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Every few hundred years in Western history there occurs a sharp transformation. Within a few short decades, society – its worldview, its basic values, its social and political structures, its arts, its key institutions – rearranges itself...We are currently living through such a time.

– Peter Drucker

A large body of reliable evidence shows that there is a significant percent of the global population that have either constructed or adopted a worldview that is what we might call "post-conventional." There are men and women (young and old) in every part of society imaginable that have a deep desire to change things, to improve their situation, workplace, community, family, or religious institution. These "independent thinkers" have differentiated from the conventional worldview that many of their peers, friends, and loved ones are still subject to. These increasingly aware individuals have glimpsed the future and see clearly that there is something else possible. They want to positively influence the people and circumstances in their lives. They are willing, and eager, but in the vast majority of cases, they have the benefit of very little if any adequate guidance on how to lead.

Why?

Because leadership theory as we know it doesn’t work. It’s bogus.

Our society has so many terrific sources of guidance for physical wellbeing, emotional wellbeing, even spiritual wellbeing. We have effective methodologies that show us how to build a house, choose investments, relate with a romantic partner, raise children…you name it. At the time of this writing, in the early part of the 21st century, many fields of human endeavor have been adequately understood, objectified, documented, and explained in ways that are accessible and applicable to reasonably intelligent readers. And most of this information is available to anyone with an Internet connection.
However, leadership is the exception. Leadership—as a field of study, and as a practice—as it is currently (conventionally) understood and taught is hopelessly flawed. Until recently, no one had applied integral theory or integral psychology to leadership.

The study and practice of leadership is concerned with one overarching question: *How can individuals and groups influence and motivate others to achieve significant results.*

If you do a literature survey of the field of leadership (as my colleagues and I have done over the past decade), what you will find is a large pile of half-baked theories informed by narrow worldviews that reflect the assumption of the advocates that everyone possesses the same values systems as the author of that particular school of leadership.

The result? A deeply confused, fragmented, vague, and contradictory body of knowledge around what should be one of the most important fields of human study.

This paper—along with my online Integral Leadership Manifesto and the accompanying integral leadership book I am co-authoring with Dr. Russ Volckmann this year—is about how we as leaders can leverage this emerging paradigm to help us become more effective, potent forces for good. This material showcases innovative methods to package and present many of the major insights coming out of the field of integral leadership that are practical for both the integral community, and perhaps more importantly, for a mainstream leadership audience.

Leadership theory, as it has been conventionally taught for the past century, has been primarily the domain of gray-haired, conservative white males. I want to change that. My desire is to help bring leadership theory out of the ivory towers of academia and stodgy boardrooms of public corporations and put it into the hands of scrappy entrepreneurs, youthful visionaries, and gritty revolutionaries that need it.

In *Tribes: We Need You to Lead Us*, Seth Godin insists that everyone can be a leader and that anyone who wants to make a difference can. He implores readers, “You’re a leader. We need you.” I agree. You don’t need to be an employee of a large corporation selected by committee to be a “high potential” in a company-sponsored “Leadership Development Program” to learn to lead. And you don’t need any particular title or sanctioned authority to drive change in your organization. Your group needs a leader. Why not you? If you want to create change, and you are willing to put in the practice it requires to develop your integral leadership skills, you can learn to lead as well as or better than any CEO.
Which Style of Leadership Works Best?

There are as many styles of leadership as there are types of leaders and diverse people and situations in which the phenomenon of leadership emerges. The approach described in this paper works in any situation where human beings are involved. Not because integral leadership is a one-size-fits-all approach. Rather, the opposite. One-size-fits-all approaches rarely work with any consistency. Integral leadership does work consistently precisely because it transcends and includes all the other styles (or schools) of leadership.

Abraham Maslow famously stated, “If the only tool you have is a hammer, you tend to see every problem as a nail.”

Leadership as it is conventionally taught is made up of different schools. There’s the Hammer School…the Plier School…the Crescent School…and the Screwdriver School. Historically, the pundits of each of these various schools were perfectly content to enthusiastically, and exclusively, advocate their singular approach.

Why insist that a hammer is the tool of choice for every leadership job? Why didn’t these brilliant scholars offer an approach that could adapt to the diverse psychological make-ups and environmental complexities of different situations?

The reason is that, up until very recently, there was no practical way to adequately assess the intricacies of a situation and reliably know if it required a hammer, pliers, crescent wrench or screwdriver. In fact, situational assessments of this nature are very difficult to do accurately.

However, user-friendly, practical methods now exist. These approaches have been field-tested with hundreds of leaders and thousands of employees. The verdict: these methods work. This publication is one of the first texts to offer these methods in an accessible way to a mainstream audience.
I would not give a fig for the simplicity this side of complexity, but I would give my life for the simplicity on the other side of complexity.

— Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr.

Simplicity on the Other Side of Complexity

It is important to clarify what I mean when I use the term integral.

The dictionary definition of integral is “possessing everything essential or significant; complete; whole.”

That is precisely how I use the term. Integral is essential, whole. So an integral approach to leadership is the approach that is essential (requisite) in the specific situation in which the phenomenon of leadership is arising.

Integral approaches (whether to medicine, education, psychology, ecology, politics, etc.) seek to incorporate all of the essential perspectives, approaches, and schools of thought into a unified, comprehensive, inclusive, and empirically accurate framework.

Most conventional leadership styles (schools of leadership) work with some people some of the time. Few, if any, work with all people in every situation. An integral approach to leadership seeks to incorporate the enduring truths while drawing on a broader and more sophisticated model of human interaction to provide overarching guidelines for which approaches will work consistently with which people in which situations.

There are many books on conventional theories and practices of leadership. And there are many books on Integral Theory and methodology. There are even a few pioneering texts that are beginning to explore how these two fields might be usefully combined into this emerging practice of “integral leadership.” While these are all excellent resources for our friends and colleagues who are involved with leadership theory and integral methodology as part of their profession, these publications are generally less accessible, and less useful, for the general public due to their perceived “complexity.” The field of Integral Theory is often experienced by newcomers as highly technical, at times difficult to understand, and frequently difficult to apply.

My goal is to offer a way to put Integral Theory into action in the real world while simultaneously popularizing a new, superior model of leadership.
The deceptively simple framework I will introduce in this paper draws on my direct experience of more than 10,000 hours teaching integral leadership to hundreds of CEOs and executives in the original Integral Leadership Program (a rigorous, practice-based, 52-week, intensive executive education program now in its 10th year). This uniquely simple and effective way to introduce the practice of integral leadership (to a mainstream audience) is the result of a multimillion-dollar decade-long experiment that has resulted in what many people consider to be the “simplicity on the other side of complexity”.

Apple’s ubiquitous iPod provides a useful, and perhaps relevant, analogy to help explain the expression *simplicity on the other side of complexity*.

As you may recall, back in 2001 Steve Jobs led Apple into the crowded portable digital music (mp3) player market by introducing the iPod and iTunes. Within a few years, Apple dominated the portable music player market, decimating more than 50 competitors, and achieved a 74% market share for his iPod player. Even more significantly, he transformed the way music was distributed and used by consumers. He went on to leverage his success with the iPod to create a halo effect for the entire Apple product line, spurring unprecedented traffic into Apple’s retail locations, and ultimately leading to the dominance of the iPhone and more recently the iPad. Prior to its release, experts, pundits and manufacturers of portable music player technology emphasized the technical capabilities of these remarkable little devices. They would speak of transfer rates in megabits per second, IDE hardware breakthroughs, mp3 vs. mp4 audio compression schemes, and remarkable miniaturization manufacturing innovations. And they believed that consumers cared about these things.

We recognize a very similar phenomenon with our friends and colleagues who are experts, pundits and providers of Integral Theory and Methodology in and around Integral Institute (and its various satellite organizations) and our publication *Integral Leadership Review*.

Those of us who are enthusiastic advocates for applied Integral Theory can be a lot like the early mp3 player manufacturers.

We often speak of the technical capabilities of this new “technology.” But rather than talk about transfer rates, megabits per second, and miniaturization, we speak of quadrants, lines, levels, states and types. We rave about remarkable innovations such as integral methodological pluralism. We are enthusiastic advocates things for second-
order adaptive change methodologies that move sentient holons out of gamma traps, through flex states into new alpha configurations.

As integral enthusiasts, like the early mp3 manufacturers, we sometimes naively believe that consumers care about those things.

It’s not that Steve Jobs didn’t care about the technology as much as his peers. Clearly, he possessed a deep and nuanced understanding of the technology that he intended to use to transform his industry (and other industries, as we have now seen).

What set Jobs apart was his understanding of what consumers cared about.

The people who would really benefit from an iPod didn’t care about file compression, transfer rates, or IDE miniaturization. They cared about music.

What Jobs understood was that if you give people something they can use, something easy and enjoyable to use, something they can begin using immediately, then they will use it!

As anyone who owns one can tell you, the design of the iPod is elegant: form meets function at the next level. For me, the iPod is a good illustration of simplicity on the other side of complexity.

My goal is to offer leaders and aspiring leaders something useful, something easy and enjoyable to use…. something they can begin using immediately.

In the same way that iPod consumers care about music (not the technology), leaders care about motivating and influencing people to accomplish significant results (not integral theory).

Let me be explicit. I’m proposing that the integral community is like Apple, and the mp3 market is like the market for leadership approaches (theory and practices). I believe that integral leadership could be the iPod of leadership.

So what about all of our technical friends and colleagues who share our passion for the details of leadership theory and the fine nuance available in integral theory and methodology?

In my experience, computer geeks love iPods (and iPhones and iPads) just as much—maybe even more—than the average user. They pore over the spec sheets, marvel in the design details, and revel in the innovative application of emerging technologies.
For all of my integral friends (and fellow integral geeks) reading this paper (and the manifesto and book), let me be perfectly clear: My goal first and foremost is to provide a description of “integral leadership” that you can proudly share with your clients, your employees, your minister, and even your mom. None of them will have to learn a thing about the integral equivalent of file compression, transfer rates, or IDE miniaturization. And it is also my hope that when you study the endnotes, dig into the details of the book, and reflect deeply on what’s really going on here, you can appreciate the skillful application of Integral Theory. Who knew that the iPod (and later the iPhone) would be revolutionize an industry and transform Apple from a computer company into the world's leading consumer electronics company. I have an intuition that integral leadership could be integral’s "killer app." Wouldn’t that be cool. Stranger things have happened.

The Promise of Integral Leadership

In previous times, when culture in many parts of the world (and many organizations) was homogenous, a single leadership approach could emerge that was suited to that narrow band of life conditions and worldviews (value systems). As I write this in the early part of the 21st century, for most leaders those days have past. Due to globalization, cultural diversity, the accelerating evolution of technology, and the ever-increasing information and communication channels and choices, complexity is increasing at an alarming rate.

You may be familiar with Einstein’s quote, “You cannot solve a problem with the same level of thinking that created the problem.” My experience working with CEOs suggests that many leaders are not yet armed with a perspective sufficiently “next level” enough to solve their current-level problems. I have come to believe that an integrally-informed perspective is what is required to address many of the complex problems leaders face today.

What if it were possible to stitch all of these partial leadership theories together into a unified, comprehensive, inclusive, overarching theoretical framework that—as an integrated whole—could succeed where the individual parts previously failed?

The promise of integral leadership is to know when, where and with whom a given leadership approach will reliably work (and when it will reliably fail).
The Integral Framework

Clearly, hundreds of books have been written on various aspects of management and leadership theory that address the nuance of these activities. Like all things integral, there are many legitimate and valid ways to render an idea. A number of models of integral leadership have been proposed, and in the years to come, many new models will emerge. There can be a lot of merit in complex, detailed, nuanced models; and there is much merit in simple, memorable, actionable models. In this section, I am going to briefly introduce a simple model of integral leadership that I developed with the help of Ken Wilber and the Integral Institute Business and Leadership Center in 2006. During this brief presentation, I am going to review the core elements of AQAL Integral Theory that underlies much of my work and the work of many of my integral colleagues.

For the purposes of simplicity, the list of dynamic activities involved in organizational leadership can be roughly grouped into three broad groupings that fall under the headings of Awareness, Approach, and Action.

**Awareness** – This category includes activities that involve perceiving the relevant details of the current situation, desired situation, and gaps. In military leadership, this is sometimes called “situational awareness”—a term that I have also found useful in training corporate leaders.

**Approach** – This category includes the activities associated with developing objectives and strategy. Here the leader(s) determine what is important and needed given the reality of the situation along with relevant resources and constraints. In many situations, the most important factor in this category is selecting the appropriate “leadership style” for the circumstances.

**Action** – Of course, once leaders select an approach, it is then necessary to translate that approach into specific action. This final category includes the specific tactics, interventions, and action steps to be performed by the leader(s) and the individuals in the group. In simple terms, this is what the leader actually chooses to do or not do.

In our training programs we teach leaders to ask three fundamental questions in every “leadership situation.” These are:

1. **What is really happening?**
2. **What is most important and needed?**
3. **What should be done? What is the most helpful thing I can do?**
If you were to survey a group of people with these three questions about the exact SAME situation, you would get wildly different answers!

The answers to these questions reflect what these individuals are aware of and not aware of, what they emphasize and focus on (biases) and what perspectives they valorize or marginalize. A person’s worldview (values and beliefs) will significantly influence what they deem important and what approaches and actions they think are warranted (or even acceptable). Note that this is true of leaders, followers, and all other stakeholders associated with any given situation. Different people perceive different details of a situation (awareness), hold different values about what is most important and what is needed in a particular situation (approach), and what behavior or action is appropriate and helpful and what is not (action).

An integral leader who has adequately developed her capacity for perspective taking will recognize that the way the other individuals involved in any given situation might answer these three questions is, itself, crucial data that must be taken into consideration for the leader herself to accurately answer the first question: “What’s really happening here?” Therefore, the answers to these three deceptively simple questions are both interdependent and recursive. If you recognize that each person involved in a situation has their own point of view, and therefore, their own answers to these questions, it’s easy to see how these questions can be used to reveal (and more adequately account for) tremendous nuance and complexity that conventional leaders will tend to overlook.

While worldview is the most fundamental factor influencing how people answer these questions—and forms the foundation of the Leadership Rosetta Stone—integral practitioners recognize that there are numerous additional factors to consider:

A person’s cognitive, emotional, social, and moral stages of development also impact how a person will answer these questions. Typology plays a role as well. The integral principle of “native perspectives” shows us that some personality types emphasize the tangible/objective details of a situation while others emphasize the intangible/subjective factors. Similarly, some pay more attention to individual behavior while others notice group dynamics. This is also known as “quadrant bias.” Of course the economics, infrastructure, processes and systems, and the physical environment are all crucial factors that influence a person’s answers to these three fundamental questions. The state of the infrastructure, system, and/or culture impacts how people answer these questions, not to mention the mental and emotional state of the person asking the question! Clearly, if we are to account for all this complexity, we need a reliable map, or framework, that can make sense of it. This is where “integral” comes in.
AQAL Stands for All Everything

As mentioned previously, the dictionary definition of integral is: “possessing everything essential or significant; complete; whole.” Integral approaches seek to incorporate all of the essential perspectives, schools of thought, and methods available into a unified, comprehensive, inclusive, and empirically accurate framework.

There are a number of helpful frameworks researchers can draw upon to architect an “integral understanding” or an “integral approach” to a given field. My eleven years in the trenches designing and delivering intensive integral leader development programs have led me to conclude that the AQAL Integral Framework developed by Ken Wilber and the Integral Institute is, by far, the most precise map currently available for this purpose.

For any readers less familiar with it, the AQAL acronym, as originally articulated by Wilber, was short for: All Quadrants, all Lines, all Levels, all States, all Types. Note that only the first two elements (Quadrants and Lines) are specifically indicated in four-letter acronym. In the practical application of integral theory and methodology, the specific names of the core elements of AQAL are articulated in different ways depending on the application (e.g. business, education, sustainability, etc.). For example, Levels are sometimes referred to as “Stages”, which is not exactly the same, but close. Styles are sometimes singled out as a distinct element and other times they are simply considered a subset of Types. Similarly Lenses (worldviews) are sometimes emphasized as we do in the practice of Integral Leadership while in other applications they may be treated as simply a derivative of Stages and Types. I realize this quickly gets rather technical. I briefly mention it here so that new students of integral have a basic orientation to these essential elements and so that my experienced integral readers can recognize the specific AQAL configuration being used here in the service of integral leadership.

In my experience using the AQAL framework for integral leadership, it has been most useful to configure the elements as: All Quadrants, all Lines, all Levels, all Lenses, all States, all Styles, all Types.

Please note, I am only devoting a couple of pages to the Integral Framework in this paper. However, I have published a separate article entitled “The Integral Framework” which is available to Integral Leadership Collaborative members. Additionally, many of my other publications (including the book with Russ Volckmann) elaborate extensively on how integral leaders can use these AQAL elements to answer the three meta questions—along with tools associated with each aspect of the framework. The primary focus of this introductory paper is worldviews and the universal leadership styles associated with each.
Worldview Is the Key that Unlocks the Potential of Integral Leadership

In the above description of the Integral Framework, I listed “Lenses” as one of the fundamental aspects of AQAL when applied to leadership.

My research along with significant amounts of in-the-field experience have lead me to believe that the widespread lack of awareness about this thing called “meaning making lenses” is at the heart of why many so called “solutions” to society’s most pressing problems meet with disappointing failure. This is true across nearly every aspect of human society: education, business and economic development, governance and politics, and interpersonal/ideological/ethnic/military conflict. Yet there is no area that I’m aware of where meaning making lenses is more relevant than the domain of leadership.

Integral psychology has much to say about meaning making lenses. For purposes of a popular, accessible, and practical model of integral leadership, I will use the term “worldviews” in place of “meaning making lens.” The vast majority of conventional approaches to leadership (and management, and the other societal problems and solutions) fail to adequately take into account the fact that people with different worldviews interpret the same facts very differently.

The American Psychological Association defines worldview as: A way of describing the universe and life within it, both in terms of what is and what ought to be. A given worldview is a set of beliefs that includes assumptions regarding what objects or experiences are good or bad, and what goals, behaviors, and relationships are desirable or undesirable.

While the above academic definition is useful for reference, a simpler layman’s definition is sufficient for our purposes here: A worldview is “the overall perspective from which one sees and interprets the world.” This “overall perspective” is, in its essence, made up of values and universal beliefs. By values, I mean what a person considers “most important” (their priorities in life), and by universal beliefs I mean broad-based beliefs about self, people, and how the world (the system) works.

I believe that the failure to adequately grasp worldviews lies at the heart of the problem with conventional approaches to leadership. Those approaches often wrongly assume that people’s motivations are homogenous. Most conventional approaches to leadership (and also management) fail to adequately take into account the fact that people with different worldviews have very different priorities and value different things. As such, a leadership approach that is very resonant with one employee, team or department might be ineffective or even offensive for another.
What About Personality Types or Situational Leadership?

All comprehensive leader development programs teach some method for understanding people. Some simply teach listening skills, many teach various kinds of “personality typology” systems, and a few use lines/levels (stages of development) to help leaders better understand their followers and what makes them tick. I’m familiar with most of these methods for helping leaders understand their follower. (And I have experimented with many of them in our various leader development programs over the past 15 years.)

Nothing, I mean nothing, is more effective at helping leaders understand people than worldviews.

I’m going to use an American idiom—being “in the ballpark”—as an analogy to illustrate this crucial point. Those personality types, situational leadership tactics, and get-to-know-your-people methods are like finding your section and seat at a large baseball game. Assuming that you are in the correct stadium, knowing the exact section, row and seat number is very helpful.

Here’s the catch. In this analogy, a follower’s worldview (their values and universal beliefs) represents the stadium. If as a leader, you have failed to accurately recognize your follower’s worldview, then you are not even in the right ballpark; therefore the details about their personality type and behavioral tendencies (even their goals) are essentially useless.

Values (not goals) are what motivate people. A person’s worldview (values + global beliefs) defines:

• What one cares about
• What one believes is worthwhile
• What one believes lacks value (is wrong, bad, or to be avoided)
• How things “are”
• How things “should be’
If as a leader, you have not first accurately identified a follower’s predominant worldview, there is an excellent chance that you are not even in the ballpark of what that person cares about and the what style of leadership they are most likely to be resonant with and respond to favorably.

In the Integral Leadership Program, we teach a module called “Understanding People.” It is exclusively about worldviews. Even though we have our students (mostly CEOs) for 52 weeks, we don’t even bother teaching personality types. Knowing the worldview you are dealing with is 80% of what matters for effective leadership. The other details about the person (including personality type) is 20%.

There’s no reason to focus on the details until you are certain you are in the right ballpark. Being in the right ballpark means recognizing their worldview accurately, and using the appropriate leadership style that people with that worldview will respond to. If you can do that, you can do something that 99% of leaders are not able to do. Get this right, and the rest is gravy. (Then the details about personality types and so on can be useful as a bonus.)

**Introducing the Leadership Rosetta Stone**

As most readers are familiar, the *Rosetta Stone* is an ancient Egyptian artifact on which the same information is inscribed in three different languages: Egyptian hieroglyphs, Demotic, and Greek. Once discovered, the Rosetta Stone allowed researchers to decode the language of Egyptian hieroglyphs for the first time in history.

Today, the term “Rosetta Stone” is used idiomatically to describe any critical key that unlocks something previously impossible to decipher.

Integral leadership represents a synthesis and integration of many useful frameworks and insights from the past hundred years of management and leadership theory, sociology, and psychology.
The field of leadership theory points to many different approaches and "leadership styles." The field of psychology (various branches) point to a myriad of factors that influence people’s motivation and behavior. The “Leadership Rosetta Stone” is a meta-framework that integrates the most important and useful of these leadership theories and psychological models.

In terms of leadership theory, this model represents simplicity on the other side of theoretical complexity. In terms of practice, this methodology allows leaders to quickly and accurately assess a given situation and people involved, zero in on the key motivational drivers (cares, concerns, values), and select the leadership approach that is most likely to succeed.

The model is comprised of two core components: worldviews and leadership styles. Integral psychology shows us that the vast majority of the values and belief systems that most leaders encounter fall into four broad worldviews.

Our big breakthrough in the development of a practical approach to integral leadership came when after years of research we discovered that the entire body of leadership theory can be broadly situated into what I call the “four universal leadership styles” that correlate to the four common worldviews.

Therefore, the profoundly simple and powerful key to understanding, motivating, and influencing people is this: use the leadership style that is most resonant with the person’s (or group’s) dominant worldview. For purposes of ease of use, in the illustration below, I use the term mindset in place of worldview.
The Leadership Rosetta Stone

**Strategic Leadership**

“The person with the most expertise leads via strategic planning and tangible incentives”

*Approach:*

Leverage financial incentives to motivate teams to execute strategic plans in order to outperform competitors

*Works With Whom:*

People with a Modern worldviews who seek opportunities to advance toward their goals

*Works Where:*

Sales departments, professional services firms, innovation-driven organizations, senior management positions, and in roles that require advanced levels of education

**Authoritarian Leadership**

“The person with the authority leads via chain of command”

*Approach:*

Comply with the established protocols to meet requirements prescribed by authority

*Works With Whom:*

People with Traditional worldviews who value stability and conformity and rely on people in positions of (positional or perceived moral) authority for direction and meaning

*Works Where:*

Faith-based organizations, law enforcement, quality assurance, compliance / accounting / clerical work, and many blue collar jobs

**Collaborative Leadership**

“Leadership is not vested in any single person; rather consensus-based, self-managed teams lead themselves”

*Approach:*

Invite people’s perceptions, feelings and intuition via roundtable discussion and dialog to arrive at consensus, then work collaboratively toward common goals that serve the greater good

*Works With Whom:*

People with Pluralistic worldviews who value connection, authenticity, and opportunity for personal growth

*Works Where:*

Socially responsible and/or sustainability-focused organizations, “humanized” workplaces, non-profits, and “self-managed teams”

**Autocratic Leadership**

“The person with the power leads via command and control”

*Approach:*

Impose will through reputation, fear and respect, tightly control information and choices, reward compliance and punish disloyalty

*Works With Whom:*

People with Imperial worldviews who respect dominance and aggression, and perform best under strict supervision

*Works Where:*

Combat units, physical laborers working in small crews, rural or inner city environments
**Brett Thomas**

Brett Thomas is the co-founder of Stagen, a Texas-based organizational consulting firm that specializes in Integral Leadership. He is the author and architect of the Stagen Leadership Academy's 52-week intensive *Integral Leadership Program* (now in its 10th year). Brett is a 20-year veteran in the field of human performance and organizational development having designed and facilitated hundreds of workshops and corporate training programs. Brett has logged over 10,000+ hours coaching CEOs. He has published hundreds of pages of applied integral theory and has co-designed and co-delivered numerous international conferences and seminars on applied integral theory. Brett served many years as the Managing Director of the Integral Institute *Business and Leadership Center* and on the Editorial Board for the *Journal of Integral Theory and Practice*. Brett currently serves on the boards of both *Integral Leadership Review* and *Integral Publishers*. 
Endnotes

1 Russ Volckmann and I wrote an article devoted to this topic entitled, “The Problem with Leadership Theory.” The article is available for download for members of the Integral Leadership Collaborative.

2 While readers don’t need to be a CEO, be enrolled in a leadership development program, or be in an elected or appointed “leadership position”, it’s certainly fine if you are! I have worked with hundreds of CEOs and other senior leaders in positions of authority and have designed countless corporate leadership development programs including co-developing and co-facilitating integral leadership programs with Ken Wilber at the Integral Institute as well as the gold standard Integral Leadership Program at the Stagen Leadership Academy.

3 The real names of these schools along with other details are covered in our forthcoming book on Integral Leadership.

4 Ken Wilber and our colleagues at the Integral Institute have developed integral approaches to medicine, education, psychology, ecology, politics, business, and dozens of other domains building on the All Quadrants, All Lines, All Levels, All States, All Types (AQAL) framework.

5 In 2005, in an effort to explain what the Stagen Leadership Institute was doing in our pioneering Integral Leadership Program, my partner Rand Stagen and I authored a white paper entitled “Next-Level Leadership” which details Steve Jobs’ leadership of Apple during this transition. It is available at http://www.stagen.com/perspectives/next-level/

6 Students of developmental theory—especially constructivist developmental psychology—recognize that people hold worldviews in different ways. Some worldviews (or aspects of worldviews) are “constructed” using mental structures associated with their developmental stages while other worldviews (or aspects of worldviews) have simply been “adopted” from cultural sources such as parents, teachers, religion, the media, etc. While developmental psychologists emphasize the mental structures people use to construct worldviews, integral leadership practitioners emphasize the worldviews that people espouse without being concerned about whether those worldviews were constructed or simply adopted. I encourage leaders to leave those concerns to the developmental psychologists. As an integral leader, once you learn to accurately recognize people’s espoused (adopted) worldviews, you will be able to interact with them skillfully using an appropriate leadership style that will be resonant, helpful, and
appreciated. That is precisely the focus of the forthcoming Leadership Rosetta Stone and Understanding People sections.

7 This academic definition, and further detail, can be found in “The Psychology of Worldviews” by Mark E. Koltko-Rivera, published in the American Psychological Association Review of General Psychology 2004, Vol. 8

8 Despite employing differing terminologies, a massive body of research points to a surprisingly consistent range of worldviews. The four most common worldviews are well known to social scientists as: Modern, Postmodern, Traditional, and Imperial. Extensive empirical data and peer-reviewed articulation of these models suggest that underlying, organizing similarities between worldviews occur broadly across cultures and historic periods.

9 I summarized the other major schools of leadership in the article “The Problem with Leadership Theory.” These universal leadership styles do not replace previously-developed schools of leadership and so-called “styles;” rather, these broad categories—which I call “Universal Leadership Styles”—transcend and include previous styles and schools of leadership. These broad categories provide a framework of orienting generalizations that can be used to determine which specific leadership approaches and techniques are likely to work in a given situation with specific people. At first this may seem like a far-reaching over-simplification, yet as you will see, in practice, people really do tend to strongly resonate with these styles based on their worldview. Once you begin to look around and notice this pattern in action, you will be amazed how true the basic pattern holds. For example, people with a Traditional worldview almost always prefer Authoritarian leadership, and so on, for all four pairings.

10 The model presented here is intended to be a summarized and simplified presentation of worldviews geared for leaders. The use of values and worldviews is widespread and informed by a multitude of different models and approaches that differ in details but are quite similar in principle and overarching conclusions. Values research is widely used by psychologists, political scientists, and marketers. Some of the popular values models include the Rokeach Value Survey (RVS), the Values and Lifestyles (VALS) methodology developed at SRI International, the List of Values (LOV) developed at the University of Michigan Survey Research Center by Lynn Kahle, the Emergent Cyclical Levels of Existence Theory (ECLET) by Dr. Clare Graves, Spiral Dynamics by Don Beck and Chris Cowan which is based on the Graves model, and the Holonomic Theory of the Evolution of Consciousness (HTEC) by Jenny Wade. As seen in this and many other Wilber books, integral theory adopted the color-coding scheme originally developed at the National Values Center (under the direction of Don Beck and
Chris Cowan) to refer to values and worldviews. This convention has proven to be extremely useful and has seen widespread adoption among integral researchers, theorists, and practitioners, as color-coding provides a useful shorthand to refer to the categorical similarities between different models while transcending the varied terminologies employed by each. To help differentiate values from stages of development along specific developmental lines, Wilber introduced a separate color scheme for what he calls “altitudes.” Altitudes are levels (stages) of structural complexity along a given developmental line. Of course, I use the values/worldview colors here and not Wilber’s altitude colors precisely because values/worldviews can be adopted by a person or group for any number of reasons (seen in all four quadrants, especially circumstances and culture) and therefore should never be reduced to or conflated with altitudes (stages).