Appendix A1

The Sociological Surround of Executive Development

According to a recent statistic, the average time executives of Fortune 500 companies stay on their jobs is currently 3.4 years. At the same time, membership in the International Coaching Federation doubled to 2,600, and enrollment at Coach University, an organization that teaches coaching skills, grew from 285 to 785 (Nakache, 1997, p. 208). What do these figures say about people's relationship to their work, next to love (relationship) the most often quoted domain in which people develop? How can work and love be harmonized in a society dominated by large organizations (Mintzberg, 1989). What kind of "turbulence" are organizations caught up in, and what is the quality of psychological coping of those who suffer from, or thrive by, it? Is the increase in the demand for coaching a cry for help, or simply a strategic move on the part of organizations? If so, what kind of career contract undergirds "human development in the workplace" (Demick & Miller, 1993), and how does the development of organization members relate to that of organizations themselves, to their success and failure? These are some of the questions career theory has addressed since its founding in the 1970's, by employing the abstract notion of "career" as a focus for formulating sociological and anthropological answers. In this inquiry, central notions have been career anchors (Schein, 1978), career contract (Argyris, 1960; Hall et al., 1996), career development (Hall, 1976), and career stages (Dalton, 1989).

The above mentioned statistics put the notion of development in the workplace at center stage. According to what is known from empirical research, human beings do not develop within time spans as short as 3.4 years, not even individuals in the comparatively small subpopulation of "expansive" corporate executives "on the go" (Kaplan, 1991). How, from the sociological and anthropological perspectives of career theory, can one make sense of what is going on in the contemporary workplace in terms of actual (ontic) human development? Cognitive-developmental sociologist R. Kegan has metaphorically captured the answer to this question by stating on empirical grounds that people in the current U.S. society, particularly professionals, are "in over their heads" (Kegan, 1994, pp. 187-197). That is, "the curriculum of modern life in relation to the capacities of the adult mind" (R. Kegan, 1994, p. 5) seems to be out of balance. How, then, does career theory think about the development of professional personnel, or "executives"?

D.T. Hall, one of the founders of career theory (Hall, 1976), addresses "Developing the whole person at midlife and beyond" under the heading "The new career contract" (Hall, 1995, pp. 269 f.). He suggests that understanding the "current status and future potential of older workers," requires "a reexamination of traditional models of career stages, particularly in relation to issues of aging in the career context" (Hall, 1995, p. 269). He then examines the career contract, "the set of mutual expectations between employer and employee" (Hall, 1995, p. 269). His summary view of the new contract is that it "reflects a move from an organizationally based career to a protean or self-based career" for which "meta-

skills" ... (skills for learning how to learn) [such as] identity development and heightened adaptability" are of prime importance (Hall, 1995, p. 269). In an implied reference to the staying-power of executives in organizations, Hall suggests that in the new career contract "the focus is on many cycles of learning stages (continuous learning), rather than a single lifelong career stage cycle" (Hall, 1995, p. 269).

Ever since Argyris (1960) and Schein (1978) raised the issue of human needs versus organizational strategy, the Marxian question, whether society at large, and organizations in particular, obstruct human development (Easton & Guddat, 1967), has been a significant topic in 20th century organizational and sociological literature (Basseches, 1984; Kohn, 1980). The theory that has most rigorously and succinctly taken up issues of human development in organizations has been career theory, a discipline established by Hall (1976), Schein (1978), and van Maanen (1977). In contrast to the theory of "executive development" which is largely written from the vantage point of organizational requirements (McCall, 1998), career theory, which provides the sociological, anthropological, and psychological grounding for the former, has assiduously paid attention to issues of human development. While initially, career theory was more of a theory of careers than of people having careers (Kegan, 1994, p. 178), during the last decade this discipline has become increasingly psychologically and developmentally oriented (Kram, 1988; Arthur, Hall, & Lawrence, 1989; Hall & Associates, 1996). Although career theory, following its mandate, has remained largely focused on the role, not the self, of persons having careers, it has increasingly dealt with the intersection of role and self, although in a more agentic than ontic fashion (Hall, 1996; Kram, 1988; Fletcher, 1996). At the same time, career theory has successfully kept its distance from the fashion- and fad-oriented thinking that is rampant in the popular executive development literature, including that of coaching.

In what follows, I will review the following issues in career theory that have a close bearing on what Hall (1996) has called the "new career contract" between contemporary employer and employee:

1. Career Development and Adult Development
2. A Model of Career Development in Organizations
3. The Integration of "Relational Theory" into CareerTheory
4. The New, "Protean" Career Contract.

In toto, this review should furnish us with a sufficient understanding of the interplay of sociological and psychological issues of development in the workplace, required to assess notions in the theory of executive development, such as executive development activities (coaching and mentoring).

1. Career Development and Adult Development

In order to demonstrate "the utility of adult development theory in understanding career adjustment processes" for career theory, Cytrynbaum & Crites (1989, pp. 80 f.) review the theories of Erikson (1963), Levinson et al. (1978), Vaillant (1977), and Gould (1978, 1981), Pollock (1981, 1987), Lowenthal et al. (1975), and Neugarten (1975, 1979). As a conclusion to their paper, they recommend

more work "in the direction of ... developmental contextualism, the analysis of the changing individual in the changing career context" (Crytrynbaum et al., 1989, p. 84). As this formulation shows, the uniqueness of career theory lies in "this interplay between the individual and the organization" (Dalton, 1989, p. 90), often conceived of as "reciprocity" of their development (Arthur & Kram, 1989). Under the impact of constructive-developmental theories of development (Gilligan, 1982), in the 1980's this reciprocity has often come to be seen as "relational," leading to an integration of feminist perspectives on development and an emphasis on "relational resources" such as mentoring (Kram, 1988; Fletcher, 1996).

Among the developmental literature explored by Cytrynbaum & Crites, Levinson et al.'s (1978) theory of adult development receives major emphasis. (For a review of Levinson's theory, see Appendix A3). This is in keeping with the fact that Levinson et al. share with pre-1990's career theory the "phasic" (life-phase specific) focus on age-cohorts and the close attention that is paid to the social context of career development. This focus entails an emphasis on the notion of "life structure," i.e., "the underlying pattern or design of a person's life at a given time" (Levinson & Gooden, 1985) that seems to be custom-made for theorizing about patterns of career

development over time. The authors concede that Levinson's conception of adult development and his methodology have been challenged, especially the ambiguity of the term "life structure," the claim to universality of age-specific periods and transitions, and the generalizability of the dream" (Crytrynbaum et al., 1989, p. 78). As a consequence, the authors name "three persistent dilemmas in the study of adult and career development (Crytrynbaum et al., 1989, pp. 78-85):

Dilemma #1. "The appropriateness of generalizing from models of adult development based on male subjects to the adult development of women" (Crytrynbaum et al., 1989, p. 78), with the conclusion that "in studying the adult development of women, such parameters as stage of development, investment in family role, and the life cycle stage of the family among other parameters must be taken into account (Crytrynbaum et al., 1989, p. 80).

Dilemma #2. "The relative contribution of individual and social systems parameters to adult and career development" (Crytrynbaum et al., 1989, p. 80). This issue concerns the question of whether the developmental process of adults is primarily determined by internal biological and psychological needs versus the contribution of social and organizational contexts. Perceptive as they are to this issue, the authors suggest that what is needed is "a person-environment interactional approach to development" with an emphasis on "age effects" (Crytrynbaum et al., 1989, p. 81), thereby demonstrating their adherence to the "phasic," in contrast to the "structural," approach to development (see Appendix A3).

Dilemma #3. The "integration of adult development and career development theories." Regarding this dilemma, the authors state (Crytrynbaum et al., 1989, p. 82):

> None of the major adult development theorists cite the literature in career-vocational psychology, and conversely, few references to Levinson, Gould, Vaillant, and so on, are made by the major career developmental theorists.

> ... few adult development theorists have incorporated work-career parameters as markers of adult life course phases along with family or procreative development and biological development. ... Levinson (1986) does not focus on career development aa a separate line of development, but he does incorporate career and work development as a major component of the life structure during the young adulthood and middle adulthood eras. ... Relatively speaking, however, little integrative work has been done.

This assessment of the lack of "integration" between career and adult development theories, written from a phasic (life-phase model) perspective of development, is strikingly similar to one written five years earlier by one of the constructivist theorists of adult development (Basseches, 1984, p. 340):

> ... the context of the workplace is one which has been nearly completely ignored by developmental psychologists. ... While studies of adult development ... (e.g., Vaillant, 1977) have occasionally considered the effects of major events in people's worklife--entrance into the job market, job loss, job change, and career advancement--the nature of jobs entered or left has for the most part been neglected.

Is it that the provenance of this topic, first treated in the early writings of the Hegel- and Feuerback-student Karl Marx (Easton & Guddat, 1967) 150 years ago, is too risky an issue in our individualistic culture? However that may be, Cytrynbaum et al.'s conclusion, that "few applications of adult development theory to the work setting have, in fact, been reported" (Crytrynbaum et al., 1989, p. 83) is to the point: our understanding of human development in the workplace is only an incipient one (Demick & Miller, 1993). Interestingly, the authors see R. Kegan's early theory (Kegan, 1982) as "charting progressive age-related sequences of internal structure organization in personality, character, emotion, and intellect within stages that are irreversible, sequential, and hierarchical." While they agree that "this work is relevant to the study of careers," they surmise that "its impact is being most felt through related issues of leadership and organization development" (Crytrynbaum et al., 1989, p. 85).

Reconsidering Cytrynbaum et al.'s dilemmas, above, I find that each of them has very different ontic-developmental relevance. The first dilemma is that of gender differences in development, while the second addresses the age-old nature-nurture issue, namely, the dialectic of personality and environment. The third dilemma is that of how to integrate career and adult development theory, envisioned, it seems, in terms of life-phase theories of development. The meaning of the term "integration" in this context is, however, not entirely clear.

2. A Model of Career Development in Organizations

Some useful distinctions regarding career are provided by Dalton (1989). Dalton distinguishes two different but related topics in the theory of career

development: first, developmental models of careers in organizations, and (2) effects of organizations on individual development. The first topic regards the issue of how individual careers in organizations "develop" over time, while the second regards the supportive and/or detrimental effects of organizations on individual development (the Marxian question). The author sees the second topic as the broader, genuinely "developmental," one, since it addresses the question of "how does membership and participation in organizations shape or influence individual development?" and "how do organizational processes inhibit (or foster, O.L.) our development as human beings (Dalton, 1989, p. 90).

The ontic-developmentally most interesting model of how careers develop in organizations is Dalton's own model which he understands as "organizationally based" (Dalton, 1989, p. 94). Understanding the term career as "development along some path" (Dalton, 1989, p. 89), Dalton proposes a "career stages model of careers" (Dalton, 1989, p. 97). What Dalton calls "stages" are, however, not ontic-developmental stages, but levels of performance in terms of the functions an organization considers as critical to its functioning. Very similar to "competency models" used in contemporary coaching (Saporito, 1996, pp. 96 f.), the model (Dalton, 1989, p. 94):

> begins with certain properties of organizations, such as structures and needed functions, and define career development in terms of individuals adapting to, and moving through, those structures or learning to perform these functions.

Reasoning along these lines, Dalton arrives at a model reminiscent of certain training models of clinical supervision (Stoltenberg et al., 1987). The model comprises four levels of ability to perform critical organizational functions (Dalton, 1989, p. 97):

- Stage 1: working under the direction of another professional
- Stage 1: assuming responsibility for projects
- Stage 3: being involved in the development of other people
- Stage 4: providing direction for the organization, & representing the organization to others, with the concomitant wielding of formal or informal power.

The logic of this model is clear: the more critical the functions performed for the well-being and survival of the organization, the higher the level of performance ascribed to the individual. Dalton summarizes (Dalton, 1989, p. 98):

> The four stages represent clusters of functions that are progressively more highly valued by those whose job it is to evaluate and reward others on behalf of the organization.

Dalton is aware that each of these stages or levels has its own equivalent of psychological self-management (Dalton, 1989, p. 97):

> Movement from one stage to the next entails changes in activities, changes in their relationship with others in the organization, and new psychological issues with which they (i.e., individuals, O.L.) have to cope.

However, these new psychological growth challenges are not spelled out by the model. Reporting his empirical research, Dalton importantly states (Dalton, 1989, pp. 98-99):

> Significantly, the stages were not age related. ... Nor did formal position account for the stages; in several of the organizations studied, more than half of those described as being in Stage III held no supervisory or management positions.

As the author points out, "Dalton et al. (1986) have shown empirically that there is a strong relationship between the stage that an individual is described as performing and the person's performance ratings."

With this organizationally based model in mind, Dalton addresses "the larger question of how organizations affect individual development" (Dalton, 1989, p. 98). By this he means what opportunities for growth exist at each of his stages in the organization. Dalton captures the psychological coping and growth required for each stage in the following terms (Dalton, 1989, p. 100):

- Stage 1: developing a sense of (professional) identity
- Stage 2: developing competence/experiencing mastery
- Stage 3: building mutually developmental relationships
- Stage 4: developing the capacity to lead & exercise power on behalf the organization.

In this description, the emphasis clearly is "on the possibility and necessity for individuals to learn and develop" (Dalton, 1989, p. 99),-- what in now fashionable

action learning language might be called powerful experiences (McCall, 1998). As in executive development theories, Dalton here takes "the needs and properties of organizations as a given, and examine(s) the adaptation of the individual to those needs and properties as the developmental course" (Dalton, 1989, p. 99). What is not fully recognized in such a perspective is that each of these developmental tasks in fact represents a new order of cognitive complexity, and may require a new mode of managing the self both intra- and interpersonally (Kegan, 1994, p. 164):

> What may be lacking is an understanding that the demand of work, the hidden curriculum of work, does not require that a new set of skills be "put in," but that a new threshhold of consciousness be reached.

In other words, what is needed is a close cognitive-developmental scrutiny of what it entails to "develop a sense of professional identity," "experience psychological success," "build mutually developmental relationships," and hold a conception of power and authority that enables one to "develop the capacity to lead and exercise power on behalf of the organization," with the understanding that each of these tasks might be conceived very differently by individuals at different ontic-developmental positions. There is also the possibility, first recognized in E.H. Schein's formulation of individual "career anchors" (Schein, 1978), and rightly emphasized by Dalton (1989, p. 99), that individual's having the "autonomy and independence anchor" might find "themselves increasingly unable and unwilling to work in large organizations" (Dalton, 1989, p. 99). But here again, the question arises of what it entails cognitive-developmentally, as well as in terms of defenses and relational style (management of psychological boundaries), to "have" such a career anchor. Thus, while Dalton's levels are psychologically highly salient, their description remains developmentally undifferentiated. This sweeping generalization in no way diminishes the perceptiveness and relevance of Dalton's findings, however. It is only meant to point out that many of the notions of career theory, while developmentally enticing, lack sufficient psychological "bite" or degree of differentiation. Rather than envisioning an "integration" of the theories of career and adult development, then, what seems to be needed is more empirical scrutiny of the cognitive-developmental implications of categories used in career theory today. One could then perhaps evaluate what Dalton's ascriptions of individual performance profiles--taken as developmental milestones-- mean psychologically, or entail in terms of the professional agenda of individuals

associated with those profiles.

As Montross rightly points out (Montross & Shinkman, 1992, p. 5):

> there is not, at present, a single, comprehensive, well-integrated theory of career development. There are, rather, a number of theories which ... include psychological, social learning, developmental, and sociological theories, to name a few.

As demonstrated by Super's model of career development (Super, 1992, pp.35-64), there exists, in career theory, an almost philosophical fervor of system building. Another immediate observation is that the life-span concept, first introduced by Levinson et al. (1978), deeply fascinates the imagination of career theorists. This is probably the case because the notion of "life-span development" in the phasic, age-dependent sense of Levinson, is a term on the border of psychological and sociological thinking that lends itself to a host of projections. Its epistemological ambiguity actually seems to be its strength, to judge from the career theory literature. However, in the 1990's, even "systemic" minds like Super's seem to have reached a point of no return where, in the "self-designing organization" (Weick & Berlinger, 1989; Super, 1992, p. 79):

> the objective career dissolves (as do the sociological constants that made it possible, O.L.), and gets replaced by the subjective (i.e., inner, O.L.) career as a framework for career growth. In this course of events, subjective careers not only provide career definition for each person, they play back as expressions of career preferences both to immediate employers and to society's institutions generally.

In an endorsement of Hall's "new career contract" entailing the "protean career" (see below), Super takes up Weick & Berlinger's five qualities of careers of the 21st century (1989 [Arthur et al., 1989, pp. 313-328), namely, spiral career concepts; decoupling identity from jobs; preserving direction; distinctive competence; and synthesizing complex information,to answer the question "what are the prospects for accommodating the future work force within those [i.e., 'self-designing'] organizations?" Here, "self-designing organizations" are circumscribed as follows (Super, 1992, p. 78):

> The central idea is to assume a continually challenging, fast-changing environment instead of the relatively benevolent, stable environment found in traditional organizational forms. Thus, a self-designing organization's primary purpose is to read, interpret, and learn from signals available in the host environment, and to respond accordingly" (?, O.L.).

In the context of the envisioned "turbulent" environment (Super, 1992, pp. 78-79), a person:

- with a "spiral" career orientation develops
  a complex career plan that changes often, incorporates multiple visions of self, and uses trial and error as important sources of information;
- views jobs as temporary so that they are less
  likely to become "benchmarks of identity," thus decoupling identity from job;
- maintains "the kind of career insight that
  continually recognizes new choices and therefore contributes to the self-designing nature of ... companies"
- identifies distinctive competences and joins
  with others having diverse abilities to contribute to a primary self-designing organization goal, namely its redesign;
- synthesizes complex information, to accomplish
  moving from idea generation to effective synthesis and implementation of proposals, able to integrate the patterns of awareness in the organization into larger visions, etc.

Here, academic language seems to have taken off into a never-never-land of unimaginable scope whose psychological equivalents have gotten lost in the urge to create a vision. Notions such as "multiple visions of self," "job identity," "self-designing organization," "distinctive competence," "integration of patterns of

awareness in the organization into larger visions," etc. reflect the shaken foundations of a career theory that for too long has neglected to scrutinize its own language in an awareness of the psychological entailments and complexities it is conjuring up.

3. The Integration of Relational Theory into Career Theory

In an empirical study directly addressing Cytrynbaum & Crites's first "dilemma of career theory," that of gender differences, Hodgetts shows in a study on

"How male and female managers transform relationships with authority at midlife" (1994, p. v) that:

> Both similarities and differences in constructions of authority relationships were found for male and female managers at Loevinger stages (3/4) and (4). At each ego-stage level, most similarities in management style and descriptions of authority behavior seemed rooted in the underlying "developmental logics" that managers held at each stage: an "interpersonal" logic that defined the self as embedded in relationships with others; an "institutional" logic (with its own set of internal values and standards) that defined the self as separate from others; and an "inter-individual" logic that defined the self as part of a larger whole, and as engaged in a process of mutual dialog with others. Important gender differences in authority behavior and constructions were also found at each stage level. ...
>
> Perhaps the major finding of this study was the discovery of a "gender cross-over effect," in which lower-stage managers of both sexes exhibited authority-styles and attitudes consistent with commonly held gender stereotypes, while higher-stage managers exhibited "opposite sex" authority styles. These empirical findings suggest that male and female managers transform relationships with authority at midlife in different ways, and point to the existence of distinct developmental journeys to power, authority, and maturity for men and women.

In this compact results statement, Hodgetts touches upon all of the major topics that "relational theory" (Gilligan, 1982; Kegan, 1994) has brought to career theory during the last decade. The statement regards empirical findings about how men and women differ in "dealing with," i.e. internally constructing, issues of authority and power in dependence of their "ontic," cognitive-developmental "stage" (here measured in terms of Loevinger's sentence completion test; Loevinger, 1976). The crucial distinction used in Hodgetts epistemological analysis, but not made explicit by him, is that between relational style and cognitive-developmental position (Loevinger's "ego level"), also referred to by Kegan as that between "management style" and "order of consciousness" (Kegan, 1994, pp. 224-228).The matter of style is addressed by Hodgetts in terms of "similarities" as well as "differences" found between male and female managers, while the matter of delopmental position is referred to as the individual "logics" (i.e., ego level) a manager's meaning-making instantiates.

What Hodgetts results statement is saying is that until midlife (35-45 years), the management style adopted by male and female managers tended to be in harmony with culturally defined gender notions, i.e., "relational" (female) or "separate" (male), while these managers were sharing the same developmental position; and that at midlfe (45 years up) managers in his sample showed a "gender cross-over effect," according to which they changed their preferred managerial style by adopting "opposite sex" authority styles (male managers acting relationally, and female managers acting as separate selves), again, without deviating from their developmental position. Interestingly, the cross-over effect manifested itself only in individuals at the higher developmental position, where "institutional" and "inter-individual" logics held sway. In other words, managers at the lower developmental (interpersonal logic) position stuck to "authority styles and attitudes consistent with commonly held gender stereotypes" (Hodgetts, 1994, p.v).

Hodgetts' findings underscore several crucial insights about the linkages between "style" or "voice" (Gilligan, 1982), on one hand, and developmental position (or "logic"), on the other:

- behavioral style and underlying developmental position are strictly to be distinguished;
- at every stage of "ontic" development, managers may display either a "relational" or a "separate" style (i.e., each stage of development has behavioral, "relational" and "separate," variants)
- only managers at higher stages of "ontic" development showed themselves capable of transcending the gender-stereotypical equation of "female" with a "relational," and of "male" with a "separate" stance, but only at midlife (ca. 45 years of age).

Hodgett's results are especially salient in the context of Dalton's finding that "the most difficult developmental task for those making the transition into [his model's] Stage IV (the highest level of critical-function performance, O.L.) is learning to exercise power on behalf of the organization." Dalton states (1989, p. 105):

> Schein (1978) made a similar observation about the individuals whom he identified as having a managerial

> [career] anchor (i.e., career preference). Schein identified three types of competence, in combination, that were needed to do the work of the general manager: analytical, interpersonal, and emotional. He noted that all three ware important but that what differentiated the managerially oriented group most from those with different anchors was the fact that 'they explicitly drew attention to the emotional aspects of their job and saw as part of their development the evolution of the insight that they could deal with emotionally tough situations.' This emotional competence included 'the capacity to bear high levels of responsibility without becoming paralyzed, and the ability to exercise power without guilt or shame' (Schein 1978, p. 136).

This quote brings up the intriguing question how, what Schein identified as career preferences ("career anchors") may relate to differences in relational versus separate style regardless of developmental position, and also, whether what he identified as lifelong preferences has ontic-developmental preconditions. Importantly, Schein found that the "managerially oriented group" of managers "explicitly drew attention to the emotional aspects of their job" and thus displayed the emotional competence one would associate with a "relational" style of role functioning.

Hodgetts' findings cut to the core of the many debates about "relational style" and "relational resources" of development in the workplace, as well as the "relational approach" to career theory itself, that have become characteristic of the literature on careers in the ninetees (Hall, 1996; Fletcher, 1994; Jacques, 1989; Kram & Hall, 1996). For the most part, this literature has remained within the life-phase approach to human development established by Levinson et al. (1978), whose work consistently stressed the importance of relationship and of mentoring (Kram, 1996, p. 133). Although the limits of Levinson et al.'s model have been noted (Super, 1992, pp. 78 f.; Cytrynbaum et al., 1989, p. 78), and its reduced relevance has been recognized as being due to the crumbling of long-term sociological constants of career development (Kram, 1996, p. 136), a major work on career development edited by D.H. Montross and Shinkman in 1992 is strikingly still structured in terms of the hallowed phasic tradition of "exploration stage" followed by "establishment," "maintenance," and "disengagement" stages (i.e., phases).

If Hodgett's findings hold up to empirical scrutiny, he can be said to have established that there are ontic-developmental limits to how relational an individual can be at a particular point along his or her life-span trajectory, no matter how many relational resources are brought to bear on that individual. This is so since relational resources only go "into effect," so to say, once the individual knowing how to make use of them in his or her experiences can internally construct them as "resources," and thus experience them as "powerful." Until such time, existing relational resources lay in waiting, so to speak. This entails that there is no single relational resource that is per se powerful, and also that what is "powerful" differs significantly among individuals of different ontic-developmental status quo.

In terms of career theory, as well as executive development, the ontic-developmental moratorium or "injunction" on the use of relational resources, formulated above, entails that increasing efforts need to be made by organizations to have their members learn how to use relational resources, assuming that they are ontic-developmentally ready to do so, and can make use of their learnings for their ontic development. This brings up the further question, so far not discussed in career theory, of what is the relationship between learning and development over the human lifespan, and what contribution making development happen (agentically) can actually make to ontic development (Basseches, 1984).

A good indication of the awareness of these issues in contemporary career theory is the work by Kram (1983, 1988, 1996) and Fletcher (1994). Kram, who has done pioneering work on mentoring, defines a relational approach to career development as follows (Kram, 1996, p. 133):

> A relational approach to career development explores the ways in which individuals learn and grow in their work-related experiences through connections with others, taking a holistic view of individuals and the nature of their interactions with assignments, people, organizations, and the social context in which they work.

The crucial terms here are "experiences," "connections," and "interactions." Furthermore, "learn" and "grow" are linked without specifying how they actually relate. Assumed is further a "holistic" view of (other, O.L.) individuals and the nature of their (own, O.L.) interactions in an organization. The language here is typical of much of relational career theory, which I perceive as a problem-posing more than a problem-solving device for research in adult development.

Kram rightfully points out (Kram, 1996, p. 133) that "in some ways, this relational approach is not new." Making the link between phasic and relational career

theory, she states (Kram, 1996, p. 133):

> Since the earliest studies of boss-subordinate relationships (for example, Berlew and Hall, 1966) and throughout the last two decades of research on mentoring (for example, Kram, 1983; Levinson, Darrow, Levinson, and McKee, 1978; Dalton and Thompson, 1986), the important role of relationships in career devlopment has been consistently demonstrated.

Emphasizing the phasic-development framework for these explorations, Kram continues (1996, pp. 133-134):

> The earliest work on the role of relationships in career development emphasized the importance of mentoring and coaching for individuals in the establishment stage of their careers (Hall, 1976; Super, 1957; Dalton and Thompson, 1986). ... For example, Dalton, Thompson, and Price (1977) demonstrated how providing mentoring and sponsorship are part of the essential developmental tasks that they associated with stages three and four of

> professional career. Stage three, the mentor stage, is a phase when individuals begin to teach, coach, and develop others. Stage four, the sponsor stage, is a time (i.e., phase, O.L.) when managers have sufficient experience and influence to shape the future direction of their organization.

Making it clear that these notions are part of history, Kram issues a broad mandate for "relational activities" in organizations, including those addressing diversity issues (1996, p. 134):

> Recent and dramatic changes in the workplace ... render this established view of mentoring and other developmental relationships insufficient. In today's context, individuals of all ages, organizational tenure, and career stage find themselves to be novices--having to learn a radically new job, acquire new technical skills, or work with people of vastly different backgrounds and world views.

Taking a holistic view of developmental activities in organizations, Kram replaces the notion of learning in and from relationships by that of colearning (Kram, 1996, p. 134):

> In addition, in contrast to periods characterized by stability and linear careers, potential mentors in the
>
> current context ... no longer hold the expertise and security to serve as trusted advisers in the traditional sense. Their role in developing less experienced colleagues is necessarily being transformed into one of colearner (Kram and Hall, 1996). The learning and coaching that evolves between junior and senior colleagues in today's environment must be necessarily more mutual and reciprocal.

Making the transition from phasic to relational career theory, and directly repudiating one of the major foundations of phasic developmental theory introduced by Levinson et al. (1978), Kram states (1996, p. 136):

> Until recently, career theorists and practitioners had developed fairly consistent views about how individuals' careers unfold over time (Dalton, 1989). Although a number of different perspectives had emerged (for exmaple, life-span models, organizationally-based models [see our rendition of Dalton, above], individual differences models (Schein), all of these tended to take a (phasic-) developmental view of individuals' career-related experiences. Thus, if one knew a person's age, tenure (in the organization or in a particular career), personality, values, and/or learning style, one could predict fairly accurately what that person's salient career concerns and developmental stage might be (Super, 1986).

As the above quote makes very clear, phasic-developmental views were based on the assumption that members of particular age-cohorts follow a similar "pattern" of career development, and can be seen as

playing similar "roles" in organizations. This strictly sociological view of careers, has, however, strict limitations (see Appendix A3, section 2). "If one knew a person's age, etc." implies that the degree of psychological differentiation between individuals of the same age-cohort in traditional career theory has been a very coarse one, and has pertained more to an individual's "role" in an organization, as defined by current culture, than his or her "self." This clearly points to the sociological dependency of career theory on the surrounding culture (what Marx would have called "ideology of the bourgeois establishment"). As long as sociological constants of job tenure were in place, it was not required for career theory to go to a deeper level in the analysis of careers. It therefore amounts to an "ideological revolution" in career theory that in a 1997 publicatione, Kram et al. state (Hall, Kram, & Briscoe, 1997, p. 322) :

> We would argue that the central focus of careers as we move into the twenty-first century is increasingly the self. ... What this means is that whereas the old career contract was with the organization, the new contract is with the self.

Of course, this statement opens up a new pandora's box, that of "self," which seems to be the appropriate anchor for reading and evaluating the new career theory. The turning point marked by this new paradigm brings career theory into the purview of psychology in general, and constructivist theories of development in particular, --what Cytrynbaum hinted at as the "integration of career and adult development." As Kram concludes (Kram, 1996, p. 136):

> The new career context ... renders these (phasic) developmental models less effective in understanding, predicting, and responding to a particular individual's career concerns.

How, then, should career concerns be addressed through "relational activities"? From Kram's vantage point, "it is the more recent work on women's development the illumninates the necessary conditions for ... relationships to foster personal growth (rather than only career advancement)" (Kram, 1996, p. 140). For her, the most relevant capacities are: "self-reflection, empathy, and listening, as well as the willingness to be vulnerable" (Kram, 1996, p. 140). While Kram does not investigate what are the ontic-developmental preconditions for such capacities to arise and be maintained, she details some of the organizational conditions that might further growth
in relationships (Kram, 1996, p. 141):

- recognition and rewards for mentoring, coaching, teamwork
- education and training on relational skills
- structured opportunities for reflection and relational activity
- coaching, 360-degree feedback processes
- mentoring programs, mentoring circles, and dialogue groups.

Kram makes it clear that the notions of interdependence, mutuality, and reciprocity which undergird these conditions, are foreign to "traditional theories .. (of) growth" that conceptualize (Kram, 1996, p. 140):

> growth as a process of individuation and achievement in which individuals move from a stage of dependency to one of independence,

in contrast to a relational model where growth is seen (Kram, 1996, p. 140):

> as movement through increasingly complex states of interdependence. ... Thus development is viewed less as a process of differentiating oneself from others as it is understanding oneself as increasingly connected to others.

From this relational vantage point, Kram conceives of three forms of coaching that she likens to "therapeutic relationships" (1996, pp. 151-152):

- traditional career assistance
- coaching for skills needed to go about building new relationships
- coaching for giving feedback to clients "who may not have the relational skills ... to initiate ... dialogue with others."

Here the traditional distinction of coaching and mentoring has become largely insubstantial. Evidently,"growth-in-connection models" of development in the workplace are apt to to new models of coaching.

Enlightening in this regard is a chapter by Fletcher, entitled "A relational approach to the protean worker," where "protean" refers to Hall's conceptualization of careers under the new career contract (Hall et al., 1996). Fletcher's thinking is undergirded by a passion that at times reminds one of the young Marx writing in the 1840's. She is keenly aware of the ease with which relational competences and the individuals that have and nurture them tend to "disappear" in the organizational context, compared to task expertises and those who exercise them. This sensitivity to relational competences is of relevance to theories of coaching which, as shown below, mainly focus on the task expertises coaching provides, barely mentioning the developmental potential of the coaching process and alliance itself (see Appendix A4, section 3). What Fletcher says about present limits of career theory, and of executive development activities in organizations (such as coaching) straightforwardly applies to the theory and practice of coaching. In her view, relational competencies in general are "undertheorized and underexamined in the organizational literature" (Fletcher, 1996, p. 112).

Arguing on the basis of child development research, without referencing the adult-developmental dimension, Fletcher argues that "even early relational interactions between mother and child ... are more fully two-directional" than one-directional. Conceiving of later adult relationships in analogy with relationships in infancy, she suggests "that the process of adult growth might be more accurately described ... as process of movement through increasingly complex states of interdependence," where "each party is potentially teacher and learner" (Fletcher, 1996, p. 114). Importantly, in harmony with clinical-developmental assumptions, Fletcher argues (Fletcher, 1996, p. 116):

> that relational growth is not dependent on strong affection between parties. That is, relational interactions characterized by interdependence, mutuality, and reciprocity have some structural elements that can be engaged and can lead to growth for both parties regardless of their level of mutual intimacy or affection.

This leads her to believe (Fletcher, 1996, p. 117) "that relational interactions are ... sites of growth, development, and professional achievement for both parties" involved in the interaction.

In a recent study of engineers (Fletcher, 1994), Fletcher found four types of relational practice (Fletcher, 1996, p. 117):

- keeping projects related to people and resources they need to survive
- empowering or enabling others' achievement
- using relational skills to create conditions enabling
  one's own growth and professional accomplishment
  (e.g., being aware of the emotional context of situations)
- enhancing team spirit and a sense of collaboration in the work setting.

From the vantage point of studies like this one, Fletcher formulates a critique of what she sees as "the task-focused, hierarchical nature of current career and self-developmental activities in organizations (Fletcher, 1996, p. 119). Alerted to the developmental delay many organizations experience with regard to the relational viewpoint, Fletcher states (1996, pp. 119, 111):

> ... the findings from the study of design engineers indicate that people who engaged in relational practice were not simply unrewarded for the value their approach
>
> added to organizational goals. In fact, in many cases they were misunderstood and exploited or suffered negative career consequences for engaging in these activities. ... the relational practice of continuous teaching enjoys no ... organizational dividend.

She formulates five pragmatic strategies for reinforcing organization members' relational perspective on work (Fletcher, 1996, pp. 120-124): (1) redefine the role of "other" in your own development, (2) develop a

language of competence in describing relational practice, (3) clarify and communicate the value of relational skills, (4) recognize and reward the value that relational activity currently adds to organizational effectiveness, and 5) address the issue of work-life integration. One might say that the second strategy is an important function of the new career theory. In my view, Fletcher's second strategy is an important function of a new kind of coaching that management psychologists are called upon to undertake.

Fletcher introduces a relational model of growth-in-connection. In this context, she distinguishes three past models of career development formulated in the thirty-year span of 1957 to 1986 (Fletcher, 1996, p. 109):

- life-span models
- individual differences models
- models of cognitive complexity.

In her view, all of these models "tend to view development as a vertical, hierarchical process and the career as a linear, age-related progression that is assumed to occur within stable organizational or occupational settings." Despite differences among them, "they envision career as movement through set stages. This conception of career is linked in these models to a more explicit developmental prejudice, namely, that "growth is ... moving from a state of dependency and embeddedness with others to relative states of independence and psychological autonomy," where "the hallmark of growth in this process of individuation and integration is an increasingly differentiated sense of self" (Fletcher, 1996, p. 108). Detailing the sources of these models, she states (1996, p. 108):

> Whether the image is one of stages or seasons (Levinson et al., 1978; Erikson, 1963), of different levels of cognitive complexity (Kegan, 1982; Loevinger, 1976;
>
> Perry, 1970) or of stages of moral development (Kohlberg, 1976), the emphasis in most of these models is on the differentiating process itself and the goal of establishing a strong sense of self-identity.

Despite the existence of models of growth 'after formal operations' and 'beyond autonomy' (e.g., Souvaine, Lahey, and Kegan, 1990), in Fletcher's view "organizational models of career success continue to reflect more traditional notions of growth," thus extending the staying-power of traditional career theory. Traditional notions of development in the workplace tend "to foster competitive behavior and skills in self-promotion; ... they tend to "idealize individual heroics over collaboration, independent achievement over collective output, and winning short-term contests over contributing to the collective advancement of more long-range goals" (Fletcher, 1996, p. 111).

From the vantage point of Fletcher's growth-in-connection model, there is, in the traditional models of career development, "an overemphasis on independence, cognitive processes, and deductive, syllogistic reasoning (Fletcher, 1996, p. 108), associated with an "emphasis on the mastery dimensions of growth" that "largely ignore(s) the relational dimensions" of human development (Fletcher, 1996, p. 109). Citing Bandura's model of self-efficacy as a representative example of this ideology, Fletcher is equally critical of one of the foundational works of career theory, by Hall (1976), whose model of psychological success in her view (Fletcher, 1996, p. 110):

> stresses the ways in which the independent achievement of challenging tasks and goals can lead to a spiraling process of growth not only in task competence, but also in self-confidence and in a willingness to take on additional challenges.

Summarizing the history of career theory into the ninetees, Fletcher writes (1996, p. 110):

> These three concepts--age-related stages, linear career movement within a stable organization or occupation, and an emphasis on challenging tasks as the primary sites of learning--traditionally have defined the landscape of career development initiatives in organizations.

In taking note of the coaching literature (Appendix A4), the reader will be able to

appreciate the justness of Fletcher's observations on career development initiatives.

Delving into the sociological reasons for the--not yet vanished-- ideology of "vertical" career development, Fletcher surmises that what makes relational practice difficult to establish in today's organizations is the fact that present organizations tend to perpetuate deeply ingrained distinctions contemporary culture makes between the private and public domain, of love and work (Fletcher, 1996, p. 127). In young-Marx fashion, Fletcher conceives of a "new, blended protean worker of the future" who (Fletcher, 1996, p. 127):

> is a blend of public and private, work and family, rational and emotional, masculine and feminine [which] is quite a departure from organizational norms.

According to Fletcher (1996, p. 127):

> this means ... addressing some of the cultural determinants of work behavior and design that reinforce the image of an "ideal" worker as someone with no outside responsibilities and a firm boundary between work and personal life.

With regard to executive development activities, this entails (Fletcher, 1996, p. 127):

> that initiatives that encourage and support changing,

> evolving individuals, accompanied by environments that use these changes as catalysts for innovation, will free people to enthusiastically engage in the kind of relational self-growth activities organizations will ultimately find beneficial.

In this formulation, the transformation of the individual comes first, and is "accompanied by environments that use" these transformations "as catalysts for innovation." This is far cry from the complete trust some writers in executive development seem to have in executive development "systems," meant to bring about executives' personal transformation (see Appendix A2, section 2).

4. The New, Protean Career Contract

The ideological and methodological changes in recent career theory discussed so far have been powerfully focused and made precise in D.T. Hall's formulaic notion of

the new career contract, also referred to as a contract undergirding the protean career (Hall, 1976, 1986; Hall et al., 1996, 1997). Hall has also outlined many of the consequences for organizational design, development, and business strategy that follow from the new career contract (Hall & Moss, 1998; Hall, 1996; Seibert et al., 1995).

According to Hall, the career contract is a psychological one linking organization and organization members (Hall, 1976; Hall & Moss, 1998, p. 23):

> The idea of the psychological contract gained currency in the early 1960's when writers such as Chris Argyris, Harry Levinson, and Edgar Schein used the term to describe the employer-employee relationship. ... Later, Ian MacNeil discussed two forms of what he called the "social contract."

According to Hall, MacNeil distinguished two kinds of social contract (Hall & Moss, 1998, p. 24):

> The first, which he called relational, was based on assumptions of a long-term, mutually satisfying relationship. In contrast, the [second, or] transactional contract was based on a shorter term exchange of benefits and contributions. ... Although MacNeil's discussion focused on the role of an individual in a larger society, his concepts seem applicable to organizations as well.

Hall elaborates that the relational, "old" contract could be likened to that in effect in a family since it comprises "parental benefits" such as lifetime employment and generous pension plans. Another aspect of the relational contract was "identification with the organization, a sense of pride in being associated with the company" (Hall & Moss, 1998, p. 23). While it is Hall's statistics-based conclusion that this

contract was a "myth," since "fewer than 5 percent of Americans worked under any implicit agreement regarding long-term security" (Hall & Moss, 1998, p. 23), nevertheless the relational contract shaped career theory's ideas about the typical development of careers in organizations. Hall's assessment, based on empirical studies, is "that the contract has shifted from a relational to transactional relationship" (Hall et al., 1996, p. 17). From the point of view of the individual's career, what one is seeing, according to Hall, is "a shift from the organizational career to what can be called the 'protean' career. This concept focuses attention on an individual's psychological success as a

basis for his or her development in the workplace" (Hall & Moss, 1998, pp. 24-25):

> The protean career is a process which the person, not the organization, is managing. It consists of all the person's varied experiences in education, training, work in several organizations, changes in occupational field, etc. The protean person's own personal career choices and search for self-fulfilment are the unifying or integrative elements in his or her life. The criterion of success is internal (psychological success), not external.

In an even more constructivist formulation of the meaning of the new career contract and of the protean career associated with it, Hall formulates (Hall, Briscoe, & Kram, 1997, p. 321):

> In the past the focus was more on what has been called the external career, the series of positions or jobs that the person holds over the course of the career. Perhaps related to the fact that the external opportunity structure has become more constrained, the focus has shifted to the internal career, which describes the individual's perceptions and self-constructions of career phenomena (Hall, 1976; McAdams & Ochberg, 988) (my emphasis, O.L.).

Nowhere in my reading of career theory is the constructivist turning point of the discipline more evident than in the above quotation. As Hall elaborates further, the notion of protean career decouples "the concept of career from a connection to any one organization (or to an organization, period)" (Hall & Mirvis, 1996, p. 19). This notion "provides a different way of thinking about the relationship between the organization and the employee" (Hall & Mirvis, p. 21):

> Whereas most of our previous literature on the organizational career has had the organization as the figural element with the individual as background, in the protean career, the person is figure, and the organization is ground. Organizations provide a context, a medium in which individuals pursue their personal aspirations.

As a consequence of this shift to a contract previously only known in sports and the arts, the protean career contract is with the self, not the organization (Hall et al., 1998, p. 322):

> We would argue that the central focus of careers as we move into the twenty-first century is increasingly with the self. As the business environment has become more turbulent, complex, and demanding, with organizations taking less responsibility for employee career development, individuals have had to view the career as one of self-employment. This is what we have called the protean career. Key to the protean career is one's ability to reinvent onself and one's career, to change one's personal identity, and to learn continously throughout the career. What this means is that whereas the old career contract was with the organization, the new contract is with the self.

The conclusion that under the new career contract everybody is self-employed has been drawn independently in developmental psychology by R. Kegan, as is documented by the title of chapter 5 of "In over our heads" (1994, p. 137), "Working: On seeking to hire the self-employed." Hall asks, as does Kegan, but in a way more geared to the question of what, after the demise of the old relational career contract, can undergird employees' development in the workplace (Hall & Moss, 1998, p. 322):

> ... what facilitates the development of the protean career? Why are so many individuals unable to enter the "new economy", being relegated to a bleak life of constant job-hunting or minimum-wage jobs and insecure life-styles, with little in the way of satisfaction, meaning, and future?

Thus stressing the "dark side" of the new career contract (Hall et al., 1996, p. 6), the fact that for many workers it is "over their head," Hall proposes that to find answers to the above questions requires (Hall et al., 1996, p. 7):

> a more holistic view of the individual, one that encompasses all spheres of activity and all corresponding facets of personal identity. ... We need to look at the individual's overall quest for meaning and purpose, ... and probe the individual's sense of direction in the search for work that has personal meaning. Viewing the career as a personal quest also implies finding influences on development that are uniquely equipped to promote personal development.

Simultaneously with conceptualizing "new developmental demands on the employee" (Hall & Mirvis, 1996, p. 23), Hall also explores how organizations can best adapt to the new career contract, especially via the domain of executive development. He thus renews the double focus that Dalton ascribed to career theory, who saw the theory's uniqueness in the fact that it focuses on "this very interplay between the individual

and the organization" (Dalton, 1989, p. 90).It is this interplay that is equally crucial for executive development activities such as coaching.

In the remainder of this chapter, I first address some of Hall's conceptualizations regarding individuals' development in the workplace. At the beginning of the Appendix A2, I render some of his views of what can be done to "strengthen the weak link in strategic executive development," and to integrate individual development and global business strategy (Seibert, Hall, & Kram, 1995).

According to Hall, Briscoe, and Kram (1997, p. 322), there are four factors that facilitate development in the workplace in the protean sense of the term:

- (personal) identity
- (identity) learning
- values
- relationships.

Identity is seen as made up of a number of sub-identities "each of which is the person's view of the part of the self which is engaged in the enactment of a particular role," and whose "growth is promoted by psychological success" (Hall, Briscoe, and Kram, 1997, p. 323). The authors note that in the domain of identity, empirical sources point to the fact "that the current occupational and social environment demands an identity capacity (stage 4; Kegan, 1994) that is greater than most people now possess (stage 3). As a consequence, "questions about identity and competence are likely to resurface more often than traditional models would predict" (Hall, Briscoe, and Kram, 1997, p. 323). Regarding learning as a catalyst for development in the workplace, the authors distinguish between "learning from self," which relates to values and enduring beliefs, on one hand, and "learning from others," which regards relational competences such as mutuality, interdependence, and co-learning, on the other (Kram & Hall, 1996). In an attempt at prognosis, they foresee a possible divergence of high- and low-involvement career paths (Hall, Briscoe, and Kram (1997, p. 327; see also Hall, 1993):

> We would speculate that among protean careerists a psychological shift will take place away from the
>
> organization's values and more toward one's own. ... Certainly one possible response could be the diminishment of the work sub-identity as a prime source of value expression which is the key to motivation within the work role.

In contrast to value-learning that strengthens personal identity, learning from others has to do with establishing alliances at work (Hall, Briscoe, and Kram, 1997, p. 328):

> In the absence of organizational career paths and and corporate career development programs, the developmental tasks of early and middle adulthood are dramatically different from what they were when

> prevailing adult development theories of Levinson et al. (1978) and others were developed. ... In order for individuals to benefit from connections with others at work, they will need capacities for self-reflection, empathy, and active listening, as well as the willingness to be vulnerable and self-disclosing (Kram, 1996).

This state of affairs leads to what Hall et al. formulate as four paradoxes of identity (Hall, Briscoe, and Kram, 1997, pp. 330-332):

> Paradox #1: The career is being driven increasingly by identity and values at a time when opportunities to express identity and values through work are diminishing (the search for fulfilment being "no longer contained primarily within the boundaries of the organization," O.L.)
>
> Paradox #2: Relational opportunities of identity development are more needed than ever, just as they are becoming less accessible (in organizations, O.L.).
>
> Paradox #3: Learning from experience is becoming more critical but, with a more turbulent environment, past experience has less relevance to current experience (due to rapid change, O.L.)
>
> Paradox #4: The career is dead. Long live the career. (I.e., as "as one's career work is becoming an arena for expressing one's identity and values, ... one's membership in a particular orientation is becoming less central to one's overall identity").

The change in the career contract has the further consequence that "personal mastery cycles" are shortened as much as the life cycle of the new technologies (Hall & Mirvis, 1996, p. 33):

> As a result, people's careers increasingly will become a succession of "ministages" (or short-cycle learning stages) of exploration-trial-mastery-exit, as they move in and out of various product areas, technologies, functions, organizations, and other work environments. The key issue determining a learning stage will not be chronological age ... but "career age."

In addition, in the protean career (Hall & Mirvis, 1996, p. 35):

> ... the more we come to view constant learning as part of the new career contract and not just as a particular career pattern for a certain type of person, ... the more we move toward valuing a form of development that includes both female and male patterns.

In my view, the "paradoxes" mentioned above, as well as the shortening of the cycles of professional learning, and the need to acquire both task knowledge and personal knowledge (Hall, 1986, pp. 235-265), necessitate entirely new forms of coaching and mentoring in organizations.

Before proceeding to the issue of "strategic executive development" under the new career contract, a methodological remark is in order here. Noteworthy in the above statements about "early and middle adulthood" (Hall & Mirvis, 1996, p. 29) is the entwinement of phasic and structural notions of adult development. While, on one hand, the authors embrace the notion that the protean career is, in terms of personal identity capacity, "over most people's head," their formulation retains the concept that this is particularly the case for "early and middle," rather than for all of adulthood, presumably because they do not think of late adulthood as relating to an active worklife.

In terms of epistemological analysis, while the authors welcome ontic-developmental insight, they do not actually apply it to notions they are using, such as "identity," "learning" (vs. development), "relational resources," and others. If they did, they would have to ask themselves "what is the (protean) person having to manage psychologically?" (Kegan, 1994, p. 167).

It is in part the "double perspective" of career theory--its mission to pay attention to the individual and the organization at the same time,-- that, in my view,

makes the absorption of cognitive-developmental analysis into career theory difficult. There is, however, one viewpoint that could facilitate the "integration" of theories of career and (structural) adult development theory. Such an integration would be of great value for future theories of executive development, including coaching and mentoring. I am referring to cognitive-science notions first introduced into organizational theory by cognitive sociologists such as H.P. Sims and D.A. Gioia (1986). These authors study "social cognition in organizations," or "organizational cognition." In close proximity to Schein's "cultural analysis" approach (Schein, 1992), these authors conceive of organizations as cognitive constructs existing in the minds of organization members, as indicated by the following quote (Sims & Gioia, 1986, p. 348):

> ... organizational reality is a socially constructed one, forged out of a consensus of vision and action that exists largely or completely in the minds of the organization's members.

This notion entails that what career theory calls "the organization" is actually not something "out there," like a container with people flowing through it, but is actually "right in here," namely, in the minds of the organization's members that are part of a particular culture. Given that each of these individuals has an ontic-developmental history, notions that such individuals have of organizations, including of their career in organizations, is subject to the development of the structural "logics"--in contrast to "styles"-- that Hodgett's study spelled out in empirical detail. In other words, the bridge between career theory and structural adult-development theory could be cognitive science, more specifically a cognitive sociology or epistemology of organizations, as proposed by Sims and Gioia. In such a theory, the notion of professional agenda (set of assumptions made with regard to work), introduced in this study, could become a major concept.

Thinking back to the results of Hodgetts' research and our interpretation of them, it seems evident that the new career theory has fully embraced "relational theory" (Gilligan, 1982; Miller, 1991; Jordan et al. 1991), and thus has switched to a different style of conceptualization. What is now in focus in career theory is what Hodgett's called "relational attitudes and styles," in contrast to (ontic-) developmental "logics" (Hodgetts, 1994, p. v). While this is a dramatic step, it entails the risk that matters of "style" and of "logics" (ontic-developmental position) will continue to be

treated as synonymous, with a resulting increase in what Basseches calls "inadequate operationalization of concepts" (Basseches, 1984, p. 313). To judge from the quotations of writings by Hall and his associates, above, these authors have begun to integrate ontic-developmental insights into to their findings, but are still standing "midway" between the phasic and the structural theories. While this might well change in the future, one might also have to take into account for career theory at large that, just as there are developmental constraints on the self-conception of those who have careers, there also exist developmental constraints on the theorizing about the self-conception of those who have careers, i.e., of career theory itself. As I pointed out in a recent publication on the future of cognitive science, theories are not immune to developmental constraints on uses of self (Laske, 1997, p. 23):

> There are life-span developmental (and probably biographical) constraints on what uses of self a cognitive scientist may adopt. This amounts to saying that the cognitive science community is collectively subject to life-span developmental constraints no wishful thinking and no methodological critique can remove. What is needed, rather, is to develop supports within the cognitive science community itself, for transcending lower-order uses of self.

Another aspect of the new career theory, as noted above, is its concern for what are the "strategic" moves organizations can or ought to make to adapt to the new career contract, and thereby adapt to their environment. The current catchword for this double adaptation of organizations is "executive development." Since what organizations are thought to do is "strategizing," the term, more precisely, is "strategic executive development." But who in these organizations is doing the strategizing? Who's task is it to make strategic moves if not executives? Thus the notion of executive development has an interesting dialectics, since an implicit question it poses is: who is "developing" the executives who can make "executive development" become a strategy that helps organizations survive and strive in turbulent environments? This is the question to whose many facets I turn in Appendix A2.

Appendix A2

Strategic executive development

> Many organizations invest a great deal in something they call development while having only a vague idea of what it is and what it is for. Since training is easier to understand than development, it gets the lion's share of the finanmcial and emotional commitment, even though, I believe, developmental dollars are generally more cost-effective. It is a matter of searching where the light is brightest rather than where the treasure is going to lie.
>
> Lester L. Tobias (1995, pp. 56-63).

My readers and I have now surveyed the sociological landscape in which both executive development and coaching/mentoring take place at the end of the 20th century. Depending on whether we are cognitive or behavioral sociologists, we will view the landscape as something of our construction, in here, or as something that has its reality in what we perceive as turbulence out there. As is apparent from my previous formulations, as a management psychologist, I view organizations as something "inside of us," embodied in mental constructs individuals "act out" in the so-called real world. For this reason, the opening-up of career theory to issues of self is viewed by me primarily as a cognitive-developmental maturation of the theory, with exciting consequences for its "structural," in contrast to "phasic," future.

It speaks for the dialectic of social situations that career theory has opened itself up to issues of human self at the same time that organizations have come to dominate our lives (Mintzberg, 1989). By so doing and implicitly acknowledging the vanishing of socially sanctioned, fixed developmental sequences ("phases") in organizational careers, career theory has drawn a tension-laden triangle between (1) the self and (2) the role of executives, on one hand, and (3) organizational strategy, on the other. This triangle is the most salient focus of current writing in executive development as a strategy for organizational survival and success.

A general summary statement one could make about executive development is that it is a "public relations notion" (Basseches, 1984) covering relationships of executive self and role, on the one hand, and of executive and organization, on the other. Sciences being children of their time, underneath this public relations notion emerges a new question, that of how executive self and role can be brought into balance, or

integrated with organizational imperatives. While, according to Hall et al. (1996), the executive's self is the actual contract partner in the new career contract, the executive's role is the "career anchor" that, for a limited time, binds him or her to an organization, and this role is the center of debate in strategical deliberations. However, the issue of how executive "integrate" self and role--if that is a term that makes

any sense--has only begun to be recognized as crucial in the literature. In a panoply of approaches, issues of self/role integration have been viewed as pertaining to "character" (Kaplan, 1991), "experience" (McCall, 1998) "protean" flexibility (Hall et al. 1996), and "leadership style" (Drath, 1990). Due to a pervasive cognitive-behavioral bias, issues of coaching and mentoring have been trivialized by concentrating attention on "traits," "skills," or "performance," without acknowledging the psychological demands of self-management undergirding these aspects of executive functioning, and the ontic-developmental limits of executive development activities, including relational practice. For this reason, I have introduced the notion of professional agenda, to create a cognitive-science construct upon which empirical and theoretical attention can be focused in such a way that the self-role dialectic as a developmental issue can be focused on and assessed with ontic-developmental realism.

The term "executive development" is a hornet nest of ambiguities. It encompasses requisite organizational procedures and mechanisms for guaranteeing executive leadership, on one hand, and the ontic development of individual executives selected as leadership resources, on the other. In addition, the term implicitly deals with two kinds of executives: those who design and implement executive development strategies, and who therefore ideally already need to be "developed" themselves for this task; and those executives meant to become the resources upon which executive development procedures are to be brought to bear--which raises the Platonic question of "who develops the developers?"

While it seems true that up until recently, the executive development literature was strictly about individuals' role as executives, in contrast to their self, and thus more sociologically more than psychologically oriented, at the end of the century, writings on executive development have begun, often with futuristic appeal, to address the relationship between executives' organizational role and their private and ontic-developmental self (Drath, 1990; Martin, 1996). This highly welcome encroachment of the executive development literature on the dialectic domain of self has made it necessary to pay closer attention to ontic-developmental implications of

executive development activities. This is especially the case since coaching, and its target, the executive's professional agenda, lives in the force field between individual and organizational imperatives, as well as between executive role and executive self (Martin, 1996).

Below, I will review literature on executive development that, in my view, has important implications for coaching. The review will be structured as follows:

1. Organizational Policies for Integrating Executive Development and Business Strategy
2. A Model of Executive Development in Organizations
3. Executive Role and Executive Self
4. The Dialectics of Managerial Strengths and Weaknesses.

1.Organizational Policies for Integrating Executive Development and Business Strategy

One illuminating way of looking at the executive development imperative in turbulence-prone organizations is to adopt the perspective of Bolman & Deal (1991) who distinguish between four conceptual "frames" in which to view organizations. According to these authors, organizational matters are too complex to conceive of them in a single frame or perspective. Especially in turbulent environments, multiframe thinking is a must. In cognitive-science fashion Bolman and Deal distinguish four related, but different frames for viewing organizational matters. These frames are based "on four major schools of organizational theory and research" (Bolman & Deal, 1991, p. 14):

- the structural frame
- the human resource frame
- the political frame
- the symbolic frame.

The frames are not simply "concepts," however. As conceptual maps, they determine what managers "see." Consequently, they also give rise to "scenarios" and are "tools for action" (Bolman & Deal, 1991, p. 11). Rather than defining these frame abstractly, I will recast one of the questions posed by executive development according to the four frames. For the sake of gedankenexperiment, I will take the question to be Seibert et al.'s (1995), of how to integrate individual development and global business strategy.

Managers adopting a structural perspective might, first of all, not be aware of the new career contract. Since in their view "organizations work most effectively when environmental turbulence and personal preferences are constrained by norms of rationality" (Bolman & Deal, 1991, p. 48), they might be missing the salient changes that have occurred in the mutual expectations between employer and employee during the last two decades. Alternatively, since structural-frame thinking emphasizes the organizations vertical and horizontal command structure, managers adopting a structural frame might find coordination and control best safeguarded by adopting some kind of "re-engineering" policy. For them, "organizational problems typically originate from inappropriate structures or inadequate systems and can be resolved through restructuring or developing new systems" (Bolman & Deal, p. 48). While this solution might put "global business strategy" on firmer ground, it would leave individual development and its integration with strategy hanging in the storms of turbulence. In short, a structural perspective alone is ineffective in this context, since such a frame is most salient when there is low conflict and ambiguity, which in turbulence is not the case (Bolman & Deal, pp. 343 f.). However, this does not mean that a structural frame is anachronistic under the new career contract. It only means that such a frame alone does not create scenarios of sufficient saliency, and is not associated with sufficient tools to

deal with the situation, although it can be helpful in establishing clarity in organizational roles and relationships.

Managers adopting a human resource frame would see the lead question as a derivative of the conflict between individual and organizational need and development they have perceived all along. They would find this viewpoint (frame) especially salient when turbulence leads to a situation in which employee leverage is high or increasing, and morale, perhaps due to downsizing, is low. Their conviction is that "when the fit between individual and organization is poor, one or both will suffer: individuals will be exploited, or will seek to exploit the organization, or both" (Bolman & Deal, 1991, p. 121). Consequenly, "a good fit between individual and organization benefits both: human beings find meaning and satisfying work, and organizations get the human talent and energy that they need" (Bolman & Deal, 1991, p. 121). Thus, managers adopting this frame of thinking about the lead question will feel they are right on target, and will work toward an "executive development system" (McCall, 1998) that is efficient in resolving the conflict between individual and organizational needs. The difficulty for them will lie in finding the structural and

political tools to do what they think is right. They will feel that the human-resource perspective is now an organizational imperative to create "competitive advantage." In this thought, they will be cheered by the new protean career theory which has "relational practice" written all over its banners.

Managers who adopt a political frame will also focus on the mismatch between organizational and individual needs, but from a different perspective. They will think in terms of scarce organizational resources for employee development, especially when diversity is high or increasing and power in the organization is diffuse and unstable (Bolman & Deal, 1991, pp. 225 f.). In these managers' view, "there are enduring differences among individuals and groups in their values, preferences, beliefs, information, and perceptions of reality" (Bolman & Deal, 1991, p. 186). Therefore, depending on the company division the managers in question reside in, they will either feel that they are in the wrong or right coalition (interest group) that makes them either powerless or powerful. As human resource managers they will aspire to greater influence over the organization, in order to press their agenda of "integrating individual development and global business strategy." As managers in other divisions of the company they will feel that their power is eroding, since the human resource perspective seems to have taken over company thinking, squandering the scarce resource that turbulence requires to be used with the utmost care. Being "normatively cynical and pessimistic" (Bolman & Deal, 1991, p. 238), at their very best, these managers will want to create arenas where issues can be negotiated, and divisive issues can be unearthed and made fully conscious.

Managers who adopt the symbolic frame are focusing on the organization's culture, i.e., its basic assumptions. That is, they focus on the value systems and symbolic artifacts deriving from such assumptions (Bolman & Deal, 1991, pp. 243 f.;
Schein, 1992), that are relevant in a particular organization. With Schein, their conviction will be that "the most intriguing leadership role in culture management is one in which the leader attempts to develop a learning organization that will be able to make its own perpetual diagnosis and self-manage whatever transformations are needed as the environment changes" (Schein, 1992, p. 363). Especially in times of high employee diversity, ambiguous information and goals, and poorly understood cause-effect links, these managers will view the integration of individual development and global business strategy as an important conduit to strengthen the organization's culture. Focused on the meaning of events, rather than the events themselves, and

aware that "many of the most significant events and processes in organizations are ambiguous or uncertain" (Bolman & Deal, 1991, p. 244), these managers will want to create new symbols of organizational unity, and therefore will be likely to embrace the agenda of the human-resource managers as their own. In fact, they will be "holier than the pope" in elevating the agenda of human-resource managers to a "global," i.e. cultural, agenda in the name of the organization as a "learning organization" (Senge, 1990). They will want to make "strategic executive development" a "core shared assumption" in their organization (Schein, 1992, p. 364). In this purusit they will have to confront the sobering dialectical question raised regarding stability through change by the founder of cultural analysis (Schein, 1992, p. 363):

> But can one imagine and attempt to develop a set of assumptions that can became stable and thus function as a culture and yet encourage and allow for perpetual learning and change?

All of the four voices outlined above can be found in the executive development literature I selectively discuss below. The reader will by now have concluded for himself or herself, that the new career theory is an enticing mix of human-resource and symbolic thinking. In the current moment, this mix seems to push the structural ("re-engineering") and political perspectives to the sidelines of organizational action, but for how long? We will also have to honor the insight of Bolman and Deal (1991, p. 322):

> ... all organizations contain multiple realities, and every event can be interpreted in a number of ways. ... The simultaneous existence of multiple realities often leads to misunderstanding and conflict when different individuals use different perspectives to frame the same event.

In many ways, the central sociological "event" in contemporary organizations is the new career contract in its many facets. While this contract organizationally demands the integration of individual development and global business strategy, from the perspective of protean individuals it is also antithetical to it. Below, I go into some detail about where theories of executive development struggling with this antinomy are heading.

***

When, in light of the new career contract, individual development and global business strategy are perceived as being out of sync, where is the culprit? Adopting a human-resource perspective, Seibert, Hall, and Kram (1995) see the culprit in the "weak link" between business strategy and executive development strategy. They declare (Seibert et al., p. 550):

> Executive development activities detached from business strategy, no matter how elegant they may be, are clearly failures from a strategic perspective.

To make such activities more effective company-wide, the authors issue the following prescription (Seibert, Hall, and Kram, 1995, pp. 549-550):

> The starting point in linking executive development to business strategy is the future direction of the business; this is determined by the business environment (e.g., customers, technology, global competitors). Based upon the business environment a business strategy must be developed, then a strategy for executive development must be derived logically [my emphasis, O.L.] from the strategic direction of the firm. Finally, specific executive development activities should proceed from a coherent executive development strategy.

In light of the logic adopted by the authors, they find three main deficiencies in current executive development practice (Seibert, Hall, and Kram, 1995, pp. 550-551):

1. the human resource development function (HRD) has not kept close to senior line management, mainly because "HRD has been more inwardly focused than outwardly focused, ... more concerned with its own products than with its customers' needs;"
2. the inability of HRD to respond quickly enough to its customers' (i.e., line management's) needs;
3. the tendency of HRD (usually with the support of line

> management) "to build a false dichotomy between developing individuals and conducting business."

As is predictable from a human-resource perspective, this dichotomy is the real culprit: developing talent and doing business are presently two distinct activities. Given that "recognition of the significance of this link is not increasing, ... the issue is now how to successfully make the link (Seibert, Hall, and Kram, 1995, p. 551). The authors point out that "leading companies (e.g., 3M, Motorola, O.L.) seem to recognize that development is a natural part of doing business" (Seibert, Hall, and Kram, 1995, p. 558). Adopting, in addition, a symbolic (cultural) perspective, they endorse "the need for companies to become learning organizations" (Seibert, Hall, and Kram, 1995, p. 558). This cultural imperative brings up the issue of how "meaningful learning is to occur on the job" (Seibert, Hall, and Kram, 1995, p. 558). Clarifying what is meant by learning, they propose that development, seen as a natural part of doing business, is best viewed "as happening spontaneously" (Seibert, Hall, and Kram, 1995, p. 558). By this phrase, they refer to Fletcher's notion that "informal transfer of knowledge could be seen as the essence of organizational learning" (Fletcher, 1996, p. 106).

In other words, organizational learning is, to use a neuropsychological term, "incidental," in that it is "action learning" based on the everyday experience of being exposed to challenging issues (rather than formal class-room learning on which executive education has been based in the past). By adopting the notion of incidental
learning, the authors introduce a major theme in current executive development theory. They also give a formulaic definition of what is strategic executive development, as follows (Seibert, Hall, & Kram, 1995, p. 559):

> Strategic executive development is the (1) implementation of explicit corporate and business strategies through the (2) identification and (3) growth of (4) wanted executive skills, experiences, and motivations for the (5) intermediate and long-range future.

In short, the goal is to conceive of business strategy in terms of the human-resource needs they imply. In this formulation, the idea is to "START with the business strategy and pressing business needs growing out of that strategy and then work to INTEGRATE development opportunities into the implementation of that strategy" (Seibert, Hall, & Kram, 1995, p. 559). In my view, this deceptively simple definition entails the following complex issues:

1. how to <u>define</u> business strategy in such a way that

one can logically [?, O.L.] derive the executive skills, experiences, and motivations that are "wanted," --or else how to "translate" business strategy into well-defined human resource "wants"

2. how to find or develop those executives who can actually define business strategy in such a way as to "derive" from strategy the required human-resource wants
3. how to identify wanted executive skills, experiences, and motivations among the members of the organizational apex of the company
4. how to grow the "skills, experiences, and motivations" through incidental or "action learning"
5. how to identify what are organizational "development opportunities"
6. how, to integrate [found] development opportunities into the implementation of the business strategy
7. how to link found developmental opportunities to executive development activities such as coaching and mentoring
8. how to implement business strategy so as to make the best possible use, for both individual and organization, of the existing development opportunities.

Given the multiple realities organizations present, each of these eight how-to questions could potentially invite 8x4=32 different scenarios for answering them. Even if one should want to group the human-resource and symbolic perspectives together, on one hand, and structural-political perspectives together, on the other, there would still be at least 8x2=16 different ways to approach an answer to the stated questions.

One of the most salient of these questions, from an ontic-developmental point of view, is the second one. The definition of strategic executive development given by Seibert et al. seems to presuppose that there are "ready-made" executives who have enough of a cognitive grasp of human development along with other organizational issues that they can define business strategy so that it can be translated, in terms of whatever "logic," into required skills, experiences, and motivations;" or, alternatively, that one can at least "develop" such individuals. The latter leads to an infinite regress of having to develop the developers and trendsetters, since the development strategy for the latter purpose already has to be in place in order to begin to create an executive development strategy. Aside from that, what are the structural and political implications of developing such executives, and should that succeed, of

implementing the developmental strategy as part of the business strategy? As is apparent, a pure human-resource perspective on strategic executive development, as suggested by Seibert et al. (1995), even if extrapolated to the cultural level, of

learning organizations, will not suffice. Or if that extrapolation should occur and succeed, as might be the case in a "learning organization," structural and political consequences will ensue that will demand utmost executive acumen to be dealt with successfully.

Beyond its critical purpose, the above gedankenexperiment has the purpose of alerting the reader to the many unsolved issues posed by "strategic executive development," including the question where in this scheme of things executive coaching would fit in, and where it would achieve its greatest benefit. Should psychologist-coaches, as human-resource experts, be instrumental in defining the business strategy in terms of organizationally wanted "skills, experiences, and motivations?" Should coaches become the long-term trainers of executives who are instrumental in defining such a "translatable" business strategy, thus helping to bridge political, structural, and human-resource/symbolic concerns in the organization? Should psychologist-coaches be those who find and define the "developmental opportunities" that exist or can be created in organizations? How should psychologist-coaches adapt their strategy to the goal of either defining and implementing appropriate business strategy, or to "developing" those executives whose "skills, experiences, and motivations" are in demand? How do skills relate to experiences, and how do motivations relate to the acquisition of skills, on one hand, and to experiences, on the other? Can an individual be motivated to have certain developmental experiences and, by incidental learning in the context of developmental opportunities, acquire the requisite skills? What are "developmental job experiences? Does developmental psychology, and psychology at large, know enough to answer these questions about skills, experiences, and motivations?

Seibert et al.'s (1995) recommendations regarding career development practices under the new psychological contract are the following (Seibert et al., 1995, pp. 560-562):

- move beyond HRD and up to the current strategic objectives of the organization
- make "experience-based learning" (i.e., incidental learning) the centerpiece of executive development activities
- do not oversystematize; instead, plan to be responsive to "continually emerging developmental opportunities"
- provide support for experience-based learning.

From the point of view of a coaching mandate, I consider the last-mentioned recommendation as the most salient. This suggestion seems to speak against an "executive development system." The suggestion seems to avoid the cultural dialectic of stability and change that Schein is referring to when he questions the possibility of "stabilizing," thus institutionalizing, "perpetual learning and change" (Schein, 1992, p. 361):

> When we pose the issue of perpetual learning in the context of cultural analysis, we confront a paradox. Culture is a stabilizer, a conservative force, a way of making things predictable. Does this mean, then, that culture itself is increasingly dysfunctional, or is it possible to imagine a culture that by its very nature is learning oriented, adaptive, and innovative?

Schein's critical symbolic perspective on the "learning organization," circumscribes, in my view, the essential conundrum of current executive development philosophies. I would also introduce a cognitive-science perspective. Such a perspective would pinpoint the simplification terrible that occurs when intangibles such as experience are marketed as "developmental" or "powerful;" and if opportunities for them to occur are thought to straightforwardly "derive" from formulations of business strategy or organizational reality, --as if one could stipulate what such experiences are for all individuals involved, under what conditions they occur, and could provide a finite list of them. Such a view not only discounts the multiple realities that organizations are (Bolman & Deal, 1991); it also runs counter to all psychological and developmental knowledge regarding experiences and the meaning they have for human beings. For it is, according to the insight of constructive-developmental psychology, not the experiences themselves that matter, but the meaning individuals make of them in accordance with their ontic-developmental capacity at whereever along their life's

trajectory they may be (Kegan, 1982; Carlsen, 1988, pp. 185 f.). As Seibert et al. (1995, pp. 561-562) rightfully stress:

> Finally, emphasizing the use of job experiences as the primary source of learning does not imply that learning occurs automatically through experience. Learning cannot be left to chance. Managers need to be encouraged to frame their daily experiences as learning opportunities, and to be supported in their efforts to extract learning from experience (my emphasis, O.L.)

Here, if anywhere in organizational meaning-making, seems to me to be the niche that psychologist-coaches can carve out for themselves, namely, to support managers in their efforts to "extract" learning from experience. To give such support is still a far cry from answering the question of whether learning ever translates into (ontic) development, and if so, under what organizational and psychological conditions it does so. This sequence from experience to learning to (ontic) development, and the possibility of instituting that sequence agentically, through human effort, is the psychological axis around which all current executive-development philosophies turn. There is presently no psychological theory that would support the claim that:

experience=>learning=>(ontic) development,

although there are beginnings of such a theory in Basseches' work (1984) whose focus is on the development of dialectical thinking in the workplace as an aspect of ontic development (see Appendix A3, section 2).

While developmental psychologists think they know THAT ontic development occurs, exactly HOW it occurs remains a mystery. To know the HOW of development would entail knowing everything from the brain chemistry of memory and the neurology of learning to the neuropsychological and epistemological substrates of transitions between stages of ontic development, both with regard to the agent of development (such as a coach) and the recipient of support for development (such as an executive). As the example of schools for children and colleges for adults show, one can try to institute learning that leads to development, but the limits of such agentic efforts are very apparent (Gardner, 1991, 1997; Basseches, 1984).

Hall has suggested that it is futile to attempt listing specific developmental

experiences a worker or executive can, or ought to, develop. Instead, he suggests that what needs to be developed are meta-competencies comprising both task knowledge and personal (relational) knowledge. For him, such metacompetencies essentially amount to "learning how to learn" (Hall & Moss, 1998, pp. 31-32):

> To realize the potential of the new career, the individual must develop new competencies related to the management of self and career. ... In particular, the person must learn how to develop self-knowledge (identity awareness) and adaptability. We call these "meta-competencies," since they are the skills required for learning how to learn....

Making the link to Argyris' theories, Hall et al. continue (Hall et al., p. 32):

> Adaptability alone might produce what Chris Argyris calls "Model 1" reactive change, while adaptability plus self-knowledge promotes "Model 2" generative change.

Of course, it might take clinical-developmental expertise to tell the difference between reactive and generative change occurring in a person. Also, what might be only adaptive at one ontic-developmental level, might be considered generative at another.

Nevertheless, Hall's distinction is a crucial one. It is also made by M. Basseches (1984) when discussing what is a "philosophically justifiable conception of development" in contrast to a "public

relations use of the term 'development'" (Basseches, 1984, pp. 313, 322). As Basseches sees it, the difference between the two lies in the fact that generative change (Basseches, 1984, p. 324):

> enables one to make sense of change in oneself in a way which affirms the past and recognizes the dialectical or developmental continuity underlying the structural discontinuity between one's past and present selves. The latter alternative also will allow one to greet future crises with more equanimity ...
> If one's sense of who one is transcends who one is at any period of time, then even though the content of what one believes and how one lives may be shaken up as a result of a crisis, the sense of oneself and life as a process need not be.

Basseches calls Hall's "adaptability plus self-knowledge" dialectical thinking, and

concludes (Basseches, 1994, p. 324):

> This ability to recognize continuity in process, even in radical change, is the greater level of equilibrium provided by dialectical thinking.

The question remains, however, of how such a developmental equilibrium can be instilled, or brought about, if at all, by agentic procedures of executive development, strategic or not. This question might be answerable, if we knew what for an individual is STRATEGIC in his or her current life, but this knowledge, too, is knowledge that needs sustained psychological support in order to emerge.

2. A Model of Executive Development in Organizations

Empirical research on the adult development of executives has a short history. The first to study how executives are actually spending their time and function in concrete task performances, in stark contrast to the mythologies surrounding them, was H. Mintzberg, who took a decidedly cognitive-behavioral view of executives' work process. (Mintzberg, 1989, 1973). The first developmental psychologist to find the workplace worthy of empirical study was M. Basseches (1984), who attempted an epistemological analysis of employee's thinking patterns. Since Basseches' primary competence at that time was in development in the educational domain, he attempted to extrapolate from sociological studies by Kohn (1980) regarding the influence of the cognitive complexity of jobs on adult self-concept, seen in light of his own theory of dialectical thinking as an aspect of adult development. Both Mintzberg (1979) and Basseches (1984) focus primarily on the thinking that executives do, rather than their experience in the broader biographical or clinical sense.

One reason why executive development theories have found it hard to get empirically grounded, or at least to specify precisely what they are about, is that it is not evident even today what the major

foundational concepts of such theories should be. Should the research focus on behavior, life course, personality, ideology, reflection, and implicit theories of executives, or should it rather be focused on character, personality, talent, leadership capabilities, and professional derailment? A balanced profile of the executive as a cognitive-emotional human being has not emerged, neither in contemporary culture nor, therefore, in scientific research.In addition, an individualistic culture like the current U.S. culture, which tends to mythologize executives as heros, contributes to the difficulty of doing research on their functioning

that is relatively free of ethnocentrism. Last but not least, the ambiguity of the term "executive development" does not contribute to formulating clear research goals. Is the topic of empirical research:

- the "executive" team of an organization
- the individual who fulfils "executive" functions or plays
  an "executive" role
- the cognitive-emotional capacities of the executive's self
- the relationship of the executive individual to the organization
- or all of the above?

Of what is the individual the "executive" force:

- an organization's culture
- an organization's structure
* an organization's strategy and goals
- his own self-management
- or all of the above?

In methodological terms, is the investigation one of:

- the epistemological (theory-in-use or basic-assumption)
  level of development
- the clinical/biographical "personality" or "character" level
- the behavioral, "action" or "experience" and "learning" level
- the "espoused level" of verbal utterances?
- or all of the above?

Questions abound.

Recently, a notion that has taken hold of executive development theorists is "action learning" or "learning from experience," in contrast to formal class-room learning (e.g., McCall et al., 1988). This notion focuses on the contingencies of learning, i.e., the organizational, thus sociological conditions under which learning and experience can be said to occur and relate with each other (wherein "experience" is a

much fuzzier term than even "learning.") The focus on learning from experience has opened up new questions as to what is the source of adult learning, especially in the workplace, and how it may relate to experience, on one hand, and ontic development, on the other. Alas, before the notion of "learning from experience" could be researched in depth (e.g., Feldman, 1986), the term, taken in its behavioral sense, has become a

buzzword without much scientific grounding in the psychological or sociological literature. What is more, the relationship of learning to development continues to be controversial (e.g., Perkins et al. (1993). As I substantiate in Appendix A3, research on ontic development in the workplace has only begun.

The most comprehensive and sophisticated model of an "executive development system" formulated so far is that of McCall (1998). In preparation for penning this model, public-relationally announced as that of "high flyers," the author delved into "the lessons of experience" of executives (McCall et al., 1988) and the pathology of professional derailment understood as residing in the psychosocial relationship of executives to their organization. The model is based on "biographical action research," a methodology close to clinical analysis as defined in the Orientation to this study. McCall's model is based on the philosophical belief that there are powerful experiences that lead to learning and bring about development of some kind. The model addresses head-on crucial philosophical questions regarding the relationship of learning to development, as outlined at the outset of this Appendix.

What is particularly noticeable in the formulation of McCall's model, from the point of view of this study, is the (at least implicit) emphasis with which it endorses the need for coaching and mentoring of executives. McCall also takes on the psychologically trivial but pervasive "Darwinian version of development" to be found in organizations, according to which the refinement of available (executive) "talent" alone will suffice to guarantee executive development. In this sense, his notion of development, although it remains wholly in the domain of "agentic" human effort, is critical of the organizational literature that has still to come to appreciate the need for executive development. Joining "talent" to "experience" in defining the developmental "right stuff," McCall re-opens the philosophical nature-nurture debate that is still with us after 2000 years or more.

As holds for much of current career theory, McCall's theory is based on a joined human-resource and symbolic perspective, pushing structural and political considerations impinging on development to the sidelines. However, the one structural concession he is making is an important one (McCall, 1998, p. 84):

> From a developmental perspective, business units or divisions can be thought of as "schools," each with a "curriculum" consisting of the experiences and exposures common to people who are successful within that part of the organization.

In close proximity to questions raised by Basseches (1984, p. 354) and the sociologist Kohn (1980) regarding the influence of the structure of the workplace on the development of human capabilities, McCall (1998, pp. 84-85) states:

> Although the particular patterns are subject to change, the analytical approach assumes that the nature of the business and the structure of work in each of the organizations determines [sic!] the patterns of experience that talented people [sic!] will have.

While this is a big "although," putting in parentheses the concrete process by which different individuals learn and give meaning to their experiences, McCall can be credited with reinventing this long-standing question regarding human development in the workplace. In terms of Bolman & Deal's work, McCall is also highly aware of the political issues that make the implementation of executive development practices, especially of the strategical kind, a highly difficult undertaking. Below, I will first render McCall's critique of the "Darwinian philosophy of development" that has kept agentic development out of the corporate agenda (McCall, 1998, p. 11). Subsequently, I will discuss details of McCall executive development system, with particular emphasis on issues of ontic development and coaching.

In ideological proximity to the writings by Hall et al. (1996, 1997, 1998) discussed above, it is McCall's intention to "construct a framework that would integrate executive development with the strategic intent of the organization and with other resource systems" (McCall, 1998, p. x). To this end, McCall "explores the organizational context in which development through experience takes place" (McCall, 1998, p. x). The crucial notions in these formulations are "integrate," "strategic intent," "organizational context," and "development through experience." Of these concepts, "strategic intent" is the most ambiguous, since it has structural, political, human-resource, and symbolic implications. There is furthermore a difference between "strategy" and "strategical intent," the latter raising the political question of whose intent--what organizational coalition's intent-- it actually is. Integration, too, is ambiguous. It typically poses structural problems and has political preconditions and consequences. In the present context, the term "integration" seems to emphasize the link stressed by Hall et al., between business strategy and issues of developing the next generation of leaders. The term thus speaks to the attempt to set up a linkage between human-resource concerns, on one hand, and business strategy, on the other.

As we have learned from Hall et al., this link implies the need for "translating" business strategy "logically" into executive development wants, and making the way an organization is steered dependent upon human-resource development issues. This is a venture that may pose problems of re-structuring and provoke political negotations. Finally, McCall's formulation mentions the integration of executive development efforts with other human resource systems, of which Hall et al. (1996, 1997, 1998a, 1998b)

have shown that they are typically inner-oriented and therefore too slow to respond in time to environmentally provoked imperatives.

Suggesting that "executive development begins with experience and is driven by business strategy" (McCall, 1998, p. 18), McCall elects to take on the following issues:

- what experiences matter in shaping executives as leaders
- how important is the context in which development takes place
- how to choose among the valuable lessons many experiences teach
- how to think about talent other than as a static asset
- how to get the right people into the right experiences at the right time.

(Of course, the notion that one can "choose" experiences, and get people "into them" at an appointed time is not an ontic-developmental conception of experiences).

In McCall's work, we have before us an investigation into "development in the workplace" for a special subpopulation. The work exhaustively addresses the organizational issues of executive development. The main issue explored by McCall is how the development of executives as leaders can be promoted by using the experiential resources already available in an organization, which so far have not been optimally exploited for the purpose of leadership development. McCall, knowing that he is battling the widespread corporate notion (inherited from the old career contract), that the development of executives naturally takes care of itself if only one refines existing talent, and lets it prove its Darwinian survival skills, makes agentic development in the workplace appear as a powerful futuristic vision. The effort to promote development in the workplace is recommended by him with the touch and fervor of a crusader. This fervor is fueled by what McCall considers an irrefutable base of evidence,--largely gathered by himself at the Center for Creative Leadership, North Carolina (McCall et al., 1988). The evidence seems to speak in favor of the notion that

the organizational context embodies developmental experiences.

In a broader, historical perspective, McCall continues a tradition begun by Basseches (1984) and Kohn (1980), of inquiring into the influence of the structure of the workplace, and the psychological challenges it poses, on human development. As Basseches puts it from the point of view of dialectical thinking considered as a marker of adult development (1984, pp. 302-303):

> For an educational experience to promote development, it must challenge those structures of reasoning which the individual uses to make sense of the world. It must first engage the individual's existing structures and, with them, the individual's emotional and cognitive investment in the experience. Then it must stretch those structures to their limits, and beyond, to the

> point where they are found wanting. At the same time, the experience must provide the elementary material out of which the individual can construct new, more sophisticated cognitive structures.

The same point has been made for children long ago, e.g., by Sanford (1967, p. 51):

> The essential point is that a person develops through being challenged: for change to occur, there must be internal and external stimuli which upset his existing equilibrium, which cause instability that existing modes of adaptation do not suffice to correct, and which thus require the person to make new responses and so to expand his personality. If the stimuli are minor or routine, the child, instead of changing, will simply react as he has before.

Pointing to the need for unlearning as a precondition for learning, Sanford states in behavioristic fashion (1967, p. 51):

> It is because of their greater repertory of routine responses that students and adults do not change as readily as children. The dynamics of change, however, are essentially the same in all three groups. We need not wait for them to "grow naturally" under conditions of comfort and protection (we would wait a long time, according to the present formulation); nor should we suppose that once people have become "mature," no more developmental change is possible.

Embedding McCall's quest in a larger research tradition makes his claim that conscious agentic development makes sense for executives more believable that it would be on account of only the most recent executive development research.

A notion that readily comes to mind which is useful for framing McCall's enterprise is K. Lewin's notion of re-education. This notion explicitly acknowledges the unlearning aspect of learning Sanford touches on. It is forcefully stated by Bennis as follows (Bennis, 1984 [1961]), p. 273):

> One central theme running through the concerns and curiosities of the mature Lewin ... is the theme of re-education. Through what processes do men and women alter, replace, or transcend patterns of thinking, valuation, volition, overt behavior by which they have previously managed and justified their lives into patterns of thinking, valuation, volition, and action which are better oriented to the realities and actualities of contemporary existence, personal and social ...? These processes are more complex than those of learning anew as any action leader, therapist, or teacher of adults (and, one might add, coach, O.L.) knows from experience. They involve not extrinsic additions of knowledge or behavioral repertoire to the self or person but changes in the self, and the working through of self-supported resistances to such changes (highlighting, O.L.). And, since self-patterns are sustained by norms

> and relationships in the groups to which a person belongs or aspires to belong, effective re-education of a person requires changes in the envirioning society and culture as well.

By detailing the changes Lewin thought required for re-education to occur, Benne (1984, p. 274) highlights the quest McCall has embarked upon:

> Lewin's analysis assumed that effective re-education must affect the person being re-educated in three ways. The person's cognitive structure must be altered. And for Lewin this structure included the person's modes of perception, his ways of seeing his physical and social worlds, as well as the facts, concepts, expectations, and beliefs with which a person thinks about the possibilities of action and the consequences of action in his phenomenal world. But re-education must involve the person in modifying his valences and values as well as his cognitive structures. Valences and values include not alone
>
> the principles of what he should and should not do or consider doing ... They include also his attractions and aversions to his and other groups and their standards, his feelings in regard to status differences and authority, and his reaction to various sources of approval and disapproval of himself. Re-education finally must effect a person's motoric actions, his repertoire of behavioral skills, and the degree of a person's conscious control of his bodily and social movements.

In this quote, Lewin broadens both Sanford's and Basseches' perspective on agentic development, by including, in addition to cognitive changes, axiological and physiological changes. While McCall does not share Sanford's and Lewin's emphasis on unlearning as a precondition for learning through experience, and thus is simplifying the issue of adult learning to some considerable degree, he is fully aware of the need for combined changes in the executive's self and in the organizational environment, for executive learning to lead to development.

McCall states his own notion of development as follows (McCall, 1998, p. 11):

> The world 'development' has two meanings. From one perspective, [agentic] development involves identifying and then realizing potentialities--strengthening and polishing what already exists. From another perspective, development is about the acquisition of abilities--bringing new things into being.

Of these two meanings of [agentic] development, the first one is that most often embraced by corporate leadership. McCall addresses this view as the The right stuff

ideology of development. This perspective is frequently articulated by using the term "talent," or natural gifts that lie ready to be strengthened and refined. (One is reminded of Sanford's "we would wait a long time ..."). Agreeing that "both processes are obviously at work," McCall states (1998, p. 11):

> Executive leadership is a gift bestowed [by nature], so the heart of development is discovering those qualities and then finding their limits through a series of progressively more difficult experiences.

In the "right stuff" ideology, the notion of fixed developmental sequences guaranteed by the old career contract that naturally lead to "progressively more difficult experiences" as outlined by Dalton (1989) shines through. McCall's basic argument is that, under the new career contract, a Darwinian "standing back" to watch the fittest talent survive will not do.

An important ingredient in McCall's notion of executive development under the new career contract is the insight he draws from his research on the derailment of executives, --what he calls the "derailment conspiracy" (McCall, 1998, pp. 21-60). This research uncovers two important lessons: (1) organizations typically conspire to the professional failure of executives by one-sidedly boosting their organizationally useful "strengths," without also acknowledging that "every strength can be a weakness" (pp. 35-37), depending on the context. As a consequence, (2) the notion of success is a relative one, since success may turn into its opposite, given the right conditions for the reversal. These lessons have a direct bearing on the right-stuff ideology (McCall, 1998, p. 35):

> The corporate version of the right stuff (i.e., talent, O.L.) is built on the assumption that there is a finite list of virtues (i.e., positive traits, O.L.) that defines effective executive leadership, and that these virtues distinguish exceptional from average executives. If every strength is also a potential weakness, however, neither assumption holds.

Not only do "blind spots matter eventually" (McCall, 1998, p. 39), "defining effectiveness solely in terms of results masks significant developmental needs" (McCall, 1998, p. 41). As McCall debunks the static nature of executive "strengths and weaknesses," he also notices the cultural aspect of derailment in organizations (McCall, 1998, p. 53):

> The organization creates a climate that can make learning and change harder or easier, depending on the prevalent assumptions about development,

and this may lead to organizational complicity. Derailment is thus best conceived as "loss of potential developmental opportunities" (McCall, 1998, p. 56). In addition, McCall attributes derailment to the

individualistic, task-oriented culture of most organizations who neglect relational competencies (1998, p. 57):

> A closer look (at the derailment issue) revealed that the culture strongly emphasized and subsequently assessed and rewarded individual achievement, when at higher levels many of the skills needed for success shifted toward team work, coordination and cooperation with others, and working through others to achieve synergy.

McCall thus implicates the delay in switching from the old to the new career contract in executive derailment. Adopting a symbolic perspective, he states (1998, p. 58):

> At the most basic level, development is directly affected by the organization's strategy (what it is trying to achieve) and by its values (what it is willing to do to get there)

From this insight derives the goal of McCall's philosophy of executive development (McCall, 1998, p. 58), to "create a context in which development is supported or, at the very least, in which it is not subverted." He makes it clear that this philosophy is one that is in harmony with the new career contract, to speak with Hall (McCall, 1998, p. 59):

> The bottom line for individuals is that no one cares as much about a person's development than the person. Whether the organization supports development or inhibits it, individuals need to take responsibility for achieving their potential.

There is a considerable paradox in the fact that, at a time where nobody in the organization may care about personal development, the same organization is urged to do its utmost to establish a link between its strategic intent and the development of executives. Are executives exempt from the negligence with which organizations, under the new career contract, treat personal development? Or is executive development a different genus compared to development of other personnel? This situation is either a fifth paradox in addition those named by Hall et al. (1997, pp. 330-332), or it is an elaboration of his second paradox specifically regarding the plentifulness of relational resources. However that may be, one wonders what is meant by "strategic intent" that excludes personal development, and how such intent, given what it excludes, can then be linked to the personal development of executives. Or is executive development void of any personal component, so that one can successfully develop executive capacities and simultaneously neglect their personal growth? Are personal growth and executive

growth of a different type?

According to McCall (1998, pp. 61 f.), what makes executive development special is that business divisions of an organization, in addition to being structural divisions in the sense of Mintzberg (1989), represent different cultures, as it were, more precisely schools with their own idiosyncratic curriculum (McGall, 1998, p. 84):

> From a developmental perspective, business units or divisions can be thought of as "schools," each with a "curriculum" consisting of the experiences and exposures common to people who are successful within that part of the business.

Mistakenly (I think) assuming that all talented people learn alike, this view leads McCall to the the further assumption that (McCall, 84):

> although the particular patterns are subject to change [sic!], the analytical approach (?, O.L.) assumes that the nature of the business and the structure of work in each part of the organization determines [sic!] the patterns of experience that talented people will have (my emphasis).

Having made these assumptions, McCall details what particular business divisions have to offer learners in terms of skills that they, as members of the divisions, might be "good" and "not good" at (e.g., "resourcefulness" in a market-driven division compared to "analysis" in finance, Fig. 4-1, p. 86). He sees executives as having four kinds of opportunities for encountering developmental experiences, more precisely contexts in which such experiences can occur (McCall, 1998, pp. 65 f):

- (job) assignments
- other people (especially supervisors)
- hardships and setbacks
- formal programs & non-work experiences.

Among the first-mentioned, job transitions, obstacles, and task-environment related opportunities stand out. They form what he calls the "core elements of powerful experiences" (McCall, 1998, pp. 66-67). However, in contrast to Sanford (1967) and Basseches (1984), McCall, while he tabulates the "challenges" involved in such experiences (Fig. 3-2, pp. 66-67), does not give anything approaching a detailed

cognitive analysis of the job structures providing such challenges, nor does he specify, in a way comparable to Basseches (1984), what must happen cognitively for experiences that arise from the structurally provided opportunities to be powerful, i.e., transformative. In my view, some of the crucial issues implied when calling experiences "powerful," are:

- what makes experiences "powerful" for an individual during an either stable or transitional life phase (Levinson, 1978)
- how specifically is a powerful experience "powerful" for an individual, depending on his/her developmental position (Basseches, 1984)
- what kind of meaning-making process is required for experiences to become "powerful" (Kegan, 1982)
- what does it take for an individual to "have," rather than just "be," his or her powerful experiences (Kegan, 1994)
- what is the "re-educative potential" of experiences that are powerful.

These issues are, alas, completely neglected by McCall. Rather, his emphasis is on the sociological verity that (McCall, 1998, p. 76):

> Historically, organizational experience has been thought of in terms of generic job titles and types, and learning from them approached as stepwise sequences of increasing responsibility and exposure through rotation,

as we saw in Dalton's developmental model (Dalton, 1989). In fact, I get the impression that McCall is attempting to replace the sociological constants missing from the new career contract, that guaranteed those "stepwise (developmental) sequences of increasing responsibility," by the powerful experiences he sees beckoning in a variety of structural divisions of an organization that function as "schools" with different "curriculums." Such a one-stop solution overburdens the fragile notion of experience, even if experience translates into organizational opportunities for experience, and reduces the multidimensionality of adult development in the workplace to a faddish

hope.

However, McCall is aware of the fact that "experiences that create lasting change are rarely the product of routine daily fare or of minor turns in an otherwise straight road," suggesting that "experiences that have a strong personal impact are almost always loaded with adversity (McCall, 1998, p. 62). The hint at adversity seems to me to be a one-sided, non-dialectical view of challenges. This hint captures only the fact, to speak with Basseches (1984, pp. 302-303), that the experience "challenges those

structures of reasoning which the individual uses to make sense of the world," thus "stretching" these structures "to their limits;" however, the positive dialectic element, according to which "(at the same time) the experience must provide the elementary material out of which the individual can construct new, more sophisticated cognitive structures" (Basseches, 1984, pp. 302-303) is missing from this pessimistic account.

A further problem posed by McCall's notion of powerful experiences is the extent to which they translate into learning and eventually, into development. Since McCall does not distinguish learning from development, the latter transmutation of experience is not a topic for him. In regard to the link between experience and learning, it seems to be McCall's assumption that all talented people learn alike (McCall, 1998, p. 84) which is circular reasoning since "talented" is defined as giving evidence of being able to learn (McCall, 1998, pp. 189-190):

> the analytical approach assumes that the nature of the business and the structure of work in each part of the organization determines the patterns of experience that talented people will have,

to which he adds (McCall, 1998, p. 88):

> The nature of those experiences in turn dictates what they could learn and what learnings they are not exposed to.

Therefore, the basic assumption of his general model for developing executive talent, is (McCall, 1998, p. 188):

> people with the ability to learn from experience, (i.e., talented people, O.L.), when given [sic!] key experiences as determined by the business strategy,
>
> will learn the needed skills if given the right kind of support.

The double "if" shows that McCall is aware of the possibility that neither are people "given key experiences" nor "given the right support" to learn from them. These two requirements are part of his "general model for developing executive talent" displayed below (McCall, 1998, p. 189):

Insert Fig. A2 here

The diagram expresses McCall's view that talent combined with experience yields the "right stuff," i.e., optimally functioning executives who, having been selected according to business-strategical imperatives, are likely to implement those

imperatives, thereby guaranteeing a symbiosis of individual and organizational development. In order for this to happen, there need to be put in place structural opportunities, or mechanisms, that get people into the right experiences at the right time." These mechanisms must be in tune with, if not an expression of, the organizations "strategic intent," which suggests both what experiences are requisite ones, and what, specifically, is the "right stuff" to be developed in executives. In order for organizationally provided experiences to "translate" into optimum outcome, catalysts are needed, i.e., "actions that can be taken to facilitate a person's learning [of] what an experience might teach" (McCall, 1998, p. 164). The most important catalytic role is played by an "executive development system" (comprising coaching and mentoring, among other activities) that helps people "convert experience into learning" (McCall, 1998, p. 164).

McCall presents the above model as a strategic, thus predictive, one (McCall, 1998, p. 193). In a voice assuming urgency and authoritative knowing, he declares (McCall, 1998, p. 191):

> ... all components in the model are related, so if someone chooses to walk the development path, all the pieces must align, or time, talent, and money will be wasted.

In a self-critical move, McCall identifies a number of "dilemmas," or intrinsic difficulties associated with the model (McCall, 1998, pp. 188-202). In the figure, above, these dilemmas are identified by integers in circles (#1 to 5), to which I have
added my own dilemmas (#6 to 10), identified by integers in boxes. There are five dilemmas mentioned by McCall, and five dilemmas added by me. The diagram comprises three round and three linear shapes. The linear shapes refer to organizational matters, while the round shapes are specific to human-resource concerns. (The bracket linking talent and experience, added by me, indicate that developmentally both are dimensions of self, in contrast to the "right stuff" that psychologically presupposes an integration of self and role (Martin, 1996; Laske, 1999). In the diagram, there are three sets of arrows, (a) the ones to and from "mechanisms" and (b) to and from "business strategy," and the ones (c) from "experience" to "the right stuff." Arrows #6 and #7 are not part of McCall's diagram, but have been introduced to highlight important links between the "right stuff" (talent+experience), on one hand, and business strategy and mechanisms, on the other.

McCall's arrows indicate that "talent" must be processed by "mechanisms" that offer talented individuals developmentally productive experiences. As indicated by the arrows emerging from the "business strategy" box, these experiences must be in harmony with the strategic intent of the organization. This intent must simultaneously inform the philosophy of what is "the right stuff" that executives (as reliable resources of the organization) need to embody. The third pair of arrows traverse the domain of catalysts, indicating that only with the aid of catalytic processes such as coaching and

mentoring, can experience be expected to be "learned from," and thus issue in the "right stuff" the organization is looking for in its executives.

In my view, McCall's dilemmas are well-taken, and are likely to figure in any coaching and mentoring policy put in place in an organization. Below, I will first discuss McCall's organizational (#1 to 5), and then my own, ontic-developmentally informed, dilemmas (#6 to 10).

The five dilemmas posed by the model that are acknowledged by McCall himself are as follows:

dilemma #1: how to think about talent
dilemma #2: mechanisms controlling selection necessarily also control development
dilemma #3: development is spurred by challenge and risk, which is contrary to organizational imperatives of predictability
dilemma #4: learning from experience is not automatic
dilemma #5: business strategy must address multiple possibilities.

These dilemmas are all organizational ones. In my view, dilemmas #2, #3, and #5 are primarily structural and political ones, while #1 and #4 are also psychological and ontic-developmental ones. A discussion of these dilemmas follows.

The way McCall thinks about dilemmas of talent is political in the sense of Bolman & Deal (1991), in that it is framed in terms of scarce resources. Since challenging assignments are typically critical for the organization, and since there is only a finite number of them (McCall, 1998, p. 190):

> there is a tension between choosing someone who has already proven the ability to handle the assignment versus the person who would learn the most from having it.

This dilemma relates to the second one, in which selection policy as a guarantor of stability vs. change is at issue. While critical functions cannot be put at risk by inviting unforseeable change brought about by lack of competence, the developmental potential of critical-function assignments is at risk of being sacrificed in favor of competence-based predictability (if not stability). From this follows, in more psychological and human-resource terms, that--since the competencies needed for the organizational future cannot be found in executives in some primitive form--the best way of think of talent can best be assessed "by looking for evidence of ability to learn from experience" (McCall, 1998, p. 197), rather than something like a personal essence. This would make it easier to pursue a selection policy that does not sacrifice the developmental potential of jobs.

The second dilemma has both a structural and a political aspect. Structurally, selection is the driving force behind the mechanisms by which promising executives are enabled to obtain developmentally relevant experiences (Hall, 1986). Politically, "whatever process controls who gets what experiences is actually controlling--to the extent that it can be controlled--experience" (McCall, 1998, p.

190). Thus, the mechanisms "provided by the organization to make (assignment) decisions for the people in the talent pool is the critical link in the process" of linking talent to experience" (McCall, 1998, p. 198). Structurally, the inherent difficulties of development qua selection demand that (McCall, 1998, p. 199):

> the development system will have to include some version of a high potential pool, of succession planning, and of
>
> an empowered executive development staff, (all of which must be) monitored closely by the top executives.

Politically, the issue of empowering the executive development staff is a critical one.

The third McCallian dilemma involves the vagaries of experience, in the sense that "the lessons it teaches may be many or few, good or bad, intended or accidental" (McCall, 1998, p. 190), and that consequently, it does not straightforwardly lead to learning. At the same time, experience, according to McCall is "the primary vehicle for development" (McCall, 1998, p. 196). The third dilemma arises from a "weak link" between structural opportunities (or curriculums) available and needed experience. McCall's special concern are the organizational aspects of experience, namely, "key experiences," --those pre-packaged developmental experiences that are taught by business divisions as "corporate schools" (McCall, 1998, p. 196):

> An audit of valuable opportunities should include task forces, projects, and potent staff assignments, as well as courses and programs that might be used for specific developmental needs. Often neglected but just as important is the identification of role models throughout the organization--people who demonstrate the desired qualities and could be used to help develop others.

if, I would add, they are ontic-developmentally ready to do so.

McCall's fourth dilemma "arises because learning from experience is not automatic" (McCall, 1998, p. 191). In contrast to the third dilemma, as formulated the fourth dilemma sounds like it is inherent in the notion of experience. But not so. In McCall's view, the dilemma arises (1998, p. 191):

> because the same actions that can be used to improve short-term performance-setting goals, making people accountable, contingent rewards--are also the ones that might be used to encourage [long-term, O.L.] development. But which gets a manager's priority: getting the job done or promoting development? (my emphasis, O.L.)

Thus, this dilemma is seen as a political one as well, since it entails distributing scarce resources called "experiences."

McCall's fifth dilemma is once more a political one. It arises as follows

(McCall, p. 191):

> an organization can face a strategic dilemma in that the business strategy must address multiple possibilities. Is development of talent more or less important than technology, customer focus, global alliances, value creation, or any number of potentially potent sources of competitive advantage?

In short, it is a matter of organizational politics whether developmental issues receive the fair treatment they deserve.

As shown, McCall's dilemmas, except for the first one regarding talent, are of a structural-political kind (in Bolman & Deal's sense of these terms). They require the structural re-organization and political re-alignment of coalitions within the organization, as well as the creation of a culture that is supportive of putting in place a strategic executive development policy. In McCall's view, this presupposes that the human-resources department be politically empowered and simultaneously refashioned into an "executive development system" as a structural-political component in its own right. For McCall, the weight of these structural-political imperatives outweighs any "dilemma" that his model might be said to give rise to on conceptual, psychological, and epistemological grounds. One of the psychological issues, although not considered a "dilemma" by McCall, is "why people don't change." This dilemma figures prominently in his discussion of the catalysts for development (McCall, 1998, pp. 161-182).

McCall's discussion of change is based on the view that "corporate practice in executive development tends to leave the creation of change up to the individual" (McCall, 1998, p. 162). He is fully aware of the difficulty of change, and of the psychological support it requires to happen and be maintained (McCall, 1998, p. 161). He is also aware that "development of talented leaders could not be programmed by a standard series of sequential jobs" (McCall, 1998, p. 81), as under the old career contract. This leads him to conclude (McCall, 1998, p. 163):

> Recognizing that an organization cannot force someone to develop, an effective executive developmental process must take into account the reasons that intelligent people, aware of the need to change, may not try to change or, trying, may not succeed.

One reason for this, in his view, is that "learning from experience is a faculty almost never practiced" (McCall, 1998, p. 163). He surmises that such learning has a change potential so far not tapped. Consequently, he sees catalysts for change as catalysts for learning (McCall, 1998, p. 181), and singles out three of them (McCall, 1998, pp. 167 f):

- improving information (i.e., feedback about performance)
- providing incentives and resources (for change)
- supporting the change effort.

The first two are seen by McCall in a cognitive-behavioral perspective. The third one, especially important in the context of coaching and mentoring, receives a highly sensitive treatment by McCall. McCall identifies "two kinds of obstactes" for learning from experience (McCall, 1998, p. 177), "the emotional cost of trying to change and the ways in which the actions of others can undermine the effort to change." The truth is "that change is difficult to achieve all alone" (McCall, 1998, p. 177):

> Personal change is an emotional undertaking. Uncertainty, fear, inadequacy, loss, damage to self-esteem, intimidation, and humiliation ... are significant and potentially debilitating emotions

evoked by change. Therefore (McCall, 1998, p. 177):

> anything the organization can do to create a supportive environment when people undertake difficult challenges will serve as a catalyst for development. Whether this support takes the form of encouragement from a boss or an acknowledgement from a human resources coach, it helps to know that someone else know what one is going through and cares.

From an ontic-developmental vantage point, McCall's model provokes a number of dilemmas having to do with the intrinsic ambiguity of the concepts he uses (such as "change," "talent," "experience," "the right stuff," and "strategic intent") to discuss a mix of agentic and ontic development issues. Resolving these dilemmas requires making some fundamental distinctions missing from McCall's model. Without these distinctions, the model suffers from "an inadequate operationalization of concepts" including some circular reasoning, as Basseches observed in his critique of Levinson et al. (Appendix A3.1below). Formost among the distinctions that need to be made are those between learning and development, and between experience as a canned, pre-packaged structural opportunity for experience and its psychological equivalent that accounts for the "power" of the experience. McCall's surface-structure treatment of these issues is apparent from the fact that none of the dilemmas he names are associated with the catalysts he thinks are needed to make sure that "experience" translates into "learning", thus bringing about "development."

Below, I first state, and then discuss, what I consider additional, basic-assumption dilemmas of McCalls model. These dilemmas are of two related, but different kinds. The first group of dilemmas (#6 & #7) is methodological and regards circular reasoning:

> <u>dilemma #6</u>: defining a business strategy that can be

"translated" into executive-development needs and associated activities already presupposes the "right stuff," thus the development system that is meant to produce it (broken-line arrow, outer right)

dilemma #7: translating business strategy into mechanisms supporting leadership challenges equally presupposes the "right stuff" that this translation is meant to make possible (broken-line arrow, middle of diagram).

The second group of dilemmas regards the degree of conceptual differentiation, or the weak relationship to psychological complexity, of McCall's model. It comprises an ontic-developmentally dubious assumption (dilemma #8), and a lack of definitions (dilemmas #9 & 10):

dilemma #8: the assumption that all talented people learn alike, more generally that individuals, by combining natural gifts (talent) and the benefits of nurture (experience), are automatically blessed with an ontic-developmental status (of maturity) that enables them to make experiences "powerful" in a way that produces the "right stuff"

dilemma #9: the fact that sensitive treatment of difficulties of personal change remains anecdotal, i.e., systematically without consequences for McCall's definition of the catalysts for learning

dilemma #10: the definition of the executive "right stuff," is left implicit, thus is a screen for wishful-thinking projections of all kinds (which adds to the obscuration of ontic-developmental issues).

To make the first group of dilemmas (#6 & #7) more apparent, all one needs to do to is connect the "right-stuff" shape in Fig. A2 to the box labeled "business strategy" (as shown in the figure). In so doing, one reveals the implicit connection that business strategy fit for serving as the basis of McCall's model entertains with the "right-stuff" outcome of the model. This "closing the loop" entails ontic-developmentally, that McCall's executive development system already presupposes what it is supposed to generate: without the right stuff embodied in at least a subgroup of executives in charge of the executive-development system, the system modeled by McCall cannot be put in place. It is not that McCall consciously practices circular reasoning; rather he is not aware of the preconditions of the components of his model. Although McCall devotes an entire chapter to the question of how to "translate" business strategy into leadership challenges (not, however, considering it a dilemma), he does not seem to reflect upon the fact that defining business strategy in the way required for putting in place a potent executive-development system is not just a political issue of strategic intent, but requires a level of ontic-developmental maturity on the part of those who "have " the intent, that readies them from own experience and their internal construence of it, to promote executive development.

The circularity is not simply a logical flaw; rather, it introduces the ontic-development--and coaching--dilemma of how an organization can provide members of its structural apex with the capability of being themselves developmentally ready to conceive of executive development in the way that McCall thinks they should. In short, the model poses the Platonic question of who develops the developers, or their human-resource service firm assistants. Ontic-developmentally, this entails that there may exist constraints that hinder, not so much the model from being a sound one, but from being grasped in the first place by people whose own development does not ready them
for solving developmental issues. In more cognitive-science parlance, the ontic-developmental maturity of the entire organization as a "thinking organization," in terms of the demands the culture makes on adults' mind (Kegan, 1994), may not be up to par with the requirements of McCall's model (in which case no preaching will help).

In part, the limitations of McCall's model have to do with the fact is an atomistic rather than systemic one (as is e.g., Martin's, see Appendix A4, section 4). By this I mean that McCall thinks in rather undifferentiated terms of either the entire
organization or single executives, and therefore does not fully account for the holistic, "systemic" aspect of organizational development. In short, McCall does not convincingly capture the way executives manage psychological and developmental issues both privately and as a group, and thus does not see the systemic influence of their common-denominator developmental level on the way they might go about implementing his model.

Dilemma #7 regards the translation of business strategy into leadership challenges (McCall, 1998, p. 191). McCall's notion of translation (McCall, 1998, pp. 83 f.) is based on his notion of business units as different "schools" having their own specific "curriculum" that determines what individuals learn to be "good at." The characteristic outcomes of different curriculums are catalogued by him in terms of psychological "traits" such as "risk-taking" and "seeing the big picture" (McCall, 1998, p. 86). The common-sense psychology underlying these traits (seen as capacities) is a thoroughly behavioral one that completely disregards any ontic-developmental differences between executives that are said to "have" such capacities. Put differently, the traits that constitute the basis of translation of business strategy to leadership challenges, and based upon that, to mechanisms and catalysts of executive development, are attached to the role, rather than the self, of people. I am here reminded of Hall's notion that, rather than trying to stipulate traits or capacities executives should possess, it is more apt to speak of meta-competencies that people need under the new career contract, in particular, the ability of "learning to learn" which manifests itself in the domain of both task knowledge (adaptability) and personal knowledge (self-knowledge).

This suggestion might correct for McCall's list of psychological traits and his predominant emphasis on task knowledge over personal knowledge (McCall, 1998, p. 86). However, my critique of McCall would be more far-reaching. I would point out that the behavioral traits used by McCall as the

basis of translating business strategy into appropriate mechanisms (dilemma #7) are conceptually deficient. This is so since just as in dilemma #6, McCall fails to consider the ontic-developmental verity that executives making the desired translation must already embody the "stuff" the executive-development system is meant to produce. McCall's notion of translation (of business strategy into mechanisms) is thoroughly circular (dilemma #7), as is the entire model (due to the requirement of having the right stuff feed business strategy; dilemma #6).

I can be more brief with regard to the remaining dilemmas (#8 to #10) of McCall's model, since they will be taken up again in later chapters. Dilemma #8 is embodied in McCall's notion of "powerful experiences." Given that the psychological and ontic-developmental equivalents of these "experiences" are disregarded by McCall, it would be preferable to refer to them as "strategically important prospective developmental opportunities, provided by an organization's internal business schools, for learning on the job," rather than "experiences," a term that implies personal meaning-making.

What McCall fails to consider in the notion of "powerful experiences" is the requisite meaning-making process that, depending on a person's ontic-developmental level, makes experiences powerful. He also completely disregards what Lewin has taught us about the difficulty of learning from experience to satisfy the need of adults, to "unlearn" not only cognitive schemata, but equally axiological schemes (values) and physiological habits. Most importantly, what McCall's notion of powerful experiences disregards is the difference between learning, or adaptation, and development.

Dilemma #9, the lack of systematic influence of McCall's sensitive treatment of the need for support in personal change on his model, again speaks to the thoroughly behavioristic conception of change undergirding his model of development. This issue will be taken up further by reflections on the relationship between role and self, and issues of their "integration," below, as well as in Appendix A3. Finally, dilemma #10 speaks to the fact that although McCall thoroughly reshapes the notion of "right stuff," taken over from the corporate ideology of development he criticizes, he fails to provide a succinct definition of his own. This is not only a definitional issue. A succinct definition of the right stuff in his own model might have enabled McCall to become aware of the circularity of his reasoning, thus avoiding dilemmas #6 and #7.

The unsolved dilemma's of McCall's model regard the following issues of relevance to the notion of professional agenda, and of coaching:

- the relationship of role to self, and the issue of
  their "integration" in executives
- the ontic-developmental preconditions of formulating
  business strategy and "translating" it into
  an executive development system
- the issue of developmental catalysts for learning

learning from experience.

I take up the first issue in the remainder of this chapter. The second issue is treated in Appendix A3, while the third issues is taken up in Appendix A4.

3. The Dialectic of Executive Role and Executive Self

The writer who, in my view, has been most explicit about the dialectic existing between executive role and self, although without taking a developmental approach to the issue, is the "corporate therapist" I. Martin (1996). Coming from a tradition of systemic and psychoanalytic family therapy (Kirschner, D. & Kirschner, S., 1986), Martin has outlined a program of corporate mentoring for purposes of what she calls "culture transformation." In Schein's terms, Martin's culture transformation is more of a transformation of values foisted upon basic assumptions, than of basic assumptions themselves. What is of primary interest here is her conceptualization of the relationship of self and role that is absent from McCall's model. This conceptualization is crucial for developing an understanding of issues of developmental coaching.

Under the caption of "Mentoring for accelerating (organizational and individual) growth," the prime target of Martin's "corporate therapy" (Martin, 1996, pp. 137 f.), she outlines a "levels of self" personality model that, in my view, does justice to the psychological dialectic of executive self and role that has moved to center stage under the new career contract. The model sees executive role as an aspect of executive self. It "conceptualizes the self as occurring simultaneously on ten connected levels of consciousness, in which perception moves successively from an external to an internal focus" (Martin, 1996, pp. 140-141):

> Awareness and mastery of each level is the goal of self-transformation. As each level is consciously perceived and examined, the opportunity to go deeper becomes possible. Just by incorporating each level into awareness, the transforming individual achieves mastery, as he now has free choice in accepting or rejecting each level. It is also believed that the journey through the ten levels requires a trained facilitator to provide nurturance, acceptance, enactment, and direction. ... This facilitator must be far along in his own self-transformation to be an effective guide and interpreter.

Martin's model of executive self is shown below (Martin, 1996, p. 140).

Insert Fig. A1 here

The ego-psychological details of the model are, for my purposes, less important than the level of complexity it indicates is required for coaching executives. Martin's model raises one's level of awareness of what one is talking about when speaking of "traits," "character," and "style" in executive development, even though she neglects the ontic-developmental aspect of the executive self.

Each of the levels in the model, in the figure indicated by integers, has a name that highlights the level, or layer, it signifies. In their entirety, the levels constitute a matrix of possible personal change which frames guidelines for coaching and mentoring executives. In overview, the layers of executive self comprised by the model are as follows (Martin, 1996, pp. 142-146):

False self and defenses

1. role
2. illusion
3. defenses
4. developmental conflicts
5. terror and rage

Ego

6. foundation of the ego
7. gender identification
8. triangulation tactics
9. observing ego
10. executive ego.

Of these levels, the first five constitute "protective layers guarding the inner self structures" (Martin, 1996, p. 144), while the last five constitute the executive's ego, or inner self, as shown in Fig. A1. The first two levels, of role and illusion, represent "the "false self" personality presented in everyday life, while levels #3 to #5 regard further protective "defenses" in the broader sense, most of them deriving from the person's attachment history.

Layer #1, of executive role, captures the person "as he defines himself by social/cultural symbols and criteria including gender, title, degrees, financial status,

marital status, and so forth." Layer #2 represents "a set of misperceptions the person holds as beliefs regarding life, death, success, power, health, wealth, happiness, love, achievement, leadership, and so forth, ... learned in the family and reinforced by popular culture" (Martin, 1996, p. 142). These illusions stand in the way of change, and "must be transmuted in order for growth to occur" (Martin, 1996, p. 142):

> Both of these levels comprise the 'false self" personality presented in everyday life. In most people, full conscious awareness of the eight deeper levels stops here. In fact in most corporations, understanding causes of performance barriers stops at the illusion level. This is why organizational change is often short-term and rhetorical rather than transformational ... When deeper barriers remain hidden, the [person's psychological] organization remains 'safe' although inacessible and indifferent to major change. The following eight levels can be accessed through facilitating a powerful and strategic process of self-discovery, in which a therapeutic relationship forms the foundation for transformation.

Levels #3 to #5, of "defenses," often referred to as a person's character in the clinical literature (Vaillant, 1977, 1993; Erikson, 1950; Miller, 1984), are not per se hindrances to change, but become barriers to change when not attended to. They are necessary for the survival of the human organism, thus value-free (Freud, 1984; Greenberg & Mitchell, 1983).

These levels have recently begun to capture the imagination of some writers on executive development who use "biographical action research" as a consulting and research tool (Kaplan, 1991). Specifically, level #3 is the level of defenses by which a person "unconsciously guards against disappointments, anxieties, conflicts, and changes that exceed his acceptable pace" (Martin, 1996, pp. 142-143). Defenses are "autonomic reactions outside conscious awareness and must be strategically elevated to be penetrated and confronted;" as such they are "barriers to effective and objective decision-making and leadership" (Martin, 1996, pp. 143-144). The level of defenses, especially when reinforced by organizational success, leads to executive failure and derailment.

On the next two layers, #4 and #5, Martin conceptualizes "developmental conflicts" in the sense of Erikson (1950) and "terror and rage" in the sense of A. Miller (1984). Both rooted in a person's history of attachment to caregivers, these layers are further hindrances to personal change when not brought to awareness. They

are deeper-level defenses that cannot simply be confronted. Rather, they must be re-enacted, i.e., re-experienced,-- one might speak of psychological action-learning (Martin, 1996, p. 144):

> Successive, fulfilling re-enactments promote positive change and integration. As conflicts are resolved, greater energy and creativity is freed up for leadership.

Martin considers the 5th level, of terror and rage, "the last protective layer guarding the inner self structures ... [that] is often displayed as sudden movements toward or away from powerful intimate others," especially abandonment terror (separation anxiety) and engulfment terror" (Martin, 1996, pp. 144-145). In her view, executive-development activities that do not deal with the false self (layers #1-2) and the defenses of an executive (layers #3-5) are short-lived in their result and strategically superficial, and cannot lead to a transformation of organizational culture.

Of the remaining five levels, #6 represents, in Martin's view, "basic self-love ... and eagerness for growth, ... born out of positive contact with the original parenting figures" (Martin, 1996, p. 145). This layer undergirds a person's gendered identity (#7). Closer to the executive ego (layer #10), is the triangulation paradigm a person typically uses in relating "in groups of three or more, based upon one's role prescription in the family of origin," by forming "triangles" or alliances with a third person to escape the stress of dyadic relationships (Kantor & Lehr, 1976). This layer (#8) "establishes a blueprint for later corporate teamwork" (Martin, 1996, p. 146), thus for making use of the "relational resources" of organizations as a basis for establishing a self-syntonic relational practice. It is thus a layer Fletcher presupposes, when she calls for a "new, 'blended' protean worker of the future:

> someone who is a blend of public and private, work and family, rational and emotional, masculine and feminine, ...

and thus "quite a departure from organizational--(and one might add, clinical, O.L.)-- norms" (Fletcher, 1996, p. 127). Finally, the observing ego (#9) is, in Martin's conception, the level of self-awareness. It represents "the ability to monitor one's own behavior with a realistic eye" and therefore is "particularly useful in leadership situations in which one's impact must be accurately gauged." Martin spells out "executive ego" (layer #10) as "the part of the self that can oversee and direct an ongoing internal transformational process in which barriers (to growth) can be observed and then transmuted" (Martin, 1996, p. 146). Ontic-developmentally, this layer is a primary target of any coaching and mentoring.

While McCall's (1998) approach to executive development is a strictly organizational and behavioral one, Martin's (1996) approach is informed by psychoanalytically based "systemic" family therapy (where "systemic" refers to the fact that the family is seen as an organization, i.e., a system). Neither of these approaches is an ontic-developmental one, except in the marginal sense that psychoanalytic theory (as used by Martin) is a theory of child development. While McCall's interest is in the executive role and in how to enhance it by way of agentic development activities rooted in business strategy, Martin focuses on the difficulty of doing so without "taking the person (i.e., the self, O.L.) into account (Kaplan, 1991, xii). Needed thus is an approach that combines the organizational with the personal perspective or, as I prefer to see it, links executive role to executive self at a deep, cognitive-science level.

Based on the model briefly commented on above, and depicted in Fig. A1, Martin formulates a theory of executive development that sees coaching--her term is "corporate therapy"--as the crucial "mechanism" and "catalyst" for producing "the right stuff," namely, an organization-wide culture transformation. I present her theory in Appendix 4, section 4. Below, I turn to a review of two executive

development researchers who have pioneered a way of establishing a link between executive self and executive role.

4. The Dialectic of Managerial Strengths and Weaknesses

> Ihr vielen unbestürmten Städte,
> habt ihr euch nie den Feind ersehnt?
> All of your undisturbed cities,
> haven't you ever longed for the Enemy?
>
> R.M. Rilke, Das Stundenbuch (A Book for for the Hours of Prayer)
>
> R. Bly, Selected Poems of R.M. Rilke, New York: Harper & Row, 1981.

Kaplan's (1991) work has to do with the imperative to "get personal" in executive development research as well as research-based executive-development

activities. He names his method "biographical action research." The method combines understanding lopsided adult development in executives with consulting to (coaching) them. In following this method, Kaplan "gets personal" regarding what Martin has conceived as the combined "false self" and "defense" layers of self (layers #1 to #5) that are in place to protect the executive's ego from shame and failure. Kaplan's getting personal is conceptualized by him as getting at executive character, in particular the character he names expansive. In ontic-developmental terms (Hodgett, 1994; Kegan, 1994; Popp, 1996), expansive character could be seen a particular style of adult functioning that is separate rather than relational, based on rigid boundaries and low flexibility in regard to interpersonal functioning. Given his broad conception of what it takes to accomplish a "character shift" away from expansiveness (separate style), Kaplan honors the insights one finds in K. Lewin's writings (Benne, 1984). That is, Kaplan is highly aware that a shift away from expansive character is not only a purely cognitive, but equally a value and a "motoric" shift. Such a shift can be expected to be resisted, or blocked by the inability to unlearn existing behavioral repertoires. Moreover, as McCall (1998) found in researching executive derailment, Kaplan also finds that "organizational complicity" is involved. In short, although Kaplan argues largely in terms of agentic development, his argument is informed by a broad range of psychoanalytic and ontic-developmental literature. The focus of his research and practice is on re-education and its associated difficulties of unlearning (Benne, 1984).

In contrast to McCall (1998), Kaplan is convinced that a behavioral approach to executive development does not suffice. (This conviction, shared by me, is the basis of dilemmas #8 to #10 of my critique of McCall.) Rather, a behavioral and a "personal" approach have to be used in conjunction with

each other (Kaplan, 1991, p. xii), to assist executives capable of "deep introspective self-development (Kaplan, 1991, p. 231). Kaplan sees the limitations of behavioral approaches to executive development as follows (Kaplan, 1991, p. 148):

> Behavioral methods are limited by the fact that they intentionally keep the person out of it (i.e., the research and coaching). (In a behavioral perspective,) change is something that the individual imposes upon himself or herself with minimal reference to identity, which after all accounts for the behavior in question.

By contrast, "personal approaches" are primarily concerned with correcting for lopsided development exemplified by expansive character. The term "character" as used by Kaplan is very close to the psychoanalytic notion, where it refers to a system of defenses (used in a value-neutral sense), in place to protect a person's inner self-structures (Vaillant, 1977, 1993, Martin, 1996). For Kaplan, character is (Kaplan, 1991, pp. 4-5):

> a set of deep-seated strategies used to enhance or protect one's sense of self-worth.

In order to put the expansive character in perspective, Kaplan contrasts it with the "relational character," thus harking back to Hodgetts (1994) research into style versus developmental logics (Hodgetts, 1994). In harmony with assumptions made by Kegan (1982), Kaplan conceives of a relational style (yearning for inclusion) in contrast to a style bent on independent achievement (yearning for autonomy) as two poles of human endeavor (Kaplan, 1991, pp. 175-176). He defines the relational character as follows (1991, p. 5):

> Rather than wanting to differentiate themselves as independent achievers, they (individuals manifesting a relational character, O.L.) want to integrate themselves into interdependent relationships. Relational people are thus those who are driven to seek communion or connectedness to in order to feel good about themselves.

As this implies, expansive executives may be functioning exquisitely in carrying out their decisional or informational roles (Mintzberg, 1989), but fall short in their interpersonal performance and their handling of power and authority. The reason for this developmental lopsidedness is that expansive executives have no other way to gain and maintain a feeling of self-worth, thus no other way to protect their ego-functioning (Martin's layers #6 to #10, Fig. 3). Such executives strive for success and achievement "as a means of obtaining and reinforcing a sense of self-worth, and are "vitally concerned with gaining mastery over his or her environment" (Kaplan, 1991, p. 5). This bias in favor of task mastery over relational competence leads to incongruencies in the level of executive development. However, change is possible.

Change is seen by Kaplan as an evolutionary, rather than revolutionary, development, as the word "shift" would lead one to assume (Kaplan, 1991, p. xiv):

> We have found that, while difficult, it is possible for executives to change in basic ways. Such changes are the evolutions--not revolutions--that many adults go through in the course of their lives. When managers undergo such an evolution--I call it a character shift --their performance noticeably improves. Not only that, they feel happier and better adjusted.

In this quote, Kaplan comes very close to endorsing an ontic notion of development, according to which executive development is a genus of adult development that not only "many," but all, adults pass through. More explicitly he states (Kaplan, 1991, p. 233):

> Any help they (i.e., expansive executives) get from professionals in doing so (i.e., making a character shift in midlife) is simply a way of enhancing or accelerating the natural process of maturation.

In short, the expansive character is a constellation of defenses, or personal style, that weakens an executive's capacity to gain and maintain self-worth in relational ways, and thus to achieve a developmental balance.

Kaplan distinguishes three types of expansive character. Each of these maintains, in Martin's terms (Fig. A1), a slightly different defensive posture or clinical profile (Kaplan, 1991, pp. 25 f., 71 f., 187 f):

- the striver-builder
- the self-vindicator/fix-it specialist
- the perfectionist-systematizer.

These different clinical profiles are associated by Kaplan with specific character difficulties. The striver-builder has difficulty with self-awareness and "owning up," predominantly relies on external recognition, and manifests self-deceptive narcissism. The self-vindicator suffers from ungratified narcissism (perhaps as a compensation for abuse in his family of origin), and uses overcompensation (reaction formation) to an extreme degree. Finally, the perfectionist-systematizer inflexibly sticks to principles and consequently is hypervigilant for lapses from principled action, having a dominant need to be right. As one executive instantiating the latter profile put it (Kaplan, 1991, p. 146):

> I have worked on providing positive feedback to my

> people. It's almost impossible for me to do it. I experience tremendous emotional turmoil. I try to provide some positive feedback, but I find it agonizing to do so. ... I understand the roots of this. I expect perfection.

An interesting way to emphasize the commonality of these dispositions, going beyond Martin's purely clinical model, might be to say, following Popp (1996, pp. 145 f.; see Appendix A3), that regardless of what is their specific ontic-developmental position or "order of consciousness" (Kegan, 1994), expansive characters have a rigid way of defining the boundaries that delimit self from not-self (Popp, 1996, p. 147). In addition, they manifest little flexibility in the way in which they regulate the permeability of their boundaries contextually in concrete situations (Popp, 1996, p. 157).

Kaplan expresses this rigidity by referring to executives as individual's who "don't get the message." He points out that such individuals can count on a considerable amount of "organizational complicity," to speak with McCall (1998). Kaplan rightfully points to organizational culture as the source of such complicity (Kaplan, 1991, p. 228):

> There are organizational circumstances in which what is required is an executive who is clearly overbalanced on the side of results (my emphasis).

Thus, the impermeability manifesting in an executive's style and, presumably, professional agenda, is powerfully nurtured and assisted by organizational requirements and norms (Kaplan, 1991, p. 30):

> The chief factor blocking helpful feedback to anyone in an organization is the near universal norm that inhibits people from telling other people what they really think of them. The form functions as a defense against the anxiety practically everyone feels about "getting personal" with someone else, especially when the message is critical and when much is riding on the judgment being rendered. To this [cultural, O.L.] condition affecting everyone is added the executive-specific condition of holding a highly placed position.

In short, power and authority inhibit disconfirming criticism (Kaplan, 1991, p. 36),

leading to isolation, need for flattery, resistance to criticism, and need for self-justification. For Kaplan, executive development activities such as coaching and mentoring must be put in place to counteract this psychosocial conspiracy (Kaplan, 1991, p. 228):

> The class of interventions with which we have been principally concerned in this book is deeply introspective self-development. This is self-development precipitated by a concentrated dose of constructive criticism (my emphasis).

As here expressed, Kaplan's notion of the thrust of executive-development activities stands in stark contrast to McCall's (1998). McCall's theory of professional role is out of touch with Kaplan's theory of motivation and professional self. Both, however, are an ingredient of an executive's professional agenda, as conceived in this study. McCall's "powerful experiences" would seem bloodless to Kaplan, since they "keep the person, i.e., the self, out (of it)." In fact, Kaplan might suspect such experiences--really structural opportunities--to be "mechanisms" utilized by the organizational conspiracy in propping up lopsidedly developed executives, thereby preparing them for derailment.

McCall's and Kaplan's theories of executive development are built on two different paradigms. These paradigms are dichotomous, and cry out for integration. Paradigm #1 is entitled "development by learning from experience" (where "experience" stands for "organizational opportunity," and is thus void of personal meaning-making), while paradigm #2 regards "deeply introspective self-development." Although Kaplan feels obliged to assert that deep personal development "is not for everyone" (Kaplan, 1991, p. 235) and "is not a panacea, ... a solution for all performance problems" (Kaplan, 1991, p. xiii), he nevertheless believes that personal development is ultimately "a way of enhancing or accelerating the natural process of maturation" (Kaplan, 1991, p. 233), thus a necessary ingredient for ontic development.

The fact that there exists almost no overlap between the two philosophies points to the fact that a comprehensive theory of executive development presently does not exist. Consequently, there is no consistent notion of what organizational activities "executive development" actually comprises, or should comprise. While McCall emphasizes task knowledge, as exercised in decisional and informational role functioning, Kaplan emphasizes personal knowledge, as manifest in interpersonal

performances that engage the self. Neither writer explicitly makes Hall's ability of

learning to learn, the capability of multiperspectival thinking (Hall, 1996), a cornerstone of his analysis. However, both writers understand the dialectics of executive strengths and weaknesses, the fact that what is called a "strength" in one context, required and/or exaggerated as it may be by an organization's culture, might turn into its opposite in another context.

***

The latter notion has been further explored by Drath (1990) with an emphasis on the meaning-making process of executives who experience a developmental "arrest" in the sense of Kaplan (1991). In defining the meaning-making process, Drath refers to Kegan (1982) whose notion of ontic development over the lifespan is based on that process. As Drath puts it (1990, p. 484):

> This article emphasizes the relationship between
> the structure of personal meaning [making] and
> the demands of leadership. I address the process
> by which a self is constructed and given meaning,
> the ever-shifting balance between self and other
> as the primary developmental movement of the self,
> and how the demands of leadership summon an
> especially autonomous meaning for the self,
> and then tend to fix that meaning and inhibit
> further development of personal meaning (making).

In Drath's view, it is "the demands of leadership" themselves that conspire to the developmental arrest Kaplan has diagnosed. While the dialectic of strengths and weaknesses is clearly seen by McCall (1998, pp. 21 f,), Drath's takes McCall's and Kaplan's inquiry to another level, that of meaning-making as the process undergirding self development (Kegan, 1982, 1994).

As McCall sees it, the dynamics of derailment comprises the following elements (McCall, 1998, p. 36):

- strengths become weaknesses
- blind spots (eventually) matter
- success leads to arrogance
- bad luck ("a run-in with fate") prevails.

This characterization is amplified by McCall by specifying the "dark sides" of competencies typically esteemed and promoted in executives (McCall, 1998, p. 37). (For example, somebody whose competency is to be "innovative" may have a tendency to unrealistic, impractical, wasting time and money.) In addition, McCall points out that there are "unindicted co-conspirators" to the developmental arrest, since "the organization creates a climate that can make learning and change harder or easier, depending on prevalent assumptions about development" (McCall, 1998, p. 53). The cultural assumptions on which the organizational conspiracy is based, are detailed by McCall as follows (McCall, 1998, p. 57):

> A closer look revealed that the culture strongly
> emphasized and subsequently assessed and rewarded
> individual achievement, when at higher levels many
> of the skills needed for success shifted toward
> teamwork, coordination and cooperation with others,
> and working through others to achieve synergy.

For both Kaplan (1991) and Drath (1990), as of course for Martin (1996), such a behavioral characterization of strengths and weaknesses in executives is insufficient, since it is not differentiated enough. The characterization lacks reference to how the executive's self is constructed (or "has ontically developed"), from which all behavioral manifestations are thought to follow. Except for psychoanalytical theories of executive self (Martin, 1996), the process of self-construction has so far not been taken

seriously in theories of executive development. Considering that coaching and mentoring are "executive-development activities," this lack of ontic-developmental differentiation has also had an impact on the prevalent theories of coaching and mentoring. It is this topic that Drath (1990) focuses on, thereby introducing cognitive-structural theories of adult development into research on executive development.

Drath states the topic as follows (Drath, 1990, p. 484):

> ... the strengths and weaknesses of successful, effective managers are related to capacities and limitations in their systems of personal meaning.

Singling out for attention executives' lack of relational competence (McCall's "insensitivity"), Drath states (Drath, 1990, p. 484):

> ... their (the executives') structure of meaning is the root of their difficulty with implementing participative management.

With regard to relational competence, in a context of increasing diversity, executives are "in a bind," in that they are asked "to behave toward subordinates in ways that run counter to what has made them successful" (Drath, 1990, p. 484). Thus emphasizing Lewin's theme of re-education and unlearning, Drath postulates (Drath, 1990, p. 484):

> To escape this bind, managers must engage in development at a personal level, and organizations must evolve into institutions that can support such development.

This postulate of organization-wide re-education and culture transformation is, as Lewin has been telling us, difficult to achieve in practical terms: it involves unlearning (Drath, 1990, p. 484):

> We have described how high-level managers have difficulty getting, accepting, and acting on developmental feedback.

Given that the characterological aspect of this difficulty has been explored by Kaplan (1989, 1990, 1991), what remains is the complementary task (Drath, 1990, p. 484):

> to examine the relationship between character and leadership from the viewpoint of development and self-construction, ... (thereby addressing) the activity of creating contexts of meaning in which such concerns as mastery and self-worth make sense.

Since the theoretical underpinnings of Drath's investigation of executive strengths and weaknesses will be more closely outlined in Appendix A3, I restrict myself here to a brief summary.

In full harmony with Kegan (1982), although without the benefit of having access to (Kegan, 1994), Drath derives from the former's 1982 theory of the evolving self the following hypothesis (Drath, 1990, p. 488):

> that many important managerial strengths and weaknesses are related to the capacities and limits of a manager's life "stage" in the development of meaning making with respect to self and others.

(While Kegan distinguishes the epistemological "other" from the social "others," Drath does not.) While so far in this study, the term "stage" has indicated a stage of life-structure "development" in the sense of Levinson et al. (1978), in the context of Drath's study, "stage" refers to what I have called ontic-developmental position or level, equivalent to Kegan's "order of consciousness." In particular, Drath's focus is on Kegan's "institutional stage," an ontic-developmental position not determined by, although limited by, age. For Drath, this position has two main aspects (Drath, 1990, p. 488):

> (1) ... interpersonal relationships ... move from being subject (something the executive is immersed in, O.L.) to being object (something that is under the control of the executive's system of values, O.L.), and ...
> (2) ... the creation of a distinct, autonomous identity, which becomes the subject (the context in which the executive is embedded, and thus cannot take responsibilty for, O.L.) of this meaning structure.

("Meaning structure" here refers to Kegan's "order of consciousness," and my equivalent "ontic-developmental position"). The shift stated under (1), above, is actually based on (2). A short way to circumscribe the "shift" is to say that one ceases to BE ones relationships in favor of HAVING them. This implies that one is "conscious of" having them, thus able to control them, rather than being unconsciously immersed in them. The semantic meaning of the term "institutional" in (2), above, refers to the fact that a person at this ontic-developmental position creates "a distinct, autonomous identity" that is an institution in its own right. Given that, according to Kegan (1982), all ontic-developmental positions have their inherent limits, the person managing his or her self from this position is embedded in, or subject to, that position, and thus is not typically aware of the limits of his or her institutional self (or the quality of his or her meaning-making, for that matter). Rather, the institutional quality of psychological functioning is at the "basic assumption" level where it defines the person's culture.

The ontic-developmental dialectics of executives' strengths and weaknesses is demonstrated by Drath in regard to interpersonal relationships within an organization. At the institutional stage of ontic development (Drath, 1990, p. 488):

> one can separate the self from the context of the interpersonal and become one's "own person." ... [This] brings into being an identity that takes over the function of self-regulation previously accomplished through direct reference to the needs and standards of others such as parents, authority figures, or peers. In this stage, the identity becomes a "psychic institution" that sets up an internal "government" of self regulation.

It is relevant here, to remind the reader of the basic conceptualization undergirding this study, briefly outlined the Orientation to the study. The way interpersonal relationships are managed by an executive is for me an aspect of their professional agenda. In my view, the same that Drath, following Kegan, says of the way executives manage interpersonal relationships can be said of the professional agenda in its entirety. (For a justification of this generalization, see Appendix A3). An executive at the "institutional" ontic-developmental position is no longer identified with and immersed in the agenda, mistaking the organization for him- or herself (or the organization's values for his or her own). Rather, the executive has redrawn his or her psychological boundaries so that they do not coincide with organizational boundaries, whether inner or outer.

For instance, it would be difficult for Kaplan's "striver-builder" (Kaplan, 1991, pp. 25 f.), a person who heavily relies on external recognition, to do so without becoming aware of it in his transition to the institutional position. In that developmental position, he would possess at least the potential to overcome his or her own pre-institutional limits (in the ontic-developmental sense) that constitute "expansiveness." This, however, is made difficult in his present (pre-institutional) epistemologic by the fact that his management of inner and outer boundaries lets the organization appear to him as the predominating (external and internal) "institution" to whom he owes primary loyalty. The organization, in turn, may like and reward him for what he is, thus sabotaging his "unlearning" of cognitive schemes, values, and physiological and emotional reactions. It is this difficulty encountered in personal "re-education" (Benne, 1984) that both Kaplan and Drath refer to as "organizational conspiracy." Evidently, this is an issue of psychological boundary management, and

thus of great relevlance in coaching for development.

What in McCall (1998) and Kaplan (1991) was seen as personal "strengths" and "weaknesses" becomes, in Drath's view, a manifestation of the positive and the negative aspects of the particular ontic-developmental stage an executive is at. Drath (1990) thus transforms the behavioral (McCall) or characterological (Kaplan) dialectics of strengths and weaknesses in executives into an ontic-

developmental one. This seemingly straightforward transformation is however, not without its problems (Kegan, 1994) since, to speak with Hodgetts (1994), it assimilates what is a relational or separate style to a developmental logic. As pointed out at the beginning of Appendix A1, by referring to Hodgetts' work, this amounts to a simplification of the dialectics involved. By equating style with (developmental) logics, one reduces the options executives can be said to have at each ontic-developmental stage. For instance, an executive at the stage preceding the "institutional" stage, referred to by Kegan as "interpersonal," is not straightforwardly determined by his or her ontic-developmental position or "logics," to display either a "relational" or a "separate" (autonomous) style. Rather, this stylistic choice remains in existence at all adult-developmental positions (i.e., for all logics).

To illustrate the importance of the distinction between style and ontic-developmental position (logic), take the example Drath gives to explain "toughness in decision making" of executives (Drath, 1990, p. 490):

> Another prominent managerial strength arising from taking relationship as an object is toughness in decision making. This [toughness] is possible because of the way the institutional stage dramatically reduces the role of interpersonal feelings in decision making. Although a manager's "rational" approach to decisions can be explained in terms of learned skills [i.e., behaviorally], the objectification of feelings allows such a rational analysis to proceed without the manager's experiencing undue qualms.

In terms of Kegan's 1994 book, this is a caricature of ontic-developmental psychology writing. It suffers not only from the lack of distinguishing between style and logic (which the Drath of 1990 could not have known about), but also from an incorrect assimilation of value-laden terms such as "rational" and "feeling" and of super-ego manifestations such as "undue qualms," to ontic-developmental, i.e., epistemological,

concepts.

In reality, ontic-developmental inquiry is more subtle. There is no straightforward, one-to-one relationship between character traits such as "toughness" and behavioral manifestations such as "experiencing (no) undue qualms" to ontic-developmental positions. This is so because the gist of a developmental assessment regards the process by which, for example, decisions, are made, not the quality of, or the outcome of, the decisions (which, of course, highly matter in an organizational context). In light of this distinction between epistemological process and psychological or organizational outcome, it is incorrect to speak of, e.g., the institutional stage, as automatically entailing that it "dramatically reduces the role of interpersonal feelings in decision making." As this reductionist use of ontic-developmental

nomenclature demonstrates, using this nomenclature responsibly presupposes doing away with many of the "public relations uses" of developmental terms that are abundant in the phasic-developmental literature in general, and the executive development literature in particular (Basseches, 1984). It entails making distinctions not typically made, which enhance the order of complexity of writings about executive development.

The above critique of Drath's exposition of ontic-developmental theory in no way diminishes its methodological relevance, and the fact that it is a pioneering piece of writing in the organizational literature. In fact, Drath's inquiry is so incisive that he was able to articulate, almost a decade ago, what from a (developmental) cognitive-science perspective would be seen as the link between organizational structure and the ontic-developmental position of those who establish and politically maintain it (Drath, 1990, p. 493):

> ... the institutional stage of meaning evolution corresponds to and flourishes in what Jaques (1989) calls the "accountability hierarchy." I believe that many of our present organizations have arisen from the predominant meaning structure of the white men firmly entrenched in this stage who have largely formed these organizations. This type of organization, with its system of hierarchical accountability and its regulatory mechanisms, is a fitting environment for the self-regulating internal government of the institutional stage.

In this quote, Drath falls back into the incorrect identification of style with logic. This identification invalidates many of his straightforward-seeming deductions regarding

managerial strengths and weaknesses. However, although he is disregarding that an organizational institution cannot be straightforwardly assimilated to the epistemological "institution" of self at the ontic-developmental stage called "institutional," he is here formulating a forceful cognitive-science argument. The argument is that of sociologists inspired by cognitive science, such as Sims and Gioia (1986), who propose that organizations should be understood as "thinking organizations" in that their members' implicit theories (i.e., basic assumptions or theories-in-use) determine much of the very structure of organizations (Sims & Gioia, 1986, p. 1):

> People in organizations are not simply "actors." They are unique in that they do not just do, they also think. More accurately, perhaps, they often take action as a result of their thinking. In a related vein, organizations themselves do not "behave" independently of the people who construct and manage them. At their essence organizations are products of the thought and' action of their members [my highlighting].

With specific regard to organizational structure, Downey & Brief state (1986, p. 165):

> This chapter deals with the broad issue of what role cognition plays in the development of organizational structure In addition to arguing that cognitions play a central role in the development of organizational structures, this chapter will develop two ... ideas. First, we will suggest that cognitive structures of organizational members are, in fact, an essential ingredient in organizational functions. Second, we will attempt to demonstrate that an understanding of the ways in which cognitive structures might exert their influence is critical to practicing managers.

Although these authors, a decade and a half ago, were not thinking ontic-developmentally, their argument undergirds Drath's conjecture of a link between where ontic-developmentally the executives comprising an organization's apex "are," and what is the structure, if not also the political and human-resource culture, of that organization.

The demonstration, above, would suggest that the introduction of ontic-developmental psychology into theories of executive development is of far-reaching relevance to the future of organizational theory at large, forshadowing a synthesis of theories say, by Mintzberg (1989), Schein (1992), and Kegan (1994). Such an extension of organizational theory into the ontic-developmental domain would shed light on the structural-political relevance of coaching and mentoring which so far have predominantly been conceived in terms of a human-resource perspective. These executive-development activities, when carried out with an ontic-developmental goal in mind, could in fact become instrumental in changing the developmental status of an entire organization (see chapter V, section 2.7). It is unlikely that such a "culture transformation," to speak with Martin (1996), can be expected to result from merely clinical interventions. Rather, it would seem to require clinical-developmental coaching strategies.

In retrospect, Kaplan's assessment of expansive character as developmental "arrest" (Kaplan, 1991) and Drath's (1990) attempt to link that arrest to ontic-developmental theory, can be said to be major conceptual breakthroughs in regard to an empirically based, scientific theory of executive development. It is a finding that puts McCall's "learning from experience," or action learning, and Kaplan's "deeply introspective self-development" into one and the same ontic-developmental groove, that of constructive-developmental theory. The perspective supported by this theory undercuts the ideological tendency, so "powerful" in this society, to single out executives as heros, and bestow on them special qualities that seem ontic-developmentally beyond reach, and thus mysterious. Kaplan's findings also re-invigorate the Marxian question, researched by Kohn (1980) and Basseches (1984), and equally taken up by Argyris and Schein, about what are the deformations of character and of human development that organizational culture, especially patriarchal culture, imposes on individual development, and the long-term cost of such

deformations even in terms of dollars and cents. By showing expansiveness to be developmental arrest, thus a failure in re-education, Kaplan also placates the "conspiracy" (McCall, 1998) of certain organizational cultures whose basic assumptions about development, along the Darwinian lines of the "right stuff," not only contribute to individual developmental arrest society-wide, but are themselves based on developmental positions exemplifying such an arrest. Both Kaplan and Drath thus implicitly speak to the necessity of a "culture transformation" (Martin, 1996) of such organizations. As a result, notions of organizations as "thinking organizations," i.e., as built on the developmental dispositions of organization members (Sims & Gioia,

1986), enter into the theory of executive development. The theory is thus encouraged to become one in which theories of self and theories of organizational role are no longer kept apart. In light of such a theory, any design of "executive development systems" that is built on executive role alone is empirically unaccaptable from the moment of its introduction. This has the further consequence that theories of coaching that "leave the person (i.e., the self) out" of their purview, and rely on organizationally-based "competency models," are both theoretically limited and lack practical effectiveness. The reasons for this are shown more clearly in Appendix 3, on theories of adult development.

Appendix A3

Theories of adult development

In the previous two sections, I have elucidated the sociological surround of executive-development activities, as well as the organizational and psychological impediments that create dilemmas in pursuing such activities. In this chapter, I take on the intricacies of adult-developmental notions of self, psychological boundaries, and real-time, day-to-day psychological functioning in a "clinical" sense of the term. After a general introduction to adult-developmental issues, I discuss, in sequence, stage theories of personal change, of adult development, and of managerial effectiveness:

1. Introduction to Adult-Developmental Theory
2. Stage Theories of Personal Change
3. Stage Theories of Adult Development
4. Stage Theories of Managerial Effectiveness.

My discussion focuses on development in the workplace, more specifically, executive development and coaching as an executive development activity.

1 Introduction to Adult-Developmental Theory

If we have learned anything from the literature discussed in previous chapters, especially studies by Kaplan and Drath in Appendix A2, it is "that studies dealing with the whole person are more valuable than those that look at how a person performs certain isolated tasks" (Commons, 1996, p. x). According to the editor of a recent central reference work in clinical-developmental psychology, this is also the focus of that discipline's present endeavors. Developmentally oriented research efforts are most helpful in finding new ways of conceptualizing "what is going in coaching," taken as an executive development activity. However, to apply such research is not a straightforward task, nor can the way one goes about it be entirely value-free. But perhaps, the research can become increasingly less ethnocentric.

In this study, I view executive development as a special form of adult development in the workplace. About a decade ago, Cytrynbaum et al. and Basseches independently, and from different vantage points, concluded that there does not exist a

comprehensive theory of such development. This fact is highly astonishing in a culture in which work assumes a central place for the self-understanding of its adults members, and increasingly even of some of its adolescents. It seems to me a reasonable belief, well expressed by Goldberg (1996, p. 1):

> that people can be best understood as acting in such a way as to make their experiences meaningful to them in terms of how they conceptualize the situations in which they find themselves in light of their perception of their own personal identity.

This ontic-developmental formulation has three points of emphasis: (1) making experiences meaningful to oneself, and (2) conceptualizing situations in one finds oneself, (3) in light of one's own personal identity.

The first point is a constructivist one. It emphasizes that experiences, however "powerful," are not by themselves meaningful, and that they become "powerful" only to the extent that they result from a meaning-making process centrally related to one's identity. This entails that "learning from experience" (as in, e.g., "experience tells us") is different from "learning from experiences" (as in, e.g., "this job was a good experience for me"), in that the former deals with objectified, pre-packaged experiences or developmental opportunities as outlined in McCall (1998), while the latter speaks to the impact of experiences on personal identity. The second point, above, is a cognitive one. It says that adults develop at least a pop-theory of what situation they are in, by employing long-standing "learned" intellectual schemata, implicit theories, cognitive maps, etc. (Sims & Gioia, 1986) to make sense of what is going on around them. The third point, finally, is an epistemological one. It postulates that humans make sense of experiences with reference to their own identity as they presently conceptualize and articulate (espouse) it. This is a subtle point, since it entails that there may be a gulf between "theory-in-use" and "espoused theory" (Argyris et al., 1985), or organizationally between "basic assumptions" and espoused values (strategies, goals, philosophies) (Schein, 1992, p. 17). Whether personal or organizational identity is concerned, from a cognitive-developmental perspective this "in light of ... identity" is a crucial matter. Far from being a relativistic caveat, "in light of" emphasizes that perspectives individuals hold, and experiences they "have," are determined by their position along the trajectory of lifespan development, and that this development is centrally happening around what, in this culture, individuals consider their identity. This in turn determines where and how individuals see the boundaries between ME and NOT-ME, or SUBJECT and OBJECT, and how flexibly they handle such boundaries (Popp, 1996, pp. 147 f.). Sociologically and anthropologically, taking such issues into account amounts to breaking down the barrier between private and public life, as Fletcher finds necessary for creating the "new 'blended' protean worker" who is in charge of his or her own development (Fletcher, 1996, p. 127).

Essentially, then, in "getting personal" (Kaplan, 1991) and introducing adult developmental issues into executive development theory, I am introducing a new level of complexity, both conceptual and empirical. In the new context, it becomes important to be more aware of what values one is endorsing,

and to state the beliefs one adopts more explicitly. This is nothing but what Argyris has encouraged us to do for a long time. Just as it is difficult to define mental health out of context with "implicit or explicit reference to an idea of a healthy human society" (Basseches, 1984, p. 333), so it is, in my view, difficult to define what is healthy executive development without implicit or explicit reference to that same idea, especially in a society dominated by organizations (Mintzberg, 1989). From my vantage point, adopting a view of executive development as related to healthy human development, can critically inform studies in the relationship of individual and organization in executive development (Schein, 1978).

Why, however, did one have to wait for this point of view to emerge until the beginning of the 21st century? The reasons for this are legion, including the nature of the old career contract that implied rigid developmental steps or phases (Dalton, 1989); the "Darwinian" right-stuff ideology of development pervasive to this day in organizations (McCall, 1998); the lack of a cognitive-science theory of organizations and culture (Bolman & Deal, 1991; Schein, 1992); the absence of "relational theory" (Gilligan, 1982) and, last but not least, the absence of a scientific interest in people's relationship to work and development at work (Basseches, 1984; Cytrynbaum et al., 1989, Demick & Miller, 1993). In addition, there are methodological reasons for, and ideological struggles contributing to, this absence of studies in human development in the workplace in clinical-developmental psychology (Goldberg, 1996). Some of these bear brief mention here.

The notion of adult development emerged as an (initially polemic) antidote to the notion of child development in the post-Piagetian (1970) and post-Kohlbergian

(1969) research traditions. The term signals the empirical fact as well as theoretical persuasion that human development is life-long, far from coming to rest in early adulthood. The notion of adult development began its life as a clinical-developmental term. As a consequence, the initial emphasis was on the link between psychological pathology, or "mental disorder," and the delays and arrests of development typical of individuals carrying a pathology. Says the preface to a recent compendium on adult development (Commons, Demick, and Goldberg, 1996, p. ix):

> The majority of the adult-developmental literature
> is crowded with studies on loss and pathology.

More precisely, the theory of adult development began in the Freudian domain of love and pathology, in many ways constituting what today is called "developmental psychopathology" (Noam, 1988; Noam & Dill, 1996). However, as Noam (1988) points out, a difference should be made between developmental psychopathology and clinical-developmental psychology. The former has as its primary focus "developmentally based interventions to alleviate or prevent psychological problems" (Noam, 1988, p. 92), especially in children and adolescents, while the latter, in Demick's view, applies more generally to

problems of managing transitions in adult life (Demick, 1996, p. 340), of which transitions in individuals' work life may be an important ingredient (Demick & Miller, 1993). Where, by contrast, psychodynamic thinking has dealt with adult work and with organizations (Czander, 1993), especially in the object-relational tradition (Kets de Vries, et al., 1984; Kets de Vries, 1984), it has never adopted an adult-developmental point of view, essentially seeing problems of adult life as extensions of immutable structures laid down in childhood and adolescence.

It is mainly due to J. Piaget's studies in genetic epistemology, that is, human cognition (1948-1975; Piaget, 1970) that the "positive growth" strand of constructivist adult development research has emerged (Loevinger, 1976; Kegan, 1982; Basseches, 1984). Dialectically breaking away from, and thus simultaneously maintaining the link to, psychodynamic theories of human development, Kegan, discussing the "unrecognized genius of Jean Piaget," states (Kegan, 1982, pp. 33; 44):

> The notion of development as a sequence of internalizations, a favorite conception of psychodynamic thinking, is quite consistent with
>
> the Piagetian concept of growth. ... It is just this recognition that processes of internalization are intrinsically related to the movement of adaptation which makes the Piagetian perspective so promising; ... this evolutionary movement is the ... grounding phenomenon in personality.

This is underscored by Basseches, who emphasizes that Piaget's interest "was primarily in understanding knowledge, and general forms of knowing, rather than in understanding individual persons (1989, p. 189):

> [Piaget's) theory made a major contribution to to developmental psychology by helping psychologists to think of development as transformation in the direction of greater epistemological adequacy, or as construction of more adequate forms of knowing.

Since Piaget's telos of development falls into early adulthood and is thought by him to regard structures (schemata) of "formal thinking," much of the positive-growth research following J. Piaget and his brother in spirit, L. Kohlberg, stylized itself as being focused on "postformal" thought, or thought developing only after early adulthood. Today, the notion of "postformal thought" is firmly established (Commons, Armon et al. (Eds.), 1990), and largely converges with that of "adult development" seen from a neo-Piagtian, "constructivist" point of view.

In addition to the constructivist research tradition, a life-phase oriented, "phasic" tradition has arisen from the work of Levinson et al. (1978). It is this tradition, centered around the notion of a periodically refashioned "life structure" that, more than any other, has had an impact on career theory's notions of adult development and its relational resources (Kram, 1988; Kram & Hall, 1996). In this

tradition, adult development is seen as an alternation of "stable (structure-building) periods and transitional (structure-changing) periods" (Levinson et al., 1978, p. 49). Establishing oneself at work in early adulthood is seen as an important ingredient of establishing a life structure which is the medium in which to realize a personal vision (dream) of life, i.e., a "deeply personal understanding of self in the world that is projected into the future" (Cytrynbaum et al., 1989, p. 75). In following this Levinsonian tradition, Demick (1996), in an attempt to clarify different theoretical approaches to adult development, sees a crucial difference between theories of life and of personality (p. 117):

> I have drawn on Levinson's (1986) distinction between theories of lives (conceptualizations of answers to such questions as "What is this person's life like?") and theories of personality (conceptualizations of answers to such questions as "What kind of a person is this?).

As Demick makes clear, this distinction is largely, although in his view not entirely, identical with the one between the "phasic" (Levinson) and the "structural" (Piagetian) research traditions (Demick, 1996, p. 117):

> I have chosen ... not to discuss here those structural theories that have focused on individuals as collections of traits (e.g., Kegan, 1982; Loevinger, 1976), skills (e.g., Selman, 1980), and/or psychoanalytically oriented theories that have emphasized isolated human aspects such as wishes/conflicts (e.g., Erikson, 1969; Freud, 1935) and defenses (e.g., Vaillant, 1977).

This somewhat polemic and controversial statement regarding the "structural" tradition of adult development research is made by Demick in favor of what he names a "person-in-environment approach" to adult development, especially critical life transitions. Demick's approach has many elements in common with Levinson's "phasic" approach, except that it is a "stage," and not a "non-stage," approach to development as is Levinson's (Demick, 1996, p. 116; Wapner & Demick, 1992).

An long-standing controversy in theories of adult development is that around the notion of stage. This debate has lead to the distinction of "stage" versus "non-stage" approaches. The notion of stage is important for this study of executive coaching from a methodological point of view. Whether they know it or not, Kaplan's and Drath's "biographical action research" methodologically partakes in the mentioned debate. Adopting a non-stage approach to adult development, Kaplan (1991) focuses on how executives' biography might influence their professional life, especially how it might elucidate executives' difficulties of "making a character shift" in working toward change in their adult life. Kaplan speaks of developmental "imbalance" as leading to "developmental arrest," and sees biographical action research as a way of redressing lopsided development (Kaplan, 1991, p. 227). By contrast, Drath (1990), taking a stage-approach to adult development, attempts to explain the difficulty executives encounter in making a

character shift by employing Kegan's concept of stage as an "order of consciousness" (Kegan, 1982). While Drath is only dimly aware of what

employing a stage concept methodologically entails, his choice has far-reaching consequences for the constructive-developmental exploration of executive development.

As Demick (1996) reports, far-reaching entailments of the stage concept that they found in conflict with clinical findings have led "Noam (1988) and Basseches (1989) in particular" (Demick, 1996, Epilog, pp. 341-342):

> to go beyond pure stage theories that propose universal structures for crucial yet isolated aspects of human functioning. As Noam has stated, earlier stage theories "have reduced the social construction of self to a current balance between person and world, and have lost sight of the fact that the self, in fact, can continuously fluctuate between different developmental levels" (Noam, p. 94).

Since, in an orthodox-Piagetian identification of "stage" with "developmental level," such fluctuations tend to be viewed as "regressions to a lower stage," the dialectics of stability and change in such fluctuations becomes hard or impossible to account for. In addition, if "stage" is taken as a stable "equilibrium" in the ongoing dynamics of adult meaning-making, rather than a relatively stable point of transition to a subsequent equilibrium (Kegan, 1994), one is likely to find it hard to see, to speak with Drath (1990) and McCall (1998), that personal "strengths" have their own inherent peril. This is so since (Kegan, 1994, p. 373):

> increased complexity can also be put to the purpose of creating ever more elaborate ways of holding off unintegrated parts of the self's meaning-making.

In a needed correction of notions of stage, Noam (1988, 1996) has investigated (Demick, p. 342):

> the ways in which weaknesses of self may be manifest not only at lower states of ego and self development, by also at more complex stages ...

According to Demick, this had led Noam (Demick, 1996, Epilog, p. 342):

> to eschew the notion of developmental arrest/fixation and to propose that stage descriptions of self need

> to be complemented by more content-oriented, biographical or life history considerations.

Noam himself has done so by introducing the notion of encapsulation, i.e., of "pockets of old meaning systems that are guided by the cognitive and affective logic ... that governed at the time the encapsulation occurred" in a psychodynamic sense. Noam demonstrates empirically that a "higher" stage of adult development is not by definition "better" but embodies its own limitations and perils. Making a distinction between self-complexity and self-integration, Noam states (Noam & Dill, 1996, p. 289):

> Self-complexity refers to the extent of differentiation within the self and in relationships to others. Self-complexity, however, is no guarantee for positive mental health. ...

By contrast, Noam's concept of self-integration (Noam et Dill, 1996, p. 289),

> refers to the ways in which earlier developmental positions have been built upon and synthesized. If earlier self-positions have not been adequately transformed, the self is fragile and prone to fragmentation.

In other words, self-complexity that is not supported by self-integration is not a sign of health, but of pathology.

A correction of stage theories similar to that by Noam is undertaken Basseches (Demick, 1996, p. 342):

> In a similar manner, Basseches (1989) has argued that "structural stage conceptions fail to reflect the complexity and diversity of individuals' meaning-making," and need to be complemented by an understanding of each person's unique psychological organization, ... defined as the sum total of a person's activities and meaning-making schemes as exists at any point in time.

In consequence of this, Basseches argues that "while individuals are best understood as having their own unique psychological organizations and developmental histories, stages are best understood as philosophical, not psychological concepts" (Basseches, 1989, p. 192).

It is this insight into the complexity of individuals' life, including their professional life, that justifies the adoption of what Kaplan (1991) calls "biographical

action research," a non-stage approach to executive development in which an individual's "unique psychological organization" becomes thematic. This approach differs from Noam's and Basseches' primarily in that it sees clinical intervention in a more organizationally informed manner, where the attempt of the person intervening, whether consultant or coach, is "to enact a community of inquiry in a community of practice" (Argyris et al., 1987, p. 12). Seemingly unaware of the entailments of embracing Kegan's stage theory of development, Drath (1990) takes a near-orthodox Piagetian view of the stage concept, in supposing that the inherent limitations of any stage straightforwardly determine all behavioral and

axiological (value-related) manifestations of an individual's meaning-making. As one can infer from the previous discussion of Hodgett's research (Appendix A1), regarding the difference between style (expansive, relational, separate, etc.) and (epistemo-) logic, this is not a correct rendition of Kegan's current thinking.

The relationship between Kaplan's non-stage and Drath's stage approach to executive development is elucidated by Basseches's reflection on the stage concept. According to Basseches, "stage structure may be looked at in two ways" (Basseches, 1989, pp. 194-196):

> I as an answer to the question of how an epistemological equilibrium is produced
>
> II as describing features which we can recognize, ... across individuals' unique psychological organization.

The first interpretation of stage, referred to as "epistemological," primarily has to do with ontogenetically emerging forms of knowing self and world that constitute an equilibrium of accommodation to, and assimilation of, experience (Piaget, 1970; Alexander et al. (Eds.), 1990). The second interpretation of the stage concept, highly useful for psychotherapy and coaching, is (Basseches, 1989, p. 196):

> an ideal-type description of forms of equilibrium [of experience that] ... direct our attention to precisely those common features of psychological organization which can be seen as being in part responsible for a person's degree of success
>
> or failure in maintainin an equilibrium in a particular area of their functioning.

The second interpretation of stage is implicitly articulated by Kaplan (1991) in expressions such as "lopsided development" and "imbalance to be redressed" in executives' character, i.e., as a failure to maintain an experiential equilibrium. By contrast, the first interpretation of stage is employed by Drath (1990), to explain this failure "epistemologically," as a result of the limitations of meaning-making at a particular stage. While the first stage interpretation is epistemological, referring to forms of knowing, the second stage interpretation is --not strictly psychological in the clinical sense, but an important guide to psychological understanding. In very concrete terms (Basseches, 1989, p. 196):

> Each ideal-type form of equilibrium articulated by constructive-developmental theory describes a capacity for handling particular types of problems as well as a lack of capacity for even grasping more

sophisticated sorts of problems.

In other words, in terms of interpretation II, stage describes "strengths" and "weaknesses" of a particular equilibrium in assimilating and accommodating to experience, personal or organizational. The important point Basseches is making in

offering two interpretations of the notion of stage is that it makes good sense from a practical perspective, both in psychotherapy and coaching, to conceive of psychological organization as based on epistemological "equilibrium structures" (Basseches, 1989, p. 196):

> In sum, the stage structure models (i.e., stage theories of development, O.L.) draw our attention to formal features that can be recognized as more or less clearly reflected in various samples of the meaning-making activity of individuals, and that have a great deal to do with the person's epistemological and adaptive effectiveness. They help us notice important differences in different people's capacity to assimilate information and organize activity, or in a single person's varying capacities to assimilate and organize across situations.

At the same time, Basseches reminds us that "stage" is a philosophical, not a strictly

psychological, concept (Basseches, 1989, p. 196):

> But we must remember the distinction between psychological organizations and philosophical structures. Each person's psychological organization is unique and has developed according to its own unique history. Philosophical stages logically presuppose preceding stages, and this relationship assures the empirical prediction that one will not find the defining features of an earlier stage in the same sequence, within a person's developmental history. However, many different stage sequences, could, in theory, be formulated, and none should be seen as descriptive accounts of all individuals' psychological histories (my emphasis, O.L.).

In my view, this entails that "in theory" a theory specific to executive development could be constructed that makes use of the notion of stage to elucidate the psychological and developmental histories of executives. However, as shown by Drath (1990), such a theory would be at high risk for massively reducing the complexity of executives' unique psychological organization to some ideal-typical commonality.

Demick summarizes the controversies over the stage concept as follows (Demick, 1996, p. 343):

> Both theorists (i.e., Noam and Basseches) would agree that:
> (a) there is continuity between normal and abnormal behavior;
> (b) a goal of clinical intervention is to help individuals create new and more balanced meaning in his or her life;
> (c) ... the concept of transformation is an extremely powerful one with the potential to integrate the subfields of clinical and developmental psychology.

Reminding the reader of the title of this study, namely, "Transformative effects of coaching on executives' professional agenda," I hold that the concept of transformation is also a strategical concept for integrating clinical-developmental psychology with organizational psychology, or at least that branch of it that regards executive development. In working on issues of transformation, it cannot be stipulated in advance whether stage or non-stage theories will fare better. While stage theories tend to assume that human functioning is the same across all the different domains of living,

non-stage theories, or theories maintaining a critical distance to the notion of stage, are perhaps more sensitive to discontinuities in both life and personality. I would agree with R. Kegan, that it makes methodological sense "to hold a 'consistency assumption,' but not a simple-minded one" (Kegan, 1994, p. 371):

> I do believe that the self seeks coherence in its organizing according to its most complex principle of organization, but it does not always succeed. Even when it does not succeed, however, I believe that forms of consistency are still be in evidence.

Taking the on-going debate between stage and non-stage theories of adult development into account, Demick takes up a suggestion made by Bee (1992), who elaborates a useful matrix of developmental theories available today (Demick, 1996, p. 118).

Insert Fig. A3 here

As shown, the diagram partitions extant theories of adult development into four categories, based on the twofold distinction between development and change, on one hand, and the assumption of stages or lack thereof, on the other. While there certainly are considerable differences between the theories grouped together by these categories, there is enough of a family similarity to justify their being viewed as members of a group. As can be seen, none of the "developmental" theories so far adopted in career theory and research on executive development--and on coaching, for that matter-- qualifies as an ontic-developmental theory in terms of Basseches' criteria (which are independent of stage versus non-

stage assumptions). In terms of these criteria, Kaplan's theory of expansive character can be understood as a non-stage theory of change, while Levinson et al.'s theory is best categorized as a stage-theory of change. This classification groups Kaplan's theory together with a number of important clinical theories of "personal change in an organizational context" that make no claim to be dealing with adult development (Czander, 1993; Martin, 1996). The classification is in harmony with the fact that while Kaplan is aware of issues of "developmental arrest," he is not explicit regarding the ontic-developmental implications of "character shifts." By contrast, his colleague Drath attempts to "explain" executives' strengths and weaknesses as a straightforward consequence of

their "being at" a certain stage of development (following the early Kegan).

There are various ways in which the distinction between development and change, made in Fig. A3, can be conceived. In the present context, two aspects of this distinction seem most relevant: the meaning of this distinction (1) for theories of "learning from experience," particularly in the sense of McCall (1998); and (2) for conceptions of what might be going on in coaching (see Appendix A4). In my view, the most concise explication as to what is involved in the distinction between development and change is that made by Basseches in the context of his critique of Levinson's phasic theory of adult development (of which below). Basseches who, as shown in Fig. A3, adopts a non-stage theory as does Levinson et al. (and thus cannot be accused of favoring stage theories over non-stage theories), acknowledges the merits of Levinson's conception of adult development as follows (Basseches, 1984, p. 324):

> From the perspective of a concern with adult development, ... the important question raised by Levinson et al.'s findings may be phrased as follows: Under what circumstances does confronting a life-crisis (which is due to one's life-structure becoming unworkable) lead simply to the formation of a new set of beliefs and a new way of living more appropriate to the future (the next life structure); and under what circumstances does the confrontation lead to reconceptualizing one's life historically, in a more sophisticated and dialectical way?

A simplified way of restating this definition might be say that while change has to do with adaptation and learning--the formation of new beliefs and the adoption of a new way of living--, development has to do with a transformation of the logic, or "epistemology" of ways of meaning-making that ensues from a change or personal learning. In light of this definition, experience translates as little automatically into learning as learning and change automatically translate into development. In fact, what can be learned and adapted to, and how what is learned is made use of and adapted to, depends on the process of meaning-making that undergirds the change or learning in question. For theories of "learning from experience" this entails that the burden on them is to demonstrate that what has been learned not only

leads to new adaptations, but "to reconceptualizing one's life historically, in an [ontic-developmentally] more sophisticated and dialectical way." For theories of coaching that aspire to be more than mere theories of personal change this entails that they, too, should demonstrate that

the outcome of coaching entails a transformation, in the ontic-developmental sense of the word, of ways of "conceptualizing one's life historically."

In order to demonstrate the meaning of the distinction just drawn between change and development, let me return to some of the unsolved dilemmas of McCall's model of executive development (Appendix A2, section 2). Once one takes an ontic-developmental view, stage or non-stage, of executive development, the circularity of McCall's model (dilemma #6) becomes quite evident. There is simply no way in which those executives who are supposed to define business strategy that can be "translated" into the appropriate mechanisms and catalysts for producing the organizationally right stuff out of learning from experience, can do so without going through the system they are meant to put in place themselves. From an ontic-developmental vantage point, I would also doubt their ability to know how to "translate" business strategy into organizational needs and wants that can drive (so to speak) the appropriate mechanisms and catalysts able to guarantee executive development in an ontic-developmental sense (dilemma #7). Furthermore, the assumption that individuals, by combining natural gifts and the benefits of nurture (experience), are automatically blessed with an ontic-developmental status (of maturity) that enables them to make experiences powerful in a way that produces the organizationally "right stuff," is mistaken. As developmental theories inform us, how "powerful" in the sense of Kaplan's "deeply introspective self-development" (Kaplan, 1991, p. 231) experiences are for an individual, entirely depends on the way the individual makes meaning of such experiences. However, McCall's model in no way addresses executives' meaning making of their experiences (dilemma #8).

The subsequent dilemma (#9), that McCall's awareness of the difficulty of personal change has no more than an anecdotal (non-systematic) influence on his conception of executive development, reflects the fact that his model is entirely based on notions of behavioral change that Kaplan has taught us are insufficient for a theory of personal change. In addition to Kaplan, ontic-developmental theories inform us that even personal change qua character shift does not guarantee "deeply introspective self-development" in the sense of transnformative change. Finally, McCall's definition of the "right stuff" (executives' optinmal potential), left essentially implicit by him (dilemma #10), does not provide any reasonable criterion of either personal change à la Kaplan, or of ontic-developmental theory, stage or non-stage.

2 Stage Theories of Change

The term "developmental," when used in career and organizational theory today, in most cases points to the influence of Levinson et al.'s work (1978) which according to Fig. A3. is a stage-theory of change. To understand and come to terms with this classification, a rendition of Basseches' critique of Levinson et al.'s approach to adult development is most helpful. Seen from Basseches' (1989) explication of the stage concept, partially rendered above, Levinson et al.'s life "phase" is an ideal-typical abstraction of common features of life experience (of members of an age cohort) that "describes a capacity for handling particular types of problems, as well as a lack of capacity for even grasping more sophisticated sorts of problems" (Basseches, 1989, p. 196). Since the question asked by Levinson et al. is not "what kind of person is this" but "what is this person's life like" (Demick, 1996, p. 117), his "stage" conception is that of a life's "phase" posing certain problems called "life tasks" in the sense of Erikson (1950). Importantly, this conception of life tasks, since it holds for entire groups of people, is associated with an age-bounded cohort of individuals. In Levinson et al.' work, the notion of life tasks is linked to that of a "dream," or vision, in Cytrynbaum et al.'s words (Cytrynbaum & Crites, 1989, p. 75):

> a deeply personal understanding of self in the world that is projected into the future. It is composed of an array of conscious and unconscious components and is the primary source of direction and energy in the adult life course. Clarifying and expressing this dream through the ever-changing exigencies of external circumstances and internal forces is an overriding process and challenge in adult development.

A second, systematically crucial building-stone of Levinson et al.'s theory of adult development is the notion of a "life structure." A life structure is "the underlying pattern or design of a person's life at a given time" (Levinson et al., 1985, p. 5), and is the medium in which to accomplish the task of realizing a person's phase-specific dream. In contrast to stage theories of development, Levinson's approach to the change of life structure from phase to phase adheres to a contextualist as well as transactional point of view (Demick, 1996, p. 199), since it "treat[s] the person-in-environment, or self-in-world, system as a holistic entity in its physical, interpersonal, and/or sociocultural context" (Demick, 1996, p. 199). As Cytrynbaum et al. render it (Cytrynbaum & Crites, 1989, p. 75):

> There are three components to the life structure: the sociocultural world that impinges on a particular individual, the complex aspects and patterns of the self, and the nature of the person's participation in the world through relationships, roles, and transactions between self and world. The life structure is malleable and subject to change. Levinson analyzes it by identifying the person's decisions, how he or she implements them, and

> how he or she responds to their consequences.

Thus the unit of analysis in Levinson's theory is the "self-in-world." Persons are seen as an embodiment of their life structure, i.e., more sociologically than psychologically as members of an age cohort that has certain life tasks to accomplish. More specifically, there are nine phases, of which 6 are stable and 3 are transitional [age thirty, age fifty, and late adult] within the age span from 17 to 65 years (Demick, 1996, p. 122; Levinson et al., 1978, p. 49):

> The essential character of the sequence [of phases] is the same for all the men in our study. It consists of a series of alternate stable (structure-building) periods and transitional (structure-changing) periods.

(Despite the fact that Levinson's original study was based exclusicely on men, Levinson maintained that the patterns detected in his sample were valid for both men and women.) According to Levinson's highly "rational" theory of motivation (Cytrynbaum et al., p. 75):

> at each transitional juncture the individual reviews his or her life structure in terms of how "satisfactorily" it is expressing the dream.

From this basic rendition of Levinson's theory, it is apparent that it was predestined to be of great relevance for organizational theory under the old career contract, where fixed "developmental sequences" of life tasks were the accepted norm (Hall, 1976; Dalton, 1989). Also, Levinson's contextualist and transactional views were inspiring for a theory of mentoring under stable organizational conditions (Kram, 1988, 1996) since, in Levinson's view, the "significance [of mentoring] for both participants and the dynamics and phases within mentoring relationships have important implications for career adjustment and development" (Cytrynbaum et al., 1989, p. 75). However,

as one of the pioneers of the theory of organizational mentoring, K. Kram puts it (1996, p. 134):

> Recent and dramatic changes in the workplace ... render this established view of mentoring and other developmental relationships insufficient in today's context.

As shown in Appendix A1, the transition to the new, protean career contract has removed many of the sociological constants that Levinson et al. ideologically took for granted.

The fact that Levinson's theory is bound to certain sociological conditions which the theory did not critically reflect upon is one of the entry points of Basseches (1984) critique of "the adult life-crises literature," including Levinson's work. Basseches sees two classes of problems associated with that

literature, conceptual-empirical and value-related. Conceptual problems have two causes (Basseches, 1984, p. 313):

> (a) The inadequate operationalization of concepts of some of the frameworks makes it impossible for evidence to abjudicate their differences. The descriptions of the regularities of the life course are not tied to observable events. Instead, and this is the second problem, (b) authors define regularities in relation to the other concepts of their own schemes. This kind of circular reasoning poses an obstacle to relating the schemes to each other empirically.

Basseches surmises that "the circular reasoning suggests that we are dealing not so much with descriptions of observed empirical regularities as with prescriptive frames of reference for describing what the authors believe should be happening in the course of adulthood," somthing one could equally say of McCall's circular reasoning (Basseches, 1984, p. 313). As Basseches points out, it is here that issues of value emerge. Basseches names two axiological weaknesses in the life-crises literature (Basseches, 1984, p. 313):

> One of these can be called ... (c) the "public relations use of the term 'development'." The term "development" is used, apparently in order to take advantage of its positive connotations, but
>
> a definition of the term which would make those connotations appropriate is absent. (Example: "student development staff.")
> A second value-related weakness ... in the literature is (d) the reliance on arbitrary values. In the absence of an explicit conception of development which can be justified as valuable, the explicit or implicit value judgments which pervade this literature are not well founded.

In other words, the apparent "strength" of Levinson's theory, in terms of career theory and organizational theory, to be based on (unreflected) sociological conditions of employment that are embraced as "satisfactory" by the theory, is seen as a theoretical weakness by Basseches. Sensitive to safeguarding value-neutral, universal development in contrast to "ethnocentric," society-endorsed change imposed on individuals, Basseches suspects a link between an uncritical declaration of change as "development" and agentic notions of development. In commenting on one of Levinson's chapters, Basseches says (1984, p. 321):

> ... the authors most surprisingly entitle their next chapter "Fostering Adult Development," again as if it is not something that just happens, but rather something we should try to make happen.

Basseches then shows in detail, how this "agentic" element of Levinson's theory testifies to its relativity to an existing cultural context (Basseches, 1984, p. 321):

> (the problem with this evaluative framework) ... leads to a heavy emphasis on adjustment to whatever happens to be the values of a taken-for-granted society as it is, rather than on possibilities for improving the nature of that society.

This critique of ethnocentric notions in adult development theory is very close to Argyris' and Schein's critique of accepting current organizational values as being of benefit to the development and psychological success of the individual. Of course, most of the literature in organizational theory today, including theories of executive development and of coaching (see Appendix A4, below) could be said to commit the same

ethnocentric faux pas.

Basseches, adopting Levinson's contextualistic view of human life, makes it

clear that he regards Levinson's work as being of great value (Basseches, 1984, p. 323):

> Levinson et al.'s explanation of periodicity is rooted in a dialectical view of adult life. For an individual's way of being in the world to be maintained, it must be structured. Structures are necessarily psychosocial structures, shaped by both biological and psychological needs as well as by social expectations. Since aging is accompanied by biological and psychological changes as well as by changes in social expectations, life structures that are adequate at one point in life are likely to become less adequate over time, and will have to be either modified or dismantled and restructured.

In harmony with this assessment, Basseches finds Levinson's "key insight" to be that regarding human life as a "series of alternate stable (structure-building) periods and transitional (structure-changing) periods" (Levinson et al., 1978, p. 49). From the point of view of a theorist of human development (in contrast to change), Basseches then interprets Levinson's findings in terms of the crucial epistemological question they raise (Basseches, 1984, p. 324):

> From the perspective of a concern with adult development, as I have defined it in this book (i.e., the 1984), the important question raised by Levinson et al.'s findings may be phrased as follows: Under what circumstances does confronting a life-crisis which is due to one's life structure becoming unworkable lead simply to the formation of a new set of beliefs and a new way of living more appropriate to the future (the next life structure); and under what circumstances does the confrontation lead to reconceptualizing one's life historically, in a more sophisticated and dialectical way?

In this quote, the first alternative regards change and adaptation, while the second regards development. The latter is thus conceived as revolving around the ability to "reconceptualize one's life historically, in a more ... dialectical way." Without going into subtleties of Basseches' theory of dialectical thinking here, what surfaces as crucial in the distinction between change and development in Basseches' thinking is the issue of ego continuity over one's life time, and the question whether a theory of adult progression through life is capable of rendering such continuity. This is made clear by Basseches by way of a gedankenexperiment. First, Basseches draws a portrait of

development, based on the continuity of a person's ego over time (Basseches, 1984, pp. 324-325):

> When faced with a life-crisis, the individual may let go of rigid ways of thinking associated with the failing life structure and may reappropriate those (older, O.L.) ways of thinking in historical and developmental perspective. That is, the truths one knew may be seen not as ultimate truths but as effective means of coping with a particular period in history and in one's life span. They are thus relativized to a more dialectical perception of the self and society changing over time through processes of organization, disorganization, and reorganization (--dialectical because old meaning structures are not simply abandoned, but in being abandoned are being transformed and integrated into the new appropriate structures of thinking, O.L.).

This example of continuity and development is then followed by one describing change and adaptation (Basseches, 1984, p. 325):

> Alternatively, a life-crisis may lead simply to a rejection of one's past rigid ideas and the adoption of new, but equally rigid ones. In such cases, a life-crisis can be said to have occurred, and the individual can be said to have adapted, but not developed. The person's new understanding of crisis is as susceptible to being fundamentally rocked by the next life crisis as was the previous one (my emphasis, O.L.).

Basseches summarizes as follows (Basseches, 1984, p. 325):

> The problems in Levinson's et al. work can be avoided (a) by seeing predictable life-crises not as development in themselves but as opportunities for development; (b) by distinguishing developmental responses to crises from merely adaptive ones; and (c) by relating predictable life crises to triggers in the spheres of biological changes, psychological changes resulting

> from earlier experiences, and age-triggered
> changed in social expectations--rather than to
> particular age periods.

Basseches' critical epistomological as well as ego-psychological argument leads to a

refinement of concepts of adult-developmental theory. Striking from the point of view of my critique of McCall (1998), for instance, is Basseches suggestion under (a), above, to see experiences (such as life crises) "not as development in themselves but as opportunities for development." Beyond the familiar critique of Levinson regarding the boundedness of phases or stages by chronological age, Basseches introduces the ego-psychological perspective. In this perspective, "opportunities for development" work as triggers of actual (i.e., ontic) development only when processed (made meaning of) by an individual in such a way that the continuity of ego is safeguarded by transformations of older life- and thought-structures into a new and "more sophisticated" outcomel. The outcome must amount to a "re-education" of the individual not only in cognitive, but also in value-related and physiological terms. In light of this, Kaplan's "character shifts" can be seen as "developmental opportunities" rather than instantiations of development (as Drath's interpretation of Kaplan's work may lead one to think). Also, dilemmas #6 to #10 of McCall's model (Appendix 2, section 2) derive from the fact that McCall (1998) mistakes "developmental opportunities" (which he calls "powerful experiences") for triggers of ontic development.

As demonstrated, Basseches' critique of Levinson is less focused on the size of Levinson's sample, his biographic method, and the difficulty encountered in generalizing from one gender to the other, or any of the "dilemmas" that Cytrynbaum et al. perceives in Levinson's work, such as "the relative contribution of individual and social systems parameters to adult and career development" (Cytrynbaum et al., 1989, pp. 80-82). Rather, as a neo-Piagetian thinker in the tradition of ego psychology, Basseches focuses on the synthesis of higher forms of thinking or meaning-making by way of transforming cognitive structures.

Reflecting on the specific relevance of Basseches's critique of Levinson et al.'s theory to a future theory of executive development and of coaching, I find that the
following aspects stand out. Basseches critique of Levinson et al. (1978) has clarified:

> (1) distinctions between notions of
> (a) change and development
> (b) agentic and ontic development
>
> (2) the risks a theory of development, in particular a theory of executive development, is exposed to when uncritically endorsing values
> current in present society
>
> (3) the task of mentoring and coaching as providing
> a safe haven for the development of values that are in conflict

> with values current in present society, thus in present-day mainstream organizations.

3. Stage Theories of Development

I see issues of executive coaching as embedded in problems of executive development as the latter are embedded in problems posed by adult development in the workplace. Given that "the context of the workplace is one which has been nearly completely ignored by developmental psychologists" (Basseches, 1984, p. 341), it is entirely conceivable that our knowledge of how adults develop over the life-span is a partial one, precisely because "the development of professionals in the workplace, which is a crucial ingredient of life-span development, is still not well understood" (Morris, 1993, p. 181). As a consequence, our notions of what is executive development in ontic terms, how to promote it agentically, and what are the goals and outcomes of coaching and mentoring, are likely to be highly ethnocentric and tied to our partial understanding of development of individuals in the workplace.

In doing research on adult development in the workplace, one crucial methodological decision to be made is how to conceptualize what Cytrynbaum called the "relative contribution of individual and social systems parameters to adult and career development" (Cytrynbaum et al., 1989, p. 80). As can be inferred from the preceding discussion, much depends, for this decision, on what one chooses as the unit of analysis for a theory. Levinson adopts a "self-in-social-world," or "person-in-environment," unit of analysis (Demick, 1996, p. 120), paying the price of being uncritical toward the values of that environment, or even falling prey to a "public-relations use of the term development" (Basseches, 1984, p. 313). Other theories have opted to choose "isolated variables affecting [the] individual adult" (Demick, 1996, p. 120), such as executive and leadership responsibility and management effectiveness (Dalton, 1989; Drath, 1990; Kaplan, 1991; Hall et al., 1996; McCall, 1998), ego-psychological notions such as identity (Erikson, 1950), moral thinking (Kohlberg, 1969), social perspective-taking (Selman, 1980), order of consciousness (Kegan, 1982), or similar conceptualizations.

However, what if the last-mentioned ego-psychological categories are not "isolated variables" as Demick (1996, pp. 117, 120) maintains, but are crucial aspects of one and the same developmental profile of a person? In that case, insight into the "order of consciousness," for instance, can be comprehensive enough to determine

how the "person-in-environment" construes and, consequently, experiences the environment in which she finds herself. Whether this assumption is "epistemological imperialism" (my term) or not is, I think, abjudicable by empirical evidence. As Basseches points out in his discussion of the stage concept, often philosophical concepts can be most useful in elucidating psychological, and I would add, organizational, issues and ambiguities. R. Kegan's theory, classified in Fig. A3 as a "stage theory of development," is a

case in point. Below, I will restrict myself to a short outline of his theory with a focus on its implications for a theory of adult development at work, and of coaching.

As I have shown in my discussion of Drath's writing (Appendix 2, section 4), it is important to make a distinction between Kegan's theories of 1982 and 1994. In plain terms, the former does not distinguish between style and order of consciousness (or logics), while the latter does. This is a major clarification in terms of executive development, since what might have been misconstrued, according to Kegan's current insight, as being a matter of ontic-developmental position (as assumed by Drath, 1990), is really a matter of adopted style congruent with many different ontic-developmental positions (Kegan, 1994, p. 7). At the same time, this clarification has, if I read Basseches correctly, contributed to making Kegan's "order of consciousness" all the more emphatically a "philosophical category" that is less likely to lend itself to serving as a direct causative force in explaining human behavior, and executive development in particular, than is assumed by Drath (1990).

In addition, there is a second, not always noticed, difference between the 1982 and the 1994 work of Kegan, and that is his assumption in the latter work, that orders of consciousness--what I call ontic-developmental positions--are simultaneously cultural forces establishing mental curriculums that "make demands on" the capacities of the adult mind almost as Freud's drives make demands on a person's ego. In my view, this conception of developmental positions or stages moves Kegan's thought closer to that of cognitive sociologists (such as the Wissenssoziologe K. Mannheim and the cognitive-dialectics sociologist Th.W. Adorno) than ego-psychologists. By the same token, it moves his work closer to Levinson's "person-in-environment" unit of analysis than would be granted by Demick (1996, pp. 117, 120), on the one hand, and to conceptions of culture such as that by Schein (1992), on the other.

The ontic-developmental stages Kegan calls "orders of consciousness" are not simply intrapersonal frameworks for making meaning of one's life, but are equally

psychosocial forces that determine how a society dominated by organizations attempts to "discipline" individual minds while simultaneously giving those minds the epistemological freedom to conceive of their social and interpersonal surround as best they can. I submit that this interpretation of Kegan's orders of consciousness is almost a perfect equivalent of the new, "protean" career contract according to which society, in the form of organizations, abdicates its nurturing role as a safe haven of human development and makes the individual responsible for his own development "as best he or she can." This is another way of saying that, in my view, while Levinson's theoretical hour has passed, Kegan's theoretical hour has come. By this I mean that his theory is likely to be most helpful in establishing new insight into adult development, specifically executive development, under the new career contract.

The crucial question regarding human development through work was initially posed the young Karl Marx (Easton & Guddat, 1967 (1848)). Marx phrased the question as a critique of the fact that

individual development was largely arrested by society, and was reduced to attaining those "orders of consciousness" that were useful for satisfying the capitalistic requirements of organizations producing society's lifelihood and riches. A sociologically watered-down (thus ideologically more neutral) version of the Marxian question survived into the 20th century in the form posed, e.g., by Kohn (1980), regarding the link between the structural characteristics of jobs on intellectual development (Basseches, 1984, p. 342). In a more cognitively refined form, the Marxian question is posed by Kegan as a matter of adult development at large, and of development in the workplace in particular. The question asks: What does professionalism, as one of society's "curricular" demands on capacities of the adult mind (Kegan, 1994, p. 5), require of, and contribute to, human development?

The way Kegan approaches this question is informed by many of the beliefs, assumptions, and insights we have first encountered through Basseches' writing. Although, as outlined above, Basseches (1989) as a non-stage theorist is critical of both the "adult life-crises" literature and the stage-bound, constructive-developmental literature (e.g., Kegan), there is a wide zone of mutual agreement between his approach and Kegan's. Most crucially, both are concerned, as was Piaget, with epistemology, i.e., "with the question of how knowledge is constructed through a series of forms with increasing equilibrium" (Basseches, 1989, p. 194) to which Piaget's "stage" concept is the orthodox answer. In addition, both Basseches and Kegan make universality claims regarding the relevance of epistemological principles in human development, whether bound to stage or not. Therefore, they see such principles as encompassing all aspects of adult development, such as cognitive, emotional, intrapersonal and interpersonal. While Basseches is preoccupied with the struggle and conflict of individuals to safeguard their rationality in the face of overwhelming societal and internal odds (Basseches, 1989), Kegan, while highly sensitive to the struggle involved, takes a more "appolonian" view of human development as a journey. However, both share the concept of meaning-making as a central, development-propelling and motivating process, and thus the stance called "constructive-developmental psychology" which sets them apart from more psychoanalytically oriented approaches (Basseches, 1989, p. 199):

> Constructive-developmental psychology, in contrast describes an intellect that constructs desires, goals, understandings, values, and motives, by organizing and reorganizing the raw materials of physiological responses in progressively more sophisticated "rational" ways. Rather than assuming that affect derives from fixed instincts, and that thought mainly manages the tasks of producing instinctual satisfaction, constructive-developmental psychology assumes that affect is constructively organized and that meaning-making (the organizational/adaptational process itself) is a basic

human motivation (my emphasis, O.L.).

Given Kegan's increasing interest in the sociological surround of epistemological functioning (Kegan, 1994), he construes the lifespan trajectory of human meaning-making as being a psychosocial force simultaneously operating "from within" and "from without." This almost "hegelian" position enables him to design an all-inclusive "phenomenology of spirit" (to quote Hegel's 1805 title) to explain the huge diversity of meaning-making phenomena that determine human thinking, feeling, and acting. This explanatory effort is made precise and focused by adopting what Kegan calls "the subject-object principle" which is centrally concerned with how experience is constructed over the lifespan (Kegan, 1994, p. 32):

> ... a principle of mental organization has an inner logic or, more properly speaking, an "epistemologic." The root or "deep structure" of any principle of mental organization is the subject-object relationship.
>
> "Object" refers to those elements of our knowing or organizing that we can reflect on, handle, look at, be responsible for, relate to each other, take control of, internalize, assimilate, or otherwise operate upon. ... "Subject" refers to those elements of our knowing or organizing that we are identified with, tied to, fused with, or embedded in. We have object; we are subject.

However, what any person at any point in their life may "have" as object or may "be" as subject is not static, but is a product of evolution, that of meaning-making (Kegan, 1994, p. 34):

> ... what we take as subject and what we take as object are not necessarily fixed for us. They are not permanent. ... In fact, transforming our epistemologies, liberating ourselves from that in which we are embedded, making what was subject into object so that we can "have it" rather than "be had" by it--this is the most powerful way I know to conceptualize the growth of the mind.

Here, in the term liberating, is spelled out Kegan's version of the Freudium dictum that "where id is, ego shall be," i.e., where the drives were, the rational, controlling ego shall, despite its "discontents," prevail. In the subsequent "be had by it" we have a further element of liberation, that of emerging from embeddedness in our own, physiologically grounded, subjectivity, --with increasingly "qualitatively better guarantees to the world of its distinctness" (Kegan, 1982, p. 77).

Viewing the construction of human experience in these terms, Kegan then constructs a spiral-shaped trajectory of ontic-developmental "epistemologics" (Kegan, 1982, p. 192), clarified in his later work by reference to a sequence of underlying categories (Kegan, 1994, p. 35), that encompasses the predictable and empirically falsifiable ways human pursue in emerging from the embeddedness in their experience. Kegan's outline of stages has confirming parallels in the research undertaken by Kohlberg

(1969), Loevinger (1976), Fowler (1981), and others. In contrast to these partners in spirit, Kegan's unique emphasis in the later work (1994) is the notion that this sequence of epistemologics, or ontic-developmental logics, is an aspect of culture (Kegan, 1994, p. 34):

> Here I want to suggest that to the list of phenomena a culture creates and we study, we should add "claims
>
> on the minds of its members." This books examines the relationship between the principles we may possess and the complexity of mind that contemporary culture unrecognizedly asks us to possess through its many claims and expectations (my emphasis, O.L.).

Through this culture-analytical turn, Kegan's opens his investigation, and the investigation of those who adopt his perspective, to the dialectic between the epistemologics of organized society and those of its individual members. In my view, he thereby makes possible an analysis of the developmental constraints of organizations as "thinking organizations" whose reality "exists largely or completely in the minds of the organization's members" (Gioia, 1986, p. 384). While this opening brings Kegan into close vicinity to Schein's "cultural analysis' (1992), his theory has the advantage of understanding the developmental constraints that underly Schein's basic assumptions.

In terms of the present investigation into executive development and coaching, Kegan's new, sociologically and anthropologically inclined, interpretation of developmental principles by which experience is constructed is of great value. Much of the theorizing we have reviewed in the domain of executive development is centered around philosophies of experience and theories of what makes learning from experience "powerful" both for individuals and organizations (Hall, 1996; McCall, 1998). The same can be said of coaching, where "experience" and "growing through experience" is, rightfully, a central concern. For Kegan, issues of experience are, as we have seen, bound to the "subject-object principle." This fact might be paraphrased informally by saying that what crucially matters in how people make meaning of experiences, from a constructive-developmental perspective on organizational functioning, is whether they simply "are" their experiences, or whether they indeed "have them." This epistemological distinction entails that there are different ways, depending on ontic-developmental level, to "make" or "have" experiences. As a consequence,one cannot assess executives' experience without analyzing the developmental and categorical structures that underly their meaning-making.

Kegan's phenomenology of development in the workplace is centered around the notion of professionalism, its nature, and the demands it makes on individual adults (Kegan, 1994, pp. 137 f.). In his view, professionalism, thus having a professional agenda --rather than being (subject to) it,-- in and by itself requires a certain ontic-developmental position or "order of consciousness." Essentially, Kegan agrees

with what career theorist Hall et al. (1996) call the new, protean career contract, where personal development is a contract with self, not with an organization. In his phenomenology of professionalism, Kegan explicitly ties the notion of management, as well as notions of power and authority, to the order of consciousness required for a professional, summarizing that these are determinative of individuals' relationship to their work at a particular point in their life (Kegan, 1994, p. 161):

> What exactly is this psychological capacity that allows people to meet the demand or expectation that adults "own" their work? What allows them to retain ownership (of their work, O.L.) when ... they are in an institutionally less powerful relationship than those who would take it from them?

What gives rise to this psychological capacity is an order of consciousness (also called the 4th order) that is instantiated by an individual, --male or female, of relational or separate style,-- who has emerged from embeddedness in his or her subjectivity to the point where his epistemologic, or internal mental organization, is that of a "self-authoring" individual (Kegan, 1994, p. 312). Self-authoring individuals, also referred to as "institutional selves" (Kegan, 1982, pp. 221 f.), are individuals capable of having a "career" rather than a "job" (Kegan, 1982, p. 227). Such individuals are authoring their own value system, and have their own integrity regardless of external power contexts that might deprive them of the significance of their own work. To hold this "professional" view of their work, self-authoring individuals have to have a relationship to their work that is based on a particular form of self-management (Kegan, 1994, p. 167):

> The first issue any management training oriented to transformation would have to address is exactly this: what is the person having to manage psychologically? ... But what this management entails differs depending on how the self (i.e., how experience, O.L.) is constructed, what its central principle of cohesion, its fundamental loyalty, and its principal threat are.

As this quote implies, holding a specific ontic-developmental position entails that the associated epistemologic determines not only an individual's central principle of cohesion, but also his or her fundamental loyalty (to self and others), and their principal vulnerability. In a more explicit statement about management, Kegan states

(1994, p. 168):

> The very idea of managing--the central preoccupation in the work literature and the schools of business--suggesting as it does the activities of handling, arranging, configuring, deciding, executing, finessing, operating, and presiding would seem to require or to imply the authoring capacities of the fourth order of consciousness. ...

> The greater internality of this way of knowing now creates the self--not the present social surround--as the source of direction and value.

Accordingly, a "manager" in Kegan's epistemologic of work is an individual who, prior to managing others has reached a stage of development where he or she can manage themselves, and their internal experiences and values. As Kegan elaborates (1994, p. 168):

> The expectation that we be self-initiating, self-correcting, and self-evaluating rather than depend on others to frame the problems, initiate the adjustments, or determine whether things are going acceptably well, runs through much of the work literature. ... In a sense, this expectation is really an extension of owning one's work, since this is the way we might naturally behave if we truly regarded our jobs as belong to us (as "careers" O.L.).

The same, according to Kegan, holds for the requirement that a professional who is a "manager," be "guided by our own vision at work rather than be without a vision or be captive of the authority's agenda," where "vision" includes what Levinson called the "dream" (Kegan, 1994, pp. 172-173):

> The demand for a vision is really a demand for an ideological (i.e., self-authoring) way of knowing. ... I use the term as the sociologist Karl Mannheim did to refer to a system of explanation amounting to a theory of relationships.

In short, "the general claim upon us at work" is (Kegan, 1994, p. 175):

> that we take responsibility (i.e., take as object, O.L.) for what happens to us internally and externally,
>
> rather than see our present internal circumstances or future external possibilities as caused by someone else.

In this quote, the parallels between Kegan's fourth order of consciousness and Hall's protean career are very transparent. In fact, one can say without risk of distoring either researcher's point of view, that the latter is the organizational, thus the sociological, manifestation of the former. Equally, what Kaplan (1991) referred to as the developmental arrest of expansiveness in executives can be seen as a reflection of the fact that expansive "managers" are unable, in one form or another, to take responsibility for what happens to them internally.

In this context, Basseches' critique of the notion of stage [or order of consciousness], which extends to both Drath (1990) and Kegan himself (1994), assumes considerable salience. As demonstrated in the critique of Drath (1990), an unreflected use of orders of consciousness as causal, or

even phenomenological, "explanations" of (e.g.) managerial behavior mistakes what is a grounding framework for a figural cause. Even if the distinction between epistemologics and (relational vs. separate) style is taken into account (Hodgetts, 1994), and the limitations of managerial behavior are seen as outflow of style rather than the logics, there remains an element of reduction of psychological (and biographical) complexity that Basseches makes us sensitive to (Basseches, 1989, p. 193):

> I propose that we see each individual as having her unique "psychological organization." ... Use of (this term, O.L.) ... to refer to each individual's unique way of organizing her activity-in-the-world and making sense of her experience will help us distinguish these psychological phenomena from the "cognitive structures" described by constructive-developmental stages. "Cognitive structures," or stages, which I will propose calling "equilibrium structures," are best viewed as philosophical concepts tied to genetic epistemology's concern with the nature of knowledge ...

In other words, one might conceive of Kegan's orders of consciousness as "philosophico-teleological," ideal-typical guideposts in empirically researching, for instance, managers' way of making meaning of experience or strengths and weaknesses, rather than as causal explanations of them. In so doing, one may want to employ, as Kaplan (1991, 1998) suggests, methods of "biographical action research," in order to

safeguard the uniqueness of a manager's psychological organization (in Basseches sense) that cannot flawlessly be subsumed under some stage. However, this in no way distracts from the guiding power of orders of consciousness as Kegan outlines them, especially since these orders are not conceived as purely internal forces, but equally as psychosocial demands on adult minds. In terms of coaching strategy, an understanding of the behavioral and axiological consequences of orders of consciousness for a particular executive would seem to be of great assistance in building a coaching alliance.

A useful way of illuminating the need for mediating stage concepts, on the one hand, and Basseches' "unique psychological organization" of individuals, on the other, is Popp's notion of psychological boundaries (Popp, 1996). She conceives of such boundaries as both a "noun," or state of differentiation between self and not-self, and as a "verb," or constructive process evolving over the lifespan (Popp, 1996, p. 147). According to her model, boundaries evolve along two dimensions, a vertical dimension of mental growth, and a horizontal dimension of mental health (Noam, 1986, 1988; Rogers & Kegan, 1990). Along the vertical dimension (of mental growth), we are dealing with the evolution of the self through universal orders of consciousness (or stages), while along the horizontal dimension (of mental health) we are focussing attention on the idiosyncratic "style of boundary negotiation" (Popp, 1996, p. 152) which characterizes a "unique psychological organization" in the clinical sense (Basseches, 1989). The horizontal dimension, of "mental health," is the domain in which individuals' unique psychological

organization expresses itself interpersonally and in relationship to organizations. According to Popp, this dimension is "comprised of the permeability/impermeability of boundaries and the subdimension of the flexibility of boundaries (Popp, 1996, p. 152). I see Popp's conceptualization as one that mediates between Basseches' and Kegan's epistemological positions. In this conceptualization (1996, p. 152):

> ... the degree of permeability refers to the general degree of openness or closedness between what is self and what is not-self (or between what is subject and what is object). The degree of flexibility refers to the range of "motion" possible in the regulation of the permeability--how much one is able to open up or close down the general degree of permeability.

In order to make the quality of boundary negotiations individuals constantly engage in more concrete, Popp, using metaphors, compares the demarcations between subject and object to "fence-building materials" (e.g., chicken wire), and the flexibility--the degree to which one can "regulate and change the permeability of one's psychological boundaries" (Popp, 1996, p. 153),-- to the changes in the denseness of the erected boundary (e.g., wide and narrow openings in chicken wire). She makes the important assumption "that the area nearer the middle of this horizontal dimension," i.e., near the intersection of the vertical and horizontal dimensions under the bell-curve, is more adaptive then either extreme (of either high or low permeability and flexibility). Popp suggests that each permeability/flexibility "style" of personal interaction favored by a particular individual has its own idiosyncratic vulnerabilities. More precisely (Popp, 1996, p. 153):

> ... this model provides ... a new way of postulating three kinds of vulnerability. First, there is the vulnerability that accompanies any subject-object stage. ... Second, with a very permeable boundary, someone may be vulnerable to being unable to hold his or her own in the face of opposition or confrontation. Third, there is a kind of vulnerability that has to do with one's degree of flexibility and resilience.

In short, an executive's vulnerability may be one of maintaining his or her epistemologic (stage), of the permeability of personal boundaries, and of degree of flexibility his or her boundaries exhibit. As a consequence, we can speak of "permeability positions" (Popp, 1996, p. 155) ranging from high to low permeability. Furthermore, we can associate each of these positions with "flexibility ranges" (Popp, 1996, p. 157), equally from high to low, where "flexibility refers to the capacity for regulation or adjustment of the permeability of one's psychological boundaries," which is "contextually driven" (Popp, 1996, p. 157).

Given Popp's conceptualization, understood as a mediation between Kegan's orders of consciousness and Basseches' unique psychological organization, I can now reformulate what Kaplan

(1991) referred to as "expansive character," which he saw as a manifestation of developmental arrest. What Kaplan's three types of expansive character, --the striver-builder, self-vindicator/fix-it specialist, and the
perfectionist-systematizer,-- have in common, regardless of the order of consciousness they presently embody, is a particular style of boundary negotation,
characterized by a certain degree of permeability (associated with a particular range of flexibility positions). This style of boundary negotiation is a variant of Hodgett's (1994) relational and separate styles, thus a stylistic variation of a particular epistemologic. This style of maintaining personal boundaries determines the way in which executives relate to themselves as well as to co-workers and the organization.

For instance, the interactional style of Kaplan's striver-builder (Kaplan, 1991, pp. 25 f.), who is characterized by heavily relying on external recognition, is high permeability (toward higher-ups' influences) and low flexibility (with regard to his difficulty of self-awareness and "owning up"). By contrast, the self-vindicator/fix-it specialist (Kaplan, 1991, pp. 71 f.) would seem to follow an interactional style characterized by low permeability and medium to high flexibility, since he is described as indulging in ungratified, "impermeable" narcissism along an entire range of provocations into overcompensation. Finally, the perfectionist-systematizer (Kaplan, 1991, pp. 187 f.), unites low permeability (dominant need to be "right") with low flexibility (inflexibly sticking to principles and hypervigilant for lapses from principled action). The latter, in particular, "does not get the message," since he is "resistant to change" that would relieve him of his position on, or near, the left ("low") side of permeability, and thus removed from the "healthy" middle zone at the intersection of both vertical (mental growth) and horizontal (mental health) axis of human development. Importantly, this conceptualization is independent of the executive's specific "order of consciousness," which to know, however, would lend precision to diagnosing his particular pathology. Depending on where such an executive is positioned ontic-developmentally, helping him or her achieve a higher permeability of boundaries and greater flexibility in modulating that permeability would require a particular coaching strategy. For instance, one might surmise, with Kegan, that neither of Kaplan's expansive executives are true managers (in the ontic-developmental sense of that term), who fully "have" a professional agenda, but to a considerable degree can be said to "be" or (be embedded in) their agenda. This further suggests that a coach who is aware of an executive's epistemologic as well as unique psychological organization, and their mediation by a particular style of boundary negotiation, is of higher quality than one who is not.

4. Stage Theories of Managerial Effectiveness

Effectiveness at work, especially as a manager and leader, is one of the important "organizational imperatives" usually addressed in coaching. It is an attribute ensconced in many "competency models" (Witherspoon, 1996, p. 130) or "profiles of success" (Saporito, 1996, p. 101) that try to assess executives in light of attributes an organization would like them to possess. In the age of learning organizations (Senge, 1990) which try, to speak with Schein (1992, p. 363), to institutionalize something as ineffable and dynamic as learning as a culture, effectiveness through learning from experience is said to be at a higher premium than ever, a claim that is difficult to assess since no standards for effectiveness exist.

In my view, ontic-developmental inquiry into notions such as "learning from experience" yields a fresh dose of scepticism regarding the term. An ontic-developmental assessment of individual executives can contribute to making transparent the relationship between managerial effectiveness and executives' epistemologic. Such an assessment can also shed light on outcomes of 360-degree feedback procedures, and contribute to formulating more substantial individual development plans.As shown in chapters IV and V, ontic-developmental asssessment can moreover be used to assess and monitor entire developmental programs, and serve as a tool in culture transformation ventures.

As the previous rendition of selected principles of epistemological inquiry has shown, ontic-developmental theories are capable of describing "movement from simplistic to complex thinking; from power-oriented to principle-oriented ideas of morality; from instrumental conceptions of interpersonal relationships to ideas of mutual responsiveness ...; and from limited self-awareness to an increasingly complex understanding of one's own and others' motivations" (Weathersby, 1993, p. 68). Especially the "capacity to reframe situations, to understand multiple points of view, and to understand that 'truth' or meaning is at least partially created by the participants in a situation is associated with later developmental stages" (Weathersby, 1993, p. 68).

As Torbert and others have shown theoretically and empirically (Torbert, 1987, 1994), "managerial effectiveness implies characteristics of later developmental stages; ... transformational models of leadership, in particular, require the capabilities of later stages for implementation" (Weathersby, 1993, p. 68). Fisher et al. (1987, p. 257) state:

> Managerial effectiveness can be explained (sic!) from a human development point of view. Recent research links structural theories of adult development to decision making and leadership performance. The implications are far-reaching for the management development professions. Applying what is known about human development would mean major changes in goals and methods for management education in universities, management training in organizations, and the practice of organization development (e.g., coaching, O.L.)

While I agree with Fisher et al.'s conclusion, on account of the distinction between epistemological principles as philosophical categories and the uniqueness of individuals' psychological organization (Basseches, 1989), I would prefer to say that such principles "shed light on," rather than causally explain, findings about managerial effectiveness. I say this not to downgrade such principles, but to signal that to use them as "causal factors" (as, e.g., in Drath, 1990), in my view leads to a simplification of the mental processes involved in managerial effectiveness. I also take exception to the formulation, found in Fisher et al. that (1987, p. 259):

> recent structural developmental theories, be they theories of interpersonal development (Selman, 1980), moral development of interpersonal development (Kohlberg, 1969), ego development (Loevinger, 1976), or of the evolution of meaning making (Kegan, 1982) identify clear, discrete steps along a stairway of human development.

Given what we know about stages as "philosophico-teleological" categories (Basseches, 1989), on one hand, and the complexities of idiosyncratic work-personality functioning (Sperry, 1996, pp. 161-173) and the struggle to maintain standards of rationality in one's psychological life (Basseches, 1989), on the other, the idea of "discrete steps along a stairway of human development" amounts to a lamentable parody of ontic-developmental theory. This is not to say that the link between orders of consciousness and executive development does not exist. It is only to safeguard ontic-developmental findings from being marketed wholesale as the solution to problems of executive development. Nevertheless, what such studies are showing is that there exist ontic-developmental constraints on executive development that writers using the term "development" as a public-relations category tend to miss. Even if such a "stairway of human development" were to exist, which is not the case, we would still be no further

in knowing how exactly to "implement" agentic development with such a staircase in mind. To speak with McCall (1998), the fundamental question is what mechanisms and catalysts, if they indeed exist, are helpful in promoting executive and management development. In my view, this question hinges on whether it can be shown through a cognitive-science inquiry what are the difficulties of "learning from experience" (Feldman, J. 1986, pp. 263-292), and how such learning, if at all, "translates" into ontic development.

As these reflections show, there exists a difficulty in knowing how to employ ontic-developmental principles to "explain" behavioral manifestations of human thought and action, or at least, how to employ such principles responsibly, in a non-reductive fashion. Is it not conceivable that such principles are more of a problem-posing than a problem-solving device? Is human behavior in general, and executive

behavior in particular, pervasively determined by meaning-making, and if so, what is the ontological status of being so determined?

It seems to me, then, that the introduction of ontic-developmental principles of explanation into organizational theory and practice poses its own unique methodological problems, which so far have not been clarified sufficiently to offer any kind of solution. In the interim, I would prefer to speak of ontic-developmental principles as "shedding light" on certain selected organizational phenomena, especially on the constitutive entwinement of "individual and social systems parameters," to speak with Cytrynbaum et al. (1989, p. 198). Otherwise, one ends up with generalities like the following where individual and organizational development are tossed together into the night of undifferentiated totality where, as Hegel put it, "all cats are grey" (Fisher et al., 1987, p. 265):

> Organizations, like individuals, are observed to grow through clearly discrete stages of development, beginning with an entrepreneurial stage, moving into one or more bureaucratic stages, followed in some cases by postbureaucratic stages.

Here, the term "stage" is on a wild goose chase for phenomena that might feed its greedy mouth, without any consideration of what might be the precise meaning of comparing individual and organizational "stages." I conclude from the above quotes that we are at the beginning of an exciting foundational period of a new science of organizations in which ontic-developmental principles are linked, in an increasingly refined way, to

cognitive-science categories for analyzing organizations as cognitive entities. While one can argue "that how managers act can be explained to a large extent [sic!] by how they "make meaning of their managerial world," this is still a far cry from knowing what the term "explaining" means in the present context.

In light of this situation, I would distinguish two aspects of using ontic-developmental principles in organizational research, one that is "inspirational," and the other that is "empirical." Given that, in my view, much of the organizational literature, with the possible exception of career theory, has a "problematic relationship to complexity" (Basseches, 1984), tending as it does to remain at a low level of "adequate operationalization of concepts" (Basseches, 1984, p. 313), an introduction of the highly differentiated concepts of constructive-developmental theory is highly "inspirational," and thus to be welcomed as a motivational force. However, as shown, the use of such concepts for the purpose of "explaining" empirical organizational phenomena is fraught with many methodological difficulties.

With regard both the theory and the practice of coaching, this scientific situation is a true challenge. How should a theory of coaching address the entwinement of epistemologic stage with the

unique psychological organization of an individual manager, and what assessment and coaching strategies are appropriate for dealing with the complexity of cognitive-affective and organizational functioning that coaching is supposed to focus on and alter? Furthermore, what makes the cognitive-developmental status of the coach compatible with that of the manager being coached, and what are the ontic-developmental preconditions of transformative coaching for a particular coaching alliance? (For example, can a coach of an order of consciousness "lower than" that of a manager be effective in his or her work?) In order to address these and other issues in coaching, and to elaborate a model of "developmental coaching," it might be helpful to seek support from both the theory of clinical supervision (Laske, 1999) and of psychotherapy (Basseches, 1989). After all, both of them deal with an individual's unique psychological organization, although often to the exclusion of any ontic-developmental considerations.

Only a short pointer in the direction of such research can be positioned here. Most helpful for doing so is again Basseches (1989). As he points out, there are only a few dozen of stage structures in the world, while "there are as many 'psychological organizations' as there are people in the world" (Basseches, 1989, p. 197):

> While stage structures are, by definition, integrated wholes -- forms of equilibrium -- a person's cognitive organization exists in a continuous process of equilibration ..., in which the imperfections in (psychological, O.L.) organization and adaptation are as salient as the equilibrium. Structures of equilibrium are very neat. Psychological organizations are very messy (my emphasis, O.L.).

Basseches also reminds us that "multiple stage theories and multiple stage sequences may all be used simultaneously," to elucidate a particular individual case (Basseches, 1989, p. 197). From this he concludes (Basseches, 1989, pp. 197-198):

> Whereas assuming stage structures to be psychological leads to the question, "which are the real stages" (the ones that correspond to the psychological reality), assuming them to be descriptions of forms of equilibrium, organized into sequences of increasing sophistication and (real-life, O.L.) adequacy, allows that different theorists may describe different modes of creating equilibrium, all of which may be expressed in an individual's psychological functioning to greater or lesser extent.

The point made, above, is that what creates "non-dialectical," and thus irresponsible, simplifications of the messiness of psychological functioning, and of organizational functioning for that matter, is the identification of epistemologic stages with such functioning (demonstrated by the quote from Fisher et al.,

above). With regard to "developmental coaching," this means that while epistemological analysis is helpful in
providing guide-posts for psychological assessment, such analysis cannot in and by itself do justice to the complexity and messiness of executive functioning. As Noam's (1988) and Kaplan's (1991) work suggests, ontic-developmental analysis must be complemented by a "clinical" or "biographical" assessment of individual executives, and its outcomes must be mapped into a specific domain. This is true all the more since executive functioning is embedded in an organizational context that in important ways gives rise to, and determines, adaptations of individual psychological functioning ("experience"). The conclusion drawn from this reflection by Basseches is, I think, constitutive of any substantial theory of coaching (Basseches, 1989, p. 198):

> This perspective involves viewing individual psychological organization (i.e., the idiosyncracies of individual executives as persons, O.L.) ... as much more messy,
>
> characterized by organizational strenghts and weaknesses (in the strict clinical sense, O.L.). Such a conception contrasts with both the single-stage sequence view (the view that there is one progression of forms of psychological organization that each individual moves through) and master-stage sequence view (the view that though theorists may describe different stage sequences, they are all manifestations of a single stage sequence that describes a core psychological reality) of psychological development, both of which use stages to describe psychological realities. The proposed conception appears much more appropriate to the reality of psychotherapeutic work (and coaching work, where one encounters the complexity of individual cases, O.L.), while equally grounded in a dialectical, constructivist-developmental model of how meaning evolves (my emphasis, O.L.).

Accordingly, not only might various different stage theories be helpful for conceptualizing the developmental profile of individual executives and the developmental compatibility embodied in a particular coaching alliance, --some stage sequences might be more appropriate than others to elucidate psychological functioning in organizations. But in no case can one expect the application of any stage theory, however "master-minded," to yield a comprehensive assessment of the complexity of a particular coaching situation.

The above conclusion by Basseches poses the important question, of what might be the strengths and weaknesses of Kegan's theory of stages as orders of consciousness,
when applied to the case of executive development and coaching. While this is essentially an empirical question, to be partially assessed in this thesis, I would surmise that Kegan's conception of stages as points of transition, rather than static equilibria, and the fact that his stages are not only internal, but equally psychosocial, thus historical, forces making demands on adults' mind, is a weighty asset in its favor. However, what matters in the application of his theory, as of all other stage theories, is the

sensitivity with which the messiness of the "unique psychological organization" (Basseches 1989) of executives is actually approached, both theoretically and practically.

In Appendix A4, on coaching, I investigate where present coaching theories and coaching practice stand in regard to these ontic-developmental issues.

Appendix A4

Coaching as a Catalyst for Executive Development

> What psychoanalysis was in 1950 and human-potential experiences were in the 1960's and '70's, coaching is becoming in the 1990s
>
> --the preferred way to make yourself a better person. ... I often hear it said by coaching enthusiasts that, in the future, everybody
>
> will have a coach. Judging from the speed with which its popularity is increasing ... sometimes think that in the future every-body will be a coach.
>
> W.T. Anderson (1998, p. 35.)

It is useful, both in theoretical and practical regards, to distinguish several aspects of coaching as viewed and described in the literature:

1. the way members of the organizational apex and human resource departments view coaching
2. the way human-resource consulting firms and their expert coaches, academically represented by "consulting psychology," view coaching
3. the way organizational theory conceives of coaching
4. the way clinical-developmental psychology views coaching
5. the way executives view and experience coaching.

While considerable discrepancy may be found between these perspectives, the first three (1-3) and last two (4-5) are likely show noticeable commonalities among themselves. Although perspectives #1 and #3 sometimes overlap, on the whole the way organizational theory reflects what actually happens in corporations is ideological at best, in contrast to being value-neutral. As to the link between perspectives #2 and #3, in my view one reason why investigations into coaching stand were they stand is that much of the organizational-theory literature on coaching is written by representatives of human resource service firms, and thus is a "how WE DO it" literature that often lacks solid theoretical foundations in other than pragmatic human-resource points of view. Within perspective #4, the clinical viewpoint is currently more firmly established and linked to other perspectives than is the developmental one, as vividly demonstrated

by this study. This study can be seen as an attempt to remedy this situation. The pursuit of this goal is centered around a research design for studying perspective #5, that of selected coaches and their clients.

Of the five perspectives named above, only perspectives #2 and #5 have so far not been considered in depth in this study, while we have given a voice to perspective #1 (Appendix A2), perspective #3 (Appendices A1 & A2), and perspective #4

(Appendix A3). Since perspective #5 is the topic of this study, and thus will be addressed below under Research Questions (chapter I), the bulk of the current chapter is centered around perspective #2, namely, selected views of how consulting firms and their experts experience and conceptualize coaching.

In terms of structure, I commence with an introduction, followed by an outline of definitions and of the history of the term coaching. I proceed to discussing two types of pragmatic approaches, those of human-resource service firms alias "consulting psychology," and those of a more clinical bent. In detail, then, this chapter comprises the following sections:

1. Coaching in Perspective
2. Definition and History of the term "Coaching"
3. Cognitive-Behavioral Practic Theories forCoaching Executives
4. A Systemic Approach to Executive Development Through
   Culture Transformation.

1. Coaching in Perspective

The "executive development activity" called coaching takes place in the force field between executive role and executive self, on one hand, and of individual and organization, on the other. In ontic-developmental terms, this activity focuses on executives' unique psychological organization (Basseches, 1989; Kaplan, 1991; Martin, 1996) but may equally be viewed in terms of one of the extant theories of epistemological stages (Kegan, 1994). In harmony with the diversity of developmental functions implied by the many inner and outer forces that impinge on human functioning in organizations, there exists a multitude of approaches to intervening in the life of individuals who, as "executives," are the heads of functional units of an organization, whether general managers or upper policy makers (Sperry, L. 1993, pp. 257-266).

The overwhelming majority of coaching approaches are, to speak in terms of Fig. A3, based on some theory of personal change, stage or non-stage, and do not venture into the realm of theories of development in the sense outlined in Appendix A3. This entails that theories of coaching, as far as they exist beyond the level of pragmatic philosophies of how to "DO" coaching, are following either a "person-in-environment" approach, or a more clinical, "executive character" oriented, non-stage approach

reminiscent of Kaplan (1991) and Martin (1996). In addition to these two theory-derived approaches, and more along the line of thinking of McCall (1998), there exists a host of formalized and semi-formalized pragmatic, "how to" approaches to coaching deriving from non-clinical business consulting. These approaches mainly use a variety of trait-psychological conceptions of personal change filtered through, and intertwined with, conceptions of "organizational imperatives." In no cases known to me are these organizational imperatives seen as linked to what Kegan has called the developmental demands made by organizations and contemporary society at large, on adults' mind.

There are several different ways to cut through the maze of "clinical-organizational interventions" referred to as coaching (and sometimes as mentoring or, more broadly, corporate therapy). One is that of Sperry (1996), who distinguishes executive development activities according to their target, such as individual, team, or organization (Sperry, 1996, p. 121). Another is to classify approaches to coaching according to the purpose of the intervention. This latter classification leads Witherspoon to distinguishing coaching:

- for skills
- for performance (& derailment)
- for (agentic) development
- for agenda,

where the latter category refers to coaching for helping managers "actually determine (day-to-day, O.L.) direction," in contrast to formal strategical planning (Witherspoon, 1996, p. 126). While Witherspoons's classification is a useful one in that it stresses the fact that coaching activity comprises "a continuum of roles" (Witherspoon, 1996, p. 124), it does not address the thrust of the present investigation which is focused on the distinction between coaching for personal change (in the sense of Kaplan (1991) and Martin (1996)) as part of an "executive development system" (McCall, 1998), and coaching for development, or coaching issueing in, development (in the sense of theories of adult development). I have implicitly referred to the latter form of coaching as coaching that effects transformations of executives' professional agenda. Whether coaching should pursue such transformations as an explicit goal, or expect them as an outcome, or both, is an open question.

In keeping with my ontic-developmental focus (modulated by Basseches' critique of the stage concept), namely, to determine the ontic-developmental potential as well as preconditions of coaching, I concentrate, in what follows, on individual, one-to-one coaching, particularly as carried out by external, rather than internal, coaches. I consult representative

conceptualizations of coaching for skills, performance, (agentic) development, and agenda, following Witherspoon's lead. In addition to reviewing "practice theories for coaching executives," I also put in perspective Kaplans's and Martin's clinically inspired "coaching for personal change" already introduced above, relating them to McCall's (1998) "catalysts" from his model of executive development.

2. Definition and History of the Term "Coaching"

As reported by Witherspoon (1996, p. 127), T. Belf (1995, p. 1) defines coaching as:

> an ongoing relationship which focuses on the client taking action toward the realization of their vision, goals or desires. Coaching uses a process of inquiry and personal discovery to build the client's level of awareness and responsibility and provides the client with structure, support, and feedback.

As this definition conveys, typically the emphasis in coaching, in contrast to, e.g., psychotherapy, is on actions realizing visions, goals, or desires, thus on outcome. While in the context of personal coaching, the latter may be customized to the client, in the organizational context, "visions, goals, or desires" are typically pre-defined by business strategy (McCall, 1998; Hall, 1996). As a consequence, what the person coached has to manage psychologically to "realize" visions etc. through "actions" is considered secondary. For this reason, the client, seen as an organizational resource, or a vehicle of "talent and experience," clearly needs structure, support, and feedback, as well as appropriate "mechanisms" and "catalysts" (McCall, 1998), to adapt to organizationally mandated visions, goals, or desires. According to the quote, an essential ingredient of this transmutation of organizational imperatives to personal motivations and efforts is the executive's self-awareness and responsibility, to be "build" by the coach. As Witherspoon puts it by referring to Belf (1995, p. 1):

> Executive coaching might be defined as a confidential, highly personal learning process: 'an organized, personal learning provided over a specified period of time to bring about the possibility of effective action, performance improvement and/or personal growth.'

An additional element in this definition is the inclusion of learning, not only learning that is experienced by the client, but which is "provided" to the client, with an emphasis on managerial effectiveness in conjunction with personal growth. (Here, as pervasively in the organizational literature, learning and development remain undistinguished.) Putting coaching in perspective, Witherspoon adds (1996, p. 127):

> Coaching is more personal and individualized than other forms of organizational learning (e.g. workshops or traditional classrooms). In working one-on-one,

> there is the recognition that no two people are alike. Each person has a unique knowledge base, learning pace, and learning style. Consequently, executives progress at their own pace and are held accountable for their progress.

This reference to executives' unique psychological organization (Basseches, 1989) introduces, of course, the dialectic between their "messy" personal idiosyncracies, on one hand, and the ideal-typical "epistemologic" (Kegan, 1994) on the other, of which the latter may be a manifestation. The definition, in fact, implicitly refers to a particular epistemologic, by stating that "executives ... are held accountable for their progress." This not only implies the new career contract (Hall, 1996) which makes everybody responsible for his or her development, but equally the "institutional" epistemologic demanding that one treat one's job as a "career," and qualify as a "manager." Witherspoon rounds off this definition as follows (Witherspoon, 1996, p. 127):

> Coaching can uncover blind spots and change one's personal style.

As McCall made clear, "blind spots eventually matter" (McCall, 1998, p. 39 f.) and presumed strengths can materialize as weaknesses in specific contexts (McCall, 1998, p. 35). In addition, the executive might be moved, perhaps by way of coaching, to change his or her style, whether this is seen as one of "character" (Kaplan, 1991), or in terms of permeability and flexibility of psychological boundaries (Popp, 1996; Appendix A3).

A more academically oriented definition of coaching is offered by Kilburg who stresses the heterogeneity of concepts and methods used in contemporary coaching (1996, p. 59):

> As it is currently practiced, executive coaching appears to be an eclectic mix of concepts and methods ... Traditional organization development methods, adult education, management training, industrial-organizational psychology, and generic consultation skills are being blended together to define a (new) subdisciplines.

Aware of the proximity of coaching to clinical work, Kilburg adds (1996, pp. 59-60):

> For consulting psychologists, another important development is that the theories and methodologies of clinical psychology, with its strong historical emphasis on diagnosis and changing the dysfunction behavior patterns of individuals, are now being applied to the other consulting approaches used with executives

While this panoply of methods includes those of clinical psychology, no mention is made here of developmental psychology, often identified with "developmental psychopathology" or "child development."

In a more historical vein, Evered & Selman report (1989, pp. 31-32):

> The word 'coach' was first used in the modern sense of a sports coach in the 1880's (referring specifically to one who trained a team of athletes to win a boat race). Previously (beginning in the 1840's), the word "coach" was used colloquially at Oxford University to refer to a private (vs. university) tutor who prepared a student for an examination. But the first use of the word "coach" in English occurred in the 1500s to refer to a particular kind of carriage. (It still does.) Hence the root meaning of the verb "to coach": to convey a valued person from where he or she was to where he or she wanted to be .

This historical elucidation of the term clearly shows the embeddedness of its meaning in the culture of the time in which it was used, with contemporary coaches ending up as the "coachmen" of executive carriages, thus as support staff. Moving into the 20th century, Evered & Selman report that the term coaching was initially used for what today we would call internal coaches (1989, p. 32):

> The earliest efforts to explore coaching as a management function seem to come from the work of Myles Mace in the 1950s. He conceived of coaching as a worthy and acquirable management skill (Mace & Mahler, 1958; Mace, 1959).

This is corroborated by Kilburg (1996), who makes clear that by far the largest body of literature on coaching focuses on (1) "exhorting managers to exert themselves to add coaching to their roles," and (2) "coaching subordinates for high performance," (Kilburg, 1996, pp. 135-136). According to Kilburg's account, the turning point for the external coaching of executives occurs in the 1990s (Levinson, 1991; Sperry (1993); Kelly, 1985; Lukaszewski (1988); O'Connell (1990), bringing to the fore the following topics (Kilburg, 1996, p. 136):

- improving performance at the skill level and establishing
  a relationship that enhances executives' psychological development
- counseling top leaders in corporations
- the relationship among consulting, counseling, and coaching with executives
- problems consultants face in coaching assignments with managers,

among others. Kilburg concludes that, while "the application of coaching as a concept and set of techniques to the art and practice of management has been growing rapidly through the 1980s and 1990s, ... the scientific basis for these applications is extremely limited at this time. This is even more true for the practice of coaching in the context of consultation" (Kilburg, 1996, p. 136).

Remarking that "there is little ... literature on (executive) coaching that is really noteworthy until Fournis (1978), Evered & Selman impart a noteworthy cultural perspective when they say in conclusion to their article (Evered & Selman, 1989, p. 31):

> Thoughtful managers have been looking for a way to pinpoint the skills that make the elusive "art" of management appear so natural in "great" managers. Coaching captures these essentials in a way that enables people to shift their thinking from a traditional paradigm of control/order/prescription to a paradigm designed for acknowledging and empowering people in action. It creates a new context for management, one that fosters a genuine
>
> partnership between managers and employees so that both can be imagined from a perspective of our traditional management culture.

This humanistic conception of (internal) coaching as an antidote to the control paradigm of "traditional management culture" emphasizes a potential for "culture transformation" (Martin, 1996) where coaching is conceived as an intervention, not only into the professional life of individuals, but of entire organizations. Endorsing this symbolic perspective, the authors just quoted state (Evered & Selman, 1989, p. 32):

> ... it is interesting to note that Frederick Taylor might have written the last paragraph [quoted above], ... except that in place of the word "coaching" he would have used "scientific management." The critical difference lies in the degree to which people in organizations, both managers and employees, are empowered. "Coaching" is explicitly designed to empower, whereas "scientific management" has an 80-year track record of disempowering people at work. Hence Taylor's vision of a genuine partnership in the workplace was never realized.

The simple reflection that those who have been coached might become, through transformative changes effected by (external) coaching, able (internal) coaches themselves (Martin, 1996), makes it apparent that the line between external and
internal coaches is, developmentally speaking, rather thin. Moreover, one can see the positive side of the new career contract as embodying a "paradigm of empowerment" as is apparent from writings of the career theorist Fletcher (Appendix A1). As Fletcher shows, there is plenty of room for futuristic speculation in theories of executive development (including coaching).

3. Cognitive-Behavioral Practice Theories for Coaching Executives

To my mind, the most fitting framework for discussing a selected number of approaches to (external) coaching, as documented in the literature, is McCall's (1998) insight that a pervasive corporate development philosophy is the "Darwinian" one of "talent" defined as a finite list of psychological traits that

embody the "right stuff" needed for transmuting organizational imperatives into personal ones. As McCall has shown, this non-developmental, if not anti-developmental, philosophy entails a minimal need for agentic development efforts, the view being that accomplishment will

"naturally" select out those executives who demonstrably embody organizational visions and goals, as shown by their previous accomplishments. Adopting the notion of "survival" in the Darwinian metaphor, McCall's book-long effort has been to segue from the "survival of the fittest" to the "development of the fittest" (McCall, 1998, p. 16), by critiquing the --both agentically and ontically-- shallow development philosophy he finds prevalent in many contemporary corporations. Although he does not explicitly mention coaching or mentoring, conceptually McCall positions executive coaching as one of the "catalysts" required for making learning from experience possible and effective, capable of delivering "the right stuff" to executives who personally embody relevant organizational visions. McCall thus assigns to coaching a highly strategical function, in all senses of the term. He is aware that executive development activities are a crucial ingredient of the constant effort of organizations, to maintain equilibrium both in the relationships of its members to each other and to their environment, as a means of realizing the vision and goals constituting its culture. This effort at equilibration entails that organizations must continually work at transmuting corporate imperatives into personal ones, while allowing individuals to innovate without being stifled by organizational imperatives.

McCall's focused treatment of catalysts of organizational transmutation, which he sees as catalysts of learning from experience provided by developmental opportunities is, however, not the norm in the literature. As is to be expected, there exists a large variety of conceptions of coaching and of its purposes, hinted at in Fig. A4, below, which summarizes highlights from literature written between 1990 and 1997.

Insert Fig. A4 here

In the diagram, I have sorted purposes into two bins, one regarding activities having an organizational, and another regarding activities having a personal, focus. I have also indicated what in the literature are thought to be some of the organizational alternatives to channeling energy into the transmutation of organizational ("strategic") into personal ("executive") imperatives. These alternatives raise the important question of what is the specificity of (external) one-on-one coaching of executives, and how this particular catalyst should be contextualized by way of other, related executive development activities.

In an attempt to bring some conceptual transparency to the multitude of coaching goals depicted in Fig. A4, one might distinguish, with Kilburg, three foci: (1) system focus (on the organization), (2) executive focus (on the individual), and (3) mediated focus, which regards "the relationships and behavioral factors that mediate all interactions and activities between the manager and his or her organization" (Kilburg, 1996, p. 138). As he puts it (Kilburg, 1996, p. 138):

> A consultant working with a client executive can provide assistance to an individual inside of or crossing over any of the foci.

Thinking in terms of three different, but connected, mental spaces which coach and client inhabit in the context of their coaching alliance, I conceive of Kilburg's three foci as three "Houses" in which coach and client take up residence during the period of their alliance. The metaphor of houses is meant to convey that there are three mental spaces which coach and executive reside in, and move about, during their work together. As shown in Fig. 3, there are two houses, the Professional House and the Company House, such that the latter comprises two parts, called the First and Second Company House.

Insert Fig. 3 here

Kilburg's executive focus, which targets the executive's self, is embodied in the Professional House, while his mediated focus is rendered by the First, and his system focus by the Second, Company House (Laske, 1999). The two Company Houses differ in their focus. The First Company House is a mental space for deliberating the relationship the executive entertains with all of the parties in the organization, i.e., the different roles the executive "plays" in the organization (Kilburg, 1996, p. 138). By contrast, the Second Company House is a mental space in which the coaching process is centered around issues arising from the imperative to see the "big picture" of the company and its environment, including the need to adopt multiple perspectives to understand the situations and events happening in the company. As shown in Fig. 3, two features of the Houses stand out: first, that they are linked to each other, and second, that each of them is focused on a different primary issue the coaching alliance is concerned with: self-and other-awareness in the Professional House, self- and role-integration in the First Company House, and integrated leadership in the Second

Company House. The links have to do with the fact that the "bottom floor" of the Professional House is predicated on the notion of an "evolving self" that not only determines the remaining floors (levels) of the Professional House, especially the professional agenda, but indirectly determines the levels of the two remaining houses. This link between the professional's self, whether the coach's or the executive's, on one hand, and the mental spaces of coaching, on the other, represents the reality that whatever is achieved in the coaching alliance ultimately is rooted in the ontic-developmental status quo of the self of

both parties in the coaching alliance. In short, Fig. 3 embodies the ontic-developmental hypothesis that without an understanding of the "evolving self", in particular of the executive, an understanding of what happens in the coaching alliance is very limited. For this reason, particular emphasis is reserved in Fig. 3 for the fact that the coach's and executive's self concept determines their respective professional agenda.

The foregoing conceptualization, called an "integrated model of developmental coaching" (IMDC) differs from Kilburg's only in that the Professional House (Kilburg's executive focus) comprises, not only matters of professional self of the executive, but of the coach as well. After all, both professionals are forming an alliance whose psychological and developmental structure is the basis of change efforts made in the coaching. This makes it reasonable to conceive of coach and client as "co-learners" rather than as a dyad in which one party is in some sense "above" the other one, as the old career contract would lead one to assume (Kram, 1996). Adopting the conceptualization of "Houses" of the coaching process, one can reformulate Kilburg's (previous) quote (1996, p. 138) by saying that "a consultant working with a client executive can provide assistance to an individual inside of, or crossing through, any of the houses."

The reformulation of coaching foci as "Houses" in the above model of coaching at first seems to be just a metaphorical nicety. However, the differentia specifica of the model lies in the fact that it stresses the process ongoing between coach and client, rather than being fixated, as are most models of coaching, on the outcome (thus disregarding the coaching process itself as a major ingredient of the change effort). In addition, the IMDC does not reflect a practice theory of (how to do) coaching, but a cognitive science theory of what happens in coaching, regardless of the approach to coaching taken. Given this framework for understanding coaching as a process by which organizational imperatives are transmuted into personal ones (of the executive), I

would agree with Kilburg that (1996, p. 138):

> a more rigorous conceptual approach to executive coaching as a specific consultation service would choose the executive focus (i.e., the professional house, O.L.) ... as the primary target of the consultation. (These) coaching activities would flow over into the other foci (houses, O.L.) primarily as a way of helping the individual learn how to better function as a person and a leader in a given organization.

However, I would propose, in addition, to see the relationship of the Houses (Kilburg's foci) in a dialectical fashion, to the effect that they are intrinsically linked not only in the coach's, but also in the client's, mind. By this I mean that whatever change transpires in the company houses (Kilburg's system and mediated focus) is psychologically and developmentally rooted in the client's professional house, where matters of self are primarily topical. These matters of self pose the problem of how an executive's self and role are

(to be) integrated, and how the executive's "unique psychological organization" (Basseches, 1989)--what Kaplan (1991) calls "character,"-- influences his or her presence in the company houses. In particular, these matters of self regard what I have called the executive's professional agenda. The agenda comprises the executive's basic assumptions regarding self, role, and relationship to the organization that constitute a professional's Professional Agenda. This entails that the executive's ontic-developmental position, or epistemologic, is a constitutive element of the Professional Agenda, thus of the executive's relationship to work (Kegan, 1994).

In contrast to Kilburg's model, which is based on psychodynamic concepts, the IMDC is a constructive-developmental one that subsumes purely psychoanalytic concepts. In harmony with Basseches' elucidation of the stage concept, the model is designed to focus attention as much on the "messy," "disorganized" aspects of the individual executive's psychological organization as on the epistemologic he or she can be shown to instantiate in his professional life. The model adheres to Basseches' definition in which (Basseches, 1989, p. 194):

> ... the idea of a person's "unique psychological organization" must refer, somewhat paradoxically, to the state of disorganization, as well as to the state of organization, of the sum total of a person's
>
> activities and meaning-making schemes as exists at any point in time.

From the vantage point of the integrated developmental model, Kilburg's conception of "components of executive coaching interventions" (Kilburg, 1996, p. 139) appears as rather mechanistic. While not as one-sided a practice theory as other such models, Kilburg's model is still focused on the HOW, rather than the What, of the coaching process. Kilburg conceives of five steps composing that process:

1. developing an intervention agreement
2. building a coaching relationship
3. creating and managing expectations of coaching success
4. providing an experience of behavioral mastery or cognitive control over the problems and issues
5. evaluation and attribution of coaching success or failure.

While common-sensical enough, this breakdown of the coaching process into steps along the time-line embodies assumptions, especially in the 4th step, that seem to derive from the "old" rather than the "new" career contract. In this conceptualization, the coach is seen as demonstrating "behavioral mastery" and "cognitive control over the problems and issues," and is thus presumably instantiating a "higher" epistemologic than the exeeutive. Not only might this not hold under the new, protean career contract (Kram, 1996), where coaching is one among many other "relational activities." The notion of "behavioral mastery" and "cognitive control" is, in my view, a misconstruence of the intrinsic complexity and "messiness" of the coaching process as a psychological process in which two professionals of different

expertise are engaged in seeing their way through the "disorganizations" that prevail individually as well as organizationally, --and in staying with these disorganizations achieve a degree of closeness that is not likely to occur in neater, more streamlined situations (Martin, 1996). In other words, the more schematic and "neat" coaching alliances are designed to be, the less potential do they entail for developmentally relevant outcomes.

From the vantage point of the integrated model (Laske, 1999), the organizational and personal foci of coaching emphasized by recent literature (as depicted in Fig. A4) primarily regard the "organizational imperatives" deriving from business strategy. These imperatives determine how coaching is conceptualized in terms of a specific organization's culture. As a consequence, these imperatives influence the "mechanisms" and "catalysts" (McCall, 1998) an organization puts in

place for guaranteeing the transmutation of its imperatives into personal ones. The list of alternatives in Fig. A4 gives an idea of what are the different mechanisms an organization might select when making decisions about relational activities.

***

Consulting psychology as it is presently known is a discipline that is "homeless" between clinical psychology, on one hand, and industrial/organizational psychology, on the other. As far as it exists as an academic discipline, and certainly as a practical discipline, it is primarily based on cognitive-behavioral premises, according to which learning is the primary human capacity. In this conception, current behavior is based on past behavior, which can, to a large extent, be "unlearned" (the term taken in a more simplistic sense than K. Lewin would have found acceptable). The cognitive-behavioral concept of learning refers to "agentic" development (i.e., change) in the sense of this study. The concept fits non-developmental approaches to coaching to a fault. However, from a combined clinical-developmental and cognitive-science perspective (Laske, 1999), consulting psychology, being based on the mechanistic premises of Newtonian science, presently has no tools for understanding transformative psychological change (i.e., ontic development), either in individuals or in organizations (Kramer & Bopp, 1989). As these authors state (Kramer et al., 1989, p. 1):

> The inappropriateness of the Newtonian model to the subject matter of psychology has been argued extensively on levels extending from the procedural and method-ological to the theoretical to the ethical and meta-physical.

More explicitly, they continue (Kramer & Bopp, p. 3):

> Since the primary focus of both clinical and develop-

> mental psychology is on change, the predominance of mechanistic theories in these fields, which have emphasized a passive organism, linear causality, unidirectional determinism, stability, static personality traits, and individual/biological maturation, has been disheartening. It is our view that such models have left serious gaps in our understanding of this complex, dynamic subject matter.

There is some reason to believe that this critique is equally, if not more valid in regard

to theories dealing with individual change in an organizational context, as occurs in coaching. Although the constructive-developmental perspective, introduced in this study, has a potential for working toward more sophisticated notions and explanations of psychological change, or resistance to it, as we have seen the link between individual epistemologic (ontic-developmental position) and unique psychological organization (clinical profile) of an individual is far from being transparent. As the above mentioned authors, editors of a book on "Transformation in clinical and developmental psychology," conclude (Kramer et al., 1993, p. 3):

> .. the nature of psychological change eludes the conceptual tools of traditional theoretical models which assume stasis and entropy.

As a remedy for this stalling of insight into transformation, Kramer et al. (1993) propose that researchers pay increasing attention to contextual as well as organismic (including dialectical) approaches by which phenomena are seen as interdependent rather than linked by linear causality. Without going into the fine details of their meta-theoretical debate regarding transformative change, that debate is, in my view, a potent reminder that the tools presently wielded by consulting psychologists rather add to, than relieve of, the situation of stalled insight Kramer et al. find themselves in. I would suggest that much of this stalling of insight has a developmental root, having to do with the epistemologic of the theorists who employ such tools (Laske, 1997).

One important way in which the above critique regards the present discussion is that mechanistic thinking (as represented by McCall's "mechanisms" and "catalysts") cannot deal with process, but only with its outcome and with conditions for putting processes in place organizationally. In close proximity to recent developments in cognitive-behavioral, "protocol-based," psychology (e.g. Linehan, 1993), the hallmark of approaches to coaching of consulting firms is the formalization and "strategizing" of the coaching process for purposes of marketing human-resource services. In such formalizations, primary emphasis is put on individual and/or organizational outcomes, not on the dynamics of the coaching process itself, or the relevance of this dynamics for actually producing psychological outcomes.

In harmony with this emphasis on outcome, consulting psychology's view of coaching is mainly focused on principles of general, "flawless," consulting practice, where the issues regard (1) contracting,

(2) dealing with resistance, (3) getting the data, and (4) giving feedback (Block, 1981). As a consequence, the goal of consulting

psychologists' writing on coaching is primarily that of establishing what Witherspoon calls a practice theory for coaching executives. He explains this notion as follows (Witherspoon, 1996, p.133):

> A practice theory resembles formal theory but is based on experience, not systematic research. It constitutes a mental map of what is important (in coaching, O.L.) and what to do about it.

Although I would dispute the link Witherspoon sets up between a practice theory and Argyris' theory-in-use (Argyris et al., 1985), which in my view is a cognitive-science theory, I agree with Witherspoon that such an experienced-based theory is valuable, although the question remains whose "experience" one is talking about, that of the coach, the executive, or the organizational interpreters of coaching outcome.

In concert with the practice of general business-consulting, coaching experts typically follow a sequence of steps that "set the foundation" for coaching (Saporito, 1996, p. 98). Although these sequences differ depending upon the idiosyncractic coaching philosophy put into practice, they show a great deal of similarity. For example, Saporito distinguishes the following steps (1996, pp. 97-99):

> Step 1: Defining the context
> Step 2: Assessment of the individual
> Step 3: Developmental planning
> Step 4: Implementation.

In step 1, three main questions are asked: (a) what are the organizational imperatives?, (b) what are the success factors for that particular role within the organization?, and (c) what are the behavioral requirements necessary to achieve these success factors? Evidently, the philosophy here is that behavioral change can be tailored to organizational requirements, and that specific "developmental" needs of executives can be targeted. The "big picture" of development, at the intersection of epistemologic and unique psychological organization, is discounted.

Saporito's step 2 is, predictably, the assessment of the individual executive in light of the "profile of successT^{M}," in order to match selected psychological traits against the business-strategy mandated "right stuff" needs and wants of the organization. This step yields a "Personal Development GuideT^{M}," that "highlights key

development issues that will set the stage for our feedback to the executive, and for subsequent executive coaching" (Saporito, 1996, p. 99). In addition to the guide, this step entails a 360-degree feedback

process. The procedure is a cross between a performance review (broadened to include the perceptions of co-workers) and a clinical assessment. The outcome of a 360-degree feedback process can be viewed in analogy to an assessment-based clinical diagnosis meant to serve as the foundation for psychotherapy, except that the targets of the therapy are not defined by the developmental needs of the person's self, but externally, by the requirements of his or her role, as defined by organizational and cultural imperatives.

Saporito's third step, developmental planning, is composed of two substeps, feedback and developmental planning proper. The former is based on "in-depth discussions and reviews" as a "critical part of helping to create the level of insight into the executive that enables him or her to see the developmental issues to be addressed" (Saporito, p. 99). This step is realized by feedback to the individual, a 3-way discussion with the supervisor, and the creation of a "Leadership Development Plan [TM]." Concretely, this entails, as well expressed by the above formulation, that a level of [organizational] insight into the executive is created that is independent of the level of insight of the executive into himself. This organizational insight is then used as a tool for "him or her to see," rather than experience, the developmental issues to be addressed. (One does not have to be a developmental psychologist, but only a good clinician, to "see" that this step is loaded with psychological issues.)

Saporato's fourth step, finally, is the implementation of executive coaching and of "developmental experiences." As Saporito phrases it (Saporito, 1996, p. 99):

> This is the point in the process in which we move from determining what the (organizational and individual, O.L.) needs are and how we will work on them to actually getting it done. It is this stage that the coaching becomes more evident and concentrated, although coaching actually has been taking place from the beginning (i.e., step 1).

In other words, before we can enter any of the coaching "houses," we have to clear the forest of organizational requirements and filter them down to those that apply to the particular executive. We then have to convince the executive that he or she (as a carrier of roles) indeed has the "developmental needs" we have found he or she has. To

speak with Diedrichs, Saporito's profile of "success" is focused on the "considerations and responsibilities of a particular role as opposed to (my emphasis, O.L.) the need-dispositions that govern his or her unique tendencies to orient and act in a certain way" (Diedrich, 1996, p. 62). From Saporito's vantage point, we obviously cannot assume, as we might under the new career contract, that the executive is taking development into his or her own hands (having criteria of psychological success of his or her own); nor can we be sure that he or she has arrived at an ontic-developmental position where,

having a "career" rather than a "job," the executive has a professional self-concept (and associated agenda) that guarantees his managerial effectiveness. In short, one seems to be dealing with executives at Kegan's stage-3 level who have to rely, for their wholeness and autonomous functioning, on the organizational surround.

A practice theory of coaching that is psychologically better informed, thus more aware of the dialectics of self and role, is spelled out by Diedrich. Although he, too, uses a "profile of (organizational) success, or "ideographic profile of cognitive, affective, and social factors" (in the executive) that, "when matched with the role expectations for a given executive position, is used to predict success or failure" (Diedrich, 1996, p. 61), Diedrich uses learner-centered principles as spelled out by Division 15 of the APA. These principles assert that learning "is a process of discovering and constructing personal and shared meaning from information and experience" (Principle 1); that learning is affected by a broad range of motivational factors (Principle 5), and that "learning and self-esteem are heightened when individuals are in respectful and caring relationships with others who see their potential, genuinely appreciate their unique talents, and accept them as individuals" (Diedrich, 1996, p. 61). Diedrich describes his approach as follows (Diedrich, 1996, p. 63):

> My efforts focus primarily on factors that are internal to the learner, while recognizing the context or social system in which the executive behavior takes place. I stress the fact that the executive needs to view behavior as a function of both role and personality; that is his or her observed behavior exists as a proportion of two types of performance: role-relevant versus personality-relevant.

Although not acknowledging the full extent to which role and personality (or self) are entwined developmentally, this approach to coaching practice assures to some extent

that "both the executive and the organization view the coaching process as an ongoing activity that is developmentally oriented, as opposed to a quick fix that is problem-centered" (Diedrich, 1996, pp. 62-63). In accordance with this goal, Diedrich suggests that the coach focus (Diedrich, 1996, p. 62):

> on the development of increased awareness and insight,
> the evaluation of choices or alternative behaviors,
> and the planning and implementation of more effective
> executive behavior and performance.

Of course, how increased awareness and insight into self, linked as they are to a person's epistemologic, is to be achieved through coaching remains an open question.

A similar approach is documented by Tobias who acknowledges a close link of coaching with general business consulting (1996, p. 88):

> Whereas when I am doing consulting, the focus tends to be on the entire organization, when I am doing coaching, the focus is more on a single individual. It should be pointed out, however, that in either case I tend to define the client as the individual with whom I am working.
>
> Another potential distinction between coaching and consulting is that coaching may be done within and outside of the confines of an ongoing consulting relationship. ... When coaching is done in isolation, the absence of organizational context will inevitably limit the coach's perspective on the presenting problem.

Replacing the term "profile of success" by that of a "psychological study," Tobias, taking the view of a management psychologist, explains that such a study (Tobias, 1996, p. 90):

> attempts to capture a person's capacities, style, direction, level of emotional maturity, and the degree to which he or she capitalizes on basic potentials. It (the study, O.L.) can point out to the individual a variety of inadvertent consequences that may result from the individual's good intentions, such as how the individual's strengths, when overused, may predict the individual's weaknesses, and how current successes as well as current maladaptive behaviors may sprout from roots in the person's past. The psychological study serves not only to bring a person's strengths into the foreground, as reassuring contrast to the usual focus on his or her shortcomings.

This insight into the dialectic of strengths and weaknesses, made transparent by Kaplan (1991) and McCall (1998), as well as by Basseches (1989), gives Tobias approach to "the person sent for coaching" (Tobias, 1996, p. 90) an air of psychological insight and compassion. His formulation also reminds one of the stigma that may be attached to such "remedial" coaching if the culture of the organization is not based on assumptions that make self-development through the use of relational activities (Kram, 1996; Fletcher, 1996) an accepted goal.

The notion that coaching presupposes a particular organizational culture is endorsed by Peterson. Peterson defines coaching as "the process of equipping people with the tools, knowledge, and opportunities they need to develop themselves and become more effective" (Peterson, 1996, p. 78). He and his co-authors agree with McCall (1998) that "in today's organizations, the development of people is not optional, it is a business necessity" (Gebelein, Lee, & Sloan, 1996, p. 1). In order to teach organizations this point of view, Peterson et al. recommend an organization-wide "development audit™" that determines "the importance of people's development to the organization's business goals (Gebelein et al., 1996, pp. 2-3):

> The audit helps organizations clarify strategic goals; identity the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to achieve those goals; evaluate the current development system and its successes; and determine the changes needed to integrate the development of people into the

> fabric of how people in the organization work.

In Peterson et al.'s approach, McCall's (1998) vision, of defining business strategy with development goals in mind, and of "translating" it to appropriate mechanisms and catalysts of the executive-development system takes on concrete form. Peterson et al. recommend to "develop a strategy with the communications department that regularly and frequently conveys this message--[of how critical the development of people is to
the future of the organization] to the organization" (Gebelein et al., 1996, p. 3). Once clear expectations regarding devlopment are set inside of the organization, it is time to "put processes in place that support the development of people (Gebelein et al., 1996, p. 3):

> Strategic performance modeling will help determine the roles, competencies, and standards of performance needed in the future. Hiring criteria will help set standards for competency in coaching, development, continuous
>
> learning, intellectual curiosity, and personal and intellectual flexibility.

Here, coaching is a component of a "development system" that itself is embedded in a company-wide, audit-based effort at developing people. This effort is two-sided (Gebelein et al., p. 3):

> Development requires a partnership between the individual and the organization. Both are responsible for development; each needs to do its part to make it happen.

More precisely, the individual must "prepare a plan for development to share with his or her manager" and work on and ask for feedback about his or her development (Gebelein et al., 1996, p. 4). The organization, in turn, is responsible for (1) making development a clear expectaction, (2) requiring plans for development from everyone, (3) making coaching a responsibility of managers, (4) providing coaching training for team leaders, (5) rewarding and recognizing both "developees" and "developers," (6) teaching people the basic principles of development, (7) providing the required resources and opportunities, and (8) monitoring the development system put in place.

In Peterson et al.'s comprehensive "agentic" development philosophy, the ontic-developmental dilemma's emerging in McCall's conception do, of course, reoccur. Although transferred to the executive-development service firm and its agents, the essential circularity implied by having to develop the developers remains alive. In my view, this circularity requires the organization to take constructive-developmental notions of assessment and coaching into account. This seems to put a particular responsibility on coaches who, according to Peterson et al., have to "teach people the
basic principles of development" (organizational responsibility no. 6, above).

With regard to the individual executive, Peterson starts from the notion that it is his or her responsibility to formulate a "development plan" (Peterson & Hicks, 1995, p. 2). This rationalistic notion of agentic development partly reflects organizational imperatives, partly is it an artifact of the drive of executive-development service firms, to formalize agentic development in the form of "plans" and "programs," on-line and/or off-line. This "development under pressure" brings home a surface-understanding of the need for development. Psychologically, it also sets up ontic-developmental obstacles that stem from not properly aligning the individual's ontic-developmental needs, unknown to both the individual and the organization (which

is fixated on some competency model) with organizational needs, and further, of not taking the potential gulf between the executive's unique psychological organization and his or her epistemologic into account.

Speaking to the executive, Peterson and co-authors transfer their procedural need for a development plan onto the executive (Davis, Gebelein, Hellervik, Sheard, & Skube, 1995, p. 5):

> For effective [sic!] development to occur, you will need a plan that is tailored to your development needs and includes ways to get continued feedback ... You can grow on your own yet your efforts can be significantly enhanced with the support of others who can provide ongoing feedback and encourage accountability.

This relational philosophy, reminiscent of Kram's (1996) and Fletcher's (1996) thinking, is here merged with the American self-help tradition. Presented in a "handbook," it takes on a didactic, formalized appearance (Davis et al., 1995, pp. 2-3):

> Additional keys to success in improving managerial performance include:
> - an accurate assessment of current strength and weaknesses
> - a written development plan focusing on increasing strengths and improving weak areas [of functiong]
> - specific behavioral goals
> - a plan tailored to your learning style
> - ongoing feedback on progress
> - recognition of improvement.

By using on-line tools, an executive formulating his or her development plan can access a "knowledge base" of management skills. These skills can be fitted into the written development plan which, in addition, may be enhanced by coaching suggestions coming from the executive's superior, also available on-line.

Similar to the "expert systems" of 1980s that were meant to improve experts' performance on the job (Laske, 1986, 1991), these on-line development tools are focused on abstract knowledge (competence). Competential knowledge of this kind lives in a different domain of cognitive-emotional functioning than the actual, real-time performance knowledge of executives. The competential knowledge

base is "out of touch" with executives' local knowledge (Geerts, 1983), comprising real-time performance requirements that derive from corporate culture. Competential knowledge

enshrined in a "knowledge base" excludes the idiosyncratic task-environmental conditions of actually using the knowledge pieces recommended for use. For this reason, the executive needs the assistance of a coach who can "turn" the systematized (on-line) knowledge base, imported into the organization by executive-development service firms, into "real," i.e., functioning and conversational knowledge, simultaneously safeguarding the executive's idiosyncractic intrapsychic needs (Laske, 1993).

Turning his attention to requirements to be fulfilled by the coach [not restricted to internal coaching], Peterson touts five coaching strategies that, according to him, have "emerged from research and applied experience (Peterson, 1996, p. 78; see also Peterson & Hicks, 1996):

1. forge a partnership
2. inspire commitment
3. grow skills
4. promote persistence
5. shape the environment.

The essential ingredient of (1) is to "build trust and understanding so people want to work with you" (Peterson, 1996, p. 79):

> To build trust, coaches must learn how people view the world and what they care about, [or, as Carl Rogers said] 'the best vantage point for understanding behavior is from the internal frame of reference of the individual.'

To inspire commitment (strategy #2), coaches should "build insight and motivation so people focus their energy on goals that matter" (Peterson, 1996, p. 79). This is best done "by helping people obtain information that is personally relevant to achieving their goals." According to Peterson's insight, "such information comes in four categories: (information on) goals, abilities, (others', O.L.) perceptions, and (organizational, O.L.) standards" (GAPS for short; Peterson, 1996, p. 79). This "informational" approach entails that "once the necessary GAPS information is available, coaches help people translate their new insights into action by prioritizing their development goals and developing a concrete plan for development and behavior change" (Peterson, 1996, p. 80). Peterson's "GAPS information" is another term for "profile of success" or "competency model," although it is more open to the need for

self-authoring than these alternative concepts.

Strategy #3, growing skills, has to do with "build(ing) new competencies to ensure people know how to do what is required" (by or in the organization, O.L.). Here, in close proximity to thoughts by McCall about "catalysts," "the role of the coach is to find the best way for an individual to learn a specific skill," either through "role-playing, the observation of experts in action, and hands-on experience" (Peterson, 1996, p. 80). As Peterson adds (1996, p. 80):

> Regardless of the learning method that is used, real-world experience is essential to deepen insight and forge sound judgement about how and when to apply what has been learned.

This is done in two ways: (a) space the practice, and (b) promote active experimentation (Peterson, 1996, p. 80).

Peterson's strategy #4, promoting persistence, has to do with "build(ing) stamina discipline to make sure learning lasts on the job" (Peterson, 1996, p. 80). It entails:

- being a talent agent, helping people find opportunities that require them to apply skills they have learned
- manage the mundane (routine aspects of development)
- fight fear of failure
- break the habit cycle.

Completing this cognitive-behavioral program, strategy #5 targets build(ing) organizational support to reward learning and remove barriers (to an individual's development): "Shaping the environment moves the coach from an exclusive focus on the one-on-one relationship (to the client) to the broader organizational playing field (Peterson, 1996, p. 81).

Reflections on coaching practice do, of course, imply notions of coaching competence. It is of interest to note that authors describing cognitive-behavioral coaching methods typically do not maintain a strictly behavioral stance when defining coaching competence. Signaling an awareness of a need for standards of competence to be fulfilled by trained psychologist-coaches, Brotman, Liberi, & Wasylyshyn (1998), for example, define the goal of coaching as "sustained behavior change." Consequently, a competent coach is seen as one who is able to support sustaining behavioral change. Such change is defined as follows (Brotman et al., 1998, p. 42):

> The executive displays a change in the targeted behavior(s). This change is consistent even under pressure or stress. The new behavior is sustained by (a) the internalization of deeper psychological insights about undesirable behavior(s) and (b) targeted coaching that converts the insights into

pragmatic action steps.

In this definion, the coach is an expert who notices behavior change, and assists the executive in "converting deeper psychological insights" regarding organizationally "undesirable" deficiencies into action steps that can aid in removing them. The above definition does not signal any awareness of the dialectics of strengths and weaknesses (Kaplan, 1991). Neither does it take into account that behavior change not serving an ontic-developmental function is, by definition, not sustainable, even if it should be momentarily adaptive.

The authors base their definition of the core competencies of coaches on software called the Career Architect (1992). The competencies are defined behaviorally. They "constitute a skill set weighted toward being a 'trusted and approachable person' who can establish long-lasting relationships with a variety of people throughout an organization" (Brotman et al., p. 42). These competencies include: (1) approachability, (2) comfort around top management, (3) compassion, (4) creativity, (5) customer focus, (6) integrity and trust, (7) intellectual horsepower [sic!], (8) interpersonal savvy, (9) listening, (10) dealing with paradox, (11) political savvy, and -- last but not least (12) self-knowledge. The emphasis in this laundry list of psychological traits of a competent coach is that only trained psychologists qualify as experts in sustaining behavior change. Therefore, coaching must be "psychologically based" (Brotman et al., 1998, p. 43). Adopting a psychodynamic vocabulary, the authors agree with Tobias (1996, p. 88) that (Brotman et al., 1998, p. 43):

> While some change is possible in the absence of an explicitly intrapsychic focus, ... in its complete absence, the consultant will just walk blindly through a mine field of psychological resistance.

According to Brotman et al. (1998, p. 43), the competent executive coach will "(a)

identify habitual scripts and learn how the adverse elements of these scripts erode leadership effectiveness; (b) reveal truth and fresh insights about what drives the executive (a more psychodynamic notion, O.L.); (c) convert insights into observable behavior change; (d) distinguish between higher level, healthy defenses and those that are more primitive and damaging to both the self and others; (e) objectify the executive's subjective reality and internal dialogue by anchoring them in candor and a self-actualization pattern congruent with business objectives and organizational priorities as well as with an executive's aspirations" (Brotman et al., 1998, p. 43). Although the notion of 'script' might suggest some inkling of theories in use as different from espoused theories, here, the emphasis is strictly behavioral. Coaches' professional agenda is seen as one-dimensional. In addition, there is also uncalled-for confidence that "self-actualization patterns" will somehow magically align with

"business objectives and organizational priorities," a confidence that conveniently skirts the issue of how individual and organizational development actually relate.

Clinical outcome research (Luborsky, Crits-Christoph, Mintz, Auerbach, 1988) suggests that the adopted method of therapy is largely irrelevant in comparison to the force of the therapeutic alliance operating as a change agent. This entails that a cognitive-behavioral approach to coaching might work just as well as a psychodynamic one, as might an approach that is a mix of cognitive-behavioral and psychodynamic elements in the sense of Brotman et al. It is, however, noticeable in these authors' definition of coaching competence, that they easily glide into more psychoanalytic thinking, without acknowledging that tendency explicitly. Notions such as "internal dialogue" would otherwise be inadmissible. In harmony with observation, the authors state (Brotman et al., 1998, p. 43):

> In our view, executive coaching that fails to focus on intrapsychic factors produces a shallow result, a recapitulation of the obvious (?, O.L.) with minimal guidance for behavioral change.

Agreeing that "other specialists may bring important talents to the task of coaching" (Brotman et al., 1998, p. 43), the authors maintain that there are "three major factors that make psychologists uniquely qualified as executive coaches: (1) coaching tactics, (2) psychological tools, and (3) graduate training leading to licensure. This triad forms the "triple T" proficiency of psychologist-coaches.

In defining tactics, Brotman et al. rely on Argyris (1991; Brotman et al.,

1998, p. 44):

> Successful coaching must swiftly neutralize the inevitability of defensive reasoning. In our experience, the most powerful tactics is the executive-coach relationship ... Another essential coaching tactics that reinforces the likelihood of new learning and change is the coach's courage [sic!] to convey and confront the core reality of an executive versus his or her well-protected persona.

These tactics, once considered psychodynamic principles, call for commensurate tools (Brotman et al., 1998, p. 44):

> Using the developmental history and testing as primary tools, competent coaches identify themes from the executive's life stories ... Through the ethical use of carefully selected tools, including developmental history and tests of intelligence, personality, motivation, cognitive style, managerial style, interests and aptitudes, the consultant provides a psychological study that honors the whole person and pinpoints fruitful avenues for developmental exploration.

Among the tools of psychologist-coaches, who are clearly speaking pro domo here, assessment methods honed in clinical psychology are given first-rank importance (Brotman et al., 1998, p. 44):

> When providing feedback, it is crucial that psychologists link psychometric data with the contextual realities of the executive's workgroup and organizational culture.

The authors see the function of feedback as follows (Brotman et al., 1998, p. 44):

> The product (of feedback) is an interactive loop between intrapsychic causation and outward manifestation, that is, the grist for the coaching phase of an executive coaching engagement.

The art of coaching, then, lies in utilizing the "interactive loop" between inner self-structures and outer, behavioral manifestations, in such a way that (Brotman et al., pp. 44-45):

> the coach ... remain(s) focused on how the client's personal growth can result in behavioral shifts as well as (can) initiate and facilitate organizational change.

> The belief (is) that the individual is always the client and that the needs of the organization will be met through an executive's personal growth and sustained behavior change.

This belief in the harmony of organizational with clinical change, while convenient for clinical psychologists, does, however, not offer any solution to issues of executive development, a domain in which the linkage between individual and organizational functioning is very much at the center of attention.

As demonstrated above, even coaches working cognitive-behaviorally tend to define their work in rather psychodynamic terms. This pragmatic eclecticism reflects current psychological practice. Noticeable is the complete lack of constructive-developmental thinking in the coaching profession, either in thinking about the coach or the "coachee." Equally noticeable is the undeveloped thinking of coaches as to how individual changes actually "translate" into organizational change. This is so since the notion of what is an organization, and what forms the bridge between individual and organizational change efforts, is underresearched and undertheorized in the executive-development literature. As demonstrated above, it is an issue that only a cognitive-science theory of organizations might be able to shed light on.

***

The representative samples from the current coaching literature, outlined above, instantiate what Witherspoon has rightfully called "practice theories for coaching executives." As demonstrated, these theories are of the behavioral or cognitive-behavioral variety, in that they assume the reality of static psychological traits, clinical symptoms, and irrational beliefs as resulting from previous behavior. Such theories assume that such traits, symptoms, and beliefs can be "changed" by a appropriately supported systematic practice called "learning." While these theories are focused on issues of learning, they have not demonstrated that they hold a grip on "deep" personal change. This is so since, to speak with Kaplan (1991), they "leave the person out" of their practice and, by not "getting personal, do not and cannot distinguish between change as adaptation and as development.

While cognitive-behavioral therapy has been shown to be effective in the undoing of long-term symptom profiles that are based on physiological dysregulation, such as agoraphobia, panic disorder, and even borderline personality disorder, the

treatment of more "cognitive" conflicts, disorganizations, and irrational beliefs (Ellis, 1994), especially where they are rooted in developmental delay or arrest, have not yielded convincing results (Noam, 1988; Basseches, 1989). As they overreach into the field of executive development, these theories are at the further disadvantage that, in contrast to "dialectical behavior therapy" (Linehan, 1993), they do not acknowledge the "fundamental interrelatedness or wholeness of reality," thereby directing "our attention to the immediate and larger contexts of behavior, as well as to the interrelatedness of individual behavior patterns" (Linehan, 1993, p. 1). These theories also do not acknowledge, as does dialectic behavior therapy, that "reality is not ... static, but is comprised of internal opposing forces, ... (such that) dichotomous and extreme thinking, behavior, and emotions ... are viewed as dialectical failures" (i.e., as failures of dialectical thinking; Linehan, 1993, p. 2). Finally, although these theories carry the word "change" on all of their tongues, the methodology they are associated with does not permit them to acknowledge "that the fundamental nature of reality is change and process, rather than content and structure" (Linehan, 1993, p. 2), since process falls outside of their jurisdiction. While, as we know from clinical outcome research, the particular treatment modality chosen statistically matters less than the working alliance established between psychotherapist (or coach) and client, from a theoretical vantage-point cognitive-behavioral theory is not a sufficient basis for understanding either personal change or coaching for personal change.

As shown, central notions in cognitive-behavioral thinking about coaching executives are "profile of success," "competency model," or "GAPS information" (Peterson, 1996). As Witherspoon states (1996, p. 130):

> Success profiles (also known as competency models)
> define sets of skills and behaviors shown by
> research and experience to be strongly related
> to effective performance in management, leadership,

and executive positions.

A success profile is thus an assessment tool. The tool relates organizational imperatives, expressed in trait-psychological parlance, to the unique psychological organization of executivess' role functioning, in contrast to self-structures. Therefore, the tool excludes an assessment of ontic-developmental level. In practice theories for coaching executives, the competency model, which implicitly is an assessment model, is the basis of an "executive development plan" that forms the

foundation for the activity of the coach, whose task it is to help the executive transmute organizational imperatives into personal ones. The assumption thus is that the competency model, which permits a matching of organizational wants to executive resources, is sufficient for guaranteeing equilibrium between organizational and personal imperatives. However, since the match between the two is based on static psychological traits --excluding any acknowledgement of the dialectics between executive self and role, or between executive strengths and weaknesses,-- the match can be said to be built "on sand." In my view, McCall has a better handle on the organizational dilemmas associated with the "translation" of business strategy into competency models (his "mechanisms and catalysts") than the just reviewed practice theories for coaching executives. Of course, the psychological dilemmas provoked by McCall's model remain equally unresolved in the theories reviewed above.

A more comprehensive view of the practice of coaching is presented by Witherspoon (1996). Witherspoon rightly remarks that every coaching situation is unique, since executives are "in different stages of their careers and in varied settings" (Witherspoon, 1996, p. 125). For this reason, it is most apt to see coaching as a "continuum of roles." Accordingly, Witherspoon usefully distinguishes four distinctly different coaching roles that an "external, one-on-one coach (plays) in a business context" (Witherspoon, p. 125):

- coaching for skills
- coaching for performance [in present job]
- coaching for development [for future job]
- coaching for agenda (day-to-day direction in agenda setting).

I conclude this section by outlining Witherspoon's ideas.

Distinguishing four roles a coach can play, dependent on client need, Witherspoon gives the impression that a different strategy is appropriate for each of the roles. He states (1996, p. 127):

> In practice, the coaching roles may overlap. A coach contracted to help in skills building may end up working on performance issues, or a longer term relationship may be forged that contributes to the

> executive's overall development. Changes in role, however, should be acknowledged by all parties.

As to the first role, coaching for skills, Witherspoon includes under skills "basic concepts, strategies, methods, behaviors, attitudes, and perspectives associated with success in business" (Witherspoon, 1996, p. 127). As he sees it, what distinguishes coaching for skills from the other roles is clarity of purpose, and therefore high consensus and commitment, and "time is often a key purpose" (Witherspoon, 1996, p. 128). By contrast, "coaching for performance focuses on the executive's present job. For this coaching role, "there may be less shared agreement and a greater threat to some learners than there is in coaching for skills" (Witherspoon, 1996, p. 129):

> Coaching for performance helps people improve their effectiveness on the job. This coaching role can help executives to practice and apply new skills; clarify performance goals when expectations about behavior are unclear or when business goals, roles, or conditions change ... Coaching for performance can also help change individual behaviors and correct problems by confronting ineffective attitudes or other motivational issues. ... In these cases, the coach acts as a performacne coach by helping executives asses their performance, obtain feedback on strengths and weaknesses, and enhance effectiveness.

Thus, while coaching for skills has clear, but narrowly defined goals, coaching for performance regards more complex issues regarding effectiveness on the job. In another, still more fuzzy, role the coach focuses on a person's future job: "Typically the executive needs to prepare for advancement by strengthening leadership skills and to address long-term development needs" (Witherspoon, 1996, p. 129). As a consequence (Witherspoon, 1996, p. 130):

> Clear, specific goals may be lacking or limited. ... Because coaching for the future is involved, shared agreement about development coaching can be difficult and varies considerably. ... [such] coaching can be intense and analytical and therefore the most threatening to some learners. Of all the coaching roles, this one focuses on executive development and personal growth.

The term "development" as used here is the agentic, not the ontic, one; it refers to "development toward a future job." Actually, this is a precise definition of the most common meaning of the term "executive development" in the literature, which refers

to an expansion of role, not to a differentiation of self-structures.

Finally, coaching can be geared to assisting executives in setting direction in their daily agenda, whatever scope they may choose to give it. In contrast to the cognitive-science notion of "professional agenda," as used in this study, Witherspoon's term "agenda" is taken from Kotter (1982, p. 66), where it refers to the "loosely connected goals and plans addressing a range of time frames covering a broad range of business issues" and includes "both vague and specific goals and plans" (Witherspoon, 1996, p. 126). To further clarify his use of the term "agenda," Witherspoon states (1996, p. 131):

> Coaching for the executive's agenda deals with broader purposes--the continual life results and well-being an executive wants. The scope ranges considerably and usually goes beyond a single person or situation. ... Situations well suited to this type of coaching role include supporting better decisions when an executive needs insight and perspective, expanding options when creative suggestions could improve the chances for sound decisions, ... or guiding the executive through unknown or unexplored areas when he or she feels overwhelmed.

In coaching for agenda, coaching is under the control of the executive, since "sessions evolve in response to the executive's agenda; ...because an executives agenda can be broad and evolving, this type of coaching tends to involve comprehensive learning" (Witherspoon, 1996, p. 131). Coaching is under the control of the executive because the latter takes charge of his own development, as a manager should.

Although Witherspoon's use of the term agenda is not identical with the cognitive-science term of "professional agenda" introduced as a focus in this study, there are some relevant links between the two uses of the term. As Witherspoon emphasizes (Witherspoon, 1996, p. 131):

> Coaching for the executive's agenda deals with broader purposes--the continual life results and well-being an executive wants.

Although this quotation does not explicitly refers to aspects of the executive's self, Witherspoon makes it clear that "this type of coaching tends to involve comprehensive learning" (Witherspoon, 1996, p. 131):

> The coach, as an objective outsider and "talking partner," questions and engages the executive on major issues, an option less open to corporate insiders. ... Consequently, the time and clarity for this coaching role can be highly variable, from a short-term contract to a long-term relationship. ... The threat tends to be low, as the executive sets the agenda and controls its content.

Here, the external coach is seen as a "talking partner" in close alliance with the executive who, with some broadening of the term, could even be seen as a "co-learner" sharing the executive's "professional house"

in which matters of self are topical. As Witherspoon makes clear, in cases of coaching for agenda (which is potentially "coaching for ontic development"), the so-called clarity of cognitive-behavioral goals underlying skills and performance issues vanishes.

An important aspect of Witherspoon's continuum of coaching roles is the relationship it entails between assessment model and coaching role. Simply put, the more we move toward ontic-developmental coaching for agenda, the more we are in need of what H. Levinson conveys as being an open assessment (Levinson, 1996, p. 117):

> I ask the counselee to give me specific examples of his or her behavior in the wide range of executive practice he or she has experienced. I ask in particular what has provided him or her with special gratification, peak experiences, or highly gratifying achievements ... My concern is less with the specifics of achievement and more with the continuities of behavior, in short, what did he or she actually do. ... I am also interested in the client's disappointments, failures, and mode of recovery from them.

Although this is an inquiry focused on behavior, Levinsons mode of assessment is open in the sense that it is not prematurely weighted down by organizational imperatives, as is the case in using competency models. Levinson is very aware of the dialectics of self and role of an executive (Levinson, 1996, 116):

> To be a successful executive (Levinson, 1980), one must be able to take charge of his or her authoritative role comfortably, to manage the inevitable ambivalence of subordinates and the rivalry of peers and superiors, and
>
> to avoid being caught up in the regressive behavior of the work group he or she leads (Kernberg, 1978, 1979).

Detailing the dialectics of self and role further, Levinson states (1996, p. 118):

> From a psychoanalytic point of view, appropriate and effective role behavior require[s] the incumbent of a role to take charge of that role, to recognize and accept his or her accountablity to the values and the methods of the organization and to those to whom he or she reports. A manager or executive is also account-able to his or her own conscience (of which the ego ideal [that which the executive aspires to be, O.L.] is a component), for the executive must live with himself or herself. Therefore, the executive should not violate his or her own standards even if he or she must leave the role.

Adopting moral philosophy parlance, Levinson here articulates what I refer to as the dialectic between self and role (which is an epistemologic, thus ontic-developmental one). In Kegan's (1994) terms, what

Levinson is saying is that, as a manager, the executive must have emerged from his role, thus his embeddedness in the organizational context as a psychological surround, enough to be able to maintain a self-authoring stance by which to act responsibly both toward the organization and himself. Having in mind senior executives, Levinson also expresses an awareness of developmental issues in the sense of stage theories of change (e.g., Levinson et al., 1978) when he says (1996, p. 119):

> The consultant would wisely help clients to understand the psychology of their stage of adult development and both the problems and advantages of characteristic behavior in that life stage.

Although the tradition on which Levinson relies is psychoanalytic and phasic, rather than constructive-developmental, Levinson is clearly supportive of an open assessment, in contrast to the closed assessment of competency models. It seems to me that not only does the mode of assessment adopted in coaching determine the coaching role that can be realized, the latter also determines the mode of assessment that is most appropriate. Thus, there is a dialectics of mode of assessment (closed to open) and coaching role. This is not to say that an open assessment such as Levinson's is inappropriate in coaching for skills or performance, for example. As Kaplan (1991)

and MaCall (1998) have both pointed out, "blind spots matter eventually," and "strengths can be weaknesses in a certain context." This entails that even in coaching for skills and performance, closed assessments in terms of competency models are risky at best, and traumatizing at worst. Also, such "trait"-based assessment misses the crucial point of any psychological assessment, to capture the dynamics that generates the traits at issue. As Kaplan phrases it in "Getting at character" (Kaplan, 1998, p. 1):

> The purpose of assessment for development is to stimulate individuals to see themselves differently and therefore to behavior differently and more effectively. To do this, the aassessment must help individuals clearly understand the problems with their current ways of operating and, correspondingly, the opportunities to operate more effectively. What individuals understand about themselves must be clear and powerful enough to compel them to change their minds about themselves and, as a result, change the way the behave (my emphasis, O.L.).

While Kaplan's "assessment for development" still does not enter into the dialectics of epistemologic (Kegan, 1994) and unique psychological organization (Basseches, 1989), it captures an essential aspect of coaching for development: "to stimulate individuals to see themselves differently, ... (and to) clearly understand the problems with their current ways of operating." As Kaplan makes clear, "competency" assessments based on organizational imperatives cannot pass for assessments for development, for two reasons at least. First, such assessments do not capture what the person psychologically has to manage

him- or herself in adjusting to organizatioal imperatives, thus the dynamics of the traits being matched, and second, such assessments do not "stimulate" the person in a transformative way to undergo personal change. The best, such competency assessments can produce, to speak with Basseches (1984, 1989), is adaptational change, not a developmental dialectics safeguarding the "continuity of behavior" Levinson is emphasizing.

Pursueing Levinson's psychoanalytic ideas further, below, I discuss an approach to coaching executives called "corporate therapy." This notion is broader than that of coaching, in that it potentially comprises organizational diagnosis, clinical-organizational interventions that are company-wide, and executive consulting
(Sperry, 1996).

4. A Systemic Approach to Executive Development Through Culture Transformation

The most ambitious attempt to link psychoanalytic theory to a company-wide effort of promoting executive development has been made by Martin (1996) in her work on corporate therapy. Influenced by family therapy (Kirschner & Kirschner, 1996), as well as her own organizational practice, Martin, whose psychoanalytical model was presented above (Appendix A2, section 3), has formulated a "practice theory" for coaching executives as a tool for an organization-wide "culture transformation."

Adopting current views of coaching, Martin bases much of her work on the distinction between coaching and mentoring (Martin, 1996, p. 103):

> Coaching differs from mentoring in that it is shorter in duration and requires less commitment on both the part of the organization and the corporate therapist. Participation is often optional, because it is not viewed as a systematic strategy for overall culture change (my emphasis, O.L.). Duration is also optional. Executives may opt to contract for a few sessions or like therapy, the decision to terminate may be made at any time.

Aside from the contingencies of how coaching is carried out, the emphasis in this statement is on the fact that coaching is not "a systematic strategy for culture change." By contrast, Martin's conceives of mentoring as being just such a strategy. Since in her view, personal change is impossible without a close working alliance between both parties to the change effort, Martin sees mentoring as based on a psychological contract similar to that of "individually-based private" psychotherapy (Martin, 1996, pp. 103-104):

> Mentoring, on the other hand, requires a deeper commitment. While the executive coach believes the participant is solely responsible for his performance, the mentor ... believes that both he and the mentee are equally responsible. As a growth agent, the mentor must be available on demand. ... an intimate bond is

> formed in which the mentee is guided, prodded, and disciplined toward breakthroughs in his performance. Stretch goals are envisioned and performance is measured on a regular basis.

Except for the emphasis on the working alliance between mentor and mentee, this notion of mentoring as corporate therapy reminds one of Witherspoon's "coaching for agenda." But while such coaching is under the control of the executive, in Martin's conception mentoring is under the control of an organization's executive team as guided by an external mentoring firm called CDM (Creative Dimensions in Management, Inc.). Such mentoring is geared to satisfying organizational imperatives that she addresses as imperatives of performance breakthroughs through organization-wide culture transformation. The uniqueness of Martin's approach to coaching as the primary executive development tool lies in the seamless joining of efforts at personal and organizational change, and in her family-therapy inspired, holistic and systemic view of executive development. Since the executive team is seen as an organization's culture bearer, in fact, the "organizational ego," cultural transformation is defined as the self-transformation of the executive team (Martin, 1996, p. 156):

> ... culture transformation is viewed a metaphor for the simultaneous transformation of a critical mass of executives through mentoring.

Since the idea of corporate therapy is "centrifugal mentoring" (my term), which spreads mentoring through an organization by turning executive mentees into mentors of their peers and subordinates (Martin, 1996, p. 156):

> ... systematic transformation will occur as mentoring unfolds.

While Martin's "culture transformation" might not pass Schein's cultural analysis, since it does not address the deepest layer of basic assumptions but rather espoused values that derive from it (Schein, 1992, p. 17), nevertheless Martin embraces Schein's philosophy that organizations need to develop the "culture bearers," i.e., the executives, to realize a competitive advantage. In particular, she targets espoused values regarding the limits of individual and company performance as obstacles to reaping such advantage. In my view, she is not highly critical regarding the cultural assumptions she herself is espousing.

Intent on establishing corporate therapy as an organization-wide tool for culture transformation leading to performance breakthroughs, Martin defines "transformation" as follows (Martin, 1996, p. 109):

> Actualizing the corporate vision essentially means transforming the leaders and employees of an organization to be able to transcend their own performance limits, so that breakthroughs in leadership, sales, quality, operating results, and profitability can be achieved.

Thus, transformation refers to the effort of transcending real or imagined "performance limits" established by organizational culture, or rather, transcending the values espoused in an organization on account of its culture. Transformation, then, is related to what Schein, following Lewin, calls "unfreezing" followed by "cognitive restructuring" and "refreezing" (Schein, 1992, pp. 298-302). Echoing Basseches' notion of development versus adaptation, Schein states (1992, p. 298):

> If any part of the core structure (of an organization's culture, O.L.) is to change in more than minor incremental ways, the system must first experience enough disequilibrium to force a coping process that goes beyond just reinforcing the assumptions that are already in place. ... This is what Lewin called unfreezing, or creating a motivation to change.

Since such a disconfirmation (disequilibrium) does not, by itself, create a motivation to change, the further step of "cognitive restructuring" is required (Schein, 1992, p. 301):

> Once an organization has been unfrozen, the change process proceeds along a number of different lines that reflect either new learning through trial and error based on scanning the environment broadly, or imitation of role models based on psychological identification with the role model (my emphasis, O.L.).

It is this latter mode of cognitive restructuring on which Martin relies. As Schein elaborates (Schein, 1992, p. 301):

> In either case, the essence of the new learning is usually some cognitive redefinition of some of the core concepts in the assumption set,

adding, in a further elaboration (Schein, 1992, p. 302):

> Most change processes emphasize the need for behavior change. Such change is important in laying the groundwork for cognitive redefinition but is not sufficient unless such redefinition takes place.

Completing his definition of the dynamics of culture change, Schein explains (Schein, 1992, p. 302):

> The final step in any given change process is refreezing, which refers to the necessity for the new behavior and set of cognitions to be reinforced, to produce once again confirming data. ... Once confirming data from important environmental sources, external stakeholders, or internal sources are produced, the new assumptions gradually stabilize until new disconfirmations start the change process all over again (my emphasis, O.L.).

In addition to warning that culture changes are apt to be ongoing, thus able to reverse previous accomplishments, Schein carefully defines the limits of his model of the dynamics of culture change (Schein, 1992, p. 303):

> The foregoing model describes any change process, whether at the individual, group, or organizational level. The model identifies the necessary psychological conditions that must be present for any change to occur. When we look at organizational cultures and subcultures, we need in addition some broader categories of change that apply particularly to larger social systems ...

While a discussion of such "broader categories" is beyond the scope of this section, it is important to note, in light of Martin's concept of corporate therapy, that Schein himself speaks of "self-guided evolution through organizational therapy." He does so explicitly along psychoanalytic lines, thus joining Martin (1996) and Czander (1993) (Schein, 1992, p. 307):

> If one thinks of culture as in part a learned defense mechanism to avoid uncertainty and anxiety, then one should be able to help the organization assess for itself the strengths and weaknesses of its culture, and to help it modify the cultural assumptions if that becomes necessary for survival and effective functioning.

As Schein sees it (Schein, 1992, p. 312):

> The key issue for leaders is that they must become marginal in their own culture to a sufficient degree to recognize what may be its maladaptive assumptions and to learn some new ways of thinking themselves as a prelude to unfreezing and changing their organization (my emphasis, O.L.)

While Martin agrees with Schein on the potential of organizational therapy and the need to "target" the culture bearers when attempting a culture change, she wants to bring about "culture transformation" processes not by "marginalizing the leaders," but rather by instilling in them a higher vision of their own potential (Martin, 1996, p. 110):

> During the culture transformation process, the organization's tasks at all levels are to internalize

> a higher vision about its potential and how it will conduct business, adopt new values for relating to customers and to each other, demonstrate a leadership style that supports and continually extends the vision, and show dramatic and consistent improvement in bottomline performance (i.e., the needed "confirming data," O.L.)

Embracing Schein's "imitation of role models based on psychological identification with the role model" (Schein, 1992, p. 301) as the principal method of cognitive restructuring, she relies on "managed change by infusion of outsiders" (Schein, 1992, p. 323) in the form of external consultants. These consultants are corporate therapists who can "explode myths" (Schein, 1992, pp. 325-326), i.e., espoused theories that lead organizations to experience developmental arrest. In Martin's view, what needs to be changed in order to transform organizational cultures is the leading executives' professional agenda, to use my own term. According to Martin, the principal way in which to change executives' professional agenda is by self-transformation.

From Martin's psychoanalytic vantage point, executives' professional agenda is based on the model of consciousness outlined in Fig. A1, above. In harmony with this model, Martin outlines four phases of culture transformation that overlap with five phases of coaching process. Working in a team with other (external) coaches, the coach must handle both phases in order to achieve a culture transformation. This transformation is based on an organization-wide process in which organizational requirements in the form of visions of performance breakthrough become transmuted into personal imperatives. To achieve this goal, Martin targets the executive ego (see

Fig. A1). This is "that part of the self that can oversee and direct an ongoing internal transformation process in which barriers can be observed and transmuted" (Martin, 1996, p. 146).

From this perspective, Martin argues that (1996, p. 110):

> ... everyday perception is largely constructed from emotional factors, (therefore) close attention is paid (by her strategy O.L.) to how each phase is perceived within the culture. ... This helps determine how to optimally resolve each phase over the specific time frame which is optimal.

Martin distinguishes the following four "developmental phases of culture transformation," to be brought about by corporate therapists over a time period of about two years (Martin, 1996, pp. 110-116):

I	Transference (3-6 months)
II	Bonding ([6 months)
III	Transmutation (1 year)
IV	Launching (at start of year 2).

The first phase is focused on the "creation of a positive, hopeful, and enthusiastic climate in which people relinquish historical disappointments and reestablish a greater trust and dependency upon their leadership. This is accomplished through ... the customer and culture analysis processes" (Martin, 1996, p. 110). A customer analysis, consisting of video-taped interviews of selected customers "representing all markets and segments," is "utilized to test the market viability of the new corporate vision as well as to quantify its potential marketshare, thus set realistic expectations for (organizational) growth" (Martin, 1996, p. 110). The culture analysis, equally a structured interview process, entails interviewing "key managers representing the top five management levels individually," to capture how they "articulate their strengths, ultimate potential contribution, and what they believe must happen for a quantum leap in performance to occur" (Martin, 1996, pp. 110-111). This phase is named the "transference phase" since at the conclusion of these studies (Martin, 1996, p. 111):

> a series of positive management changes recommended by the participants are rapidly implemented. The positive transference (to management) created through this process psychologically "opens" the system for growth, and builds the necessary reciprocity for performance results to be delivered by participants.

In this phase, the corporate therapist's task is to reduce "indifference, passive aggression, rebellion, anger, mistrust and disbelief within management in relationship to their organization," thus freeing "this subculture ... to be oriented toward the future vision" (Martin, 1996, p. 111). This is a first, necessary culture change fostering a "leadership style of unconditional positive regard, positive programming, nurturance, and forgiveness" (Martin, 1996, p. 111).

In the second phase, of bonding, "the culture focuses on learning a new set of beliefs," by identifying "the gap between current skill sets and those required to deliver the vision" (Martin, 1996, p. 111). Corporate therapists are engaged in this phase in three ways: via (a) a deepening customer relationships training, (b) a mentoring program, and (c) team building. The first task is "designed to actualize the sales potential identified by customers during the customer analysis phase," while the third facilitates the formation of "cross-functional teams constructed for the removal of operational barriers" (Martin, 1996, p. 112).

As in the first phase, corporate therapists are business consultants before they are "therapists," in that the initial efforts are directed to the entire management team, not individual executives. Of the three partial efforts named for bonding, the second, mentoring, is the "'glue that ensures the success of the transformation process organization-wide" (Martin, 1996, p. 112). Mentoring in this phase is described by Martin as follows (1996, p. 112):

> The top five levels of management are supported weekly in managing their own PAR process [with the aid of] mentors. This program helps them avoid the psychological pitfalls of transformation ...

The acronym 'PAR' is taken from Kirschner's family therapy (Kirschner et al., 1996), and stands for "progressive abreactive regression." Martin says of the three interrelated programs mentioned above that they "strategically manage the systemic PAR process and provide the link between individual growth and operating results" (Martin, 1996, p. 112). In fact, she conceives of culture transformation as being

based on mentoring as a "corporate application for accelerating the PAR process" (Martin, 1996, p. 139). In short, mentoring targets the impact of the PAR process on the leading executives' professional agenda.

Insert Fig. A1 here

As shown in Fig. A1, the executive's self consists of 10 layers of (partly unconscious) mental functioning, the first five of which are protective of the five ego functions of self-love, gender-identification, object-relational competence, observing ego, and executive ego making up the ego (see Appendix A2, section 3). In order to manage the PAR process, each of these ten levels must be brought to self-awareness, and this results in "self-transformation" (Martin, 1996, p. 140). Of the protective levels, the first two comprise the executive's "false self," while the remaining three make up his or her defensive self (character). For Martin, there is no way of "getting personal," to speak with Kaplan (1991), before the five outer, protective levels have been raised to consciousness.

Essentially, the PAR process calls up all of the executive's protective defenses, thus hindering especially the higher ego functions (observing and executive ego) from operating properly, i.e., in synchrony with the organizational system the executive is part of. This entails that executives become incapable of monitoring their own behavior with a realistic eye (as Kaplan's expansive characters do) and to "oversee and direct an ongoing internal transformational process in which barriers (within oneself])can be observed and then transmuted" (Martin, 1996, p. 146). Although Martin does not explicitly say so, the implication of her model of executive functioning seems to be that the non-defensive ego functions, transmuted by mentoring, operate in some kind of pre-established harmony with the organization's visions, as established by the first two phases of the culture transformation.

Although phase #2 of culture transformation is focused on "the horizontal integration of management at the senior level, which creates the solidarity necessary for a new belief system to be accepted organization-wide" (Martin, 1996, p. 112), this phase is also characterized by the development of political divisions within the senior management team. In fact, the "executive mentee group" splits into

two (potentially hostile) coalitions, one that "unconsciously assigns symbolic roles to its members," while the other comprises those "most threatened by the implications of

transformation" who therefore "bond as well" (Martin, 1996, p. 112):

> This (second) group includes the rebels and loners of the organization, and unconsciously assigns them roles to act out resistance and conflicts for the group.

Members of the team self-select, so to speak, to represent progressive and regressive voices in the team. This bipolarization of the executive team puts the corporate therapists, who work in teams as well, into the position of having to manage the explosive group dynamics of the executive team. As a result of the turbulent testing that ensues within the executive team, the third phase, of transmutation, gradually establishes, with the aid of corporate therapists, "an emphasis on the alignment of new values within each senior executive's functional organization" (Martin, 1996, p. 113). Viewing the executive mentee group as a family, Martin observes (1996, p. 113):

> Compulsive repetitious patterns of behavior of historical family origin predominate in an unconscious attempt to maintain the old culture. Through strategic and symbolic re-enactments led by the CEO, senior executives, and mentors, old patterns are transformed into healthy ... results-driven interactions.

To the extent that these re-enactments succeed:

> (they) help create a critical mass of leadership at all levels vertically within each function. Additionally, the mentoring program has created interpersonally sophisticated leaders who accept the regressive trend as inherent to growth. Both of these internal processes --horizontal integration and vertical alignment--create an infrastructure for real and long-lasting organizational transformation.

During the transmutation phase, "negative and positive transferences are at their height, as illusions and defenses-- ([the protective outer layers of executive ego functioning, O.L.)-- are discarded. In addition (Martin, 1996, p. 114):

> competition, jealousies, longings, and self-destructive tendencies emerge. The culture unconsciously assigns members in the resistant subgroup the task of dismantling executive leadership. These maneuvers must be predicted
>
> and disarmed before they thwart the momentum of the transformation underway.

In this context, "self-awareness, as a result of one-to-one mentoring, leads to greater scrutiny of both leaders and mentors" (Martin, 1996, p. 114). As recognition increases that "there is no place to hide from weak performance and poor leadership" (1996, p. 114), "members driven to act out resistance and rebellion move into alignment or choose to leave the organization" (1996, p. 114). While a "second wave of positive transference" to management builds, as greater success at work is realized" (Martin, 1996, p. 114):

> personal tensions begin to mount. Individuals express fear they are out-growing their personal networks at home. Mentees must be groomed to become mentors in order for family bonds to be strengthened.

Thus addressing the work-family dialectics researched by career theory, Martin sees transmutation to take its toll on the organization members' private life. The drama she describes unfolds and spills over into the private domain (Martin, 1996, p. 114):

> there is full attention paid to this critical dynamic as a part of the overall transformation process, as significant others must be brought along with the change. The [organizational] culture, familiar now with the necessity of regression as part of growth, recognizes this need for ongoing support in order to continue to grow. The marital unit is promoted as the vehicle for ongoing self-transformation. (my emphasis, O.L.)

As Martin makes thus clear, transforming the executive's own professional agenda is not enough. While doing so would be hard enough for the corporate therapist, the latter must, by necessity, act as a family therapist as well, both within the organization (with a focus on the executive team) and outside of it (with a focus on the marital unit executives are part of). What is asked for here is nothing but "total" transformation, the mobilization of all forces that can help sell a product. In what sounds like a parody of the value system guiding young Marx, in Martin's vision producing and selling have become the end-all of human existence. On the executive's side, the expansion of his or her agenda to encompass marital and family relationships corresponds to
Witherspoon's notion that coaching for agenda (Witherspoon, 1996, p. 131):

> deals with broader purposes--the continual life results and well-being an executive wants. The scope ranges considerably and usually goes beyond a single person or situation,

only that in the context of culture transformation, the executive is no longer free to opt out except by "leaving the organization." Martin's radical vision of the organization of the future, which she promotes through corporate therapy, rekindles issues topical in career theory and family therapy. In her own way, Martin demonstrates the embeddedness of issues of coaching in the broad conceptual context constructed in this thesis.

After this drama of resistances discarded and ego functions strengthened has played out, the organization is ready for the last phase, that of launching. What is launched is the new vision that is now embraced as a way of life (Martin, 1996, p. 115). As Martin describes it (1996, pp. 115-116):

> During this time, the organization becomes increasingly skillful in observing, monitoring, and critiquing its own internal management process. ... The organization also assumes greater responsibility for its management errors. ... As each leadership level assumes the role of ongoing change agent and seeks support at an appropriate level, weaning [from the old culture] formally occurs. ... At the conclusion of the trans-formation process, mentees at each level are bonded to each other, thus increasing loyalty and initiate. Change is viewed as an opportunity for growth. Resistance is viewed as inherent to growth and should be consciously processed with supportive mentors (my emphasis, O.L.).

The latter (high-lighted) portion of the quote perhaps best expresses Martin's view of the task that culture transformation poses for the team of corporate therapists collaborating in a particular organization. These corporate therapists have their own professional agenda (i.e., reside in their own "professional house"), which is geared to promoting "wall-to-wall" culture transformation in a particular organization. As in clinical contexts, the therapist team is being supervised by its own mentors. Beginning with the organization's environment (customer analysis), the team gradually moves inward and begins to manage the dynamics of organization-wide culture change. During its transversal of the four phases of culture transformation, in which it is embedded, the corporate therapists and their client executives pass through five phases unfolding

over a time period of two years (Martin, 1996, pp. 150-156):

1. Testing (transformation of self-esteem)
2. Transference (transformation of acceptance of potential)
3. Symbiosis (transformation of personal power)
4. Transmutation (transformation of self-love)
5. Transformation (transformation of personal freedom).

In striking contrast to cognitive-behavioral approaches, in Martin's testing phase, the mentee is assessing the mentor, not the other way around. Assessment occurs on both an interpersonal and intrapsychic level. Interpersonally, the mentee "attacks the mentor as incompetent, as he is not a specialist in the client's business or industry" (Martin, 1996, p. 150). Intrapsychically, "self disclosure and awareness (on the side of the mentee) is initially limited to the role and illusion levels of consciousness" (see the two outer layers, Fig. A1; Martin, 1996, p. 150). Under these circumstances, the mentor's task is "to build (in the client) enough positive transference for growth to occur." This the mentor does "by engaging the client to examine the successes throughout his life" (Martin, 1996, pp. 150-151):

> This process culminates in an extensive analysis by the mentor of the mentee's core strengths. They are communicated in a specific format (both face to face and in writing) in a way which promotes a trans-formation of the mentee's self-esteem.

Thus, rather than being measured against abstract "organizational imperatives" external to the executive, as is implicit in competency models, the executive is taken seriously as a person, in a way close to that described by H. Levinson, above.

In phase two of the mentoring, having completed the "Success Interview," the mentee "is (intrapsychically)feeling the longing to surrender to authenticity, as well as defensive in exposing his true weaknesses and deficits" (Martin, 1996, p. 151). Having already shed his or her "false self," the mentee is now ready to leave behind his defenses, but not without regressing. Correspondingly, the mentor's "key task for accelerating (individual and organizational) growth ... is to engage the mentee in a creative application of his core strengths" (Martin, 1996, p. 151). At the conclusion of this stage (Martin, 1996, p. 151):

> the mentee agrees to "experiment" with self-transformation by attempting to actualize the various ... visions (regarding his true potential) with the ongoing support of the mentor.

Having reenacted his own successes in life, and engaged in exercising his or her core strengths, the executive is ready for "symbiosis." Assured of the "unconditional positive regard" of the mentor, the mentee can now deepen the bond with the mentor, up to this time "limited to a shared commitment to actualize the mentee's vision" (Martin, 1996, p. 151). In this safe haven, conflicts are free to emerge, especially "various compulsive repetitous patterns learned in the family of origin" (Martin, 1996, p. 154). The mentor's task in this phase is described as follows (Martin, 1996, p. 154):

> The mentor's key tasks at this phase are to provide positive programming and helpful strategies for achieving the vision (of the mentee's true potential,

> O.L.), as well as interpret conflicts as they occur. Mastery is achieved through corrective enactments (e.g., caretaking of the mentee) creatively engineered by the mentor. Further, the mentor introduces a series of skill-building tutorial modules specific to achieving the mentee's vision (of true potential).

Here, "coaching for skills" is an integral part of building a vision of the executive's true potential, thus linked to the executive's self. The symbiotic phase culminates in a transformation of "personal power" (Martin, 1996, p. 154):

> The mentee recognizes that he is free to respond to the world in any way he chooses and is not constrained by experiences from the past. Defenses such as projection and displacement become unnecessary when anxiety and ambivalence can be faced head on.

The executive now stands in his or her own power. Developmentally speaking, he or she has become "self-authoring." The executive's task is now to integrate self parts into observing ego (layer #9, Fig. A1), thereby transmuting the defensive shields protecting self-love (layer #6, Fig. A1). There are four ways for the executive to demonstrate that transmutation is occurring: either fears of (1) abandonment, (2) annihilation, (3) entrapment, or (4) engulfment arise. Therefore, in this phase "the mentoring relationship is the most fragile, volatile, and pivotal for future self-

transformation" (Martin, 1996, p. 154). The executive may also attempt to "self-destruct," by threatening "to quit the program, leave the organization, tell off his boss, or miss a critical deadline" (Martin, 1996, p. 155). The culmination of this phase, which may last a full year, lies in transformation of self-love (Martin, 1996, p. 155):

> The mentee, having projected both positive and hateful aspects of the self onto the mentor, claims his totality of being. ... Having realized several of his 45 percent stretch goals, the mentee now profoundly understands the process of transformation (my emphasis, O.L.).

In short, organizations cannot change other than through the experience of personal transformation made by members of the executive team. Internal transmutation goes hand in hand with the realization of organizational "stretch goals" that initially were beyond the ken of the executive's vision of his true potential. The mentee is now ready to be "launched" as a mentor him- or herself. The mentor teaches him the art of mentoring, and the mentee agrees "to mentor two organization members who are not direct supports" (Martin, 1996, p. 156). Martin summarizes the meaning of culture transformation as linked to corporate therapy efforts as follows (Martin, 1996, p. 156):

> As "culture transformation" is viewed as a metaphor for the simultaneous transformation of a critical

> mass of executives through mentoring, it follows that systemic transformation will occur as mentoring unfolds. To ensure this (unfolding, O.L.), equal attention is paid to examining the impact of transformation on operational and leadership processes. As people transform, they seek to transform their business and environment. This alignment (between personal and organizational transformation, O.L.) is the goal of culture transformation (my emphasis, O.L.)

While one might object that Martin is dealing with mentoring, not coaching, on systematic grounds I am not prepared to admit such a distinction. In terms of the new career contract as a contract with self, instead of the organization (Hall et al., 1996),
the traditional distinction between these two types of executive development activity is dubious at best, if not anachronistic. From a clinical and ontic-developmental point of view that focuses on the relational potential of the working alliance between the two

parties to the coaching or mentoring contract, the distinction is equally insubstantial. Only the different organizational contingencies under which the activity occurs might lend some reality to the distinction.

Regarding the change in professional agenda involved, Martin holds a systemic view. In her practice theory of coaching as "corporate therapy," she is emphasizing that the executive's self needs to be conceived from a systemic perspective where role feeds self as much as the other way around. She is also emphasizing that an executive's professional agenda cannot be restricted to aspects of him- or herself as an isolated individual. The executive is better conceived of as a "person-in-environment" (Demick, 1996), enmeshed in a network of relationships, both with the executive team he is part of, and his own family, as much as he is determined by his family of origin. Finally, Martin emphasizes that cognitive-behavioral competency models one-sidedly stressing "skills," "performance," and even "development" for a future job, miss the fact that the executive is a person making meaning of his life in all of the various regards that feed his or her self. In short, only a holistic view of the executive as a person, to speak with Kaplan (1991), gives coaching any chance to transform what the coach is given to work with.

***

Above, I have reviewed two kinds of practice theory for coaching executives, a cognitive-behavioral and a psychoanalytical one. The first targets organizational requirements and their behavioral-change consequences. The second takes a systemic view of executive development, and targets personal experience of what transformation means as the basis for implementing organizational transformation. In accordance with the shift of focus implicit in the second approach, the conception of the coach has also changed. Rather than being a "change agent" for a single executive, he or she is a

corporate therapist with expertise in both individual and family therapy working in collaboration with other therapists. This is well conveyed by the notion of "corporate therapy."

In contrast to the approaches to executive development articulated by Hall (1996), Kaplan (1991), McCall (1998), although in some proximity to "relational" views in career theory, such as held by Kram (1988, 1996) and Fletcher (1996), Martin sees executive development as taking place in the context of two "family systems:" that of the executive team representing the culture of an organization, and that of the executive's own present family (as a re-creation of his or her family of origin). By combining notions of systemic family therapy with psychoanalytic concepts, she manages to target, in her version of coaching, both the dynamics of the executive's self and role, and that of the executive's membership in the two families. Although Martin does not explicitly think ontic-developmentally, as little as does her mentor, H. Levinson (1968, 1976, 1984), she nevertheless implicitly articulates a theory of development as transformational change. As shown, her conception of executive development is embedded in a theory of culture change that, apparently without her knowing, links her with Schein (1992).

Perhaps with the exception of Witherspoon (1996), none of the cognitive-behavioral practice theories outlined above seem to have any use for the notion of executives' professional agenda, or any sensitivity for its developmental implications. By contrast, it is easy to show that Martin has a notion of professional agenda. Given that executive development is, for her, a systemic issue, she clearly articulates that an executive's agenda is determined by his or her ability, to transmute the false-self and character defenses that guard his or her inner self-structures. By elucidating the dynamics of executive transformation as the basis of organization-wide culture transformation, Martin also sheds light on what are the requisite targets of coaching practice. The resistances the executive is embroiled in, according to her model of personality and of corporate therapy are, in my view, a rendition of Basseches "unique psychological organization," and of the irrationalities associated with it. As Basseches points out (Basseches, 1989, p. 188):

> The family systems tradition has clarified dialectical relationships among the behaviors of different members of families. This tradition has described forms of social organization (family systems) that coordinate and maintain equilibrium in the relationship of individuals to each other and their environment, as well as the processes by which these forms (family systems) are transformed. ...
>
> The psychoanalytic tradition has clarified dialectical relationships between conscious functioning (the ego [e.g., Martin's layers #6-#10, Fig. 2]) and other motivationally powerful aspects of personality. This tradition has described forms of psychological

> organization (defensive systems) that coordinate and maintain equilibrium between unconscious and conscious motives, as well as the processes by which these forms (defensive systems) are transformed.

Martin not only combines these two traditions, but also links them to a theory of culture change close in spirit to Schein's work. As a consequence, she is able to articulate a "systemic view of executive development" that is unique in the literature. Martin sees the psychological organization of executives as undergirding an organization's social fabric. In her view, thesetwo domains are linked by cultural factors, mainly those of transference to the organization's "vision", embodied by the executive team. In fact, in Martin's view, the organization IS the executive team, and a culture transformation is a transformation of the executive team. In that sense, following Schein (1992), she sees organizational leaders as "culture managers," although in a somewhat instrumental way. She also shares with Schein the lack of ontic-developmental thinking, and therefore does not acknowledge the constraints for bringing about culture change that such thinking would insist exist. Although more systemically than individualistically oriented, Martin lacks, as does family therapy, "the philosophical grounding for distinguishing developmental transformation from change in general" (Basseches, 1989, p. 189). I would therefore describe her theory of executive development, along with that of Kaplan (1991), as a non-stage theory of change.

In terms of Kilburg's (1996) and Laske's (1999) tri-focal models of coaching, Martin's model is focused on what happens between coach and executive in the "professional house" (Kilburg's executive focus). For her, it is the psychydynamic dialectic between self and role in the professional house that determines, to a large extent, how and to what extent the executive resides in the company houses. A central notion for the executive's acting and realizing him- or herself in the company houses is transference, the positive or negative identification the executive "has" or "is" regarding the organization. In ontic-developmental terms, this transference is a matter of personal boundary management in regard to self and not-self, both individually and with regard to the organization. The goal of Martin's corporate therapy is to transmute the false-self and defense layers of the executive to remake him or her into a "culture manager" of the organization (Schein, 1992). This is to be done by first enabling him or her, to manage their personal boundaries.

Todate, Martin's writing is the only source in the literature for assessing what might be the phases of intrapsychic change occurring in the executive during the period of coaching. Her five phases of transformation that begin with the "testing" of the coach and end in the transformation of the executive's personality, including the object-relational link to his present family, are milestones of the coaching process. In her systemic view, these milestones of personal change

determine, and are determined by, the dynamics of the executive's membership in the executive team which is his or her adopted second family. At the center of Martin's attention regarding the phases of the coaching process is to get the resistance experienced by the executive, as well as by the organization as a whole, accepted as a natural and expectable result of culture transformation. It is the primary task of the coach, to manage the dynamics of the coaching alliance, which for Martin embodies the potential for personal change. Martin is also paying attention to what is going on in the coach's own professional house, i.e., to what the coach has to do to manage his own "counter-transference" to the executive and the organization (Laske, 1999). In this sense, too, her's is a systemic model of coaching.

With regard to the organization's business strategy that feeds the culture transformation process, Martin sees it embodied in the vision of breakthrough performance. Breakthrough performance is based on the organization's understanding of its customer base more than that of its competitors. Without understanding its customers, an organization cannot understand itself. The organization's customers are viewed as part of the relational fabric that undergirds successful organizational functioning. Equally, they are a part of the organization's culture. This contextualist view of the organization is a further ingredient of Martin's systemic view.

In short, Martin's model of executive coaching is the most comprehensive so far designed, both in terms of understanding the inner dynamic of the coaching alliance as it plays out in the three coaching houses (Kilburg's executive, systemic, and mediated focus of coaching), and in terms of the impact of the coaching alliances existing in an organization on the transformation of the organization's culture. In her view, culture transformations are to be based on the dynamics of the coaching process itself. This dynamics leads the executive coached to understanding self-transformation, and to becoming a coach himself, thus spreading the energy of personal transformation experienced by him- or herself through the organization as a whole. This notion of "centrifugal coaching" is close in spirit to the "relational approaches" to career theory discussed by Kram (1996) and Fletcher (1996), and largely anticipated in Kram's work on mentoring (1988). However, both the relational and the systemic approach

fail to acknowledge the ontic-developmental constraints of executive development discussed in Appendix A3.

Appendix B1

Subject/Object Theory

The peculiarity of the subject/object interview can be made more transparent by detailing (1) the range and epistemological interpretation of stage-developmental hypotheses that can be formulated, on one hand, and (2) the logistics of interview administration, on the other. I begin with the range of possible hypotheses. According to Kegan's theory, the general sequence of steps between two successive stages is as follows:

X X(Y) X/Y Y/X Y(X) Y,

where X is the lower, and Y is the higher, successive stage score. Numerically, the lowest stage score is 1, and the highest one is 5. As the nomenclature shows, the emphasis in Kegan's theory (and interview) falls on the transition between stages, e.g.,

3 3(4) 3/4 4/3 4(3) 4,

not the endpoints of the progression between two stages. Along the progression from X to Y, a consistently more secure dominance of Y over X is articulated. That is, Y/X is a "higher" stage than X/Y in that in the former, there is no slippage from Y back to X as in X/Y. In concrete terms, if X=3 and Y=4, 3/4 is a lower stage than 4/3 because the individual, being on a journey from stage 3 to stage 4, in 3/4 is more at risk for slipping back to the lower stage than is the individual at stage 4/3. In semantically explicit terms, an individual whose epistemilogic telos is to journey from being made up, in his or her identity, by internalized validations of others (and thus not fully able to distinguish between the real persons articulating such validations, and the validations themselves), to being fully self-authoring (and thus able to hold others' validations as his or her own system), is further along the journey at stage 4/3 than on stage 3/4. This is so, because being at 3/4, the person, while embracing a self-authoring epistemologic (stage 4), uses that epistemologic only tentatively and timidly, seeking refuge in the safer environment of 3/4 when given the chance to assert their self-authoring capability. By contrast, an individual at stage 4/3 is more secure in her self-authoring stance, in that she does not need to refer (and defer) to

others' validations regarding her own identity. Only when reaching 4, having journeyed past 4/3 and 4(3), can the individual be said to have fully reached a self-authoring stance, without being at any risk whatsoever to fall back to a 3-ish stage position, for instance by holding on to a residual lower stage, expressed by 4(3).

Regardless of the numerical value of X and Y, the ontic-developmental progression carries the following general interpretation:

(a) X = fully articulated (lower) stage
(b) X(Y) = incipient use of the higher structure,
but not forceful enough to be sustained
(c) X/Y = conflictual position; use of the new,
higher structure for strengthening the lower
structure, thus slipping back to the earlier
epistemologic (disequilibrium)
(d) Y/X = conflictual position; going beyond the old,
lower epistemologic, but in situations of
stress still reverting at times to the
residual lower stage (disequilibrium)
(e) Y(X) = fully operating at the higher epistemologic,
still tenuous, but not slipping back
(f) Y = fully articulated new epistemologic.

The stages that most likely figure in a stage-developmental assessment of agentic coaching efforts are those of 4 and 5. Exceptionally, a 3-ish stage score might be required to characterize an executive's epistemologic. Thus, the progression most likely to be thematic in a subject/object interview with executives is:

3 3(4) 3/4 4/3 4(3) 4 4(5) 4/5 5/4 5(4) 5.

The sequence starts with a fully developed stage 3, at which others' needs, rights, and valuations are internalized and make up the basis of the executive's interactions with the organization. The sequence ends with a fully developed stage 5, at which the executive's interactions with the organization are based on the practice of making him- or herself the context of the ceaseless transformation of other systems, whether they

be parts of the self, other persons, parts of the organization, or the organization itself. Along the range of these 11 ontic-developmental stage scores, the generic interpretation of the fully articulated, equilibrated epistemologics in the organizational context, especially with regard to the Professional Agenda, is as follows:

Stage 3: The executive plays his roles in harmony with what he thinks he is being viewed as being by others. There is little of a capability to take different perspectives on his position and on organizational matters. The executive's identity, and in consequence thereof, his professional agenda, is based on the notion that the valuations of persons and groups around him is the supreme standard of his professional integrity. As a consequence, the executive's professional agenda is something he is embedded in, or subject to, as much as he is embedded in and subject to others' validations. The executive's developmental telos is to become a self-system (stage 4), by differentiating himself from the internalized viewpoints of others, and thus become "one's own man."

Stage 4: The executive plays her roles as a self-possessed person who "knows what she wants." His self-identity is forming a fully coherent system. At this position, the executive has fully transcended others' validations as co-determinants of her meaning-making; these valuations are now fully separate from the individuals giving rise to them, and form a system in and of themselves that allows the executive to self-author her validations and actions. As a consequence, the executive now relates to her agenda as somebody who tends to "be" rather than "have" an agenda, since she is fully identified with it. Her developmental telos is to transcend her own identity as an unassailable system, by becoming more apt at making herself the context of the transformation of other systems, eventually without regard to her own identity.

Stage 5: The executive plays his roles by being the context of his own and others' transformation, being fully generative of other person's and system's potential. He successfully differentiates himself from his own self-authoring process, being dis-identified with his own ideology. Process outweighs product and outcome. The executive's developmental telos of being an "interindividual" system has been reached. He is fully immersed in the process of transacting his life in the context of the organization as a "theater" of systems staging his own transformation, fearless of losing their own identity. The executive is fully capable of "learning to learn," ceaselessly transforming his own agenda, and those of others.

These characterizations of different epistemologics should be accepted with caution. They are given here only to exemplify differences between the equilibrated epistemologic positions along the trajectory of stage scores. Therefore, they should not be read as "character sketches" or statements about psychological boundaries. As pointed out in Appendix A3, a translation of epistemologics into psychological traits, in the attempt to equate them with individuals' unique psychological organization, is a katabasis eis allo genos, and thus fallacious. In terms of Fig. 2, the above characterizations are fully in the domain of self, and may manifest in the domain of boundaries and psychological organization in a multitude of different ways.

For a more detailed specification of transitional subject/object stages, see chapter IV, section 1.

Appendix B2

Dialectical-Schemata Theory

It was previously noted, in this study Basseches' dialectical-schemata interview appears as the professional-agenda interview. This is the case since as outlined in chapter II, the decision was made to probe executives' conception of their professional agenda by using Basseches' dialectical-schemata framework. A more precise formulation of Basseches' analysis method for the professional-agenda interview is called for. In my use of Basseches' method, certain alterations and additions, further explored in chapter V, section 2, should be noted.

Basseches created the dialectical-schemata framework as a tool "to identify elements of dialectical thinking in interview protocols" generally (Basseches, 1984, p. 181). For this purpose, Basseches adopted the following analysis procedure (Basseches, 1984, p. 156):

> The ... (interview) transcripts were coded by noting those excerpts in which clear and possible manifestations of each of the 24 dialectical schemata were present. A numerical Dialectical Schemata (DS) Index was then calculated for each transcript by tallying 0-3 points for each schema, depending on whether the transcripts contained no manifestation of the schema (0 pts.), a possible manifestation of the schema (1 pt.), several possible manifestations of the schema (2 pts.), or a clear manifestation of the schema (3 pts.). In addition, the number of schemata clearly manifested in each transcript and the number of schemata completely absent in each transcript were recorded. To complement these quantitative measures, the profiles of schemata present and absent for each interview were inspected, and recurring patterns were noted.

As this quote makes clear, Basseches adopts a quantitative as well as qualitative method of analyzing the presence or absence of dialectical schemata in the interview text. The quantitative measure, or dialectical-schemata index, has to do with the clarity with which individual schemata emerge from the interview, thus the extent to which a subject can be credited with holding a "conception of dialectical schemata as an organized whole" (Basseches, 1984, p. 157). By contrast, the qualitative measure, or profile (schemata configuration), had to do with the emphasis a subject gives certain

kinds of schemata in comparison to others (e.g., by making predominant use of motion and relationship schemata, and neglecting form schemata). In more detail, Basseches formulates this latter, qualitative, aspect of the use of schemata as follows (Basseches, 1984, p. 182):

> In the same way in which the concrete-operational child comes to live in a world populated by reversible operations, and the formal-operational

> adolescent lives in a world populated by interrelated hypothetical propositions, so dialectical schemata place one in a world populated by systems undergoing transformation. However, my research has revealed that a set of people, all of whom live in that world of systems undergoing transformation, differ markedly in how they choose to live in that world.

In short, an individual can choose to live in the world of change by focusing on motion, form, relationship, and/or a metaformal combination of them. Such a developmental "choice," however, precludes a comprehensive notion of the ceaseless change. The qualitative profile derived from the dialectical schemata analysis is thus meant to show more explicitly how individuals live in a world of systems undergoing transformation. In the present context, the qualitative analysis has to do with how executives live in a world in which their own, personal systems, both as adult humans, and as executives, undergo transformation (viz., under the influence of coaching interventions). The qualitative analysis also shows how the transformation of executives' personal system is related (for them) to the systemic transformations in their organizational surround. Below, I comment in more detail on the differences between the (quantitative) dialectical-schemata index and the (qualitative) dialectical-schemata profile arising from the professional-agenda interview.

Basseches discusses two different interpretations of the quantitative index when applied to interview material: a developmental and a non-developmental one. In the developmental perspective, the index (i.e., sum of all schemata endorsements in an interview) specifies the extent to which an individual has integrated the 24 schemata that manifest system-transformational ("dialectical") thinking into an organized whole (Basseches, 1984, p. 157). This finding would suggest "that an interview with a higher index reflects a greater likelihood that the interviewee possesses the coordinated set of dialectical schemata (my emphasis, O.L.) required for viewing systems in transformation, thereby articulating a step beyond the formal-operational

thinking of an adolescent. In that perspective, a higher index "reflects an interviewee's greater progress toward the achievement" of such thinking "as an organized set of schemata" (Basseches' emphasis; Basseches, 1984, p. 158). In contrast to the developmental perspective, the dialectical-schemata index can also be interpreted in a non-developmental "learning perspective." In such a perspective, "the 24 dialectical schemata would be viewed as 24 discrete thought tactics, rather than as components of a coordinated form of cognitive organization called dialectical thinking" (Basseches, 1984, p. 162). (The assumptions Basseches bestows on the quantitative index, my procedure in interpreting DSPT^{TM} outcomes bestows on the qualitative profile, or schemata configuration).

Without going into the intricacies of comparing these two methodological interpretations of the dialectical-schemata index (Basseches, 1984, pp. 162 f.), I adopt Basseches' developmental interpretation of the dialectical-schemata index measure. I make the methodological assumption that the

ontic-developmental complexification of executive thought promoted through coaching interventions tends to express itself in the professional-agenda interview material not only by way of a higher dialectical-schemata index. but also by a higher proportion of category-specific endorsements of schemata. Since the four categories of motion, form, relationship, and metaform (transformation) comprise a varying number of schemata (motion=m=8, form=f=3, relationship=r=4, metaform=t=9), category-specific endorsements are calibrated in terms of percent of optimal endorsement. (Optimal endorsement of motion schemata is 8x3=24; for form it is 3x3=9, for relationship 4x3=12, and for metaform=9x3=27, accrueing to a total of 72.) In pragmatic terms, this entails the following steps:

1) assessing the strengths of endorsement of a schema in terms of weak [=1], medium [=2], and strong [=3]

2. tallying all schemata endorsements to compute an index score (n/72)

3. assessing the number of schemata endorsed (n/24), and the associated number of schemata absent (m/24)

4. assessing the qualitative nature of the result schemata configuration, e.g., its formalist, non-formalist, relativist, or other nature, depending on the empirical findings.

Since the number of schemata under each of the four categories is variable (m=8, f=3, r=4, t=9), statisticial computation is limited to percentages, i.e., percent of endorsement of 24 motion, 9 form, 12 relationship, and 27 metaform schemata.

Within the context of the DSPT^{TM}, limited computability of dialectical-schemata outcomes is not a serious flaw, since these outcomes do not have to bear the full burden of a comprehensive developmental analysis. Rather, they are relevant only in their relationship to the indexed stage score derived derived from subject/object interview material (which is a qualitative measure). In other words, in the context of the analysis procedure adopted for this study, the dialectical-schema configuration that characterizes the specific developmental (nonstage) "pathway" of an executive and its associated index score are commensurable with a qualitative stage score. In contrast to the stage score, which provides a structural description of developmental status, the dialectical-schemata configuration provides a process (procedural) description of developmental status quo. This is so since the dialectical-schemata configuration captures, in symbolic form, aspects of the mental processes that are required to understand transformational change. The dialectical-schemata configuration thus reflects the mental processes that enable individuals to maintain, regress from, or transcend a particular stage.

Although it is stated in numerical form, Lahey et al.'s subject/object stage score, expressed as X/[Y], where [Y] may be empty, is a qualitative, not a quantitative, measure. The measure indicates the relative dominance that a teleological successor stage has, or does not have, over a preceding,

predecessor stage. (For instance, "3/4" articulates that stage-3 conceptualizations of self still dominate stage-4 conceptualizations in an individual's meaning-making, in contrast to "4/3", where the opposite holds.) My methodological hypothesis about how Kegan's stage-developmental score and relates to Basseches' nonstage developmental score (Basseches) is that Basseches' qualitative configuration, quantitatively expressed by the notion of "percent of optimum endorsement," not his index measure, constructive-developmentally associates with Kegan's stage score. In my view, the quantitative index measure can nevertheless serve as corroborating evidence for the complexity of executives conceptualizations of changes to their own person or to the organizational system.

Interview Agreement Form

Professional-Agenda Interview

I herewith agree to participate in a tape-recorded interview for the sake of a study on executive coaching. I understand that I will be asked about the changes I have experienced in the process of being in a coaching relationship, both in regard to my professional functioning and my professional self-image. I do not have to answer any questions I choose not to address. Any excerpts taken from this interview, written or spoken, will disguise all names of persons and places so as to preserve my anonymity and privacy. I understand also that I will not receive direct feedback on my interview. However, I will have access to a copy of the tape of the interview as well as the transcript, if I so desire. Also, I will have access to the results of the interview through the Discussion section of Otto Laske's thesis "Transformative effects of coaching on executives' professional agenda," from which all personal references will have been removed.

Furthermore, I understand that although most people find these interviews engaging and interesting, should I feel like discontinuing the interview for any reasons, I may do so at any time.

None of the information I will share in this interview will be conveyed, in any form, to either my coach or the organization for which I am working, or to anybody else.

I, the researcher, am grateful for your generosity in making time available for my learning, and for making this study on coaching possible.

_____ _____

Interviewee Date

Interview Agreement Form

Subject/Object Interview

I herewith agree to participate in a tape-recorded interview for the sake of a study about how executives make meaning of their personal experience in the workplace. I understand that I will be asked about recent everyday experiences (like feeling angry or in conflict). I do not have to answer any questions I choose not to address. Any excerpts taken from this interview, written or spoken, will disguise all names of persons and places so as to preserve my anonymity and privacy. I understand also that I will not receive direct feedback on my interview. However, I will have access to a copy of the tape of the interview as well as the transcript, if I so desire. Also, I will have access to the results of the interview through the Discussion section of Otto Laske's thesis "Transformative effects of coaching on executives' professional agenda," from which all personal references will have been removed.

Furthermore, I understand that although most people find these interviews engaging and interesting, should I feel like discontinuing the interview for any reasons, I may do so at any time.

None of the information I will share in this interview will be conveyed, in any form, to either my coach or the organization for which I am working, or to anybody else.

I, the researcher, am grateful for your generosity in making time available for my learning, and for making this study on coaching possible.

_____ _____

Interviewee Date

Appendix C1

Interview Material, S1

Dialectical-Schemata Profile, S1

As demonstrated in terms of content in chapter III, S1 has a vivid understanding of the recent changes that have occurred in his world, both in his environment and within himself. In terms of the categories of motion, form, relationship and/or their metaformal integration, the utterances below can be understood as follows.

(Note: quotations from Basseches' 1984 appear in <'...'>, while quotes from the professional-agenda interview text of subjects appear in <"...">). Schematically salient bits are in italics.

Motion

#4[1] [correlativity]

Any coaching or counseling that has any quality behind it will you understand that that's a necessary element of what you need to do, being able to understand that different bosses have different styles themselves in terms of what they like and dislike, and that you need to pay attention to how different executives respond. If you are reporting to somebody who is a screamer, then you have figure out a way to counteract that.

S1 here conceptualizes upward communication (with superiors) in terms of correlativity. He points out that each executive has to understand and approach different superiors in a different, correlative manner. Although S1 expresses this correlativity in a somewhat antagonistic fashion ("counteract"), he makes it clear that the way he interacts with a particular superior is informed by his assessment of that superior's style and personality, thus in a correlative fashion. To the extent that S1 and his partner can be seen as antithetical, the correlative motion between them can be said to effect a synthesis. However, S1's view is more wedded to the antithetical nature of the interaction.

#5[2] [ongoing interaction as source of motion]

I also spend a lot of time with my people, as a mentor, as a coach, as a teacher. I tend to define my role as helping them achieve the best that they can achieve. Sometimes I jump in the middle, saying: 'you row one side of the boat, I am rowing the other.' I am in the middle of the scrum with the guys.

I let them make their decision; that's my own management style. They live by the sword, they die by the sword. If I have a strong opinion or belief about something, I let them

know exactly what it is. And I stimulate them with a lot of questions, I pull out my "I am confused" hat, explain this to me, just so that they think for themselves.

In these statement, the interaction between S1 and his co-workers is seen as the source that moves the unit forward, toward the best they can achieve. There is a focus on the motion that ensues. In both statements, the interaction is described in terms of helping co-workers realize the best in themselves, and of working with them toward common goals.

#6[2] [interactive character of knowledge]

We did it [building the business] by functioning as a team, stimulating a lot of debate. I like to bring myself right down into what they [my co-workers] are doing. Everyone functions somewhat autonomously, and they all know what their mission is. And as long we are all clear regarding the mission, I don't need to be [with them] on a day to day basis. But there are cases where I really literally need to sit down and go through an analysis with somebody, and just provide another opinion on other ways of looking at things. I am colleague of yours, so let me help you figure out what we are doing here.

In this statement, two aspects might be distinguished. First, 'motion in knowledge as an interaction of ideas with each other, within or among individual thinkers,' and 'transformation of knowledge that takes place via interaction of what is previously known with new empirical data' (Basseches, 1984, p. 95). The members of the team are seen as autonomous individuals who, in interaction with the leader, S1, achieve their mission. This conceptualization is very close to the previous one, in which 'a pattern of movement resulting from ongoing interaction is recognized' (Basseches, 1984, p. 93).

#8[1] [understanding events/situations as moments of development]

It's not just skills, it's development. Development is difficult to measure. It's not just change. It's even more difficult for people to have the perspective that things are being developed. There are not many people who have a capacity for insight [into that]. It's got to be cultivated.

In this statement, S1 stresses the difference between change and development in human affairs, without clarifying what exactly the differences are. He makes it clear that development is "difficult to measure," and that it takes insight to conceptualize is, a capability that has to be cultivated. In short, S1 sees the world in terms of correlativity, ongoing interaction, and development, and is aware of the interactive quality of knowledge and insight.

Form

#11[3] [contextual relativism: plurality of lines of interpretation, conclusions, ways of acting]

In a large bureaucracy ... you need to have a different set of rules. And maybe actually, that's the big lesson: each manager, each person needs to figure out how to function given what the rules are in the environment, given what the composition of the environment is rules that are entirely implicit. And the rules are largely driven by personalities which then become folklores. Personalities create some kind of modus operandi you are not allowed to violate.

Coaching has given me more of the awareness of how perceptions and interpretations can work for you both positively and negatively. That's been the major influence from the coaching. It's more how you're perceived. You construct your own perception [[viz., the world's perception of you, O.L.], what the rest of the world's experience [of you] is, you are shaping not only your work, you're shaping [others'] perception.

I am the one who is constructing the rest of the world's experience of me Think of G. Bush who was a technically brilliant president who, however, was perceived as a bumbling idiot, and of Regan, who was a bumbling idiot and everybody loved him]-- but he constructed that perception, as did Bush.

The coaching experience is different for every single person. You are dealing with personalities that are reacting and doing things in very different ways, and also have flaws and deficiencies that are quite unique, and they are at different stages, in different organizations, different sizes of organization, different culture. So there isn't just one set of criteria [to do or understand coaching].

The central point in these four statements is the assumption (1) that there is a plurality of lines of interpretation, conclusions, and ways of acting, and (2) that rules of conduct, interpretations, and perceptions of others are dependent upon the context which they constitute and from which they emerge. The first statement emphasizes that "each person needs to figure out how to function which what the rules are in the environment." The second statement focuses on the impact one's own actions have on one's environment, to the effect that one is actually constructing how others perceive one, thereby shaping one's social environment. The third statement gives a salient example of this insight. The fourth statement stresses the multiplicity of personalities, organizations, their developmental stages, and cultures, and the resulting multiplicity of experience each of these forms or systems can be said to have.

In short, S1 here articulates an assumption of contextual relativism (Basseches, 1984, pp. 111 f) which promotes attention to the context in which ideas, rules, and other mental entities exist, by either stressing the influence of the context,

or its coming into being. In carrying further his notion of motion as the source of knowledge, S1 articulates 'moves in thought which function (a) to direct ... attention to organized and patterned wholes (forms), and enable [one] to recognize and describe such forms' (Basseches, 1985, p. 75).

Relationship

#12[3] [assertion of relationships and limits of separateness]

I don't necessarily want to go and check with management over every single decision. I also don't mince my words, ever. When I want to say something you are going to hear it. Some of the coaching has helped me to tamper that, and understand that. That kind of [aggressive] behavior is counterproductive, detrimental, that's what the coaching has helped me understand. Loo, cowboy, you function in a bureaucracy here. You have to understand that they boys have a different set of rules, and ... recognize that focusing on building a great product is important, but it will definitely limit your compensation and exposure.

[Coaching] has helped me to step back and have a look at something, and [act] not necessarily so quickly, and to ask myself my favorite question: "I don't understand what's going on here. So, I take a look at the big picture, that is one thing the coaching has helped me [with]. I have learned to step back, relax, you know, don't react, take a look, don't overreact. The influence of the coaching has been more on understanding the impact of the way we function here, or the way I function, relative to what's really important here, which is ... the surrounding environment and the upward communication, tempering your actions, with understanding what any particular action, what type of downstream effect [it could ripple into]. It's a certain level of functional maturity, I would call it. Understanding that there is a whole stadium of people who are watching.

I tend to have very quick visceral reactions to things, and [coaching] has helped me to step back and have a look at something, and not necessarily react so quickly. Ask myself my favorite question: "I don't understand this, what is going on here." So I take a look at the big picture, that is one thing the coaching has helped me with. You are [i.e., I am, O.L.] more careful with things, more patient Rather than just react and say "this is not working for me," step back and ask"why does somebody think this way, what is this linked to, what is the politics behind this. Is it worth fighting for or not--you make these kinds of decisions.

'The process or turning explicit attention to relationships (schema #12) is

easily coordinated with the motion-oriented schemata' (Basseches, 1984, p. 115). In the above statements, the focus is on the idea that relationships are crucial, and that there are limits to separateness, especially in the social realm. Coaching is seen as having reinforced this notion in many different ways, and as having modeled for S1 the value of relatedness. The first statement spells out that the attempt to separate oneself from the organizational surround by being self-centered or product-centered is "counterproductive, detrimental." The second and third statements speak about the

reflective stance that is necessary to honor constitutive relationships with others. In short, in the above, S1 endorses the constitutive and interactive nature of relationships, especially between human actors.

#13[1] [critique of perspectives based on separateness]

Very common in businesses who have an entrepreneurial bent (which is, again, one bucket we still have our foot in) is that there is very little time given to structure, management, development. It's usually survival up front, it's competitive Does somebody really say: as part of our business plan we need to have a real emphasis on management and coaching and cultivating and team work, and team building? That doesn't exist here. And ultimately, that is going to get us into trouble with the competition.

In harmony with his endorsement of relationships, S1 here critiques the lack of cultivating team work, thus the emphasis on separateness, that is prevalent in competitive, survival-oriented organizational cultures. This isolationist tendency also cuts off the organization from the larger competitive environment, and therefore can get them "into trouble with the competition" that is more invested in the development of a team culture. S1 thereby criticizes organizations that behave as 'aggregates of discretes,' and the ensuing pluralistic attitude of 'everybody for himself.'

#14[1] [two-way reciprocal relationship; parties in a relationship acting upon each other]

I have a new child, she's is 17 weeks, and I would say that the coaching has had some influence on me [in this regard]. When I got home [recently], my little girl had the most incredible bout of constipation, and she was up one night all night long. And I had the night shift. She is in pain. Guess what, nothing else matters at that point. I actually think that coaching has given me a level of empathy on the professional front that has carried over personally.

Rather than being a mediator between the two [parties in my unit], I am a participant in both. I don't consider myself as being a final decision maker. I am, if anything, I let them make their decision, that's my own management style.

In another move to emphasize the fact that relationships are interactive and constitutive, S1 here describes two-way reciprocal relationships. In the first statement, the relationship is with his own child, and gives rise to empathy. In the second statement, there is a combined emphasis on motion and on relationship, focused on his co-workers.

Considering that dialectic is a 'developmental movement through forms which occurs via ... relationships' (Basseches, 1984, p. 75), S1's notion of relationships,

especially when combined with those of motion and form, gives rise to an understanding of relationships as interactive as well as constitutive. This entails that for S1, the elements of a relationship are what they are only as parts of the relationship, and that in this sense the relationship logically precedes the elements. So, when S1 asserts that he is not a mediator (who remains outside of the parties interacting) but a "participant in both [parties]," he is expressing an intense engagement with other forms and systems that is in harmony with his simultaneous endorsement of motion and form.

Meta-formal

#16[1] [disequilibrium within a system]

We all have curses and blessings, and sometimes the same thing is a curse and a blessing, and you just have to accept one with the other.

Despite the somewhat flippant expression, this statement expresses a 'move in thought in which systems' limits of stability are made salient by the thinker's pointing to contradictions' (Basseches, 1984, p. 76). What is more, S1 embraces the simultaneity of opposites. While he does not explicitly endorse contradiction as a positive source of transformation, he accepts its existence.

#18[1] [value associated with developmental transformation]

One of my thrills is watching my people do some great work. It's an absolute thrill. People have gone on from here to do awesome work, just clever, clever work. And that I get my kicks on. I am not a power guy. I just enjoy watching them blossom, it's a real treat.

In the above statement, S1 describes developmental movement in valuational terms; he relates 'value to [a] movement in developmental direction, thus bringing into awareness the process of form construction, specifically of individual development (Basseches, 1984, p. 77). Development is seen as a 'process of transformation ... in which more sophisticated forms are constructed or organized,' as a source of value (Basseches, 1984, p. 77). However, this is a weak instantiation of the schema, since S1 does not explicitly state 'that some forms derive special value from that overall movement [of development, O.L.] by virtue of their stability through it' (Basseches, 1984, p. 131).

#20[1] #20 [coordinating systems in relationships]

There is always dynamic tension between the two [subparts of my unit, viz.,

portfolio management and research, O.L.]. The analysts [who do the research, O.L.] want the managers to buy certain funds that they follow, that even though the portfolio managers generate the rates of return on the portfolios, that they get recognized for their contribution in helping us select the right securities, or avoid terrible securities. So. I am constantly working to make sure that both of them are working like gears [in a machine], that they function harmoniously.

S1 here pays attention 'to problems of coordinating systems (forms) in relation to each other' (Basseches, 1984, p. 136). He describes his function as that of coordinating the workings of two related "camps", each of which has a different dynamic. There is a recognition 'that forms or systems interact with each other and that their interaction can be organized to be mutually sustaining' (Basseches, 1984, p.

136). However, since S1 does not make explicit exactly how this organization is accomplished, this is a weak instantiation of the schema in question.

#22[1] [quantitative => qualitative change]

> This is the worst environment for that [i.e., development, O.L.]. This culture here has, I think, truly evolved. [describes his firm in 1991]. There was a common thread in this place that we were here to grow and develop. The sheer size and the weight of the business, and its impact on our revenu, on public perception of us, the sheer magnitude changed the way we have to function here. And if anything, what we are struggling with is how do we mature as a bureaucracy that has some deep-rooted politics and a culture that one foot in the bucket (which is the old bucket, the entrepreneurial team), and the other foot in the bucket is we have to manage things here, not for growth but size, and the thing that's most deficient here is management training, a recognition of what good management is.

S1 here argues historically as well as developmentally. The emphasis is on the 'description of a qualitative change as the result of quantitative changes within a form,' viz., the organization (Basseches, 1984, p. 140). S1 describes specific properties defining the organization (bureaucracy, dichotomy of entrepreneurial spirit and "management for size"), and 'how changing the quantitative properties within ... [the organization, O.L.] ... eventually leads to the qualitative properties changing' (Basseches, 1984, p. 141).

#24[1] [multiple perspectives]

> Coaching has helped me develop an ability to step back and take another view of the same picture from a different angle, and be a little more patient about things, especially in my case where I am very charging, hard-charging, [saying] 'let's get this done, let's get [this ball] rolling.'

This statement details the larger inclusiveness that results when one steps back from a situation and takes another view of it "from a different angle." It deals with taking a new perspective more than with taking multiple perspectives. For this reason, it is a weak instantiation of the schema in question.

In short, in his metaformal way of thinking, S1 embraces contradiction as a source of positive movement (#16), associates value with developmental transformation (#18), attends to coordinating related, complementary systems (#20), asserts that quantitative change will eventually turn into qualitative change, or transformation (#22), and 'treats a large problem as a whole by viewing the whole from several vantage points' (Basseches, 1984, p. 147, Basseches' emphasis).

***

Subject/Object Profile, S1

At the beginning of the interview, S1 puts selected stimulus cards before him in the following order: (1) important to me, (2) "strong stand," (3) "torn/conflict," (4) "angry," (5) "success," saying that the

remaining cards "follow from this." In the second half of the interview, he intersperses the "sad" stimulus into the initial sequence. He thereby demonstrates, and also explicitly states, that all of his thoughts and feelings flow from what is important to him,. Therefore, the stimulus card to begin with is the first one. In the course of the interview, S1 takes his favorite metaphors from the realm of sports. This is indicative of his team-oriented spirit of functioning. Another favorite metaphor is "at the end of the day," which indicates that S1 is after principled conclusions.

The present interview ranges over a number of different adult-developmental positions, along a trajectory from 4(3) to 4 and 4(5). Along this trajectory, individuals strengthen their capacity to take a "self-authoring" stance, meaning that they generate, and become enbedded in, their own ideological system that bestows on them their personal and professional identity. Along this range, there is an ever increasing capacity to detach from a fusion of the self with internalized images of others and their values, and to author one's own view of the world. Simultaneously, the risk arises to be and remain "blind" to the ideological "I-system," in the sense of being unable to see the limits of its authoring power over one's experience, and thus be unable to detach from it. Accordingly, in what follows, the reader might want to pay

attention to how S1 constructs his workplace experience in terms of (1) what the boundaries are between him and the organization or co-workers, (2) how he defines the limits of his knowing, and (3) what he can, or cannot, take responsibility for in his functioning. The commentary attached to the individual bits is meant to make the reader think along with the author of the thesis.

BIT 1 = 4

[Pointing to the "important to me" card]. This--'important to me' really drives everything else. You've got to say to yourself: "what's my compass," and then everything else kind of goes around it. This [topic] then drives what I feel and think about, in terms of taking a strong stand, etc. [It] also then deals with how I can get torn about certain things, because in essence it starts in one point, and you get pulled to one area, what are the things that are really critical to you that drive anger. .... because anger doesn't just happen by itself. And what's important to me clearly drives my feelings and thoughts about the successes or accomplishments. .And there are times where I can give you very specific background on how sad I feel about certain experiences.

S1 takes responsibility for his feelings, in fact, "everything else" in his experience, as deriving from what is important to him. In turn, what is important to him constitutes the self system that "runs" his experience. There is no reference to internalized standards deriving from others, nor any indication of knowing about the limits of the personal stance as described.

BIT 2 = 4(3)

Particularly in the experiences I have had here recently, just the nature of the way the organization changes, you don't have much control over much of the change, you are constantly trying to figure out how to react to a change you feel coming. So, you are [always] asking: 'at the end of the day, what is it that is really important to me?', and then react to the environment. [The most significant of these changes] challenge the underlying motivation or philosophical tenet that we used to build the group. Those changes constantly influence what's really important to you.

S1 acknowledges that under circumstances he does not control, specifically those affecting changes in organizational culture, he is struggling to figure out how to react. In such circumstances, he experiences his self-system as the anchor that tells him, "at the end of the day," what truly matters to him. Thus, there is a slight risk that he might adhere to standards external to him, inorder to keep up with the changes that occur.

BIT 3 = 4

What's important to me, really at the end of the day, is being recognized by my peers, and the organization, probably more importantly my employees, that we have built something and achieved something that didn't exist. We built a new paradigm for doing business, or new businesses. And what's really important to me is that I get enormous pleasure personally out of seeing how the individual contributions from all the folks here wind up, everybody playing their part and rowing their boat.

PS: In answer to a prompt, the recognition is said to be "pretty much that of the group". However, this group recognition is ultimately for the self: "At the end of the day, I rather have people say: "S1's group is great."

S1 here provides evidence of his relational style, the tendency to identify with the team he leads as WE. However, this identification does not lead him to question his own self-system. What matters, "at the end of the day," is "that people say: S1's group is great," an attribution to his own self.

BIT 4 = 4

Yes, I am the leader. My job is to help set direction, and counsel, and run a process here [that] we all determine collectively, what business we want to be in, what we want to achieve, how we want to achieve it, and so for me, to get a lot of gratification out of this, I need to see all the cylinders operating well, I need to see our products be recognized, and to see the organization recognize that we have a very solid business, and build a good product, and that collectively we have put a lot of good thought into how we approach that [business].

Even though he is de facto leader of his unit, S1 depends, for his gratification, not only on the well-functioning of the group, but also on external recognition. However, he is acting according to self-defined goals.

Bit 5 = 4

There are two levels of recognition, the external recognition that pertains to how our group is perceived by the firm, and then the second kind of recognition is that among us, how the various

individuals feel recognized. And the recognition comes in two forms, one is private, the other public. Public recognition is really respect from their peers, and private recognition pertains to compensation and status." [The external recognition regards] how we collectively perceive the organization and management as respecting and supporting what we do.

When you're recognized is probably this feeling similar to that of someone who is hitting a home run. It's that sweet crack of the bat, and the instant feeling that you know the ball is going over the fence. So when you get recognized for doing very good work, when you get called up by either the senior executives, or you get tremendous feedback from your peers, that's a really sweet feeling, and how I personally deal with it [probably from my athletic background] is you just take it in stride, you get this very internally warm feeling of achievement, [realizing that] much of the past twenty years I have put into my career are now starting to bear fruit.

S1 here contributes success to himself on account of having built his own career over 20 years. Knowing that the deserves the success enables him to "just take it in stride" when his work gets acknowledged by others. There is no dependency on being in others' good graces.

BIT 6 = 4(3)

Moving forward is a function of how you feel about where you have been. It's a function of what kind of a foundation you've got. So when you are in the middle of something, in a tough situation, you always start to question whether or not you have got enough background experience, training, smarts, -- things that are behind you get questioned. [If I am successful I have] that feeling of "wow, it has paid off." Everything I have done to train myself, everything that the group has done, it's that sweet crack of the bat. [Recognition] verifies things [and that's what sweet about it].

S1 here acknowledges that "in a tough situation," i.e., under pressure, he is inclined to question himself, his foundations. Thus, there is a slight regression in that circumstance.

BIT 7 = 4(5)

By and large, one thing that I do, have to do, sometimes the folks that report into me, they may not see something as something that's well recognized. It's just a matter of perspective, where you sit. And what you [then] need to do is very directly sit down and communicate with them. Sometimes they don't see it; they are just lower on the fox hole. Where I get a lot of satisfaction is seeing one of my analysts making an excellent presentation on a holding that we have the thrill that I get is: 'wow,' the training that we put into this, the collective wisdom that we gathered to figure out how to do this work, I just saw it displayed. A good leader needs to take their own ego, and leave it at the door, and make sure that they understand that it is the collective work, the collective achievements that make the difference.

Here, S1 is more explicit about what previously he called "just taking it in stride." As a group leader, he can stand back from his own self system, and convey a different perspective on their work to his peers who are "lower on the fox hole." However, while he acknowledges that the wisdom of the unit is a "collective" one, it is still "his" unit that has the wisdom. This makes it possible for him "to leave his own ego at the door," i.e., understate it to the group. Thus, there is a moment of transcendence of his own system toward a more interindividual ("5-ish") stance here.

BIT 8 = 4(5)

[A good result by itself may totally overshadow] what it took that person to get

there. [But] therein lies the place where you get torn and conflicted. I don't think necessarily the rest of the world thinks that way. I think people have agendas that are very different, agendas that are driven more by political status and position than understanding what's really good work [in terms of their own values]. So, what it takes doing very good work winds up getting overshadowed by what the actual result is.

S1 here sees the uniqueness of his self system as rooted in an awarenes of "how he got here," which informs his view of what is "really good work." This is in contrast to most people, who get sidetracked by the result of what they do. This historical and developmental awareness is also a potential cause for getting torn and conflicted when the self system is under siege (asking: do I have the wherewithal to pull this off?).

Bit 9 = 4

There are really only two major things that I can think of that make me either get torn or conflicted over. [Case 1] One of them is that I am a man of integrity, and I don't let anybody violate that at all. I actually go into the anger camp when someone asks me to do something that really violates what in my mind is a general principle that I won't violate. [Case 2] The other place where I wind up getting torn and conflicted [and this going to sound quite egotistical] is because I am not thinking 'tomorrow' or 'next month;' I am looking out typically three years or more. 40% of my time is worrying about what we are doing today, [and] 60% is worrying about 'where is this going?'

I had a tremendous amount of conflict in my own head when we moved reporting-wise from the manager of old to the new manager.They [i.e., the new management, O.L.] clearly didn't want to understand and didn't want to take the time to understand why we were doing what we are doing on the research side. They wanted to change everything. Where I was torn was going back and saying to my people: guess what, we were wrong collectively, all you brilliant people I brought in here, you were wrong. The conflict was: I didn't think we were wrong, I knew we were right. And frankly, this is not a me-thing, it is WE who were right.

S1 speaks of two types of conflict he can get into. The first one occurs when he is asked to violate his own principles; the second one, when changes occur in the environment that are taken by him as indicating that he and his group were wrong in their judgment (which then violates his self-perception). The interpretation of changes as being incommensurate with his self perception strongly endorses S1's own system, which makes him reject changes not in harmony with his principles. Apparently, the awareness of having over the years accumulated a solid self system does not simultaneously provide insight into the limits of that system. (Even if his unit is "right," changes could still be interpreted, not as "wrong," but as deriving from a different viewpoint.) As it is, the occurrence of changes is seen as endangering his own and his unit's working principle, as well as the perception that they "were right." (S1 signals some awareness of how exposed his situation is by stating "this is going to sound quite egotistical ...," which, if elaborated, would lead me to score this bit as 4(5)).

BIT 10 = 4

[How is your integrity related to your convictions?] It's all driven by pride. I'll tell you what the pride is. The pride comes in where it's a violation of my intellectual integrity, not necessarily my moral integrity. For something we are trying to do that has a much longer term than I know ultimately we will

wind up getting to. Integrity has to do with, forget knowing, trusting your instincts. You don't necessarily need to know something. You need to have enough of that background where you wind up trusting your instincts. Intellectually, there is a certain amount of just raw thinking that needs to go [i.e., come] in, and at the end of the day, there is a feel [that your gut feeling is violated], that's why your pride gets into the way.

S1 here comments on the pervasiveness of his self system that determines not only his thinking and knowledge, but his gut feelings. This is a classical stage-4. It neither indicates dependence on internalized others, nor any transcendence toward an awareness of the limits of the self system.

BIT 11 = 4(3)

When my pride is hurt, I get quiet and sad, dejected, which is another way of describing quiet and sad. When I get to a point where everything we put our time and energy into is either not recognized, or it's torn apart, or we are being forced to make a shift that I know is not good for us, what happens is that my own pride--knowing that, Jesus Christ, we've done this well, the pride that I have in what we do winds up getting sliced. Nine times out of 10 what I wind up doing is I wind up in my own way fuming in a very quiet way, and sometimes it can last for a few months. It bothers me that deeply. And I just wake up one day and say: 'fuck it, what to hell, it's bigger than I am.' [The hurt] is directly proportional to the amount of energy you put into something.

S1 here articulates a certain inflexibility of viewing failure in the environment, in that he cannot provide alternate ways of interpreting his own feelings. When his pride gets hurt, the system feels overwhelmed, and circumstances are viewed as "bigger than me," i.e., as beyond the self system's control. In short, he doesn't take full responsibility for his own feelings.

BIT 12 = 4

Some of the issues that force me to take a very strong stand is when there is lot of noise around something, and people are not seeing things clearly, that's when I tend to take the strongest stand. To try to cut through the noise. And in this business, there is a lot of noise [noise=things that detract from the work]. So, recently, I took a very strong stand, and

it was stupid politically, It wasn't stupid because of the business, the business [voice in him O.L.]said: 'Goddam, take a strong stand.' I am an entrepreneur. So [for me, it's a] terrible place to live in a bureaucracy, but, I am here. [The noise] detracts from what the core issue is, that's when I take a strong stand. I am not here to deal with noise. [However,] dead men are those that don't deal with noise. What I had to adapt to is all of the noise, and its very difficult. The hunter does not deal with noise much, he moves from target to target to target. [There are obstacles,] but they are all self-imposed. The environment, whether you are hunting or you are farming, will always give you obstacles. The question is: what degree of pain do you want to go through, to be a good hunter. The more difficult you make something for me, the more I like it, which explains why I have a hard time dealing with noise.

"Noise" is anything that falls outside of the boundaries drawn between subject and object, as seen by the self system. S1 is aware, however, that those are "dead" who do not deal with such noise. He finds adapting to "all that noise" very difficult. The hunter/farmer reference harks back to a previous statement (omitted), that in the organization, S1 is seen "more as a hunter than a farmer" (which he agrees is partly correct). A hunter like S1 is so preoccupied

with some present target that dealing with noise is not his strength. His own obstacles are all "self imposed," rather than external. The emphasis is on challenges (self imposed obstacles), not on how to deal with external noise distracting from challenges. In the extreme case, this stance leads to ideological isolation from the environment, since he cannot transcend his own self-system.

BIT 13 = 4

I decided to take a very strong stand on a piece of business we were negotiating. We were at the 11th hour with a client, and then all of a sudden, they piled in some additional noise, and I blew my cork. I wound up getting a couple of chatter from a couple of entities that were thrown into the mix at the 11th hour. And I should really just have dealt with them, but they were about to lose the deal. Sitting in this meeting, I just looked and said: 'You know something? I need to get an answer to this client, and you are saying things that are so stupid, I am not dealing with this anymore.' And I walked out. That's political death. But our integrity was on the line with the client. In a bureaucracy, nobody owns the business, [while] entrepreneurs own businesses. Mentally, we, the team owns the business collectively. [so we have to take a strong stand].

S1 here demonstrates how total embeddedness in the self system can be professionally risky, even if that embeddedness is articulated as a collective stance. He labels his own 4-ish stance "political death." Despite this insight, he does not realize that his self system has its own "bureaucracy," or unyielding exterior, except that it is an "entrepreneurial" one. S1 also demonstrates the convergence of an executive's

developmental position and its organizational consequences, whether they function as obstacles or are supportive of his actions.

BIT 14 = 4

I'll tell you something that nearly tore me up. I lost an employee here who was a great contributor and a real stable person. She was a really smart thinker, and well respected by our peers, hard worker. And we lost her. And she said she just wasn't excited in doing the work any more, because the culture had changed a lot, and also because of the change of the business direction, she didn't have the kind of resources she thought she needed. I was so torn about losing her. I did not want to lose her. It just really made me sad. That's a thing that really eats you: losing good people just because they have integrity, and you can't protect them.

Here, S1 identifies with another self system of high integrity and unyieldingness. Losing this collaborator was for him a loss of self. Not being able to protect her, i.e., his identity, was torment. A violation of a system like one's own creates a pain commensurate with one's degree of identification with, or embeddedness in, one's own self system. Such pain is the pain associated with the self system.

End of Interview, S1

Appendix C2

Interview Material, S2

Dialectical-Schemata Profile, S2

As demonstrated in terms of content in chapter III, S2 is a highly pro-active thinker. He is less interested in the changes that have occurred in the environment than in the changes that could be brought about by him, and the question of the timeliness of such changes. In terms of the categories of motion, form, relationship and/or their metaformal integration, the utterances below (taken from the professional-agenda interview) can be understood as follows.

(Note: quotations from Basseches' 1984 appear in <'...'>, while quotes from the professional-agenda interview text of subjects appear in <"...">). Schematically salient bits appear in italics.

Motion

#2[3] [primacy of motion]

My former boss described me as one of those people who is going to be unbelievably successful, whichever way you want to measure it, yet totally miserable. Who just never sees any value in what they do, always going to the next thing. I have been that way all of my life. The kill is unimportant, the hunt is a blast I set these goals for myself, and I go, and when I get there, it's not enough. So, I'm somebody who never ever either takes credit or feels good about any success. But successful I am.

S2 here embraces motion as the primary reality. Motion both thrives on, and relieves, the disequilibrium (unhappiness) that is a necessary ingredient of transformation. The emphasis is on the motio created,, rather than on the negativity of pain and unhappiness that generates it (schema #16).

#5[1] [interaction as source of movement]

I think it [the coaching] is more collaborative. I think early on, I made it clear [to the coach] exactly what I wanted to do, and what my goals are. Since the coach believed in the goal, I set the agenda, and he more [or less] delivered on it, but only because he believed it. So it may seem as if I was setting it [i.e., the agenda], but [the coach] believed that course because he believed it could happen. And so there was a constant give and take that propelled us.

S2 sees choaching as an interactive & collaborative relationship, not a reciprocal one (schema #14). The movement that occurs in coaching is rooted in the ongoing interaction between agenda setting on the side of the executive, and believing and supporting the agenda on the side of the coach.

#6[1] [active character of knowledge]

Selling [is] having them start out without having any understanding of the product, and then having them believe at the end that it's their idea. You are not there to impose something; you are there to make people believe in it, which is much different. People have said that I have created a lot of change in the year I've been here, but it has been done in a way that most people [have come to] believe in the cause, and have moved toward that by themselves.

The understanding of a product by a customer, or of ideas by co-workers, is based on the active participation of the other party, who are "made to believe in it." Nothing is imposed externally. This is how S2 has been successful in introducing change: by having others come to believe in it.

#7[3] [avoidance or exposure of objectificaction, hypostatization, and reification]

This company was in the process of conducting a strategic review of its businesses, and I was going to be a contributor to that. And if I would have contributed to the company's study of this, my boss would have valued that a lot. But we (the coach and I) recognized that there were other things that perhaps were affecting my superior's behavior. There was a succession plan that he had to put in place. He has a way of operating in the company where he never [acts on his own]. He is not a cut-and-burn type of boss, he likes to gain consensus, manage groups of people, sort of pacify groups of people. He is consensus-oriented. When we thought all of that through [in the coaching], there was a way to approach this and some strategic thinking that I can give him, that did more than solve a bunch of technical problems in some of our businesses, that helped him manage the rest of my peers, and to help him solve his succession planning issue [which, of course, I have a stake in]. If you viewed it as something that not only benefitted me but was solving a huge problem for him, that just opened my eyes in terms of how to think about this. For a time I was thinking about everything I would do toward this end might be self-serving. And [as I reviewed it I said to myself] wait a minute, I am helping him solve the biggest problem he has. The fact that part of it is beneficial to me, and self-serving to some extent, became irrelevant.

A lot of people don't see me as a risk taker. I have been criticized for not being as risk-tolerant as I say I am. I don't think I am at the leading edge of risk-taking. But this is a bland, benign environment, not exciting, not cosmopolitan. This company is too risk averse [even for my taste, O.L.]. It's not culturally diverse; it is slow to react to changes in the market place. These are changes that need to be made. The slowness to react has a lot to do with the risk tolerance. While this company believes it merely avoids trends and fads, it was actually the inability to react quickly that kept them out of trouble. But that only works for so long. [The company] avoided a lot of disasters by not moving quickly, but they talked themselves into believing that it was insight that allowed them to do that rather than an inability to react. And [as president], I would change that.

In both of these statements, S2 injects motion back into a where it is denied. In the first statement, he realizes that hypostatizing his self interest in becoming president, and keeping it separate from the overall momentum of the process (of searching for a successor) the president is engaged in, is counterproductive. Seen in the larger context of that process, the fact that he has a stake in the outcome is irrelevant, given that they presently have. In the second statement, S2 criticizes the company's low risk tolerance. He exposes its attempt to keep separate from the momentum of the environment, and then mistaking that for wisdom. Although he himself is not "at the leading edge of risk-taking," as president he would change that, and reintroduce motion into the company process.

#8[3] [developmental or historical explanation; placing events within the processes of which they are a part]

I am currently trying NOT to have people thinking of me just as the CFO [chief financial officer, O.L.]. In order to run a company, you have to start shedding the CFO role, because, CFO's have made it to CEO [chief executive officer], but some get tagged as a financial guy, and so you have to start acting like the president of a company. And taking leadership roles, that's taking little things that could have been non-events, and turning them into leadership [issues], and [thereby] exerting myself in that situation.

If you are committed to a goal, then any minute of any day that is not spent doing something toward the ultimate goal is a complete waste of time. What [the coach] helps me do is take projects and work, it may not all be so obvious how it could fit into that structure [of my ultimate goal] and think about it differently, and use it to get there.

I have always had a personal ability to do things with the end in mind. I have a very clear picture of where I want to be, and what I want to do. (Some actually believe I have that because I have been there before, which is another subject). [The coach] is very helpful in making me see that a lot more

clearly, in terms of how to relate the day-to-day activities to the overall goal, and to transform that [i.e., them] into building blocks and stepping stones to get where I want to go.

[The coach] has helped me in focusing my attention in acting presidential. Acting in more of a leadership role. Taking a leadership role, taking little things that could have non-events, and turning them into leadership events, and exerting myself in the situation. So the issue has been: how can I take what would seem to be a technical project and transform it into something more than just merely the answer that my superior is looking for, to transform it into a building block for that ultimate goal.

In these statements, events or situations are seen by S2 as part of a process, that of becoming president of a company. As ingredients of 'acting presidential,' they are being transformed from what they are per se. Behind the development of a presidential attitude and style is utter goal-orientedness.

Form
n.a.

Relationship

#14[2] [interactive relationship; parties in a relationship acting upon each other, thus have to be compatible]
Coaching is taking raw talent and molding it toward something [which requires developmental compatibility]. And so, when I think of my coach, I think he has been most helpful in taking things I already fundamentally believe in and have practiced for years and years and years, and channel that.

Again, taking something I fundamentally believe in, because I have practiced this throughout my business career. The person has to see it. The coach cannot create a partner out of someone who has no idea [of] what it [i.e., some item of the professional agenda, O.L.] is, doesn't believe, can't feel in their stomach. Coaching can't take someone who doesn't have that, and create it. Frankly, if I didn't have some of that ability already, I am not sure coaching someone who has no idea of where he wants to go would help them at all get there.

We shouldn't select the same coach institutionally. I could picture him [the coach], knowing how well it works for me, failing miserably with 2 or 3 other people that I work with. [[The coach] and I think a lot alike, and there are people who just don't think like that are not in sink with his thinking. He has a picture of where he is trying to get them, [and so it's an interactive process, O.L.] .Unless a good coach also can recognize the situation, and can apply himself differently in different situations. Maybe that's the point; maybe he has the ability to do that.

In these statements, S2 is dealing with the concept of "developmental compatibility" as a precondition for reciprocity in coaching. His view of coaching is that it is a two-way reciprocal relationship premised on mutual understanding, in which a developmental transformation occurs on account of the interactive and constitutive relationship that is established. The remark in the second statement, that "the coach cannot create a partner out of someone who has no idea [of] what it [i.e., some item of the professional agenda, O.L.] is," emphasizes that the coach cannot create a partner out of just anybody, but only when there is compability. Therefore, coaches should not be selected "institutionally," meaning for the entire executive team, but individually, geared to the individual executive concerned.

Metaformal

#20[1] [coordinating systems, here: coordinate himself with president and with partners to the negotiations]

Playing the ambassador, the advisor role, helping him [the boss] broker agreements, that's something that shows leadership. How does a president pick his closest advisor? It better be someone who knows how to act like a president. In that situation, it was almost like [being] an emissary, that type of role, peace keeping, brokering negotiation, the art of compromise that's certainly a big part of it.

A broker coordinates two related systems for the benefit of the systems involved. The brokering is described as that of an emissary who represents one system that is to be coordinated with another one. This activity is seen as taking a leadership role.

#24[3] [multiperspectival thinking]

[The coach] has helped me put myself into whomever's behavior I am trying to affect to stand in their shoes and think like them. If you want to get them do something, think about their perspective. And he has helped me to understand a lot of other perspectives on a particular issue.

I just delivered a presentation that was very important to my boss. It wasn't exactly my point of view. It was the company's point of view, but it was not consistent with my point of view, although not entirely disconnected to it. If you sign on as somebody's advisor, you offer your point of view when asked, and hopefully, 7-8 out of 10 times, it will influence the decision. It's never quite exactly your decision. But as long you feel it's not out of moral standards, or range of tolerance, it's now a company decision, and you need to take that position, and advance it. When you feel you can no longer do that, there is only one option: to resign. Many people couldn't believe that I could get up and deliver convincingly a program, a methodology, a position that wasn't exactly a position I believed in., but it was a reasonable position for the company to take. So, yes, I seem to have this ability to move people in a direction, to convince them, they tell me I can sell. You are selling ideas.

S2 here acknowledges the one-sidedness of any perspective, and the need to put oneself into others' shoes and "think like them." He sees a need for inclusiveness in company matters.. The ability to take multiple perspectives includes that of publicly endorsing a viewpoint that may not be one preferred by oneself. As a leader, one should be able to do so, without thereby betraying one's own principles.

Subject/Object Profile, S2

In contrast to S1, S2's process is associative. It does not follow a predefined logic. Rather, S2's sequencing of stimuli is oriented to what he perceives as his personal limitations (which from the outset removes all attempts at 'grandstanding"). S2 starts the interview with the (1) "anger" card, signalling early on that he never channels anger at the point where it occurs. He then proceeds to the (2) "anxious" card. Both anger and fear are seen by him as ways of protecting the integrity of his self system which, to him, is the only lasting value. Next is (3) "success/ achievement," which is construed as that of an artist in a stage performance. Given S2's understanding of negativity as a driving force in his make-up, it is not astonishing that success is perceived as intermingled with (5) conflict ('torn/conflict' card), mainly seen as internal by him. The interview ends with references to (6) the 'change' card, change

being conceived as internal and peculiar to his "being always on the go." Throughout, S2 shows impressive psychological insight into the inner workings of his professional life, and does so in a totally non-defensive way. Insight into his "unique psychological organization" sets the tone for, and pervades, the interview.

BIT 1 = 4(5)

There were two situations recently, and one was at our board meeting. A topic came up that was fitting for me to respond to, and before I could respond to it, my predecessor responded to it. And it was kind of obvious [that] he was grandstanding, to become part of the conversation, to act as an elder statesman, and it made me furious. What made me furious was it was not a difficult question, [so] that I felt, boy, I would have liked to have chimed in with an answer to that one, because it really would have showed that I was insightful, and had knowledge of this topic. So it was appropriate for me to answer that question. It almost made me look not sharp, [as if] I had a gap in my knowledge. And I was furious for a well, it was a little longer than a minute. And I've learned a long time ago it's how you deal with things, it's not what you say, it's what you don't say and don't do that can be just as important. And when I read the situation, what I decided to do was not say anything. And I thought, o.k., they seemed to have accepted the answer (although he did not really address their question). I quickly realized that most of the people in the room, if they had the same sense I did, would have sensed that he was trying to grandstand, and to try to trump that would have looked equally as foolish. And I recognized that, and thought that playing coy and sitting back, and just not doing anything was perhaps the most appropriate reaction. But I felt diminished; I felt my role had been diminished. So it did make me furious, just the fact that somebody would grandstand and try to preempt me made me angry. But I realized very quickly, it happened very quickly, that in the grand scheme of things, this [episode] was unimportant.

S2 "signs in" with a stance indicating he can see himself as part of an audience of listeners to somebody who is grandstanding, although he is the one the grandstanding is hurting most. He is aware of his reaction, can take it as object, and knows how to put it into perspective. He is clearly not embedded in his self system, since he is able to deal with the audience he is part of as a separate system whose judgment he can trust, and link it to his own self system.

BIT 2 = 4

Anger is a situation that comes to me frequently. I don't quite know why. People that know me know exactly what it is. And they [my collaborators] know exactly how I channel it and use it. Because I never channel it at the point that made me angry. I would never have taken this person aside after the meeting and let loose on him. Rather, I would go to a friend, and vent for about 5 minutes, feel better and then just go on. I do have these bursts, things that infuriate me, but I have learned a long time ago [not to react].

S2 takes his anger, a part of his self, as object. He is very clear about how he manages his own anger, and is evidently in charge of it.

BIT 3 = 4

A lot of people have told me that I operate out of almost a constant fear of failure. And so, I am always trying to please everybody, and want to make sure that I am doing the best job I can. So when that [trying to do the best job, O.L.] gets compromised in some way, I do get angry I don't get angry when people disagree with me, I get angry when they are trying to manipulate things, and when they are trying to do something almost inappropriate. So, I do have these bursts, but I internalize them to make them productive, exactly.

S2 is aware of his being ruled by fear and therefore trying to please others (a stance of 4(3)). Although he sees that as a critical flaw, and admits to succumbing to it internally, he also acknowledges that he is in control of it. He is certainly not embedded in his anger.

BIT 4 = 4(3)

I was furious when I thought: '[my boss] will think that I had a shortcoming.' And when I talked to him, I saw that he had seen right through it [i.e., the grandstanding]. Actually, it worked in the opposite direction. Not only did the anger go away, but I felt validated [after talking to the boss]. Which actually has a lot to do with self image.

S2 here conveys the need for validation, acknowledging that at times he can not accept that his shortcomings be seen by others. He thus depends on them for reconstituting his self image, thus slipping back into a less than self-authoring condition.

BIT 5 = 4

I learned a long time ago that there were very few things that would carry you through your entire career, and they sound so soft, things like integrity, credibility, and those real, fundamental cornerstones of your being [emphatic]. You can learn all of this technical matter, that's transferable. I think the very successful executives have those fundamentals, the essence of their persona, credibility, integrity, honesty. And I know that [that is] the only thing I really have long-term to sell. All this knowledge is fleeting, because in 5 years from now, guess what, the world will have changed, the products will be different, the markets will be different, I will have changed, everything will have changed. So the knowledge is fleeting, it's fleeting,. The only thing you have is this [integrity], and when someone tries to chip at that, I get angry, anxious, I get a lot of things. So, I protect that, because that is my value.

S2 knows to detach parts of himself e.g., his knowledge and competence, from the core of his self system, viz., integrity. Anxiety can be a consequence when his integrity is tampered with. "The only thing you have is this integrity" is a classic 4-stance to protect his own sense of integrity.

BIT 6 = 4

I have always felt that my strong desire, my obsession with wanting to run something large and institutional has a lot to do with that [self image of integrity]. There are people who know me very well who say [that] I have this fatal flaw [not to feel good about myself unless I run something large]. 'And [they say:] 'the minute we let you run the company, you will already be on to the next thing.' So, where do I go from here? 'And that you will be very successful, but never happy. ' 'That has a lot to do with [the fact that] I will not feel [happy]. The inability to feel happiness is the image [that] I see for myself [i.e., as characteristic of me, O.L.]

S2 knows the contribution his unique psychological organization makes to the situation he is in, embracing negativity as part of his self image. He knows that his self system needs constant refueling, but does not have a way of escaping that system's requirements, e.g., by inviting others in who could help him transform himself.

BIT 7 = 4

This is the way I operate: you work yourself into a frenzy at this stage, because I operate under fear, consistent fear of failure. The success comes, the moment of elation is there for, pick a time, an hour, and then the next day I am already obsessing about what am I going to do [next]. That is my method of operating. There is a crescendo that leads up to [the presentation], and typically what happens [is that] I get up there, the notes go away, the lights go on, the curtain opens, and I just have this ability--I hope this doesn't sound too pompous.--when the lights go on something goes off in me. I don't know what it is, that I can talk to people, and deliver, so I know it's going to turn out allright. But you couldn't convince me [of that] two months before, that I wouldn't make a fool of myself on that occasion. I never know before

I get up there, no butterflies in the stomach, I am on, that's it. And then, you know, it's going well. It's like a singer, you can talk to performers, they know early in their performance whether they are hitting it [or not]. So, I knew it was going well. When [my boss] finally gave me that point of recognition--and I can tell by how effusive he is with his comments--I knew that his meter was going off on the other end. But by the next day, it had pretty much worn off.

A restatement of his insight into himself. S2 describes the dynamics of his psychological functioning in a way that metaphorizes him as a performer who knows he is performing. He is also aware of his relation to the audience, as any good performer, thereby transcending his performance. Again, there is no notion of alternate ways to perform other than stay within the limits of his self system.

BIT 8 = 4(5)

I describe professional situations as one of two things: militaristic exercises or artistic performances. I am extremely ritualistic when it comes to preparing. I think about what I am going to wear that day, make sure its appropriate, I got it, and I call it my 'battle dress.' [Example of general Patton]. It's ceremonial, it's ritualistic, and it is a performance.

And I do honestly understand when these performers say that [taking the performance as a ritual] just knocks the lights out of the room. And when they got done with it [the performance, O.L.], they just bellowed their lungs out and danced all over the place for 4 and a half hours, they don't feel tired at all. There is a feeling of elation, as you say, transcending the situation, where you should be dead tired, but you become part of it. The combination of all that is that rush, when you know you have moved people to think in a different way, transformed them, when you have moved them to an experience they hadn't had before.

S2 here clarifies that the elation that what lifts him out of his self system is premised on transforming others into thinking in a different way, and moving them beyond themselves. His elation is thus more than an exercise in self glory. Rather, it is a result of transforming himself into a context for the transformation of others. However, this transcending move is "elative," thus ultimately serving his own self system. Thus, two self-structures are at work (4 and 5), and the lower structure stays in command.

BIT 9 = 4

If the company were to restructure, I would be the one doing it, which would be just another plane of technical and intense action, the pathos of it all, a two-year orchestration of a huge effort. And the adrenalin rush would be there. That didn't happen. So when we come back after this momentous event [of deciding not to restructure], we are pretty much back to very mundane management topics here. And every day I walk in[to] this place since then, I leave a piece of me outside, I know I do, I can feel it. I have no adrenalin. I feel tired. Right now, I need the next one of that., so I have to create it. And that is very much an element of me.

Another of his insights into his peculiar psychological organization.

BIT 10 = 4

The conclusion I came to was if you look at our five-year business plan, we could execute it as a mutual company or a stock company. And because that was true, I found no reason to stay in mutual. I was answering the question: 'why stay in mutual?', while everbody else was asking the question: 'why be de-mutualized?' Its a different question. I came to the conclusion that we should de-mutualize. [My boss] didn't agree. He thought that because we could do either [i.e., carry out the 5-year business plan either way], we ought to stay in mutual for a limited time, monitor the environment, and then make the call when the time felt like not only could you, but you needed to [de-mutualize]. So, I had to think about that,

because one thing I cannot do is compromise my principles. If it would be the wrong thing to do, I couldn't have gotten up there and delivered the message and put together a presentation. [However}, it was not the wrong thing to do [viz., to stay in mutual]. The beautiful thing about this problem is that there is no right or wrong. There was maybe a preference, and I felt strongly that we should do it [i.e., de-mutualize], but there wasn't a great deal of consensus [about that]. And [if we had de-mutualized] we would have to have moved forward as a whole to get this done. So it wasn't the wrong answer, it just wasn't the one I would have preferred.

Here, S2 sees the multifaceted nature of all decisions, and demonstrates that he can take a perspective on his process and his own preferences. While structurally in conflict, upon consulting his principles, he decides he can deliver a message in favor of a decision that is not his preference, but that helps his boss advance his agenda. Taking the lack of consensus of the organization into account, he decides he has to forego remaining embedded in his preference.

Bit 11= 4(5)

So, a week before the presentation, I had to wrestle with the fact [of]whether I could get up in front of the board and convince them that this was the right thing to do, when I actually didn't believe initially that it was. I decided after counseling with people that know me, and that knew the technical content, that I could do that [example of President Kennedy]. So I had to make the decision that the president made a call, [and] I advised him differently. If I was fundamentally opposed, or it would have compromised my integrity, I couldn't go and help him deliver that message, but it didn't. It wasn't my preferred approach, but I had to sit back and say: 'can I help him get this plan done?' [Help him restructure this company, continue to monitor the external landscape, improve the company's profitability, and in 2-3 years from now maybe make the call [to de-mutualize?]. And the answer was 'sure'; although I didn't agree with the decision. But I could have been wrong. We could have voted for restructuring the company, we could have tried it and we could have failed. I could have been deadwrong. His was a much more risk-averse approach. Mine was a little more entrepreneurial and risk-taking. But it wasn't wrong. It was a wise decision [viz. not to de-mutualize], and it fit. If he had felt that mutuality is the only way to deliver insurance to the market place, I wouldn't have delivered the presentation, and I wouldn't be sitting here right now.

S2 can prioritize and mediate hard choices based on his own standards. As long as his principles, thus his integrity, are not violated, S2 can embrace and support decisions of a superior that differ from his own preferences. He enables himself to do so by consulting others and investigating the limitations of his own preferences. Through such an interindividual engagement, he gathers the steam to support something he has advised against. In doing so, his foremost goal is to act for the good of the organization, in terms of where it now stands, seeing himself as an integral part of a larger whole, and an advisor to the president. He is correlating two different systems, his own and the company's.

BIT 12 = 4(5)

I won't compromise. As I said, all you have is your integrity, and what people sense of you, that's the only thing you can carry with you your whole life. If the board had said: 'boy, is this guy [i.e., his superior, O.L.] off his rocker, that is the stupidest thing I've ever heard,' I wouldn't have gone up there either. But it wasn't that way. I still felt I could help

[my boss] deliver that message. We were successful in doing that, and not compromise what I personally believe to be true. You are asking is part of my job to make [my boss] successful?

Absolutely. CFO [financial officer], CIO [investment officer], it's all technical mumbo-jumbo. He runs the company. Our job is to make sure that he is successful. His job is to make sure the company is successful. So it's all linked, and that's what you have to work with.

A reinforcement of the previous statement. S2 is testing the limits of his self system, to gauge the extent to which it will support decisions he is not in favor of. He then not only subordinates his agenda to that of a superior, but forcefully helps his superior to make his agenda heard, without compromising his own principles and integrity. Thereby, he demonstrates that he can for pragmatic reasons transcend his own beliefs, but only when doing so ultimately strengthens his own professional situation.

BIT 13 = 4(5)

My former boss never took [my advice]. I always thought that he never took my advice. Because every time we would have a problem, and I gave my opinion, his conclusion never was what my opinon was. After we sold the company, I got to know him personally, and we almost acted like brothers rather than CEO [executive officer] & CFO [financial officer], and I him hit with this one day. He said 'are you crazy?.' I said: 'you never ever took my advice.' He said: 'I took it all the time. There is a synthesis that goes on. You are not the only person I ask. I ask 10 other people, too, people not even in the company. What do I do, how do I think about this? Somewhere in that answer [of yours is] a piece of the actual solution, or a way of thinking. What if I thought about it differently; I didn't like X's answer, but boy, he approached it from a different angle. What if I approached it from that side?' And that's when you realize that CEO's answers never appear to be these packaged things that are handed to them. They are a synthesis of ideas. And if you stimulate their thought process, let's say you don't have a good answer, but you asked a great question? That's helpful! So, absolutely, my job is to make that man successful. And believe me, I am a lot more successful at my job than a lot of other people, because I understand that.

S2 here demonstrates an ability of appreciating the holistic, synthetic, and participatory nature of organizational decision-making processes which is a precondition of transcending one's self-embeddedness, and of transforming others as well as oneself. Contributions of an advisor to the president are seen as nothing but moments of a larger process, in which various different elements come to matter. S6 thinks he is successful because he understands this dialectic of part (ingredient) and dynamic whole that is the hallmark of an organized system.

BIT 14 = 4

I've had opportunities to 'make more money,' and go down one path rather than another. You can only pick one path: would you rather be rich or famous? That's almost a facetious way of looking at it. It's not the fame per se, but the recognition, reaching a level of performance, becoming the best, I've always believed that. It sounds corny, but to be the best at what you do [has always been important to me]. I can't think of anything else. And getting there is a lousy feeling, is a rotten feeling. Because when you get there, if you are built like me, you have to go somewhere else. And that's o.k. So far, I've done o.k. living that way. That's what is important, getting to be the best at what you do, whatever that is. I can't think of living in any environment where you are not striving for experiencing something different. And like many people have told me, 'the word "content" is not in your vocabulary.' That [kind of persuasion] doesn't make for content people. It makes for people who are just

always miserable and who say: 'I got to experience something else, to stay engaged.' And I am constantly engaged. And if I am not, as I said, I am not dealing with it very well at all.

S2 "signs out" with a somewhat pained self-portrait, noting his need for constant change and momentum. He speaks of more than a painful and unflattering side of his unique psychological organization, however. He articulates his affinity with a disposition in which striving for an optimum of achievement necessitates, or brings with it, the need to constantly re-evaluate oneself and put oneself in question, to sustain momentum, and has a grasp of the interrelatedness of positive and negative elements of his process. There is no evidence here of him questioning the 4-ish stance he is instantiating.

End of Interview S2

Appendix C3

Interview Material, S3

Dialectical-Schemata Profile, S3

As demonstrated in terms of content in chapter III, S3's grasp of the intrinsic and constitutive nature of relationships, not only between people but also between domains of work, is not highly developed at this time. His product- and fact-centered approach to tasks makes it hard for him to link work dimensions and personal dimensions among themselves and to each other, which leads to a highly compartmentalized way of thinking. This finding is substantiated by the structural (dialectical-schemata) analysis, below.

(Note: quotations from Basseches' 1984 appear in <'...'>, while quotes from the professional-agenda interview text of subjects appear in <"...">). Schematically salient bits appear in italics.

Motion

#1[3] [excluded element, TAS movement in thought]

I really would like to develop some new techniques of investment. Somewhat of a departure from what we use now. One thing we do to a great degree is that we use the in-house analysts in our process. And what I'd like to do is develop some systematic techniques which may use information independent of the analysts. The advantages would be diversification in our investment process, additional capacity (bringing in more ideas); those would be two advantages. [Using analysts] is one approach, there are lot of approaches, and that's just one. Coming up with something new, that's how I learn, that's what I find most interesting. Do something new in the investment field, there are limitless possibilities.

A lot of it is working with the analysts., understanding what's driving the stock prices. And traditionally quantitative techniques didn't go down to the analysts' level. And the analysts don't go up to kind of a systematic process. So my idea is to bridge the gap [between traditional techniques less refined than the analysts and the systematic process not acceeded to by the analysts, O.L.]. Have an approach which utilizes some quantitative techniques, but tries to capture perhaps the intuition of a fundamental approach. And recognizing a lot of the variables vary from one stock to another, instead of being common to all stocks. And I believe if you can develop an approach which is more flexible, [because it links two different approaches], you would be more successful.

When I started this, it was almost all my ideas. And then I made the effort to be more inclusive. And so, now, we share a lot of ideas of what the best angle is, how to develop a new product, and where we need to go.

[The new people I hire], the don't have to be the same as all of us, they just need to get along with others. They need to have some unique skill that we don't have, hard-working, well educated, bright, and honest. These are some of the key criteria. Creative.

In all of these statements, S3 is concerned with the inclusion of a heretofore excluded element, in order to become more inclusive and, thereby, more successful.

In the first two statements, the antithesis introduced to arrive at a more complex synthesis concerns new analysis techniques that bridge the gulf between presently separate approaches, while in the third and fourth statements, the same issue of complexification is treated with regard to including heretofore excluded co-workers or hiring new co-workers.

#5[2] [interaction as source of movement]

The difference between my and other groups is that my client is a face to face sale; they [clients} are very sophisticated. That forces you to be able to articulate a very good story, and assure them that this is how it's going to work, to behave. Well, most of the other managers, they don't know their clients; they have never met the investor on the street. So they don't have the pressure to force this discipline. And yet, for us, that's what drives us, this interaction, you know.

My goal is being better by my own standards. But you measure it by success within the organization, obviously. I have nobody saying to me "this is what you need to do to get to such and such." I have to open up my own opportunities, definitely. I need to do that. In the old organization, you did not need to go around doing all that communication work. Now, jobs are more narrowly defined, and there is less interaction between groups, I'd say.

S3 is here seeing interaction as a source of movement. In the first statement, the movement is one provoked by dealing with the "investor in the street;" in the second statement, it results from structural changes in the organization that must be counteracted by being increased communication.

#6[2] [interactive character of knowledge]

One thing [the coach] helped with is that up until 1996, my involvement outside of my group on the investment side was limited, and had a much closer relationship with the distribution side. There used to be what's called, ...one institution which did both investment and sales & distribution. And that unit was broken up, and all the investment folks such as myself were put in the main investment company, and the distribution was retained. That gave me the opportunity to contribute more to the other investment folks, but it was a challenge, since while I knew them, I didn't have the interaction that would have been helpful to make a better contribution. Some of the help from [the coach] was giving me some feedback on what he saw as opportunities of just talking to people in general, as well as suggestions on how to get a higher profile of our contributions to the organization.

One thing I found helpful is to have [the coach] talk to a couple of people in my group, and get some feedback from them on how they saw me. Because what I do when I review [folks in my team], I say "is there any suggestion you can provide me [with] ... on how to do a better job," and I think having him go talk to those folks was a way to do that, but be removed, so they could feel more comfortable providing some suggestions. What [the coach] brings back is not the feedback itself, but some suggestions based on his discussion with them [i.e., people in my group, O.L.]

In these statements, S3 affirms the practical and active character of knowledge. In both statements, movement in knowledge is seen "as a result of the interaction of ideas with each other," especially among individuals. The second statement aims for a higher form of interaction which is made more effective by removing barriers to frankness and directness.

Form

#10[2] [forms as equilibrated wholes]

To do my work effectively, I need to keep my toes in four different waters: (1) research and product development, (2) portfolio management, (3) meeting with prospective clients and maintaining that relationship, and (4) maintaining the relationship with current clients. You have to do all four I believe in my business to be successful. And the trick is, maintaining the balance. There has been too much on the side of the latter two (prospective & current clients). (5) And all that comes along with managing the business [which] is probably a fifth spoke here. And it is the first two I want to spend more time on.

We are designing the product, and producing it, which is the investment strategy and the implementation of the investment strategy, and the enhancement of it. .Defining a strategy, adhering to it, communicating that upfront to the client, providing the client with updates on that. So we tend to manage portfolios that have a very specific objective in mind. The other part we bring to the table is product development capabilities. And it is investment product development, not just ideas, but actually designing,

inventing the strategy. And the business side of it would be selling the product and servicing it. So these are the two areas of expertise we have that I believe are unique within the organization.

S3 presents his unit as a form or system. In the first statement, he describes his function in structural terms, naming the pieces that compose it, and stressing the equilibrium that needs to be achieved. In the second statement, the emphasis is on the uniqueness of the two pieces, the investment side and the business side, that make up the unit's work.

Relationship
n.a.

Metaformal

#17[1] [resolution of disequilibrium as development to higher levels of equilibrium]

As the business grows, you end up spending less time on the investment side, and more time on the business side. And we have had some real challenges getting the support on the business side. I want to spend more time on the investment side. What I am trying to do is to offload things I have been doing for a while that are no longer of interest to me, and focus more on things I like to learn more about. I think a lot about things on the business side of things, and about pushing people outside of my immediate group to deliver and move forward. It's a bigger problem since the group has grown. The number of sales people, for example, we interface with, and the number of sales people I need to motivate.

As the business has grown, the unit has moved into a disequilibrium of the business with the investment side (in the sense of schema #22, influence of quantity on quality.). S3 would like to counteract the changes by working on the now disadvantaged side of the unit, to restore its equilibrium.

Subject/Object Profile, S3

S3 is the only executive who approaches the subject/object stimuli alphabetically, explaining that "there are a lot of engineers in my family." Accordingly , he starts with the 'angry' card, and proceeds as if he had to get through all the cards given him. In so doing, he is utterly frank and always highly concrete, leaving nothing to interpretation.

Bit 1 = 4

Basically, I get angry when people are dishonest. That's probably the biggest thing. For instance, when somebody lies. I got this voice mail somebody had sent out to a number of people, on an issue he had been working on, and the person sending out the mail had exxagerated several items, to make their point. The problem was, it wasn't true. So, what I did was to try to verify for myself, whether in fact that was true or not, because I didn't want to have a big discussion with somebody if I was wrong, not to accuse anybody. So after verifying that this was true [i.e., that it was an exaggeration, O.L.], I went and met with a person from the group that was working on this. I explained to them that I had always operating under the presumption, the understanding that people were telling me the truth, and if they don't tell the truth, it becomes very difficult to work together. I would find it very tough to move ahead on these initiatives with this person. So I explained to them why it was very important that they tell the truth, and explained to them that to go forward we needed to be honest with each other if we were to have a good relationship with each other. So it was basically, verifying, and then meeting the person face to face, and

going through the issues, and then agreeing how we were going to behave. We all have to be honest with each other if we want to meet goals of excellence, and maintain strong relationships. It was [a case of] exxagerating to demonstrate his point. And this was the second example of this in recent

times. So I wanted to nip it in the bud. To do that is not difficult. I just call him up and say I want him over here.

S3 signs in with a highly casuistic thought process reigned by binary logic: matters are either true or false, and this can be ascertained by checking facts. He is not checking for the limitations of his own assumptions (that there was exaggeration). S3 is classically embedded in his self system, such that his own insight is the standard of others' honesty. His interpersonal stance coincides with that assumption.

BIT 2 = 4

We were planning to hire somebody. They weren't straight with me on how this search was progressing. And it seemed to they had been giving me misinformation several times, which led to delays. What was important to me was that this would not sacrifice the long-term objectives of the business. So what I did is I took into my own hands, both the hiring of that person, and secondly to begin two initiatives. I felt if this person was not hired, because this thing [i.e., the hiring process, O.L.] had been messed up, we would miss the window [of opportunity, O.L.]. So I had to devote effort to ... basically doing it myself to get it done. Those two initiatives were important to me, so I did them, because I believed they had to be done. That is something that is not supposed to be my day to day responsibility. I can certainly strategize but not implement it as well. So I had to implement [it myself]. The goal of growth of the business could have been jeopardized. I certainly feel that's my responsibility. It's a business I built from ground zero, and to keep it growing you have to do a number of things. So, because it was important to me I did it myself. What's important to the business is what is important to me.

A restatement of the previous. Misinformation is thought to be intentional ("They weren't straight with me"). There is complete identification of his own identity with the long-term objectives of the business, regardless of how somebody else might see those objectives ("What's important to the business is what is important to me"). The emphasis is on being right, in the sense of an ethics of justice.

BIT 3 = 4

Taking a strong stand, day to day, is pretty natural for me. But [doing it] on a big issue is something which I have to prepare for. I have to sit down and think about what are the issues here, what's really going on, get a better undertanding of the issue. Personality-wise, I don't go looking for confrontation. But I am also not afraid to take a stand when it feels important.

This is a big example. I think the strongest stand I took was where there occurred a change in fee policy for my group's products. I had made a proposal regarding fee policy, and at a very high level, it was just cast aside, and a different fee policy adopted. At the time, my boss did not support as well as I would have hoped the original fee policy. So what I did I went to his boss actually, first I told my boss I wanted to go to his boss. And so, although he didn't like the idea too much, I prepared an argument, and explained to his boss that the

reason I am meeting with you is because I want to have the opportunity to try to change your mind. So I gave him some data to support that this is an issue that requires a thoughtful review, and not simply a haphazard change in policy. And then he gave me the opportunity to work with Finance, gave me that introduction, so that we could pursue what would be the corporate fee policy. What ended up happening is that at this most senior level, the fee policy was reversed, and my original proposal was adopted. That was a big success for me. But it was a huge drain in terms of resources, just the number of hours I had to spend to thoroughly analyze it and make sure all my ducks were in a row.

S3's embeddedness in his own self system compels him to change other people's mind in favor of his insights. This sometime succeeds, and sometimes fails. In the present case, it was successful. Interindividually, the change brought about in others is a unilateral one, and this is acceptable because it is "factually supported." There is no evidence here that S3 can take others' point of view.

BIT 4 = 4

My boss was not particularly happy about it. That's why I wanted to be sure I told him I wanted to do this. And I told him I didn't want him to come to the meeting [laughs]. I know he was hurt a little bit by that, but I explained to him that I thought it was my business, and I wanted to have the opportunity to focus just on what I had to say.

Interpersonal dynamics is subordinated to factual truth and well-argued insight. Taking interindividual dynamics into account appears as a mere distraction from the subject matter at hand, as articulated by S3. His self-authoring stance is based on a profound lack of understanding of the category of interactive and constitutive relationship.

BIT 5 = 4(3)

There was a fellow who started working with me for 6 to 12 months, and he told me: 'When we first started to work with each other, I was getting a little disappointed because you were always telling us what to do, and acting as if you knew what was right. But then, after working with you for a while, I realized that you were right [laughs]. I have confidence in whether I know something or not. And I seek people's input. But then there are certain things I believe I know how it's done. So it's not as if I am imagining [it] in my head, I know how it should be done.

S3 trusts his self system and its insights. Even those initially sceptical eventually tend to agree that he is right. This is felt to be a vindication, so there is a slight regressive tendency here.

BIT 6 = 4

I had a lot to do, and I basically consider it a drain on making progress in my job if I have to do stuff like that [i.e., trying to change others' minds, O.L.] It seems to me [that] it's pretty obvious since I've made my proposal anyway, and a pretty clear case originally. And so I do it. I think it's important [to try to convince others, O.L.], but at the same time I am disappointed that I have to do it, because I could be moving things forward [instead]. The unfortunate thing is that you spend time backfilling, trying to convince somebody not to make a wrong decision so that you can keep going forward. I consider this one of my biggest successes here. They would have really screwed up the business had they done that. This is not about convincing people as much as getting the job done right. So, convincing people internally that this is the way it should be done is just a means to an end.

S3 is disappointed when he has to state the (i.e., his) obvious truth more than once. It is a drain on his resources of time and energy. To engage interindividually is justifiable only if all other means fail. "Moving things forward" is seen as a purely objective, person-independent matter. The limits drawn by

S3's self system are clear-cut and without ambiguity. Again, there is a profound lack of understanding the category of relationship.

BIT 7 = 4

[Interviewer asks: 'is this to say that there is only one way to do it right?'] [S3 laughs]. I have a lot of experience, and while I am not expert on everything, I believe I have strong feelings about certain things. And am pretty sure I'm right. At the same time, I am asking other people for input, for suggestions on how to do this.

S3 admits that he may not always be right. "Strong feelings" tell him where self-doubt is out of place. However, he does ask others for input, not so much to change their minds, but to "get it right," thus confirming his own standards.

BIT 8 = 4

This is a case where I was not successful. Another big policy case, at the same time that there was a change in management. That unfortunately led to, I believe, the wrong decision being made. And after the fact it turned out to be the wrong decision. I have a lot of facts to back that up. We lost a lot of assets. The company lost value for their clients. And for me, it was a disappointment that they did not listen to us [!], we were the one's that were doing it, delivering excellent performance.

Wrong decisions are made when his insights are disregarded, and this can be proven by facts. Embeddedness in the self system leads to disappointment when the system's insights are violated. Despite the term 'us,' what matters to him is not the group of collaborators, but his own standards for what the group is doing.

BIT 9 = 4

[Interviewer asks: "how does your group relate to the decisions you are making?"] I think about the matter, and then I may have a chat with the two senior folks in the group, and sometimes the three of us will sit down and talk about the issue. And I'll ask them for help, or I ask them to listen to my presentation on the issue. [Interviewer asks: 'Is it then a group consensus?'] [S3 laughs] No, it's less of a consensus. It's probably more me. And when I get their input, I'll modify things a little better, to get the optimal presentation.

S3 accepts other's input and molds it to his own purposes. He is not engaged in changing co-workers' mind, not are they trying to change his. While their input becomes part of his decision-making, the ultimate decision is his. S3 here demonstrate a "separate," versus a "relational," style of interaction that is in the service of realizing (to him) obvious business objectives.

BIT 10 = 4

[Interviewer asks whether he is in the business of changing people's mind]. That's your job, to convince them, as in any selling. But internally, you sort of think, well, this is pretty obvious, guys, you know. And I should hopefully just be able only to explain this once, and things move from there, and generally it goes that way. And with many things to do, that takes you off line.

S3 signs out by emphasizing a unilateral change process in which something quite obvious to him is "sold" as beneficial or required to others. In "this is pretty obvious, guys, you know," embeddedness in the self system is strikingly manifest.

End of Interview S3

Appendix C4

Interview Materials, S4

Dialectical-Schemata Profile, S4

As demonstrated in terms of content in chapter III, in her professional functioning, S4 is of highly relational style. She understands the interactivity of insight generation as well as the active character of knowledge. She is also an expert at coordinating different systems (company, client, and candidate) and is increasingly aware of the requirement to take multiple perspectives. In terms of the categories of motion, form, relationship and/or their metaformal integration, the utterances below (taken from the professional-agenda interview) can be understood as follows.

(Note: quotations from Basseches' 1984 appear in <'...'>, while quotes from the professional-agenda interview text of subjects appear in <"...">). Schematically salient bits appear in italics.

Motion

#1[3] [excluded element: TAS in thought]

Another major outcome [of coaching] has been that I've learned that I can ask for help which has really strengthened my relationship with the other male partners. They do have a lot of experience. They are older. And I always looked at it as me against them. And now, if I have an issue that occurring, I go get their opinion on this. And it has been amazing: now they come to me! Whereas before, I would have done it all alone, and hope for the best solution. But I have realized that being an ENFJ, I need some of the T [laughs] and the S from my male counterparts, to come up with really the best solution. And so, what I will do now is go to people that I know have different preferences than I do, different strengths. Relying on other people's strength. I don't have to do it all [by myself].

S4 here emphasizes the need for inclusion of elements foreign to her, in order to find optimal solutions. She describes motion within thought from a thesis to an antithesis, for the sake of synthesis.

#6[1] [affirmation of practical and active character of knowledge]

As a coach and a mentor I do developmental plans with my people. I am probably just a little more sensitive as to how I ask them for information. That I don't jump to conclusions as quickly as maybe I did in the past. That I get more facts [about the person]. Now I ask 'what would you do?' 'What are your thoughts about how you should handle this.' That's what makes them grow; that's how they develop. It's not my giving them an answer.

S4 emphasizes the active character of knowledge that gives rise to insight. Insight is based on an exchange between two thinkers, rather than unilaterally legislated. Therefore, she now invites participation where she formerly would have acted onher own.

#7[1] [thought avoiding hypostatization]

I am open to anything. I would open another division, move to another city, I like the idea of virtual offices. To beat a recession, we start virtual offices. We have our people based and trained in our X Office, to work markets on [other] areas of the country, some of the markets that are hot. So that, when recession does hit here, we already have a presence in those places, but low overhead, via the internet. You really don't need to be physically located [in a certain area.] You could always fly out once a month to visit clients if you chose to do that. If you get enough presence in an area, you may then decide to have a physical office [there].

S4 here expresses 'a kind of internal wariness about how one regards ... what may appear to be stable, selb-subsistent things' (Basseches, 1984, p. 98). The idea of virtual offices introduces motion back into what is conventionally seeen a once-and-for-all decision (fixed physical offices).

Form
n.a.

Relationship

#13[1] [critique of a perspective based on separateness, e.g., subjectivism, pluralism]
Before the coaching began, I was ready to leave. I hated my job. I did not get along with the president. He wanted to keep me, but he was also very frustrated with me. Because I acted out, sometimes not totally inappropriately, but I was acting out in a way a managing partner shouldn't. I became territorial about things that were not important. I was not looking at the big picture, the corporate picture. I was looking at things from my perspective, as to what is good for me, for my team, as opposed to what's good for the organization. And once I understood that, I became much more effective.

S4 criticizes herself for holding a perspective of separateness, drawing attention to the need for intersubjective agreement. The idea that an individual person could be considered as the ultimate source of evaluation is exposed as deficient. Such saparateness let's one lose the big picture.

Metaformal

16[1] [process of embracing contradictions as a positive element of synthesis]
I am much more able to step outside of myself, and look in the mirror, and say, 'o.k., you really screwed up on this, how can you fix it?' I am learning, before I have to fix [a mistake], to step aside, [saying:] 'what would my opposite side do in my situation? I am developing my shadow side in midlife, which is still a little unsteady. So often my reactions in

that shadow side mode are not always my best shot. So, learning to trust my intuition as to when I need to not respond to someone when I am angry or upset I am much more reflective, introspective.

S4 here endorses the development of negativity ('shadow') within herself as a way of achieving a higher developmental level. She has a heightened awareness of sources of disequlibrium in herself stemming from is antithetical to her typical way of functioning.

#17[2] [resolution of disequilibrium]
I was coming up with all these ideas. No one would listen, and someone else would say my idea, and the president would say 'that's a great idea.' And I said: 'I just said that.' It was the way I was presenting it. I was presenting it as an intuitive feeler, here all the great things we can do, as opposed to sequentially, let's pick one that has a priority. Go for that one, then the next one. Once I started doing that, I became much more part of the team, and monumental changes started to occur. I got to start the new division I had wanted to do. [My boss] started to say 'yes' more often, because I learned to communicate with him in a way he could understand.

I have a workaholic personality. I love what I do. It's not a job for me, it's fun. I would work 7 days a week. But I also stopped working out. There are a lot of other personal issues that surface as a result of my concentrating just on work. Now I exercise 6 times per week, I eat very, very healthy, I lost 20-30 pounds so far, I ran in a road race I have a much better balance, am very involved with a local church now, so for me it's the unity [of physical and spiritual]. I feel like I am in balance, whereas [before] I was off kelter. And that's I think because I had trouble communicating, because I was burnt out.

S4 describes a developmental transformation of herself to higher complexity which resolves a prior disequilibrium, both of herself and her relationship to the environment. The resolution of the disequilibrium is understood' in terms of a notion of transformation in the developmental direction' (Basseches, 1984, p. 126). In the first statement, the disequilibrium is that with her environment whose functioning she does not understand; in the second statement, the disequilibrium is one among parts of herself that made her feel "burnt out."

#20[1] [coordinating forms]
Unofficially, I coach a lot of people around me. People who come in early and we'll talk about issues they are having. I really like watch people grow. I am a really successful recruiter, and I know I can do it. And at this point in my life, I want to help other people do it. I tell everybody on my team 'I want everyone be more successful than I am.' That's fun for me. And coaching them so they understand that nobody can make them successful except them. That they have to choose to be successful. And that means to have balance in their life, it's not being here 24 hours a day, it's a balance between work and outside life.

S4 speaks to the coordination of work and outside life as the root of balance that

leads to success, which is one of the tenets of her coaching.

#24[3] [multiple perspectives]
I don't think that it's necessarily paramount that the coach have a similar personality type to the person [coached], but [rather] that the coach can step outside of whatever their personality is, and play the role of the person the subject [executive] is having an issue with, or be able to get the person they are working with to see matters from another than their own personality type or their own perspective.

One of the best role plays that we [my coach and I] did was like this. We had an awards ceremony. The president overlooked me. I wasn't called up for the award I had won. And I was absolutely devastated. My initial reaction was hurt, anger, it was 'I am out of here.' So, we role-played what I was going to say to him, and I became aware of my own thinking. So I realized [that] I could communicate my feelings to him without getting angry, or defensive, once I was able to take a perspective on myself. We just communicated as adults.

I used to get very defensive, saying 'get off my territory,' very confrontational when somebody micro-managed me. Through coaching, one of the behaviors I changed was to step back and not react immediately but to go back and put together something: 'here are the reasons why I would like to hire another person at this juncture.' That is one major change, to try to put myself in his shoes. If I were him, what questions would I be asking? .And [through the coaching] this is be coming easier for me.

My coach has a preference for ENFP (MBTI type), so she too thought in concepts [like myself]. So we could relate at the same level, because that's how I think. But what helped me tremendously, and one way in which I have really changed my behavior, is the president of the company and all of the other managers on my team have a preference for introversion, [they are ISTJ personalities. And at meetings they would not listen to me, partly because I did not know how to play the men's game, that you have to get in there and speak up and not let somebody talk over you. So, I've learned to see things their way, and that has made all the difference for me personally.

In all of these statements, S4 emphasizes multiple perspectives as a way of "taking a large problem as a whole and viewing the whole from several perspectives" (Basseches, 1984, p. 147, Basseches' emphasis). She stresses the effect the taking of multiple perspectives has had on her own functioning.

***

Subject/Object Profile, S4

In harmony with her relational style, S4 begins the interview by commenting on the 'sad' card, referring to the death of a former candidate with whom she has worked over many years. She then proceeds to the 'moved/touched' card, reflecting on the risks of emotional involvement. This is followed by reference to 'success/

accomplishment,' and 'important to me which give her an opportunity to articulate her values. Next is 'taking a strong stand,' a card she interprets as referring to the ability of confronting clients. The interview closes with the 'control' stimulus.

BIT 1 = 4

A colleague showed me a press release saying that my candidate had been killed in a diving accident. He was 30 years old, and I hat known him since he finished college, now placing him for the third time. I was in shock. I had this overwhelming sense of sadness and grief. He wasn't just a sale, a way for me to make money. I loved this person as a human being, the way I love my candidates and my clients. I've really been a coach to him, and a friend. A very mellow, very gentle spirit. And I got home and I cried all night, at the loss of, the overwhelming sense of sadness. My clients don't always see [how much I care about them]. You have to keep that professional distance. And I come in and work on the weekend if someone is out of work, and they need extra help in preparing, and I bring them in and teach them how to interview--things that are not really "part of my job." It really hurts me very deeply that something has happened to someone I have developed a relationship with here in my professional life. I identify with clients. They are not just clients, but people I care about. And if you lose someone that you care about it hurts you personally. [There is] a sense of loss. I grieved as much for the client [I mentioned] as I did when my father died. I am a Christian, so I have God with me, I am never alone.

S4 signs in by articulating her ontic-developmental position in terms of a relational style. She refers to internalized images of others (e.g., her father, God) as guides. S4 is aware of the risk for her to show openly how much she cares about her clients. This makes her redouble her effort, to keep professional distance. In this way,

she transcends regressive tendencies of the self and their relational manifestation.

BIT 2 = 4

I do have very good boundaries. I don't meet candidates for dinner, off site. It's work that is bonding, just as coaching is. I think I am effective as a recruiter because most of my candidates bond with me and trust me, so when I give them ideas or feedback they listen. Early in my career, I think I tried to place a friend. And it just didn't work. I was not objective. It was like counseling a family member, you are too close to it. My job is not to judge, but listen, and find out what they [clients] really want, not what they say they want initially. And if it [what they are looking for, O.L.] is out there, [then] help connect them.

Although the first statement reminds us of the effort it takes to assume a self-authoring position (her struggle to keep good boundaries; 4(3)), on the whole this passage demonstrates a higher developmental position. In order look out for "not what clients say, but what they really want," S4 has to follow her own standards, and also assume a client's perspective. S4 is concerned about clients' "true" wants which they

may not be aware of, and these wants are not visible to S4 unless she can transcend her own self system, and assume a perspective on the client's true potential. This way, she is interacting with a second self system on its own terms, beging secure in her own.

BIT 3 = 4

[Interviewer asks: how does this professional self you describe relate to your own private self?] It run's parallel. There is some overlap. If I had to draw a picture, there would be two circles intersecting, with a shared area in the middle. [Is it in that shared area that you work?]. Yes, most of the time. [Are you better at working in this intersection than 5 years ago?]. Yes. [She gives an example of 10 years ago]. At that time, I got really sucked into emotionalism, e.g., when clients would lose their home. So now I know what it means emotionally not to cross that line. It's like being attracted to someone, but you can choose not to act on it. So you say to yourself: 'Yes, I am having these feelings; this person is very attractive to me. But I am not going to do anything about it; I am not going to act on it.' By now, this has become second nature.

S4 affirms her self-authoring stance. Compared to earlier times, this stance has become second nature, thus immune to 'slipping back' into 4(3) or 4/3 (something she refers to as 'emotionalism'). What it precisely means for her professional and private self to be intersecting is not entirely clear.

BIT 4 = 4

People see me in that role, as counselor. They see me in a position of power, of authority, as the expert. And like in your business [of being a psychologist], you have to be very careful not to abuse that. When people come to me they may be on the verge of a nervous breakdown. There are usually lots of other issues in people's life rather than just their job change. It would be very easy for them to latch [onto me] and say: 'you can save me.' And I recognize that, and take that into account in counseling them.

S4 has a clear sense of boundaries and the distinction between her own and her clients' agenda. As a consequence, she is aware of the impact of her self system on her clients, as well as their vulnerability to wishful thinking, and able to see the embeddedness of career issues in the complexity of individuals lives.

BIT 5 = 4

The three things I wrote down spontaneously [as important to me] are: integrity, honesty, always doing the right thing, both for the candidate who comes to me and for the client. And for me that means, being direct even if that's not what the person wants to hear; being very clear in communicating what I mean. I get right to the point. [gives an example]. I also advise my clients when I think we [my firm] are not the best resource for them. Or else I request that the client come up with at least a year's worth of projects or more that you [i.e. the client, O.L.] have the person [to be hired] work on, other than this first project that you [i.e., the client, O.L.] need[s] done. That's where the integrity and honesty comes in. Could I place the person? Do I have a drawer full of candidates that would be a good fit? Yes. But is that the right thing to do? No. Not for the candidate who could potentially be out of work in 2-6 months; and not for the client who really needs to think about where they want to go. I want to do the best for both of them [i.e., both parties, O.L.].

S4 has her own professional standards for how to coordinate the two systems, of candidate and client. She makes her own demands on them, thus exerting her authority, without being swayed by either expectations. S4 is able to make subtle distinctions between different kinds of priorities and needs of her candidates and clients.

BIT 6 = 4(5)

[My job involves] a three-way partnership: my company, the client, and the candidate. Realistically, our allegiance should be totally to the client. But that's not the way the [company] culture works. We are not 'head hunters,' we are consultants [to both parties]-- a big difference. I am interested when I meet with a candidate, not just where they want to be now, but where do they see themselves 3 to 5 years from now. I do a career audit with them [regarding these questions], asking is this job going to get you where you want to be, or should you rather stay in your company? [She gives an example where she tells the candidate]: 'even though its painful, even though you get into fights with your boss at this point in the project, you might consider 'sticking it out' for another year or two, just as a growing, learning experience.' So, I am not afraid of confrontation at all, but it's how you do it. And there are certain people where I don't do that because I don't perceive that they are emotionally stable [enough] to handle it (i.e., the confrontation).

To work with clients, S4 needs to assess their cognitive-emotional stability, to know the extent to which she can confront them. Not only must she be aware of her own impact on them, she must be able to take their perspective and stand 'in their shoes.' To be able to do so, she has to transcend her own self system, and envision changes the client or candidate is not aware of. In short, she conceptualizes motion to a different state and takes into account developmental movement. This, in turn, has a positive effect on her self-perception, helping her to take her own self as object.

BIT 7 = 4(5)

I like autonomy, control. I like to hire whom I want to hire, advertise when I want to advertise, pretty much do my own thing. The person I work with is a micro-manager. He looks into detail he doesn't need to [know]. That just bugs me. I used to get very defensive, saying 'get off my territory.' very confrontational. That is one major change, to try to put myself in his shoes. If I were him, what questions would I be asking? And [through the coaching] this is becoming easier for me. I tend to go from A to Z, and people are still up here at B. So I need to zip back, and find a way to bring people with me. And this has gotten much better, not only with the president, but also with my peers.

Through coaching, S4 has improved her ability to take others' perspective and 'bring them with her.' She is longer embedded in her own self system acting confrontationally. She acknowledges her own style, recognizing the need to change, and challenging herself to change.

BIT 8 = 4(5)

[To get something, she negotiates with peers, rather than just demanding it. She might say:]. 'I need your help. I really want to expand my group. I want one my of people to start mentoring someone. What are your thoughts on how we can use the available [office] space?' It takes longer. But everybody feels they won. That's a dramatic difference from the way I would [previously] have handled it: wanting to have control immediately, and not realizing how my approach was kind of offputting.

S4 realizes that she needs others to get her own objectives accomplished. Given

her ability to see the limitations of carrying on in a self-determined way, she is able to ask for help. Not only is she not holding others responsible for her feelings and experiences; she is beginning to look at herself from another self-system's point of view, thereby transcending her own.

End of Interview S4

Appendix C5

Interview Materials, S5

Dialectical-Schemata Profile, S5

As demonstrated in terms of content in chapter III, S5 has a good grasp of metaformal thinking, in the sense that (Basseches, 1984, p. 151) he is at ease when describing particular phenomena in the context of larger organizing forms (such as his own present professional position in the larger context of his personal development), and equally can relate forms to each other (such as when he describes how his former self has held itself through in the changes that have occured and hos it is linked to his present functioning). This ability can equally be traced by structural analysis, as shown below.
(Note: quotations from Basseches' 1984 appear in <'...'>, while quotes from the professional-agenda interview text of subjects appear in <"...">). Schematically salient bits appear in italics.

Motion
n.a.

Form
n.a.

Relationship

#12[3] [assertion of the limits of separation, and the value of relatedness].
[S5 tells a story about a death in the firm that was soon forgotten] On Monday, it was a tragedy. But by Wednesday, his entire account base had been reassigned, and the company went forward. So, any illusion we have that work should be the most important part of our life I have never believed in. I believe that work has to be integrated into the rest of your life. It's not something by itself.

S5 emphasizes the interpenetration of work and life which not to see creates the "illusion" that work is the most important part of life.

#15[3] [assertion of internal relationships or relationships as constitutive]
The stuff that has been covered in coaching has reminded me of the fact that work and life have to be integrated -- there is more to life than work. Increasingly through this [coaching] experience, I have been reminded that the two [life and work, O.L.] have always
been related for me. It has always been important to me that the rest of my life was balanced with work, and that the skills, that things you learn in one are part of the other, carry over into the other.

More specifically, S5 sees life and work as constitutive of each other, and thus as intrinsically related. This means that their relationships logically precedes either, and that they are what they are only in their interpenetration.

Metaformal

#16[3] [contradiction & negativity as a positive element of transformation]
I felt I had been demoted, which literally I was, and deprived of some opportunities to have a voice that I had had. So, now, you go away and deal with some of these issues from a distance. The European experience didn't always feel [like a promotion], day to day. But if you can step back from your day to day life, and deal a little more objectively with things (that's the kind of objectivity I lost for some time), then you see the developmental line. Due to the coaching, I am not [obsessed about this demotion as I used to be]. There were aspects of this that really gnawed away at me, and they don't do that any

more. I am much more open to 'what's going to happen is going to happen.' I either clearly demonstrate what I am capable of doing, and be able to put that to use here, or I'll do something else.

In the coaching process, we did three layers of 360 feedback [with seniors, peers, and subordinates, O.L.] It's all about choices again. You can choose to adapt [or not]. People have impressions, and you can influence those impressions, in a variety of ways. You can convey a different persona, if you so choose. And if there is feedback in there that you fundamentally don't agree with [because you believe it's contrary to what you want to be yourself], you also can choose to ignore it. If we did this [feedback process] today, I would be less defensive. What I have described to you all has to do with becoming less defensive, [becoming] more comfortable with being myself even where there is some critical feedback.

[How this unit is viewed outside of itself, in the larger company] has been an issue for a long time. That's one of the reasons I wanted to take this job. The unit was not viewed as very successful, as a place where people were anxious and come and work here. It lacked energy, was almost behind the times in terms of where the company is trying to go. And I was interested in that for one, it presented much more upsides trying to change those [views], and two, I thought I could do some good.

In all of these statements, S5 demonstrates his acceptance of negativity as an element of growth. Whether the negativity manifests in the form of a demotion or 360 degree feedback does not matter. This dialectical stance also makes him accept the task of leading a unit which is not viewed entirely favorably, since "it presented much more upsides trying to change those [negative] views" than directing a unit in good standing. Contradictions are viewed in the larger context of "turning them around," i.e., using them to arrive at a more equilibrated outcome.

#18[3] [valuation of movement in a developmental direction]

One of the many things I learned, not just from coaching, but from reflections and discussions with my spouse and others, is [that] I couldn't have replicated the experience I had over there [in Europe] through anything staying here. If you believe in continuous learning as being one of the key objectives, and if you believe that change is usually good, not bad, it was an incomparable experience.

S5 here endorses movement in a developmental direction as having special value, thereby relating form and motion (which he does not endorse explicitly) to value. Change is seen as usually good, in that it necessitates continuous learning.

#19[1] [evaluative comparison of systems]

Producing the numbers [i.e., results], that is a given. That is not enough. It's too one-dimensional. How do you get to producing the numbers? There a different ways to do that. And you can be dictatorial and just assume, again, you can produce mercenaries to produce results, but there is nothing else in that equation. You need a group of people who can go before a group and actually get them to want to follow you, want to be with you .in your pursuit of trying to reach certain objectives. And when times get tough, on the margin, that will mean something to people, I believe. So, the numbers are the lesser part of the equation.

S5 evaluates a "one-dimensional" way of producing results to an "inspirational" approach, where results follow from engagement with the vision of a leader. Two approoaches are put side by side and evaluated. The greater value is seen in a more inclusive approach to producing results, which is multi-dimensional.

#20[1] [importance of coordinating related systems]

Based on 150 companies and relationships we are responsible for, we have profit & loss & earnings targets we are supposed to make, based on those relationships. How much revenues from those companies do we intend to generate every year? It could come from selling them loans, managing their foreign exchange, selling them investment banking products, all sorts of different things. How do we harness the talents of this group against a specific set of customers, to generate revenues for the company? My task is to try to make the mission of this unit [of multinational banking] consistent with with mission of the overall corporate bank first of all, and secondly with the overall company, and to get the unit into a position where it earns adequate returns.

S5 is here concerned with coordinating different systems, viz., first, his unit with the "overall corporate bank," and second, "with the overall company." The way the coordination is achieved regards how talent in his group is harnessed in relation to a specific group of customers, which poses another coordination task. Although S5 does not specify how the systems are coordinated, he strongly endorses the need for coordination.

#21[3] [description of open, self-transforming system; constancy of form through developmental change]

In coming back [from Europe], I was more uncertain about being able to separate my view of my capabilities from others' [view]. And so, there is a degree of self-confidence

involved in that. If you believe in yourself without being arrogant or cocky about it, you are, I believe, open to lots more possibilities than if you try to gauge your own value based on everybody's feedback. Because the feedback could be right or wrong. So in your core, you have to believe in yourself. And I, again, that has been true for me for the 30 years I have been working, since college. And for a couple of years, I lost that. And in coming back, I was dealing with some of those [feelings]. 4 or 5 months later, after taking them on, I feel better about it. And I will say as well that the last 6 to 8 months of my European experience helped as well. Whether anybody else recognizes that or not, we did it, and if I could do it there [in Europe], I can probably do it somewhere else.

[The coach and the coaching process] have really helped me to get some of those issues sorted back out. Only lately am I beginning, in part because of the coaching, in part because of circumstances, to get my old self back.. Coaching has been catalytic on a couple of other fronts. It has gotten me to become re-interested [in leadership issues].. When you then feel like nobody really cares about that, and in fact you feel beaten up yourself, and the personality of the company over the last few years has drifted, in a way that is somewhat counter to these values, -- far more task-oriented, less balanced--where performance becomes almost a mercenary kind of thing, I have believed in [those leadership capabilities] for a long time, but for a couple of years, that position wasn't getting you anywhere, and you almost give up. One of the things that I have done in the coaching experience, I have done more reading, not just of (these) books, to rethink and relearn some different aspects of what leadership means to me anyway, and then try to re-implement them.

In these statements, S5 traces a long-term developmental process marked by stability through change. He is describing himself as an "open, self-transforming system which assimilates new elements from the outside and changes its form in accomodating them" (Basseches, 1984, p. 138). S5 sees the transformations as "getting his old self back," thus emphasizing the stability of his self system through change (which otherwise is not explicitly endorsed). He also stresses perseverance, his not giving up on leadership values dear to him but irrelevant to others, thereby introducing a valuational dimension (schema #18). Overall, S5 "emphasizes the constancy of some formal aspect(s) of a system through any single transformation of other aspects" (Basseches, 1984, p. 140).

#24[1] [multiperspectival thinking]

What I have learned from [the coaching] is that you can in fact portray different aspects of your personality at different times to different audiences, by choice. I can't fundamentally change who I am, and I don't want to, but you can pick your spots. And I am trying to do that more regulary, taking different perspectives.

S5 can take multiple perspectives on himself as a system, and can emphasizd one over the other at will, depending on his audience or jury. That he cannot change himself taken as a holistic entity is due to fact that his self system comes into being again and again only through the change process that it is engaged in, and does not exist independent of it.

Subject/Object Profile, S5

S5 starts with the 'success' stimulus, "because it is most fresh," referring to a recent retreat of leaders of his unit during which the values he would like to see endorsed were largely accepted. He proceeds to 'moved/touched,' speaking of a colleague, and returns to 'success,' which, for him, is not merely technical, but value-related. Next is 'strong stand,' which gives him the opportunity of speaking about the reemergence of his former self-assured self. From there, he proceeds to control, both self-control and control over what happens organizationally. S5 ends with the 'important to me' card, reasserting his values.

BIT 1 = 4(5)

My entire focus, or virtually entire focus, for the last 90 days has had to do with change, both for this unit, and for me. And to some extent, [the card entitled] success and accomplishment is what I choose first because it's most fresh. The two-day session that we had [recently], the feedback I've gotten from both my own colleagues and from others who participated, or only heard about it, has been remarkably positive. Since a lot of the effort I have been expending since the Spring was pointed to conveying what we have put together in a way that people could embrace. Now I have come through [with my message, O.L.], and they seem to have embraced it pretty well. My boss [too] has alluded to what she perceived to be the great success of what the unit has done, as well as citing some things, saying I couldn't envision anyone who could have more of an impact than you. For me, that points to the fact that some of the things I have tried to do are showing through.

S5 signs in by expressing a 5-ish interest in having things change and develop, not only for himself, but for his unit. Achievement is not taken by him as a credit to his own greatness, but as a sign that he on the right track in trying to transform others. Two structures (4 & 5) are active, but they are not competing. The implicit tendency is to take credit for changing others, for the benefit of his own self system.

BIT 2 = 4

This success doesn't, for me, only have to do with the technical aspects [of my performance], but the tools I have been able to use, both to convey things differently [i.e., analytically rather than expressively], and also to balance the other parts of my value system. Whether or not I achieve what hierarchical level [viz., a higher level of managerial responsibility, O.L.], what's more important to me is that through a couple of rounds of adversity I have demonstrated that I could have an impact . That's being recognized. But what's even more important to myself is that I have proven to myself that I can do this. So I don't care quite as much about things that were bothering me, driving me, before.

For S5, success is a developmental indicator. What matters to him is that he has shown to himself that he can have an impact on others, and that the tools he has utilized (including the process), have been effective. In addition, he has restored balance to his value system in which (see below) leadership values have always figured prominently. Self confirmation is more important to him than external recognition.

BIT 3 = 4(5)

[In response to the reaction of a colleague to the changes taking place in the organizational environment, O.L.] But on a day to day basis, as part of a relatively contained environment, where we all impact one other, do you focus on the aspects of the larger issues that are frustrating to you, or do you subordinate those in the interest of the more positive parts [of company functioning, O.L., and having a positive impact on the group around you. Well, that little speech was probably more related to me than her. So we all have a choice to make along those lines every day.

S5 has an alternative of either going after frustrating global organizational issues (as a critic of the company), or having a positive impact on his immediate work environment. He has opted for the latter, subordinating frustrating issues "in the interest of the more positive parts" [of company functioning, O.L.] More than in a critical stance, he is interested in bringing about change in his own unit, that is, in acting to bring about the transformation of others. This goal presupposes more than the 4-ish ability to recognize and make priorities of competing perceptions of organizational experience. It requires choosing a constructive, developmentally oriented strategy over a purely critical one.

BIT 4 = 4(5)

There are two levels in this [success]. I am happy about the external recognition, and happy about the way I feel inside. Being able to design or help design, not only a strategy, but a process for communicating the strategy, and creating an environment where we can discuss it and get people to internalize it, has a lot to do with the kind of behaviors that have <u>always</u> been important to me in leading a team. Because of some inner frustrations, for some time I wasn't performing that role particularly well. [But the coaching has confirmed many of my self evaluations, and so I am actually feeling more energized and effective in doing what I always liked to do.

S5 expresses a 5-ish interest in changing things by devising a "process for communicating the (new) strategy," and getting it discussed and internalized by his co-workers. Transformative behaviors are essential to him as a leader, and this not narrowly for benefitting his own self system (4), but in order to put in place a more

advanced transformative process within his unit, as well as himself. Although there is an indication that his resolve to transform is in part due to the coaching (and thus potentially a 3-ish influence on him), this indication has to be seen in balance with his own statement of what has ALWAYS been important to him as a leader.

BIT 5 = 5/4

[Interviewer commenting that his new self is his old self re-emerging]. I think I have been able to demonstrate to people that I can produce results. But as well, I can do so in a way that enables me to embed some of the values I feel strongly about into that process. Which in turn, lastly, validates another belief I have, that we don't have to all focus purely on tasks to the exclusion of other aspects of life. That, in fact, diversity in that sense is a very good thing. ... And other people seem to see that, even those that come from a different side of the platform than I. And we seem to balance each other, which is great.

S5 is clearly in charge of his own process and choices. He is interested in realizing in his unit values that he feels strongly about, and refuses to compartmentalize work and life. Therefore, he sees diversity as a good thing, regardless of whether it ultimately benefits him or not. In short, he is secure enough in himself to take the risk of making his values public. He is not worried about how to safeguard his own integrity in the process (4/5). He even indicates being aware of the limits of his own value system, giving dissenting voices their due.

BIT 6 = 4

[Interviewer asks about the relationship of internal to external affirmation]. It is a blend. But in the end, if you don't feel it internally, I don't think it matters much on the outside. In fact, in my view, you can permit the opinion of others to change your opinion [of yourself] much more easily in the negative than the positive. In the end, I don't think you can succeed if you don't feel good inside. And you can fool people to feel good about you for some period of time. I don't how how I would weigh it, 70/30, but it's far more important to me how I feel inside. I guess that's my answer.

External affirmation is nothing without internal affirmation. There is no way to succeed by acclamation only. You have to believe in your own strengths. While you can be influenced by people's critique of you in a 3-ish way, regressing from your own self-authoring stance, where it is a matter of setting your own standards, nobody else but you can assist you.

BIT 7 = 4(5)

During the last years, I wasn't willing to take a strong stand on much. [But this has changed.] As in most businesses, as collaborative as we try to be, there are also competing

[interests]. If it's a finite set of resources, some group may think they should get more. And there were at least 2-3 occasions over the last couple of months where some of my peers, or even superiors would say, in a public form, "we shouldn't support what [S5] is trying to do, those resources could be used much more effectively some place else. And that might be a valid point of view. You have a choice then, either to say 'I don't care,' and at some level, in fact, you have to be that detached, but if you really believe that in fact for the company, not just yourself, [that] it is the right thing to pursue a given stand, then you should stand up for it. I tried to do [that] in a way that was different. In these cases where I took a stand, I would first use analytical reasoning, as opposed to emotional reaction, to support my position, which is something I might not have done that way before. Which in fact may have enabled me, in fact, to win the argument in the end. [And a lot of that has come from the coaching work I have done.]What I have learned from [the coaching] is that you can in fact portray different aspects of your personality at different times to different audiences, by choice. I can't fundamentally change who I am, and I don't want to, but I can pick my spots. And I am trying to do that more regulary.

One can endorse company goals from a 3-ish as well as 5-ish position (not to speak of stage 4). In the first case one endorses them because others believe in them, thus following external standards; in

the second , on endorses them because one's perception of company needs is rooted in one's own self-authoring stance. While in earlier times, S5's ability to take a strong stand regarding company goals has been of the first kind, through the influence of coaching, he has become able to take a strong stand on the basis of his own self-authoring. In this, he has been helped by learning how to present himself in the context of different audiences and their expectations. Thereby, he has gained more insight into the limitations of his own style, as well as his self system. He is now trying to make stylistic choices regarding self-presentation more consistently.

BIT 8 = 5/4

The aspects of your personality that you convey and how those are interpreted, can be valued differently in different organizations at different times. And along the lines of leadership and strength etc., it has not been advantageous in this company to be perceived as expressive, or being able to relate too easily to your own employees, because then you are not detached enough. It's about factual analysis and [i.e., vs.] feelings, and where those two, the subjective and the objective [,intersect, O.L.]. How do you inspire people? I don't think you can inspire and motivate people just based on facts. I think we've lost the balance.

S5 here expresses a kind of contextual relativism: aspects of personality are valued differently in different venues at different times. This inspires in him a critique of his present organizational environment, based on his own self-authoring stance. A balanced environment is one that can inspire and motivate people, rather than

one being strictly based on task structure and outcome. It is important for him as a leader to model that perspective for the unit without fretting about how to safeguard his own integrity. (In a 4/5 position, this would have been too risky a thing to pursue.) The emphasis is not on him, but on how to inspire and transform others.

BIT 9 = 4(3)

There are still incidences where some people [get] promoted to very senior title, and every single one of these people, except for two who are new to the company, were either former peers or subordinates. I didn't enjoy that. But, as much as I didn't enjoy it, it didn't undermine any of the things we have talked about. I can't control it. It is what it is. The rest will play out or it won't. And six months ago, I would have been much angrier. I am not nearly as angry, and I think it's because I undertand things better about myself, and what I am really trying to focus on. This doesn't mean [that] I don't harbor resentments, I do have some. It's about putting work into perspective. Work is so much of our identity. But at the core, it isn't. It's only a piece of life.

S5 here expresses a perspective on work in general, as being only one of the pieces of human life. Although he is still hurt by promotions excluding him, his foremost interest lies in understanding "what I am really trying to focus on." While S5 is here trying to maintain the high ground of the previous statement, there is a regression to the point of protecting the self system by way of anger over outcomes caused by others, even though a perspective transcending such a regression is articulated

at the same time. There is thus a discrepancy between his confidence in his own v alues and his anger at others' promotion in his stead.

BIT 10 = 5/4

I chose some articles that have to do with paradox, and change, and ... the unpredictability of life, and what you do when you are confronted with paradox and change. These articles are relevant to what I have been dealing with in the last years, and certainly the last couple of months. I have shared them with the entire team, and asked them to read them before we went away for two days. And we integrated some of these themes into the discussion. If I can, in that general way, [convey] some of the lessons I have learned, and experiences I have had to people I can most directly influence, and maybe eventually again to some larger audiences, --great! That's what I am thinking about now. In the best of times, I think any manager, any leader is partially a teacher.

As a leader who is also a teacher, it is important to S5 to integrate his values and experiences into the processes shaping his business unit, especially since his co-workers are the people he can most directly influence. Since his own life experience has taught him about paradox and change, values deriving from that experience are the most important in what he wants to convey to others. He is thus actively engaged in

transforming others and in being himself transformed by that action in the process. Although one might object that there is no evidence that he can take a perspective on the limitations of his own valuations, in the developmental context of the interview as a whole it is safe to assume that S5 is aware of those limitations.

End of Interview S5

Appendix C6

Interview Materials, S6

Dialectical-Schemata Profile, S6

To judge from the content of his PPPF and CS, S6 is highly aware of negativity and disequilibrium in himself and between himself and his environment. More than other interviewees, with the exception of S1, he is also sensitive to the relative position of an element within a form or system (e.g., his own position in the organization), and able to describe systems in equilibrational and functional terms. In short, he is adept at conceptualizing form. In harmony with his sensitivity for adversity and negativity, it is easy for him to locate contradictions as sources of disequilibrium within a form or system, and to undertand the resolution of disequilibrium as a transformation in the developmental direction (Basseches, 1984, p. 122). Evaluative comparisons come easy to him, and he pays much attention to how to coordinate different world views, systems, and expectations. This is fully born out by a structural analysis of his professional-agenda interview.

(Note: quotations from Basseches' 1984 appear in <'...'>, while quotes from the professional-agenda interview text of subjects appear in <"...">). Schematically salient bits appear in italics.

Motion

#2[3] [primacy of motion]
[Quoting R. Kennedy, "there are people who look at things as they are and ask why?, there are other people who look at how things ought to be, and ask why not?"] I am very much a why-not kind of person. To the degree that I enjoy change, that I am not comfortable or satisfied with the status quo, I am not a maintenance oriented person. I am somewhat creative, certainly impatient, and love the variety of my day, and that's what makes me tick.

S6 here endorses the primacy of motion, more precisely the primary value of motion which ensues from a hypothetical "why-not?" attitude toward human affairs.

#7[1] [injecting motion when denied or lacking]
The smaller group had become comfortable in not only the status quo and their own autonomy, but also in thinking that I was the source of the problem. So now we are bringing motion into the group, and spreading the ... solution, bringing in [more people], cross-functional teams, and a little sense of accountability, [and] so there is slightly less convenient an excuse that I am the reason that we are not functioning as well as we should. [While this has made the job safer] there are other risks inherent in this change, as there are in any change. [Because] now everybody knows everything.

S6 has reorganized his department in order to avoid the ossification of existing structure, and to bring motion back into the process of its functioning. This move has resulted in putting in place cross-functional teams, and in extending accountability. While it has removed himself as the main target of internal criticism, it has also created new risks, as holds true for every change.

Form

#11[3] [contextual relativism]
I am entrusted with confidence to exercise judgment about where we should and shouldn't play a role, what role that should be, what risks are prudent to take, where we should take a stand--there is great

deal of judgment and subtlety involved in that delegation. And that authority is very ..., it's not an unambiguous delegation of that authority, it's conditional, situational authority. Unlike somebody who might run a business and is governed by a bottom line, there are many other stakeholders and points of accountability in the world that I dwell in. It [the authority, O.L.] is highly dependent upon trust, confidence, and it's a job that you earn every day; it's a tricky place to be. I usually ask for forgiveness rather than permission.

S6's sees his authority as conditional and dependent upon the situation because of which it is bestowed on him. Therefore, he conceives of his authority in the larger context of what is presently happening in the organization, and the relevance of that situation in the larger organizational context. Ideas and values he is putting into practice are therefore relative to the context that gives rise to the temporary authority he wields.

Relationship
n. a.

Metaformal

#16[3] [disequilibrium as a positive element; limits of structural stability, or necessity of contradiction]

[disequilibrium between himself and the company]
I was roundly criticized both by my boss and some of the colleagues (anonymously obviouslyby them) for certain behaviors that they and he found unacceptable. So I had to change. And I did not have to have a coach. But I was reaching out, because I needed to change, and I wanted to change, and I wanted help in change. [These were behaviors such as] impatience, a less than predictable management style, and a not very uniform sense of collegiality among my peers. There is a good deal of dissonance around my presence which is exacerbated by my visibility. There are very legitimate observations about things that need to change if I am going to be effective in this organization.

[disequilibrium of his self vs. his unit, and self & output of his activity]
People have a extremely high regard for the output of my job. That may be too sweeping. But my boss, most of my subordinates, and many of my peers would say: the [firm] enjoys a very favorable public image, and [S6] does a very nice job of representing the company on the outside. That he keeps us out of a lot of trouble, that his people are extremely highly motivated, and that he's a great value-adder to the equation. And it's hard sometimes to dissociate me from my portfolio and the people that work for me, and I would say that on balance people say: 'We do a great job.' People are less pleased with how I do that job, and how I relate to them.

[disequilibrium between him and those judging him]
And the reason I clarify this and try to speak to it at greater length is it's not that people question WHAT I have done, but they do question WHY I do it. So, that's a little bit in between interpersonal and substance [subject matter], because it injects an element of trust or suspicion. ... A lot of what I do, no one can figure out how I do it, and they don't have parallel paths, they don't have parallel experiences, they don't have parallel aspirations, so, it's a bit mysterious, and some people trivialize it and say: 'any idiot can do that.' Others think I'm Houdini, but many people wonder why {I do what I do, O.L.], what makes me tick: am I loyal, am I personally ambitious? That is, .they try to figure me out, and some with a degree of bias or antipathy, which I may have contributed to.

[disequilibrium of internal and external functioning]
Let's characterize it as 'internal management.' An impatient, somewhat creative, gregarious, non-conforming guy is not necessarily going to be very good at internal management, that is not the essence, it's a foundation of the job. The essence, as I view the job, is the other stuff [what I do externally, O.L.] But given that I am evaluated by people who live in this building on this floor every day, even when they are prepared to acknowledge that the stuff on the outside is good for the company, they see me on the inside, and that's where they want improvement. So I have to live with this discrepancy.

[disequilibrium throughout his personal realm]
A guy like me has nowhere to go in this company. The question is whether I stay, whether I survive. I can't become President of the company. They are not going to hire me for anything else. Part of the dilemma is: can I stay, am I bored, can we [i.e., the coach and I] find this equilibrium between the internal, the external, my own personal developmental needs, my midlife crisis, whatever is going on in my life? And my situation is a little more complicated than the next guys, in part because improving this performance does not necessarily lead to a promotion. I have nowhere to go except [to change] and feel better, more solid, about myself.

The above statements are dealing with dissonance and discrepancy that S6's organizational functioning is characterized by. The first statement deals with the dissonance that his presence in the organization provokes, while the second and third statements point up the divergence between what he achieves and how his personality is seen by others. The fourth statement deals with the discrepancy of his internal and external functioning in the organization, while the fifth describe disequilibrium as affecting all realms of his functioing. All of the statements describe the existence, or process of emergence, of sources of disequilibrium that prevails either between him

and the organization, or within himself. They point to limits of stability that he keenly aware of. In short, negativity is embraced by S6 as an inevitable ingredient of his situation.

#17[2] [resolution of disequilibrium; link between contradiction/ negativity (pain) and transformation]
I have undertaken for the first time a very structured and disciplined business planning cycle, asked for help from a professional consultant, to help structure two off-site meetings, first I reconstituted my direct reports-- I used to have a weekly staff meeting [of 5-6 reports] which became too familiar and incestuous and predictable in all the pathological ways, not the best ways of good, predictable management, and I felt that we should flatten the organization, engage more people around the table, and empower more talent to inform our direction. I created a new group, more than twice as large, and people who felt they hadn't a place at the table, so to speak, and weren't decision makers, and encouraged them to be in fact change agent within my department. The offsite meeting culminated in a business plan oriented around 3-4 major quantifiable goals with accountability assigned to one and all. There was a good deal of pain in arriving at this plan.

It was a very unusual move not only for me but virtually all the participants. It was threatening to many. But at the end of the day for all of us, I think, certainly for me, in terms of the clarity of what we are trying to achieve, the discipline with which we arrived at our plan and accountabilities that are built in to its delivery [there was an improvement] We have always had goals and objectives, but never a formal business planning process. And this was as good and as rigorous as you have in a for-profit business. And if you are in a staff function, it's very hard to quantify results. So this was a big, transformative improvement.

There is a whole other category that coaching has effected, because we have been talking about these sorts of issues, not just the behaviors, and modifications, but reconciling these different worlds and expectations [of S6's internal and external functioning, O.L.], and simply the process of being able to engage in that conversation. I don't know that it's a synthesizing mechanism, but it's a very comfortable and honest opportunity to talk about things I can't talk to anybody else about. So, I call the coach my rabbi.

In the two statements above, S6 establishes the connection between negativity (located by schema #16) and transformation which leads to development. First, he has redesigned the report structure to bring in excluded competences and take care of a

disequilibrium among the people reporting to him; second, in talks with the coach, S6 sees an opportunity for coming to an improved undertanding of his situation in a developmental direction.

#18[2] [value of developmental transformation; incorporating valuational terms when describing developmental movement]

I also, as a result of this process of introspection and coaching, feel a much greater equanimity. Previously, there was a part of me that felt as though I was always on thin ice, the change I was creating, the image [of the firm] I was presenting was either a misrepresentation or an exaggeration, or something that if I didn't pull it off could collapse of its own weight. And I am feeling as though I am on a more secure footing, and that who I am

engaged in is somewhat less risky. I feel less that a risk is an out-of-body experience, so to speak, where it's totally grafting on to, or exogenous to, in part because I feel somewhat better grounded. I feel as though some of that trust and confidence has been repaired if I were to make a mistake, for instance, in the past I felt as though I make a mistake I am out of here. Whereas I feel much more confident that what I am doing now is linked and grounded much more than it was in the past, a business activity. So, I could be more effective. So, there is some possibility here, some new value.

Since this larger group is in place, a different perception of me has taken hold, viz. that he [S6] is now focusing in on this, he is not distracted, he is not off to the White House, he is staying with it, he is being responsive, and he is not blowing up, and he is not getting petulant or angry. So there is slightly less convenient an excuse that I am the reason that we are not functioning as well as we should.

Here, S6 relates value to the categories of motion as well as form (i.e., his own self system). He describes his own transformation as being in the developmental direction, not only as seen by himself, but as seen by others (who have less of a reason to find fault with him). Implicitly, he is valueing form with its attendant conflicts as moments toward the development of a more integrated kind of professional functioning.

#19[3] [evaluative comparison of forms; susceptibility to coordination]

I think in the minds of some of the people around that table i.e., the new, enlarged group, O.L.], there is still a divide between what we are talking about and what [S6] does, and how [S6] does what he does. The image I convey for the [firm] externally and the person who I am in doing that externally, I am perfectly comfortable with. The person I am inside and in the process of reshaping, if you will, my image internally I am less comfortable with. I am a natural on the outside, on the inside, I am still not [fully accepted, O.L.}. I get murdered if I spend too much time outside the company, but that's where I am good and have real value for the company. When I come back inside, I destroy my value relatively [speaking], that's depleting, I am not very good at it, and I am not myself. I am working at it Outside, I am working hard, but like the equivalent of a good athlete; it's not self-conscious at all.

These two [aspects of my function, the inside and the outside one] are not totally divorced [from each other]. I am more patient as a person and in my role external to the inside of the company. My job used to be called 'director of external affairs,' so externally, I am more patient, I am less impulsive, I am probably somewhat more conscious of avoiding sarcasm, my effect on others, but less of a dramatic change on the outside than the inside.

S6 here engages in an evaluative comparison between his internal and external functioning in the organization. This involves taking a metaformal perspective, where two forms or systems are put side by side, and related to each other in valuational terms. The basis of the comparison is the susceptibility of the two sides of his functioning to coordination, and the level of equilibrium (inclusiveness) he can achieve.

#20[1] [coordination of systems]

I am an image maker, [the representative of a culture]. But [I am] also attempting to change that culture, and change the perception of that culture. So, it's tricky, very tricky. You are a change agent, and you have an implicit strategy. So you have to be credible externally in conveying that image, but it has to resonate enough internally to have integrity. It's premised on the notion that it [the image] represents an institution that is more of what it aspires to be than what it is. I am at the edge.

S6 here embraces the contradiction of representing a culture that he is simultaneously attempting to change. The supreme task is to coordinate two aspects of the organization, one that pertains to its present, and one that characterizes its future. This task is seen as "tricky," since it includes hitting a moving target.

***

Subject/Object Profile, S6

Looking over the 10 stimuli given him, S6 initially singles out the 'important to me' card, then relegates all others to subordinate standing:

I think I am increasingly focusing on what is important to ME, as opposed to what to others about me, or about my emotions (which quite frequently have been angry, sad, or conflicted, or moved, touched, certainly anxious.

He addresses these motions as "cacophony," something to get away from rather than into. The relevance of the 'important to me' principle is proportional to the extent to which he is reconciled with himself:

So, to the extent that I know what is important to me,I feel successful, more creative, less anxious, less sad, less affected by the pettiness. I come to the situation with a much more pronounced serenity.

After exploring the 'important to me' stimulus, he enters into a discourse about the meaning of the ME in 'important to me':

... the ME is the essential, the essence of who I am and what I aspire to be, and what I want my legacy to feel like, and how I want to spend the rest of my days.

S6 then proceeds to the 'control' stimulus, eventually returning to the issue of the equilibrium of internal and external functioning. In short, his metaformal conception

of things carries over into the subject/object interview, below.

BIT 1=4

This whole process of executive coaching, refining my professional behaviors, examining my professional and personal challenges, coinciding with a very open and honest conversation with my coach about my future, --not really career planning, but should I stay [in the organization]; what else might I think about; coinciding with my turning fifty, a couple of my kids having difficulty, you know, the stuff of life ...

and getting a healthier perspective on a bunch of things has led me, not to a conclusion or any triumphant resolution, but I think I am increasingly focusing on what is important to ME, as opposed to what is important to others about me, or about my emotions (which quite frequently have been angry, or sad, or conflicted, or moved, touched, certainly anxious), I have become during this process much more reconciled and comfortable with ultimately a value proposition that is much more comfortable in this cacophony, in thinking about what is important to ME.

S6 signs in with a clear statement of what he is able to transcend: the cacophony of his own feelings, and what is important about him to others. He is aware of the multiplicity of his personality, parts of which he can take as object. He simultaneously puts in perspective that work is only one aspect of his life, not something his entire existence is premised upon.

BIT 2=4

What is most important to me is my family and those I love, and probably the second most important thing to me is that I feel as though there is some value I am providing or creating in my professional and non-family context. And I even have a little fun, and I enjoy being with people, and in activities where I enjoy myself, where people enjoy me, and not get so riled by things which fall outside that domain, where I might otherwise become sad or

anxious, or any of the other. So, it's not so much that I am just playing to my strength, but I have become much more comfortable with thinking about, and focusing in on, what's important to me. And there is a lot of noise around coaching and performance and evaluation in an institutional setting at a level where I find myself. And a lot of that noise is irrelevant to what's important to me, and some of it is very painful, but it is relevant to me [in my professional standing, O.L.], and I am working on it, but at the end of the day, and I am working hard to achieve at least a threshhold level of of acceptability on those indicators [defined by the environment], but at the end of the day those aren't important to me, except to the degree that I neutralize the extent to which they are negative.

S6 draws a clear boundary between what's important to him and the "noise" around "refining his professional behaviors" through coaching. As far as he is concerned, organizational requirements have well defined limits. They have relevance only by reminnding him to neutralize negative feedback. And given that his work identity is only a piece of his identity as a person, those negative aspects can be seen in

their true relevance. In transcending the cacophony of his feeling, thus taken as object, he can enjoy himself more deeply.

BIT 3=4

So, the ME in this equation of what is important to me as I am trying to reconcile more closely the professional and the personal, and the family. It's curious, in many respects I have been more successful at work than I have been at home, but my home is more important to me. As the kids get older and have developed some pretty significant issues, I feel as though that's at least one fairly profound and very painful manifestation of failure, and it's a lot more important to me than any corrolary success I may have achieved [at work]. And increasingly, I take responsibility for that [failure].

S6 is comparing two partial systems, his professional and his family-focused one. By admitting to failure at home, he is able to put his self system in perspective. The failure of living up to his own

standards propels him to search for a way to reconcile more closely existing divergencies. By taking responsibility for relating both his professional and family selves, he demonstrates a holistic stance. The above is a statement both of his limitations and a search for a closer unity of his partial systems.

BIT 4=4

[This adversity] has given me a better standard as to what is important to me. And the ME is not just sort of the selfish me. No, the ME is the essential, the essence of who I am and what I aspire to be, and what I want my legacy to feel like, and how I want to spend the rest of my days. This is not a huge 'Aha,' where I have been screwing around and focusing on things that weren't important to me at the job before. Stylistically, it has affected how I interact with people, less competitively, less aggressively. I don't let people get to me and get under my skin as easily; I am not hurt as deeply when they try to get under my skin. I am able to park things. But this is a subtle, 51/49 change, or may be 60/40. I know that there are things that happened even this week at work, where I was disappointed, disillusioned, even angry, at certain of my colleagues and subordinates. But I know that what I brought with me and the lingering effect on me was subtly but materially different because of this new focus and appreciation I have of what's important to ME, --as opposed to what's important about what that person did to me, or what I did to them, or how they disappointed me, or how they were disloyal. At the end of that day, I was able to park it, and just sort of say: 'that person is a jerk, or I am disappointed, but I am now going on to something that is more important to me.'

S6 is learning how take and have more control over his own processes and self, as compared to the past. H defines himself in a broad way that transcends "the selfish me." It comprises what he aspires to be, not just what he is temporarily. He can thus make a distinction between what he is now and what he is "essentially," which includes

his potential. He acknowledges that this perspective does not do away with conflict caused by how he may fail regarding others, and how they may annoy or hurt him. However, he can put his own failure and hurt, as well his hurting others, in perspective. He does not need to identify with conflicted feelings caused by others, but can take them as object.

BIT 5=4(3)

In the past, I would have been much less able to gain that perspective and that height, and that sort of strategic vision. Not that I think I have strategic vision on my life and where I am going and what I do, but a much greater sense of personal equanimity and much more distance from those things that in the past would make me anxious, sad, disappointed, and what not. And also, drilling down and enjoying much more deeply, and not as episodically, those things in my professional work which are satisfying, rather than making them peripheral to the core of my circumstance. I think they factor much more largely in how I view the substance and essence of what I do. And it's a difficult reconciliation at the end of the day, because it's not necessarily what of my colleagues, my subordinates, or my boss think is as important as some other aspects of the job, [viz.] where I might be, and find myself, doing things that are not as important to me. And I am not being dishonest or fraudulent in masking from them. [emphatic] But I am doing what is important to me. And that aspect of the job that's important to me, [is] where it intersects with what value it is I can create for the company.

Although S6 is learening to listen more to own inner authority, and less to external authorities, he is not feeling fully self-authoring in regard to his "reconciliation." What is satisfying to S6 at work now has more meaning for him as a

person (for his personal growth), although it might essentially differ from what his colleagues view as important. What's important [to him] in the job is determined by what's important to him as a person, and that is where it coincides with what value he can create for the larger organization. However, what he considers his contribution to the organization may well conflict with what his environment expects of him, which makes his position psychologically challenging. It also weakens his self presentation.

BIT 6=4(3)

So, to the extent that I know what is important to me, I feel I am successful, more creative, less anxious, less sad, less affected by the pettiness I think I come to the situation with a much more pronounced serenity. And that allows me to be more effective on the inside [i.e., as part of the company, O.L.], just as I am highly effective on the outside [defining public perception of the company, O.L.]. I am not effective on the inside, but I surely, by this circumstance or confluence, I find myself to be much less defensive, and much less at the focus [of attention, O.L.], much more confident and comfortable with being myself, here. And my self is fairly creative, certainly different and frequently opiniated, but I have been doing that without having the edge that makes other people nervous and anxious.

S6 is developing his own sense of what is important to him, and his own set of standards of self management. He does not view himself as equally effective inside and outside of the company, but sees a positive relationship between increased equanimity and inside effectiveness.. This new balance makes it less likely for him to be embedded in negative emotions, and to present with an 'edge' in his relationship with others.

BIT 7=4

And one way you could see that [viz., that he has more regard for, and trust in, the competency of his co-workers] is by what I no longer do. I am a stickler for detail, and drive myself hard. And I think I am probably characterized by others as a perfectionist. And the net effect for my associates and colleagues is that they feel as though there is almost nothing they can do that will satisfy my level of expectation. [Example: galley proofs]. And in the past, without thought --it's just the way I work, and it's my level of expectation, --I'd go through [company communications to the outside world] with a red pen, and I have 45 observations on a 4-page [investor] brochure. I no longer do that. And it's a virtual circle. Because when people feel less criticized, they are more likely to exercise more initiative. So, I am not only less detail-oriented, and involved, and critical, but they are more creative and self-confident, and take charge. And while I still occasionally slip back into the old mold, I think it has been benign both for me and for them.

S6 manifests a great deal of interindividual insight here (4(5)). He is giving his coworkers a new margin of freedom to be themselves and act creatively, in the exact proportion that he is reducing his obsessive-compulsive perfectionism and is beginning to trust their competence. However, he agrees that he sometimes slips back to a more 4-ish position of righteousness and pedantry.

BIT 8=4

I always encouraged them [my subordinates]. But I would always, regrettably, still be the smartest guy in the room. And as someone who has a lot of pride in what we do and how we do it, maybe too much pride, maybe those things were too important to me, and now they are less important. So, it is a style that was particularly intimidating.

S6 articulates a 4-ish change in behavior. He has let go of having to be 'the smartest guy in the room.' To the extent that his self is a more self-authoring one, his pride is becoming less important to him.

BIT 9=4(5)

I feel myself being certainly more patient, kinder, and more parental in my interactions with my peers and subordinates. As a guy who has 100 people working for him, I feel more avuncular than I ever did before. I have always wanted to [further others' development], and I have always attracted bright people around me who have known [that] about me, that I wanted them to take risks. And I would inject them perhaps with a little bit of

creativity and pizzazz and cover, and have gone out of my way all my life to mentor young talent. But nevertheless, I think it has been difficult for people to always react positively [to that]. Many people that work for me I am not a mentor to, they are just my munchkins, and for them I think I have become much more of a father figure, and much more of a kind of leader, an older guy who is very enthusiastic and encouraging and supportive. And they still know these [negative] things about me, so I think they are scared to death to make a mistake, but they are not intimidated any longer. And I, for my part, thereby get the benefit of being more seen for whom I really am.

Given his organizational function, S6 is very concerned about how he is being perceived by others. This is built into his job description, according to which he represents his organization in public (rather than only indicating some 3-ish dependency on others' judgment). Above, he conveys an urge toward generativity, regretting that this urge has not always been perceived by others. To this extent, he remains somewhat at others' mercy. However, he has reached the insight that letting go of embeddedness in his own value generator gives him the "benefit of being more seen for whom I really am,' viz. somebody who is not a navel-gazer. This implies that he has found it difficult to articulate a 5-ish (interindividual) stance, somethat that is, however, becoming easier for him in the context of the coaching.

BIT 10=4(5)

[A conversation with a female colleague dwelling on her personal issues]. I find that I do that [i.e., have personal exchanges with colleagues, O.L.] now more frequently, although much less directly in the context of [work] projects. And I bring in a variety of subtle and hopefully not intrusive observations and concerns to bear on the matter. [And] that, I know, is qualitatively different from how I would have interacted with her [or any colleague, O.L.] about two years ago. It's a time in my life of stewardship.

S6 is less rigid regarding personal/professional boundaries. He is aware of the trickyness of that boundary but takes the risk of being more personal for the sake of "stewardship." He is obviously still new at exerting stewardship, but nevertheless endorses increasingly doing so as a future direction in his life.

BIT 11=4

Anyone you are talking to about executive coaching is by definition concerned about control, and authority, and power, and hierarchy, and attendant manifestations of that, or they are kidding themselves and you. So, control would be, I think, something all of us can relate to. And over time, I have lost control of some aspects of what I aspired to run, or once had [possession of] at the company. I would say that there has been some further erosion [of control], as well as gains--but I have been much less concerned about the consequences of that control, or lack of control, or competition, now than I ever have been before, because again, it's less important to me.

S6 has let go of control and has become less concerned about the consequences of doing so. Control is less important to what he thinks of himself as being. The reasons for this are not entirely clear.

BIT 12=4/5

At a time like this [i.e., a crisis], my skill set is [just waiting to be used], I'm like a race horse, like a fallow bred. I know exactly what to do. I know how to communicate to the press. I know what employees need to know. I know how to get to the facts. I know how to make things happen. To do that, one has to exercise enormous amounts of authority within a company which is basically collegial. It's a very difficult thing to do. At a time like this [of crisis, there are others which are deeply involved at a somewhat higher level, [who] own the operational issues and the people affected On the other hand, at the end of the day, this becomes a public issue. And I control that [issue].

In the past, I probably would have been more motivated to think of myself as an adversary or [as] competing with others around the room, and I would be perceived that way. I am being as effective as I have ever been, and that's pretty damn effective on this crisis at this moment. Others may feel differently about me. But my own feeling is [that] I am doing what is important to me, what I am good at, what needs to be done, and I am not anxious, or concerned, or competitive, or [feeling] alone. Much more than I have in many years, I feel I am part of a team where I am in effect a virtual leader for much of what the team is doing. And I am able to then delegate control to others, and come in and out rather seamlessly, doing what is important to me, and what the company needs from me.

S6 articulates the difficulty of acting authoritatively within a network of colleagues. To act upon internal issues by controlling their public aspect requires a high degree of self-authoring, along with an interindividual stance as a team player. S6 is now secure enough in himself to exercise authority in a collegial environment, which is something that invites conflict. He feels to be part of a team that includes those who might be critical of him. He is able to delegate control, and "come in and out [of it] rather seamlessly," i.e., without either feeling like or being an outsider. To the extent that he has transformed himself, he can now transform others. He does this by giving them an opportunity to prove themselves, without risking thei integrity of his own self system.

BIT 13=4(5)

I may have achieved the same results [using control] in the past, but I wouldn't have done it as effectively as I did [recently]. Not Socratic or Zen-like, I am neither of those two, just a little bit more maturity behind it all. Rather than needing to assert authority or seize control, it's more of the kind of authority that is derived by exuding good judgment and the power of maturity. This may be somewhat my version of things. But even if I'm overstating it and there were bruised feelings [on the side of one of the parties], it is surely a different

attitude that I brought to the deliberations, and a different feeling I have at the end of the deliberations in terms of how it was likely that I was perceived, and how other people were affected by how I acted.

S6 here describes, but does not demonstrate, a position in which authority is not asserted by insinuated, by "exuding good judgment and the power of maturity" (5/4). He makes a distinction between his own and others' perspective on his conduct. The more he has let go of the need to seize control (4), the more he has been effective. This has had the additional benefit that his concerns regarding the manner in which he is being perceived have begun to vanish from his agenda of self management.

BIT 14=4

Things are more integrated, whether it is the external and internal functioning, or different parts of myself. All of the above. It's not a day at the beach, and I don't have this down to a science; and there is still plenty of anxiety and sadness, and issues. But, at the company, I am a lot less anxious about what I do and how I am perceived, in part because I am doing what's important to me, and I am doing it well, and I am doing it with a consistency that makes me confident that this is the right thing to do. It's not that I am blasé, but it really doesn't matter as much as it would have in the past that this is accepted. In the past, I [often felt as if I] was out there on a limb, and playing very much at the edge, and I often still do, but I am not anxious about it.

S6 has overcome a 4/3, and even a 4(3), self position in which he felt like playing at the edge, and was anxious about how he might be perceived. Here, he demonstrates a holistic, balanced view of himself, without denying residual conflict. The "different parts of himself" are more integrated. The above statements testify to his having found a truly self-authoring stance.

BIT 15=4

There is a lot of adversity in my life right now. But again, I am able to reconcile a lot of it in a much more seamless and integrated fashion. I am a very busy guy. And in the past, people would almost have viewed me as frenetic. One event two nights ago that I chaired was a huge fundraiser. But rather than being most of the things I would have been about that in the past, I approached it in a way which may even to the outside felt exactly the same, but it felt different on the inside. I did what was important to me, it felt good, I did it well, in fact the reality is no one else could have done it. But it felt like it was part of who I am, and what the day brings, and I went home and did the dishes. Lots of stuff going on, big personalities, but I was approaching it all in a way which felt inside different, subtly different.

Taken in the context of the interview as a whole, this is a final endorsement of his new-won inner security as a self-authoring person who can take a large part of his professional self and his emotions as object, and act free of the need to grab control, and generously. S6 admits to a lot of residual adversity, but also demonstrates that he is able to take on the task of resolving it in a more self-determined manner. His emphasis remains placed on the self, without any evidence of transcending his self system.

End of Interview S6

End, Appendices C1-C6,

of Interview Materials

Appendix C7

Table C7.1
Schemata Occurrence, S1

SCHEMA	Possible occurrence =1	Several occurrences	Articulated occurrence:
MOTION=6			
#1, Excluded element			
#2, Primacy of motion			
#3, Tripartite thesis (T/A/S			
#4 Correlativity	x		
#5 Ongoing Interaction		x	
#6 Interaction of Ideas		x	
#7 Avoiding reification			
#8 Elements as moments of a process	x		
FORM=3			
#9 Element as part of who			
#10 Equilibrated forms & systems			
#11 Frames of reference			x
RELATIONSHIP=5			
#12 Existence of relationships			x
#13 Individual not ultimate	x		
#14 Interactive relationshi	x		
#15 Constitutive relationships			
TRANSFORMATION =5			
#16 Embracing contradicti & negativity	x		
#17 Resolution of disequilibrium			
#18 Valuation of form in motion	x		
#19 Comparison of forms			
#20 Coordination of forms	x		
#21 Open, self-transformir system			
#22 Quantity becomes quality	x		
#23 Limits of formalism			
#24 Multiple perspectives	x		

Table C7.2
Schemata Occurrence, S2

SCHEMA	Possible occurrence =1	Several occurrences=2	Articulated occurrence= 3
MOTION=11			
#1, Excluded element			
#2, Primacy of motion			x
#3, Tripartite thesis (T/A/S			
#4 Correlativity			
#5 Ongoing Interaction	x		
#6 Interaction of Ideas	x		
#7 Avoiding reification			x
#8 Elements as moments of a process			x
FORM=0			
#9 Element as part of who			
#10 Equilibrated forms & systems			
#11 Frames of reference			
RELATIONSHIP=2			
#12 Existence of relationships			
#13 Individual not ultimate			
#14 Interactive relationshi			
#15 Constitutive relationships		x	
TRANSFORMATION =4			
#16 Embracing contradicti & negativity			
#17 Resolution of disequilibrium			
#18 Valuation of form in motion			
#19 Comparison of forms			
#20 Coordination of forms	x		
#21 Open, self-transformir system			
#22 Quantity becomes quality			
#23 Limits of formalism			
#24 Multiple perspectives			x

Table C7.3
Schemata Occurrence, S3

SCHEMA	Possible occurrence =1	Several occurrences=2	Articulated occurrence= 3
MOTION=7			
#1, Excluded element			x
#2, Primacy of motion			
#3, Tripartite thesis (T/A/S			
#4 Correlativity			
#5 Ongoing Interaction		x	
#6 Interaction of Ideas		x	
#7 Avoiding reification			
#8 Elements as moments of a process			
FORM=2			
#9 Element as part of whole			
#10 Equilibrated forms & systems		x	
#11 Frames of reference			
RELATIONSHIP=0			
#12 Existence of relationships			
#13 Individual not ultimate			
#14 Interactive relationshi			
#15 Constitutive relationships			
TRANSFORMATION =1			
#16 Embracing contradicti & negativity			
#17 Resolution of disequilibrium	x		
#18 Valuation of form in motion			
#19 Comparison of forms			
#20 Coordination of forms			
#21 Open, self-transformir system			
#22 Quantity becomes quality			
#23 Limits of formalism			
#24 Multiple perspectives			

Table C7.4
Schemata Occurrence, S4

SCHEMA	Possible occurrence =1	Several occurrences=2	Articulated occurrence= 3
MOTION=5			
#1, Excluded element			x
#2, Primacy of motion			
#3, Tripartite thesis (T/A/S			
#4 Correlativity			
#5 Ongoing Interaction			
#6 Interaction of Ideas	x		
#7 Avoiding reification	x		
#8 Elements as moments of a process			
FORM=0			
#9 Element as part of who			
#10 Equilibrated forms & systems			
#11 Frames of reference			
RELATIONSHIP=1			
#12 Existence of relationships			
#13 Individual not ultimate	x		
#14 Interactive relationshi			
#15 Constitutive relationships			
TRANSFORMATION =7			
#16 Embracing contradicti & negativity	x		
#17 Resolution of disequilibrium		x	
#18 Valuation of form in motion			
#19 Comparison of forms			
#20 Coordination of forms	x		
#21 Open, self-transformir system			
#22 Quantity becomes quality			
#23 Limits of formalism			
#24 Multiple perspectives			x

Table C7.5
Schemata Occurrence, S5

SCHEMA	Possible occurrence =1	Several occurrences=2	Articulated occurrence=
MOTION=0			
#1, Excluded element			
#2, Primacy of motion			
#3, Tripartite thesis T/A/S			
#4 Correlativity			
#5 Ongoing Interaction			
#6 Interaction of Ideas			
#7 Avoiding reification			
#8 Elements as moments of a process			
FORM=0			
#9 Element as part of who			
#10 Equilibrated forms & systems			
#11 Frames of reference			
RELATIONSHIP=6			
#12 Existence of relationships			x
#13 Individual not ultimate			
#14 Interactive relationshi			
#15 Constitutive relationships			x
TRANSFORM-ATION=12			
#16 Embracing contradicti & negativity			x
#17 Resolution of disequilibrium			
#18 Valuation of form in motion			x
#19 Comparison of forms	x		
#20 Coordination of forms	x		
#21 Open, self-transformir system			x
#22 Quantity becomes quality			
#23 Limits of formalism			
#24 Multiple perspectives	x		

Table C7.6
Schemata Occurrence, S6

SCHEMA	Possible occurrence =1	Several occurrences=2	Articulated occurrence=
MOTION=4			
#1, Excluded element			
#2, Primacy of motion			x
#3, Tripartite thesis T/A/S			
#4 Correlativity			
#5 Ongoing Interaction			
#6 Interaction of Ideas			
#7 Avoiding reification	x		
#8 Elements as moments of a process			
FORM=3			
#9 Element as part of who			
#10 Equilibrated forms & systems			
#11 Frames of reference			x
RELATIONSHIP=0			
#12 Existence of relationships			
#13 Individual not ultimate			
#14 Interactive relationshi			
#15 Constitutive relationships			
TRANSFORM-ATION=11			
#16 Embracing contradicti & negativity			x
#17 Resolution of disequilibrium		x	
#18 Valuation of form in motion		x	
#19 Comparison of forms			x
#20 Coordination of forms	x		
#21 Open, self-transformir system			
#22 Quantity becomes quality			
#23 Limits of formalism			
#24 Multiple perspectives			

Appendix C8

Dialectical-Schemata Summary

Table III.1. Index Score and Cluster Scores of S1

Index Score	Total Motion	Total Form	Total Relations	Total Metaform	Schemata Absent	Type of Endorse-ment
19/72	6 [#4-5,6, 8]	3 [#11]	5 [#12-14]	5 [#16,18, 20,22, 24]	11/24	Motionist

Table III.3. Index Score and Cluster Scores for S2

Index Score	Total Motion	Total Form	Total Relations	Total Metaform	Schemata Absent	Type of Endorse-ment
17/72	11 #2, 5-8	0	2 #14	4 #20, 24	16/24	Non-formalist; motionist

Table III.5. Index Score and Cluster Scores for S3

Index Score	Total Motion	Total Form	Total Relations	Total Metaform	Schemata Absent	Type of Endorse-ment
10/72	7 #1,5-6	2 #10	0	1 #17	19/24	Non-formalist; motionist

Table III.7. Index Score and Cluster Scores for S4

Index Score	Total Motion	Total Form	Total Relations	Total Metaform	Schemata Absent	Type of Endorse-ment
13/72	5 #1, 6-7	0	1 #13	7 #16-17 20, 24	16/24	Non-formalist; motionist

Table III.9. Index Score and Cluster Scores for S5

Index Score	Total Motion	Total Form	Total Relations	Total Metaform	Schemata Absent	Type of Endorse-ment
18/72	0	0	6 #12,15	12 #16,18,19, 20, 21, 24	16/24	Non-formalist; meta-formalist

Table III.11. Index score and cluster scores for S6

Index Score	Total Motion	Total Form	Total Relations	Total Metaform	Schemata Absent	Type of Endorse-ment
18/72	4 #2, 7	3 #11	0	11 #16-20	16/24	Relativist "with the airs of a formalist"

Table III.13
Summary of Endorsements
of Dialectical Schemata
per Subject

Schema	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6
#1			3	3		
#2		3				3
#3						
#4	1					
#5	1	1	2			
#6	2	1	2	1		
#7		3		1		1
#8	1	3				
#9						
#10			2			
#11	3					3
#12	3				3	
#13	1			1		
#14	1	2				
#15					3	
#16	1			1	3	3
#17			1	2		2
#18	1				3	2
#19					1	3
#20	1	1		1	1	1
#21					3	
#22	1					
#23						
#24	1	3		3	1	
Index	18/72	17/72	10/72	13/72	18/72	18/72

Subject/Object Summary

S1

4(3)	4	4(5)	
3	9	2	=14

Table III.2. Stage Scores of S1

Developmental Range	Single Overall Stage Score	Clarity	Counter-Hypothesis #1=4(3)	Counter-Hypothesis #2 =4(5)	Bits Beyond Stage 4 (Potential)
4(3) - 4(5)	4	c=9/14	power=3	power=2	p=2/14

S2

4(3)	4	4(5)	
1	8	5	=14

Table III.4 Stage Scores of S2

Developmental Range	Single Overall Stage Score	Clarity	Counter-Hypothesis #1 = 4(3)	Counter-Hypothesis #2 = 4(5)	Bits Beyond Stage 4 (Potential)
4(3)- 4(5)	4	c=8/14	power=1	power=5	p=5/14

S3

4(3)	4	
1	9	=10

Table III.6 Stage Scores of S3

Develop-mental Range	Single Overall Stage Score	Clarity	Counter-Hypothesis #1 = 4(3)	Counter-Hypothesis #2 = 4(5)	Bits Beyond Stage 4 (Potential)
4(3)-4	4	c=9/10	power=1	power=0	p=0/10

S4

4	4(5)	
5	3	=8

Table III.8 Stage Scores of S4

Develop-mental Range	Single Overall Stage Score	Clarity	Counter-Hypothesis #1 = 4(5)	Counter-Hypothesis #2 = 4(5)	Bits Beyond Stage 4 (Potential)
4-4(5)	4	c=5/8	power=3	power=0	p=3/8

S5

4(3)	4	4(5)	4/5	5/4	
1	2	4	0	3	=10

Table III.10 Stage Scores of S5

Develop-mental Range	Single Overall Stage Score	Clarity	Counter-Hypothesis #1 = 4	Counter-Hypothesis #2 = 5/4	Bits Beyond Stage 4 (Potential)
4(3) - 5/4	4(5)	c=4/10	power=2	power=3	p=7/10

S6

4(3)	4	4(5)	4/5	
2	9	3	1	=15

Table III.12 Stage Scores of S6

Develop-mental Range	Single Overall Stage Score	Clarity	Counter-Hypothesis #1 = 4(5)	Counter-Hypothesis #2 = 4(3)	Bits Beyond Stage 4 (Potential)
4(3)-4/5	4	c=9/15	power=3	power=2	p=4/15

*

Table III.14
Summary of Subject/Object
"Single Overall" Stage Scores
per Subject

Bit	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6
1	4	4(5)	4	4	4(5)	4

2	4(3)	4	4	4	4	4
3	4	4	4	4	4(5)	4
4	4	4(3)	4	4	4(5)	4
5	4	4	4(3)	4	5/4	4(3)
6	4(3)	4	4	4(5)	4	4(3)
7	4(5)	4	4	4(5)	4(5)	4
8	4(5)	4(5)	4	4(5)	5/4	4
9	4	4	4		4(3)	4(5)
10	4	4	4		5/4	4(5)
11	4(3)	4(5)				4
12	4	4(5)				4/5
13	4	4(5)				4(5)
14	4	4				4
15						4
SOS	4	4	4	4	4(5)	4

Table III.15
Subjects S1 to S6
Ranked in Order of "Bits Beyond Stage 4"
(Potential Index) & Clarity Index

Subject Ranking	Single Overall Score	# Bits > Stage 4 (Potential Index)	Subject/Object Clarity Index
S5	4(5)	7	4
S6	4	4	9
S2	4	5	8
S4	4	3	5
S1	4	2	9
S3	4	0	9

Table III.16
Compact Result Statement
Including Indexed Stage Score,
and Absolute & Relative
Schemata Configurations

STAGE (TELOS)	COGNITIVE-DEVELOPMENTAL FLEXIBILITY (PROCESS)	PERCENT OF OPTIMUM [m=24,f=9, r=12,t=27]
S1 = 4 {2,9}	[6,3,5,5]	[25,33,42,19]

S2 = 4 {5,8}	[11,0,2,4]	[46,0,17,15]
S3 = 4 {0,9}	[7,2,0,1]	[29,22,0,0]
S4 = 4 {3,5}	[5,0,1,7]	[21,0,1,26]
S5 = 4(5) {7,4}	[0,0,6,12]	[0,0,50,44]
S6 = 4 {4,9}	[4,3,0,11]	[17,33,0,41]
Group average		[23,15,18,24]

Table III.17
Compact Result Statement
Including Indexed Stage Score
& Relative Schemata Endorsements

STAGE (TELOS)	PERCENT OF OPTIMUM [m=24,f=9,r=12,t=27]
S1 = 4 {2,9}	[25,33,42,19]
S2 = 4 {5,8}	[46,0,17,15]
S3 = 4 {0,9}	[29,22,0,0]
S4 = 4 {3,5}	[21,0,1,26]
S5 = 4(5) {7,4}	[0,0,50,44]
S6 = 4 {4,9}	[17,33,0,41]
Group average	[23,15,18,24]

Appendix D1

(Chapter V.3.4)

Coaching Recommendations for S2

Regarding executive S2:

STAGE (TELOS)	PERCENT OF OPTIMUM [m,f,r,t]
S2 = 4 {p=5, c=8}	[46,0,17,15]
Group average	[23,15,18,24]

S2= 4 {5,8} [m=+23,f=-15,r=-1,t=+9],

a DSPT^{TM} assessment expert would point out that in comparison with the group as a whole, S2 shares the strength of its incipient insight into interactive and constitutive relationships (r=-1%), but performs under average in both form (f=-15%) and metaform (t=-9%) endorsements. This entails that his ability to grasp stability through change, not of single elements, but their organization into a system, and his attention to organized and patterned wholes and conceptual contexts, is underdeveloped, and that his ability both to conceptualize and bring about a developmental (transformative) resolution of disequilibrium, especially in himself, is equally weak. By contrast, S2 exceeds the group's sensitivity for change to an almost "hypervigilant" (Moncata, 1999) degree (m=+23%). In addition to his uneven process assessment, which marks him as developmentally vulnerable rather than resilient in regard to stability through change, he is relatively ensconced in a self-authoring stance (c=8 in a group range from c=4 to 9), although with some considerable potential for moving out of his present stage position (p=5 in a group range from p=0 to 7). This holds in
particular, since S5 shows resilience in the domains of grasping the primacy of motion (schema #2), and the interactive nature of producing new ideas (schema #5). S2 is

also able to conceive of events and situations in the company as moments of an

overarching process (motion schema #6) and can take multiple perspectives on organizational subject matter (metaform schema #24) even if particular viewpoints diverge from his own, as shown by his recent presentation to the Board of Directors.

In light of this diagnostic statement, the assessment expert might formulate the following recommendation to the coach and the Corporate Development Officer:

It is recommended that S2's grasp of self-transcendence be promoted through continued coaching as a resource for company leadership, with an emphasis on not letting his keen self insight and relative ensconcement in his self-system interfere with his ability to make himself the context of others' transformation. Given that he is below the group mean in terms of three out of four process measures (f=-15,r=-1,r=-9%), coaching of S2 is especially strongly indicated. In terms of the coaching agenda, schooling his constructive ability in grasping the stability of forms and systems across change, and experiencing constitutive relationships is particularly recommended.

This can be achieved by relying on his well-established talent of setting directions for himself and of envisioning future goals, while simultaneously discouraging his propensity, to focus on the outcome of transformational changes for the benefit of his own self system (t=-9%; p < c). In addition, S2 could be challenged to assume more of a mentoring role in his approach to the executive team as a whole, rather than restricting himself to his privileged relationship with the company President. Finally, given his fine understanding of the primacy of change, and of interactivity as a source of knowledge generation (schemata #2 & 5), S2 could be provoked to become even more risk-taking, especially as a member of the executive team, rather than in isolation. He would be helped in this task by his fairly developed ability to take multiple perspectives (schema #24) and by his dynamic understanding of events and situations as moments of a larger organizational and/or personal process (motion schema #6).

Since S2's process profile marks him as the outstanding motionist of the group, it is particularly recommended that the coach assist S2 in strengthening his insight into the stablity of form across change, in order to countereact his tendency to act
impulsively, on the basis of an "andrenalin rush" (Vignette S2, chapter III), and for the sake of showmanship. In terms of agenda planning, this can best be done by appealing to S2's incipient understanding of structural, human-resource, political,

and symbolic (cultural) frames as specific action scenanrios whose equilibrium must
be taken into account (Bolman & Deal, 1991). Within the coaching alliance itself, S2's form and metaform deficits can be alleviated by paying attention to the contextual nature of coach-coachee interactions, and to strengthening S2's capability, to step outside of his idiosyncratic value system.

Coaching Recommendations for S3

Regarding executive S3:

STAGE (TELOS)	PERCENT OF OPTIMUM [m,f,r,t]
S3 = 4 {p=0, c=9}	[29,22,0,0]
Group average	[23,15,18,24]

S3= 4 {0,9} [m=+6, f=+7, r=-18, t=-24],

a DSPT™ assessment expert would point out that in comparison with the group as a whole, S3 slightly exceeds its "motionist" bent (m=+6%) and capability of conceptualizing stability through change (f=+7%), but performs far below average in two out of four category endorsements (r=-18; t=-24%). In fact, his ability to conceptualize either relationship or metaform is at this point barely developed at all. This entails that S3 presently finds it difficult to understand relationships that are constitutive in the sense that they precede the elements they relate and organize, and thus make the parties to the relationship what they are. (An example in point is his going beyond his own boss to advocate for an idea of his own in the presence of his bosses superior which, while indicating a strong self-authoring stance, also reflects his difficulty to conceptualize interactive and constitutive relationships). The process profile above entails further: that S3's ability to "take forms of organizations (or systems) as objects and describe, organize, and describe ways of relating these forms to each other" (Basseches, 1984, p. 154) is highly underdeveloped. Therefore, his capacity for understanding systems undergoing transformational change is as minimal as his ability to grasp interactive and constitutive relationships, whether they are an aspect of personal or organizatinal systems. In contrast to this considerable epistemological vulnerability, S3 endorses the inclusion of heretofore excluded elements as they pertain to his own developmental needs (motion schema #1).

While S3's process profile allows for very competent product-focused work, it does not privilege S3 with regard to leadership assignments that transcend the working of his own unit. Despite exceeding the group's average grasp of both motion and form, S3 does not presently flourish developmentally. His potential stuckness is well rendered by his stage-4 {0,9} score

according to which his potential for transcending his self system is nil, while the clarity with which his present stage position is expressed is at a maximum. Given S3's separate rather than relational style (which sets him apart from S1, for instance), this epistemologic commits him to deep embeddedness in his self-authoring process.

In light of this diagnostic statement, the DSPT^{TM} assessment expert would formulate the following recommendation to the coach and Corporate Development Officer:

It is recommended that S3's emergence from embeddedness in his own self-authoring stance be promoted through continued coaching. In coaching work, emphasis on exercising his ability to conceptualize constitutive relationships between processes and systems, and on schooling his understanding of the nature of open, self-transforming systems, including the need to take multiple perspectives on them, would be most beneficial. This groundwork would assist him in learning to take new and multiple perspectives and increasingly become engaged in interactive learning opportunities shared with subordinates, peers, and superiors. Eventually, such work would enanble him to dis-identify with purely technical tasks, and step outside of his own ideological system.

Concretely, this coaching agenda can be accomplished by relying on S3's eagerness to include in his technical work possibilities heretofore excluded, and on his grasp of ongoing interaction as a source of movement (m=+6%). However, it is crucial to make him sensitive to the transfer of these abilities to areas other than his immediate task domain, for instance by having him assume a more interactive (rather than confrontive) stance toward his superiors. His undertanding of the active character of knowledge and of wholes as equilibrated structures (f=+7%) can also be harnessed to this purpose, as long as he is made aware of the limits of his infallibility, and the dependency of achievement in his preferred domain of functioning on satisfying stakeholders outside that domain. This entails to teach him that often results do not speak for themselves, in that others' perception of the process by which results are accomplished are of equal or greater relevance for continued organizational success. Further progress toward a higher ontic-developmental telos is a particular challenge

for this executive, since his cognitive flexibility in the domains of relationship and metaform is totally absent (r=0; t=0). Given that his profile is that of a "motionist with the airs of a formalist," without a grasp of constitutive embedding in a system of relations and of multiple systems in relation to each other, the task of the coach is clearly one of promoting his flexiblity in these areas of deficit. Before these deficits are removed, there is little likelihood that S3 will realize his potential for moving to a higher ontic-developmental telos. Rather, he might experience developmental stasis, remaining ensconced in his present stage position.

Comparison of S1 and S3

In order to shed more light on the highly different ways in which a particular structure profile such as stage-4 can be embodied and realized by an executive, and to show the utility of comparing two DSPT^{TM} profiles to each other (especially for the sake of succession planning), it is helpful to take a retrospective look at S1 and S3 in comparison with each other.

STAGE (TELOS)	PERCENT OF OPTIMUM [m,f,r,t]
S1 = 4 {p=2, c=9}	[25,33,42,19]
S3 = 4 {p=0, c=9}	[29,22,0,.05]
Group average	[23,15,18,24]
S1	[+2,+18,+24,-5%]
S3	[+6,+7,-18,-24%]

These two executives have in common that they are structurally both at stage-4, and are motionists in terms of their process profile. They are also both weak with regard to metaform endorsements, and show a potential for transcending stage-4 that is inferior to the clarity with which they articulate their present structural position. Within the context of these commonalities, however, there are important differences that transcend their stylistic preferences (as shown in the vignettes, S1 practices a more relational, and S3 a more separate, style of interpersonal functioning. Although a stage score of 4 typically characterizes individuals of high integrity whose limitation lies in their near-total embeddedness in their own value generator, that embeddedness may be "modulated" by a difference in style as an articulation (rather than of a grounding) of stage.

In the present case, the relationality of S1's style probably shows more clearly in the evenness of his schemata endorsements than in his slightly higher potential

versus clarity index (4{2,9} vs. 4{0,9}). Aside from the fact that S1's endorsement of
form is higher than S3's (33% versus 22%), which would tend to contribute to S1's being more aware of the stability of equilibrated forms (like his own personality) through change, more importantly in

comparison with S3, S1 much more highly endorses schemata of the relationship category (r=+24 versus r=-18%), and is also more highly aware of systems undergoing transformation (t=-5 versus -24%). In fact, S1's insight into relationship schemata far exceeds the group mean (42% vs. the group average of 18%). He is outperformed in this regard only by S5 (r=50%, viz., +32% above the group mean). In contrast to S1's cognitive-developmental flexibilty, S3's endorsements of the relationship category, together with his metaform endorsements, are the weakest in his process profile.

Coaching Recommendations for S4

Regarding executive S4:

STAGE (TELOS)	PERCENT OF OPTIMUM [m,f,r,t]
S4 = 4 {p=3, c=5}	[21,0,1,26]
Group average	[23,15,18,24]

S4= 4 {3,5} [m=-2,f=-15,r=-17,t=+2],

the DSPT^{TM} assessment expert would point out that S4 dramatically underperforms the group in terms of her form and relationship endorsements (f=-15, r=-17%), while slightly exceeding the group's metaform endorsement (t=+2%), with only a minimal under-performance in the motion category (m=-2%). As a consequence, S4 is experiencing a lack of constructive form and relationship tools for carrying out solid, rather than "hollow" (intuitive), metaformal conceptualizations. Considered in the context of the group's potential/clarity index, S4 holds a middle position (p=3, group range=0-7; c=5, group range=4-9). This entails that, in contrast to S1, S3, and S6 (see Table IV.5h, chapter IV), she is at a low risk for developmental arrest at stage-4. In terms of resilience, S4 shows some potential for stage transcendence (p=3). She strongly endorses including formerly excluded elements in her process (motion schema #1), and is also able to take multiple perspectives (metaform schema #24).

In light of this diagnostic statement, an assessment expert might formulate the following recommendation to the coach and the Corporate Development Officer:

It is recommended that S4 be encouraged to further dis-identify with her self system, by following her relational gifts in solliciting others' help, and by extending her mentoring to the executive team itself (rather than continue to experience the need to 'play the men's game'). Schooling her analytical grasp of stability of systems across change and of constitutive relationships between systems, including persons, is

particularly recommended (f=-15, r=-17%). This can be achieved by relying on her

eagerness to learn and expand her repertory of options, and her ability to take multiple perspectives (schemata #1 & 24). To a lesser degree, it can be achieved by supporting her still incipient grasp of how to resolve disequilibrium, by helping her understand situations or personal traits as elements of an ongoing process, rather than as isolated elements ("types") or binary alternatives. This schooling could be strengthened by assisting her in assuming a less global identification with the company culture she is part of, which often masks her own personal strengths and values, and by encouraging her to give herself credit for strengths not typically rewarded in the organization due to male dominance. Equally beneficial would it be to challenge her to take up a mentoring role toward the executive team and challenge its members to acknowledge the benefits of her relational, in contrast to separate, style. This would be a natural extension of her performance as a counselor, and would assist her in transferring her talent, of negotiating three-way partnerships, to the organizational environment in which she functions.

Coaching Recommendations for S6

Regarding executive S6,

STAGE (TELOS)	PERCENT OF OPTIMUM [m,f,r,t]
S6 = 4 {p=4, c=9}	[17,33,0,41]
Group average	[23,15,18,24]

S6= 4 {4,9} [m=-6,f=+18,r=-18,t=+17],

the DSPT^{TM} assessment expert would point out that S6 exceeds the group's mean form and metaform endorsements to an almost equal degree (f=+18, t=+17%), while his motion endorsements are below average (m=-6%), and his relationship endorsements are dramatically below the expectable (r=-18%). In terms of the potential/clarity index associated with his present developmental level, S6 holds a middle position in terms of his potential for transcending stage4 (p=4 in a group range of 0-7). At the same time, he shows significant ensconcement in his present status quo (c=9 in a group range of 4-9). This entails that he is handicapped regarding a motion upward in the teleological range (e.g., to 4(5)) by his deficit in conceptualizing interactive and constitutive relationships and, to a lesser degree, motion (change), despite the fact that his grasp of form and metaform is among the strongest in the group of his peers (f=+18, t=+17%). Hs process profile, considered in terms of his epistemologic (structure profile), entails pronounced conflict, since the stability of form across ceaseless motion (including that of his own person), and his constitutive relatedness to other systems, such as his host organization and/orinternal psychological subsystems, is not properly articulated by him. As a result, there is in this DSPT^{TM} profile considerable disequilibrium, as has been clearly expressed by him in structure-confirming content descriptions (see Vignette S6, chapter III).

In contrast to the vulnerability indicated above, S6 shows considerable

resilience in all process categories except for relationship. Although less than his peers, he is aware of the primary of motion (schema #2), and is also capable of

relating situations and events to their conceptual context (form schema #11). Moreover, S6 is able to accept contradiction and negativity as necessary ingredients of developmental change (metaform schema #16), and is able to compare, although not relate, different forms and systems (metaform schema #19). In toto, S6 has a considerable grasp of transformational change in a developmental direction. In this, he is only rivaled by S5, with whom he shares the lack of constructive means, especially relationship, to solidify metaformal conceptualizations.

In light of this diagnostic statement, an assessment expert might formulate the following recommendation to the coach and the Corporate Developmental Officer:

Given the lack of relationship endorsements in S6's process assessment, and the stasis and conflict in his structure assessment, where potential for transcendence is outweighed by embeddedness in his status quo, it is recommended that coaching utilize his grasp of self-transcendence in the service of self reconciliation, for the purpose of satisfying his urge for increased generativity ("avuncular" behavior). This entails assisting him in not letting his keen self insight (i.e., insight into his unique psychological organization) interfere with his ability, to make himself the context of others' transformation. Given the absence of endorsements of the relationship category in his process profile, coaching could assist S6 in solidifying his advanced metaformal understanding, by promoting his perception of the limits of separation and the nature of intrinsic, constitutive relationships (schemata #12, 15). In addition, coaching could further enhance S6's self-awareness in the direction of a more cautious subjectivism, especially in establishing valuations (schema #13). Using the coaching alliance as a model, the coach could also enhance S6's grasp and ability, to elucidate two-way reciprocal relationships (schema #14). This could best be achieved by building on S6's incipient grasp of motion (schemata #2), and extending it to the inclusion of heretofore excluded elements (schema #1), as well as the ability to locate phenomena in the context of a larger whole (schema #8). By so doing, the coach could lessen the relativistic bent of S6's construence of reality, and facilitate a more even-handed treatment of issues that are important to him. For instance, since at present S6's family functioning and organizational activity, on one hand, and his internal and external functioning in the organization, on the other, form separate, neatly disjunct, subsystems, enlarging the coaching agenda to comprise both types of separated system

could be beneficial to his outlook on what is important to him. In addition, S6's perception of himself as increasingly avuncular could be strengthened further by actions in the directions of extending a helping hand to a wider spread of talent he is aware of in the organizational surround, which would facilitate his progression to a more 5-ish position of interindividual functioning. This progression would aid S6 in putting in place a professional agenda in which his mission would not be confined to the task of equilibrating his internal and his external functioning. His mission could be extended beyond minimally answering internal criticism, and doing so could become a vehicle

for diminishing disequilibrium in his profile in other than professional areas as well. This would facilitate making his intuition-based judgments (metaform=41%) more open to rational replication, and thus more transparent to inside observers who now consider them as visions they cannot replicate. It would also lessen the irreverent aspect of his performance that flies in the face of others' understanding of relationship. Thereby, his integration of self and role would no longer have to be split along the line of external versus internal organizational functioning, but could blossom forth to a type of integrated leadership that is highly valued in the company. As a result, the present dichotomy between his private and professional life could be diminished or erased.

End of Appendix D1

Appendix D2

DSPT™ Summary Sheets

for (1) organizational and (2) clinical uses

DSPT^{TM} Assessment Summary
Organizational Version

Case Id: _____

Job Function: _____

Coach: _____

Assessor: _____

Date: _____

STRUCTURE ASSESSMENT

Teleological Range: x-2 x-1 X=____ x+1 x+2 Total bits=

_____

Potential/Clarity: c= _____ p= _____

PROCESS ASSESSMENT

Raw Endorsement: m= f= r= t=

Index=_____/72 [m/24; f/9; r/12; t/27]

% Endorsement: m= f= r= t=

Group Mean (or Follow-up): m= f= r= t=

Differential: m= f= r= t=

Strong Endorsements [3]: # _____

Medium Endorsements [2]: #_____

Weak Endorsements [1]: #_____

No. Categories Absent: m= ____ /8 f= ____/3 r= ____/4 t= ____/9

Total=_____/24

Ontic-Developmental Position: X{p,c} [m,f,r,t(%)]

_____

EVALUATION:

Risk for Slippage: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Risk for Stasis: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Resilience (Transcendence): 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

ORGANIZATIONAL ENVIRONMENT INFORMATION:

Present Professional Performance and Functioning (Keywords):

_____

_____

Change Story (Keywords):

_____

_____

Strategical Objectives (Keywords):

_____

COLLATERAL INFORMATION:

Cognition/Intelligence:_____

Workplace Personality: _____

Other (360-Feedback):_____

IMPRESSIONS:

Self-Other Awareness	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Self-Role Integration	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Integrated Leadership	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

RECOMMENDATIONS:

_____

Signature

DSPT™ Assessment Summary
Clinical Version

Case Id: _____

Name: _____

Date of Birth: _____

Clinician: _____

Date: _____

STRUCTURE ASSESSMENT

Teleological Range: x-2 x-1 X=____ x+1 x+2 Total bits=

_____

Potential/Clarity: c= _____ p= _____

PROCESS ASSESSMENT

Raw Endorsement: m= f= r= t=

Index=_____/72 [m/24; f=9; r=12; t=27]

% Endorsement: m= f= r= t=

Follow-Up : m= f= r= t=

Differential: m= f= r= t=

Strong Endorsements [3]: # _____

Medium Endorsements [2]: #_____

Weak Endorsements [1]: #_____

No. Categories Absent: m= ____ /8 f= ____/3 r= ____/4 t= ____/9

Total=_____/24

Ontic-Developmental Position: X{p,c} [m,f,r,t(%)]

_____

EVALUATION:

Risk for Slippage: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Risk for Stasis: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Resilience (Transcendence): 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT:

Present Performance and Functioning:

_____

_____

Change Story:

_____

_____

COLLATERAL INFORMATION:

Intelligence:

VIQ= PIQ= VP= FD= PO= PS=

Cognitive Functioning:

Attention= ; Executive= ;

Reasoning= ; Visual/Spatial= ;

Memory= ; Language= ;

Personality (Rorschach):

Thinking= ; Affect= ;

Reality Perception= ; Self-Perception ;

Interpersonal: ;

TAT:

_____

_____

IMPRESSIONS:

Self-Other Awareness	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Self-Role Integration	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Perspective-Taking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

RECOMMENDATIONS:

_____
Signature

Appendix D3

Generic Methodological Difficulties
of Epistemological Assessment

An epistemological assessment tool like the DSPT^{TM} determines ontic-developmental status quo or "ego level" (Loevinger, 1976; Lê Xuân Hy et al., 1996). The term epistemological refers to the fact that the instrument determines the mental construence, or frame of reference, by which an individual places him- or herself into the order of things physical and social. The stipulation of such a level raises the question of the relationship between epistemological and behavioral manifestations of human thought and action. This issue is intrinsic to the "mapping" of ontic-developmental scores into a specific empirical domain, whether organizational or clinical (see subsection 2.2 of chapter V).

In the training manual for the Sentence Completion Test, entitled "Measuring ego development" (Lê Xuân Hy et al., 1996), the authors make a number of observations that equally apply to the DSPT^{TM}. These observations are briefly discussed below. Although the authors of the Sentence Completion Test are not fully successful in separating content and structure, as is done in the DSPT^{TM}, and nevertheless assume that their determination of ego level is purely "structural," they convey several important insights. In particular, there are two categories of observation, one that applies to (1) the existence of multiple developmental levels and their confounding variance, and a second one that applies to (2) the issue of one-to-one correspondence, and of mapping ontic-developmental scores into a chosen empirical domain.

> In regard to the first issue, the authors state (Lê Xuân Hy et al., 1996, pp. 7-8):
> (a) all kinds of development are occurring at the same times. There is no completely error-free method of separating one strand of development from another. A particular bit of behavior may, and in general must be assumed to, reflect more than one strand of development. Ego developmental is conceptually distinct from intellectual development and psychosexual (or psychosocial, O.L.) development, but is bound to be correlated with them during childhood and adolescence. There is not even a guarantee of "local independence"; that is, even for a group of constant chronological age, there may be a correlation between ego development and other strands of development. Thus, there is a confounding of variance that no amount of data will resolve into its component sources. If one depends entirely on empirical methods, one is at the mercy of confounded variance; so theory must always temper reliance on data, even more so because our data inevitably contain gaps.
>
> (b) there is no error-free method of distinguishing probable signs of one ego level from signs of a probable correlate. To the extent that the correlates are other developmental variables, this principle is the same as the second one (i.e., (a) above, O.L.). Other correlates, such as socioeconomic status (SES), are not developmental. How can one be sure whether a particular kind of behavior results from low ego level or associated low economic and social level? In principle, with infinite amounts of data, one could decide; in practice, with the kinds of data available, one cannot be sure.
>
> (c) every person in principle displays behavior at more than one level. Every behavior sample must be assumed to be diverse with respect to level. The basic tasks of psychometrics are to translate

> qualitative aspects of behavior to quantitative and to reduce diverse observations to single scores. There is no unique way to do either. Different psychometric procedures may lead to at least slight different pictures of successive stages.

Observation (a) states that any epistemologicl assessment confronts the issue of multiple developmental strands as, e.g., that of intellectual, psychosexual, psychosocial, and ego development. Rather than seeing one of these as undergirding the others as a kind of "master stage" (Basseches, 1984), the authors assume that all of these strands play into each other. Were one to adopt this view, one could speak of ontic-developmental level assessed by the DSPT™ as one "dimension" of development among others. One could then state that behavioral and psychodynamic approaches to executive development are missing an important dimension of development, leaving the relationship of the different dimensions open.

Observation (b), while it documents the authors confusion of content and structure, points out that ontic-developmental status and other "developmental variables" may be difficult to sort out. While this observation may hold for a strictly diagnostic tool, such as the ego-level determined by the Sentence Completion Test, it is not strongly to the point regarding a prognostic tool such as the DSPT™. This is so because a DSPT™ score does not prognosticate a single developmental level, but movement within a range of levels.

By contrast, observation (c) is highly salient for work with the DSPT™. The observation is captured by the notion of teleological range.

As to the issue of one-to-one correspondence, and thus of mapping, the authors also make pertinent observations (Lê Xuân Hy et al., 1996, pp. 7-8) :

> (d) there is no one-to-one correspondence between any bit of behavior and its underlying disposition--in this case, ego level. No bit of behavior is or can be assumed to be more than probabilistically related to ego level.
>
> (e) no task can be guaranteed to display just what one wants to know about ego level. In a structured test, the investigator is projecting his or her own frame of reference rather than tapping the frame of reference of the subjects, which is what reveals their ego level. In unstructured tests, one cannot control what the subject will choose to reveal. Testers become very adept at interpreting minimal signs, but there is always the chance a person will conceal all or respond in a way that conceals usual ego level, in whatever sense others reveal theirs (my emphasis, O.L.)
>
> (f) there are intrinsic difficulties in assigning behavioral signs to any developmental level. A sign that appears at one level in tentative and embryonic version appears at higher levels in increasingly clear and elaborated versions.
>
> (g) a behavioral sign may be discriminating in one direction only; thus, there is an intrinsic ambiguity in assigning it to any level

within those to which it applies.

Observation (d) clearly points to the difficulty of mapping DSPT^{TM} results into an observational domain. The authors' idea is that a developmental level is related to behavior "probabilistically." This is not the notion in the DSPT$^{TM.}$ The notion is rather that ontic-developmental level applies "holistically," the difficulty being in prognosticating exactly how stage slippage, stasis, or transcendence is likely to manifest behaviorally.

Observation (e) confirms that epistemological tools regard an individual's "frame of reference," which in the DSPT^{TM} is expressed as a subject/object "world view," one one hand, and a dialectical-schemata "world view" (focused around motion, form, relationship, or metaform), on the other. The subject/object frame of reference privileges that way in which individuals negotiate boundaries between ME and NOT-ME, which is seen as the crucial developmental marker. By contrast, the frame of reference in the process assessment of the DSPT^{TM} is individuals' reasoning about the world (focus on change) in terms of the categories of motion, form, relationship, and metaform. The assumption made in the DSPT^{TM} is that the two conjoined frames of reference are complementary, one of them, the process assessment, being prognostic of the other, the structure assessment. In short, how one places oneself into the physical and social world in regard to motion, form, relationship, and metaform does not determine, but epistemologically influences, one's way of negotiating the boundaries

between ME and NOT-ME, since it indicates how an individual conceives of systems in transformation.

Observation (f) indicates Lê Xuân Hy et al.'s difficulty of separating content and structure, and is thus not pertinent to the DSPT$^{TM.}$

Observation (g) emphasizes the ambiguity of ontic-developmental level with regard to behavioral domains. However, prognostic thinking can frequently make good use of this ambiguity, by enumerating potential outcomes that may be related "holistically."

In short, the user of any epistemological tool, whether of the Sentence Completion Test or the DSPT^{TM}, will have to struggle with the following difficult issues:

first, there exists an overlap of different developmental strands none of which can be declared a "master stage" (Basseches, 1984), but contributes to development as a whole

second, epistemological tools target a missing dimension of psychological assessment that teleologically highlights, rather than probabilistically determines, other developmental dimensions such as the intellectual, psychosexual, or psychosocial one

third, prognostic epistemological tools as the DSPT^{TM} must find a way of creatively using the ambiguity that characterizes the relationship of ontic-developmental and behavioral levels of human thought and action.