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Abstract

In his book, *In over our heads: the mental demands of modern life*, Kegan (1994) has suggested that the average level of adults’ thinking is more complex today than at previous times in history. This is due, in part, to our increased lifespans, which have enabled complex thinking to evolve and emerge. However, Kegan has also suggested that the demands of the social environment are expanding much faster than the average complexity of adult thinking and learning. In Kegan’s terms, we are “in over our heads.” Using a semi-clinical, semi-structured, qualitative interview with twenty adult learners, this study investigated the role of shadow work, employed after Kegan and Lahey’s (2009) Immunity to Change (ITC) process in support of the adult developmental journey. Shadow work refers to one or more processes that a person may use to uncover, or bring to awareness, repressed aspects of Self. The data analysis suggests that horizontal learning—becoming more whole through shadow work—may support vertical development, or increased complexity. Specifically, shadow work, employed after the ITC process, may support the adult developmental journey in three important ways. First, shadow work may result in a release of energy by changing one’s relationship to what Kegan and Rogers (1991) have referred to as “a characterological disposition” (p. 138). The highly individualized characterological disposition may be psychologically created within a person through the influence of that individual’s childhood holding environment (social environment). Second, shadow work may support horizontal learning, which may in turn support vertical development. Finally, the unrealized energy that may be released by shadow work may catalyze increasing developmental complexity.

Further, the data analysis suggests that shadow work, following the ITC process, may influence the adult learner’s relationship to the characteristics of andragogy. Shadow work, in support of
the adult developmental journey, may facilitate one’s ability to collaboratively engage wicked problems.

*Keywords:* adult learning, adult development, andragogy, Constructive-developmental theory, horizontal growth, Immunity to Change, integral learning, integral conflict, Kegan and Lahey, projection, shadow, shadow work, transformational learning, transformative learning, vertical growth, wicked problems.
Chapter 1

Background and Context

My research interest in facilitating adult learning and adult development in relationship to solving complex problems emerged over many years as a result of my personal journey. It began in my early twenties, after responding to one particular emergency call as a paramedic. During the call, I became sharply aware of the difference between prevention and late intervention. A man, who had been shot in the head, looked into my eyes and asked me, “Am I going to make it?” Even as I was reassuring him, I thought to myself, there is not a damn thing I can do. This is one of several experiences that led me to become a practitioner of conflict resolution. I began to associate the term “first responder” with prevention, rather than late emergency intervention. I wanted to help people negotiate conflict before the trigger was pulled. Years later as a mediator, I saw an interesting pattern: when faced with complex issues and multiple perspectives, some people were very dualistic and positional, while others were more flexible, resilient, and able to adapt. I began to understand these differences in terms of adult learning and adult development. Thereafter, I became aware of Carl Jung’s (1875-1961)\(^1\) concept of “shadow” (1958). This paper is an exploration of the role of shadow and shadow work in adult learning and adult development.

As part of one’s subconscious, by definition, shadow is outside of our awareness. Jung (1958) described shadow as the part of the “Self” that is separated from the conscious ego through repression. As long as those aspects of Self remain repressed as shadow, they impact us in ways that we struggle to see and understand. A person’s shadow is mostly created during the

\(^1\) When used in this format (xxxx-xxxx), the date range represents the individual’s year of birth and year of death.
formative years of childhood. Bly (1988) used, as a metaphor for Shadow, a long, heavy, invisible bag we drag behind us. He explained that “we spend our life until we’re twenty” filling the bag with our shadows. Then, “we spend the rest of our lives trying to get them out again” (p. 18). These two distinct phases are often referred to as the first adulthood (filling the bag) and the second adulthood (emptying the bag). It is during the second adulthood that one’s self-authored needs, relationships, and ideologies may form and emerge (Kegan, 1994). Although our bag of shadows is subconscious, we feel the burden of carrying it. Bly (1988) observed that as one- or two-year-old children we have a whole “360-degree” personality; “energy radiated out from all parts of our body and all parts of our psyche...we had a ball of energy” (p. 17). However, by the time a person is twenty, all that remains of the 360-degree personality is a “thin slice” of our former wholeness; the rest is now in the bag (p. 18). As a result, “the bigger the bag, the less energy...we can think of our personal bag as containing energy now unavailable to us” (p. 25). This implies that the meaning one made (the understanding she constructed) about what belongs in or out of her bag continues to inform her epistemology in adulthood. Most often, this occurs without her awareness. I suggest that the energy that is consumed by shadow, and potentially liberated by becoming more whole through shadow work, can influence the adult developmental journey in important ways.

In writing about adult development, I am referring to Robert Kegan's (1982) Constructive-developmental theory. Kegan has suggested that development continues throughout

---

2 To minimize confusion, I use the personal pronoun “she” and the object pronoun “her” throughout this paper.

3 Here, shadow work refers to one or more processes that a person may use to uncover, or bring to awareness, her shadow(s). The term is not meant to denote any particular individual’s view or approach.
the adult lifespan. Kegan’s theory allows for the influence of outer dimensions on one’s development, such as the environment and one’s social and emotional competency. Kegan’s notion that outer dimensions influence development throughout one’s lifespan is distinct from other theorists, such as Piaget, who suggested that development is an inner cognitive function limited to childhood and adolescence. In Kegan’s model, developmental growth is identified using stages and sub-stages that mark the evolution in the complexity of one’s organization of information and meaning-making. He views the organization of information and meaning-making as the “primary human motion” (1982, p. 8).

I became curious about the influence of shadow work on adult development while I was exploring my own struggle with procrastination during an “Immunity to Change” workshop with Kegan. The Immunity to Change (ITC) process is designed to help a participant identify the competing commitments and the assumptions that act as an obstacle and inhibit one from reaching a goal (Kegan & Lahey, 2009). In contrast to entropy—which Kegan describes as increasing disorder or diminishing energy—and negentropy—which he defines as the “complexification” of order and concentrating energy, Kegan and Lahey’s ITC process focuses on disrupting “dynamic equilibrium,” which Kegan sees as a third force of motion: “How can we secure for ourselves the supports most likely to foster real change, change that actually escapes the immunizing gravity of our own dynamic equilibria and leads to new concentrations of energy, enhanced capacity, greater complexity?” (Kegan & Lahey, 2001, p. 6). Kegan believes that the dynamic equilibrium that contributes to one’s immunity to change can inhibit concentration of energy, enhanced capacity, and greater complexity. These are all markers of developmental growth. I will explore Kegan’s concept of “concentration of energy” later, as it relates to shadow work and the ITC process.
Identifying my competing commitments and assumptions was not enough to overcome my resistance to change; my dynamic equilibrium remained quite robust. It was only later, after I became aware of Jung’s concept of shadow, that I understood what my competing commitments and assumptions were about. Shadow work helped me to become more whole. Knowing *where* my commitments and assumptions came from and *why* they developed had more power than knowing *what* they were.

Through reflective work and active imagination,⁴ I was able to gain some awareness of the repressed aspect of Self (i.e., shadow) that was influencing my procrastination. To uncover my repressed content, I focused on and followed the feelings that I experienced while procrastinating. With perseverance, I slowly and gently continued to “sit with” these feelings and allowed them to guide my memory to an earlier time. In following the feelings back to my earliest childhood memories, I was able to recall the environment, experiences, messages, and the meaning I made around procrastination. This resulted in new insight about the childhood experiences that shaped my assumptions about procrastination and the childhood needs that were met through procrastination.

This insight and new learning enabled me to understand how my adult behaviors were in service to my childhood experiences and the meaning I made in childhood of these experiences. In my judgment, the assimilated beliefs established in the form of my shadows helped keep me embedded in the behavior of procrastination. Originating in childhood, these beliefs perpetuated the need for safety and caution even as my adult environments challenged me to be more aware, engaged, and adaptive.

---

⁴ Developed by Jung (1997), active imagination is a perspective-shifting technique in which the ego has an iterative discourse with other aspects of the Self.
The shadow I developed in childhood to avoid the danger associated with taking risks became an obstacle to achieving my adult goals. Recognizing this, I began to the question whether the ITC process could be enhanced by bringing one’s shadow to one’s awareness through shadow work. Shadow work, which is completed after the ITC process, may help participants to better understand where commitments and assumptions come from and why. This understanding may facilitate a release of energy to support the disruption of the dynamic equilibrium that tends to keep in place one’s immunity to change. Shadow work may release energy that supports developmental growth.

My research is an exploration of the intersection between Jung’s (1958) theory of shadow and Kegan’s (1982) theory of development. In particular, it explores how shadow work, following the ITC process, may support an individual’s ability to understand her shadow, become more whole, and release trapped energy that might then be available to catalyze developmental complexity.

The role of Jung’s notion of shadow in relationship to Constructive-developmental theory has important implications for adult learning theory and praxis. In a world that is becoming increasingly complex, many adults find themselves to be over-challenged as they seek balance among the increasingly complex task demands of the external environment (Kegan, 1994). It is essential that adults utilize greater complexity in their understanding of and engagement with current global changes in technology, climate change, and increasing domestic and international conflict on every level. Internal dynamics such as the values and beliefs one holds, the deep structures of meaning-making that shape one’s understanding, and the repressed aspects of Self

---

5 As used by Commons, M. L., Trudeau, E. J., Stein, S. A., Richards, F. A., & Krause, S. R. (1998), the term task demands refers to the hierarchical complexity required to complete a specific task.
that Jung termed shadow, may impact the way an adult engages with these external issues. To explore the relationship between shadow and the adult developmental journey, this qualitative study used a semi-structured, semi-clinical interview with twenty adult graduate students that were participants in a shadow work discussion and exercise following a workshop based on Kegan and Lahey’s (2009) Immunity to Change process.

**Statement of the Problem**

We need higher developmental complexity because our environment is becoming more complex (Kegan, 1994). Every era has sociocultural challenges. Yet, during the agricultural\(^6\) and industrial eras, the pace of increase in environmental complexity was slower than it is today in our information- and knowledge-based society. In the past, as the complexity of the environment slowly increased, the developmental complexity of most people was adequate for them to keep up. Although the environment was becoming more complex, there was time for individuals to adapt to the challenge. Today, we experience more frequent and more complex environmental challenges resulting from global changes, such as technological advances and climate change. Many of these challenges cannot be solved with existing knowledge, skills, or processes. Rather, these challenges require that we adapt and create new solutions. These adaptive challenges may outpace the developmental capacity and complexity of many of us. That is, we may be developmentally incapable of making the change. This creates a collective disequilibrium; members of society are unable to meet the challenges they face. According to Kegan, “the expectations upon us…demand something more than mere behavior, the acquisition of specific skills, or the mastery of particular knowledge. They make demands on our minds, on *how* we

\(^6\) Here, the term “agricultural” is meant to refer to an era before the Industrial Revolution. The term is not meant to represent modern or commercial agriculture.
know, on the complexity of our consciousness” (Kegan, 1994, p. 5, italics in original). In Kegan’s terms, we are “in over our heads” (1994). This phrase describes the gap that occurs when the complexity and challenges of our environment are greater than our ability to make sense of them. To close this gap, we need people to increase their developmental capacity. We might do this through the identification and reframing of obstacles to development, or through approaches that support and possibly accelerate the evolution of more complex structures of meaning-making. In this context, I suggest that the influence of shadow on adult development and meaning-making may be an important consideration.

Wicked problems. A few examples of complex problems will help to contextualize the need for more complex structures of meaning-making. Global challenges, such as the pace of technological advancements and climate changes, are more complex than many people can accommodate. These types of challenges can be characterized as “wicked problems,” which are quite different from “tame problems” (Rittel & Webber, 1973). Tame problems exist within a single system, have a clear center, and can be efficiently resolved by action with a clear path and output (p. 160). In contrast, wicked problems involve large and often interconnecting systems. Further, with wicked problems, an outcome in one system affects another, and the nature of the problem and the path of intervention are unclear. This makes wicked problems inherently difficult to define and resolve. Lastly, the rules used for understanding current and future certainty and the decisions made with regard to the problem are complicated by the values, beliefs, and principles held by the people involved (p. 163). A wicked problem requires one to have complex thinking in order to understand, discuss, and engage the issues involved. When encountering a wicked problem, each stakeholder has a different judgment—bound to their psychosocial context and stage of development—of what constitutes an appropriate approach to
resolving the problems within the multiple systems involved. The complexity of the demand placed on one’s cognitive capacity—one’s perspective and awareness—may exceed her ability. Individuals that cannot take in the full scope of issues are in over their head.

Examples of wicked problems are readily available. For instance, rapid advancements in technology present challenges that fit the definition of a wicked problem. The tethered telephone line (landline) and phone booth are becoming less common. In our age, communication is often fast and mobile. Many of the conversations that were once held in the privacy of the home, office, or phone booth now occur via cellular phones in public spaces such as the checkout line, waiting rooms, and sidewalks. Unlike during the days of the radio, or those of the three-station black and white television, people now may be exposed to immense amounts of information from around the world through voice, text, email, social media, and the World Wide Web, all provided by the smart phone in their pocket. This example of a new social behavior, enabled by advances in technology, may challenge culturally informed concepts of privacy and politeness—concepts that are formed and understood through the complexity of our development.

Technology is also creating wicked problems in medicine (Fleck, 2012). Technology-driven medical advances will, for example, make it possible to grow engineered organs from stem cells that have been created from regular tissue rather than embryos (Taylor, 2009). As a new source, these bioengineered organs may help alleviate the demand for natural organs for transplants and research. But this new capacity to bioengineer organs in the laboratory begets complex and wicked problems. The creation of human organs has significant implications for the religious, political-legal, and socio-economic systems. The new technology may eliminate many of the right-to-life issues associated with the use of embryonic stem cells and, at the same time,
affect existing and conflicting values, beliefs, and principles, thereby creating new complex issues of self and society.

Another wicked problem we face is climate change. Karl, Melillo, and Peterson (2009) have indicated that throughout this century global temperatures will rise, sea levels will increase by three to four feet, storms will become more frequent and more intense, and there will be frequent heat waves and drought. Curtis and Schneider (2011) have estimated that the rising sea level will affect 20 million people in the United States by 2030. These authors have predicted that such an event will also result in changes to migration patterns and have other social and economic implications in the United States as the population abandons low-lying coastal areas in search of new places to live. Rising sea levels are a global problem, impacting not just the United States, but also other island and coastal areas in Cuba, Japan, Australia, and West Africa. Fitzgibbon and Mensah (2012) have discussed how climate change creates wicked problems in Ghana because of its dependency on rain-fed agriculture. Susceptibility to drought, coupled with rapid population growth, stresses the capacity of government institutions to effectively address water management issues (p. 4).

Though many people may be challenged by wicked problems, each person’s response to the challenge depends on her current developmental stage. Wicked problems may present complexities that overwhelm an individual’s meaning-making capacity, resulting in only a partial understanding of the problem and, therefore, ineffective solutions. Given the ubiquity of wicked problems in modern life, the importance of overcoming obstacles to adult learning and development becomes clear. Otherwise, we will remain “in over our heads.”
**Adult learning and development.** Keeping the complexity of wicked problems in mind, let us briefly consider a few of the key theories of how adults learn: self-directed learning, transformative learning, and andragogy. Each of these theories will be presented and juxtaposed with Kegan’s Constructive-developmental theory here. They will also be treated in more detail in the literature review, where all of the stages of Kegan’s model will also be discussed.

Merriam (2001a) describes Self-directed learning as the learning that adults gain throughout their normal daily activities as guided by their own interests and without the aid of an instructor. According to the theory of self-directed learning, one can—autonomously—navigate one’s way through complex problems. But according to Kegan’s Constructive-developmental theory, learning is less straightforward that this. We need to question whether the learner is truly self-directed and has sufficient developmental complexity to be autonomous, or the learner is responding to the influence of external rules or group influence.

According to Kegan, at one particular developmental stage, the individual looks to external authorities for her sense of what the right thing to do is. To be disloyal to her relationship with the external authority by going her own way instead of following the group may threaten her sense of identity. However, when the individual’s source of authority is internal, her identity is no longer bound to external relationships. When faced with a wicked problem, people who depend upon an external authority for legitimacy may tend to go along with the group in order to preserve their relationship and their identity. In contrast, individuals with internally sourced authority may advance unique and even unpopular perspectives about the issue. Whether an individual acts autonomously or not is an important factor influencing group process, and therefore will be discussed in greater depth in the literature review.
Transformative learning theory focuses on the knower’s ability to negotiate her learning (Mezirow, 2000). For Mezirow (1991, 2000), transformative learning occurs when the knower changes her assumptions and predispositions, which create her “habit of mind” and point of view, to establish new frames of reference. Transformative learning theory emphasizes a change in learned content. Kegan (2000), on the other hand, contends that in the development of the individual what changes is not just the content of one’s learning but its form, or structure. Kegan uses the term transformational—rather than transformative—learning, to refer to a change in the complexity of one’s organization of meaning-making. Whereas Mezirow’s transformative learning involves a change in what one knows, which we can think about as horizontal development, Kegan’s transformational learning involves a change in how one knows, which we can conceive of as vertical development (Cook-Greuter, 2004). According to Kegan, a person’s understanding of a wicked problem is informed by her stage of development. This is because the complexity of her deep structures of consciousness shapes her sense-making and the organization of her assumptions. It is this complexity that creates her habit of mind and point of view. That is, structure shapes one’s relationship to content. Simply adding new content or more knowledge does not necessarily result in the developmental growth of increased capacity or complexity.

In 1968, Malcolm Knowles (1913-1997) advanced the term “andragogy” as “the art and science” of adult learning. Andragogy, Knowles (1980) asserted, was distinct from the art and science of pedagogy, or childhood learning. Arising from humanistic psychology, Knowles’ principles of andragogy suggest that, with maturity:

- Adult learners move from being dependent on others for their learning toward being self-directed;
- Life experience is a learning resource;
Social roles influence readiness to learn; and

As one matures, time-perspective shifts from a focus on the future to immediate application, resulting in learning for problem-solving.

Knowles further suggested that internal motivation is more powerful than external motivation, and that adults need to be able to connect and apply their learning within their daily lives (1980; 1984). These characteristics may be more useful in practice, however, when understood in the context of Kegan’s Constructive-developmental theory. In Kegan’s theory, whether one relies on others for authority and whether one is motivated externally or internally is developmentally informed.

According to Kegan (1980, 1982), development can continue throughout the adult lifespan. Popp and Portnow (2001) have distinguished Kegan’s contribution to the field by noting how Constructive-developmental theory links “constructivism,” the idea that we construct our reality from our experience, with “developmentalism,” the idea that the way we construct our reality becomes more complex over time through interactions with our social environments. Each stage of growth enables our greater capacity for perspective taking, complex understanding, and engagement. The vertical growth described by Constructive-developmental theory is a disruptive evolution. As an existing structure of meaning-making is disrupted, it is replaced by a more complex structure. This evolution of complexity influences how one constructs reality within one’s psychosocial environment (see literature review below). Individuals with more complex meaning-making have the ability to see more broadly and hold multiple perspectives.

As one’s relationship to the psychosocial environment of self and others becomes more complex,

---

7 There is a distinction between the notion of stage development that occurs and ends (discontinuous) and the notion of stage development that may continue throughout the lifespan (continuous).
one may see into the world more deeply. This becomes important when challenged with understanding and solving wicked problems and conflicts.

Although Kegan’s is a hierarchical model, more complex stages of meaning-making are not necessarily more appropriate than less complex ones. Meeting needs requires a fit between the demands of one’s environment and one’s developmental stage (Kegan, 1994). The individual’s developmental complexity seeks balance with one’s environment. We need higher developmental complexity because our environment demands it, not because higher complexity is inherently better. Despite this demand, and for many reasons, an individual’s developmental complexity might not keep pace. In Kegan’s view, one experiences an immunity to change around a particular issue when one’s worries and fears, originating from competing commitments and the “Big Assumption,” hold one’s thinking and actions in place through dynamic equilibrium. This immunity to change may be a disadvantage when one is challenged by complex problems. Shadow work, following the ITC process, may enable a participant to better understand where her competing commitment and assumption comes from and why. This new learning may further disrupt the dynamic equilibrium. Shadow work may inform one about the content of the competing commitment and Big Assumption and about the relationship the competing commitment and Big Assumption may have to repressed aspects of Self.

---

8 Kegan and Lahey (2001) use the term “Big Assumption” to denote an unconscious and powerful assumption that acts to hold in place dynamic equilibrium. The assumption influences beliefs and behaviors in ways that tend to neutralize conscious intentions and commitments.

9 The unconscious competing commitment works against (competes with) a consciously made commitment goal.
Shadow. Understanding the impact of shadow and how we project repressed aspects of Self onto others during the adult developmental journey may enable adults to identify and overcome obstacles to change and growth. Jung (1958) explored the concept of shadow as an essential element of the Self. Separated from the conscious ego through repression,\(^\text{10}\) Jung suggested that the aspects of Self that are held in shadow must be brought into consciousness (released from shadow) and integrated with the ego to resolve self-conflict. Becoming more whole in this way is type of horizontal development. Describing how shadow is formed, Bly (1988) has suggested that, as children, we repress aspects of our Self to gain approval from external authority figures such as our parents, teachers, and friends. Some of the repressed aspects may be considered to be “dark” (often interpreted as bad) and some may be considered to be “light” (often interpreted as good). Repressing aspects results in our becoming less of our Self and more incomplete. As a child, developmentally, only one dominant voice (the one we turn to for love and safety) can exist; this dominant voice requires the repression of its counterpoint. As a result, we shape our development so that we become who these important authorities tell us we should be. This can occur through negative feedback, such as shame, guilt, and embarrassment, or through positive feedback, such as praise and honor. Thereafter, as adults, our shadow may be “triggered” by seeing in others those things in our Self which we have hidden in our shadow. That is, we “project” our repressed nature onto others. Once we have projected and been triggered, we may experience very strong feelings and emotions about the situation or the people involved.

I am interested in the influence that shadow work (efforts to identify, understand, and reintegrate shadow) has on the adult developmental journey. To overcome our immunity to

\(^{10}\) Repression, in this context, means suppressed psychic content that is no longer accessible to recollection.
change, it may be helpful to identify our shadow and to reevaluate how shadow and projection influence our development, our learning, and our ability to live an integrated adult life.

**Research Question**

The literature on the relationship between Jungian shadow, adult learning theories, and Constructive-developmental theory is sparse. It is plausible that shadow influences our developmental growth, and that the reintegration of shadow could release unrealized energy. The reintegration of shadow may also provide insights catalytic to the evolution of more complex structures of meaning-making. To further our understanding of the terrain between shadow and the evolving complexity of structures of meaning-making, my research with twenty adults explores a variety of experiences of the Immunity to Change process with the following questions:

1. What are some of the possible ways that an adult's awareness of shadow might enhance overcoming her Immunity to Change?
   a. What were the ways that each participant recognized, understood, made meaning of, and experienced her shadow in the ITC process?
   b. How did each participant describe this experience (i.e., did she speak in terms of projection, shadow, or something else; in terms of awareness, understanding, or something else; in terms of embedded, extricated, reintegrated, or something else? Did she experience it as pain, grief, fear, joy, or something else?)?

2. How might this increase in awareness of shadow support and/or enhance the adult’s developmental growth and learning?
a. What are the different ways that participants describe what they learned about themselves and their shadow in the ITC process?

b. What patterns, if any, emerge between the ways in which the participants describe this experience and shadow?

**Purpose of the Study**

The study’s purpose was to explore the role that shadow work plays in helping individuals gain a better understanding of the commitments and assumptions that make an individual immune to change. This included identifying any benefits that exploring one’s shadow adds to Kegan’s Immunity to Change process. This study may contribute to future research on the role shadow may play in the adult developmental journey. In addition to informing theories of adult learning and adult development, this study may influence the practice of conflict interveners, leaders, change agents, adult educators, and others that work with people to engage complex problems.

**Significance of Rationale**

We are being called to greater complexity and growth in order to effectively engage with the wicked problems we face. There may be a dialectic role between adult development and learning about shadow. As developmental capacity and complexity increases, one may relate differently to those past experiences associated with repressed aspects of her Self. The change in her psychological perspective may foster new meaning-making. As one reintegrates shadow, the disruption of embeddedness may release unrealized energy needed to catalyze developmental growth. In addition, understanding the role of shadow in adult development and adult learning may affect how educators understand themselves and the adult students with whom they work.
Reintegrating repressed aspects of Self (shadow) can be conceived of as a form of emancipatory learning (Hooks, 1994; Freire, 1993; Kilgore, 2001; Merriam, Caffarella, & Baumgartner 2007; Mezirow, 1991), because it may create greater agency (choice and opportunity) that is unavailable to us when we carry a lot of shadow. If one can take responsibility for her shadow, she may have the opportunity to be more intentional about the dark and the light aspects of Self that have been hidden away. As Day and Matthes (1992) have suggested, this emancipatory learning, a process of individuation, is more than simply moving away from a dependency on external authority to a reliance on internal authority. Rather, it represents becoming a more whole and integrated Self. As long as aspects of Self remain repressed as shadow, we may project our repressed Self onto others. This projection feeds attribution, through which we ascribe positive attributes to our self and conceive any negative attributes as a disposition of the other and may inhibit taking responsibility for our own circumstances. When faced with wicked problems, projection may perpetuate or exacerbate tendencies of “tribalism”\(^\text{11}\)—i.e., we may displace our collective wounds and/or denied strengths onto the other (outsider). Through projection, we may make the other our scapegoat (Perera, 1986).

The complexity of the challenges we face is increasing faster than most people’s ability to keep pace (Kegan, 1994). As a result, we may not have complex enough meaning-making to address wicked problems. In this context, it may be essential for us to develop complex

\(^{11}\) Here, “tribalism” refers to a collection of individuals acting in unison based on group membership. Only individuals in the group are accepted and trusted. Those out of the group may be perceived dispositionally as negative or as a threat.
structures of meaning-making as quickly as we can. Identifying and removing the obstacles that impede our growth may be one way to do so.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

This literature review focuses on the intersection of adult learning, adult development, and shadow because this terrain informs how we think about an adult’s ability to learn and develop in response to the demands of complex environments. Adult learning theories focus on elements such as the learning goals or motivation of the learner, life experience, social context, and chronological age. In three of these theories—experiential learning, self-directed learning, and andragogy—one can see an implied developmental influence. In contrast, developmental stage theorists such as Brown (2012), Cook-Greuter & Soulen (2007), Kegan (1994), McGuigan & Popp (in press), and Wilber (2007) are more explicit about the relationship between adult learning and adult development. This chapter explores the literature to see how these theoretical domains might inform each other. The review begins with adult learning theories, continues with Constructive-developmental theory, and ends with shadow. The chapter concludes with a discussion on the relationship between horizontal development (horizontal learning) and vertical development.

Adult Learning Theories

Contemporary theories of adult learning can be traced back to existentialism and the disciplines of philosophy and psychology. John Dewey (1859-1952), informed by Kant (1724-1804) and Hegel (1770-1831), helped to establish progressive education and a focus on childhood learning through experience (Dewey, 2009; 1938). Adult education as a distinct area of practice began in 1926. In 1928, Thorndike, Bregman, Tilton, and Woodyard (Merriam, 2001a) published, from a behavioral psychological perspective, one of the first studies on whether adults could learn. This early research focused on the speed and rate of learning, and
demonstrated that most adults performed poorly in these metrics. However, it later became evident that the poor performance of adults was due to situational variables. When learning ability was considered, older adults did just as well as younger adults (Merriam, 2001a).

Thorndike et al.’s study, though it was one of the first studies on adult learning, did not herald a new dawn in research in adult education. Since the middle of the nineteenth century, few studies by educational psychologists on intelligence, problem-solving, and cognitive development have differentiated between children and adults (Merriam, 2001a). Today, there are more than fifty theories of learning (Kearsley, 2010)—for example, Skinner’s (1950) Operant Conditioning Theory, Wertheimer’s (1959) Gestalt Theory, and Bransford’s Anchored Instruction (1993). However, only a few of the fifty theories specifically focus on adult learning; these few include experiential learning, self-directed learning, and andragogy.

**Experiential learning.** Experiential learning theory has been applied to several contexts. It has, for example, been used to explore the meaning made of everyday experiences and applied learning activities in the classroom. To better understand experiential learning theory, it may be helpful to use Fenwick’s (2000) framework of five perspectives—constructivist, psychoanalytic, situated learning, critical cultural, and enactivist. These perspectives reflect a typology of cognition and are informed by Fenwick’s studies of professional and vocational contexts of work and learning. The constructivist perspective, represented by Dewey (1938), Piaget (1966), Kolb (1984), Schôn (1983), Mezirow (1991), and Boud and Miller (1996), has emphasized recalling, reflecting upon, discussing, and analyzing experiences in relationship to new contexts. These activities result in new learning through reflective action. Kolb’s work in experiential learning, in which the learner forms abstract concepts after generalizing observations of, and reflections on, concrete experiences (1984), drew upon the work of James (1890, 1912), Lewin (1951), Rogers
(1951, 1964), and Freire (1993). The constructivist perspective recognizes and acknowledges that new understanding can be made from experience, but it does not address the developmental complexity influencing one’s organization of that experience.

When adult learning theories are considered in relation to adult development, it is helpful to make a distinction between learning more content (horizontal development) and developing a more complex relationship to content (vertical development) (Cook-Greuter, 2004; Cook-Grueter & Soulen, 2007). Horizontal development increases what one knows and strengthens one’s technical expertise, functional knowledge, skills, and behaviors. This type of learning is useful for solving clearly defined problems, or technical challenges. In contrast, vertical development changes how one knows and makes meaning, enabling one to engage complex problems or adaptive challenges (Schön, 1983; Kegan, 1994; Torbert, 2004; McGuigan & Popp, in press). As it applies to experiential learning, the increase in complexity involved in vertical development changes the way one relates to present and past experiences and to the learning thereof. In vertical development, past experiences may bring new meaning, insight, and learning. The relationship between horizontal development and vertical development is fully explored at the end of this chapter.

Fenwick’s (2000) psychoanalytic perspective on experiential learning, which assesses the role of the conscious and unconscious mind, reflects the work of Jung (1958) and Freud (2012), as well as object relations theory. According to Fenwick, “knowledge dilemmas unfold through struggles between the unconscious and conscious mind, which is aware of unconscious rumblings but can neither access them fully nor understand their language” (2000, p. 251).

---

12 Though the terms conscious and unconscious as used in the works by Freud and Jung are employed in this study, it is acknowledged that these terms are not universally endorsed.
Britzman (1998, 2007, 2011) built on the work of Anna Freud (1978) and understood learning to emerge from the interaction between conscious thought and the unconscious. The interruption of conscious thought by the unconscious leads the conscious mind to take notice of contradictions of experience, whereby the individual realizes certain self-truths. Britzman termed these self-truths “lost subjects.” Understanding the interruption by and influence of the unconscious mind on the conscious mind may be an important step in theorizing adult learning. However, the psychoanalytic perspective does not understand the unconscious and repressed parts of Self, projection, or adult learning in terms of Constructive-developmental theory or shadow. Rather, it understands the relation between conscious and unconscious in terms of object relations; one develops patterns of expectation based on interactions with people in one’s life (Winnicott, 1965; Freud, 1978). That is, the dynamic relationship between the conscious and unconscious is built on pattern recognition in psychoanalytic perspective, subject-object complexity in Constructive-developmental theory, and repressed aspects of Self in the concept of shadow.

The situated learning perspective suggests that learning is influenced by the domain or context (situation) within which it emerges. Adults learn in an environment that has cultural influence, context, and specific tasks and activities. These social aspects define the learning group or community (Fenwick, 2000). When one joins a community of learners, there is a migration from the periphery of engagement toward fuller participation as one acquires the beliefs and values of the group (Lave, 1988; Lave & Wenger, 1991). Wilson (1992; Wilson & Myers, 1999) has explained that situated learning emerges from within the experience rather than from the experience. Although the situated learning perspective makes a connection between the social context and learning, it is silent on the phenomenon of vertical development—i.e., increasing the complexity of one’s organization of information and meaning-making. From a
Constructive-developmental theory perspective, one’s developmental stage mediates the influence of the social context, or “holding environment,” on learning; one’s relationship to and engagement within the group, and the learning that emerges from within this experience, are developmentally informed (Kegan, 1982).

Donald Winnicott (1896-1971) first used the term “holding environment” in reference to the dyad between the mother and her child during infancy. In effect, there is never just an infant, but an infant in relation to the mother (Winnicott, 1965). Constructive-developmental theory (Kegan, 1979, 1980, 1982) has expanded this concept to include the many psychosocial environments in which we find ourselves. Kegan (1982) has indicated that throughout one’s lifetime a person may enter, enmesh with, and differentiate from many holding environments. The holding environment may nudge one toward greater capacity and complexity by appropriately challenging and supporting one’s developmental growth (developmental progression). Alternatively, the holding environment may impose inappropriate challenges and support, keeping one enmeshed and embedded, thus inhibiting developmental growth (i.e., developmental immobilization or regression). According to Kegan, the holding environment as a “culture of embeddedness [or domain] … out of which we repeatedly are recreated” (1982, p. 121). This culture serves three functions: “it must hold on. It must let go. And it must stick around so that it can be integrated” (p. 121). The individual is influenced by numerous holding environments concurrently—for example, her home, work, faith community, and friends. Each holding environment has the potential to support and/or inhibit growth. A holding environment might pull on a person to stay embedded and not move toward individuation, or it might push her forward toward individuation; “There is never just a you; and at this very moment your own buoyancy or lack of it, your own sense of wholeness or lack of it, is in large part a function of
how your own current embeddedness culture [your holding environment] is holding you” (Kegan, 1982, p. 116).

Building on the work of biologists Maturana and Varela (1972), McGuigan and Popp (2007) have described this psychosocial dynamic as “autopoiesis,” a reflexive process “through which living organisms inevitably and constantly create and recreate themselves in their ongoing engagement with a changing external environment” (p. 223). McGuigan and Popp understand autopoiesis as a process of ongoing, increasingly complex meaning-making through interaction with and adaptation to one’s environment.

Fenwick’s fourth perspective of experiential learning is the critical cultural perspective. The critical cultural perspective recognizes that the way one understands history, politics, culture, and gender are informed by the implicit and explicit dominant narrative (Fenwick, 2000; Brookfield, 2008). Therefore, a powerful, dominant, widely accepted ideology has a profound influence on learning.

Fenwick’s last experiential learning perspective is the enactivist perspective, or co-emergence. The co-emergence perspective suggests that the learner is interconnected with the system within which she learns; her learning both influences and is influenced by the system (Davis & Sumara, 1997). In other words, an individual influences the very system that she is a part of, even as she is influenced by it; the context and person are inseparable (Fenwick, 2000). This concept of co-emergence is important to the discussion of holding environment; each member of the holding environment can effect some change in that environment.

**Self-directed learning.** Self-Directed Learning theory (SDL) suggests that learning is part of daily life and that systematic learning occurs without the direction of an instructor (Tough, 1967, 1971; Houle, 1961). According to SDL, critical reflection, greater autonomy, and
social action are important to learning (Merriam, 2001a). Grow’s (1991, 1994) SDL model differentiated levels of autonomy. In this model, the level of support provided by the educator is based on whether the learner’s level of autonomy is identified as being dependent, interested, involved, or self-directed. This autonomy-support relationship may make Grow’s model appear to be a stage development model. However, Grow’s approach was based on the behavioral situated leadership model of Hersey and Blanchard (1988), not on Constructive-developmental theory.

Drawing from Rogers, Habermas, and Friere, Mezirow (1991, 1996, 2000) held that critical reflection is what makes SDL transformative. Others in the field (Boyd, 1983; Clark, 1993; Cranton, 1994; Daloz, 1986, 2000; Dirkx, 1998, 2001) have made the same observation. To facilitate change in one’s habit of mind, Mezirow (1991) suggested, one should reflect on the premises or assumptions held rather than the content or structure of the material. Mezirow defined a habit of mind as “a set of assumptions—broad, generalized, orienting predisposition that act as a filter for interpreting the meaning of experience” (2000, p. 6). One’s habit of mind combines with one’s point of view, “sets of immediate, specific beliefs, feelings, attitudes, and values judgments,” resulting in a frame of reference, which is a “meaning perspective” (p. 18). An individual is usually aware of her point of view, but unaware of her habit of mind. This makes a habit of mind more difficult to change and more difficult to negotiate. According to Mezirow (2000), a change in one’s point of view or habit of mind represents transformative learning. Mezirow’s theory differs from Kegan’s in terminology and corresponding understanding of the learning process. In Kegan’s (2000) terms, transformational learning changes the complexity of the form or structures of meaning-making; “we do not only form
meaning, and we do not only change our meanings; we change the very form by which we are making our meanings. We change our epistemologies” (p. 52).

Mezirow’s concept of transformative learning shifts the understanding of learning away from an emphasis on just the addition of content (horizontal development) toward the meaning that one makes of the content. But Kegan’s concept of transformational learning shifts this understanding even further by establishing a connection between the meaning that one makes of the content and the structural complexity of one’s meaning-making. That is, to Mezirow an individual’s premises, values, and beliefs are the learning lens through which meaning is made; to Kegan premises, values, and beliefs are themselves understood through an individual’s structural developmental lens of meaning-making. Kegan emphasizes the influence of vertical development on horizontal development and understands this as adult learning.

**Andragogy.** Andragogy is a term for “the art and science of helping adults learn” (Knowles, 1980, p. 43). Andragogy is separate and distinct from pedagogy, which is the science of helping children learn (Knowles, 1968). With his work never fully accepted as a theory of adult learning, Knowles (1989) later indicated that andragogy was a “model of assumptions about learning or a conceptual framework” (p. 112). Regardless of whether it is viewed as a theory, set of principles, model of assumptions, or conceptual framework, andragogy has played a role in making adult learning a discipline of study that is separate and distinct from the study of teaching children (Brookfield, 1986: Merriam et. al., 2007). More than forty years after it was introduced, Knowles’ work continues to significantly influence adult training and curricula design. The principles of andragogy are as follows:

- Maturity involves moving from being dependent to being self-directed in one’s learning interests and activities;
- Life experience serves adults as a learning resource;
- The social roles an adult holds influence her readiness to learn;
- As adults mature, they shift their focus of time from the future to the immediate application, resulting in learning for problem-solving;
- Internal motivation is more powerful than external motivation; and
- An adult learner’s internal motivation is influenced by one’s understanding of the rationale or why the learning is important (Knowles, 1980, 1984; Merriam, 2001a, 2001c; Merriam et al., 2007).

Andragogy uses chronological age rather than developmental growth as a benchmark to define maturity. In contrast to Constructive-developmental theory, andragogy may overgeneralize the ability of adult learners; the principles of andragogy may reflect the characteristics of specific stages in Kegan’s model rather than the characteristics of any particular chronological age.

**Four Territories and four quadrants.** Torbert’s (2004) Four Territories model (Table 1) grew out of the work of Argyris and Schön, who were his academic mentors. Argyris (1976) and Schön (Argyris & Schön, 1974) advanced the concept of “reflection-in-action.” Reflection-in-action is an element of reflective practice, a shift of epistemology away from knowing or reflecting-on-action. Instead of acting in the moment and then reflecting back at a later time to gain understanding and insight (reflecting-on-action), one shifts one’s perspective to take in the what, how, and why of the activity in real-time as it unfolds. This results in an immediate feedback loop that allows an individual to intentionally make real-time modifications. Torbert (2004) expanded this concept to include four distinct foci of “action inquiry.” He called the four foci the “Four Territories.” Each territory has a distinct feedback loop (Table 1). Single-loop
feedback considers the outcomes and the actions that give rise to them. Double-loop feedback considers the outcomes, the actions that give rise to them, and the strategy that gives rise to these actions. Triple-loop feedback considers, in real-time, the outcomes, the actions that give rise to them, the strategy that gives to these actions, and the vision and intention that gives rise to this strategy. Each feedback loop is increasingly more difficult to hold in real-time awareness (Torbert, 2004; Argyris, 1976; Argyris & Schön, 1974).

Table 1

Torbert's Four Territories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loop</th>
<th>Territory</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>One's Vision and Intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triple-Loop</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>One's Strategy and Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double-Loop</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>One's Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Loop</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Resulting Outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Four Territories model may provide a useful context for understanding adult learning theories in distinguishing the content of learning and the complexity of learning. For example, in single-loop learning, an individual can reflect on her actions and how her actions influence outcomes. What she learns can be used to modify her actions and resulting outcomes. Torbert has indicated that single-loop action inquiry is accessible to most individuals. In double-loop learning, an individual can reflect on her strategies and how her strategies influence her actions and outcomes. What she learns can be immediately used to modify her strategies, actions and
outcomes. Finally, in triple-loop learning, an individual can reflect in real-time on her intentions and how her intentions influence her strategies, actions and outcomes. What she learns can be immediately used to modify her intentions, strategies, actions and outcomes. According to Torbert, double-loop action inquiry is demonstrated by those using creative or problem-solving abilities involving strategy, schema, and plans (2004, p. 23). Few of us demonstrate triple-loop action inquiry into “our attention itself, our super-vision” (p. 23). Torbert’s model—by encouraging us to consider the complexity of learning in addition to the content of learning—may influence how we understand experiential learning, self-directed learning, and andragogy. The model provides a framework for considering the level of attention or scope of vision that one may bring to learning. Further, the model implies that real-time critical reflection and self-reflection may influence the pace of learning.

Another tool that is useful for understanding adult learning theories is Wilber’s (1995) Integral All Quadrant All Lines (AQAL) model, which is a transdisciplinary meta-theory. Theories are commonly considered to be either discipline-specific, multidisciplinary, or interdisciplinary (encompassing a few areas of study). A meta-theory can be applied across numerous disciplines (transdisciplinary) and provides theorists of the various disciplines with a shared foundation that can help bridge discipline-specific language and concepts. A meta-theory is inquiry-centric, not discipline-centric, investigation. The Integral AQAL model (Figure 1) is represented using a two-by-two square of four quadrants. Each quadrant represents a combination of inner or outer perspectives, each with a singular or plural orientation. The upper-left quadrant represents the inner, singular, and subjective perspective, which includes the interior dimensions of the individual (e.g., identity and morality). The upper-right quadrant represents the outer, singular, and objective perspective, which includes the exterior forms of the
individual (e.g., biology and behavior). The lower-left quadrant represents the inner, plural, and inter-subjective perspective, which includes the interior dimensions of the group (e.g., culture and shared values). The lower-right quadrant represents the outer, plural, and inter-objective perspective, which includes the exterior forms of the group (e.g., social structures and systems). As a “holistic” model, the Integral AQAL model illustrates what Wilber (2000) has called “tetra-interaction:” the ability of the organism to influence the holding environment even as the holding environment influences the organism. That is, all quadrants interact with one another all the time.

As an organizing tool, the quadrants can be used to categorize adult learning theories. Figure 1 illustrates that each learning theory represents a specific perspective and orientation within the AQAL model. When each is considered in context to the whole, the integrated view may provide us with greater understanding. Taking an integrated approach to education, known as “Integral Education,” is represented in the work of Esbjörn-Hargens, Reams, and Gunnlauson (2010) who were influenced, in addition to others, by Aurobindo (2003), Chaudhari (1977) and Wilber (1995, 2000).

Figure 1. Wilber’s AQAL Model
In addition to the aforementioned quadrants, the AQAL model has four other key elements: “lines,” which represent areas of growth (e.g. emotional, ego), “stages” of growth, “states” of consciousness (e.g. gross, subtle, and causal), and “types” (e.g. masculine, feminine, intuitive, and feeling).\(^\text{13}\) Kegan’s Constructive-developmental theory, which describes the interior dimensions of one’s meaning-making capacity and complexity, is mapped in the upper-left quadrant of the AQAL model, as one developmental line on which stages are reflected through the use of dots or discs (Figure 2). Constructive-developmental theory, including the stages of complexity, is reviewed in more detail in the section on adult development.

Summary. Best practice for teaching adult learners in higher education settings has been to apply the principles of adult learning theories, such as experiential learning, self-directed learning, and andragogy. However, taken individually, each theory represents a single perspective on adult learning, in which learning is understood, respectively, in terms of biology,  

\(^\text{13}\) Note that lines, stages, states, and types are not reflected in Figure 1.
psychology, environment, or behavior. This discipline-centric approach may be limiting in at least two significant ways. First, although there may be recognition within a theory that change occurs (for example, a shift from dependency on the educator to independence, extrinsic to intrinsic motivation, or a change in one’s habit of mind), more needs to be said about how that change is related to developmental structure. Also, one must discuss further how adult learning theories and adult development theories inform one another. Torbert’s (2004) Four Territories model and Wilber’s (1995) Integral All Quadrant All Lines (AQAL) model may be useful in addressing these two challenges because the models provide additional insight by integrating the seemingly disparate elements of adult learning and adult development theories into a single holistic view.

**Adult Development**

As it applies to adults, development looks at the changes and transitions experienced during one’s lifespan. Clark and Caffarella (1999b) have categorized these changes and transitions into four perspectives of adult development: biological, psychological, sociocultural, and integrative. From the biological perspective, the external environment, health habits, accidents, and the disease process will contribute to physiological aging and change. The biological perspective is located in the upper right quadrant in the AQAL model. In the upper-left quadrant, the psychological perspective explores our interior space, including ego development, moral development, identity development, emotional development, cognition, and intellect. The psychological perspective of adult development grew out of Jean Piaget’s (1896-1980) constructivist theory of child development and James Mark Baldwin’s (1861-1934) work in cognitive growth constructed through iterative step or “circular reaction with variations” (Broughton & Freeman-Moir, 1982, p. xviii). The sociocultural perspective considers the
influence on adult development of society and culture—for example, the social roles of parent, partner, worker, or friend (AQAL lower-right) and cultural aspects (AQAL lower-left) such as race, ethnicity, gender, social class, and sexual orientation (Clark & Caffarella, 1999; Evans, Forney & Guido-DiBrito, 1998; Merriam et al., 2007; Tenant & Pogson, 1995). The integral perspective suggests that adults are complex and cannot be classified using single perspectives. Perun and Bielby (1980), Baltes (1982), Esbjörn-Hargens, Reams, and Gunnlauson (2010), Magnusson (1995), and Wilber (1995) are researchers who have explored an integral meta-perspective in past decades.

**Stage theories.** Stage theorists (structural theorists) were influenced by Baldwin, who, informed by the work of Darwin, introduced the concept of mental development as an iterative process of evolution of complexity through which one constructs meaning (Broughton & Freeman-Moir, 1982). The principles of evolution hold that: each stage is qualitatively different with distinct organizing principles; the structures that define a stage include the structures of the previous stage; and the structures of the current stage will be incorporated into the next stage. As such, each evolutionary stage is more complex than the previous stage and less complex than the next stage. All stage theorists hold that the stage sequence is universal—it applies to everyone. But when and how fast evolution occurs is individually variable (Hayslip Jr., Neuman, Louden, & Chapman, 2006). Adult stage theories include those that focus on ego development (Loevinger 1976; Cook-Grueter, 1990), values (Graves 1971, Beck & Cowan, 1996), emotions (Goleman, 1995), morals (Kohlberg, 1981; Gilligan, 1987), and needs (Maslow, 1943).

**Constructive-developmental theory.** Kegan’s (1979, 1980, 1982, 1994, 2000) Constructive-developmental theory has identified stages and sub-stages that mark the evolution in complexity of one’s organization of information and meaning-making. A term coined in
Kegan’s seminal 1982 essay, “Constructive-developmental” theory is neo-Piagetian. Kegan takes Piaget’s work on the developmental stages of cognition and children’s and adolescents’ understanding of the external world and extends it to theorize the evolution of meaning-making in adults. Kegan’s work grew “out of Piaget’s underlying framework, rather than his psychology” (p. 15). Kegan (1982) has described the Piagetian approach as “viewing meaning-making from the outside...balancing and rebalancing subject and object, or self and other” (p. 12). In contrast, Kegan oriented his Constructive-developmental theory to focus on the inside, from the perspective of the self, to explore what balance is, and to understand what evolves in a stage sequence of increasing complexity to change meaning-making. This is a shift away from epistemology to ontology. For Kegan,

There is thus no feeling, no experience, no thought, no perception, independent of a meaning-making context in which it becomes a feeling, an experience, a thought, a perception, because we are the meaning-making context. (1982, p. 11, italics in original).

Kegan’s theory encompasses the formation, preservation, and evolution of psychological stages composing one’s cognition, emotion, personal, and social realms throughout adulthood (1982, 1994, 2000). This composition of meaning, or act of meaning-making, includes intrapersonal and interpersonal experience situated in a social context. For Kegan (1979, 1980), meaning-making is not a psychoanalytic process that locates the source of adult phenomena in childhood experience, nor an existential phenomena of the isolated individual. Rather, meaning-making is the unfolding and evolution of understanding in relationship to the challenges and supports of one’s holding environments.
For example, imagine a conflict between co-workers that challenges one’s values or beliefs. The complexity of one’s meaning-making will influence what one can see objectively and what one cannot see. If one can objectively see her values and beliefs she may foster a different psychosocial response than if she is still enmeshed within (subject to) her values and beliefs. She may be more successful in managing her anger, or in managing a tendency to become defensive, when she relates to her values and beliefs as something she has (as an object) rather than something she is (something that has her—that she is subject to). When she can take an objective perspective on her values and beliefs, she may engage in a calm and open manner. She may engage more effectively with a clearer understanding of what is happening within her intrapersonal space—how she is making meaning of the conflict, and the interpersonal space—how her meaning-making influences her interactions with others.

According to Kegan’s Constructive-developmental theory, the act of organizing experience through the evolution of meaning-making systems is the primary activity of being human (1982, p. 8). Our meaning-making system shapes and influences our understanding of experiences, behaviors, thinking, and feeling. Kegan’s (1979, 1980) theory indicates how in each stage there occurs a “redifferentiating” and “reintegrating” of the self-other relationship. One has the sense of losing one’s self as one navigates the transition of differentiation and reintegration (identity formation, disruption, and reformation). Lastly, Kegan holds that focusing on the individual’s developmental position is likely to result in the labeling of her as belonging to a certain stage, as constituting a problem, or as having a pathology. For this reason, practitioners should focus on how an individual composes meaning rather than on an individual’s developmental position (Kegan, 1980).
For Kegan, the changing subject-object relationship defines developmental growth. Aspects of experience, such as thoughts, behaviors, and emotions, are considered “objects” when one is capable of taking a third-person perspective on one’s first-person experience. This transition to an objective perspective is a marker of increasing complexity of mind; the individual can now observe and think about that to which they were once subject. For example, the sentence “I am fearful” implies the speaker is enmeshed with and subject to the emotion (i.e., the first-person perspective). “I have fear,” on the other hand, implies that the speaker has gained distance and perspective, and can now hold the emotion as an object (i.e., the third-person perspective). Until this transformation in one’s epistemology occurs, that which is subject continues to be “the lens being looked through” (Kegan, 1982, 1994). In other words, when the individual is subject to the aspect of experience, she “is had” by the experience (it possesses her). When the individual sees the aspect of experience as object, she “has” the experience (she possesses it) (Kegan, 1982, 1994; Kegan & Lahey, 2009). This subject-object shift may be facilitated through the disruption of the dynamic equilibrium that contributed to holding the previous subject-object relationship in place. In this theoretical context, first-person and third-person perspectives can be understood as a matter of psychological distance.

Kegan’s model employs a five-stage scale with four sub-stages between each stage, represented as x(y), x/y, y/x, and y(x) (Table 2). Each developmental stage reflects specific subject-object characteristics that indicate one’s changing complexity of mind and how one organizes and makes meaning of information and experience. As complexity increases, that which was subject in the previous stage becomes object. For example, one is subject to her relationships in stage three and the relationships have become object in stage four. Therefore,

---

14 Three stages were illustrated using dots in Figure 2.
one can observe and think about (hold a third-person perspective to) the characteristics of previous stages, but remains subject to the characteristics of the current stage (enmeshed in first-person experience). The instrument used to assess one’s developmental stage is called the Subject-Object Interview (SOI). Instruction on the administration and the analysis of the SOI was developed by Lahey, Souvaine, Kegan, Goodman, and Felix (1988).

The name of each stage, or “order,” has changed through the years as Kegan’s work has progressed. Therefore, the reader may be more familiar with a different name for a stage than the name used in the present study. In the first order (impulsive), considered a stage of early childhood, the child is subject to her impulses. The second order (instrumental or concrete) is characterized by her being subject to her needs and interpreting experiences through a concrete, literal, and dualistic structure of meaning-making. Although considered a pre-adult stage, Kegan et al. (2001), Popp and Portnow (2001), and Berger (2012) indicated that some adults never move beyond the instrumental stage.

In the most common adult stage (Kegan, 1994), the third order (interpersonal or socializing), the individual can see as object the needs that she was subject to in the second order. But meaning-making is now subject to relationships, such as the opinions and expectations of the group. In the fourth order (self-authoring), the individual is able to see or make objective the relationship influence to which she was previously subject. Her relationship affiliation is extricated and objective; the lens through which she makes meaning has evolved and become more complex. In the fourth order, the individual is now subject to her own ideologies, including her values and beliefs. In the fifth order, the individual sees that self-authored meaning-making is itself a construction and so experiences the construction of meaning in every moment.
Table 2

Kegan’s Developmental Stages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Subject and Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>Subject: <em>Impulses</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Object: <em>Impulses</em>  Subject: <em>Needs</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Object: <em>Needs</em>  Subject: <em>Relationships</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>Object: <em>Relationships</em>  Subject: <em>Ideologies including Values and Beliefs</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>Object: <em>Ideologies</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

McGuigan and Popp (2009, pp. 6-7) have provided a useful example of how an individual’s language about an environmental conflict reflects Kegan’s developmental stages. Table 3 captures McGuigan and Popp’s example of the participant’s language, along with a column reflecting the characteristic of understanding for each of the second, third and fourth orders.

Table 3

Examples of Developmentally Informed Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual’s Developmental Stage</th>
<th>Example of Language</th>
<th>Characteristics of Understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Second                          | “I don’t see the point of these meetings. We know we have to eliminate greenhouse gases. The Kyoto Accord told us how, so why don’t we just do it? It’s really not that complicated. You just get rid of greenhouse gases and we fix the problem. Period.” | -Subject to own needs  
-Uses concrete and dualistic rules  
-See a right or a wrong way with no third way  
-Simplifies by minimizing discussion  
-Inability to hold abstract ideas or multiple perspectives  
-Can only consider action through one of the two paths apparent to them |
Table 3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual’s Developmental Stage</th>
<th>Example of Language</th>
<th>Characteristics of Understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>“I like the concept of democracy, but it is very inefficient, but I am attracted to the whole autocratic approach. We need this person to just come in and be like, this is the way it is going to happen. Whoever writes the bill or passes it through the legislature – nothing is going to happen until they tell us to do it.”</td>
<td>-Subject to relationships&lt;br&gt;-Has larger capacity to consider multiple perspectives, abstractions, and the resulting thirds way options&lt;br&gt;-Yet, having strong affiliation to their identity group, they are uncomfortable with and will attempt to minimize differences and conflict in service to a single authority or consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>“You try to make everyone understand the basis for decisions and you try to make the best social decisions possible and the ones you make today are not the same as the decision you would come to five years from now. Even with the same knowledge, society is changing so you can look at the same system and the same information at two different points in time and there you will come up with two slightly different answers.”</td>
<td>-Subject to ideologies&lt;br&gt;-Enabled to take in and be informed by data from their surroundings including the perspectives of others, abstraction, and the desire of group consensus or authority and then contribute in accordance with their own ideology&lt;br&gt;-Reflects a systems level of understanding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When considering adult learning in the context of Kegan’s Constructive-developmental theory, the learner’s internal or external direction and motivation (both principles of andragogy) are influenced by her development. Kegan states that the meaning made from experience will vary depending on the subject-object relationship. Therefore, an educator may find it useful to understand the adult learner’s subject-object relationship in relation to her needs, relationships, and ideologies. Applied approaches to adult learning, such as experiential learning, self-directed learning, and andragogy, may impact each adult very differently based on her developmental
stage; the subject-object relationship characteristic of each stage influences one’s meaning-making and the understanding gained from the learning experience.

**Immunity to change.** Some adults seem to reach a plateau and stop rather than continue with vertical growth within a holding environment. According to Kegan and Lahey (2009), people may have a “master motive” that acts to immunize them to change (Preface, p. x). This master motive is an inner defensive system that acts through competing interests (p. 47). Simultaneously, people possess a parallel, outside dimension influenced by cognitive thought that functions as a commitment and driving force toward goal attainment. Because they are part of the same system (commitment and competing commitment—two sides of the same coin), the outside dimension, which is accessible to the individual and can be examined from a third-person perspective (i.e., her behavior and strategy) can be utilized to bring the inner dimension (competing commitment–master motive) into view. However, one cannot initially see one’s master motive from a third-person perspective because her inner defensive system/immunity is informed by the complexity of her organization of information and meaning-making—i.e., the unseen lens through which she looks. She is subject to the master motive. Kegan and Lahey’s Immunity to Change process is designed to help participants bring forward unconscious content (competing interests and hidden assumptions) to make the master motive conscious. Participants move through a developmentally informed process from being “unconsciously immune,” to “consciously immune,” to “consciously released,” to “unconsciously released” (Kegan & Lahey, 2009, p. 272). The ITC process includes a series of exercises that guide participants through the sequence listed in Table 4. The process enables one to identify and test the “Big Assumption” to determine if it acts to immunize the individual against the desired change, described as the improvement goal. The ITC process may enable the participant to see, for the first time, the
meaning attributed to the immunity content and, therefore, test the validity of the master motive or immunity preventing her from change and goal attainment.

Table 4

ITC Process Sequence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Exercise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>Identify an improvement goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>Name the behaviors that work against reaching the improvement goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>Filling the worry box—What fear or worry exists about stopping the behavior in step 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>Uncovering the hidden commitment beneath the worry or fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>Identifying the Big Assumption that holds these competing commitments in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>Write a biographical history of the Big Assumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>Create a test to explore if the Big Assumption is true or false</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ITC process offers the participant access to and use of “more sophisticated levels of mental complexity” (Kegan & Lahey, 2009, p.51) by presenting an adaptive challenge intended to disrupt the subject-object equilibrium holding her in place. Through this dialectic process, the participant may bring aspects of what was once subject into awareness, enabling those aspects to be considered objectively. The disruption of the subject-object equilibrium enables the growth necessary to “look at what before she was looking through” (p. 53, italics in original).

Kegan begins the ITC workshop by discussing the principles of Constructive-developmental theory before walking participants through the process. Near the end of the ITC process, he asks participants to develop a small test to see if their Big Assumption is true.

McGuigan modified this approach by adding, at the end of Kegan’s process (above), a discussion of shadow and an exercise to bring shadow into awareness (McGuigan & Popp, 2009).

McGuigan’s addition of shadow work raises several questions: Does discussing shadow and
doing shadow work at the end of the ITC process release energy and thereby influence how one understands the Big Assumption? Further, since understanding the Big Assumption is intended to developmentally nudge the participant to a more complex perspective on their immunity, how does shadow work support the developmental journey? In other words, does the participant’s ability to hold a third-person perspective on her early experiences related to shadow formation and projection (to differentiate and witness) help her to release energy that may be needed to disrupt subject-object equilibrium and support making the subjective content of the mind objective?

**Concentration of energy.** According to Kegan, the complexification of mind must be understood in terms of how one relates to—organizes and makes meaning of—information and experience. Vertical development is facilitated by the disruption of the dynamic equilibrium that holds one in place, resistant to complexification. Disrupting the dynamic equilibrium requires sufficient energy to overcome the equilibrium force. Kegan & Lahey (2001) understand this evolutionary growth as negentropy, the opposite of entropy. Unlike entropy, where energy diminishes and order moves toward disorder, negentropy is the complexification of order, enhanced capacity, and a concentration of energy.

In contrast to Piaget’s model, which understood the self as *located in* a single energy system in equilibrium with all living things, Kegan’s (1982) Constructive-developmental theory understands the energy system in equilibrium *as the self*:

In fact, Piaget’s vision derives from a model of open-systems evolutionary biology.... But perhaps we can begin by saying that it [Piaget’s vision] does not place an energy system within us so much as it places us in a single energy system of all living things. Its primary attention, then, is not to shifts and changes in an
internal equilibrium, but to an equilibrium in the world, between the progressively individuated self and the bigger life field, an interaction sculpted by both and constitutive of reality itself. (p. 43)

Energy is the currency of growth in Constructive-developmental theory; evolution toward greater complexity requires sufficient energy. Thus, the ITC process aims to overcome competing commitments that may contribute to holding us in equilibrium and making us immune to change. According to Kegan,

Although we don’t usually consider we hold commitments such as these, if we do they name not just something we are stuck with, like a cold or a bad back, but interestingly an active, energy-expending way of living. They name a way our creativity is being continuously spent, and spending it this way may be a clue to how our own temporizing equilibrium—our own immune system—sustains itself.

(Kegan and Lahey, 2001, pp. 49-51)

In Kegan’s understanding, then, an individual is an energy system. An individual’s immunity holds enough energy to maintain her dynamic equilibrium. To develop more complexity in one’s meaning-making, one requires additional energy. Recognizing the Big Assumption creates “added energy to continue the exploration. We tend to be more curious about something that we notice having such a big influence on our living. Curiosity is the high-test fuel for the engine of learning” (Kegan and Lahey, 2001, p. 83). Furthermore, psychic functions consume energy to maintain themselves:

Finally, let us consider the more chronic phenomenon of ‘split off,’ encapsulated, or dissociated aspects of our experiencing, which fail to be transformed by the new, more complex principle of organization and continue to be organized
according to earlier, simpler principles. The fact that such situations always take a
toll on psychic life (cognitively, they can cause distortions; affectively, they can
generate painful symptoms; biologically, they drain off energy that goes into
keeping the parts separate) demonstrates that the self seeks consistency even if it
cannot always achieve it. (Kegan, 1994, p. 373)

The energy that psychic functions “drain off” could be redirected to support developmental
growth. Although Kegan does not address shadow, one can extend the concept of energy
consumption and release to shadow. How might the energy one uses to keep aspects of Self
repressed (shadow) be released and redirected to augment the energy one needs for vertical
development?

**Summary.** To describe the equilibrium in place during a state of consciousness, Combs
(1995, 2009) provided a metaphor. Imagine an individual standing in the center of a room with
two giant rubber bands around her waist, each attached to the opposing wall. While she is in the
middle of the room, there is equal tension in both bands. As she walks toward one of the
opposing walls, the band on that side slackens, enabling her to move more freely. However, the
opposite band stretches and pulls harder on her to return her to the center point where the two
opposing forces are in equilibrium. Most of the time, as she stands in the room, she is not aware
of her location or the effects of the forces working upon her. She can only see where she was
once the forces maintaining equilibrium have been overcome and she arrives somewhere else.

Applying Combs’ metaphor to Constructive-developmental theory, vertical development
requires sufficient energy to break the bands constituting the dynamic equilibrium that holds one
in place. Horizontal growth from shadow work may release energy that may then be available to
augment the energy required for vertical development in the adult developmental journey.
Shadow

Jung, a student of Sigmund Freud (1856-1939), contributed to the development of analytic psychology and the concepts of archetype, collective unconscious, and shadow. Jung (1958) suggested that the psyche consists of conscious parts and subconscious parts, all of which are essential to a person being psychologically whole. The conscious parts are the ego and persona. These conscious parts are influenced by the subconscious parts—the collective unconscious, the individual Self, anima or animus, and shadow. As an individual, one is conscious of one’s ego and, perhaps, of one’s persona, which is used to represent oneself to others. However, according to Jung (1958), the ego knows only its own content and, therefore, self-knowledge requires that shadow, which by definition is subconscious, be brought to consciousness and integrated. That is, to return to wholeness—to bridge the subconscious and the conscious—requires the unification of opposites. According to Jung, “Empirically, therefore, the self appears as a play of light and shadow, although conceived as a totality and unity in which the opposites are united (Jung, 1971, paragraph 790). We are blind to unity in our choice of light over shadow or when we acknowledge our goodness and deny our evil. This division is reflected by a quote attributed to Jung, “I would rather be whole than good.”

Combs suggested that shadow is pre-reflective and just outside of awareness, rather than subconscious. According to this view, the manifestations of shadow can be seen, but not recognized, examined, or understood (Combs, personal communication, September 9, 2010). For this reason, shadow work activities bolster the individual in exploring the manifestations of shadow, such as projection. This exploration may shift one’s perspective and facilitate shadow reintegration. While the focus of my research is the role of shadow on the adult developmental
journey, it is important to understand Jung’s conceptualization of how the psyche is organized in general in order to understand the significance of the shadow.

Repression. Shadows are aspects of our Self that were repressed and denied while we were children in order to create and maintain the persona demanded by those whom we considered authority figures and from whom we wanted love. Shadow is often characterized as the undesirable and dark part of the Self that lurks beneath our pleasant and socially acceptable ego and persona. Yet, many (Bly, 1988; Kopp, 1980; Johnson, 1993; Richo, 1999; Zweig & Abrams, 1991) have emphasized that shadow can also be comprised of desirable and light aspects of the Self (i.e., golden shadow). Shadow is not created only through the repression of some aspect that is judged to be dark. Rather, it is created when dark and light aspects of the Self are judged to be socially unacceptable within our initial holding environments, such as our family of origin. According to Johnson (1993), for the light shadow to be understood as “light,” it must have a dark counterpart. While we may want to hide the dark aspects of Self from the world, we must never hide them from ourselves; when in balance with light, dark shadow is a contributor to a center point, which “is the whole (holy) place” (p. 14, parenthesis in original).

Shadow is the part of ourselves that we repress because it is inconsistent with who we think we are, or who we are told we should be (Richo, 1999). Bly (1988) has provided a powerful portrayal of how, in childhood, we become diminished when we repress aspects of our Self to gain approval from external authority such as our parents, teachers, and friends:

Arriving from the farthest reaches of the universe, bringing with us appetites well preserved from our mammal inheritance, spontaneities wonderfully preserved from our 150,000 years of tree life, angers well preserved from our 5,000 years of tribal life—in short, with our 360-degree radiance—and we offered this gift to our
parents. They didn’t want it. They wanted a nice girl or a nice boy. (Bly, 1988, p. 24)

We repress aspects of Self as a response to our holding environment. Bly (1988) has indicated that we unknowingly drag this repressed content behind us as if it were a long, heavy bag. The bag is a metaphor for the work it takes to repress parts of who we are and to project our repressed Self onto the other. Unknowingly, we spend our pre-adult life filling the bag and then spend our adult life trying to liberate our repressed aspects by emptying the bag. Filling and dragging the bag behind us requires physical and psychological energy, and this consumption of energy limits us; we cannot contribute fully to others and the world (Bly, 1988). Through shadow work, however, one can become more whole (horizontal development) and may release energy in support of vertical development.

**Projection.** We become uneasy when we see, in someone else, characteristics of our Self that we have disowned and repressed as shadow. Although we cannot see our own shadow,\(^{15}\) we can see our repressed nature reflected by others. When we see in others that which we have hidden, we are “triggered.” Once triggered, we may experience very strong feelings and emotions about the situation or the people involved. These feelings are usually negative, possibly hostile, and are usually more extreme than is warranted by the situation. That is, we may not be reacting to the other person or the situation, but rather our own repressed aspects—shadow, which we have attributed to or projected onto the other (Bly, 1988; Richo, 1999; Wilber, 2007). Whitmont (1991) has indicated that everything unconscious is projected, therefore repressed aspects of Self, or shadow, are encountered in our projections. When one is asked to describe the people they dislike the most, “these very qualities are so unacceptable to him precisely because

---

\(^{15}\) By definition, once we see our Shadow it no longer exists.
they represent his own repressed side; only that which we cannot accept within ourselves do we find impossible to live with in others” (p. 14).

This triggering can result in what Schimel, Greenberg, Arndt, Pyszczynski, and O’Mahen (2000) have described as psychological distancing, whereby we see ourselves as very different from the other. One says, “I would never do that sort of thing; I’m not that kind of person” (p. 460). Wilber (2007) has indicated that we can determine whether or not we are projecting our shadow by examining what we experience with the other. If our experience with the other informs us, then shadow and projection is not at work. However, if our experience with the other holds energy and creates strong feelings, such as anger, then we are likely projecting and therefore unknowingly experiencing our own shadow. Through shadow work (which I characterize as horizontal development), we may move toward becoming whole and regaining our 360-degree personality. We may remove shadows from the bag, recover what was repressed, and release the energy.

**Reintegration.** Bly (1988) has developed a specific sequence to break free from shadow. First, we need to recognize the inconsistency between reality and our projections, then call on our moral intelligence to reconcile the incongruence of what we are projecting with reality, sense our diminishment, and, finally, recognize our lack of energy resulting from repressed shadow. Bly has suggested that through this sequence one can retrieve or “eat” the shadow. This is reintegration of Self, a returning to a more complete self. According to Kopp (1980), nothing is too good or too bad to belong to us; both the dark and light aspects of shadow should be re-owned by returning to the “borderland” where the ego was first formed, in order to identify,  

---

16 This sequence represents a reintegration of that particular aspect of the Self. We may have many Shadows.
acknowledge, and reclaim all that was disowned and lost. Miller’s (1989) approach to reintegration was to make our shadow conscious by asking others how they see us, paying attention to the content of our projections, learning from our misstatements and behavior, paying attention to our humor and identity, and reflecting on our dreams, daydreams, and fantasies. Wilber (2007) has contended that the reintegration of shadow can be achieved by trying to engage it from multiple perspectives. To engage the shadow, Wilber (2007) has recommended a “3-2-1” approach; one starts with a first-person perspective of being the shadow (and following the feeling or dissonance), then takes a second-person perspective by talking to the shadow, followed by a third-person perspective of seeing the shadow.

**Shadow and energy.** Working with shadow is difficult, not only because it is hard to see and understand, but because it requires one to be courageous (Robertson, 1992). This is also true of overcoming one’s immunity to change. To overcome the fear of leaving one’s comfort zone, to face discouragement and challenges, to reflect and gain new insight and understanding, and to take perspective and share what one has learned with others are all markers of what Joseph Campbell (1904-1987) described as the “Hero’s Journey” (1949).

Vertical developmental requires energy, which may be diminished because of one’s shadow. According to Bly (1988), “we can think of our personal bag as containing energy now unavailable to us” (p. 25); “If we have given away thirty parts of our self, we will then eventually feel ourselves diminished in thirty different ways” (p. 37). But, though we feel diminished, the energy is in fact not diminished. In Richo’s (1999) words: “the energy invested in hiding or repudiating our bright potential may be misdirected[,] but it has not diminished. With creativity we can release and redirect the derailed energy” (p. 114).
Summarizing, Constructive-developmental theory indicates that we are an energy system and that our immunity uses energy to maintain dynamic equilibrium. To disrupt dynamic equilibrium and develop increased capacity and complexity, we need to increase the amount of energy available to us. Further, this literature review indicates that shadow work may release the energy being used to hold shadow in place, and this energy may then be available for other needs. Given the subconscious content that resides in shadow, we might say that we are our own antagonist. We might, then, also say that we need to be our own hero to bring this content into awareness and release energy that can be redirected. In this way, shadow work may support the adult developmental journey.

**Horizontal Learning and Vertical Development**

Through the literature review, we have explored the domains of adult learning, adult development, and shadow that are relevant to this study, including some of the ways that each domain may influence the others. However, we need a fuller understanding of the relationship between these domains to explicate how adult learning and shadow work can support adult development. This relationship becomes clearer when we explore the two dimensions in which development can occur (Brown, 2012, Cook-Greuter & Soulen, 2007; Kegan, 1994; McGuigan & Popp, in press; Wilber, 2007).

Cook-Greuter (2004, 2007) has described these two dimensions of development, respectively, using the terms *vertical development*, or increasing complexity, and *horizontal development*, or expanding content. In this context, “development” and “growth” can be used synonymously; vertical development is vertical growth and horizontal development is horizontal growth. Figures 2 and 3 visually represent the stages of complexity (vertical development) using the position of discs (or dots) on a bi-directional line. A particular stage of complexity is
indicated by that disc’s location (disc height). A higher disc location represents greater complexity. Horizontal development is represented by the disc width. A wider disc indicates a greater amount of content—i.e., information, knowledge, and skills. For the purpose of illustration, the discs in Figure 3 reflect increased horizontal development with increased vertical development; the discs in Figure 3 get wider as they get higher. However, this may not always be the case because one dimension of development can occur without the other. The possible combinations of development and the missing slices from the discs presented in Figure 3 will be explained shortly.

Figure 3. Horizontal and Vertical Development

**Vertical development.** Vertical development reflects changes in structure. According to Cook-Greuter (2004, 2007), vertical development can be thought of as occurring in an up or down direction. Moving upward represents an individual’s development of increasing complexity and the ability to take a new and more integrated perspective. Cook-Greuter and Soulen (2007) compare increasing developmental complexity to climbing a mountain:

> At each turn of the path up the mountain, hikers can see more of the territory they have already traversed. They can see the multiple turns and reversals in the path. The climbers can see further into and across the valley. The closer they get to the summit, the easier it becomes to see behind to the shadow side and uncover formerly hidden aspects of the territory. Finally, at the top, they can see beyond their particular mountain to other ranges and further horizons. The more the hikers can see, the wiser, more timely, more systematic and informed their actions and decisions are likely to be. This is so because more of the relevant information, connections, and dynamic relationships become visible. (p. 183)

Note that it is implied that the hiker’s climb may continue throughout the lifespan; the hiker is not making a casual climb up the mountain to briefly check out the panoramic view only to descend and return to base camp. Rather, as the hiker climbs up the mountain she sets up a new base camp at each completed stage of the journey. This new base remains until the next stage of the climb is undertaken. Each stage of increased complexity achieved becomes the beginning point for the next stage of developmental growth. In this metaphor, the elevation of each base camp is analogous to the vertical height of each disc in Figure 3.

When Cook-Greuter and Soulen’s (2007) hiker moves downward she is developmentally regressing (see Figure 3). This regression may be temporary or permanent, as it is influenced by
“life circumstances, environment, stress and illness” (p. 183). In other words, one’s vertical development may be influenced by the challenge and support experienced within her holding environment. The hiker that descends the mountain and returns to a previous base camp may be facing significant barriers to developmental growth—barriers that may influence the individual to resist any future climb.

**Horizontal development.** Unlike vertical development, which reflects structures of complexity, horizontal development reflects amount of content. Cook-Greuter (2004, 2007) has described horizontal development as informational (not transformational) growth at one’s current developmental stage; it occurs by increasing the breadth of one’s information, knowledge, and skills. To avoid confusing these two types of development, I prefer to use the term *vertical development*, which reflects the characteristics of stage theories previously discussed, and the term *horizontal learning*, which more accurately reflects the acquisition of information, knowledge, and skills without implying how one relates—in terms of complexity—to the content.

Horizontal learning may pertain to information, knowledge, and skills from many domains. Each quadrant of the integral AQAL model provides a perspective that can be used to categorize and understand the information, knowledge, and skills that are considered to be horizontal learning. The upper-right quadrant (outer, singular and objective perspective) may include information and knowledge about the exterior forms of the individual (e.g., biology and behavior). This could include autopoiesis and empirical sciences such as physical and behavior analysis. For example, one might expand her information and knowledge about anatomy, physiology, or behavior. Next, the lower-right quadrant (outer, plural, and inter-objective perspective) may include information and knowledge about the exterior forms of the group (e.g.,
social structures and systems). This could include aspects of social autopoiesis and those referred to in systems theory, such as assessing social structures and systems. For example, one might expand her information and knowledge about workplace process and procedures. The lower-left quadrant (inner, plural, and inter-subjective perspective) may include information and knowledge about the interior dimensions of the group (e.g., culture and shared values). This could include aspects of hermeneutics and ethnography such as the exploration of culture and worldviews. For example, one might expand her information and knowledge about interpersonal communications and issues of diversity. Lastly, the upper-left quadrant (inner, singular, and subjective perspective) may include information, knowledge, and skills about the interior dimensions of an individual (e.g., identity and morality). This could include phenomenological and psychological inquiry, including self-awareness. For example, one might expand her information and knowledge about emotional or moral intelligence, about the formation of ego or identity, or about shadow and projection.

**Influence of shadow on horizontal learning and vertical development.** In the present study, the term horizontal learning is assumed to refer specifically to expanding the breadth of information, knowledge, and skills within the upper-left quadrant—the interior dimensions of an individual. In particular, I am referring to shadow work that supports becoming whole (see Figure 4). In the words of Bly (1988), becoming more whole is to restore the missing slices to our “360-degree personality” (p. 17), or to our “round globe of energy” (p. 18).
Becoming whole—by learning about one’s shadow and projection through shadow work—is a form of horizontal learning. The missing slices from each disk in Figure 3 and the missing slices from each globe in Figure 4 illustrate the repressed aspects of the Self. They represent what we have hidden in the long heavy bag we drag behind us, which restricts our being a 360-degree whole Self. As illustrated by Figure 4, shadow may remain out of our view and continue to consume energy as we experience horizontal learning in other areas of our life and as we become more complex through vertical development.

In my judgment, Cook-Greuter and Soulen’s (2007) mountain metaphor lacks one important element: the energy needed to fuel and support the hiker’s climb. As Kegan and Lahey (2001) have indicated, negentropy, or the complexification of order (vertical development), requires energy. Becoming more whole through shadow work (horizontal learning) may release energy that is then available to support increasing complexity (vertical development).

In this review of literature on adult learning, adult development, and shadow and integral theory, it becomes clear that shadow work may augment horizontal and/or vertical development.
In particular, in Constructive-developmental theory and shadow work, we may recognize four potential combinations of development. An individual may:

- remain at one’s current fraction of wholeness at one’s current stage of developmental complexity,
- become more whole at one’s current stage of developmental complexity,
- become more complex at one’s current fraction of wholeness, or
- become more whole and more complex.

Describing the effect of vertical growth on horizontal learning in general, Taylor (2000) has indicated that “changing how one knows risks changes in everything one knows about...the totality of one’s adult commitments” (p. 160). That is, increasing complexity (structure) changes how one relates to content. But how does Taylor’s statement apply to the concept of shadow? Wilber (2007) has suggested that unless one becomes aware of her shadow and projection, vertical development may lead to a more complex, wounded individual. The disassociated aspect may be construed (and projected) as “other” in a more complex way and not recognized as self or owned through personal accountability. With vertical development, a person becomes more complex and relates to content in a more complex way. However, if repressed aspects of Self remain out of view, the individual may not necessarily become more whole or release the energy required to climb further.18

We might also consider the effect of learning about the concepts of vertical development on increasing one’s complexity. Cook-Greuter and Soulen (2007) have indicated that learning about complexity (structure) increases horizontal learning but may not be sufficient for vertical

---

18 However, the increased perspective gained with greater complexity may facilitate horizontal learning including becoming more whole through shadow work.
development to occur; “because [the] acquisition of knowledge is part of horizontal growth, learning about development theories is not [by itself] sufficient to help people transform” (p. 183). The factors that enable horizontal learning to support vertical development are “specific long-term practices, self-reflection, and dialogue, as well as living in the company of others further along the developmental path” (p. 183).

Shadow work, including self-reflection and dialogue, that occurs in an intentional holding environment is horizontal learning that may catalyze vertical development. Becoming more whole may release energy that, in turn, would then be available to augment one’s climb toward increasing complexity. To meet the demands of our complex world, developmentally, we may need to support individuals in becoming both whole and complex.

**Summary**

Kegan’s Constructive-developmental theory (1979, 1982, 1994, 2000) offers a framework that educators could use to create a holding environment that is informed by the complexity of the adult learner’s meaning-making, achieving an optimal balance between challenge and support. If one is under-challenged or over-supported, one may not grow at all. Conversely, if one is over-challenged or under-supported, one may be overwhelmed and growth may be immobilized or even regress. Praxis can function to encourage an individual beyond learning more information to developing a more complex understanding. Or, it may function to over-challenge her.

Kegan and Lahey (2009) indicated that though an individual’s defense system can keep her immune and resistant to change, the ITC process may enable her to identify the Big Assumption that is holding her in place. One’s ability to hold a third-person perspective (allowing differentiation and witnessing) of her early shadow-constituting experiences may
release the energy needed to disrupt subject-object equilibrium and move the subjective structure of the mind to objective content. Kopp (1980), Bly (1988), Miller (1991), and Wilber (2007) have demonstrated that shadow can be brought forward from the unconscious into awareness, examined, and even integrated, thereby releasing energy. Shadow work may, therefore, support an adult’s vertical developmental journey to wholeness.

There is scant literature on how adult learning theories, Constructive-developmental theory, and shadow intersect and interact with one another. The role of shadow in adult learning and adult development needs to be further explored. To this end, the research that follows explores the questions: What are some ways that shadow work might support an adult in overcoming her immunity to change? How might shadow work support and/or enhance her developmental growth and learning? These are important questions in the context of our complex world and the wicked problems and conflicts we face.
Chapter 3

Research Design

My interest in this research is rooted in my own personal journey to understand my shadow and the influence it has had on my learning and development. I have found this journey to be one of growth and new meaning-making. It has been, at times, deeply uncomfortable and emotional. My experiences have informed my orienting hypothesis.

This research was informed by an orienting hypothesis: shadow work influences one’s ability to overcome an immunity to change. Guided by a constructivist orientation, a qualitative and inductive approach to the investigation was utilized (Creswell, 2007, 2009).

Qualitative Paradigm

This study used a qualitative method to explore the ways that adults’ awareness of their shadows can enhance overcoming their immunity to change, thereby supporting developmental growth and learning. Little research has been undertaken to explore the relationship between adult learning theory, Constructive-developmental theory, and Jung’s notion of shadow. The qualitative characteristics of this study include semi-structured and semi-clinical interviews using open-ended questions regarding a shared experience, interview data, and transcript analysis. The transcript analysis included memoing and open and axial coding for theme and pattern determination (Bailey, 2007; Creswell, 2009). In addition, an orienting hypothesis was maintained to guide the exploration. This enabled an awareness of bias, an inductive process of collecting and analyzing data was followed, as well as posing a hypothesis for future research (Creswell, 2009). Informed by the work of Kvale and Brinkmann (2009) and Bailey (2007), semi-clinical and semi-structured interviews with open-ended questions were used to collect data. This enabled the interviewer to be present, reflexive, and empathetic with the participants.
as they answered questions with regard to a previously attended workshop, which, for many, had evoked powerful emotions. This method of interviewing enabled the interviewer to listen intently to the participants’ reports of their workshop experience.

**Population and Sample**

The study required a sample of adult participants that had experienced both shadow work and the Immunity to Change process. The twenty participants were purposely selected as the study sample because of their previous participation in a 4-hour workshop based on the Immunity to Change process led by Dr. McGuigan, Chair of The School for Integral Studies in Conflict and Leadership at Antioch University Midwest. The twenty participants were enrolled adult learners in the Master of Arts program in Conflict Analysis and Engagement or the Master of Arts program in Management and Leading Change at the time of the workshop, which was conducted during the spring 2012 residency, and at the time of the study interviews, which were conducted in August of 2012. The twenty study participants represent the total number (100%) of workshop attendees and study invitees. The researcher had established a threshold of 16 study participants before beginning data collection; achieving one hundred percent participation of workshop attendees was not expected, or necessary.

The selected participants reflect the program’s student profile: African American females (n=2), African American male (n=1), Asian female (n=1), Caribbean male (n=1), Caucasian females (n=11), Caucasian males (n=3), and Hispanic male (n=1). The average age of participants was approximately forty years. To ensure anonymity, no additional descriptive statistics are provided and all gender references to participants have been eliminated from the interview excerpts.
Table 5

Race and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American females</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian female</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian females</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian males</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ethical Considerations**

Several factors were taken into consideration to help mitigate possible coercion resulting from my knowing the participants as students, in my role as Enrollment Manager and as Adjunct Faculty within the program. My involvement with the students in my role as an Enrollment Manager ended six months before the time of study participation. Furthermore, none of the participants were registered in any of my courses in my role as Adjunct Faculty. Students were well socialized into the program, having completed at least two residencies within the program from the time they entered (representing a minimum of six months of enrollment prior to the interview). In addition, it was emphasized to the students that participation was voluntary and that nonparticipation would in no way prejudice the students’ role or standing in the program. The scheduling of interviews occurred by email, thereby providing additional comfort to any who might have wished to decline participation (see Appendix A). These efforts were intended to reduce the influence of the early relationship I formed with participants when I worked with
them as Enrollment Manager, and to ensure a reasonable boundary between the role of Adjunct Faculty.

In compliance with the guidelines of Lesley University’s Institutional Research Board (IRB), participants were notified in the request for participation that the purpose of the research was to identify and understand dynamics that may influence adult learning and development. The request for participation provided an overview of the research purpose without using language or providing details that might influence the participants’ interview responses. The request for participation disclosed that an estimated ninety minutes were expected for completion of the interview, a procedural description of the interview, and that audio recording would be used for the purpose of transcription. Although there are no known risks associated with participation, all participants were informed through the consent form (Appendix B) that the interview might elicit upsetting memories and uncomfortable emotions. Further, the consent form indicated that: participation was voluntary; individuals had the right to refuse to be in the study; individuals could skip interview questions, individuals could ask questions at any time, and individuals had the right to drop out of the study at any time. To foster anonymity, numerical identifiers (rather than names) were used to identify individual participants on all research records other than the consent form. All hard and electronic copies of research records and data were, and remain, stored in a locked file cabinet in my possession. Hard copies will be destroyed after five years and electronic copies will remain on duplicate flash drives in locked storage. In addition, the participants were informed that the data and findings might be used for future publications and presentations.
Data Collection

Private, individual, face-to-face or telephonic interviews were conducted with each participant. Interview space was mutually selected and agreed upon in order to optimize the participant’s comfort. In addition to comfort, consideration was given to selecting locations that contributed to participant anonymity. The interviews were digitally audio-recorded. The ability to capture high-quality audio to reduce potential errors and ambiguity during verbatim transcription was an additional consideration when selecting the interview location.

After reviewing the informed consent, addressing participant questions, and obtaining the participants’ authorization to participate, a semi-structured, semi-clinical, qualitative interview was conducted. The participants were asked to describe their participation in the Understanding Your Immunity to Change workshop. Open-ended questions were asked to elicit the participant’s experience and insight during the workshop, including questions about their awareness of strong energy (Kvale, 1996).

In reference to the participant’s experience with the Immunity to Change process, study participants were asked the following interview questions:

1. What was your Immunity to Change commitment? (This is column one on the worksheet [Figure 5] and the question provides insight to the developmental stage one is moving toward as a leading or growing edge).
2. What were you doing or not doing with respect to realizing your commitment in your life? (This is column two on the worksheet and begins to bring into awareness the competing commitment).

19 As used in this section, the term “worksheet” means the ITC process worksheet represented in Figure 5.
3. What were the biggest worries or anxieties that showed up when you thought about doing or not doing the behaviors in column two? (This is the top section of column three on the worksheet and continues to bring into awareness the competing commitment).

4. What was your competing commitment? (This is the bottom section of column three on the worksheet).

5. What was your Big Assumption? (This is column four on the worksheet and provides insight to the developmental stage away from which one is moving).

6. In what way was your Big Assumption impacting you?

7. What insights did you have about your life when you discovered your Big Assumption? (Potentially illuminates the effect of shadow).

8. How has your understanding of the Big Assumption changed from these insights? (Potentially begins to illuminate shadow).

9. What is your understanding of shadow?

10. How does your understanding of shadow today link up to your Big Assumption?

11. In what way has your experience in the workshop changed your thinking about yourself or your life?

12. What have you learned about your shadow and how it plays a role in your life?

13. What is the biggest change you have noticed about yourself?

14. How does your shadow link back to your commitment goal?

15. How has the experience, insight or understanding of shadow and the Immunity to Change process influenced you as an adult learner?

During the interviews, I paraphrased responses to verify understanding and to qualify the scope and context of the participant response. These techniques enabled participants to confirm,
refute, clarify, or expand their expressions, ensuring shared understanding and functioning as a real-time participant verification check. Interviews ranged in time from twenty-one to sixty-one minutes and averaged forty-three minutes. A digital record of each interview, void of all identifiers and labeled by participant number, was professionally transcribed. After random checks identified several significant errors, each transcription was checked word-for-word against the audio recording for accuracy.

Analysis of Data

Data analysis was completed through inductive reflection and by following Moustakas’ (1994) outline for empirical phenomenological methods. Although possible themes and patterns emerged during data collection, transcript analysis was not initiated until all interviews had been conducted, transcribed, and corrected for accuracy. As a first step in the analysis, all of the verbatim transcripts were read to obtain a general sense of the data and to make memos in the transcript margin (Creswell, 2007, 2009). The transcripts were then read a second time for statements that seemed significant; Moustakas (1994) has referred to this step as “horizontalization.” In this second reading, each statement was considered as potentially meaningful to the original inquiry and to be of equal importance (Creswell, 2007, 2009; Patton, 2002). Although neither word frequency nor any other analysis functions of the software were used, Nvivo 10® was selected as a tool for coding and managing data as a result of limitations in the use of Microsoft Word® and Excel®. During the third reading, each relevant statement was labeled for meaning and clustered into temporary and flexible themes and categories of similar concepts as a starting point for coding. As these themes and categories emerged, labels were changed or added using language from the participants themselves to reflect emergent differences and distinctions. This resulted in a more in-depth analysis of labeling (Creswell,
2007, 2009). Finally, a fourth reading was used to explore the emergent themes for textural and structural descriptions. These themes were then supported with examples from participant interviews. This process enabled the essence and meaning of phenomena to emerge through the integration of textural and structural descriptions.

**Credibility and Quality**

Strategies to ensure credibility and quality included transparency and clarity of researcher bias and the presentation of negative or discrepant information (Creswell, 2009). Any presuppositions and the orienting hypothesis were written and maintained in an effort to contain the potential influence of any bias. A commitment to present all negative or discrepant information reflects a willingness to share findings that disconfirm or challenge the aforementioned presuppositions and orienting hypothesis. In addition, the researcher remained open to new understanding and changes in thinking, which served as reflexive validity (Stiles, 1999). Lastly, the numerous discussions of the research process, raw data, and interpretation with committee members served as peer review (Merriam, 1998).
Chapter 4

Presentation of Findings

As previously noted, literature regarding the relationship between shadow, adult learning, and Constructive-developmental theory is sparse. It is plausible to assume that shadow may influence our developmental growth. Becoming more whole through shadow work may release unrealized energy that may then be available to support or catalyze the evolution of more complex structures of meaning-making. The purpose of this study was to explore the role that shadow work may play in helping individuals gain a better understanding of their immunity to change. This included identifying any benefits that exploring one’s shadow adds to Kegan’s Immunity to Change process by asking the following questions:

1. What are some of the possible ways that an adult's awareness of shadow might enhance overcoming her Immunity to Change?
   a. What were the ways that each participant recognized, understood, made meaning of, and experienced her shadow in the ITC process?
   b. How did each participant describe this experience (i.e., did she speak in terms of projection, shadow, or something else; in terms of awareness, understanding, or something else; in terms of embedded, extricated, reintegrated, or something else? Did she experience it as pain, grief, fear, joy, or something else?)?

2. How might this increase in awareness of shadow support and/or enhance the adult’s developmental growth and learning?
   a. What are the different ways that participants describe what they learned about themselves and their shadow in the ITC process?
b. What patterns, if any, emerge between the ways in which the participants describe this experience and shadow?

The study findings for the Immunity to Change process are presented first because they serve as a foundation for the findings for the shadow work discussion and exercise. To help the reader better understand the relationship between each section of the ITC process, quotations from a single participant (participant 4) have been provided throughout the presentation of the ITC findings. Participant 4 is referred to by the gender neutral pseudonym “Pat.” Pat is an exemplar of the nine participants who reported that shadow work made the ITC process more powerful (Table 12). Further, examples from Pat have been used throughout the presentation of the shadow work findings, along with illustrative examples from other participants who have been identified by participant number.

**Immunity to Change Process**

During the Spring 2012 *Understanding Your Immunity to Change* workshop with Dr. McGuigan, participants were guided through each step of the ITC process as previously described in Table 4 (in Chapter 2). Participants used a four column process worksheet (similar to the one presented in Figure 5) to record their responses to the ITC questions. The first series of findings reflect how the participants responded to the questions asked of them in order to complete each section of the ITC process worksheet. The data for the first series of findings was

---

20 The interview transcript is the source for participant quotations. Each transcript quoted from has been cited as a personal communication using the date of the interview. To avoid redundancy, the citation for participant 4 has been provided only once.
collected using interview questions one through five,\textsuperscript{21} plus interview questions six, seven, and eight, which asked participants to discuss the impact of their Big Assumption.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
<th>Column 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment Goal</td>
<td>Doing / Not Doing That Works Against Commitment Goal</td>
<td>Worry Box and Competing Commitment</td>
<td>Big Assumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{I am committed to...}</td>
<td>\textit{What am I doing or not doing that prevents me from fully realizing my column one commitment...}</td>
<td>\textit{What is my discomfort, worry, or fear of stopping what I am doing or not doing in column 2}</td>
<td>\textit{My competing commitments hold in place my assumption that...}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>\textit{I may also be committed to...}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commitment goal.** The first question asked of study participants was, “what was your Immunity to Change commitment goal?” The participants were told that they should select (and record in column one of the ITC worksheet, represented in Figure 5 above) a commitment goal that represents an individual adaptive challenge,\textsuperscript{22} would result in significant positive change,\textsuperscript{21}

\textsuperscript{21} Interview questions one through five follow the first five questions participants are asked when completing the ITC process.

\textsuperscript{22} Kegan extended the use of Ronald Heifetz’s (1998) concept of adaptive vs. technical challenges to the ITC process. The skills, routines, and processes needed to respond to technical challenges are well known, whereas adaptive challenges require a transformed mindset that results from developmental growth (Kegan, 2009, p. 29). Kegan asks participants to form an adaptive commitment goal in order to shift their focus from the “problem” to “the person having the problem” (p. 29). One can equate Webber’s wicked problem to Heifetz’s notion of an
and may reflect what a group of four to five trusted advisors would recommend as a personal adaptive change that would have the greatest impact on one’s individual success. The participants’ responses were grouped into the 13 categories presented in Table 6. The categories included: a commitment to become a better listener (n=3), to work more effectively with conflict (n=3), to not judge or pre-judge others (n=2), to be more professionally engaged (n=2), and to be more tolerant of others (n=2). Pat’s commitment goal was to “relinquish control and become a better listener” (personal communication, August, 01, 2012).

Table 6

Commitment Goal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To become a better listener</td>
<td>p2, p4, p9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To work more effectively with conflict</td>
<td>p7, p11, p14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To not judge or pre-judge others</td>
<td>p1, p3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be more professionally engaged and to network</td>
<td>p5, p18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be more patient and tolerant with others</td>
<td>p12, p13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have more empathy for others</td>
<td>p20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be more conscious how (my) behavior affects others</td>
<td>p19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be better leader</td>
<td>p6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To stop feeling guilty about the behavior of others</td>
<td>p16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ask for help</td>
<td>p17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have more confidence</td>
<td>p10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To review large amounts of written materials</td>
<td>p8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To quit smoking</td>
<td>p15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

adaptive challenge. Kegan’s work is focused on the developmental complexity needed to respond to the adaptive challenge.
Doing or not doing. The second question posed to study participants was, “What were you doing or not doing that prevents you from fully realizing your column one commitment in your life?” This is column two on the ITC process worksheet (Figure 5). This question is intended to bring into awareness the behavior to which a participant defaults, rather than following through on the commitment (column one) that the participant indicated would be of greater service to achieving individual success. This question begins the process of “sneaking up” on the competing commitment, to bring it into awareness and understand how it functions to hold in place the Big Assumption. As presented in Table 7, the categories included: procrastinating, distancing, or avoiding (n=9); anticipating issues, thinking ahead, premature judgment, or premature problem-solving (n=7); interrupting others while they are speaking, speaking too soon, not fully understanding, or not listening (n=5); and commiserating with peers, meeting needs of others, or pleasing others (n=4). Although Pat’s commitment was to “relinquish control and become a better listener,” Pat was, in actuality, “leading, taking control, not listening, began with end in mind [and] immediately went to problem-solving.”

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procrastinating, distancing, avoiding (tasks or interactions with others)</td>
<td>p2, p5, p6, p8, p15, p16, p17, p18, p20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipating issues, thinking ahead, premature judgment, premature problem-solving</td>
<td>p3, p4, p6, p7, p12, p13, p19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23 The tables presenting multiple responses by a single participant will reflect more than 20 responses in the number column.
Table 7 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interrupting others while speaking, speaking too soon, not fully understanding, not listening</td>
<td>p1, p3, p4, p9, p12, p5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commiserating with peers, meeting needs of others, pleasing others</td>
<td>p6, p10, p11, p14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking negative thoughts or self-talk</td>
<td>p10, p17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming irritated with people</td>
<td>p13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Worry and Fears.** Question three asked the study participants about the discomfort that occurred from thinking about not continuing column two activities. Participants were asked, “What were the biggest worries or anxieties that show up when you think about doing the opposite of the behaviors in column two?” The worry box is the top section of column three on the ITC process worksheet (Figure 5). This part of the ITC process enables one to consider the role of the named doing or not doing behavior in one’s life, and thereby helps one to take a step closer to identifying the competing commitment. The categories, as presented in Table 8, included: concerns about how one appears to others (n=7), concerns about not being able to meet responsibility to others (n=6), concerns about keeping relationship with others (n=4), and concerns about falling behind (n=4). Pat indicated “I wouldn't be able to provide for my family” and “a fear of professional failure” as worries if Pat were to stop leading and taking control.

---

24 The tables presenting multiple responses by a single participant will reflect more than 20 responses in the number column.
Table 8

Worries and Fears

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concerns about how appear to others: inadequate, weak, ineffective, negative</td>
<td>p1, p6, p7, p8, p10, p11, p12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns about not being able to meet responsibility to others: family, friend, coworker</td>
<td>p3, p4, p5, p6, p7, p15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns about keeping relationship with others: rejected, disconnected, alienated</td>
<td>p5, p14, p16, p18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns about falling behind: time, information, demands</td>
<td>p1, p2, p8, p9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns about keeping current identity: meeting own values and needs, keep stable do not disrupt</td>
<td>p17, p19, p20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns about failing</td>
<td>p4, p6, p15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns about ability to control: maintain order, rules, power</td>
<td>p12, p13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Competing commitments.** The next question study participants were asked was, “What is your competing commitment?” The competing commitment (bottom of column three) is brought into one’s awareness by wrapping the worries and fears from the worry box into a sentence stem that begins with “I may also be committed to....” This helps the participant to understand the worry (top of column three) that arises from thinking about stopping what one is doing or not doing (column two) that works against that individual’s commitment goal (column one). The competing commitment comes into focus as an active commitment to *prevent* the worries and fears from coming true—or, as Kegan and Lahey put it, to prevent “hell...from breaking out on earth” (2001, p. 55). When looking at the commitment goal in the context of the competing commitment, it becomes clear that the commitment goal and competing commitment work against each other, thereby maintaining equilibrium (homeostasis), which inhibits change.
For example, Pat’s commitment to “relinquish control and become a better listener” was neutralized by a competing commitment of “wanting personal relationships always to be successful” (Figure 6). This is the immunity system in action; the participant’s commitment goal can be thought of as having one’s right foot on the gas pedal and the participant’s competing commitment, as having, at the same time, one’s left foot on the brake pedal (Kegan & Lahey, 2009). The immunity system begins to come into focus once the participant recognizes the opposing forces working within. We can see how the competing commitments neutralize the inertia of the commitment goal by comparing the categories of Table 9 and Table 6. The categories in Table 9 included: maintaining one’s identity, esteem, or persona (n=7); maintaining one’s role of authority, command, or influence (n=5); and maintaining one’s readiness for new information, interests, or opportunities (n=4).

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintain identity, esteem, persona</td>
<td>p6, p10, p14, p17, p18, p19, p20</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain role authority, command, influence</td>
<td>p1, p7, p11, p12, p13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain readiness for new information, interest, opportunity</td>
<td>p2, p3, p8, p9,</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain stability in personal relationships</td>
<td>p4, p16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain autonomy, independence, space</td>
<td>p5, p15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Big Assumption.** Question five asked study participants to identify their Big Assumption. This is column four on the worksheet and provides insight to the force (master motive) that is creating the immunity to change. As presented in Table 10, the categories
represent assumptions that one will be left behind by others or end up alone (n=7), and may not be good enough or able to meet challenges (n=6). Pat’s commitment to “relinquish control and become a better listener” was neutralized by a competing commitment of “wanting personal relationships always to be successful,” which was holding in place Pat’s Big Assumption. With respect to the commitment goal, Pat realized: “I assume that if I allow an argument to go unfinished or not agreed to, then my partner will leave me.” With the immunity in focus, Pat understood that it had been difficult to “relinquish control and become a better listener” because Pat assumed “my partner will leave me.”

Table 10

Big Assumption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assume will be left behind by others or end up alone</td>
<td>p4, p9, p10, p14, p16, p17, p18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assume may not be good enough or able to meet challenges</td>
<td>p2, p5, p6, p8, p15, p19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assume must be assertive and take quick action to avoid negative outcome</td>
<td>p3, p7, p11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assume others will think incompetent, lazy or weak</td>
<td>p1, p11, p20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assume must never question or speak truth to authority</td>
<td>p12, p13, p16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25During the interview, it became clear that 4 of the participants (p2, p5, p10, p13) had identified an assumption about the commitment goal, rather than an underlying assumption holding in place a competing commitment. However, each of the 4 participants was able to identify the Big Assumption while discussing one’s response to the ITC process worksheet.
In Kegan and Lahey’s ITC process, after the Big Assumption has been identified the participants are asked to write a “biography” of it. The story told of the Big Assumption is left to the participant. The intent of this exercise is to create an opportunity for the participant to gain additional meaning and insight. Potentially, writing the biography enables one to clarify and thicken the story. The participant may create a new narrative from a new perspective (third-person) that enables her to reflect on the previously unseen aspects of her first-person experience. This shift in perspective may enable the participant to more effectively make sense of and engage with the content. A sample ITC worksheet for Pat is shown in Figure 6.

---

**Figure 6. Pat’s ITC Process Worksheet**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
<th>Column 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment Goal</td>
<td>Doing / Not Doing That Works Against Commitment Goal</td>
<td>Worry Box and Competing Commitment</td>
<td>Big Assumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>I am committed to</em>...</td>
<td><em>What am I doing or not doing that prevents me from fully realizing my column one commitment?</em></td>
<td><em>What is my discomfort, worry, or fear of stopping what I am doing or not doing in column 2?</em></td>
<td><em>My competing commitments hold in place my assumption that...</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“relinquish control and become a better listener”</td>
<td>“leading, taking control, not listening; began with end in mind, immediately went to problem-solving, [and] lack of empathy, task oriented, positional, impatient.”</td>
<td>“I wouldn't be able to provide for my family and a fear of professional failure”</td>
<td>&quot;I assume that if I allow an argument to go unfinished or not agreed to, then my partner will leave me.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>I may also be committed to</em>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“wanting personal relationships always to be successful”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;if I'm not successful professionally, my partner will leave me.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
The ITC process experience. Understanding how each participant experienced the ITC process and the shadow work discussion and exercise helps us to differentiate the two approaches. As presented in Table 11, one-half of the participants (n=10) reported that the ITC process by itself was a strong exercise that provided a structure or map that helped one to reflect. Other participants experienced the ITC process as enabling new understanding or breakthrough (n=4), or as helping one to be honest and more aware (n=3). Two participants reported that the ITC process was difficult or unclear, and Pat experienced the ITC process as just “another seminar.” Pat explained,

...if you don't get to the shadow issue, this is just another methodology, another process, another hour and a half seminar that gets you some stuff to put on a paper, but doesn't have any lasting ability. It doesn't have any sustainability.

Other participants believed differently. Participant 11 stated, “it was pretty powerful” (personal communication, August 7, 2012). For participant 18, the ITC process was, “like [the] peeling of an onion. I don’t think that I could jump from ‘I wanna network’ into ‘oh, you think you’re gonna die alone’” (personal communication, August 20, 2012).

Table 11
Ways Participants Experienced ITC Exercise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong exercise, provided structured map, helped with reflection</td>
<td>p5, p6, p7, p9, p10, p11, p15, p17, p19, p20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabled new understanding, breakthrough</td>
<td>p6, p8, p16, p18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped to be honest with self, awareness</td>
<td>p12, p13, p14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult, unclear</td>
<td>p3, p7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another seminar</td>
<td>p4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No data</td>
<td>p1, p2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shadow Work, Adult Development, and Adult Learning

During the second part of the spring 2012 *Understanding Your Immunity to Change* Workshop with Dr. McGuigan, instead of writing the biography of the Big Assumption, each participant explored the Big Assumption following a shadow work discussion and exercise. The exploration included any change in the understanding of one’s Big Assumption following the shadow work. Data about the Big Assumption and shadow work was collected through interview questions 9 through 15.

**The shadow exploration experience.** As presented in Table 12, of the 18 participants responding, one-half of the participants (n=9) reported that exploring shadow made the ITC process more powerful, and made clear, or helped them to understand, the competing commitments and Big Assumption. For others, exploring shadow enabled one to go deeper, inward, or to the core (n=6). Pat reported,

> the shadow piece was very powerful for me, very powerful. This learning has been so much more clear and reveal[ed] to me what the real cause is and what the possible solutions are [more] than anything else I've ever experienced.

Participant 19 experienced the shadow work as taking one “deeper and deeper, like spelunking, and uncover[ing] something that I didn’t even know was there” (personal communication, August 31, 2012). Participant 11 indicated that without the shadow work, “I might not be able to change my behaviors” (personal communication, August 7, 2012).
Table 12

Ways Participants Experienced Shadow Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More powerful, made clear or helped to understand my competing commitments and Big Assumption</td>
<td>p3, p4, p5, p7, p9, p12, p15, p17, p18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabled to go deeper, inward, to core</td>
<td>p6, p8, p10, p14, p16, p19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognized projection, trigger, when hijacked</td>
<td>p13, p20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made ITC sustainable, able to change behavior</td>
<td>p11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No data</td>
<td>p1, p2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Understanding of shadow.** Although each of the participants that responded to the question reported that shadow work enhanced overcoming their immunity to change, as presented in Table 13, seven participants understood shadow as projection, and five participants understood shadow to be repressed aspects of Self. Other categories of understanding included: motivators or drivers of thoughts and behaviors (n=3), faults (n=2), things we hide (n=2), and life experience (n=1). Discussing the shadow work experience, Pat indicated,

> it's done a great job with me understanding projection and trying to do much less of that. Because before they were all lumped together, there was no way to separate it, and I'm at least noticing that when that happens.

Other responses included that of participant 1, who indicated, “my shadow are those demons that have driven me to where I am and that has kind of made my person” (personal communication, July 30, 2012), participant 15 who stated, “my understanding of shadow is what I would call my hidden reaction to things or how I would react or act when no one is looking” (personal communication, August 14, 2012), and participant 14 who stated, “we deny them so much and
hide them within our subconscious. They operate but on a very unconscious level” (personal communication, August 12, 2012). The misunderstanding of shadow is explored in the next chapter: *Interpretation of Findings and Discussion.*

Table 13

Understanding of Shadow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projection</td>
<td>p4, p7, p9, p11, p12, p18, p19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repressed aspect of self</td>
<td>p6, p10, p13, p14, p20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivators or driver of thoughts behavior</td>
<td>p1, p8, p17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faults</td>
<td>p3, p5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things we hide</td>
<td>p2, p15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life experience</td>
<td>p16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Shadow, parents, and the Big Assumption.** When speaking about shadow the participants linked the Big Assumption to how they experienced one or both parents within the childhood holding environment of the home. As presented in Table 14, the way parents were experienced included: a parent who was controlling (n=7), a parent who did not listen or discouraged conversation (n=4), a parent who made the participant responsible for the care of others (n=3), and a parent who expected perfection (n=3). Pat linked the Big Assumption “my partner will leave me” to Pat’s relationship with Pat’s father: “I think that lack of confidence sprang from my not having confidence in my relationship with my father ‘cause he didn't [have] confidence in me. You were not allowed to burden him.” Participant 13, who assumed one should not question or speak truth to authority, described a controlling and unquestionable parent:
There’s a definite right and wrong and there is nothing in-between because right is what I tell you and there is nothing else but what I tell you, and that’s the way it is, and if you don’t do what I tell you, then there is punishment, so laws are the laws. (personal communication, August 11, 2012)

Participant 18 linked the Big Assumption “that I would die alone” to parents that Don’t want to listen to you. Little children shouldn’t bother adults. There was a place and a time for getting to know people, and I do not believe that I ever learned what that was, and as an adult, that’s what left me kind of like perplexed on how to do it. (personal communication, August 20, 2012)

Table 14
Ways Experienced Parent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent was controlling, unquestionable authority</td>
<td>p1, p5, p12, p13, p14, p16, p17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent did not listen, did not converse with, told not bother or burden others</td>
<td>p2, p4, p9, p18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent made responsible for care of other children or adults in the family</td>
<td>p7, p8, p15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent expected perfection, had high expectations</td>
<td>p3, p6, p11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent told do not show emotions or weakness</td>
<td>p19, p20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents told do not dream big and be realistic</td>
<td>p10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As presented in Table 15, 19 participants continued to be affected in adulthood by the way they experienced a parent in childhood. Without awareness, almost one-half of the participants (n=9) continued, as adults, to follow the beliefs, expectations, and behaviors of the
Another segment of participants (n=6) mimicked the parent’s actions. Some participants felt isolated or misunderstood by others (n=4). Pat’s comments were indicative:

This issue of being a better listener and relinquishing control has made me realize that, as a [parent], for my children I didn't listen to them very much. I think, in many respects, because that's how my father treated me. I was doing that which I was taught. I just thought I was doing it in a positive light.

Participant 7 linked the Big Assumption, one must be assertive and take quick action to avoid negative outcomes, to carrying into adulthood the father’s expectations of participant seven when a child. Participant 7 explained,

He actually relied a lot on my ability to do a lot of things for him. I think a lot of that feeling of you have to be in control, you have to think about, the worst-case scenario so you can prepare comes out of that and so that expectation that he had has carried forward. (personal communication, August 3, 2012)

Table 15
As Adult, In Response to Parent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continued responding to the beliefs, expectations, and behaviors</td>
<td>p3, p7, p8, p10, p11, p15, p17, p19, p20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imitated, began to act the same</td>
<td>p1, p2, p4, p5, p12, p13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt isolated, misunderstood by others</td>
<td>p9, p14, p16, p18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No data</td>
<td>p6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Projection and attribution. Each participant related the types of people who triggered projection to his/her experience of the parent and childhood home (Table 16). These triggers included: people who are selfish, self-serving, or self-promoting (n=6); people who don’t listen (n=3); people who make excuses, don’t finish, or use potential (n=3); people who are lazy or laid-back (n=2); people who are bullies or tyrants (n=2); and people who are controlling (n=2). Pat connected the triggers of selfish or self-serving people back to what Pat understood to be the selfishness of Pat’s father.

I don't need a college education, he didn't have one. I didn't need to play [sports] because that meant he had to go watch me. He would work all the overtime he could get, and that funded his vacations, not the family vacations but the guy trips. In 26 years living together, we didn't take one family vacation.

For participant 7, projection onto individuals who do not look ahead or anticipate negative outcomes made sense given participant 7’s father’s need for control and constant preparation for the worst-case scenario.

Table 16

Projection and Attribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selfish, self-serving, self-promoting</td>
<td>p3, p4, p6, p12, p18, p20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t listen</td>
<td>p2, p9, p16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes excuses, doesn’t finish or use potential</td>
<td>p8, p10, p19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazy or laid back</td>
<td>p1, p11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bully or tyrant</td>
<td>p5, p13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling</td>
<td>p14, p17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrogant or assuming</td>
<td>p15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn’t look ahead or anticipate</td>
<td>p7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Self and shadow. Table 17 presents the various ways that the participants described what they had learned about themselves and their shadow. The categories included: the participant tried to control outcomes because of the influence of shadow (n=6), the participant’s behavior pushed people away (n=6), and shadow made the participant have negative feelings (n=3). In the context of discussing the Big Assumption, Pat realized how people were pushed away in personal and professional settings by behavior that “provided some chaos, a wake behind me. People have all said, ‘there's no middle ground with [Pat] you either love [Pat], or you hate [Pat]. It's all black, or it's all white.’” Participant 12, who assumed “one must never question or speak truth to authority,” linked the Big Assumption to the behavior of the participant’s father: “even if he says the sky is purple, and it's blue, it's purple because he said so because he is the boss.” Further, participant 12 reported that as an outcome of mimicking the father, participant 12 had experienced loss as an adult; “I lost out on a lot of information, a lot of dialogue, and I don't have friendships” (personal communication, August 9, 2012).

Table 17
Learned About Self and Shadow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I tried to control outcomes because of the influence of shadow</td>
<td>p6, p8, p9, p10, p17, p18, p20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My behavior pushed people away</td>
<td>p1, p3, p4, p7, p12, p13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow made me feel insecure, bad, angry</td>
<td>p2, p5, p11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t have to react, opportunity to understand self better</td>
<td>p15, p19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clueless what real shadows are</td>
<td>p14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow is obstacle to forward progress</td>
<td>p16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone doing best they can</td>
<td>p18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As presented in Table 18, when the participants were asked to describe what they noticed about themselves following the ITC process and shadow work, they described release, affirmation, or self-forgiveness (n=7), new awareness or differentiation (n=5), openness in thinking or understanding (n=5), and feeling more in control or empowered (n=3). Pat’s differentiation occurred in relation to the energy bound up in the father-child relationship. Pat stated,

When I would pass his car, it would cause physical energy. I mean I’d go home, and my blood pressure's up. My heart rate's up, and my [partner] would say, ‘You saw your father’.... This did, for me, this ITC process and looking at that shadow, allowed me to arrive at a place where the energy has dissipated. Yes, the feelings are there. I don't like my 20 years of living with him. I don't like all the things that happened – that didn't happen – but I don't have that elevated energy level when someone brings up his name, or when you go through a box of photos, and you happen to see it like I did ten years ago before this process...I'm in a better position to say it's real, and it belongs over there with my father, or it belongs over here with whatever. And it doesn't necessarily belong over here with my [partner] or with my relationships with my kids. It's enabled me to say I understand it, I know where it belongs and, more importantly, where it doesn't belong.

Participant 6 experienced self-forgiveness: “it just made me be more forgiving of myself and not beat myself up over things that I’m really probably just creating in my head” (personal communication, August 2, 2012).
Table 18

ITC Shadow Work Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Release, affirmation or self-forgiveness</td>
<td>p2, p3, p6, p8, p14, p16, p18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New awareness or differentiation</td>
<td>p4, p6, p7, p13, p17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness in thinking or understanding</td>
<td>p1, p9, p10, p12, p20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More in control, empowered</td>
<td>p5, p15, p19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Shadow and adult development.** In describing the changes that each participant noticed about him/herself following the completion of the workshop, as presented in Table 19, seven participants indicated that they were more self-aware or self-reflective. Other categories included taking more accountability (n=6), and experiencing relationships as more meaningful, important, and connected (n=5). Pat experienced a shift in accountability:

I thought it was me versus them. They just didn't get it, and I was gonna make them get it. And now I've realized it was me who didn't get it. It has very little to do with them and everything to do with me.

Participant 6 stated, “I’m just really looking at the relationships between me and the individual. And that has helped tremendously. It feels like a healthy relationship” (personal communication, August 2, 2012).
Table 19

Biggest Changes Noticed About Self

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More self-aware, reflective</td>
<td>p3, p7, p9, p10, p13, p18, p20</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased accountability – less to do with them more to do with me</td>
<td>p4, p5, p11, p12, p15, p19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships more meaningful, important, connected</td>
<td>p1, p2, p6, p8, p17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do care how people see me</td>
<td>p16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t need people to like me</td>
<td>p14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In describing how the way they’d changed had influenced their interaction with others, Table 20 presents participants’ reports of being: more tolerant of others (n=8); more willing to engage others (n=6); more confident and comfortable with others (n=6); more patient, relaxed, and calm with others (n=4); better listeners, (n=3); and able to make better use of time with others (p=2). Pat reported, “I’m more relaxed, more patient, [a] better listener, and those three things together have obviously made me, I think, a better person, in all situations, conflict and otherwise.” Participant 8 remarked, “I’m so much more willing to forgive, so much more willing to ignore and not make things so significant, so big a deal” (personal communication, August 4, 2012).
Table 20

Interactions with Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More tolerant of others</td>
<td>p8, p11, p12, p13, p15, p17, p18, p20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More willing to engage</td>
<td>p1, p5, p7, p8, p10, p13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More confident; comfortable</td>
<td>p2, p4, p6, p9, p14, p16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Patient; relaxed, calm</td>
<td>p1, p4, p6, p19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Listener</td>
<td>p1, p3, p4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better use of time</td>
<td>p5, p8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Shadow and adult learning.** The participants were asked how they had been influenced as adult learners by the experience, insight, or understanding gained through the ITC process and shadow work. As presented in Table 21, the participants reported: learning having a daily application rather than primarily being about a future orientation or purpose (n=8); feeling more invested and engaged in learning (n=6); learning becoming intrinsically rather than extrinsically motivated (n=5); learning seeming to be more expansive, deeper, and more open (n=4); the learner is more accountable with less procrastination (n=2); and learning being integrated in mind, body, and spirit (n=2). In context to being an adult learner, Pat reported, “I feel more confident that what I have to say has some value. I'm learning how to say it better depending on the environment.” Further, participant 8 stated, “I now find myself having less of a clear demarcation between academic work and real life or the application to living on a daily basis” (personal communication, August 4, 2012).
Table 21

Influenced as Adult Learner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily application not future oriented</td>
<td>p2, p4, p8, p10, p11, p12, p13, p15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invested and engaged - empowered, confident, passion</td>
<td>p4, p6, p9, p16, p17, p18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic rather than extrinsic motivation</td>
<td>p1, p7, p8, p10, p17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigger, deeper, more open,</td>
<td>p1, p2, p9, p20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More accountable less procrastination</td>
<td>p5, p13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More integrated mind, body, spirit</td>
<td>p14, p17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more insight learning from others</td>
<td>p2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous does not stop</td>
<td>p3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlearning</td>
<td>p19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

The majority of participants (n=16) reported that the ITC process helped them to identify the Big Assumption and gain insight about how the Big Assumption was working against the commitment goal (Table 11). Further, 18 participants (all that responded) reported that an exploration of shadow made the ITC process more powerful, clearer, deeper, or enabled the recognition of projections (Table 12). Though this majority had a favorable experience of shadow exploration, the experience of some participants did not appear favorable. Five participants defined shadow in terms of repressed aspects of Self (Table 13), and only three of these five could readily name what aspect of Self had been repressed in shadow (Table 22).
Table 22
Repressed Aspect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidence to dream big</td>
<td>p10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness and aggressiveness</td>
<td>p14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability and weakness</td>
<td>p20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The gap between the number of participants that experienced shadow exploration as being useful (Table 12) and the number of participants that were able to define shadow (Table 13) or identify shadow (Table 22) may indicate that shadow reintegration is a process that unfolds over time. Further, all 20 of the participants reported that they gained additional insight from the shadow exploration beyond the insight gained from the ITC process.

As reported, shadow work resulted in new insights including how the parent and family life influenced them as an adult, and an understanding of projections and the specific types of situations that trigger them. Participants reported noticing changes in self-awareness, behavior, accountability, or relationships. Further, participants reported that they were more confident, relaxed, tolerant, or willing to engage when interacting with others—qualities that may have signaled a shift in energy. Lastly, participants reported a greater investment and engagement in learning. Motivation was reported to be intrinsic rather than extrinsic, and learning was reported to be a daily application rather than a future orientation or purpose.
Chapter 5

Interpretation of Findings and Discussion

We may begin to form a hypothesis about a participant’s developmental stage from her ITC process content. However, to make an accurate assessment of her developmental complexity we would need to utilize the Subject-Object Interview. In addition to eliciting interview content, a system emerges through the SOI that can be used to scaffold and benchmark a participant’s developmental structure (Kegan, 2009). This study did not utilize the SOI and therefore the findings of the study cannot be used to measure a participant’s vertical development. Rather, the findings support an analysis of how shadow work may support horizontal learning and release unrealized energy that may catalyze developmental growth. This energy release may occur even if one does not fully understand the concept of shadow.

Since shadow, by definition, cannot be seen, it is not surprising or disappointing that only three of the 20 participants were able to define shadow and name a repressed aspect of Self (Table 22). Shadow work may help one to progress toward shadow reintegration, and to experience useful changes and outcomes in her life, even if she does not understand the concept of shadow or how it functions. For example, with respect to vertical development, an individual may evolve in terms of complexity in one’s subject-object relationship without having any understanding of Constructive-developmental theory. Similarly, with respect to horizontal learning, when projecting shadow an individual may experience inconsistencies, resulting in new insight without having any understanding of shadow or how it functions (Bly, 1988; Kopp, 1980; 26 That is, the interview questions intentionally elicit a response reflecting the participant’s highest stage of development. Through scaffolding, the participant may respond at the individual’s highest existing complexity of relatedness.)
Miller, 1991; Wilber, 2006). My data analysis, thus, suggests that shadow work may support horizontal learning and the release of unrealized energy, even if one does not fully understand the concept of shadow or how it functions. An individual’s understanding of shadow is informed by one’s developmental complexity.

In my judgment, the participants’ reports about shadow work are consistent with what the literature has described as the steps one may experience during shadow reintegration (Bly, 1988; Kopp, 1980; Miller, 1991; Wilber, 2006). In 2011, I created a sequence (Table 23) for use in a small pilot study (McLaughlin, 2011). Table 23 presents the shadow reintegration transitions that have been described in the literature. By including shadow work at the end of the ITC process, participants may learn that projection and shadow exist (steps 1 and 2) even if they do not fully understand how shadow functions or experience the reintegration of repressed aspects of Self (steps 3 and 4). In this current study, through shadow work, each participant remembered or added new information about the Self. This information and experience of wholeness constitute a form of horizontal learning. Lastly, the shadow reintegration sequence may appear to be linear, however, in shadow work, insight and awareness may emerge, fade away out of mind (return to shadow), and re-emerge at a later time. The duration of this “cycle time” may shorten as horizontal learning and vertical development increase.

Table 23

Shadow Reintegration Sequence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Ability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>Projection Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awareness of troublesome inconsistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awareness of projection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>Shadow Diminishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding of projection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learn of shadow existence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Ability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Three | Shadow Work  
Understanding of shadow  
Awareness of shadow source |
| Four  | Identity Enlargement  
Understanding of shadow source  
Reclaiming and integrating repressed aspects of self |

Shadow and Adult Development

The data analysis suggests that shadow work, following the ITC process, may support the adult developmental journey in three important ways. First, shadow work may support energy release from a change in one’s relationship to what Kegan and Rogers (1991) have called a “characterological disposition.” Second, shadow work may support horizontal learning that facilitates vertical development. Finally, shadow work may release unrealized energy that may catalyze developmental growth.

Energy release resulting from a change in one’s relationship to a characterological disposition. Kegan and Rogers (1991) crafted the term “characterological disposition” to describe a disposition that is highly individualized and psychologically created within a person as a result of that individual’s childhood holding environment (social environment); “more precisely, [disposition] may have its origins in the way those people treat us who are actually

---

27 Horizontal learning increases what one knows (information) and strengthens one’s technical expertise, functional knowledge, skills, and behaviors.

28 Vertical development increases the complexity of how one relates to what one knows. Increased complexity changes how one thinks and makes meaning, enabling one to engage complex problems or adaptive challenges differently.
performing (what will become) our own psychological functions” (p. 136, parenthesis in original). Further, the authors indicate, “how subject relates to object, we argue, may be an internal psychological recasting of or reaction to what had been an external, social situation” (p. 137, italics in original). Once internalized psychologically, the disposition is so powerful that, in adulthood, it may continue to remain in place throughout the many holding environments and the developmental growth one experiences in her lifespan:

Once a previously external, social situation (for example, a parental relationship to a child that is punitive or perfectionistic or narcissistic or inattentive or unpredictable) has become an internal psychological situation, a characterological disposition toward subject-object relating is created. It has a life of its own relatively independent of social situations that may or may not perpetuate it. And in the absence of some explicit, conscious relationship to the disposition itself (and some awareness will not even be possible until a given stage of subject-object differentiation is reached), this disposition will continue in some way throughout successive transformations. (Kegan and Rogers, 1991, p. 138, parentheses in original)

Though a child may experience numerous social environments, according to Kegan and Rogers, it is specifically the parental relationship that is one of the holding environments that may create within the child a “psychological recasting of or reaction to what had been an external social situation” (p. 137).

Kegan and Rogers’ description of “characterological disposition” formation may help explain the fact that, in the present study, fifteen participants reported that they continued (without awareness as adults) to follow (n=9) or mimic (n=6) the parent’s behavior (Table 15).
That is, the participants’ following or mimicking of the parent may signal that they took on the psychological function of the parent. The fifteen participants became aware of following or mimicking the parent through shadow work when they related the Big Assumption to a parent and the childhood social environment of the home. Kegan and Rogers’ concept of “psychological recasting” is not the same as shadow or the Big Assumption. Rather, aspects of Self that conflicted with following or mimicking the parental behaviors, attitudes, or beliefs may have been repressed as shadow. Similarly, the disposition may reflect the fears associated with the Big Assumption. For example, an uptight and controlling disposition may influence one’s shadow of being relaxed and reflect one’s Big Assumption that she will die alone. In this study the data analysis suggests that shadow work, following the ITC process, may support participants in creating a new relationship to the disposition (Kegan and Rogers, 1991).

According to Kegan and Rogers, “in the absence of some explicit, conscious relationship to the disposition itself...this disposition will continue in some way throughout successive transformations” (p. 138). In other words, as developmental complexity increases, the characterological disposition may remain unchanged. That is, the disposition may continue to influence the individual as when it was formed, resulting in an area resistant to further development. Although not the same as shadow, we may infer that holding in place a characterological disposition consumes psychological energy. Further, developing an “explicit, conscious relationship to the disposition itself” (p. 138) may enable one to gain new insight and release energy that may support her developmental journey. Based on my research and interpretation of the data, shadow work in combination with the ITC process may disrupt a characterological disposition. A “conscious relationship to the disposition” may emerge as one takes a third-person perspective on her childhood holding environment.
**Horizontal learning in support of vertical development.** The data analysis suggests that shadow work, following the ITC process, may support horizontal growth that in turn supports vertical growth. As described in the literature review, horizontal learning occurs as an individual increases the information available to her. An individual may learn new content about numerous topics in numerous domains. In describing this learning process, we often focus on:

- the individual exterior (e.g. biology, behavior); AQAL upper-right,
- the plural exterior/inter-objective space (e.g. systems, processes); AQAL lower-right, or
- the plural interior/inter-subjective space (e.g. culture, values, beliefs); AQAL lower-left.

In respect to the ITC process and shadow work, the focus of horizontal learning is one’s interior space—the individual interior/intra-subjective; AQAL upper-left quadrant. Reflection and taking a third-person perspective may facilitate horizontal learning in any of these domains. In this study, the analysis indicates that shadow work adds to the horizontal learning of the individual interior by facilitating insight about how one makes meaning and relates to experience—beyond the structural gains of the ITC process alone. One may gain more information through insight that emerges from shadow work and through a shift in one’s perspective (Bly, 1988; Kopp, 1980; Miller, 1991; Wilber, 2006).

The literature on shadow and projection indicates that one may remember or gain information from troubling inconsistencies (Bly, 1988; Kopp, 1980; Miller, 1991; Wilber, 2006). Likewise, the adult learning literature suggests that one may add new information through the experience of a disorienting dilemma (Mezirow, 1991, 2000). Although horizontal learning is implied in these approaches, they do not specifically discuss horizontal learning in support of
vertical development. More specifically, their descriptions of shadow reintegra-
tion and transformative learning do not address the concept of wholeness in support of complexity. It was Kegan’s (2000) innovation to link disruptive content to changes in developmental complexity in his article, *What "form" transforms? A Constructive-developmental approach to transformative learning*. In the ITC process, Kegan’s approach is to disrupt the dynamic equilibrium by sneaking up on the master motive (Big Assumption). This approach is disruptive because it brings into view the ways in which the individual had been enmeshed in her meaning-making, which had been outside of her awareness. This may enable one to be reflective and take a third person-perspective on what has become new content—i.e., information about how one made meaning of experiences. This is an example of using horizontal learning to support vertical development.

Kegan and Lahey’s (2009) ITC process uses horizontal learning about one’s interior space to support vertical development. The interpretation of the data implies that the horizontal learning from shadow work may function in a similar way. Shadow work may enable one to sneak up on and bring into view new information and understanding about meaning-making of repressed aspects of Self or shadow projection, which had been outside of the individual’s awareness. This enables one to be reflective and take a third person-perspective on what has become (because it is no longer subjective) new content.

Though Kegan (1982, 2000, 2001) had already linked disruptive learning and energy to development, his focus was not on shadow. The present study illuminates the role of shadow work in increasing horizontal learning and releasing energy in support of vertical development. This study did not measure vertical development, but it does provide a context for its discussion.
By creating new insight, and releasing energy, the horizontal learning of shadow work may support vertical development by serving as or initiating disruption to equilibrium.

With horizontal learning, an individual may be able to use the new perception of wholeness and the new insight and information gained to create new choices when she experiences a challenge. In experiencing a wider range of available choices, she may become less defensive in her approach. Instead of engaging the challenge in a way familiar to her, she may pause, and—inaugurated by new insight and choice—engage in a new and different manner. With persistence over time, she may begin to relate to challenges differently, with greater complexity. The capacity to take in and create greater complexity is vertical development. Based on the participants’ reports, shadow work may thus act as a catalyst of horizontal learning that supports increasing complexity.

As presented in Table 12, participants (n=17) reported that shadow work helped them to understand the competing commitments and Big Assumption (n=9), enabled them to go deeper or more inward (n=6), or helped them to recognize projection and triggers (n=2). From this data, we may infer that participants gained insights from shadow work additional to any insight gained from the ITC process. The data analysis indicates, for example, that each of the study participants (n=20) gained awareness and understanding of the source of one’s projections and associated triggers (Table 16). As presented in Table 17, participants reported gaining a better understand of one’s behaviors and feelings such as controlling outcomes (n=6), pushing people away (n=6), and feeling insecure, bad, or angry (n=3). Further, each participant reported experiencing a big change in oneself (Table 19), including greater self-awareness (n=7), increased personal accountability (n=6), and more meaningful relationships (n=5). Lastly, participants reported experiencing a change in the way they interacted with others, including
more tolerance for others (n=8), more willingness to engage others (n=6), greater confidence with others (n=6), and more patience with others (n=4) (Table 20). These changes may represent new insight and horizontal learning that may support participants’ vertical development.

**Shadow work to release energy.** The data analysis suggests that shadow work, following the ITC process, may support an individual to become more whole (in the Jungian sense) and release unrealized energy that, once available, may support increasing developmental complexity. As discussed in the literature review, Kegan & Lahey (2001) have indicated that an individual is an energy system and that while an individual’s immunity to change holds enough energy to maintain her dynamic equilibrium, an individual may require additional, available energy in order to increase her developmental complexity. According to Bly (1988), one’s bag of shadows keeps energy unavailable to her and Richo (1999) suggests that the energy used to keep shadow repressed is misdirected but not diminished. Both authors agree that the energy consumed by shadow may be released.

The categories presented in Table 18 suggest that energy may be released as a result of the ITC shadow work experience. The categories used to describe the participants’ experience include: release, affirmation, or self-forgiveness (n=7); new awareness or differentiation (n=5); openness in thinking or understanding (n=5); and more in control or empowered (n=3). Pat is the only participant that spoke directly of energy. According to Pat, energy was bound to a parent and the childhood family life. Pat is also the only participant to directly discuss a release of energy resulting from the ITC process and shadow work experience. However, it may be useful to recognize, as reflected in Table 18, that Pat’s discussion of energy release was made in the context of differentiating Pat’s relationship to this energy. Following the workshop, it could be said that Pat had ownership over the energy; the energy no longer had ownership over Pat. Pat’s
energy toward Pat’s father had been released. Similarly, although it makes no direct mention of energy, we may infer that Table 18 descriptors represent less fragmentation and a release of energy (release, affirmation, or self-forgiveness; new awareness or differentiation; openness in thinking or understanding; and more in control or empowered). These categories reflect a change in the Self’s regulation of Self-energy. Based on the data analysis, I believe that participants experienced an energy release, and that this energy may be available to support developmental growth.

The data analysis suggests that shadow work may support the adult developmental journey, by making one’s characterological disposition explicit and bringing it into a conscious relationship to one’s Self, by supporting horizontal learning through new insight, and by releasing energy that may then be available for vertical development.

**Shadow and Adult Learning**

As explored in the literature review, Constructive-developmental theory may have important implications for adult learning theories such as experiential learning, self-directed learning, and andragogy. The data analysis suggests that shadow work, following the ITC process, may support adult learning by supporting vertical development.

When the participants were asked how they had been influenced as an adult learner from the ITC process and shadow work experience, 15 of the participants reported changes that reflected one or more of the characteristics of andragogy. This finding is interesting because we might expect that the study participants, as adult learners, would already possess the characteristics of andragogy. As presented in Table 21, participants reported: a shift away from a future orientation and toward a daily application of learning (n=8); becoming more invested and
engaged (n=6); and becoming intrinsically motivated to learn instead of being extrinsically motivated (n=5).

The data analysis suggests that the characteristics of andragogy are developmentally informed. That is, the relationship of the adult learner to a characteristic will become more complex with vertical growth. In Kegan’s model, a fully self-authoring adult (stage four) can hold multiple perspectives concurrently. The subject-object relationship of a fully self-authoring adult may reflect the autonomy that is associated with the characteristics of andragogy. That is not to say that only adults with self-authoring (stage four) complexity can display the characteristics of andragogy. Rather, the way one relates to the characteristics of andragogy at stage four will reflect self-authorship, whereas at stage three, the characteristics of andragogy may be influenced by the learner’s relationships, and at stage two, the characteristics of andragogy may be influenced by the learner’s instrumental needs. With vertical growth the learner may show more complexity in the way she relates to and reflects the characteristics of:

- self-directedness;
- the ability to make meaning and learn from life experience;
- the influence of one’s social roles on learning;
- the immediate application of learning with a focus on problem-solving
- understanding the rationale of why learning is important; and
- intrinsic motivation.

From this framework of understanding, andragogy may reflect the informational or transformational learning of an individual. This distinction may indicate the developmental complexity with which the learner relates to the characteristics. A learner may behave in a self-
directed manner, yet make meaning of the behavior in relationship to her needs, relationship, or ideology, values, and beliefs. The following, for example, are all possibilities:

- I have to be self-directed because the syllabus requires it... or I will get a bad grade and fail.
- I am supposed to be self-directed but if I do not agree with what the group wants to do they will be upset with me.
- I am self-directed and eager to “call out” hegemony as a principle of my learning.

Understanding the characteristics of andragogy in relation to the evolving adult will inform praxis and enable an educator to optimize, for each student, the balance of challenge and support, facilitating adult learning and growth. In this respect, it may be useful to explore, in future research, other changes that participants reported in this study such as personal accountability, agency, and patience, as other potential characteristics of andragogy, beyond those Knowles identified.

Lastly, one’s developmental complexity does impact her speed and type of learning (single-, double-, and triple-loop). A learner that is subject to an event may experience slower learning. Whereas, a learner that is able to consider an event from an object perspective may experience faster learning. The objective perspective will enable the learner to be less defensive and less attached to the event and the possible learning. One might say the learner is more available to learn with each subject-object shift of her identity. This observation extends beyond the classroom. For example, imagine a workplace conflict that involves individuals who have different values and beliefs. One’s developmental complexity, or ability to experience the event objectively, may enable her to engage with others in a calm and open manner that supports her ability to learn in the moment. Instead of being defensive, she may be able to explore and reflect
on the way each party is framing (triple-loop) and advocating (double-loop) the issue (Torbert, 2004). The double- or triple-loop inquiry may help the individual to understand a person’s values and beliefs in terms of her own identity and principles rather than an attribute of her disposition. The inquiry may help her to learn about the people involved in the conflict. The ability to learn quickly while encountering complex problems and conflicts may foster collaboration, productivity, and efficiency.

**Implication in Complex and Conflictual Environments**

The complexity needed to address wicked problems may be greater than people’s developmental capacity to make sense of them. The problems faced may be made more complex because of the lack of balance between the task demands of the problem and the current balance point of many community members. Complex environments present task demands that challenge us to develop greater developmental capacity and complexity. Each person’s organization of information and meaning-making is relative to her current developmental stage. When the task demands of a wicked problem exceed one’s developmental complexity, one may have an inaccurate or partial understanding of the problem, which may lead to ineffective solutions.

Imagine, for example, study participants functioning as a group of individuals—a board of directors, executive leadership team, or a project team. Imagine that the group members need to work together to solve a wicked problem, despite differences in values, beliefs, and principles. To ensure a problem-solving process that is collaborative and successful, consider the possible influence of the doing or not doing behaviors presented in Table 7 in relation to the type of people who may trigger projection (Table 16). The behaviors of procrastinating (n=9), premature problem-solving (n=7), interrupting others (n=5), or pleasing others (n=4) (Table 7) may exacerbate projection and attribution from the group members who are triggered by others they
judge to be selfish (n=6), to not listen (n=3), to make excuses (n=3), to be lazy (n=2), to be bullies (n=2), or to be controlling (n=2) (Table 16). In contrast, imagine that the group members participated in a shadow work and ITC process workshop in preparation for working together. Over time, these individuals may demonstrate greater horizontal insight, released energy, and greater autonomy in learning. To ensure a problem-solving process that is collaborative and successful, it is useful to consider the influence of the individual: enacting the commitment goal of becoming a better listener (n=3); working more effectively with conflict (n=3); trying to not judge or pre-judge others (n=2); or being more patient and tolerant with others (n=2) (Table 6). It may also be useful to consider the influence of the individual: demonstrating self-awareness (n=7), accountability (n=6), or connected relationships (n=5) (Table 19); being more tolerant of others (n=8), willing to engage (n=6), confident (n=6), patient (n=4), a better listener (n=3), or making better use of time (n=2) (Table 20). We can imagine that one’s horizontal and vertical growth and one’s informational and transformational learning may influence her ability to collaboratively engage in complex and conflict-laden environments.

The data analysis suggests that shadow work, following the ITC process, may support the adult developmental journey. Shadow work may: support the release of energy by a change in one’s relationship to a characterological disposition, support horizontal learning that may in turn support vertical development and, release unrealized energy that may catalyze increasing developmental complexity. Further, the data analysis suggests that shadow work, following the ITC process, may influence the adult learner’s relationship to the characteristics of andragogy. Shadow work, in support of the adult developmental journey, may facilitate one’s ability to collaboratively engage wicked problems.
Strengths of the Study

Because the participants knew the interviewer, there was a high level of trust. The participants seemed to be forthcoming and open to sharing their experience during the interview. Using a semi-clinical, semi-structured interview, this study captured the participants’ experiences while participating in the workshop. This qualitative approach enabled the interviewer to be present, reflexive, and empathetic with the participants as they answered questions about their workshop experience. For many of the participants, the experience evoked energy and brought new awareness to who they were and about the foundation of their behaviors and beliefs. During the interviews, paraphrasing by the interviewer enabled the participants to confirm, refute, clarify, or expand their expressions. The paraphrasing ensured an accurate understanding of information and functioned as a real-time participant verification check.

Having a digital record of the participant’s interview ensured accuracy as it enabled a word-for-word comparison between each recording and each transcript. After a random check, this comparison identified several significant errors. Following Moustakas’ (1994) outline for empirical phenomenological methods enabled data analysis through inductive reflection using a series of iterative steps. Strategies to ensure credibility and quality included transparency and clarity of the researcher’s bias and of the presentation of negative or discrepant information (Creswell, 2009). Presuppositions and the orienting hypothesis were written down and maintained in awareness to control for bias. A commitment to present all negative or discrepant information reflects a willingness to share findings that disconfirm or challenge the presuppositions and orienting hypothesis. In addition, remaining open to new understandings and changes in thinking during the research provided reflexive validity (Stiles, 1999). Lastly, the
numerous discussions of the research process, raw data, and data analysis with the committee members served as peer review (Merriam, 2009).

Beyond methodology, I believe that the study reflects a creative response to the need for new knowledge about the relationship of horizontal learning, characterized in Jung's concepts of shadow and wholeness of Self, to vertical development, characterized in Kegan's Constructive-developmental theory. Further, I believe that the study initiates an integral approach by exploring in the interpretation and discussion of the findings the relationships of the interior dimensions of the individual (shadow and complexity in meaning-making: AQAL upper-left quadrant), and the exterior dimensions of the individual (behavior and actions: upper-right quadrant) in relation to an inter-subjective perspective (culture and shared values: lower-left quadrant) and an inter-objective perspective (social structures and systems: lower-right quadrant).

Study Limitations

There are several limitations to this study. The participants’ experience in the workshop may be influenced by their experiences as enrolled adult learners in the Master of Arts program in Conflict Analysis and Engagement or the Master of Arts program in Management and Leading Change. Program coursework may have provided language or frames of reference not possessed by a non-student sample. Further, due to the small sample of 20 individuals, the study findings cannot be generalized to a larger population. However, given that every individual is on a developmental journey, many of the findings may be transferable to adults interested in developmental growth through shadow work. Further, to accurately measure whether a participant gained additional insight or increased complexity of mind, one would need to assess the participant using the Subject-Object Interview prior to and again at least six months following the ITC process and shadow work.
Finally, it should be noted again, that my research interest is rooted in my personal journey to understand my shadow and the influence it has had on my learning and development. I began with an orienting hypothesis that was strongly influenced by my personal experience overcoming my immunity to change and working to reintegrate my shadow. However, I maintained a high awareness of my bias throughout the study, though it may still have influenced my findings and interpretations.

**Future Research**

The data analysis indicates that shadow work, following the ITC process, may: support energy release from a change in one’s relationship to a characterological disposition; support horizontal learning that may in turn support vertical development; and may release unrealized energy that may catalyze increasing developmental complexity. However, to accurately measure developmental growth using Kegan’s model, the developmental stage of each participant would need to be assessed using the Subject-Object Interview (SOI) prior to the shadow work, and again six to twelve months following shadow work. Further, one might consider using the SOI to assess pre- and post-development in at least three groups—a group completing the ITC process, a group completing the shadow work discussion and exercise, and a group completing both the ITC process and the shadow work—to differentiate the developmental influence of each process. Lastly, one might also consider assessing development and shadow within the same individual in a longitudinal study.

In addition to further studying how shadow as horizontal learning influences vertical development, one might explore the influence of shadow on states of consciousness. This might include exploring shadow as it relates to Maslow’s (2011) concept of peak-experiences and to the Wilber Combs Lattice (Combs, 2009).
Conclusion

Reflecting on my journey, I continue to focus on prevention rather than late intervention. I still advocate effective engagement before the trigger is pulled. Further, I have expanded my vision to include the support of organizational and systemic changes that foster wholeness and vertical growth. Not surprisingly, this transition coincides with my own developmental growth. The illusion of separateness further dissolves with each step realized toward Unity.

Many organizations tend to focus on supporting informational learning and the development of technical skills. In my judgment, organizations need to become more intentional about creating holding environments that foster the growth of the interior dimensions of the individual—wholeness and complexity. This expanded focus can benefit the organization and the individual. In context to the workplace, as an employee becomes more whole and complex she may demonstrate improved relationships, creativity, efficiency, productivity, and thereby she may reduce waste and costs.

It is likely that individuals have always been challenged to meet the social cultural demands of the time. However, because of the factors previously discussed, it is possible that individuals today face more complex challenges than those of any previous generation. Therefore, it may be more important now than at any other time in history to find a way to catalyze developmental growth.

Shadow work may support the adult developmental journey, by: supporting energy release from a change in one’s relationship to a characterological disposition; supporting horizontal learning that may in turn support vertical development; and releasing unrealized energy that may catalyze increasing developmental complexity. Shadow work, in support of the adult developmental journey, may contribute to one becoming more whole and more complex.
Such individual may be needed to meet the challenges presented by the wicked problems at hand and those that will emerge.
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Appendix A: Participant Invitation

Recruitment Email – McLaughlin Dissertation

Subject: Research for My Dissertation

Dear (Name),

I am writing to ask if you will volunteer as a participant in my doctoral research.

The purpose of the study is to conduct research that may help to find and understand aspects that effect adult learning and development. The total amount of time to participate will be about 60 to 90 minutes.

Your participation will consist of an in person or audio interview at which time you will be asked to respond to a series of questions about your participation in the Immunity to Change workshop during your Spring 2012 Residency including your immunity to change.

I have attached a copy of the informed consent for your review. Please reply to participate and schedule your interview.

Regardless of your decision, thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Rob

Robin Gregory McLaughlin, Student Investigator
Doctoral Candidate
PhD in Educational Studies: Adult Learning
School of Education
Lesley University
Cambridge, Massachusetts
rmclaug2@lesley.edu
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Informed Consent

Robin Gregory McLaughlin, Student Investigator
Doctoral Candidate
PhD in Educational Studies: Adult Learning
School of Education
Lesley University
Cambridge, Massachusetts
rmclaug2@lesley.edu

Terrence Keeney, Faculty Principle Investigator
Associate Professor
Social Sciences
Director, Learning Community Bachelors Program
Lesley University
Cambridge, Massachusetts
tkeeney@lesley.edu

Lesley University Institutional Research Board
Cambridge, Massachusetts
rcruz@lesley.edu
Purpose

The purpose of this research is to identify and understand the dynamics that may influence adult learning and development.

Request and Description of Participation

You are being asked to volunteer for a research study. Your participation will consist of an in person interview where you will be asked to respond to a series of questions about your participation in the Immunity to Change workshop and your immunity to change. The total amount of time to participate will be approximately 60 to 90 minutes.

Procedures

You will be interviewed by the student researcher who will audio record the interview and make some notes by hand including observations made during the interview. The interview audio recording will be transcribed by a professional contractor resulting in a verbatim copy of the interview. The audio, hand notes, and transcription will be analyzed as research data.

Participant Responsibilities and Expectations

You will only be interacting with the Student Researcher. The interview will last approximately 60 to 90 minutes and the entire interview will be completed in a single session. The interview will be conducted in a quiet and private location immediately after your written consent is given.
Risks

There are no known risks to participating in this study. The interview will ask about your immunity to change and your participation in the Immunity to Change workshop. Upsetting, emotional and or uncomfortable memories may emerge. Your name will not be used in association with this study or the information you provide. Data collected including audio, notes, and transcripts will be saved and archived as research documents. Participation in this research may not provide any benefit to you the participant.

Participation in research is voluntary. You have the right to refuse to be in this study. If you decide to be in the study and change your mind, you have the right drop out at any time. You may skip questions. You may ask questions at any time. Whatever you decide, you will not lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Confidentiality, Privacy and Anonymity

You have the right to remain anonymous. If you elect to remain anonymous, we will keep your records private and confidential to the extent allowed by law. We will use numerical identifiers rather than your name on study records. Your name and other facts that might identify you will not appear when we present this study or publish its results. If for some reason you do not wish to remain anonymous, you may specifically authorize the use of material that would identify you as a subject in the experiment.

We will give you a copy of this consent form to keep.
Signature for Consent

I am 18 years of age or older. The nature and purpose of this research have been satisfactorily explained to me and I agree to become a participant in the study as described above. I understand that I am free to discontinue participation at any time if I so choose and that the investigator will gladly answer any questions that arise during the course of the research.

_________________________________________________  _________________________
Participant's Signature  Date

_________________________________________________
Participant's Printed name

_________________________________________________  _________________________
Investigator's Signature  Date

_________________________________________________
Investigator's Printed name
Appendix C: Interview Questions

Interview Questions

Prompt

I will ask you a series of question about your immunity to change and any insights gained through your participation in the workshop. After your respond to each question, I will paraphrase what you said to ensure I understand your meaning correctly and thereafter I may ask follow-up question for additional clarity. Please take a moment to recall your experience in the Immunity to Change workshop led by Dr. McGuigan at the spring 2012 residency.

Questions

1. What was your Immunity to Change commitment? (This is column one on the worksheet and the question provides insight to the developmental stage one is moving toward as a leading or growing edge).
2. What were you doing or not doing with respect to realizing your commitment in your life? (This is column two on the worksheet and begins to bring into awareness the competing commitment).
3. What were the biggest worries or anxieties that showed up when you thought about doing or not doing the behaviors in column two? (This is column three on the worksheet and continues to bring into awareness the competing commitment).
4. What was your competing commitment? (This is column three on the worksheet).
5. What was your Big Assumption? (This is column four on the worksheet and provides insight to the developmental stage away from which one is moving).
6. In what way was your Big Assumption impacting you?
7. What insights did you have about your life when you discovered you Big Assumption? (Illuminates effect of Shadow).
8. How has your understanding of the Big Assumption changed from these insights? (Begins to illuminate Shadow).
9. What is your understanding of Shadow?
10. How does your understanding of Shadow today link up to your Big Assumption?
11. In what way has your experience in the workshop changed your thinking about yourself or your life?
12. What have you learned about your Shadow and how it plays a role in your life?
13. What is the biggest change you have noticed about yourself?
14. How does your Shadow link back to your commitment goal?
15. How has the experience, insight or understanding of Shadow and the Immunity to Change process influenced you as an adult learner?

That concludes the interview. Thank you for participating.