Pepperdine University

Pepperdine Digital Commons

2010

A study of the application of the concepts of Karen Horney in leadership development within the National Management Association of the Boeing company

Frank Z. Nunez

Recommended Citation

Pepperdine University

Graduate School of Education and Psychology

A STUDY OF THE APPLICATION OF THE CONCEPTS OF KAREN HORNEY IN

LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE NATIONAL MANAGEMENT

ASSOCIATION OF THE BOEING COMPANY

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction

of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education in Organizational Change

by

Frank V. Nunez

November, 2010

Susan Nero, Ph.D.– Dissertation Chairperson

This dissertation, written by

Frank V. Nunez

under the guidance of a Faculty Committee and approved by its members, has been submitted to and accepted by the Graduate Faculty in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Doctoral Committee:

Susan Nero, Ph.D., Chairperson

Rogelio Martinez, Ed.D.

Kent Rhodes, Ph.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

VITA

Education

1978   BS Health Science   California State University, Long Beach

1986   MA Human Resource Management   University of Redlands

Professional Experience

1978 – Present   Human Resources Manager, The Boeing Company

1995 – 1996   Faculty, University of Phoenix

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the usefulness of the personality theories of Karen Horney in leadership development. The Horney concepts examined are: (a) the basic anxiety, (b) the real and idealized self, (c) the self-defeating cycle, and (d) the three movements of people. The research questions guiding this inquiry are: Will professionals who are willing to develop their leadership capabilities find the theories of Karen Horney useful in that pursuit? How can these concepts contribute to deeper self-awareness? How can deeper self-awareness generated from these concepts influence a leader's development?

The literature review indicates that Karen Horney's concepts are used by leadership development practitioners but not being taught to leaders. The concepts are introduced in a 1-day workshop, which allows a group of volunteer leaders to experience and explore the concepts in a safe learning environment. Volunteers then contract to use at least 1 Horney concept for 2 weeks on the job and report their results via a semistructured interview. Interview data along with data collected from written postworkshop course evaluations are analyzed using a 6-step qualitative method.

While there is much written on what to practice and learn to become a leader, there is not much written about the forces that prevent leadership growth and development, how to recognize them, and what to do about them. The findings from this study break some new ground in the usefulness of this approach in leadership development research.

This research furthers the knowledge and understanding of leadership by introducing a way of understanding the emotional drivers that help and hinder leadership development. The research demonstrates that the concepts of Karen Horney can be used

as a sense making framework for self-reflection and self-understanding that exposes the unconscious forces that prevent leadership growth. By doing so, aspiring leaders, in addition to dealing with the outside, tangible obstacles to their leadership development, could also identify the internal obstacles, the forces that operate out of their awareness that are not so obvious, that prevent leadership growth.

Chapter One: The Problem

This dissertation documents an evaluative study of the usefulness in leadership development of the theory of the idealized self as conceived by Horney. The research focused on Horney's theories of the basic anxiety, the idealized self and the three movements of people. The study originally intended to assess whether the theories were useful to leadership development practitioners and/or leadership learners, however, the review of the literature in Chapter two provided me with an answer to the leadership practitioner question. Therefore the data collection addressed the second focus of this inquiry only—the leadership learner.

The study employed a workshop design delivered to 12–15 voluntary subjects consisting of managers and professionals in leadership positions followed up by an interview design to determine usefulness of the concepts taught. Usefulness was defined from the workshop participant's perspective for how well the theory helped them improve their leadership performance. The first chapter presents the background of the issue upon which the study is based, the specific problem addressed by the study along with its significance to the organizational change field and an overview of the approach used.

Background

I will begin by relating a personal experience with the theories of Horney and how this has inspired me to conduct this research. I will also share my thinking around some possible lines of inquiry using her theories.

About 10 years ago I experienced a dreadful, prolonged episode of deep anger and self-contempt. I struggled to understand where these feelings were coming from and why

I was feeling them. I luckily sought and obtained counseling which helped me identify and understand the source of my anger, but more importantly, the source of my self-contempt. However, it was not until my doctoral studies in Organizational Change at the Pepperdine University that I discovered the name of this thing that plagued me to near despair and negatively affected all my most cherished relationships. The concepts of the idealized self, the search for glory and the resulting self-contempt, were revealed to me in *Points of Influence* written by Segal and the name of Horney became a beacon for my curiosity.

When I finally realized there was nothing wrong with me, that I wasn't a bad person, or a wrong person, I was liberated. I felt freer than I had ever felt before, but freer from what? Was this the kind of freedom Wilber (2000a) speaks of as "simply a sense of freedom, a sense of release, a sense of not being bound" (p. 200). For Wilber, this sense of freedom is the real self, the real you. For me, it really did feel like "a vast expanse of Freedom and Liberation from the constrictions of identifying with these little subjects and objects that enter the stream of time and are ground up in that agonizing torrent" (p. 202). For me, those little subjects and objects were all the tyrannical *shoulds* brought on by my idealized self. Horney conceived of the idealized self as the actualization of an idealized self-image (Horney, 1950), which is the product of one's imagination. The torrent Wilber (2000a) speaks of is what we typically call "experience, where subject and object collide…like a punch in the face…where the self is…the battered self—it is utterly battered by the universe 'out there'" (p. 208). For me, I didn't realize how battered I was until it finally stopped and it was Karen Horney's theory of the idealized self that helped stop the battering.

Horney lived from 1885 until 1952. She was a student of Sigmund Freud and practiced psychiatry in Europe and the United States. She founded the American Institute for Psychoanalysis in 1942 and was a practicing psychotherapist until her death in 1952. She disagreed with Freud on the sexual focus of the unconscious and instead focused on social and cultural forces as the main determinants of human behavior. Segal's (1997) summary of Karen Horney's contributions capture the potential usefulness of her work. Segal wrote:

> Horney's pioneering identification of the real self identified the positive force within individuals behind their psychological growth and development. Her identification of the forces moving toward, against and away from people identified the origins of effective and dysfunctional management styles. Her identification of the ideal self also helps practitioners to identify and work with the roots of much dysfunctional organizational behavior. (p. 137)

Interestingly, the personality theories of Horney, a Freudian trained psychologist who eventually rejected Freudian orthodoxy, do not inform to any substantial degree the current organizational behavior literature as robustly as other post-Freudian thinkers and this is in spite of how much her theories contribute to our understanding of organizational behavior. Segal (1997) wrote:

> Karen Horney identified…aspects of our personality that have crucial impact upon behavior in organizations. The real self is the basis for positive growth and change, and the ideal self is the basis for much individual and organizational dysfunction. Three movements—toward, against and away from people—are the basis for much management style. (p. 111)

A personal search on the ABI Informed and Pro Quest database for organizational behavior and leadership literature as informed by the psychoanalytic social theory of Karen Horney turned up very little. A broader search on psychoanalytical references turned up the usual sources—mostly Freud, Jung, the Klein, Jaques, Rogers, but there was little mention of Horney. For as much as these "foundational" thinkers have advanced our abilities to better understand humans in organizations, I find it curious that we are not using Horney's theories more substantially to enrich our understanding.

There was general agreement in the literature that self-awareness is positively correlated to leadership effectiveness (Brown & Starkey, 2000; Diamante & London, 2002). Building on that foundation, I thought it could likely be the case that an understanding of the Horney theories could be translated into effective leadership behaviors. Perhaps a leadership development practitioner could use the theory of the ideal self in a leadership development context to promote leadership self-awareness. My thinking was this: If self-awareness is so important, wouldn't a deeper awareness of the motivations that drive behavior be more useful than an awareness of behavioral preferences or habits, as we find in most personality self-assessments? Could we not cut to the chase and look at the needs that drive behavior?

There is a maxim in organizational behavior circles which states we cannot change what we don't understand. I think the corollary of this is that simple awareness is not enough, awareness must lead to understanding. Awareness of one's style preferences or awareness of others' perceptions of one's behaviors is certainly worthwhile and there is much research that bears this out. What I attempted to inquire into was whether introducing some novel concepts to leaders and leadership development practitioners in a

simple, easily understood way would help them understand themselves a little better so that they could use this new self-understanding to become a better leader.

Definition of Terms

A brief listing of some terms used throughout this paper is beneficial to any readers not familiar with the basic subject of psychology or Karen Horney. More detailed explanations are present throughout in later chapters:

- Anxiety—An intense emotional response caused by the preconscious recognition that a repressed conflict is about to emerge into consciousness (Anxiety)

- Depth Psychology—psychoanalytic approaches to therapy and research that take the unconscious into account. Depth psychology explores the relationship between the conscious and the unconscious and includes both psychoanalysis and Jungian psychology (what is depth psychology).

- Developmental psychology—The branch of psychology concerned with interaction between physical and psychological processes and with stages of growth from conception throughout the entire life span (Developmental Psychology).

- Experiential learning—a model of adult learning wherein a person engages in some activity, looks back at the activity critically, abstracts some useful insight from the analysis and puts the results to work (Pfeiffer, 1975).

- Integral theory—a theory of consciousness developed by Ken Wilber which draws on the strengths of each of multiple psychological approaches, and attempts to incorporate and integrate their essential features (Wilber, 1997).

- Mental models—deeply held internal images of how the world works, images that limit us to familiar ways of thinking and acting (Senge, 2006).

- Narcissism—a personality disorder characterized by a pervasive pattern of grandiosity, need for admiration, and lack of empathy (APA, 1994).

- Neurosis—a mental and emotional disorder that affects only part of the personality, is accompanied by a less distorted perception of reality than in a psychosis, does not result in disturbance of the use of language, and is accompanied by various physical, physiological, and mental disturbances (Neurosis).

- Object relations theory—Psychoanalytic theory that originated with Melanie Klein's view that the building blocks of how people experience the world emerge from their relations to loved and hated objects (Object relations theory).

- Psychoanalytic psychology—The branch of psychology emphasizing psychodynamic therapy developed by Freud; an intensive and prolonged technique for exploring unconscious motivations and conflicts in neurotic, anxiety-ridden individuals (Psychoanalytic psychology).

- Self-hate—the result of the central inner conflict between the real self and the idealized self; expressed as relentless demands on the self, self-accusations, self-contempt and other self-destructive behavior (Horney, 1950).

- Unconscious—The domain of the psyche that stores repressed urges and primitive impulses (Unconscious).

Conceptual Approach

I will now explain the theoretical framework that was most salient to this research. I will also offer some examples of how a person might experience these concepts in more concrete terms.

Horney's psychoanalytic theory. *The real self*. According to Horney (1950), within every human is "that central inner force, common to all human beings and yet unique in each which is the deep source of growth…(a) free healthy development in accordance with the potentials of one's generic and individual nature" (p. 17). She identifies this as the real self. When humans have what Horney calls "favorable conditions for growth" (p. 18)—an atmosphere of warmth, the good will of others and healthy friction—a person grows in harmony with the real self. She has referred to it variously as "this alive center" (p. 155) and "the original force toward individual growth and fulfillment" (p. 158) and she concedes that while it may be "an abstraction, it is nevertheless felt and we can say that every glimpse we get of it feels more real, more certain, more definite than anything else" (p. 158).

The basic anxiety. However, when these favorable conditions are lacking, especially in childhood, humans develop "a profound insecurity and vague apprehensiveness" (Horney, 1950, p. 18) and "a feeling of being isolated and helpless in a world conceived as hostile" (p. 18), which Horney calls "the basic anxiety" (p. 18). Horney (1939) cites an example of an environment in which "the…free use of energies is thwarted…self-esteem and self-reliance are undermined, fear is instilled by intimidation and isolation" (p. 75). Horney's example could easily describe many workplaces in the world. She believed the foundation of the basic anxiety was laid in childhood but that it

develops into adulthood and also "underlies all relationships to people" (Horney, 1937, p. 90).

But unlike Freud, who believed the basic anxiety is sexually based, Horney believed the basic anxiety is socially and culturally based. This cultural aspect is important to understanding organizational behavior. When one considers the basis of modern western culture (and more specifically business culture) one sees that it is rooted in capitalistic competition for scarce resources. Horney concedes "Among the factors in western civilization which engender potential hostility, the fact that this culture is built on individual competitiveness probably ranks first" (Horney, 1950, p. 173). A competition based culture results in a view of the world wherein business leaders are taught to see the external environment as a hostile world to be conquered and exploited. This is exemplified by Porter (1980), in his classic book on business strategy, *Competitive Strategy: Techniques for Analyzing Industries and Competitors*, in which he suggests managers view their organization's environments in terms of five competitive forces, or threats: the threat of new entrants, the threat of substitute products, competitive rivalries, power of buyers and power of suppliers.

In his interview with Labarre (2000) Kostenbaum makes a similar observation capturing the tyranny of the idealized self in our economy. "What I call the 'new-economy pathology' is driven by impossible demands—better quality, lower prices, faster innovation—that generate unprecedented forms of stress" (p. 224). This cultural hostility is such a pervasive part of our everyday lives that it takes no leap of logic to see how this hostility can awaken the basic anxiety, thus leading to the expression of one of the three neurotic trends.

The three movements of people. According to Horney (1950), deep feelings of helplessness and isolation in a hostile world demand a solution, a response to relieve this pervasive anxiety. Horney identified three movements that she described as neurotic trends or attempts to solve the basic anxiety. One can move *toward* people by seeing oneself as loving and unselfish. This results in having strong needs for affection and approval. One can move *against* people by seeing oneself as a tough and ruthless person resulting in strong needs for power and to exploit others. A person can move *away from* people by seeing oneself as independent and self-sufficient. This creates strong needs for privacy and independence.

All of these solutions help relieve the basic anxiety and the choices are available to all humans to use in a healthy way according to the situation; one exercises choice and takes responsibility for the consequences. For example, one should be able to accommodate when the situation calls for it, fight if necessary or to withdraw when appropriate. But there are those who use theses stances in an unhealthy way, primarily exhibiting one response across all their relationships. The person experiences no choice. Behavior becomes compulsive. According to Horney (1950), the unhealthy person is not driving her own behavior—she is being driven by her neurosis. For example, a situation may rightly call for compliance, but a person may respond by fighting or withdrawing, even though these may be nonproductive or dangerous responses for the circumstances.

The tyranny of the idealized self. "Living within a competitive society, and feeling at bottom—as he does—isolated and hostile, [the neurotic] can only develop an urgent need *to lift himself above others*" (Horney, 1950, p. 21). By using an artificial solution (one of the three movements) to cope with others, genuine feelings and thoughts

are silenced in favor of immediate safety. The more these real, legitimate feelings are silenced the more the real self recedes into the background, until it is no longer accessible. Something else must come in and take its place. "Gradually and unconsciously, the imagination sets to work and creates…an idealized image" (p. 22). When this happens the chosen solution, whether it is movement toward, against, or away from, people become glorified: "Compliance becomes goodness; love, saintliness; aggressiveness becomes strength, leadership, heroism, omnipotence; aloofness becomes wisdom, self-sufficiency, independence" (p. 22).

There continues to be a natural desire toward self-realization, but the real self becomes a diminished self and in its absence, the idealized self takes over. Horney (1950) describes this self-idealization as the "comprehensive neurotic solution" (p. 23); a solution that not only satisfies the immediate need to resolve the basic anxiety and make one feel safe again, but it also replaces the real self with a much more desirable self, one that is much more congruent with the values and expectations of a competitive culture. It is a self-image driven by three all consuming needs: (a) the need for perfection—in order to achieve the idealized self-image the person falls victim to the "Tyranny of the Should" (Horney, 1950, p. 65); (b) a neurotic ambition for external success—a compulsive drive for superiority in *all* things; and (c) a need for vindictive triumph—"to put others to shame or defeat them through one's very success,…to inflict suffering upon them— mostly of the humiliating kind" (Horney, 1950, p. 24). These three elements make up what Horney terms the "search for glory" (p. 24).

The self-defeating cycle. Within the search for glory there is a destructively pathological cycle of impossible self-demands and loathsome self-contempt. In Horney's

(1950) view, the real self is not dead—it lies deeply dormant—as the idealized self imposes "a change in the course of the individual's whole life and development. It infiltrates his aspirations, his goals, his conduct of life, and his relations with others" (p. 24). As a result, in Horney's view of the psyche, the real self must fight for its survival: "This indeed is the essential characteristic with every neurotic: he is at war with himself" (p. 112). This internal war is characterized by what Horney describes as the "central inner conflict" (p. 112)—self-hate, which I will describe below.

According to the psychodynamics of Horney's (1950) model, a person's idealized self, in order to prove its perfection, imposes a system of impossible shoulds, or inflexible, irrational inner dictates that amount to the person believing nothing should be impossible to achieve. There is no regard to the feasibility or the conditions necessary for the fulfillment of the shoulds. Because these demands are not grounded in rationality, they are almost always impossible to achieve. When a person experiences this lack of achievement an anxiety arises. The blame for failure is placed on the real self and results in a dynamic of self-hatred. The self-hate can lead to self-accusations of weakness and incompetence, self-contempt or belittling, self-frustration by denying real pride in real accomplishments. In Horney's view, the expression of self-hate is the relentless demands on the real self—demands for further perfection, which results in more impossible shoulds, which results in more failure, which results in more anxiety, which results in more self-hate. I refer to this set of relationships as the self-defeating cycle.

The psychoanalytic theory of Horney (1950) was the theoretical framework upon which this research was based. A person might experience these concepts in terms of the real self—a feeling of natural, spontaneous growth; the basic anxiety—a feeling of

helplessness; the three movements of people—attempts to relieve anxiety by behaving submissively, aggressively or indifferently toward others; and the idealized self—a search for glory and a negative cycle of self-hate.

I will summarize the problem statement of this research by explaining the problem being examined, the purpose of the study, and the research questions to be answered by the study.

Problem Statement

There appears to be little to no overt use of Horney's (1950) theory of the idealized self in the organizational change field and specifically in the leadership development/self-awareness arena. It is not clear if Horney' theories are overlooked, ignored or, perhaps, used tacitly. It may even be that these ideas have been previously investigated and discarded. The intent of this study was to determine the usefulness of these ideas from two perspectives: the perspective of the leadership development practitioner and the perspective of the individual wishing to develop himself or herself as a leader. I will refer to this second group as leadership learners.

Assumptions

In undertaking this research it was assumed that the general population has very little knowledge of Horney's (1950) psychological concepts and that the participants in this research would need an adequate immersion into the concepts in order to participate in the research. Because this research deals with concepts of depth psychology, any consideration of the usefulness of these concepts was preceded by participants engaging in some process of self-reflection. Research volunteers were assumed to be open to and comfortable with some level of introspection and were willing to engage in this in a

workshop format with other willing participants. It was also assumed that people interested in leadership positions are interested in acquiring and developing leadership abilities: they would be willing to put in some effort to achieve this and that people in a management club that focuses on leadership development would be there because they are interested in becoming leaders and therefore would volunteer on that basis. I assumed that not all participants would find these concepts useful; therefore a negative experience was just as valid as a positive experience.

The Purpose of This Study

The purpose of this study was to test whether Horney's (1950) concepts of the basic anxiety, the three movements of people as a response to the basic anxiety, the idealized self and the search for glory were useful to leadership development practitioners and leadership learners. For the purpose of this research the term useful was applied to leadership capability. Horney's concepts would be judged useful if they can be seen as a frame or tool by leadership learners for helping them improve their leadership behavior.

The Research Question

The following research questions were chosen to narrow the focus of this inquiry and to help guide the methodology for this research:

    1. How do leadership development practitioners use the theories of Horney in their practice?

        a. Are they aware of Karen Horney's ideas?

        b. Do they use the theories explicitly or implicitly in their practice with leaders?

        c. If they don't use the theories, why not?

d. Would they consider using the theories—and how?

This first question was answered by the literature review and is no longer a part of the data collection effort.

2. Will professionals who are willing to develop their leadership capabilities find the theories of Horney useful in that pursuit?

a. How can these theories contribute to deeper self-awareness?

b. How can deeper self-awareness generated from these theories influence a leader's development?

Overview of Methodology

The design for this research was originally intended to be conducted in two parts: a design for the first question and a separate design for the second question. The review of the literature has answered question one about the use of Horney's (1950) theories by practitioners interested in developing self-awareness and leadership ability in others. Therefore the design for research question two was a workshop design. All participants were self selected volunteers utilizing personal and professional networks.

Interview design. In order to collect data from leadership development practitioners an interview method was used. The interview was a series of open ended questions intended to elicit practitioner knowledge of and opinions about the theories of Horney.

Workshop design. The intent of this design was to create an experiential workshop for volunteer leaders so that I could present Horney's (1950) theories as simply and as clearly as possible. The intent of the workshop was for participants to understand Horney's core ideas well enough to test them against their personal and work experiences

and determine their validity and usefulness. The data collection involved several

methods: (a) post workshop assessment using paper and pencil instruments, and (b)

follow-up interviews with workshop participants.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

The theories of Horney will be the central focus of the literature review. In order to develop a conceptual foundation for this research, various theoretical positions as well as existing studies which address leadership, self-awareness and developmental psychology will be reviewed. Conceptual and operational definitions of key ideas and concepts will also be included. This approach to the literature will determine to what extent the study of Horney's theories is meaningful, relevant, and significant to the field of leadership development.

Background

The application of the applied behavioral sciences contributes in important, meaningful ways to understanding human behavior in organizations, and Hersey and Blanchard (1993) define the basic unit of behavior as the actions of people. Segal (1997) emphasizes the importance of individual psychology in the organization: "Theories of personality, explicitly or implicitly, have always been important for those who work in organizations. It is impossible to work with people in an organization without some idea of how and why they behave as they do" (p. xi).

Recent research confirms the value of applying psychological constructs to organizations. Brown and Starkey (2000) identified a link between organizational identity and organizational learning and, in so doing, have demonstrated how a knowledge of the psychology of organization members can help in understanding organizations better: "Psychological, and especially psychodynamic, approaches to organization studies can yield insights into collective behavior…. organizations can be understood usefully in terms of the psychology of the participants they are composed of" (p. 114). Brown (1997)

shows how a "psychoanalytic concept could be applied at the collective level without reification" (p. 63) and that "organizations exist in the minds of their members, organizational identities are parts of their individual member's identities, and organizational needs and behaviors are the collective needs and behaviors of their members acting under the influence of their organizational self-images" (p. 650). Still others (Carr, 2000; Staw, 1991) endorse and advocate for the usefulness of psychodynamics in understanding organizational change and the relevance of psychological theories in explaining organizational actions.

Psychological theories broaden our understanding of not only organizational behavior in general but also one of the most critical behaviors in organizations: leadership, which as Bennis and Nanus (1985) point out is "the central ingredient to the way progress is created and to the way organizations develop" (p. 19). Northouse (2004) defines leadership as "a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal" (p. 3).

The literature on organizational behavior is richly informed by the work of Freud, Jung, Rogers, Klein, Bion and many other psychological theorists. These theories have become the basis for discussions of organizational and leadership behavior. The Myers Briggs Type Indicator uses the Jungian theory of psychological type (Michael, 2003); the work of Melanie Klein is used to explain unconscious defenses against anxiety (Schwartz, 1990) and Wilfred Bion is often cited when discussing the unconscious elements of group behavior (Segal, 1997).

The psychoanalytic work of Horney is the focus of this research. A psychoanalytic framework, according to Renshon (2004), consists of four core elements:

(a) the existence and operation of unconscious motivation; (b) the idea that a person's internal and interpersonal psychology develops and consolidates over time; (c) the idea that the process of consolidation results in patterns of choice that reflect interior psychology, and that these choices are discernable if one pays close attention to a leader over time and circumstance; and (d) that these patterns of internal and interpersonal psychology develop in relation to each other, and together form a package that is best understood as a person's character psychology.

Chapter one presented a brief review of the major theoretical constructs developed by Horney. The question posed in this research focuses on Horney's theories and on the development of leaders. At the core of Horney's theories and leadership development is the assumption, as stated by Renshon, that people grow and develop psychologically over time. Therefore a review of the literature of theories of human development will be considered.

Theories of Human Development

Horney's developmental approach to human psychology is foundational to more current human developmental models including developmental consciousness. Developmental consciousness is defined by Kegan (1994) as "the forms of meaning-regulation, the transformation of consciousness, [and] the internal experience of these processes" (p. 7). Developmental psychology is defined as the branch of psychology concerned with interaction between physical and psychological processes and with stages of growth from conception throughout the entire life span. Wilber (1997) notes, "Developmental psychology views consciousness not as a single entity but as a developmentally unfolding process with a substantially different architecture at each of

its stages of growth" (p. 2). Kegan (1982) and Wilber (2000a) both assert that the basis for consciousness theory is object relations theory. Ingram and Lerner (1992) make the case that Horney's theories fit in the object-relations branch of psychology. Horney (1939) wrote of the "organic development" (p. 44) of the self, which fits this category of concepts nicely. Horney has been known as a depth psychologist and according to Wilber (2000a), "Consciousness and depth are synonymous. Consciousness is simply what depth looks like from the inside, from within" (p. 37). Literature relating to Horney's psychology of human growth will be explored along with the literature of other current scholars of human developmental theory, including Kegan and Wilber. The role of anxiety will also be examined as well as the impact of culture in human development.

The Human Growth Psychology of Horney

Literature addressing Horney's theories of human growth and development will be reviewed here along with research articles or dissertations focusing on contributions of Horney to the general field of psychology as well as other applications of her work.

Horney is identified as a member of what has become known as Third Force Psychology. Powell (1991) wrote:

> Third Force psychology provides a view of human nature at odds with that of the Freudians and the behaviorists. This differing view of human nature can be described in a number of ways—as being optimistic, more holistic, finding within man a more complex hierarchy of inherent needs and values. (p. 8)

Cassel (2001) further notes, "Third Force Psychology…is characterized as being 'person centered' in nature. The basic characteristic for change in Third Force Psychology are planned to be internal in nature, and to be created and implemented by a thinking and

planning individual" (p. 132).

Abraham Maslow is considered a third force psychologist and is widely known

for his hierarchy of human development culminating in a "self-actualized" (as cited in

Hersey & Blanchard, 1993, p. 35) human being. Paris (1998) points out that Horney's

theories "are entirely compatible with those of Abraham Maslow, who was influenced by

her. Both theories are based on the idea of a 'real self' that is the object of life to

actualize" (p. 24). Maslow focused on what human beings need for healthy growth while

Horney focused on what happens when these needs aren't met. "The theories of Horney

and Maslow are complimentary and taken together provide a more comprehensive picture

of human behavior that neither provides by itself" (p. 24). It should also be noted that the

Maslow hierarchy is often taught to managers and leaders and is considered a standard

theory in traditional leadership education and training.

Another line of thought (Ingram & Lerner, 1992) makes a case for considering

Horney as an object relations theorist. Object relations theory is "a family of theories

having a common denominator, namely, the view that the personality is structured as a

function of early relations with significant others and that subsequent development leads

to adaptation and modification" (p. 37). By identifying commonalities to "significant

object relations theorists" the authors argue that Horney's work stands solidly on its own

as object relations theory.

Horney's theories of human growth conflicted with the accepted Freudian theories

of her time. "Because of its criticism of Freud, *New Ways in Psychoanalysis* made

Horney infamous among orthodox analysts and led to her ostracism from the

psychoanalytic establishment" (Paris, 1998, p. 1). Horney theorized about the stage-like

nature of human development and this conflicted with Freud's "mechanistic" view of development. In *New Ways in Psychoanalysis*, written in 1939, Horney (1939) observes that development proceeds in "evolutionistic" (p. 42) stages. She wrote:

> Things which exist today have not existed in the same form from the very beginning, but *have developed out of previous stages* [italics added]. These preceding stages may have little resemblance to the present forms, but *the present forms would be unthinkable without the preceding ones* [italics added]. (p. 42)

Current scholars continue to find value in Horney's view of human development. Smith (2007) assessed the theories of Horney against their usefulness in 21st century psychology and concludes, "Karen Horney offers us…a glowingly human set of constructs…a positive, growth-minded and open system" (p. 66). Smith sees compatibilities with attachment theory, self-psychology, inter-subjectivity and the person in the environment. She states, "Many ideas currently circulating in the psychological and psychoanalytic communities have correspondence with the theories put forth by Karen Horney during the first half of the twentieth century" (p. 57). Paris (1999a) points out how the later theories of other self theorists, such as James Masterson, Heinz Kohut, D. W. Winnicot, Alice Miller, and R. D. Laing have much in common with Horney's theories. Self theorists, according to Baumeister (1999), can be understood as scholars concerned with four major problems of the self: knowing and conceptualizing the self; defining or creating the self; understanding one's potential and fulfilling it; and relating the self to society.

Since Horney's developmental approach is fundamental to current thinking, which includes developmental models of consciousness, a brief review of the literature of other developmental theorists is appropriate. Two contemporary developmental theorists whose theories encompass the work of many of the classical developmental theorists are included: Robert Kegan and Ken Wilber.

The developmental psychology of Robert Kegan. The core of Horney's conception of human growth is the real self. For Robert Kegan the self is also the focal point of his developmental theory, which is based on the cognitive-development theories of Jean Piaget. Kegan (1982), in his book *The Evolving Self*, presents a theory of,

> …human being as meaning making…exploring the inner experience and outer contours of our transformations in consciousness throughout the lifespan…a theory of the psychological evolution of meaning-systems or ways of knowing, in short, a theory of the development of consciousness. (p. 6)

Kegan's theory, like Horney's theory, relates to human development as experienced from the inside. Kegan (1994) defines psychological growth as "the unselfconscious development of successively more complex principles for organizing experience" (p. 29). Discussing the environmental requirements for healthy growth Kegan, like Horney, recognizes the necessity of favorable conditions. Kegan states, "People grow best where they continuously experience an ingenious blend of support and challenge; the rest is commentary" (p. 42). This ability to evolve into better, more meaningful meaning-making depends on the same factors Horney postulated in 1950—a combination of good will and healthy friction of others.

Whether it is called growth or development, Kegan, like Horney, advocates a concept of evolution. Kegan (1994) defines the psychological meaning of evolution as:

A lifetime activity of differentiating and integrating what is taken as self and what is taken as other…[and that s]ubject-object relations emerge out of a lifelong process of development: a succession of qualitative differentiations of the self from the world, with a qualitatively more extensive object with which to be in relation created each time. (pp. 76–77)

This lifelong evolutionary activity "involves the very creating of the object (a process of differentiation) as well as our relating to it (a process of integration)" (Kegan, 1982, p. 77). According to Kegan, this lifelong activity of differentiating self (subject) from other (object) occurs in a series of stages or "evolutionary truces" (p. 82) that "establish a balance between subject and object" (p. 82). According to Kegan's evolution of consciousness theory, people go through a lifelong process of moving between these stages and as they do, this growth, this development of the self from one stage to the next, creates psychological tension.

Kegan (1982) emphasizes the vulnerability of the self during these transitions and since these transitions occur throughout a lifetime there is a lifetime of vulnerability. As the self emerges from one stage and begins to embed into the next stage the person begins to feel the effects of this motion, this stress on the tension between self and other. Kegan describes these effects as a sense of "loss–anxiety and depression…distress" (p. 82) understood and felt by the person as "a separation from myself from what is gradually becoming the old me, from which I am not yet sufficiently differentiated to integrate as other" (p. 82).

Kegan (1982) and Horney (1950) appear to have in common a deep appreciation for, yet a slightly different understanding of, the anxiety produced by the developmental process of moving from one stage of consciousness to the next—the process of human growth. Kegan views this psychologically traumatic experience—the feelings of isolation, self-alienation, anxiety and depression—as the terms of evolution that must be negotiated at each step of development. He recognizes these basic anxieties as inevitable and necessary if a person is to grow.

Kegan (1982) identifies and articulates the process of growth, whereas Horney (1950) focuses on the forces that work against growth; when the terms of the evolutionary truce are broken. Their theories appear complimentary and when considered together they give a more comprehensive picture of the human in the act of being than either gives by itself.

Kegan's (1982) theory of human development has generated a body of research and practical application. Kegan's theories are the basis for many leadership research studies. Several representative studies are presented here.

Collyer (1996) proposed two distinct forms of leadership, inclusive and independent, and that leaders aspire to one or the other form. Relative to each form of leadership is a unique orientation of self that reflects both a person's stage of development and leadership form. This orientation and the projected leadership are either encouraged or discouraged by the surrounding social structure. Adapting the work of Kegan, Collyer used the subject-object methodology for determining the research subjects' stage of development. Hypothesizing that a discouraging social structure would

manifest as regressed stage development, Collyer could find no evidence of this regressed development.

Benay (1997) looked at how leaders think and create meaning in their roles by exploring the connections between concepts of transformational and transactional leadership models, double-loop learning, and social cognitive development. Eight leaders were assessed using Robert Kegan's subject-object interview and another social cognitive tool. The results of her study suggest a relationship between the cognitive developmental level of the leaders as measured by Kegan's stages and their transformational leadership abilities.

Focusing on women students' leadership experiences from the perspective of Kegan's developmental psychology, Spillett (1995) proposed a theory of leadership development for young women leaders emphasizing a developmental agenda in the interpersonal domain. Her research, conducted on 13 student leaders and using multiple interviews over three months, focused in particular on five student leaders who revealed developmental difficulties in three content areas: delegating tasks to members, expressing disagreement with others, and negotiating their relationships with college authorities. Her findings suggest that social expectations for the role of women often conflict with the role of leader and that in order to progress from one developmental level to the next leadership development might include "becoming aware of, taking perspective on, and eventually relativizing and integrating these conflicting demands" (p. 275).

The developmental work of Keegan (1982) was inspired by the cognitive developmental work of Jean Piaget which has also inspired the work of American philosopher Ken Wilber who has taken the stage work of many theorists and synthesized

it into a far reaching model of human growth and consciousness development called integral psychology.

The integral philosophy of Ken Wilber. According to Wilber (2006), the whole point of the integral approach is to find the "critically essential keys to human growth, based on the sum total of human knowledge…[it uses] all of the world's great traditions to create a composite map, a comprehensive map, an all-inclusive or integral map" (p. 6) of human development.

Wilber (1997) created a four quadrant model to represent the four domains of human development and the hierarchy of developmental stages in each quadrant. The model includes an interior (subjective)—exterior (objective) dimension and the individual (intersubjective)—collective (interobjective) dimension. The domain of the individual interior is the consciousness quadrant; the domain of the collective interior is the cultural quadrant. These two domains constitute the left-hand side of the four quadrant model. The domain of individual exterior is the behavioral quadrant; the domain of collective exterior is the social quadrant. These two domains constitute the right-hand side of the model.

Wilber (1997) sought to include as many of the great developmental psychologists as possible into his integral map. The map is indeed a stage based model of human development culled from a wide variety of stage theorists from both east and west and across time to include premodern, modern, and postmodern sources. Wilber's model, "creates a comprehensive template for the stages of personal development to be constructed" (Cacioppe & Edwards, 2005, p. 88).

Wilber's (2000a) integral theory has been used in a variety of applications, including business strategy (Landrum & Gardner, 2005), organizational change (Edwards, 2005), community values (Hamilton, 2006), organizational development (Cacioppe & Edwards, 2005), and, most salient to this research, leadership development (Joiner & Josephs, 2007; Pauchant, 2005; Torbert, 2004).

Pauchant (2005) proposed a research program on the content and process of integral leadership using Wilber's (2000a) integral model as a frame for the research. Pauchant (2005) wrote:

> The proposed research's goal is to document in a rigorous and empirical way how leaders who are considered to have achieved a post-conventional development have led with others successful organizations or nations. It is also to document the process from which these leaders have grown. (p. 223)

Pauchant argues that the Wilber model has "the potential to contribute to a developmental theory and practice of leadership that we badly need in our complex and suffering world" (p. 223).

The adaptability of Wilber's integral model is well documented with, claims Wilber (2006), a thousand graduate theses on how to implement the approach. The broad applicability of the integral approach appeals to researchers who have used it as an explanatory system for further understanding of their particular disciplines. Since Wilber's integral approach is intended to "honor and embrace every legitimate aspect of human consciousness" (Wilber, 2000b, p. 2), one might wonder if some elements of Horney's work are part of such an effort. Wilber's work is a vast consolidation of others' work and he does indeed bring a unique way of viewing and understanding all that has

come before. However, a search of the literature did not reveal any evidence of Horney's theories influencing or contributing to Wilber's philosophy.

Although Wilber (2000b) does not directly mention Horney in his work, there is an historic connection through William James' influence on her as well as her influence on Maslow, both of whom Wilber cites as early exemplars of integral thinking. Horney's work is infused with references to James, who according to Wilber (2000b), was one of "the truly founding psychologists'' (p. xi) and a "modern pioneer" (p. xi) of an integral approach. Influences aside, there is a common thread between the work of Horney, Kegan and Wilber and that thread is the role of anxiety in healthy human development.

The role of anxiety in human development. Horney (1950), Kegan (1982), and Wilber (2000a) all emphasize the far reaching influence of anxiety in a person's life. As the understanding of psychology, emotional and brain science has evolved, the understanding of anxiety has also evolved from a view of anxiety as unhealthy, unconscious and mostly uncontrollable to a more current understanding of anxiety as something that is natural and can be moderated. An examination of the recent literature on the role of anxiety in human development provides further insight into the relationship between Horney's theories and leadership development. Horney was an advocate of the healthy psychological growth of human beings as well as an advocate for the belief that every human being had the potential for growth and should be given the chance to do so. "Healthy strivings stem from a propensity, inherent in human beings, to develop given potentialities. The belief in an inherent urge to grow has always been the basic tenet upon which our theoretical and therapeutic approach rests" (Horney, 1950, p. 38).

When forces interfered with this growth she saw this as a "true human tragedy" (Horney, 1950, p. 377). She viewed the pathology of neurosis as "a tragic waste in human experience…if there are constructive, creative strivings and these are wrecked by obstructive or destructive forces" (p. 378). It was this tragedy she dedicated her entire work into identifying, analyzing and healing. Horney's chief adversary, the cause of all the neurotic trends she fought against was the basic anxiety.

Anxiety is defined by the Merriam Webster dictionary as a painful or apprehensive uneasiness of mind usually over an impending or anticipated ill; a fearful concern or interest. Horney (1939) defines anxiety as "an emotional response to danger, as is fear" (p. 194). She characterizes anxiety as different from fear in three major respects: (a) anxiety has the quality of diffuseness and uncertainty, where as fear is more concrete; (b) the personality is the thing menaced by the anxiety, while in fear the menace may be physical; and (c) a feeling of helplessness toward the danger as compared to having the capacity to deal with the danger. Horney (1950) made a distinction between anxiety and the basic anxiety, contending that the basic anxiety comes from a lack of healthy psychological growth caused by the lack of "an atmosphere of warmth…the goodwill of others…and healthy friction" (p. 18) in childhood. One distinction is based on the presence of fear and the other is based on the absence of healthy growth. Horney specifies that the anxiety is also produced by the threat of the three neurotic trends (moving away, toward, or against others) failing to operate. When the trends fail, the person's safety is threatened and this produces anxiety.

Horney (1939) disagreed with Freud on many accounts over the fundamental nature of anxiety. Since Freud's psychological theories were all physiologically based,

his theory of anxiety was explained according to sexual and instinctual concepts. Freud's concept of anxiety "remained an expression of pent up libido, though it was defined as the individual's feelings of fear and helplessness toward a pent-up libido tension" (as cited in Horney, 1939, p. 57). According to Freud's doctrine of instinctual satisfaction, "satisfaction is the result of a decrease in instinctual tension; anxiety is the result of its increase" (as cited in Horney, 1939, p. 196). In both cases, Freud and Horney agree that anxiety is indeed the product of a psychological tension, although they disagree on the root of that tension.

Horney (1950) described the basic anxiety as "a profound insecurity and vague apprehensiveness" (p. 18) and "feeling isolated and helpless toward a world potentially hostile" (p. 367). This is the trigger for the neurotic solutions to protect the person from the hostile world around them. Throughout all her writings, Horney railed against the coercive affects of modern society. Whether she was explaining the search for glory, neurotic claims, self-contempt or neurotic trends, she cited, one after the other, current, for her day, cultural examples of "the soil out of which a neurosis may grow" a combination of "feelings of alienation, hostility, fear and diminished self-confidence…which creates a basic feeling of helplessness toward a world conceived as potentially dangerous" (Horney, 1939, p. 172). It is no surprise then when Smith (2007) observes, "Anxiety, a central and organizing theme in her work, is present in today's world at a level which would have been unimaginable to Horney and her contemporaries" (p. 57). A review of the literature on anxiety is, therefore, germane to an understanding of Horney's theories as well as their relationship with the current environment of leadership development.

Wilber (2000b) emphasizes that as the self grows from one developmental level to the next, the letting go of the previous level is "experienced only with great difficulty" (p. 36) and can potentially produce great trauma. Kegan (1982) is more specific about this trauma, "Central to the experiences of qualitative change or decentration…are the affects of loss—anxiety and depression.…distress understood as the felt experience of an evolutionary transformation" (p. 82). Horney's (1939) observation of anxiety as "frequently the result of being in some acute dilemma without being aware of it" (p. 205) corresponds to this notion that anxiety is a natural by-product of healthy human growth. There is much in the literature to suggest that anxiety is also a part of our culture. The literature that will be discussed next will provide examples of this.

Supporting the claim that culture produces anxiety, Brown (1997) found that organizational culture reinforces a variety of ego-defense processes. Investigating the causes of human capital flight, Ingalls (2000) points to the "conditions of stress brought about by the normal and natural challenges of life…personal struggles that usually bring us into conflict with others" (p. 18). Among these is recognition of the presence of anxiety as an everyday challenge for the modern manager.

Gilbert (2005) writes about the relationship between anxiety and planning:

What is the conceptual tie that binds anxiety and planning? Both, of course, are intimately connected to thinking about the future. We feel anxiety when we anticipate something bad will happen, and we plan by imagining how our actions will unfold over time. Planning requires that we peer into our futures, and anxiety is one of the reactions we may have when we do. (p. 14)

Linking anxiety to chronic, repetitive worries, Goleman (2005) refers to anxiety

as "a low grade emotional hijacking: the worries seem to come from nowhere, are uncontrollable, generate steady hum of anxiety, are impervious to reason, and lock the worrier into a single, inflexible view of the worrisome topic" (p. 64). Goleman also points out the positive side of anxiety, citing classical psychological literature describing how an optimal combination of anxiety and performance can accomplish outstanding achievements, while too little anxiety can bring about apathy and too much anxiety can produce failure. Referring to anxiety as "the distress evoked by life's pressures" (p. 172), Goleman links anxiety to simple stress. However, he notes:

> In modern life anxiety is more often out of proportion and out of place—distress comes in the face of situation that we must live with or that are conjured out of the mind…repeated bouts of anxiety signal high levels of stress. (p. 172)

This certainly supports Horney's assertion that our culture is a source of anxiety.

In the organizational literature, anxiety has been discussed by Argyris & Schön (1978), Koestenbaum (1991), Quinn (2000), Schein (1992), and Schön (1983). Schein (1992) frames anxiety within the context of cultural change. Elaborating on the stages of group evolution, Schein observes that one of the two basic mechanisms for learning group norms is anxiety avoidance. In order to cope with the internal integration issues of change, people will learn the norms that help them best avoid the anxiety that the movement from the group building stage to the group working stage produces.

The process of learning produces anxiety: "The prospect of learning new ways of perceiving, thinking, feeling, and behaving itself creates…what we can think of as learning anxiety, a feeling that 'I cannot learn this without losing a feeling of self-esteem or group membership'" (Schein, 1992, p. 322). Schein recognizes the natural presence of

anxiety as a necessary component in the change process. In describing the disequilibrium, or unfreezing, created by the change, Schein identifies three different processes present: disconfirming data, anxiety and psychological safety. This process of unlearning in order to learn something new sounds very familiar to the transcend and include concept of Wilber, which is based on the evolutionary truces described by Kegan. Kegan's (1982) insight as to how one makes meaning of a change is connected to how one is "settling the issue of what is self and what is other" (p. 113).

Quinn (2000) describes anxiety in relationship to emergent reality, which is "reality that is unfolding independently of [a] system" (p. 9) and that it "requires new behaviors that [people] are not yet ready to embrace…tends to threaten deeply held values and to suggest the need for taking a risk by plunging into the unknown" (p. 9). According to Quinn, anxiety is something to inquire about, not avoid; it is something to be explored, not denied. From this perspective, anxiety is a positive force. Quinn asserts that people who desire to be agents of change should engage in "regular, personal transcendence of fears, constant effort to step outside our scripts and engage emerging reality, continuous struggle to live an inner directed and other-focused life" (p. 105). Rosen (2008), in his book *Just Enough Anxiety*, argues that anxiety is a fact of life and instead of avoiding anxiety, a person should harness it as a positive force for success.

Rosen's (2008) research and practice have confirmed for him the value of the gap that Chris Argyris identifies as the gap between espoused theories of action and theories in use. Rosen refers to this mental gap as being "our personal laboratory for change, where anxiety lives and flourishes" (p. 62).

This personal laboratory for change corresponds with the reflection in action ideas espoused by Schön (1983). Schön identified a theory of reflective practice wherein "practitioners reveal a capacity for reflection on their intuitive knowing in the midst of action" (p. vii). In researching the structure of reflection-in-action, Schön observed that when faced with a problem that cannot be easily solved using existing context, or frames, professional practitioners construct a new way of seeing the problem, a new context or frame, which he calls a "frame experiment" (p. 63). The practitioner inquires into the problem by constructing a new description of it and then testing that description with an on-the-spot experiment. Schön recognizes the difficulty of this and how many professional practitioners "feel profoundly uneasy" (p. 69) attempting this type of inquiry, which is so different from their tacit technical expertise.

According to Rosen (2008), the anxiety produced by the gap is the stuff from which leaders can work on and improve their capabilities—as long as it is managed wisely. Rosen wrote:

> Effective leaders are able to manage their own anxiety and reshape or resize the gap—or people's perception of the gap—to create the right amount of anxiety for the situation. The result is a greater capacity to lead and achieve results. It's about knowing how much anxiety is just enough. (p. 67)

Although Rosen advocates the positive and healthy qualities of anxiety, he echoes both Horney and Wilber when he warns, "If you try to repress your anxiety, you will need all your energy to hold it at bay" (p. 71).

Similar to the observations of Goleman (2005), Rosen (2008) suggests that there is such a thing as just enough anxiety and that it is this balance between too little and too

much anxiety which is the challenge successful leaders must face. Rosen describes two

kinds of leaders—the Too Little Anxiety leaders and the Too Much Anxiety leaders.

Within each kind of leader there are four behavioral types. For the Too Little Anxiety

Leaders, Rosen observes idealistic, detached, overpleasing and cautious behaviors. Rosen

defines "just enough anxiety" (p. 96) as consistent with "the ability to be comfortable

with discomfort. If you have just enough anxiety, you embrace change. You reach for

opportunities to learn and grow" (p. 96).

Management consultant and philosopher Peter Koestenbaum approaches anxiety

not only as a fact of life, but as a direct outcome of what he refers to as "the new-

economy pathology…driven by impossible demands…that generate an unprecedented

form of stress" (as cited in Labarre, 2000, p. 224). Taking into account the extraordinary

demands on today's leaders Koestenbaum (1991) advises:

> It is therefore critical to understand that anxiety is the key to courage, for courage
>
> is the decision to tolerate maximum amounts of anxiety. You should face your
>
> anxiety, you should stay with your anxiety, and you should explore your anxiety.
>
> (p. 190)

Koestenbaum reveals a simple truth of the human condition that also echoes Horney's

(1950) positive belief in the human capacity to grow toward self-realization. As human

beings, we have free will and as such we are free to define who and what we will

become. With this freedom comes anxiety. It is this essential anxiety that is the struggle

that Horney speaks of in the subtitle of her final book, *Neurosis and Human Growth: The*

struggle Toward Self-Realization. Koestenbaum (1991) offers a definition of anxiety,

which I find congruent with a Horneyian concept of growth:

Anxiety is how it feels to grow. One becomes an adult by learning to move

through anxiety, to stay with and not avoid it. Leadership, therefore, means to

face anxiety, not fear it, to make it your constant companion. Anxiety is the

natural condition of human beings. Anxiety reveals truths that we wish to hide but

in fact need for our greater health. Anxiety is the experience of growth itself. How

does it feel to proceed to the next stage of growth? The answer is, be anxious.

Anxiety must, therefore, be valued, not denied. (p. 192)

Adding to the thought on the positive aspects of anxiety, Bennet and Bennet

(2004) assert that anxiety can lead to transformational change, forcing organizations to

"create a strong environment and culture within which people can effectively feel

freedom, stability, and loyalty" (p. 21) in the face of uncertainty and a complex, stressful

environment. Kegan and Lahey (2009) discuss more expansive ways of knowing as part

of their method for uncovering the unconscious mental models that produce resistance to

change, or what they refer to as "immunity to change" (p. 48). In order to uncover this

immunity, one must increase one's mental complexity and to do that requires a certain

level of anxiety called "optimal conflict" (p. 54), which involves a persistent experience

of some frustration or dilemma, which causes one to come face to face with one's limits

of their current thinking, which in turn forces one to "put at risk a way of knowing the

world that also serves as a way of managing a persistent, fundamental anxiety" (p. 56).

This approach to anxiety exposes any false sense of immunity to change and allows the

individual to make fundamental choices to grow beyond the anxiety and improve her life.

The leadership research of Kouzes and Posner (2007) revealed that 95% of the

personal best leadership experiences they studied were described as exciting and yet 15%

of those cases also generated fear and anxiety that leaders found to be energizing and

challenging. Noting that these leaders applied what they call "psychological hardiness"

(p. 206), Kouzes and Posner note, "With a positive view, you can transform stressful

events into manageable or desirable situations" (p. 208). Working with anxiety is an

important aspect of leadership and since our contemporary Western culture fosters much

of the anxiety people experience, the role of culture in human development will be

discussed next.

   The role of culture in human development. Horney's (1939) idea about the

importance of the role of culture in a person's growth is also more acceptable than it was

during her lifetime. Horney criticized Freud for "his habitual failure to take cultural

factors into consideration" (p. 98), attributing psychological maladies to biological or

instinctual causes. Horney's (1950) theory of neurosis is more culturally based than

biologically based, defining the basic anxiety as a feeling of being "isolated and helpless

toward a world conceived as potentially hostile" (p. 18) and attributing this anxiety, and

the neurotic trends to cope with it, to the lack of "favorable conditions for growth" (p. 13)

requiring "an atmosphere of warmth" (p. 18) along with the "goodwill of others" (p. 18)

and "healthy friction" (p. 18) with others. She is especially critical of Western cultures

stating that "among the factors in western civilization which engender potential hostility,

the fact that this culture is built on individual competitiveness probably ranks first"

(Horney, 1939, p. 173). For Horney, "the problem of the influence of cultural conditions

in creating neurotic conflicts is far more complex than Freud sees it" (p. 177). Smith

(2007) reinforces this idea from a contemporary perspective, stating, "Anxiety, a central

and organizing theme in her work, is present in today's world at a level which would have been unimaginable to Horney and her contemporaries" (p. 60).

Many current scholars and practitioners recognize the growing importance of the cultural influence on people's behavior. Cresti (2003) wrote:

The idea that the psychological study of human nature must take into account not only the individual but also the social environment in which he lives has been steadily gaining ground in the wake of the socio-anthropological and psychoanalytical studies that have flourished in the previous century. (p. 196)

Smith (2007) stated, "Her ideas about human behavior and about psychotherapy have a remarkably contemporary feel. Her appreciation of the impact of environment and culture on development…has acquired more and more currency in analytic circles" (p. 66). Paris (1998) reports that Horney became famous for creating "a heightened awareness of cultural factors in mental disturbance and inspired studies of culture from a psychoanalytic perspective" (p. 1). Within the organizational literature there is a large body of research and discussion of organizational cultures, including the important work of Ed Schein.

According to Schein (1992), culture can be represented by three levels of phenomena. The most easily observable level is that of artifacts; those phenomena that are easily seen, felt and heard such as organizational structure and processes. The next level is less visible and consists of espoused values and beliefs, such as strategies, philosophies and goals. The third level is the most difficult to observe because it is mostly unconscious. This is the underlying assumptions; the taken for granted beliefs and perceptions. This deeper level of culture exerts a powerful influence on organizational

members. In critiquing the effectiveness of organizational studies, Schein concedes that "We failed to note that culture, viewed as such taken-for-granted, shared, tacit ways of perceiving, thinking and reacting, was one of the most powerful and stable forces operating in organizations" (Schein, 1996, p. 231). While Horney recognized the influence of culture on the individual, Schein's research confirms the far reaching individual and organizational impact of culture.

Thus far in the field of leadership development, the developmental theories of Kegan (1982) and Wilber (2000a) have been reviewed. The literature on the role anxiety plays in developmental theories and the important connection to Horney's theories of anxiety and its cultural causes has also been examined. Following the major theoretical components of Horney's theories, literature on the concept of self-awareness will be explored next. First, a general examination of the concept of self will be presented and some comparisons among the real self, the authentic self, and the idealized self will be made where appropriate. This will be done within the context of leadership. Based on this foundation the section concludes with a review of recent literature on the importance of self-awareness to the contemporary execution of leadership.

Self-Awareness

As a psychoanalyst, Horney (1950) seems to have viewed self-awareness as equivalent to self-knowledge. But as a humanistic psychiatrist, she knew that at the root of self-awareness was a fundamental human trait. "The only responsibility that matters…is, at bottom, no more but also no less than *plain, simple honesty about himself and his life*" (p. 169). But for Horney, rational knowledge would not suffice for true self-understanding. It had to be something deeper. "Knowledge of [oneself] must not remain

an intellectual knowledge, though it may start out this way, but must become an *emotional experience*" (p. 342). A general examination of the concept of the self will set the stage for further explorations of literature on the authentic self, the idealized self, and the need for self awareness.

   The self. The idea of a self is long standing and precedes Horney and modern psychology. Baumeister (1999) traced the evolution of the self in Western thought from a self-conscious concern with self-deception in the Puritan age, to the Romantic notion of fulfilling a destiny, to the Victorian hypocrisy and repression of the hypertrophied self, to the early 20th century acceptance of the impossibility of knowing the complete self. Jun (2005) points out the Cartesian roots of the modern Western conception of the self and along with Baumeister, accounts for how the atomistic self as reflected in the Early Modern period of Western culture focused on the individualistic quality of the human being.

   Horney (1950) conceived the self in several parts. She described the real self as "the alive, unique, personal center of the individual; the only part that can, and wants, to grow" (p. 155). She described the real self not so much as a static entity, but as a "central inner force" (p. 17) that is at the heart of every human being's "inherent urge to grow" (p. 38). She claimed that human beings tend toward development, that growth is something all human beings have an intrinsic need to do and her choice of active language to describe it is deliberate. Horney (1950) theorized that the real self,

   …engenders the spontaneity of feelings, whether these be joy, yearning, love, anger, fear, despair. It also is the source of spontaneous interest and energies…the capacity to wish and to will; it is the part of ourselves that wants to grow and to

fulfill itself.…when strong and active [it] enables us to make decisions and

assume responsibility for them. It therefore leads to genuine integration and a

sound sense of wholeness, oneness. (p. 157)

A second self theorized by Horney (1950) is the "actual self" (p. 157). Where the

real self is a "possible self" (Paris, 1999a, p. 158), the actual self is conceived by Horney

(1950) as:

An all-inclusive term for everything a person is at a given time: body and soul,

healthy and neurotic. We have it in mind when we say we want to know

ourselves; i.e., we want to know ourselves as we are. The real self…is what we

refer to when we say we want to find ourselves. (p. 158)

There is also a third self that Horney (1950) theorized—the idealized self—but

that will be elaborated upon later in this section. There are other more current

conceptions of the self that should be explored in order to gain a fuller appreciation of

this phenomenon.

Where Horney's (1950) concept of the real self is "the alive, unique, personal

center of ourselves; the only part that can, and wants, to grow" (p. 155), Kegan (1982)

refers to the self as,

…the zone of mediation where meaning is made.…From some perspectives it is

one among many functions, all of which together make up the person. From other

perspectives it is the very ground of personality itself—it *is* the person. (p. 3)

Kegan further explains, "There is presumed to be a basic unity to personality, a unity best

understood as a process rather than an entity. This process…gives rise to the 'self,' the

meaning-making system with which the process gets identified" (p. 5). Like Horney, the

subject of his theory is the human being, the person. Horney (1950) views the person engaged in a lifelong quest for self-realization—the act of growth. For Kegan (1982), the "'person' is understood to refer as much to an activity as to a thing—an ever progressive motion engaged in giving itself a new form" (p. 8). The person is the act of growing. Both Horney and Kegan share a view of a human being as a human in the "ever progressive motion" (Kegan, 1982, p. 8) of being.

Wilber's (2000b) concept of the self is explained within the context of his integral approach to reality. The self exists within the four quadrants of the integral model and touches them all. The self is "the locus of identity, will, metabolism, navigation, defenses and integration…as the locus of integration, the self is responsible for balancing and integrating all of the levels, lines and states in the individual" (p. 37). It is this navigational quality of the self, the ability to negotiate and advance along from one developmental stage to the next, evolving as it goes, expanding its consciousness along the way, that coincides with Horney's (1950) active conception of the self. In order to convey this active self Wilber uses the metaphor of "ladder" (p. 130) for the developmental levels and "climber" (p. 130) for the self.

Wilber (2000b) also refers to the self as having two parts: an observing self called the distal self, experienced as an I; and the observed self called the proximate self, experienced as a me. The two of them together he calls the overall self. This is important in the development of the self as it is the subjective self that becomes the objective self as the self evolves from one developmental level to the next. It is the proximate self, the "central source of identity" (p. 33) that navigates the developmental levels. Wilber also

refers to this self as the actual self describing it as "the self that is actually there at any given moment" (Wilber, 2000a, p. 147).

A subscriber to the view of the self as potential is Scharmer (2007). He refers to this as the "highest future self" (p. 401). In developing the theory of presencing with Senge, Jaworski and Flowers, Scharmer takes the view of self as "a vehicle for bringing forth new worlds" (Senge, Scharmer, Jawaroski, & Flowers, 2004, p. 234). Not unlike Horney's conception of an actual self and a real self, Scharmer (2007) sees two selves also:

> Every human being is not one, but two. One is the person who we have become through the journey of the past. The other is the dormant being of the future we could become through our forward journey. That being of the future is our highest or best future possibility. (p. 401)

This higher self is for Scharmer (2007), the real self; the self that "transcends pettiness and signifies our 'best future possibility'" (p. 164). It is important to note that Scharmer offers this perspective specifically within the context of leadership.

The literature contains many theories about the nature and importance of the self. A more thorough understanding of the self requires a closer examination of the two aspects of the self that are the most salient to leadership—the real or authentic self and the false or idealized self.

Ideas of an authentic self. The idea of a real, or authentic self in current leadership literature bears little to no resemblance to the notion of the real self as Horney suggested. Horney's (1950) idea of a real self is a foundational concept. The real self is the foundation of a healthy human being, brought about by healthy conditions for growth

in childhood, and for all practical intents, throughout life. It is the basis for all other growth of the self toward actualization, toward achieving its inherent potentialities. This is not very different from Scharmer's (2007) declaration that the self "represents the most fundamental grounding condition" (p. 375) for all human beings. Scharmer created his Theory U for leaders and anyone who initiates change. It is in this context that he references a real self and an authentic self in almost an interchangeable way. He states, "an authentic self…is identical to our highest future possibility" (p. 252) and claims that "Presencing" is the process of connecting one's current self to one's authentic self, but that this connection is but a step toward actualizing the real self—the self of our "highest, best future possibility" (p. 189) and, most importantly for Scharmer, in a way that allows this future to emerge in the present.

George, Sims, McLean and Mayer (2007), an advocate for authentic leadership, references an authentic self as something all leaders who aspire to authenticity need to explore and understand; however, he does not offer any conceptual explanation for what this authentic self is.

Taylor (2006) argues for a competency based concept of a real self that is the anchor for the Intentional Change Theory of Boyatzis and Akrivou (2006). Taylor (2006) claims that the real self is made up of two parts:

> First, it is the accurate self-knowledge a person possesses of his or her own competence. Accurate self-knowledge refers to what a person knows about him or herself that is correct. Next, the real self is also the correct assessment of a person's competence as reported by others in the contexts in which the person interacts. (p. 644)

From this perspective, the real self would appear to act as a subjective and objective measure of a person's capabilities. Taylor (2006) confirms this by stating, "The real self is not independent of the context in which it acts; it is in the collective view from multiple contexts where the real self is more fully apprehended" (p. 645). The real self, therefore, is a product of self and others and is neither something inherent nor does it possess any future potential. From the competency-based view, Taylor (2006) asserts the purpose of the self is to achieve increased competence and sustainable intentional change:

> The real self serves as a filter to judge what types of goals are necessary to reach the ideal self. Accessing the real self serves as a check-point from which to measure progress toward the ideal self. The real self provides the "reality check" to see things clearly in route to one's ideal aspirations. (p. 647)

By arguing that the ideal self sets the target for intentional change, the real self then becomes part of the feedback system by which progress is measured. Taylor (2006) suggests that leadership development efforts may benefit from a more expansive understanding of the real self and its relation to intentional change. Even though Taylor calls for a more substantive understanding of the self in leadership development, there are some that find the concept of the self too ephemeral.

Examining how the humanistic approach to consciousness applies to action research, Rowan (2006) identifies the real self with the Centaur stage of consciousness development Wilber espoused. This is stage six in the Wilber holarchy of self-development and Rowan describes the self at this stage as "aware of both mind and body as experiences. That is, the observing self is beginning to transcend both the mind and the body and thus can be aware of them as objects in awareness, as experiences" (p. 174).

This is the stage that Wilber equates with Maslow's stage of self-actualization. Rowan recognizes this level of self brings with it "a great sense of…authenticity" (Rowan, 2006, p. 111). Because of this, he challenges the notion of no self by stating that the real self "is situated very concretely both in the empirical realm of psychological research and in the conceptual realm of philosophy" (Rowan, 2006, p. 111) and further asserts that contact with the real self is part and parcel of the real, tangible, often painful developmental struggle that Horney was so clear about and that Kegan and Wilber both confirm. According to Rowan (2006):

> The Real Self, then, is not an ultimate stage of development. It is not strange, alien or mystical. It is just the innermost truest part of the separate individual, seen still as separate individual. It can be described as the existential self, or the integrated bodymind Centaur. And as such it offers a center for the full integration of the person. (p. 112)

Summing up the ineffable quality of the real self, Rowan (2006) submits that despite challenges of postmodern deconstructivism, despite the fact that "no one has ever come up with a good theoretical description or empirical investigation of the Real Self" (p. 113) he suggests this is because "the Real Self is not a concept but an experience" (p. 113). Perhaps this understanding of the self calls into question its real usefulness in leadership development.

To summarize, some ideas in current leadership literature are congruent with Horney's ideas. Scharmer's (2007) idea of a self as a highest future possibility is similar to Horney's (1950) sense of inherent potentialities. Some viewpoints, such as Taylor's assertion that the self has no potential but instead is a filter for measuring progress toward

an ideal self, are more divergent from Horney. Both of these lines of inquiry and research are examples of how ideas about the self are currently incorporated in management development.

The relevance of the real or authentic self can be more fully appreciated when compared to the concept of the idealized self, for it is this experience of the self that can influence a leader in both positive and negative ways. Therefore, an examination of literature on the idealized self is necessary.

Ideas of an idealized self. Horney (1950) described the idealized self as the "comprehensive neurotic solution" (p. 23): a solution that not only satisfies the immediate need to resolve the basic anxiety and make one feel safe again, but it also replaces the real self with a much more desirable self, one that is much more congruent with the values and expectations of a competitive culture. It is a self-image driven by three all consuming needs: (a) the need for perfection—in order to achieve the idealized self-image the person falls victim to the Tyranny of the Should; (b) a neurotic ambition for external success—a compulsive drive for superiority in *all* things; and (c) a need for vindictive triumph—"to put others to shame or defeat them through one's very success…to inflict suffering upon them—mostly of the humiliating kind" (p. 27). These three elements make up what Horney terms the search for glory.

While Horney (1950) did write about ideals, she never wrote about an ideal self, that is, a desirable self that was worth pursuing as supremely excellent. This may be because she saw the self and humanity in terms of growth potential, as something that may never be achieved but was certainly worth the pursuit. For Horney, this exemplar was the real self and to name it an ideal self alongside her concept of an idealized self

would have been too confusing. It is important, therefore, to make the distinction between a self that is ideal and one that is idealized.

A positive example of an ideal self is offered by Boyatzis and Akrivou (2006) who posit:

Within the perspective of positive psychology, the ideal self (IS) is not considered a defensive function; it is the core mechanism for self-regulation and intrinsic motivation. It is manifest as a personal vision, or an image of what kind of person one wishes to be, what the person hopes to accomplish in life and work. (p. 625)

Arguing that the ideal self is fundamental to their Intentional Change Theory Boyatzis and Akrvou (2006) make a case for the content of the ideal self that is very familiar to the real self articulated by Horney nearly 60 years ago:

The ideal self (IS) is an evolving, motivational core within the self, focusing a person's desires and hope, aspirations and dreams, purpose and calling. The ideal self serves a mechanism linked to self-regulation; it helps to organize the will to change and direct it, with positive affect from within the person.

[Another] component of the ideal self is the person's core identity. This is relatively stable, and likely unconscious set of enduring individual characteristics, like his/her unconscious motives and traits, as well as roles adopted consistently in social settings. In this manner, the core identity is the personal context within which underlies the historical and continuing aspects of a person's ideal self and one's deeply seated autobiographical themes that make a vision coherent and intense. (pp. 625, 627)

Multiple names for this same positive concept of an ideal self appear in the

literature. However, the difference between an ideal self and an idealized self is central to Horney's thinking. The concept of the idealized self is most often referred to in the current psychological literature when the behavioral disorder called narcissism is discussed. Writing in 1939, Horney recognized the clinical definition of narcissism as a person who is in love with himself. Her own definition was to describe narcissism as self-inflation wherein "the person loves and admires himself for values for which there is no adequate foundation" (p. 89). According to Miller and Campbell (2008) there is no clear agreement on the concept of narcissism in current psychodynamic literature. Yet the research on narcissism is plentiful. There have been recent studies into the negative effects of narcissism on organizations (Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2007; Leichter, 2002; Rapier, 2005), as well as research into the positive effects (Brown, 1997; Carser, 1988; Maccoby, 2004) and the relationship between narcissism and leadership (Bruhn, 1991; Jones, Lasky, Russell-Gale, & LeFevere, 2004; King, 2003; Yocum, 2006).

Bruhn (1991) found, "Narcissistic managers are often highly intelligent, hardworking and eminently capable in their fields" (p. 45) and that despite the productivity that comes with hard work, the detriments are many: distrust among employees, unrealistic expectations, diminished creativity and low morale. King (2003) explored the link between perfectionism and a leader's self-esteem, self-efficacy and narcissism. Regression analysis revealed that leader perfectionism correlated positively with self-esteem and negatively with self-efficacy and narcissism; when leader narcissism increases, perfectionism decreases. Brown (1997) found that leaders with high self-esteem impose impossible standards on themselves and others.

Jones et al. (2004) demonstrated how the dominant culture and a counter culture can coexist in a single organization and both are the product of the manipulative narcissistic leader. Countercultures exist only because they give something the leader needs that make the leader look good. "Narcissistic leadership style has engendered a climate of repression, compliance, fear, and the subversion of individual thought and willpower" (p. 231), which exists beneath a "facade of polite agreement and compliance" (p. 231) also created by the same narcissistic leader.

Yocum's (2006) research sought to clarify the role narcissistic personality, combined with high levels of Emotional Intelligence, plays in leadership effectiveness. Results indicate that narcissistic leaders strong in the Using Emotions—the ability to harness the power of one's emotions—dimension of emotional intelligence were less effective leaders and were less trusted. Results also indicate that narcissistic leaders strong in the Managing Emotions—being open to emotion and being able to engage in or detach from them—dimension of emotional intelligence were more trusted. Yocum concluded that while emotional intelligence may be a valuable trait for leaders, for those leaders prone to manipulative personality, emotional intelligence is just another tool for them to use in their manipulation of others.

Rapier (2005) found a particularly telling characteristic of narcissistic leaders. "Despite the apparent sustained devotion of their energies to socially productive endeavors, the primary goal of the self-oriented narcissist may be to gain recognition, fame and glory" (p. 129), and that the driver of this narcissism is "excessive self-absorption, intense ambition and grandiose fantasies" (p. 129). She concludes, "The

research confirmed a preoccupation with dreams of glory, power, status and prestige" (p. 128).

These characteristics, as well as the others mentioned above, of a narcissistic personality are very similar to Horney's (1939) description of the idealized self. In her theoretical framework, she did not believe narcissism to be merely an expression of self-love, but rather an expression of alienation from the self. Not only was it a defense mechanism, but it is also a schism of the self, so her discussion of narcissism does not run parallel to current research in that subject. The stronger corresponding idea in Horney's work remains the idea of the idealized self.

The other manifestation of the idealized self represented in the literature is the idea of a false self. Horney (1950) conceived of the idealized self as the actualization of an idealized self-image which itself is the product of one's imagination. She described the idealized image in a variety of ways: as something "removed from reality" (Horney, 1945, p. 96); as an "unconscious phenomenon" (p. 97); as having a "static quality" (p. 98); and "a kind of artistic creation" (p. 104) or as a "pseudoself" (p. 376). As if to fortify the counterfeit nature of the self created from this image she acknowledges it to be "a fictitious or illusory self, but that would be only a half truth" (p. 108) because although "it is an imaginative creation [it is] interwoven with and determined by very realistic factors" (p. 108). For Horney, the idealized self is a false self.

In the literature, most current concepts of an idealized self revolve around either the personality disorder of narcissism or around the general idea of a false self. This may indicate the possibility that Horney's notion of an idealized self is outdated, or it may indicate that her theory has so infused the current thinking that it is taken for granted and

not attributed to her. The literature review offered few examples of leadership development practitioners using this idea. However, one practitioner who is also a clinical psychologist is an exception.

In her book, *Leadership Therapy,* Microsoft consulting psychologist Rowley (2007) identifies six confidence traps that many leaders fall into, one of them being the false self. Citing Donald Winnicot as the introducer of the concept of True Self and False Self in the 1960s, Rowley explains, consistent with traditional psychology, that the false self is a construct that begins in childhood but gets carried with us into adulthood. In the workplace, "a False Self forces people to stretch or censor parts of themselves so as to remain 'safe' within their organization" (p. 101) and that "if your True Self becomes submerged by a False Self, no one can get to know you. You may not even get to know yourself" (p. 102). Based on the work of George (2007) and Taylor (2006), and the importance of the self in establishing and maintaining healthy relationships, leadership capability would likely suffer as a result.

There is some precedent for the idea of a false self affecting a leader's capability. There is also evidence in the literature that the self is an important part of the total leadership experience. Therefore, the ability to differentiate between a false and a real self would seem to require some level of self-awareness. An examination of the literature on self-awareness follows.

The need for self-awareness. Horney (1950) cautioned against mistaking rational knowledge for self-awareness. "Observation and critical intelligence are no substitute for that inner certainty with reference to others which is possessed by a person who is realistically aware of himself as himself and others as themselves" (p. 295) and that "the

mere intellectual realization is in the strict sense of the word no realization at all: it does not become real to him; it does not become his personal property; it does not take root in him" (p. 343). It must be acknowledged that Horney makes these warnings in the context of physician-led analytic therapy, but she so believed in the power of individuals to solve their own problems that she pioneered the idea of self-analysis in 1942 with her book by the same name.

In the current literature, Rosen (2008) defines self-awareness as the ability to "read and manage our emotions. We know how change and uncertainty affect us. We understand what makes us anxious and can manage our anxiety" (p. 79). For Goleman (2000), "Self-awareness means having a deep understanding of one's emotions, strengths, weaknesses, needs and drives" (p. 95). Goleman (2004) further asserts:

> Self-awareness extends to a person's understanding of his or her values and goals. People with high self-awareness are able to speak accurately and openly…about their emotions and the impact they have on their work. Self-aware people know— and are comfortable talking about—their limitations and strengths, and they often demonstrate a thirst for constructive criticism. (p. 96)

> Joiner and Joseph (2007) claim:

> Self-awareness refers to the quality of attention and reflection you bring to your own thoughts, feelings, and behaviors. [I]t also refers to the accuracy and completeness of your self-knowledge, including how well you understand your current strengths and limitations as a leader. (p. 37)

Self-awareness is also seen from a subject-object perspective. Moshavi, Brown, and Dodd (2003) operationalize self-awareness "by comparing an individual's ratings of his

or her behavior to ratings of that individual given to others" (p. 408) and as a result,

> Self-awareness is viewed in terms of three major self-other agreement categories: overestimators [those who rate themselves higher than others would], underestimators [those who would rate themselves lower than others would], and those in-agreement [self ratings are similar to other ratings]. (p. 408)

The authors collected data on the relationship between a leader's self-awareness of his leadership behavior and the attitudes and performance of subordinates. Within this context they assume "individuals who are self-aware are better at incorporating information from others into their behavior" (Moshavi et al., 2003, p. 408). Arguing that beliefs and assumptions about the self are foundational to any philosophy of leadership, Liddell (2005) contends that the concept of self-awareness is constructed in a way that actually limits self-awareness. Citing the modernist concept of the self as egocentric he claims that self-awareness is little more than "the acquisition of knowledge…for the purpose of power and control over self first, then the organization, then the market" (p. 20).

Holden (2006) observes, "The path to executive development passes directly through the self, which we often forget" (p. 23). Goleman (2000) cites research conducted by Hay/McBer on 3,871 executives randomly selected. The findings revealed six leadership styles: coercive, authoritative, affiliative, democratic, pacesetting, and coaching. Of these styles, the coaching style draws the most on the capability of self-awareness, which is an aspect of Emotional Intelligence. According to the research, coaching is the style used least often. According to the Hay/McBer study, this is because coaching requires constant dialogue and this takes time away from getting things done.

Holden and Goleman seem to be saying that self-awareness, although necessary to leadership, is not often used by leaders.

There is also some divergent thought about the value of self-awareness to leaders. Trinka (2004) cites a study of 360 degree assessments of nearly 1,000 IRS managers, which produced key competencies that differentiate great leaders in the IRS from everyone else. Self-awareness was not among the variables listed in the assessment. In this study external awareness was one of the differentiators of leadership greatness. For the IRS, self-awareness is not a leadership competency. Leadership development practitioner Gene Mage (2004) observes, "History is littered with self-aware individuals who were painfully unable to do anything about what they knew" (p. 2) and using General George Custer as an example, warns, "It takes more than self-awareness to improve your leadership or your life. You cannot move forward by continually looking inward" (p. 2). There is even some questioning of the value of self-awareness by clinical practitioners Hansen (2009) as well as a recent research project examining the effects of self-awareness on transformational leadership, which limits the concept to being no more than a leader's agreement with followers about his or her own leadership (Tekleab, Sims Yun, Tesluk and Cox, 2008). However, the researchers demonstrate that leader self-awareness alone is insufficient: "Leader self-awareness per se does not substitute for effective leadership. That is, leadership does have a main effect! In particular, the results of polynomial regression suggest that both leadership behavior and leader self-awareness can influence outcomes" (p. 198).

Despite this contradictory evidence about the value of self-awareness in leaders, far more leadership theorists and leadership development practitioners argue for the value

and the need than argue against it. Bennis (2003) reminds us, "Socrates said 'The unexamined life is not worth living'. I'd go a step further: the unexamined life is impossible to live successfully" (p. 62). Rosen (2008) declares:

> Self-awareness forms the foundation for living in uncertainty. It enables us to play to our strengths and compensate for our weaknesses in the midst of change. It allows us to be cognizant of what is going on around us—and within us—from moment to moment. (p. 79)

So, while empirical research may not show the importance of self-awareness in leadership, leadership theorists and leadership practitioners disagree.

For Koestenbaum (1991), the exploration of the self is accomplished through self-reflective action, but he laments that in today's culture, "There is little or no tolerance for the kinds of character-building conversations that pave the way for meaningful change" (as cited in Labarre, 2000, p. 226). This attempt at deeper, internal self-understanding is at least as valuable as any attempts to understand a problem simply from the external, technological side. Labarre stated, "Reflection doesn't take anything away from decisiveness, from being a person of action. In fact, it generates inner toughness that you need to be an effective person of action—to be a leader" (p. 226). Schön (1983) points out as part of his theory of reflection-in-action that many believe that the practice of reflecting during action is dangerous because, "When we think about what we are doing, we surface complexity, which interferes with the smooth flow of action. The complexity that we can manage unconsciously paralyzes us when we bring it in to consciousness" (p. 277).

The literature demonstrates there is some debate about the need for self-awareness among leaders. Despite the exhortations of the leadership gurus that self-awareness is desirable, and, therefore, needed, there is data which suggest self-awareness is not desirable and, therefore, is not needed. This seems to contradict Horney's contention of the importance of self-knowledge and could explain why her ideas appear to be not fully embraced.

Leadership Development

An overview of the literature on leadership development is explored in this section. First the definition of as well as the need for leadership and leadership development will be examined. Literature on the need for self-understanding as an important part of leadership development will be reviewed as well as the concept of authentic leadership. Finally, literature on the relationship of the ideal self to leadership will be considered.

Definitions of leadership. The word leadership was originally used in the early 1800s in writings about the political influence and control of the British Parliament during the first half of the 19th century (Bass, 1990). In this period, leadership was "based on inheritance, usurpation or appointment" (p. 11) and was considered to occur most frequently in Anglo-Saxon countries. Northouse (2004) points out that during the last 50 years, as many as 65 different kinds of classification systems exist to define leadership dimensions, and eventually defines leadership as "a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal" (p. 3). Northouse contends that being a process means leadership is not a trait, but is transactional, that a

leader affects others, leadership occurs in groups and that it must result in the achievement of something.

Leadership is also viewed as a process of change. Barker (2001) recognizes the assumption that the leader is the source of leadership. Barker stated, "When leadership is defined, the definition usually addresses the nature of the *leader* and not the nature of *leadership*" (p. 478). When the act of leadership is examined, "Leadership…can be defined as a process of transformative change where the ethics of individuals are integrated into the mores of a community a means of evolutionary social development" (p. 491). Kotter (1990) compares leadership to management to make the point, "Management is about coping with complexity. Leadership, by contrast, is about coping with change" (p. 104). Moving the focus back to the leader, Senge et al. (2004) assess, "We are coming to believe that 'leaders' are people who are committed to deep change in themselves and their organizations" (p. 36).

Higgs (2003) argues that if researchers adopt a sense making paradigm, it becomes feasible to identify a model of leadership. The model emerges when the measure of effectiveness is changed from organizational success to the impact of leaders on followers and on building capability. Andrews and Fields (1998) also favor putting more emphasis on those being led and less on the leader:

> We have lost touch with leadership as a meaningful concept in everyday organizational life…leadership does not exist separate to follower perceptions. Therefore, we suggest that any resolution to the question "what is leadership?" must look within the mind of the follower to observe the process of influence. (p. 128)

Defining leadership is extraordinarily difficult (Fairholm, 1998), occupying the minds of great thinkers for many centuries (Higgs, 2003). No matter what definition one subscribes to, there is a consensus in the literature that whatever leadership is, there is a lack of it.

The need for leadership. There has been much criticism aimed at leadership recently. George et al. (2007) observe, "Over the past five years, people have developed a deep distrust of leaders. It is increasingly evident we need a new kind of business leader in the twenty-first century" (p. 130). Mintzberg (2004) rails against the traditional and all too prevalent notion of a single heroic leader and characterizes it as "a cult of leadership that is dragging business down" (p. 22). According to a poll conducted in 2005 by U.S. News & World Report in collaboration with Harvard University's Center for Public Leadership, there is a crisis in confidence of American leaders. "Americans are highly critical of the current state of the nation's leadership. Nearly 2 out of 3 believe their leaders have been corrupted by being in power" ("Poll: A Leadership Deficit," 2005).

Northouse (2004) previously made this observation in the first sentence of his leadership text *Leadership Theory & Practice*: "Effective leadership is in high demand. In particular there is a strong call for ethical leadership" (p. xi). The forces driving this demand are many. Reviewing the broader business literature, Higgs (2003) identifies several common themes: changes in societal values, changes in investor focus, challenges in implementing organization change and awareness of the impact of stress on employees.

Equally apparent as the need for quality leaders is the lack of a supply of effective leaders. According to T&D (Kaplan-Leiserson, 2005), the journal of the American

Society of Training & Development, of the companies surveyed by Executive

Development Associates, almost 70% experienced moderate to major leadership

shortages—and with potentially serious consequences: "While businesses can limp along

with worker positions unfilled, a shortage of leaders can cause serious problems for the

company's growth and affect the business in long-lasting ways" (p. 14).

Barrett (1999), reporting on causes of leadership shortages in 1999, identified a

trend of rampant high end job shopping among executive leaders, noting that despite

competitive compensation, "For some ambitious executives, though, there is no cash

substitute for power" (p. 90). As if satisfying the desire for more power weren't enough

in the struggle to combat this shortage, the looming threat of retiring baby boomers

compromises corporate succession plans and retention strategies.

Looming shortages in business sectors such as the federal government (Sanders,

1997), nursing (Wolf, Bradle, & Nelson, 2005), power utilities (Ring, 2006), health care

(Shipman, 2007), pharmaceutical (Wilcox, 2005), and higher education (Evelyn, 2001)

have been documented and/or researched to reveal that each faces a common challenge to

not only find leaders to replace those retiring, but to find leaders with the right skills. As

Wilcox (2005) warns, "Fewer and fewer managers have the kind of coordination,

foresight, and complex problem-solving ability needed to succeed in a general

management job" (p. 94).

Clearly, effective leadership is still lacking and this despite what Ready and

Conger (2003) consider an epidemic of leadership development. An overview of the

current literature on leadership development follows, including whether leadership

development works and if it does, whether it is necessary to address the concerns about current leadership.

The need for leadership development. According to the Center for Creative Leadership (Hernez-Broome & Hughes, n.d.), there has been an explosion of interest in leadership development during the past 20 years. Leadership development is most frequently seen as a set of planned activities aimed at improving leadership effectiveness delivered in an instructional setting. At the United States Military Academy, leadership development is "a synthesis of leading, studying leadership, and teaching leadership…in an effort to train, educate and inspire our Army's future officers"(Crandall, 2007, p. xxvi). Klein and Ziegert (2004) define leadership development as the process whereby individuals gain knowledge and skills that enhance their effectiveness in setting direction, creating alignment and maintaining commitment in groups of people who chare common work. By this definition this process could occur inside or outside of a formal classroom or seminar experience. Others view leadership development as less classroom training and more experiential learning. "I would argue that more leaders have been made by accident, circumstance, sheer grit or will than have been made by all the leadership courses put together" (Bennis, 2003, p. 34).

Elmuti, Minnis, and Abebe (2005) recognize that the debate over whether leadership can be taught will not end any time soon, but they also point out that an important assumption around this debate is "that people can learn, grow and change and that this learning and personal growth does enhance individual effectiveness" (p. 1019). Allio (2005) agrees we need more and better leaders, but he strongly disagrees that leadership development training is the path toward either. He does however admit,

"While leadership cannot be taught, leadership can be learned. Men and women become leaders by practice" (p. 1071). So whether by experiential or by cognitive learning process, what elements of leadership should be included in leadership development?

The need for self-understanding in leadership development. "When the 75 members of Stanford Graduate School of Business' Advisory Council were asked to recommend the most important capability for leaders to develop, their answer was nearly unanimous: self-awareness" (George et al., 2007, p. 133). Ever since Goleman (2005) wrote *Emotional Intelligence,* researchers and practitioners have paid a lot more attention to this aspect of leadership. Kerr, Gavin, Heaton and Boyle (2006) investigated the relationship between emotional intelligence and leadership effectiveness. Their research confirms that emotional intelligence is prominent in the leadership literature as a key influencer of effective leadership and that emotionally intelligent leaders can have a variety of effects at multiple levels of an organization's social system ranging from the quality of member interactions to building supportive networks.

Diamante and London (2002) emphasize the importance of balance between a leader's external growth, that is, technology skills, with internal growth, for example, self-knowledge. As a result there have been calls for more leadership research on the interior domain of the leader and to include "critical reflection upon the nature of self concepts" (Brown & Starkey, 2000, p. 110) as an important management task. As the concept of the self as an important element of leadership is discussed more in the leadership development literature it has become one of the most researched yet least understood leadership phenomenon (Baumeister, 1999).

Allio (2005) contends that self-knowledge is a key learning component in leadership development yet he doesn't debate how best to learn or teach this. Hay and Hodgkinson (2006) suggest that leadership is a "two way process of influence" (p. 155) and that "helping managers develop an enhanced self-awareness may in some way contribute" (p. 155) to better leadership. Scott Taylor (2006) sees the benefits as well: "It is advantageous for organizations to better understand more clearly what exposes employee current capability and unleashes human potential. Such benefits can be realized by accessing the real self" (p. 643). Unlike Allio, Taylor suggests the use of multisource feedback as a means of accessing the real self, but he is quick to point out this method has its limits in achieving self-understanding, that is, what a person knows about him or herself that is correct, as opposed to self-awareness or reflexive consciousness.

A literature review revealed two examples of Horney's theories actively used in leadership development practice. Robert Anderson is founder of The Leadership Circle, a leadership development company offering consulting and workshop services. On his Web site he has written several white papers on the subject of leadership development. According to Anderson:

> Much of leadership development has been too superficial. The kind of cultural change we have been striving for requires far more than mere skill development from our leaders. It requires that they grow—that they significantly upgrade their inner 'operating system'…to gain a deeper understanding of themselves, the world, and their relationship to others. (personal communication, April 22, 2009)

Anderson uses Horney's three movements of people as an integrative framework to help leaders expose, explore, and better understand the reactive level structure of their

personalities. In a personal conversation with Anderson, he explained that he uses this concept because the language of Horney is intuitive and is no trouble for his clients to understand—there is no need for them to understand the theory behind it. He finds that it works very well in generating the deeper level work he believes is so important to leadership (R. Anderson, personal communication, April 22, 2009).

Holden (2006) is an executive coach and he also advocates the deeper level work of leadership development. "We seldom look more deeply at the assumptions that drive our behavior, the mental operating system that supports our behavior" (p. 21). Holden identifies three mindsets that limit leaders: Excessive Control, Excessive Aloofness, and Excessive Approval Seeking. These are the three movements of Horney except that they are characterized as inner assumptions here. Holden firmly believes leaders need this kind of development in their lives.

The literature on self-understanding as a component of formal leadership development supports the contention that self-awareness is necessary as part of the leadership development process. The earlier section of the review of the literature on the nature of the self has included discussion of the real self and the idealized self. What follows is a review of literature that relates leadership to the real self and the idealized self.

Authentic leadership. It has been asserted that the real self is an authentic self and that an awareness and understanding of this authentic self is important to the execution of leadership. In recent years, the idea of authentic leadership has been discussed in the literature. Often identified as authentic or genuine leadership, "The concept of authenticity (i.e., the idea of 'being oneself' or being 'true to oneself') is

becoming a central focus of responsible behavior of leaders in post-Enron era"

(Novicevic, Buckley, Brown, & Evans, 2006, p. 64). Novicevic et al. note, "Leader

authenticity is described today more broadly as leader resolve to take responsibility for

personal freedom and organizational and communal obligations so that leaders could

make choices that would help them construct their selves as moral individuals" (p. 64).

George et al. (2007*)* has written the most popular work in the literature of

authentic leadership. He and his coauthors point out that during the last 50 years and in

more than 1,000 studies, no one has produced a clear profile of the ideal leader. "No one

can be authentic by trying to imitate someone else" (p. 129). Emphasizing the

developmental nature of leadership, George et al. advise:

> Discovering your authentic leadership requires a commitment to developing
>
> yourself…[leaders] frame their life stories in ways that allow them to see
>
> themselves as…individuals who can develop self-awareness from their
>
> experiences. Authentic leaders act on that awareness by practicing their values
>
> and principles, sometimes at substantial risk to themselves. (p. 130)

Ingalls (2000) sees leadership as genuine rather than authentic. He argues that the

learning disabilities of organizations are functions of counterfeit leadership. Framed in

terms of leadership wants and needs, the genuine leader keeps wants and needs in balance

while the counterfeit leader is unable to do this. Ingalls describes a person's experience of

too much imbalance in counterfeit wants and needs in terms similar to the Horneyean

description of the idealized self: contemptuous, intimidating, aggressive, overbearing,

domineering.

Goffee and Jones (2005) claim, "The concept of authenticity is often misunderstood, not least by leaders themselves" (p. 88). They describe achieving authenticity as a two step process: making sure ones actions match ones words and finding common ground with the people one leads. They conclude, "Great leaders understand that their reputation for authenticity needs to be painstakingly earned and carefully managed" (p. 94).

Novicevic et al. (2006) reflect on authenticity by looking at the tension inherent in the struggle for human growth, and conclude that authenticity "will be influenced by the extent to which [leaders] are able to manage the tensions that occur within each of their responsibilities, as well as the conflict between their responsibilities" (p. 73); "Only those who can master successfully these challenges…will exhibit authentic leadership" (p. 73).

In the current leadership literature, authenticity is closely linked to a healthy sense of the real self. Horney presented the idea of the real self as in conflict with the idealized self. The literature on the relationships between leadership and the idealized self follows.

The relationship of leadership to the idealized self. According to Schein (1992), leaders play a highly influential role in creating the organizations they lead:

> The initial design of the organization and the periodic reorganizations that companies go through…provide ample opportunities for the founders and leaders to embed their deeply held assumptions about the task, the means to accomplish it, the nature of people, and the right kinds of relationships to foster among people. (p. 274)

The organization structure and the behaviors these structures and cultures encourage and reward find their genesis in the minds of the leaders who create the

organizations they lead. Leaders are flawed human beings who bring "their own inner conflicts and the inconsistencies of their own personal makeup" (Schein, 1992, p. 376) into the workplace. With so many opportunities for leaders to influence the culture of an organization, it would not be unexpected for leaders to bring their anxieties and neuroses into the organization.

Schwartz (1990) posited that organizations may behave in ways consistent with the need to actualize an idealized image into the idealized self. Schwartz sought to explain why organizational life, as experienced by his students, was so focused around trying to get ahead. He noticed that for these students, "Getting ahead was a moral imperative…they believed in the righteousness of what they were doing" (p. 3). Schwartz came to see that in order to justify the moral imperative of their quest for achievement the organizational system also had to "define their moral value" (p. 3) for them. From this he realized that these organizational participants have "an abstract idea of organization, an idea of the organization as a *vehicle for the revelation of their own grandiosity*[emphasis added]" (p. 4).

In a similar vein, the work of Kets de Vries has focused on the neurotic organization and leadership. Together with Danny Miller of McGill University Kets de Vries researched and constructed five "constellations" (Kets de Vries & Miller, 1986, p. 268) of common neurotic styles and associated characteristics in organizations.

Kets de Vries (2005), in his research on what he terms neurotic imposters he examined the behavior of "many talented, hard-working, and capable leaders—men and women who have achieved great things—[who] believe that they don't deserve their success" (p. 110). Kets deVries describes a textbook example of the self-defeating cycle:

The vicious cycle begins when the imposter sets impossible goals. She fails to reach these goals, of course (because *no one* could reach them), then tortures herself endlessly about the failure, which incites further self-flagellation, accentuates the feelings of imposture, and inspires her to designate yet another unattainable set of goals—and the entire cycle of workaholism and fraudulence begins again. (p. 112)

Kets de Vries is describing the exact same cycle Horney (1950) describes as the tyranny of the should which is one persistent phenomenon within the experience of the idealized self.

In research conducted at the Swinburne University of Technology in Melbourne, Australia, a similar example of the organizational manifestation of the idealized self is discussed. The researchers used a longitudinal approach over 24 months to examine the phenomena of dominant cultures and countercultures coexisting simultaneously in a single organization. Their research concluded that countercultures were allowed to exist by dominant leaders in order to serve the narcissistic need of the leaders' idealized self to exaggerate its accomplishments. Jones et al. (2004) wrote:

We argue that, for instrumental reasons, such [counterculture] values are allowed to exist. [The leader] connives in their survival, expropriates their strengths for his own credit, but keeps the proponents of such values at arms length by relegating them to marginal status. (p. 230)

In this case, legitimate contributions to organizational success are marginalized by the narcissistic need of the leader.

Leadership behaviors as manifestations of the idealized self appear within the governing variables of the Model I theory-in-use put forward by Argyris and Schön (1978). A theory-in-use is a theory of action, or mental map, used by people in a tacit way to plan and carry out their actions in the world. Argyris and Schön list four basic values, or governing variables of behaviors, seen in people that use the Model I theories in use. They are: (a) achieve the purposes as I perceive them; (b) maximize winning and minimize losing; (c) minimize generating or expressing negative feelings; and (d) be rational—minimize emotionality.

Although these norms are not the exclusive domain of leaders, Argyris and Schön's (1974) research featured leaders as the primary research subjects. Argyris and Schön refer to governing variables as "goals the actor strives for" (p. 66). The use of the word strive intends to capture the strength of the variables' governing influence. These goals are driven by "internal maps" (Argyris, 1977, p. 120). They also refer to them as "settings of one's programs" (Argyris & Schon, 1974, p. 19), referring to the subconscious depth of these controlling assumptions. Within each of these maps, values or assumptions we find the kind of thinking driven by an idealized self. Argyris (1991) indeed confirms that these values are "a reflection of how [people] think—the cognitive rules or reasoning [used] to design and implement their actions. Think of these rules as a 'master program' stored in the brain, governing all behavior" (p. 100). Programmed throughout a lifetime, the governing variables become values which are reinforced by a culture conforming to model I shoulds. In the case of Argyris and Schön, the language corresponds with Horney's (1950) and the tyranny of the should is explicit in this model.

Using language such as maximize winning or neurotic imposters or inner conflicts and character structures, the leadership literature contains a well-developed body of inquiry into the relationship between leadership and the various personal and organizational manifestations of an idealized self.

Summary

The purpose of this literature review is to establish a conceptual foundation for this research by presenting: (a) the theoretical positions germane to leadership, self-awareness, and developmental psychology; (b) studies that relate leadership development, self-awareness, and developmental psychology; and (c) conceptual and operational definitions of key ideas and concepts. It was not the purpose of this review to answer any of the research questions. However, the literature does reveal some new insights.

Focusing on her contributions toward the overall benefit of the human condition, the current literature primarily emphasizes Horney's clinical priority—human growth and development. Whereas many current practitioners and theorists focus on the stages of human development and the process of movement between the stages, Horney focused on the negative forces that interfere with the process of growth. Hers was a much wider perspective than contemporaries of her time (most of whom were male and strict Freudians) were able or willing to consider, resulting in her radically different view of the human being. Because of her broad perspective, and because her theories are so much a part of current developmental thinking, it is appropriate to wonder why one particular developmental subject of inquiry—leadership—would not be incorporating her theories.

The literature suggests that leadership is not a static phenomenon. Thought of as a process of change, leadership is seen as a growth process; one does not just become a leader, one grows into leadership. Indeed much of the literature suggests that leadership can be learned; it can be developed. Leadership as a developmental process is a journey of growth and is often a struggle with the negative forces preventing growth. This was Horney's purpose: to "fight the struggle on its own ground" (Horney, 1967, p. 118) and not accept dysfunctional, unhealthy human relationships as a biological destiny or repetition of past occurrences. This is where Horney can possibly contribute the most to leadership development. For, as Schein (1992) points out, human relationships are at the core of every culture and leaders must concern themselves with this deeper dimension of leadership.

Despite some evidence contrary to Horney's conception of the real self, modern writers report that contact with the real self or more authentic aspect of the person is part of the universal developmental struggle for balancing the tension inherent between self and other, which Horney articulated in great detail. Her ideas of the idealized self are congruent with current ideas of a false, inauthentic self.

The literature review revealed four sources that relate Horney's work directly to leadership development. Segal's (1997) *Points of Influence* related her theories to organizational or leadership behavior. Focusing on her contributions toward the overall benefit of the human condition, the literature primarily emphasizes Horney's clinical priority—human growth and development. Rowley (2007) uses concepts of the idealized self to identify confidence traps leaders must be wary of. Anderson (personal communication, April 22, 2009) uses the three movements of people in leadership

development to help leaders identify their reactive tendencies that get in the way of their creative tendencies and Holden (2006) advocates using the three movements in leadership development also but characterizes them as inner assumptions that hold leaders back. The literature also reveals many indirect relationships between current thinking about leadership and self-awareness and Horney's core psychological constructs.

Horney (1950) states that an intellectual awareness of behavior is not enough— the individual must go deeper. The concepts of the authentic and idealized self and anxiety have become important in the practice of developing leaders. Building on this, perhaps it is possible to introduce a wider Horneyean perspective, and also a deeper one and to consider whether some ideas that were overlooked 60 years ago may now legitimately be included in the practice of developing leaders.

The literature shows that Horney is seen as a change agent. She chose clinical psychotherapy to create change one patient at a time. Her writings have changed the study of psychology to include ideas about human growth and potential; her positive, holistic view of the human potential for lifetime development and growth has become fundamental to current models of consciousness development. There are numerous references to current leadership scholars, practitioners, and theorists who employ concepts very similar to those developed by Horney. Their work can result in a potentially wider perspective for understanding leadership and the interior challenges leaders face as part of their development.

This review of the literature demonstrates the current usefulness of Horney's theories and provides support for continued inquiry and exploration into a more detailed

application of her specific ideas and their application to the practice of leadership development.

Contribution of the Study

Roethlisberger (1963) suggests we need a way of thinking that will allow us to see our personality systems in the larger social system. Horney's theories of the basic anxiety and the three movements of people may potentially be one way of framing our thinking. The research of Khaleelee and Woolf (1996) emphasize that leadership capacity is a function of personality development. Horney's theory of the idealized self can aid in understanding the emotional drivers that help and hinder this development. Personal characteristics are an element of determining leadership capability and some of them are authenticity, self-belief and self-awareness (i.e., understanding who you are; Higgs, 2003).

Perhaps this study can encourage future research into the use of Horney theories as a foundation for exploring the actions necessary to move between the stages of psychological development. This could include the stages of development theorized, researched and articulated by Abraham Maslow, Jane Loevinger, Jean Piaget, Robert Keegan, and Ken Wilber and translated into management practice by Bill Torbert, Bill Joiner, and Stephen Josephs. Torbert and Joiner and Josephs offer specific actions that readers can take to help evolve from one developmental stage to the next. Torbert (2004) advocates the use of action inquiry as a "way of simultaneously conducting action and inquiry as a disciplined leadership practice" (p. 1) and a "lifelong process of transformational learning" (p. 1). Torbert's four territories of experience include outside events, one's own sensed performance, action logics and intentional attention.

Knowledge of how environmental and cultural forces can cause the basic anxiety may inform the first territory. An understanding of the three responses to the basic anxiety can enrich an understanding of behavior in that territory. An understanding of the needs forming the basis of the three responses can help leaders understand the strategies they are applying and why.

Joiner and Josephs (2007), in *Leadership Agility,* synthesize more than 30 years of research findings from the above-mentioned developmental psychologists with the action logic theory of Torbert (2004) and the stage-development framework of Ken Wilber. It is not the intent of this research to determine how Horney's theories fit into any of the previously mentioned developmental models. However, applying the concepts of Horney to the development of self-awareness in leaders can perhaps enhance the leader or potential leader's ability to use action inquiry practices more effectively.

Chapter Three: Methodology and Procedures

The purpose of this study was to assess the usefulness in leadership development of the personality theories of Horney. The intent of the study was to judge usefulness according to whether the theories are used by, (a) leadership development practitioners and (b) leadership learners who have been introduced to the theories in the form of a one-day workshop. The literature review unexpectedly demonstrated the usefulness of Horney's theories among current practitioners and researchers (Anderson, personal communication, April 22, 2009; Holden, 2006; Rowley, 2007) who report implementing aspects of her theories. The extent to which Horney's ideas have been incorporated into the work of later theorists as well as leadership development practitioners encourages continued inquiry and exploration into a more detailed application of her specific ideas to the practice of leadership development. As a result, the original intent of the interview methodology for leadership practitioners no longer appeared useful for this study and in fact appeared redundant.

Therefore, the research focused solely on the usefulness of Horney's (1950) ideas in the development of aspiring leaders. This was done by employing the design and delivery of a one-day experiential workshop for volunteer leaders. The workshop was designed so that Horney's theories, using her own language, were presented as simply and as clearly as possible. The desired outcome for the workshop was participants' understanding and application of the concepts in their personal and work experiences. If understanding and application of the ideas could be demonstrated as a result of the workshop experience, then the research could provide evidence of the validity and usefulness of Horney's concepts in the process of leadership development.

Toward this end the content of the workshop, primarily the Horney concepts, was presented to an audience of training and development practitioners at the *2009 Your Turn to Learn* conference of the San Diego Chapter of the American Society of Training and Development on November 4, 2009. This was done as a quasipilot experiment to test informally the validity of the Horney content and assess reactions to the concepts.

The presentation was a one hour breakout session presented to 26 participants, which required brief, succinct explanations and examples of each of the five concepts. At the end, participants were asked to complete a simple two-question session feedback form: What concept was clearest to you and what concept was least clear?

Given the extreme time constraint and the potentially complex nature of the concepts it was gratifying to find general agreement among all participants that the topic was interesting: no one remarked that the topic as not worth their time. It was also encouraging that many people wanted to hear more and learn more about these concepts. This was encouraging on two counts: Development practitioners found the concepts interesting and the connection to leadership was apparent. Confidence was gained that the research project was on the right track. This rest of this chapter describes participant recruitment and selection, the workshop design, data collection, and the methods applied to the data analysis.

Research Participants

In the following section the specific information about workshop participants is discussed, including the sample population; selection criteria; initial and subsequent contact with the sample population; and information that was shared with potential participants.

Participant selection. This study focused on the usefulness of the personality theories of Horney from the perspective of aspiring leaders. The population of interest was, therefore, employees of organizations who may or may not currently be in formal leadership positions but have a desire to develop themselves and achieve a leadership position within their professional field of practice. This may include their current or a future, different organization. It was important for this research that the participants have more than just a passing interest in becoming a leader; they must have a desire and be willing to explore different development paths toward that goal. Participants were selected based on the above and were recruited from the Boeing population in Southern California since the research was conducted there and to minimize potential travel time and costs to out-of-state participants. Participants were recruited from the local National Management Association Boeing Chapter since there are many members in the association who fit the selection criteria. Participants were healthy adults to the greatest extent possible, but given the value Boeing places on diversity, no participants were rejected because of any physical disability that could not be accommodated, including pregnancy. It was the intent of the researcher to recruit between 12 and 15 participants. This number made for a good experiential training group in that it generated a diversity of thought and opinion and made for robust discussion and processing of the theories presented. The number was also a manageable number within the scope of the researcher's time and resource constraints.

It was recognized that obtaining volunteers for an academic research project could prove difficult. Given some of the potential drawbacks to using instruments, it was anticipated that this may take some creative marketing of the workshop to potential

audiences. The workshop was advertised among the National Management Association communication network using e-mail announcements informing participants of the nature of the workshop, the content of the material to be presented and the specific date, time, and place of the workshop (see Appendix D). Twenty four people signed up to attend the workshop, but for various personal and business reasons, only 13 could attend. The research design called for a minimum of 12 participants so this sample was sufficient to proceed.

Demographics

The selection of participants was not based on age, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, or any other illegal bias. It was intended that the workshop participants represent the broadest possible sample of people from the target population and as feasible, the participant group was constructed to maximize a random and nonbiased sample. The sample population for the workshop consisted of five females and eight males. The majority of participants were white (seven) followed by African American (two), Hispanic (two), and Asian (one). All participants were members of the National Management Association and averaged 18 years of service in The Boeing Company. Of the sample, only two were current members of management; however, two other participants had previously held management positions but were not managers. All members of the sample considered themselves to be in leadership positions, despite many not having a formal management title. All members of the sample conversed in English during the workshop, but one member did have difficulty with English as a Second Language and this proved challenging during data collection.

Participant notification. Potential participants were initially notified according to the method previously mentioned. Upon a declaration of interest in the workshop each participant received a copy of an informed consent letter (see Appendix E) required by the Human Research Institutional Review Board. Each participant signed the consent letter i to acknowledge that he or she was aware that he or she was participating in doctoral research and participation was voluntary.

I had originally intended to prescreen participants by telephone for proper interest and to ensure they met the participant criteria. I was unable to do this because of time constraints placed on me by work and travel commitments.

Ethical issues. In addition to the issue of informed consent, confidentiality and potential consequences were considered. Confidentiality in research is the promise to participants that data identifying them will not be reported (Kvale, 1996). Participants were informed that all of their responses to workshop instruments, small group and large group processing discussion, as well as all interview information would be completely anonymous and that no personal information would ever be made public. These issues were explained in all written materials (see Appendices D and E) as well as highlighted at the beginning and end of the workshop. A potential ethical issue existed in that the workshop participants are all from the same organizational culture. The Boeing Company is an extremely large and complex culture, with many subcultures existing according to geographical site, business unit mission, and heritage organization (the present Boeing Company is a merger of McDonnell Douglas, Rockwell International, and heritage Boeing). It was possible that participants may wonder whether their participation may somehow affect their or fellow participants' job performance. This possible risk was

mitigated through the process of informed consent and was also emphasized verbally and in writing at the beginning and end of the workshop. Participants were informed that any feedback they gave, whether positive or negative, would not reflect on the quality of their job performance, nor would it be used to judge the performance of the researcher-workshop facilitator, who is also a Boeing employee.

Workshop Design

The next section describes the design of the workshop along with a chronological description of the delivery of the workshop.

Design rationale. The workshop design was influenced by the nature of the research material and the absence of similar workshops in use in the field of leadership development. The research centered on the usefulness of theories and concepts and as such was not presented solely as intellectual exercises—they were grounded in some practically applicable ways. To learn Horney's language and the concepts would not be enough: they must be experienced. According to Laird (1985), workshops are defined as "extensive clinics addressing a specific problem" (p. 167) and offer "action plans" (p. 167) and/or "material which participants can use back on the job" (p. 167). This fits with the intent of the research which is to determine if Horney's (1950) theories are useful in leadership development both in the classroom and back on the job. The sources used for the key elements of the workshop and the reflective practices were taken from Horney.

This workshop was experientially based in adult learning theory as articulated by Knowles (1988): "The psychic rewards are greater from releasing the energy of learners than from controlling it" (p. 97). Experiential learning allows a person to release this energy by actively engaging in an activity, look back at the activity critically, abstract

some useful insight from their analysis and put that result to work in their real life and ultimately become responsible for their own learning (Pfeiffer, 1975). Experiential learning is also congruent with Horney's (1950) call for self-knowledge to be more than an intellectual knowledge but instead to "become real" (p. 343) and become one's "personal property" (p. 343). The experiential design provided participants opportunities for individual and small group work along with whole group sharing and processing of insights and learning.

Workshop objectives were based on Horney's (1950) demand that individuals do more than just have an intellectual experience—they must have an inner certainty and be realistically aware of oneself. Coolidge (2004) asserts that Horney,

> …thought that patients must learn to assume responsibility for themselves and feel active and responsible for their decisions and the consequences of those decisions. Patients should also develop an inner independence, which might involve establishing their own hierarchy of values and apply these values to their own lives. (p. 5)

Therefore the workshop was designed around five distinct outcomes. Through the use of lecture, paper and pencil self-assessments, and experiential activities workshop, participants would be able to: (a) explain the concepts of the basic anxiety, the real self and the idealized self, the three movements of people, and the self-defeating cycle and their importance to leadership development; (b) explain the connection between human growth and leadership development; (c) explain the role anxiety plays in leadership growth and development; (d) explain the effects of these tacit forces on leadership

effectiveness and growth by experiencing them in a leadership simulation; and (e) practice a self-awareness methodology that they will use back on the job.

The workshop was conducted on a Saturday morning, January 30, 2010 in a conference room at a Boeing facility. The workshop began with a review of the workshop purpose and learning objectives. Participants were informed how the objectives would be achieved as well as the expected norms for participation. Participants were previously instructed to think about three leadership challenges they face at their jobs and shared these when they made their introductions at the beginning of the workshop. These activities represented the level-setting phase of the workshop.

Next, participants were introduced to the results of a leadership gap survey (Center for Creative Leadership, 2009). The objective was to share the latest leadership research and establish the context and credibility for the leadership competencies about to be presented. Participants in the study rated competencies such as decisiveness, managing change, and self-awareness from most important to least important as well as which competencies were most needed and least demonstrated. The group members validated from their own experiences that these competencies, such as self-awareness, managing change, leading people, and decisiveness, are a fair representation of what most organizations value in its leaders.

Participants interacted with this data by finding similarities between the Center for Creative Leadership data and their three leadership challenges and by predicting which leadership competencies represent the greatest gap between need and demonstrated ability. Participants then conducted a self-assessment (described in detail in the data collection methods section of this chapter) to aid them in identifying aspects of their

personality that might influence the kind of choices they may make to close their leadership competency gaps. The instrument assesses the three Horney personality types: compliant, aggressive, and detached. The data generated by this assessment was used in all subsequent processing activities as participants worked to process their awareness of each new Horney concept introduced to them.

The next section of the workshop focused on Horney (1950) and her theories. Some biographical information on Horney was presented along with some basic themes and assumptions of her theories. The basic anxiety was presented first, followed by the three movements of people, the real and idealized self and the self-defeating cycle. After each concept was introduced participants were given various processing questions to help them grasp and make sense of these ideas. After the three movements of people were introduced, participants scored their self-assessment and processed that data using an experiential method that will be described subsequently.

A question was then posed to the participants: What do any of these theories have to do with leadership? The workshop then introduced the concept of human growth, since this was the core idea underlying Horney's work. The idea of nonlinear growth was introduced along with all the forces that create tension and anxiety during growth. This was then translated into leadership growth using Joiner and Josephs Leadership Agility framework. Published in 2007, the framework is the result of interviews with 220 managers conducted throughout a four-year research period and combines the developmental stage theory of Torbert and Kegan with the integral theory of Wilber.

Participants discussed their understanding of the leadership growth concept using processing questions and their self-assessment scores in small- and large-group

discussion. They began making connections between these forces and their interference with growth and how that might affect them as leaders. Participants reflected on how their unconscious choices for coping with anxiety might influence their leadership behaviors and the leadership gaps they identified earlier.

Finally, participants engaged in a leadership simulation. The activity was a structured experience called "Al Khobari: An Information Sharing Multiple Role Play" (Pfeiffer, 1980). The activity was chosen because it covers multiple leadership competencies such as problem solving, information sharing, decision making, and managing conflict and requires the participants to work under time pressure—an anxiety producing dynamic. The content of the activity also fits an aerospace-defense contractor population and it was used successfully by the researcher in other training situations. Once again, participants took the data from their experience with this activity, shared them in small- and then large-group settings, interpreted what the data meant, generalized it back into the Horney (1950) concepts, and found ways to apply it to their leadership challenges and experiences.

At the end of the workshop participants completed a "Contract for Change Worksheet" (see Appendix C) instructing them to: (a) think about the Horney concepts they had just been introduced to; (b) consider their potential influence on leadership growth; and then (c) list three things they would like to start, stop, or continue doing in order to grow as a leader. Upon completion of the worksheet, participants were verbally instructed to return to their work situations and during the next two weeks use at least one of the Horney concepts they had learned and apply it to make at least one of the behavioral changes (start something, stop something, or continue something) to which

they had committed. Participants could use more than one concept and could make more than one change attempt if they chose, but they were only required by the protocol to do one.

During this workshop, the researcher played the role of workshop facilitator. Participants were made aware of this at the beginning of the workshop. In this role, the researcher adhered to facilitator guidelines recommended by Pfeiffer, Heslin, and Jones (1976) as well as his 19 years of facilitation experience. It should be noted that in spite of this experience, this workshop was not delivered or facilitated as a typical corporate learning experience. For example, in many similar, nonresearch related leadership workshops, additional time beyond the planned agenda is often given to participants if they are making deep, meaningful connections between the workshop experiences and their real-world professional life. Oftentimes, some agenda items are skipped over if the group wishes to adapt the agenda to fit their needs at that moment and seize on any serendipitous learning opportunities. That was not the case here.

The workshop was designed to last 6.5 hours, the time limit was strictly adhered to, and workshop activity instructions were very specific. The workshop was conducted according to the design stated with one variation. I had intended to capture participant comments and inputs from the small- and large-group discussions and later analyze these. However, because of the nature of the material presented and the resulting personal depth of the processing and generalizing discussions that occurred, I was only able to capture the briefest essence of participants' thoughts, feelings, and insights. In other words, I could not keep up with the group. As a result, the comments I wrote on the flip charts turned out to be cryptic at best and of little analytical value.

Limitations and delimitations. There are advantages and disadvantages to using

feedback instruments and experiential activities. Advantages of the experiential activities

have been previously stated, but there were potential pitfalls the facilitator became aware

of and prepared for. Objectives for a structured experiential activity are necessarily

general and learning is done through discovery; therefore, the exact learning objectives

cannot be specified beforehand and this may frustrate some participants. During the

publishing phase, participants may have become so focused on the activity that they need

to be prodded into separating themselves from it. The processing phase is the group

dynamics part of the cycle and the action of talking through all the data reported by the

group must not leave anything out, otherwise participants may experience a sense of

unfinished business. The same caveat is true for the generalizing phase. The facilitator

made sure to draw out as many complete and even controversial generalizations by

remaining objective and nonevaluative. A key requirement for this workshop was that

participants were comfortable expressing themselves openly. Because of the highly

participatory nature of the workshop and the potential risk of exposing oneself

psychologically through the use of a personality assessment instrument, it was necessary

to ensure that no one felt uneasy about being open in an atmosphere that required people

to make themselves vulnerable.

Pfeiffer et al. (1976) lists many advantages and disadvantages to the use of

instrumentation. Among the advantages most salient to this research are its instruments

promote personal involvement, it supplies personal feedback earlier than participants are

able to without the instrument, and it facilitates contracting for new behaviors and fosters

open reception of feedback through low threat. The disadvantages that are most relevant

to this research are the possibility of fear of psychological exposure, a perception of the instruments as irrelevant to the subject of the workshop, feedback overload, and a fear over loss of control over the data generated. A skillful facilitator can overcome these disadvantages by legitimizing the use of instruments early in the workshop, clarifying the theoretical basis of the instruments, allowing sufficient time for the processing of data using the experiential learning cycle, and assuring participants that they have ultimate control over the data. Validity and reliability data as noted previously were shared with participants as well.

Another possible limitation was that the workshop participants were from the same corporation, and hence, the same organizational culture. It was possible they would bring a fairly common set of deeply held assumptions, beliefs, and values based on their length of experience and organizational position in the culture. However, another deeply held value in The Boeing Company is diversity, and this value was indeed part of the cultural mix in the workshop and it acted to offset any possible participant bias.

Data Collection and Analysis Methods

Marshall and Rossman (2006) defined qualitative research as a broad approach to the study of social phenomena the genres of which are naturalistic, interpretive, and increasingly critical and which draw on multiple methods of inquiry. The nature of this study was exploratory in that the area of investigation—the usefulness of Horney theory in leadership development—is so new or vague that an exploration must be conducted just to learn something about the problem (Cooper & Emory, 1995). The following section describes the two separate data collection activities employed in support of the

research: Activities conducted during the workshop and postworkshop. The data

collection and data analysis methods used for each activity are also described.

Workshop methods. *Data collection method*. A self-assessment instrument was

used in order to provide data about each participant to himself or herself so that he or she

could use the experiential process to reflect on the data, consider what it may mean to

him or her in the context of their self-assessment instrument scores, and generalize what

this may have to do with his or her roles and experiences as leaders. According to Pfeiffer

(1975), "the primary value of instrumentation…is a source of personal feedback for

individuals" (p. 9). The data generated from these feedback instruments were not

collected and were not analyzed by the researcher.

The choice of assessment instrument was based on practical value (time and cost,

ease of use-analysis), scientific value (related to the research topic as closely as possible),

and learning value in that it allowed participants to make connections between their

leadership practices and their scores. The self-assessment instrument chosen was the

Horney Coolidge Tri-dimensional Inventory (HCTI). This instrument was designed by

Professor Frederick L. Coolidge of the University of Colorado as a means for measuring

Horney's three types of people: Compliant, Aggressive, and Detached, based on their

defensive strategy of moving toward, against, or away from people. Published originally

in 2002, I used the February 2005 version sent to me by Dr. Coolidge. It is a 57-item,

three-scale self-assessment designed to take about 10 to 15 minutes to complete. It was

the only instrument identified during the literature review that measures any dimensions

of Horney theory. It was, therefore, ideal for the purpose of researching the value of

Horney theory in leadership development. The HCTI has excellent test-retest reliabilities

(Coolidge, Moore, Yamazaki, Stewart, & Segal, 2001), and construct validity has been established (Coolidge, Segal, Benight, & Danielian, 2004).

Data analysis method. The experiential learning process was used during the workshop to analyze the data produced by the self-assessment. This method was chosen for its practical value-simplicity, ease of use, and high participative value. It was also chosen for its potential to produce a quality and quantity of data in a very short time. The activity was processed using the experiential learning cycle of Experiencing, Publishing, Processing, Generalizing, and Applying (Pfeiffer, 1975) with the generalizing and applying phases connecting leadership back to Horneyian theory. Also, as mentioned before and as supported by Coghlan and Brannick (2005), emotions are just as important during the reflection phase as thinking; therefore, feelings about the learning were also explored. Workshop participants used the experiential learning cycle to: (a) analyze their self-assessment feedback data, and (b) process their experiential activities into useful generalizations about the dynamics of leadership behavior.

Postworkshop methods. *Data collection method.* A paper and pencil course evaluation was given at the end of the workshop to assess accomplishment of the stated objectives. A 4-point Likert scale was used to assess agreement or disagreement with statements about the objective and process of the workshop along with open-ended questions to assess the clarity of the workshop content. This data served as evidence of learning and increased understanding of Horney's concepts.

A postworkshop follow-up interview was used for determining the effectiveness of the Horney concepts in the participant's practice of leadership. Kvale (1996) has described a qualitative research interview as "literally an interview, an inter-change of

views between two persons conversing about a theme of mutual interest" (p. 14).

Marshall and Rossman (2006) describe the interview as being more of a conversation

than any kind of formal event. This research took this approach as the intent was to learn

from workshop participants who among them used Horney's theories in their personal

leadership development and found those theories to benefit them in improving their

leadership skills or abilities. It was stated at the beginning of this dissertation that

usefulness will be defined by the participant and this researcher will not force any

preconceived idea of what useful means upon any participant. While it may be true what

Levin said about nothing being more useful than a good theory, for the purpose of this

research, usefulness is in the eye of the beholder.

The interviews took place two weeks after the completion of the workshop in

accordance with a contracting protocol completed at the end of the workshop. It was

anticipated that not all participants would contract at the end of the workshop to use what

they had learned, and that not all those who contract to use what they learned would, in

fact, do so. It turned out, all participants contracted to use a theory in a change attempt.

Since a less formal interview was the intent of the data collection, a

semistructured interview was used. Bryamn and Bell (2003) describe the semistructured

interview as using a list of fairly specific questions to guide the interview, but the

interviewee is given a great deal of leeway in how to reply. As it was the intent to capture

the lived world of the workshop participants as it relates to their experience as leaders,

this approach seemed most appropriate.

The researcher used a research assistant to conduct the interviews to minimize any researcher bias or participant bias occurring in the collection of interview data. An interview guide (see Appendix F) was employed to ensure the main topics of interest were covered. Interviews were conducted by phone in order to limit potential bias inherent in a face to face interview (Creswell, 2003). There were 13 participants in the workshop but only 12 were interviewed. (One participant went on a medical leave at the time of the two week behavioral change attempt and was unable to apply any of the concepts in that context). The primary researcher solicited participants to choose a date and time from a one-week window that fit their professional and personal schedules. The resulting schedule was sent to the assistant researcher who contacted all 12 participants according to the schedule. The interviews lasted approximately one hour.

Data analysis method. The participant paper and pencil course evaluations were anonymous. They were collected at the end of the workshop and summarized. Each evaluation contained a four-value rating scale that gauges how well the course was conducted. A mean score was calculated along with the range of responses. The evaluation also included two open-ended questions that determined which concepts were understandable and which concepts were confusing.

The assistant researcher collected data from the postworkshop interviews. The assistant researcher read through the start-stop-continue behaviors format first, relating back to the contract for leadership change as needed. During the interview, participants were asked to explore why they used a concept, how they used it, whether a change occurred, and whether the concept was related to the change. If they did not use a concept, they were probed for why they didn't.

After the interviewee laid out what she or he had accomplished or not in his or her attempted behavioral change, then the assistant researcher moved on to questions that addressed the Horney concepts specifically, taking them one by one, to determine how the person rated each concept and to state affirmatively what concept was most significant in his or her leadership growth for the two-week period (see Appendix F). The last three questions of the interview sought to determine what effect the concepts had on: (a) participants' leadership development perspective, (b) any new abilities acquired from use of the concepts, and (c) their proclivity for continued use of the concepts.

The research objective is to learn how valuable each Horney concept is for each person; therefore, the data analysis looked at the Horney concepts and how participants referenced them during the interviews. The assistant collected the postworkshop interviews data by means of note taking, capturing as much verbatim data as possible. This data was analyzed using Creswell's (2003) qualitative method. The six-step process involves: (a) organizing and preparing the data for analysis, (b) reading through all the data, (c) coding the data, (d) generating categories or themes, (e) representing the themes in a qualitative narrative, and (f) interpreting the meaning of the data.

The research assistant's field notes were given to me and I transcribed them verbatim into a word document. I then read through all the transcribed responses by each participant to get an overall sense of the information and reflect on its possible meaning. I took notes on any general impressions or themes that I began to notice. Next, I sorted the responses by interview question and read them again in this order to explore further any emerging impressions. I took a heuristic approach to the meaning that was emerging from the comments and I made brief one- or two-word notes of what that meaning might

be. I eventually produced a list of categories and their definitions shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Codes Used in Analysis of Participant's Interview Comments

Theme	Category	Definition
Stance	Toward	Comment indicating a stance of moving toward others
	Against	Comment indicating a stance of moving against others
	Away	Comment indicating a stance of moving away from others
Voice	Real Self	Things you might hear the real self say
	Idealized Self	Things you might hear an idealized self say
	T.O.T.S	Things someone might say if they are in the tyranny of the should
Growth	Intentional	Comment states deliberate intent
	Reasonable	Comment rational and realistic
	Possible	Expressions of hope and feasibility
	Willingness	Expression of enthusiasm and eagerness
	Courage	Willingness to take a risk
	Improve Something	A condition is not broken, but could be improved upon
Self	Awareness of Self	Comment indicates awareness of oneself within the context of the situation
	Concern With Self	Comment indicates primary concern of situation is self
	Understand Self	Desire to understand self better
Positive	Confident	Comment expresses little or no uncertainty about the situation
	Positive Perspective	Sees the situation as positive
	Positive	Comments of a positive tone or tenor
	Open Minded	Willingness to consider other possibilities
Struggle	Confession	Comment admits some failing or shortcoming
	Uncertain	Comment expresses little or no certainty about the situation
Negative	Blaming	Comment assigns blame
	Envious	Comment includes statements of envy towards others
	Unreasonable	Comment sounds irrational and unrealistic
	Impossible	Expressions of hopelessness or helplessness
	Unwillingness	Expressions of reluctance and disinclination
	Negative	Comments of a negative tone or tenor
	Criticzing	Comments disapproving of something

(*table continues*)

Theme	Category	Definition
Others	Awareness of Others	Comment indicates awareness of others within the context of the situation
	Concern With Others	Comment indicates primary concern of situation is others
	Understand Others	Desire to understand others better

I then sorted interview responses into broad categories and then into finer-detailed themes, allowing multiple comments and recurring patterns to be grouped and analyzed for representation of a theme reflecting an experience of a concept. These are listed in the column labeled "theme." The major categories clustered around several Horney themes:

Stance—comments indicating one of the three movements of people.

Voice—comments that link to the real self, the idealized self or the tyranny of the should.

Growth—comments relating to Horney criteria for human growth.

Self—comments focusing on or pertaining to the self.

Positive—comments of a generally positive tone.

Struggle—comments evoking the struggle for human growth.

Negative—comments of a generally positive tone.

Others—comments focusing on or pertaining to others.

Limitations and delimitations. Disadvantages of the interview method were considered. According to Creswell (2003) interviews provide indirect information filtered through the views of interviewees and not all subjects are as equally perceptive and articulate. Marshall and Rossman (2006) point out that interviewees may be unwilling or uncomfortable sharing at the level of detail the interviewer seeks. Interviewer error can

also be a source of bias in that an interviewer may distort the results of the questioning by word emphasis, vocal tone, or question rephrasing (Cooper & Emory, 1995).

Advantages of the interview method include gaining access to an internal experience and the ability to "understand the meanings that everyday activities hold for people" (Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p. 102). Bryamn and Bell (2003) point out that some events are just not amenable to other data collection methods and that interviews allow for the least impact on people's time and the situation being studied. Another advantage is the flexibility of being able to ask questions not on the interview guide in response to subjects discovering new insights or awareness about the topic (Kvale, 1996). The result can be richer more detailed answers than the original question might have elicited.

Validity and Reliability

As noted by Cooper and Emory (1995) two key characteristics of any sound research project are the ability of the research to measure what it claims to measure (validity) and that the results of the research are consistent over time (reliability). Bryman and Bell (2003) and Marshall and Rossman (2006) concede the importance of validity and reliability in quantitative research, but they also contest the relevance of these cannon to qualitative research. Creswell (2003) states emphatically:

> Validity does not carry the same connotation as it does in quantitative research, nor is it a companion of reliability (examining stability or consistency of responses…) or generalizability (the external validity of applying results to new settings, people or samples…). Overall…reliability and generalizability play a minor role in qualitative inquiry. (p. 195)

The research assumed this stance and instead endeavored to instill quality and rigor throughout all steps of the research process. There was no intent to negate the importance of precise observations and logical arguments by integrating validity into the craftsmanship of the total research design. "Ideally, the quality of craftsmanship results in products with knowledge clams that are so powerful and convincing in their own right that they, so to say, carry the validation with them" (Kvale, 1996, p. 252). This was the intent of this research.

Toward this end, the content of the workshop, primarily the Horney concepts, was presented to an audience of training and development practitioners at the *2009 Your Turn to Learn* conference of the San Diego Chapter of the American Society of Training and Development on November 4, 2009. This was done as a quasipilot experiment to test informally the validity of the Horney content and assess reactions to the concepts.

The presentation was a one-hour breakout session presented to 26 participants, which required brief, succinct explanations and examples of each of the five concepts. At the end, participants were asked to complete a simple two-question session feedback form: What concept was clearest to you and what concept was least clear?

Given the extreme time constraint and the potentially complex nature of the concepts, it was gratifying to find general agreement among all participants that the topic was interesting; no one remarked that the topic as not worth their time. It was also encouraging that many people wanted to hear more and learn more about these concepts. This was encouraging on two counts: Development practitioners found the concepts interesting and the connection to leadership was apparent. Confidence was gained that the research project was on the right track.

Chapter Four: Results

In this chapter, I will analyze the data collected from the research participants. The three sources of the data are the participants' written evaluations of the workshop, postworkshop interviews of the participants by a research assistant, and the researcher's observations and field notes taken during and after the workshop. I have organized the data into two major categories. The first category is workshop assessment. These data, gathered from participant paper and pencil workshop evaluations, measure the flow of activities and information during the workshop to assess whether the concepts were clear and easy to understand and whether they could relate them back to participants' leadership lives.

The second category is the assessment of the outcomes of the workshop, that is, the success or failure of the behavioral change the participants attempted using at least one of the Horney concepts. These data were gathered primarily from postworkshop interviews and include participant ratings of the Horney concepts as well as participant comments about their experiences. These discussions of the two types of data will be followed by a summary of the findings.

Workshop Assessment

The purpose of obtaining participant's written evaluations at the conclusion of the workshop was to assess the process of the workshop and to determine if the concepts were communicated clearly. The workshop evaluation form (see Appendix B) was a combination of Likert-scale ratings of the process of the workshop and open-ended questions about the clarity of the concepts presented. The Likert ratings addressed

instructor performance, congruence of learning objectives, etc. The open-ended questions addressed potential issues of content clarity.

Workshop ratings. All participants completed a written workshop evaluation at the end of the workshop. All Likert items were completed by all participants; however, two participants did not complete all the open-ended questions. In these two instances, some of the questions were left blank, indicating the participants were either unwilling to answer or were unable to answer. Workshop process ratings were based on a 4-point scale of agreement or disagreement with the rating statement. For scoring purposes the ratings were assigned numerical values ranging from 1 for "strongly disagree" to 4 for "strongly agree." Table 2 shows the summary of the Likert scores for the evaluation of the workshop process. Participants were asked whether they strongly agreed, agreed, disagreed, or strongly disagreed with the statements.

Table 2

Summary of Workshop Process Ratings on a 4-Point Scale

Evaluation Statement	Mean Score	Range
1. Overall, I learned a great deal from this workshop.	3.6	3–4
2. The instructor told us what we could expect to learn as a result of taking this workshop.	3.5	3–4
3. The instructor provided adequate opportunities for questions and discussion during class time.	3.8	3–4
4. As the workshop progressed the instructor showed how each topic fit into the course as a whole.	3.4	3–4
5. Overall, the instructor's explanations were clear and understandable.	3.6	3–4
6. The learning activities were well integrated into the workshop.	3.5	2–4
7. There was close agreement between the stated workshop objectives and what was actually covered.	3.5	3–4

(*table continues*)

Evaluation Statement	Mean Score	Range
8. Expectations for learning in this workshop were clearly communicated.	3.5	3–4
9. I felt comfortable about expressing myself candidly during the workshop.	3.8	3–4

Ratings were consistently positive. There was only one "disagree" rating (for item 4, "As the workshop progressed the instructor showed how each topic fit into the course as a whole") among all ratings given on all items and 67% of the ratings given were "strongly agree." A key statement, item 9 ("I felt comfortable about expressing myself candidly during the workshop"), received the highest mean score of 3.8, indicating that people felt the environment was psychologically safe and allowed them to express themselves. Since the nature of the material being discussed had the potential of being very personal, a high score on this item was necessary to ensure the validity of the thoughts, ideas and comments expressed by participants during and after the workshop.

These scores suggest that participants were positive about the conduct of the course. Also, because of the nature of the concepts presented, it was important to allow adequate time for participants to process the concepts presented in order to abstract useful insights which they could then apply to their leadership lives. Based on the rating for item 3, this appears to have been achieved. Further evidence of this connecting the dots between psychological concepts and real-world leadership challenges is present in the narrative comments from the workshop evaluation.

Workshop comments. Workshop comments were collected from the printed workshop evaluation form. The form had two open-ended questions about the clarity of the content of the workshop: "What has been the 'muddiest' point in this workshop? That

is, what topic(s) remain the least clear to you?" and "What questions remain uppermost in your mind?" Table 3 shows a summary of these comments-responses.

Table 3

Summary of Workshop Written Evaluations Regarding Clarity

Subject	What has been the "muddiest" point in this workshop? That is, what topic(s) remain the least clear to you?
A	None
B	For the short amount of time the leader did an excellent job of explaining the topics' Four Forces, and providing an example in the Al Kohbari exercise. Well done!
C	When you identified you are in the self-defeating cycle, how do you get out of it?
D	relevance of decision types
E	No answer
F	No answer
G	No answer
H	The future leadership gap was all over the place, it pointed out that there were no wrong placement for the ratings but points out not all leaders priorities the same.
I	Breaking the cycle that permits anxiety to disrupt the balance between self and Idealized self. Don't like the term anxiety - too much of a negative connotation, can there be a better term—"tension."
J	No answer
K	None
L	No answer
M	Basic anxiety, self-defeating cycle, 3 solutions for dealing with self-defeating cycle
Subject	What questions remain uppermost in your mind?
A	None at this time
B	I'm interested in transferring my leadership Masters degree to a local area school that is approved by LTP.
C	Where to go from here. Not sure I know enough from this to how to handle myself when I understand my reactions better.
D	tips for moving to be a Catalyst after being an achiever.
E	no answer
F	none
G	Do you see the organizational development insight influencing our culture at Boeing?
H	None

(*table continues*)

Subject	What questions remain uppermost in your mind?
I	How to keep anxiety from disrupting balance.
J	The concept of the "tyranny of the should"
K	None
L	None
M	Subject M. What is the real self? I haven't lived in that state since I was a kid.

There was no real consensus among participants about any specific workshop topic being unclear. Two participants wanted to learn more about how to break the self-defeating cycle, suggesting not so much confusion about the concept as an appetite for more information about it. One participant listed three of the four Horney concepts as remaining unclear. Two participants listed nothing and five participants gave no answer to this question. Leaving the question unanswered suggests several possibilities: (a) The respondent may have been unwilling to answer based on a possible perception that the question was unworthy of an answer; (b) The respondent may have felt rushed at the end of the day and did not have time to answer; (c) The respondent may have believed the content was clear enough and there was no need to answer the questions; or (d) The workshop content was so confusing they could not articulate what they did not understand. All participants but one affirmatively answered the follow-up clarity question: What questions remain uppermost in your mind? However, only five of the 12 affirmatively answered stated they had no remaining questions about the content. Of the other seven, four referred to material from the workshop, while the other three asked questions that had nothing to do with the content. This suggests that in spite of high mean scores for items 3 and 5, the clarity of the content of the workshop was mixed.

Seven out of 12 responses to the question: What could the facilitator have done differently to help you understand today's workshop material? were positive,

complementing the facilitator and the workshop. Five subjects left this question blank.
It's possible that these subjects believed the workshop content was beyond the
facilitator's ability to clarify any further. These seemingly conflicting responses do not
provide any clear findings on the clarity of the workshop content.

The clarity of the workshop content was important to the next open-ended
question in the written workshop evaluation, which asked about significant lessons from
the workshop: What are the two significant (central or useful) things (concepts, topics)
you have learned during this workshop? Table 4 presents these responses.

Table 4

Summary of Workshop Written Evaluations of Lessons From the Workshop

Subject	What are the two significant (central or useful) things (concepts, topics) you have learned during this workshop?
A	Anxiety influences leadership**;** relationship gage on anxiety in leadership
B	1) As self-aware as I believed I was, we all change and must all still stay in touch with our real selves, idealized self and the pitfalls of anxiety. 2) Always something and someone (Horney) to learn about to help us grow personally and professionally**.**
C	How you respond to situations are based on learned responses from childhood and since then.
D	Future leadership gap. 3 methods to deal with anxiety
E	Leadership tips
F	Work as a team within the objectives; respect and accept others
G	Anxiety and how to recognize it, understand it, and then deal from that point of understanding. Tools to deal—tools for personal practices
H	Openness and self-awareness
I	The self-defeating cycle, how they search for glory, and tyranny of the should reinforce
J	Being self-aware and applying openness and reflection to become a better person-leader
K	Basic Anxiety; The Self: Real self and Idealized self; How to get out from "the self-defeating cycle"
L	20 leadership competencies
M	The self-defeating cycle; basic anxiety

Eight participants named at least one Horney concept as the most significant thing they learned. Four participants seemed more focused on general leadership guidance. The most frequently stated concept was the Basic Anxiety (six). The second most mentioned Horney concept was the Self-Defeating Cycle (three). The three movements were mentioned only once and the Real Self-Idealized Self twice. Of note in these statements are the three participants who connected the concepts to leadership, the intent of the workshop.

In summary, the purpose of the participants' written evaluation at the end of the workshop was to assess the process of the workshop and to determine if the concepts were communicated clearly. The data presented suggests that the workshop process was, for the most part, effective in that it delivered the Horney concepts in a clear and easily understood way for a majority of participants.

Postworkshop Assessment—Behavioral Change Outcomes

The second set of data was collected two weeks after the completion of the workshop in accordance with a contracting protocol completed at the end of the workshop. These follow-up interviews were conducted to assess the outcomes of the participant's attempt to use a Horney concept to effect a behavioral change.

The data include a combination of numerical ratings of the Horney concepts and data derived from the results of participants' change efforts as well as participant comments about their experience with the Horney concepts during their change efforts.

The object of the postworkshop interview was to learn how valuable each Horney concept is for each workshop participant; therefore, the focus of the data analysis was the four Horney concepts presented in the workshop and how the participants reference them

during their interviews. The first interview question of the interview was: Do you have any questions about these concepts before we proceed? This was asked to determine if there was any clarification of the concepts required in order to answer the subsequent questions. Only one participant required a brief refresher.

Question 2 was: Describe the leadership situation you attempted these changes in. This question attempts to establish a leadership context in which the behavioral change attempt occurs. Table 5 lists these comments below.

Table 5

Summary of All Answers to Interview Question 2

Subject	Question 2: Describe the leadership situation you attempted these changes in.
A	"I was there to pay attention to the role of the team—the team and using collaborative techniques. I act as a bridge from technical people to the customer."
B	"I left the workshop wanting to work on more than one situation. I work in a highly unionized environment. I wanted to work on reverse psychology and thinking outside the box to effect change. The attitudes and guidelines that govern my work have been well-established at Boeing for a long time."
C	"I have a coworker who is slightly senior to me but who doesn't follow through to complete his work. I kick him in the butt and he runs a little bit. I have to go kick him in the butt again and he runs a little further. I want him to do his work with less direction from me."
D	"I want to work on being a leader on purpose rather than being the reluctant leader. I can't let anxiety get the best of me. I have always been self-aware."
E	"Yes, I did choose a leadership situation. It is centered around anxiety. The change I wanted to make is managing others less and leading more. I have staff who are in remote locations that I don't see every day. I want to identify and relate to them more in their states, not mine."
F	"I feel totally isolated from teammates. It takes me two to three days to do something that it would take the team four months to do otherwise. Everyone else is more tuned into their families and just use the company as a means to provide. They do what they have to do and go home. My leadership development challenge is how to cope with others who are less competent than me."
G	"I am very much into the reflection part of leadership development. People get unnerved and people get anxious. I want to be able to step back and possibly reframe."

(*table continues*)

Subject	Question 2: Describe the leadership situation you attempted these changes in.
H	"I am dealing with conflict between two employees. One is my direct report and the other one reports to someone else."
I	"I have been placed in an impossible situation. I have been asked to do a large project that is impossible to complete in the time I've been given and with no budget. I need a lot of support and I collaborate with a team of eight to 10 people."
J	"The biggest thing I was interested in was taking the class in order to understand the concepts; especially the concept of basic anxiety. I wanted to understand when other people are feeling anxious."
K	Did not answer
L	"My current goal is to help my team's improvement. We use a tool. My customers are internal. Need to inspire others. I have felt that I am too compliant and need to learn to be more assertive."

During the analysis it became apparent that the comments expressed more than one theme. Eight out of 12 participants expressed a willingness to take on a leadership challenge that might be a risk, but they also expressed eagerness and enthusiasm at the prospect of making a deliberate and intentional change toward growing as a leader. These comments express a theme of personal improvement, as well as a willingness to use the Horney concepts to become more effective in interpersonally challenging leadership situations. These situations might raise issues of communication, control, or coaching, but they clearly require some kind of leadership interaction with others and they are framed in terms of the behavior of others rather than the participant's behavior.

In these comments we hear people describing thorny workplace relationships where they are looking for psychological insight that will help them behave more effectively. These participants have, for the most part, chosen the kinds of situations where the Horney concepts might provide new insight. It also seems that the idea of recognizing and dealing with anxiety is the commonly mentioned aspect of Horney that comes up in these responses.

Interview questions 3 through 5 focused on the attempted behavioral change using at least one of the Horney concepts. Interview question 3 was asked in four parts:

1. What was the behavior you wanted to START doing?

2. Did you make the change you wanted?

3. If you made the change what was the result of the change? Did you find this result satisfactory? Why or why not?; and

4. If you did not make the change what prevented you from making the change?

Table 6 presents representative quotes from the responses to question 3a.

Table 6

Summary of All Answers to Interview Question 3a

Subject	Questions 3a: What was the behavior you wanted to START doing?
A	"Not just starting a behavior but I wanted to continue what I learned in an earlier class. Wearing a different hat."
B	"I wanted to improve my attitude and optimism that there could be positive change. I wanted to use my positive attitude to be a team person."
C	"Set a better example. Be more persuasive. Use my coaching skills."
D	"I want to start reframing issues in real time as a way to manage my stress and anxiety."
E	"I initiated weekly one-on-one meetings with each member of my staff in order to gain a better pulse of the team. I also initiated more conversation opportunities—increased the number of opportunities to communicate. Ad hoc Monday morning 'how was your weekend' conversations."
F	"How can I become a real teammate? How to be accepted for who I am and what I am. I planned to stop asking so many questions and blend in. They aren't going to change, so I need to know how to work with them better. Take a back seat. Wait to see who steps up."
G	"Use reflection to manage my own anxiety. We are going through a lot of layoffs."
H	"I wanted to start indirectly refereeing the situation to try to help both people."
I	"Yes. I have focused my team on 'good enough' without going into my usual demand for perfection and its self-defeating cycle."
J	"I wanted to understand and gain better approaches to other people. I have been reluctant to give feedback. Also, I want to lower my self-abasement."

(*table continues*)

Subject	Questions 3a: What was the behavior you wanted to START doing?
K	"I've got to change who I am. I've been through something rough. I can't be angry or blame anyone else but I must find a new and different way forward. I want to learn how to be appropriately assertive in the moment and know how to say no but that's all part of a bigger problem."
L	"Mediate. Focus. Openness. Honesty. Want to move away from compliance by identifying anxiety. To be assertive."

Nine out of the 12 responses to 3a were oriented toward self-improvement such as the comment made by participant B: "I wanted to improve my attitude and optimism that there could be positive change. I wanted to use my positive attitude to be a team person." Most people want to be more authentic and effective in their relationships and there is an implied desire to learn and change. The one exception is participant C who seems to be more into performing than into gaining insight or becoming more congruent and authentic in her or his own behavior.

Questions 3b asked: Did you make the change you wanted seeking a "yes" or "no" response? Of the 12 participants interviewed, 10 reported that they did make the change they sought; two did not.

Question 3c asked: If you made the change what was the result of the change? Did you find this result satisfactory? Why or why not? Table 7 presents a summary of these comments.

Table 7

Summary of All Answers to Interview Question 3c

Subject	Question 3c: If you made the change what was the result of the change? Did you find this result satisfactory? Why or why not?
A	Did not answer
B	"Did not make the change. I work in a 'we/them' environment. They just weren't having it."

(*table continues*)

Subject	Question 3c: If you made the change what was the result of the change? Did you find this result satisfactory? Why or why not?
C	"Sort of. Hit and miss. I went through the development of the plan with my co-worker and reviewed his agreements. I tried to understand: does he need more confidence? Does he have anxiety? I got good feedback from my boss re: my use of coaching behaviors. Now my coworker has fewer options for evading work. I let others talk to me more. I engaged others in different ways during the two weeks."
D	"Yes. My productivity and outlook has improved. My work is faster and clearer."
E	"Yes. I got proactive. I dispensed with normal business and then explored more informal and personal areas."
F	"No—I am who I am."
G	"Yes, I was able to use it in real time, preemptively. Yes, I could take in more input."
H	"Yes. I went to management and asked if the person who didn't report to me could support me in an activity that was assigned to me and already involving the other party to the conflict. I have noticed a change in the attitude of the one who is temporarily assigned to me as I have worked her into my activity."
I	"Yes. I was able to remember some of the teaching from the workshop, recognize my spiral and stop it. I was on a 'quest for glory.' Also, in the past two weeks, I have been able to help my college age daughter (who had heard of Horney) with some impossible, unrealistic demands she was making on herself. I went to the library and got a Horney book."
J	"Yes. My anxiety has dissipated."
K	"I've been on a 13-month journey of transformation. I've immersed myself in learning. I conduct myself differently since I've been on this journey of self-development. My dominant style used to be what I call 'controlled aggression.' I'm from NJ. I know how to do it. Yes, I'm learning how to tackle problems and not people."
L	"The workshop helped me see my self-defeating cycle that I was in. I did a big presentation. My boss didn't want me to do it, but I went ahead anyway. My boss liked it and I got recognition."

Participants' responses were predominantly positive and expressed desires for intentional growth. Four of the 12 comments explained a causal link between a Horney concept and the result achieved implying a strong sense of utility for the concept. Again, as in question 3a, responses showed a shift from an emphasis on others to an emphasis on the self with seven out of 12 comments focusing on the self as compared to focusing on

others. A good example of this is participant L: "The workshop helped me see my self-defeating cycle that I was in. I did a big presentation. My boss didn't want me to do it, but I went ahead anyway. My boss liked it and I got recognition."

Question 3d was: If you did not make the change, what prevented you from making the change? The 10 participants that made successful changes did not answer this question, as would be expected. However, the two that did not make successful changes also did not answer this question. Rather, they answered 3d as part of question 3c as is seen in the Table 7.

Interview questions 4 and 5 were asked in the same four part manner. Question 4a asked: What was the behavior you wanted to STOP doing? Table 8 presents a list of the responses to question 4a.

Table 8

Summary of All Answers to Interview Question 4a

Subject	Question 4a: What was the behavior you wanted to STOP doing?
A	"I tend to dominate and I want to rely more on the team. Be a bridge."
B	"My being overly directive and overly in charge."
C	"I wanted to stop being so busy that I don't allow others to relate to me. Lower barriers to communications; be less threatening."
D	"Stop thinking I know everything about my team."
E	"I wanted to stop speaking too quickly—wait until I heard what was being said before commenting and to be less technical in my speech."
F	"I want to stop asking so many questions."
G	"Stop being in such a hurry so that I might catch more of what's going on."
H	"The focus of the changes I wanted to make was more positive (not what I wanted to stop) and what I might do proactively."
I	"I wanted to stop escalating my expectations of myself and others and go for 'good enough.'"
J	"I want to stop thinking that anxiety means that I'm not cut out to lead."
K	"Last year I was passive aggressive, I didn't try very much and I did a mediocre job. I got mediocre results."
L	"Most definitely the self-defeating cycle. I compare myself to others. Feel bad about self when other's get awards. Not jealous, just feel inferior."

Responses are again predominantly positive and growth oriented, seeking to cease behaviors that would prevent growth as a leader. A sense of struggle and a somewhat self-critical tone is also present. The Horney concepts appear to have been able to help these participants elicit some personal candor and authenticity. This demonstrates self-reflection and a willingness to address aspects of their personal psychology that are not working for them. By disclosing their psychological and behavioral ticks these participants appear to be exhibiting an ability to apply this insight to themselves.

Questions 4b asked: Did you make the change you wanted seeking a "yes" or "no" response? There was less success for the stop behaviors than for the start behaviors as four of the 12 participants did not experience success at stopping the behavior they identified. One of the participants focused on positive, affirmative change only and did not attempt to stop any behaviors. For another participant, a nonnative speaker of English, the interviewer was unable to make sense of the response. The language barrier prevented the interviewer from getting a clear "yes" or "no" answer and was, therefore, unable to determine whether the change was successful.

Question 4c asked: If you made the change what was the result of the change? Did you find this result satisfactory? Why or why not? Table 9 presents a list of the responses to question 4c.

Table 9

Summary of All Answers to Interview Question 4c

Subject	Question 4c asked: If you made the change what was the result of the change? Did you find this result satisfactory? Why or why not?
A	"I don't remember."

(*table continues*)

Subject	Question 4c asked: If you made the change what was the result of the change? Did you find this result satisfactory? Why or why not?
B	Did not answer
C	"It's ongoing work for me."
D	"Yes, I was Col. Miller in the exercise. Big 'ah ha' I solved the problem immediately using military leadership principles I have been taught. I sat back and waited for the others to respond along the lines that military leadership training would dictate that they would use. In a multigenerational workforce it is easy to slip out of awareness that they have a different map of the world."
E	"It was a behavior change in me but I haven't noticed any behavior change in others. I will definitely keep on doing this."
F	Did not answer
G	"Some"
H	"Yes, but not completely. Need to grow more. You can formulate better opinions when you do that."
I	"I got more support (but not perfect). Eight or nine people really 'got it.' One guy insisted on clinging to his perfectionist ways."
J	"This has changed my understanding of my potential."
K	"My pay it forward attitude has become an inspiration to others and I believe I'm having an impact throughout my organization. I've had articles published in the Boeing publications and have participated in the making of a video. I am learning how to approach people as people."
L	"Yes. Very empowering. I have a habit of sitting on the edge of the bed at night reviewing all the things I did wrong. I STOPPED that. This has been a BIG help for me. I am sleeping better."

Responses are consistent with answers to 4b; there were less successes and less satisfaction with attempts to stop a negative behavior. Most people appear engaged in improvement and want to continue. Three did not answer. Participant G gave a slight and ambivalent response, but the rest seemed engaged and in some kind of continuous improvement process. There were more comments expressing how difficult this behavior change was and there was not as much success as with the positive change. There were comments that suggest the concepts helped to recognize the negative behavior that needs to be stopped, but actually stopping an existing behavior proved more difficult than starting a new behavior change.

These are mixed results; some did change and for those who did the experience was significant: "People really 'got it'"; "Very empowering"; "I will definitely keep doing this"; "My pay it forward attitude has become an inspiration to others"; and "This has changed my understanding of my potential" all suggest the concept used was useful in stopping negative behavior and achieving some self-validation.

Question 4d asked: If you did not make the change, what prevented you from making the change. There were only two comments for question 4d and these came from two of the four who did not make the behavior change. These two participants attributed their lack of success to their cultural work environments.

Question 5a asked: What was the behavior you wanted to CONTINUE doing? Table 10 presents the comments from all participants.

Table 10

Summary of All Answers to Interview Question 5a

Subject	Question 5a: What was the behavior you wanted to CONTINUE doing?
A	"I want to go along with others except in their area of expertise."
B	"Didn't identify any"
C	"I have a good grasp of the importance of ethics and diversity from the Boeing training. I have respect for differences and appreciate uniquenesses."
D	"I will continue to use four personal practices: reframe, better self, continue to learn from others, and use immediately."
E	"Active listening. Staying present. Staying committed to the conversation."
F	"Don't be a dumbass. I am always willing to grow, enhance, learn."
G	"Being straight with people. Being honest and direct. Give people real answers. I don't believe in being political."
H	"None. I just wanted to be more observant of myself and how I come across."
I	"I have always been the person who manages to appear calm on the surface even when, like a duck, I am paddling like hell below the surface. I think others benefit from my calm demeanor in crisis situations. I reduce the overall anxiety level by not alarming others."

(*table continues*)

Subject	Question 5a: What was the behavior you wanted to CONTINUE doing?
J	"Realizing and managing my basic anxiety"
K	"I want to continue building my trust in others and knowing my limitations. Also, I support my wife and other women in their growth in assertiveness."
L	"I work well with others. I like to help and I'm good at it. Stopping the self-defeating cycle is the biggest thing."

It appears that even though the intent of this behavior change was to focus on continuing a leadership behavior, some participants interpreted this differently and focused on continuing a Horney concept. This may be due in part to a problem in the construction of the questions. Despite this possibility, reactions to the attempt to continue a positive behavior are predominantly positive. These comments appear evenly focused on the self and others for each respondent and in four of the 12 comments there is evidence of participants adopting Horney's movement toward others.

Questions 5b asked: Did you continue the behavior you wanted seeking a "yes" or "no" response? Of the 12 responses, six of the participants did not answer the question; two experienced mixed results; and only four expressed success at continuing a positive behavior.

Question 5c asked: If you continued the behavior what was the result of the change? Did you find this result satisfactory? Why or why not? Table 11 presents the comments from all participants.

Table 11

Summary of All Answers to Interview Question 5c

Subject	Question 5c asked: If you continued the behavior what was the result of the change? Did you find this result satisfactory? Why or why not?
A	Did not answer
B	Did not answer
C	Did not answer

(*table continues*)

Subject	Question 5c asked: If you continued the behavior what was the result of the change? Did you find this result satisfactory? Why or why not?
D	Did not answer
E	"I have reinforced the habit of staying present."
F	Did not answer
G	"People think it's better even when the news is not good. However, people have to be trusted to take the information right."
H	Did not answer
I	"Yes, but mixed results. Old habits die hard."
J	"I'm more successful in keeping my basic anxiety from compounding the problem and I use it in a personal context too."
K	"Yes, I'm more in the moment. Not being the dummy."
L	"Yes. I continue to work well with others but I did have working well with others confused with being compliant."

These comments are mixed at best and reflect the answers to question 5b. For the four participants who were able to continue a positive behavior there is some proactive self-reflection occurring. However, eight respondents produced answers that were difficult to relate to the question asked or no answer at all. This makes it difficult to interpret the results to question 5c. The subjects, having answered two similarly worded questions previously might have been confused by the redundancy of the questions or perhaps even fatigued by them indicating a weakness in the data-collection design.

For question 5d: If you did not continue the behavior, what prevented you from continuing the behavior? there were no answers. This result suggests participants did not want to answer this question. The continue questions just did not generate the energy and enthusiasm that the others did. This may be a case of interview fatigue.

Questions 6–9 asked participants to rate what concept was most significant in their leadership growth for the two-week period using a 5-point scale ranging from insignificant on the low extreme to very significant on the high extreme. Questions 6 asked: How would you rate the significance of the concept of the basic anxiety to improving your leadership behaviors over the last two weeks? Question 7 asked: How

would you rate the significance of the concept of the self-defeating cycle to improving your leadership behaviors over the last two weeks? Question 8 asked: How would you rate the significance of the concept of the three movements of people to improving your leadership behaviors over the last two weeks? Question 9 asked: How would you rate the significance of the concept of the real and idealized self to improving your leadership behaviors over the last two weeks?

All participants had an opportunity to rate all four of the concepts using the five possible choices. In order to compute average scores I assigned a value to each rating ranging from 1 on the low extreme to 5 on the high extreme. The frequency of ratings used by participants was examined in order to gain a sense of the overall value of the concepts to participants. This data is summarized in Table 12.

Table 12

Summary of Concept Ratings and Frequency of Responses to Horney Concepts

Rating	Value	Basic Anxiety		Real and Idealized Self		Three Movements		Self-Defeating Cycle		$\sum F$
		f	Score	f	Score	f	Score	f	Score	
Insignificant	1	0	0	2	2	4	4	5	5	11
Somewhat Insignificant	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	0	0	3
Somewhat Significant	3	3	9	2	6	3	9	1	3	9
Significant	4	4	16	3	12	2	8	2	9	11
Very Significant	5	4	20	4	20	2	10	4	20	14
Average Score			3.92		3.50		2.75		3.00	

Two thirds of the 12 participants found the basic anxiety to be significant or highly significant in improving their leadership behavior. Half found the self-defeating cycle to be significant or very significant in improving their leadership behavior. However, five of the 12, or 41%, found the concept to have no significance at all.

More participants found the three movements of people to be somewhat

insignificant or insignificant than found the concept to be at least significant. Of the participants, 25% rated it only somewhat significant. In contrast, 9 of the 12 participants found the real and idealized self have some significance, and seven participants found the idea to be significant or very significant in improving their leadership behavior.

The three movements of people appears to be the least highly rated (average score = 2.75) and the self-defeating cycle received the highest frequency of insignificant ratings (average score = 3.00) yet it is the self-defeating cycle that was rated in the end of workshop survey as the most significant lesson in the workshop—second only to the basic anxiety. This may speak to the concept being easy to understand but difficult to apply.

The basic anxiety is the highest rated concept (average score = 3.92) with real and idealized self the next most significant (average score = 3.5). This is consistent with the end of workshop survey data on most significant lesson from the workshop. It appears the participants found these concepts easy to understand, recall and apply to leadership.

These data indicate that the basic anxiety, the real and idealized self and the self-defeating cycle have some significance to participants in their attempts to change their leadership behavior, that is, to grow as leaders. On the other hand, the three movements of people is rated just barely somewhat significant, but for four participants it was significant. It is interesting to note that it was not mentioned in the muddiest point or as a need for further clarification, again perhaps suggesting that a concept may be easily understood, but not practically applicable.

The rating used most frequently to describe the Horney concepts was "very significant" ($f = 14$ out of 48 responses, 29%). "Significant" ($f = 11$ out of 48 responses,

23%) and "insignificant" ($f = 11$ out of 48 responses, 23%) were the second most frequent ratings given. A majority of the respondents, 7 out of 12, used the two highest ratings most frequently across all concepts.

Questions 10 through 12 sought to explore what other changes might occur in the participant as a result of the introduction of the Horney concepts. Question 10 asked: How have the concepts you learned changed your perspective about your leadership development? Table 13 presents a list of these comments.

Table 13

Summary of Comments From Question 10

Subject	Question 10: How have the concepts you learned changed your perspective about your leadership development?
A	"I agree with what was taught at the workshop. It helps a lot. It gave me awareness. I can adjust my behavior based on that awareness."
B	"The concepts helped me more personally more than my group. More patience in me, helped with anxiety. Some of the stress is self inflicted. I did see a change in myself."
C	"The concepts improved my understanding of others. I know when others are stressed, isolating, afraid, etc. I can understand that they have other places they are coming from."
D	"Yes. I got what I wanted - better knowledge of Horney. I wanted a means for planning a career path. This helped me get in touch with my anxiety."
E	"Increased awareness"
F	"Yes. I took away some things that I could use—give other people a chance; not to jump out in front of others with answers. Coach others. Be less aggressive."
G	"Not very much. I already have a model of leadership I am working on. Nice to hear some areas I already subscribed to."
H	"I don't think it changed anything."
I	"I have been ambivalent about my own leadership development or "mixed." I see myself more as Spock rather than Kirk. However, recent events have forced me to lead more in the open rather than being the brains behind the scene. I am uncomfortable with the charismatic leader role. Thinking about Horney gives me another tool to understand myself and others."
J	"I am more in tune with the aspects of myself and others according to the three movements of people. I am better positioned to take that into account when making impactful decisions."

(*table continues*)

Subject	Question 10: How have the concepts you learned changed your perspective about your leadership development?
K	"I have a different understanding of anxiety. Horney helped me understand that there are unconscious triggers that may send you down the wrong path. A negative thought is an opportunity for anxiety to take over. The most significant reason that executives don't get ahead is because of bad behaviors."
L	"The workshop was very beneficial to me. Prior to Frank's class, I had a traditional view of leadership and I felt defeated—that I could never be a leader. Now, I see that leadership is all about relationships and I can do that. I can because it's about dealing with your own anxiety and the anxiety of others."

All but two participants reported positive changes in their perspective on leadership development. Most comments were about getting something they could use and were stated in an optimistic, future oriented manner. These comments mention usefulness for dealing with others almost as much as focusing on self-understanding and self-awareness. For the most part these comments reflect a growing awareness of anxiety.

Questions 11 specifically asked: What, if anything, are you able to do now that you could/would not do prior to the workshop? This question sought to determine whether any meaningful increase in leadership skill or ability occurred over the two-week period. Table 14 presents all participant responses.

Table 14

Summary of Comments From Question 11

Subject	Question 11: What, if anything, are you able to do now that you could/would not do prior to the workshop?
A	"None. Pretty much knew the material already from previous workshops but it was a good confirmation"
B	"More patience in me"
C	"Find the root causes of anxiety in others. Horney's perspective provided another way to think about where others are coming from."
D	"Recognize my own value. Identify my anxiety and move on. Don't act on just my own way of seeing things."

(*table continues*)

Subject	Question 11: What, if anything, are you able to do now that you could/would not do prior to the workshop?
E	"Along the lines of being confident of my actions. These concepts have become part of my tool set."
F	"None. Saw the solution to the Al Khobari exercise immediately. Solved in five minutes, told the others the answer. Had 25 minutes left to joke around and coach the shy person on how to present."
G	"Nothing. Not a bad course. I enjoyed it but it didn't change anything for me. I don't think that the self is the best unit of analysis. Trying to get away from focus on self."
H	"No effect"
I	"Nothing"
J	"Glad to know I'm not the only person who has and struggle with basic anxiety! Awareness of basic anxiety as a common phenomenon is helpful."
K	"I have upped my level of assertiveness and am telling things the way they really are. It's not how quickly you get the good news—It's how quickly you get the bad news so you can act on it. I tell others that it gets more ruthless as you go along. When you start to succeed, get recognition and go higher in your organization, people try to take you down."
L	"Now I am willing to take more risks and actually seek opportunities to take risks and be more assertive."

Some answers in question 10 mentioned acquiring skills relating to others, such as subject C's response, "The concepts improved my understanding of others. I know when others are stressed, isolating, afraid, etc. I can understand that they have other places they are coming from." However, in answering question 11 five of the 12 participants found no new abilities, even though in answering question 10 two of these five positively stated they took away some new tools. For example, subject I flatly answered "Nothing" to question 11, but answered question 10 "Thinking about Horney gives me another tool to understand myself and others." This may be a result of the nonlinear nature of the interview responses mentioned by the assistant researcher or interview fatigue.

Question 12 asked: Which concepts would you continue to use in your development as a leader? Why or why not? This is the question most directly related to usefulness because one would not be willing to continue using something that had no

perceived future utility. Table 15 presents all participant responses.

Table 15

Summary of Comments From Question 12

Subject	Question 12: Which concepts would you continue to use in your development as a leader? Why or why not?
A	"The three movements of people."
B	"None, due to the situation. An 'If it's not in the contract…' mentality. The least senior man I have reporting to me has been there and in the union for 25 years. It's in the culture now. These guys were trained by all the guys who went before."
C	"Three movements of people. Predict how others will react. More able to modify my own reactions to others."
D	"I will continue to use self-awareness and Horney's four basic concepts to gain control of my own responses: Redirect, reframe, and walk away."
E	"Anxiety—recognizing the three positions and having a baseline or barometer about self and others so I can modify."
F	"Be who I am. Be aware of others. Give others a chance."
G	"Don't believe in the three movements. Too negative of a view of people. Some merit to self-defeating cycle. I read Ekert Tolle whose fundamental philosophy is not about self. I am moving that way."
H	"Awareness of my own presence and how I come across to people. As a lead you must be careful of what you say and how you seem to others."
I	"The anxiety concept is something I'll continue to use to try to manage myself and possibly use to make better responses to the states of others. However, I don't like the word 'anxiety' because of its negative connotations. Nonetheless, I will try to 'make this my own.' Without anxiety some people would never respond or turn in work. Need to figure out appropriate ways to stress myself and others."
J	"Seeing that the concept of a downward spiral is a real, documented phenomenon. If I can recognize that in someone else, perhaps I can step in and assist or change my approach."
K	"The subconscious generates negatives which, if you are aware of them, you can generate a positive. Many people can't open themselves up to learning. Are trapped in their own understanding of the world and ways of being. Also, I now understand how anxiety can spawn a plethora of negative behaviors. I can use that awareness to stop a negative spiral."
L	"Will continue to use all of them but especially the self-defeating cycle. Will spend more time on my real self. I have self-awareness of my compliance that's not working for me. I think overall my level of stress has decreased. This has helped me a lot. I am sleeping better. When you sleep better you have more energy. Leadership is all about relationships; dealing with your own anxiety and the anxiety of others."

Only one out of the 12 participants found nothing to continue using because of the stifling union culture in which he works. One respondent found only some merit to the self-defeating cycle. This is based on his subscribing to the no-self philosophy of Eckhart Tolle. Of the remaining participants, usefulness appears to be expressed in terms of the self being the most frequently named beneficiary of the Horney concepts. There is still usefulness for dealing with others as well. One person in particular, participant L, appears to be in a fairly meaningful process of self-discovery. This person appears to have made a significant emotional shift from self-doubt to self-confidence to the point where the person is experiencing physiologically healthy improvements such as improved sleep and more energy.

Summary and Findings

The purpose of this research study is to test whether Horney's concepts of the basic anxiety, the three movements of people as a response to the basic anxiety, the real and idealized self and self-defeating cycle are useful to leadership learners. Horney's concepts would be judged useful if they could be seen as a frame or tool by leadership learners for helping them improve their leadership behavior. Based on the workshop evaluations, the workshop was successful and seen as useful by participants. Additionally, there are four important findings that emerged from the analysis of the data.

Finding 1: Participants reported no great difficulties in learning the Horney concepts. Data collected from the workshop evaluations (see Appendix B) confirmed: (a) participants identified in the Muddiest Point question as being unclear or requiring further clarification; and (b) when asked if there are any remaining unanswered questions, the tyranny of the should and the real self were mentioned only once. There was only one

follow-up question about the concepts at the beginning of the interviews; all other participants had a clear understanding and needed no further clarifying or refreshing.

Finding 2: Participants gave the basic anxiety, the idealized self, and the self-defeating cycle the highest ratings of significance in their behavioral change attempts. Two data support this finding: concept rating scores and frequency of ratings used. Based on the significance ratings participants gave each concept along with the frequency of ratings used, participants most frequently described the Horney concepts as "very significant" in helping these leaders attempt a change in their leadership behavior. These changes tended most often to be positive changes—changes involving the attempt to start a new behavior. The comments supported this finding also. Additionally, two thirds of the participants found the results of their change efforts satisfactory in improving their leadership capabilities. Of the four Horney concepts presented, the basic anxiety seems to have caught on the most with this group.

Finding 3: Not all Horney concepts are as easily translatable to leadership development usefulness. Participants may easily understand a concept, but that doesn't mean they can easily explain or apply it. Participants gave the self-defeating cycle received the highest number of "insignificant" ratings, yet there were three people who rated it "very significant," experienced satisfaction with their change efforts, and cited it in the open-ended questions. Not all of the concepts are valuable for everyone, but for those who resonate with a particular concept, that concept takes on significant meaning for them as evidenced by the following comments:

Seeing that the concept of a downward spiral is a real, documented phenomenon.

If I can recognize that in someone else, perhaps I can step in and assist or change

my approach.

[I] will continue to use all of them but especially the self-defeating cycle.

[I] will spend more time on my real self. I have self-awareness of my compliance

that's not working for me. I think overall my level of stress has decreased. This

has helped me a lot. I am sleeping better. When you sleep better you have more

energy. Leadership is all about relationships; dealing with your own anxiety and

the anxiety of others.

Finding 4: Participants gave the three movements of people the lowest rating

of significance in their behavioral change attempt. Participants rated the three

movements of people to be least significant in improving leadership behavior with an

average rating score of 2.75 out of 4. Only two participants mentioned the three

movements as a concept they would continue to use after the workshop, suggesting that

the other concepts might have greater future utility.

Finding 5: Participants demonstrated great difficulty responding to the data

collection methodology. There were difficulties with the data-collection design that

became apparent when the interviews were conducted. The workshop design gave

participants an introductory level of understanding of Horney's concepts. However, the

interview questions that were intended to determine how well these concepts resulted in

meaningful leadership behavior change produced only partially useful data. This is

attributable primarily to the complexity in the length and redundancy of the interview

questions. Hence, the data collected in the interview did not provide the expected level of insight into the postworkshop application of the concepts.

Finding 6: Participant comments support the idea that the basic anxiety, the three movements of people, the idealized self, and the self-defeating cycle can act as forces that prevent leadership growth. The Leadership Gap Survey conducted by the Center for Creative Leadership in 2009 and used in the workshop as a context setting aide provided data for participants on several key leadership gaps such as leading people and inspiring commitment. Participants accepted the validity of the Center for Creative Leadership gaps and compared them to their own leadership experiences. In the workshop we explored the causes of these gaps and what might be getting in the way of closing the gaps. Participants agreed that not only were there external obstacles contributing to these gaps; there might also be internal obstacles. The Horney concepts were then introduced and the leadership gaps were considered again using these new concepts as a frame. There was consensus among participants during the workshop that the Horney concepts offered a different understanding of the gaps. Participants agreed that if they could close their gaps, they could become better leaders. They also agreed that the Horney concepts could help them identify the internal forces that might be causing those gaps.

Conclusion

The following research questions narrowed and guided the focus of the inquiry:

1. Will professionals who are willing to develop their leadership capabilities find the theories of Horney useful in that pursuit?

2. How can these theories contribute to deeper self-awareness?

3. How can deeper self-awareness generated from these theories influence a leader's development?

This chapter analyzed the data collected from research participants and identified key findings resulting from the data. These findings have provided some answers to the research questions. Will professionals who are willing to develop their leadership capabilities find the theories of Horney useful in that pursuit? The transfer of knowledge and the resultant participant responses indicate a strong and profitable engagement with the material. As a result there were a lot of affirming statements about Horney and her concepts. A lot of value resulted for most people who attended the training; all the concepts were cited as useful in the interviews, but some were more valuable than others.

How can these theories contribute to deeper self awareness? Most participants wanted to be more authentic and effective in their interpersonal relationships. This demonstrated self-reflection and a willingness to learn and change. The Horney concepts appear to have contributed to this new level of self-awareness and an ability to apply this insight to themselves and not just others. By presenting the Horney concepts, using her language, participants were able to take the first steps toward identifying their own internal leadership gaps.

How can deeper self-awareness generated by these theories influence a leader's development? The comments represented an enthusiastic endorsement for the Horney concepts. As a result most participants appeared engaged in their behavioral improvement and wanted to continue using these concepts in their leadership development. The workshop format allowed participants to explore the concepts as forces that prevent

leadership growth, and to carry that learning back into their daily leadership lives. Some participants reported undergoing transformative processes as a result.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the usefulness of Horney's theories according to leadership learners who have been introduced to the theories in the form of a one-day workshop. The three findings identified in this chapter will become the central focus of the next chapter where I will draw conclusions and discuss the implications for this research.

Chapter Five: Discussion

In this chapter, I will discuss the conclusions that can be drawn from this study. I will also explore what the findings and the line of inquiry that they generate may imply for future research and practice.

It is appropriate to call out my assumptions about this research and these concepts and how my interpretations of these findings might be filtered. I assumed that normal healthy human beings strive for psychological safety, not just physical safety. This has been demonstrated in the literature and is most popularly represented in Maslow's hierarchy of needs. I also assumed that normal human growth is indeed a struggle, that no one proceeds along the developmental path uninterrupted and, like in nature, struggle is necessary to develop the internal and external strength for survival. Like Horney, I also assume people *want* to grow. I also assumed that if people are given the tools to overcome obstacles, they will, for the most part, use those tools. Perhaps my greatest assumption is that nobody is perfect and that everyone can use a little help now and then.

General Observations

The interview responses lead to several general observations about the data collected from this group of aspiring leaders: (a) the interview design appears to be flawed and led to confusing responses to the interview questions; (b) The Horney concepts are teachable; (c) all the concepts were cited as useful, but it is the recognition and application of the concept of anxiety that seems to resonate most meaningfully; and (d) the participants' use of the Horney concepts led to their increased self-awareness and they found this to be valuable.

After reading, categorizing, coding, analyzing and seeking to explain the comments from all the interview questions some additional themes emerge. An eagerness or appetite for the concepts emerged. Prior to ever being asked what concepts they would use again, participants made many comments in the interviews about wanting to use the concepts in the future. Participants talked about being better positioned for the future by having another tool to use, being able to adjust future behavior, feeling empowered. Three participants talked about using the concepts outside of the leadership context in their personal lives and finding success there. The Horney concepts also generated some curiosity in two participants who took active steps to learn more about Horney.

The participants struggled to stay engaged with the concepts. The nature of these concepts, coming from the world of depth psychology, required some potentially serious introspection. This was a risk recognized in pursuing this inquiry. I experienced this during the workshop trying to capture the participants' processing of the concepts into insights and generalizations. All the participants were thoroughly engaged in the discussions and the thoughts, comments, insights, and ideas emerged in a way that their words meandered, seeking connection to the Horney concepts or other's insights; many comments were started by one person and finished by another. Thoughts were fleeting and few of them could be expressed in full sentences. It was a struggle to take notes on the flip charts as was previously mentioned. The research assistant experienced this also when conducting the interviews and described it as participants responding nonlinearly to the questions. Their answers jumped unpredictably to other topics, some of which were to be asked in subsequent questions. Her sense was that the participants could have benefited from some more time spent with the concepts to gain more contextual

experience. It was clear that they required more mastery with the concepts than they were able to bring to bear; it was a struggle to answer and accurately capture those answers.

And yet…from the comments captured, one can see that participants were connecting the dots. For the most part, they used the Horney language in the correct context, especially as it related to the importance of self and others. Despite the obvious struggle, I observed across the length of this study the participants' growing comfort with the concepts and their desire to identify and understand their behavior and the behavior of others in ways that made sense.

Not everyone found the concepts useful. Only two participants found the concepts to be of little to no significance to their leadership development. They were not successful in any of their change attempts. The common factor for both participants is their cultural environment. One is a union shop environment governed by strict, inflexible contract rules and regulations and the other an environment described as isolated and unchanging. Both described the others they are dealing with as inflexible and unchanging. Their interview comments were not as insightful or as enthusiastic as other participants.

Conclusions

The findings from this study break some new ground in leadership development research. Much has been written about how to acquire and develop leadership skills. Authors such as George et al. (2007), Kouzes and Posner (2007), Maxwell (2007), and many others lay out multistep instructions for aspiring leaders to follow. While there is a plethora of instruction manuals on what to practice and learn to become a leader, there is not much written about the forces that prevent leadership growth and development—

hardly anything about how to identify and recognize these forces and even less about what to do when confronting them.

Roethlisberger (1963) suggested we need a way of thinking that will allow us to see our personality systems in the larger social system. Research has shown that personal characteristics are part of determining leadership capability (Higgs, 2003). What I hoped to do with this research was to further the knowledge and understanding of leadership by introducing a way of understanding the emotional drivers that help and hinder leadership development. Specifically, I hoped to share a sense making framework; a growth oriented, environmentally driven model for self-reflection and self-understanding that could expose the forces that prevent our growth as leaders. By doing so, aspiring leaders, in addition to being able to deal with the outside, tangible obstacles to their leadership development, could also identify the internal obstacles, the forces that operate out of their awareness that are not so obvious, that prevent our growth as leaders.

The intention of this study is to offer aspiring leaders a different framework through which to view their leadership growth and development. The heart of this framework is Horney's concepts. These concepts are a lens that will help individuals to know-recognize the forces that work against personal development: (a) the basic anxiety, (b) the real and idealized self, (c) the self-defeating cycle, and (d) the solutions we unconsciously choose to cope with these forces: the three movements of people. The following sections will describe the conclusions drawn from this study.

The four concepts of Horney, using her own language, appear to be teachable and understandable to aspiring business leaders. First, the research described here shows that the psychological concepts of the basic anxiety, the real and idealized self, the self-

defeating cycle, and the three movements of people are teachable to and learnable by aspiring leaders in business. The subjects were all professionals at various stages of their careers. There was a mixed demographic, although all subjects were members of the same professional management association within the same company. The concepts were presented in a workshop format that allowed participants to share reactions to, insights on, and observations about the concepts; discuss patterns and dynamics that emerged from these insights; generalize principles about how to apply these concepts in the real world; and make plans for doing so. Based on the comments obtained from the postworkshop interviews and the frequency of successful attempts to start new behavior changes back in their real leadership lives, it is likely that these concepts are not beyond the intellectual or emotional reach of a professional leadership population, even one in the highly technical aerospace engineering industry. However, the psychological depth of these concepts and the concomitant depth at which participants explored their feelings and motivations and, in some cases, their childhood, requires more time and effort than was allotted by the research design.

There was a design flaw in the data-collection methodology. In this respect, the research methodology was flawed. Specifically, the concept application activities that the participants were asked to undertake after the workshop and the subsequent interview protocol were both inadequate. The research design did not anticipate the complexity of the Horney concepts and the challenge for participants to apply these ideas to their on-the-job leadership challenges, and then to discuss and make sense of these experiences when talking to an interviewer.

The concept-application methodology called for the participant to attempt three types of change and this proved to be two attempts too many. It is likely that stopping negative or unwanted behaviors (e.g., smoking, over-eating, shyness, bossiness, impatience, etc.) takes more time than two weeks for a significant change to occur. Whereas, experimenting with new behaviors, positive behaviors, may appear much more promising after two weeks. Also, being asked about the attempt to continue a positive leadership behavior, only confused participants who had been told to change something in their two previously discussed attempts to apply the Horney concepts.

The interview questions that gave the respondents the most difficulty and that also produced the most confusing answers were based on this three-part behavioral change attempt, resulting in three similarly worded and multiple-part questions. This proved to be redundant and confusing for participants, rather than providing the intended framework for a thorough and complete discussion of their experience.

More fundamental to the question posed by this research is the need to emphasize the comprehensive nature of the Horney model as a theory of human development and behavior, and not a set of individual concepts. The data highlight the inherent and necessary complexity in the Horney material. Inadvertently, the research design requested isolated discussion of the particular concepts presented in the workshop. Separating these concepts for the purpose of discussion and data collection appeared to be difficult for the participants and insufficient for their personal meaning making. It appears that no matter how literate a person gets with this material, it is hard to speak in a focused, isolated way about any one idea as complete and separate from the others.

Horney's model, like most psychodynamic theory, loses its conceptual potency when reduced to component parts. The model also addresses aspects of experience that are challenging to discuss in simple, direct answers, which is what the interview questions elicited. In retrospect, more open-ended questions that would have allowed the participants to discuss their experience with postworkshop concept-application in a more organic and comprehensive way might have provided additional insight into the use and usefulness of Horney's model in a leadership context.

Leadership growth is a struggle. However, in spite of the flaws of the research methodology, the data demonstrate that struggle appears to be a natural part of the leadership growth process. This is also supported in the literature by Wilber (2000a), Kegan (1982), and Torbert (2004). Both the assistant researcher and I experienced this struggle firsthand during the conduct of the workshop and during the postworkshop interviews. During the workshop, participants struggled to find the right words to express their reactions to a concept; their words and thoughts bounced around the room, to and from one participant to another, seeking connection and meaning in an effort to crystallize an insight. Participants were deeply engaged with the material and the resulting discussion, but had difficulty articulating the generalizations they were trying to make and the principles they could apply to their leadership lives.

During the postworkshop interviews, subjects tended to give nonlinear responses to questions 3, 4, and 5 of the postworkshop, semistructured interview. Participants often responded by answering a question that had not yet been posed; they repeated or rephrased remarks made in response to other questions or spoke in broad streams of

consciousness related to the topic of the research but not necessarily to the point of the question.

Nonetheless, at the end of the workshop and in the subsequent interviews the subjects reported an internal experience of change and the ignition of growth in their personal evolution. They further conveyed that the change was of personal significance even if they didn't provide the specific language or anecdotal evidence to support such a claim. For example, participant L stated that the Horney concepts are, "Very empowering. I have a habit of sitting on the edge of the bed at night reviewing all the things I did wrong. I stopped that. This has been a big help for me. I am sleeping better."

From this the assistant researcher inferred that while the participants' lessons from the workshop appeared to have indeed invoked change in the subjects' understanding of their individual leadership situations, more background in or experience with the concepts would be needed to make the lasting changes that some desired. Our experience with the subjects and their experience with their own evolution support the nonlinear nature of leadership growth researched by Torbert (2004), who describes the learning process associated with leadership growth as "not a mechanistic, automated feedback process producing continuous change, but is instead a bumpy, discontinuous, sometimes upending, and transformational kind of learning" (p. 91).

The subjects' inconsistent and unfocused interview responses suggested that mastery of the Horney material requires more experience with the ideas than the subjects were able to acquire in the two weeks following the workshop or possibly requires more exposure and explanation than the workshop design provided. While the Horney concepts do appear teachable and learnable—and clearly a more adequate methodology is called

for—research into the question must take into consideration the personal struggle that may occur when a person begins to internalize and to act upon Horney's deep psychological ideas. This struggle, which was experienced by both subjects and researchers, could likely indicate that the subjects were indeed working seriously with the material that was presented to them in the workshop, but that the understanding and application were perhaps still emerging and tacit and not easily explained to another person. Perhaps a more phenomenological approach to interviewing might have helped clarify the experience of the struggle.

The Horney (1950) concepts are useful to aspiring leaders trying to improve their leadership abilities. A majority of subjects found the Horney concepts significant to their leadership development over the two-week period and were satisfied with the results they produced. Despite the struggle, or maybe even because of it, the subjects all wanted to do something that would make them a better leader. They all attempted to make sense of the concepts and how they might apply them to leadership. They all attempted to make sense of themselves and experimented with how this new self-awareness could make them better leaders. As a result, many recognized they needed to make a change and took the first steps toward that change. Participant D stated, "I want to work on being a leader on purpose rather than being the reluctant leader. I can't let anxiety get the best of me," and participant J reported, "I wanted to understand and gain better approaches to other people. I have been reluctant to give feedback. Also, I want to lower my self-abasement."

A majority affirmatively stated they would continue to use these concepts in their leadership lives. For example, participant I stated, "The anxiety concept is something I'll

continue to use to try to manage myself and possibly use to make better responses to the states of others," and participant L said:

> I will continue to use all of them but especially the self-defeating cycle. I will spend more time on my real self. I have self-awareness of my compliance that's not working for me. I think overall my level of stress has decreased. This has helped me a lot. I am sleeping better.

It was never the intent of this study to define useful as it applied to the participants in their personal application of Horney's ideas. However, since 10 of 12 participants reported that they were willing to continue using these concepts, this suggests the ideas have utility for their future leadership lives. This parallels my personal experience and supports my hypothesis that professionals who are willing to develop their leadership capabilities find the theories of Horney useful in that pursuit and answers the research question of this study.

There are internal forces that work against growth and once identified, leaders are willing to explore what those forces might be and what they might be able to do to lessen their impact. I believe this is the case because Horney's concepts offer a means for identifying and understanding the forces that prevent leadership growth. Whereas many current practitioners and theorists focus on the stages of leadership growth and the process of movement between those stages, there isn't much out there about the obstacles that interrupt, or sometimes halt growth. If we agree with Roethlisberger (1963) that seeing our personality system in the larger social system can improve the way we work with each other, then Horney offers us a way of exposing that internal system—the emotional drivers that help and hinder our development as people and as leaders. Thanks

to the work of Senge (2006), people recognize that when they need to change they need to change their mental models. But how does one change a mental model? One begins by exposing the mental model and having done so, explores the values and assumptions that support that model.

Because of the work Horney (1950) accomplished more than 50 years ago, we have a language that makes it easier to expose our mental models about leadership growth and development as demonstrated by this study. By applying Horney's ideas we can now understand the cultural and environmental forces that contribute to the basic anxiety. From this we can identify and understand our responses to that anxiety: The three movements of people as well as the needs forming the basis of the three movements and this in turn helps leaders understand the anxiety reducing strategies they are applying and why.

Once participants understood that there are internal forces that work against growth, they were eager to explore what those forces might be and what they might be able to do to lessen their impact. When I aggregated postworkshop interview comments that spoke to a specific Horney concept the meaning they struggled to make became more apparent. For example, comments about the basic anxiety imply that understanding and accepting one's anxiety allows one to do something positive about it that can ultimately benefit self and others. Participant H commented, "Frank's workshop made me aware of the anxiety in myself and the need to manage it" and participant J stated, "I'm more successful in keeping my basic anxiety from compounding the problem." Participant K said:

I have a different understanding of anxiety. Horney helped me understand that there are unconscious triggers that may send you down the wrong path. A negative thought is an opportunity for anxiety to take over. The most significant reason that executives don't get ahead is because of bad behaviors.

These comments also suggest a prescription for all leaders: Leadership development requires better self-understanding, and better self-understanding requires acquainting oneself with one's basic anxiety and the choices one makes for coping with it. Two thirds of the subjects found the concept of the basic anxiety to be highly significant in improving their leadership behavior over the two-week period. For this group, as well as for others who used the concept of the self-defeating cycle with great success in their behavior change attempts, this new understanding of themselves and others lead to beneficial leadership behaviors that produced beneficial results. For example, Participant L indicated:

> The workshop was very beneficial to me. Prior to Frank's class, I had a traditional view of leadership and I felt defeated—that I could never be a leader. Now, I see that leadership is all about relationships and I can do that. I can because it's about dealing with your own anxiety and the anxiety of others.

The experience of these subjects also speaks to the research question in that it demonstrates that professionals who are willing to develop their leadership capabilities not only find the theories of Horney useful in that pursuit, but they also produce tangible, beneficial results.

The conclusions drawn from this study cannot be generalized beyond this small study sample. The results and conclusions drawn suggest that the Horney concepts are

indeed useful for this particular group of aspiring leaders who were trying to develop and improve their leadership capabilities. The concepts are complex; however, participants nearly unanimously strongly agreed with statement 9 of the end of workshop evaluation: I felt comfortable about expressing myself candidly during the workshop. This suggests they did not feel intimidated by the complexity of the concepts and in spite of their struggle, felt comfortable being open and honest. Despite the risk that many people feel about the possibility of being analyzed or opening up psychological wounds, these subjects felt comfortable in an environment, and with a subject, that required them to potentially make themselves vulnerable.

In summary, this study has demonstrated that the psychological concepts of Horney show potential as a new frame for leaders-managers to view and understand leadership development. It has also shown that the concepts, when used by aspiring leaders, are useful in improving leadership skills. The study provides additional data in support of understanding leadership as a growth process. The study also supports the literature about the importance of leader self-awareness. It has brought to light the intricacies of transferring complex psychological theory to a leadership frame in a workplace setting and that this may be a limitation in teaching and using Horney. In the following section, I will explore what these conclusions might imply for further research and practice in the field of leadership development.

Implications of this Research

If we accept the proposition that understanding the forces that prevent growth is at least as important as understanding the forces that enable growth and that this understanding contributes to leadership growth and development, then we can ask the

question: What might be the implications for organizations and individuals wishing to improve their leadership skills and abilities? What do the results say about future research?

Future Research

One implication is that leadership development can be improved by helping leaders identify their internal subconscious barriers and do it in a way and with a language that is intuitive and accessible. Leaders might then be more willing to do the deeper level work that Anderson (personal communication, April 22, 2009) and others find so lacking in most leadership development efforts. However, the results of this study have demonstrated how difficult this deeper level work can be. Future research may, therefore, consider examining the conditions that must be present in order to create the appropriate learning environment for effective engagement with the Horney concepts.

I used the HCTI during the workshop as a tool for introducing and facilitating engagement with the Horney concepts. This inventory allowed participants to assess the three movements of people in their own behavior: their levels of compliance to, aggressiveness against, or detachment from others. This was done so that participants could make connections between their leadership behaviors and their HCTI scores and then generalize about their roles and experiences as leaders. As mentioned previously, these subjects eventually used the three movements of people as a frame for not only understanding themselves, but for understanding the behavior of others. Such a potentially useful frame deserves further research among larger and more diverse samples of subjects. By assessing leader's unconscious anxiety-coping mechanism, we can expose their mental models using a language that is not threatening or intimidating and that

allows them to explore their personality systems in the larger social system of work. This kind of self-assessment goes beyond what the MBTI or the other Jungian-based personality assessment instruments do. Instead of just exposing personality preferences, the Horney frame exposes the mental model that unconsciously drives those preferences; it allows us to not just accept personality traits as static preferences. It allows us instead to understand the deeper emotional drivers that hinder our development as human beings and as leaders. Because of this, the suitability of the HCTI for use in a leadership context should be further investigated. While acceptable construct validity has been established for use with college students, further validation of the HCTI in a leadership context is needed to determine its long-term usefulness with a variety of leaders from a variety of professions.

It appears from this study that an understanding of the forces that prevent growth allows one to discover and explore those forces within oneself. This allows one to better understand the nature of those forces within oneself, which in turn allows one to connect leadership success or failure to these forces and then take actions that improve leadership growth. It remains to be discovered if this level of awareness actually translates into measurable leadership success on a larger scale. Correlating leadership growth with the forces the prevent growth would further our understanding of leadership behavior and how to better develop leaders. Research could be done that tests leaders exposed to the Horney concepts against leaders that are not and then measuring their effectiveness in common leadership situations and/or using before and after leadership self-assessments and leadership follower assessments.

As stated earlier, the results of this study clearly demonstrate the difficulties of transferring complex psychological theory to a leadership frame in a workplace setting and this requires a more carefully designed data generation and collection methodology so that the understanding and application of these ideas might be understood at a deeper level. Something longer than a 5-hour workshop is probably more appropriate, and longer than two weeks to practice the concepts in the real world is needed also—not so much to reduce the struggle, for struggle is necessary for growth, but to give subjects more experience dealing with the struggle so that they can have a stronger contextual foundation. Offering telephone coaching support during this practice period might also be useful to allow participants and opportunity to gain clarification on the concepts as they experience them in real-life situations.

The interview protocol should be simplified and tested ahead of its application. Giving participants multiple change opportunities (start, stop, and continue) created an unnecessarily complicated change challenge for which they were clearly not prepared. Interview questions should be carefully crafted so that questions are not too similar in content and focus. Future studies of these concepts should also test the workshop design in order to ensure the experiential activities cover the most relevant and current leadership challenges.

Expansion of the study to include a larger, more diverse population of leaders would most likely add to our knowledge of leadership development. The results suggest that additional investigation that tests the application to leadership practice of these concepts may add to our knowledge of leadership, behavior, and the impact these negative forces have on behavior in organizations.

Practice

This study demonstrates that organizations could introduce the Horney concepts through a similar workshop. An assumption present in the research is that in order to develop leaders it is not enough to talk about leadership and how we show up as leaders and how our personality preferences affect our leadership behavior. We have to experience how our choices for coping with anxiety affect our leadership behavior. The workshop offers a learning laboratory, a safe environment where leaders can explore, experiment, succeed, and maybe even struggle, but from all of this they will learn: They can share, reflect, generalize, and apply these concepts back in their real life as leaders. Insights from these experiences are examined using the lens of Horney's concepts. Leaders can apply their understanding of their anxiety resolution choices, or their possible place in the self-defeating cycle in this learning laboratory where new self-awareness can begin the journey to greater growth. The interview responses of the participants in this study indicate that workshop attendance led to increased self-awareness and attempts at developing new leadership behaviors. Coaches, trainers, and consultants can consider incorporating these methods in their organizational work.

The literature and recent research cited in the literature review suggests that leadership is not a static phenomenon. Thought of as a process of change, leadership is seen as a growth process; one does not just *become* a leader by traits, or by skills, or even by divine intervention; one grows into leadership. Looking across all the leadership literature from trait theory and two-factor theory to team leadership and collaborative leadership theory—from Drucker and Bennis to Collins, Torbert, and Joiner and Josephs—all of these theories and thinkers all have one thing in common: They all focus

on relationships. Human relationships are at the core of every leadership theory and indeed all human culture and leaders must concern themselves with this deeper dimension of leadership.

Leadership as a developmental process is a journey of growth and is often a struggle with the negative forces preventing growth. Horney wrote eloquently about this struggle and she spent her life finding ways to help people cope with the struggle and find their better self so that they could become fully realized human beings.

From this, organizations can begin seeing leadership differently: If it is a process and it is about growth, do we grow into leadership? If we grow, is growth a struggle? If growth is a struggle, what are the forces that prevent growth? If we can find a language that helps us understand these forces in a natural, unthreatening way, are we then better equipped to do something about them? If we can do something about them, will that make us better leaders? This study suggests that Horney's theories might be an answer.

Final Thoughts on Horney and Leadership

Focusing on her contributions toward the overall benefit of the human condition, the literature primarily emphasizes Horney's clinical priority—human growth and development. Rowley (2007) uses concepts of the idealized self to identify confidence traps of which leaders must be wary. Bob Anderson uses the three movements of people to help leaders identify their reactive tendencies that get in the way of their creative tendencies, and Holden (2006) characterizes them as inner assumptions that hold leaders back: Excessive Control, Excessive Aloofness and Excessive Approval Seeking. In his framework of character psychology, Renshon (2004) includes three elements that "are central to everyone's internal psychology: ambition, [sic] character integrity (fidelity to

ideals and values) and relatedness" (p. 60). His conception of relatedness is based on Horney's three movements of people: toward, away, or against others.

It is difficult to back up the claim that Horney's theories may have contributed to the stage development work of current human development theorists. Being a woman in a field dominated by men and defying accepted Freudian orthodoxy at a time when the idea of a thinking woman was dismissed, it is no stretch to imagine that so many others might have been inspired by her genius and not given her any credit for the inspiration. Paris (1999b) believes that her ideas were too far ahead of their time to be taken seriously by the Freudian establishment and that it has only been recently that they are getting the serious recognition they have long deserved.

More than 50 years later, it appears the rest of the world is catching up with Horney. Smith (2007) stated, "Karen Horney was in many ways a woman ahead of her time. Her optimistic view of the plasticity of development and the unending human potential for growth is supported by recent and current brain and infant research" (p. 66). Benton (1994) expresses a sincere appreciation for what Horney must have gone through and a deeper respect for the currency of her thought today:

> Although her work clearly deviated from Freud…Horney was not considered an influential force in the Freudian orthodoxy of analytic knowledge. In the current academic climate, Horney's ideas seem incredibly lucid and sensible. Science and time have proven her logic correct on many points and, though often unacknowledged, many of her ideas have become part of the general knowledge of today's practitioner. (p. 42)

The work of Horney has shown how we make things more difficult for ourselves;

how we waste energy chasing impossible shoulds, rationalizing lies instead of promoting awareness. We never stop growing, we never stop wanting to grow! We've seen how we confuse safety with perfection: You can be in a safe environment that is not perfect. You can also be in a perfect environment that is not safe at all.

We've seen that leadership is a process; a process of growth or as Bennis (2003) calls it, becoming a leader. The word become is an intransitive verb that means an object is not required to carry out the action. The word lead is a transitive verb that means you need an object to carry out the action. One needs others to lead; one only needs oneself to become. We become—we evolve—from moment to moment, from hour to hour, and from day to day. For leaders, the act of becoming occurs in the midst of the experience of leading. One needs more of one's real self—that which gives one that sense of freedom (Horney's definition)—to become a leader more than one needs objective others. You need objective others (followers) to lead, to know how you are leading, but not to become a leader.

Leadership Coach Holden (2006) said, "As human beings we long to know our self and to be known" (p. 24), but we also fear this knowledge and this vulnerability. Horney's goal was called wholeheartedness—to be without pretense and to be emotionally secure. I think nowadays we call this authentic. How important is this kind of self-awareness to leadership? Consider this: Employee engagement gets a lot of leadership attention. It has two dimensions: intellectual engagement and emotional engagement. I think it is more about safety: creating psychological safety in the workplace. Leaders are beginning to understand how important this is: It's not just physical safety any more. Can you imagine how difficult it is to create this safety if the

leader does not see the world as a safe place? This is impossible to do if you are in the grip of the idealized self because all you see is threats, and you don't have the energy to cope with them. Here's the irony: It is this psychological safety that the leader in the grip of the idealized self needs the most, yet she is incapable of giving it to anyone, including her.

My purpose in completing this study of the applicability of Horney's theories to leadership development was more than just about completing the requirements for a doctoral degree. Thanks to her brilliance I have been able to find a way of understanding my own personal struggle and I have experienced both ups and downs—growth, for me any way, is indeed a struggle. But growth is also a journey, not a destination. Having Horney along on my journey has been inspirational and life affirming. My hope for this study is that I've given readers some insight into some new levels of inquiry as well as actions to change their behavior and that whatever negative forces anyone may be dealing with, especially in the crucible of leadership, they too might find a companion in Horney.

REFERENCES

Allio, R. J. (2005). Leadership development: Teaching versus learning. *Management Decision, 43*(7/8), 1071–1077.

Anxiety. (2010). In *APA glossary of psychological terms.* Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/research/action/glossary.aspx

American Psychiatric Association. (1994). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.

Andrews, J. P., & Fields, R. H. G. (1998). Regrounding the concept of leadership. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal, 19*(3), 9.

Argyris, C. (1977). Double loop learning in organizations. *Harvard Business Review, 55*(5), 115–125.

Argyris, C. (1991). Teaching smart people how to learn. *Harvard Business Review, 4*(2), 99–109.

Argyris, C., & Schon, D. A. (1974). *Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. (1978). *Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective* (1st ed.). Reading, MA: Adison-Wesley.

Barker, R. A. (2001). The nature of leadership. *Human Relations, 54*(4), 26.

Barrett, A. (1999, June 7). How to keep rising stars from straying. *Business Week,* p. 80.

Bass, B. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory research and managerial applications* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.

Baumeister, R. F. (1999). The nature and structure of the self: An overview. In R. F. Baumeister (Ed.), *The Self in Social Psychology* (pp. 1–20). Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.

Benay, P. (1997). *Social-cognitive development and transformational leadership: A case study.* (Unpublished dissertation). University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Amherst, MA.

Bennis, W. (2003). *On becoming a leader*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge* (1st ed.). New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Bennet, A. & Bennet, D. (2004). *Organizational survival in the new world.* Amsterdam: Elsivier Butterworh Heinemann.

Benton, R. L. (1994). *The prophetic voice of Karen Horney in the evolution of psychoanalytic female developmental theory - from Freud to contemporary revisionists.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. 9512000)

Boyatzis, R. E., & Akrivou, K. (2006). The ideal self as the driver of intentional change. *Journal of Management Development, 25*(7), 19.

Brown, A. D. (1997). Narcissism, identity and legitimacy. *Academy of Management Review, 22*(3), 44.

Brown, A. D., & Starkey, K. (2000). Organizational identity and learning: A psychodynamic perspective. *The Academy of Management Review, 25*(1), 102.

Bruhn, J. G. (1991). Control, narcissism, and management style. *The Health Care Supervisor, 9*(4), 10.

Bryman, A., & Bell, E. (2003). *Business research methods*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Cacioppe, R., & Edwards, M. (2005). Seeking the Holy Grail of organisational development. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal, 26*(2), 86–105.

Carr, A. (2000). Critical theory and the psychodynamics of change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 13*(3), 289–299.

Carser, D. L. (1988). *The effect of healthy narcissism on leadership style and staff satisfaction*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. 8922240)

Cassel, R. N. (2001). Comparing the dynamics of second and third force psychology. *Education, 122*(1), 131.

Center for Creative Leadership. (2009). *The leadership gap.* Retrieved from http://www.centerforcreativeleadeship.com/leadership/pdf/research/leadershipGap.pdf

Chatterjee, A., & Hambrick, D. C. (2007). It's all about me: Narcissistic chief executive officers and their effects on company strategy and performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 52*(3), 37.

Coghlan, D., & Brannick, T., (2005). *Doing action research in your organization*. London, England: Sage.

Collyer, J. (1996). *Independent and inclusive leadership experiences in relation to critical consciousness and social structure*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. 9729093)

Coolidge, F. L., Moore, C. J., Yamazaki, T. G., Stewart, S. E., & Segal, D. L. (2001). On the relationship between Karen Horney's tripartite neurotic type theory and personality disorder features. *Personality & Individual Differences, 30*, 1387–1400.

Coolidge, F. L., Segal, D. L., Benight, C. C., & Danielian, J. (2004). The predictive power of Horney's psychoanalytic approach: An empirical study. *American Journal of Psychoanalysis, 64*(4), 12.

Coolidge, F. L. P. (2004). *Horney-Coolidge tridimensional inventory: Manual.* University of Colorado at Colorado Springs, CO: Coolidge.

Cooper, D. R., & Emory, C. W. (1995). *Business research methods*. Chicago, IL: Irwin.

Crandall, D. (2007). Introduction. In M. D. Crandall (Ed.), *Leadership lessons from West Point* (1st ed., p. 397). San Francisco, CA: Josey Bass.

Cresti, A. (2003). Book review: Analisi di Gruppo. La prospettiva interpersonale di Karen Horney [The interpersonal perspective of Karen Horney]. *American Journal of Psychoanalysis, 63*(2), 3.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Developmental Psychology. (2010). In *APA glossary of psychological terms.* Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/research/action/glossary.aspx

Diamante, T., & London, M. (2002). Expansive leadership in the age of digital technology. *Journal of Management Development, 21*(6), 404–416.

Edwards, M. G. (2005). The integral holon: A holonomic approach to organisational change and transformation. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 18*(3), 269.

Elmuti, D., Minnis, W., & Abebe, M. (2005). Does education have a role in developing leadership skills? *Management Decision, 43*(7/8), 1018–1031.

Evelyn, J. (2001). Community colleges face a crisis of leadership. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 47*(30), A36.

Fairholm, G. W. (1998). Leadership as an exercise in virtual reality. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal, 19*(4), 7.

George, B., Sims, P., McLean, A. N., & Mayer, D. (2007). Discovering your authentic leadership. *Harvard Business Review, 85*(2), 129-138.

Gilbert, D. (2005). *Stumbling on happiness*. New York, NY: Random House.

Goffee, R., & Jones, G. (2005). Managing authenticity: The paradox of great leadership. *Harvard Business Review, 19*(3), 10.

Goleman, D. (2000). Leadership that gets results. *Harvard Business Review, 78*(2), 13.

Goleman, D. (2004). What makes a leader? *Harvard Business Review, 82*(1), 11.

Goleman, D. (2005). *Emotional intelligence* (10th ed.). New York, NY: Bantam Books.

Hamilton, M. (2006). Integral metamap creates common language for urban change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 19*(3), 276–306.

Hansen, J. T. (2009). Self-awareness revisited: Reconsidering a core value of the counseling profession. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 87*(2), 186–193.

Hay, A., & Hodgkinson, M. (2006). Rethinking leadership: A way forward for teaching leadership? *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 27*(2), 144–158.

Hernez-Broome, G., & Hughes, R. L. (n.d.). *Leadership development: Past, present, & future*. Retrieved from http://www.ccl.org/leadership/pdf/research/cclLeadership Development.pdf

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1993). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources* (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Higgs, M. (2003). How can we make sense of leadership in the 21st century? *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal, 24*(5), 273–284.

Holden, D. (2006). The forgotten self: Executive development for the 21st century. *Industrial Management, 48*(5), 19.

Horney, K. (1937). *The neurotic personality of our time*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Co.

Horney, K. (1939). *New ways in psychoanalysis*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Co.

Horney, K. (1945). *Our inner conflicts*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Co.

Horney, K. (1950). *Neurosis and human growth: The struggle toward self-realization* (1st ed.). New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Co.

Horney, K. (1967). *Feminine psychology*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Co.

Ingalls, J. D. (2000). Genuine and counterfeit leadership: The root causes and cures of human capital flight. *Strategy and Leadership, 28*(6), 16–22.

Ingram, D. H., & Lerner, J. A. (1992). Horney theory: An object relations theory. *The American Journal of Psychoanalysis, 52*(1), 37–44.

Joiner, B., & Josephs, S. (2007). *Leadership agility: Five levels of mastery for anticipating and initiating change*. San Francisco, CA: Josey Bass.

Jones, R., Lasky, B., Russell-Gale, H., & LeFevere, M. (2004). Leadership and the development of dominant and countercultures: A narcissistic perspective. *The Leadership & Organizational Development Journal, 25*(2), 216–233.

Jun, J. S. (2005). The self in the social construction of organizational reality: Eastern and Western views. *Administrative Theory and Praxis, 27*(1), 25.

Kaplan-Leiserson, E. (2005). Leader loss. *T + D, 59*(9), 14.

Kegan, R. (1982). *The evolving self: Problem and process in human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kegan, R. (1994). *In over our heads: The mental demands of modern life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kegan, R. & Lahey, L. (2009). *Immunity to change.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Kerr, R., Garvin, J., Heaton, N., & Boyle, E. (2006). Emotional intelligence and leadership effectiveness. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 27*(4), 265–279.

Kets de Vries, M. F. R. (2005). The dangers of feeling like a fake. *Harvard Business Review*, *83*(9), 108–116.

Kets de Vries, M. F. R., & Miller, D. (1986). Personality, culture, and organization. *Academy of Management Review, 11*(2), 266–279.

Khaleelee, O., & Woolf, R. (1996). Personality, life experience and leadership capability. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal, 17*(6), 5–11.

King, J. L. (2003). *Perfectionism in leadership: Exploring the link between leader self-esteem, leader self-efficacy, leader narcissism and perfectionism*. (Doctoral dissertation, Regent University). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses

database. (UMI No. 3139034)

Klein, K. J., & Ziegert, J. C. (2004). Leader development & change over time: A conceptual integration & exploration of research challenges. In D. V. Day, S. J. Zacarro, & S. M. Halpin (Eds.), *Leader development for transforming organizations* (pp. 359–382). Mahwah, NJ: Lawernce Earlbaum Associates.

Knowles, M. (1988). The ten most important lessons I've learned about adult education. *What works at work: Lessons from the masters.* Minneapolis, MN: Lakewood.

Koestenbaum, P. (1991). *Leadership: The inner side of greatness: A philosophy for leaders*. San Francisco, CA: Josey Bass.

Kotter, J. P. (1990). What leaders really do. *Harvard Business Review*, *68*(3), 103.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. S. (2007). *The leadership challenge* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Josey Bass.

Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Labarre, P. (2000, March). Do you have the will to lead? *Fast Company,* 222–230.

Laird, D. (1985). *Approaches to training and development.* Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.

Landrum, N. E., & Gardner, C. L. (2005). Using integral theory to effect strategic change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 18*(3), 247.

Leichter, D. J. (2002). *The epidemic of corporate narcissism in a capitalistic society.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. 3132357)

Liddell, L. S. (2005). *Leadership development: Expanding the framework: "Founding the holy."* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. NR08679)

Maccoby, M. (2004). Narcissistic leaders: The incredible pros, the inevitable cons. *Harvard Business Review, 82*(1), 11.

Mage, G. (2004). *Self-awareness is no leadership cure-all.* Retrieved from http://www.accessmylibrary.com/article-1G1-126156357/self-awareness-no-leadership.html

Marshall, c., & Rossman, G. B. (2006). *Designing qualitative research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Maxwell, J. C., (2007). *The 21 irrefutable laws of leadership*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.

Michael, J. (2003). Using the Myers-Briggs type indicator as a tool for leadership development? Apply with caution. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 10*(1), 68.

Miller, J. D. & Campbell, W. K. (2008). Comparing clinical and social-personality conceptualizations of narcissism. *Journal of Personality, 76*(3), 25.

Mintzberg, H. (2004). Enough leadership. *Harvard Business Review, 82*(11), 22.

Moshavi, D., Brown, F. W., & Dodd, N. G. (2003). Leader self-awareness and its relationship to subordinate attitudes and performance. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal, 24*(7), 12.

Neurosis. (2010). In *Merriam-Webster online dictionary.* Retrieved from http://www.merriam-webster.com/

Northouse, P. (2004). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Novicevic, M. M., Buckley, M. R., Brown, J. A., & Evans, R. (2006). Authentic leadership: A historical perspective. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 13*(1), 13.

Object relations. (2010). In *APA glossary of psychological terms.* Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/research/action/glossary.aspx

Paris, B. J. (1998). Horney and humanistic psychoanalysis. In R. Frager & J. Fadiman (Eds.), *Personality and personal growth* (4th ed., p. 564). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Paris, B. J. (1999a). Karen Horney's vision of the self. *American Journal of Psychoanalysis, 59*(2), 10.

Paris, B. J. (1999b). *Why Horney?* Retrieved from http://plaza.ufl.edu/bjparis/

Pauchant, T. C. (2005). Integral Leadership: A research proposal. *Journal of Organization Change Management, 18*(3), 19.

Pfeiffer, J. W. (1975). *Reference guide to handbooks and annuals*. La Jolla, CA: University Associates.

Pfeiffer, J. W., Heslin, R., & Jones, J. E. (1976). *Instrumentation in human relations training*. La Jolla, CA: University Associates.

Pfeiffer, J. W. (1980). *Structured experience kit.* La Jolla, CA: University Associates.

Poll: A leadership deficit. (2005, October 31). *U.S. News & World Report, 139,* 80.

Porter, M. (1980). *Competitive strategy: Techniques for analyzing industries and competitors*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Powell, C. A. (1991). *Missed connections: A Horneyan analysis of Anne Tyler's characters.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. 1343952)

Psychoanalytic. (2010). In *APA glossary of psychological terms.* Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/research/action/glossary.aspx

Quinn, R. E. (2000). *Change the world: How ordinary people can accomplish extraordinary results*. San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass.

Rapier, M. L. (2005). *An interview study of narcissistic executives: Piercing the corporate veil of narcissism in the workplace.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. 3212939)

Ready, D. A., & Conger, J. A. (2003). Why leadership development efforts fail. *MIT Sloan Management Review, 44*(3), 83–88.

Renshon, S. A. (2004). *Psychoanalyzing presidents without a couch: Lessons from the William J. Clinton and George W. Bush presidencies* (p. 18), Center for Public Leadership. Cambridge, MA.

Ring, S. (2006). *Developing the business case for executive coaching at SaskPower.* (Masters Thesis) Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. MR17560)

Roethlisberger, F. J. (1963). The territory and skill of the administrator. *Management of Personnel Quarterly, 2*(2), 3.

Rosen, R. H. (2008). *Just enough anxiety*. New York, NY: Penguin.

Rowan, J. (2006) The humanistic approach to action research. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of action research* (pp. 106-330). London, England: Sage.

Rowley, A. (2007). *Leadership therapy: Inside the mind of Microsoft*. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

Sanders, R. P. (1997). The future isn't what it used to be. *Public Manager, 26*(1), 23.

Scharmer, C. O. (2007). *Theory U: Leading from the future as it emerges: The social technology of presencing*. Cambridge, MA: Society for Organizational Learning.

Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass.

Schein, E. H. (1996). Culture: The missing concept in organization studies. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 41*(2), 12.

Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Schwartz, H. S. (1990). *Narcissistic process and corporate decay: The theory of the organizational ideal* (1st ed.). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Segal, M. (1997). *Points of influence: A guide to using personality theory at work* (1st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass.

Senge, P. (2006). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York, NY: Doubleday.

Senge, P., Scharmer, C. O., Jaworski, J., Flowers, B. S. (2004). *Presence: Exploring profound change in people, organizations and society*. New York, NY: Random House.

Shipman, F. B. (2007). *Formal succession planning in healthcare organizations: Meeting leadership needs in a changing American workforce.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. 3301348)

Smith, W. B. (2007). Karen Horney and psychotherapy in the 21st century. *Clinical Social Work Journal, 35*(1), 57.

Spillett, M. A. (1995). *Women student leaders' constructions of leadership: A developmental perspective*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. 9534635)

Staw, B. M. (1991). Dressing up like an organization: When psychological theories can explain organizational action. *Journal of Management, 17*(4), 805–819.

Taylor, S. N. (2006). Why the real self is fundamental to intentional change. *Journal of Management Development, 25*(7), 643–656.

Tekleab, A.G., Sims, Jr., H. P., Yun, S., Tesluk, P. E., & Cox, J. (2008). Are we on the same page? Effects of self-awareness of empowering and transformational leadership. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 14*(3), 185–201.

Torbert, B. (2004). *Action inquiry: The secret of timely and transforming leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Trinka, J. (2004). Building great leaders at the IRS. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 36*(7), 3.

Unconscious. (2010). In *APA glossary of psychological terms.* Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/research/action/glossary.aspx

What is depth psychology? (n.d.) Retrieved from http://www.terrapsych.com/depth.html

Wilber, K. (1997). An integral theory of consciousness. *Journal of Consciousness Studies, 4*(1), 71–92.

Wilber, K. (2000a). *A brief history of everything* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Shambhala.

Wilber, K. (2000b). *Integral psychology*. Boston, MA: Shambhala.

Wilber, K. (2006). *Integral spirituality*. Boston, MA: Shambhala.

Wilcox, I. (2005). Raising renaissance managers. *Pharmaceutical Executive, 25*(6), 94.

Wolf, G., Bradle, J., & Nelson, G. (2005). Bridging the strategic leadership gap. *Journal of Nursing Administration, 35*(2), 54.

Yocum, R. (2006). *The moderating effects of narcissism on the relationship between emotional intelligence and leadership effectiveness, moral Reasoning and managerial trust.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. 3263333)

APPENDIX A

Workshop Announcement Letter

TO: Potential Workshop Participants

My name is Frank V. Nunez. I am a doctoral student at Pepperdine University studying Organizational Change. My dissertation research project is titled "An Evaluative study of the usefulness of the Personality Theories of Karen Horney in Leadership Development." The purpose of my study is to evaluate whether people with leadership aspirations will find certain little known personality theories useful in their leadership development efforts. The workshop objectives are:

- explain the concepts of the basic anxiety, the real self and the idealized self, the three movements of people, and the self-defeating cycle and their importance to leadership development;

- explain the connection between human growth and leadership development;

- explain the role anxiety plays in leadership growth and development;

- explain the effects of these tacit forces on leadership effectiveness and growth by experiencing them in a leadership simulation and

- practice a self-awareness methodology that participants will use back on the job.

The workshop will last approximately 61/2 hours and will be held on a Saturday. Upon conclusion of the workshop participants will contract with the researcher to attempt a behavioral change using at least one of the concepts taught in the workshop. The researcher will then conduct follow up interviews with participants two weeks after conclusion of the workshop in order to determine the results of the attempted change.

This workshop is designed for employees of organizations who may not currently be in formal leadership positions but have a desire to develop themselves and achieve a leadership position within their professional field of practice. This may include their current or a future, different organization. It is important for this research that the participants have more than just a passing interest in becoming a leader; they must have a desire and be willing to explore different development paths toward that goal.

The workshop is a highly participative learning laboratory where you will be challenged to stretch outside your current judgments, explore with a sense of curiosity and openness in a safe learning environment.

I will be happy to answer any questions you might have or provide additional information.

Thank you for your interest in my research and your own development.

APPENDIX B

Research Subject Information and Consent Form

TITLE:	**A study of the application of the concepts of Karen Horney in leadership development within the National Management Association of The Boeing Company**
SPONSOR:	Pepperdine University
INVESTIGATOR:	Frank V. Nunez
SITE(S):	a Boeing facility in Southern California: Huntington Beach, Anaheim or Seal Beach

This consent form may contain words that you do not understand. Please ask the researcher

or the study staff to explain any words or information that you do not clearly understand.

You may take home an unsigned copy of this consent form to think about or discuss with

family or friends before making your decision.

SUMMARY

- You are being asked to be in a research study because you have been identified as an aspiring leader by virtue of your membership in the National management Association.
- Your decision to be in this study is voluntary.
- If you decide to be in this study and then change your mind, you can leave the study at any time.
- You will be in this study for a one day workshop and then two weeks later in a follow-up interview.
- If you agree to be in this study, your research records will become part of this study. They may be looked at or copied by the sponsor of this study or government agencies or other groups associated with the study.

More detailed information about this study is in this consent form. Please read it

carefully.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY:

The purposes of this study are:

> To determine the usefulness of the personality theories of Karen Horney in
> leadership development by introducing the concepts to aspiring leaders in a
> simple, easily understood way that will help them understand themselves a little
> better so that they can use this new self understanding to become a better leader.

You will be in this study for up to three weeks. Approximately 12 -15 subjects will
participate in this study. The study is scheduled to take place between *January 29, 2010*
and *February 28, 2010*, and will be done between the hours of 8:00 am and 5:00 pm. The
workshop portion of the study will be done on a Saturday morning and afternoon.

PROCEDURES

If you decide to participate, you will:

> Participate in a one-day workshop to learn and practice the theories; you will
> participate in a lecture, a self assessment instrument, small group and large group
> discussion and an in-class leadership simulation. After the workshop you will
> apply at least one theory in a real world leadership situation. Two weeks later you
> will participate in a follow-up interview to determine whether the theory/theories
> you used were useful or not.

RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

There are no anticipated risks in this study that are greater than you will encounter in
performing your normal duties. During the small and large group discussion you may
become uncomfortable sharing certain thoughts, ideas or opinions. During the use of the
theories in a real leadership situation you may have a negative experience with the

theories. If you experience any discomfort, you should inform the researcher immediately and stop your participation.

BENEFITS

You may or may not benefit directly from participation in the study. The study seeks to determine the beneficial usefulness of certain psychological theories as they are applied to a leadership situation. There is no intention to force participants to find beneficial use of the theories; a negative experience with the theories will be just as valid as a positive experience with the theories.

The results from the study may open a window for future research. If leadership learners find Horney's theories useful in their development as leaders and leadership development practitioners are not using these theories, then practitioners could be made aware of this gap so that they can start giving their customers something they want and find valuable. This might encourage more practitioners to investigate for themselves what the theories of Karen Horney can offer and perhaps conduct more research on them or use them as a theoretical basis for research on leadership behavior.

COSTS

There is no cost to you for participating in this study.

PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION

You will not receive any additional payment for participating in this study.

ALTERNATIVE TREATMENT

This is not a treatment study. Your alternative is to not participate in this study.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Information from this study will be given to the sponsor. Research records and the

consent form signed by you may be looked at and/or copied for research and regulatory purposes by:

- Pepperdine University
- The Boeing Company

Absolute confidentiality cannot be guaranteed because of the need to give information to these parties. The results of this research study may be presented at meetings or in publications. Your identity will not be disclosed in those presentations. Your identity will not be released to the general public without your consent, unless specifically required by law.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may decide not to participate or you may leave the study at any time. Your decision will not result in any penalty or loss of benefits to which you are entitled, nor will it have any effect on your employment at The Boeing Company. If significant new findings develop during the course of this study that may relate to your decision to continue participation, you will be informed.

Your participation in this study may be stopped at any time by the researcher or the sponsor without your consent because:

- you have not followed study instructions;
- the sponsor has stopped the study; or
- administrative reasons require your withdrawal.

SOURCE OF FUNDING FOR THE STUDY

This study is being funded by the principal research investigator

QUESTIONS

If you have any questions about this study or your participation in this study, contact:

Frank V. Nunez at

If you have questions about your rights as a research subject, you may contact:

Greg Lim

Human Subjects Protection Program Administrator

The Boeing Company

Do not sign this consent form unless you have had a chance to ask questions and have received satisfactory answers to all of your questions.

If you agree to be in this study, you will receive a signed and dated copy of this consent form for your records.

CONSENT

I have read the information in this consent form. All my questions about the study and my participation in it have been answered. I freely consent to be in this research study.

I authorize the use and disclosure of my information to the parties listed in the confidentiality section of this consent for the purposes described above.

By signing this consent form, I have not given up any of my legal rights.

_____

Subject Name

CONSENT SIGNATURE

_____   _____

Signature of Subject   Date

_____   _____

Signature of Person Conducting Informed   Date

Consent Discussion

APPENDIX C

Workshop Design

SLIDE	TIME	ACTIVITY	TOOLS
1	1:00	Welcome participants Introduce self, thank participants for coming	
2	2:00	Review agenda	
3	5:00	Review purpose of workshop Present new theories, improve self awareness; provide data for a research dissertation	
4	2:00	Review objectives	
5	2:00	Review how objectives will be achieved; lecture, self assessments, experiential activities	
6	5:00	Review workshop norms; solicit additional norm from participants; list on flip chart pad	
7	30:00	Introductions – have participants introduce themselves and offer three work related leadership challenges they are facing	
8	2:00	Transition from their leadership	

		challenges into the CCL Leadership Gap Survey – it may be that their challenges are the same as many other leaders. Let's find out.	
9	2:00 5:00	Share the findings of the survey with the group Have participants place three self sticking dots on the CCL list next to the leadership competency that best matches their leadership challenge.	Poster size print-out of CCL Leadership Competencies
10	10:00	Hand out blank Leadership Gap Matrix handout. Inform participants that CCL grouped these competencies into four categories. Reveal categories one at a time and explain. Participants at each table come to consensus, fill in each square of their Leadership Gap Matrix and each table presents one completed sheet for discussion.	Leadership Gap Matrix
11	10:00	Share the CCL Leadership Gap Matrix findings	

		Reveal each corner of the matrix one corner at a time. Find out if any table team got all the Key Gap competencies correct. Remind the group that we will use this information about the gaps in a later group of activities. Mention Harry Gray quote as lead-in for learning more about oneself	
12	15:00	Introduce the Horney Coolidge Tridimensional Inventory (HCTI). We'll take a look and explore some of the aspects of our personality that might influence the kinds of choices we make to close these leadership capability gaps. Allow participants to complete assessment but do not score it yet.	Horney Coolidge Tridimensional Inventory (HCTI)
13	2:00	Share biographical info about Karen Horney	
14	2:00	Briefly preview the highlights of Horney's psychoanalytic work	
15	2:00	Briefly review the major themes of	

		Horney's theory: rejected Freud, growth oriented, importance of the self, social influences on personality	
16	1:00	Show examples of a threatening world: its easy to see how many people would perceive the world as threatening	
17	5:00	Introduce the basic anxiety	
18	15:00	Small group discussion and large group sharing to process the concept of the basic anxiety. Use questions on this slide.	
19	8:00	Introduce the three movements of people	
20	2:00	Show strengths and weaknesses of Compliant Type	
21	2:00	Show strengths and weaknesses of Aggressive Type	
22	2:00	Show strengths and weaknesses of Detached Type	
23	10:00	Score results from HCTI	HCTI Score Sheet
	15:00	Small group discussion and large	

		group sharing to process the concept of the three movements of people as well as their individual scores. Use processing questions on this slide.	
24	5:00	Introduce the concept of the real self and the idealized self	
25	5:00	Introduce the Self Defeating Cycle	
26	15:00	Small group discussion and large group sharing to process the concept of the Self Defeating Cycle. Use processing questions on this slide. They can use their HCTI scores as sense making aides.	
27	2:00	Summarize the idea that these are forces that interfere with growth	
28	1:00	So what does all this have to do with leadership? We can answer that by understanding what human growth looks like. Emphasize that growth is not a linear process	
29	10:00	Introduce all the forces at work in growth	

| | | The process of human growth is a series of transitions from one stage of consciousness to another. Transitions occur throughout a lifetime and the self is vulnerable during these transitions. A lifetime of vulnerability creates anxiety.

Growth = anxiety. Growth is also a lifetime of tension between forces pulling one to grow and forces pulling one to maintain.

Use a large rubber band. Have someone take another end. Pull. Feel the tension? "YES". What else do you feel as the tension increases? "Like it might break and snap me in the face". I bet your feeling anxious about that aren't you? "YES"! |

Large rubber band

Volunteer from group |
| 30 | 5:00 | Connect the stages of human growth to the Joiner & Josephs "Leadership Agility" model of leadership growth | |

		As one grows over a lifetime of learning to lead, human relationships become more critically important. Make the connection to Horney's concept of growth in human relationships.	
31	15:00	Small group discussion and large group sharing to process the concept of human and leadership growth. Use processing questions on this slide. They can use their HCTI scores as sense making aides.	
32	5:00	Summarize what's been presented so far. Ask for and answer any clarifying questions	
33	2:00	Introduce the experiential activity. Let's develop greater awareness of how these unconscious forces might affect leadership behavior and how that behavior affects leadership relationships.	

		Preview the experiential activity. Tie the activity back to the CCL Key Gap list: these are the key gaps CCL identified.	
34	2:00	Introduce the Leadership Simulation activity	**LUNCH – 11:47 until 1:00**
35	5:00	Review instructions for the activity	Al Kohbari Instruction sheet
	60:00	Allow time for participants to complete the activity	Al Kohbari role sheets Al Kohbari data sheets Al Kohbari equipment specification sheet
36	5:00	Review guidelines for decision making	
37, 38	15:00	Small group discussion and large group sharing to process the concept of decisiveness in leadership. Use	

		processing questions on this slide. They can use their HCTI scores as sense making aides.	
39	2:00	So What? Challenge participants to take the next step	
40	2:00	What does all this have to do with leadership growth and development? Why bother with all these activities? What has to happen next? You've had a chance to experiment in a safe environment. Its time to take the next step and experiment back in your real world. But before you can do that you need a framework for that experimentation and lucky for you, it's the very thing you've been doing here for the last three hours.	
41	10:00	Reveal the purpose of the experiential activities as a "rehearsal" for trying new behaviors back on the job	

		explain how all their small group and large group discussions have been opportunities to practice a methodology they will use back on their jobs to experiment with these new concepts in their leadership journey All the processing questions were designed to get you to express yourself openly and freely, become aware of the unconscious forces and their influence and begin developing a capacity for change using this new knowledge and self-awareness	
42	20:00	Contract with participants for follow-on activities Participants will commit to using the Horney concepts in an effort to change one leadership behavior and to report their results in a follow-up interview	

		with the researcher.	
		Pass out follow up contract. Have participants read, ask questions, commit to a date, sign the form and return to the researcher	

APPENDIX D

Contracting for Change Worksheet

By now you may have identified some aspects of your self that need change. Think about why this is important to you and which of your values are at stake. Think about how potential changes you make will help you grow as a leader.

Looking back over the concepts you just been introduced to and how they influence leadership growth, answer the following:

List no more than three things you would like to START doing to grow as a leader.

1.

2.

3.

List no more than three things you would like to STOP doing to grow as a leader.

1.

2.

3.

List no more than three things you would like to CONTINUE doing to grow as a leader.

1.

2.

3.

You will be contacted in 2 weeks for a follow up interview to review the results of your change efforts. Good luck!

APPENDIX E

Postworkshop Interview Questions

You participated in a leadership workshop two weeks ago. In that workshop you were introduced to four concepts:

The basic anxiety - a feeling of being isolated and helpless in a world conceived as hostile

The self-defeating cycle – a destructively pathological cycle of impossible self-demands and loathsome self-contempt

The three movements of people - the solutions for resolving the basic anxiety

The real & idealized self – an idealized self-image driven by a need for perfection, ambition for success and vindictive triumph over others

1. Do you have any questions about these concepts before we proceed?

At the end of the workshop you identified some leadership behaviors that you would either like to start, stop or continue. You agreed to attempt a behavioral change using at least one of the concepts you learned in the workshop.

2. Describe the leadership situation you attempted these changes in.

3. For the behavior(s) you wanted to START doing:
   a. what was the behavior?
   b. did you make the change you wanted?
   c. if you made the change, what was the result of the change? Did you find this result satisfactory? Why or why not?
   d. if you did not make the change, what prevented you from making the change?

4. For the behavior(s) you wanted to STOP doing:
   e. what was the behavior?
   f. did you make the change you wanted?
   g. if you made the change, what was the result of the change? Did you find this result satisfactory? Why or why not?
   h. if you did not make the change, what prevented you from making the change?

5. For the behavior(s) you wanted to CONTINUE doing:
    i. what was the behavior?
    j. did the behavior continue?
    k. if you continued the behavior, what was the result? Did you find this result satisfactory? Why or why not?
    l. if you did not continue the behavior, what prevented you from continuing the behavior?

6. How would you rate the significance of the concept of **the basic anxiety** to improving your leadership behaviors over the last two weeks?
    ❑ Insignificant to my leadership growth
    ❑ Somewhat insignificant to my leadership growth
    ❑ Somewhat significant to my leadership growth
    ❑ Significant to my leadership growth
    ❑ Very significant to my leadership growth

7. How would you rate the significance of the concept of **the self-defeating cycle** to improving your leadership behaviors over the last two weeks?
    ❑ Insignificant to my leadership growth
    ❑ Somewhat insignificant to my leadership growth
    ❑ Somewhat significant to my leadership growth
    ❑ Significant to my leadership growth
    ❑ Very significant to my leadership growth

8. How would you rate the significance of the concept of **the three movements of people** to improving your leadership behaviors over the last two weeks?
    ❑ Insignificant to my leadership growth
    ❑ Somewhat insignificant to my leadership growth
    ❑ Somewhat significant to my leadership growth
    ❑ Significant to my leadership growth
    ❑ Very significant to my leadership growth

9. How would you rate the significance of the concept of **the real & idealized self** to improving your leadership behaviors over the last two weeks?
    ❑ Insignificant to my leadership growth
    ❑ Somewhat insignificant to my leadership growth
    ❑ Somewhat significant to my leadership growth
    ❑ Significant to my leadership growth
    ❑ Very significant to my leadership growth

10. How have the concepts you learned changed your perspective about your

leadership development?

11. What, if anything, are you able to do now that you could/would not do prior to the workshop?

12. Which concepts would you continue to use in your development as a leader? Why or why not?

APPENDIX F

Workshop Evaluation Survey

Please evaluate the workshop using the following scale:

SA – Strongly Agree, A – Agree, D – Disagree, SD – Strongly Disagree

1	Overall, I learned a great deal from this workshop.	SA	A	D	SD
2	The instructor told us what we could expect to learn as a result of taking this workshop.	SA	A	D	SD
3	The instructor provided adequate opportunities for questions and discussion during class time.	SA	A	D	SD
4	As the workshop progressed the instructor showed how each topic fit into the course as a whole.	SA	A	D	SD
5	Overall, the instructor's explanations were clear and understandable.	SA	A	D	SD
6	The learning activities were well integrated into the workshop.	SA	A	D	SD
7	There was close agreement between the stated workshop objectives and what was actually covered.	SA	A	D	SD
8	Expectations for learning in this workshop were clearly communicated.	SA	A	D	SD
9	I felt comfortable about expressing myself candidly during the workshop	SA	A	D	SD

Course Evaluation Survey (cont'd)

The Muddiest Point
Instructions: Please answer the following two questions as concisely as possible.

What has been the "muddiest" point in this workshop? That is, what topic(s) remain the least clear to you?

What could the facilitator have done differently to help you understand today's workshop material?

The One Minute Paper
Instructions: Please answer the following two questions as concisely as possible.

What are the two significant (central or useful) things (concepts, topics) you have learned during this workshop?

What questions remain uppermost in your mind?