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CHAPTER I

NATURE OF THE RESEARCH

Among corporations, there seems to be a dawning recognition that future success lies not in replication of past practices but in new structures, new modes of interaction, and new perspectives on corporate identity (Senge, 1990; Terry, 1993; Block, 1993; Bennis, 1989). Such seems to be the case for the nation's schools, health care institutions, governmental agencies, and non-profit organizations as well. Whether in the private or public sector, these entities are learning that true change requires a reframing of perspectives and beliefs at organizational, work group, and individual levels.

To effectively bring about change, leaders and their team members must engage with one another as co-facilitators of a change process. They must understand that to successfully accomplish change is to transform not only the observable tasks and structures of the organization but also the people within it. (Bennis, 1989; Kouzes and Posner, 1993; Buchholz and Roth, 1987). Both as individuals and as a group, they must recognize that, to become catalysts for the transformation process, they themselves must be willing to undergo some degree of personal transformation and to help others do the same. Then they must act on those understandings to insure that, particularly in cases demanding radical change, their efforts collectively contribute to reformulating the identity of the organization or subgroup (its sense of self) and, at times, even the identities of the individuals involved (Robertson, 1988). The concept of identity will be further defined and clarified in what follows.
At issue, then, is how leaders and other change agents transform themselves in order to effectively transform an organization or organizational unit. Even more germane may be how they prepare to transform themselves and one another in order to insure the quality and success of the change effort. Whether one addresses the top-level leadership team, a lower level workforce team, or a group not directly associated with any formal organization, the essential issues and questions remain the same: 1) What forms of interaction among team members best serve the transformation process? 2) Who must I be -- who do I want to be -- within this process? Underlying an attempt to answer these questions is a basic assumption that the form and quality of interaction between, among, and within change agents directly influence the changes that occur (Bennis, 1989; Dilts & Epstein, 1990).

**Background**

The research problem presented here focuses on the changes taking place within a group of people as they engage in the study of leadership, particularly self-leadership, and the pursuit of increased knowledge and personal growth in preparation for leading others into new futures. Of particular interest is how these would-be change agents uncover beliefs and habits of mind or action which serve to inhibit them from entertaining new ways of perceiving the world and their role in it. How do they learn to suspend beliefs, judgments, and the like in order to allow for the creation and manifestation of the new visions and modes of operation they claim to seek? The essence of much of this lies in the manner in which people, individually or collectively, construct reality and perceive themselves and others within that reality (Senge, 1990; Dilts, 1990).
Arriving at a new reality is the goal of any change effort, as it is the goal of all education. As Novak and Gowin state, "Educating is the process by which we actually seek to change the meaning of experience" (1984, p. 5). Such a change produces a new reality for those involved. For groups, it is generally agreed that this requires co-participation in vision creation and consensus on the norms and values underlying that vision. At its best, such participation is characterized by individuals' feeling equally able (both permitted and invited) to voice ideas, wants, needs, concerns, hopes and fears regarding the future and the goals of the group's interaction.

It is presumed here that the dialogue held between and among group members and how it is facilitated significantly influences members' capacity to accept one another's views and to generate and engage with new ideas. Indeed, understandings of the very nature of dialogue often need to be subjected to careful examination. Leaders must not take lightly their responsibilities in setting the stage for interaction and for facilitating that interaction in ways which produce safety for group members so that communications may be open, honest, and meaningful (M. Friedman, 1992; Kayser, 1990; Buchholz & Roth, 1987).

The concept of safety is key to effective and productive interaction, helping those involved to gain full access to their personal resources. But more is required than merely the freedom to speak one's mind. It is imperative that the perceptions of individuals be shared and that, somehow, each be able to suspend old patterns of thinking in order that new thoughts and new meanings may be collectively generated (Senge, 1990; Gibb, 1978; Bohm, 1992). People must be led to a place where the creation of a new vision is possible -- a place where each person may fully engage with and commit to the processes of
visioning and meaning-making, as well as making and implementing plans, in order to manifest the desired future.

Careful probing may be needed to assist individuals in discerning their own beliefs and perceptions in order that they may voice them to others. Often, long held beliefs and constructions of reality are not immediately evident to their owners, for they sometimes lie at a subconscious level and are intricately woven into the person's own sense of identity (Andreas, 1994; Dilts, 1990; M. Friedman, 1992). To reveal these deep beliefs constitutes a different form of self-disclosure than to simply engage in voicing likes and dislikes, enthusiasms and cautions. It may involve generating further self-knowledge and understanding on the part of each member of the group and helping each to articulate the newly found information and its consequences.

In general, it seems reasonable to assume that no person can engage with others in a change effort for a sustained period of time without both the group and the person undergoing some form of change (E. Friedman, 1985). Much of the requisite change may come about through silent reflection following an exchange of ideas; however, it is believed that both group and individual discovery and change can be enhanced and accelerated through various forms of dialogic interaction with self and others (Bohm, 1990; Gerling and Sheppard, 1993). For this to be the case, there must exist patterns of dialogue which specifically help individuals to access their own belief systems and perceptual filters (e.g., lenses through which we uniquely see the world). Such patterns of dialogue can serve to provoke new insights regarding the present impact of beliefs and their transformation or replacement through generating new ones. These new beliefs and filters will serve, it is hoped, both to promote growth in
the individual and to move the group forward in accomplishing its task (Dilts, 1990; M. Friedman, 1992)

Taken together, the issues set forth thus far center on the notions of perception, identity, dialogue, disclosure, and empowerment (each of which will be defined in what follows). Each may be addressed in reference to a group or to an individual and may be addressed as an external or internal phenomenon. Each links with and influences the other.
Overview of the Study

In the larger context of organizational change and organizational leadership are nested contexts of large and small group change and leadership, as well as individual change and self-leadership. Pertinent to these domains is research which investigates the means by which people achieve a greater sense of empowerment through their interactions with one another as well as with their inner selves. Such research seeks to discern the role of specific forms of dialogue and linguistic patterns prompting individuals and groups as a whole to adopt new constructions of reality and to successfully devise and support one another in enacting planned change.

In an organizational context, conduct of a full investigation into these topics would require inquiry into the proposition that each person involved in an "effective" group change effort changes, not just in external ways, but internally as a human being (E. Friedman, 1985; Curtis and Stricker, 1990; Torbert, 1991). It would need to probe the impact of such individual change on the group's potential for task accomplishment. It would also concern itself with discerning the kinds of personal and collective transformations which contribute most to the success of the creative effort. Studies of highly successful leaders of organizations which have recast themselves for the future have indeed dealt with some of these topics (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Kouzes & Posner, 1997, 1993).

Further documentation of the influence of both natural and contrived patterns of dialogue on producing internal states capable of creating new
visions and installing new cultures would significantly contribute to the knowledge and understandings needed for improving organizational life and approaches to organizational change. The implications of such a contribution would surely apply to both leaders currently involved in change processes and to would-be leaders preparing themselves to engage with change.

Yet this aspect of inquiry into leadership-for-change remains too often unaddressed or inadequately addressed. Behavior modification continues to prevail in the forms of facilitation, training and skill-building assistance provided to those involved in planning for and enacting change (Bass, 1990; Congers, 1992). While the role team leaders play in facilitating and guiding interaction is regularly acknowledged, as is the need for cooperative and collaborative behaviors on the part of other team members, a deeper understanding of the nature of individual and collective transformation is needed if the leadership development programs of today are to adequately prepare leaders for tomorrow.

The scope and complexity of such a study would demand the efforts of many people over extended periods of time and begs the use of case studies with leaders who are engaged both in personal transformation and as change agents in their organizations. In addition, longitudinal studies of individuals engaged in new forms of leadership and leadership training will be needed to assess the impact they have on their organizations and the extent to which that impact is attributable to the training and development of the individual.

**Scope of the Study**

For the purpose of this study, the scope was limited to investigating aspects of the change process encountered in the personal growth and
learning experiences of a group of leaders and would-be leaders engaged
together in a classroom study of leadership. The curriculum was designed to
emphasize the development of the individual leader as a whole human being,
connected in body, mind, and spirit. It also sought to provide students with
techniques and experiences intended to help them more fully access their own
internal resources as well as to develop a vision of who they wished to be as
leaders and how to progress toward achieving that vision. Thus, the emphasis
of the study is on the unfolding of the course and, in particular, certain course
components with a specific focus also placed on the nature of participants'
subjective experiences within the context of their own unique learning journeys.

Perhaps the single most significant issue regarding an individual's
development as a transformative leader is how that person learns and how, as
an adult, s/he manages his or her own growth processes (E. Friedman, 1985;
Robertson, 1988). Also of significance are how the individual deals with and
leads himself or herself; his/her perceptions of leadership, of self, of others and
of the world; and how these perceptions shift and change with experience and
education (Manz, 1992; Dilts & Epstein, 1990; Torbert, 1991). Of interest in the
study then were how personal learning goals were conceived and acted upon,
how received information was converted to personal knowledge, how planned
interventions influenced individual growth and development, how desired
outcomes were integrated or internalized by the person, and how those
learnings were manifest in action in the world.

The research presented here centers on the experiential learning of
students over the ten-week time frame of the course, acknowledging the
limitations of a classroom context and of investigating (or even expecting) deep
change over a short term. The study does not address, except in general ways,
the interrelationships between and among individual students and/or instructors or all the specific dynamics of the group and its sub-groups. Nor does it attempt to fully probe issues regarding the readiness of each individual to embark on this type of journey.

**Course Participants**

Participating in the course experience were graduate students in master's degree programs in public administration and health administration, doctoral students in education, and a post-bachelors student in the process of selecting a master's program. Also attending were a non-degree student and an associate professor in another college. These students ranged in age from twenty-four to forty-eight and held, or had held, positions with state and public agencies, hospitals, universities, public schools, and the military. Several were full-time students, some with graduate assistant positions, and several were employed full-time and taking one or more classes. To enumerate a few of the specific positions held one was a secretary, one a computer programmer, one a principal, one a deputy director, and one an agency vice president.

The life circumstances of the group placed the majority in a period of transition, whether that transition involved a career change or an upcoming marriage or some other form of stress and excitement in their lives. A few would be graduating in June and looking for full-time employment in their field; another few would be graduating in a year or so and would be seeking to enter a new field; others would be staying in current positions and attempting to serve as more effective change agents from those positions.

Altogether, the sixteen class participants brought great diversity to the group in backgrounds and professions, in personality styles and interests, in
modes of thinking and feeling and in approaches to life. This diversity, including in learning styles and readiness for change, would serve the group well in probing new perspectives and ways of being in the world.

The class of members met in a large conference room with a long rectangular table in the center. A second table in the front corner of the room held the overhead projector and course materials and handouts for each evening. Small group work took place in cluster settings spaced around the room. There were chairs around the table and also chairs against each of the two long walls; students drew these together into small conversational groupings for the exercises. Sometimes, the tables were pulled aside to make a larger space for demonstrations or exercises which took more room. Occasionally, early in the course, students relocated to other office space to complete their exercises, but for the most part, conversations took place in the classroom.

Issues

Social scientists continue to pursue understanding of the ways in which human beings learn and bring about change in their own comprehensions, attitudes, and behaviors and to probe the nature of leadership and leadership development. While the literature abundantly describes the characteristics of people deemed to be effective leaders in our times (see, for example, Covey, 1990, Kouzes & Posner, 1993, or Terry, 1993) and tells us of their worldviews and some of their current practices, as well as of the knowledge, skills, and attitudes one might seek in emulating such leaders, it tells us considerably less about the means people employ -- the internal arrangements they are able to make -- to achieve these desired characteristics.
So the issue remains of answering the inevitable question of how. How do we go about making desired changes in ourselves, and how do we internalize and integrate these changes so that we may experience them as enduring, significant, and generative? In other words, once we engage ourselves in purposeful efforts to develop our own leadership capacity, once we are able to describe the person we want to be as leader or leaderful follower, how, indeed, do we go about making the desired changes? How do we experience the journey from an existing to a desired state?

In leadership literature over the past decade, as researchers have probed the nature of the transformational leader and effective blends of leader-manager traits and capacities, increasing attention has been paid to the inner world of the leader; that is, to the leader's qualities as a continuous learner and his or her pursuit of self-knowledge, personal mastery, and self-leadership. (Bennis, 1985; Torbert, 1987; Kouzes and Posner, 1988; Quinn, 1988; Manz, 1990; Senge, 1990; Covey, 1990).

Approaches to increasing self-knowledge and to probing subjective experience in order to achieve desired personal growth exist in multiple fields. One such approach is that taken in neurolinguistic programming (NLP), a field whose practitioners have thus far mostly concerned themselves with application, training, and continued development of specialized technologies but whose claims to effective strategies have, as yet, to be adequately researched (Sharpley, 1984; Einspruch & Forman, 1985; Bradeley & Biedermann, 1985; Duncan, Konéfal & Spechler, 1990). It would appear that NLP offers a response to the question of how people achieve personal mastery and develop leadership qualities. If this is so, if indeed NLP is to make a
significant contribution to leadership development, then its models and processes deserve exploration and systematic research.

While the research presented here does not seek to produce comprehensive answers to each of the questions posed or to address all of the issues raised thus far, it nevertheless adds to the knowledge base further description of individuals' experiences with personal change processes, in particular, those associated with interventions intended to assist in developing desired leader qualities. In addition to engaging students with exercises designed by and based on the research of Steven Covey, the curriculum of the course described here highlights the use of neurolinguistic programming (NLP) technology; the study seeks to describe participants' experiences with these particular concepts and interventions, together with their outcomes. While some practitioner-researchers indeed apply and study the impact of NLP processes on leadership development (see, for example, Gerling & Sheppard, 1993, or Dilts & Epstein, 1990), at present there is a paucity of academic research in this area.

While more will be said about NLP in Chapter 2, for now NLP can be described as both a process and a model of a process, involving "an examination of the entire system of feedback and response, both behaviorally and biologically, occurring in the interactions between (a) a human being and himself/herself, (b) a human being and other human beings, and (c) a human being and his/her environment" (DiIts, 1983, p. 5). Thus NLP practitioners deals with the structure of subjective experience: how we organize what we see, hear, and feel, and how we edit and filter the outside world through our senses. It also explores how we describe it in language and how we act, both intentionally and unintentionally, to produce results. (O'Connor & Seymour, 1990, p. 23)
operate from the assumptions that we all live in our own unique reality and act on the basis of what we perceive; that language is a filter, as are our beliefs; and that by changing our filters, we can change our world (Diits, 1990; O'Connor & Seymour, 1990).

Focus and Design

The aim of this study was to explore learning interventions and outcomes within the context of leadership development training, including how people perceived, fit, and extended their learning experiences in relation to their desired outcomes as leaders and as human beings. The study is a naturalistic inquiry in which observation, interviewing, and document analysis are used in exploring participants' experiences.

The design of the curriculum drew upon Ian Cunningham's (1984) work with self-managed learning (a study conducted with management developers) and his model of interactive holistic research. Using Cunningham's model as an initial framework, but conceiving of his five research methods as learning contexts, the design sought to engage students with each of the following contexts: existing theories and ideas -- contextual locating; situations and contexts of human action -- action contexts; interaction with others -- dialogic and collaborative contexts; and acknowledgement and utilization of one's self -- experiential contexts. These and other conceptual frameworks employed in the research and/or the design of the course are addressed in other sections of this document, particularly in Chapters 2 and 3.

Also in Chapter 3 is a full description of the structure of the course and descriptions of the research methodology and the role of the researcher in the study. What follows here is a brief commentary on the research perspective, a
formal statement of the research problem, and a listing of the specific questions driving the investigation, together with definitions of terms, the assumptions of the researcher and an overview of the document as a whole.
Guideposts of the Research

The Research Perspective

The research presented here was conceived within a naturalistic paradigm. In matching the approach to the research with the requirements of the questions posed and the context within which it was conducted, qualitative views and methods were deemed to be the most appropriate choice (Marshall & Rossman, 1989). These enabled the researcher to access the context in an in-depth fashion and to engage with participants regarding the processes, experiences, perceptions and meanings involved (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 1990). In particular, this choice provided the capacity to access subjective experience and to engage in participatory and holistic knowing and knowledge in action, encompassing as much of the experience as participants were willing to reveal and as was readily observable. (Reason, 1988) For an inquiry into learning processes and how people learn in classroom or work contexts, such a perspective was both desirable and essential.

Of particular significance was the flexibility naturalistic inquiry provided in allowing processes to evolve and patterns and meanings to emerge during the course of the research (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 1990). As Denzin noted, "the research methods must be capable of reflecting process or change..." (1989, p.18)
The Research Question

This study explored the question: How did participants in an experiential, graduate-level leadership course emphasizing the development of self as leader and structured around principles of neuro-linguistic programming perceive changes in their personal growth and development? That is, what were the experiences and emergent outcomes of participants engaged with a curriculum and a learning environment designed to facilitate personal change pertaining to their learning processes, desired outcomes, and evolving perspectives on and actions within their worlds.

In light of this, the researcher posed four primary questions. Those which significantly guided the research are listed first in the set appearing below. Secondary questions follow these, providing additional detail to the overall focus of the study.

Guiding questions

How did participants talk about and engage in

- their own learning and leadership development?
- their personal change efforts?
- their experience with course concepts and interventions?

What were the emergent outcomes of this particular set of experiences?

Additional questions

- How did the course unfold over time, and how did participants experience it?
- How did the planned learning activities impact student growth?
- What types of learning challenges did participants pose for themselves? for others?
• How did they engage others in their learning processes?
• What perceived changes did participants report in their attitudes? in their behaviors?
• To what did they attribute these changes?
• By what means did they discern and evaluate these changes?
• Through what modes did they acquire learnings / accomplish change?

Definition of Terms

Primary among the concepts involved in this research are those of identity, self-knowledge, perception, growth, development and change, autonomy, empowerment, insight induction, and dialogue. Definitions and further consideration of many of these concepts are provided in Chapter 2. A few are provided in what follows, and notations are made of related concepts. In addition, the researcher's concepts of leaderfulness, reciprocal empowerment and catalytic dialogue are introduced.

Identity.

Robert Dilts (1990) defines identity as our sense of who we are; a sense which organizes our beliefs, capabilities and behaviors into a single system (p. 217). Beliefs are defined as generalizations about cause, meaning, and boundaries which guide and interpret our perceptions of reality by linking them with our values. Capability is defined as mastery over an entire class of behavior -- knowing how to do something. Capabilities come from the development of a mental map that allows us to select and organize groups of individual behaviors in ways that work effectively for us. The process of facilitating the acquisition of new strategies or behaviors, Dilts defines as installation. One's identity then is not static or fixed, but always changing as
one acquires new strategies for installing new beliefs, capabilities, or behaviors. More broadly, identity is intended here to include values and attitudes as well as beliefs, capabilities and behaviors.

**Self-knowledge.**

Self-knowledge will refer here to the information an individual possesses regarding his or her own personal history, values, beliefs, capacities, attitudes and behavioral traits or predispositions -- those things which make up one's identity. An increase in self-knowledge will mean the acquisition of new information or receipt of a new insight regarding oneself which adds to or otherwise modifies currently held perceptions.

The related concepts of individual growth and development refer to the changes a person experiences as a result of the acquisition or enhancement of skills, attitudes and/or knowledge, particularly self-knowledge. Newly acquired group and/or organizational knowledge and understanding are considered in the study to be components of individual development as well.

The level of a person's self-knowledge, or the depth to which one knows and understands oneself, may only be ascertained in accordance with the individual's demonstrated ability to express the aforementioned data. Inquiry by another often elicits more information than the individual is able to spontaneously report and proves helpful in prompting fuller expression. It must be noted, however, that self-report reveals solely what resides in the person's conscious awareness at the time. A more accurate picture of the person might be had by combining self-reported data with other-reported data, when it is available, and assessing the congruence between the two. In the study it is not the specific level of self-knowledge that is of interest, but rather the individual's own perceptions of growth, regardless of his or her original baseline. That is,
data are sought with regard to perceived change, its attributed source, and
description of the contrast between new and former levels of knowledge or
understanding.

**Leadership.**

Definitions of leader and leadership abound, as one might expect, and
each has its particular focus. Several of these are enumerated in Chapter 2.
Among these is Copeland's (1942) definition of leadership as "the art of dealing
with human nature...the art of influencing a body of people by persuasion or
example to follow a line of action" (cited in Bass, 1990, p. 15). Some reduce
this by focusing on the latter portion, defining leadership as simply the capacity
to influence. Others focus on the earlier segment. These include Robert Terry,
who defines leadership as "a fundamental and profound engagement with the
world and the human condition" (1993, p. 139). Still others focus on the "self" of
the leader. For example, Murray Bowen (1966) asserts that the critical aspect of
leadership is being a "self" while still remaining part of a system and that the key
to successful leadership depends more on the leader's capacity for self-
differentiation than on his or her ability to motivate others.

The perspective from which the topic is approached in the study recalls the
writings of Margaret Wheatley (1992) and draws upon the researcher's own
conception of leadership as a simultaneous blend of person, role, function, and
process -- seen, ultimately, as a composite of human identities. In this
conception, leadership is both a function and a state of action-being not unlike
the wave-particle nature of light. Those who provide leadership within an
organization do so both through their actions and their presence. Like light as
particles, they send packets of energy out into the world -- ideas, images,
symbols. As waves, their light superimposes on other wave patterns,
sometimes causing interference but often amplifying value, creating new frequencies, or generating resonance. Somehow the essence of the person elucidates an identity and set of beliefs about life, work, purpose, and the nature of human beings which serve both to awaken and to attract others as well as to call forth the best in them.

While engaging in a continuous learning process themselves, high-performing leaders connect with others on deep levels and, at the same time, consistently teach others through their interactions with them. Both directly and indirectly, leaders affect the quality of life of all those in their organization as well as of multiple stakeholders outside the organization. The effective leader is a multi-faceted, highly complex human being who fulfills equally complex functions.

**Empowerment.**

Gershon and Straub (1989) define empowerment as "harnessing the passion of your heart and the power of your mind and creat[ing] your fullest expression of being human" (p. 5). Empowerment understood in this way involves shifting our basic attitude toward life from problem-solving to vision-creating. It involves more than mastery of powerful techniques; it is mastery of a conscious, self-aware life (Ibid.).

In this document, the word empowerment refers to the ability, readiness, and willingness to fully access one's inner resources, manifesting in external reality the potential that has remained dormant within. Empowerment manifests itself as personal power demonstrated through speech, behavior, and action in one's real life milieu -- both in work and personal environments.
Learning.

In Ausubel's theory of learning (1963), to learn meaningfully, individuals must choose to relate new knowledge to relevant concepts and propositions they already know (in Novak and Gowin, *Learning to Learn*, p. 7). Reception learning is distinguished from discovery learning by the learner's capacity in the latter to identify and select the information to be learned. Discovery learning can be guided, or it can be autonomous. Learning is personal and idiosyncratic, as opposed to knowledge, which is public and shared (Ibid.). In the study presented here, the learning emphasized is discovery learning and, in particular, experiential learning. Knowledge, especially self-knowledge is sought, and students are regularly invited to share. Educating is a primary goal, where education is interpreted in its original sense -- educare, to draw out. Thus it is viewed as a process and can also be seen as Novak and Gowin describe it, as the process by which we actively seek to change the meaning of experience.

Dialogue.

Dialogue is often considered by many to simply be talk -- discourse that is experienced face-to-face. More provocative and explicit definitions for the term are presented in Chapter 2, beginning with those of Peter Senge and David Bohm. Of these, the one more congruent with the researcher's intent is Bohm's which emphasizes "a stream of meaning flowing among us and through us and between us, out of which will flow some new understanding, something creative" (1992, p. 16). For Bohm, "even one person can have a sense of dialogue within himself, if the spirit of dialogue is present" (1990, p. 1). Also of particular significance to the study are Martin Buber's (1923) concepts of dialogue and the I-Thou relationship. More will be said of these in Chapter 2 as well. Regardless of the definition used, dialogue serves as both method and
data with regard to the communication and construction of meaning between two or more people. Through dialogue, people attempt to express and to control subjective and intersubjective experience.

In seeking to discern patterns of dialogue which evoke specific responses, the research attends to dialogic episodes in which one or more of the parties involved experiences a new insight and shares or otherwise acts on that insight to alter perceptions, to modify understandings, or to generate new ideas or thought patterns with which they or others might engage.

In particular, the dialogic act under investigation here engages self-discovery, is of a generative nature, involves something distinctly new to the person or group and ultimately results in lasting change. Under these conditions, the researcher refers to the dialogic episode as "catalytic dialogue." Instances of such catalytic dialogue were sought in the study both within naturally occurring patterns of dialogue and those which were induced through the intentional behaviors of one of the participants or facilitators (Instructors). Initially, it was anticipated that some catalytic dialogue would occur within the context of a person's externalizing his or her own inner thought processing. It was further anticipated that, although the form the impact would take was not predicted, self-disclosure on the part of one or more individuals would impact the development of the group and its interaction patterns. Altogether, it was hoped that a more specific definition of catalytic dialogue would evolve throughout the course of the research, and so it did. One of the evidences used as a potential indicator of the occurrence of catalytic dialogue was taken to be any noticeable transition of energy states within a person or in an interaction, such as the intensity in voice volume and tempos rising when conflicting views were being expressed.
Assumptions

The framework of research conducted here is embedded in an ontology of human activity. Thus individuals and groups are seen as constructing, in major part, their own reality and as possessing the potential to transform to some degree themselves and their society on the basis of their own reflection. In Brian Fay's (1987) terminology, this infers the assumption that people are intellectual, curious, reflective and willful. It further assumes that people are not always conscious of their own perceptual viewpoint, motivations, and desires (Dilts, 1990; Rooney, 1991). Nevertheless, they possess internal resources which, when appropriately tapped, allow for activation of their potential (Dilts, 1983), and it is this realization of potential that is of chief importance in dealing with notions of insight induction (or catalytic dialogue), empowerment, and self-and other-understanding within a framework of human interaction.

The researcher accepts as basic premises that language is a model of thought, that it addresses and expresses both the conscious and other-than-conscious mind, and that it can be used both to ascertain and to change, at least to some degree, a person's beliefs, perceptual filters and constructions of reality. Also, it is accepted that persons naturally operate from a state of false consciousness but can obtain access to a true self or core being and be assisted in so doing through coaching or similar forms of facilitated interaction (intervention) which employ specific, intentional patterns of inquiry and dialogue (Dilts, 1990; Andreas, 1989 and 1994).

Additional assumptions include the following:

• Change occurs at the level of subjective and intersubjective experience; external behavior change alone will not sustain a new reality.
• Personal/individual transformation drives and accompanies group/organizational transformation.

• Self-awareness, self-understanding, and self-empowerment are critical to personal transformation.

• Sensations of empowerment, transformation, insight, etc., are accompanied by changes in human energy states.

• The emotions (access to the feeling function) play a significant role in change.

• Learning and unlearning are at the core of transformational change; each requires accessing and engaging both the conscious and other-than-conscious mind.

• Individual and collective inquiry together are required to accomplish change.

Finally, the presuppositions of neuro-linguistic programming are adopted as a basis from which to view and understand effective communication. A statement of some of these is provided here (NLP Comprehensive, 1990, pp. 27-28), while a full set may be found in Chapter 4.

• The meaning of one’s communication is the response one gets. Communication is about creating an experience in, and getting a response from, the listener.

• People respond to their map of reality, not to reality itself. By changing maps, it is possible to change reality.

• Requisite variety: the element in a system with the most flexibility will be the controlling element.

• People always make the best choice available to them at the time.

• Choice is better than no choice.

• People already have all the resources they need. What they need is access to these ... at appropriate times and places.
Significance of the Study

The significance of the study rests in its potential to contribute to existing bodies of knowledge in multiple areas: action research methodology, self-managed learning, public and educational administration curriculum design, and leadership development. As suggested earlier, the initial design intended that data be collected in such a way as to provide a window on each of the proposed contexts of knowing and their interaction with one another (this convergence of contexts was not addressed by Cunningham). While the findings do not offer much in this area, they nevertheless suggest refinements in methodological approaches for further researching the topic. In addition, the resultant illustrations of individuals' experiential learning serve to suggest ways in which curricula may be designed to be more congruent with adults' natural and learned approaches to growth and self-development and their learning styles.

This study differs from other investigations into leadership development in its inclusion of neurolinguistic programming concepts and technologies as a major component. To the researcher's knowledge, no formal research has been conducted on other NLP-based leadership programs. Previously published research on NLP has been directed at one or another of its propositions or practices in relative isolation and has not addressed many of the practices included here much less treatments involving combinations of these practices. Thus the study contributes to leadership training research by investigating a new and somewhat different content and design. It also addresses a different form of pedagogy, what one might call a therapeutic type of pedagogy, and one of the conclusions of the study is that it is indeed possible to introduce such pedagogy into the university classroom with relative success.
The findings of the research confirm much of what is already known about personal change but add tools which students found helpful in facilitating change the inquiry. The study provides both trainers and individual leaders with intentional patterns of interaction they may employ, as well as with means for improving their abilities to discern potentialities of individuals and groups and to help others gain access to and more fully utilize their internal resources. On a personal level, the utility of the research speaks to quality of life and learning issues for individual employees or group members. The findings may be applied to produce increases in an individual’s sense of agency, efficacy, empowerment and autonomy through increased self- and other-knowledge and understanding. A renewed sense of self and capacity to access personal resources may also result in an increased capacity to resolve developmental issues and thereby lead to a greater sense of fulfillment in work and life.

For organizations, the benefit lies in tapping more fully the resources of current personnel, adding to those resources, and, through providing both personal and professional development benefits, gaining more productive, creative, motivated and fulfilled employees whose commitment to the organization will remain high in the future. It is just such results that are addressed in the fields of human resource development and organizational development. But again, these theorists and practitioners often do not delve into the inner transformation of the individuals involved in ways which more fully address the subjective experience of those individuals and/or the intersubjective experience of the groups in which they participate.

In addition, research findings may affect organizational thinking with regard to interaction norms and training and professional development practices. It would be hoped also that the findings may be used to contribute to
increases in the effectiveness of internal and external communication, to improved health of organizations and their employees, and to the development of learning organizations. At least questions are raised which address these areas and may prompt further research on the topic.

Outline of the Text

The basic flow of this dissertation text is as follows: Chapter 1 offers rationale for the study and outlines the research questions along with the focus and design of the research endeavor. Chapter 2 reviews the literature which informs the curriculum design and/or helps the interpretation of findings. Chapter 3 describes the methodology employed, and Chapter 4 addresses the structure and function of the course design, as well as the lived experience of the curriculum. The latter includes consideration of the students' assessments (as recorded in journal entries, exit interviews, class debriefings, evaluation instruments and follow-up interviews) and the match between these and instructor intentions. An effort is also made to identify those components of the course which had the greatest impact on student growth and change. Chapter 5 then offers a summary of the insights, findings and conclusions of the study; it revisits the original research questions and makes recommendations for future research, as well as considers implications for leadership development in the years ahead.

Summary

To summarize, the research effort presented here describes the real-life hands-on experience of a university class in which self-directed leadership and the nature of transformative, generative change were the focus of the course
design. In this class specific techniques from the field of neurolinguistic programming were taught in order to raise students' awareness of the ways in which they participate in creating subjective reality. The instructors' intentions were to take seriously both the conscious and other-than-conscious dimensions involved in personal transformation and the notion of catalytic dialogue and its impact on the process of generative change.

In this living lab, albeit of short (ten week) duration, attention was focused on the ways in which subjective reality is perceived and acted upon according to the filters of our beliefs and assumptions. The goal was to assist participants in arriving at a new and clearer perception of reality and in recognizing their role in constructing reality in order that they become more effective change agents in their respective worlds. In order to achieve these outcomes, instructors sought to engage with students as co-facilitators in what was eventually to become its own "change process." In so doing, the instructors believed they themselves must be willing to undergo some degree of personal transformation. And so the journey began.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of the literature review chapter is to provide a conceptual basis for the design of the leadership course under study and support for the focus of information delivery and exercises selected by the facilitators. Additionally, the chapter provides readers with a context in which to understand the personal and group journeys of course participants and a basis upon which to ground expectancies regarding research findings. That is, the research offers a framework in which to understand limitations of the study, especially as they pertain to the expectations we might place on the nature of the findings and how much personal change people could be expected to achieve within such a context, setting, and time frame. The material presented includes the stages students are likely to encounter on their journey as well as anticipated manifestations of their working on a self-development project -- in this case a leadership one. Also, the literature selected provides further evidence for the choice of the research topic. Altogether it is intended to help elucidate the need for this type of intervention in leadership development and the foundation upon which the course was built.

Because a study of the nature of change, personal development and learning necessarily draws from so many different fields and disciplines, the literature reviewed here reflects something of an eclectic approach, just as neuro-linguistic programming (NLP) has been described as an eclectic theory, drawing as it does from the fields of linguistics, communication, psychotherapy,
and brain function studies, to name a few. Similarly, the concepts of learning, personal growth, change, and leadership are all addressed in a variety of literatures, including the 'academic' literatures of psychology, education, management, psychotherapy and spirituality, as well as in today's 'popular' literatures in areas such as business, education, psychology and self-help. In the latter category are the findings and exposes of people like Stephen Covey, whose *Seven Habits of Highly Effective People* (1989) is making its own ripples in the non-academic world. Thus the effort reflects an eclectic and multi-disciplinary approach, with no effort being made to probe the depths of any one literature, but rather to draw from many sources to provide the frameworks and supports deemed relevant to undergirding the study.

In particular, literature which incorporates work with or exercises pertaining to facilitating the development of specific competencies and the integration of particular concepts in the thinking and behavior of human beings is highlighted in each area, with supportive or complementary writings serving in a secondary role. In this way, the selection of course content and exercises may be more clearly seen as flowing from or being derived from these works.

At present, one of society's experiments in transforming organizations and organizational life involves the learning organization. Thus, with a focus on how the literature informs the design of the course and how it forewarns us of predictable elements in the experience of participants, the review begins with the literature on learning organizations and subsequently proceeds through literature on leadership and on change to that of dialogue. This path, in some sense, funnels the reader through a hierarchy of levels beginning with the organizational level, then the group level and down to the individual level, all the way to the inner world of the individual, both when in interaction with others
and when alone. Actually, the same sort of spiral exists within some of the literatures themselves. In particular, this is true of the learning organization literature, and so it serves to provide a framework for the whole.

Overall, the chapter addresses desired competencies of the leader both in leading others and leading self, with particular attention being given to how one initiates and achieves the personal change desired to internalize and integrate these competencies into the new self being forged for the future. The emphasis on process, on the how to's of the desired learnings, then leads the review from the topics of dialogue and coaching into the literature of neuro-linguistic programming, from which many of the course concepts and exercises were drawn and which served as a basis for the type of coaching taught in the course. The reader is finally led out of the literature through the conceptual frameworks which are foundational to some of the NLP processes and the researcher's modification of Cunningham's framework for research on the self-managed learning and development of organizational managers.

The chapter concludes with a summary of the key concepts to be carried by the reader into the remainder of the document, that is, into the research itself. The final figure is intended to provide a basic orientation framework for the factors and constructs taken into account in designing the course and interpreting the data in this effort to construct leaders from within.
Learning Organizations As Framework

One of the more significant visions of the 1990's is that of the learning organization. Although considered to be a trendy concept by some, this trend may indeed be manifesting itself at this point in our societal development because it is the needed 'next approach' in a rapidly changing and increasingly complex world. The nature of leadership development, when approached in this framework, centers on developing people as leaders of learning organizations.

The underlying precepts of the learning organization and the concept of organizational learning are not new to this decade, but trace to the works of people like Argyris and Schon and others before them, as well as being addressed by Warren Bennis and others since that time. More recently, Peter Senge specifically addresses the development of learning organizations in his book *The Fifth Discipline* (1990), which served to launch the now widespread popularity of the concept among business and educational leaders and to initiate what some are already calling a paradigm shift. It is this work which provides a foundation for various of the themes that appear in this chapter.

Senge defines learning organizations as ones where people continually "expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire; where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured; where collective aspiration is set free and where people are continually learning how to learn together" (p. 3). He asserts that to create a learning organization is to have people engage in a set of disciplines. By his definition, this means to engage in practices and
principles through which we continually learn as we apply and integrate them in our lives and through which we uniquely express our reality and priorities. This is something quite distinct from having someone else's preferred model imposed upon us and is precisely what the instructors hoped to facilitate in the leadership course.

At the heart of a learning organization, Senge suggests, is *metanoia*, a shift of mind or, more specifically, a transcendence of mind. The word *metanoia* has deep and old roots in the spiritual disciplines of both Eastern and Western cultures. Literally, it means "to turn." It represents a turning away from an old no-longer-helpful pattern of behavior toward something new -- a better way that is more congruent with one's deepest longings and being.

It is this shift of mind -- this *metanoia* -- that is at the root of all personal change, of all notions of empowerment, of present-day perspectives on learning and knowledge, and of the call for individuals to engage in self-leadership. At the same time, *metanoia* is at the heart of collaboration, of co-creativity and of co-generativity. Such a shift begins to provide us the internal locus of control so necessary to our own experience of efficacy in the world -- an experience said to be the most sought-after state among people in any organization (Costa and Garmston, 1986). In Senge's view,

to grasp the meaning of 'metanoia' is to grasp the deeper meaning of 'learning', for learning also involves a fundamental shift or movement of the mind. ... Real learning gets to the heart of what it means to be human. Through learning, we re-create ourselves. Through learning we become able to do something we never were able to do. Through learning, we re-perceive the world and our relationship to it. Through learning, we extend our capacity to create, to be part of the generative process of life. There is within each of us a deep hunger for this type of learning. (pp. 13-14)
He goes on to say this is the basic meaning of a learning organization: "an organization that is continually expanding its capacity to create its future" (p. 14). It is an organization for which adaptive learning or survival learning is joined by generative learning, learning that enhances our capacity to create.

Douglas Robertson, author of *Self-Directed Growth* (1988), would call this taking a 'proactive perspective', a perspective which acknowledges the tie between past, present, and future and embraces the constancy of change. He sees choice as an essential of human existence and asserts that people must recognize that their present is constructed of the choices they make and that they participate, moment by moment, in creating their options, although they are not the only participants. In short, we take responsibility for our own power, knowing it is not absolute, and we accept our responsibility as change agents, or, as he prefers, agents of growth. According to Robertson, the practice of proactivity is "perhaps the most fundamental and important development skill" (p. 7).

At issue, then, is how to bring about such a shift of mind and enactment of personal power. How do people, individually and collectively, achieve this? and What other types of shifts are desirable or necessary in order to manifest the vision of a learning organization in our own small worlds? It may be inspiring to speak of such things in the abstract, but what do we do to bring them to life out on the sidewalk? In designing this leadership course, it was the intent of the instructors to provide a context in which students could experience a generative learning environment and live a proactive perspective in the classroom. This was to be accomplished essentially through a process of dialogue with self and others.
The Approach

An assumption of this study is that individual change must precede, accompany, and drive group efforts in any would-be learning organization. To be of greater value, this change must occur at the deeper levels of the person, and dialogue and strategies expressly intended to foster metanoia are key factors in bringing about these kinds of changes. The need exists to expand on the range of techniques one might use to induce metanoia and to install a foundation for each of Senge's discipline, as well as the need to further address the question of how to get started on the creative path.

In developing a plan for initiating a learning organization, knowledge and understanding of a basic core of content and processes with which people would engage one another is desirable. What follows begins with a brief consideration of the fifth discipline, systems thinking, and continues to address it in the context of each of the other four, as Senge does. The additions offered reflect, in majority, the work of Douglas Robertson, Arthur Costa and Robert Garmston, and authors in the field of neurolinguistic programming (NLP) such as Richard Bandler and John Grinder or Robert Dilts and Todd Epstein.

As noted earlier, NLP's focus is to provide people with more choice -- a primary component in the notion of empowerment. The concepts and rationale put forth by its proponents match quite closely those offered by Senge, and its technologies continue to be adapted for use by groups as well as individuals. O'Connor and Seymour (1990) refer to the acronym NLP as more appropriately representing the "new language of psychology" or the "new learning paradigm." Thus the reader will encounter multiple references to NLP techniques intended to augment Senge's responses in the 'how to' category.
In Senge's book, which he says is intended for "those of us interested in the art and practice of collective learning" (p. 16), he articulates what he believes to be "five new 'component technologies' which are gradually converging to innovate learning organizations" (p. 6). These are: personal mastery, mental models, building shared vision, team learning, and systems thinking. The interdependence of the five and their simultaneous development as an 'ensemble' is highlighted by his emphasis on systems thinking as the fifth discipline.

Systems Thinking

As Senge presents it, systems thinking is "a discipline for seeing wholes" which offers us "a language that begins by restructuring how we think" (p. 128) and allows us to "see through complexity to the underlying structures generating change." The essence of the discipline is metanoia. It involves shifting our perspective from looking for linear cause-effect chains to seeing patterns of interrelationships and from seeing snapshots of events to seeing movies of processes of change. A shift of mind allows us to move from seeing problems as caused by someone or something external to ourselves to seeing how our own actions create the problems we experience. We shift from viewing ourselves as separate from the world to seeing ourselves as connected to the world. We are able to discover how we, in fact, create our reality.

Systems thinking and its practice is based in an understanding of the concept of feedback as a reciprocal flow of influence and in the notion that reality is circular, not linear. Through systems thinking, we learn to expect time delays in compensatory feedback, to view influence as both cause and effect, to differentiate dynamic from detail complexity, and to become aware of the power
of language to shape our perceptions. Most importantly, perhaps, we learn to place ourselves within the system, thus acknowledging that we continually influence as well as are influenced by our reality and that we all "share responsibility for problems generated by the system" (p. 78).

The more we are able to introduce people to a broader view of their small world within the organization and help them to organize and integrate that information, the more likely it is that they, too, can add perspective to the mix, as well as become responsible and responsive to their part, other parts, and the whole in new ways. Introducing information on the mind-body system into the dialogue of would-be learning organizations helps to support this perspective.

**Personal Mastery**

For a learning organization to come to and sustain life, Senge asserts that there must be individuals at all levels who engage in the discipline of personal mastery. It is here that the creation truly begins: with the development of a shared understanding of what personal mastery is and what its role is in introducing us to and preparing us for the work of collective learning. The cornerstones of personal mastery are, in Senge's vocabulary, personal vision and mission, creative tension, commitment to truth, and rapport between normal awareness and the subconscious.

In short, personal mastery requires continually clarifying personal vision, focusing energies, developing patience, and seeing reality objectively. Here personal vision expresses the ability to focus on ultimate intrinsic desires (beyond secondary goals) and on results rather than means. Personal mission is one's deep sense of purpose. By articulating and continually refining the two together, we claim a destination and a direction for our desired futures. Then,
by blending with these what we have discerned to be our core values, we round out the sense of self needed to begin to align our beliefs, capacities, and behaviors so that they may literally pull us to that future. Personal vision, conceived in this way, is actually one's calling in life.

Of particular importance in developing personal mastery is learning how to generate and sustain the creative tension produced by the gap between current reality and our vision and to recognize and use this tension as the source of our creative energy. Mastering this creative tension produces a shift in our perspective on reality, including transforming our view of failure to one of opportunity to learn. This is akin to the NLP presupposition that there is no failure, there is only feedback. Research presented by Costa and Garmston (1986) informs us that, while the journey across the gap may be traveled along many routes, and while it can be influenced by external factors, it is most powerfully influenced by language and its capacity to expose and alter our internal representations of and beliefs about the world.

What operates against us in this discipline are beliefs contrary to our personal mastery -- beliefs that we are not able to fulfill our desires (we are powerless) or that we are unworthy to have what we want. Senge draws from Robert Fritz's work, The Path of Least Resistance (1989), in identifying these belief categories and in describing the structural conflict which results from forces pulling us toward our goals and those which, anchored in old beliefs, hold us back. The fact that these limiting beliefs are typically below the level of conscious awareness simply adds to their power over us. As a result, change at this level requires altering the deep structures of our lives.

Strongly connected to all of this is the operation of the unconscious implicit in the practice of personal mastery. To deny the role of the unconscious, what
some call intuitive ways of knowing, would deprive us of both a source of information and an alliance with the aspect of mind which truly does the learning and carries out the changes we desire. Because our unconscious is inherently responsive to a clear focus, meditation and exercises which focus our minds on desired results and making choices are recommended. A systems perspective impacts this discipline not only in clarifying its structures but also in fostering a reintegration of reason and intuition and perhaps providing an alternative language which allows people to find their intuition more explicable.

Douglas Robertson's (1988) work would suggest that personal mastery includes creating a conscious, well-organized framework for development -- thus providing a basis for constructive intervention with regard to individuals and groups -- and generating a personal theory of growth. Growth, according to Robertson, is transformation, and development should be approached "as a transformation of the self toward increasing life-competence, rather than more generally as an unfolding of changes in life's circumstances and our roles within those circumstances" (p. 19). His recommendation to begin with a focus on growth rather than change is akin to Senge's persistent focus on learning, but adds to that agenda.

He focuses on the learning process and our ability to learn and calls us to become more competent at self-directed learning, including learning from experience. Just as practitioners of NLP assert, he suggests that "...understanding our past experiences and planning for future experiences are activities which occur in our present experience, and which enhance its quality. That's really what this ... is all about: enriching the quality of our moment to moment existence" (p. 56).
Robertson's views recall Costa and Garmston's (1986) use of the phrase "brain-compatibility" with reference to their model of teaching and learning. We need a brain-compatible model, theory, and practice of growth, one which is congruent with the natural operation of our brain and mind, both conscious and unconscious. In this specific context then, we might ask, what would a "brain-compatible" workplace look like? That is, what would a learning organization look like?

Peter Kline and Bernard Saunders, in their book Ten Steps to a Learning Organization (1993), develop a set of principles which they believe, "once accepted at the upper levels of an organization, [will] necessarily extend to the inner belief systems of employees and become implicit in the organizational culture and structure" (p. 15). These sixteen (16) principles constitute a kind of preview and guide to the changes in attitude and behavior that characterize an emergent learning organization. An adapted version appears in Table 1.

Mental Models
The key to making Kline and Saunders' principles operative in an organization is thought to lie in their being accepted by those at the upper levels. Particularly there, it is important to understand that "new insights [often] fail to get put into practice because they conflict with deeply held internal images of how the world works, images that limit us to familiar ways of thinking and acting" (Senge, p. 174). These limited images are called our mental models. They are typically out-of-conscious, so we seek to bring them to conscious awareness, test them against today's reality, and modify them to more closely resemble current or desired realities. In dealing with these,
Table 1
Principles of a Learning Organization

1. Prime the mind of individuals at every level to be self-directed;

2. View mistakes as stepping stones to continuous learning and essential to further business growth;

3. Be willing to rework organizational systems and structures of all types;

4. Acknowledge that learning is an emotional process and create a corporate culture that is a supportive place to be;

5. Celebrate the learning process for its own sake, not just its end product;

6. Celebrate all learners equally;

7. Accomplish as much transfer of knowledge and power from person to person as possible;

8. Encourage and teach learners to structure their own learning rather than structuring it for them;

9. Teach the process of self-evaluation;

10. Recognize and accept as a goal the complete liberation of all human intelligence everywhere;

11. Recognize that different learning preferences are alternate tools for approaching and accomplishing learning;

12. Encourage people to discover their own learning and thinking styles and make these accessible to others;

13. Cultivate each employee's abilities in all fields of knowledge, and spread the idea that nothing is forever inaccessible to people;

14. Recognize that in order to learn something so it is easy to use, it must be logical, moral, and fun;

15. Model the belief that ideas can be developed best through dialogue and discussion;

16. Treat everything as subject to re-examination and investigation.

(adapted from Kline & Saunders, 1993, pp. 16-18)
Robert Dilts (1990) tells us, we are often delving into deeply held beliefs and values, even into the individual's own identity and spirituality or essence.

Simply put, mental models are formed of images, assumptions, and stories. We all have them. We all use them. They are necessary to our functioning and, at the same time, problematic if they remain tacit, unexamined, and unchanging as we continue to develop ourselves, to experience new things, and generally to live our lives in a rapidly changing world. They often block us from acting on our intentions, from being able to really employ systems thinking, and from being fully resourceful in getting what we want. The question Senge poses is, "if mental models can impede learning -- freezing [organizations] in outmoded practices -- why can't they also help accelerate learning?" (p. 178)

In addition, the research of Aldus Huxley and others has shown us that the mind typically engages in three functions in order to protect itself from the overwhelming onslaught of sensory data to which it is exposed every second. These three functions are: generalization, deletion, and distortion. The more we can become aware of our own tendencies to engage in each of these, the more open we may become to changing certain of our habitual responses to ones which better support who we are and what we want of our lives.

**Shared Vision**

Senge introduces this discipline by saying, shared vision "is not an idea. ... It is, rather, a force in people's hearts, a force of impressive power," power that comes from common caring. It answers the question, "what do we want to create?" (p. 206) and results from people sharing a similar picture of the future, one involving what deeply matters to them, and being committed to one
another's having it. Shared vision is distinctly different from a solution to some problem and provides the energy and focus for generative learning.

As one might expect, the tools for building and working with shared vision originate from personal mastery, wherein the belief in individual capacities to create futures is internalized. As people continuously share their personal visions over time, shared visions grow as the by-product of their interactions. Efforts to communicate and spread the vision, will be limited by the capacity to integrate diversity and deal with conflicts that arise. Thus work with conflict, negotiation strategies, and individual styles may need to be incorporated in people's learnings.

**Team Learning**

When a team of people exhibit a commonality of direction and a harmonizing of individual energies such that resonance or synergy develops that team may be said to have "alignment." This alignment is thought to be a necessary condition for generating team empowerment from individual empowerment and to be a process having three critical dimensions: the need to think insightfully about complex issues; the need for innovative, coordinated action supported by 'operational trust'; and consideration of the role of members on other teams.

Also significant to team learning is balancing discussion and dialogue such that they complement one another. Although one is seen as convergent and the other divergent, both can lead to new courses of action. It is important here that dialogue be grounded in reflection and inquiry skills and acuity regarding when members are not disclosing or not reflecting on assumptions or not inquiring into one another's thinking is particularly valuable. With practice,
the skill of team learning will be mastered, and the learning team will have learned how to learn together.

Both Robertson and Senge concern themselves with the need for learning facilitators, and Robertson points out the principle that even what we conceive of as individual growth is in many ways a systemic outcome. Therefore, besides attending to facilitation of the team dialogue and helping people learn to effectively facilitate, it might be recommended that team members seek mentors to serve as additional facilitators of their own growth and that they serve as mentors for others. Or they might choose to pair into coaching teams who spend additional time attending to one another's learning. Still, it is human nature to resist getting help, so careful attention must be paid to balancing autonomy and relatedness issues. As learning teams evolve, it will be important to address the fit of responsibility to community and promotion of interdependence among team members with individuals' pre-existing concepts of autonomy and current self-concepts, as they relate to questions of independence and dependence.
Leadership

"If we don't change our direction, we're likely to end up where we're headed."
Old Chinese Proverb

Historical Background

Although the term "leader" has been traced to the year 1300 in the English language, it took until the early nineteenth century for the word "leadership" to appear and until recent times for it to emerge in most other modern languages. Nevertheless, it has become a subject of much interest and research in this century.

Bernard M. Bass, in Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research and Managerial Applications (1990), categorizes some of the ways leadership has been conceived through time, including

as the focus of group processes, as a matter of personality (one is born, not made), as a matter of inducing compliance, as the exercise of influence, as particular behaviors, as a form of persuasion, as a power relation, as an instrument to achieve goals, as an effect of interaction, as a differentiated role, as initiation of structure, and as many combinations of these definitions. (p. 11)

Facets of all of these, although perhaps interpreted differently now, serve to inform this study, particularly with respect to the design of the leadership course.

In 1929, J. B. Nash wrote that "leadership implies influencing change in the conduct of people." Copeland expanded on this in 1942, defining leadership as "the art of dealing with human nature.... the art of influencing a body of people by persuasion or example to follow a line of action" (p. 15). At the same
time, other theorists proposed leadership to be neither a cause of group action
nor a means of controlling it but rather an effect of it. For example, Pigors wrote
in 1935, "leadership is a process of mutual stimulation which, by the successful
interplay of individual differences, controls human energy in the pursuit of a
common cause" (p. 16). These theorists brought attention to the concept of
leadership emerging from the interaction process itself.

Notable in the 1950's and 1960's writings on leadership was the
significance given to the desire of the individual to be self-directed and self-
initiating in contrast to the desire of organizations to structure members' roles
and to control their performance.

An organization will be most effective when its leadership provides the
means whereby followers may make a creative contribution to it as a
natural outgrowth of their needs for growth, self-expression, and
maturity. [However] most organizations pursue a one-way model in the
way people are supposed to relate to others. (Argyris, cited in Bass,
1990, p. 43)

Particularly significant to the birth of recent conceptions was the effort to
distinguish leadership from management in the 1970's and 1980's and the
results of that research. This differentiation, offered in the seminal work of
James MacGregor Burns in 1978, moved leadership theory beyond what had
come to be called transactional theories into the realm of transformational
theories, further pursued by Bennis and Nanus, Tichy and Devanna, and others.
Bass succinctly describes the difference as follows: "in exchanging promises
for votes, the transactional leader works within the framework of the self-
interests of his or her constituency, whereas the transformational leader moves
to change the framework" (p. 21).
For those who followed Burns, transformational leadership involved managing meanings for followers (e.g., Jongbloed & Frost, 1985) and, beyond that, actually transforming them by creating visions of attainable goals and articulating the means of achieving them. (See, for example, Bennis, 1983; Bass, 1985; Tichy & Devanna, 1986, Kouzes & Posner, 1988). In the words of Gardner (1988), "leaders play a part in shaping the state of mind that is the society" -- a society which functions only when its people share common beliefs and values regarding standards of behavior (cited in Bass, p. 10).

Researchers such as these highlighted the shift that has occurred in our understandings of leadership, of personal power as an essential in leading, and of the leader as an agent of change. Their resultant theories offer some common leader characteristics: visioning, establishing trust and credibility, possessing passion, facilitating empowerment and efficacy, maturing and developing the self, displaying courage and integrity, and enacting continuous learning. They acknowledge leadership as a learnable set of skills and the challenge of adventure as a primary motivator for such leaders, who possess high levels of cognitive complexity, and who identify themselves largely as change agents and risk-takers.

Among the new competencies required by such leadership were: to acknowledge and share uncertainty, to embrace failure and error, to respond to the future, to become interpersonally competent, and to gain self-knowledge. Regarding the last of these, Bennis tells us that "When you know what you consist of and what you want to make of it, then you can invent yourself" (p. 1989). According to Kouzes and Posner, "the most effective leaders are those who first learn to lead themselves" (p. xix, 1988).
Leadership As Self-Differentiation.

The emphasis of transformational theories on self-knowledge and self-development is reinforced by work in another context dealing with a systems theory approach to leadership. These efforts began with the work of Murray Bowen (1966) in family systems theory and continued with Edwin Friedman's (1985) work with churches, synagogues, governmental agencies and business organizations. The basic concept addressed by both is that of leadership through self-differentiation, which asserts that if a leader will take primary responsibility for his or her position as "head" and work to define his/her own goals and self, while staying in touch with the rest of the organism, there is a more than a reasonable chance that the "body" will follow. The critical aspect of such leadership is being a "self" while still remaining a part of a system. According to Bowen, it is the most difficult thing in the world to do, and yet, when accomplished, the process will convert the dependency that is the source of most sabotage in organizations to achieving the organization's purpose (which has by then become everyone's purpose).

The assertion here is that the key to successful leadership has more to do with the leader's capacity for self-definition than with the ability to motivate others. The major characteristic of leadership through self-differentiation is that it does not create the usual dichotomy or polarity between leaders and followers. Instead, it conceptualizes the problems of resistance in terms of an organic model that emphasizes a continuous connection between the head and the body politic.

... it focuses on the organic nature of their relationship as constituent parts of the same organism.... Avoided once more is linear thinking where A causes B, that is, where a leader motivates a follower or a follower resists a leader. Instead of viewing the interactions of leaders
and followers as the impact each has upon the other, a family systems concept of leadership looks at how they function as part of one another...[It] does not belittle the importance of an organization's coherence. But, because it distinguishes between togetherness and stuck-togetherness, it refuses to purchase the intactness of the group at the cost of the self-integrity of its members. (Friedman, p. 228)

One of the central components of leadership through self-differentiation is the capacity and willingness of the leader to take nonreactive, carefully conceived, and clearly defined positions, while remaining alert to and communicating with the rest of the system. Difficult as this may be, in Friedman's view, "the functioning of any organism, often its survival, and certainly its evolution, are directly dependent on the capacity of its head to do precisely that. Define self and continue to stay in touch" (Ibid, p. 229). It is important to note here that the leader is not trying to define the followers, only himself or herself.

What creates polarization in an organization is not the actual content of an issue but rather the emotional processes that foster a conflict of wills (efforts to convert one another). When a leader can remain non-reactive to the reactivity of followers, the intensity wanes and polarization can be avoided. This is accomplished by attending to self-functioning rather than attempting to change the functioning of others. The motivation to follow arises from the continued connectedness between leader and follower and the fact that, in an atmosphere free of emotional coercion, a self is always more attractive than a 'no-self'.

This means, of course, that leaders have an obligation, to their following, to their Creator, and to their species, to keep working at their own self-differentiation. That, indeed, is leadership's basic challenge. When leaders accept that challenge, they automatically challenge their followers to do the same and, thus, maximize the process of self-differentiation throughout the entire [system].
It is in this sense that being 'self-ish' is in the service of the organization. And it is in this sense, most of all, that in any family, the functioning of the members depends primarily on the functioning (which includes the thinking) of the being 'at the top'. (Ibid, p. 233)

Kline and Saunders describe the same phenomenon by saying,

The link between personal mastery and participation in the organization is a powerful one, for when you recognize that your personal growth is important to the whole team that works with you, you'll develop a bond with colleagues, growing out of your mutual discovery of common values and interests. (1993, p. 137)

Leadership in the Nineties

Of specific interest in the writings of the current decade are those investigating leadership as a relationship and/or a service and those which continue to explore the personal mastery required in leadership. Based on a study of leadership from the point of view of followers, Kouzes and Posner tell us that "Leadership is a reciprocal relationship between those who choose to lead and those who decide to follow. Any discussion of leadership must attend to the dynamics of this relationship" (p. 1) -- a relationship based on mutual needs and interests, a relationship the foundation of which is credibility. Their findings suggest that "The secret to closing the credibility gap lies in a collective willingness to get closer, to become known, and to get to know others -- as human beings..." (1993, p. 46).

Peter Block, in Stewardship (1993) describes us as "a nation profoundly conflicted about what we believe" (p. xii) and offers his concept of stewardship as having "the potential to reintegrate parts of ourselves and move beyond [current] debates in our organizations. ... Stewardship is the umbrella idea which promises the means of achieving fundamental change in the way we
govern our institutions (p. xix-xx). It requires that we deepen our commitment to service, that we act on our own account, and that we be willing to be accountable for a body larger than ourselves. It is a search for the means of experiencing partnership and empowerment. Strong leadership in itself, says Block, is incapable of creating the fundamental changes our organizations require because we have framed the role of leader in such a way that it fosters wanting others to assume the ownership and responsibility for our group or organization, a circumstance in which real change will not and cannot occur.

When partnership is chosen over patriarchy, we acknowledge our interdependence and act to balance the power. We give more choice to those we serve. We distribute ownership and responsibility. We accept joint accountability and are absolutely honest with one another. We hold each and every person responsible for defining vision and values and sharing those, but honor individual visions and values by not seeking a common set. Instead, we seek a common mission and a common membership contract for the community. Our collective purpose is then defined through dialogue among people at all levels, with the dialogue itself being a desirable outcome. This is stewardship in action: to "ask people to talk about what matters to them, not to ask people to support what matters to us" (p. 205).

When we choose empowerment over dependency or entitlement, we choose adventure over safety. We discover our own voice and make our own choices. We choose to make the change our own, although not ours alone, and move from participation to creation and re-creation. We cease to externalize the problems and to speak of how we will change other people. Rather we turn the questions inward. "Bringing our own spirituality into the workplace is an inward journey. The revolution begins in our own hearts. It is the conversation about
the integrity of our own actions that ultimately gives us hope" (p. 39). And when we experience all of this, we experience freedom.

When we choose service over self-interest, we shift our expectations of those in power, who, in making the same choice, begin to investigate the right use of power. In so choosing, we enter into the emotional work of stewardship, which includes facing and resolving our own wishes for dependency and for dominance.

To bring about desired and necessary reform, Block, like so many others, recommends that we build and nurture self-directed teams, but, unlike many others, advises us to make these teams even more autonomous through accountability. He advises using qualitative measures in assessing quality, progress on goals, and performance, saying, "What truly matters in our lives is measured through conversation. Our dialogue with customers, employees, peers, and our own hearts is the most powerful source of data about where we stand" (p. 209).

In challenging us to do all this, what Block finds is that there are almost no models, so we must "create our own experiment" (p. 183). And he confronts us with using the question of how as a defense against taking action to implement the needed organizational change. If this were not so, people would in fact be "in progress" in moving their workplaces toward high-performing teams and customer-centeredness by implementing the hundreds of specific actions recommended in books like those of Senge and Covey and Peters, even his own The Empowered Manager (1987). Where the interference or resistance occurs is not in having concrete suggestions and strategies, but rather in the inner work that must be done.
Block suggests that in asking how, we are getting in touch with our own internal questions about serving, being safe, and experiencing freedom -- questions which are germane not only to individuals, but to organizations, for "these issues are what community, work, and organizations exist to answer" (p. 235). The answer lies within the questioner and requires exploration into our inner space.

The answer, then, to "How?" is to stop asking the question that way. ... Ask instead these questions:

- What will it take for me to claim my own freedom and create an organization of my own choosing?
- What is it I uniquely have to offer? What do I wish to leave behind here? What is the nature of the unique service I bring to the table?
- When will I finally choose adventure and accept the fact that there is no safe path? That my underlying security comes from counting on my own actions or from some higher power, neither of which will be discovered via an engineering solution.

These questions become the context for the discussion on ways to move toward stewardship. (p. 237)

Thus Block asserts his belief that "the task for each of us is to define a future we choose to create, using the workplace as the medium" (p. 185) and confronts us with the paradox of patriarchy setting out to change or heal itself. The reform needed, says he, is the conversion to stewardship, a journey which begins with the self yet differs from the journeys described by others.

Stewardship is the willingness to work on ourselves first, to stay in intimate contact with those around us, to own our doubts and limitations, and make them part of our dialogue with others. Our humanness is defined more by our vulnerability than our strengths. This is something different from leading from the heart, or walking our talk, or articulating a vision. ...

Stewardship enables the use of power with grace. What is unique about this revolution -- and gives us hope -- is that it is being initiated by
the ruling class, the managerial class. ... [It] is a revolution initiated and designed by those in power. (pp. 43-45)

The intentions of the instructors of the Leadership II course were precisely to "create our own experiment" in using power with grace: the intention was to provide a living context in which it would be possible for both instructors and students alike to get in touch with our own internal questions about ... being safe and experiencing freedom ... modeling vulnerability, owning doubts and limitations, and making them part of our dialogue with others.
Growth, Change and Development

The study of leadership, then, leads us into the areas of personal growth, change and development, as we explore this concept of "self-ish-ness" by a new definition. Adventure Group (1992) views organizational change as a mutual interaction of individuals who, within the context of a group, actively and continuously invite each other to co-create themselves and their organizations via their ability to be simultaneously action-oriented and reflective both as individuals and as group members. In this perspective, generative change is a collective, collaborative, simultaneous process of individual, group and whole system change. They write:

Organizational change begins with individuals who have committed themselves to clarifying their own personal vision and core values within the context of a group and in relation to the organization, and who have committed themselves to identifying, articulating and holding their personal assumptions up for corporate critical examination (AdVenture Group, 1992)

Forging New Selves, Living in the Constancy of Change

Most of us would concede, along with Douglas L. Robertson, in his book, Self-Directed Growth (1988), that it is impossible to become involved in change efforts for an extended period of time without ourselves changing in some way. We would probably also agree that there is a direct variation between the degree of change requested, the degree of internal acceptance, and the amount of personal change involved. Yet we, for the most part, continue to address change as something outside ourselves and to define our response to
it as adapting or coping. In fact, for some time now, coping skills seem to have hit and remained on the top ten list of skills required for personal (and interpersonal) success and competency.

Coping, however, implies a response to uncontrollable events in our environment and an external locus of control. While it is true that none of us is actually in control of our own lives, and we all encounter frustration, sometimes even despair, regarding our inability to be in control, it is, nevertheless, true that we can control our responses to our environment. Believing that we each create our own realities, a perspective more desirable than one of coping would seem to be to enhance our internal locus of control and to create and maintain a proactive perspective in our lives. As Gershon and Straub tell us, we must engage in self-creation, shifting our perspective from coping and fitting in to excelling and moving out, shifting "our basic attitude toward life from problem-solving to vision-creating," and "developing an acute awareness of the possibilities that lie within us" (1989, p. 6). It is such a stance that constitutes a proactive perspective.

**Proactivity.**

The word proactive is not new. Nor is its use in the context of humans learning to deal with their environments. But it may be new in the context of humans learning to deal with themselves and with one another as they collectively resolve issues regarding their environment, whether it be their work environment and professional life or their family and personal life.

The proactive perspective recognizes that change is constant, and that we are involved in its process, no matter how powerful we become, either personally or through our allegiances...Being proactive simply means that we take responsibility for our power to create our options, while being fully aware that our power is not absolute. Thus, we
accept that we are all agents of change, whether we like it or not. (Robertson, p. 7)

In other words, for an organization or agency to be effective in creating and manifesting a desired future, organizational energy must be spent on the development of its people - as individuals, as well as parts of a collective.

Changes occur not only in the organizational systems of the natural world but in our theories about these organizational systems. ... according to Kuhn (1962), advances sometimes are made within an existing paradigm, at other times the paradigm shifts. So psychological change occurs in these ways as well. Sometimes behaviors, thoughts, and feelings are altered within an existing framework, at other times our whole organizational system changes. Our theories of change must account for both types of phenomena. (Curtis, 1990, p. 2)

Actually the aim may be better seen as one of living empowered lives; that we become self-empowering and engage with others in mutually empowering ways. This will involve us in a deeper change process, one Robertson calls transformative change, which is substantially different from simply coping with that which happens "to" us. The latter he refers to as "simple change": that which does not necessarily result in some kind of transformation of the self, or some major part of it. Change which is somehow importantly transformative of the self, he calls "growth". In the literature on systemic change, these two varieties of change are sometimes called "first-order" and "second-order" change respectively (see Watzlawick, Weakland, Fisch, 1974). For Robertson it is infinitely clear that "growth is transformation...[and] while growth always involves change, not all change involves growth" (p. 18).

**Therapy.**

In these times, the place where deep transformative change is forged is often the therapist's office. The overall goal of therapy, as articulated by Marvin
Goldfried (1990), appears to be the same as that of various change-agent groups, teachers, leaders, etc., that is, toward increasing life competency. Rather than being change agents, we are called then to be "growth agents". A large part of being a successful growth agent is having an effective perspective on ourselves and on our world.

The overall goal of therapy may be seen as the place where the patient/client can build up a new set of learning experiences, hopefully until a critical mass has allowed them to change their view of themselves. Once such change in self-perception has been achieved, there is greater room for optimism that they have indeed learned a new way of more effectively dealing with their world (pp. 36-37).

What we hope to discover is how to accelerate such learning progress.

Greenberg and Rhodes (1990) inform us that

When a person wishes to change some aspect of him- or herself or therapists try to help people change, it is the rigidity or "stuckness" of an intrinsically dynamic process, which is repeatedly organizing itself maladaptively in a rigid manner, that needs to be addressed, rather than changing the self itself... therapy is ... rather like changing an organization (Bohart, 1988), dealing with a set of dynamic processes that produce a given structure, such as organizing the person to experience the self as a damaged child. If the process of organization can be influenced, the resultant self-organization will change. (p.41)

Although there are a variety of different orientations among writers, there are some common themes that cut across the different perspectives. A review of various descriptions of the change process (Goldfried & Padawer, 1982) suggest the following common principles: (1) the facilitation of expectations that psychotherapy will be helpful; (2) the existence of an optimal therapeutic relationship; (3) the offering of feedback for purposes of increasing the patient's/client's awareness; (4) the encouragement of corrective experiences; and (5) the emphasis on continued reality testing (cited in Goldfried, p. 31).
A Systems Perspective

In the process of transformative change, we become acutely aware that anything whose parts are organized to form an entity which is something more than just the sum of its parts, including ourselves, is a system, and operates as such. Changes in systems typically occur on two levels, either as a change in parts or a change in the relationship of the parts. According to Robertson, the first of these involves self-regulation, while the second involves what can be called self-reorganization. (1990, p. 27)

Within the personality system of an individual, there can also, then, be two types of change: a regulation or simple adjustment which leaves one's overall identity unchanged, or a basic reorganization, which tends to affect multiple aspects of our selves. For example, if a person's self-concept were to change substantially, it is likely that a profound ripple effect would take place throughout the whole personality. The paradox of personality reorganization is that, on the one hand, our personalities as systems tend to resist reorganization and, on the other hand, at the same time, there seems to be embedded in our internal system a powerful element which urges the personality on toward growth.

One of the keys to facilitating personal growth is to learn to understand and to become more at peace with the way the process of growth proceeds, so that we can bolster the growth motivation within us and cooperate with the overall deeper seeking of the self toward wholeness. Growth does not need to be always associated with trauma, though it does have its "wilderness" phases and is not necessarily "comfortable". We can be at peace with that which is not comfortable, however. Changing one part in our system may eventually result in changing the whole, and we need to be aware of this possibility. More will be
said about this later and in the discussion of "parts work" of neurolinguistic programming.

We are a mind/body system which deals with both content and process; we have interrelated formal and functional properties. The "what" of our construction of reality is determined by our beliefs, attitudes, and values. Using Robertson's definitions, beliefs have to do with what we think is real and true, attitudes reveal how we feel about the various parts of our realities and truths, and values are what we think should be real and true. (1990, p. 37). The content of our minds -- the world which each of us constructs -- are comprised by the formal properties of our minds, while the functional properties constitute the ways in which we construct our world and relate to it. These functional properties are about process, about the mind in action, the mind as verb. So, there are thoughts, and there is thinking; there are feelings and there is the process of feeling; there are perceptions and there is the action of perceiving; there are values and there is the process of valuing.

When we wish to change a way we think, feel or act, we may need to change our image of certain situations (a mental form). For instance, using Robertson's example, if we wish to control our anger, by changing our expectations -- our picture of what "should" occur or have occurred -- we can make it easier to reduce our outrage (a mental function). Beginning the other way, with a mental function, being willing to feel empathy for someone may result in a change in our belief or attitude about them or their situation. In this case, improvement in the mind's functional properties (processes) can facilitate change in the mind's formal properties (contents).

This is to demonstrate that the formal and functional properties of the mind interrelate significantly and to reinforce the notion that making the distinction
between the two properties is important in approaching transformative change and growth because it helps us discern what it is exactly that we wish to work on. Do we want to work on our thoughts or our thinking, our values or our valuing, and so on? The paradox, of course, is that it is never totally either/or but rather an issue of both/and.

**Transition and Transformation**

This brings us back to the general principle that growth involves some kind of transformation of the self. Robertson introduces his definition of growth by saying

> Whether we are looking at our own experiences or those of other people, whether the experiences relate to our whole selves or to some specific part of us, whether they be in the personal or professional domains of our lives, growth involves transformation. *Growth is the birth of something new in us.* (p. 44)

This growth is about creating something that was not there before. (For works which inform this definition, Robertson refers the reader to Gilligan, 1982; Kegan, 1982; Kohlberg, 1969, 1973; Kohlberg, Levine, and Hewer, 1983; Loevinger & Blasi, 1976; Perry, 1970; Piaget & Inhelder, 1969; Sanford, 1966; and Werner, 1948).

Given this understanding of the nature of change and the fact that it will be uncomfortable even though deeply sought and wanted by the person's self, it is next important then to understand the phases of development and the process of transformation. Robertson reiterates the story about the man who has lost his keys on the sidewalk and is looking for them under a lamp post, to help make his point. When the man is asked why he is not looking for the keys where he dropped them, he replies, "because the light is better over here!" The story
alerts us to the reality that our old world is where the light is best, and that most of us, no matter how wise and mature, do not readily think of looking for what we need in the dark. But growth requires that we indeed step into the darkness, that we leave the old order behind and take up a new one.

With this leaving the old for the new -- this metanoia -- we will experience grief over the loss of our old world, no matter how much we need and even want the new world. The depth and magnitude of our grief will depend on the depth and magnitude of our transformation. Robertson says we are most vulnerable to this grief when we are between worlds, having left the old but not yet arrived at the new. We need to recognize our own grieving style and realize that we will probably use it in our growth process. Courage, especially, will be the order of the day.

There are, however *maps* for the new territory -- patterns that exist to guide us through the wilderness of transformation. First there is the alternating pattern of change and stability. We need to know and expect that there will be periods of equilibrium and periods of disequilibrium, that dramatic change is usually followed by a period of stability and integration of the change into the system. We need to understand that this pattern of transformation-stability-transformation-stability can be honored without forsaking the general orientation toward generative growth and that, in fact, people need time to let the changes settle in and to allow themselves and the people around them to adjust to their new "selves".

In addition, growth experiences and life transitions generically have three phases. Familiarity with these phases can help us remain motivated and accepting of our own natural processes. These phases tend to occur, whether or not we have allowed for them in our planning. They are described by William
Bridges, who has adapted them from van Gennep's Rites of Passage (1960), and appear in his book Transitions (1980). The more central the growth we are experiencing is to the core of our being, the more noticeable will be the impact of these three phases on our lives and selves.

1. Endings -- "Endings are a time of realizing that our old ways don't work as well as they did, or as we now would like, and of letting go of the frame of reference which is centered on these old ways" (cited in Robertson, 1990, p. 63). They are characterized by "the four D's": disengagement, disidentification, disenchantment, and disorientation. Endings can come in many ways and be planned or unplanned, gradual or eruptive, major or minor, anticipated or unanticipated, positive or negative, and our reactions to them can be just as varied. But what is consistently true about this stage of transformation is that it is a time of "being in the wilderness" and of confusion; we are not quite sure yet where we are going, and maybe even where we have been; at the same time we realize that creating a new world is going to be an immense amount of work.

2. Neutral Zone -- Following endings, we find ourselves in a place which requires the tolerance of ambiguity. This is the in-between place where we are in transit between two worlds. There we are enabled to see things anew without the filters of the old world, sometimes even to experience sensations of heightened awareness. New insights come, new choices emerge, we feel freed to risk new behaviors, and we have time to integrate our new learnings.
3. New Beginnings -- This is a time for fully internalizing our
transformation, both within ourselves and in our relationships. It is a
period of letting the ramifications of our growth "spin out" and letting
ourselves get used to them ... a time for the ripple effects to work
themselves out.

Response to Threat

Growth requires challenge. It also requires support, and balance is
needed between the two. When the challenge is too great, we feel threatened,
and the potential for growth suffers. Robertson reminds us of the necessity and
significance of minimizing (unnecessary) threat where that is possible, because
threat is distracting to the growth process and moves us out of proactivity back
to reactivity, in fear. In reactivity, a person's overriding goal becomes self-
protection and maintenance of the status quo--survival. Also, threat is simply
debilitating in that it depletes our courage. Thus, toward the end of reducing
threat, it is useful to know our threat patterns: what is threatening to us and what
our typical response to threat is.

The Place of Emotions.

Leslie Greenberg and Rene Rhodes, writing in Curtis and Stricker's How
People Change--Inside and Outside Therapy (1990) describe the variety of
roles that emotions play in the change process and their various motivational
properties. One of the authors' basic premises is that in understanding human
change, process is primary. We are in a continual process of becoming,
constantly creating or constructing ourselves and our world anew. As
Whitehead wrote in 1929, "Being is always a process of becoming and is itself
constituted by becoming" (cited in Greenberg and Rhodes, p. 40).
As noted earlier, our human systems (our selves) engage in a self-organizing process as we interact. This process operates in such a way that content learning does not and cannot produce developmental change. Rather, being flexibly organized to respond to the demands of any given situation as it moves and changes is what allows growth to take place. According to the authors, psychotherapy "offers people an opportunity to experience themselves in a new way. What is regained in therapy is the self as organizing process. Therapy, rather than attempting to repair the self, reengages the self in the process of self-organizing" (p. 43). Because we are primarily emotional beings more than we are rational beings, feelers more than thinkers, when we undergo a change in the basic self-organizing process, we can feel overwhelmingly threatened.

[We] respond to this with anxiety, terror, and dread because change is experienced as destruction of the self. Reciprocally, the formation of a new integration (a new self-organized coherence) often brings an experience of relief, joy, and excitement. [Therefore] pain, distress, and sadness signal that change is taking place and that support is needed. Tolerance of fear of change is thus important.... Ultimately, learning that the self is a process makes people less afraid and more able to change. (p. 46)

Using sadness as one example, the author recognized that its expression was often aborted because of feelings of shame, and that this sadness/shame combination could be traced to interpersonal anxieties. Next they observed that clients experienced a deep fear that if they "allowed themselves to feel this sadness and pain they would fall apart, lose control, go out of their mind." So here, the "actual experience of the emotion is feared." Thirdly, not only is the actual feeling of sadness feared, but "the call to action that facing the sadness (over a particular loss, for example) triggers" is feared. (p. 52) So, feeling the
emotion becomes "a reorganizing moment where people often experience a kind of disequilibrium" (p. 55).

The act of allowing the emotion threatens a sense of self-coherence because there is a real sense that the 'me-as-I-know-myself-now' is being threatened. "In a sense there is a cycle of disintegration and reintegration as the self-system lets down barriers, allows new experiences and feelings, and then reorganizes around these new feelings." So "the very act of apprehending one's (sadness) is a change experience." The goal then of psychotherapy is, in part, "to free people to have emotional experiences in the presence of others that feel safe and are the product of self-agency rather than an assault on it" (pp. 55-56).

Nevis (1987) says of resistance that it must be respected. "Attempts to overpower it, avoid it, or eliminate it are not effective methods.... Staying with the resistance in order to fully experience it and then moving on from there is the solution ... again, "process" (cited in Bunker and DeLisle, 1990, p. 143).

What can be concluded from this is that tolerance of unpleasant experiences is going to be essential to the change process. Central to psychoanalytic theory is the idea that the ego must be capable of tolerating anxiety without disintegrating. (Fenichel, 1945; Wachtel, 1977, 1987) Martin Luther is one of the most "visible" examples of someone who experienced a depression close to insanity (Erickson, 1962) from which then a new re-organization of the personality was forged -- a "conversion" which caused a ripple effect throughout the ages for all of Christendom.

The uncomfortable reality is that, as Stricker (1990) points out, "change always disrupts disequilibrium. When it occurs, there are pressures, arising both from within and without, to undo the change and restore the equilibrium."
According to Stricker, "education is the primary vehicle for the production of change, but education is a great deal more than the transmission of information" (pp. 212-213).

Ecology and Planning.

Robertson (1990) urges us to pay attention to the ripple effects of growth, considering early on the consequences of our transformation, so that we do not begin growth projects naively or without considering the impact our changes will have on others. (p. 185 ff.) NLPers call this ecology and similarly urge us to think through such issues before engaging in activities to set the growth project in motion. What they call outcome specification (refer to Chapter 1), Robertson calls developmental planning. Both recognize each of us as parts of a variety of systems and honor the fact that our own personal changes will indeed affect others in the system. Thus the term ecology is aptly applied.

In the Robertson version, we first clarify the objectives of our growth project (our desired outcomes) and then explore ourselves and our worlds for resources--actual and potential, external and internal--which can help us to achieve the objectives. What threats will there be, what supports, for each phase of the learning cycle? How will our self-awareness be enhanced? How will our new learnings be integrated? What will their effects be on our selves and our worlds?

Next, strategy formation involves creating images of anticipated actualities; this is the time for being very specific about what we will do. We can help ourselves in this phase by visualizing scenarios representing the possibilities and noticing what is different in each and our responses to them. Following strategy formation, we determine evaluation methods for assessing how we will know when we have made progress toward achieving our objectives. In
addition to looking at our own feelings and behaviors here, we may wish to incorporate other people's perceptions of our progress into our evaluation plan.

The final phase involves creating timelines: sequencing the various activities of the plan and connecting them to dates. While growth projects, by definition, evolve on their own timeline in many respects, and sequencing cannot be really scheduled, framing some kind of timeline serves to help us keep moving and works against stuckness or stagnation. They encourage thinking ahead to possible or likely interrelationships of various activities of the growth project, so they may be addressed most effectively.

Creating effective growth plans hinges on making these critical links between our desired futures and concrete presents. Considering ripple effects in advance will both deepen our commitment to the growth project and give us a solid, well-constructed base for what we are trying to do. (Ibid.)

William Torbert, writing in *The Power of Balance -- Transforming Self, Society, and Scientific Inquiry* (1991) warns that transforming power requires a continual, humble effort -- not just to be rational, but to be aware of the present moment in all its fullness. This awareness effort includes and transcends one's own material interests, emotional preferences, and intellectual theory about the situation, as well as those of others and the institutions involved. This effort also transcends the narrowness of the present and experiences how the past is growing into this moment and the future is growing out of it. (1991, pp. 56-57)

This living awareness -- self-awareness, ultimately -- is not only a thread running through the literature on personal change and transformation, but once again is also a spiritual principle in both Eastern and Western traditions. Awareness increases our openness to other possibilities, other perspectives, other ways of doing things. One of the qualities of Torbert's so-called "liberating
structure" is that the structure is open, in principle, to inspection and challenge by organization members. A leadership committed to and practiced in seeking, recognizing and righting personal and organizational incongruities will be a leadership characterized by self-awareness. This means also that transforming leaders tend to move toward, not away from trouble, and invite mutuality. Transforming power is not only open to but actively seeks challenge and contradiction. (p. 38)

In this leadership course, maintaining awareness of the ripple effects of the exercises upon the participants' lives and monitoring the level of threat this created, striving toward a balance between challenge and safety, were goals and intentions of the instructors. This became its own exercise in sensory acuity and listening carefully to participants' spoken and unspoken communication, and a challenge to the instructors' own self-awareness.
Dialogue As Facilitative of Generative Change

David Bohm, a theoretical physicist writing on the subject of dialogue, tracks the derivation of the word from the Greek *dialogos*. *Logos* means "the word" or the meaning of the word, and *dia* means "through", not two. This derivation "suggests a stream of meaning flowing among us and through us and between us, out of which will flow some new understanding, something creative" (1989, p. 16). It is important to note here that Bohm also allows for the instance of a single individual having dialogue with himself or herself, as long as the spirit of dialogue is present. In interaction, as people become sensitive to nuances beyond what is in their own minds, there becomes a shared meaning. They can then talk together coherently as well as think together. This coherence is akin to the in-phase coherence of light that creates the intensity of a laser beam. There is much power in it, including at a tacit level.

Dialogue and Reflection

According to Bohm (1989), "the purpose of dialogue is to reveal the incoherence in our thought." According to Peter Senge (1990), "the purpose of dialogue is to go beyond any one individual's understanding." (cited in Senge, 1990, p. 241) Both are appropriate expressions of the role dialogue plays in development. Somehow, too, a link between dialogue and reflection seems to be self-evident. How could one be fully present without the other? Yet not all who write or research reflectivity also directly address the dialogical context in
which reflection often takes place, much less the mutual and generative nature of the two.

Richard Paul, whose primary research and writing has focused on critical thinking, emphasizes the role of dialogue and dialogical thinking in learning (as carried out both internally and externally) and makes the claim that people learn best in dialogical contexts. Paul (1990), uses the term dialogical thinking to refer to thinking that involves dialogue or extended exchange between different points of view, cognitive domains, or frames of reference, an openness to multiple points of view. Dialectical thinking, on the other hand, refers to dialogical thinking conducted to test the strengths and weaknesses of opposing points of view. Both are multilingual. That is, both refer to the ability to reason accurately and "fairmindedly," within opposing points of view and contradictory frames of reference. As most real-life issues are multilingual, dialogical and dialectical thinking are appropriate modes through which to address complex issues. In distinguishing between inert knowledge and the inability to transfer knowledge, Paul alerts us to the fact that children often "do not transfer the knowledge they learn in school to new settings because they already have activated ideas and beliefs to use in those settings." Only by bringing out the child's own ideas in dialogical and dialectical settings can the child begin to reconstruct and progressively transcend those conceptions" (p. 211).

The same may be said of adults engaged in development activities. While they may, indeed, engage in reflective thinking and carry on discourse with colleagues and others, unless they have truly engaged with their own beliefs and values, they risk simply superimposing the beliefs of another on their own, investing great amounts of energy in carrying out the behaviors which stem from such beliefs (that is, those which are supposed to result) and achieving,
perhaps, some of the desired outcomes, but only temporarily. Unless the outcomes carry sufficient power to sustain the individual's efforts, the behaviors are likely to diminish and the beliefs to revert to what is more habituated in the person.

As dialogical thinking is a series of reciprocal creative acts, critical thinking cannot be separated from creative thinking. One is continually creating a new point of view. Because our minds are never empty of beliefs or without a point of view, Paul reminds us that the process of gaining knowledge is at its roots dialogical. The implication of dialogue for reflective practice is in the need to carry on dialogue in the absence of others with whom to engage—in other words, self-dialogue. Here we must frame the dialogical exchange ourselves, and so must apply skills of empathy and reciprocity. For some, this is what reflection actually means.

**Integrative Process**

Mary Ann Hazen (1987) in "Dialogue as a Process of Integration in Human Systems," describes dialogue "as a process ... a connection ... in which each interactor meets the other in mutuality, reciprocity and co-inquiry." Dialogue, she says, "moves systems toward wholeness, allowing them to integrate aspects of themselves which might otherwise be denied, cut off, repressed, suppressed, or distorted, and allows for the development of the system and the subsystems which comprise it" (p. 119). Basic to this understanding of dialogue is, once again, the constructivist perspective.

To Hazen, dialogue is both a transforming moment and an integrative process. Naming one's experience in the present calls forth both reflection on the experience and action to change its nature, its impact on the future. This
dialogic combination is what Paolo Friere (1970) calls "praxis". As we name and rename, we create our social world. In fact, "we transform our world [each time] we speak our truth or recognize another's truth" (p. 125). Because dialogue takes place not only between small groups but at other levels as well, subsystems of any human system can, through dialogue, become integrated while the larger system itself moves toward wholeness.

The interperson nature of dialogue requires mutuality, which can only exist and flourish when each person recognizes the other and the self as persons -- growing and developing human beings -- not as objects to be used or manipulated. The relationship is reciprocal; that is, each believes that he or she is able to learn from and to teach the other. Each gives, and each receives. Each contributes to the other's growth, and each recognizes and acknowledges that contribution. In the process of dialogue, conflict is not denied. "It is perceived as an integral and perhaps necessary aspect of the relationship.... Differences are stated and acknowledged. Agreement, if it is reached, is reached through understanding and is not forced or manipulated" (p. 124).

As people relate to one another in mutuality, reciprocity, and co-inquiry, they create knowledge. They are transformed, and they and their system become more integrated. Private knowledge becomes public, and, when shared within the larger system, it, too, changes, becomes more integrated and is transformed.

Meeting: Being Called Forth

Finally, the writings of Maurice Friedman, particularly in Dialogue and the Human Image - Beyond Humanistic Psychology (1992), add an important dimension to consideration of the nature and significance of dialogue, taking
the understanding of dialogue deeper than heretofore. Friedman begins by reviewing Martin Buber's "ontology of the between," which begins with the premise that "all real living is meeting." That is, when two persons "happen* to each other, what is common to them reaches beyond the sphere of each. This is the "sphere of the between" and is the basic reality. In an essential relation, the other becomes present not merely in the imagination or feelings but in the depths of one's substance, so that one experiences the mystery of the other being in the mystery of one's own. For such a relationship to be possible, each must be a real person in his or her own right. (p. 4)

This is what creates the possibility for real oneness as opposed to enmeshment.

According to Friedman, "the sphere of the between comes to its fullness in the life of dialogue." Genuine dialogue, however, is not attained through seeking it. Rather we experience genuine dialogue "by allowing the other to exist in his or her otherness and not just as a content of our experience and thought" (Ibid.). As inferred by the title of his book, Friedman claims "there is an essential interrelationship between the life of dialogue and the image of the human" (p. 5). The meaningful personal and social direction implied by this image simultaneously concerns itself with authentic human existence as a whole and what is authentic for each individual;

... for it is precisely in our uniqueness that each of us realizes what the human can become in us. We come to awareness of ourselves as selves not just through our individuality, however, but in our dialogue with other selves -- in their response to us and in the way they call us into being. (p. 5)

Friedman agrees with Maslow and others that the basic needs of self-actualizing people can be filled only by and through other human beings, that such people do not realize themselves through aiming at self-actualization, but
instead are deeply involved in their work and in responding to what is called out in them. If becoming what we feel we should become as persons, even under the guise of becoming better able to help others to realize themselves, we are not likely to get beyond ourselves to genuine dialogue with others.

Friedman makes the distinction, too, between human potentiality and the direction it is given, something self-actualization and self-realization leave unaddressed but which remains part of the human image, claiming that we only discover our potentiality when faced with actuality and that we do not really know our resources -- our potential -- in advance of that call. Our potentialities are not always in our control. They are not something in us. Rather, "they are between us and what calls us out." For example, he asserts,

The questioner is just as important as the answerer. A wise person is not a fount of knowledge. On the contrary, he or she is helpless until someone asks a question great enough to evoke a profound response. A person does not have wisdom. Wisdom literally happens, comes to be, in the between. (p. 19)

He goes on to say,

The word self has no meaning ... apart from the way in which we bring our deep responses to life situations. Jesus said, "He who would find his life must lose it." But if you set out to lose your life in order to find it, you will not really have lost it and, therefore, cannot really find it. This is the paradox of aiming directly at self-realization as a goal instead of allowing it to come as a by-product of living itself. (p. 19)

At the same time that we honor the place of questioning in dialogue, we must also cultivate moment-to-moment awareness of the concrete situation and bring our selves, our presence, to it. Friedman cites the work of William Coulson in emphasizing the value of bringing people together in dialogue to promote their relating again person-to-person rather than function-to-function
and paraphrases Coulson in declaring that, "The humanizing need within institutional life is for occasions for genuine meeting; it is out of such meeting that real community will arise" (p.31).

The kind of changes we hope to bring about in organizations, the transformations we hope to facilitate within people, and the empowerment we wish to foster call for the type of interaction and community building addressed here. The goal is not to create a community of affinity or like-mindedness, but rather, a community of otherness, and in that community, each to discover and to have called out a more authentic self.

Thus dialogue serves more than surface purposes in clarifying our thinking, exposing us to the beliefs and perspectives of others (as well as our own), allowing us to access new ideas, to generate new knowledge, and so forth. It simultaneously calls forth our deepest being and gives direction to our potential. These are things that casual discourse cannot and will not accomplish in us.

**Presence**

A second paradox we encounter is this.

Some of the very things we try in order to reveal the human image hide it further...Sensitivity training is no substitute for sensitivity, openness and responsiveness ... to the unique, concrete situation in all its fullness and not just to what one is looking for. (p. 27)

There is something about structuring the experience that tampers with the natural process of evolving personal transformation; the encounter in the encounter group "goes better when the leader yields to the process and shares
in its suffering, vulnerability, and surprise" (p. 30). All great self-realization is a
by-product of being really present in the situation in which we are involved.

Finally, Hycner (1991) discusses a similar awareness of the necessary
dialectic between I-Thou and I-It relationships wherein he speaks of presence.
Present-centeredness is what keeps the process of therapy fully alive,
responding moment by moment to the ongoing changes forthcoming.
Remaining in the present moment fully available to what is now....and
now....and now...is the crux of prayer. Perhaps, too, it is a cornerstone of
learning.

It was the hope and intention of the Leadership II course instructors that
this class could be a place where dialogue in its deeper meanings could
emerge and where the students' experiences would be named and heard by
others--a place where relationships could be created in mutuality, reciprocity,
and co-inquiry, thereby creating knowledge. In response to this, questioning
and presence, structure and spontaneity, were all seen to have a place in
creating and allowing for experiences of meaningful dialogue. Among the
processes employed to foster this was coaching, but coaching in very specific
forms, intended to be congruent with the principles of dialogical presence stated
above.

Coaching

As organizations have begun to shift to developing teams and, in
particular, self-directed work teams, the practice of coaching has attracted
considerably more attention than in the past. Beverly Geber, in her article,
"From Manager Into Coach" (1992), asserts that coaching is not a subset of the
field of management, but is the essence of management, in which the purpose is to enable people in team to generate results and to be empowered by the results they generate. Roger D. Evered and James C. Selman, in "Coaching and the Art of Management" (1990), list what they consider to be the characteristics of a good coach. Among these are to be focused on the development of each person; to be committed to the possibility that there are no absolute limits to the performance of either an individual or an organization; to be a learner and to listen acutely. (pp. 122-124) In short, what they perceive to be happening is

a paradigm shift from traditional concerns with hierarchical authority, order and control, and motivation by job insecurity, to one that is based on partnership for achieving results, and commitment to collaborating in accomplishing new possibilities rather than maintaining old structures. (p. 127)

These same characteristics apply to effective leadership, and the leader, too, must often assume the role of coach. This suggests that the leader learn how to effectively communicate as a coach and to carry on coaching dialogues.

**Cognitive Coaching.**

Among the forms of supervisory and peer coaching practices which evolved in the field of education during the 1980's, one in particular draws specifically on the beliefs and practices of NLP. Arthur Costa and Robert Garmston, in *The Art of Cognitive Coaching* (1989), offer a syllabus and training manual for coaching the intellectual skills they deemed necessary for effective and educationally sound decision-making on the part of teachers and school systems. With slight modification, the approach is suitable for use by any group of people in any field or organization, even family units.
Among the foci of training in cognitive coaching are the range of factors affecting decision-making, the functions of the mind and the effects of stress on brain functioning, the distinctions between coaching and evaluation, the intellectual functions of teaching and administration, indicators of individuals' intellectual autonomy, and the act of coaching itself. Supporting these are information and exercises on desired outcomes, rapport, ecology, cognitive styles, representational systems, belief systems, and working with states of mind related to their definition of autonomy.

This form of coaching differs significantly from what many think of when hearing the term and is the form described and taught in the leadership course subject to study here, along with some of the concepts and information which attend it. Among the basic assumptions of cognitive coaching -- derived from its synthesis of research -- are:

- Thought and perceptions produce all behavior;
- Teaching, administering, leading, etc. is decision-making;
- Learning and performance require changes in thought and perception; and
- All adults can grow cognitively.

It is this cognitive growth and change in thought and perceptions that coaching is intended to facilitate, and it does so through inquiry and dialogue.

The stated purpose of cognitive coaching is to modify the capacity of individuals to modify themselves and to construct knowledge from experience; its goals are trust, learning (on the part of the coach, as well as the person being coached), and autonomy, where autonomy is defined as having the capacity to act with intentionality; to generate and choose from alternatives; to use precise language; to take responsibility; to monitor, reflect upon and learn from
experience; to align behaviors with values; and to activate community. In this framework, autonomy is posited to have five dimensions. These represent the five major states of mind which are deemed to be prerequisite to autonomous behavior in any individual. They are orientation perspectives and internal conditions existing in the person which serve as the source of their behavior. The five include:

- **Efficacy** - possessing an internal locus of control and sense of making a difference in the world;
- **Flexibility** - having the capacity to view things from a variety of perspectives and to engage in multiple and simultaneous outcomes and activities;
- **Precision** - seeking refinement, specificity and exactness in performance and communication;
- **Consciousness** - engaging in metacognition and in mental editing and mental rehearsal;
- **Community** - participating in collegial efforts and contributing to a common good

The role of the coach is described by Costa and Garmston as a mediator who intervenes in order to bring meaning to experience. This aligns with the concept of learning as a social process and the beliefs that "humans mature intellectually in reciprocal relationships with other humans."

Every function in...cultural development appears twice: first on the social level, and later on the individual level; first between people (interpsychological) and then inside (intrapsychological). This applies equally to voluntary attention, to logical memory, and to the formation of concepts. All the higher functions originate as actual relationships between individuals. (Vygotsky, 1978)
If we accept that the mediational tools required to move from an existing state to a desired state involve language as well as environmental tools, then the mediator or coach must be someone who can employ both with reasonable facility.

In the leadership course, the instructors sought to teach students how to coach through supplying them with scripts and demonstrations, as well as modeling associated behaviors and beliefs in basically all general interactions with them. The students were then expected to practice coaching with each other and were assigned to coaching trios to facilitate their practice and to improve their skills through the feedback of teammates.
Neuro-Linguistic Programming

Neuro-Linguistic Programming (NLP) as an area of research and practice, as noted in Chapter I, was inaugurated by Richard Bandler and John Grinder in 1975 with the publication of *The Structure of Magic*, Volume 1. Its growth as a field has been supported by the work of Robert Dilts, Leslie Cameron-Bandler, David Gordon, Steve and Connirae Andreas, Michael Grinder, and others, some of whom contributed to the early work and findings of NLP and later launched its use into the fields of business, education, health care and even spirituality. As it was not the intent of the founders to restrict its application to psychology or psychotherapy, the work of the many have helped to broaden its scope of application and make training in its techniques available to people in virtually all walks of life and across a wide span of age groups.

Joseph O'Connor and John Seymour, in *Introducing Neuro-Linguistic Programming - The New Psychology of Personal Excellence* (1990), declare that "NLP represents an attitude of mind and a way of being in the world ... It is a set of models, skills and techniques for thinking and acting effectively ..." (p. 17). In conformity with Bandler and Grinder's original notions, they write,

NLP deals with the structure of human subjective experience; how we organize what we see, hear and feel, and how we edit and filter the outside world through our senses. It also explores how we describe it in language and how we act, both intentionally and unintentionally, to produce results.... Everyone lives in their unique reality built from their sense impressions and individual experiences of life, and we act on the basis of what we perceive: our model of the world....The filters we put on our perceptions determine what sort of world we live in....
We have many natural, useful and necessary filters. Language is a filter. It is a map of our thoughts and experiences, removed a further level from the real world. Our beliefs also act as filters, causing us to act in certain ways and to notice some things at the expense of others. NLP offers one way of thinking about ourselves and the world; it is itself a filter.... By changing [our] filters, [we] can change [our] world. (pp. 23-24)

In the introduction to *Changing Belief Systems with NLP* (1990), Robert Dilts expands on how beliefs act as filters and addresses our gaining choice over our beliefs by restructuring, unlearning or changing old beliefs which limit us and imprinting new ones which expand our potential.

The notion of choice and the aim of giving people more choice about what they do is primary in NLP. Drawing on the work of Gregory Bateson, we are reminded that most of what we do and do best, we do unconsciously. Initially, we learn by consciously mastering small behaviors. We then add and expand upon those behaviors until we have created unconscious habits. If indeed, as George Miller proposed in 1956, our consciousness is limited to seven plus or minus two bits of information (either from the external world or our own internal thought world), this learning process and the relegation of behaviors to the unconscious is highly important in that we may then free our conscious mind to notice and attend to other things.

Certain behavioral patterns, the beliefs out of which we act and all the life-giving processes of our body, together with all that we have learned and experienced, rest in our unconscious, as do those things we might notice in the present but do not. Thus we must deal both with our conscious and our unconscious or other-than-conscious mind as we attempt to create or discern new choices for beliefs or behaviors. Furthermore, in order to build new
choices and more efficient patterns, we must go backwards in the learning loop and first unlearn, so we can then relearn or learn anew.

Based on their knowledge of NLP processes and procedures, O'Connor and Seymour describe a potential three-minute seminar on NLP as being comprised of an outcome statement, an acuity statement, and a flexibility statement.

... the presenter would walk on and say, "Ladies and gentlemen, to be successful in life you need only remember three things. Firstly, know what you want; have a clear idea of your outcome in any situation. Secondly, be alert and keep your senses open so that you notice what you are getting. Thirdly, have the flexibility to keep changing what you do until you get what you want." He would then write the words Outcome, Acuity, Flexibility on the board and leave. (p. 27)

They remind us that,"Being effective in the world means producing the results you choose [and] the first step is to choose" (p. 28).

**Concepts and Techniques**

Clearly, the ability to specify a well-formed outcome -- one which satisfies criteria such as being positively stated, in the control of the person, and ecological -- is considered essential to the skill base of an NLP practitioner (user). In addition, the user must develop sensory acuity (present moment sensory awareness) both in communicating with himself or herself (thinking and reflecting) and in communicating with others. This helps people to notice whether or not they are getting the results they desire. Then, as Bandler and Grinder would say, if what they are doing is not working, they must be ready to do something else. This, of course, requires flexibility on the part of the user, which, in turn, requires that they possess a reasonably broad repertoire. Choice is deemed to exist only when an individual can specify three possible
approaches or alternatives. Otherwise, the person has no choice (one alternative) or experiences a dilemma (two alternatives). More than three alternatives can be too many, overwhelming the person.

Elicitation, calibration, and anchoring are three primary skills in a practitioner's repertoire. All three deal with a person's state of mind. O'Connor and Seymour define state of mind as "all the thoughts, emotions and physiology that we express at the moment; the mental pictures, sounds, feelings, and all the patterns of physical posture and breathing;" indicating that, "mind and body are completely interconnected, so our thoughts immediately influence our physiology, and vice versa" (1990, p. 63). Elicitation refers to guiding someone (or oneself) into a specific state; calibration refers to recognizing a state change, that is, recognizing a change in one's internal state, often visible externally as it is displayed through breathing, skin tone, pupil dilation, and the like; and anchoring refers to providing a stimulus (usually external) which is linked to and triggers a particular state.

In researching the work of psychotherapists Satir, Perls, and Erickson, Bandler and Grinder observed and modeled their skills and developed the concepts of preferred representational system (PRS), pacing and leading. They suggested that, after determining a person's PRS -- calibrated to the individual in a specific context -- one could, by mirroring the person's physiology and verbally matching his or her predicates, enhance rapport with the person and eventually lead him or her to another state. (The phrase "matching predicates" refers to speaking to the person in his/her preferred mode of receiving information -- the preferred "modality"-- which is usually visual, auditory, or kinesthetic, what NLPers refer to as VAK.) Similarly, they believed that by determining the unique sequence of modalities employed as a person takes in
and processes information in various situations, one could then pace that process (or, in some instances, help the individual to find other strategies) and successfully lead the person toward desired outcomes, thereby facilitating change.

Of communication itself, O'Connor and Seymour remind us that

When you communicate with another person, you perceive their response, and react with your own thoughts and feelings. Your ongoing behaviour is generated by your internal responses to what you see and hear. ... Your partner is responding to your behaviour in the same way. You communicate with your words, with your voice quality, and with your body: postures, gestures, expressions. You cannot not communicate. Some message is conveyed even if you say nothing and keep still. (1990, pp. 33-34)

They go on to say,

If the words are the content of the message, then the postures, gestures, expression, and voice tonality are the context in which the message is embedded, and together they make the meaning of the communication. ... To be an effective communicator, act on the [NLP] principle that:

The meaning of the communication is the response that you get.

NLP is the ability to respond effectively to others and to understand and respect their model of the world. ... You already influence others, the only choice is whether to be conscious or unconscious of the effects you create. The only question is, can you influence with integrity? Is the influence you are having in alignment with your values? NLP techniques are neutral. (pp. 35-36)

Regarding the notions of rapport, pacing, and leading, they assert the importance of both verbal and non-verbal rapport for the free-flow of communication. When two people's bodies and words are "in sync," they are "engaged in a dance of mutual responsiveness." Hence, if the meaning of communication is the response it elicits, gaining rapport is the ability to elicit responses. (pp. 37-38) Where rapport allows you to build a bridge to the other person so that you have some point of understanding and contact, pacing is
establishing the bridge through respectful attention to the person's state in the moment. Leading, then, is changing your behavior in gradual increments so that the other person follows. "Leading will not work without rapport. You cannot lead someone over a bridge without building it first" (p. 39).

The notions of outcome specification, sensory acuity, elicitation and calibration of states, anchoring, representational systems, establishing rapport, and pacing and leading are all intertwined and basic to NLP techniques. Beyond these, Bandler and Grinder developed what they called the Meta-Model, a model of language use which employs questions to elicit specificity and clarity and to bring to awareness persons' tendencies, among others, to generalize, to presuppose, to construct equivalences, to use nominalizations, and to engage in cause-effect thinking and mind-reading. Students in the leadership course were introduced to each of these concepts and techniques at some time and on some level during the ten weeks.

The Fit of NLP With Systems and Transformative Change

Robertson's conception of the person as a mind/body system with interrelated formal and functional properties clearly aligns with those of NLP practitioners and researchers. Both support Senge's emphasis on differentiating thoughts (mental forms) from thinking (mental processes), although here the concept explicitly extends to perceptions/perceiving, feelings/feeling and values/valuing.

NLP's techniques for "parts work" (six-step reframing, visual squash, etc.) and belief change operate out of this systems perspective. Submodality work and language patterns address the contents of the mind, while strategy work and other language patterns address process, although each has implications
for the other. Robertson suggests that distinguishing whether to work on our thoughts/feelings/values or our thinking/feeling/valuing is a significant step in any development effort. NLP researchers such as Dilts offer conceptual frameworks which address this notion as well. More will be said about this in what follows.
Conceptual Frameworks

Conceptually, the research here draws upon Ian Cunningham's research on self-managed learning, in which he studied management developers, specifically, instructional staff charged with providing assistance to learners and learning groups who write their own curriculum and take charge of their own learning processes. In describing his work, Cunningham says, "I synthesized methods from independent study, action learning and self-development into an approach which I labelled 'self-managed learning'" (1988, p. 163).

Cunningham was particularly interested in questioning techniques used in NLP, as presented originally in Bandler and Grinder's The Structure of Magic, Volumes 1 and 2 (1975). The objective of such techniques is to obtain sensory-specific data by challenging ambiguous language to gain clarity. He says of his use of the technique within aspects of his collaborative research,

What it convinced me of was the centrality of language: ... that our language was imprecise, ambiguous and wooly, and that I could see little progress in this field [management development] unless we developed more rigorous and sophisticated ways of dealing with language patterns." (p. 176)

Elaborating on this, he goes on to say, "The situation, as I see it, is that we have a mass of unclear terms used in 'management development' (including 'management development' itself) but which are allowed to masquerade as precise and with agreed meaning" (p. 177).

One of the dilemmas Cunningham found to be significant to study/support group advisors but which lacked adequate coverage in the literature of his day
was what he calls the support-confront dilemma. That is, to what degree should the advisor support group members and to what degree confront them? He and colleagues in a collaborative research group arrived at a rather simple solution:

One supports being
One confronts doing

Know it or not, Cunningham expresses here one of the fundamental tenets of NLP. He describes the issue as having "added to a wider consideration of the separation of 'being' and 'doing' factors in studying human beings and their actions (doings)" (p. 181).

The Holistic Learning Model

Cunningham developed a research framework comprised of five interconnecting methods and called his efforts "interactive holistic research." He claims to have

... wanted to emphasize the value of a method of researching which uses

1 existing theories and ideas (contextual locating)
2 situations and contexts of human action (action research)
3 the interaction with others (dialogic research and collaborative research)
4 and acknowledges and utilizes one's self (experiential research).

The ideal is to run these modes almost concurrently. As I am talking with others I am aware of myself as well as the other(s); I am aware of existing theoretical and conceptual schema and I am aware of the context of the action. (p.181)

As these modes can at best be run only 'almost concurrent,' he calls for close attention to be paid to the interplay of interaction of the five.
This study uses the Cunningham model as an initial framework but conceives of and labels the five research methods as contexts of knowing or learning contexts, that is, relational contexts in which learning can occur. It assumes that there are at least five learning relationships or contexts engaged by participants within the construct of the leadership course. The adjusted model is called a holistic learning model and retains the same emphasis on attention to the interaction of the five learning contexts as does Cunningham's. Figure 1 shows the model, which differs from Cunningham's only in the substitution of the word context for the word research. Descriptions of the five methods and the variation of this model from the original follow. (See also Cunningham, 1988, pp. 164-172.)
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Figure 1
A Holistic Learning Model
The Dialogic Context.

In Cunningham's framework, dialogic "research" centers on two person interaction in which dialogue is used as a mode of 'finding out.' It is, at one level, a special case of collaborative research wherein one need attend only to the interpersonal relationship of two people rather than to the group process of three or more. Dialogue is seen as providing a place in which both to test and develop concepts, models or propositions produced elsewhere and to provide these same elements as input to other contexts.

Here the dialogic "learning context" is comprised of occasions in which dialogue and verbal sharing occur between and among two or more persons and, in some instances, even includes episodes of self-talk, as dialogue is interpreted along the lines of Bohm's "flow of meaning." It nevertheless retains Cunningham's attributes as a mode of finding out and a context inclusive of comments, questions, and the initiation of new areas of exploration and feedback. A pure dialogic context might be characterized in this model by an exchange of divergent thoughts, ideas, and beliefs which cause participants to become acutely aware of and, often, to reassess their own perspectives in a way which prompts each to create new meanings. The dialogic remains in this model a special case of the collaborative learning context, but involves a more free and spontaneous flow of topics with less of a central focus of discussion and/or exploration.

The Collaborative Context.

For Cunningham, the collaborative research component involves research conducted by a group who together determine the topics and means of investigation. It may be of two types. The first reflects cooperative inquiry modes, where researchers study their own experience in the group to which
they belong. The second involves people coming together to study experience that has occurred outside the group and may or may not include studying the group's own processes and experiences. (Cunningham deemed only the second to be relevant to his study of support group advisors.)

Collaborative learning contexts in the holistic model remain largely describable as one of Cunningham's two types, although perhaps simplified or given more distinct boundaries. The first type here refers to occasions when participants discuss, assess, provide feedback on, or otherwise study their experience as a collective. The second involves the study of individual's experiences outside the group. This may similarly include examining the nature of those experiences and their link with desired learnings.

The Experiential Context.

Cunningham's experiential research focuses on the direct experience of the person/researcher, who thereby becomes the 'subject.' Again there are two types: "the personal, where the researcher and subject are one and the same," and "the dialogic, where experience and/or response to experience is shared with others." (p. 164) Here, a basic requirement of experiential research (which Cunningham borrows from Ferguson's Aquarian Conspiracy, 1980) is "to experience one's own experiencing, to be aware of one's awareness and conscious of one's consciousness," as each person makes linkages between self and the world around him/her. (p. 174)

The adjusted model's experiential contexts retain the direct experience of the individual learner as a focus and also are of two types: the personal and the dialogic. Here, the personal refers to one's own sense-making of one's experience. In other words, it involves the recognitions and insights we come to in reflecting on our own experiences and what we might be learning from them.
The dialogic again refers to experience and/or response to experience which is shared with others (or is held with self but with the spirit of dialogue present) and hopefully incorporates feedback from them. As in Cunningham's model, the experiential context is characterized by the individual's recognition and awareness of his or her own knowing and experiencing of his/her own experience, as each attempts to find their fit in the world and make sense of their lives.

**The Action Context.**

Action research, according to Cunningham, involves active doing or in-the-moment action and reflection as one tests personal research in action. (Action may be a special case of the experiential, differentiated only by its present rather than past time frame.) Action "contexts" involve experimenting with new actions or thought processes and any reflection-in-action that takes place while so doing. Again, action contexts are distinguishable from experiential contexts by their orientation to the present rather than the past.

**Contextual locating.**

For Cunningham, contextual locating provides the backcloth of patterns and ideas within which more specific efforts are carried out. It refers to both inputs and outputs related to the context in which one operates and may involve literature, conferences, publications, discussions, and the like. That is, the individual's engagement with reading, writing, talking to others, doing and experiencing things, together with linking the thinking and doing elements, constitute his or her context. This remains the same in the holistic learning model. Specific to the study is the common background students brought to the course experience through having all taken at least the first course of the
leadership series, thus being exposed to a common core of authors and conceptions of leadership.

The NLP Outcome Model

The research here also draws upon NLP's outcome chain model as a framework in which to establish goals, access the beliefs and values undergirding those goals, and probe the resources one has and needs in order to achieve desired outcomes. Specific questions within the chain were posed by Cunningham in conducting his research. (Cunningham also espouses several of the NLP presuppositions and articulates beliefs and assumptions quite congruent with NLP's perspective on human behavior and our unique subjective experience.)

The outcome model has two distinct parts. The first is designed to elicit a chain of outcomes associated with the deeper structures of one's belief and value systems. It begins with asking the individual what he or she wants. In other words, what is the immediate outcome the person desires? The response is then followed by questions asking, in an iterative process, what having that outcome will do for the person, what it will make possible for the person or what the person wants even more than this particular outcome. The goal here is to continue the question-response pattern until no further responses are available. The person has come to the end of the chain. There is nothing beyond this particular "core outcome," as elicited from the desire initially stated.

NLPers believe that distinctly different starting points or immediate outcomes will often lead to the same core outcome and that each individual has several such core outcomes representing the ultimate goals of that person's life. These are the identity elements and transcendent goals which the person seeks
to manifest or achieve through their actions in the world. The NLP presupposition that behind every behavior there is a positive intent refers to the individual's desired core outcomes and the intermediate outcomes to which they are linked, together with the behaviors the person exhibits in an effort to achieve them.

It is hoped that, by becoming aware of our own core outcomes and articulating them, we may become increasingly aware of what motivates us, at the deepest levels, to behave in certain ways. This awareness should then make it possible for us to recognize where we need more choice in our behavior, so that we may begin work to increase our repertoire of responses. As a result, our behaviors can be aligned more closely with who we wish to be in the world and can better support us in our becoming that person. This portion of the outcome chain is shown in Figure 2 below.

(continue...)

--->

Chunk up to meta outcomes

--- "Core Outcomes"

--->

And when you have **that**, what will that do for you?

--->

When you have (that), what will that do for you?

WHAT DO YOU WANT?

Figure 2
Outcome Chain Model
(Part 1)
Part 2 of the Outcome Model is constituted by questions which move away from the abstract and toward the concrete. Here the person is asked about evidence criteria, context attributes, resources, and personal ecology in an effort to "specify" the outcome sufficiently to be able to plan and take action toward achieving it.

The evidence question -- Where, when and with whom do you want this outcome? -- seeks a response which is sensory based. In other words, the person is being asked to describe what he or she will see, hear, and feel that will serve as evidence of achieving the outcome. The context question alerts the individual to others who may be affected by his or her having the outcome or by efforts to achieve it. Knowing this allows the person to speak with these people and incorporate them or at least attempt to achieve their support in the effort.

One of the more compelling questions in the model seems to be, What stops you from already having your outcome? While the context question may elicit insights about potential external resistance, this question probes internal resistance. Together, the two address the ecological issues surrounding or brought about by attempts to achieve the desired outcome. At times, resistances will also be evoked in the first part of the elicitation. These need to be noted and dealt with if one is to be fully congruent in striving for the outcome. Sometimes, modification of the outcome is necessary in order to avoid internally provoked sabotage of one's conscious and intentional efforts. Part 2 of the outcome chain is shown in Figure 3.

Of particular importance in applying the model is to attend to what NLP calls the well-formedness conditions for outcome specification. These specify that responses to the questions need to be formed in the positive and need to
be under the control of the individual. They also need to be addressed to, at least ultimately, issues of behavior and response which are sufficiently narrow to allow listing specific action steps to start the path to achievement. In NLP terminology, the "chunk size" needs to be relatively small. Too general an outcome simply becomes unmanageable and discouraging.
In addressing the resources a person has available, it is important to articulate both internal and external resources and to probe for ones which may have not yet been accessed by the individual. Strategies can then be built, using both these untapped resources and those specified as needed, to acquire sufficient resources to support achieving the outcome.

The outcome chain model is used in the study both as an exercise for students to engage and as a sort for the data. Therefore the reader will find it being referenced in each of the remaining chapters of this document. Similarly, multiple references occur to Robert Dilts' framework regarding the neurology of brain functioning. His neurological or, simply, logical levels likewise serve a dual function, in that students are engaged both at the beginning and end of the course in an exercise using the logical levels and they provide a way of talking about and discriminating among the internal levels or depths at which students are working or exploring.

**Dilts' Neurological Levels**

In his book, *Changing Belief Systems with NLP* (1990), Dilts identifies six neurological levels which he believes depict the organization of our mental system, drawing upon the work of Gregory Bateson. Einspruch and Forman (1985) summarize Bateson's four logical levels of learning as follows:

The first level is the level of content, and this is the level at which most people spend their lives. Here one learns how to tie one's shoes, cook a meal, drive a car, and so on. Some people become acquainted with second-level learning: the learning of context, or learning how to learn. People who operate at this level may rapidly learn any new content-specific area, because they are capable of moving through the learning process in an efficient, effective manner. In rare cases, persons may rise to the third logical level of learning, the learning of how to learn context. In this case one is operating at a level of contextual pattern
recognition; one is able to easily identify and operate on the structure of any experience. It is at this level that Bandler and Grinder operate when they are modeling (or teaching modeling to) some one. Bateson reserved his fourth class of learning for those accomplished persons like yogis and Zen masters. (p.590)

According to both Bateson and Dilts, any biological or social system is organized into levels, and the function of each level is to organize the information below it. Because our brain processes at different levels, we are capable of different levels of thinking and being.

In the Dilts model, the most basic level in the hierarchy is that of the environment, where we encounter external constraints. (See Figure 4.) We

Figure 4
Dilts' Neurological Levels

| Evolutionary Change | ---| ---| --- | --- | --- |
| Generative Change | ---| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Remedial Change | ---| --- | --- | --- | --- |
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then operate on our environment through our behaviors, which are guided by our mental maps and our current repertoire of strategies. These two -- maps and strategies -- define what we think of as our capabilities, which are, in turn, organized by our beliefs and values, which are organized by our identity. Dilts calls the level beyond identity spirituality (some call it essence) and is currently researching a level beyond that. With reference to the model, Dilts asks, when a person is experiencing a difficulty, is it coming

from his/her external context?
from not having a specific sort of behavior required by that environment?
from not having developed the appropriate map or strategy to generate that behavior?
from a lack of belief or conflicting belief which interferes? or from some interference at the level of identity?

As with Bateson's hierarchies, these, too, according to Dilts, are important distinctions to make and have significant implications for learning, communications, and change.

As a consequence of this hierarchy, Dilts proposes that, in order to bring about change at any of the levels, we must address the issue from the level above it, and that making a change at a given level will automatically effect the levels below it. For instance, if we wish to change a behavior, we need to deal with it from the capability level or a level above that, and a change made in a belief, for example, will spontaneously bring about changes in both capabilities and behaviors. One of the goals of working with one's inner world and unconscious, then, is to uncover beliefs and values, or even parts of our identity,
that hold us back from achieving what we want, as well as those which support us in our efforts.

Dilts defines a belief as "a generalization about a relationship between experiences" and claims that there are three main types of belief issues. There are beliefs which deal with causal relationships, beliefs which deal with meaning relationships and beliefs which deal with limits. These categories are: hopelessness -- 'if the outcome is not possible, why bother?'; helplessness -- 'that may be true or available for some people, but I don't have what it takes'; and worthlessness -- 'I don't deserve it.' (p. 22) He goes on to say

One of the interesting things about beliefs is that because they are on a different level than behavior or capabilities, they don't change according to the same rules. ... When you have a belief, even environmental and behavioral evidence will not change it, because a belief is not about reality. You have a belief in place of knowledge about reality. Beliefs are about things that nobody can know in reality.... The function of belief has to do with the activation of capabilities and behaviors. (pp. 8-9)

Dilts refers to the work of Albert Bandura (1977) on self-efficacy-expectation (your belief in your own effectiveness at doing something) and his studies comparing expectation to actual performance, saying that the behavior curve will rise more quickly as the person learns strategies for how to do something. This supports the importance of capabilities (maps and strategies) residing at a level between behaviors and beliefs. According to Dilts, "Beliefs are intended to provide a motivation and a vision so that actual behavior can begin to develop and rise to meet them," and "... Readiness for change, other major life changes, and the permissions given are all important with regard to changing beliefs" (p. 11).
An Orientation Framework

As noted at the start of this chapter, the literature review began with the literature of learning organizations and followed a path through the literature on leadership to that on personal change and, subsequently, dialogue; the reader was taken through hierarchical levels from organization to group to individual and to the inner world of the individual. The review addressed desired leader competencies both in leading others and leading self and focused on the aspect of bringing about desired personal change. The emphasis throughout was on process and the how to's of desired learning. This path then led the reader back out through the literature on coaching and NLP to the conceptual frameworks of several NLP course components and the holistic learning model adapted to guide the design of the course and collection of data.

Within this vast assortment of ideas and recommended processes several key concepts hold particular significance for developing an understanding of the purposes of the course offering and the desired outcomes of the instructors. These key concepts are summarized in Figure 5. The figure provides the reader with a framework in which to locate concepts and to orient himself or herself in the discussions which lie ahead. The framework takes on the form of the holistic learning model, retaining systems thinking and the concepts of change, growth and development as focal points. Within it are acknowledged the centrality of rapport and facilitated interaction to relational leadership, the form of leadership promoted by the course curriculum, together with communication, planning, and attending to ecology. Within the five learning contexts, the reader will find the cornerstones of the learning organization, the logical levels of the brain/mind, the behaviors, capabilities and competencies sought in developing the leader-self, and factors which influence the desired
outcomes of personal systemic change. It is all of this which the researcher asks the reader to keep in mind as he or she moves ahead to the remaining chapters.

Figure 5
Orientation Framework
CHAPTER III
METODOLOGY

This chapter is comprised of four parts. First, the research design is presented including procedures, the research paradigm, and perspectives of the researcher. Second, an overview of the course is provided. Third, the research process is detailed, and finally, limitations and problematic aspects of the research are presented.

Research Design

The study's research plan employed an embedded case study method with multiple levels and units of analysis. Such qualitative methodology was determined to be most responsive to the research questions and to the context and focus of this exploratory study (See Marshall & Rossman, 1989). In light of the absence of academic research on certain components, this study may even qualify as a revelatory case in Yin's (1989) categorization.

The research included the design and implementation of the leadership course, in particular the selection, delivery and student assessments of components reflecting specific perspectives, practices and procedures of neurolinguistic programming (NLP). Secondarily, it addressed individual learning and progress over time, including student experience of the inner world, as influenced by these components. Class episodes and student experiences with NLP exercises are treated as subcases within the study.
The primary strategy for the research was that of participant observation within a broad context of collaborative inquiry. The researcher served in roles of observer, participant observer, and what will be called here facilitator observer -- a special case of participant observation in which the researcher facilitates as well as participates in the experience.

Research Procedures

Site and Subject Selection.

The study was conducted with volunteer participants in a graduate level leadership development class offered at a large metropolitan university. Students taking the class varied in age from the mid-twenties to the late forties, spanned a range from full-time to part-time to single-course enrollment, were enrolled in master's or doctoral programs or continuing education, and represented an array of areas of employment, typically within health fields, public agencies and education. Also participating in the course experience, although not enrolled as students, were an associate professor from another college and an NLP colleague of the instructors.

Selection of the Instructional Team.

The course was designed and taught by a team of three people, including the researcher and another doctoral candidate, all of whom were trained and certified in neurolinguistic programming at the practitioner and/or master practitioner level as well as being experienced educators. The instructor of record was a full professor and author of his school's first leadership course, which had been offered for more than a decade and which now served as a prerequisite for this course. (More will be said about the instructional team in a later section).
In addition, the researcher and primary instructor had invited two colleagues from their training as master practitioners to participate in or observe the experimental course. The one mentioned above joined the class at its third session and facilitated two activities over the course of the quarter. The second served as an observer and guest instructor for parts of the third, fourth and eighth class sessions.

**Access.**

Access for the research was secured through conversation with the teaching team and students enrolling in the course. At the first class session, a formal request was made of the students to permit their data to be used, and, subsequently, all gave their permission. Of the fourteen students, eight volunteered to participate in the more in-depth aspect of the research, although two of the eight later dropped the course due to other commitments on their time.

**Reflective Writings.**

A methodology journal was used to record questions, reflections on the design, implications of having collected or not collected certain data and methodological decisions. These writings specifically addressed approaches to organizing, interpreting and displaying the data, and issues related to data analysis. The rationale for data sorts were recorded, along with the codings used for each pass, particularly for the work with personal case studies; recommendations were included for what might have been done to improve the design and its implementation. In addition, field notes were maintained throughout the study, and the researcher engaged in reflective writings in class along with the students.
Trustworthiness.

Inherent in the design of the research is the triangulation of data collection methods and sources; findings were triangulated by combining participant documentation with researcher and co-instructor observations and the work of a peer reviewer/debriefer. During the term of the course, questions were posed to participants to confirm or disconfirm commonalities in experience. Both in these conversations and during interviews, shared meanings and clarity of understanding were sought by the researcher through exact paraphrasing, the offering of summary paraphrases, and probing for specificity where needed.

Raw data were organized and analyzed so they could be readily audited. Co-instructors were asked to review portions of the data, analysis and presentation in light of their own experience and to comment on interpretations as well as to correct any misrepresentation of their actions, intentions, observations or understandings. In addition, member checks were initiated with two of the participants in the individual case studies, although they were not formally conducted regarding the experience of the class as a whole. Finally, regular meetings were held with the peer debriefer after the initial entry of data, transcriptions, data sorts and preliminary analyses were well underway. This time was primarily spent in dialogue and collaborative inquiry regarding data sorts, interpretations and findings (The role of the peer debriefer is clarified in a subsequent section).

Confidentiality.

Although assurance of total confidentiality is not considered possible, participants were promised that every effort would be made to mask their identities in reporting the research. In addition to changing the names of student participants, potentially identifying information regarding their
employment, degree area, and so on has been omitted; even the instructors are left unnamed in order to make it more difficult to determine which of a series of experimental leadership courses might be the context for this particular study. Also, in some cases where student quotes are used, the speaker or author is left anonymous.

The Research Paradigm

This research is conceived within a naturalistic, interpretivist paradigm. When humans are viewed as thinking, self-directed beings who are choice-makers, as they are viewed here, then their behaviors and their learnings are best described from a perspective wherein the goals include understanding and shared meaning (see, for example, Heron, 1981). When humans are viewed as social beings whose interactions shape one another and shape the realities they are co-creating, then there can be no single tangible reality. Rather, there are multiple, constructed realities which are holistic in nature and which require interaction for their description; in each interaction lies the potential for perceived realities to once again change.

These beliefs are foundational to the design of the course under study and to the learning outcomes set forth by the instructors. They are also basic axioms of the naturalistic paradigm, wherein the knower and the known are interactive and inseparable. In fact, the reader will find present virtually all of the characteristics of operational naturalistic inquiry described by Lincoln and Guba (1985). These include the researcher as human instrument, qualitative methods, inductive data analysis, emergent design, the utilization of tacit (intuitive or felt) knowledge and idiographic interpretation. As these authors assert, "Inquiry must exhibit value resonance" with respect to the choice of
paradigm, the choice of theory guiding data collection/analysis and the interpretation of findings, and the values inherent in the context, "if the inquiry is to produce meaningful results" (p. 38).

For research which inquires into subjective experience and the development of the self, the levels of communication and meaning which are engaged become particularly significant. These must include the factual, the common, and the intersubjective levels with which interpretivists deal. Interpretivism has at its foundation the expansion of inquiry into the nature of human consciousness and spirituality. Its holistic view seeks to understand the dimensions of human experience, and its theories are constructed from the perspective of individual actors not detached observers. The primary objective of its methods is to understand. Humans act and are acted upon, and what is of interest is their subjective and intersubjective experience. Thus the choice of an interpretivist paradigm becomes a logical one.

To some degree, critical theory and critical social science have an impact on this research as well. The researcher's role as instructor and coach announces the intention to generate new awarenesses in individuals and the group and the intention to surface beliefs which motivate behaviors but may, in some cases, be outside of the person's or group's awareness. An interpretive approach to explaining action and interaction does not typically leave room for "false consciousness," as it is called by critical theorists.

Overall, the research paradigm and methodology were selected to allow for in-depth access to and engagement with the context and participants regarding experience, perceptions and meanings (Refer to Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Reason, 1988; Patton, 1990; and others). The hope was to make available as much of the experience as participants were willing to reveal or as
was readily observable in order to adequately explore and describe this approach to developing leadership from within.

In what follows, because students' realities cannot be separated from their context, care is given to describing and interpreting the course and classroom context and identifiable attending factors. Detailed description is offered both in describing the course components and in relating the students' lived experience. These, too, conform to the requirements of the form of inquiry selected and the nature of the underlying paradigms.
Conduct of the Course

The leadership course itself was comprised of ten evening sessions, each three hours in length, and required a student commitment of approximately ten hours outside of class to conduct team projects. The nature of these projects was developed as the course unfolded. Ultimately each was designed to meet desired aspects of the research design as well as the instructors' desired outcomes for the course.

Three texts were selected as the only required reading in the course: The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People (1989) by Steven Covey, The Fifth Discipline (1990) by Peter Senge, and Introduction to Neurolinguistic Programming (1990) by Joseph O'Connor and John Seymour. Additional supplementary readings were anticipated but not actually distributed. While reading assignments spanned the ten weeks of the syllabus, the bulk of the material was to be read during the first four weeks, and almost no time was spent in class discussing the readings.

Beyond reading, students were expected to keep a journal, to develop a learning contract, to apply concepts and skills to other aspects of their lives, and to engage in further reflection on their own learnings and experiences within the class as well as their application experiments in the world. Guidelines were supplied for journal entries which asked specifically about students' attempts at application, including personal evaluations of the impact of their actions and how they might modify them in future efforts, whether or not they had deemed
the experiment successful. A copy of these guidelines may be found in Appendix B.

Occasionally students were asked to complete exercises from the Covey text as journal entries or to attempt exercises from the O'Connor and Seymour book. Other assignments were made on a week-by-week basis according to the material covered and discussions held in class. A session agenda was posted each week with an initial list of assignments, open to modification at the end of that class session. Topics and assignments did not always comply to the initial draft syllabus, a circumstance which frustrated some students but which allowed the course to unfold or be generated in-the-moment.

Planning for the course began in December and by the end of March had resulted in a draft syllabus and set of goals together with a considerable number of pages of idea sheets listing potential topics, scope and sequence outlines, and exercises to be used or designed for implementation as topics were finalized. It was the desire of the instructors that students be co-creators and, to a limited degree, co-facilitators of the course design. This was expressed the first night of class, although time limitations precluded such collaboration with but a few exceptions. While perhaps not fitting an ideal model of course planning, the weekly planning/debriefing sessions of the instructional team continued to generate potentialities, to prioritize topics, and to attempt to tailor the course to its participants. Efforts included weekly revisions based on content coverage in the previous session and an openness to spontaneous revision as classes were conducted.

Three additional requirements took shape during the conduct of the course. Because the instructors emphasized coaching as a means of facilitating another's efforts in discovering aspects of self, in planning, and in
debriefing or evaluating experience, some of the skills of coaching were expressly presented and practiced in class. Additional practice was desired, however, particularly as the definition and role expanded beyond that of guide for a scripted exercise (See also the handout titled Players' Roles for Guided Journeys in Appendix B). Thus, in the fourth week of the course, trios were established and assigned the task of coaching one another on a weekly basis outside of class. This became the first defined team project, and the randomly selected groupings were designated as "peer resource teams."

Guidelines were provided for student and team use, supplemented by sample worksheets for recording two specific types of coaching sessions (Refer to the same appendix for copies of these). At times, coaching topics were assigned, such as planning or debriefing an application of skills in a work-related setting. In other assignments the coach was asked to perform the role of guide for a particular exercise from the neurolinguistic programming (NLP) text, such as the six-step reframing of parts. Still at other times, teams were free to select their own topics and the focus of their time together.

The second requirement (and team project), also presented during the fourth week, was to participate in a design team. These teams were each charged with designing a leadership challenge for another team: a single or composite exercise which the team would conduct for a second team during the seventh session of the class. While each design team worked, its members were simultaneously engaged in what the researcher called a stop-action format, intended to document reflection-in-action (The design task and reflective questions may also be found in Appendix B).

The third requirement, one of producing an evaluation portfolio, emerged from the overall emphasis on self-directedness in the course and came in
response to student questions about grades. Initially, no grading criteria had been established, and students were told that a means for assigning grades would be determined as the course proceeded. Students were simply instructed to devise an initial learning contract for themselves and to plan to collect evidence of their progress and achievements over subsequent weeks. Later they were asked to share their contract and their desired outcomes with the members of their peer resource team and seek help and feedback from them in achieving these outcomes. These records, together with other forms of evidence, would then constitute their final portfolio.

In week nine, students were asked to begin completing an assessment document authored by the researcher and preparing their self-evaluation, which could be submitted in writing with their portfolio or presented orally in a conference during the exam week of the quarter. Later, they were told to propose the grade each wished to receive or felt he or she deserved and encouraged to work with their team on both the grade and their self-evaluation. In general, the grades students assigned were the grades they received.

With regard to the general conduct of a class session, most sessions contained two or three instructional segments, depending on the time required to complete exercises or demonstrations; occasions of running out of time plagued the course from beginning to end. Although frustrating, this came to be accepted within the context of the emergent, experimental nature of the course.

In the planning phase, an initial design called for the instructional segments of each class session to be bounded by a focused opening -- a relaxation exercise, meditation, or story to set a tone and elicit a learning state -- and a closing of a similar nature, following a ten or fifteen minute segment devoted to collectively debriefing the night's experience. While the former
remained a priority on the agenda, in actuality the latter rarely occurred.

Prime examples of this are evidenced particularly in the middle of the course, when a considerable block of time was given in the fourth session to an "open frame" -- a period of discussion with no preset agenda -- wherein class members disclosed their diverse feelings about the course and their experience thus far. In session six a debriefing of the informal dinner preceding class led into discussion of one student's current circumstance, and the agenda was altered to prioritize coaching that student and sharing observations about the process for the majority of the remaining class time.

At the end of the course, class members collectively debriefed their experiences, assessed the course, and made recommendations for subsequent offerings. This class time was followed by another informal dinner to continue the discussion and to further probe how one might learn to connect inner and outer worlds. Details of the events of each class session are provided in Chapter 4.
Conduct of the Research

At the end of the first class session, students were informed that the course would be the subject of research conducted by one of the instructors. In fact, some of the students were already aware of that. A formal request was then made for volunteers to participate in the more in-depth aspects of that research. Seven volunteered immediately and met with the researcher following class. An eighth volunteer emerged at the second class session. Subsequently the remaining class members each gave their permission to use whatever might be of significance to the research that could be gleaned from tapes of class, conversations with them, and/or their written work (e.g., in-class writings, journals, etc.).

At that first meeting of the intended case study group, the volunteers were asked to begin completing a class debriefing memo in addition to their regular journal assignment and to participate in a one-hour interview at a time convenient for them over the course of the next few days. The memo was to be completed within twenty-four hours of the class, so that their thoughts would be relatively fresh, and was to consume no more than fifteen minutes of their time. The purpose of the interview would be to provide information on their current context, such as where they were in their lives, their aspirations, their interest in leadership and this particular leadership course, and their goals in the class.

Additionally, it was pointed out that they would be asked to participate in an exit interview at the end of the course and to attend one or two group sessions outside of regular class time. Each then was provided a memo
outlining these expectations and the time commitment their participation would entail (A copy of the memo and the class debriefing memo may be found in Appendix A). While member checks were referenced at the time, they were more fully explained at the context interview with individuals agreeing then to participate on an as-needed basis.

**Data collection**

Data collection took place through a variety of means and was subject to several limitations. All class and special topic sessions were both video-taped and audio-taped. Most often, however, in-class small groups operated within the same large classroom space and as a result only segments of some group’s conversations were picked up by the video recorder while others were picked up by the audio recorder at the other end of the room. Thus, not all interactions were fully available for analysis. Since those speaking were not always visible in the video recordings, the potential for visual analysis of behaviors was similarly reduced. In a few cases, groups dispersed to other rooms or offices to conduct exercises, allowing for only one group’s work to be documented on video-tape since there was only one video camera. When required, the other groups supplied audiotapes of their interactions. Additionally, the planning/debriefing sessions of the instructors were audio-taped, as were the interviews conducted with the sub-group of volunteers; the latter were later transcribed in full while only partial transcription was made of the instructor sessions. With the exception of sessions in which equipment failed, this data was fully available to the researcher, and all class tapes were made available to students upon request. Copies of interview tapes were regularly supplied to those who were
interviewed. Researcher field notes and methodology notes were also maintained.

It may be noted here that, in all cases, interviews were structured by an interview guide to assure that the desired topics were addressed in each, regardless of the order in which the questions were asked. Each interview was conducted with sufficient degrees of freedom to wander into other topics of interest to the interviewee (as long as these were at least somewhat relevant) and to explore a topic in greater depth. Students were always told ahead, although briefly, what the purpose of the interview was (i.e., the data being sought) and what the questions generally would cover. At the outset of the actual interview, the researcher typically shared the list of guiding questions and let the student begin to respond in whatever order he or she felt most comfortable (copies of all interview guides may be found in Appendix A).

Before the close of an interview, students were invited to add information beyond the questions asked or to pose and answer their own questions in order to more adequately supply the desired information and also to generate greater understanding on the part of the researcher. This allowed students the chance to tell the researcher what each thought was important for her to know. The interviews were purposefully conversational in nature, and the researcher used these opportunities to establish rapport and increasingly build trust with the person being interviewed. In a few instances, once the business of the session was completed or even if not, parts of the dialogue became mini-coaching sessions with the researcher facilitating the interviewee's thinking about and coming to conclusions, gaining perspective on or increasing understanding of some issue of particular interest.
Self-reported data, comprising the bulk of the written documentation of individuals' experiences, included occasional in-class reflective writings, assigned text exercises, and out-of-class journaling. Students were also asked to devise a learning contract for themselves, keep a record of their peer coaching sessions, and complete a course assessment. The degree to which this data became available for analysis was a function of collecting in-class writings (typically this occurred when NCR paper was used) and the choices individuals made as to what to include in their journal submissions and what to append to their self-evaluations as evidence of goal achievement.

A listing of potential data sources appears in Table 2. Notable here is the distinction between data collected on all course participants and those in the research sub-group. Only the sub-group volunteers were interviewed, brought together for a focus group discussion and asked to complete class debriefing memos. Additional conversations were held with some of the research participants in both categories, although little, if any, analysis was done on those recordings primarily due to the vast amount of data already available.

Other-reported data completes the documentation source list and was comprised of self-reports and interviews recorded by the researcher or peer reviewer, observations made by classmates or instructors, and specific feedback supplied to the individual by others. In the former instance, as participants worked on class exercises in small groups, it was often the case that one individual served as respondent to a set of questions and another served as recorder of those responses. Thus it was not always clear whether the recorder used the individual's specific words and phrases or supplied his or her own, summarizing what was heard through the listener's filters or perhaps capturing only parts of the response in writing. In some cases, respondents
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Self-Documentation</strong> (Written Record)</th>
<th><strong>Other-Documentation</strong> (Taped or Written Record)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class Debriefing Memos *</td>
<td>Context Interview *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal entries</td>
<td>Class sessions (1-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class exercises:</td>
<td>Full class:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints</td>
<td>- meditations, stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reframing issues</td>
<td>- presentations, directions,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating Results</td>
<td>- demonstrations,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Outcome chain]</td>
<td>- discussions/dialogues,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story or metaphor</td>
<td>- debriefings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Safe space activities]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching exercises:</td>
<td>Full class exercises:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debrief application effort</td>
<td>- circle of excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan application effort</td>
<td>- types of feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reframe parts</td>
<td>- perceptual positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>- mentors and sages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text exercises (Covey):</td>
<td>- aligned self; timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Funeral visualization (eulogy)</td>
<td>- logical levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Present roles, satisfaction level</td>
<td>- job interview /rapport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Personal mission statement</td>
<td>- share missions - listen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Centers, patterns and implications</td>
<td>- outcomes (3 Q) - record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Neglected Quadrant II activity</td>
<td>- class outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Time management matrix</td>
<td>- rep systems; eye access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Responsibilities to delegate</td>
<td>- flexibility and calibration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Roles, goals, action plans for week</td>
<td>- outcome chain - record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Weekly organization, evaluation</td>
<td>- roles/parts &amp; safe space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Emotional bank account deposits</td>
<td>- mind-reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>- sleight of mouth; reframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehearsals &amp; Practices:</td>
<td>- eliciting criteria; strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Try on</em> NLP presupposition(s)</td>
<td>- favorite story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track eye movements on TV show</td>
<td>- aligned self; timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity how want to receive feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide peer feedback</td>
<td>Design Team sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generate priority outcomes</td>
<td>Focus Group session *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exit Interview *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follow-Up Interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* sub-group participants only
also reported the data in their journals or revisited the experience as a journal entry after further reflection on the questions. In these instances the data was considered to be self-reported. Follow-up interviews a year later were conducted by phone by the peer reviewer who simply made notes of the student responses. Thus data from these interviews were subject to the same influences as noted above.

Finally, class and special topic session tapes served as a source of comments from or about individual class members, groups, the class as a whole and instructional aspects of the course as well as providing a source of observable data for the researcher. More will be said about the latter in the section on data analysis. The organization and computer entry of class data together with the transcribing of interviews was begun while the course was still in session and continued well beyond its conclusion and the conduct of the exit interviews.

In designing the data collection, the researcher hoped to collect baseline information on class members through journal entries (including assigned exercises) and class activities which asked them to describe current problem states, desired outcomes, resource needs, and so forth. Changes in the expression of these could then be tracked over subsequent weeks as evidence was sought regarding the response to and influence of the NLP principles and exercises. It was also intended that, as one class member guided, coached, or provided feedback to another, records of the interaction would address not only the thought processes and expressed states of the respondent but also how students viewed one another and how they attempted to provide assistance and support for each other in achieving desired outcomes. The instructors voiced the desire that class members become increasingly accountable to one another
for facilitating individual learning and goal achievement and at times asked that students specifically incorporate such data in their records. In reality, however, this rarely occurred. Similarly, it was hoped that the work of the design teams would evoke reflective dialogue regarding students' contributions to the team, some degree of peer feedback, and disclosure of student views of leadership and leaders' desirable qualities at that point in time, but, again, this rarely occurred.

Throughout the life of the course, the researcher assumed the freedom to review the data collected, to ask what was missing in order to more fully describe the delivery and receipt of the course's NLP components and profile participants and their experiences, and to act on that information. This self-permission and the absence of desired data in each of the above instances prompted including a requirement for peer feedback and specific evidence of progress and learning in students' self-evaluations. Hindsight would say that greater specificity should have been sought regarding insights evoked in students through class dialogues and exercises as well as regarding student views of leadership and any changes they perceived in those views as a result of their experience in the course. Some of the latter was covered in the exit interview for subgroup participants, but a generalized assignment for all students on the topic may have been advisable and would be desirable in the future. In terms of the former, a revised set of journal guidelines for the week's second entry would facilitate gathering more detailed data.

**Data Analysis**

The primary mode of data analysis used was analytic induction, which was deemed most appropriate for naturalistic data processing and, in particular, for
an exploratory study. (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall & Rossman, 1989; Patton, 1990; Yin, 1989). Consequently, patterns, themes and categories of analysis came from the data, and the induction involved both indigenous and analyst-constructed typologies. The application of sensitizing concepts assisted the process (Patton, 1990; Marshall & Rossman, 1989). Content analysis, as described by Patton, was also carried out with regard to observation and interview data, personal journals, and other documentation for case study participants. Throughout, the researcher attended to negative cases and to the testing of emergent propositions. A summary of the data sources, approach to analysis and primary research questions is provided in Table 3.

In the original research design, the major emphasis was to be placed on case studies of those who had volunteered for the in-depth aspect of the research involving the inner experiences and personal change of these students. These would then be supplemented by descriptions of the more general experience of the class as a whole to create a fuller context in which to understand the case analyses.

Initially, analysis proceeded on the individual data of the research sub-group members, taken one at a time. At minimum, three passes of the data were made for sorting purposes: one for strictly indigenous constructs, another for data fitting the typology of the outcome chain model (a sort which evolved from the results of the first individual's sort), and a third for data applicable to the holistic learning model. Written documentation was addressed before observational data was introduced from the audio- and/or video-tapes.

To begin the analysis, a transcript of the individual's context interview was examined for expressed issues or tensions, motivations, learning preferences, and desires or expectations for the course experience and personal
Table 3
Data Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do participants talk about and engage in</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Data reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• their own learning</td>
<td>Class observation</td>
<td>Analytic induction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>- indigenous typologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class writings</td>
<td>- constructed typologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journals</td>
<td>Search for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small group observations</td>
<td>- disconfirming evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design team observations and records</td>
<td>- emerging themes and propositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer coaching records</td>
<td>Use of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning contract reports</td>
<td>- sensitizing concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Debriefings</td>
<td>- triangulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written Assessments</td>
<td>Content analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follow-up interviews</td>
<td>Member checks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

development as well as sites and opportunities for application of and experimentation with proposed learnings. This data provided the framework for narrating and illustrating the background, aspirations, and current status of each sub-group participant. In addition, the data provided information germane to the
subsequent construction of an outcome and learning profile for the individual
and the format finally selected for presenting the data.

Other self-reported documentation (refer to Table 2) was then examined in
conjunction with the interview data for emerging themes and potential patterns
of eliciting and testing new insights and information, the application of
discoveries and learnings, and evidence of progress toward expressed learning
goals or desired outcomes together with processes employed to integrate
learnings and attributions made regarding the impact of course components on
personal change and growth. Subsequently, exit interview transcripts were
reviewed for confirming and disconfirming evidence with regard to the
aforementioned areas.

Finally, class video tapes were examined for observable behavior
changes and any additional information provided by or about the participant.
All course videotapes were viewed one or two times and selected segments
were transcribed. The initial viewing and transcription focused on auditory
information. What was said? Were there changes in vocabulary, framings of
issues or self-disclosures? What topics prompted the most discussion? Were
there language patterns (terminology, topic repetition, etc.) which dropped away
or were newly initiated by the subjects over the weeks? This information was
then filed with the rest of the students' data. Selected tapes or tape segments
were then viewed again for physiological indicators of state changes or
behavior changes during specific exercises or their debriefings and for
nonverbal cues regarding what may have been occurring for the student in the
moment.

No sub-group participant submitted all of the documentation cited as a
potential source of data, and only one submitted most of it. The wide variation
in amount and extent of documentation, both within the research sub-group and the class as a whole, serves as a limitation to the study but may also evidence differences in participants' approaches to and styles of learning. In addition, the range of documentation served as a criterion for determining the scope of the analysis. Based on the absence of data in one instance and the wholesale loss of data in a second, two of the sub-group participants were eliminated from the pool of six as candidates for an in-depth analysis. What data was available from these two was retained with that of other class members, all of whose efforts would contribute to providing an overall view of the course and to confirming or disconfirming propositions and conclusions. Among the remaining four, three were selected for the development of full case studies on the basis of what seemed to the researcher to be their representation of three distinct positions on an action-reflection continuum and the potential for providing interestingly diverse accounts of course experience. Underscoring the selection of the three was also the difference in their personality types, as determined through the Myers-Briggs Type Inventory.

Of particular interest within the data were the emerging articulations of problem states, desired outcomes, perceived resource needs, and emerging insights as found in the continuing presence or subsequent absence of language describing initial and successive states. Tracking the data strands of the NLP outcome specification model facilitated these efforts in addition to tracking experience with exercises specifically noted by the students. Also of interest were the observed and perceived alterations of overt behavior and expressed habits of mind, including basic assumptions about self and others, beliefs and values; what stood out in students' minds as provocative of further reflection and experimentation; the actions taken to explore applications; and
the criteria employed to evaluate actions and interactions in the world and their consequences. The analysis also covered, to a lesser degree, these students' descriptions of their own thinking and learning processes, including the fit of course-promoted activities with their own acknowledged styles and preferences and the perceived results of exploring other styles and modes, some of which were relatively new to participants while others were representative of previously non-preferred, less developed modes.

After initial drafting of the outcome and learning stories of the three individuals' journeys, the data were reviewed for what they revealed regarding the contribution of course components to these students' own perceived development and their individual conceptions of leadership. How did they express, if at all, the evolution of their concept of a leader and themselves as present and future leaders? What in their experience with the course was cited as being particularly helpful in achieving personal change? What modifications would they suggest in future implementations of the course? Here the primary sources of data were class open frames and the full class debriefing at the end of the last class, together with completed assessment forms and students' self-evaluations.

Phase two of the analysis was begun while phase one continued. This phase proceeded with addressing small group interaction, including how participants presented themselves; what they revealed in interaction with their class exercise trios, design teams and resource teams; and what insights were gained through these experiences. The information was then added to individual stories, as appropriate, and sorted for pertinence to the collective journey. A member check was conducted with the student whose case was nearest completion, and her comments were incorporated into her story.
A Shift in Focus.

Phase three was then fully initiated. This phase specifically addressed the experience of the class as a whole and the impact of course exercises and activities on the insights and learnings of the rest of the course participants as well as members of the sub-group. Shortly after entering this phase, the decision was made to shift the focus of the study away from only a few individuals, having found that there was insufficient triangulation regarding their claims of personal change and outward manifestations of these to assure confidence in reporting findings, and to emphasize instead the course itself and the experience of the whole group. This new focus provided the opportunity to gain a broader perspective on the course experience and to better address the type of pedagogy employed and the selection and application of NLP components, based on the responses they elicited in this set of graduate students. Thus the research could make a more substantial contribution to the area of curriculum and course design for leadership development programs.

To begin, the documentation of each student was reviewed, one at a time. Notes were made and data coded by class session and topic, where the codings sometimes referred to the context/subject (e.g. logical levels, outcomes, safety, etc.) and/or sometimes to the nature of the response (e.g., big insight, confusion, self-discovery, self-disclosure, etc.). What was sought in particular were reports of new learnings, new insights and desired change within a cluster of responses to course-related events. When the initial sorting, resorting and clustering was completed, attention moved once again to the video-tapes. Transcripts were reviewed and tapes were watched for evidence of changing behaviors and modes of talk as well as for manifestations of particularly high or
low energy levels. Patterns were sought along with indicators of a strong commonality or diversity of experience.

Previous writings on the course itself were then revisited to add the specific intentions of the instructors and their sense at the time of the impact of some of their decisions as well as of the more spontaneous occurrences. These were taken from the planning/debriefing tapes and the researcher's memory as well as recent observations in reviewing the tapes. Eventually the data from student assessments were sorted and a response sought to the question of whether or not the instructors' desired outcomes for the course, along with those of its participants, were achieved. Concurrent with this were the follow-up telephone interviews and the writing of the description of the class participants' lived experience. A brief summary of the analysis is presented in Table 4.

Once the focus of the research had shifted, the seemingly greater complexity already encountered in working on the personal case studies made the sort of the entire class move more quickly. In all likelihood, it also biased that sort in that the researcher carried into it some judgments regarding the relative significance of particular events. In developing the three case studies, it had become apparent that certain of the class activities had had a particular impact on students and that some things which had been big issues during early parts of the course had lessened in importance as students felt progress being made.

Thus in approaching a data sort of the experience of the group as a whole, the question of commonality of experience came to the fore. Were there class sessions which were particularly powerful or insightful for the majority of students? If so, what factors were present in these sessions as opposed to others? In the same vein, were there sessions which were especially flat or in
which things did not evolve as desired, and what factors were present in these that inhibited the effectiveness or potential impact of the class activities?

In actuality, the full class sort disconfirmed some of these expectations but revealed some things which may have otherwise gone unnoticed. For example, one of the most talked about exercises for all three case study students was not even mentioned by most of their classmates, and some of the surprise at secondary gains expressed by others was absent from the writings or class comments of the three.

Table 4
Summary of Phase 3 Data Analysis

- Inductive Analysis
- Coding of Data by Individual
- Emergent Themes (indigenous to person)
- Sort for Desired Outcomes
  Evidence of Progress
  Reported Insights
  Responses to Class Events
  Indicators of Change
- Sort of Assessment Data
- Analysis of Commonalities and Differences
- Corroboration with Peer Reviewer
- Identification of Findings and Insights
- Response to Research Questions
- Drawing of Conclusions
Data Presentation.

Another aspect affected by the sequencing of the analyses was the data presentation. Where mind-mapping had been used in parts of the personal case study analyses and the students' stories were told from slightly differing perspectives and in somewhat different formats, the data presentation here is quite uniform and, as will be noted, evolves directly from in-sequence student comments. The decision had been made earlier to let much of the lived experience of students be told by the students themselves through their own quotes with some interpretation offered by the researcher but also with room left for the reader's own interpretation.

Here, too, the presentation and analysis take a narrative form, allowing students to tell their own story as orchestrated by the researcher. The use of student quotes assists in minimizing researcher bias, although some bias is typically present in every selection process. Throughout, the attempt was made to bring all voices into the telling of the tale, although some students had much more to say than others. The selection of quotations, whether from interviews, class comments, journals or other sources, was made according to several criteria:

1. Was any particular new insight revealed or referenced? Did the statement provide evidence of self-discovery?
2. Did the student offer the statement as an example of something particularly important or new to him/her?
3. Was the statement a direct response to something that had occurred in the class (e.g., was it prompted by an exercise or prompted by another's comments, questions, story, etc.?)
4. Did the statement seem to be representative of the response of several students or did it offer a strikingly different and contrasting perspective?

5. Did the statement raise issues or questions which later became significant to the class or to the individual?

6. Did the statement offer confirming or disconfirming evidence of a particular response to experience?

In each instance, as one or more persons expressed a view or disclosed an internal response, evidence was sought of a contradictory response in order to present contrasting views and other indicators of diverse experience in addition to seeking and pointing out commonalities.

Overall, the narrative is intended to display the range of reactions students had to class exercises and assignments and the diversity of students' approaches to using the information or processes in their lives inside and outside of class. Specifically, the range of impact of the journaling assignment is evident, in that some students used their journal entries to probe self-knowledge and experience much more extensively than others.

While in the personal case studies the researcher tracked the individual's expressed concerns, wants, fears and delights -- the known and the discovered -- together with expressions of progress, contrasting, for example, something done or said in week five that might confirm, expand upon, or contradict something in week two, this detailed an analysis was not employed in the same way when dealing with the class as a whole. Instead, the goal became generating a flow of experience, activity and response, including expressions of diversity and commonality, patterns were sought which might describe how students engaged the course and the types of discoveries students made as
well as how they brought meaning to their experience. The researcher looked for signs of growth through changes in thinking, verbal expression and behavior, and explicit examples of these were included. Despite the lack of detailed descriptions of the experience by each and every student, the vast amount of data presented still produces a long story, indeed, and certainly one which qualifies as "thick description."

Role of the Peer Debriefee

The peer debriefer was a person whose vocational field intersected with the subject of this research at the point of sharing interest in the nature of transformative, generative change and in the nature of leadership development. Her exposure to the field of NLP had been minimal at the outset, with no NLP training and no prior reading in the field. There was, rather, some skepticism about NLP on her part based in prior experience, not with NLP but with some persons in her organization who more generally sought techniques for growth without suffering, gain without pain, or, in short, "quick fixes" and "instant intimacy." She brought to the research project a distrust of programs or exercises in general that offer promise of change which ultimately turn out to be short-lived and which manipulate toward the facilitator's personal gain in the process.

On the other hand, the peer (or the debriefer) had personally observed enduring transformative change in someone who had done extensive NLP training and had moved into leadership roles in an organization, and positively impacted its direction. So there was a curiosity about NLP that made it worth the debriefer's time to delve extensively into this study; this would allow her to carefully discern (in a more objective way than NLP training and literature
would provide), NLP’s prospective use or value to other adults as well as to herself.

The peer debriefer began by reviewing the videotapes from the ten class sessions and annotating everything that was audible: all instructions and lectureettes, small group conversations, exercises and demonstrations, and shared stories, transcribing verbatim selected parts. The researcher, too, had viewed the tapes and had begun her own transcriptions.

Next, she read the researcher’s summaries and notes from the literature (what led to Chapter 2 here) and some introductory books on NLP. She then reviewed the students’ journal entries (or excerpted portions) and transcriptions of the researcher’s context and exit interviews, along with class debriefing memos, individuals’ outcome specifications, exercise notes, student assessments, and other documentation previously compiled and entered by the researcher. Working from the review of the literature, she then categorized student responses separating out those comments which seemed to reflect greater or lesser degrees of real change, as change was defined in the literature, and/or the discernible impact of particular class activities. Criteria for this selection included students expressing the significance of or some effect of an experience and/or experiencing and articulating a changed energy state around some issue or event that made (or was making) a difference in their subsequent behavior.

During the late spring, one year after the close of the course, the peer debriefer conducted interviews with all of the course participants who could be reached at that time (11 of the 12). The interview was aimed at determining what, if anything, in the course was still being used in the students' daily personal or professional lives. Here it was hoped that students would be more
honest in providing responses to the debriefer than they might be to the researcher, who had contacted them in advance to request their permission to be interviewed and to introduce the caller. Participants were not supplied with the questions until the time of the debriefer’s call.

Throughout the researcher’s process of analyzing and interpreting the data, the peer debriefer’s role was to point out any incongruities in the students’ responses both within their own range of responses and with the researcher’s use of them, and to generally serve as the person who put the project “to the test.” The test was a comparison of the work of the researcher with that of the peer debriefer. For example, it was found on several occasions that each had coded data in the same way and selected the same quotes to illustrate themes or specific categories of data.

Given the emphasis on dialogue and insight in the study, the sessions held between researcher and peer debriefer were dialogic in nature and geared to drawing out the insights and interpretations of the researcher and debating them, arguing for the strength or lack of evidence and seeking to answer the question: what’s missing? The debriefer then also assisted in editing, critiquing, and raising questions within various drafts of the document.

Other Factors

Among other factors influencing the research were the characteristics and qualities of the instructional team, including the beliefs and assumptions they brought to the classroom and to the design and delivery of the course, and the experience of students with the first course in the leadership series. In addition, the relationships built between researcher and students, together with students’ relationships with the other instructors, have the potential to impact the reporting
of experience and the responses to research-related questions. These topics are each addressed in what follows.

**The Instructional Team.**

The instructional team for the class, as noted earlier, consisted of the professor of record, charged with primary responsibility for the course, and two Ph.D. candidates studying in the areas of leadership, public policy and management, and educational administration or higher education. All three had completed previous training in neurolinguistic programming (NLP) at different levels, described below.

This training begins at what is called the "Practitioner" level. At this level, beginners who are interested in the general field and want to better understand its principles, processes, and applications start to learn the NLP concepts, framework, and presuppositions and to involve themselves on an experiential level with specific exercises. These exercises are designed to (a) increase awareness of the filters of both perception and language through which we experience and interpret subjective reality, and (b) begin to generate new and more effective uses of language as well as new modes of behavior and belief patterns as a result of becoming more conscious of these filters. In addition, participants learn methods for increasing their sensory acuity and for discerning changes in their own and others' emotional states, moving toward a goal of accessing states of greater resourcefulness. They learn a process for specifying the outcomes they wish to pursue, including criteria for determining how, when, where, and with whom they wish to achieve those outcomes. They also learn processes for accessing "core states" and core values, those which consciously or unconsciously they hold most deeply.
For persons who wish to continue NLP training at a more advanced degree, a second level of training is offered called the "Master Track." Masters certification training is designed to continue with some of the previous processes, practices and exercises as well as to add new ones at levels in which more emphasis is placed on depth of change and the practical application and integration of NLP principles and processes in daily life situations. More focus is placed here on learning how to guide others in the processes and techniques as well.

The primary instructor for the leadership course and the researcher for this project had each completed both the practitioner and master track levels of NLP training, (over a two-year course of study), prior to the final design and implementation of the leadership course curriculum. The third instructor was in the process of completing practitioner level training during the first few weeks of the leadership course offering.

What the three instructors shared in common was a curiosity about whether a number of the techniques and processes they had learned in the NLP training program could be taught within the milieu of a more traditional classroom setting; there, in which prior motivation toward NLP could not be presumed on the part of the students, but an interest in leadership development could be presumed to be the shared goal of the group. These instructors also shared a strong belief in the value of self-knowledge, self-discovery, the workings of the unconscious, and experiential education. In addition, they shared the belief that effective leadership is fostered by constructing leaders from within.

Finally, the instructors brought to the course design and delivery the shared reality of each having experienced the NLP techniques to be helpful in
their own personal and leadership development. This introduces a bias of some degree, even if only at unconscious levels, which then becomes a limitation of the study: the three instructors introducing and offering a belief system, or at least a model of a process, about which they have prior personal convictions. On the other hand, to be sure, every educator chooses at some level the approach and curriculum which he or she is convinced will be most instructive toward the desired outcomes set for the course to be taught. In this sense, then, there was nothing out of the ordinary about the characteristics and qualities this team brought to the classroom.

Despite some overt differences in style and differences in some pedagogical beliefs, this instructional team also shared characteristics, as measured on the MBTI (Myers-Briggs Type Inventory), of introversion and intuition. Similarly, each were thinkers and perceivers although to different degrees. One of the Ph.D. students was considerably more expressive, assertive, spontaneous and unstructured than the other two instructors, while the other (the researcher) required more time to think, plan, and reflect than the others. These style or type differences showed clearly in their interaction in class and the assignment or selection of exercises and lecturettes each would prepare and deliver. The instructor of record was already known for his high expectations of and belief in students and his personable style. He also became known for the joy he felt and the affirmation he gave to each person's progress, be it made in small steps or giant leaps.

The First Leadership Course.

Students in this study described their experience of the first course of the series as being distinctly different from previous classes they had taken at the university and positively so. They specified the course's focus on self-discovery
and experiential learning as largely fostering that difference, together with the person of the primary instructor and his classroom culture. This experience then created a mental picture and expectation of what the second course would be like, even though prospective enrollees were provided information about its delving more deeply into the self and its experimental nature. Indeed, a few of the students had actually had prior experience with NLP coaching sessions as an optional adjunct to the first course, so had already been engaged in a typical NLP exercise.

Although the background information on the proposed course made students curious, it seems to not have particularly changed their expectation that the approach to leadership offered in the second course would be a continuation of the first. The curriculum of that course had engaged participants in studying models of leadership, working with case studies, exploring their own characteristics and preferences through a variety of inventories, and participating in a strategic planning simulation. Thus many entered this course anticipating, whether consciously or unconsciously, that they would continue to be engaged in filling out inventories, learning about new models of human behavior or personality, dialoguing with one another, and perhaps conducting role plays and/or participating in team projects.

While discussions and presentations in the course sometimes drew upon the knowledge students had gained through instruments like the Myers-Briggs Type Inventory, the Kilmann-Thomas Conflict Style Inventory, or Quinn's Competing Values Model, what they found in this course were structures designed to draw out from each person descriptions of who he or she was, distinct from having an external source tell them who they were. In other words, the structures drew upon the inner knowing of participants and were essentially
void of labels for people. They also found their own beliefs about themselves and their world being challenged and encountered an invitation to consider aspects of themselves, including thought patterns and feelings in addition to behaviors, which they had never before explored.

The design and curriculum of this course, therefore, was a surprise given the emphasis placed on right- as well as left-brain activities, work with the other-than-conscious mind, and investigations of internal subjective experience. Students' comments reflected surprise, delight, frustration, and fear at the prospect of working in these realms. For example, several had never experienced meditation or guided visualization exercises before; many had not yet probed their own core values; and most had neither coached nor been coached in any setting outside of athletics. The behaviors required of these students clearly offered them new challenges and often stretched them into new modes of thought and styles of learning.

**Relationship Bias.**

The relationship built between the instructors, perhaps particularly the researcher, and course participants may account for student responses being more positive than they would otherwise have been. At the same time, the responses citing exercises which did not work, were confusing, or had no meaning or significance seem to indicate that the relationship also had a component allowing for honesty. The fact that the course and class were the subject of research itself introduces the potential for biased performance, as noted in the Hawthorne studies. This might be particularly true for the students who participated in the sub-group targeted for in-depth analysis. Nevertheless, students were asked simply to be themselves in their interactions and to be truthful in their evaluations so that the curriculum and pedagogy might benefit
from analysis of their experiences and consideration of their recommendations. Thus one would hope that most, if not all, students honored that request.

Problematic Aspects

Several aspects of the research were found to be particularly problematic. The first of these regards the units of analysis and the confusion brought on at times by addressing both specific course components and the inner experience and personal change of course participants. The second involves the nature of the data.

As the reader will recall, the data which provide the foundation for this research endeavor represent a wide mix drawn from the observable large-group interactions, small-group interactions, and exercises and the non-observable inner reflections of course participants. They reside in dyadic and triadic settings, in recorded personal interviews at the beginning and end of the ten weeks and twelve months later, and in students' verbal self-reports and self-assessments throughout the course as well as those provided during the class debriefing at the end of the course. They appear in the form of journal transcripts, class writings, final self-reports, and course evaluations. And all contribute to telling the tale of a class of graduate students engaging with a curriculum designed to develop leadership from within. Yet even with the abundance of data collected, problems arise from the insufficiency of data in some areas and from the predominance of data which were self-reported.

The first of these issues, insufficiency of data, speaks to the inability in some areas to provide the desired triangulation. Little to no peer data was submitted by many of the students, and no observation data was collected outside of the class setting. Also, the same data was not available for all
students (e.g., interview data) and not all spoke to all topics in class, in their journals or in other course writings (e.g., not all turned in a course assessment; some lost parts of their data, and so on). While some of these represent typical problems in research, they nevertheless inhibit analysis efforts and the ability of the researcher to assert findings with confidence. Thus the reader will note efforts to make explicit the relative frequency of responses by inserting qualifiers such as a few, most, one, some, or all.

The problem created by the self-reported status of so much of the data lies in providing confidence in the data regarding students' inner state changes. As noted earlier, this same problem led to the shift in focus from individual students and the changes they personally experienced to the course and descriptions of experience across the whole class in response to design aspects and specific components of the course curriculum.

For some, perhaps most, or even all readers and researchers, self-reported data is automatically suspect and of dubious value unless corroborated by more objective observation. However, researchers are increasingly seeking to give voice to their subjects in their presentation of data (e.g., classroom teachers telling their own tale of what they believe to be happening for students in their classes) and to take into account the subjective experience of research participants. In reality, the topic of inner state changes, new insights, aha experiences, and the like can really only be reported by the self who experiences them. Nevertheless, the integration of new perspectives, new learnings, and personal change can be expected to promote changes in the person's behaviors and attitudes which can be witnessed by others. The integration relies on the individual's capacity to put thought into action, and outside observation is appropriately called for to corroborate the changes.
A typical example of research wherein the triangulation is deemed sufficient to provide confidence in the findings reported and conclusions drawn might rely on data which are sourced in interviews, participant-completed questionnaires, and researcher observation. Two of the three sources represent a form of self-report, but the researcher was able to observe and corroborate much of what was reported. In this study, where the researcher was unable to witness, for example, the emergence of insights or the details of the inner experience of a participant, few findings can be asserted regarding students' deep personal change. Findings can be reported with great confidence, however, on the expressed responses of students to the events of class sessions and curricular components. Triangulation is provided for these through confirmation of the peer reviewer/debriefer on the selection of meaningful events, illustrative quotes, and so on.

The third problematic aspect of the research deals with the role of the researcher as an instructor in the course. Although it is not expected that the researcher can act without bias, this role adds to that bias, evidencing a greater than normal investment on her part in the outcomes of the course and student responsiveness to course components. In attempting to counteract that bias, negative cases and contradictory responses are included throughout the data presentation, and much of the tale of students' lived experience is told through the students' own words.

Next is the atypical nature of the research participants. All of these students already had experience with the instructor of record and, in many cases, the researcher. This brings to the research an already established relationship which, as described earlier, affects the data. As an advanced course in essentially the same topic area, having the same instructor(s) a
second time is not unusual. However, in researching the response to NLP practices and processes, it is not to be expected that the students have any prior experience with these. In this case some did, while most did not. No effort was made to distinguish the two groups based on the early insertion of an NLP exercise in which all participated, providing all with a common NLP experience. What is atypical and what distinguishes this group of research participants from others one might encounter is the common interest in self-knowledge and self-discovery evidenced by their enrollment in the course, given the description provided of its emphasis on probing the inner self.

Fifth in this category is the blend of NLP principles and processes with those of Covey and, to a lesser degree, Senge in the curriculum of the course. Actually, Covey's habits align very well with NLP principles, and some of his exercises could have been substituted with similar ones labeled or known as NLP exercises. Also one finds in Senge's book one or more exercises which directly correlate with NLP exercises (e.g., outcome specification) and principles which similarly align with those of NLP. Thus to engage students with both, in addition to the writings of Seymour and O'Connor, created a blend which was hoped to provide reinforcement of the principles to be addressed and support for delving into one's inner world together with creating a comfortability for students, given the popularity of the two books and some student foreknowledge of the impact these authors have been having on organizational life, or at least some organizational leaders. In particular, given the readable nature of Covey's book and his abundance of examples, the combination could help students to engage the issue of dealing with internal resources and limitations.
Finally, there is the potential that the researcher fell into what some call the conclusions trap. As Wolcott (1990) indicates, qualitative researchers are prone to attempting to draw conclusions beyond what the data support. In his words,

How do you conclude a qualitative study? - You don't. ... In reporting qualitative work I avoid the term conclusion. I do not want to work toward a grand flourish that might tempt me beyond the boundaries of the material I have been presenting or detract from the power (and exceed the limitations) of an individual case. (p. 55)

He goes on to say, "Rather than striving for closure, see if you can leave both yourself and your readers pondering the essential issues you have addressed" (Ibid.). I believe readers will agree that this descriptive study surfaces a number of essential issues worth pondering.
CHAPTER IV
DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

This chapter addresses the curriculum of a graduate-level leadership course; the primary focus is on how participants described their course experience, with a specific focus on its NLP aspects. First, we look at the course itself, at what emerged as its most significant features, and at the instructors' desired design outcomes. We then proceed with an account of students' lived experience for each regular class session and the intervening weeks, as related in their verbal and written comments and observed by the researcher and co-instructors. Next, we explore a synthesis of student evaluations of the course and a comparison to instructors' intentions. Last, we give a final look at what were deemed to be the most significant of the course's NLP components. An emphasis in the data presentation is placed on dialogue -- both internal dialogue and that among and between students and instructors.
The Leadership Course: Instructional Expectations

The course creation and delivery afforded the instructors an opportunity to investigate student exploration of the inner world and subjective experience in a classroom setting. A primary emphasis was co-creating with the students an environment in which people of diverse ages, backgrounds, interests and goals would feel willing and able to undertake such a challenge. The hope was to create and nurture an environment in which students could begin to experience both *being* and *doing* as certainly more conscious, and often nearly simultaneous, states.

**Focus on Identity and Drawing Out the Self.**

Perhaps the most unique feature of the course was its focus on the identity level of the student. Leadership training is often aimed at changing behaviors and developing specific skills and capabilities. In the terminology of Robert Dilts' (1990) neurological levels (see Chapter 2) such teaching targets the levels of behavior and capacity. The expectations of adults attending leadership classes and workshops focus on being able to do something new, something they were unable to do before, as a result of the experience. Similarly, much teaching engages people with beliefs and values, whether directly or indirectly; however, the learning tends to be a cognitive one and often does not reach the depths identified by Dilts' belief/value level.

The focus in the leadership course was on not only *doing* something new as a result of the learnings, but *being* someone new. This was to occur as a result of discovering or uncovering more of one's deepest self and deeply held
values. Course experiences were designed to align behaviors, capabilities, beliefs and values to produce the self -- the identity -- one most wanted to fully be. In such a pursuit, unlearning has an importance at least equal to learning and is a recognized and valued aspect of the learning process.

**Introduction to the Unknown and Predictable Diversity.**

Also significant in the course was the embedded invitation to the unknown. Unlike the flexibility brought to the teaching/learning process by a predictability of student response, including typical questions and stuck-points, in this course, the instructors had little to help them to predict specific student responses or the stories that would emerge relating students' past and present experiences. Therefore, the orientation for the instructors was, of necessity, openness -- openness to facilitating whatever might unfold.

For most students, venturing into the inner world was indeed venturing into the unknown. In line with a typical NLP perspective efforts were made to cultivate wonder and openness in students about their own inner workings and those of others, framing this venture positively rather than negatively. It was hoped that just such wonder and openness would be instilled in these students and that among student gains would be their becoming increasingly present to others in ways which honored the uniqueness of the other and engendered curiosity about how he or she perceived the world, constructed reality, and coded information. Diversity was addressed, therefore, as giftedness; inquiring into the approaches, views and priorities of others was treated as a viable and desirable means of expanding one's world. To "accept" diversity was not enough, nor was it appropriate to dismiss it as involving particular features of the other person but having no consequence to oneself. The instructors valued a perspective that there is always something to be learned about ourselves
through our encounters with others, especially if they are not like us. Students were encouraged to engage life by addressing each and every individual as someone from whom they can learn.

If anything could be predicted regarding the student experience of and response to the course, it was the likelihood of variability in response. Differences in age, background, readiness, learning style, developmental stage, personality, and current life state, to name a few, all contributed to an expectation that students would respond differently to each of the exercises. Any given exercise, discussion or sharing would likely be more powerful for some individuals than for others. The lag time between experience and response could also be expected to vary among individuals, as would the depth and significance of their responses. In addition, the level and timing of self-disclosure, whether accomplished quite straightforwardly or through storying, whether intended as disclosure or having become so unconsciously, could not be predicted any more than what its impact would be on other students.

Students were told the first night that among the competencies leaders would find necessary for the future was a facility with narrative communication. Thus they would encounter an emphasis on metaphor and story in the course as modes of teaching and learning as well as forms of self-expression and disclosure. While students were not required to write metaphors or stories, story-writing was encouraged, and the telling of stories was a more-or-less regular feature of the course. Although a specific story assignment was made in the fourth week of the course, most storying occurred spontaneously and informally. As students told stories about themselves and their experiences, they often revealed a script they had lived, were living or rewriting.


**Modelled Disclosure and Vulnerability.**

In reality, some students experienced a felt expectation of self-disclosure in the context of this class. From the instructors' viewpoint, it always remained the student's choice as to how much to disclose or at what level to engage in an exercise. However, their degree of choice did not become fully clear to some students until as late as the fourth week. The stress students may have felt with regard to disclosure was ultimately deemed by them to be largely self-generated. At the same time, it was an expressed and agreed upon expectation among the instructors that they model the way for students in the realm of disclosure. This then generated perhaps the most unique feature of the course, namely the effort the instructors made to model Storying, disclosure and, most importantly, the vulnerability that accompanies the work of truly exploring one's inner world. Here it was predicted that if the instructors allowed themselves to become known and to overtly engage in self-exploration, then students would feel free to allow themselves to do the same.

**Secondary Gains.**

Closely associated with disclosure was the reliance placed on secondary gain and vicarious exploration. As both students and instructors increased their capacity and willingness to "go public," the potential for gains and learnings on the part of some could be predicted to increase; at the same time so, too, could an increase in the level of perceived threat, fear, and resistance for others.

Often what students encountered, whether or not anticipated, were efforts to disconfirm habits of thought and to destabilize the normal, taken-for-granted, expected encounters with the world and habituated patterns of interaction. Beginning with the very first night, students were asked to have new eyes and new ears as well as to express their own voices, perhaps even new voices, in
their interactions with the world and one another. The challenge to do this generated an ever-present tension, but it was deemed necessary to produce growth as long as the intensity did not become too great, thereby rendering the tension counterproductive. Some of the polarities students experienced were between letting go of certain behaviors while preserving positive intentions, going inside versus disclosing self in public, and balancing threat with opportunity.

**Desired Outcomes**

In planning the curriculum of the course, the instructional intentions were focused on often neglected or forgotten aspects of leadership: the inner world of the individual and gaining access to and support from that inner world. This would be addressed in the course through discovering or uncovering and accessing inner resources and gaining greater awareness of the self with regard to both being and doing. The specific intentions behind various curricular components and modes of instruction are delineated in the next section. The instructors wanted to help students make connections with their inner life and self and to highlight the link of self-leadership with leading others. Thus the form of leadership to be investigated might best be called "relational leadership." Aspects to be addressed included:

- Attending to the what/who one wants to do/be as a leader, and providing tools to accomplish this vision (i.e., tools for the how).
- Enhancing inter-personal and intra-personal competencies by enabling people to have deep experiences and helping them learn to translate these to the more surface levels applicable in organizations.
• Generating learning experiences that engaged a full range of learning modes and styles, aimed toward accelerated learning and improved retention by interspersing both left- and right-brain experiences.

• Facilitating self-empowerment and choice-making, specifically highlighting a particular form of coaching as a skill to learn and practice in aiding this process.

• Calling forth and affirming the best in people and facilitating their growth into who they want to become.

These were envisioned to be made possible, particularly the last of the list, by establishing a risk-taking, fail-safe environment in which to explore one's inner depths for growth. By replacing evaluation and modifying control needs and judgments with curiosity and a sense of adventure, and by drawing upon connections made with the other-than-conscious mind and exploring internal subjective experience, the skills of relational leadership would be promoted.

The intention was to create an environment in which key aspects of leadership could be lived rather than merely learned. The methodology was to have the instructors model the beliefs, ideas, and principles being taught. To this end, emphasis was placed on the experiential: exercises, demonstrations of tools and techniques, and instructors sharing their own inner world and being explorers seekers along with the students. These intentions required a rather fluid course structure in which students were encouraged to, if not actually co-create, at least be active participants in a course which was highly student-responsive. In short, the intention was to create a kind of real and very human "learning lab" in which, to whatever extent possible, teaching happened and
learning took place by *drawing out* from the students rather than their being passively *acted upon*. 
The Course Curriculum

Overview and Framing

As indicated earlier, the leadership course was comprised of ten three-hour class sessions held once a week over a ten week quarter. A prerequisite was imposed of having taken the school's original leadership course (taught by the same professor of record) within the past three years, or students could enroll with special permission of the instructors. From the outset, the course was framed in the metaphor of a traveling players' theater, signifying the journey of self-knowledge the instructors hoped each student would take.

The focus of the course was announced to be "the inner world of the leader." That is, would-be students were alerted to the emphasis on subjective experience which would guide the course and told to expect something slightly different from the types of exercises to which they had become accustomed in the first course of the series. Efforts would include the scripting, re-scripting, and rehearsing of new behaviors, as well as trying out new roles and modes of thought, but center on self and relationship in new ways. Students were also told of the experimental nature of the course and the fact that this would be its debut in the curriculum.

The instructors' desire to be responsive to the events and feedback of each session in designing the next prompted an invitation to students to co-create the course as it evolved and an initial syllabus intentionally written in broad strokes. The syllabus themes, as provided to students, together with the instructional themes embedded in the course design are shown in Tables 5 and 6.
Table 5
Syllabus Themes

The focus of the course is strategic leadership in public and not-for-profit organizations. Several strategic leadership themes will be explored:

1) Underlying principles to guide strategic leaders
2) Interpersonal leadership skills of establishing rapport and influencing with integrity
3) Inner worlds of leaders; how to access your intuitive capabilities, core states and feelings, and other resources and gifts
4) Developing a well-formed mission, vision, and outcome statements
5) Enrolling and empowering stakeholders
6) On-line creative negotiations and reframing
7) Discovering leaders' inner models
8) Systems thinking, cybernetics, and holonomic orders
9) Leaders' roles linking inner and outer worlds
10) Leaderful teams: Life after TQM

*Not addressed in this class

Table 6
Instructional Themes

- Rapport & Ecology
- Purposeful Communication
- Core Values and Desired Outcomes
- Engaging Two Minds
- Perspectives
- Accessing and Developing Resources
- Coaching
- Story and Metaphor

- Respectful Interaction
- Generative Dialogue
- Mission & Outcomes
- Learning & Unlearning
- Perceptions & Frames
- Skills & States
- Facilitating Choice
- Rescripting
The course became a continuous work in progress with frequent deviations from initial plans. Time constraints ultimately precluded much student co-creation, although some evidence of this exists. While spontaneity and flexibility became increasingly significant, most, if not all, of the instructors' initial priorities and certain basic patterns of class activity remained in evidence. A calendar of the content of each class session is provided in Figure 6.

Regarding format, most class sessions included a mix of brief lectuettees and in-class exercises aimed at actively engaging students in developing vision and skills, accessing and adding new resources, and creating new mental models. An initial template of session format was developed but quickly abandoned to provide greater coherence in topic engagement and to meet the need for flexibility. As noted earlier, required texts for the course included Senge's The Fifth Discipline (1990), Covey's 7 Habits of Highly Effective People (1989), and O'Connor and Seymour's Introduction to NLP (1990). These were selected to promote personal and system perspectives along with providing information and exercises linking subjective and objective experience and some how-to's of personal change. As one student later described, the Covey book helped to provide students a context in which to place and understand the NLP concepts and processes, which had been the instructional intent.

Students were required to journal in a continuing effort to facilitate their becoming reflective practitioners of leadership, analyzing specific interactions for cause-effect relationships, feeling responses, and options for future action. Their entries were prompted by a specific set of guiding questions (See Appendix B for a list of these). Readings, text exercises, group projects, and required journal topics were chosen to supplement class activities. Some were specifically devised in an effort to provide opportunities in each of the learning
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1</th>
<th>3/29</th>
<th>Intro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Name Game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complaints List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Presuppositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Logical Levels Demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and Exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>Logical Levels (cont)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rapport/Triune Brain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview Exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Share Missions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outcomes 1 Exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- three questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>4/12</td>
<td>Review Meditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outcomes 2: Individual &amp; Class; Wall charts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rep Sys/Eye Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Calibrating States -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility Exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>4/19</td>
<td>Instructor Stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reflect; Write story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open Frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ecology Checks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Circle of Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome Chain Exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Set up PR&amp;D Teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>4/26</td>
<td>Old Man Story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback to Storyteller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Types of Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coaching Demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purposes of Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group Work: Safe Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demo w/Parts Reframing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>5/3</td>
<td>Pizza Get-together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(enhancing safe space)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Debriefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coaching Class Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion: Authentic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogue &amp; Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>5/10</td>
<td>Leadership Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(team performances)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Debriefings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>5/17</td>
<td>Affirmation Meditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perceptual Positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mind-Reading Exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Framing/Reframing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and Sleight of Mouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Criteria Demo &amp; Exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(strategies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td>5/24</td>
<td>Team Performances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(revised challenges)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Childhood Story Demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dyads: personal story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mentors &amp; Sages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(full group exercise)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment handout</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6
Class Tracking - Content of Acts
contexts described in the holistic model adapted from Ian Cunningham (refer to Chapter 2).

Class Sessions

Act 1.

Act One introduced students to what the instructors called "Journeys to Leaderfulness." Together and alone, students and instructors alike could expect to be involved in three simultaneous journeys: the unique personal journey of the individual, the team journey of various small groups, and the common journey of the collective. The departure point was understood to be the existing state of each entity and the destination the desired state specified by the individual or group. A primary component of each journey would involve the inner world of the individual -- the leader -- described as including one's own value and belief systems, personal concepts of leadership, vision of self as a leader, personal mission, internal resources, and more, together with the manifestations of each of these in one's interactions with others.

The theater metaphor was then introduced highlighting the notions of rehearsals, performances, casting, understudy, scripting and re-scripting. Each workshop session was billed as an act within a play comprised of various scenes, and students were encouraged to don the role of an actor trying out new scripts and roles and, when ready, to try these out in the world, whether that be a university, work or community setting or with family and friends. The metaphor was chosen to support students in taking risks. They could attempt new behaviors without fear, because these were merely rehearsals which could always be changed or improved upon prior to an actual performance.
The goals of the course were described as having been written broadly enough to encompass whatever the group as a whole might later determine to be their individual and collective desired outcomes for the course. Students were told to expect to be engaged in, among other things, developing a vision and mission, taking inventory of their internal and external resources, building their repertoire of skills and knowledge, and calling one another forth through dialogue. Subsequently, the instructors addressed Robert Quinn's view that conscious self-improvement is possible but is something many managers and leaders choose not to undertake, choosing instead to excuse themselves from the responsibility.

A metaphoric story followed the initial framing which, in turn, was followed by a name game asking participants to introduce themselves using an alliterative adjective representing some aspect of themselves as leader -- the leading gift they would like others to know and recognize. Then students were asked to make a list of their current frustrations or complaints. The intended purpose was in part to help students achieve a state of learning readiness, that is, to offer them a means of letting go of the world external to the classroom, along with its stresses, and thereby open themselves to the ideas and experiences of the evening. In addition, the task was aimed at helping to motivate students toward change efforts and to link the course with their daily lives. Finally, the complaint list also provided fodder for a re-scripting exercise, modelling a means of reframing and subsequently addressing and articulating action steps to apply to their lists.

A demonstration was provided, after which students engaged in rewriting some of their complaints as specific issues to be addressed. Their issues were then compared to a list of Murphy's presuppositions, including, for example,
"People don't have enough resources - they need to get more from others" and "If what you are doing isn't working, keep at it and try harder." Further comparison was made with a list of NLP presuppositions. The equivalent statements on this list included: "People have within them all the resources they need" and "If what you're doing isn't working, do anything else." After discussing the list students rewrote several as "I-statements* and shared them with the rest of the class (Copies of both lists may be found in Appendix B).

Conversation then continued regarding how each of us, largely unconsciously, acts out of a set of presuppositions about ourselves, others, and our worlds. Class members identified those presuppositions which felt familiar and whose implications felt empowering and supportive as well as those which seemed most foreign. Students were encouraged to try on one or more of these presuppositions for blocks of time in the next week and to pay attention to the potential differences they might encounter in engaging the world from these perspectives.

A generic listing of NLP presuppositions is provided in Table 7 for easy reference. While there may appear to be little new thought in the NLP list and indeed some items on the list are directly borrowed from earlier literature, the simplicity, clarity and collective impact of the presuppositions seem to hold much power and potential for change when fully adopted. It was the hope of the instructors that students would indeed come to adopting at least some of the perspectives set forth in these presuppositions.

The scene culminated with a visualization exercise to elicit the modalities present in students' internal representations when they view the world as an unfriendly place and then as a friendly place. Starting with holding the first belief in mind, students were to picture themselves in a large city and notice the
There will be exceptions to all of these presuppositions, but they are a very useful starting basis for effective communication.

- **Communication is redundant.** We are always communicating, in all three major representational systems: visual, auditory, and kinesthetic.

- **The meaning of your communication is the response you get.** Communication is not about what we intend, or about saying the right words; it is about creating an experience in, and getting a response from, the listener. The "bottom line" of our communication is the response we elicit.

- **People respond to their map of reality, not to reality itself.** NLP is the science of changing these maps. By changing our maps, it is possible to change our reality.

- **Requisite variety:** The element in a system with the most flexibility will be the controlling element.

- **People work perfectly.** No one is wrong or broken; it is simply a matter of finding out how we function now, so that we can effectively change that to something more useful or desirable for the future.

- **People always make the best choice available to them at the time** (but usually there are lots of other better ones they have not yet thought of or have not yet learned).

- **Every behavior is useful in some context.**

- **Choice is better than no choice.**

- **Anyone can do anything.** If one person can do something, it is possible to model it and to teach it to anyone else.

- **People already have all the resources they need.** What they need is access to these resources at appropriate times and places.

- **There is no such thing as failure, only feedback.** Every response we receive can be utilized somehow.

- **Chunking:** Anything can be accomplished (by anyone) if we break the task down into small enough chunks.

Adapted from NLP Comprehensive Practitioner Training Manual, Andreas & Andreas, 1990.
qualities of the scene. Were there people present? What did the people look like? How did they feel about those people? Were there colors and what kinds of colors, or was the scene in black and white? What sounds were present? How would they describe those sounds? After releasing the first scene and comparing their responses, students were to take on the second belief and repeat the visualization, paying attention to the same things. They then compared the two experiences. The goal here was to raise awareness of internal representations and physiological responses to opposing thought patterns and to provide students with at least some initial and immediate sensory evidence of the impact of our beliefs on our experience of the world.

Next, Robert Dilts' (1990) conception of the brain/mind and its neurological levels was presented (refer to Chapter 2 for the conceptual framework), and a demonstration was provided of his exercise on the co-alignment of these levels. The purpose of the exercise was to discover thoughts, feelings, values, and beliefs which may or may not have been in the person's conscious awareness and to begin to bring them into congruence with each other (to "align" the levels). The exercise started by focusing on some particular setting; in this case, the environment was assigned to be the classroom for the course, including course participants, and the focus of the exploration was to be the individual's learning and growth while in this setting with these people. The instructors selected the exercise for the opening night of the course in order to quickly engage students in exploring the unconscious and accessing their inner worlds. The decision to try this exercise so early was prompted by the powerful results of one instructor's first-hand experience with it. At the same time, the instructors acknowledged the risk that some might not be ready for this or find themselves "turned off" to a course with such unusual content and expectations.
The logical levels exercise is conducted by laying labelled sheets of paper on the floor in the following order: Environment, Behaviors, Capabilities, Beliefs and Values, Identity, and Spirituality or Essence. The person acting as explorer begins by standing in front of the first paper, labeled environment, with his or her back to the path. S/he then steps backward onto the designated space, as directed by a guide, and walks the path of the remaining logical levels, from environment through spirituality, pausing at each physical space to respond to a scripted set of questions.

Upon completing the path and carrying with him or her the elicited sensations and representations of all levels, the explorer is asked to come up with a personal metaphor or symbol representing his or her core, essence, highest values or journey. Thereafter, s/he attempts to internalize (anchor) the accumulated sensations in his/her body and begins to walk forward along the return path, once again pausing at each space in order to notice any differences in the internal experience of being in that space.

The demonstration was conducted by one of the instructors with a student volunteer. Thereafter, trios were formed, and students alternated in the roles of guide, explorer and recorder/observer, following the script provided. At the end of each walk they discussed the experience and offered observations. Due to the length of the demonstration, the time remaining allowed for only one round of the exercise to be completed that evening. After considerable debate among the instructors and consultation with a few class members, it was decided that time be given to completing the exercise (rounds two and three) the following week rather than offering an optional session before or after the regular class time. This would provide students with both a common initial experience and an opportunity to serve in all roles in the exercise.
Act 2.

Students entered Act 2 having been assigned to read and to journal on the experience of the first act. They were also required to work through the parts of the Covey book regarding one’s circle of influence, roles, centers, and personal mission statement and to complete some of the written exercises and take a “first cut” at writing a mission statement. In addition, they were to be prepared to share their experience of trying on various NLP presuppositions.

The act opened with a guided meditation intended to establish a learning state and to generate openness to the potentials of human growth suggested by the subsequent lecturette. In this case the meditation also was intended to assist students in establishing an individualized inner (mental) retreat. The meditation was followed by a brief presentation on perception, learning, the functions of the right and left hemispheres of the brain and their integration, brain waves, and the purposes and use of meditation (used here to refer to a variety of guided relaxation and visualization exercises). The instructional objectives of the presentation included raising awareness of what is now known about the functioning of the brain and the states of mind most conducive to learning and to connecting with our other-than-conscious mind, as well as alerting students to the possibility of creating new neurological pathways for thinking, feeling, and behaving. This serves to counter the old adage, “You can't teach an old dog new tricks,” and was intended to provide students with new hope for changing habitual patterns of thought and behavior. Students were also advised of the instructors’ belief that by incorporating the right brain with the left and more intentionally calling upon and engaging the unconscious, students would be able to accelerate their learning.
Upon completing and debriefing the logical levels exercise, students were presented with information on verbal and nonverbal communication, the concepts of trust and rapport, and the effect of stress on brain functioning, as described by MacLean (1987) in his work on the triune brain. The latter supplies physiological reasons for our sometimes spontaneous emotional and seemingly irrational responses to events as we undergo stress and alerts us to the need-fulfilling requirements of our physiology in order to return from the emotional or instinctual realms of the brain to full operation of the thinking brain. Herein lies the importance of establishing and maintaining rapport in interaction with others. NLP describes rapport as a moment-to-moment state of trust. This state is believed to be enhanced or reduced through matching or mismatching the breathing, posture, gestures and language of the interactants.

On a minor scale, the effects of rapport on decision-making were then explored in the context of a job interview exercise in which students engaged in groups of four. Among those serving in the role of job applicant, one was covertly directed to match the posture and gestures of the interviewer while providing mediocre to poor responses to questions and a second to mismatch while providing good to excellent responses. Interviewers were to declare their choice for the position before the directions were revealed, observers provided feedback, and all engaged in debriefing the experience.

A final scene asked one student from each trio to share his or her personal mission statement while the remaining members of the new trio simply listened, paying attention to what the speaker communicated nonverbally. The listeners tried to enhance feelings of trust and to create what the collective called "safe space" within their small group. The role of speaker then rotated so all had the experience of articulating their mission while others silently listened to them.
After all the trios had completed the exercise, an instructor presented the NLP format for outcome elicitation through the first several steps. As noted in Chapter 2, the format specifies asking people what they individually want; what it will do for them to have that; and, when they have it, what they want even more or what is even more important to that person. The latter question is repeated while the person continues to respond in an effort to arrive at a primary or "core" outcome, to which the immediate outcome and others in the chain are linked. Students were asked to choose an outcome associated with some part of what they had just presented as their initial mission statement.

After completing this portion of the elicitation (the "chunking up" portion), the following two questions were asked: How will you know when you have this outcome (referring to the first outcome stated)? What will you see, hear, and feel when you have this in your life? Thus the person is asked to provide sensory-based evidence of achieving the outcome. This begins the "chunking down" portion of the elicitation. Some factors contributing to the "well-formedness" of desired outcomes were also addressed, including stating things in the positive and in first person (The latter refers to keeping desired outcomes under one's own control and not dependent on the behavior of others). Students rotated as guide, explorer, and observer/recorder until all three had completed the exercise. When an outcome was stated in the negative, such as "I don't want to ..." or depended on another person, for example, "I want so-and-so to ...", the guide was to ask the explorer to restate the outcome or to respond to questions like "What do you want instead?" or "What do you personally want to be doing/feeling/etc., when so-and-so behaves that way?"

The intent of this first outcome exercise was to engage students in articulating and describing some want or need while at the same time exploring
why they want it, where their motivations lie, what higher value the outcome serves, what parameters are associated with it, what aspects are under their own control, and what will serve as sensory evidence of its achievement. The scripted questions take explorers along a continuum from abstract to concrete, although discontinuously so, perhaps the way normal daily experience proceeds. The questions are intended to draw on all the senses to help explorers make connections between and among behaviors, attitudes, and intentions. The experience tends to reinforce the presupposition about positive intent, to heighten sensory awareness, to reinforce the notion of establishing evidence criteria, to increase awareness of personal meta-outcomes and to promote integration. In introducing the exercise the instructor distinguished the basis and purpose of this form of outcome elicitation from a management-by-objectives framework by saying that "what is present here but missing in [the latter] ... is your whole brain and your whole self understanding of what you want." Like the logical levels exercise, this process was intended to provide students with a deeper structure through which to experience a way of ascertaining the desired outcomes of the full self.

Typically people have little or no experience in probing their wants or needs to this extent, and the introductory exercise was formulated to graduate the experience and pave the way for the extensive probing of the full outcome specification chain in subsequent sessions. Additionally, it was important to the instructors, both for the effectiveness of the course and the research being conducted, that students get in touch with desired outcomes early in the quarter.

Final comments addressed the translation of the exercise to a more surface level for use in the work world and pointed out how the language could be fitted in and how students might move through the first couple of questions
without their audience recognizing its inherent focus on personal change. The instructor also noted for students the likelihood of encountering overlapping outcomes at the higher (meta) levels with continued application of the elicitation script to various initial outcomes. Between-class expectations included reading, attending to rapport skills, continuing work on a personal mission and vision, and completing Covey’s time management matrix. Covey’s exercise to write one’s own eulogy was offered as an optional “stretch.” With regard to vision and desired outcomes, students were to spend the week asking themselves “What do I want?” and were to probe the question in a variety of domains, such as job, relationships, and competencies.

Act 3.

The opening meditation for Act 3 was written to take participants on a review journey through the happenings and learnings of the earlier sessions. This was intended to bring forward and reinforce previous teaching points and learnings, to create a unified sense of the collective, and, as before, to create in each person an enhanced learning state in preparation for the evening. After the guided experience, students and instructors alike engaged in silent writing regarding the integration of personal and collective outcomes desired of the quarter’s experience. First, each was to list the five major results (outcomes) s/he wanted and was committed to realizing during the current quarter. Next, each was to list the most essential results achievable as a group which would build on and reinforce his/her personal outcomes. These lists were then shared in trios with the goal of surfacing three key consensus results for the class as a whole which simultaneously supported individual outcomes. Volunteer scribes recorded and posted these on wall charts for presentation to and discussion among the full class.
This exercise had originally been intended for Act 2 to focus thinking early on what might be accomplished over the duration of the course and to begin to acknowledge and interweave individual and group desires. The posting of results was done here with the intention of returning to them regularly to discuss progress, measures of progress, and desirable changes in the emphasis or direction of the course. Students were also told that the instructors would be seeking a new way to grade based on ways of reporting progress in the developmental process -- ways which at this point were quite open to influence and suggestion.

The next scene centered on representational systems and eye-accessing cues. As the eyes are typically described as windows to the soul, so, too, are they windows to the brain. By calibrating and observing a person's eye movements, NLP advocates believe we are able to discern the ways in which a person is processing and coding information. According to the guest instructor, such knowledge and acuity "helps the listener realize the speaker's reality as they process thoughts, being engaged in their own way of communicating; so it helps with rapport." He demonstrated the accessing cues, as normally displayed by a right-handed person, and students practiced describing whether he was seeing, hearing, or feeling something, engaged in talking to himself, or experiencing an emotion, and whether or not the information was being remembered or constructed in the moment. He then led students through exercises with word lists and matching or translating words and phrases to gain recognition and familiarity with common visual, auditory, and kinesthetic (VAK) terminology, as well as to discern their own preferred modality (representational system).
The purpose of these types of exercises was to alert people to the existence and use of both the representational systems and eye accessing cues and to increase their acuity regarding these in themselves and others. Paying attention and matching the other person's cues is believed to have strong implications for establishing and maintaining rapport. Also it is believed that if we increase our ability to use or translate each of the various modalities and better use other parts of our brain, we can enhance our experience, increase our ability to empathize, and add information or resources to our own thinking and feeling.

Subsequently, another instructor demonstrated, with the help of a student volunteer, a method for ascertaining (calibrating) a person's state of being while the person is thinking about a particular event or circumstance and strategies for changing that state. The movement desired was from a less resourceful to a more resourceful state. Students then engaged in a flexibility exercise in which one person trains another in how to "push my buttons," and a role play was engaged wherein the first person induced a resourceful state, with the help of the third trio member, and attempted to anchor and retain that state while the second behaved as directed in an effort to, for example, anger the first, thus pulling him or her into a different and less resourceful state.

The act closed with a reading from Virginia Satir's *Peoplemaking* (1972) entitled "A Unique Human Being." Assignments were then made to read, as usual, and to watch eye movements on a television talk show as well as to listen for the use of words in the various representational systems. Students were also asked to complete a Covey exercise identifying an emotional bank account which was currently "in the red," track the person's representational systems
and eye accessing cues, and practice matching and pacing them to make deposits to the account.

**Act 4.**

Act 4 began with a reading and moved into a story. Actually, the story was a series of stories, beginning with some background and moving into the instructor's own experience of the logical levels exercise and the metaphors and symbols she encountered while traversing the levels, along with the pains and joys of several other events in her life during the past year. Students were then asked to engage in silent writing focused on the story of their own journeys through the course to date or the creation of a metaphor to describe that experience, and several shared part or all of what they had written with the full class. An open frame followed in which students were invited to continue to address their personal responses to the organization and activities of the course over the past several weeks (This occurrence was both spontaneous, flowing naturally from the previous activity, and planned, in that previously planned open frames had been lost in the agenda to provisions for extra time in ongoing activities). This time, the instructors wished to insure that such a time for feedback and the sharing of experience would be available.

Following the open frame, the primary instructor introduced further comments on personal ecology wherein he urged students to pay attention to and honor any "objectors" they encountered in their explorations. The objectors might make themselves known through an inner voice cautioning the person about proceeding or expressing concern or fear, or perhaps through physical sensations alerting them to feelings of nervousness or anxiety. If the objections were strong, the students were to not force themselves to proceed. He then reiterated an earlier suggestion to the class that they might choose to work on
issues that were 3's, 4's or 5's on a "Richter Scale" rather than 10's. Basically, 
his comments provided affirmation and validation, even permission, for students 
to be who they were and had been and to take only those risks for which they 
had readied themselves; students should continue to probe and probe deeply, 
but at a pace and depth that was graduated. He also reminded students of their 
ability to do the exercises "content free" without specifying, for example, the 
people involved or the topic addressed.

In the next scene, students were introduced to additional concepts 
surrounding personal resource states and, after a demonstration, were guided 
as a group through creating and anchoring their own "Circle of Excellence."
The intention of the exercise was to put participants in touch with a time in which 
they "shined" and found easily accessible all the resources they had needed for 
that situation. By recalling such a time, embellishing it with other desirable 
resources and anchoring it in the body by some kinesthetic means (pressing 
two fingers together or otherwise touching their body in some way), participants 
would then create the possibility of having this resource state available to them 
any time they chose to call it forth.

This was followed by a return to the previously generated class outcomes, 
now clustered into three general categories (as shown in Table 8), and the 
revisiting of what students had written or said about their desired individual 
outcomes in devising class outcomes to support them. Dyadic work followed to 
complete the full elicitation and specification of individual outcomes. For some, 
this built upon the work of Act 2; for others it drew from Act 3 activity. In either 
case, students were asked to select outcomes which mattered enough to them 
to ask someone to help facilitate their achievement.
Table 8  
Class Outcome Clusters

I.  
SAFE ENVIRONMENTS & RESPECTFUL INTERACTION  
CREATING THE SET(S) - BECOMING DRAMA & VOCAL COACHES  

• Develop a safe learning environment to co-experience learning by enhancing coaching and carefrontation skills.  
• We will have a fail-safe environment.  
• Let go of control; empower others (and self).  
  Cultivate environment of honest communication / free play of language.  
• Create a tool to share something we have learned in our journey.  
• To develop tools / learn to support each other.  
• To learn to understand and appreciate others.

II.  
ACCESSING & ACTIVATING POTENTIAL  
SCRIPTING LINES - PLAYING NEW ROLES-CASTING PERFORMANCES  

• Provide language (verbal & non-verbal) that energizes, activates, and releases potential of self  
• Develop a safe learning environment to co-experience learning by enhancing coaching and carefrontation skills.  
• Everyone gets a chance to play all parts, do all the jobs.  
• Permission to engage each other to broaden perspectives.  
• To appreciate our own growth.

III.  
CULTIVATING CHOICE & CREATIVITY  
BECOMING PLAYWrights - DIRECTORS - PRODUCERS  

• Access and mature creative part to provide synergetic options, choices, and actions.  
• Make a contribution based on shared values we have found - possibly a contribution to our community in the PPM program.  
• Create a tool to share something we have learned in our journey.  
• To develop tools / learn to support each other.  

(* => overlap)

As described earlier, in eliciting an outcome chain, one person asks the scripted questions while the other attempts to allow responses to emerge from both mind and heart. This time the questions asked were when, where, and with whom the person wished to achieve his/her outcome(s); what stopped him/her from having it right now; what resources s/he already had available to bring to bear on achieving this outcome; what resources s/he would need; and what might constitute a first step in taking action to achieve the outcome (refer
to the discussion of the outcome chain provided in Chapter 2). In the view of the instructors, among the most significant of these questions, relative to students' already having their desired outcomes, was "What stops you?" This question was intended to help people gain awareness of their own blocks or resistances to moving on to achieving their outcomes and to having those outcomes fully present in their lives right that moment.

Finally, students were presented with directions, groupings, and rationale for participation in an outside-of-class set of projects. Each class member was randomly assigned to both a peer resource and a design team in which s/he was expected to participate during the next several weeks. Design teams (five members each) were to set a time to meet with the researcher-instructor to receive direction for their team task (described in the section following Act 5). Resource teams (three members each) were to arrange to meet weekly with the purpose of coaching one another, conducting guided exercises and holding each other accountable for efforts associated with achieving their previously specified outcome(s). Each trio member was asked, through this vehicle, to serve as a peer resource by taking some responsibility for facilitating his or her partners' learning and growth and providing feedback to partners as requested. Handouts were provided regarding coaching, as it would be defined and implemented in this class, together with sample question sets (scripts) for planning or debriefing purposes. Students were asked to keep records of their sessions and the progress each made toward achieving desired outcomes.

**Act 5.**

In Act 5, a demonstration was provided which utilized and improvised upon one of the sample question sets in the coaching handouts. The coaching demonstration followed the opening story and first scene. It offered students an
opportunity to hear a published tale of a well respected author (together with expressing what deeper meaning the story held for them) and then engaged them in providing feedback on the personal story told by an instructor the previous week. The announced goal of the task was to help the instructor to become a better storyteller. After reflecting upon what each might say to help this storyteller improve her skills, students volunteered feedback which a different instructor/facilitator then noted on one of four charts without explanation. After a time, students were asked to label the charts based on the types of statements collected in each grouping and to propose new forms of feedback for any as yet blank charts. Then time was provided for direct interaction between students and storyteller. This give-and-take led into a presentation and discussion of four specific types of feedback and the purposes and appropriate uses of each.

The labels became judgment/evaluation, essentially the "you statements"; listener/observer responses, the "I statements"; objective data, the observed behaviors; and questions for the storyteller. The exercise was included at this point to surface some common assumptions about and interpretations of the term feedback and to offer students alternative forms. In other words, it was intended to help students discover the differences between offering someone evaluative comments or advice; asserting one's own likes, dislikes and preferences; providing objective, observable data which the person can use in evaluating his or her own performance; and posing questions to prompt further thinking on the part of the individual, in this case the storyteller. Typically it is the question-posing and offering of data which are most suitable for the coaching sessions desired in the course. The subsequent demonstration then focused on coaching the storyteller through a debriefing of the experience. The
debriefing was intended to highlight the form of coaching desired in interactions of the student resource teams and to illustrate use of the previously distributed question set, as well as appropriate modification to further individualize the interaction.

Scenes three and four then introduced students to the NLP concept of internal parts and reframing by first engaging them in an interaction of externalized parts in a group setting through a role play. The analogy to be drawn here was the unique role each individual and his or her vested interests play in group decision making, paralleling the different "parts" within an individual which must be voiced and dealt with in order for the person to congruently pursue a desired goal or course of action.

Students were divided into small groups and secretly given prescribed roles to play within the group (gatekeeper, communicator, etc.) as it dealt with devising an action plan for creating safe space within or among a group of people coming together for the first time. Each person was to behave according to role and seek to have his or her interests addressed by the group which sought to generate a cohesive, workable plan for the whole. The individual role assignments were expected to cause some conflict in the group but, after a time, the secretly assigned roles were to be revealed to the others, together with the intentions represented by each role. The instructors' hope was to engage students in consensus building in the midst of conflict and to highlight the notion of positive intention underlying various behaviors so that an experiential understanding of this might be taken into the work with individuals' internal voices and parts. The safe space topic was selected based on the students' expressed concerns with the issue. Time provided for initial group discussion
was followed by time in which to reveal role intentions and to revisit and revise the proposed action plan prior to sharing it with the full class.

Transitional comments moved the focus from externalized to internalized parts, and two of the instructors demonstrated a coaching session in which one coached the other on achieving a desired outcome. In this case the outcome was to involve some specific change of behavior desired by the explorer; during the course of the conversation, any emergent internal voices or parts were to be revealed and addressed in an effort to gain support for making the change. Of particular importance in the demonstration was the introduction of specific ecology checks which are questions dealing with the security of the person both in revealing his/her internal experience -- thoughts, feelings, pictures, sounds, etc. -- to an audience (the coach) and to other parts of himself/herself and in actually achieving the outcome, i.e., the implications of this for other parts of the person.

Highlighted here were the importance of surfacing and engaging with internal "objectors," listening to their objections and the positive intent behind each objection, generating new or expanded choices for the behavior of each part, and negotiating overall consensus among them in support of achieving the individual's desired change. In NLP terminology, the process is called Six-Step Reframing and calls upon the creative part of the person to assist in formulating behavioral and perceptual options for one or more internal parts. Next, it is important to gain the permission and consensus needed to allow the person to congruently pursue his or her goal, whether it be the original one or a revised version based on conversation with these parts. Most simply put, the goal of six-step reframing is to help us to avoid self-sabotage. Through the process, persons engage in internal research to determine why they want a specific
change but do not seem able to bring it about and then to reframe it so that the outcome becomes achievable.

Debriefing students' experiences of the coaching demonstration and continuing the discussion of internal parts, ecology and safe space closed the evening's act. Students were then asked to conduct the reframing exercise with each other in their upcoming resource team session, as well as to continue (or begin) work on coaching one another regarding their practice in the real world. Journals and written exercises were also collected for the first half of the quarter.

**Design Team Sessions.**

The design team sessions were held outside of class during weeks five and six. The experience was structured to be multi-faceted and to highlight once again taking responsibility in facilitating the growth and goal achievement of others, although in much less specific terms than the coaching experience. The collection of individuals forming each team resulted from a random process with peer resource teams being designated from among these so that each trio member belonged to a different design team.

Phase one of the project asked students to indeed act as a design group, while phase two had them serve as a performance group for another design team. At the initial session, each team was given a generalized list of desired outcomes for members of a second team and asked to design a "leadership challenge" for the team which would facilitate their progress toward achieving their outcomes.

The creation of such an assignment originated from the research design in an effort to incorporate a setting for collaboration among groups larger than the typical class trio and specifically focused on accomplishing a common task.
Secondly, the first session was conducted in the context of a reflection-in-action exercise to provide participants with that kind of experience and to supply data in the realm of action research. Consequently, after team members were given the design assignment and provided with copies of outcomes, the researcher called periodic process time-outs and asked reflective questions to which they were to respond in writing. A sharing of responses and a general debriefing of the stop-action portion of their experience was held off until the very end of the session, while design work proceeded between time-outs. Thirdly, the task addressed facilitating the growth of others in terms of the expressed objectives of the course and was responsive to the research question regarding the activities and learning tasks participants design for themselves and others and how they engage others in learning.

Act 6.

Act 6 began with an informal gathering of the group at a local pizza parlor, as agreed upon at the end of Act 5. Such a gathering had been proposed in one form or another by several of the small groups in presenting their safe space action plans and was intended to speak to the tensions felt in the large group which did not seem to be experienced when class members worked in trios and quads.

Upon reconvening in the classroom, discussion was held about patterns and insights revealed in students' journals. There was a growing recognition that what holds people back from achieving goals and behaving in desired ways are most often their inner resistances rather than external circumstances and their sometimes small repertoires of behaviors appropriate to who they wished to be in the world. Affirmations were given for students' work and efforts as well as validation for reporting failed attempts, and students shared
examples of each. This set the stage for a description of the final product the instructors would like students to submit -- *some kind of booklet that is all of what you've done that is somehow recordable, because we know a lot of it is not.* They were to include what they considered to be evidence of their learning and progress toward desired outcomes, including samples of feedback they received from their teams, their coaching trios, or, perhaps, people at work or home who might have noticed a change. While the assignment lacked some specificity, this allowed the freedom for students to determine for themselves what constituted evidence of progress and change and gave them a framework within which to begin composing their final self-evaluation. Discussion then continued regarding the role of the coach in helping individuals to discern how they learn and change and motivate themselves before the class moved into a debriefing of the dinner experience.

As an outgrowth of a shared dinner conversation, one class member disclosed to the group his immediate sense of crisis in his life and his need to devise a strategy for dealing with this. The disclosure launched a long period of dialogue with the student in what became an extended and intensive coaching session. The class, most of whom had remained silent observers, then debriefed their experience of being witnesses to the dialogue. Discussion continued on the different forms of questions and strategies employed by those acting as coaches (primarily one student and one instructor) as well as the verbal and nonverbal signals being given by the class member and how these may have been interpreted. Instructors revisited the internal parts that had emerged and the functions they served, reinforcing the work and learnings of the previous week, and then guided the final question-answer segment delving into the speaker's experience.
Act 7.

Week seven was slated for the performances of the design teams in the leadership challenges, so all of Act 7 was devoted to conducting and debriefing these mini-workshops. None of the challenges directly involved NLP processes with the exception of some reframing, although they were devoted to assisting team members in achieving outcomes they had set for themselves as participants in the course. Thus individuals were asked to focus on their selected outcome during the specifically designed activities.

Act 8.

Act 8 began with a meditation affirming the uniqueness of individuals, describing patterns of energy flowing through each person, and evoking sensations of increasing personal power and confidence in maintaining balance amidst change. This was followed by a request by the instructor for affirmations for the previous week's performances and discussion of resultant learnings. An overview of the agenda for the evening was presented in order to articulate for students a direct link between and among perceptual positions and leadership, creative framing and reframing, mediation processes, mental structures, and eliciting the criteria we need to guide us in making choices. This was done to make visible the common thread running through the agenda and to bring into consciousness a focus on leadership and explicate ways in which each of these skills enhances leadership capacity.

The class then moved into an exercise designed to help participants empathize with another's point of view as well as to observe their own behaviors from an objective standpoint. The exercise dealt with the perceptual positions of first, second, and third persons; these are called in NLP terminology the positions of Self, Other, and Observer. The instructor-facilitator conducted
this as a guided visualization for the full group, but first specified the purposes of the exercise and related stories regarding her initial experiences with it.

The goals of the perceptual positions exercise were to help students understand and clearly distinguish the positions of Self, Other and Observer; to recognize the potential benefits and pitfalls of each; and to recognize individually the position where they tended to spend most of their time. In terms of the latter, students were asked to picture a scene with themselves and one other person and to notice what they saw. If they saw just the other person, it might be that they regularly acted from first or self position, speaking their own minds and feelings and acting on their own behalf. This might depend on the emotional atmosphere of the scene, however. It was possible, too, that they stepped so often or deeply into second position, the position of the other, that they tended to give greater emphasis to what the other person thinks and feels and, as a result, found themselves acting on that person's behalf even to the neglect of their own needs. A test for inappropriately taking second position was to ask whether or not they often found themselves walking away from an interaction having taken on the other person's emotions, anxieties, and problems and having become enmeshed with that person. This is an outcome quite distinct from empathetically entering that person's world to gain information regarding how the other sees and feels about a situation and then returning to the place of the self.

A third possibility was that students saw both themselves and the other person in the scene. This signalled the taking of the observer position which, if they did so most of the time, meant they might be engaging life as a spectator rather than as a participant. The observer position could also be assumed as a response to acting too strongly from first or second position. Thus a person
would be unable to hear another person's perspective and experience or be unable to express his or her own. In such a situation, assuming the observer position for even a short time provides a means of bringing some objectivity to the situation and can serve to enhance the quality of the interaction and produce better outcomes for both parties.

After a time for questions and comments, the instructor led the group as a whole through a guided visualization exercise aimed at facilitating movement between and among perceptual positions and aligning perceptions in each. Students were to find a memory of a conflictual situation with another person (perhaps rated at a level from 4 to 6 on a scale of 1 to 10 for emotional content) and make a picture of that, adjusting the location of the picture and positions of the interactants as directed. Throughout, students were to notice specifically what they were seeing, hearing, or feeling and the effects of adjusting aspects of the scene as the exercise progressed.

Students were asked not only to shift and adjust the picture as they moved to a new position, but to align perceptions in two of the three. Alignment of the self position involved seeing directly through one's own eyes, hearing through one's ears, and feeling oneself speak from the base of the throat. If any of these seemed to emanate from another location, students were to move the source to the specified location. Aligning the observer position included scanning one's own state for emotions and thoughts belonging to either the observed self or the other and sending those back to the appropriate party in order to establish a clean, objective, and resourceful observer position. The appropriate role of the observer was to establish the desired state and to collect data on both persons so that, upon returning to the self position, the new information might be acted upon in the interaction.
Second position, the position of the other, is not aligned. Rather, participants were to practice suspending their own states, stepping into the other for a brief time in order to gain a sense of that person's experience in the moment, and immediately return to their own states, noting the information they had gathered. An example might be the experience of seeing oneself through the eyes of the other and noting the anger that appears on one's face or hearing the tones of condescension in one's voice. On the other hand, one might experience the other's feelings of not being heard or not being able to have voice in the conversation. Having noticed these, empathy can be developed and the information taken back to self position can allow the explorer to modify his or her behavior, to better express his/her intentions, and to redirect continuing interaction, as needed, toward achieving a preferred outcome.

After debriefing the exercise and sharing additional options for working with perceptual positions, students engaged in a mind-reading exercise, largely for the fun of it, but also to illustrate the power of having rapport with another and being able to fully enter their state. Here one member of a trio imagined himself or herself fully engaged in an activity while another member, with the assistance of the third, exactly matched the body position and breathing of the first. After maintaining the match for a time, the individual was to guess at what the first person was doing in his or her mind.

Scene five then engaged students with the concept of framing and reframing. A guest instructor (and NLP master practitioner) led this discussion and invited participants to offer up examples of statements for the instructor and class to reframe in their response to the speaker. The object of the reframe was to produce a change for the speaker in either the context or the meaning of the statement. (Often, the goal is simply to interrupt the speaker's thinking in order
to open a mental space to the possibility of a different interpretation). Students were then provided with a list of strategies for reframing differing types of statements. Of these fifteen patterns of response, some were totally new to the students, while others were quite familiar. These were discussed and the examples clarified. Dyadic work followed wherein students had time to practice various forms. Each time, the speaker of the prescribed statement was to notice whether or not hearing the other's reframe brought about a shift in state and to describe the effect.

The final topic of the evening involved strategies and sorting criteria for making decisions. A third instructor led the discussion, emphasizing the significance of distinguishing between motivations which direct us "away from" undesirable outcomes and those which draw us "toward" some desired outcome. She then conducted a demonstration with a student volunteer to discern the student's strategy for deciding, in this case, what she would choose to put on her plate from a buffet line; the strategy also provided her with a technique for sorting and prioritizing criteria for the selection to make her decision both easier and more effective. After debriefing the demonstration, students entered trio work to carry out the exercise and, as usual, time was given to sharing their experience of the exercise. The act closed with directions for student self-assessments, including the requirement that students provide evidence to support their conclusions.

Act 9.

Challenge performances again led off Act 9 with design teams having been instructed to use the feedback provided them in Act 7 to create a modified, fifteen minute version to be conducted in the first half of this session. Following the performances and debriefings, the class addressed metaphor and the
possibility that there are childhood stories which have become metaphors for living out our present day reality. A student moved into the instructor role for this scene (the one who was also a certified master practitioner of NLP). She elicited a favorite story from another of the students and guided the exploration of the relationship between the characters and their qualities and the storyteller, including the absence of certain characters in the remembered version. Dyads were then formed for students to share stories with one another and help each other discern their significance, followed by a debriefing of students' stories and any new insights these evoked.

Scene three engaged students in an exercise on mentors and sages which, as an instructor explained, was "aimed at calling forth the wisdom and qualities of another, in the process of which the individual's own wisdom and special qualities would be called forth." Students were directed to find an issue or circumstance for which they wished guidance or sought greater resourcefulness. This might deal with their mission and purpose in life or perhaps with some current problem they had been trying to resolve or create strategies for resolving. In selecting the issue, they were asked to simply allow their right brain to offer up what would be an appropriate choice.

Each student was given paper props to be positioned on the floor in a specific manner; they were instructed to mark out the problem or mission space, spaces for three mentors, and a message space. They were then to identify three people, actual or mythic, alive or deceased, from whom they would like to receive advice or insight. The instructor then guided the group as a whole through the process. The process began with stepping onto the first mentor space and attempting to fully access that person by visualizing him or her, taking on the posture the person assumed in that mental picture, hearing how
the person sounded as s/he spoke, and then asking for his or her guidance and listening for the mentor's response. Given that message, students were to move to the message space and reflect for a moment or two on what they now knew and the effect the message had on their mission or problem. Then, carrying that information with them, they were led through the same process with each of the remaining mentors. Upon completing the process, these same resources could be expected to remain available to them to be called upon at other times.

This exercise and its debriefing concluded the act. Students then received assessment documents for the course and instructions for completing them, as well as additional information regarding their self-evaluations and the due dates for each.

Act 10.

The final act of the play, Act 10, began with what came to be labeled "hypertalk" and remained uniquely associated with the primary instructor. This rapidly recited presentation took students through a review of the course, act by act, including initial goals and intended learnings, the main points of lectures, readings and exercises together with their purposes, and the new skills and ways of using the mind fostered by each of the activities. Throughout, the instructor linked the new knowledge base with applications students had experienced; he sought to create a picture of the whole into which each act and assignment would fit. He also included comments reinforcing the link of inner exploration and inner work with the development of leadership.

In scene two, another instructor divided the class into pairs of recorders and explorers and guided the class through an integration activity called the Aligned Self. One student in each pair acted as recorder while the rest of the group went through the exercise. Then these explorers guided their partners
through the same steps. The exercise itself combined aspects of the outcome chain exercise with internal parts work similar to that dealt with in six-step reframing and subsequently concluded with a walk on one’s timeline. In connecting the elicitation of core values with discerning objectors and "growing up parts," the goal was to align the self so as to bring inner aspects of the self into congruence.

This goal was reinforced by following the alignment exercise with the walk along a personal timeline. Here students were asked to regain, as fully as possible, the state of having their core outcomes present together with the positive intentions of the part with which they had been working. Students were directed to imagine their own personal timeline stretched out before them like a measuring tape upon which they were to position themselves at a place just before conception. They were then to imagine that they could enter into life with these resources and outcomes already in place and move from birth to the present and into the future. The purpose of this was to move the outcome state unconsciously through experiences of the past, thereby rescripting them and more fully integrating the state in the person. Then they would or should be able to project that state into the future and set up conditions for the desired outcomes to be more available and attainable as time goes on.

The aligned self exercise and its debriefing were followed by revisiting the logical levels exercise of the first act. This time the group was led as a whole through the walk from environment through essence (or spirituality) and back, directed by the same instructor who originally introduced the activity. To begin, students were asked to select an environment at work or in private life wherein they wished to accomplish something specific and to assume they have all the resources needed to do so. As before, they were asked to address aspects of
the environment they would like to retain or change, the behaviors they wanted to display (especially learning behaviors), the capabilities needed to allow those behaviors, and the values and beliefs undergirding these. They were also to consider who they were in this and, what was even more important, to project beyond what they currently wanted or thought. Again, each was asked to find a metaphor or symbol to represent the identity and essence that had emerged along the way. Keeping these in mind and holding the achieved state, students were then guided in reversing their path and noticing the perceptual changes which occurred. Like the aligned self exercise, the logical levels walk was intended to promote integration at deep, unconscious levels.

Upon debriefing the experience, students and instructors alike sat in a circle on the floor and listened to the Blue Spider Story, a story of a young boy's instruction in creating sacred ground within his own small world -- a story of the potential we all have for creating sacred space wherever we are. An open frame debriefing and verbal assessment of the course followed; this wound down into the completion of the university required evaluation forms and a late night group dinner for those who could attend. Final journals were to be submitted by the end of the week along with students' self-evaluations.
The Course Experience

Student expectations coming into the course were that it would be a largely experiential course, that a new approach and new ideas would be presented, and that it might be somewhat different from its prerequisite course. The first two weeks (Acts 1 and 2) were introductory in nature and presented the general ideas of exploring subjective experience and tapping more fully into the resources of the mind. Students were alerted that they would be being asked to look more deeply into themselves than they perhaps had been doing in any other academic environment as well as being asked to be responsible to others in the facilitation of their growth through coaching. While students expected to engage in further self-exploration and dialogue with peers, they were clearly not expecting to be confronted with real personal change at deep levels of the inner life. Among the instructor comments introducing the course were the following.

What we want to do is to expand choices each of you has available, so you have more "response-ability" in the world both inside and outside, and those choices then, hopefully, will expand to your identity and values.

. . . We've learned that you can accelerate your learning process if there's someone else there who understands what you're trying to accomplish and is there to give you effective feedback, communication, and coaching. . . . The new leadership theory says coaching is what leaders will be doing in the future in facilitating other people . . . not only their overt behaviors, but also their deep inner world of understanding.

. . . What we offer with NLP is a way to accelerate the learning. . . . What Covey and Senge miss is that there is already available a way to accelerate the process of releasing the old habits and adding new ones that you want - habits that work for you.

. . . What we will be about is what I'm going to call "maturing ourselves."
The descriptions of the primary curricular components which follow begin with general comments about class sessions, review the intent and the specific processes used as necessary, and proceed to examples of student actions or reactions to exercises and dialogue in class together with reflective data from their journals. While the narration is sequenced to tell the story of the class sessions in order, with one set of experiences preceding the next to provide the full context for student responses, the whole is structured to highlight class experiences with specific NLP concepts and interventions. Reference is made, in some cases, to related events in subsequent weeks and/or to implications evidenced later, as appropriate, and, clearly, not all student writings or comments are included. Some interpretation and analysis are provided throughout, although the reader is invited to make his/her own interpretations as well.

Introduction to the Course

Besides alerting students to the framework and expectations of the course, the first class session was designed to afford students experience with some of the types of exercises and modes of learning they would be encountering throughout the ten weeks. These included:

- The use of metaphor -- in this case, framing the course to give permission and support to students for deep exploration and risk-taking.
- A "complaint dump" to free the conscious mind of potential interferences with class experiencing, as well as reframing these complaints as manageable issues.
• Surfacing basic assumptions (presuppositions) which individuals unconsciously act upon in life and attempting to replace limiting or non-supportive beliefs with more empowering ones.

• Using visualization to become aware of the power of personal sensory (visual, auditory, and kinesthetic) coding to affect experience.

Finally, students witnessed and subsequently participated in the logical levels exercise, an exercise formulated to prompt a connection with their inner world and innermost hopes and values, as well as beginning to articulate, own and disclose them. Attempts were also made to interject humor and fun into the session experience alongside the serious business of exploring the unconscious and one's own representations of internal subjective experience.

Presuppositions and the Logical Levels

During the presupposition segment of the class, several students remarked at the time (or in their journal entries later) on the possibilities that open if one, indeed, were to integrate the NLP presuppositions as ways of being in the world. For Walt, in particular, adopting the presupposition "the meaning of your communication is the response you get" subsequently had significance for his personal mission statement. Addressing one of the Murphy's wordings, he also offered an early disclosure which added to the humor of the segment. "Last quarter I found I have a control problem ... {reading} '...the element with the most rigidity ..' and that element is me." Of the NLP set as a whole, David wrote, "What a great set of positive attitudes to have about people and the world. Almost every one speaks a world of truth for me." Nevertheless, the same was not true for some others, and a healthy skepticism accompanied responses to one or more of the presuppositions. In particular, the challenge Frank made to
the statement "behind every behavior is a positive intention," drew people into a significant discussion of intent, syntax, and the paradoxes of duality.

Most controversial of the first evening's modules, perhaps even of the course as a whole, was the logical levels demonstration and trio exercise. One of the students who least knew the others volunteered for this demonstration which, the reader will recall, involved stepping backward through various levels of thought and meaning as directed by a guide and responding to questions at each new level. The levels were represented by pieces of paper laid out on the floor creating a visual "path." The order of the levels moved the explorer from environment through behaviors to capabilities, then through beliefs and values to identity and, finally, to essence or spirituality and back again.

At times, as this student walked the path, a sudden reluctance came over him, but with the encouragement of the instructor-guide he did not let this prevent him from proceeding. His physiology showed that he was experiencing changing states, and his responses to the guiding questions seemed to be simultaneously thoughtful and spontaneous. He seemed to be answering from the deeper places of being that the exercise intended to take him. Moments of humorous interchange between himself and the instructor broke some of the seriousness but also betrayed his own nervousness in having all eyes and ears attentive to him. In debriefing his experience, the student expressed feeling that he was standing there naked in front of the others -- a tribute to the vulnerability he had shown and the authenticity with which he had revealed himself in his responses. Surely he wondered if others thought his disclosures were unusual or silly. Yet the depths he had reached and the courage he had displayed were later applauded by his peers, who in majority remained rather silent throughout
his journey. Some had carefully observed him, while others had shut their eyes or looked away, at times whispering something to a neighbor.

The movement into trios and receiving of directions allowed a release from the tension pervading the room, a tension born seemingly of a mix of embarrassment, amazement, excitement, and fear all intermingled. Despite their misgivings, trio members then went to work dividing up roles and attempting to carry out the exercise as designed.

Overall, student responses to the logical levels exercise ranged from a sense of peacefulness to surprise and intrigue to confusion to a real sense of threat, although very little of this was expressed in the debriefings. In fact, when students were asked at the end of the session whether or not there were any parts of the evening with which they felt uncomfortable -- to be answered then or in private later -- no one offered a response. In the journals and debriefing memos, however, we find responses such as Sally's: "the demonstration was a real mind-blower" and Heather's: "I felt really uncomfortable - as naked as [he] in a way." Students wrote of their avoidance of being the first to explore in their trio, the anxiety they felt about adequately guiding such an exploration, their fear of doing this exercise with people they did not necessarily know well, and of their concern regarding various insights that had emerged.

Among the responses during the conduct of the trio work was Joyce's.

This is a really weird exercise. I mean I really do feel different ... very conscious ... Rather than just my views, I think it's much bigger ... there is a candle ... I'm worried about worrying ... have this visual about leaving things outside the door and what happens to me and others when I don't ... I could affect people differently if I left all that ...

Later, she remarked: "There is just something about people repeating things back to you ..." (referring to the guide's use of her own words in giving further
instruction -- what NLP calls backtracking), and in the second week's journal wrote, "The big thing to take away from the logical levels exercise is the questioning ... [and] the repeating things back to the person." The power of these techniques seemed to stay with Joyce throughout the course, as evidenced by her frequent references to them.

Tim journaled, "I think this exercise is a great tool for deep introspection and goal setting, and I think having a record of what is said is crucial." He also was the only member of the focus group who, five weeks later, thought the exercise should be retained in the first session. Most of the rest believed placing it in the third week of the class would have made it less unsettling and more effective. Despite some uneasiness prompted by the demo, Barbara wrote that, in the trio work, "The openness of others had a calming impact on me. I felt more secure and safe by the end of the session." Here she spoke to the change in energy states that sometimes accompanied student experiences. Additional responses accrued after continuation of the exercise the following week. Among them were the following.

Carrie reported that her trio was "too analytical" and that she was "not comfortable enough with the group to do [the exercise] wholeheartedly." Walt indicated that it was "not so personal since it was the second time doing it," so, having processed it over the week and set boundaries on what responses he would verbalize, he felt comfortable in doing the exercise but noted that "it may have been more emotionally meaningful [had he performed it] a week ago... it may have been less spontaneous now."

In debriefing the exercise with her trio, Heather described an experience of having things "just come out" that she did not think were there. Others, too, wrote of this in their journals. In addition, Joyce wrote of the excitement Barbara
expressed about the experience "having really changed her framing of things," while Barbara herself wrote later, "The experience was difficult but presented a real challenge to me to explore the deeper parts of myself." What had seemed troublesome at first was the spiritual dimension, with which she believed herself to be less in touch than other dimensions and so went on to include its deeper exploration in her initial mission. Subsequently in week three she found: "In writing the mission statement and doing the logical levels, I discovered that I am not in touch with my spiritual dimension at all!"

Overall, it seems that for some, like Tim, the logical levels was an experience of connection with themselves, with others, and with something beyond both. For others there had been a sense of disconnection, as expressed in Barbara's new insight. For still others, the experience produced confusion in not yet seeing (or feeling) the purpose and meaning, in feeling expectations imposed for self-disclosure, in anticipating responses but receiving spontaneous surprises, and/or simply in interpreting and translating the directions. For a variety of reasons, including these, if there were to be a theme for Act 1 (and perhaps Act 2 as well), it might not just be "Introduction." More fittingly, it might simply be "Surprise!"

In the second session, prior to returning to the logical levels exercise, a guided relaxation/meditation was conducted which had students create within themselves a type of sanctuary or mental retreat. "The guided imagery exercise gave me a resource for reflection and security when I need it," wrote Barbara, while Walt wrote

Beginning the class with a meditation was terrific. So relaxing. I was really in a state to begin work! This state could be described as a clean closet with little to clutter the opportunity to explore the corners and the space. [I was] in a mood to learn more about myself.
The hope offered by the subsequent lecturette on brain waves and brain neurology was felt by at least one student, Heather, whose journal entry read as follows:

During the discussion of the ways the brain works and how our habits of responses build paths into our brain, I was really struck by the thought that I could build a new path. ... I feel optimistic and confident that I can take control of myself and make changes. One doesn't have to be extraordinarily clever to make a new path, one just has to go over the path again and again.

Rapport and Desired Outcomes

After the logical levels reprise, students discussed the meaning of rapport and trust, debated definitions of these, and heard about the workings of the triune brain. They then experimented with rapport in the job interview exercise involving matching and mismatching and highlighting verbal and non-verbal communication.

The Job Interview.

Regarding this exercise Brian wrote, "[It] was great! The impact of body language and the importance of inter-relationships other than the spoken word was eye opening. That I got the job even though my answers were horrible - because of our rapport!" Barbara deemed the exercise "enlightening" and put body matching into practice that week at work where she found, "We were able to see each other's perspectives in a new way!"

From the point of view of the potential employers, Linda expressed in the debriefing that she became aware of her own "real good definition of space" and of Frank's pushing into it. As a result, she had hired Heather, with whom she felt more personally comfortable, despite Frank's having had "better words."
Her differing responses to the two had indeed been quite visible in her own body postures, gestures, and tone of voice while conducting the interviews. Paul, who had served as observer, declared Frank as his choice saying, "I seem to focus more on words than actions."

For Walt, who journaled a detailed description of his own discomfort with the mismatching of both body movements and verbal flow, the link was made between this out-of-rapport discomfort and his propensity to give up his position or alter his responses in order to adapt to and please others. What he discovered was, "[I am] a kinesthetic processor of language ... that influences what I say, whether or not I abandon a position or say things I don't want to say, pleasing others ..." Having experienced this insight, his thoughts turned to practicing holding his position by applying the NLP text's material on rapport, and he began to envision the potential in an upcoming event. "Sounds exciting already. How to handle a committee meeting the NLP way!" (Later Walt reported his delight with how the meeting went and his ability to carry out the plans he had made and rehearsed for that meeting). The significance of the new knowledge for Walt lay in allowing him to make better sense of his own communication behaviors and to begin to strategize ways to improve them, thus making further progress on his primary personal outcome.

From Mission to Outcomes.

While generating personal mission statements is not an NLP exercise, silently listening to others and using nonverbals to communicate understanding, acceptance and support is. This related to building rapport and creating the safety which allows, in fact invites, the speaker to continue to talk and to disclose self. The sharing initial mission statements also led into the first in a series of outcome exercises, wherein the rapport felt can substantially impact
the levels the respondent can achieve in seeking core outcomes. Also, the results of the two exercises can be used (and were by some) to mutually supplement one another. Thus student mission statements are given brief attention here.

Some students, like Sally and Brian, wrote their mission statements on a very personal level. Others, like Carrie, broke the task down into a personal and a professional category. After sharing, Linda commented to her trio,

Well, I had to think a lot to come up with those ... It just helped me kind of clarify ... bring [things] together into one person. Strange thing for me to think about ... I never had thought about it. I was just trying to kind of 'get there'.

Paul, it turned out, had already written a mission statement in preparation for the start of the new year. In journaling prior to this session, he described the composition as an act of "putting values into words" and "an exercise in rescripting." For the purposes of the class, he would retain the same statement largely in tact but "reorchestrate" it by reordering goals around the roles he plays in his life. And so he did, continuing to work on the statement through the next several weeks, as did many other of the students. Of particular interest in Paul's journal was the disclosure that, in his words, he has been "wandering around in an intellectual and personal malaize [sic] for the last two years" and that he had only "recently discovered a vast store of emotion and feeling within [his] soul." Perhaps this is why he volunteered to be the explorer for the logical levels demonstration in Act 1. Perhaps the malaise was a sufficient motivator to prompt him to volunteer in front of a group he barely knew in an effort to align behavior and emotion with beliefs, identity and spirituality. Perhaps not.
Regardless, Paul much later described the experience as one which set the tone of the course for him and for his learning for the rest of the quarter.

While in the first act we found the instructors behaving pretty much as expected -- imparting information, facilitating exercises, conversing and observing -- in this act, one, the researcher, participated both as an explorer in the logical levels exercise and as a trio member in the sharing of mission statements and responding to the initial outcome questions. A second, the instructor of record, modeled the outcome elicitation with a personal example, sharing his desire to be better able to respond in situations of conflict, thus to be more assertive, so that he might gain peace of mind. The purpose of such behaviors and disclosures was to be authentic with students, to play with them on a more level playing field, and to be vulnerable in their midst; thus instructors were modeling the risk-taking believed by the instructional team to be necessary in order to help students make the greatest gains.

What seemed to strike people about the outcome exercise was the similarity of responses despite the perceived diversity of the group. While Carrie journaled that the experience was "useful but not a deep personal probing like the other" (referring to the logical levels), she found the sameness of what people wanted to signal for her that, as a class, "we can accomplish quite a bit." In fact, in the debriefing of the exercise, she requested to hear the results of other groups, asking "Are there, like, universal fears?" The question may have been prompted by Linda's comment to her set of responses, "I think when we're done, I'm just going to say ditto." Linda later wrote that the commonality of the concerns and misgivings of so many "makes it easier to be like I want to be with this group." She then went on to write that the realization that the people she works with and interacts with on a day-to-day basis have
essentially the same worries that she does should allow her to "not worry so much about what they think or that they are better people than I am". This was one of the issues, an issue of confidence, that she had selected to address that quarter.

**Internal Happenings.**

At this point, it seems important to note the concern the instructors felt regarding their sequencing of topics and their goal of creating a safe learning environment. While people's expressed and non-verbal responses seemed to span a wide range of reactions to the events of the first two acts, it remained difficult to discern, especially for the very quiet students, what indeed was happening for them inside. Once again, the request for feedback from the group, aimed at making adjustments in the course, was met with silence born either out of the reluctance of the group to criticize the instructors, their initial resistance to sharing or, perhaps, simply the lateness of the hour.

To one degree or another, the inner happenings were expressed by several in week two's journals, although these were not available to be read until their submission in week five. The reflections included here are those of David, Connie and Barbara, respectively.

At work, I am going to take some risks and create a new working environment.... One of the great fundamental lessons ... that I don't know how people should live their lives.... What I can do for others is help them understand themselves. If only someone had taught me about interpersonal skills when I was much younger.... Also, I continue to wrestle with what I want from the class. In many respects I've done a lot of what the course aims at providing -- the alignment of basic spiritual/essential values with everyday actions/feelings. So the road I travel is well worn.

This course, so far, has been about self-empowerment through setting goals, changing habits and using techniques that release creativity. We can rewrite our scripts.... I am learning about taking the time to set
goals and really looking at who I am and what I want in life -- to identify
develop principles and not "flashes in the pan" to guide me.... What is clearer
now is that I haven't set goals which are as firm as I thought they were.
This is true primarily in the career area. I feel I am making progress
because ... everyday I set an agenda and apply [Covey's] four quadrant
criteria to my decision-making.... It's a safe learning environment for
me. On a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being the safest, I'm at an 8/9. I feel
safer when I am most prepared.

Journaling is difficult.... I am having trouble exploring what is happening
internally ... not having the deep experiences that others are having.

The influence of the Covey readings apparent in Connie's journal was also
addressed by Paul and Brian, together with other thoughts.

Covey missed the point that the terrain is relative to the individual. I
construct my reality. ... Life is how we make it. ... Life changes according
to our understanding of the potential we have to shape our sphere of
influence.... If everyone read Covey and really applied his concepts of
principled living, then perceptions of reality would change even though
economic indicators and all that would remain.... Either way, something
is happening in my life to refocus, to remake, reorient, redefine, and
rediscover.... Something is changing for me and I like it!

I think a lot of the exercises have been interesting because it makes
you think deep, deeper about yourself -- deeper about myself than I
ever have.... Reading Covey [through the first two habits] ... a lot of that
hit home. I am thinking, what can I change, what can't I, who am I -- all
that I haven't really ever thought about in that perspective before. So I
am getting a lot out of it in that way.... As far as where I want to end in
the course, I think just more of a personal awareness, and if I can get
that out of it, it'll be enough.... I've been taking one day at a time. I have
gotten so frustrated with not knowing where my future lies. If I can get a
sense of [my criteria] for the future, that's all the help I need.

Tim, who wrote extensively about the importance of fostering personal and
professional growth in organizations, concluded his reflections by saying, "I
want to see what steps I can take to be a transformational follower and make
our work place a better incubator in which to develop people."
By Act 3, several students had been looking deeply enough at themselves to have made conscious (or unconscious) decisions not to attend that week's class for various reasons that they later explained had to do with emotional safety and dealing with resistances. Interestingly enough, the third week's work was in part centered around learning how to access inner resources in the face of change and challenge and, more generally, "state management" and calibration. Were a theme to be assigned to Week 3 it might be "Reassessing Earlier Expectations in Light of New Understandings and Resources."

Class Outcomes.

After the review meditation, the group, including the instructors, engaged in developing "Individual and Theater Results." While there was much diversity in the outcomes and their articulation, as selected by individuals and small groups, much of the essence was the same across groups as well as in those presented by the instructors.

Among Connie's trio outcomes, for example, were looking at leadership differently and getting to know, appreciate, and develop individual strengths. This translated into a class outcome of empowering others, which aligned with one of the sets from the instructors and several of the other trios. Walt later wrote of the experience that "putting together our thoughts generated some additional group interests that transcended each of our interests" but noted that, despite what seemed to be a very frank discussion, "We gave each other little in the way of cues that would unlock deeper thinking or understanding."

Nevertheless he concluded that "the way to truth claims is in the dialogue."

Developing Acuity.

In the subsequent segment on eye accessing cues and representational systems, students seemed to find the information and exercises enlightening,
fun and intriguing. At the same time, quite a few students retained a degree of skepticism about each which seemed to foster the curiosity needed for them to pursue developing acuity for these in other arenas. Students later reported being joyfully engaged in eye-watching during the days which followed, although they found work with the representational systems more difficult. Overall, they expressed that the diversity and uniqueness of human beings had become evident to them in a new way.

The flexibility exercise which followed was intended to help students to develop acuity for recognizing the states (moods) of others and themselves and to develop more facility in changing states from less resourceful to more resourceful ones. The instructor again introduced the exercise with a personal example. Both in observing trios at work and through students' self-reports, it was apparent that several explorers had trouble accessing a comfortable, resourceful state and that coaches had difficulty helping them to anchor the state, once achieved. For this reason and for what seemed to be greater personal interest in the previous topics and/or confusion about some of the directions, some groups never attempted the full exercise or felt particularly confident about what they were taking away from the experience. Thus it was felt by the instructors that, overall, the scene produced more confusion than learning.

**Disclosure Through Story and Metaphor**

The next three acts -- Acts 4, 5, and 6 -- seemed to mark a major transition in the flow of the class: a time of reorientation and recommitment -- a "staying with" despite personal fears of going within, disagreements among class members, and some periods of chaos or, at least, confusion. An overarching
theme for these class sessions might be "Shared Vulnerability" or "Out of Chaos Comes A New Order."

Act 4 began with one of the instructor's sharing a personal story and students writing the story of their class experience up to that time. This was followed by an "open frame," a time for sharing whatever they wished of those stories and whatever else might be on their minds, hearts, or souls in the moment. The time itself, which extended for over an hour, was characterized by great honesty and authenticity and served to open the gates to building greater rapport and generating deeper trust, although not necessarily all in this single evening. Several other events would occur first.

In the sharing of stories, people talked about the risks of being open and of exploring new levels where they had not been before. Paul, for one, focused on something that was asked and began to differentiate for the class the trust and safety issues that exploring one's inner world tended to surface.

I was struck by the question: To what degree is this environment safe? Since the first night it's not been very safe at all. Recall C.S. Lewis and the story of the little girl and the lion ... she wants a drink ... if you promise not to bite me ... If we define safe as comfort, yes this environment is safe. If we define what we're doing as safe, it's not ... going inside ... I don't feel very safe at all.

Joyce responded by sharing that through her journaling during the first two weeks, she had looked deeply into herself and did not like what she saw; that she had consciously chosen not to come to class the third week because she did not feel she could contain her emotions in the class environment.

I thought the same thing. I couldn't ask for a more comfortable environment. This class is so accepting, but the whole exercise that we go through when we journal and when we think. My worst habit is to think about things too much ... I'm very hyperanalytical, so to do that
intentionally creates a lot of upset in me. I was working on my journal and was so upset by what I discovered that I didn't want to come to class because I felt I couldn't sit through class and not be really emotional... I'm just letting myself be upset for a while and live with the feeling... it feels like a lot of work, more than people would realize.

This sharing elicited a similar disclosure by Brian, who indicated he, too, had made a clear decision not to attend. Brian, like Joyce, was already on his way to class when he decided to turn back. "I also missed last week. I couldn't take it. I needed a break." Somehow these statements seem to contrast what he wrote about his journey earlier in the same session.

The class also is frustrating. It is difficult to share some thoughts and feelings. Progress is slow and feelings are not that deep. I have a hard shell that can be broken, but it is very difficult to do... As far as comfortability -- it's average... There is a barrier around me... I think there are too many obstacles to have experiences that are of that much meaning. I am trying though.

After these comments, Frank stood to read the poem he had written, a very personal poem, one filled with pain and loss, concluding with a reference to the children who had died at Waco. He ended by saying, "I had a difficult time coming back. Academics seem pretty pointless when you watch seventeen children go up in flames" (He, too, had absented himself from Act 3). The silence his comments received was difficult to interpret and clearly disappointing to him. Comments followed on the power of the word and the power of a single person to touch and change us with his or her words. Then an instructor described her own sometimes very difficult experiences in dealing with the inner world.

When Joyce responded that she was glad someone else goes through what she does, David spoke up to ask what goes on in her head when she is feeling so overwhelmed: "Why are you feeling so uncomfortable? ... I don't feel
that way at all." Then Barbara added, "I'm glad you said that. I just don't get it. ... I'm just not in touch. Nancy just said (referring to the Myers-Briggs Type Inventory), 'it's because you're an ST, Bev.'" Joyce then added that her NTJ is not very comfortable with emotion and that she needed to think about it but wanted someday to answer David's question.

As the open frame continued, several new voices entered the dialogue, putting forth ideas about personal search, religiosity, NLP, and authenticity. For example, Paul added, "We need to find within ourselves since we no longer have the church to define who we are." Eventually the topics came back to story, and Walt shared his metaphor with the group: "This class represents the metaphor of braid. It is the development of the inside and outside of human maturation and development -- one within the other." He then went on to say that he had never learned how to be real until he got in this class (perhaps beginning with the first of the series of courses) and that the journaling had taught him a lot.

The mutual sharing of vulnerabilities, sparked perhaps by the instructor sharing her vulnerability, had created increased rapport and "safe space," leading Walt to share, to his own surprise, a very personal story in the early stages of the open frame and later to want to thank people for their sharings, their gifts to the rest of the class -- "gifts because we feel something when they are shared." In his journal that week Walt wrote

During the reflective session ... I was again surprised that I shared ... a personal item ... I did not have to share it. But through the sharing of others, I became or evolved into a more comfortable place, a place in which the ambiguity of sharing became a certainty of sharing.... What are the underlying rules ... rules of the game of trust?... One of the rules I am certain is the realization of power ... the power and the institution and the organization of the course ... how much does that
impact on the silence of others at the table? ... or do they complement
one another and create a sense of certainty to which some of the group
responded and shared, some at a very deep and revealing level....
Can we identify the assumptions ... lead the class to a sense of trust...
And if that led to intimacy? Perhaps there is the greatest fear.

Additionally, Walt voiced his disappointment at not having received any
questions about his disclosure and the absence of sharings from so many of his
classmates. While he believed the class should do more sharing, he perceived
that many were "very uncomfortable in this kind of setting. This is not the kind of
class they expected and certainly did not expect to get this involved with the self
and examination of the self." In this journal, Walt also foreshadowed his
personal storytelling evening with the class by writing, "I happen to think that a
storytelling session in front of the class might be good for me. But I wonder,
really wonder, how uncomfortable the audience might be with this storytelling
scenario."

Interestingly enough, during the very session at which all of this came
under discussion, Carrie was absent. She wrote in her journal that she was
feeling overwhelmed, specifically in her work with her vision statement, and in
such tumult that she could not bear being introspective so chose not to come to
class. Instead, she found herself sitting at a table at the Student Union,
attempting to "get vibrations" from the class while pondering the timing of the
class in her life. Perhaps this was not a good time to have engaged this
adventure, feeling as uncentered and reactive as she did. Or perhaps it was the
best time. At any rate she was relieved to know that some of her classmates
were "pushing at the uncomfortable margins as well." This sharply contrasted
David's entry after the class. Of the open frame he wrote, "The open frame was
very interesting. I was surprised by the genuine 'pain' and discomfort some
were feeling. I think others shared my surprise. What am I missing?"
Although she spoke up only once during the open frame, Nancy's journal entry for the night revealed a depth of experience different from those already expressed.

Wow, it was an uncomfortable time period. [The instructor] shared her personal story and it was really very moving. Discussion ensued. It was as though our (class) group is really beginning to gel, getting to know each other, developing trust. And then Joyce shares her personal story and difficulty in writing her journal and the sheer emotions and subsequent inability to come to class. Brian concurs. I know what Joyce is saying, feeling - my shell, too, was not so thick at one point ten years or more ago. I was squirming inside as she exposed her feelings - I was thinking "duck and cover." You don't have to tell us that. It makes us (me) think. I was touched by her emotion. I looked at others around me - I interpreted looks of disbelief, humor, compassion. I find cynicism comforting. (The instructor said something about hiding behind cynical remarks at one point in her life).

I didn't lend anything to the group - Barbara said I don't get it and I made a sarcastic remark ... It's not buried that deep that I can't empathize with Joyce, but her honesty was disturbing to me. I am used to people bearing the "Soul" in a counseling session situation ... but in a class? I would, if done over, take a step back, put myself in Joyce's place, look at the world with those expressed feelings in mind, negate the cynicism, laughter inside. It is ok to express ourselves - it's a safe environment - even if there are "shelled" people like me.

Frank got me too. My shell is thick with tragedies. I've worked in social services ... and there's no human suffering I am surprised by and am rarely driven to apparent, riveting shock and dismay. He made me become very conscious that I had not thought seriously nor "frozen a moment" to feel the pain of that situation, particularly the children. Where did I break down my empathy and build the shell. I wondered how others felt too - it was a mood-setting poem: Paul, the leaf in the river, the children in Waco. He spoke the language - invoked the images and I interpreted the pain.

The swirling of emotions in that room: Joyce, Brian, Frank, energetic Adam - dichotomies. Emotions bouncing, interacting, intertwining. I found humor/cynicism is mymainstay. I was uncomfortable so I wrote notes to Barbara - an escape. In the future I will try to be open - break down the resistance I build when uncomfortable emotions enter. Fully open - send the feeling that it is ok - it is safe. I reflected later, on the way home, I always feel a certain cleansing, a sense of peace and awareness after classes. It is a spiritual experience and if I really
opened, I would grow, move into another reality, another model. This week I will practice the circle of excellence two times - I resist it as I speak - but I will.

The primary instructor followed the open frame with a commentary on personal ecology. The permission this reiterated for students to explore issues at their own rate and to select exercise topics within their own range of comfort seemed to bring relief to a number of the students and to lower their anxieties about future engagement in the work of the course.

**Accessing Inner Resources**

The Circle of Excellence exercise which followed also served to bolster confidence in many, and for some students this became the most widely used of the exercises in the course. For example, Barbara, who served as the volunteer explorer for the Circle demonstration, adopted the technique for studying and then taking her comprehensive exams. Brian wrote of his plans to use the Circle to help with his moods and his tendency to feel and think negatively. A year later each still had a reminder of their circles taped to a wall in their homes.

After reviewing the class outcomes developed previously, students engaged in a full outcome chain exercise using one of their most desired personal outcomes. The evening ended with the formation of the resource (coaching) and design teams.

For Barbara, the evening evoked a disturbing question. In the Circle of Excellence segment, the only resourceful states she was able to recall had occurred in her teens and early twenties. "Does this mean that I have lost touch with my own resourcefulness?" Prompted by this insight, she later wrote that she had begun to "spend more time now concentrating on my own resources, and I've felt more confident and competent" as a result. For Joyce, what she
identified for herself as the "BIG POINTS" of the class were the feedback she received in open frame that she sometimes goes inside when she should be going outside herself for feedback and/or validation and her discovery in the outcome chain exercise that she needed to back up to independence and start over in her goal of moving toward interdependence.

By this time, Heather, too, had come to the same recognition. She also began to reveal the discomfort she felt in her inner exploration, although her concern, like Carrie's centered particularly around articulating a mission for her life. In her journal entry her strongest plea was simply to be a good enough person and to be acceptable as she was.

I feel empty, insignificant, and frightened as I try to work through some of the exercises. I keep trying to work on my mission statement and I keep feeling confused. I don't know what my mission is. Why don't I know? What if my life has no mission? or no purpose? The word "mission" sounds so lofty, so important. I don't feel capable of accomplishing lofty and important. I'm just little old me. And, there is a part of me that wants "little old me" to be acceptable.

Heather's story seems to depict her very real struggle to internalize her goals in a new way and the very real desire to find a place of peace and acceptance within herself. More is said about Heather's experience in Appendix D, where a brief sample is offered of the kind of movement that took place for her, as for some others of the students, through the course of the ten weeks.

Coaching and the Use of Structured Dialogue

Act 5 began with the reading of a story, to which class members made almost no response despite the request for its meaning to them. This was followed by an exercise on types of feedback, focusing on the instructor's
disclosure story from the previous session. The exercise prompted a debate regarding observation and evaluation which, according to student comments, added to the broadening of perspectives on the meaning of feedback and left them with a variety of questions to ponder. This exchange was followed by a coaching demonstration and a discussion of coaching, as it was being taught in the course.

At the very start of the demonstration’s debriefing Frank asserted, "I'd like to raise a potentially problematic issue.... If we're using questions to create a safe space for the person, how safe do these questions make us feel?" Ultimately his questions and comments prompted an anticipated and thought-provoking dialogue regarding the intentionality and purpose of coaching and its potential to be manipulative and abusive. This discussion generated considerable discomfort for some of the students but at the same time proved to be an important factor in making the session what seemed to be a major turning point in the course. Therein, class participants were able to observe that disagreement and conflict do not have to be destructive and are, in fact, part and parcel of the realm of leadership. Here was a model of interaction which moves toward, rather than away from conflict. In addition, the entire segment once again placed instructors (and professors) in vulnerable positions and demonstrated their willingness to also do what students were being asked to do in front of an even larger audience.

Reframing Parts.

The segments which followed each dealt with the notion of parts which go together to make up a whole, whether speaking of the individual members of a group (an external framework) or referring to the conscious and unconscious parts of an individual (an internal framework). The focus was to be on surfacing
and effectively dealing with "objectors" found among these parts, thus attending to the ecological needs of the situation, and, in a larger frame, on negotiating and dealing with conflict. For the first of these segments students engaged in a role play and dealt with the issue of creating "safe space" within groups.

For the most part, students quickly fell out of their roles, perhaps due to their interest in the content rather than the process. They seemed to eschew roles either to avoid the potential conflict or out of confusion regarding the directions for the exercise. While most continued to address themselves to the assignment, one group focused on creating safety in general and what had or had not fostered safety both in this and the previous leadership course. While sharing small group plans and discussion points, this group pointed out the difference in the degree of safety felt in small group and the tension felt when the large group convened. They and others suggested that this tension might be reduced by gathering as a class for an informal meal in a different setting. Upon return to the topic at the end of class, consensus was reached on having just such an informal gathering.

Comments linking the group exercise to an internal framework for parts set the scene for the demonstration of a parts reframing conducted between two instructors. The primary instructor served this time not as coach, but as coachee, and offered as his topic a very real and personal struggle between work and play or rest -- between being confined to doing what he should be doing or exerting the freedom to rest and to do what he wanted to do. The demonstration lasted about twenty minutes and spontaneously surfaced not only a set of objectors, as hoped for in order to demonstrate work with personal ecology and internal negotiations, but a new and deeper objection unanticipated by its owner, as well as a depth of feeling unanticipated by the
student observers. During this time, the classroom seemed transformed into a living lab, and those present were introduced to a level of disclosure and authenticity quite atypical in the interactions of professors and students.

Prior to its start, the instructor had shared with the class some of his habits in engaging this type of work and his reasons for them. Afterwards both he and the coach shared their own experiences of the session and responded to student questions. Frank then asserted that, in his experience at the university, this was the first and most real risk-taking he had observed on the part of a professor and inquired into the risks taken and the instructor's comfort in so doing. In response, the latter spoke to his experience with disclosing to students and the benefits accrued for his own growth, a framing quite different from that posed by the former out of his past experiences. Subsequent to this exchange, there was a discussion about parts and the need to reconcile these in order to maintain internal cohesion and integration. The act then closed with further comments about the rapport between the two demonstrators and the meanings and purposes of the silences within their interaction.

Overall, with the exception of a few people, the impact of the last scene remained largely unexpressed until much later. David wrote of his confusion regarding "what we had actually been through and where it fit in," a confusion which prompted him to return before leaving class to ask that question. Brian described it as yet another way this professor tries to make the class a safe space and credited the discussions about what is not a safe place with "putting in perspective the amount of time and effort it takes to be relatively safe." Others referred in very general terms to the sincerity and authenticity of the scene, but most remained silent.
For the instructors, the act was difficult to evaluate. What, indeed was needed to generate a shift from talking about safety to actually producing it for self and others? What assumptions and beliefs did each student take away about coaching, and what experience would they create for themselves in their upcoming coaching sessions? What, too, had been the impact of the last demonstration? Had it generated threat or comfort, intrigue or fear? Would students begin to work with their own parts, or would they need more help and direction in risking working with one another in such ways?

The plan for the sixth session was reworked to allow time at the beginning to review segments of the tape of the last demonstration, pointing out the technique of the coach in attempting to guide the explorer in parts reframing. Time would then be allowed for student questions and a group review of the steps of the process to enable them to gain confidence in conducting the exercise in their coaching trios (Only one of the teams had already done so). Through asking students about their frame of reference in witnessing the demonstration, the transition would be made to working with perceptual positions and then to an exercise on mentors and sages.

A Personal Story.

In reality, almost none of the plan for Act 6 was actually carried out. The evening began with the dinner and moved into the classroom, as planned, but one of the dinner discussions resurfaced in the debriefing and drove the agenda for the rest of the session. To begin, the primary instructor commented on the quality of the students' journals. In particular, he addressed the ways in which people described themselves as being held back from achieving their goals or risking new behaviors, validated the reporting of failed attempts at new action, and addressed the role of coaching in strategies for learning. Several
students then gave examples of new things they had tried and, in particular, what had really worked well for them.

Following this, students were asked whether or not the dinner had accomplished what they had hoped; a few then shared things they learned about other students or the instructors they would not otherwise have known. Barbara was one of the respondents, and her comments about her coaching partner, Walt, opened a door for him to disclose his current crisis, although nothing said required him to do so.

I guess I'll share something. I just found out ... and I need to develop a strategy to get me to safe space about [this], because I'm not safe now ... I also have a circle of excellence (referring to Barbara's earlier story) ... One of the ways, of the things I find helpful about this class and from the work I've done with the instructors is to be able to try to find those safe places and ways to access them so I or we can function. So, that's what I have to share ... some things I have to work out.

Several people then asked Walt questions and whether the class could help him in resolving the issue. Despite his response of no, the questions continued, and the scene eventually moved into a coaching session with one of the instructors serving as coach and working, in particular, with Walt's controlling and creative parts. As closure was brought to the coaching aspect, discussion was held about aspects of the dialogue and Walt's experience of it. One aspect that emerged expressed the contrast between how Frank wished to channel the dialogue with Walt and the direction it in fact took when he gave way to the instructor as primary guide. This raised once again the issue of manipulation and posed some significant questions regarding the degree of authenticity of coaching which, more or less, follows a prescribed script. Frank asserted:
I never rely on a map or predetermined strategy ... Each person is different; each setting is different ... This does not feel like authenticity to me. It is too contrived ... I don't think the purpose of authentic dialogue is for you to discover yourself ... or for us to discover the truth of a statement ... It would drive me nuts to always be coaching. I couldn't be authentic that way ... I want to help you ... but I don't want to enter your world unless you let me and we share it together. ... I'd rather live that story with him rather than coach him into it ... In my sense, it became lost, it became posturing ... Well, clearly I am projecting. But the worst dialogue I've ever had is when I try to out-think the person.

Sarah then distinguished dialogue between two people from dialogue which is carried on within a person. She pointed out to the class the body positions and hand gestures Walt made signifying some of what may have been going on internally. This included a "coming together" gesture which she had interpreted as signalling that he had achieved some degree of closure and integration. She went on to address the meeting of the unconscious minds of the coach and explorer, saying, "You cannot out-think the whole process of experiencing physiology and body changes" and adding "I don't believe you can do [this type of coaching] effectively without genuinely loving and having a spiritual tie with the person you are working with."

Interspersed in the whole of this discussion were questions from students and comments from instructors about the parts of persons which show up and for which we seek some kind of alignment and harmony; about the intentions these parts have for us; about different patterns people demonstrate in approaching dialogue with one another and NLP's "stylized" version; about perfectionism and striving too hard to do something "exactly right;" about the act and art of coaching; and about NLP in general. Included also was a linking of Walt's experience here with the desired outcome he had expressed of becoming less controlling. This was initiated by Barbara, who, as his coach in
their recent peer session, inquired whether he wished to retain the outcome they had worked with or to modify it in some way, given the positive intention now revealed of his controlling part. Tim also posed a question to Walt and to the group as a whole pertaining to the notion of choice. This was perhaps prompted by the request made in the reframing for the creative part to come up with other options for Walt in the situation.

The general problem you're having, Walt, is totally different from those I have ... but there is a common element that I want very much to look at and see if other people are experiencing it. And that is, once an option has come into your mind, suddenly you grab onto it and you won't let go of it. I do that. I think most of us do, though perhaps in other ways.

Among other student comments were those in response to some of the issues raised by Frank. For example, Tim spoke to the effects of coaching sessions he has participated in, and Connie addressed the pros and cons of integrating a structure to call upon in interaction with others.

... when you think about NLP, there's one thing that's undeniable. It's a handy tool for getting hold of new parts of you that you didn't have available to you before. At least that's what I've experienced. I have available to me now new parts of me that I didn't have a grasp of before. And that alone may be worth the whole thing. Because I came out of my sessions, you know, just having hold of a part of me that I've never integrated. I've combined certain things in a certain way or listened to voices in a certain way. And as far as whether it's structured in an effective way or not, it gives you a tool to get a hold of parts that at least I couldn't get hold of before.

For me, I tend to react initially the same way Frank does. I'll take one cut at a time and see where that goes. When I'm through with the list, one of the things I do, which we learned we should not do [if we are to effectively listen] is to think about the next thing. Let whatever happens happen and not think about the next thing you're going to say and so on. But the way I look at this now is this structured approach, once I have enough time to make it mine, it can become a tool that I think will let me relate to all kinds of people, like in a work or a leadership situation, that I might not have had ... it's just flowing naturally. So if I
get this down and don't worry about what I say next, and I have a feeling that this takes a while..., then you have something that if it just doesn't come one chip at a time, you have a structure to work from. Yeah, I worry, too, about not the manipulative side of the controlling part. Am I trying to make happen with my structured list of questions something that is really not mine to make happen?

Following Connie’s comments, the primary instructor closed the debates and dialogue with further comments about parts, drawing in some of the points Frank had made.

From an NLP perspective, ... I often experience a part that wants to get into the action ... a less mature part ... They got caught at some place ... and I haven't had a chance to update them with what I now know ... So then I carry on a conversation with them, what they're about when they show up, and ask what is it that you really want from me. I might be manipulative, because I want safety. The only way I've found to have a safe space is to have people do things the way I want them. Or maybe I have a particular need for a certain kind of order, and the only way I can get it is to manipulate ... Are there other ways? Ask the creative part, is this the only way to get it? Another way to do it is to create disorder ... and you can't manipulate that, you can't tell what the heck is coming out of that ... which is a strategy, of course, for non-manipulation ... It could just be that Frank and I just don't manipulate anymore. So there you have it.

This would later be recalled as a point at which the instructor modeled sharing his own vulnerability by pointing to his own experience with "less mature parts"; and it would also be seen as a "bridge building" around the tension generated by the discussion of manipulation.

Linda then produced the final scene of the act by reading two poems from a Shel Silverstein children's book which had spoken to her about "the kinds of things we are doing here." One was called "The Shadow," the other, "The Oak and The Rose," which ended with the line, "It's not so much that I have grown, says the tree, it's just that you've stayed so small."
Assessing the Dialogue.

Overall, the act had been filled with disclosures and what seemed to be very real dialogue. Students saw and heard things from the instructors which, it was hoped, reinforced their giving themselves permission to feel okay about not knowing where a dialogue might lead and what would come next; about not needing to "know it all" before risking to engage in these kinds of dialogues; about not always doing it "right" or even believing that there is a way or only one way to be most effective. Once again they witnessed the expression of differing views and beliefs on the part of the two professors and among the professor-student and the graduate student instructors. Once again they were confronted with issues surrounding coaching, this time focusing on the matter of power inequities when one person (the coach) has a "map" -- knows where he or she is leading the person -- and the other person (the coachee) does not, and how authentic such an interaction can be. Is the coaching dialogue one arising from and expressing empathy, or is it a form of manipulation? And once again, the class was able to contain the disagreements, and people were allowed to be, to express, to feel what and who they were.

Of particular importance to nearly all present was the class giving its time to Walt’s situation. While some students tuned the discussion out as a digression from the task or because they personally could not relate to Walt’s angst, for several students (by later report in their journals) this discussion -- the vulnerable sharing of the class member as well as the empathic way he was dealt with by the others who listened to his pain -- became an important hinge point, as one student labeled it, in the course. The act as a whole marked a transition point at which people became real stakeholders in the inner work approach to leadership.
Among the journal writings that week were comments on all aspects of the session. Linda had already been through the process with which Walt was struggling, so she felt much empathy for him. At the same time she felt somewhat intimidated by the scene in that she did not yet feel able to do the same kind of coaching she had witnessed. Nevertheless, she expressed her pleasure with both the fact that "it [the coaching] works!" and the support the whole gave to her own experience.

The [session] continues to make me more comfortable with my own internal voices/parts/states/whatever. It bolsters my faith in quest ... The fact that this happened on the spur of the moment (unplanned) and it worked out reinforces the notion that this doesn't have to work only in a "contrived" situation.

With regard to the dialogue debate, she wrote, "a dialogue between two people and one person facilitating another person's 'seeing' of their own dialogue are not necessarily the same, but not diametrically opposed - both should have genuine involvement of both people."

Brian, who admitted to "checking out" of some of the interaction with Walt and spending the time dealing with one of his own deep issues, seemingly unrelated to Walt's, wrote that he was quite struck by

...Walt's honesty and feelings and how he really opened himself and his stress to the class. His reflection and honesty made me think a lot about myself ... Deep discussions and processes make me think a lot about my life and my skills. It could be very beneficial, and it has been.

Barbara's engagement with Walt's issue was visible throughout, beginning with her introducing their conversation at dinner, through her taking notes while he spoke and answered questions, to her bringing the discussion back to their
coaching session and the potential rescripting of his desired outcome. This engagement led her to her own new and powerful insight:

I put myself in the role of his coach and looked at his experience from that perspective. Thinking of him and not myself really changed my feelings about the situation ... I saw the coach having Walt give value to his controlling part ... "Behind every behavior is a positive intention" meant something new to me then!

Similarly, Joyce wrote about her "BIG DISCOVERY" in becoming confident in her own acting out of "good - the best" intentions, and, in a different vein, David spoke to safety issues. "We were striving to stimulate greater safety; I believe it worked. We're building a family." Of his own experience of the evening, Walt wrote

Upon reflection, it seems to me that my need to talk about the situation in class overrode my initial desire to bound the crisis in privacy. I guess there seems to be a psychological point at which stress and energy spills over the boundaries of our personal being in the world, and in those "moments" the need to find and align the boundaries, with the help of others, overrides the necessary privacy. What components of the mind establish the boundaries by which we secure privacy in the face of those who may not have the right to know, but stand to help if such privacy is shared? At what point is sharing a function of wanting to share and/or a function of needing to share? In the case of my experience on Monday night, my behavior was a function of personally needing to share. And in [the instructor's] case it was a function of trying to get me to realign my self-identity.

As [she] coached me, I felt the anxiety leaving my body and a sense of calm returning to my being. I remember that I was so intent on the emotion of the moment in my own person, that I was not aware of the environment outside my body. I remember talking to her and working with her, but being totally oblivious to the other people in the room. It was only after I was able to achieve some centeredness, that I became once again aware that I was in a classroom environment. In some respects, I became so focused on what was going on inside me, that I lost some touch with the experience available to me on the outside.

The NLP descriptions of reality, especially the triple description, seems relevant at this point. I know how I felt during that experience, being in
touch with my kinesthetic self. But how did my behavior look to others? I should have taken some time in class to ask others how it felt to be listening to me and what they were feeling at the time. In the third instance I could try and have the experience of seeing my state from the objective eyes of another, a third person. ... The trick seems here to be able to flow between levels. I suspect those watching me felt uncomfortable, empathetic or detached. At any rate, if I judged my actions as a third party, I would have observed someone in crisis, someone who needed to talk about the situation and process the situation. I can tell you that this is a huge change for me, since I have normally kept all of these emotions hidden from view. How I would have handled the situation a year ago would have been to stuff the emotion and feelings and not deal with them. In this respect, these leadership courses have been a wonderful help.

Of interest also was Walt's response in class when he was asked what it was like for him when he asked his creative part for some alternatives. To this he replied

... It was like this web. It was like everything was connected and I began to understand it ... other people ... you must have support ... a support group is a treasure. It seems to me that this kind of dialogue, although I would choose not to do it with twenty people, is part of that ... and that has truly been an education ...

**Aligning Perceptual Positions**

Week seven's class dealt solely with the performances resulting from each design team's "leadership challenge" for their partner team. The activities did not incorporate NLP principles or processes other than some use of general reframing and differing perceptual positions. However, more careful use of language was evident in the review of videotapes of this segment.

Act 8 began with a meditation focusing on breathing and affirmations, then moved into an invitation for affirmations and discussion regarding the previous week's performances. Herein two discoveries were shared. The first regarded Tim's new awareness that "any interaction doesn't have to be perfect to avail something. ... As long as it is a sincere interaction, it is worthwhile." The second
was Connie's discovery that "[she] could allow [herself] not to be pulled off course by whether it went as [she] thought it should or whether this or that went right."

In the next scene, students worked with perceptual positions and the notion of being able to move at will into and out of first, second, and third person positions. Joyce revealed the most in class as the perceptual positions exercise was debriefed. The experience had been "quite powerful" for her in seeing herself through the eyes of the second person, feeling and seeing the anger she had not known was there, and, from the observer position, noting that "I hovered above the situation, very judgmental. To pull myself down to eye level was very hard." Later she wrote, "It was very vivid ... Saying you're trying to see it from the other person's perspective takes on a whole new meaning now!" and attributed the "success" of the exercise for her to "the safeness of our classroom; the sound of the instructor's voice; my desire to get as much as I could out of the exercise; and my ability to recall details of events and conversations." Connie indicated that she, too, could see the other's position and feelings as well as her own, writing that, "I think it gave me a 'big picture' perspective."

Linda had found that self position was the most difficult for her. "The awareness that self was hard ties into the basis for some of the things I'm working on (self-esteem, modifying my critical voices, and so on). This gives me another tool/approach to working on them." In commenting on the evening as a whole, she wrote, "I think these ideas (and this class) was especially helpful for me. I feel good about the experiences -- for some reason, everything flowed better for me tonight."

The mind-reading exercise which followed was intended to increase people's awareness of the connections between mind and body by having them
exactly mirror one another -- down to the breathing, head tilt, and positioning of feet and fingers -- and try to guess the physical activity the other was mentally rehearsing. That is, they were to enter into second position and attempt to read the thoughts of the other person. Overall, while perhaps it created curiosity and certainly fun for many, the exercise was a total failure in terms of the instructors' desired results and left students confused as to its purpose. This may have been caused by the lack of quiet concentration, insufficient attention to precise matching, or the lack of experience of the participants in this kind of work. Regardless, it served as something of a mental diversion after the long visualization exercise.

**Reframing Language and Sorting Criteria**

In the next scene, students were invited to frame and reframe several scenarios that they were led into by one of the guest instructor's personal stories. Subsequently the students were introduced to a list of language patterns used to interrupt thought patterns and raise awareness regarding the equivalence and cause-effect thinking which people so often engage in, as well as patterns of generalizing and deleting information. While students found it relatively simple to follow the patterns provided in example statements and expressed the belief that these would be useful, only one journaled at the time that she would be consciously practicing them. The main ideas of this scene were, in the instructors' views, somewhat lost. The focus of the scene may have been better placed on simple reframing with language and just a few of the "sleight of mouth" patterns. What the exercise aroused again for a few was the question of manipulation. Referring to this session, Tim stated in his exit interview
Some things feel wrong ... manipulative ... natural discomfort. ... I felt it more strongly with the language session. I think maybe it becomes issues of integrity and honesty. ... But everything we do is designed to elicit some kind of response. About everything we do is manipulative.

Nevertheless, later writings revealed that these were among the concepts and techniques which several of the students later put into practice. So perhaps the main ideas got through after all.

The final scene, however, drew many comments. While the demonstration for sorting criteria and selecting strategies for decision-making may have dealt with a very simple topic, the trio work seemed to have delved into some important areas of decision for several of the small groups. It also elicited, once again, a remark from Joyce expressing that "it is still amazing to me that just having someone say back to me what I have just said ... could be so helpful." Of the exercise as a whole, Barbara wrote

I decided, based on the criteria I developed for myself with their coaching, to go for the [new job] position if it's offered to me. It's a great feeling to know I've made a decision and why I chose that particular decision ... actually get to exercise a third option that Joyce had me identify ... MOVING TOWARD -- sounds like a new motto for me!

Later in the week, however, she found herself in a quite different state, as her journal reveals reflections on her experience to date.

When I came to class, I had some idea of what to expect because I had been in the first leadership class. I expected ... But I've been caught off guard by the depth of the exploration and have had difficulty with making this a personal experience. The first realization came with the logical levels journey. I've had difficulty detecting my spiritual dimension and what it is that I believe about myself and what my core really is ... not able to return to the state for resourcefulness ... feel adrift ... want to be more in tune with the journey ...
Learning From Stories and Mentors

Week nine's act began with the reprises of the team performances referred to earlier. After the debriefing, Sarah conducted a childhood story exercise aimed at exploring whether there are stories we heard a long time ago which have become a kind of filter for our looking out at the world. Is it possible that one of these stories has become a metaphor for our living in present day reality? And could we choose a different story if we now want to?

Joyce volunteered to be the explorer, and Sarah elicited her favorite childhood story, a story of Winnie the Pooh. As Joyce related the story, describing each of the characters she remembered and their parts in the story, Sarah interjected prompting questions. Of these, Joyce acknowledged one question in particular, "Who was/is Pooh?" as having "started it all." She wrote later, "I felt brave and honest, yet exposed ... knotted up. I felt things falling into my mouth out of my heart and my memory. I felt cleansed." The experience for Joyce led to further parking lot discussion with Sarah and a subsequent realization that she had omitted the character Rabbit, the worrier, a key descriptor of Joyce herself.

While still in class, Joyce entered happily into the role of listener and prompter when the class moved into pairs to share their own favorite stories with one another and to explore the meaning of their selections. Several related parts of their stories in the class debriefing and a few found substantial links with the lives they were leading, although perhaps only later, after further exploration and reflection. One of these was Heather, whose story was "The Little Engine That Could." Another was Paul, whose journal entry and disclosure to the class the following week revealed something of the significance of the exploration to him.
My metaphor has grown and developed within the 24 hours in a way that I don't think I can fully describe. [With the help of Tim] I identified my metaphor as a reality in my life: I am an orphan. Yesterday, during the story-telling session of the class ... I discovered for the first time that a story [book] I had read over and over again when I was a child was vitally important to my life story. . . . Like Caspian, I am a restorative character ... It is even reflected in my mission statement ...

Last week I found a metaphor, through the story ... I never realized it had such power ...

The power of the discovery was also quite evident in his conversation with the researcher about it soon after -- in his knowledge of the chapter he was currently reliving and in the questions he posed regarding rescripting the story in his life.

While the story scene was referenced by several as a significant and positive experience, so, too, was the final scene of the act, the mentors and sages exercise. In introducing the exercise, the instructor described it to students by saying, "It is about calling forth someone else, in the process of which you are being called forth. ... So let your right brain journey in." In journaling the experience, Barbara and Tim wrote, respectively,

i felt honored that these mentors would take time for me. i'm going to value what they have to teach me and i'm already feeling more resourceful. my red circle of excellence is bigger now because those mentors are right in there with me.

i came out of that experience ... i just felt it was a red letter day because i felt like i'd talked with them. it was really amazing and they had terribly interesting things to say. ... i want to incorporate that second orientation of this class into my own teaching.

Walt described leaving the class "energized and uplifted." This seemed to be the feeling of many, at least with respect to the latter half of the session.
Effectively, this seemed to be the act which had something of value in it for every individual, and the power and place of story and metaphor in dialogue and, more broadly, in generative change, was made visible for all to experience, in one way or another. If there were to be an "Aha Act" for the group as a whole, Act 9 probably comes closest to being that act.

Integration and Synthesis

Finally, Act 10 was designed to provide a synthesis and integration experience. Class began with a rapid review of the course and proceeded into the Aligned Self and timeline exercises. Next, students revisited the logical levels exercise of the first act, but carried it out this time as a full group, walking the path next to one another and simultaneously responding to the guiding questions. Class then closed with students gathered in a circle on the floor to listen to the Blue Spider story and subsequently to share course experiences and make recommendations to the instructors. This class/course debriefing lasted nearly an hour and was filled with comments addressed to a wide variety of aspects of the course. Some excerpts appear below; others will be addressed in the section on Student Assessment.

When the group was asked about the differences they found in doing the logical levels this time and in this way, Paul responded by saying,

Well, that last experience was less intimidating ... But I would say that the first experience really set the tone for me in this class - that set the tone for a lot of learning experience.

Carrie responded to the question about finding different identities this time, while Tim noted the choral responses which could be heard and David the silence at the higher levels. Others added comments as well.
Carrie: Yeah, entirely different ones ... David and I talked about it seeming easier this time.

David: I felt like I was more grounded, more in the spiritual part in the beginning.

Tim: People say very similar things. (Other students nod and respond in agreement) Maybe that's part of what makes it safe, too. We're not all that different ... people don't feel confident ... struggle with that too. It's nice to know ... but the identity level was quiet ... and the spiritual.

David: I think it goes to show that there are some things that we're not that safe with ... some things I know I should never talk about.

Joyce: ... people are kind of free ... could go as far as you wanted ...

Tim: ... coming back through the logical levels was integrating ... instead of something more powerful, I took a mundane work activity this time ... found I more strongly connected my values and who I am with my beliefs to that actual activity, which I found very powerful because, you know, all sorts of things happen ... It reminded me that I need to be expressing my core commitments in my daily work, every part of it. I need to be expressing or bringing my abilities and my unique talents to my everyday work because, you know, that's who I am and why I am here.

As the conversation evolved, the instructors asked whether or not they should offer the course again. David was among the first to say yes. After other responses, he was asked why and answered,

When I said yes, do the course again, I guess I was thinking more from your perspective. You owe it to yourselves to do it a few more times just to kind of get in the swing of things. But I also think this has a lot of value.

Joyce spoke to the joy she found in sharing her excitement about the class with her fiancée and her roommate saying, "I'm so excited when I go home, their interest is peaked about what goes on in this classroom ... and other people I talk to..." She described the class as one to which she looked forward to coming and her friends and family to hearing about what was done and what
she learned. "...[It was] a very flexible environment ... I never felt any pressure about coming to class like with other classes. This instead, was, I'm so glad I could go!"

In talking about his recent discovery and other learnings, Paul described his excitement about sharing with his sister in an upcoming visit and went on to say, "I'm not sure all this stuff has sunk in for me yet ... When I go to Texas next week, I'll be taking the books and reading more." He was not alone in the sensation that it would take more time for all of the experiences and learnings to gel. Connie looked forward to the summer to reflect more on her experience, as did Sally and Heather. Heather also spoke to the pervasiveness of the class in her life the last several weeks. "I feel like Paul. I don't feel I've put it all together yet either. ... you said you were thinking about this when you weren't here. Is there ever a time I wasn't?" She also looked forward to letting her introverted self take over for a bit and not have to share all the time. Finally, Brian shared

I got a lot out of this course ... stuff I didn't have. It's just made a lot of difference in my life. ... It's made a big difference at work. I've changed my focus to ... what's happening with my whole life.

After all had shared what they wished to say and the instructors had asked the questions of interest to them, the curtain fell on the theater, and those who were able reconvened for a late dinner at a local restaurant.
Coaching and the Peer Resource Experience

The success and perceived value of the peer resource coaching teams varied widely among the trios. Some had difficulty scheduling common time and met only two or three times; others convened as many as five or six times through the remainder of the quarter. At one end of the spectrum, a member of a trio expressed disappointment with the effort, confusion over exactly what they were to be doing with the time, and frustration with the lack of structure and purpose imposed on the sessions. This raised the issue of random selection and prompted a recommendation from her that three quite introverted people not be assigned together by reason of the lack of assertion and conversation that had ensued. For this student, the entire effort had been "a waste of time" but might have been helpful had a more diverse team been assigned.

At the other end of the spectrum was a trio for whom the experience was a highlight of the course. Their coaching team was perceived to have had great value for them in the bonding that took place, the progress each felt was made toward achieving team members' outcomes, and the sense of efficacy produced; each member felt she had significantly contributed to the growth and well being of the other two. One wrote that she had "felt really worthy" because she knew she had "made a difference." In another instance, a student journaled that "in the first session we used the guidelines with good success. The setting helps fulfill a human need for support and encouragement." He then went on to express his disappointment that his trio had been unable to convene more than twice in the time allotted.
Later, yet another student wrote about the transferability of coaching skills -- of learning to really listen and to facilitate others' arriving at their own conclusions -- into times and places well beyond the confines of the course. For this student, among all the aspects of the course, "the coaching groups were particularly useful ... really made a difference ... were one aspect that could really transfer." Still another connected this skill with what she perceived to be the underlying purpose of the design team work in the course.

I thought later, if I ever have people working for me, I've got to find out what they want to include in their lives ... and then I have an obligation to try to develop activities that help that person grow ... That's what that exercise was really all about ... You know, when you know in your management gut this person can be a real contributor, you've got to do something to develop that. You can't just say they will get it on their own.

It is interesting to note that by the second round of performances, each design team had added a coaching segment to its activity. Literally all of the performers expressed in the debriefing that having a coaching time-out had made a difference for them, especially in returning their focus to their desired outcomes. One student revealed a discovery she made during that time: in selecting to speak up more as her outcome, she had not really known the rationale behind her selection. While being coached, she discovered that speaking up more would evidence being confident enough to do that and was aimed at wanting and allowing herself to be educated by others. She credited the stop-action and coaching for having prompted the discovery. A second student commented, "The coaching helps me to take a step back, put in a bigger picture of what I'm trying to do," and a third said, "I liked the [performance]
exercises ... but I didn't see the fit ... it kind of came together in the coaching aspect."

Students also remarked about coaching experiences in class. After one such session, a student quoted her evening's coach as having pointed out how "neat" it was "having people we may never see again actually coach us through problems they may not fully understand"; to this she offered enthusiastic agreement and concluded by describing coaching as "a very interesting process - it's like learning inside learning."

For many, the peer resource teams provided a setting in which to seek feedback and to discuss the assignment to develop a self-evaluation and assign yourself a grade. While several addressed the involvement of team members in their choice of grade, none supplied evidence from their team in the evaluation documentation, and only a few included records of or citations from their coaching sessions; several spoke to the value of the time together, although they admitted it was often spent more informally than they conceived real coaching to be.
Student Assessments

Participants in the leadership course were given several opportunities to provide feedback on the course and to offer their assessments of its effectiveness in meeting their expectations and the instructors' goals and objectives for the ten weeks. Evaluative comments from class, from student journals, from exit interviews, from the collective course debriefing, and from end-of-quarter course evaluations offer several common themes of overall assessment. These are described below. In addition, follow-up interviews were conducted a year later with eleven of the twelve enrolled students, and those comments are included in the section which follows.

Student Journals.

Beginning with the evaluative comments found in participants' journals, the continuing thread running through almost all the entries was that the course challenged the students to explore the deeper parts of themselves; it put them more in touch with their own resources, in many cases increasing both their competence and their confidence levels. Students expressed a sense of both personal growth and professional growth, including growth which would support their leadership efforts; they had all learned new tools for exploring their own potential and for investigating their internal conflicts and decision-making criteria. Most expressed agreement that growth is uncomfortable and seemed to be in varying stages of coming to terms with that discomfort. One student described the course as a "workbook for life." Additionally, students learned new communication skills, and several indicated they had become more aware
of their habituated communication patterns and how their interactions with other people sometimes helped them achieve their goals and sometimes erected barriers instead -- even when the ideas, structure, and content of their communication remained the same.

Most students' comments included mention of identity issues such as discovering the importance of being happy with one's self and gaining an enhanced sense of who one is and who one would like to be. Several stated they now had an increased focus and emphasis on personal mission and goal-directedness.

The main criticism in this set of materials concerned the lack of clarity in directions for the small group work, evoking the request that more structure be provided there. It was felt by a few students that time was wasted while people "sat there and nobody would say anything," as they tried to figure out where everything was going and what they were to do. As one student put it, there was "not as much flow" as she would have wished for in the class.

Exit Interviews.

In exit interviews with six of the students, the theme of increased sense of personal mission continued: determining "what you truly value and how that all ties in." Again the responses created a sense that there had definitely been more internal reflection and probing/discovering of resources than the students "had ever done before." In fact, several explicitly stated this. In the words of one, "The journey tended to be more personal than I had thought." According to another, "I had never really had to look at myself that way before." One student in particular addressed how the course had helped her make the connection between personal and professional leadership and expressed the increased emphasis she now places on communication skills.
The course's openness was valued, a feature addressed by many other students, not just those interviewed here. One student called it "a very flexible environment," while another extolled the fact that people "were treated as equal partners" in the class. The latter student also specifically confirmed the notion that process, not content, is the context for personal growth and, when asked whether or not her personal goals were achieved in the course, responded that "for me it probably surpassed what I expected to get." At the same time she voiced uncertainty as to whether this was due to the approach or to the "very strong feeling of openness" in the course environment.

I think a part of it was a difference in me: far less of a fear of trying new things and not worrying about what [I] said ... I don't know, but there is a lot more fear gone out of my life as a result of that experience.

In addition, she particularly appreciated the "internal part of the course," noting the difference between this and the first leadership course, and reported, "I definitely surpassed my goals in terms of what I could do with it (the course learnings)." Her support of the course's internal focus is linked with her sense of leadership in her comment,

If you use leadership in the sense we use it, you definitely have to have the internal...To me you are only giving people half of what they need to try to help them be good leaders without it. I hope they are not thinking about doing away with that or not offering the course again ... The external gets stifled without some internal that moves it along.

Also making connections to leadership development, another student asserted,

I guess what I really want is to keep some kind of focus on where I am, and who I am, and what I am...[leadership's] gotta' come from because of the way you are and what you're comfortable with in you, not from some external molding and that kind of thing. I've got the academic stuff down. It's the 'me' stuff...
Multiple Sources.

In all the multiple sources (including journals, evaluation sheets, original mission statements, and outcome specification exercises), one student's assessment seemed to speak the general theme for others: "We lived it, not just learned ... Life is really our greatest teacher. We all need others for encouragement and support; this setting helps fill that need." Another said, "I know I have grown as a leader and integrated something new that will influence future leadership by 'trying out' new skills in a world of action through reflecting on it; this course has been a real personal adventure." A third described his orientation to life prior to the course as being lost: "Before, I was so caught up in things outside of my circle of influence that I was unable to act. I felt out of control, lost, like a pawn..."

Regarding the coaching aspect of the course, one student remarked,

Making ourselves really listen to other people can really make a difference.... to facilitate their arriving at their own conclusions about what to do....It is worth a lot to have people see their own decisions and the factors which influence them.

Another felt her ability to coach others had been validated: "I feel like I've really made a difference for them about some big decisions in their lives, and that all ties back into my mission!" A third referred to her weekly coaching group as a support group and something she would "take into the future, [hoping to] solidify relationships with people outside work and to get something going like this."

I learned from having this sort of support group that it is lots easier if you have people who can help you sort out your decision making criteria, reinforce you as you try to envision yourself achieving a certain end, and, in general, be a cheerleader for you.
She credited the coaching with having "helped [her] a lot to open up to other people and not to be afraid of what I say"; she describes the results of her team's interactions by saying, "I have come to be able to take things a little more slowly, to give things a chance to happen, and not to try to make it all happen myself, in my own time frame."

Weaknesses cited in these assessments included the roughness of transitions between class segments, especially during the first week, and a perceived lack of clarity regarding the purposes of individual segments. Also, the logical levels exercise made several uncomfortable, "baring the soul and emotions [in that setting]."

**Written Course Assessments.**

In the multiple choice section of the researcher-developed course assessment, each evening's exercises and activities were listed, and students were asked to assign a value ranging from VD (very dissatisfied) to N (neutral) to VS (very satisfied), with U (uncertain) also being a choice. In viewing the course as a whole, the results of students' general ranking of the ten sessions fell somewhere between Satisfied and Very Satisfied. Uncertain and Neutral rankings centered primarily around the peer coaching sessions and rehearsal/practices, for which some of the accompanying comments indicated that directions were not clear and time was spent discerning exactly what to do.

The first Dissatisfied's appeared in Week 7 in response to the Design Team presentations; it appears that those rankings may have been made with regard to students' own performance in the leadership challenges rather than in assessment of their peers' performances or the challenges themselves. The first VeryDissatisfied ranking was given to the mind-reading exercise, which
also had two Dissatisfied rankings, although it had two Very Satisfied's and one Neutral ranking as well.

The personal comments offered on these sheets indicated that the course was "very different" and that the difficulty students encountered arose from having to explore their inner world, which, according to one student, "is never (or hardly ever) examined in other classes." Some students indicated they did not consider it to be a course, per se, at least not a traditional one. "It's more like a retreat for me; it's more valuable than any 'class' in that it's meaningful and useful and relevant to all aspects of our lives." "A complete paradigm shift."

In response to the question of what specifically should be kept and what dropped from the course in future offerings, the students generally felt that the NLP and Covey materials were effective and should be retained. The exercises they specifically cited for retention included the mission statement, circle of excellence, mentors and sages, and the design teams. Several others were also mentioned, along with general rapport skills. In addition, one wanted the instructors to retain the students' flexibility in developing their own learning contracts, and another wanted to retain the course's general flexibility and informality.

On the other hand, one or two participants felt some of the stories told or read to them, some of the jargon, and the early introduction of the logical levels exercise should be dropped. They suggested that, in general, perhaps the speed could slow down a bit and, once again, that instructors might "tie the segments together better, don't rush it." Here the need for clearer direction, or at least more detailed direction was again voiced. Location was also a problem for a few.
I didn't quite know what I should be doing with the Resource Team coaching sessions or the journal. I think many of the exercises done in class would have worked better for me if we had had more privacy and quiet; all of the noise in the room generated by the trios and pairs/small groups distracted me; I wanted to listen to my inner voice on most exercises, but there was too much confusion to be able to get to it.

Additionally, the suggestion was made that time be given to more sharing of what students had addressed and learned in their rehearsals and practices.

Meditations were well received, and the general feeling was that each class should begin with a meditation. Finally, the primary instructor's acceptance of his students was seen by several students as the greatest gift of the course.

**Act 10 Debriefing Session.**

At the conclusion of the course a general class debriefing was held in which participants, sitting in a circle on the floor, candidly discussed how the course had been for them. In general, students spoke with energy and some intensity about their overall feelings in experiencing the course, about the types of learning and knowledge dealt with or created, about the safety of the environment, and other topics. Many leaned into the circle while speaking or intently listening; a few stretched out on the floor, sitting up occasionally; one or two remained spectators throughout most of the discussion but responded when specifically invited to do so.

At first, students responded to questions posed by the instructors regarding their experience of that evening's class. A few students responded verbally, but many simply nodded their heads or smiled in agreement with what was said. This pertained also to responses to questions about continuing to offer the course. Throughout, the talk moved from specific topics to general ones and back; within the conversation one particular segment surfaced some important
comments about the nature of safety and some implications for future research, perhaps about the generalized potential for this kind of learning in the classroom setting. What follows is the transcript of that portion of the evening's discussion.

Instructor: So, what do you think? Should we do this class again?
David: Yeah .... yeah. {others concur; some nod in agreement}
Carrie: Can we all take it once again? (laughter) ... Why don't we just meet monthly for awhile? ... I've been thinking lately. I thought a lot about the safe space thing, and I remember outside of class you all talking about, well, we need a safe space and my saying yeah, that would be really nice but PLEEZE (laughter). No, I'm not so incredibly skeptical, but I just remember thinking there was a sort of a limit to the safe space you could have in an academic classroom, and I think just sort of in the process of coming up with the safe space, where I thought the limit was is sort of way back than the limit is. And maybe there is no limit. And I think that's really neat. And even the time we were talking about what a safe space was, I was more removed from, and I don't know if anyone else is feeling that, but this turned out to be a much safer space than I ever would have thought. If I could just make all the places ... That's what I was thinking.

Linda: It's possible to make this environment a safe space. Why can't I do that everywhere?
Carrie: Yeah. On the job or ... I think it's kind of the way you approach it and the environment you create.
Carrie: So why is this space safe?
Linda: Yeah, so why is this space safe?

{talk continues}

Carrie: Yeah, I mean that's what I've been trying to come up with. Why do I feel safe here?
David: Cuz there's no down side. What's the worst that could happen?
Tim: But there is risk!
Carrie: ... I mean the way that you're safe here is, everytime you take a risk, it's okay.
David: Oh, yeah.
Carrie: And you take risks all the time...
David: ... the relationship ... here you value the relationship enough to say ... and you don't have that insurance out there.
{talk continues}

Carrie: But how can we identify what made us feel safe here and feel *safer*? And others haven't?

Connie: Well, one think I think, to me it was realistic learning. A lot of times I think bounds are put on around this or that conflict. Sometimes I left here more confused than when I came in -- maybe I'm slower than some others (laughter) or something, but then things came together and so I didn't feel there were no boundaries. ...that was what I liked about it. You know, I didn't feel if I lost ten minutes I wouldn't make it. Then I eventually caught up in the reading ... [and] I could see how the books fit together and how the exercises really supported [them]. And to me this class was a lot of art as well as science, and any kind of art for me takes a lot of time - to do it and practice it and play with it.

It was here that Barbara related a conversation she had with a counselor the week before and which she had written up in her journal (inserted below).

The gentleman told her that his mentor had advised him to

celebrate confusion. When I'm confused, that means my normal way of dealing with life isn't working in the present situation. Confusion gives the opportunity to develop new resources. I'll bet anything that this very lesson was presented in [this class] but I missed it, and now I'm ready for it. What a great new thing for me to think about!

In class, she concluded her story by saying, "And so you have to be more resourceful. You have to be more creative and develop yourself to cope with your confusion."

The debriefing comments continued with those of Walt and Sarah.

Walt: One of the things I tried to work on this quarter ... was sort of precise communication and communicating without going around the bush nine times. So what I'm going to say here may not be very precise (laughter) but what we are/were creating here is a way of knowing that's different from the knowledge that we - all of the stuff I've done here the last two years was out of sanitized texts - says this is the way life really is. So learn that and take a test on it, and you're supposed to be educated. But what was so neat about this experience was that we
really create our own ways of knowing how things work and knowing each other - because it sort of verifies to me that there are different ways of creating knowledge besides the classroom and you sort of learn from - and that's really important and this is probably the best one.

Sarah: The thing that impressed me the most was the generosity and courage of everybody. It's not easy to even say, "Well, I liked The Little Engine That Could" or, and some of the things we asked you for were not the easiest to come up with. And also your generosity with each other and your time. It was wonderful. You know, it wasn't a competitive environment. It was a "let's get together and do this" environment, which was really very nice.

Although the dialogue continued, the essence of the thought is captured above. It speaks eloquently to the conditions that generate "safe space" and the possibility and potential for that in a classroom setting. Safety has to do, we discover, with vulnerability: the willingness of both participants and instructors to be open and available, including emotionally, to those with whom they are journeying as "equal partners." It is this shared vulnerability that provides the space in which education in the sense of "drawing out" can happen.

Follow-Up Interviews.

One year after the close of the leadership course, follow-up interviews were conducted with students in this class, requesting their responses to four questions:

1. Are you using any of the course's learnings in your current situation, whether personal life, job, etc.?

2. What, overall, was your single greatest learning from the course?

3. What would you add now, if it were taught again? How would you do it differently?

4. Where would you say, that is, in what format or way, did most of your significant learning take place: small-group discussions, large-group, one-on-one encounters, personal internal dialogue, content of the reading material, etc.?
In response to the first question, all ten of the respondents said they are currently using the learnings from the course in their personal and/or professional lives. For several, the course and interaction with instructors had helped them to make decisions regarding career changes. Specifically, they identified the Covey material, outcome specification and mission statements, methods of dealing with conflict, communication skills, rapport building, journaling, the circle of excellence, and, to some degree, meditations as processes they have retained for present use in daily life and work.

When asked what their single greatest learning was from the course, respondents overwhelmingly agreed that they benefitted most from examining themselves and who they are, vocationally and educationally, and from building their capacity to develop their own strengths and to key in on where they are in order to pay more attention to themselves in their interactions with other people. One said the single greatest learning was the concept that leadership can be studied and learned; that one can dissect the elements that make up great leadership, that one can focus on those and improve those; that leadership is not a nebulous, amorphous thing. It can be looked at and assessed.

For another, the single greatest learning was the re-focusing of his goals through the outcome specification work. Another cited coaching -- asking questions of yourself and others -- as singularly important. One said the visioning exercises, like the circle of excellence, logical levels or the meditations, were the greatest learning, while still another said he learned that "leaders ought to show some vulnerability," and that, "as a leader, you're not divorced from the experiences you're involved in ... there has to be a lot of inner work; you can't do it 'detached'." Overall, there was general agreement that, as one stated it, each "came away with some very practical tools that, with my very
fast-paced job, give me options for new ways of looking at things and dealing with things."

As to what they would add now or do differently were the course to be offered again, respondents agreed they would set out the criteria for small group work more clearly and move a bit more slowly, building relationships and a greater sense of safety before engaging exercises such as the logical levels. In this vein, one person suggested completing the structure before teaching the class, describing it as too open-ended and "loose." One respondent suggested that journaling and meeting on a regular basis with the primary instructor about entries, as had occurred in the first course, would be helpful; and another two expressed the desire for reunion meetings or some form of ongoing communication every six months or so.

The format in which the most significant learning took place varied with individual respondents. Some got the most out of one-on-one dialogue with the instructors. For others, the large group interaction was the most beneficial. The readings were said to be important, but for many served as fodder for the dialogues between people more than as content pieces alone. Overall, the large-group and small-group interactions, especially as they spurred internal dialogue, were deemed primary formats for significant learning.

**Assessments and Desired Outcomes**

To reiterate briefly the instructors' intentions and objectives, as fully articulated elsewhere, the focus of the course was to be on what they believed to be often neglected or forgotten aspects of leadership: the inner world of the individual and gaining access to and support from that inner world. What the students' assessments appear to indicate is that, indeed, this was addressed
through discovering or uncovering inner resources and gaining greater awareness of the self with regard to both being (identity issues) and doing (competence and confidence issues, particularly in professional/vocational life).

It therefore seems reasonable to conclude that the instructors achieved, in varying degrees, many of their desired outcomes. Clearly students indicate that the effort was made to draw them out, to affirm who they are and to attend to who they want to be and what they want to do, as well as to provide tools and experiences to enable and support their efforts. One can infer from their comments that participants made gains in both intra-and inter-personal competency and that they experienced some sense of empowerment as well as perceived themselves as gaining choice.

Whether or not a full range of learning modes and styles was engaged is difficult to assess. Only a few students were asked directly about the fit of the course with their learning styles, and these, although they felt stretched, did not report lasting or severe resistance to any of the approaches. Beyond that, students remarked on the experiential emphasis but did not elaborate. As to whether or not the instructors were able, through intermixing right- and left-brain activities, to truly accelerate learning and improve retention is not known but is something worth researching further. Similarly, it is difficult to discern the degree to which people were able to release judgment and control and to replace them with curiosity and a sense of adventure, but student response would say there was at least some progress on this outcome.

Although participants spoke to having been empowered to make connections with their inner life and self and to link self-leadership with leading others, it is not at all clear whether what happened in the classroom was adequately translated into processes which could be taken into the everyday
work world. This is an outcome which will need to be addressed differently another time. Nevertheless, achievement of primary outcomes regarding modeling and creating a safe learning environment seem to be affirmed.

Somehow, despite the foibles and limitations of both classroom environment and instructors, a risk-taking and relatively fail-safe space was created in which participants felt free to explore their inner depths for growth. In the students' own words, an environment was created in which key aspects of leadership were lived rather than merely learned, and the instructors were, for the most part, able to model the vulnerability that it was hoped could facilitate trust and thereby generate an environment conducive to a true and deeply personal and lasting learning experience.

It would seem that, indeed, the course became, after all, a kind of real and very human "learning lab". In the words of one participant, "How to nurture the soulfulness each individual possesses, and access it and use it for betterment of our own and others' lives, that is the greatest act of love." Another wrote, "This class has opened my eyes, heart, and soul to make me realize the importance of being happy with who I am. It has developed a path so that peacefulness can be developed ... I have grown."
A Final Look

After the initial analysis and interpretation of the data, a final look was taken from a reverse perspective. Data from the year-later follow-up interviews, the month-later exit interviews, the end-of course written assessment, and the last-class verbal debriefing were reviewed, in turn, for the frequency with which students cited NLP concepts and interventions as having been important to their learnings and their experience of the course. The results are presented in what follows and lead into the researcher's assessment of the most important or impactful of the course's NLP components.

One Year Later

The follow-up interviews were conducted with twelve of the fourteen class participants. This included the master practitioner student who now offers classes in NLP and, regardless, addressed the summer rather than the spring course in her responses. Thus her responses were eliminated from the analysis. What follows therefore, represents the responses of eleven of the twelve regularly enrolled students in the class.

In these interviews, although names of a few of the course concepts and processes (including NLP interventions) were mentioned as prompts, few students used these labels or the names given to others of the processes or interventions in describing what they were still using among their course learnings. One student specifically said she was probably using NLP but typically did not associate a name with any of it.
Of the eleven, three noted using the outcome specifications (or that process could be inferred from their comments); four cited rapport skills like mirroring/matching and, in one instance, intentionally using another's preferred representational systems in conversations; one simply referred to methods of dealing with relationships and another indicated that things done in class helped her to change her outlook on relating to people. One cited methods of dealing with conflict while a second specified working with the tension between internal parts (parts reframing and negotiations).

Communication skills came up twice, and acuity for communication styles once, as did using the eye-accessing cues. Two students included asking questions of oneself and others in their list; two mentioned anchoring; two cited the circle of excellence, and one cited visioning exercises like the circle of excellence or the logical levels exercise. One stipulated that he had "changed his thinking about his behaviors using NLP"; one said she had gained "some very practical tools that gave [her] options for new ways of looking at things and dealing with things"; a third indicated she continued informal use of NLP in, among other things, generating options. In addition, one student mentioned storytelling, and three specified coaching and journaling.

The frequency of these student responses is displayed in Table 9. These frequencies are very low, and one might interpret them to mean there was very little lasting effect of the NLP components of the course or even of other course components for that matter. On the other hand, one might be surprised that students remained able to remember specific course components and to articulate processes they had learned or which had been reinforced in the course that they were continuing to use twelve months later. In addition, it is believed by some that issues which were problematic at some point in time,
Table 9
NLP Citations in Follow-Up Interviews
(One Year Later)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Exercises/Skills</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Specification</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport Skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mirroring/matching</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>representational systems</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acuity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eye-accessing cues</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchoring</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visioning Exercises</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circle of excellence</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logical levels</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reframing Internal Parts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| General Skills / Topic Areas            |           |
| Communication Skills                    | 2         |
| Relational Skills                       | 2         |
| Dealing with Conflict                   | 1         |
| Questioning                             | 2         |
| Storytelling                            | 1         |
| Perspective on behaviors                | 1         |

| Related Areas                           |           |
| Generating Options                      | 2         |
| Coaching                                | 3         |
| Journaling                              | 3         |
once resolved, no longer stay in one's awareness. This complies with the notion that learning is performed largely by the unconscious and once a skill is learned or a way of perceiving has become internalized, these are relegated to the unconscious as new habits of thinking and behavior. Either way, the results clearly indicate that the course's NLP exercises and concepts did not remain in student awareness over time.

One Month Later

Six of the twelve students enrolled in the class, as noted earlier, participated in personal case study research and therefore in an exit interview. These interviews were conducted from three to five weeks after the last class, with most being held during the fourth week. In the interview students were asked, among other things, what had been highlights of the course for them (without prompting from the researcher), where their significant learnings had been, and what progress they felt they had made toward achieving their desired outcomes.

One student directly mentioned only the mission statement (which to his surprise turned out to be his most desired outcome of the class), coaching, changes in perception, and rapport skills. Others elaborated more on a number of aspects the course and were more specific in their remarks. One mentioned logical levels in terms of still not "getting it" and another the mind-reading as what worked least for her. One spoke to all of the exercises working and adding to the whole, supporting that all be retained, which another student did as well.

Most cited among the course components were rapport skills and acuity, coaching, and reframing internal parts. Five of the six students named rapport, with two specifying matching or pacing and four talking about representational
systems. Two spoke in general of increasing acuity; one specifically addressed calibration and one break states; three mentioned eye movements or eye accessing cues. Five also labeled coaching as one of the more impactful endeavors (Here students did not typically differentiate between coaching in class, in the leadership challenge performances, or in their peer resource teams although their examples, when given, referenced one or more of these). Four of the six talked about reframing or integrating internal parts.

Three claimed that the mentors and sages exercises had been particularly useful, with one voicing her recognition that these resources "are all within me, but this was a very interesting [and fun] way of accessing them." Three also addressed perceptual positions, although none used the label.

Two students cited reflection or self-reflection as an important aspect, with one indicating this was both a state of mind and a culture of the class. Two named journaling as significant in their learning; two cited role plays; two addressed personal mission statements; two brought up the stop-action exercise; and two spoke to increasing choice or generating options. In addition, outcome specification, childhood stories, circle of excellence, logical levels, storytelling, and their classmate's disclosure/coaching episode were each cited by two of the students.

Also named were the NLP presuppositions, meditation, and the complaints list -- one time each -- together with questioning, imagery, and dialogue. The design team presentations were noted by two persons as well, but once as a very positive experience and once as a very negative one, although significant insight came out of even the negative experience.

The results of this review are shown in Table 10. Clearly the frequencies of citing NLP components are higher than at the time of the follow-up interviews,
### Table 10
NLP Citations in Exit Interviews
(One Month Later)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Exercises/Skills</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Specification</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport Skills</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matching/pacing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>representational systems</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acuity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eye-accessing cues</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>break states</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calibrating</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptual Positions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reframing/Integrating Internal Parts</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleight of Mouth/Reframing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>childhood story</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classmate story/disclosure &amp; coaching</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visioning Exercises/Resourceful States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circle of excellence</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logical levels</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imagery</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints List</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Skills / Topic Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLP Presuppositions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Mission Statements</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Teams</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stop-action exercise</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role plays</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meditations/Relaxation exercises</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storytelling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective; changing perceptions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection / Self-reflection</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generating options / Increasing choice</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journaling</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
especially given that the data represents only six of the students. This may be a result of the greater proximity of the interview to the end of the course and may also have been affected by students' foreknowledge of their participation in such an interview. That is, the fact that these students knew they would have to address the course and their experience in it once again may have made them more conscious of remembering or trying to remember various aspects. For the most part, as students continued to respond to questions and expand upon their experiences both inside and outside of class, with the exception of one, they began to recall more of the interventions. In fact, several returned to earlier questions as they thought of things and even remarked that more was coming back to them about the class as they continued to talk.

At the End of the Quarter

Students' written course assessments, Reflections On the Journey, were to be submitted by the end of the quarter, together with or after submitting their journals and self-assessments. In the document students were not only asked to rate each and every component of the class for each act, but to list specific components they would recommend to be retained in any future offering of the course as well as those they would recommend to be dropped. In addition, they were invited to make comments on any item in the rating sheets as well as at the end of the document.

Eight of the twelve enrolled students completed and submitted the assessments. All but one of these also later participated in the follow-up interview. Among their responses to what should be retained in the course, one student cited qualities such as the class's flexibility (named also by another) and informality; another included increased meditation time and the mix of
group and individual work; one listed the coaching teams and two others included the Covey material, NLP material or both (all students had responded positively to at least two of the three texts; a few would keep all three). All but the first of these students, together with the remaining respondents, listed other specific components, as shown in Table 11, with the exception of the student who simply wrote "all."

Included with the recommended list in the table are the items which drew favorable individual comments as students rated the components of each act whether or not these items were cited later as activities to specifically retain. Such comments included "I loved this! A real aha experience" regarding the perceptual positions exercise; "one of the best things we did all quarter - very insightful for me" regarding the mentors and sages exercise; and "my favorite" regarding work with resourceful states as well as the same comment for the eye-accessing cues.

Additionally, a few made comments about safe space, and one student noted the distinctiveness of the course in the fact that the environment was more a learner/learner than teacher/learner environment. Among the items listed as being recommended to be dropped were the journal guidelines (two students listed this), stories, and the jargon. Additionally, one student recommended that the speed be reduced so that exercises could be better understood and their effects integrated. Three indicated they would recommend dropping "nothing." Finally, two voiced their discomfort with the logical levels demonstration, one of whom suggested that one of the instructors serve in the role of explorer instead of a student volunteer.

Once again the frequencies are very low, considering that there were eight respondents submitting the document. What is particularly interesting is that in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Exercises/Skills</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>summary (both) individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Specification</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport Skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>job interview (matching/mismatching)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>representational systems</td>
<td>(1) 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acuity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eye movement (accessing cues)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleight of Mouth / Reframing</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resourceful States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circle of excellence</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logical levels exercise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentors &amp; sages</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptual Positions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reframing Internal Parts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instructor sharing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>childhood story</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classmate's story &amp; coaching</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Game</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Skills / Topic Areas**

| NLP Presuppositions                      | 1           |
| Personal Mission Statements             | 2           |
| Design Teams                            | 2 (1)       |
| stop-action exercise                    |             |
| Meditations/Relaxation exercises        | 4           |

**Related Areas**

| Coaching Teams                          | 1           |

**All**

|                           | 1           |
each of the tabulations, no other element of the course received any higher
rating than some of the NLP-specific components, with the exception, perhaps,
of meditation, which is used in many fields, and coaching, which may or may not
have been conducted according to NLP-based practices.

Were components specific to the Covey text included, the general
concepts and habits would have appeared as being cited, but only one or two
would have had a rating as high as 2 or 3. And the only exercises mentioned or
commented upon in the ratings beyond the writing of mission statements would
have been one or two citings each of emotional bank accounts and the time
management matrix. All other comments or references were as non-specific as
those concerning NLP components.

Given all of this, it would seem that students had very little to say about
particular course interventions, at least in this context. The same was not true,
however, of their journal writings, which often addressed class experiences
more than they responded to the questions or directions imposed by the journal
guidelines. Exceptions to this were the student who wrote almost nothing in his
journal and only spoke very generally there about class episodes and their
impact on him or offered thoughts about his life and frustrations; another was a
woman who, although she addressed class activities in her debriefing memos,
used the journal as a place for random thoughts and, like the other student,
often wrote in phrases, some connected to specific class concepts and others
more generally addressing aspects of her thinking or behavior, her life or
specifics of previous job-related issues. Both students indicated they preferred
to reflect without being forced to articulate those reflections in writing.
At the End of the Last Class

Essentially the primary exercises or specific processes addressed in the debriefing were those of the session just completed (the logical levels, the aligned self, meditation, and story), and the comments made about these were most often prompted by instructor questions. Regarding the logical levels, four students commented on its value and the differences in the two engagements with the exercise. Others simply listened, some nodding in agreement. Basically nothing was said about the aligned self exploration or walking the timelines, nor about the story at the end, although its focus on creating sacred ground may have prompted the length discussion on safe space and the safety finally achieved in this classroom.

Topics which were initiated by students addressed learnings or things associated with their learning experience. These included safe space, as noted above, a next course, and new perspectives on their own lives. A few students also spoke to journaling and coaching. Most of these topics were treated only briefly, except for the longer segment on safe environments. The whole was very subjective, often feeling based, and generally imbued with excitement and for some a sense of loss as the adventure ended.

Summary

Based on the data reviews and frequency analyses it would seem that among the more significant of the NLP interventions were work with rapport and sensory acuity and the visualization/resourceful states exercises, specifically those of the mentors and sages, circle of excellence, and logical levels. Also of some significance was the reframing of (and negotiating with) internal parts and, to a lesser degree, outcome specification. Additionally, coaching surfaced
as having had a significant impact on many students, but the form used cannot be adequately ascertained to include it in a list of NLP-specific exercises.

What seems to be common to the first of these exercises (rapport and outcomes) is their utility and the fact that one might well use them every day. To one degree or another, people already possess skills, or at least habits, in these areas. The discussions and exercises affirmed some of what students were already aware of in themselves and extended their thinking about these, as well as introducing them to some new processes and awarenesses. The same might be said of the parts reframing. Each topic allows for processes to be conducted formally or informally, and the advertised capacity associated with each may have served as a particularly strong motivation for students to attend to them.

Regarding the resource and visualization exercises, students' growing capacity for meditative states, or at least their increased exposure to attempting them, may have enhanced their experience with exercises like the mentors and sages and the second engagement with the logical levels. The circle of excellence also falls in this category, but both the circle and the mentors exercises more overtly supply, when they "work," an immediate gain in confidence, self-esteem, and a sense of resourcefulness which many of the students addressed as issues with which they wished to deal. Thus again student motivation may have been a factor in the impact of these exercises and in students remembering them.

In contrast, the mind-reading and flexibility exercises were uniquely unsuccessful, and the aligned self-timeline exercise also lacked any significant impact, or so it would seem. The sleight of mouth exercise in the segment on reframing language, on the other hand, was a surprise in its inclusion as a memorable learning. The question remains as to which forms of reframing were
of particular value and whether or not students used more than one or two, although even a few might be quite useful.

As noted earlier, there was no single exercise or class session acclaimed as having been useful or significant by all class members at these points in time. Many exercises were specifically addressed in student journals but not mentioned in later writings or interviews. The response to some must be taken largely from the nonverbal agreement or disagreement shown in class as colleagues spoke to them. Further analysis of the impact of the exercises is limited by a lack of more specific data.

Students often wrote generically in journals or provided no response to exercises beyond "interesting," "confusing," and so on. Comments in journals, in class, or elsewhere such as "very insightful for me" or "a real aha" did not typically have appended an example or explanation of why that seemed to be the case. What is the meaning when students call an exercise "powerful" or say it "had a big impact on me" but do not mention it later in assessing the course?

One interpretation may be that the impact was really a surface level enjoyment of what had been experienced. The person was comfortable doing the exercise, had fun doing it, and encountered some idea or insight that seemed useful in the moment but which over time actually had little significance. Thus the experience was in some way a "false" reading of the event and not generative of anything substantial.

A second interpretation might be that the insight gained resolved something for the person or surfaced something which then became integrated and so no longer stood out in his or her memory. (This possibility was mentioned earlier). It is not unusual for people to lose memory of or to "let fall away" an issue, a resistance, or a problem when integrating a change. This is
one of the proposed forms of evidence of integration that the researcher recommends be further explored.

Given the nature of the data, there may be few findings which can be put forth with real conviction regarding the more concrete forms of evidence available to support them. Nonetheless, the experience of the few -- the one, two, or three of twelve -- should not be discounted. They lay the foundation for future research. Perhaps they surface propositions for continued efforts to confirm or disconfirm the value of these NLP processes and concepts in facilitating deep personal change and the development of people into truly effective leaders.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS

One interesting question regarding leadership and leadership development is how leaders, as change agents, prepare themselves for their role in effectively transforming organizations. Much research is available on the characteristics of people deemed to be effective leaders in our times and on the knowledge, skills and attitudes associated with effective leadership. Considerably less research is available about the means leaders employ to achieve these desired competencies. The research presented here was conceived to investigate an often overlooked aspect: the inner world of leadership and the learning (and unlearning) challenges posed by seeking the personal change required to lead oneself and others to desired futures.

The Context

The context selected for the study was a university classroom, and the focus of the study became the design, delivery and receipt of (response to) a graduate level course on leadership. A question guiding the whole was: how does a person committed to developing his or her leadership capacity become able to describe the person he/she wants to be as a leader, and then go about making the desired changes? A potential answer was to use the tools, techniques and belief framework of neurolinguistic programming (NLP). NLP itself is defined as the study of the structure of subjective experience. It is both a process and a model of a process, and its practitioners claim considerable
effectiveness in bringing about deep personal change. Conducting an NLP-based, experiential leadership development course afforded the instructors in this study (one of whom was the researcher) an opportunity to investigate this possibility.

The Rationale

The rationale for designing and delivering a course which emphasized the subjective experience of personal growth and change was rooted in the instructors' beliefs that at the heart of organizational change is individual change; at the heart of individual change is the capacity to change beliefs, values and perceptions; and that capacity resides in the inner world of the individual. A second factor was the perceived absence of opportunities in higher education for students of leadership to pursue forms of personal growth and learning such as those offered among NLP practices.

The rationale for conducting research which probed the inner world of leadership included the recent emphasis in leadership literature on self-leadership, personal mastery, and the character, beliefs, and thought processes of the effective leader. Next was the aforementioned abundance of research describing the who, what, when, where and why of effective leadership with a marked absence of description of the how. Third were the effectiveness claims of NLP regarding means of producing lasting, generative change and, last, the absence of academic research on the use of NLP principles and processes in the area of leadership development.
The Research

This research study has focused on the nature of transformative, generative change as it intersects with leadership development in general and self-directed leadership and learning in particular. It draws upon four literatures, including those on learning organizations, individual change and development, leadership, and neurolinguistic programming. Issues being addressed have centered on the notions of perception, dialogue, disclosure, identity, empowerment and personal change.

Among the essential aspects of the study was the use of NLP tools and concepts within the scope of a ten-week course. Would these tools and concepts facilitate change and serve to accelerate the growth process and the development of leadership potential? Would certain exercises and interventions be more important than others for the class as a whole or for specific individuals within the class? Would any of the students find themselves using NLP-based processes in making decisions or adding choices within and about their lives subsequent to the close of formal course work?

The research was conducted using qualitative methods, including interviewing a subset of the subjects; video-taping all class and team project sessions; audio-taping instructional planning and debriefing sessions; collecting written exercise documentation and student journals; facilitating a verbal course debriefing; and conducting a written researcher-designed evaluation at the end of the course as well as a follow-up interview with participants one year later. Member checks were sought from case study students and the services of a peer reviewer/debriefer were employed. Input was also sought from the two other members of the core instructional team.
One of the limitations of the study is the fact that much of the evidence of growth and achieving desired outcomes rests in self-reported data and lacks corroboration by others outside the class setting. Corroboration does exist, however, across data sources when student writings and class behaviors are considered over time and compared with instructor/researcher observations and the work of the peer reviewer. Other problematic aspects include the potential for relationship bias in student responses and researcher inquiry, possible effects of the first leadership course on this course, the blend of NLP components with the work of other authors, and the role of the researcher as an instructor in the course.

The Findings

The findings put forth address both what is said and not said, done and not done, readily observed and not so easily observed. They address patterns which emerged over time and forms of evidence which instructors may wish to attend to in the future. In addition, they raise a number of questions worthy of continued research.

Summary findings of the study are presented in Table 12. They are then linked with the research questions and addressed in greater detail, together with some of the insights and inferences arising in the analysis of student experience in the course.
Table 12
Summary Findings

1. Students made connections between leadership development and self-development and expanded their conceptions of leadership.

2. Students experienced secondary gains from listening and being present to others’ processes.

3. Student experiences confirmed much of what is known about personal change processes: specifically, the roles of emotion, chaos, confusion or disequilibrium, resistance, and time.

4. Students attributed changes they experienced to various of the course concepts, interactions, exercises, and/or assignments.

5. Students continued with certain identified practices for at least one year.

6. Students made progress on achieving desired outcomes and reported growth which had lasting effects.

7. Students reported gaining an enhanced sense of agency and choice in their lives.

8. Students and instructors together generated a safe learning environment through dialogue, disclosure, modelling, and attending to rapport.

9. The learning environment desired for fostering deep personal change closely resembled an optimal therapeutic setting.

10. A therapeutic type of pedagogy is possible in graduate education and can have positive results.
Revisiting the Research Questions

The study explored the question: how did participants in an experiential, graduate-level leadership course emphasizing the development of self as leader and structured around principles of neurolinguistic programming perceive changes in their personal growth and development? That is, what were the experiences and emergent outcomes of participants being engaged in a curriculum and learning environment designed to facilitate personal change? In light of this, four primary questions were posed to guide the research. To promote clarity and avoid redundance, the first and second of these are combined in what follows. Summary findings are presented in response to each question after which more specific information is provided regarding what course participants' experiences suggest.

How Did Participants Talk About and Engage In Their Own Learning, Leadership Development, and Personal Change Efforts?

The findings of the study regarding how students addressed their learning, leadership development, and personal change efforts may be summarized as follows.

- Students made connections between leadership development and self-development and expanded their conceptions of leadership.
- Students experienced secondary gains from listening and being present to others' processes.
- Student experiences confirmed much of what is known about change processes: specifically, the roles of emotion, chaos, confusion or disequilibrium, resistance, and time.

Upon entering the course, students found they were asked to do more than simply react to someone else's model of leadership. To develop their own leadership, they needed first to determine what served as a personal definition of leadership and the boundaries within which they intended to operate as a leader. During the first few weeks, it seemed that most participants made mental, if not verbal, distinctions between leader and self, leadership development and self development. Soon thereafter such distinctions seemed to drop away, either because students had reframed the course as pertaining to self alone or because they were indeed beginning to integrate the two. When those participating in exit interviews were asked whether they would indeed have called the course a leadership course, the reply was yes. Their rationale involved what they now saw as the connectedness of self-development with leadership development. In one way or another, all students indicated they had expanded their notions of leadership.

Regarding learning, students regularly had occasion to review their own learning modes and styles. The need for structure and explicit direction surfaced for many, as did issues of spontaneity and extemporaneous response for some, compared to being allowed the time and conditions under which to fully prepare for discussion or activity. Most students were also surprised to find that observing or participating in the unique processes and learnings of their peers added to their own learning -- surprised that others' learning became part of their own in unexpected and significant ways. Clearly the behaviors requested of students offered them new learning challenges.
In addition, it may be said that the course's emphasis on experiential learning brought about increasingly positive results for many of the students; this often depended on the instructions and purposes being made clear enough to be grasped by the participants. Also, increased familiarity with methods and processes (i.e., the forms of exercises) seemed to reduce resistance in many of the students and to open them more fully to subsequent exercises.

On the topic of personal change, some students provided very little data regarding evidence of their specific efforts; others provided generic comments; still others provided very specific examples, whether their attempts were successful or not so successful. In talking about change efforts at various times throughout the ten weeks, student stories revealed the following.

1. Some students expressed excitement about their ability to enact new behaviors while others were excited about the responses received or results achieved; for some, both occurred.
2. A few found they no longer attributed meaning to others' actions in the same way they had previously.
3. Some became aware of engaging in new thought forms which they interpreted as evidence of a shift in their mental models.
4. Several experienced frustration with the slow pace of their change, especially regarding their moving thought into action; one even felt frustration about recognizing opportunities for new action.

Throughout the course, participants discovered things about themselves which, at the time, may have surprised, delighted, frustrated or depressed them. Although there was sometimes resistance to accepting or believing the new information, several of the students seemed to manage, over time, various aspects of their resistance to these discoveries and proceeded to deal with and
set goals about the newly affirmed traits, whether strengths or weaknesses. A few reframed what they had perceived to be a negative trait so it was no longer seen as a character defect or flaw. Additionally, several students expressed comfort in the discovery that others felt many of the same fears and misgivings they felt. This knowledge seemed to empower them to more openly acknowledge their fears to themselves and to others and to begin to work directly with those fears.

**Observed Patterns of Lived Experience.**

Several course participants described their work with the self as hard, at times very emotional, and as requiring more of them than they had anticipated. In fact, when observed collectively as a class, two patterns of lived experience became evident. In the first pattern, when students’ self-knowledge and preliminary expectations of the course were confronted early in the quarter, their responses were doubt and skepticism. The extreme response was withdrawal: either full physical withdrawal in the form of staying away from class for the third or fourth session or emotional withdrawal in the form of attending class but "checking out" mentally and emotionally as experiences took place for which they were either not ready, not interested, or not able to give their attention in the moment. These students later reported that they were temporarily disengaged, "waiting to see where it goes," or that they felt forced to disengage for a time in order to protect themselves emotionally.

The middle weeks seemed to move these students into a period of disorientation and varying levels of chaos or confusion. Students moved back and forth between disengagement and intrigue, holding themselves back to honor their resistances and stepping forth in response to the attraction of what was happening with themselves and/or others. Upon entering the last third of
the quarter, a shift seemed to occur. More students seemed to engage more fully with class activities. A new commitment and energy manifested itself in classroom dynamics, dialogue and journal entries. Potential sources for this shift are many. Among them, a significant source seemed to be the felt experience of instructors and peers displaying vulnerability and the depth and power of their disclosures. Thus it would seem that instructor and peer modelling of disclosure and vulnerability indeed influenced student growth, either through the act itself, giving permission to others to do the same, or through the contents of the act, or both.

The second discernible pattern began with challenges to students' self-awareness during the first few weeks, followed by a surface level engagement with and interest in the topics being explored and the means offered for exploring them. There seemed to be an investment of curiosity and an initial energy for "doing the work" which later moved into confusion when class discussions evoked disagreements and conflict. Paradoxically, the experience of disagreement and conflict together with their resolution may have ultimately led these students to a deeper engagement and renewed commitment to continue their own journeys and to become engaged with others' journeys.

These patterns parallel William Bridges' (1980) three stages of transition and change that accompany growth. "Endings" suggest the end of old or former beliefs about leadership, learning, self, the course, and/or how we grow and change; the "neutral zone" describes the desert or wilderness experience of being in-between the old ways of behaving that are now seen to be outgrown or non-supportive and the not-yet-realized experience of the new ways of behaving that are being sought. The experience of the neutral zone is often one of confusion, disorientation, and even chaos, out of which comes a new
order. "New beginnings" establishes the reception and integration of new modes of thinking, new patterns of dialogue, and new ways of behaving and responding.

Perhaps the lived experience of the students in this course serves to affirm Bridges' description and understandings of the process of change. Perhaps the reports of these students could also provide evidence for the more general notion that transformative change is sometimes born out of chaos and sometimes out of the strength of attraction to a new state, were more known about the exact nature of the changes students believed they underwent and were these able to be confirmed by others. In the former instance, it might be that these individuals were motivated to change through a desire to get out of an unpleasant state or situation -- to move away from that which they did not want. Among the latter group we might find those whose predisposition is to move toward that which they do want -- those who were or became highly motivated to achieve some goal.

What may be said here is that the patterns of behavior of most of the students suggest that

Doubt, skepticism and physical or emotional withdrawal accompany the confrontation of new self-knowledge; and

Disorientation and varying levels of chaos or confusion, along with intrigue, also attend change.

For many, it seemed that

Witnessing or engaging in disagreement, conflict, and their resolution served as an impetus for deeper levels of engagement and renewed commitment to continuing their journey of self-discovery; and
Varying periods of time spent in a state of "already, but not yet" can be expected while attempting to achieve lasting personal change.

**Corrective Experiences.**

Several students readily acknowledged spending more time thinking about and/or writing about changes they desired than they invested in putting strategies into action. Although this was a source of frustration for them, it must be remembered that writing is itself a form of action. In fact, the guidelines for students' leadership journals, if followed, required that they describe in three distinct forms a cycle of action, reflection, and design of new action which, in itself, engaged them in a corrective experience (Goldfried, 1990). Both the thinking and the writing also gave students practice in mental rehearsal and mental editing. That is, through journaling students could begin the process of creating new neurological pathways (new connections between stimulus and response) thereby increasing the probability that they would take the desired action in future encounters with similar stimuli (Buzan, 1989; Caine & Caine, 1991).

**Integration.**

Without the feedback of others or direct observation in other settings, it cannot be confirmed that these students indeed activated new behaviors beyond those observed in class. Indeed, they may have done so or even done so without being consciously aware of their actions; this possibility is one which should be investigated in future studies. The fact that a few students rehearsed new action but were not consciously able to activate the behaviors attests to the strength of internal resistance.

In contrast, other students specifically and consciously sought opportunities in which to test out new actions or modes of dialogue or thinking.
For those who practiced specific behaviors and seriously reflected on the outcomes, the result seems to have been both a corrective experience and an opportunity to increase sensory acuity.

Overall, students varied in the degree to which they credited themselves with having integrated some change (having brought the change into their "normal" mode of being and behaving -- fitting it into the whole of the self). Some, however, offered little or no evidence of integration over this time period, at least in their writings and in their behaviors in the classroom.

The experiences reported by students in this area suggest that further research should be conducted on journaling as a corrective experience and on the effects of mental rehearsal and mental editing on both the activation of new behaviors and the readiness to integrate new action into behavioral patterns. The latter requires probing further into the nature of the resistance encountered as students think and write but remain blocked at the point of taking action.

**How Did Participants Talk About and Engage in Their Experience with Course Concepts and Interventions?**

Summary findings regarding students' experience with course concepts and interventions may be stated as follows.

- Students attributed changes they experienced to various course concepts, interactions, exercises, and/or assignments.
- Students continued with certain identified practices for at least one year.

In general, students had quite diverse experiences with the course components. Some students had favorite exercises and activities which were particularly fulfilling for them, while others moved through the course more
evenly, without much weekly comment or conversation that elaborated on their individual experiences. Both in class and in written reflections students expressed a wide variety of emotional responses to course concepts and exercises. Their levels of involvement ranged from full engagement with the information and processes to rejection of certain activities as a waste of time. Somehow between these extremes was the aforementioned recognition of unexpected secondary gains in insight which increased the value of a particular concept or intervention. The time lag or gestation period required for certain insights and learnings to emerge or to gain personal meaning varied with the individual and the event prompting the insight; students reported ranges from days to months.

Students varied, too, in the degrees to which they read, asked questions, conversed with peers or experimented with action in the world. The introduction of certain course concepts and associated vocabulary provided students with new ways of speaking about things, if not new ways of thinking about them. In several instances, students expressed having already known the information at some level, tacitly or intuitively, but not having previously been able to fully conceptualize or articulate it.

Conversations held about concepts and class interventions tended at first to be held primarily in small group settings and with family members, roommates, or spouses. Typically, only the more extroverted of the group (referring to the Myers-Briggs typology) would share their thoughts, confusions, evaluations, triumphs and trials with the large group as a whole. The more introverted, at least initially, reserved those sharings for one-on-one settings; when specifically invited to respond in class, they did so with much less elaboration. As the weeks went on, however, this changed, and introverted
students expressed feeling more comfortable sharing in the larger group, sometimes to their own surprise.

Student application of concepts and exercises varied in degrees of internal and external focus as well as in the time and energy given to reflection versus taking action. As a result of their efforts, several students expressed that they had experienced significant insights, had pursued further reflection on those, and had set goals using their new knowledge to bring about particular changes they desired. Overall, those who engaged more actively as participants in the dialogues and exercises tended to write more reflectively in their journals and to report more insights than those whose participation was more passive. Regardless, even some of the quietest and least interactive students reported having made changes in their lives based on their course experience.

Specific Interventions.

Although the impact of interventions may have varied, several of the interventions seemed to be well received by most of the students. A few were significantly liked or disliked; a few were perceived either as quite inviting or as very threatening. On the average, students deemed work with rapport and acuity and the reframing of internal parts together with resourceful states/visualization exercises like the circle of excellence, mentors and sages, and logical levels as the more "powerful" of the intervention experiences.

To a lesser degree, outcome specification had impact, and several students specifically noted the perceptual positions and childhood story exercises, along with the night of their colleague's disclosure/coaching session; these did not, however, remain in most students' memories over time. The debates surrounding coaching and both student and instructor disclosure and vulnerability were also deemed to be quite impactful at the time, but it was the
more general notion of having created a safe learning environment that endured.

What Were the Emergent Outcomes of This Particular Set of Experiences?

An analysis of the outcomes emerging from this set of experiences produces the summary findings listed below.

- Students made progress on achieving desired outcomes and reported growth which had lasting effects.
- Students reported gaining an enhanced sense of agency and choice in their lives.
- Students and instructors together generated a safe learning environment through dialogue, disclosure, modelling, and attending to rapport.
- The learning environment desired for fostering deep personal change closely resembled an optimal therapeutic environment.
- A therapeutic type of pedagogy is possible in graduate education and can have positive results.

The most obvious outcome of the set of experiences is that students increased their repertoire of tools from which to choose in pursuing changes in behavior, belief, and attitude and with which to become more precise and intentional in their communications. Many also gained new and improved access to internal resource states, or so they reported. Whether most students incorporated these into their thinking and behavior in a sustaining way or simply placed them in cognitive storage at the end of the course cannot be known for sure. We simply know that some of the tools were still in use a year later.
Over the life of the course, several observable changes indeed took place. For many, if not all, risk-taking increased, as manifest through more self-disclosure (sometimes to the surprise of even the speaker); through closer physical proximity in interactions; and through more questioning, including voicing dissent. Skills were learned; an increasing number of students engaged in backtracking and reflective listening, as well as in more probing for thought, specificity, and underlying motivation or values. Several improved their coaching skills, as demonstrated in the quality of the questions they asked, and more began to exhibit an attitude of inquiry and curiosity.

A less observable but equally generative outcome was that many participants felt they had increased choice in their lives and began to view themselves as doers and deciders with more control over their lives. Linked to this was, for a few, an expressed perception of self as responsible for the responses received and given in the environment.

In addition, students addressed the importance to them of having sought and articulated a personal mission or a set of desired outcomes. A few pondered their own personal action-reflection cycle and its implications; some even came to recognize their dependence on time and on letting time pass while insights were gestating or while their introverted or extroverted selves were getting ready to activate their counterparts. Several also tapped into their emotional and/or spiritual selves in ways they had not previously experienced. Over the weeks, many participants gained recognition of the value of disclosure and of thinking aloud, verbalizing their thoughts and feelings, and having others assist them in probing these further. Coaching teams became support groups for some. And many set new goals based on new insights.
Finally, groundwork was laid for the adaptation and use of commonly thought-to-be therapeutic techniques in educational settings. In such a setting the focus is on the fully functioning, effective person and leader rather than on an individual's dysfunctions or pathologies. Thus students who expressed feeling at times as though they were in therapy found a larger frame in which to place such experiences and could begin to develop new attitudes around personal growth efforts which need not be aimed at "fixing" someone. A new perspective was created on what is possible in a university classroom setting, and several techniques were shown to be relatively effective both in generating the safety required and prompting students to probe their inner world and begin to act on what they found. More is said about each of the findings presented here in the Insights section which follows.

Identified Competencies

Based on these findings and the several insights and inferences suggested by students' experiences with exercises and their personal change efforts, several important competencies were identified. These are listed in Table 13. With regard to the last of these, the study suggests that one might want to explore ways to hasten the process of making the unconscious conscious and of bringing to light the tacit and the intuitive. Similarly, it would seem to be advantageous to be able to accelerate the time needed for extroverts to become comfortable with holding themselves back and introverts to become comfortable with putting themselves forth in dialogue with one another.
Table 13
Identified Competencies

- Recognizing opportunities for practicing new behaviors and attitudes.
- Taking advantage of those opportunities.
- Probing the depths of the self (self-discovery).
- Engaging fear and releasing it.
- Moving thought into action.
- Self-regulation of resistances.
- Integration.
- Focusing on self and the external world simultaneously.
- Engaging in self-disclosure.
- Facilitating other-disclosure.
- Making conscious the tacit and intuitive.
Insights

Several of the insights gained through the study evolve from the not-so-new finding that transformative growth is a function of readiness (Bowen, 1966; Kohlberg, 1965; Goldfried, 1990). It cannot be imposed or created from the outside, although its way can be prepared just as one prepares the ground for planting before expecting seeds to produce fruit. Thereafter, adequate amounts of rain, sunshine and nutrients provide the opportunity and nurturance the planted seed requires.

The question becomes one of preparation and discerning the means by which to effectively influence readiness as much as it is one of finding effective means of facilitating the learning and unlearning that is desired. It was suggested in the study that many of the same factors described by Robert Dilts (1990) as the brain's logical levels -- environment, behavior, capabilities, beliefs and values, identity, and spirituality or essence -- indeed impacted students' readiness for change and influenced the growth which occurred.

To begin, there was the influence of the environment and the perceptions and expectations of those present within it. In this case, the environment was a university classroom, and we found, as anticipated, that past experience with classroom settings and expectations of what graduate coursework would be like influenced student readiness to engage differently with one another and with a course so unlike others they have taken. Next, there were the specific activities and exercises in which students were asked to participate. Readiness to risk new behaviors and to probe their own subjective experience was again
influenced by the students' previous histories, together with the beliefs, values and capabilities they brought to the work. In addition, there seemed to be factors associated with each student's stage of development at the time and the degree to which each had formed a sense of identity and was open to challenges to that identity and to forging a new self through the potential learnings.

Finally, significant within all of the above were the thinking and feeling modes of the individual and his or her unique mental maps and self perceptions out of which arose the behaviors exhibited toward self and others. One means of discovering or uncovering the beliefs and values which drive behaviors is through dialogue; it was found here that in dialogue the potential existed to generate "aha" moments which resulted in deep and lasting personal change. Such dialogue may have been held with the self or with others. It may have been naturally occurring or have followed a contrived pattern. In each case, some common characteristics were evident. It was this set of characteristics which eventually led to the definition of "catalytic" dialogue which the researcher had sought.

**Relational Environments**

By the end of the ten weeks, the most cited course characteristics was the quality of relationship established in the classroom. Despite the initial surprise and sense of threat posed by the inward focus of the course, students concluded that a safe space had been generated. They remarked on the connectedness they began to feel with others present, on the sense of safety and trust that was built through experience and dialogue, on the impact of the vulnerability displayed by instructors, and about the impact of all of this on the
whole of their experience. Furthermore, the witnessing of overt efforts to tend to relationships, to establish and maintain rapport even while inviting differing opinions, and to gain awareness of the consequences of losing rapport may have been one of the primary "aha's" they experienced.

What helped make the whole class "learnful" was the fact that [as Walt pointed out] we had "lived" it -- not just "learned." It goes to show that life is really our greatest teacher--and in class it was the living together that we had to do that really sent home the messages. In the exercises that we had to engage one another in, the trust we had to build, the risks we had to take--these prompted the learning that took place. (David)

Such 'living' of the course together would not have been possible had the relationships not been built to hold the trust needed in order to take the risks the course invited.

Rapport.

Gregory Bateson's research into the ways in which dolphins learn (as cited by NLP Comprehensive trainers, 1990) teaches us something about the nature of rapport. Some years ago, while investigating the ways the Navy trainers worked with dolphins in California, Bateson observed the practice of rewarding the dolphins for creative new tricks learned and displayed during showtime. This was purportedly the only time they were so rewarded, but Bateson discovered that the trainer also, later in the evening, rewarded the dolphins for no apparent reason at all, at least one in no way connected with new learnings. When he asked about this, the master trainer responded, "Ahhh, the fish doled out in the show tanks are for the TASK. These fish are for the RELATIONSHIP."

For people, as for dolphins, learning and development, according to Robertson (1988), are accelerated when *relationship* is primary and threat is
minimized. He reminds us that threat throws us back into reactivity (recall MacLean's 1987 findings on the triune brain) rather than propelling us forward into proactivity or creativity. Threat is minimized when at least some degree of what Rogers (1980) called "unconditional positive regard" is established in the setting, that is, when people can feel both heard by and accepted by others present.

When we consider both the intentional and unintentional behaviors of those in the environment, rapport is typically found to be a key factor influencing those behaviors and the quality of the relationships. This should not come as a surprise to anyone. People simply become more ready to risk when they experience a sense of trust and personal safety. As rapport is repeatedly established and maintained over time, the relationships become ones characterized by trust. As rapport skills are learned or enhanced, including the capacity to discern states in others (even a pending loss of rapport), so too, it seems, can the capacity to be in rapport with oneself be enhanced. Improved sensory acuity and perceptual capacity tend to influence both one's readiness to embrace change and one's motivation to do so; improved senses and perceptions open windows on how the individual's own behaviors impact the responses he or she receives from others.

In the classroom, the explicit teaching of rapport skills and perceptual skills together with paying continued attention to relationship, including holding extended dialogue regarding safe space, helped to generate the relational environment of which students later spoke. In addition, over the term of the course, the modelling of ways to express disagreement and manage the energies of conflict while maintaining some degree of rapport became an important factor in gaining the commitment of students to invest in and pursue
their inner work. Nevertheless, generating trust relationships took time, and members of the class undoubtedly experienced multiple instances of not being heard or not feeling safe as efforts to alter the environment progressed.

**The Classroom.**

Two distinct aspects of environment came into play in the study. Both dealt with the classroom as a setting for growth and deep personal change. The first, as noted earlier, regarded the preconceptions students held about the type of work which constitutes graduate studies and the type of environment the university classroom provides. The second regarded the pedagogy of the course and the optimal environment for achieving intended learning outcomes. While each is addressed separately here, there remains a link between the two.

To begin, consider the university classroom setting.

Even in the research setting where students had chosen to participate in an experimental course and were already familiar with the primary instructor's style, student comments revealed that they continued to presuppose a classroom to be a place where they would be given information to take in and on which they would be evaluated; thus, in their eyes, even in this setting, failure and risk-taking would be punished, not rewarded. This introduced a dynamic of fear at the outset, whether conscious or unconscious, which prompted resistance and moved students from proactivity into reactivity, at least for a time.

No matter how hard [the professor] tries or anybody tries, you are still in a classroom setting... [I know] it's not about transferring a certain amount of knowledge or a certain content... but again it is still a classroom, and everybody has the mind-set: "Well, I must have to know all of this or experience all of this." Yet that is just a function of the environment.
... It takes awhile to build the kind of trust that [this professor] sets up through his courses to deal with the internal stuff. In a university environment I don't know if you could put that first because of all the stereotypical images we all carry around...It is almost as though I'd like to do [both courses] over again knowing what I know now. (Linda)

I just felt like some of the folks were very uncomfortable in this kind of setting. This is not the kind of class they expected and certainly did not expect to be this involved with the self and examination of the self. ...

When I came to the class, I had some idea of what to expect, because I had been in the first leadership class. I expected that I would be asked to explore my own style and reflect on my experiences as I grew. But I've been caught off guard by the depth of the exploration and have had difficulty with making this a personal experience. (Walt)

These statements both reveal the individuals' preconceptions and expectations and offer examples of several different forms of student reactivity, including avoidance, de-personalization and the rejection of content based on context. They also speak to the nature of learning as a very personal experience. More will be said about this in a subsequent section.

What is of particular interest at this point is that the environment of the classroom was at first contrasted by students with their work environment then later with a therapeutic environment. For some students, the classroom setting provided safety in its relative anonymity, inasmuch as at the end of ten weeks participants typically disperse and may never see each other again. While there is no such thing as "instant intimacy," it is indeed possible for some people to be (or to quickly become) very comfortable with honest self-disclosure among strangers and for some measure of real trust to be built in the environment. For others, the classroom was not at all safe, due to the number of people present and a lack of familiarity with many of them. Even with time the classroom may never be a place in which individuals desire to become known or to get to know others at deep levels.
For some, the work setting provided more safety in which to try new attitudes and behaviors because there, as one participant stated, "People know me and have a history with me that goes back [many] years." Thus, if she were to experiment and the outcomes were not what she desired, people would likely be willing to overlook the incident and rely on what they know to be her intentions. For others, however, the workplace was a very unsafe environment for experimentation. Often, students found it uncomfortable to even talk about what they were learning, much less to attempt to engage work peers in their efforts; this was often due to their being viewed as trying to change others or as believing they alone knew best how things should be done. Several students, in fact, reported that attempts at discussing readings, class activities, or even mentioning they were enrolled in a leadership course brought responses that prompted their decisions to not mention such things again.

Both in the classroom and at the work place, power and authority issues exist. The traditionally perceived authority of the teacher may in some cases serve to prompt a student to engage in something she or he has some resistance about doing, yet subsequently yield positive results. On the other hand such authority may prevent students from engaging in certain behaviors and thereby inhibit their learning. Raising difficult questions or voicing disagreement, for example, may be thwarted by fears of retribution. The same is true in the workplace, where authority issues tend to be even more pronounced. In both settings, people refrain from fully deploying themselves, from putting themselves into action, because of power differentials. Unless something is done to intervene in the authority relationship and create a more level or parallel playing field, this restraint persists. Safety, then, is found to be
individually determined according to one's sense of personal agency regardless of context.

The nature of the environment and behaviors within it affect an individual's capacity to act and to exert influence (their sense of agency) in the setting. So do individual's beliefs about and confidence in that capacity. These factors generate what the researcher calls "bounded agency." That is, people find themselves operating in a box, the boundaries of which may be externally or internally imposed or both. These boundaries are movable but only in so far as one's sense of personal agency has been developed and solidified. If so, this permits the individual to maintain a sense of self within the boundaries. Where there is a reduced sense of agency, there can be little self-efficacy and little hope of effecting change.

The Pedagogy

During certain of the exercises, several students remarked on the resemblance of what they were being asked to do with undergoing therapy. This response, perhaps, was to be expected, given the therapeutic origins of many of the NLP processes, although clear distinctions were made between pursuing "healthy" mental and emotional states and resolving pathologies. Nevertheless, the response raises a significant question regarding the comparison between therapeutic environments and learning environments for this kind of inner work. While the instructors did not set out to establish a therapeutic environment, in retrospect that is indeed what occurred; therefore, consideration of the qualities of the therapeutic environment juxtaposed with the desired learnings of the course prompts a description of the teaching as a type of therapeutic pedagogy.
According to Marvin Goldfried (1992), the primary place where personal change is forged today is in the therapist's office. If indeed that is the case, it is important to look at what that setting provides that is conducive to change and at the ways in which the therapeutic setting differs from the educational, institutional setting in which we were situated for developing leadership. In their review of descriptions of the change process, Goldfried and Padawer (1992) distilled five principles present in the therapeutic environment which make change efforts effective. If one embeds in that list Jeffrey A. Kottler's (1991) characteristics of effective therapy, which offer much greater specificity, the whole provides a fairly comprehensive description of the environment the instructors intended in designing the course. The combination is shown in Table 14.

Clients enter a therapeutic setting with the expectation (or at least the hope) that the experience will be helpful and, in fact, choose to enter into relationship with a specific therapy provider at potentially great personal risk. They don at least a temporary state of openness and willingness to receive feedback from this person in the interest of increasing personal awareness and bettering the quality of their lives. They anticipate that this provider will encourage change and offer corrective experience. In addition, it is reasonable to assume they expect that risk-taking will be rewarded as will developing one's voice to articulate one's own thoughts and feelings, moving toward rather than away from conflict, and acknowledging failure.

In this era of educational research and reform, similar elements have been shown to be present in the environment of effective classrooms, albeit with some differences. In a university classroom situation, clients are motivated to enroll by a wide range of factors; there may be little uniformity in the degree to
Table 14
Effective Therapeutic Environments

An effective therapeutic environment incorporates:

(1) The facilitation of expectations that psychotherapy will be helpful.

(2) The existence of an optimal therapeutic relationship, that is, one which

(a) encourages an open sharing of feelings and thoughts, allowing data, observations, perceptions, and experiences to flow into the brain.

(b) exhibits the therapist's willingness to admit mistakes and misjudgments.

(c) provides a degree of mutual comfort, mutual trust, spontaneity and reciprocal understanding, and an absence of defensiveness.

(d) offers sufficient support and goodwill to permit challenges and confrontation without jeopardizing the stability of the relationship.

(e) facilitates the completion of tasks designed to reach client goals.

(3) The offering of feedback for purposes of increasing the client's awareness, which

(a) includes linguistic coaching in order to correct distortions or exaggerations of reality and to clarify ambiguous referents.

(b) helps clients to express more completely and fully the exact nature of their internal experiences.

(4) The encouragement of corrective experiences through

(a) influencing perceptions and altering awarenesses, encouraging clients to explore the unknown, persuading clients to take risks.

(b) providing opportunities for practicing new ways of thinking and acting.

(5) The emphasis on continued reality testing.
which they want to engage with the content and processes of the course, even when they are aware that self-discovery is an aim. As a result, individual states of readiness, in motivational terms, are generally not the same. Also, we know that motive toward self-integration and courage for change are correlated with stages of human development and have some tie to chronological age (Kohlberg, 1973; Gilligan, 1982). In classrooms at this level, ages and stages vary widely, and this becomes another factor impacting course outcomes.

**Ethical Issues.**

The whole notion of linking the classroom to the therapeutic environment raises numerous ethical issues. In the therapy setting, the therapist, unlike the instructor or teacher in a classroom setting, has had extensive training in dealing with the unfamiliar terrain of the inner world and is purportedly prepared to handle the fallout that is part of this delving process. He or she is also familiar with the pace at which the process most effectively and appropriately proceeds. The therapy provider has been made aware of the dangers of pushing the process too fast for an individual and has been trained to distinguish between the resistances arising in people which need to be honored and those which need to be released to allow forward movement.

When defenses need to remain in place because the person does not yet have adequate ego strength to face and deal with the self-knowledge that is emerging and the facilitator pushes the process, real crisis can be precipitated. At worst, this can result in a psychotic break. Therefore, one must ask whether one who has not been trained and cannot easily be trained to lead others through the depths of the inner world or trained to handle the depths with facility and expertise ought to be establishing an environment and delivering a pedagogy in which personal crises are possible though unintended outcomes?
In the specific case of the study, the instructors had been variously trained not only as educators but as NLP practitioners and/or master practitioners. Thus they had familiarity with the NLP concepts and had experienced the exercises offered in the course as well as having conducted these exercises with others under the supervision of their own trainers. This training included developing skills to discern between the states and issues arising which can be readily dealt with by the practitioner and those which call for the services of a trained psychologist. They were also trained to recognize signals which warn the practitioner to raise the depth of the exploration.

While it is not recommended or intended that the untrained reader set about conducting all of the course exercises with his or her students, many can be conducted with very little risk and others can be reduced to dialogue about the attending conceptual frameworks. Exercises may also be performed at surface levels, thereby reducing both the risks involved and the perception of threat.

Since the territory of the inner world is not black-and-white and there is no one map that fits everyone, how does one discern? A quite different question, but one which is also important, asks how decisions are made concerning what is appropriate material to offer. What becomes a true ethical issue? Is the criteria to be the exercise itself or the depth to which it is taken? Journaling, for instance, is an exercise assigned with little concern to elementary school students in today's classrooms, yet the Ira Progoff Intensive Journal Workshop is seen as belonging to the realm of therapeutic endeavor. So where is the line to be drawn? For this course, what label might be given the perceptual positions exercise or criteria sorting? When do outcome specification and
mission statements move from simply being focus tools to becoming instruments which probe deeply into one's identity?

Finally, in any setting in which issues of personal identity and meaning or purpose in life are being elicited, there is the potential for transference and counter-transference between the client and the therapist or the student and the facilitator. In the therapy setting, the provider is trained to recognize the level and quality of personal relationship that is developing and to pay attention to those dynamics and of the dangers that attend them. While transference in a relationship can be problematic, it can also be facilitative of change for both persons. When it is not tended to, is managed inappropriately, or is simply ignored out of naivete, problems can result for one or both parties.

Some of these issues, to one degree or another, are already present in the teaching/learning process of an ordinary classroom environment, but more are involved when one attempts to orient the classroom environment and pedagogy toward what has been traditionally the domain of the therapeutic setting. The aforementioned offer at least a few examples of the judgments required regarding whether to move the person deeper into his or her own issues of identity, purpose, meaning, and process or to bring him/her "up" to looking more at wholes and synthesis as opposed to analysis.

**Education as Drawing Out**

In therapy, people have intentionally become willing to make changes and to take steps into the unknown both intellectually and emotionally. In graduate education, the risks have often been confined to the intellectual plane. Therapy attempts to draw out what is within the person waiting to be confirmed and born.
Education, too, attempts to draw out what is within the person but often focuses almost exclusively on thinking with little attention given to being and feeling.

Traditionally, students do not get to choose either the learning provider or the learning/teaching style of that individual as they might in a therapeutic relationship. Also most students do not expect education to be presented in the sense of edu-care, meaning to draw out. They come to a classroom situation expecting to be acted upon, not drawn out, and to have things (mostly information) put into themselves.

Readings and research on learning organizations and the nature of leadership indicate that this installation of information and an emphasis on content knowledge is what we are now moving beyond in preferring, rather, to draw out and to co-create knowledge and meaning. Paradoxically, this particular kind of metanoia, the kind inferred by the original Greek meaning of turning away or turning aside (from traditional or habituated views) may be part of what is "new" relative to this research endeavor's findings. In addition, the relative success of efforts to establish a safe learning environment which manifests many of the characteristics of an effective (optimal) therapeutic environment, has significance for course design in the future. This applies particularly to designs which incorporate goals of encouraging students to become increasingly effective, fully-functioning human beings.

**Dialogue**

A focal point of the study has been the concept of insight induction. The data indicate that students' insights emerged in a variety of contexts, most of which may be classified as dialogical or at least to have a dialogical component. In interviews, students cited their own internal conversations at
times such as traveling to and from class as contexts for significant learning and the emergence of insights. Among class-related activities, journaling produced a dialogue with self. Coaching and even guiding an explorer through a prescribed exercise produced both internal and external dialogue. Storying, too, fostered dialogue and served to highlight the roles of listening and disclosure in evoking insight and creating meaning. Indeed, students often found themselves not only touched but probed and challenged through the stories and sharings of others, as well as moved in some way by their own self-disclosures.

It's funny how simply setting aside time to focus on these things and making ourselves really listen to other people (and get them to listen to themselves) can really make a difference. It seems that one aspect of this could transfer to other areas of our lives and that is to listen to what people say and to facilitate their arriving at their own conclusions about what to do.... It is worth a lot to have people see their own decisions and the factors which influence them. (Carrie)

There seem to be actually three persons in [these conversations]. The speaker and listener and the entity that is created through the dialogue of each interacting with the other.... The new idea, the new way of framing ideas and concepts that changes a person's actions in the everyday world ... Through the sharing of others, I became or evolved at that present time into a more comfortable place... (Walt)

Yet the notion of sharing, of responding to questions regarding one's own thoughts or feelings, goals or beliefs, of telling a story of one's own experience prompted questions for several students regarding the propriety and safety of disclosing self to others. Will it matter to them? Is it a waste of their time? Do they have the right to know? What will they think of me? What will be the consequences? How do I discern what to disclose and what to keep private?

What components of the mind establish the boundaries by which we secure privacy in the face of those who may not have the right to know,
but stand to help if such privacy is shared? At what point is sharing a function of wanting to share and/or a function of needing to share?... I can tell you (reflecting on the behavior of opening up and sharing in class) that this is a huge change for me, since I have normally kept all these emotions hidden from view. In this respect, these leadership courses have been a wonderful help. (Wait)

In Bohm's (1990) definition, dialogue is interaction through which meaning flows. This includes dialogue with oneself, as long as the "spirit of dialogue" is present. When meaning involved new insights and the interaction supported the kind of self-discovery which led to lasting, generative change, then the dialogue was deemed by the researcher to be "catalytic."

**Catalytic Dialogue.**

When students experienced episodes of significant insight, something was said, asked, conveyed, or otherwise revealed to them which sparked a new knowingness and triggered an energy shift resulting in some new form of thought, feeling or behavior. The catalyst itself -- the words, the actions -- remained, in general, unaffected. The same story, inquiry, or modelling may have had quite different effects on different people. Nevertheless, for a specific person, it brought new meaning and reframed previous understandings.

What was found here was that dialogue which is catalytic was quite contextual and generally related to or called up a belief about self or self relating to others. It involved seeing self from outside of self in a new way -- from a different vantage point or with new eyes; perhaps it involved recognizing one's self in another person or in another's story. It required disclosure, including disclosure of self to self, and often raised the issue of accepting the self that was newly revealed. It engaged both an intellectual and an emotional response, and it resulted in action. Overall, episodes of catalytic dialogue engaged individuals in transformative processes and in a reconstruction of their
reality. At minimum, subjective experience was altered and in some cases, the dialogue impacted intersubjective experience as well.

According to Martin Buber (1923) the proper context for true dialogue is one where the participants are not "its" but "I's" and "Thou's" and where there can be a meeting that takes place "in the between." If this is the context required for catalytic dialogue through which participants can become known and valued for who they are then in the process, the participants might well discover for themselves, maybe for the first time, who they really are -- at their core. To engage fully with the kind of self-disclosure needed, however, often requires sensitive probing on the part of all participants. Without self-disclosure the opportunity for personal epiphanies may be lost. As Maurice Friedman (1992) would say, through dialogue we have the potential to call one another forth. In the course, the instructors attempted to find appropriate and effective ways to do just that. Still, to be called forth, people must be willing to answer the call. As one of the instructors put it, "Most people don't realize that what's holding us back is not the other people [in the setting] but our inner stuff our fears, inner resistances to things, cautiousness and avoidance of risk-taking."

**Emotion**

Among the evidence found to be helpful in discerning episodes of catalytic dialogue was its capacity to stir people at deep emotional levels, whether in dialogue with self or with others.

I have recently discovered a vast store of emotion and feeling within my soul. A key part of my mission is to accept my emotional state, to FEEL how life affects me, and to refuse to allow anything to get in the way of allowing me to be me.... [I seek] a truly real and vibrant life, full of spiritual depth and richness. And especially full of love and growing oneness with my life mate. (Paul)
I was listening to some music the other day, and it was music from my high school years, and I just started crying. I think it was because of the overwhelmingness of where I am going, where I have been and the big picture and all, connected with the fact that I have been having this big inquiry (about my history). How have I changed, what have I lost, what have I gained? [I feel] I'm about to reveal deep, dark parts of me. (Tim)

These students' experiences and reflections mirror what Greenberg and Rhodes (1992) express about the place of emotions in the change process. In understanding human change, they say, the first assumption is that process is primary and one of the most effective means toward true transformative, generative change is allowing oneself to feel, to truly and deeply experience one's feelings about whatever bubbles up from the unconscious.

In negotiating true and lasting change, tolerance of the fear of change and the experience of grieving one's losses is deemed to be critical. We are, however, socialized to avoid our primary emotions. Rather than fearing the feeling or its expression, a person can reframe the experience instead by remembering that "it is me who chooses to feel this new emotion which represents the unknown to me." More formally put, "The experience of self-continuity does not come from the enduring content of experience, but rather from the continued sense of agency in the organizing process" (Greenberg and Rhodes, 1990, p. 48).

On the other side of the necessity to feel our feelings is the paradox of the necessity to also honor our resistances to change as they surface. Three different students mentioned that they had stayed away from class (two from the third session, one from the fourth) because the experience might be overwhelming for them. One's later journal entry seemed to succinctly summarize the feelings of the three.
... I was working on my journal and was so upset by what I discovered that I didn't want to come to class because I felt I couldn't sit through class and not be really emotional ... I'm just letting myself be upset for awhile and live with the feelings ... it feels like a lot of work, more than people would realize. (Joyce)

Such experiences point out the role and necessity of chaos and confusion in the process of growth and transformation and help us recognize that what is required is not just a matter of putting up with the disequilibrium but of honoring it by giving it a place in our process.

There is evidenced in these students' experiences a validation and confirmation of the importance of process. Process is seen as *staying with* and being open to the ongoingness of new input and new insights which each time bring about a re-shuffling of old patterns, beliefs, behaviors, attitudes and values and require re-integration. Disequilibrium's place in transformative, generative change appears to be inevitable.

He told me to celebrate confusion! When I'm confused, that means my normal way of dealing with life isn't working in the present situation. Confusion gives me the opportunity to develop new resources. I'll bet anything that this very lesson was presented in [class] but I missed it and now I'm ready for it. What a great new thing for me to think about! (Barbara)

Similarly, there is the necessity of not knowing, for a time, the meaning of recently received input. There seems to be a gestation period required for things to spring forth or blossom. The process demands patience, time, and some maturity if true "aha" experiences are to be had.
Secondary Gains

One of the surprises students experienced was the importance of vicarious learnings gleaned unexpectedly from other people's processes as a result of listening, being present to others, and observing their process. In some cases, students learned to take advantage of this by intentionally preparing themselves to tag along on someone else's exploration.

Another discovery regarded the serendipitous nature of learning. What students expected to be "learnful" sometimes was not or was disappointing in some respect. Other times what they did not expect to be helpful or new or what they thought was peripheral to their own needs, upon reflection, sometimes turned out to have major meaning for them. Thus in this study significant learning was found to have at times taken place serendipitously.

We cannot always know or plan or determine ahead what the real learning will be. We learn and grow despite our resistances, our teachers, or our environment. We cannot avoid the growth process by not showing up. But by attending to and regulating our resistances -- voicing them, acknowledging them, owning them, and respecting them as real and significant -- and by treating all people as our teachers, we can position ourselves to receive the significant feedback of our interactions as well as to attend to creating safe learning environments. We can manage our growth and direct it in ways which support our desired outcomes and the way of being we wish to experience in our world.
Conclusions

Initially, the study's findings seem simply to confirm what others have found about the change process: the need to allow for and to experience feelings as well as to honor resistances; the importance of process and staying with the process, including the attending emotions; the inevitability of a gestation period for insight and meaning to blossom; the significance of surprise and serendipity; and, perhaps most important, the need for patience born from an understanding and acceptance of the process having its own pace and momentum. Many of the students who reported feeling the chaos or the instability of change tended also to be those who reported episodes of "big insights" and action taken in light of those insights. The strong desire of several to achieve specified outcomes and/or to more effectively fulfill their mission seemed to serve as a key motivator to open them to personal change and to support persistence in their efforts. These occurrences foster the notion that real change is often born out of chaos or at least states of disequilibrium and that strong attraction to another state serves as another of its birthplaces.

Also affirmed in the study is the concept of drawing out what is already within the person. This practice recalls the NLP presupposition that we already have the resources we need, if we but learn to access them. Alongside drawing out, however, the need arose to also consider "letting" out and the implications of self-regulation, self-control, choice-making and self-responsibility. Significant to all of this, too, was the sense of agency in one's life and the concept of bounded agency. What we do in classrooms, in work settings, and in other
contexts often places conscious or unconscious boundaries around the actions of others. We also erect boundaries for ourselves out of our fears. In both cases it would seem that the implications for personal agency have further implications for effecting change.

What this research project specifically provides that has not been researched before is a felt sense of what it might be like were deep personal exploration really structured into leadership development programs by providing tools and techniques in the form of repeatable exercises such as those offered by the NLP components of this course. These exercises can indeed assist students in their inner journey toward self-differentiation -- the solid sense of personal autonomy simultaneous with connectedness to others which, according to Murray Bowen (1985), is the crux of true leadership.

Throughout the course, NLP principles and processes were applied in a classroom setting, giving students models they could both try on for themselves in the daily lab of life and practice in class with some sense of safety. Out of this process, growth occurred which seems to have had effects that lasted, at least into the next year. Specifically, students identified NLP’s rapport building, communication and language skills along with the reframing of internal parts and exercises like the circle of excellence, mentors and sages, and outcome specification as tools they continued to use in daily life and work. Some students also cited journaling and relaxation exercises or meditations as practices they have retained.

The course’s emphasis on the development of a healthy inner life demonstrated the potential for graduate education to include this type of pedagogy and curriculum in its offerings. Also demonstrated was the ability to create a learning environment comparable to the therapeutic environment in
which it is claimed that personal growth is best achieved, although there are, as noted earlier, ethical considerations in such an endeavor.

Despite the real and specific limitations the classroom setting, course duration, and diversities of participants exert on the delivery of a course such as this one and on the depth of personal growth and development that can be reached, the evidence collected and the insights gained through the study support the possibility and potential:

1. For participants to step fully into their own deeper process and experience significant movement toward self-differentiation.

2. For participants to tap into deep, core places within themselves and build community in the process.

3. For transformative change to take place and, perhaps, even be accelerated, within a classroom setting.

Regarding the role of dialogue, it was found that catalytic dialogue, as defined herein, has the potential to serve as an agent for facilitating just such experiences. This form of dialogue tends to access emotional depths; from learning to manage these depths well, participants tend to strengthen and solidify their sense of personal agency. In addition, the experiences of the study suggest that (a) full presence -- the simple state of being with another in his or her process -- itself affects outcomes and (b) safety increases with an increased sense of personal agency and the realization that one chooses one's behaviors and responses.

Lastly, the final reflections of several students in the course enhance our understandings of its impact.
I come away from this class with both an enhanced sense of who I am and who I would like to be and am also armed with tools to keep me going on my journey in the right direction. (Carrie)

The class provided several very interesting tools, the kind of tools that give you a series of questions to answer and take you down a path and get you thinking in a certain way, (cf. the outcome specification work) ... I'm involved in a pretty grand inquiry about my life and about issues and about who I want to be and polling myself and directing myself. This class in a lot of ways deepened that inquiry. In some senses it muddled some of the issues. It brought me further, but it brought me to new problems that I realized. It was progress but in reality, it's like, if I'm an old piece of furniture and I'm preparing this piece of furniture by stripping off one layer of paint, I've made some progress. But in stripping I realize there are three more layers of paint than I thought. A lot of that has happened for me. (Tim)

My friends and family are really my witnesses throughout the journey and my knowledge/knowing of success will be very personal. In fact, I would think that trying to prove it may be counter to the whole philosophy. (Joyce)
Recommendations and Implications

Modification of the Course Design

Recommendations from course participants and the evaluation of the co-instructors together with the researcher’s own experience of the course suggest that future offerings would benefit from modifying the course design and implementation in the following ways:

1. Provide students with a map of the course at the outset, with the proviso that the instructors intend session plans to be flexible; insure time for student debriefing of each class session and time to feed-forward to the next session; modify plans, as appropriate.

2. Consistently alert students to the intended outcomes and learnings being targeted in the presentations and exercises (e.g., make this part of the written agenda in addition to offering them verbally).

3. Pay attention, as instructors, to the use of vocabulary as having the potential to create power imbalances; provide definitions for technical terms and words common to the area of study; co-create the labels given to concepts, processes or other phenomenon, when such a label is found to be desirable.
4 Provide more structure for class trio work where that was perceived to be lacking and allot time to assure that students understand the directions for exercises; include more demonstrations, as requested. (Note here that part of the struggle students experienced was allowed to go on in light of their being challenged, in some instances, to be self-directive and self-organizing and to themselves impose the degree of structure desired by the group.)

5 Engage students in deriving personal and class outcomes earlier in the course; periodically revisit these and revise them, documenting changes and retaining copies of each draft.

6 Move the logical levels exercise to a later session, perhaps to the third week of class, due to the depth of the exercise and the perceived threat it poses for students.

7 Rework or replace exercises which were deemed to be of little or lesser value (e.g., mind reading, flexibility, and others).

8 Place greater emphasis on skill development in coaching, observing and providing feedback:
   a) clarify the distinctions between guiding an explorer through an exercise and coaching an individual through a planning or debriefing dialogue;
b) describe in greater detail the role of the observer or meta-person and explicitly clarify the functions to be performed, specific to the exercise (e.g., what to look/listen for, provide feedback on, etc.);
c) expand the work with giving and receiving feedback to include more demonstrations and more practice with specific forms of feedback and discerning the type of feedback appropriate to the situation;
d) have students first serve in the roles of guide, coach and observer or meta-person in class exercises monitored by the instructors and debriefed by the group.

9 Strengthen the learning potential of the journal by requiring that one of the student's weekly entries follow the guidelines provided and by reinstating student-instructor conferences for the purpose of discussing the journal and further facilitating progress on achieving personal outcomes and growth.

10 Begin earlier to address criteria for growth and evidence of progress and do so in a more focused way (e.g., spend more time as a class on this topic, returning to it periodically to add to the list of criteria and acceptable forms of evidence).

11 Strengthen assessment by insuring that students
a) collect corroborating evidence for what they deem to be progress toward achieving their desired outcomes (e.g.,
explicitly describe what might comprise a student's portfolio at the end of the course;
b) solicit peer feedback (in writing or as transcribed from a taped dialogue);
c) follow a format for self-evaluation, as determined by the instructors and class members together, and allow for individual preferences and choice in the formats offered;
d) determine together the criteria for grading in the course and the instructor and student portions of the grade.

12 Enhance the role and value of the peer resource teams by requiring (rather than merely suggesting) that team members

a) enter into a learning contract with one another regarding their individual desired outcomes;
b) play a role in the assessment of progress on those outcomes;
c) video-tape a coaching session; view it individually or collectively; and describe, in writing, their performance in each role, including areas of strength and strategies for improving;
d) keep records of their sessions with some reflective writing on each unless addressed as a journal entry.

While other refinements of the course might certainly be made, it is recommended that its emphasis on experiential learning and the establishment of a safe learning environment be retained.
Implications for Leadership Development in the Future

Based on the findings of this study and the research that supports it, it is recommended that at least some portion of courses, workshops and trainings in leadership be devoted to self-leadership and self-development. Participants should be introduced to some of the processes used in this course, such as guided journaling, the writing of mission statements, outcome elicitation and specification, and coaching. It is further recommended that students be taught specific techniques and methods of building rapport and of helping persons become more aware of the modes by which they perceive reality (i.e., the primary representational systems: visual, auditory, and kinesthetic). Covey's concepts of "emotional bank account" and balancing production with production capability are excellent introductions to a later focus on the place of emotions and, eventually, deep emotions, in the transformative change process.

Course presentation and discussion topics and exercises may all be tailored to the needs and levels of readiness of the participants, while those which are particularly germane to exploring the depths of the leader's inner world should be assigned to more advanced levels of training. What would probably be most useful would be to gradually move participants through a sequence of experiential exercises in which process is given equal importance with content. In this way awareness may be raised as to the value to the learning and growth process that interaction with others, even conflictual interaction, has. An effective sequence might be built by proportioning the emphasis placed on the internal and external world (the inner and outer realities) in a way that initially focuses most heavily on the external, then places nearly equal weight on each, and finally probes the depths of internal subjective
experience. This sequence avoids exploring the inner world of the learner too deeply too early.

Exercises which distinguish between advocacy and inquiry are also recommended, together with practicing and developing better understandings of the various forms of feedback one person might give another. So, too, are processes which surface core level assumptions (beliefs) and values so that participants can become more aware of the ways in which these filter their perceptions of reality.

Instructors are cautioned to pay particular attention to the qualities of the learning environment, especially if they intend to help students explore their inner world. It is of utmost significance that trust and a sense of safety be established if students are to take the risks required for deep personal change. In this regard, the self-differentiation of the leader/instructor becomes a crucial factor, as indicated by the importance given to modeling by the research participants. This refers not just to modeling a willingness to take risks and even fail in the presence of students or clients. More particularly, it refers to modeling the vulnerability of facing and owning one’s own “not-yet-ness” and visible inadequacies and the vulnerability of exploring right along with or even ahead of the class one’s own inner world. It appears that it is this vulnerability and willingness to self-disclose that best offers the invitation and gives the permission for others to do the same.

In a similar vein, the instructor needs to feel competent enough in managing disagreement and conflict to actually invite it into the class dialogue. Also important for the instructor is modeling the skill and capacity for effective communication, both verbal and nonverbal and including inquiry, coaching, and dialogic skills, as well as skill in giving and receiving feedback.
The research presented here further indicates the necessity on the part of future leadership development designers to seek a balance between and among creating "safe space" by reducing threat where possible, acknowledging and honoring resistances, and challenging students to manage those resistances in ways which do not prevent them from taking risks for which they are ready. This presumes a willingness on the part of the instructor to endure some level of chaos and disequilibrium and the reactions they elicit during the gestation period. The gestation period stretches from learners' wanting new beliefs and behaviors and becoming aware of their choice about this to the integration into the person's daily life of those operative action plans and strategies.

Given the place of emotions in the generative change process, there are implications for instructors/facilitators who increase their involvement in understanding and finding ways to help learners access their deep emotions. Instructors/facilitators must offer means (e.g., practicing reframing) through which students can perceive their emotions to be useful and in the service of their desired outcomes. The popular description of emotion as energy-in-motion (E-motion) speaks to transforming the energy of the feeling self to activate the growth desired -- to channel it in positive, supportive directions.

The clear implications for management in any organization, as noted earlier, are that managers would do well to initiate dialogue regarding the resistances people feel about changes which are taking (or are about to take) place in their work setting, including those resistances felt by managers themselves. More broadly, this becomes its own modeling of the art of self-disclosure and of continuous self-exploration. These are qualities by which the manager is able to demonstrate the kind of real authority and self-
empowerment that elicits a response in kind from followers. Here, too, 
journaling is recommended, since the importance of journaling cannot be 
overstated as a tool for putting -- and keeping -- leaders in touch with 
themselves as well as others.

**Modifications in Research Design and Methodology**

Were this course to be offered again with the design modifications listed 
previously, many of the limitations of this study would already have been 
addressed. This includes the need to implement better methods of 
documenting change efforts and progress. This necessity links to holding 
students more accountable for keeping records, seeking evidence, and, in 
general, better monitoring and assessing their own growth. Documentation of 
peer feedback and/or observations outside the classroom (e.g., at work, at 
home, in the community) is needed for better triangulation of the data, and 
increasingly refined criteria need to be established for evidence gleaned from 
video and audio tapes in the classroom.

Students could and should have been asked at the outset to articulate their 
own definition of leadership and to cite the most important qualities or 
competencies for a leader to possess. These questions could then be asked 
again at the end of the course and the two documents compared. Other specific 
questions that might have been asked include ones dealing with beliefs; a 
questionnaire could be developed based on materials like the NLP 
presuppositions or Covey habits which would be completed at the beginning 
and end of the course. In addition, students might have been asked to tape 
record their trio work and to make that data available. In addition a mid-term
debriefing might also be held with the class. In all cases, more precautions should be taken to prevent mechanical difficulties which impair data collection.

Recommendations for Future Research

As noted in Chapter 1, the investigation of the impact of training or coursework on leadership begs a longitudinal study of the participants and the manifestations of their learnings over time. What changes in themselves and ultimately in their working relationships and outcomes are attributable, at least in part, to the coursework and/or other interventions in which they engaged? What additional growth and learning experiences did they seek? And so on.

On a more limited scale, a set of case studies which follow the individual between class and work through the duration of the course and continue to explore the person's patterns of thought and behavior for a year or more might best serve to create new knowledge in this area. At the same time, there is also value in researching the design, delivery, and impact of leadership courses in the short term. Of particular interest might be research conducted on a year-long course or sequence of courses. Nevertheless, regardless of the setting of future research, the topics which emerge from this study remain relatively the same. Most of them derive from the questions posed in previous sections.

To summarize, it is recommended that further research be conducted on:

- Evidence of integration of learning and personal change.
- Patterns of reflection and action within intentional change efforts or growth plans.
- Journaling, mental editing and mental rehearsal as forms of corrective experience.
- Self-regulation of resistances to change.
- Acceleration of growth processes.
- Self-management of growth processes.
- Patterns of dialogue which prompt insights.
- Application of insights evoked through course interventions.
APPENDIX A

MEMOS AND INTERVIEW GUIDES
MEMO TO CASE STUDY RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

Over the next ten weeks, I will need approximately eight hours of your time in order to collect the data I need to carry out the design of my dissertation research. We may, of course, spend more time together individually, at your discretion, and it may indeed be that you, individually or collectively, will have some creative ideas of your own that will improve and enhance my methodology, but my promise to you remains that I will ask no more than the eight hour commitment I am requesting here. At present, my design calls for the time to be allocated as described below. That is, I will need

1. A one hour interview with you sometime in the next week to consider questions regarding your personal context. These will focus on the topics
   • where you are in your life right now
   • your current concerns and issues
   • your interest in and motivation for the course
   • your learning goals
   • the changes you desire

2. A two hour focus group session to reflect on learnings, interventions, and experiences of being in the classroom context. This session would be convened approximately half-way through the course at a mutually agreed upon day, time and location and include consideration of questions such as
   • what were your own thoughts and feelings as you participated in the identified class activity or group exercise?
   • how did you contribute to your group’s learning during that time? etc.

3. One-quarter hour per week (under three hours total) to complete a structured class session debriefing memo. Here I ask that, within 24 hours of the class, you reflect on your experience of that session and respond to four questions. A single paragraph response is sufficient, although you may write more if you like. In either case, please be specific.

4. A two hour group session comprised of an action-oriented experience and debriefing. This session is intended to provide an opportunity for in-the- moment reflection during the course of engaging in group action. Thus it will be conducted in a "stop-action" or "time-out" fashion, with progress in the exercise suspended at intervals to consider your current thoughts, feelings, expectations, concerns, etc. and give time to debrief potential learnings.

In addition, I seek your permission to access and use data collected in class (written responses, audio and video records of activities, etc.) and that from out-of-class work (your journals, voluntary coaching sessions, etc.) for the purposes of my research.

Lastly, beyond these ten weeks, I invite you to review and respond to my writings and interpretations of the data at whatever point(s) in time they become ready and available during the course of my subsequent analysis. I will contact you then to ascertain your interest in participating in such a member check.

Many thanks to you, in advance, for your willingness and commitment to assist me in my research. I look forward to it being a fun and very collaborative effort.
Class Debriefing Memo
Session # ___
Date __________

1. What specific ideas, insights, learnings, etc., occurred for you or particularly caught your attention during the class? When did these occur?

2. What are your current thoughts and feelings about these or other experiences?

3. How do tonight's experiences relate to your personal learning and learning goals?

4. How do tonight's experiences/learnings relate to your other work and life experiences? (i.e., how could these play out or be applied to other areas in your life?)
INTERVIEW GUIDES

CONTEXT INTERVIEW

• Where are you in your life? - How do you describe that?
• What are your current issues and concerns?
  What does that (do they) mean for you?
• What changes do you want?
• What are your learning goals?
• As you considered this particular course, what attracted you to it?
• How would you describe how you learn and/or set about changing?

EXIT INTERVIEW

• What stands out in your mind about your experience with the course?
  What were the highlights for you?
• Did you have any specific insights about yourself or others that were particularly helpful or important?
• What kind of progress did you make toward your goals?
  Did you achieve your learning or leadership goals?
• How did the experience mesh with your own style of learning?
  Was there a fit? Did you have to stretch places? etc.
• Did you find yourself "letting go" of particular behaviors, feelings (responses to things), habits of mind, etc? Did anything "drop away"?
• Did you observe yourself performing any spontaneous behaviors?
  Did you surprise yourself in any way?
• Did you talk about the course and the experience with others?
  If so, with whom?
• How did you apply what you were learning and experiencing in the course?
• What did not work for you? What might you suggest to us as instructors?
• Would you call this a "leadership" course?
FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEW (One Year Later)

1. Are you USING any of the course's learnings in your current situation, whether personal life, job, etc.?

2. What, overall, was your single greatest learning from the course?

3. What would you add now if the course were taught again? How would you do it differently?

4. Where would you say, that is in what format or way, did most of your significant learning place (i.e., in small-group discussions, in large-group interaction, in 1-on-1 encounters, from personal internal dialogue, from the content of the reading material, etc.)?
APPENDIX B

SAMPLE CLASS HANDOUTS
JOURNEYS TO LEADERFULNESS

THE COMMON JOURNEY

THE TEAM JOURNEY

THE UNIQUE PERSONAL JOURNEY

EXISTING STATE

DESIRED STATE
The Leadership Journal - Guiding Questions

Develop Journal entries regarding your experience in a particular setting (e.g., a class activity or discussion group, a work-related experience, etc.) as assigned. For each entry, respond to and reflect on the following:


2. What did you do, both passively and actively, during that time? (listen, talk, think, lead, etc.)

3. How did you feel at various times during the episode? (some feeling words might come to mind such as--joyous, excited, bored, assertive, insecure, adequate, spineless, stubborn, panicky, cooperative, deferential, etc.)

4. How do you feel/think others were feeling during that time?

5. Looking back to the event/interaction and taking a more detached view, what produced the results you achieved? How did you personally impact the group and it you?

6. Still taking a detached view, but now looking ahead to a similar situation, what would you do differently to produce both a better process and result for yourself, other group members, and the group as a whole?

7. If you are in another group context (3 or more people with some common goal) this coming week, practice a new or modified approach and see what happens (*apparent failure* is valued even more highly than *apparent success* by strategic managers). Make a new entry comparing your experiences for similarities & differences in task; your experience, actions, feelings; other's acts; processes and outcomes, and so forth.
Murphy's Presuppositions

You've heard of Murphy's Law? Murphy's Law is this: "If anything can go wrong, it will." I recently learned that Murphy's bad luck stems from his model of the world which includes the following presuppositions:

The map is the territory.
We all have the same map of the world, and it is the correct one.
Our map reflects the world completely and accurately.

Mind and body are completely separate systems, not at all connected.
Mind and body do not affect each other.

The meaning of the communication is what the sender intends.
The response of the receiver is irrelevant.

Resistance is a comment about the receiver.

If what you're doing isn't working, keep at it and try harder.

People make bad choices with the information they have.
They could make better choices, but they don't try.

The element with the most rigidity will be the most controlling element in the system.

Behind every behavior is an evil, selfish intention.

There is always failure.
If something doesn't work, give up.

If one person can learn to do something, that doesn't mean you can.

People work terribly. Everyone needs to be fixed.

Lots of behaviors have absolutely no useful context.

No choice is better than having to make a choice.

People don't have enough resources. They need to get more from others.

Anything can be accomplished if the task is taken in big enough chunks.

Adapted from NLP Connection July-September, 1990
NLP Presuppositions

NLP was founded on a set of "presuppositions," or useful assumptions about people and the world. We don't necessarily believe that all of these are "true" in every instance, but acting as if they were true is very useful.

The map is not the territory.
We all have different maps of the world. No map reflects the world completely and accurately.

Mind and body are part of the same cybernetic system.
Mind and body affect each other.

The meaning of the communication is the response it elicits.

Resistance is a comment about the communicator.
If what you're doing isn't working, do anything else.

People make the best possible choices with the information they have.

The element with the most flexibility will be the most controlling element in a system.

Behind every behavior is a positive intention.
There is no failure, only feedback.
If something doesn't work, use it to try something else.

If one person can learn to do something, anyone else can.

People work perfectly. No one is broken.

Every behavior is useful in some context.

Choice is better than no choice.

People have within them all the resources they need.

Anything can be accomplished if the task is taken in small enough chunks.

Adapted from NLP Connection
July-September, 1990
PLAYER'S ROLES FOR GUIDED JOURNEYS

(Handout - Session 1)

1. EXPLORER: The role of the explorer is to enjoy the journey, relax...and take the trip.

2. GUIDE: Guides are accompanying the explorer on the journey to assist the explorer in finding milestones, benchmarks; the guide is the script prompter, giving cues to the player/journeymen.

3. GUIDE'S COACH: (META) The guide's coach interacts (for these particular journeys) only with the guide, assisting the guide in recalling the process steps, process language, and the mileposts already identified by the journeymen.

Hints: Each map and each journey is unique to the traveler. Consider what paths and new treasures might be discovered if the uniqueness of the map is allowed to unfold from each person's un/conscious self(ves). The script(s) of the journey are played out as each of you become inter/actor(s) in the role(s) you take on and as the script is shared with others at journey’s end.
Logical Level Alignment Worksheet

Environment

- describe the environment [context]

Behaviors

- describe actions & behaviors

Capabilities

- repeat actions, behaviors
- What capabilities do I have/need to perform those actions in (context)?

Values

- repeat capabilities to accomplish those leadership activities (repeat actions, behaviors)
- What motivates me to use (capabilities) to (action, behavior) in (context)?
- What values are important to me when I am acting as a leader?

Beliefs

- What beliefs do I have or need to guide me?

Identity

- (with metaphor, anchor shoulder)
- What word/phrase/metaphor represents the kind of leader I am? represents my perceptions of myself in relation to my beliefs, values, capabilities, ...?

Spiritual

- What is the vision I am pursuing or representing as a leader?
- What is larger than myself that I represent in my identity (repeat identity)?
Logical Level Alignment Worksheet

Guide invites explorer to: Experience what it feels like, looks like; what you hear, smell, taste. Take as long as you like to experience this state, fully and completely, taking it all into your physiology - your inner experience - just as you want it. And when you are ready,

- Take this state, this physiology and inner experience of your vision, and step forward into the identity space so you experience both at the same time. Please share what you now experience.

- Take your experience of both your vision and your identity, and bring them into your belief space. Notice how it enhances your initial experience of it. Share what you notice.

- Bring your vision, identity and beliefs into your value space. Notice. Share your experience.

- Bring your vision, identity, beliefs and values into your capability space. Experience how they strengthen, change or enrich the capabilities you experience within yourself.

- Bring your vision, identity, beliefs, values and capabilities into your behavior space. Notice how even the most insignificant seeming behaviors are reflections of all of the higher levels within you.

- Bring all levels of yourself into the environment space and experience how it is transformed and enriched.

Invite explorer to step out of the environment space (remove shoulder anchor), take whatever time he or she needs, open eyes, and return to the here and now.
Perceptual Positions

Positions of Self (first), Other (second), Observer (third)

Start from a position of **SELF:**
Call up the image of your scene and, if you have not already, enter it, making certain you are associated into the scene, present in the interaction, seeing only the other person and whatever aspects of the setting are visible from that position.
- Notice how you see the other person. Notice the sounds you hear.
- Notice the feelings you are experiencing.

Move to being the **RESOURCEFUL OBSERVER:**
Now step back and out of the picture, continuing to move (it) away until you also see yourself in the scene.
Notice where the two people are with respect to your position now.
Let your mind move and adjust the picture so the two are equidistant from you; (i.e., the you out there is not closer, at the same level with one another; bigger, above, ... the other person) of the same relative size.
Adjust it again if need be, so you are looking at the two from your eye level (i.e. not from above or below the scene).

Notice any feelings you might have.
If you feel very tense or upset, move the image farther away and/or let the color pale or drain from it (e.g., make it black & white).

When you feel sufficiently detached from the scene, scan your body once again for any feelings which might belong to one or the other of those people.
- If there are such feelings, simply gather them with your hands and push them out and away (swoosh), back to the person to whom they belong and who now needs them.
- first, any which belong to the other person;
- then, any which belong to the person who looks and talks a lot like you.
Do so until you feel calm, empty, detached, clear in your role as observer.

Perhaps you begin to notice now the resourcefulness you feel, the curiosity you have about the scene, the sincere desire you have to help resolve the situation, and the acuity with which you are gathering data from what you are observing. Be aware of taking in whatever data may be useful to the situation.

Take a moment to describe to yourself (internally) exactly what you see - what you pick up as you cleanly, resourcefully, impassionately observe.
- Describe both persons.
- Describe what they are talking about.  [Remember, be objective.]

When you are ready, move the scene so that you may step back into it.
And when you have done so, take a moment to comfortably re-enter your self in that context, to experience being you again, interacting with the other person.
PERCEPTUAL POSITIONS (cont.)

Becoming FULLY SELF:
Notice what you see, and how you see it.
Look at the setting. Look at the other person.

Check that you are seeing directly through your own eyes.
If need be, shift your line of sight, the source, the focus, until you are
seeing fully through the center of your own eyes.

Notice the sounds and check that you are hearing directly through your own ears
- soundwaves directly entering both ears. Adjust if you need to.

Notice your own voice. Check that you are speaking directly from a place at the
base of your throat, your voice resonating up your throat and out your mouth.
If need be, move the source of your speech to this place.
Feel your voice emanate from the base and move up your throat and out,
fully your own.

Engage a moment in the dialogue/interaction.
Consider the data brought to the scene from your observer self.
Notice any differences from your experience of the earlier visit.
Notice your feelings now.

Take a moment to describe to yourself what you see, hear, feel in the context.
When you are ready, step out once again to the observer position.

As the observer, notice how quickly you release any emotion, any attachments
to the scene, and take on feelings of objectivity and resourcefulness.
Briefly scan the scene again.

Now, step for a moment into the OTHER, knowing you can simply observe and
notice what it is like being that person
seeing what that person sees, hearing what that person hears,
feeling what he or she feels
without taking it on as your own.
Simply gather the data, taking as long as you like, and when you are ready,
step back out, return to observe, and
describe for yourself the new information you have.

Finally, know that, while you prepare to return here, to be fully present to this
setting, your unconscious mind can finish the scenario,
stepping again into self with the new information and
resourcefully carrying on the dialogue/interaction to a useful outcome.
Reflecting on the Journey

Please take time over the next few weeks to consider your experience of (and experiences related to) this course and to share your review and reflections with us. As you respond, consider what kind of feedback would be most meaningful to you, were you to be an instructor in a future offering. Also use this opportunity to discover any new insights that might be available regarding your own learning, learning style, application of learnings, etc.

**Format**: Please rate each of the activities according to your own satisfaction with it:

Very Dissatisfied — Dissatisfied — Neutral — Satisfied — Very Satisfied

VD — D — N — S — VS — U — NA

If you are uncertain (or don’t remember the episode), mark Uncertain (U).
If you were absent or did not participate, mark Not Applicable (NA).

Also, please comment wherever you can (e.g., wherever appropriate or applicable) on your experience with the particular discussion, demonstration, exercise, etc. Specify its value to your own learning, impact on your leadership development, applicability to your life outside the classroom, capacity to promote new insights, fit with your learning style, or whatever else comes to mind that you believe would be helpful for us to know.

**Personal Criteria**: Before rating and commenting on the activities or class sessions, take a moment to discern and describe the criteria (or evidence) you personally use in assessing/evaluating the elements of a course or the overall impact of a class session (i.e., what makes something a valuable learning experience for you? how do you know you have grown as a leader or that you have learned and integrated something new which will influence your leadership in the future?)

Revisiting the Acts

Although we have supplied details to help you, we do not expect that you will recall or have a response to absolutely everything we have done or tried in the course. Your ability or inability to respond in a meaningful way is itself an indicator of the value and impact of the activity, at least on persons of your style. Just do the best you can to revisit the scene and recall impressions. All we ask is that you respond honestly and thoughtfully, sharing your insights and experience.
Act 2

Guided Meditation - "Ocean Breath"  
VD---D---N---S---VS  U  NA

Commentary - Discuss perception; learning; right- and left-brain functions and integration; use of meditation; etc.  
VD---D---N---S---VS  U  NA

Co-Alignment of Logical Levels II  
Revisit exercise and roles  
VD---D---N---S---VS  U  NA
Trio exercise (continuation)  
VD---D---N---S---VS  U  NA
(your role: _________)

Rapport I  
Discuss communication, trust, rapport, brain  
VD---D---N---S---VS  U  NA
Job interview exercise - match & mismatch  
VD---D---N---S---VS  U  NA

Outcomes I  
Share mission statements (be listened to) in trio  
VD---D---N---S---VS  U  NA
Discuss questions: want, do for you, will know  
VD---D---N---S---VS  U  NA
Elicit outcomes (guide, explore, record)  
VD---D---N---S---VS  U  NA

Commentary  
Translating to work world, finding overlapping outcomes at higher levels, etc.  
VD---D---N---S---VS  U  NA

Rehearsals & Practices  
Practice rapport skills  
VD---D---N---S---VS  U  NA
Work on personal vision, outcomes  
VD---D---N---S---VS  U  NA
Covey time matrix  
VD---D---N---S---VS  U  NA
Covey obituary (stretch)  
VD---D---N---S---VS  U  NA
Other:

Journal  
VD---D---N---S---VS  U  NA

Additional or Overall Comments:

Comparison

How would you compare this course to other courses you have had?

Response to Readings  
How would you assess the texts and their "usefulness"?

Covey -
Senge -
O'Connor & Seymour -

Comments

Retain, in particular, these things:
Drop, in particular, these things:

Feedforward for Instructors
APPENDIX C

PEER RESOURCE AND DESIGN TEAM HANDOUTS
### DESIGN TEAMS / RESOURCE TEAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEAM A</th>
<th>TEAM B</th>
<th>TEAM C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 David</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Heather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Paul</td>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Brian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Barbara</td>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>Walt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Allison</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Tim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Connie</td>
<td>Carrie</td>
<td>Joyce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Sarah</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Design Teams:
Arrange to meet in a two-hour taped session for the purpose of designing a Leadership Challenge Simulation for another team to perform. (e.g. A --> B --> C --> A) The format for the session will be facilitated "stop action," that is, there will be time-outs for reflection and debriefing.

#### Resource Teams:
Arrange to meet in a weekly coaching session for the purpose of assisting peers in the achievement of their desired outcomes. While one member coaches or guides the second, the third member takes notes and provides feedback to the first (e.g. a coaches b, c gives feedback to a; then b coaches c, a gives feedback to b; then c coaches a, b gives feedback to c). Negotiate your own learning contract with one another. Keep records both for yourselves and copies to turn in for documentation of your learning contract. (You may take some NCR sheets if you like.)

#### Optional:
Arrange for a member of your team to observe you in action in a work or other non-class setting and provide feedback. and/or Arrange for a member of your team to observe you in class (or some class segment) and provide feedback. In each instance, have a pre-session to specify what you would like your peer to look for and the type of feedback you want.

#### Preparation:
Please complete priority outcomes sheet for yourself (include in learning contract materials) and supply a copy to your resource team.
Coaching Hints

The coach's role is to mediate and enhance the coachee's capacity to bring about desired outcomes, including desired growth and change. Thus the coach engages in non-judgmental behaviors such as the following:

- Attending to rapport (pacing)
  - Backtracking
  - Acknowledging (verbal and nonverbal)
  - Recognizing states and state changes
- Asking questions intended to prompt complex thought
- Probing for specificity / Clarifying
- Paraphrasing
- Using wait time (silence)
- Providing data

If suggestions or recommendations are requested, the coach offers a response which includes three options. This provides the coachee with choice. (1 => a directive; 2 => a dilemma; 3 => choice)

Coaching Sessions - Coaching sessions may be held for several purposes:

A. Guiding an Exploration: Here the coach serves as guide and the coachee as explorer while the two conduct one of the prescribed exercises (from class or book). The third person serves as observer and coach for the guide.

B. Debriefing a Practice/Experiment: Here the coach assists the coachee in revisiting and reflecting on a set of actions and its result(s). (These might be drawn from class rehearsals and practices or one's own experimentation in the world.) The discourse would include what the coachee had intended to produce or test, how he or she planned to do that, how he/she perceived the results, and what might be done to improve performance another time.

C. Planning or Rehearsing a Practice/Experiment: Here the coach assists the coachee in developing a plan of action and specifying the desired behaviors and intended results. The discourse would include what the coachee hopes to do or accomplish, what actions he or she will perform or test, the desired results and the criteria employed. If the coachee wishes the coach to observe the practice, the coach would be looking for the evidence (criteria) described and whatever else the coachee specifies.

D. Reflections on Progress: A coach may also assist a coachee in reflecting aloud on the progress he or she is experiencing or perceiving with respect to initial (ongoing) desired outcomes. Discourse here might proceed similarly to eliciting an outcome chain but include what evidence has already been shown and resources accessed, new resistances, continuing resource needs, actions still to be tested/Performed, and so on.
Coach's Guide

Debriefing

Review expectations and selection of activity; inquire about context(s), specifics of the activity, strategies, and criteria for "success" (evidence), as determined prior to the event. Then ask the actor to review and evaluate the actual event and results, including application of the learning to future efforts.

- What activity did you engage in? When? Where? With whom?

- What was your purpose?

- What did you plan to do to make the effort meaningful? successful? ...

- How would you know whether or not you were successful? - What evidence (criteria) were you using?

- How do you feel now about your effort?

- How does what happened compare to what you had wanted? - Did you achieve what you set out to achieve?

- How did your strategies or performance affect those outcomes? - What enabled or limited your success?

- Looking back, what would you have done differently? - What will you do in the future in a similar context?
Design Team Session

Task: Design a Leadership Challenge

Plan and conduct (or provide materials and directions) for a performance which
1. Specifically addresses the outcomes (summarized) of the team members/actors, as provided
2. Ties in the literature (e.g. Covey's habits) and conceptions of leadership.
3. Moves the actors forward in achieving their desired outcomes
4. Develops and further enhances their leaderfulness

The performance is to be conducted in a 40 minute timeframe. Time will then be allotted for participants (actors) to provide feedback to the design team on the effectiveness of the design and the ways in which it moved them toward their outcomes.

Format: Stop-Action (Reflection in Action)

GENERALIZED OUTCOMES

Desired Outcomes for Team A

Be energized
Be healthy
Lead a more balanced life
Have and enact goals for myself
Feel confident
Feel personally powerful
Feel free to express myself
Feel valued
Be proactive
Be generative
Help other people
Maintain good relationships
Have discipline
Create energy, direction and skill to be in mature relationship
Let others feel free to express themselves
Feel the power of the unconscious mind
Communicate a vision and get people to give it a change; to give energy to it
Feel a sense of unity, of team, of oneness
Desired Outcomes for Team B

Be effectively assertive
Express myself more confidently and clearly
Be able to speak my mind and reveal true feelings
Not feel guilty in expressing own needs and feelings
Have good communication skills, with appropriate concern for others’ feelings (not too much)
Be a better listener
Be an empathic listener and follow a somewhat disciplined approach
To promote an equal dialogue
To engage, not withdraw
Courage to try
Courage to break old patterns
Ability to identify positive intentions
Overcome belief that some people are evil
Be self-confident
To counter self-criticisms spontaneously
To feel confident and secure in personal relationships
To approach situations without fear of being rebuked
Recognize and trust own abilities
Be and know I am a wonderful person
Accept praise

Desired Outcomes for Team C

Be a better communicator
Be a better listener
Develop empathetic understanding
Reframe communication
Understand deeply
Develop a positive attitude
Feel happy, joyful
To believe I can do anything I want
To effectively manage my life
Courage
Confidence
Faith in myself
Patience
Motivation to change
Disciplined use of time
Be more resourceful under stress
To synergize
To contribute more
Interdependence
To make a difference (for people)
Reflection in Action

Stop-Action Guiding Questions

Start time: ________

Explain time-out format. Give directions for task. Provide handouts.
Comment on language (written by coach, summarized by me). Reiterate task expectations and respond to questions. Indicate starting with a time-out.

Time-Out #1: ________ (Start-up Reflection)
1. Write about your thoughts and feelings in the moment:
   a. about the topic, the challenge just posed to you and this team, and what your individual approach would be (e.g., how would you approach the task if doing it individually)
   
   b. about your interaction with this team, and both your expectations for the outcome(s) and your role in it?
Proceed with task/discussion: ________

Time-Out #2: ________
2. Write about your thoughts and feelings in the moment:
   a. Have you been putting forth your ideas?
   b. Have others listened to you?
   c. Are you behaving as you would like to?
   
   d. What is making you effective? or What is holding you back?
   e. How will you interact in the next segment?
Proceed with task/discussion: ________

Time-Out #3: ________
3. How do you perceive this experience (team design) thus far?
   a. Have you interacted and responded as you desire(d)?
   b. Why do you think that is so?
   
   c. How closely has the group's direction matched your own?
   d. How do you feel about the direction and the decisions you have made as a group?
Go on to finish your task/discussion: ________

Time-Out #4: ________ (Final Reflection)
4. a. How do you feel overall about the outcome of the task?
   b. What was this action-reflection-action-reflection (the time-out format) like for you?

Debrief: ________
APPENDIX D

EXCERPT FROM A PERSONAL JOURNEY
Heather's Journey: An Excerpt

The open frame held during the fourth session of the leadership class became the setting for disclosures of how several students had experienced the course up to that time. Heather's comments reveal the questions the dialogue prompted in her, as she compared herself with the others. They also infer a separation between class experiences and actual inner work, which Heather tends to reserve for time alone at home when she can think and feel without other distractions.

I didn't want to share my feelings with the class, so I kept quiet, but I tried to show agreement and support by nodding my head. Although I have not had any difficulty in coming to class, I have found trying to work through the assignments and concepts very intense and overwhelming.

In Heather's writing, the word "clarity" along with language contrasting foggy with clear regularly appear in conjunction with reflections about her mission. For example, as late in the course as the debriefing memo for session nine, she wrote,

One of my goals for this class has been to get some clarity on my mission in life. I've had a hard time figuring it out--every time I try to look inside for it, everything is foggy and unclear...

Perhaps her most impactful use of these terms lies in her response to week four's assignment to find a metaphor or tell the story of your experience with the course and your progress on achieving your desired outcomes up to that time.
Heather's story is included here in its entirety not only for the insight it provides into her struggle but also to introduce the metaphors which seem important to Heather's journey and perhaps even to her life script.

**STORY**

Once upon a time, there was a girl who could not find her self. She was lost in a foggy, foggy house and although she looked in every hiding space she could think of, every space was empty. The little girl cried out "Who am I? And why am I here?" But she heard only faint whispers and echoes and felt very unsure of herself and the answers. She was discouraged but continued her search.

As she was looking through the foggy house, she also spent many hours a day practicing her routine on the balance beam. She was looking for just the right mix of work moves, school moves, spiritual moves, physical moves, and social moves to make a peaceful act.

She thought that if she could settle on a routine that resulted in a feeling of peace, she would have a proper base for continuing her search for her self. She struggled and struggled with the act and fell off the balance beam many times (usually with too many work moves). But she kept on disciplining herself to continue to practice, and to continue to search the foggy house.

One of the problems the little girl had was that although she felt she was thinking about her balancing act and finding her self all the time, every time an opportunity came up to try a new routine or search elsewhere, she forgot all about what she was looking for.

Of all of Heather's outcomes, the most global and perhaps the most pervasive are each articulated here: to discover and clarify her mission, to bring balance into her life, and to risk new action (to break through the fear). Of these, the last is perhaps the most challenging, for she has by this time already expressed the belief that "changing my actions is usually really difficult for me."
Her subsequent efforts to take new action in the world seem to bear out this self-fulfilling prophecy.

Below is the "fruit" of Heather's struggle with her mission and finding clarity in her "fog."

MISSION STATEMENT

I am a child of the universe who honors God by treating my body as a temple and the earth as my garden. I exercise regularly, eat healthful, nutritious foods, and take care to rest and relax adequately. I care for the environment by recycling, using products that gentle to the environment, and keeping a garden. I create a home that is full of love, warmth, laughter, peace, joy, and beauty. I seek to live simply.

I am a worker and a friend who treats all people with respect, honesty, integrity, and compassion. I do the very best I can do without comparing myself to others. I have my contribution to make to the world, no matter whether it is large or small. I seek to value all my co-workers and friends and help them to know how unique and worthwhile they are. I believe the light of God is in everyone and give unconditional love to all.

I am a student who learns for life. I learn how to be a better human being every day. I bring a spiritual quality to my work as well as my studies.

I am a daughter and a sister and I honor, love, and respect my family. I am dependable and will care for my parents with dignity, warmth, and humor as they age.

I am blessed in many ways and will use my blessings to give to other less fortunate people. I will give time, money, and talents for charitable purposes.

So it would seem that Heather made good progress in creating more balance in her life. As a consequence, perhaps, she later indicated that she was also experiencing less depression, or at least shorter periods of depression than had been present for her earlier.
Among other shifts, Heather reported feeling more self-confident, calmer, and a little more at peace. The latter is referenced only in her story, but it is clear there that she wanted peacefulness as a base from which to act. In addition, she spoke to increasing her repertoire of actions and strategies.

I do feel like I have more tricks in my thoughts. I think that is why I am feeling more self-confident. I have a couple of different options of how I can approach things. I think the other piece that is helping me feel more self-confident is feeling like I am valuing more of the intuition and the soft things. And feeling also like I no longer have to ignore those things, but I can actively seek them out.

Of particular importance is Heather’s sense that, besides the new feeling sensations, “it is also that I am actually doing some things with more ease and with less time agonizing over them before taking action.”
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY


Nightingale Conant.


