

# DEVELOPMENTAL EXPERIMENTS IN INDIVIDUAL AND COLLECTIVE MOVEMENT TO SECOND TIER

Terri O'Fallon

---

**ABSTRACT** This article describes seven years of research on an ongoing experiment that fosters the development of individuals and groups through an integrally informed educational program called *Generating Transformative Change* (GTC). A progressively targeted developmental action research project involving seven cohorts is described and the conclusions about three of these participant groups, involving a total of 30 people, are presented. Participants were given the Sentence Completion Test international, Maturity Assessment Profile (SCTi-MAP) upon entering the GTC program. Six months after completion of the program, participants were tested again. This article describes the individual and group developmental changes measured by these tests over a period of two years. Findings indicate that individuals grew a stage or more and groups grew one stage within the two-year period.

**KEY WORDS:** development; Integral model; stages; SCTi-MAP

---

Understand quantitative research design to be the approach of choice for third-person epistemologies, and qualitative research to be derived from and for fourth-person postmodern research perspectives (Cook-Greuter, 2002). The relatively simple descriptive research approach used for the Generating Transformative Change (GTC) program unfolded by integrating both of these approaches as they interacted within the GTC program, similar to the skin of a chameleon, which responds dynamically with its environment. Accordingly, the purpose of my research evolved as the program evolved (Torbert, 2004).

The GTC experiment did not follow typical quantitative and qualitative research steps. When the GTC program was started, its initiators sought to design and implement a program that would put into action the principles of the Integral framework as developed by Ken Wilber and colleagues (1995, 2006). The purpose of the program was to ground the theory in individual and group practices, which would be delivered through an 18-month experimental program. The program design featured embodied and applied experiences highlighting the quadrants, levels, lines, states, and types of the AQAL model. Enthusiastic about our experiment, we initially had no formal research intentions—we just wanted to do what we had become passionate about: to discover and teach how to apply Integral Theory in an embodied way. Having had experience implementing the Integral model with a few projects and years of experience in consulting and teaching, we thought we knew what to do. What followed was a natural unfolding of an inquiry process from these naïve beginnings, born out of wonder, passion, and curiosity.

In this article I will first describe how we went through this dynamic unfolding research process. Next, I describe the trajectory of the research, including the third-person descriptive results and the first- and second-

**Correspondence:** Terri O'Fallon, Pacific Integral, LLC, 6827 Oswego Place Northeast, Suite B, Seattle, WA 98115. *E-mail:* terri@pacificintegral.com.

person meaning making that were engaged in both before and after the descriptive results were available. Plans for future research are then outlined. Finally, I reflect on the unfolding research process, its results, the meanings that might be derived from this seven-year experiment, and the nature of the action research process in dynamic and evolving settings.

## **History: The Evolving Program and Research Approach**

Pacific Integral was initiated as a company with the design and development of GTC in 2003 and introduced the first cohort of 20 participants (GTC-1) in February, 2004. Four and a half years later, in October 2008, the seventh cohort was launched, and a further year later, GTC-8 is in its enrollment stage. During these seven years we gained significant experience and insights from grounded experiences born from an intention to design a curriculum that would evolve collectives into second-tier communities through the embodiment and application of Integral Theory (Wilber, 1995, 2006). Initially we had no specific definition of what a second-tier community was, and our conception and re-conception of what that term means has been part of our developmental inquiry. There have been several levels of mutual influence interacting from the beginning of the program. For example, even as the program design has evolved, the faculty of the program has undergone their own developmental shifts, which have influenced the research and inquiry and been an integral part of this experiment.

The first GTC cohort was conceived of as a consultant's development program, evoked by an interest in developing transformative agents for organizational systems. It was late in that cohort's curriculum when the faculty, which was comprised of the three company owners, discovered that each had taken the Leadership Development Profile, now known as the Sentence Completion Test international, Maturity Assessment Profile (SCTi-MAP) (Cook-Greuter, 1999, 2000; Le & Loevinger, 1989; Loevinger & Wessler, 1970), a developmental inventory that describes the ego-self line through nine developmental levels (Cook-Greuter, 2002). Having this experience in common, we began, while studying developmental descriptions (Beck & Cowan, 1996; Cook-Greuter, 2002; Kegan, 1994), to observe the participants in our program, speculating on their level of development. We were unsure of our capacity to make these distinctions, so we decided to give the SCTi-MAP inventory to the GTC-2 participants, who were now beginning the second half of their program. As we tested the participants, we simultaneously received training on how to do coaching related to the results of the test so that we could do its debriefing with our participants. For that training, two of us took a retest. This was our first experience of a retest with this inventory, and the personal experience of identifying a growth pattern in ourselves planted a seed about the future use of the inventory with our participants.

The initial testing with GTC-2 was our first foray into data collection; however, we had no plans at the time to use this material for research purposes. Our intentions were to know our participants better and to introduce them to the levels of development in a personal, embodied way, and by doing so, to provide a better program. We had had no previous experience engaging with people while knowing their tested level of development. Our imaginations were quite active relative to what we thought manifested at each level of development, but we found that we had grave misunderstandings and unfounded assumptions when it came to the lived characteristics of these levels in the human beings with whom we were engaging in person. Immediately we were thrust into a grounded inquiry of what these developmental levels really described. What was the lived meaning of Achiever, Individualist, Strategist, Construct Aware, and Unitive (Cook-Greuter, 2002, 2005) (see Appendix A)? We engaged these empirical questions both with our participants and ourselves. Learning arm-in-arm with our participants over a period of 18 months, each of us with an SCTi-MAP score indicating our level of ego-self development, raised many questions in our minds. For example, we noticed that some people who

scored at an earlier level seemed more wise and aware in our experience of them than others who had scored at a later level. This puzzle, which arose out of the meaning making from our initial data collection, prompted additional questions about the relationship between states and stages, and this in turn led to a theory-building phase (O'Fallon, 2007). Our initial purpose for testing was expanding in a rather nonlinear fashion as we witnessed the developmental structures revealing themselves in ways we were unable to predict.

Experiencing the developmental levels in ourselves and the participants in an embodied sense influenced the design of the program, which evolved differently than it would have without the scores. Developmental patterns from stage to stage began to become apparent as we witnessed the responses of participants representing a span of five levels, from Achiever through Unitive, side by side. The interrelationship of the different developmental levels of the participants within a cohort also had an impact on the learning experience; thus, the program design and delivery changed with each group. Our new understandings modified our program emphasis: the way we delivered our teaching and coaching; the way we worked with shadow, integral practices, and presentation of various models within the Integral framework; and the way we held the energetic container. However integrally informed it appeared to be, the approach that worked for one cohort did not necessarily work in the same way for another. All the while we were bringing to awareness our own developmental preferences and their influences on these program areas as well.

As we engaged with the GTC experiment, we noticed distinct changes in the participants' behaviors and in ourselves. Participants were reporting that their lives had changed, and these observations and reports supported the next evolution of data collection: a retest to determine if developmental growth of the participants had indeed happened. The retest results on the participants of GTC-3 showed substantial developmental gains; the testing and retesting continued with the subsequent two cohorts, GTC-4 and GTC-5, and we plan to retest GTC-6 and GTC-7. These collective data, along with our experiences with a number of very different cohorts, have given us insights on the developmental growth of collectives, which will be discussed below.

After three cohorts had received their retests, we began asking questions about group behavior in addition to individual behavior. The purpose of our research expanded once again to include group changes. I trained with Susanne Cook-Greuter and became a certified scorer of the scale, learning how to generate scores for both individuals and groups. Recently, we have been able to determine the developmental growth of the three cohorts that had test–retest data, in addition to determining individual developmental changes. For the most part, we found the results to be congruent with the changes in behavior of each group over their 18-month experience.

Our research purpose, then, has been somewhat like a weather system; it has responded to the highs and lows of our understandings and conundrums. We began testing the developmental levels of the participants for the purpose of grounding developmental levels in the teaching of an integral curriculum. This developed into a grounded observational approach of noting the actual behaviors of people in these various stages, which prompted us to change the program design and create theories. This in turn seeded research to test the theories. Next, noticing participant changes, we decided to give a post-test to see if we could measure any developmental movement. Noticing the differences in the collective behaviors of the groups, we used the combined individual test and retest scores to measure group centers. Our research purpose continues to dynamically unfold in multiple directions based on the manifestations that arise and mature, a continuing process that seems quite unpredictable.

In summary, we are navigating with an evolving research design that gives us real-world, in-the-moment

feedback. This feedback generates tensions in our ascribed beliefs, which in large part arise out of our own developmental level. Relieving these tensions by releasing the rigidity of our viewpoints changes the dynamics of work within the program and triggers our own transformations. In turn, additional unpredictable research questions are generated, into which we inquire, and through the emergent intentions and purposes of the research we find our engagement with participants and the design of the GTC program itself changing in a self-replicating, autopoietic research structure (Luhmann, 1995).

So far, the descriptive research we have done has fed into a developmental action research orientation (Torbert, 2004); this has been an invaluable way to do research, for it gives feedback on the ever-changing dynamics of development quickly enough that we cannot easily freeze our sense of finality, prediction, and knowing. Thus, we have developed a fluidity in the living of this process, one of experimentation related to the wonder we have about the description of embodied, applied Integral Theory and second-tier communities.

## **Third-person Research**

### *Methodology*

Throughout the research process, our methodology has been consistent and simple. Participants are given the SCTi-MAP immediately upon entering the GTC program. The inventories are then sent to an independent, certified primary scorer, and a second certified scorer also does an interrater score for each inventory. This provides for the reliability of the scores we receive on each of the participants. Next, the participants go through the GTC program. Six months after the completion of the program, and two years after they took their pre-test, a post-test is given. Again, these inventories are sent to an independent, certified scorer with a second certified rater also scoring for interrater reliability. This gives us the test-retest on the individual scores, which indicates individual developmental changes for each participant over a two-year period.

For the collective research, we add together the total weighted scores for all the participants of each cohort and divide by the number of participants to get a group total weighted score. This combined, averaged score can be compared to the designations of the total weighted scores on the Ogive charts for the SCTi-MAP, which have been statistically derived using Bay's theorem, indicating the center-of-gravity score of the group (Loevinger & Wessler, 1970). Thus, we have a pre- and post-test measure to determine if the group as a whole has moved developmentally over the two-year period.

### *Participants*

The participants of this ongoing study are members of the GTC cohorts; they apply to the program, participate in a program interview, and are selected by the faculty. Participants range from 22 to 65 years old and have educational levels that range from two years of high school to postdoctoral studies. They come from many walks of life (e.g., custodians, university professors, medical doctors, dentists, managers, senior executives, business owners, consultants, psychotherapists, governmental executives, doctoral students, cooks, etc.). Various cultures, races, physical abilities, gender preferences, and developmental levels are also represented. Each cohort has included one to four participants from countries outside North America. Participants are not randomly selected; rather, they are selected on the subjective premise that they will be able to successfully complete a 5- to 18-month program.

### *Results*

Eighty-four participants and faculty in the GTC program have taken the initial SCTi-MAP. The GTC popula-

SECOND TIER

Population	Achiever	Individualist	Strategist	Construct Aware	Unitive
U.S.-representative population	29.00%	11.30%	4.90%	1.55%	0.05%
GTC population	32.00%	23.00%	23.00%	11.00%	5.00%

Table 1. GTC participants compared to a U.S.-representative population.

tion’s scores, which are shown in Table 1, are somewhat later as a whole than the representative population described by Cook-Greuter (2005). Earlier levels not represented in the GTC population are not shown on this chart.

The participants of GTC-3, GTC-4, and GTC-5 took the SCTi-MAP at the beginning of the program and again six months after their GTC program had ended, with a two-year span between the test and the retest. GTC-6 and GTC-7 have not reached the two-year point for taking their retests. GTC-1 had no tests at all and GTC-2 had no retests. A few participants dropped out of the program before they completed it. In total, 30 participants in 3 cohorts have taken retests. Since none of the participants scored at the preconventional levels or at the Diplomat or Expert levels, our lived experience in the GTC program has been with the later five levels of development portrayed in the Loevinger–Cook-Greuter research (Cook-Greuter, 1999) (i.e., Achiever, Individualist, Strategist, Construct Aware, and Unitive). The individual shifts in stage are depicted in Table 2, and the number of participants at each level in the pre- and post-test are shown in Table 3.

In summary, 30 people in three cohorts were tested and retested. Of the 11 Achievers, 1 stayed the same, 5 grew by one stage, 4 grew by two stages, and 1 grew by three stages according to the retests.<sup>1</sup> Of 11 Individualists, 2 stayed the same, 1 grew by a half-stage, 7 grew by one stage, and 1 grew by two stages. Of the 6 Strategists, 1 stayed the same, 1 grew by a half-stage, 3 grew by one stage,<sup>2</sup> and 1 grew by two stages. One participant began at Construct Aware and remained there. The one Unitive participant, having tested at the latest stage, could not show growth in the retest and did not lose any stages.

Pre-test levels	Stage changes				
	0	+1/2	+1	+2	+3
11 Achievers	1	-	5	4	1
11 Individualists	2	1	7	1	-
6 Strategists	1	1	3	1	-
1 Construct Aware	1	-	-	-	-
1 Unitive	1	-	-	-	-

Table 2. Individual stage changes over a two-year period for GTC-3, GTC-4, and GTC-5.

Test	Achiever	Individualist	Strategist	Construct Aware	Unitive
Pre-test	11	11	6	1	1
Post-test	1	8	13	6	2

Table 3. Total individual test–retest levels.

In addition to developmental shifts, we also noticed that many of the participants who transformed from one level to another made one or more of three behavioral changes in their lives: moving, changing relationships, or changing careers/positions. For example, 20 out of the 30 (67%) who completed their program changed careers or positions during the time they were in the program or after they had completed it, 11 (37%) changed their primary relationship, and 10 (33%) made a major move to a different location. All of the individual data are descriptive and we claim no causal relationship between the GTC program and the changes people have made. We are aware that each individual in the program has multiple influences in their lives and we are but one of them.

The data in Tables 4, 5, and 6 depict the levels of the GTC-3, GTC-4, and GTC-5 groups, respectively, in the pre-test and post-test, as calculated using the changes in the group total weighted scores. Each of the three group retests indicated a one-level increase: GTC-3 moved from Individualist to Strategist, GTC-4 moved from Individualist to Strategist, and GTC-5 moved from Achiever to Individualist.

We have pre-tested GTC-6 and GTC-7; although both cohorts have completed the program, it is too early for the post-test. GTC-6 began with a group average of Achiever. Although GTC-3 and GTC-4 ended with an average of Strategist, GTC-7 is the only cohort so far that has begun with an average at the Strategist level. Thus, we have experience with two cohorts that have developed into a Strategist center, as calculated by their combined scores, and one that has begun with a center at Strategist. Strategist is the first level that is commonly designated as second tier (Cook-Greuter, 2002).

## First- and Second-person Inquiry and Meaning Making

As we watched ourselves unfolding (first-person) and the unfolding of the participants and the program (third-person), we engaged in second-person meaning making from our first- and third-person observations. This prompted third-person, data-gathering, descriptive research. In our explorations together, one of the faculty may make a first- or third-person observation and make meaning. Then, community sharing with other faculty brings about a triangulation and collective meaning making. We have also invited previous GTC participants to join our faculty. Having never been participants ourselves, we know that these faculty members can see with eyes with which we cannot; they can represent the participant view in our meaning-making process, which is informed by our own interventions and by ones that we have learned from others (e.g., Issacs, 1999; Kegan & Lahey, 2000; Smith & Berg, 1987).

Four areas stand out in our observations as having begun as first-person insights and then evolving through the sharing and meaning making in the faculty community: 1) iterating patterns of consciousness; 2) symptoms that appear to be representative of the actual time of transformation from one level to the next level; 3) attempts to define the characteristics of a second-tier community; and 4) the effects of embodying and applying the Integral framework. The evolution of these areas has ultimately prompted a program redesign.

SECOND TIER

As we observed the changes in individuals from their various pre-test levels to their post-test levels, we noticed iterating patterns. For example, there are similar patterns that arise at the earlier parts of person perspectives (the early third-person Expert, the early fourth-person Individualist, and the early fifth-person Construct Aware) and different patterns that appear to iterate at the later parts of person perspectives (the late third-person Achiever, the late fourth-person Strategist, and the late fifth-person Construct Aware). Several of these iterative patterns, such as polar-opposite patterns and patterns that deal with priorities, are suggested by individual observations that are then the subject of our collective meaning-making process. Because we have face-to-face experience with a number of people at the two later levels of Construct Aware and Unitive,

Test	Achiever	Individualist	Strategist	Construct Aware	Unitive	Group average
Pre-test	4	4	2	0	0	Individualist Early fourth-person Total Weighted Score: 258
Post-test	0	2	7	0	1	Strategist Late fourth-person Total Weighted Score: 285

Table 4. GTC-3 collective test–retest levels.

Test	Achiever	Individualist	Strategist	Construct Aware	Unitive	Group average
Pre-test	2	4	2	1	1	Individualist Early fourth-person Total Weighted Score: 257
Post-test	0	3	3	3	1	Strategist Late fourth-person Total Weighted Score: 284

Table 5. GTC-4 collective test–retest levels.

Test	Achiever	Individualist	Strategist	Construct Aware	Unitive	Group average
Pre-test	5	3	2	0	0	Achiever Late third-person Total Weighted Score: 224
Post-test	2	2	4	2	0	Individualist Early fourth-person Total Weighted Score: 260

Table 6. GTC-5 collective test–retest levels.

we have noted finer distinctions within each of these levels, as well as a clearer embodied understanding of patterns that begin in earlier levels and iterate in some form at these two levels as well.

Second, during the time of transformation—the shift from one level to the next—behavior seems to sometimes include one or more of a certain set of identifiable symptoms, such as moodiness; time struggles (e.g., being late); forgetfulness; difficulty with organizing, planning, and making decisions; and struggles with concentration, including reading. People with these temporary symptoms may not endear themselves to others. The meaning making we have done around understanding transformative shifts naturally supports a practice of compassion for oneself and others rather than the making of unconscious judgments. This supportive practice carries into the collective behavior, where it appears to bring about a feeling of understanding, support, and loosening of judgment, which could be a constraint to development. These behavioral observations have prompted coaching related to transformative shifts, compassionate action, and responsive program design.

The third area we pondered is the question of what it means to be in a second-tier community. We focused on the qualities of the Strategist level as an indicator, as that level is most often identified with entry into second tier. However, our experience, as usual, was different from our initial theories and suppositions. We had only one cohort begin with a center at Strategist. We had 15 months to engage with and observe this collective. Nearly half of the participants in this group scored at levels later than Strategist, and the influence they have had on this community has been illuminating. We are learning that the mix of levels earlier and later modify the behavior in this group, and thus a cohort with a Strategist center may not behave on the whole with Strategist-like qualities, but may as a group respond more to the qualities of the intermix of all of the levels in the collective. So, we are living the question of how to define and describe a second-tier community. Is its definition based on certain observable behavioral characteristics irrespective of the group's tested center at Strategist? Can a group with an earlier tested center cultivate Strategist-like characteristics? Can a group with a Strategist center not have Strategist-like qualities? Should we observe a number of groups that have been measured with a center of Strategist, identify the structural qualities they have in common, and use those as our indicators? Even as we have worked with three communities that have measured with a center of Strategist, it is our sense that second-tier communities, while still rare, are showing up more and more frequently. We hope that this will give us a better base of observation from which to describe and define the collective phenomenon of what has been named *second tier*.

A final area of second-person meaning making centers around the lived and applied experience of the Integral framework. With experience we have begun to find that participants at certain levels tend to background the theory even as they live it, and those at other levels want to foreground the theory and be explicit about learning and living it depending on their level of development. Having worked with seven groups of people using the Integral model as our base teaching, we are only beginning to understand the lived experiences of and implications of embodying and applying it in daily life individually and in groups.

## Emerging Research

Based on our learning from our second-person meaning making, two research agendas have arisen: 1) further description of the experience of embodying and applying the Integral framework and 2) exploration of the iterating patterns of levels of development from the earliest through the latest stages.

We are curious about the differences between programs that teach Integral Theory in an embodied and applied way and those that do not. Therefore, we are recruiting a comparison group in order to test its participants us-



ing the SCTi-MAP and retest them two years later to see how their results compare to the descriptive results of the GTC population. This group is made up of students in an accredited master's of business administration program, which does not use the Integral framework. John F. Kennedy University's Integral Research Center is also beginning to do comprehensive testing (via the iTEACH Project) on its Integral Theory master's program, including the use of the SCTi-MAP. Our program stands in between these two: while it does not offer a master's degree, our curriculum focuses on the application and embodiment of the Integral model. We will thus have descriptive data from three programs (an Integral master's degree program, an Integral applied program, and a non-Integral master's degree program) and will be able to lay those data side by side to compare differences and commonalities for the purposes of program redesign.

Also, our experience with people who have tested at the later levels has generated our interest in continued research on the SCTi-MAP itself. Can we refine the two later levels with finer distinctions? Given our observations, we sense that this is an interesting inquiry. Will we be able to document iterative patterns through the different tiers? Based on the maturing of the theory building we did related to the Wilber-Combs Lattice (Wilber, 2006), will we be able to connect states and stages in some way? This research is beginning as a result of the learning from the first-, second-, and third-person research that has been done with the GTC program over the past seven years. We are informed by the Integral Research model, which we are attempting to embody and evolve through conscious experimentation.

### *Final Thoughts on the Research Process*

Our research questions have arisen simultaneously with the findings of the research we have been conducting. As we focus on one area of learning and gather information about that area, we find the data often respond to a different question than we asked or they seed an entirely new question. This puts us face-to-face with the phenomenon of enactment.

As we continue to work with the construct of development, we are aware that research approaches come into being with each level of development. This supports our use of research as a fluid tool that itself is evolving. Late fourth-person research at the Strategist level transcends and includes third-person quantitative and early fourth-person qualitative research. Because moment-by-moment witnessing arises at later levels, we are experimenting with research approaches while transcending and including all third-person objective and fourth-person meaning-making research approaches, thus adding a fluidity and dynamism to its structure and bringing awareness that research itself is a language construction. As the research process dynamically evolves, we are experimenting with ways to interpenetrate the research approaches from each of the eight zones of IMP. We have done one pilot on the beginnings of such a research approach. Hopefully, by combining the research approaches from each zone with successively later level awareness we will be able to advance the Integral Research agenda itself. Indeed, the program and the research are much like two sides of a coin that is in the process of being flipped, one side bringing the other into existence interactively and developmentally.

### *Acknowledgments*

Thanks to Geoff Fitch for writing and editing comments.

## Appendix A

### *Descriptors of Developmental Levels from Impulsive through Unitive\**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Opposites</b>	<b>Space</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Qualities</b>	<b>Perspective</b>
Unitive	-	Kosmoscentric	Evolutionary	Unitive	Sixth-
Construct Aware	-	Kosmoscentric	Historical	Construct aware	Fifth-
Strategist	-	Sentientcentric	Generational	Context aware	Fourth-
Individualist	Both-and	Sentientcentric	About own lifetime	Context aware	Fourth-
Achiever	Either-or	Worldcentric, humancentric	About 3 to 5 years	Formal operations	Third-
Expert	One flexible side	Humancentric	Past and about 18 months in future	Abstract operations	Third-
Diplomat	One side	Stand in others' shoes	Past and present	Rule-oriented	Second-
Opportunist	-	Self-centered	In the moment	Self-oriented	Second-
Impulsive	-	At one's skin	In the moment	Impulsive	First-

\* Adapted from Cook-Greuter (2002).

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>One person gained three levels and several grew by two levels. It is our belief and experience that there are three areas that affect vertical growth: 1) the quality of the context that people are living in, 2) life's disorienting dilemmas, and 3) having a deep spiritual practice. It is our belief that some people may be exceedingly ready to move developmentally, but because of the poor or neutral quality of the context they are situated in, it is very difficult for them to gain any natural momentum even if they have a spiritual practice. When participants enter our program they are surrounded by non-judgmental people, several of whom may be at later stages than they are, and are held in a context that is positive for growth—so they wind up naturally rising to the level they would have been at had their life been situated in a context that nurtured growth. Combining the appropriate context, a spiritual practice, and a disorienting life dilemma can foster a move of two levels, and for some, three levels. In any event, it is our experience that offering the right kind of context and container generally lends a positive opening for growth. Once people embody this process, they often go back to their own context yet still understand how to continue to develop. The process of development (i.e., how to naturally hold oneself in it) appears to be, in part, a learned phenomenon.

<sup>2</sup>Initially, two people lost two stages on their inventory. This has happened three other times in separate contexts, and we have found that in every case when a retest is taken, they score at early Construct Aware. One of the qualities of early Construct Aware is a deep concern about hubris, and a concern about arrogance. Thus, in these cases their responses tend to be quick and over-simplified. The first inventory accurately scored where the responses fell, as did the second scoring. Thus, in my opinion, it takes a seasoned scorer to attend to this particular discrepancy; in due time, another retest should be offered to determine if the first retest was accurate. Also, I want to note that it seems to be a part of the flux of a person's general center when people score a half stage earlier on their retest, so I sense these scores to be generally within the realm of accuracy. When people score more than one stage later on their retest, with proper supporting observations, it seems these scores are accurate; it is my experience that it is difficult to score later than one's general center if the scoring itself is accurate.

## REFERENCES

- Beck, D., & Cowan, C. (1996). *Spiral Dynamics: Mastering values, leadership, and change*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Cook-Greuter, S. (1999). *Post-autonomous ego development: A study of its nature and measurement* [unpublished dissertation]. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Graduate School of Education.
- Cook-Greuter, S. (2002). A detailed description of the development of nine action logics. Retrieved June 23, 2009 from <http://www.cook-greuter.com/>.
- Cook-Greuter, S. (2005). Ego development: Nine levels of increasing embrace. Retrieved June 23, 2009 from <http://www.cook-greuter.com/>.
- Issacs, W. (1999). *Dialogue and the art of thinking together*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Joiner, B., & Josephs, S. (2006). *Leadership agility: Five levels of mastery for anticipating and initiating change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kegan, R. (1994). *In over our heads: The mental demands of modern life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kegan, R., & Lahey, L. (2000). *How the way we talk can change the way we work: Seven languages for transformation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lê, H., & Loevinger, J. (1989). *Measuring ego development: Supplementary manual and exercises for Form 81 of the Washington University Sentence Completion Test*. St. Louis, MO: Washington University, Department of Psychology.
- Loevinger, J., & Wessler, R. (1970). *Measuring ego development: Construction and use of a sentence completion test*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Luhmann, N. (1995). *Social systems*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- O'Fallon, T. (2007). Leadership and the interpenetration of structure and state stages: A subjective exposé. *Integral Leadership Review*, 7(5). Retrieved June 1, 2010 from <http://www.integralleader->

- shipreview.com/archives/2007-11/2007-11-article-ofallon.html.
- Smith, K., & Berg, D. (1987). *Paradoxes of group life*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Torbert, W. (2004). *Action inquiry: The secret of timely transforming leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Barrett-Koehler.
- Wilber, K. (1995) *Sex, ecology, spirituality: The spirit of evolution*. Boston, MA: Shambhala.
- Wilber, K. (2006) *Integral spirituality: A startling new role for religion in the modern and postmodern world*. Boston, MA: Shambhala.

TERRI O'FALLON, Ph.D., has taught, consulted, led, and conducted research in the field of "Learning and Change in Human Systems" for more than 46 years. Her work has included leading a non-profit corporation serving the adult developmentally disabled, public schools administration, and university teaching. Terri's previous research specialized in online and face-to-face learning communities, dialogic approaches to making new knowledge, and designing learning systems. Terri is a Principal of Pacific Integral, which conducts Generating Transformative Change, a leadership program that provides developmental research on leaders that enter and complete the program. She is a certified scorer of the Leadership MAP. Her most recent work is as Director of the Developmental Research Institute, where she is conducting research on the later levels of human development.