Struggles to Make the Grade: Is its Experimental Program Living Up to its Promise?” *Business Week*, November 23, 1987, 86.

197. Michael M. Lewis, “Bulldog Bull: Yale's feel-good School of Management,” *The New Republic*, May 23, 1988, 25.

Faculty/epistemological splitting; (c) Self sabotage and severed relations; and (d) Epistemological and mission/purpose realignment.

Conflict over increasingly inchoate mission/purpose. Conflict over the school's increasingly inchoate mission/purpose was evidenced by unilateral administrative decisions that favored and supported one side of the faculty split, heightened student and alumni discontent with SOM's direction, and sparked debate over the role and influence of *Business Week's* first ranking of business schools.

Administrative decisions unilaterally favor one side of the split. On October 27, 1988 President Benno Schmidt revealed in a letter to the SOM community that, "The Corporation, Provost and I have carefully considered the School's history and future. We have concluded that important changes must be made to enhance its scholarly and pedagogical contributions and its mission of educating management leaders in the public, private and nonprofit sectors."¹⁹⁸ Those changes favored one side of the split at SOM and eliminated the other side. OR faculty would be moved to another Yale campus and OB faculty would be eliminated from the University all-together. Six junior faculty contracts would not be renewed for Ella Bell, Mary Ann Glynn, David Berg, Jim Krantz, Ivan Lansberg and Seve Mezias. OB PhD students were given "a reasonable period" in which to complete their degrees.¹⁹⁹ One year into restructuring, Yale sociology professor Charles Perrow, who was given a joint appointment with SOM after restructuring and

198. Benno Schmidt to the member of the School of Organization and Management Community, Letter regarding restructuring, October 27, 1988, Bergman Records 1990-1992, RU 914, YRG 30-G, ACCN 2003-A-029, Box 1, MAYUL, 1.

199. Lisa Stapleton, "OR Gone; OB Cut: Revolution at SOM," *The Exchange*, October 31, MAYUL, 1 and 4.

appointed to a committee specifically charged with rebuilding the OB program at SOM by Levine, said that the remaining OB faculty would leave the school as they would “not like the new environment and we will hire new replacements.”²⁰⁰ It was understood by that time that Levine expected Alderfer to leave the school.²⁰¹ The internal strife was cited by SOM’s new dean Michael Levine in a letter to the SOM community regarding recent changes:

A lack of forward motion, somewhere between drift and paralysis, has made the School an unhappy place for at least two years, and many faculty can trace conflict and dissatisfaction back for a decade. Several faculty members of the highest national reputation have left the School within the past several years. The fact that students have not concerned themselves with or even been aware of this fact in some cases (because these faculty weren’t teaching MPPM classes) is further evidence of the problem, but their colleagues and the world have noticed and formed a view of SOM as a troubled place.²⁰²

Other sources confirm conflict, dissatisfaction and defections as the causes of SOM’s split.

Schmidt reported that “extreme divisiveness had paralyzed the School, prohibiting its institutional evolution and threatening to disintegrate the program. Drastic action was deemed necessary.”²⁰³ Months later he identifies the problem as one of two factions and

200. Meredith Hobbs, “SOM Forced to Hire New Faculty In Wake of Last Year’s Changes, *Yale Daily News*, October 31, 1989, YULDC, 3.

201. Meredith Hobbs, “SOM Forced to Hire New Faculty In Wake of Last Year’s Changes, *Yale Daily News*, October 31, 1989, YULDC, 3.

202. Michael Levine to Members of the SOM Community, Letter regarding restructuring, November 7, 1988, Bergman Records 1990-1992, RU 914, YRG 30-G, ACCN 2003-A-029, Box 1, MAYUL, 4.

203. Lisa Stapleton, Ted Weinstein, and Terry Ward, “Schmidt Offer His View,” *The Exchange*, November 4, 1988, MAYUL, 1.

that “he had to choose one side or the other in the fight.”²⁰⁴ An anonymous report by a board trustee is more revealing:

The announced changes reflect a move by the Administration to end a long-standing struggle between faculty factions over the future direction of the School, according to one Trustee. . . . The Trustee, who asked to remain anonymous, said that faculty divisiveness at SOM had become a “scandal to the University.” It was seen as so serious that the Corporation considered closing the school the Trustee said. Instead, a decision was made to reorganize SOM in such a way as to end the disputes once and for all.²⁰⁵

Schmidt’s Law School colleague, Frederick M. Rowe, a high level alum and donor, villainizes the victors in a letter copied to prominent Yale Law School colleagues and deans stating that SOM’s vision was:

“undermined by a growing faculty clique of economists with a one-dimensional view of business life and a distaste for “externalities” beyond their ken. Rising faculty dissension sapped SOM’s potential and poisoned its educational atmosphere. The malaise at SOM cried out for inspired leadership and a strong rededication by Yale to the vision which justified SOM’s existence.”²⁰⁶

Rowe adds that, “The notion of SOM more devoted to “theory” is a euphemism to hide an agenda for liquidating SOM elements not conforming to the academic economists’ model.”²⁰⁷

Students were aware that faculty disputes “plagued the school” and 83% of the student body identified “intra-faculty” relations as needing improvement in a school

204. Anne Schechter, “Special Reports Illuminate Changes at SOM,” *The Exchange*, December 14, 1988, MAYUL, 1.

205. Roger Pollack and Anne Schechter, “Michael Levine is Dean,” *The Exchange*, October 31, 1988, MAYUL, 4.

206. Frederick M. Rowe to Benno Schmidt, Letter regarding restructuring, November 4, 1988, Bergman Records 1990-1992, RU 914, YRG 30-G, ACCN 2003-A-029, Box 1, MAYUL, 1.

207. Frederick M. Rowe to Benno Schmidt, Letter regarding restructuring, November 4, 1988, Bergman Records 1990-1992, RU 914, YRG 30-G, ACCN 2003-A-029, Box 1, MAYUL, 1.

survey.²⁰⁸ Professor Marmor though provides a short history of the split at SOM and suggests that students did not know to what degree intra-faculty relations had spoiled:

According to Marmor, the student body does not understand the true extent of the faculty cleavage that has consumed and debilitated SOM in recent years. If students better knew what had transpired behind the closed doors of SOM faculty meetings, Marmor argues, they would better understand the need for action that Benno Schmidt and Michael Levine have proclaimed. In fact, they might even have expected the changes—as he did. “Do I regard the changes at SOM- the crisis- as a surprise? No, I don’t,” he said. “I think that the School of Management has been locked in a faculty conflict from the very beginning that was much greater than most students ever appreciated.” Marmor and several of his colleagues who prefer not to be quoted, trace the divisive conflict back to the creation of SOM in 1976, when the Organizational Behavior and Operations Research departments were moved from Arts and Sciences to the new graduate school. SOM’s stated mission was to offer a broad base of innovative instruction for public and private sector management. In the early years OB and OR were the only cohesive units, says Marmor, and hence they—and not the mission—dictated the direction that SOM would take.

Marmor continued with,

“The culture of the students was kind of allocated to the OB department,” says Marmor. “OB people took on the socialization function, doing “community building,” during the first week of school. What kind of community was being built? Well, the OB faculty was practically the only faculty that students met during their first week.”²⁰⁹

Faculty defections were a significant consequence of the faculty conflict at SOM and reason for the changes made at SOM. Levine wanted to create a more “hospitable” climate at the school after losing two economics and two finance professors to places like Stanford and Berkeley “because of uncertainty over the future of the school.”²¹⁰ *The Yale Daily News* reported the concern with stronger language emphasizing the split:

208. Gerald Griffin, “Restructuring and Revolt,” *Yale Daily News Magazine*, November 14, 1988, YULDC, 7.

209. Gerald Griffin, “Restructuring and Revolt,” *Yale Daily News Magazine*, November 14, 1988, YULDC, 7.

210. H. Michael Feldman, “Levine Outlines Vision of New SOM Approach,” *Yale Daily News*,

Virulent rivalries between professors began to crop up as departments battled to control the school's direction. Inevitably, the finance people and the OB and OR faculty reached the point where they simply did not like one another. The uncivil atmosphere helped induce professors—like Oliver Williamson, Paul Milgrom and Doug Diamond—to leave. Other professors simply stopped participating in faculty meetings.²¹¹

New threats of defection seemed to fuel decisions. *The Exchange* reported that, “Two sources confirmed that many SOM economics, finance and accounting faculty had threatened to leave SOM for jobs at other universities if the faculty divisiveness and leadership vacuum were not resolved to their satisfaction.”²¹² University history professor William Parker, the most outspoken faculty member regarding Schmidt's actions at SOM, supports the notion that resignation threats fueled administrative action:

It was my impression at the time that the SOM move was not simply a piece of bungling in an emergency, but rather a long-planned take-over, Wall Street style, of the core of the school, as that core had been conceived at the School's inception—a take-over planned not by the President, but by several of the minority stock-holders, specifically by two or three finance professors, using threats of resignation as blackmail.²¹³

Confirming that the split did indeed remove one side of the argument, committee members summarizing faculty reactions shared, “It was a little shocking . . . that the majority of the faculty are not against the changes, although they are concerned with the

November 3, 1988, YULDC, 1.

211. Gerald Griffin, “Restructuring and Revolt,” *Yale Daily News Magazine*, November 14, 1988, YULDC, 19.

212. Lisa Stapleton, “Outside SOM, University Officials Remain Officially Silent,” *The Exchange*, MAYUL, 1.

213. William N. Parker, “Yale Deserves Top-League Administration,” *Yale Daily News*, February 6, 1990, YULDC, 2.

way in which it was done.” Students, it seems, “expected more dissatisfaction with the results.”²¹⁴

Heightened Student and Alumni Discontent with Direction and Purpose of the School. Student and alumni discontent with the direction and purpose of the school peaked when the restructuring at SOM was announced on October 27, 1988. Within two days alumni had 70 signatures demanding a reversal of Schmidt’s decision that cited “apparent disregard for the special strengths of the SOM curriculum in training skilled and humanistic managers” as their main concern.²¹⁵ Six days after the announcement, students boycotted classes at SOM, and held an open forum to discuss Levine’s appointment and changes to the school and determine what their course of action would be. Students wore black armbands during the boycott to express their dissatisfaction with the choice of dean and the selection process.²¹⁶ Students and alumni also organized an individual letter writing campaign in addition to group letters²¹⁷ and within weeks alumni gathered 370 signatures demanding a reversal of decisions from one fourth of the school’s 1,470 graduates. Alumni representatives said they would put up a “tremendous fight” and take their complaints to the Yale Corporation.²¹⁸ By February 1989 a survey of

214. Anne Schechter, “Special Reports Illuminate Changes at SOM,” *The Exchange*, December 14, 1988, MAYUL, 8.

215. SOM Boston alumni to Benno Schmidt, Letter regarding restructuring, November 2, 1988, Bergman Records 1990-1992, RU 914, YRG 30-G, ACCN 2003-A-029, Box 1, MAYUL, 2.

216. Kiele Neas, “SOM Students to Demonstrate: Will Skip Classes to Hold Forum,” *Yale Daily News*, November 1, 1988, YULDC, 1.

217. SOM Boston alumni to Benno Schmidt, Letter regarding restructuring, November 2, 1988, Bergman Records 1990-1992, RU 914, YRG 30-G, ACCN 2003-A-029, Box 1, MAYUL, 2.

218. Bob Milius, “SOM Alumni to Meet Schmidt: Will Talk Today at Harvard Club,” *Yale Daily News*, November 18, 1988, YULDC, 1.

SOM alumni determined that two thirds of 1,400 graduates opposed the changes to the school.²¹⁹ Angered after conversations with Schmidt and Levine, alumni concluded, “We need to go on and meet with other people who are in charge of hiring and firing the president,” as he left them “no other choice.”²²⁰

Three months after the restructuring announcement, over one hundred alumni traveled to Yale for the first Alumni Action Day²²¹ and by March students and alumni held rallies, teach-ins and luncheons alongside a trustee meeting to keep corporation members aware of their deep concern “over the school’s fate.”²²² “Opposition has not dropped off,” claimed one student organizer in April of 1989 in an article titled “SOM Unrest Continues at a High Level.” Students had collected letters signed by 320 students, which included 75 graduate and Law School students not affiliated with SOM.²²³

The highest profile alumni action taken against the school came by way of airplane banners. Suggesting Benno Schmidt’s vision for SOM was more suitable for HBS, alumni had an airplane banner reading “Benno-Save Yale School of Management. Send Levine to HBS” flown over the Yale-Harvard football game that fall.²²⁴ “Save

219. Bob Milius, “Alumni of SOM Remain Opposed,” *Yale Daily News*, February 28, 1989, YULDC, 1.

220. Kiele Neas, “Schmidt, Alumni Discuss SOM Fate,” *Yale Daily News*, November 28, 1988, YULDC, 1.

221. Alex Moss, “Alumni Protest Dean’s ‘Broad Monologue’,” *The Exchange*, December 14, 1988, MAYUL, 1.

222. Michael McCormack, “Corporation to Face SOM Demonstration,” *Yale Daily News*, March 3, 1989, YULDC, 1.

223. Michael McCormack, “SOM Unrest Continues at a High Level,” *Yale Daily News Review*, April 13, YULDC, 5.

224. Bob Milius, “SOM Alumni to Meet Schmidt: Will Talk Today at Harvard Club,” *Yale Daily News*, November 18, 1988, YULDC, 1; Dave Leonhardt, “Revamping the MBA,” *Yale Alumni Magazine*,

SOM—Unhorse Benno the Boy King,” flew over the 1989 graduation ceremony while SOM graduates brought black balloons reading, ‘SOM: It’s Not Over.’²²⁵ Alumni also paid for a banner reading “Boesky. Milken. Lorenzo. Levine. All raiders will fail,” which compared Levine to corporate takeover artists, at the 1990 commencement exercises.²²⁶ *Newsweek* described the first rally at SOM as “the best run protest in the history of higher education: “While students manned the phone to drum up alumni support, a media savvy cadre worked to get national press coverage. It culminated with 250 of the school’s 360 would-be bosses marching down New Haven’s Wall Street to a dignified rally.”²²⁷

Rankings debate. Discussion and dissatisfaction about the direction of SOM included references to the ranking of business schools. *Business Week* released its first ever ranking of business schools in November of 1988 and the impending results were seen as influencing Schmidt and the Yale Corporation’s decision. That year, SOM was ranked 19th overall of the top 20 business schools.²²⁸ Wharton Vice Dean David Reibstein’s sentiments were quoted in an article exploring the influence of ranking: “Everybody is striving to be one of the top business schools. That forces them to try to be everything to everyone. SOM should be applauded for specializing and offering a unique

May/June 2007, http://archives.yalealumnimagazine.com/issues/2007_05/som.html.

225. Andrew Wexton, “Wolfe, Speeches Send Off Class of 1989,” *Yale Daily News*, September 6, 1989, YULDC, 6.

226. David Leonhardt, “SOM Doesn’t Fit in Business Week Top 20 Ratings,” *Yale Daily News*, October 24, 1990, YULDC, 1; Bruce Fellman, “Business With a Twist,” *Yale Alumni Magazine*, March 2002, http://archives.yalealumnimagazine.com/issues/02_03/SOM.html.

227. John Schwartz, “Gods and Managers at Yale: A Businesslike Protest,” *Newsweek*, November 14, 1988.

228. “How the Schools Stack Up: Business Week Rates the Top 20,” *Business Week*, November 28, 1988, 78.

approach to management. It will be a shame if it has lost that uniqueness.”²²⁹ The polling of SOM’s graduating class of ’89, the first graduating class after 1988s restructuring at SOM, is seen as the cause of SOM dropping off the top 20 ranking entirely. That class ranked the school poorly, primarily because of the “school’s focus away from dealing with people towards attracting big-name professors in finance and economics.”²³⁰

Faculty/epistemological splitting. President Schmidt and Dean Levine’s elimination of the OB program from SOM made explicit a split that had divided faculty at SOM for several years. Those features of SOM that were eliminated from the school represent influential forces perceived as hampering the progress of the majority faction in the faculty. This split was the product of OB’s amplified role, a durable theme throughout each era of SOM explored in this study, the dismissal of experiential education, clinical work and student participation, and a vision to shift the emphasis of OB at SOM from micro to macro.

Amplified role of OB. Emphasis on OB’s amplified role at SOM is applied mostly to the department’s generalized influence on students and school culture. MPPM and PhD students bemoaned the threat to SOM’s “soul” with the loss of OB as they know it²³¹ and lamented that prevailing norms of low competition and positive group work and the overall SOM environment which attracts top candidates will be lost without the IGB

229. Kiele Neas, “The SOM Dilemma: To Manage People or Money?” *Yale Daily News*, December 8, 1988, YULDC, 5.

230. David Leonhardt, “SOM Doesn’t Fit in Business Week Top 20 Ratings,” *Yale Daily News*, October 24, 1990, YULDC, 1.

231. Kiele Neas, “SOM Changes Seen as Threat to School's 'Soul',” *Yale Daily News Review*, November 4, 1988, YULDC, 3.

course.²³² The documentation examined for this study did not find any evidence of students applauding SOM's restructuring. SOM students reveal how they experienced IGB as their socialization into SOM and as a vehicle for teaching the school's "values and philosophies to incoming students."²³³ Students organized themselves by IGB groups during their first protest to discuss the changes.²³⁴ Students were attached to IGB, but

political and economics professors like Marmor worried that IGB was an instrument by which the OB faculty could marshal student support. Tenured OB professors Clay Alderfer and Vic Vroom, Marmor explains, used the vast enrollment in IGB to push the school to hire more OB faculty than the SOM mission had called for, thereby alienating many non-OB professors who protested the growing strength of Alderfer and Vroom's department. OB and OR professors resented these protests—especially because they came from newcomers.

Professors like Marmor, moreover, believed that the time spent on disputes brought on by the OB plan prevented SOM from pursuing its original mission of broadly based management instruction. Too much time and energy was being wasted on OB issues. The OB faculty naturally, disagreed. A fierce philosophical rift within SOM developed, one which sometimes paralyzed faculty meetings. The situation demanded strong leadership.²³⁵

In his letter to the SOM Community regarding the recent changes at the school, Dean Levine was more diplomatic in his explanation of OB (and OR's) history in his decision:

The size and focus of the OB program and its effects on the rest of the curriculum have been the subject of considerable concern on the part of a substantial fraction of the faculty. The size and focus of the OR faculty was determined less by the demands of management education than by history and the needs of the doctoral and undergraduate instruction. These and other problems created difficulties for the faculties' internal governance and, worse, for its ability to function as an academic community widely interested in and contributing to each other's work.

232. "OB: At the Heart of SOM's Success," *The Exchange*, February 17, 1988, MAYUL, 2.

233. Ryan Ledwidth and Ramesh Ramanathan, "Changes at SOM: What Do They Mean for the Class of 1991," *The Exchange*, September 29, 1989, MAYUL, 1.

234. Kiele Neas, "Students Unite at SOM Rally," *Yale Daily News*, November 3, 1988, YULDC, 5.

235. Gerald Griffin, "Restructuring and Revolt," *Yale Daily News Magazine*, November 14, 1988, YULDC, 19.

They also created obstacles to student-faculty interaction which kept the School from making the most of the extraordinary talents present in both the faculty and the student body.²³⁶

Levine was more candid about the role of IGB in the student experience at an SOM community meeting:

The centrality that this course takes on for many students early in their career at the school concerns me. I worry that this approach to group management comes to be seen early in some students' careers at the school as the most important approach to the most important problems a manager ever faces. Students should be exposed early to other approaches to organizational problems using a wider variety of models.²³⁷

Professor Stan Gartska reinforced the amplified role OB played in the MPPM curriculum and claimed that, "IGB became too identified with the MPPM program and was the focus of the core. There are [other] disciplines that need to get attention if we want to provide meaningful management education. We needed balance in the core."²³⁸ Exhausted by the saga, OB Chairman Clay Alderfer expressed relief that it had come to end, suggesting that, "Someone feels an extraordinary need to get rid of OB and they've worked hard to do this," and that OB had been a target for 17 years.²³⁹

Dismissal of experiential learning, clinical work and student participation.

Distinct features of SOM dismissed from the student experience along with OB were

236. Michael Levine to Members of the SOM Community, Letter regarding restructuring, November 7, 1988, Bergman Records 1990-1992, RU 914, YRG 30-G, ACCN 2003-A-029, Box 1, MAYUL, 4.

237. Michael Levine to Members of the SOM Community, Summary of meeting minutes from five meetings, November 8–16, 1988, Bergman Records 1990-1992, RU 914, YRG 30-G, ACCN 2003-A-029, Box 1, MAYUL, 3.

238. Ryan Ledwidth and Ramesh Ramanathan, "Changes at SOM: What Do They Mean for the Class of 1991, *The Exchange*, September 29, 1989, MAYUL, 4.

239. Lisa Stapleton, "OR Gone; OB Cut: Revolution at SOM," *The Exchange*, October 31, 1988, MAYUL, 5.

experiential and constructivist leadership learning in the form of IGB and student participation in structures such as liaison meetings and admissions procedures. Levine affirmed his “passionate commitment” to SOM’s mission, but acknowledged that the “pedagogical techniques for imparting the mission will undergo substantial change” and that SOM would indeed depart from the descriptions in the admissions brochure. Explaining these changes in pedagogy, Levine announced that, “You shouldn’t teach experience, that’s not the function of a management school. Why should we sell you what you can get for free after you graduate? What we sell you is a way to understand experience better than you could before.” Levine reinforced that the school’s mission would not change, but the techniques used to pursue the mission would indeed change²⁴⁰ and would focus more on “traditional teaching methods.”²⁴¹ Levine told the *New York Times* that “The changes in the organizational behavior approach are designed to move away from the PhD program, to be less clinical, personal, and experiential.”²⁴² More clearly, Levine stated, “We plan to find new ways to teach about working in groups.”²⁴³ When changes were announced Levine stated that OB would continue, “But the current emphasis on clinical, experiential and individual is only a very small slice of the field,” adding that their OB program was “very narrow. I don’t want to say it’s bad, but it is

240. Roger Pollack and Anne Schechter, “Michael Levine is Dean,” *The Exchange*, October 31, 1988, MAYUL, 1.

241. “Class Conflict: A Shake-up Stirs Outrage at Yale’s Humanistic Business School,” *Business Week*, November 14, 1988, 50.

242. Constance L. Hayes, “Views Collide Over Changes at Yale,” *New York Times*, November 9, 1988.

243. “A Conversation is a Two Way Street,” *The Exchange*, November 11, 1988, MAYUL, 2.

narrow.”²⁴⁴ Stan Gartska reported that SOM was trying to “develop an educational philosophy that places management as part of the social sciences,” and explained the disconnect between faculty and students by adding, “Students lobby for instruction in ‘techniques’, but the faculty are interested in more enduring things.”²⁴⁵

These explanations reinforced criticism by Schmidt and Levine that the OB program and the IGB courses were “excessively psychological,” “soft,” and “touchy-feely.”²⁴⁶ Reporting on the divided faculty, *Business Week* suggested quantitative faculty resented the attention students directed toward OB describing OB courses as “soft subjects [that] use a dubious ‘clinical’ approach verging on group therapy.”²⁴⁷ When confronted with the data that many alumni credit IGB with their most valuable learning, Levine saw this as further proof that something was indeed wrong with the whole curriculum.²⁴⁸ The data mostly tell a story of students in favor of OB against Levine. One anonymous student reference stands apart in all the reviewed documentation, “SOM’s reputation as a ‘touchy-feely management school’ has hindered his search for an investment banking job.”²⁴⁹

244. Roger Pollack and Anne Schechter, “Michael Levine is Dean,” *The Exchange*, October 31, 1988, MAYUL, 4.

245. Ryck Lent, “Faculty Committee Mulls Curriculum Changes,” *The Exchange*, February 23, 1989, MAYUL, 4.

246. Kiele Neas, “The SOM Dilemma: To Manage People or Money?” *Yale Daily News*, December 8, 1988, YULDC, 5.

247. “Days of Rage at Yale B-School: Dean Levine’s Makeover has Students and Alums Seeing Red,” *Business Week*, December 12, 1988, 36.

248. Roger Pollack and Ryck Lent, “Levine Speaks on Faculty, Curriculum and Communication,” *The Exchange*, February 23, 1989, MAYUL, 6.

249. Hara Amdemariam, “New SOM Dean Plans Image Makeover,” *Yale Daily News*, May 23, 225

The other element of experience dismissed with SOM's restructuring was student participation in the administration of the school, most notably liaison meetings and the admissions process. Students identified SOM as "not only a school," but as a lab "in which students learn how to manage in part by doing." The process of community building was seen as an important function in student learning.²⁵⁰ "SOM had blurred the authority distinctions between students, faculty, and administration. Students were significantly empowered in areas of student affairs, organization, admission and curriculum. There was no Student Affairs Director; instead that role was most closely approximated by a Faculty Liaison who held regular meetings with the students."²⁵¹

While Liaison meetings were a place where SOM community members were supposed to engage each other directly, Levine reported that "few faculty attended the meetings, and staff came only because they thought they had to," and that "the group had the ability to put people on the spot."²⁵² Levine described the Liaison meetings as a "happy anarchic retreat" and "vaguely counter-cultural."²⁵³ He saw the dean as "the person who should speak for the administration and replaced liaison meetings with dean meetings where students could share their concerns directly with the dean and created a

1993, YULDC, 17.

250. Meredith Hobbs, "Year Old Changes Leave Permanent Mark on SOM," *Yale Daily News*, November 1, 1989, YULDC, 1.

251. Mike Lasache, "The SOM Curriculum Wars," *The Exchange*, October 1, 1990, MAYUL, 9.

252. Meredith Hobbs, "Year Old Changes Leave Permanent Mark on SOM," *Yale Daily News*, November 1, 1989, YULDC, 5.

253. Mike Lasache, "The SOM Curriculum Wars," *The Exchange*, October 1, 1990, MAYUL, 9.

Dean of Student Affairs who focused on counseling, tutoring and registration, not liaison or committee meetings as the former Dean of Professional Studies role had required.²⁵⁴

Students were also withdrawn from the admissions process at SOM. Citing reasons of confidentiality to protect applicant identities, students who normally played a significant role in the admissions process were instead given a reduced advisory role.²⁵⁵ Professors Paul Berney and Vic Vroom lamented the changes at SOM in a presentation called “SOM The Early Years” in 1991 where they shared that “The fun, adventure, hardships and open, participatory atmosphere that characterized the ‘Old SOM’ are long gone and have been replaced by a more conventional structure” with adverse effects on the school. Berney added that, “This is now a plain vanilla business school with nothing special about it,” and that the old SOM “built an atmosphere for shared learning. Students had an active role in running and improving the school.” And the new system “made students much more passive than they used to be. They are inclined to be more obedient.” At this point they did not think SOM would revert: “I would not hold out a lot of hope for what you can do as students,” said professor Vic Vroom. “The administration will not hear what you are saying.”²⁵⁶

Micro to macro OB. That SOM wanted to shift its OB emphasis from micro to macro represents the rejection of what the original OB department at SOM represented in its research and teaching. SOM faculty and administration found the department to be too

254. Steve Algert, “Denardo Resigns as DPS,” *The Exchange*, February 1, 1989, MAYUL, 1.

255. Meredith Hobbs, “Year Old Changes Leave Permanent Mark on SOM,” *Yale Daily News*, November 1, 1989, YULDC, 1.

256. Scott Daube, “Old SOM Lecutre: The Thrill is Gone,” *The Exchange*, November 15, 1991, MAYUL, 3.

narrow in both domains. A major justification for his changes, Levine wrote in a letter to the SOM community, was that they “had reorganized the faculty to allow better focus on the Master’s program and to provide more diversity in OB,” adding that the school intends to reorient the OB program “to include senior and junior instructors pursuing forms of OB research and instruction not now emphasized.”²⁵⁷ Steve Ross also disagreed with the original arrangement where a large group of OB faculty focused on a narrow version of OB and instead sought to “support the development of an OB department which looks at the structure of organizations—ways of looking at organizations by sociologists, psychologists, political scientists,” which he said was ‘macro-OB.’²⁵⁸ SOM wanted to shift away from a focus on how individuals act in groups and move towards a more “macro” approach, “concentrating on entire organizations and their environments.”²⁵⁹ A committee was convened in the fall of 1989 to help SOM redevelop a new OB program announcing that SOM was interested in macro OB, but that micro OB would still play a role at the school. That committee of non-Yale OB faculty consisted of John Kimberly of Wharton (focused on organizational development), Charles O’Reilly of Berkeley (described as micro-psychological) and Richard Scott of Stanford (described as macro-sociological).²⁶⁰ By 1991 the faculty appointment committee, chaired by

257. Michael Levine to Members of the SOM Community, Letter regarding restructuring, November 7, 1988, Bergman Records 1990-1992, RU 914, YRG 30-G, ACCN 2003-A-029, Box 1, MAYUL, 1.

258. Lisa Stapleton, “OR Gone; OB Cut: Revolution at SOM,” *The Exchange*, October 31, 1988, MAYUL, 5.

259. Meredith Hobbs, “SOM Forced to Hire New Faculty in Wake of Last Year’s Changes,” *Yale Daily News*, October 31, 1989, 1.

260. Stewart Halpern to SOMAA Board, Memo regarding September 14 meeting with Subrata Sen, Undated, Bergman Records 1990-1992, RU 914, YRG 30-G, ACCN 2003-A-029, Box 1, MAYUL;

management professor Subrata Sen, declared OB appointments “the highest priority at the School in terms of faculty search” and relaxed its emphasis on macro to also accommodate micro OB options.²⁶¹ Officials aimed for an OB group of four to five people, two of whom would be senior, to represent the OB curriculum at SOM.²⁶² Reports by this committee were unavailable for examination.

Self-sabotage and severed relations. Four themes reveal decisions and actions by Yale and SOM administration that proved to be self-defeating in nature, damaging the school’s strengths and important relationships. Autocratic unilateral decisions regarding SOM threatened internal relations between the president and the Yale community. The consequences of these decisions sabotaged many of SOM’s strengths as a management school, generated a public relations challenge, and sabotaged support for the school from alumni and faculty.

Autocratic tactics sabotage Yale relations and presidency. The autocratic and unilateral nature of the announced changes at SOM alarmed the Yale community, specifically, the nature of Levine’s appointment as dean of SOM, elimination of an established program of study in OB, the relocation of OR to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, and the proposal of a new division in FAS to combine this group with other branches of engineering and applied science, without consulting that faculty, the OR

Joe Van Remortel, “Panel of Experts Reveiws OB,” *The Exchange*, October 1, 1991, MAYUL, 1.

261. Stewart Halpern to SOMAA Board, Memo regarding September 14 meeting with Subrata Sen, Undated, Bergman Records 1990-1992, RU 914, YRG 30-G, ACCN 2003-A-029, Box 1, MAYUL.

262. Stewart Halpern to SOMAA Board, Memo regarding September 14 meeting with Subrata Sen, Undated, Bergman Records 1990-1992, RU 914, YRG 30-G, ACCN 2003-A-029, Box 1, MAYUL.

department or the deans of Yale College and the Graduate School.²⁶³ Ire for these decisions sparked the first ever proposal to investigate a president's actions at Yale by faculty. President Schmidt sought advice from the school's advisory board, alumni and faculty, but stated that, "In the end, the selection of the dean is my responsibility. And I cannot exercise that responsibility effectively in a communal and plebiscitary mode."²⁶⁴ A resolution by graduate and professional school alumni expressed concern for the "moral, legal and governance issues" and "a dangerous precedent."²⁶⁵ More concerning though was a movement led by economics professor William Parker who mobilized support for a resolution to create a committee to examine SOM's restructuring and implications for Yale College. Parker criticized Schmidt's actions as "the rawest style of corporate takeover," claiming "Schmidt's authority is not conferred by fiat," and needed to be earned through a "respectful employment of power."²⁶⁶ Reporting on the resolution reads:

The Yale faculty is "rightly concerned over so serious and sudden an abrogation in any faculty of the University of the fundamental faculty right of passing on appointments," according to a copy of the resolution obtained this week. The document cites a further concern over "the maintenance of orderly and deliberate administrative procedures" in the whole University.²⁶⁷

263. William N. Parker, "In SOM's Wake, Bulldogs Need Watchdog," *Yale Daily News*, April 4, 1989, YULDC, 2.

264. Andrew Wexton, "Levine Named SOM Dean: Authority on Deregulation of Airline Industry," *Yale Daily News Review*, November 4, 1988, YULDC, 3.

265. Resolution Passed by Law, Forestry, and Divinity School G&P Meeting (SOM Alumnae Abstaining), April 19, 1989, Bergman Records 1990-1992, RU 914, YRG 30-G, ACCN 2003-A-029, Box 1, MAYUL.

266. Thom Geier, "Schmidt's Role in SOM Changes May be Reviewed," *Yale Daily News*, March 2, 1989, YULDC, 1.

267. Thom Geier, "Schmidt's Role in SOM Changes May be Reviewed," *Yale Daily News*, March 230

Over 200 professors met to debate the resolution to investigate the legitimacy of Schmidt's actions²⁶⁸ and 40% of faculty supported Parker's resolution, particularly because SOM faculty lost the power to initiate and review faculty appointments until further notice,²⁶⁹ an indication that internal strife at SOM did indeed focus on OB's accumulation of faculty over other programs. History professor and former Yale College Dean Howard Lamar issued a more favorable proposal "for the formation of a faculty committee to explore the relationship of SOM and Yale College in the wake of controversial changes in the procedures, programs and personnel at SOM."²⁷⁰ The subsequent report, drafted by Professor Nancy Cott, the committee's chairwoman, did accuse Schmidt of violating university policy:

"Quite apart from the merits of the outcome, the feeling is widespread that there was inadequate consultation with the parties most concerned before the President announced the changes involving our Faculty, and that the educational and practical effects of these changes have only been given full consideration post hoc,"²⁷¹

History Professor John W. Blassingame, summarized these inadequate consultations in an editorial. He writes that Jerome Pollitt, Dean of the Yale Graduate School, who sat on committees to review SOM's OB program and to select a new dean for the school learned

2, 1989, YULDC, 4.

268. Thom Geier, "Faculty Approve Schmidt, Will Not Investigate SOM," *Yale Daily News*, March 3, 1989, YULDC, 1.

269. Thom Geier, "Faculty Make History Debating Schmidt's Actions," *Yale Daily News*, March 7, 1989, YULDC, 1.

270. Thom Geier, "Faculty Approve Schmidt, Will Not Investigate SOM," *Yale Daily News*, March 3, 1989, YULDC, 1.

271. Thom Geier, "Cott Committee Questions Schmidt's SOM Actions," *Yale Daily News*, May 10, 1989, YULDC, 1.

of Schmidt's decision through the campus newspaper and that Sidney Altman, Dean of Yale College, first learned that he acquired a new department (OR) from the same newspaper. Blassingame added that the removal of tenured and junior faculty from their positions "deliberately ignored long established procedures." Blassingame continued, "Never has a President of Yale demonstrated such apparent lack of confidence in the Dean of the Graduate School," and "Never has a Dean of Yale College been publicly embarrassed in this fashion." Describing Schmidt's actions as a "full blown dictatorship" he suggested that Yale had "never before witnessed such total absence of consultation, consensus, and civility among its chief administrators. Nor has a Yale president misdirected, by ill-informed counselors, ever shown such disdain for fellow officers of the University."²⁷²

Sabotaged strengths. SOM's strengths were also sabotaged by the changes made in 1988. Those changes eroded SOM's culture and community, the school's competitive edge, and the diversity that SOM represented at Yale and in the management school field.

Sabotaged culture. Despite being ranked 19th overall in *Business Week's* first ranking of business schools, "Yale graduates did give the school the highest marks in *Business Week's* survey for emphasizing teamwork and cultivating an environment that stressed cooperation over competition."²⁷³ After restructuring, students reported that the campus felt "polarized" with "less community spirit . . . especially without Liaison and IGB to pull people in who wouldn't normally be together."²⁷⁴ Community Building, the

272. John W. Blassingame, "SOM: Dictatorship or Democracy at Yale," *The Exchange*, April 12, 1989, MAYUL, 3.

273. "Where the Schools Aren't Doing Their Homework," *Business Week*, November 28, 1988, 85.

274. Meredith Hobbs, "Year Old Changes Leave Permanent Mark on SOM," *Yale Daily News*, 232

first day for new students organized by the OB department, was also eliminated in the changes.²⁷⁵ Derided as “IGB intake day,” Community Building events formed the student groups for IGB and liaison. Students made a direct link between IGB and SOM’s student culture: “If IGB is taken away, how will we keep the student culture going?”²⁷⁶ Students saw SOM’s culture as the “the complex interaction of students, faculty and staff that makes the school what it is.”²⁷⁷ Students reported that what gave SOM its competitive edge was “that very element of the SOM culture that is being gutted by the administration.”²⁷⁸ The observation was made from the outside as well. Hoping to innovate on their own campus, Stanford representatives had observed IGB classes just before the changes at SOM,²⁷⁹ and Wharton’s Vice Dean applauded SOM’s unique value add²⁸⁰ at a time when the industry was acknowledging the need for more interpersonal skill building.²⁸¹ Summarizing opinions of Ivy League business schools at the time,

November 1, 1989, YULDC, 5.

275. Roger Pollack and Anne Schechter, “Michael Levine is Dean,” *The Exchange*, October 31, 1988, MAYUL, 1.

276. Steve Algert and Kauderer, “SOM Community Regroups, Looks Ahead at Next Steps,” *The Exchange*, November 14, 1988, MAYUL, 6.

277. Roger Pollack, Anne Schechter, and Lisa Stapleton, “Do Not Go Gently Into That Good Night SOM,” *Yale Daily News*, November 3, 1988, YULDC, 2.

278. Alex Moss, “Alumni Protest Dean’s ‘Broad Monologue’,” *The Exchange*, December 14, 1988, MAYUL, 5.

279. Lisa Stapleton, “OR Gone; OB Cut: Revolution at SOM,” *The Exchange*, October 31, MAYUL, 5.

280. Kiele Neas, “SOM Conflict Draws Attention to Basic Question: Should Schools Teach Students to Manage Money or to Manage People?” *Yale Daily News Review*, December 16, 1988, YULDC, 5.

281. “Where the Schools Aren’t Doing Their Homework,” *Business Week*, November 28, 1988, 85; Lyman W. Porter and Lawrence E. McKibbin, *Management Education and Development*, (New York: McGraw Hill, 1988), 303.

AACSB administrator Charles Hickman told the *Yale Daily News* that some employers were finding Stanford and Harvard grads too focused on competition instead of cooperation and such companies were turning to places like Indiana University to find recruits with “Midwestern” values.²⁸²

Most alumni in SOM’s own brochure cited the school’s unique OB program as contributing to their success, claiming:

“The extensive group work at SOM has left me comfortable and effective in group contexts.”; “What contributes 70% to my success is the interpersonal skills I learned at SOM.”; “The greatest value of my SOM experience was the school’s emphasis on understanding individual and group behavior.”; “SOM made me a believer in the power of effective group work.” “What is very different at SOM is the experiential focus,” noted Peggy Willers, ’89. “At Harvard, for example, what you learn is theory.”²⁸³

IGB’s popularity was linked to studies showing that managers spent 75% of their time in meetings. 95% of SOM students passed through the course even though it was not required and the “IGB effect” poured over “into other courses, study groups, and SOM’s daily function and decision making (such as Liaison).²⁸⁴ OB student advocates claimed that the department:

represents a more practical approach to management education, and say it does more to teach leadership and people-management skills than do other forms of instruction. Students argue that this fostering of leadership skills is one of the school’s strengths, and that its consensual approach, which values cooperation over competition, gives its graduates a comparative advantage in the job market.²⁸⁵

282. Kiele Neas, "SOM Conflict Draws Attention to Basic Question: Should Schools Teach Students to Manage Money or to Manage People?" *Yale Daily News Review*, December 16, 1988, YULDC, 5.

283. Lisa Stapleton, “OR Gone; OB Cut: Revolution at SOM,” *The Exchange*, October 31, MAYUL, 5.

284. Mike Lasache, “The SOM Curriculum Wars,” *The Exchange*, October 1, 1990, MAYUL, 7.

285. Kiele Neas, "SOM Conflict Draws Attention to Basic Question: Should Schools Teach

Student polls conducted at the first Community Day Protest right after SOM's changes were announced show that 75% (156 n=209) of students saw IGB as the course that most prepared them to reenter the workforce.²⁸⁶ In 1991, just before experiential and constructivist OB courses disappeared from SOM altogether, the courses *Group Relations and Organization (GRO)*, a modified version of IGB and *Managerial Leadership* were identified by a majority of polled students as “extremely valuable” (4.69 on a 5 point scale), who claimed it would be a great loss if the courses were not incorporated into the curriculum.²⁸⁷ 71% of respondents advocated for the courses to be added to the core curriculum.²⁸⁸ Alongside this praise for OB was criticism for non-OB instructors. *Business Week* reported that students insisted OB faculty were on the “cutting-edge of management” and were the better teachers at SOM.²⁸⁹ This perspective offered insight into the OB program's educational emphasis, its amplified role in the school for students, and the tension amongst faculty. Non-OB faculty were publically and unapologetically criticized as second rate by students:

What students don't like is bad teaching, badly designed test instruments, the eradication of teaching assistants, and other developments which undermine the strength of the Masters Program. We don't like the fact that many of the most dedicated teachers are being unceremoniously phased out or thrown out, while

Students to Manage Money or to Manage People?” *Yale Daily News Review*, December 16, 1988, YULDC, 5.

286. Community Day Questionnaire: Quantifiable Results, November 2, 1988, Bergman Records 1990-1992, RU 914, YRG 30-G, ACCN 2003-A-029, Box 1, MAYUL, 2.

287. Community Day Questionnaire: Quantifiable Results, November 2, 1988, Bergman Records 1990-1992, RU 914, YRG 30-G, ACCN 2003-A-029, Box 1, MAYUL, 2.

288. Community Day Questionnaire: Quantifiable Results, November 2, 1988, Bergman Records 1990-1992, RU 914, YRG 30-G, ACCN 2003-A-029, Box 1, MAYUL, 2.

289. “Days of Rage at Yale B-School: Dean Levine's Makeover has Students and Alums Seeing Red,” *Business Week*, December 12, 1988, 36.

some who don't appear to give a damn about teaching gain new influence. And what students and alumni are saying when it comes to OB is: IGB, Group Dynamics, and the rest of the current OB curriculum is an integral component part of SOM's curriculum.²⁹⁰

This kind of student criticism also offers a glimpse into how some identified with OB over the rest of the school and their criticism of the other side of the split at SOM:

And who's left to rebuild the Master's program? A bunch of people who disdain student input and think students are lazy. While yesterday's SOM valued students for what they could contribute to the process of their own education, the new regime sees students as no more than empty vessels waiting to be filled with the latest concepts (and only concepts firmly grounded in economic theory need apply here, we might add).²⁹¹

Sabotaged diversity. Lost with SOM's changes was the school's primary source of diversity. OB Professor Ella Bell was the only black professor on SOM's faculty and the only black tenure track faculty the school ever had. Mary Ann Glynn was the other female OB professor. Combined with the departure of OR, SOM lost three female professors. OB graduated more black PhDs than any other program at Yale. Clay Alderfer stated that, "the Yale OB doctoral program has shared with one other management school's OB doctoral program a reputation for being a place where black men and women might develop themselves as scholar-teachers," adding that, "More than half our OB doctoral students are women."²⁹²

290. "The New Regime's Ph-OB-ia," *The Exchange*, February 23, 1989, MAYUL, 2.

291. Roger Pollack, Anne Schechter, and Lisa Stapleton, "Do Not Go Gently Into That Good Night SOM," *Yale Daily News*, November 3, 1988, YULDC, 2.

292. John W. Blassingame, Memo regarding support for Willam N. Parker's Resolution, March 2, 1989, Bergman Records 1990-1992, RU 914, YRG 30-G, ACCN 2003-A-029, Box 1, MAYUL, 6; Clay Alderfer, "The Individual and Group Behavior of the October 27 Decision," *The Exchange*, May 4, 1989, MAYUL, 3.

In 1984 the graduating class was more than half women. By 1991 women made up 27% of the student body and 24% of the incoming class; SOM had “never had fewer female students.”²⁹³ SOM administration did not connect the restructuring of SOM to enrollment changes. They claimed, “The thrust of the problem is that we haven’t marketed ourselves well.”²⁹⁴ The losses were not only numerical. Alderfer saw his department as leading the charge for teaching race and gender dynamics:

The OB courses scheduled for reduction and elimination also teach about gender and race in organizations. It begins with IGB, which gives several weeks to these topics. It continues with Group Dynamics, Managing Organizational Systems, Personality and Leadership, Managerial Leadership, and Organizational Diagnosis—all of which explicitly take gender and racial differences as natural elements among the concepts and techniques they teach. Race and Gender in Organizations gives an entire semester to these most interesting and difficult subjects. When OB as we have known it leaves SOM, with it will go a teaching program that includes race and gender in a manner unparalleled by any major management school in the United States.²⁹⁵

A student punctuated Alderfer’s point:

The empowerment of women (and the concomitant reeducation of men to accept and value women as leaders) was a powerful dynamic at SOM. Even in the best of times, when women constituted half the student body and gender issues were consciously raised and examined through IGB, Liaison and Group Dynamics, realization of the ideal was very difficult. What are the possibilities for dialogue and growth in this arena when women are reduced to minority status and the forums for discussions have been dismantled?²⁹⁶

293. Tom Shakow, “SOM No Longer a Female Haven,” *Yale Daily News*, October 24, 1991, YULDC, 1.

294. Tom Shakow, “SOM No Longer a Female Haven,” *Yale Daily News*, October 24, 1991, YULDC, 5.

295. Clay Alderfer, “The Individual and Group Behavior of the October 27 Decision,” *The Exchange*, May 4, 1989, MAYUL, 3.

296. John Hartwell, To Ruth McMullen, Chairman, SOM Alumni Fund, “Letters to the Editors,” *The Exchange*, October 27, 1989, MAYUL, 2.

Sabotaged public relations. SOM suffered critical press and a subsequent fall in the rankings as a result of the school's restructuring. *The New York Times* reported immediately after the announcement about how "furious" people were, that students planned to sue the school for fraudulent admissions material, and quoted Professor Anstreicher's immediate resignation announcement, "It's a hostile takeover. These sorts of things aren't supposed to happen in academic institutions."²⁹⁷ Subsequent *New York Times* coverage referenced "vehement alumni"²⁹⁸ and reported on how the school eliminated its unique strengths to become more mainstream.²⁹⁹ *Business Week* revealed that an SOM alum working at SOM's second-largest employer, the investment bank First Boston Corp, would encourage the company to stop recruiting from the school.³⁰⁰ Within one week of the restructuring 20 news organizations reported the story, and the alum perspective was described as "straight forward: We believe that President Schmidt made a poor management decision both in terms of process and outcome."³⁰¹ Richard Hackman, who left SOM for Harvard in 1986 returned in March 1989 to speak at an alumni rally. Hackman, whose methods and work was primarily quantitative, represented the kind of OB faculty Levine would be looking for after the restructuring. He said SOM

297. Alison Leigh Cowan, "New Dean's Proposal Raise Concerns in a School at Yale," *New York Times*, October 30, 1988.

298. Constance L. Hays, "Change Protested at Yale's Business School," *New York Times*, November 3, 1988.

299. Constance L. Hays, "Views Collide Over Changes at Yale," *New York Times*, November 9, 1988.

300. "Days of Rage at Yale B-School: Dean Levine's Makeover has Students and Alums Seeing Red," *Business Week*, December 12, 1988, 37.

301. Matt Rogers, "A Model for Communications," *The Exchange*, November 4, 1988, MAYUL, 4.

was “swimming against the current,” and that, “I see increasing respect for stakeholders in public and private sector organizations, and attention to the rights of diverse and even conflicting interests. Against this backdrop, Yale’s decisions about SOM are anachronistic.”³⁰²

Sabotaged support. Alumni and donor support was also sabotaged by the restructuring. Not only did alumni and supporters disagree with the outcome and process of the changes, they were offended by Schmidt and Levine’s treatment of their concerns, ultimately vowing to curb or redirect their financial contributions to SOM. Political support from these stakeholder groups did not seem to exist. Alumni’s “profound distress about, and disapproval of SOM’s changes generated a movement to “withhold donations to the school, cease to allow the school to use their names and photographs for advertisements, stop hiring and recruiting graduates and stop encouraging students to attend SOM.”³⁰³ Plans were made for an “Alternative Alumni Fund” where donations would be held until alumni determined a “satisfactory resolution” was found for SOM’s future.³⁰⁴ Two months after restructuring, 25% of Boston area alumni decided to withhold contributions until Schmidt reconsidered curricular changes.³⁰⁵

302. Ryck Lent, “A Day to Challenge – and Reflect,” *The Exchange*, March 9, 1989, MAYUL, 3-4.

303. Bob Milius, “Alumni, Levine Dispute Changes: ‘Zero’ Alums Favor SOM Changes,” *Yale Daily News*, November 7, 1988, YULDC, 1.

304. Steve Algert and Steve Kauderer, “SOM Community Regroups, Looks Ahead to Next Steps,” *The Exchange*, November 14, 1988, MAYUL, 6.

305. Charles Inkeles, “SOM Students, Alumni Renew Protests,” *Yale Daily News*, December 5, 1988, YULDC, 7.

In February of 1989 a poll of alumni funded by alumni through a consulting group found that, “Of the 77 percent of alumni who donate money to the school, over 60 percent said the changes have made them less inclined to continue giving.” The same poll revealed “that about half the school’s graduates think alumni should not encourage students to apply to SOM and should refuse to allow the school to use their pictures and biographical information in its brochures.”³⁰⁶ The alumni board also decided to use their redirected contributions to “protect” SOM from Schmidt and Levine and developed principles that should be used to redirect the school which focused on cooperative team learning, diversity, emphasis on nonprofit and public sectors in addition to private, and student governance.³⁰⁷ One year after the restructuring, the SOM alumni association had successfully redirected alumni funds to their own account and alumni association copresident Robert Gips reported that SOM alumni historically gave at a rate “well above the national average,” but that donations dropped “from a 52 to 20 percent participation rate.”³⁰⁸ One year later there was also enough momentum in the alumni community that people were still holding out for decisions to be reversed so they could “feel good about giving time and money” to SOM’s development.³⁰⁹

306. Bob Milius, “Alumni of SOM Remain Opposed,” *Yale Daily News*, February 28, 1989, YULDC, 1.

307. Bob Milius, “Alumni of SOM Remain Opposed,” *Yale Daily News*, February 28, 1989, YULDC, 3.

308. Meredith Hobbs, “Year Old Changes Leave Permanent Mark on SOM,” *Yale Daily News*, November 1, 1989, YULDC, 5.

309. Ruth McMullen, Chairman, SOM Alumni Fund, “Letters to the Editors,” *The Exchange*, October 27, 1989, MAYUL, 2.

Support was further eroded when alumni felt their concerns were unacknowledged. “Shocked and concerned” alumni left meetings with Levine claiming, “He just doesn’t understand the ethos” of SOM.³¹⁰ Levine failed to generate support among current students as well. Reporting on meetings between students and Levine summarized the relationship:

“He told us, “Well, trust me—the changes will be better for you and the school in the long run,” said Chuck Slaughter, SOM ’90. “People in their 30s and 40s do not like being treated like children.”

“The general impression at SOM is that everything is up for grabs- nothing is sacred,” says Chuck Slaughter. “Benno Schmidt and Michael Levine have broken their trust with the students.”

This attitude only antagonized the graduate students at SOM. “It takes a certain arrogance to tell adult students what’s good for them,” said Jackie Prince.³¹¹

One year into their new relationship, student ire continued to rise: “I will be blunt. Benno Schmidt and Professor Levine treat us with disdain. We need couch our anger no more. Think of the half-baked excuses, the patchwork of contradictions that have marked their campaign to eradicate SOM as we have known it.”³¹² Disagreement can also be identified among high-level supporters of SOM; Trustee Henry Schract, who advised Brewster on the development of SOM quietly disagreed with SOM restructuring.³¹³ Frederick M. Rowe was a more outspoken critic. A fellow Yale Law School alum, Rowe sent Schmidt

310. Steve Algert and Anne Schechter, “Events This Week,” *The Exchange*, November 4, 1988, MAYUL, 4.

311. Gerald Griffin, “Restructuring and Revolt,” *Yale Daily News Magazine*, November 14, 1988, YULDC, 19.

312. Tom Amenta, “The Emperor’s New Clothes,” *The Exchange*, February 23, 1989, MAYUL, 3.

313. “Days of Rage at Yale B-School: Dean Levine’s Makeover has Students and Alums Seeing Red,” *Business Week*, December 12, 1988, 37.

a scathing critique of his decisions with eight prominent Yale Law School colleagues and deans in copy. Rowe not only withdraws his financial support of the whole university, but condemns Levine's credentials for the job while marking the end of Yale's humanistic tradition:

"Mike Levine is a man of limited intellect, abrasive personality, and vaulting ambition. His impressive resume as an airline executive, government official, and Southern California law/business professor cannot disguise a lack of scholarly work and intellectual distinction. As you know, he won tenure at SOM by the thinnest of margins, and never qualified for a professorial appointment at the Yale Law School. His most telling credential is a law/economics fellowship at the University of Chicago. A worse choice to revitalize SOM and to provide leadership toward its founding vision is hard to imagine. As always, the students will be the losers. Those who want a Chicago-style business education will go to Chicago; perhaps Yale will handle the overflow. Those who believed in Yale's unique founding vision can only mourn and lament the institutional arrogance Dean Levine signifies. What a sad day for Yale's Humanistic tradition. With sorrow and reluctance, I am suspending all further financial support to Yale until I receive some satisfactory explanation of these sorry events from you."³¹⁴

OR Professor Ludo Van der Hayden, who resigned from SOM due to the turmoil generated by restructuring, stated that even as a faculty member in favor of restructuring he was offended by Levine's disrespect of students, alumni and faculty in his words and actions.³¹⁵

Mission/purpose and epistemological realignment. Reviewed documents from 1988 through the early 1990s also reveal SOM's transition from turbulence to a more common business school design that emphasized macro OB, an improved finance faculty, a new mission statement, steady leadership, a rise in the *Business Week* rankings, and a

314. Frederick M. Rowe to Benno C. Schmidt, Letter regarding Levine appointment, November 4, 1988, Bergman Records 1990-1992, RU 914, YRG 30-G, ACCN 2003-A-029, Box 1, MAYUL, 2.

315. Ludo Van der Heyden, Letter to Michael Levine, March 3, 1989, MS 1635, William Nelson Parker Papers, Box 4, Folder 'S', MAYUL, 3.

departure from experiential and constructivist methods. The school also changed its name and degree.

In his letter to prospective students written just after SOM's restructuring, Levine was clear about the motivation behind the changes:

We want the MPPM program to reflect the interests of our entire faculty and enable our students to profit from a broader range of management disciplines. Our goal is to teach MPPM students to apply to their future professional tasks, not only well-established, conventional management techniques, but also the very latest research of multi-disciplinary group of distinguished scholars and teachers.³¹⁶

Levine also reported that he had broad commitment from the President, Provost and Corporation and access to the University resources he needed to achieve his vision for the MPPM program: making SOM a "first rate management school,"³¹⁷ and a dedicated faculty "committing large amount of time outside of their research and teaching to build an intellectual community."³¹⁸ Schmidt promised to bolster SOM's financial status with a "major infusion of resources." He announced that SOM was a "significant, central part of Yale's future,"³¹⁹ and that the school aimed to increase enrollment from approximately 200 to 425, hire 20 permanent and carry 45 full time instructors to teach core courses, with additional visitors teaching specialty topics "as quickly as possible."³²⁰

316. Michael Levine to prospective Students, Letter regarding exciting new changes, Bergman Records 1990-1992, RU 914, YRG 30-G, ACCN 2003-A-029, Box 1, MAYUL, 3.

317. Anne Schechter, "SOM's Evolving Financial Picture," *The Exchange*, March 9, 1989, MAYUL, 1.

318. Mark Coogan, "What's Up Mike?" *The Exchange*, March 4, 1989, MAYUL, 8.

319. Ryck Lent, "Will 'Infuse Resources': President Schmidt Addresses SOM Community," *The Exchange*, February 15, 1990, MAYUL, 1.

320. Ryck Lent, "Enrollment, Faculty Hiring on the Rise," *The Exchange*, March 1, 1990, MAYUL, 1.

No trace of SOM's "humanistic" orientation remained in Levine's letter to prospective students in the spring of '89.³²¹ The emphasis was placed on SOM's interdisciplinary tradition, and two years after the restructuring the remaining experiential and clinical oriented courses were made second year electives, required core classes were developed for all first year students. There were also fewer opportunities for student participation and greater distinctions between faculty and students.³²² OB was moved to the sociology department where undergraduate courses emphasized field work over management.³²³

It was assumed that when the class of 1990 graduated, students upset with the restructuring would disappear, and SOM would enter a smoother transition, but the class of '92 was very opposed to the required first year core classes and did more than any other class to change the curriculum.³²⁴ Students wanted a core curriculum that was more adaptable to student needs. They also asked for access to micro-organizational behavior and production courses (both affiliated with OB and OR). Two years after restructuring students hosted Awareness Week in October of 1990 with support from the SOM Alumni Association.³²⁵ Documents from that event feature contributions from 40 students who

321. Michael E. Levine to Prospective Students, Letter regarding curriculum revisions, April 25, 1989, Bergman Records 1990-1992, RU 914, YRG 30-G, ACCN 2003-A-029, Box 1, MAYUL.

322. Mike Lasache, "The SOM Curriculum Wars," *The Exchange*, October 1, 1990, MAYUL, 9.

323. Jeremy Weinerg, "Sociology Department Reviews Courses," *Yale Daily News*, February 21, 1990, YULDC, 5.

324. David Leonhardt, "Core Curriculum Under Debate at SOM," *Yale Daily News*, April 11, 1991, YULDC, 1 and 4.

325. Steven Bergman, *SOM Awareness Week 1990*, Bergman Records 1990-1992, RU 914, YRG 30-G, ACCN 2003-A-029, Box 2, MAYUL.

mourned the loss of SOM's former structure, culture and experience. Most focus on a changed culture:

It is precisely my experience of the current SOM environment; of the relationships of students, staff and faculty to it; and of the relationships of students to one another that causes me grief. The old SOM was never perfect, but it was special. It did offer hope for the possibility of institutional life in which people were encouraged to be whole persons, and that is lost. In fact, such notions are actively discouraged by the current administration. The way people behave toward one another here, now, is new to my experience of SOM, and it is not an improvement. I grieve for the loss of an institution that supported development of a fuller humanity in its students.

– Mary Loug Phillips, SOM '87 ³²⁶

Students emphasize their disconnect with the school and their instructors as their major frustration:

It's frustrating to feel that the mission that attracted us to SOM (as nebulous as it seems at times) is not held by the professor at the front of the room, and to feel that he/she really doesn't want to know who we are, who we were, who we intend to be, the kind of managers we have the potential to be. Few professors we've been in contact with have made this kind of connection with us in our core courses. ³²⁷

One year later, in the Spring of 1991, students continued to criticize the instruction, calling it "abysmal."³²⁸

Concerted rebranding. SOM sought to be the first school with dual accreditation from AACSB and the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA).³²⁹ Levine reported that this would allow SOM to be what it

326. Mary Lou Philips, *SOM Awareness Week 1990*, , Bergman Records 1990-1992, RU 914, YRG 30-G, ACCN 2003-A-029, Box 2, MAYUL.

327. Anole Lipsitz and Bill Malloch, "First Year Redux," *The Exchange*, May 4, 1990, MAYUL, 3.

328. Scott Daube, "Forum Held on Core Curriculum," *The Exchange*, April 17, 1991, MAYUL, 2.

329. Mary Taylor and David Lewis, "SOM Seeks Dual Accreditation," *The Exchange*, April 1, 245

is, “a public management and private management school.”³³⁰ However, the school received AACSB accreditation, not NASPAA accreditation, which was considered to have hurt SOM’s standing in the *U.S. News & World Report*.³³¹

Paul MacAvoy, who left a dual post in economics at Yale University and SOM to serve as dean at Rochester’s management school, returned to SOM to replace Levine as dean in 1992. When he departed for Rochester, MacAvoy said he preferred the school’s more traditional and discipline-based MBA program.³³² His return marked a significant shift away from the past toward a new identity. MacAvoy’s first priority was to bring SOM alumni and affiliates “back to the fold after the fracas.” He was also reported as developing a foundation to secure financial support from the business sector for the school’s endowment. Reporting on MacAvoy’s vision stated: “According to MacAvoy, the alumni view was that he represented a commitment from the University to getting the school back on track to complete the full development of the world’s leading Masters course in Public and Private Management.” MacAvoy also “stated the specific aim of hiring an additional four professors in the area of organizational behavior and additional ‘world class’ people in the other major departments of SOM.”³³³

1991, MAYUL, 1.

330. Cheryl Balkenhol, “Face-to-Face with the Dean,” *The Exchange*, April 12, 1990, MAYUL, 10.

331. Scott Daube, “Accreditation Granted for Business; Public Affairs on Hold,” *The Exchange*, September 17, 1991 MAYUL, 1; Cheryl Balkenhol, “Face-to-Face with the Dean,” *The Exchange*, April 12, 1990, MAYUL, 10.

332. Peggy Edersheim, “MacAvoy Leaves for Rochester; Prefers Traditional Curriculum,” *Yale Daily News*, March 28, 1983, YULDC, 1.

333. Jonathan Weisberg, “Dean MacAvoy Speaks to Second Year Students,” *The Exchange*, September 21, 1992, MAYUL, 2.

Following MacAvoy's arrival was a strong rebranding effort. A corporate image expert from the Fortune 500 world was hired as SOM's external relations director. SOM Advisory Board member, Dean Oster said SOM needed to market itself as an "MBA+," and suggested that SOM needed to remind the world that the school had always focused on "the regular old rigorous stuff."³³⁴

MacAvoy presided over a campus free of students longing for OB courses and leaned on his political network to boost the school's prestige. He appointed chairman of President Bush's Council of Economic Advisers Michael Boskin and two additional high-level economists to teach as guest lecturers. SOM's mission statement shifts significantly at this point. *The Yale Daily News* summarized:

Nowhere is the new affirmation more obvious than in admissions booklet[s] for 1993-94. Whereas the 1992-93 admissions book said "students whose focus is business need to understand how public policy is made," the 1993-94 prospectus unequivocally states SOM's emphasis is "on management as opposed to public policy creation." While the old prospectus described the MPPM program as one that "draws much of its strength and character from Yale University's commitment to liberal education," the new prospectus says only that the degree "prepares students for leadership in business, government, and nonprofit organizations." Moreover, the previous statement included as missions, educating "future managers not only for business and government but also for service and community organizations" and "pay[ing] special attention to value conflicts and issues of professional ethics." The new statement does not.³³⁵

SOM Advisory Board member and president of Proctor & Gamble said the revised mission ends "questions about [SOM's] relative balance," and that, "Frankly this is a way for SOM to get back to its fundamental purpose . . . giving top students a top-notch

334. Johathan Naatjes, "Tough Issues Raised at Advisory Board Meeting: Mission of School Discussed," *The Exchange*, April 16, 1993, MAYUL, 1.

335. Hara Amdemariam, "Up Close: Selling SOM," *Yale Daily News*, September 27, 1993, YULDC, 3.

management education.³³⁶ SOM did not immediately change the MPPM to an MBA, but did change its name in 1994 to ‘School of Management,’ keeping its initials but eliminating ‘organization’ because people did not understand “what a school of organization and management was about.”³³⁷ MacAvoy focused on new appointments for finance research,³³⁸ but assured that SOM would not become a more conventional business school like Harvard or M.I.T.³³⁹ Leadership remained a challenge for the school. Despite an invitation to extend, MacAvoy resigned after his 2-year agreement and Stan Gartska served as Acting Dean for 20 months until Jeffery Garten stepped in 1995.³⁴⁰ Under Garten, SOM maintained its multi-sector focus, but did indeed change the MPPM degree to an MBA in 1999.

Interpretive Analysis

The Function of Dysfunction

My investigation into the risk and challenge of integrating experiential and constructivist leadership learning into the management curriculum at SOM reveals a story where experiential and constructivist leadership learning methods were locked into one side of an increasingly divided school. The division was seen as requiring unilateral

336. Hara Amdemariam, "Up Close: Selling SOM," *Yale Daily News*, September 27, 1993, YULDC, 3.

337. Chris Grosso, "SOM Changes Name: School to be Renamed School of Management," *Yale Daily News*, March 1, 1994, YULDC, 1.

338. Chris Grosso, "SOM Changes Name: School to be Renamed School of Management," *Yale Daily News*, March 1, 1994, YULDC, 1.

339. Chris Grosso, "SOM Changes Name: School to be Renamed School of Management," *Yale Daily News*, March 1, 1994, YULDC, 7.

340. Troy Flint, "Levin Narrows SOM Choices to Three," *Yale Daily News*, February 28, 1995, YULDC, 2.

university intervention from the president. However, the administrative response that separated and eliminated experiential and constructivist learning from the curriculum was also dysfunctional; it eroded the school's perceived strengths of a strong culture and student community, a committed alumni base, a valued demonstration of diversity along race and gender lines, and a department with a set of courses considered the "soul" of the school by students and alumni—a school's primary audience and investor. The same administrative response drew significant criticism from university faculty, threatened the president's standing and authority at Yale, generated bad press, further eroded SOM's placement in the rankings and created difficult conditions for SOM administrators to pursue their goals for restructuring.

In an attempt to understand the defense mechanisms at play when (a) a faculty is split beyond repair and (b) the administrative response to that split is the elimination of experiential and constructivist learning despite multiple undesirable and dysfunctional consequences—I interpret these findings through a "systems psychodynamic" lens.

A systems psychodynamic lens is deployed here as it is well suited for revealing "the function of dysfunction" and understanding how defensive mechanisms are deployed to protect an organizational system, and the individuals in it from disturbing affect.³⁴¹ Seen through this lens, the actions at Yale ultimately eliminated something disturbing (experiential and constructivist leadership learning deemed "too psychological" or "touchy-feely") in an effort to preserve and maintain an identity that is grounding,

341 Black E. Ashforth and Peter H. Reingen, "Functions of Dysfunction: Managing the Dynamics of an Organizational Duality in a Natural Food Cooperative," *Administrative Sciences Quarterly* 59 (2014): 474 – 516.

orienting and reliable (traditional academic culture, silo-ed disciplines and didactic learning), at the expense of student/alumni constituents and in favor of academic/researcher constituents, regardless of the consequences to the organization's or authority's standing. Ultimately, this dynamic serves to affirm a particular identity—at any cost. Thus, experiential and constructivist leadership learning represented a threat to a desired identity.

A systems psychodynamic interpretation of the findings outlined above illuminates a primary narrative at the university level where:

1. An ambitious and ambiguous mission and purpose for SOM generated dependency on one group's expertise, which held student experience and self-construal as fundamental to the school's purpose
2. The work and perspectives of the depended upon group came to dominate interpretations of the school's mission and purpose by students and thus organizational goals
3. That dominant group came to represent and define the once ambitious and ambiguous mission and purpose
4. As a consequence of being seen as defining the mission and purpose, resource allocation was skewed towards the dominant group
5. A split emerged as experiential and constructivist methods are seen to represent the organization and other factions try to disassociate with that representation and associate with dominant business school identities

6. The split exposed ideological differences as OB and experiential and constructivist learning is seen as representing the organization at the expense of other disciplines and methods
7. The organization was forced to reevaluate its mission/purpose in relation to these differences to determine its identity
8. Unilateral power was wielded to eliminate threats to the desired identity, modify the mission and purpose, and devalue experiential and constructivist methods in favor of more traditional methods

The Impact of Experiential Methods on Students, Faculty, and the Organization

Fueling this organizational narrative is a narrative about the influence, impact and power of experiential and constructivist leadership learning—what this learning offers students and the consequences within a school unprepared for or in disagreement about the purpose of that learning. Building up from the student experience in experiential leadership courses like IGB, I propose a theory for how the student experience in that course, and its inherent subversive character, rippled up and through the organization to generate and reinforce SOM's representation by OB, the devaluation of other disciplines by students, and the subsequent faculty split which ultimately led to the elimination of these methods.

A divided student experience. SOM was never able to fully live up to its aspirational purpose and school leadership was not strong and/or consistent enough to continuously engage faculty in a collaborative effort to develop and represent a unified front on that purpose, or overcome the traditional academic forces that endow faculty with the right and power to determine their own interests over the administration's

interest. This allowed departments to gravitate toward and rely on the methods and models that represent their discipline to determine their role and contribution to the school's mission.

The OB department relied on a distinct set of educational methods that flowed from their disciplinary focus. OB aligned itself with their interpretation of SOM's purpose by offering (a) experiential learning courses where students learn for themselves how to lead effectively and humanely in groups and (b) by creating institutional structures that allow students to experience the exercise of leadership and authority within the SOM institution through Community Day, IGB groups, and the Liaison system.

Other disciplines, not connected to specific educational methods, relied on traditional teaching methods to pursue their interpretation of the school's purpose—the transmission of knowledge from professors to students. Faculty even reported that some of SOM's star academics Levine was eager to retain reduced exams to multiple-choice questions and were disinterested in MPPM students.³⁴² As a result, SOM offered a divided student experience. On one side of the divided student experience, experiential learning, and thus OB, played an active and amplified role in student learning by: encouraging students to examine authority relationships, encouraging students to learn how to learn on their own, fostering identity development, inviting students across learning boundaries, inviting students across administrative boundaries, providing structures where students could voice dissenting perspectives about their school experience. OB at SOM had roots in a robust clinical tradition at Yale University. The

342. Ludo Van der Heyden, Letter to Michael Levine, March 3, 1989, MS 1635, William Nelson Parker Papers, Box 4, Folder 'S', MAYUL, 2.

educational practices that flow from this tradition also encourage students to examine authority relations, facilitate learning how to learn on one's own, and foster identity development.

Tradition of experiential and constructivist leadership learning at Yale. To truly understand the challenge of integrating experiential and constructivist methods at the graduate school we must understand two factors: (a) function and purpose of the experiential teaching methods and their roots at Yale, and (b) the impact of faithfully engaging students with these inductive and hermeneutic pedagogies. Two experiential traditions in particular influenced the original Administrative Sciences department at Yale: Encounter Groups and Group Relations.

Encounter groups. Also known as sensitivity training groups, skills training groups, training groups, laboratory training, human relations training and T-Groups ("T" for training), the purpose of an Encounter Group is to explore and learn about group and interpersonal process and dynamics. Self-study is the primary task; there is no other task to accomplish. Encounter Groups feature participants and facilitators who consult to the group in real time and in feedback sessions. Participants are asked to share the emotions that arise within themselves in response to the behaviors or comments of other participants. The goal is to examine one's emotional response, see it as a source of bias and judgment, and the conclusions one makes. Trainers provide personal feedback, which is often challenging for participants to hear about themselves. Encounter Groups began in the late 1940s and rose to popularity in the 50s and 60s, particularly with management practitioners who were encouraged to deepen their understanding of how groups work and how they can be more aware of their role, the impact of others on themselves and

their impact on others. These experiential techniques were the gold standard for management and leadership development. National Training Laboratories (NTL) was established in 1947 to support and host Encounter Groups and was built on the work of Kurt Lewin, Kenneth Benne, Leland Bradford, and Ronald Lippitt. Lewin is credited with developing the theory and practice of Encounter Group learning based on his three-stage theoretical model for group and individual learning: unfreezing (realization that default responses are inadequate in a particular environment), unfrozen (adapting to that environment in such a way that more desirable outcomes are generated), refreezing (integrating new behaviors into an expanded repertoire of responses).³⁴³

Group relations. Group Relations Conferences, also known as Tavistock Conferences, emphasize learning about groups, though learning about interpersonal and individual behavior is an inevitable outcome. Early conferences resembled T-Groups and relied on Lewin's work. However, Wilferd Bion's influence, through A.K. Rice, infused the work with an increased focus on systems and organizations.³⁴⁴

The purpose of Group Relations is to learn about leadership in human organizations through direct experience with others in small and large groups. Group Relations Conference feature participants, a hierarchy of directors, and consultants tasked with consulting to small and large groups. Participants are asked to learn about leadership by experiencing for themselves the "interpersonal and intergroup relationships involved

343. Martin Gold, ed. *The Complete Social Scientist: A Kurt Lewin Reader*, (Washington DC: American Psychological Association, 1999).

344. Margaret J. Rioch, "Group Relations: Rationale and Technique," in *Group Relations Reader I*, eds. Arthur D. Colman and W. Harold Bexton, (Jupiter FL: A. K. Rice Institute, 1975), 3 – 10.

in leadership, in situations in which the experience can be turned into learning.”³⁴⁵ The conference experience creates conditions for these experiences, may teach theory explicitly and provides opportunities to consider applications of conference learning to their personal and professional lives.³⁴⁶

The first Group Relations Conferences in the U.S., modeled after the Tavistock Institute’s Tavistock Conference in the U.K., were directly connected to Yale University. Fraher documents A.K. Rice’s visit to America in 1963 and his warm reception at Yale School of Medicine after cool receptions at other Ivies.³⁴⁷ Rice was an anthropologist, whose work was associated with Wilfred Bion, a psychiatrist whose writing focused on group relations. Rice’s lecture at Yale was attended by over 80 faculty representing medical, psychology and management departments. Chris Argyris was in attendance and Rice described receiving many requests to visit Yale as a fellow for a year. In October 1965 Yale cohosted the first of many Tavistock styled conferences in the U.S. at Mount Holyoke College, calling it a Group Relations Conference. Frederick Redlich, dean of the psychiatry department from 1959-67 and dean of the Yale University School of Medicine from 1967-72, worked alongside Rice as a consultant at those Group Relations Conferences.³⁴⁸ The influence of group relations can be seen in Yale School of Medicine

345. A. K. Rice, *Learning for Leadership*, (London: Tavistock Publications Limited, 1965), 18.

346. A. K. Rice, *Learning for Leadership*, (London: Tavistock Publications Limited, 1965), 18.

347. Amy L. Fraher, *A History of Group Study and Psychodynamic Organizations*, (London: Free Association Books, 2004).

348. Amy L. Fraher, *A History of Group Study and Psychodynamic Organizations*, (London: Free Association Books, 2004).

course catalogues through the late 1970s, when SOM opened, offering courses to the entire Yale community rooted in group relations and experiential clinical methods.³⁴⁹

Two traditions at Yale. Both traditions informed scholarship at Yale's Ad. Sci. department under Chris Argyris' direction. Argyris left Yale in 1971, but the influence of NTL and Group Relations continued through an interdisciplinary collaboration of six faculty. Portia Bowers, Al Fritz and Clay Alderfer represented NTL. Group Relations representatives included Boris Astrachan, Ed Klein and Jim Miller.³⁵⁰ This team collaborated on organizational consultation efforts and generated some scholarship on the combined usefulness of NTL and Group Relations perspectives, publishing an article titled, "Affect, Leadership and Organizational Boundaries."³⁵¹

The research methods affiliated with this field of study are "humanizing" or "humanistic" in the sense that the research effort itself is seen as an intervention into an organization and one must consider the impact of that intervention on the system and the influence of that system on the researcher. Lewin introduced this dynamic as 'Action Research' a term that illuminates the researcher's role as an actor in the system.³⁵² Fritz Roethlisberger, 'Grandfather of OB,' illuminated the importance and impact of this dynamic in his groundbreaking 'Hawthorn' experiments with Elton Mayo.³⁵³

349. Yale University School of Medicine, *Catalogue 1977-1978*, (New Haven: Yale University, 1977), 172.

350. Clayton P. Alderfer and Edward B. Klein, "Affect, Leadership and Organizational Boundaries," *Journal of Personality and Social Systems* 1, (1978): 19-33.

351. Clayton P. Alderfer and Edward B. Klein, "Affect, Leadership and Organizational Boundaries," *Journal of Personality and Social Systems* 1, (1978): 19-33.

352. Kurt Lewin, "Action research and minority problems," *Journal of Social Issues* 2, no. 4 (1946): 3446.

353. F. J. Roethlisberger, *Man-in-Organization*, (Cambridge MA: Belknap Press of Harvard
256

Roethlisberger's work generated a cascade of exploration of the role social systems play in the workplace and their impact on productivity. Roethlisberger also transformed case-method instruction at HBS by focusing students on the role of relationships in case studies that were usually used to highlight problems of process and product. Though not necessarily experiential, this innovation marks the beginning of a humanistic OB tradition.³⁵⁴ OB faculty at SOM continued this scholarship. One of two tenured OB faculty at SOM, Vic Vroom's research focused on motivation and management in work,³⁵⁵ leadership and decision making,³⁵⁶ social interaction, group problem solving,³⁵⁷ industrial psychology,³⁵⁸ and whether leaders can learn to lead.³⁵⁹ SOM's other tenured OB faculty member, Clayton Alderfer's ERG theory (existence, relatedness and growth) built upon Maslow's hierarchy of needs.³⁶⁰ Alderfer's prolific research also focused on

University Press, 1968), 31 – 34.

354. Kenneth Richmond Andrews, *The Case Method of Teaching Human Relations and Administration*, (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1953).

355. Victor H. Vroom, *Work and Motivation*, (New York: Wiley, 1964); Victor H. Vroom, *Motivation and Management*, (New York: American Foundation for Management Research, 1965).

356. Victor H. Vroom and Philip W. Yetton, *Leadership and Decision-Making*, (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1973).

357. Victor H. Vroom, Lester D. Grant and Timothy S. Cotton, "The Consequences of Social Interaction in Group Problem Solving," *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 4, (1969).

358. Victor H. Vroom and Norman Raymond Frederick Maier, "Industrial Social Psychology," *Annual Review of Psychology* 12, (1961).

359. Victor H. Vroom and Arthur G. Jago, "Decision Making as a Social Process: Normative and Descriptive Models of Leader Behavior," *Decision Sciences* 4, (1974).

360. Clayton P. Alderfer, *Existence, Relatedness, and Growth: Human Needs in Organizational Settings*, (New York: Free Press, 1972).

intergroup relationships³⁶¹ and organizational diagnosis.³⁶² Junior OB faculty David Berg, whose tenure denial raised alarm about the future of OB at SOM³⁶³, explored the impact of the self in research and clinical methods in social research³⁶⁴ and group dynamics.³⁶⁵

These experiential and constructivist teaching methods are “humanizing” or “humanistic” in the sense that one is tasked with learning for one’s self and the instructor is implicated in the learning, exposed as potentially fallible and under the influence of the same group dynamic as the participants. Methods in Encounter Groups and Group Relations also honor each participant’s experience, and seek to connect behavior to lived experience. Thus, all behavior is legitimate and the process of connecting that behavior to one’s emotional experience validates and illuminates even the most irrational of behaviors. Carl Rogers set a precedent for humanistic education by honoring the way clients “constructed” their experience. He dismissed teaching as inconsequential, and focused instead on the facilitation of another’s sense-making. Rogers saw education as a process of helping people trust their own experience.³⁶⁶ Rogers also described Encounter

361. Clayton Alderfer and Kenwyn Smith, “Studying Intergroup Relations Embedded in Organizations,” *Administration Sciences Quarterly* 27, (1982).

362. Clayton Alderfer and L. Dave Brown, *Learning from Changing: Organizational Diagnosis and Development*, (Beverly Hills CA: Sage Publications, 1975); Clayton Alderfer, *The Practice of Organizational Diagnosis: Theory and Methods*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).

363. “Berg Tenure Loss Stirs SOM: Raising Concerns About the Future of Yale SOM’s OB Program,” *The Exchange*, January 14, 1987, MAYUL, 6.

364. David N. Berg and Kenwyn K. Smith, eds., *The Self in Social Inquiry: Researching Methods*, (Newbury Park CA: Sage Publications, 1988).

365. Kenwyn K. Smith and David N. Berg, *Paradoxes of Group Life: Understanding Conflict, Paralysis, and Movement in Group Dynamics*, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987).

366. Cecil Holden Patterson, *Foundations for a Theory of Instruction and Educational*

Groups as “the most rapidly spreading *social* invention of the century, and probably the most potent.”³⁶⁷

Rogers, the pioneer in humanizing therapeutic processes, believed that the client should be the center of the therapeutic process.³⁶⁸ Rather than beginning therapy with a pathological exploration for a client’s dysfunction, Rogers assumed his client was rationale, capable, socialized, realistic and progressing forward.³⁶⁹ The ultimate purpose then of psychotherapy was to help clients trust themselves and tap into an innate ability for self-actualization so that they may become their own persons.³⁷⁰ Rogers described the therapist’s responsibility as creating the conditions that would allow the client to do this work. On Rogers’ technique, Patterson states, “When the individual is provided with reasonable conditions for growth, his or her potentials will develop constructively, as a seed grows and becomes its potential.”³⁷¹

The early affiliation between humanistic education and therapy however foreshadowed debate about the purpose of clinical course work and its ultimate dismissal from SOM as “touchy-feely.” Redlich and Astrachan, doctors and instructors for

Psychology, (New York: Harper & Row, 1977), 300.

367. Carl R. Rogers, *Carl Rogers on Encounter Groups*, (New York: Harper & Row, 1970).

368. Carl R. Rogers, *Client-Centered Therapy: Its Current Practice, Implications, and Theory*, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951).

369. Carl R. Rogers, *On Becoming a Person: A Therapist’s View of Psychotherapy*, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961).

370. Carl R. Rogers, *On Becoming a Person: A Therapist’s View of Psychotherapy*, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961).

371. Cecil Holden Patterson, *Foundations for a Theory of Instruction and Educational Psychology*, (New York: Harper & Row, 1977), 286.

Psychiatry 133: *Group Dynamics and Psychotherapy*,³⁷² needed to defend against claims that their course was therapeutic, not educative. Their article “Group Dynamics Training” outlined the many benefits and few drawbacks to learning about group dynamics as a member of a small self-study group.³⁷³ The authors described how self-analytic small group dynamic study helped one learn about group characteristics (boundaries, structures, group task, group culture, group image) and an individual’s behavior in a group (authority relations, membership, group transactions). The article draws criticism for their claim that the participant experience is not a therapeutic experience, but a learning experience. In a letter to the editor, Gervais questions this insistence that the courses are not also therapeutic in nature.³⁷⁴ Redlich and Astrachan respond that one might have a therapeutic experience, but that the aim and goal is educative. They clarify that the aim of therapy is to alleviate pain, while the goal of small group dynamic study is purely to increase knowledge of group dynamics.³⁷⁵ This distinction between therapy and learning combined with a vocabulary that illuminates organizational life (boundaries, tasks, authority, roles) prime group relations and experiential and constructivist learning methods for professional disciplines in the United States beyond mental health. The

372. Yale University School of Medicine, *Catalogue 1963-1964*, (New Haven: Yale University, 1977), 100.

373. F. C. Redlich and Boris Astrachan, "Group Dynamics Training," *American Journal of Psychiatry* 125, (1969): 1501 – 1507.

374. Laurent Gervais, “Group Dynamics as Therapy,” *American Journal of Psychiatry* 126, (1969): 579.

375. F. C. Redlich and Boris Astrachan, “Drs. Redlich and Astrachan Reply,” *American Journal of Psychiatry* 126, (1969): 570 – 580.

management field in particular was keen to help practitioners navigate task driven institutions and bureaucracies.³⁷⁶

In a post Rogerian landscape, experiential educational methods, faithfully deployed, were inductive, hermeneutic, and constructivist—a process easily confused with therapy as the ultimate purpose of these courses was to also create conditions where participants could develop their own capacity to navigate interpersonal and group dynamics, develop greater capability and competence by experimenting with one’s own potential. The instructors who provide such spaces offer a unique and rare service to their students. These experiential and constructivist methods create spaces for people to discover their potential and their selves. When learning experientially about groups one is mostly confronted with oneself, one’s reactions, and one’s default behaviors. IGB held this space at SOM and offered students an identity workspace. However, identity workspaces in academic settings can blur the boundaries between teaching and therapy and the role the school and its faculty play in student learning.

Breaking and Blurring Educational and Administrative Boundaries

OB courses and OB influenced school structures, like Liaison, facilitated and represented boundary breaches around what learning should be and where it could happen and the role the school should play in it. Identity development became an unusually large characteristic of an academic degree program

376. The exchange echoes earlier suspicions of Fritz Roethlisberger’s teaching at Harvard Business School in 1957. His courses in human relations were accused of encouraging the MBA student to be a “sloppy sentimentalist” and to “pick at the scabs of the wounds of his psyche.” (Fritz Jules Roethlisberger, *The Elusive Phenomena: An Autobiographical Account of My Work in the Field of Organizational Behavior at the Harvard Business School*, (Cambridge MA: Harvard Business School Press, 1977), 282.

Crossing mission/purpose boundaries. OB, and SOM as a whole, crossed traditional educational boundaries by providing an identity workspace to a new kind of management student and professional. IGB went further by blurring boundaries between education and therapy in the eyes of traditional academia.

SOM's identity workspace. Petriglieri and Petriglieri identify management schools in particular as identity workspaces as they provide a holding environment for identity work.³⁷⁷ Management schools are invested with the function of an identity workspace by their students when they provide “a coherent set of reliable social defenses, sentient communities, and vital rites of passage.”³⁷⁸ SOM was primed to offer identity development. SOM was described by its first dean as an “attempt to define a whole new kind of manager. The kind of manager that is coming up rapidly in this generation, people who want to make a lot of money and still have diversity in their career.”³⁷⁹ The quote was one of many billing the school as new and unique: not HBS, first of its kind, informed by values and ethics, “a major new initiative in leadership training,” at a time when people were “questioning traditional attitudes.”³⁸⁰ Thus, SOM was primed to serve as an identity workspace for a particular group of rising management practitioners. The new MPPM degree offered a whole new kind of management education and convened

377. Gianpiero Petriglieri and Jennifer Louise Petriglieri, “Identity Workspaces: The Case of Business Schools,” *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 9 (2010): 44-60.

378. Gianpiero Petriglieri and Jennifer Louise Petriglieri, “Identity Workspaces: The Case of Business Schools,” *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 9 (2010): 44.

379. Michael Knight, “Yale Sets Up School of Administration with Dual Purpose,” *New York Times*, October 1, 1975, 57.

380. Mead Treadwell, “Yates Moves into Graduate Position,” *Yale Daily News*, November 11, 1975, YULDC, 1; Andrew Pincus, “Donaldson Take Charge at Management School,” *Yale Daily News*, October 2, 1975, YULDC, 1.

cohorts of aspiring management practitioners looking for a fresh perspective on what leadership could look like in multiple sectors. Off campus reporting distinguished SOM from other business schools for the emphasis students put on finding their “mission” or purpose in their career.³⁸¹ SOM’s humanistic mission alone primed it to be invested with the function of a new and desirable identity workspace unavailable anywhere else.

Documentation regarding career trajectory was not made available, but member-check informants recalled that nearly all admitted students selected “undecided” regarding the sector they wanted to work in upon graduating. Additionally, in his reflection on the establishment of SOM, John Perry Miller recalled how timing was important as the school hoped to leverage:

the potential new market of the student activists of the 1960s and 1970s who wanted education for managerial positions but who were ideologically opposed to going to graduate schools of business or law, the traditional paths to management positions. These students, veterans of the disturbances of the 1960s, provided a special market niche to which Yale could respond by its proposed nontraditional program for students going into anyone of the sectors and equipped to move back and forth between the various sectors.³⁸²

I find that SOM provided all three components of an identity workspace as outlined by Petriglieri and Petriglieri: social defenses, sentient community, and rites of passage.

Social defenses at SOM. SOM’s mission reinforced beliefs that public and private sectors were equally important, and could work to each other’s benefit. SOM’s promise

381. Michael M. Lewis, “Bulldog Bull: Yale’s feel-good School of Management,” *The New Republic*, May 23, 1988, 24.

382. John Perry Miller, Report: “Moving the Immovable or Management Education at Yale: Search for Unique Mission,” April 15, 1986, MS 1635, William Nelson Parker Papers, Box 4, Folder ‘S’, MAYUL, 42.

to provide a training that prepared people to operate in both sectors served as a necessary social defense for those hoping to do just that. SOM's emphasis on collaborative work and noncompetitive evaluation of students suggested that learning writ-large trumped individual performance, and SOM's Liaison System reinforced beliefs in distributed, bottom-up structures as an ideal to strive for. Each of these features defended against anxieties of a diminishing value in public services, fear of unchecked private interests, overreliance of individual performance, and renewed faith in democratic processes.

Sentient community at SOM. Sentient communities provide an experience of belonging. As a unique destination offering a niche degree to candidates from a very competitive application process admitted into small cohorts, SOM was primed to be a strong sentient community. Specific features of SOM served to strengthen that community. Students ranked SOM #1 for school community in the first *Business Week* survey, citing the school's emphasis on teamwork and its focus on cooperation over competition.³⁸³ Students described the environment as one without pressure on high grades, strong faculty-student rapport as a "close-knit community." Students said, "It's a very human school oriented toward developing people. There's a lot of emphasis on keeping it a humane place to learn."³⁸⁴ SOM did not rank students by performance and was proud of its noncompetitive grading system: proficient, pass, and fail.³⁸⁵ By reducing

383. "How the Schools Stack Up: Business Week Rates the Top 20," *Business Week*, November 28, 1988, 78.

384. Paul Botts, "SOM Focuses on Behavior in Business: SOM Students Role-Play," *Yale Daily News*, October 23, 1983, YULDC, 1.

385. John McQuaid, "New Dean Visits SOM, Speaks on Future Plans," *Yale Daily News*, April 10, 1981, YULDC, 1.

competition, SOM hoped to boost interaction among its diverse study body and remove any incentive for students to “hold back ideas in study groups.”³⁸⁶ That grading system was a defining feature of the school and a product of student input.³⁸⁷

Rites of passage at SOM. The rites of passage within SOM were significant contributors to that community. Petriglieri & Petriglieri describe pursuing a business school degree as a significant rite of passage because of the “dramatic separation from the past; movement to a secluded ground; collective isolation; a disorienting transition involving a series of ordeals, ceremonies and instructions; and finally a reintegration into the social structure with a different role.”³⁸⁸ These experiences give students the opportunity to experiment with their notion of self and transition into a new role and community. SOM featured two of its own unique rites of passage. Community building day was a mandatory rite of passage at SOM that introduced the entire school to another rite of passage, IGB. Both required students to try new things and be vulnerable with each other. These rites of passage jumpstarted identity development work as a primary and important feature of one’s experience at SOM. Nearly all students enrolled in IGB, but even if they did not, they were assigned an IGB group through Community Day activities.³⁸⁹

386. Don More, “SOM Considers Current Aims, Status,” *Yale Daily News*, December 3, 1985, YULDC, 1.

387. Hoil Kim, “Yale’s Newest School: Busier Than Thou,” *Yale Daily News Magazine*, September 9, 1978, YULDC, 8.

388. Gianpiero Petriglieri and Jennifer Louise Petriglieri, “Identity Workspaces: The Case of Business Schools,” *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 9 (2010): 54.

389. Yale School of Organization and Management, *MPPM Academic Program: Guidelines, Courses, Policies 1982-83*, MAYUL, 17.

SOM's idealistic mission and ethical, humanistic values distinguished it so significantly from other management schools that it not only entered the management degree market place; SOM unwittingly entered the identity development marketplace without realizing the consequences of doing identity development work or locating all the responsibility for identity development into one department of the faculty.

Blurring and breaking educational boundaries. IGB was the primary experiential and constructivist learning space for identity work at SOM. Learning in IGB was described as “inductive and experiential” and focused on “development in competence in working effectively with other people in organized human endeavor.”³⁹⁰ Issues examined were “human needs, personal and career development, individual-organizational interaction, processes of influence, group dynamics, intergroup relationships and leadership styles.”³⁹¹ As noted earlier in this interpretation of events, the boundary between self-analytic small group study and therapy was blurry to many. Not only did IGB blur this line, it crossed the traditional student/teacher relationship boundary.

IGB invited students across a teaching and learning boundary to create environments that authorize students to teach and learn from each other and where the instructor is exposed as vulnerable to the dynamics of the group and joins students in the learning process. This exposure is the reason experiential and constructivist methods are seen as humanizing. When Michael Levine introduced his plan for restructuring SOM he

390. Yale School of Organization and Management, *The MPPM Curriculum 1978-1979*, MAYUL, n/a.

391. Yale School of Organization and Management, *The MPPM Curriculum 1978-1979*, MAYUL, n/a.

focused on replacing experiential methods with traditional teaching methods.³⁹² This focus restored traditional teacher/student boundaries and relationships. Experiential and constructivist leadership learning in the clinical tradition hinges on reversing this relationship and crossing these boundaries to locate control over learning into the hands of the learner. Students described the self-study group process as one step beyond facilitating student thinking as the Harvard case-study method did:

The Yale approach went further. Instead of the professor assuming that he/she was teaching only individuals, a system was established whereby groups became the primary instrument by which students learned. A primary virtue of this approach, according to its proponents, was that this process simulated the small group atmosphere of the management world much more closely than the traditional or case-study method.³⁹³

Crossing administrative boundaries. OB faculty also developed and facilitated structures that invited students across administrative boundaries in the school. Liaison Meetings blurred administrative boundaries and gave students an opportunity to inform their own school. Students at SOM sat on application committees and curriculum committees alongside faculty. But Liaison represented the most disturbing breach. Faculty had begun to feel that Liaison was a student “gripe session”³⁹⁴ where students could “let off steam.”³⁹⁵ Student criticism over the accounting curriculum was censored from Liaison Meeting Minutes in December 1987. Students had begun to feel ignored

392. “Class Conflict: A Shake-up Stirs Outrage at Yale’s Humanistic Business School,” *Business Week*, November 14, 1988, 50.

393. Mike Lasache, “The SOM Curriculum Wars,” *The Exchange*, October 1, 1990, MAYUL, 7.

394. Lisa Stapleton, “Taking a Look at Liaison,” *The Exchange*, December 8, 1987, MAYUL, 6.

395. Don More, “SOM Considers Current Aims, Status,” *Yale Daily News*, December 3, 1985, YULDC, 1.

and as though trust between them and the school had been violated.³⁹⁶ Originally designed as a way for the Dean of Professional Studies (DPS) to understand student perspectives, Liaison was designed to encourage student involvement in the institution to improve the educational experience. Levine described Liaison Meetings as “a happy anarchist retreat” and “vaguely counter-cultural.”³⁹⁷ Students remembered Liaison as fundamental to SOM’s unique community and the role it played in making the whole campus a lab for learning about leadership:

This is the part of the SOM mission and culture that the administration has not understood and finds threatening. They do not see that we came to SOM because, unlike most graduate schools, we have been and expect to be treated like adults here, that our experience and maturity have been a source of strength and pride for the school, not elements to be suppressed. The old SOM challenged us both inside and outside the classroom—it was the meaningful extra-curricular activities that helped build the community feeling, not a single class, or simply studying in groups.

But the new administration doesn’t seem to understand the value of institutionally supported free communication, respect for experience and self-determination, and the value of living a whole life-inside and outside the classroom. They do not understand that students and alumni are passionate about SOM because we were deeply involved with the school and each other—this school was more than just a curriculum.³⁹⁸

The DPS position, which served as an intermediary between students and the school, was eliminated along with Liaison and replaced by a Dean of Student Affairs.³⁹⁹ The Dean of Student Affairs did not serve as an intermediary, but restored the hierarchical boundary

396. Lisa Stapleton, “Taking a Look at Liaison,” *The Exchange*, December 8, 1987, MAYUL, 1.

397. Mike Lasache, “The SOM Curriculum Wars,” *The Exchange*, October 1, 1990, MAYUL, 9.

398. “The Demise of DPS,” *The Exchange*, February 1, 1989, MAYUL, 2.

399. “The Demise of DPS,” *The Exchange*, February 1, 1989, MAYUL, 2.

by focusing on the management of student counseling, tutoring and registration functions.⁴⁰⁰

Divided student experience divided the faculty. OB's experiential methods included and honored students in such a way that they dubbed OB the "soul" of SOM. Other disciplines were thus devalued and OB was seen as over representing the school and mission by the majority of the faculty. This divided student experience divided the faculty.

By providing experiential and constructivist identity workspaces, OB faculty played an amplified role at SOM and a special and unparalleled role in the development of students and their lives. Experiential courses provide spaces that honor one's irrational experiences through an inductive developmental process. An identity workspace creates a place where one can reflect on a limited or reactionary version of him or herself at the beginning of a semester and step into a newer more spacious version of themselves, with tools to make sense of the human systems they are a part of. At the end of a semester one sees a world with more options and a self with more possibility. OB at SOM provided identity workspaces, which satisfied students' desires for identity development—even though these desires were not explicit upon admission.

On the other side of the student experience, faculty struggled to develop the content focused on public and nonprofit sectors that the school had promised and relied

400. "The Demise of DPS," *The Exchange*, February 1, 1989, MAYUL, 2.

mostly on traditional teaching techniques. Poor teaching and curriculum design were concerns raised in Liaison meetings.

Most disciplinary content is not entwined with a specific theory of learning and faculty untrained in teaching methods will default to the didactic transmission of content that dominates learning in higher education.⁴⁰¹ SOM students had a very divided experience. The role OB teachers played in facilitating identity development and joining students can in their learning made them favored faculty among students. Kets de Vries and Korotov note how such a role distinguishes these faculty from subject matter experts and that they instead serve as “sparring partners, guides, confidants, and even transferenceal ‘father/mother figures.’”⁴⁰²

The greater university system struggled to integrate OB and its educational emphasis years earlier. Member check informants suggested that Administrative Science’s academic credibility had been questioned by the FAS, which facilitated the program’s movement out of FAS and into the Institute for Social and Policy Studies before SOM was developed. But even there, the Administrative Science’s agenda seemed too educationally focused than research focused⁴⁰³ and was sent one step further away from traditional academia and towards practice when Administrative Science was moved

401. Kenneth G. Brown, J. Ben Arbaugh, George Hrivnak, and Amy Kenworthy, “Overlooked and Unappreciated: What Research Tells Us About How Teaching Must Change,” in *Disrupt or Be Disrupted: A Blueprint for Change in Management Education*, ed. Graduate Management Admission Council (Hoboken: Wiley & Sons, 2013): 244-251.

402. Manfred F. R. Kets de Vries and Konstantin Korotov, “Transformational Leadership Development Programs: Creating Long-term Sustainable Change,” in *The Handbook for Teaching Leadership: Knowing, Doing and Being*, eds. Scott Snook, Nitin Nohria, and Rakesh Khurana (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2012): 275.

403. Jem Winer, “Yale ‘Business’ School to Debut this Summer,” *Yale Daily News*, February 7, 1974, YULDC, 4.

to SOM to develop the school's curriculum as founding faculty. Despite SOM's intended purpose to train management practitioners and OB faculty's experience with practitioners through educational methods embraced by management professionals, early advisors suggested that the placement of the Administrative Sciences department at SOM was an obstacle to establishing the cutting edge research agenda in public and private management that SOM should have been built upon. The program was viewed as a "dilemma" for how to establish the school.⁴⁰⁴ In his reflection on SOM's development, John Perry Miller revealed that Ad. Sci's placement was "both an asset, and a liability in the launching of SOM,"⁴⁰⁵ but that its incorporation into the school's structure was not entirely purposeful, and weakening the department instead of moving it was a consideration during SOM's establishment.⁴⁰⁶ There was resistance in Ad. Sci to joining a professional program, but compromises were made for fear that Ad. Sci. would face funding shortages without moving to SOM. The move boosted the likelihood of consistent funding for its PhD and undergraduate degree programs.⁴⁰⁷ It was hoped additional research agendas would be added to SOM, but as the school developed, the

404. Henry Schacht to John Perry Miller, Letter regarding establishment of school, April 6, 1974, RU 11, Location: LSF, Series II, Box No.305, Folder No. 1, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, records, MAYUL.

405. John Perry Miller, Report: "Moving the Immovable or Management Education at Yale: Search for Unique Mission," April 15, 1986, MS 1635, William Nelson Parker Papers, Box 4, Folder 'S', MAYUL, 6.

406. John Perry Miller, Report: "Moving the Immovable or Management Education at Yale: Search for Unique Mission," April 15, 1986, MS 1635, William Nelson Parker Papers, Box 4, Folder 'S', MAYUL, 34.

407. John Perry Miller, Report: "Moving the Immovable or Management Education at Yale: Search for Unique Mission," April 15, 1986, MS 1635, William Nelson Parker Papers, Box 4, Folder 'S', MAYUL, 23 - 24.

role of OR and especially OB was increasingly amplified and distinct from that of other departments. Not only did OB play an amplified role in the culture of the school and student experience, other faculties did not have PhD programs or doctoral students. Educational methods and student affiliation were not the only factor in dividing faculty.

Inductive, hermeneutic, and constructivist methods honor individual experience and sense-making by provoking learning, providing sense making, encouraging reflection, and honor that sense making and reflection in a space where all learning is valid. When these methods are effectively deployed to provoke the learning they intend, the learner is activated in ways they are not by other methods. By exposing students to the pedagogies that flow from different faculty ideologies, students were put in a position which allowed them to affirm the ideology that affirmed them, projecting affection toward OB and amplifying the role of OB in their education, ultimately considering that aspect of SOM the “soul” of the school. A divided student experience exposed differences between faculty along methodological, ideological and pedagogical lines. Table 3.3 hypothesizes how those differences might emerge.

Table 3.3

Methodological, Ideological and Pedagogical Differences

	Non-OB disciplines at SOM	Organizational Behavior
Methods	Deductive Positivist	Inductive / Hermeneutic Inferential
Orientating Ideology	Linear / Reductionist Optimize	Nonlinear / Systemic Satisfice
Implicit Theory of Teaching & Learning	Didactic / Lecture	Socratic / Maieutic / dialectical

Students perceived the devaluing of OB by SOM's Board of Presiding Officers as an affront to their experience and intelligence. Other disciplines were thus devalued in return by the students who fueled the split even further, "doubling-down" on their loyalty to OB. Eventually, OB and experiential and constructivist courses were seen as overrepresenting the school and its mission by the majority of the faculty. This divided student experience fueled faculty division.

Uncontained differences. Without consistent leadership managing the vision for SOM and developing its purpose, the organization was unable to offer a coherent and integrated student experience. SOM was also unable to contain debate about the role and purpose of experiential and constructivist leadership learning—leaving faculty to take sides instead of examining the purpose of these methods. Without consistent leadership at the university and school level affirming the role of experiential and constructivist methods in achieving the school's mission, non-OB forces mobilized to reclaim SOM from OB.

Splitting, elimination, and dehumanization of leadership learning. *Defense against disturbing dynamics.* Forces mobilized at SOM to maintain the traditional academic culture and status quo that was threatened by student loyalty to the tenets and methods of the OB department. In efforts to explain SOM's restructuring, OB courses were devalued as "touchy feely," "therapy," "emotional," and "too individually focused." The after-the-fact disparagement indicates a lack of, or an insufficient container for, discussion about the purpose of IGB, inductive and experiential methods, and their resounding popularity among students. Without sufficient leadership or collaborative resource, the organization avoided the disturbing affect (generated by student loyalty to

OB courses) instead of learning from it. A systems psychodynamic theory suggests SOM as an organization suffered, not because of its members, but instead of them, as they mobilized to affirm and develop a more desirable identity similar to other management schools that maintain traditional boundaries between teachers and students and rely on traditional teaching methods.

Restructuring, then, was an effort to restore a traditional academic culture focused on faculty agency, not student learning. The ejection of experiential teaching methods was seen as the only option. OB content and pedagogy was focused on student agency and was inherently insubordinate in nature. IGB and Liaison empowered students to take control of their learning, criticize their experience, and take steps to improve their conditions.

Petriglieri and Petriglieri deploy a systems psychodynamic lens to explain the dehumanization of leadership (theory, training and education) as a simultaneous reduction of leadership to a set of instrumental and decontextualized goal-focused activities.⁴⁰⁸ They suggest that this dehumanization overlooks the ambiguity and interdependence that leaders actually face and that business schools, in an effort to rehumanize leadership, need to take more risks in teaching and scholarship, “defying conventions and expectations and learning from the anxiety and isolation that defiance entails.”⁴⁰⁹ My analysis of SOM shows how an organization that tried to do exactly that, defended against, instead of learned from, the anxieties generated when it defied

408. Gianpiero Petriglieri and Jennifer Louise Petriglieri, “Can Business Schools Humanize Leadership?” *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 14, (2015), 627.

409. Gianpiero Petriglieri and Jennifer Louise Petriglieri, “Can Business Schools Humanize Leadership?” *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 14, (2015), 642.

conventions and expectations. That defensive behavior was an elimination of scholars and scholarship that embraced ambiguity and an affirmation of scholars and scholarship that advocates linearity and rationality.

The risk and challenge. The risks in integrating experiential and constructivist methods into the professional graduate school are:

- Generating a divided student experience
- Which contributes to a divided faculty split along ideological, methodological, and pedagogical lines

The challenge for schools integrating these methods into their curriculum is in:

- Aligning all faculty to the purpose of the school and the role experiential and constructivist leadership learning and identity development plays in achieving that purpose
- Generating understanding of how experiential and constructivist methods might influence student projection upon all faculty
- Committing faculty to the school's purpose in the face of external pressure to conform to a dominant model
- Maintaining leadership that can develop a holding environment to contain, manage and learn from, not avoid or defend against, any disturbance this integration into the curriculum generates

Member check informants offer important insight here. In interviews they noted how SOM's OB program represented an extreme end of their discipline, focusing on unconscious intra- and interpersonal dynamics rooted in Encounter and Tavistock groups. Some informants suggested that any attempt to maintain a focus on the unconscious will

be met with defensive resistance. This raises questions about the range and scope of experiential and constructivist courses a school can integrate.

Chapters 1 and 2 of this dissertation feature a course that meets the demands of those calling for more courses of this nature, but puts the work of leadership at the center of its analysis. In the course, *Exercising Leadership*, which uses the adaptive leadership framework,⁴¹⁰ unconscious forces are relevant only to the extent that they inhibit progress on leadership work. A course focus on leadership and the challenge of making progress on difficult problems may be easier to integrate into the management curriculum than courses focused on self-study for the purpose of learning about groups and group processes.

Discussion

This study shifts two conversations dominant in the management education literature away from criticism and design towards implementation. The first stream of literature criticizes the state of business and management professional education, particularly the MBA. The second stream of literature focuses on the design, benefits and promise of adding experiential and humanistic leadership learning to our management education curriculums. This paper pushes us to examine more closely the risk and challenge of integrating this learning into the professional management degree curriculum. To learn more about this risk and challenge I examined a professional management school that made many of the same conclusions we are making now about the limitations of the traditional MBA and envisioned a degree program that would move

410. Ronald A. Heifetz, *Leadership Without Easy Answers*, (Cambridge MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1994).

beyond those limitations. The founders of that school also had a robust and integrated experiential and constructivist leadership learning curriculum that they thought would help them achieve that vision.

In this investigation, I reveal the challenges of maintaining and integrating that experiential and constructivist leadership learning into a professional management degree program when there is no organizational coherence regarding the mission and purpose of the organization or agreement about the role experiential and constructivist methods play in serving that mission and purpose and when there is no consistent organizational leadership that can contain, manage, and learn from the debate that emerges in relation to this integration. This effort also reveals the role experiential and constructivist leadership learning plays in student identity development and the consequences to a faculty and organization when it unwittingly provides an identity workspace for its students.

Contribution to the Literature

Research observing the limits of the MBA degree to fulfill its promise or potential in developing leaders is thorough. In the *Academy of Management Learning and Education* journal, a journal devoted to management education and learning, six of the journal's top-ten most cited articles are critiques of business schools: #1 Ghoshal's (2005) "Bad Management Theories Are Destroying Good Management Practices;"⁴¹¹ #2 Pfeffer and Fong's (2002) "The End of Business Schools? Less Success Than Meets the Eye;"⁴¹² #5 Grey's (2004) "Reinventing Business Schools: The Contribution of Critical

411. Sumantra Ghoshal, "Bad Management Theories are Destroying Good Management Practice," *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 4, (2005).

412. Jeffery Pfeffer and Christina T. Fong, "The End of Business Schools? Less Success than Meets the Eye," *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 1, (2002).

Management Education;”⁴¹³ #6 Gioia and Corley’s (2002) “Being Good Versus Looking Good: Business School Rankings and the Circean Transformation From Substance to Image;”⁴¹⁴ #9 Quinn Trank and Rynes’ (2003) “Who Moved Our Cheese? Reclaiming Professionalism in Business Education;”⁴¹⁵ and #10 Mintzberg and Gosling’s (2002) “Educating Managers Beyond Borders.”⁴¹⁶ Navaro’s (2008) article “The MBA Core Curricula of Top-Ranked U.S. Business Schools: A Study in Failure?” comes in at #12.⁴¹⁷ These articles represent only a sliver of the scholarship critical of business and management education. My work builds on these critiques by shifting the exploration towards the challenge of change at the school and university level. Research has already illuminated the tyranny of school ranking, but more must be understood about how faculties respond to rankings, and navigate the internal politics generated by these external rankings. More must also be understood about how faculties interpret their mission, and how schools manage multiple interpretations of that mission.

This effort also shifts the experiential and constructivist leadership learning conversation. The current conversation focuses on design and theory.⁴¹⁸ Other research

413. Christopher Grey, “Reinventing Business School: The Contribution of Critical Management Education,” *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 3, (2004).

414. Dennis A. Gioia and Kevin G. Corley, “Being Good Versus Looking Good: Business School Rankings and the Circean Transformation from Substance to Image,” *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 1, (2002).

415. Trank, Christine Quinn, and Sara L. Rynes. "Who moved our cheese? Reclaiming professionalism in business education." *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 2, (2003).

416. Henry Mintzberg and Jonathan Gosling, “Educating Managers Beyond Borders,” *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 1, (2002).

417. Peter Navaro, “The MBA Core Curricula of Top-Ranked U.S. Business Schools: A Study in Failure?” *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 7, (2008).

418. D. Christopher Kayes, “Experiential Learning and its Critics: Preserving the Role of Experience in Management Learning and Education,” *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 1

looks at impact and evaluation, but only on a participant level (Chapters 1 and 2 of this dissertation, cite articles from those literature reviews). Neither literature considers the challenge of integrating experiential and constructivist courses into the management curriculum beyond the occasional elective course—the real challenge for business schools if they are indeed going to transform leadership education. This effort draws our attention to risk and challenge of making that integration.

This work also contributes to reviving a systems psychodynamic perspective in the organizational behavior literature writ-large. Ashforth and Reingen⁴¹⁹ note that uncontained dualities are increasingly common in complex organizations and the subsequent dysfunction is something to understand and learn from, not suppress and defend against. This systems psychodynamic perspective is useful for understanding barriers to change and integration where the institution or school is sabotaged to protect the desired identities of the individuals belonging to that institution.⁴²⁰ The dynamic is not a conscious one and serves to stave off disorienting affect in favor of what is familiar, despite sabotaging explicitly stated goals in the process.⁴²¹

(2002); Alice Y. Kolb and David A. Kolb, “Learning Styles and Learning Spaces: Enhancing Experiential Learning in Higher Education,” *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 4 (2005); Izhak Berkovich, “Between Person and Person: Dialogical Pedagogy in Authentic Leadership Development,” *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 13 (2014); Gianpiero Petriglieri and Jennifer Louise Petriglieri, “Can Business Schools Humanize Leadership?” *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 14, (2015).

419. Blake E. Ashforth and Peter H. Reingen, “Functions of Dysfunction: Managing the Dynamics of Organizational Duality in a Natural Food Cooperative,” *Administrative Science Quarterly*, (2014).

420. Gianpiero Petriglieri and Mark Stein, “The Unwanted Self: Projective Identification in Leaders’ Identity Work,” *Organization Studies* 33, (2012).

421. Robert Kegan and Lisa L. Lahey, *Immunity to Change*, (Boston: Harvard Business Press, 2009).

Organizational behavior scholars Petriglieri and Petriglieri focus on business schools and deploy a systems psychodynamic perspective to explain how individuals use business schools as identity workspaces in a modern and transient work world without consistent holding environments for identity work.⁴²² They also use a systems psychodynamic analysis of business schools to illuminate the dehumanization and overfunctionalization of leadership study.⁴²³ This effort illuminates the consequences of facilitating identity development in the professional school and shows how dynamics among the students can interfere with the balanced functionalist and humanistic curriculum they call for.

Spender and Khurana call for coherent business school signatures that inform a PhD program's perspective on questions that need to be raised and answered. A coherent signature would encourage programs to break free of the positivist iron cage and deploy methods best suited for answering questions instead of determining which questions can be answered with their methods.⁴²⁴ The losses to the university, school and program such a change represents need to be understood. Those losses will provide clues about the desired identity the system is trying to maintain. Resistance to methodological changes can then be seen as the preservation of a desirable identity. Unless these dynamics are explored, diagnosed and considered, new capacities will not be built, especially in an

422. Gianpiero Petriglieri and Jennifer Louise Petriglieri, "Identity Workspaces: The Case of Business Schools," *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 9 (2010).

423. Gianpiero Petriglieri and Jennifer Louise Petriglieri, "Can Business Schools Humanize Leadership?" *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 14, (2015).

424. JC Spender and Rakesh Khurana, "Intellectual Signatures: Impact on Relevance and Doctoral Programs," in *Disrupt or Be Disrupted: A Blueprint for Change in Management Education*, ed. Graduate Management Admission Council (Hoboken: Wiley & Sons, 2013).

organization experiencing pressure from external measures and ranking. SOM's PhD programming was tightly coupled with instructional methodology at the masters level. Letters and memos reference an unfavorable review of SOM's OB program by the faculty of arts and sciences at Yale, however actual documentation from that review is unavailable. Member-check informants reinforced that the review of the OB program by Yale's FAS "recommended a diminished representation of OB at SOM."⁴²⁵ More must be known about the actual review to determine the role research methodologies played in informing the review.

Contribution to Practice

This work seeks to make a contribution to practice. The challenge of integrating experiential and constructivist leadership learning is a formidable one in our current positivist environment. For schools and faculties interested in such an integration, this study reveals the importance of articulating the role of experiential and constructivist leadership learning in achieving a school's purpose and creating conditions that can contain, manage and learn from the distress and disorientation such an attempt may generate. Schools must also think about how they can resist and understand the external demands and pressure that rankings and the positivist status quo will place on their school. School leaders should continuously engage their faculties in conversations about the holistic education a holistic manager and leader will ultimately need. This could foster a 50/50 environment between functionalist and humanistic perspectives on leadership learning where the tools of each serve the other. This work also helps school

425. Ludo Van der Heyden, Letter to Michael Levine, March 3, 1989, MS 1635, William Nelson Parker Papers, Box 4, Folder 'S', MAYUL, 1.

leaders think strategically about harnessing student enthusiasm for identity work and leveraging student commitment to the holding environments that facilitate their identity development. Business schools, and professional schools, have become a reliable and durable identity workspace for our students.⁴²⁶ Being deliberate about that dynamic, not providing this service unwittingly, can foster alumni community, and school relationships to the industries they populate.

Limitations and Future Directions

There are three clear limitations to my study. This analysis is limited to a single site and contextual factors unique to that site have limited the development of a universally applicable theory outlining the risks and challenges of integrating experiential and constructivist leadership learning. While every available and related document from the Yale Archives was included in this work, many relevant documents remain confidential and unavailable to the public. Some remaining documents are sealed until 2021 and others until 2090. For example, my document analysis could not include minutes from BPO meetings or administrative memos from and between Yale President Benno Schmidt or SOM Dean Michael Levine. Despite an objective process and positive confirmation with members representing all perspectives at SOM, it is likely that the documentation I rely on overly represents those disenchanted with the restructuring at SOM. Campus reporting, for instance, is consistently critical of Schmidt and Levine and their restructuring efforts. Accounts validating or highlighting the benefits of SOM's

426. Gianpiero Petriglieri and Jennifer Louise Petriglieri, "Identity Workspaces: The Case of Business Schools," *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 9 (2010); Gianpiero Petriglieri, Jack Denfield Wood, Jennifer Louise Petriglieri, "Up Close and Personal: Building Foundations for Leaders' Development Through the Personalization of Management Learning," *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 10 (2011).

restructuring in 1988 were not discovered from the available documents. Additionally, member check informants noted that I would not find stories of students who felt vulnerable, exposed and misrepresented from their IGB course experience, but that was indeed the case for some students.

Future research should consider three directions. The first direction should build from this effort by examining other sites and incorporating a wider range of methods. Research should examine the challenge of integrating experiential and constructivist learning at other business schools and professional schools in the service sector. Research in this direction can build on historical methods by interviewing and surveying important actors with experience and insight on the risk and challenge of integration. Research in this direction should also explore the most enduring aspects of academic culture and further illuminate the tension, at professional schools in particular, about the purpose of the school and the primary beneficiary of the school's purpose: the profession writ-large which benefits from the development of knowledge by researchers, or the professionals meant to benefit from an educational process at the school. A second direction should emphasize evaluation and impact of current experiential and constructivist leadership learning efforts, courses and programs on students, faculty and schools. A third direction should explore resistance to humanistic methodologies, ideologies and pedagogies at traditionally functionalist institutions beyond academia or the transformation of traditionally humanistic institutions into functionalist ones. This third direction can illuminate the defensive mechanisms human systems deploy to guard against the ambiguity humanist ideologies may represent, and shed light on the conditions required to maintain, integrate and sustain their integration and inclusion in those systems.

Table 3.4

Timeline of Events at SOM

Time	Event
1973 (Spring)	Yale President Kingman Brewster announces the creation of the “School of Organization and Management”
1974 (Winter)	The Administrative Sciences department moves to new offices at SOM, representing two thirds of faculty developing a degree program for SOM
1975 (October)	William Donaldson named as first dean
1976 (September)	Innaugural class begins its first semester
1978 (Spring)	SOM graduates its first cohort
1980–1981	Geoffry Hazard serves as acting dean
1981–1987	Burton Malkiel serves as dean
1987–1988	Merton Peck serves as acting dean
1988 October 27	Yale president Benno Schmidt appoints Michael Levine as Dean of SOM and announces plans for restructuring, which includes moving OR and not renewing contracts for six OB faculty
1992	Paul MacAvoy begins two year contract as dean
1993	SOM overhauls its mission statement
1994	Stanley Garstka serves as acting dean / The school’s name is changed to School of Management
1995	Jeffrey Garten begins ten year tenure as dean
1999	The MPPM degree is changed to a MBA

Selected Bibliography

- AACSB, "Management Education at Risk: Report of the Management Education Task Force to the AACSB International Board of Directors," <http://www.aacsb.edu/~media/AACSB/Publications/>.
- Adler, Nancy J., and Anne-Wil Harzing, "When Knowledge Wins: Transcending the Sense and Nonsense of Academic Rankings. *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 8, no. 1 (2009): 72–95.
- Akrivou, Kleio, and Hilary Bradbury-Huang, "Educating Integrated Catalysts: Transforming Business Schools towards Ethics and Sustainability." *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 14, no. 2 (2015): 222–40.
- Alderfer, Clayton P. *Existence, Relatedness, and Growth: Human Needs in Organizational Settings*. New York: Free Press, 1972.
- Alderfer, Clayton. *The Practice of Organizational Diagnosis: Theory and Methods*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Alderfer, Clayton, and L. Dave Brown. *Learning from Changing: Organizational Diagnosis and Development*, (Beverly Hills CA: Sage, 1975);
- Alderfer, Clayton P., and Edward B. Klein. "Affect, Leadership and Organizational Boundaries." *Journal of Personality and Social Systems* 1, no. 3 (1978): 19–33.
- Alderfer, Clayton, and Kenwyn Smith, "Studying Intergroup Relations Embedded in Organizations." *Administration Sciences Quarterly* 27, no. 1 (1982): 35–65.
- Andrews, Kenneth Richmond. *The Case Method of Teaching Human Relations and Administration*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1953.
- Ashforth Black E., and Peter H. Reingen. "Functions of Dysfunction: Managing the Dynamics of an Organizational Duality in a Natural Food Cooperative." *Administrative Sciences Quarterly* 59, no. 3 (2014): 474–516.
- Beineke, William S. *The Birth of the School: Reflections on the Founding of the Yale School of Management Delivered to the Charter Class of 1978*. New Haven: Yale University, 1978.
- Bennis, Warren G., and James O'Toole. "How Business Schools Lost Their Way." *Harvard Business Review* 83, May (2005): 96–104.
- Berg, David N., and Kenwyn K. Smith, eds. *The Self in Social Inquiry: Researching Methods*. Newbury Park CA: Sage, 1988.
- Berg, David N. ed. *Keeping the Faith: The Clinical Tradition in Organizational Behavior at Yale, 1962 – 1988*. Woodbridge CT: The Berg Group, 1992.

- Bergman Records, 1990–1992, RU 914, YRG 30-G, ACCN 2003-A-029, Box 1, Manuscripts and Archives at Yale University Library.
- Bergman Records, 1990–1992, RU 914, YRG 30-G, ACCN 2003-A-029, Box 2, Manuscripts and Archives at Yale University Library.
- Berkovich, Izhak. “Between Person and Person: Dialogical Pedagogy in Authentic Leadership Development.” *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 13, no. 2 (2014): 245–264.
- Brown, Kenneth G., J. Ben Arbaugh, George Hrivnak, and Amy Kenworthy. “Overlooked and Unappreciated: What Research Tells Us About How Teaching Must Change.” In *Disrupt or Be Disrupted: A Blueprint for Change in Management Education*, edited by Graduate Management Admission Council, 244–51. Hoboken: Wiley & Sons, 2013.
- Business Week*. “Class Conflict: A Shake-up Stirs Outrage at Yale’s Humanistic Business School.” November 14, 1988.
- Business Week*. “Days of Rage at Yale B-School: Dean Levine’s Makeover has Students and Alums Seeing Red.” December 12, 1988.
- Business Week*. “How the Schools Stack Up: Business Week Rates the Top 20.” November 28, 1988.
- Business Week*. “Where the Schools Aren’t Doing Their Homework.” November 28, 1988.
- Business Week*. “Yale B-School Struggles to Make the Grade: Is its Experimental Program Living Up to its Promise?” November 23, 1987.
- Clegg, Stewart R., and Anne Ross-Smith. “Revising the Boundaries: Management Education and Learning in a Postpositivist World.” *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 2, no. 1 (2003): 85–98.
- Cowan, Alison Leigh, “New Dean’s Proposal Raise Concerns in a School at Yale.” *New York Times*, October 30, 1988.
- DeRue, D. Scott, and Susan J. Ashford, “Who Will Lead and Who Will Follow? A Social Process of Leadership Identity Construction in Organizations,” *Academy of Management Review* 35, no. 4 (2010): 627–47.
- Dierdorff, Erich C., and Brooks C. Holtom. “Epilogue,” In *Disrupt or Be Disrupted: A Blueprint for Change in Management Education*, edited by Graduate Management Admission Council, 347–72. Hoboken: Wiley & Sons, 2013.

- Fellman, Bruce. "Business With a Twist." *Yale Alumni Magazine*, March 2002.
http://archives.yalealumnimagazine.com/issues/02_03/SOM.html.
- Fraher, Amy L. *A History of Group Study and Psychodynamic Organizations*. London: Free Association Books, 2004.
- Gervais, Laurent. "Group Dynamics as Therapy." *American Journal of Psychiatry* 126, no. 4 (1969): 579–79.
- Ghoshal, Sumantra. "Bad Management Theories are Destroying Good Management Practice." *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 4, no. 1 (2005): 75–91.
- Gioia, Dennis A., and Kevin G. Corley. "Being Good Versus Looking Good: Business School Rankings and the Circean Transformation from Substance to Image." *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 1, no. 1 (2002): 107–20.
- Gold, Martin, ed. *The Complete Social Scientist: A Kurt Lewin Reader*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association, 1999.
- Graduate Management Admissions Council. *Disrupt or be Disrupted: A Blueprint for Change in Management Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2013.
- Grey, Christopher. "Reinventing Business School: The Contribution of Critical Management Education." *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 3, no. 2 (2004): 178–86.
- Hayes, Constance L. "Views Collide Over Changes at Yale" *New York Times*, November 9, 1988.
- Hays, Constance L. "Change Protested at Yale's Business School." *New York Times*, November 3, 1988.
- Heifetz, Ronald A. *Leadership without Easy Answers*. Cambridge MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1994.
- Heifetz, Ronald A., Riley M. Sinder, Alice Jones, Lynn M. Hodge, and Keith A Rowley. "Teaching and Assessing Leadership Courses at the John F. Kennedy School of Government" *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 8, no. 3 (1989): 536–562.
- Holtom, Brooks C., and Lyman W. Porter. "Introduction: The Change Imperative," In *Disrupt or Be Disrupted: A Blueprint for Change in Management Education*, edited by Graduate Management Admission Council, 1–20. Hoboken: Wiley & Sons, 2013.

- Ibarra, Herminia. "Provisional Selves: Experimenting with Image and Identity in Professional Adaptation." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 44 (1999):764–91.
- Ibarra, Herminia, and Roxana Barbulescu. "Identity as Narrative: Prevalence, Effectiveness and Consequences of Narrative Identity Work in Macro Work Role Transitions." *Academy of Management Review* 35, no. 1 (2010): 135–54.
- Ibarra, Herminia, Sarah Wittman, Gianpiero Petriglieri and David V. Day. "Leadership and Identity: An Examination of Three Theories and New Research Directions." In *The Oxford Handbook of Leadership and Organizations*, edited by David V. Day, 285–301. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Kayes, D. Christopher. "Experiential Learning and its Critics: Preserving the Role of Experience in Management Learning and Education." *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 1, no. 2 (2002): 137–49.
- Kegan, Robert, and Lisa L. Lahey. *Immunity to Change*. Boston: Harvard Business Press, 2009.
- Kets de Vries, Manfred F. R., and Konstantin Korotov. "Transformational Leadership Development Programs: Creating Long-Term Sustainable Change" In *The Handbook for Teaching Leadership: Knowing, Doing, and Being*, edited by Scott Snook, Nitin Nohria, and Rakesh Khurana, 263–82. Los Angeles: Sage, 2012.
- Khurana, Rakesh. *From Higher Aims to Hired Hands*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007.
- Kingman Brewster Jr. Presidential Records, RU 11, Location LSF, Series II, Box No. 305, Folder No. 1, Manuscripts and Archives at Yale University Library.
- Kingman Brewster Jr. Presidential Records, RU 11, Location LSF, Series II, Box No. 305, Folder No. 2, Manuscripts and Archives at Yale University Library.
- Kingman Brewster Jr. Presidential Records, RU 11, Location LSF, Series II, Box No. 305, Folder No. 21, Manuscripts and Archives at Yale University Library.
- Kingman Brewster Jr. Presidential Records, RU 11, Location LSF, Series II, Box No. 305, Folder No. 22, Manuscripts and Archives at Yale University Library.
- Kingman Brewster Jr. Presidential Records, RU 11, Location LSF, Series II, Box No. 305, Folder No. 23, Manuscripts and Archives at Yale University Library.
- Kingman Brewster Jr. Speeches and articles by and about presidents of Yale Univsity, RU 65, Location LSF, Box No. 1, Folder No. 1, Manuscripts and Archives at Yale University Library.

- Kingman Brewster Jr. Speeches and articles by and about presidents of Yale University, RU 65, Location LSF, Box No. 1, Folder No. 2, Manuscripts and Archives at Yale University Library.
- Kingman Brewster Jr. Speeches and articles by and about presidents of Yale University, RU 65, Location LSF, Box No. 5, Folder No. 136, Manuscripts and Archives at Yale University Library.
- Kingman Brewster Jr. Speeches and articles by and about presidents of Yale University, RU 65, Location LSF, Box No. 5, Folder No. 140, Manuscripts and Archives at Yale University Library.
- Knight, Michael. "Yale Sets Up School of Administration with Dual Purpose." *New York Times*, October 1, 1975.
- Kolb, Alice Y., and David A. Kolb. "Learning Styles and Learning Spaces: Enhancing Experiential Learning in Higher Education" *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 4, no. 2 (2005): 193–212.
- Leonhardt, Dave. "Revamping the MBA." *Yale Alumni Magazine*, May/June 2007. http://archives.yalealumnimagazine.com/issues/2007_05/som.html.
- Lewin, Kurt. "Action research and minority problems." *Journal of Social Issues* 2, no. 4 (1946): 34–46.
- Lewis, Michael M. "Bulldog Bull: Yale's feel-good School of Management." *The New Republic*, May 23, 1988.
- Malkiel, Burton G. *A Random Walk Down Wall Street*. New York, Norton, 1973.
- Mintzberg, Henry. *Managers Not MBAs: A Hard Look at the Soft Practice of Managing and Management Development*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler, 2004.
- Mintzberg, Henry and Jonathan Gosling. "Educating Managers Beyond Borders." *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 1, no. 1 (2002): 64–76.
- Navarro, Peter. "The MBA Core Curricula of Top-Ranked U.S. Business Schools: A Study in Failure?" *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 7, no. 1 (2008): 108–23.
- Patterson, Cecil Holden. *Foundations for a Theory of Instruction and Educational Psychology*. New York: Harper & Row, 1977.
- Petriglieri, Gianpiero, and Jennifer Louise Petriglieri. "Identity Workspaces: The Case of Business Schools." *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 9, no. 1 (2010): 44–60.

- Petriglieri, Gianpiero, and Mark Stein. "The Unwanted Self: Projective Identification in Leaders' Identity Work." *Organization Studies* 33, no. 9 (2012): 1217–35.
- Petriglieri, Gianpiero. "Identity Workspaces for Leadership Development." In *The Handbook for Teaching Leadership: Knowing, Doing, and Being*, edited by Scott Snook, Nitin Nohria, and Rakesh Khurana, 295–312. Los Angeles: Sage, 2012.
- Petriglieri, Gianpiero, and Jennifer Louise Petriglieri. "Can Business Schools Humanize Leadership?" *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 14, no. 4. (2015): 625–47.
- Petriglieri, Gianpiero, Jack Denfield Wood, and Jennifer Louise Petriglieri. "Up Close and Personal: Building Foundations for Leaders' Development Through the Personalization of Management Learning." *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 10, no. 10 (2011): 430–50.
- Pfeffer, Jeffery, and Christina T. Fong. "The End of Business Schools? Less Success than Meets the Eye." *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 1, no. 1 (2002): 78–95.
- Porter, Lyman W., and Lawrence E. McKibbin. *Management Education and Development*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1988.
- Redlich, F. C., and Boris Astrachan. "Group Dynamics Training." *American Journal of Psychiatry* 125, no. 11 (1969): 1501–7.
- Redlich, F. C., and Boris Astrachan, "Drs. Redlich and Astrachan Reply," *American Journal of Psychiatry* 126, no. 4 (1969): 570–80.
- Rice, A. K. *Learning for Leadership*. London: Tavistock, 1965.
- Rioch, Margaret J. "Group Relations: Rationale and Technique." In *Group Relations Reader 1*, edited by Arthur D. Colman and W. Harold Bexton, 3–10. Jupiter FL: A. K. Rice Institute, 1975.
- Roethlisberger, F. J. *Man-in-Organization*. Cambridge MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1968.
- Rogers, Carl R. *Carl Rogers on Encounter Groups*. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.
- Rogers, Carl R. *Client-Centered Therapy: Its Current Practice, Implications, and Theory*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951.
- Rogers, Carl R. *On Becoming a Person: A Therapist's View of Psychotherapy*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.

- Rubin, Robert S., and Erich C. Dierdorff. "How Relevant is the MBA? Assessing the Alignment of Required Curricula and Required Managerial Competencies." *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 8, no. 2 (2009): 208–24.
- School of Organization and Management. *The Exchange*. Volumes I–XI, Un-catalogued Location SML, Manuscripts and Archives at Yale University Library.
- Schwartz, John. "Gods and Managers at Yale: A Businesslike Protest." *Newsweek*, November 14, 1988.
- Schyns, Birgit, Tina Kiefer, Rudolf Kerschreiter, and Alex Tymon. "Teaching Implicit Leadership Theories to Develop Leaders and Leadership: How and Why it Can Make a Difference." *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 10, no. 3 (2011): 397–408.
- Smith, Kenwyn K., and David N. Berg. *Paradoxes of Group Life: Understanding Conflict, Paralysis, and Movement in Group Dynamics*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.
- Spender, JC, and Rakesh Khurana. "Intellectual Signatures: Impact on Relevance and Doctoral Programs." In *Disrupt or Be Disrupted: A Blueprint for Change in Management Education*, edited by Graduate Management Admission Council, 95–103. Hoboken: Wiley & Sons, 2013.
- Trank, Christine Quinn, and Sara L. Rynes. "Who moved our cheese? Reclaiming professionalism in business education." *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 2, no. 2(2003): 189–205.
- Vroom, Victor H. *Work and Motivation*. New York: Wiley, 1964.
- Vroom, Victor H. *Motivation and Management*. New York: American Foundation for Management Research, 1965.
- Vroom, Victor H., Lester D. Grant and Timothy S. Cotton. "The Consequences of Social Interaction in Group Problem Solving." *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 4, no. 1(1969): 77–95.
- Vroom, Victor H., and Arthur G. Jago. "Decision Making as a Social Process: Normative and Descriptive Models of Leader Behavior" *Decision Sciences* 4, no. 4 (1974): 743–69.
- Vroom, Victor H., and Norman Raymond Frederick Maier. "Industrial Social Psychology." *Annual Review of Psychology* 12, no. 1 (1961): 413–46.
- Vroom, Victor H., and Philip W. Yetton. *Leadership and Decision-Making*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1973.

William Nelson Parker Papers, MS 1635, Box 4, Folder 'S', Manuscripts and Archives at Yale University Library.

Yale School of Organization and Management. *MPPM Academic Program Handbook 1978–1979*, Yjp65 M66+ Oversize. Manuscripts and Archives at Yale University Library.

Yale School of Organization and Management. *MPPM Academic Program: Guidelines, Courses, Policies 1982–83*, Yjp65 M66+ Oversize. Manuscripts and Archives at Yale University Library.

Yale School of Organization and Management. *The MPPM Curriculum 1978–1979*. New Haven: Yale University, 1978. Manuscripts and Archives at Yale University Library.

Yale University. *Yale Daily News*. Yale University Library Digital Collections. <http://digital.library.yale.edu/cdm/landingpage/collection/yale-ydn>.

Yale University School of Medicine. *Catalogue 1963–1964*. New Haven: Yale University, 1963. Manuscripts and Archives at Yale University Library.

Yale University School of Medicine. *Catalogue 1977–1978*. New Haven: Yale University, 1977. Manuscripts and Archives at Yale University Library.

VITA

Timothy J. O'Brien

1996–2000	New York University New York, NY <i>Secondary English Education</i>	B.S. May 2001
2000–2002	Teacher Trainer, United States Peace Corps Sorsogon, Philippines	
2004–2007	Educator, Ocean Classroom Foundation Portland, ME	
2007–2008	Harvard Graduate School of Education Cambridge, MA <i>Learning and Teaching Program</i> <i>Intellectual Contribution Faculty Tribute Award</i>	Ed. M. May 2008
2008	Fellow, Education Pioneers District of Columbia	
2008–2010	Professional Development Specialist, D.C. Public Schools District of Columbia	
2010–2016	Doctor of Education Candidate Harvard Graduate School of Education Cambridge, MA <i>Human Development and Education Program</i>	Ed. D. May 2016
2011–2014	Faculty, Instructional Rounds Institute Harvard Graduate School of Education Cambridge, MA	
2013–2014	Instructional Designer & Curriculum Developer Harvard X Cambridge, MA	
2013–2015	Leadership Consultant, Management Acceleration Program, INSEAD Fontainebleau, FR	
2014–2016	Adjunct Lecturer in Public Policy, Harvard Kennedy School Cambridge MA	