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Scholars and practitioners recognize the significance of improving leadership preparation programs. This longitudinal study (surveys and interviews) investigates how course structure and curricula support graduate students’ learning about content as well as how to attend and facilitate adult development. This paper describes: (a) changes in students’ conceptions of how to support adult development, including their new understanding that adults need challenge and support to grow; (b) how course experiences helped them understand theory and practices for supporting adult growth, and (c) how they planned to use practices in their future leadership. This investigation offers insight into how course structure, content, and instruction can support educators’ leadership development.

Twenty-first century school leadership demands are multifaceted and complex. Districts are asking principals to move beyond simply managing or administrating (scheduling, budgeting, and discipline) to leading instruction and engineering practices that promote adult growth and build professional capacity in teachers (Fullan, 2007; Kegan & Lahey, 2009; Wagner, 2007). While the importance of school leaders’ work is clear, many leaders are not equipped to manage the added and new demands of their role (Byrne-Jiménez & Orr, 2007; Childress, Johnson, Grossman, & Elmore, 2007; Elmore, 2004; Firestone & Riehl, 2005; Kegan & Lahey, 2009; Sparks, 2004).

To help leaders meet these educational challenges, we need more comprehensive preparation programs (Hoff, Yoder, & Hoff, 2006). Most higher
education leadership preparation focuses on management skills (e.g., planning and financing), which are necessary but insufficient to help aspiring leaders meet anticipated leadership demands (Donaldson, 2008; Grogan & Andrews, 2002; Houle, 2006; Peterson, 2002; Wagner, 2007). Instead, programs need to teach about relational learning, collaborative leadership, and reflective practice (Donaldson, 2006, 2008; Moller & Pankake, 2006; Osterman & Kottkamp, 2004). In addition, programs should familiarize students with adult learning and developmental theories (Boyatzis & McKee, 2005; Donaldson, 2008; Kegan & Lahey, 2009; Mizell, 2006; NSDC, 2000; Wagner et al., 2006).

Researchers (Barber, 2006; Browne-Ferrigno, 2007; Donaldson, 2008; Lugg, 2006; Mizell, 2006) have identified a longstanding knowledge gap and lack of preparation when it comes to how school leaders support adult learning and development in schools (Capper, Theoharis, & Sebastian, 2006; Hargreaves & Fink, 2006; Silverberg & Kottkamp, 2006). While we believe learning depends on good teaching in a safe space that enables risk taking, it is unclear how to achieve such learning among skilled professionals in university classrooms (Browne-Ferrigno, 2007; Pallas, 2001; Silverberg & Kottkamp, 2006). It is also unclear how the study of adult learning and development might cultivate the leadership capacities of aspiring leaders.

This article addresses these research gaps by asking: what university teaching practices and curricula can help aspiring leaders develop the capacities to support adult learning? Through qualitative interviews and pre- and post-course surveys, our research examined how aspiring leaders experienced the graduate course Leadership for Transformational Learning (LTL). In this course, students studied theories and practices that could be employed to support their own and other adults’ growth. The study sought to identify key learning strategies, content, and class structures that supported participants’ leadership development. In this article, we explain how creating learning contexts in university classrooms is one way to support adult learning and to help aspiring leaders to do this in turn in their schools. Our research questions for this article, which are part of a larger, longitudinal study (2003-2010), asked:

- How might LTL support changes in students’ conceptions of what it means to support adult development?
- How, if at all, might their experience in LTL influence how they think about supporting adult growth?
- How might LTL help them translate theories and practices for adult growth to their future leadership?

This article describes the students’ understandings of course effects by detailing: (a) changes in students’ conceptions of supporting adult development, including how they learned that facilitating adult growth
requires challenge and support; (b) how the course helped them understand theories of and practices for adult growth, and (c) how reflection on their own development inspired them to use the practices they learned in their future work. Consequently, our research suggests pedagogical practices and strategies that effectively prepare school leaders to support adult development.

**Conceptual Context**

A number of related foci informed the conceptual context for this study. For example, an understanding of the LTL course context, curricula, and developmentally-oriented practices is key to the nature of this work. Moreover, this study and the course itself were in turn informed by our larger theoretical framework, which includes the importance of leadership supportive of adult development, as well as key adult learning and developmental theories—including constructive-developmental theory (Kegan, 1982, 1994, 2000) and adult learning theory (e.g., Brookfield, 1987, 1995; Cranton, 1994; Mezirow, 1991).

**Leadership for Transformational Learning: Course Overview.** LTL was intentionally crafted with adult learning and development in mind and sought to recognize and honor the developmental orientations, diverse capacities, and differentiated needs of individual learners. In terms of content, LTL introduced students to transformational learning—or learning that builds cognitive and affective capacities to better manage the complexities of leadership and life (Drago-Severson, 2004a, 2004b, 2006a, 2006b; Kegan, 2000)—as well as key components of constructive-developmental theory (Kegan, 1982, 1994, 2000), the importance of a developmental perspective in leadership, the importance of caring for one’s own development along with that of others (e.g., Ackerman & Maslin-Ostrowski, 2002; Donaldson, 2006), and the foundations of a new model for learning-oriented leadership (Drago-Severson, 2004b). In general, LTL addressed questions such as: How can school leaders create contexts that support adults’ transformational learning? What developmental principles inform practices that better support adults’ transformational learning? Lectures, readings, group discussions, and convenings (personal case analyses of leadership experiences) constituted the course’s primary means of instruction and invited students to apply learning and theory to practice. Additional course features are described in more detail below, and a course reading list is offered in Appendix A.

**Theoretical Framework.** Supporting adult development makes schools better places of learning for both children and adults (Darling-Hammond & Sclan, 1996; Donaldson, 2006; Fullan, 2005; Kegan & Lahey, 2009). In fact, research indicates that students benefit and their achievement increases when adults learn and grow in schools (Donaldson, 2008; Guskey, 1999; Mizell, 2007). As Mizell (2007) argued, “The more often educators are engaged with their peers in effective professional learning, the more they will learn and the more likely it is their practice will improve” (p. 2). Moreover, we know
that effective school leadership is one key to school improvement (Barth, 1990; Howe, 1993; Moller & Pankake, 2006), and that teachers also play a key role (Ackerman & Mackenzie, 2007; Wagner et al., 2006). Accordingly, preparing aspiring school leaders to promote adult development is an important and critical step toward school improvement. In this section, we review the literatures that informed this investigation, including leadership supportive of adult development and adult developmental theory—and we further detail the practices and purposes that comprised the LTL context.

**Leadership Supportive of Adult Development.** According to the literature, principals can support teacher learning by: (a) creating a developmentally-oriented school culture that nurtures learning and attends to adults’ needs (Peterson & Deal, 1998; Sarason, 1995), (b) building interpersonal relationships among teachers (Barth, 1990; Bolman & Deal, 1995; Donaldson, 2006, 2008), and (c) emphasizing teacher learning (Cochran-Smith, 2006; Johnson, 1990, 1996; Johnson et al., 2004). However, researchers are only beginning to examine the practical question of how specific school-based leadership practices support adult growth. In addition, researchers are only starting to address how university courses can develop capacities of aspiring leaders to support adults’ learning (Danielson, 1996; Donaldson, 2008; Lieberman & Miller, 2001; Lugg & Shoho, 2006).

Gordon Donaldson (2008) based his robust model of leadership development on the interpersonal, cognitive, and intrapersonal components of learning. His model centers on deliberate reflection on our own leadership experiences. Successful leadership performance, he contended, “results not just from what we know about good practice but largely from how we relate to others and how well we know and can manage ourselves” (p. 3). Donaldson has shown how reflection increases the quality of adult and student learning in a school. Similarly, our research focused on how reflection in a university classroom might support leadership development.

Other current models for supporting adult growth in schools operate on different assumptions about how growth is defined and supported in school practice (Cochran-Smith, 2006; Drago-Severson, 2004b, 2009; Wagner, 2007; Wagner et al., 2006). To best support adult learning and development, some scholars emphasize a focus on individual meaning making (Daloz, 1999; Kegan, 2000), the adult as a developing person (Ackerman & Mackenzie, 2007; Kegan & Lahey, 2001, 2009), and context as an enhancer or inhibitor to growth (Donaldson, 2006; Johnson et al., 2004; Moller & Pankake, 2006). These developmental principles informed our research and the LTL course.

**Adult Developmental Theories.** Many university courses do not make use of adult developmental theory to inform course design or attend to adult learning (Drago-Severson et al., 2001; Drago-Severson, 2004b, 2009; Kegan, 2000; Wagner et al., 2006), even though developmentalists (Drago-Severson, 2009; Kegan, 2000; Kegan & Lahey, 2001,
argue that adults at various stages of ego and intellectual development respond differently to coursework. LTL used principles of adult learning (Brookfield, 1987, 1995; Mezirow, 1991, 1994, 2000) and constructive-developmental theory (Daloz 1983, 1986, 1999; Kegan 1982, 1994, 2000; Kegan & Lahey, 2001, 2009) to inform course design, teaching practices, and the interplay between individual developmental capacity and learning. As instructors (a professor and teaching fellows), we considered how different developmental orientations require different forms of support and challenge to maximize growth opportunities. Our understanding of students’ meaning making informed our assignments and feedback. We set out to support and challenge students in ways that would enable them to view their own and others’ experiences through the lenses of adult developmental theories.

Since Robert Kegan’s (1982, 1994, 2000) constructive-developmental theory was a cornerstone of the theoretical component of the course and because participants reference it in the data that follows, we provide an explanation of his theory here. Before providing descriptions of the key principles of this theory, however, we want to make clear that, like all theories, Kegan’s formulation has both strengths and limitations. Nevertheless, prior research and experience in schools has indicated that using this theory and the new learning-oriented model for leadership (Drago-Severson, 2009), which is informed by this theory, can help leaders differentiate the way they support teachers and other adults (Drago-Severson, 2004a, 2004b, 2007, 2009; Kegan, 2000; Kegan & Lahey, 2001, 2009).

**Constructive-Developmental Theory.** Kegan’s (1982, 1994, 2000) constructive-developmental theory contends that development is a lifelong process continuing throughout adulthood. According to Kegan’s (1982, 1994) theory, growth involves a constant renegotiation between what constitutes self and what constitutes other. His theory centers on two premises: (a) that people actively construct or make sense of their experiences and (b) that the ways in which people make meaning of experiences can develop over time. In other words, adults grow from one way of knowing to more complex ways of knowing at their own speed. For this to occur, a person must benefit from developmentally appropriate supports and challenges. While these developmental processes are sequential, people of similar ages and phases of their lives can make meaning with different ways of knowing. In essence, this theory: (a) centers on the relationship between what we, as human beings, can take a perspective on (hold as “object”) and what we are embedded in and cannot see or be responsible for (are “subject to”); (b) focuses on an individual’s meaning making of reality (i.e., ways of knowing or developmental level), and (c) offers supports and challenges that can help adults grow and develop throughout the lifespan.

While a deep theoretical discussion is beyond the scope of this article, we provide a brief overview of
the central characteristics of the three qualitatively different ways of knowing most prevalent in adulthood, according to Kegan (1994, 2000): the instrumental, socializing, and self-authoring ways of knowing.

An adult with an instrumental way of knowing has a “what do you have that can help me/what do I have that can help you” orientation to learning, teaching, leadership, and life. An instrumental knower understands his or her experiences in concrete terms. They are most concerned with following the rules, and they feel supported when others (colleagues, leaders) provide specific, explicit advice and guidelines to follow. For example, if instrumental knowers follow the rules and work to achieve the “right” goals, they expect concrete rewards (e.g., promotion, compensation). A limitation to this way of knowing is that an instrumental knower is not able to take another’s perspective fully, cannot think abstractly, and is unable to make generalizations from one context to another. Inviting instrumental knowers to consider multiple perspectives will support growth over time. Teaming and convenings, practices detailed in the LTL discussion below, can provide robust holding environments—in other words contexts in which adults can develop—that support this kind of growth.

Adults who make meaning with primarily a socializing way of knowing have more complex capacities for reflection. Unlike instrumental knowers, socializing knowers are able to think abstractly, make generalizations from one context to another, and reflect on others’ actions. Their orientation is other-focused; in other words, having the approval of authorities and valued others is of utmost importance. This kind of approval is what makes the self feel whole; thus, interpersonal conflict is experienced as a threat to the self and its coherence. For instance, when engaging in goal setting, socializing knowers look to others—to “authorities”—to understand what goals they should pursue. They can take rules as object (i.e., hold a perspective on them and not be run by the rules necessarily), but the approval of authorities now replaces rules in making the self whole. To support the growth of socializing knowers, it is important to create opportunities for them to voice their own opinions before learning about authorities’ (e.g., assistant principals’, coaches’, principals’) perspectives about issues under consideration. Often, it is helpful to invite socializing knowers to share their perspectives in pairs or small groups before sharing them in larger settings. This helps them to clarify their own beliefs, values, and standards, rather than adopt those of others. In LTL, sharing with pairs and triads was one of the practices that was employed to support socializing knowers’ growth.

Adults with a self-authoring way of knowing have the developmental capacity to generate internal values and standards. They can identify abstract values, principles, and longer-term purposes and are able to prioritize and integrate competing values. Self-authoring knowers have the developmental capacity to reflect on and regulate interpersonal relationships (i.e., they are no longer subject to or run by
them—they have a perspective on them), but are limited by an inability to take perspective on their own self-regulating system. When engaging in goal setting with a supervisor, they will ultimately decide for themselves which goals to pursue, although they appreciate an authority’s perspective on the goals they might work toward achieving. Self-authoring knowers will be supported in their growth when offered questions and alternatives that gently challenge them to let go of their own perspectives and embrace alternative—especially opposing—points-of-view.

In any classroom of adults or in any school or district, it is likely that adults will have different ways of knowing. Therefore, leaders (and university teachers) need to attend to this type of developmental diversity. To do this, it is necessary to incorporate pedagogical practices that will support and challenge adults with different ways of knowing (Drago-Severson, 2004a; Kegan, 1982, 1994, 2000; Kegan & Lahey, 2001, 2009) and support transformational change—or a qualitative shift in how people understand themselves, their worlds, and the relationship between the two as they grow from one way of knowing to another (Kegan, 1982, 1994, 2000).

A classroom context can serve as what Kegan (1982) refers to as a holding environment, which can help adults grow to better manage the complexities of learning and leading. We extend this concept to a university classroom, where course content, structure, and pedagogy serve as a holding environment for growth. The most effective holding environments meet adults where they are, provide challenge (or stretching opportunities) to facilitate growth (e.g., in the form of questions that create opportunities for adults to consider alternative ways of thinking, reframing assumptions, and responding or behaving), and remain in place while the person establishes the new way of knowing. Appropriate challenge requires one to gently push a person’s thinking by asking critical questions that can spur growth over time.

Holding environments must be spacious enough to provide appropriate support and challenge to adults who make meaning in developmentally different ways. Accordingly, LTL was designed to consider how the participants—and by extension those they would lead—with different developmental orientations would need different supports and challenges to maximize leadership development. For example, LTL deliberately employed diverse practices with specific developmental dimensions—explained in detail below—in order to intentionally support adult learning and growth (for a more detailed discussion, please see Drago-Severson, 2009). Likewise, in this next section, we discuss how we combined pedagogical strategies, spaces for written and dialogical reflection, and extensive written feedback on assignments to support learners with different needs.

**Leadership for Transformational Learning: Course Design, Structure, and Goals.** The dual intentions of LTL were to (a) teach the importance of developmentally-oriented leadership
and (b) simultaneously model an environment conducive to adult learning and development for students. Accordingly, the course not only taught students about the theories of adult learning and development (described above), but also afforded students the opportunity to experience such theories in practice and in action. In this paper, we provide examples of how we designed the course to foster students’ learning and growth. We also examine evidence of students’ learning—both course content and strategies to support adults’ growth and development in their own leadership.

**Specific Pedagogic Strategies Used in LTL.** *Group Work.* We gave students structured opportunities to discuss their own and other people’s work and leadership experiences through workshops, personal leadership cases, and in-class exercises. In pairs and groups of three, students examined, integrated, and applied various ideas presented in the course readings to in-class exercises and personal convening cases (we discuss our rationale in detail later). From a developmental perspective, this group work was structured to support and gently challenge participants with different ways of knowing. For example, in these smaller groups, socializing knowers could find spaces to safely voice and test their own ideas before sharing in larger group contexts. Similarly, these groups also provided leadership opportunities for self-authoring knowers, while the collaborative structure encouraged them to consider and include diverse points-of-view.

**Convening.** Another pedagogical strategy employed to create holding environments for growth were “convenings” (Drago-Severson, 2009), or collaborative discussion groups in which students “convened” to reflect upon problematic or puzzling cases from their own practice after establishing safe participatory norms. As discussed below, the process of convening helps to support learning, risk taking, the examination of assumptions, and can support development.

The in-class convening groups (Drago-Severson, 2009; Drago-Severson, Roloff-Welch, & Jones, 2007) were groups of 11 students that met each week for one hour of class time. These groups offered structured opportunities (i.e., coming together via protocol to help the case author learn about alternative perspectives on a troubling leadership experience) for the participants to dialogue with their colleagues on a written case, which we refer to as a “convening case,” from their own leadership experiences. During convening, the individual presenting his or her case listened to colleagues’ feedback on the questions that the author of the case developed. The cases focused on a specific experience of leadership in support of another person’s learning and development. Some examples of the complex issues or dilemmas that the cases centered on included: (a) initial stages of a challenging initiative or project, (b) responding to upset or disappointed colleagues to support their development, (c) managing a complex task (e.g., evaluation) in support of
another person’s development, (d) attending to issues of diversity in an effort to support learning and development, (e) working through various sets of loyalties, and (f) making a tough decision.

We assigned each participant to an in-class convening group facilitated by a member of the teaching team. Each person presented his or her case once during the semester. To prepare for convening, each participant created a consultation packet and distributed it to group members the week prior to their convening. Group members had one week to read and consider the case. We distributed guidelines for writing cases, creating a consultation packet, and participating in convenings with the class (see Drago-Severson, 2009 for more detailed description). The packet included a cover memo to the group and a detailed description of the case. The memo introduced the content of the consultation packet, as well as the focus of the case and its rationale, background, and why the case was important to the presenter’s practice. The case situated a particular professional experience within the broader organizational context and asked a set of critical questions that addressed key dilemmas. For example, conveners requested the group’s help in identifying assumptions, contrasting beliefs with actual actions, or considering what the convener might have done differently in the case situation. To help illustrate the nature and purpose of convenings, we share the following example of Brooke’s convening case.

Brooke was a history teacher who served in various leadership roles such as athletic director, varsity soccer coach, and assistant dean at her school. Brooke’s case focused on her experience as a closeted lesbian dealing with sensitive issues related to diversity, tolerance, and multicultural education in her school, and she sought her colleagues’ advice about how her values and beliefs influenced her leadership. In her cover memo, Brooke wrote, “Many people believe that leaders should be transparent, and harbor no secrets. However, what happens when a leader is not forthcoming about his or her personal life?” She asked, “Do values, ethics, and character affect a leader’s on-the-job performance? Should parents, students, and colleagues know everything about a school leader?” In her case, she described her actions—and inactions—as a leader attempting to develop a safe, open, and respectful environment for students.

The group helped Brooke to consider assumptions that may have guided her behavior and thinking or influenced her leadership behaviors in the case. Questions from the group centered on helping Brooke to consider assumptions about what it would mean to her to share the hidden parts of her identity with others. What was her greatest fear? How might her honesty help others to grow? Collectively, they worked with and for Brooke to surface discrepancies between expressed beliefs and actions, although group members described growing from this collaboration as well.

Assignments. LTL writing assignments invited students to reflect
on their own leadership for adult learning/development experiences. We asked students to consider how the readings and class discussions/exercises might inform their thinking and practices (see Appendix A for the course topics and readings list). All assignments encouraged students to choose a topic that was personally meaningful and significant. For example, the guidelines for one of the reflection assignments are presented below. This assignment was a three-page reflection paper guided by questions from the teaching team to provide a structure for the paper:

Select (a) a reading, (b) concept from a reading, or (c) concept discussed across readings that strikes you as being powerful and potentially applicable to your own work as leader in support to adult learning. Please describe and discuss aspects of the reading and/or concept and why you see it as powerful or important. You may choose a reading or concept discussed in the course thus far. You will find it helpful to review our course syllabus.

1. How might you apply this reading or concept to support adult learning and development? Please provide a specific example of how this concept or reading might translate to practice.

2. What questions arise for you as you consider transferring theory into practice? (Drago-Severson, 2009)

These papers gave us insight into the students’ thinking, and also allowed for developmentally-mindful feedback that invited students to revise and refine their ideas. The written feedback offered supportive commentary and posed questions intended to encourage students to consider their cases through the theoretical lenses that were showcased in the course.

Guest Speakers. Participants also had opportunities to interact with experienced and novice school leaders. These leaders discussed a variety of leadership challenges, including negotiating school-wide reform, implementing professional development initiatives, and facing resistance to change. These candid exchanges with school leaders enabled participants to make connections between the course and the guests’ experiences.

Our goal in designing LTL was for students to bridge theory and practice, reflect on their learning, and assume leadership roles within small student teams. We provided theoretical frameworks to build on students’ knowledge, experience, and skills. Writing, dialogue, shared reflection in pairs and teams, and case-based discussion served as the cornerstones of the course.

Method

Data for this article consisted of pre- and post-class surveys, 12 interviews, and course documents. This section describes the research setting, participant characteristics, data
collection and analytic strategies, as well as issues related to validity and generalizability of the study.

**Participants.** Twelve (7 masters and 5 doctoral students) of the 15 participants who volunteered from LTL’s 2004 spring semester class of 22 adults were purposefully selected to provide in-depth interviews. We used pre/post-course survey data, observational notes from weekly class meetings, teaching-team meetings, summer schedules, and teaching journal entries to determine which volunteers we could invite for interviews. We used the following selection criteria:

- Diversity of responses to the pre/post surveys (see below) on experiences in LTL
- Prior leadership position (e.g., teachers, aspiring principals, and leaders in ministry)
- Previous work contexts (e.g., K-12 schools, universities, non-profits, and churches)
- Type of graduate program
- Availability to participate in an interview after the end of the spring semester

Table 1 presents an overview of participants’ characteristics. The interview sample consisted of 10 women and 2 men since women constituted the majority in this class. They had diverse characteristics with respect to number of years in their current role, ethnicity, and prior educational background. We offered participants the option of using a pseudonym.

**Data collection.** Pre- and post-class surveys, in-depth interviews with the 12 participants, and course documents were the main sources of data for this study. We did not look at any survey data or administer any interviews until after final grades were submitted. Students were told this before agreeing to participate in this research.

**Surveys.** We administered pre- and post-surveys (Appendix B & C) to the entire class (N=22) at the beginning and completion of the course; all respondents voluntarily participated in the survey. The pre- and post-surveys were kept in sealed envelopes and opened after students’ final grades were submitted (participants were aware that we would not examine any pre-survey or post-survey data until after submitting final grades). The survey questions focused on four themes: (a) students’ initial conceptions of adult development (pre-survey) and any changes in their thinking after the course (post-survey), (b) prior experiences related to adult development in their professional settings, (c) initial expectations (pre-survey) and post-course reflections about the course activities (post-survey), and (d) how they planned to use course learnings in their future leadership.

The pre-surveys, consisting of eight closed and 13 open-ended questions, assisted with participant selection for the qualitative interviews. They also provided information about students’ conceptions of transformational learning and adult development before the course. The closed questions centered on participants’ background information, and the open-ended questions explored
Table 1

**Participants’ Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Graduate Student Status while in LTL*</th>
<th>Most recent leadership position and work context*</th>
<th>Aspirations for future work (role/work context) **</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Ed.D. student in Administration, Planning, and Social Policy (APSP)</td>
<td>Middle school earth science teacher in public school; Co-science department head; basketball coach</td>
<td>“be involved in professional development that improves instruction on a large scale”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Ed.M. student in APSP</td>
<td>Lead teacher at an adult literacy program; high school French and Spanish teacher</td>
<td>Secondary school teacher; aspires to “have a significant role in leading professional development initiatives”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Ed.M. student in Learning and Teaching (L&amp;T)</td>
<td>High school social studies teacher in public school</td>
<td>Teacher; hopes to apply theories to her practice; continue to develop the non-profit organization for education she created</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tawanda</td>
<td>Ed.D. student in L&amp;T</td>
<td>Special education teacher for emotionally disturbed adolescent boys at a residential treatment center; mentor teacher; staff developer</td>
<td>Aspiring special education administrator; teacher trainer and program developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Ed.M. student in Arts in Education</td>
<td>Elementary school art teacher in both public and private schools; Character Counts coordinator</td>
<td>Education director at an art museum; executive director of a community arts organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note. * Initial Questionnaire, Spring 2004. **Final Questionnaire, May 2004. We use the term “way of knowing” interchangeably with “meaning-making system,” “developmental level” and “developmental orientation.”

The post-survey consisted of 19 open-ended questions, focusing on participants’ hopes for their future role.
and work as leaders, their conceptions of supporting adult learning after LTL, and any practices and experiences that supported their learning in LTL. This article focuses on the interviews and pre- and post-surveys from the 12 selected participants.

**Interviews.** We conducted and analyzed approximately 24 hours of semi-structured, in-depth, qualitative interviews with the 12 participants (tape-recorded and transcribed verbatim) after final grades were submitted. We asked participants similar questions about various topics, including: initial conceptions of adult growth and development, experiences of professional development in their workplaces, and ways of connecting adult development theory to leadership practice. The post-course interviews asked about the following topics: how participants’ ideas about supporting adult learning and development changed; their experiences in LTL; and why and how, if at all, they planned to use practices supportive of adult development in their future leadership work (See Appendix D for sample interview questions).

**Documents.** For this article, we analyzed a variety of documents, including: the course syllabus, e-mail correspondence from students regarding LTL, and mid-term and end-of-course evaluations. These provided contextual data and enabled us to triangulate data. We also analyzed class and convening notes and notes from meetings between the teaching team and each interviewee about changes in thinking about supporting adult development. These documents also provided important validity checks.

**Data analysis.** Analytic strategies included coding interviews and observational notes for central concepts (Strauss & Corbin, 1998), organizing theoretical (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996) and emic codes (Geertz, 1974) into thematic matrices, creating narrative summaries (Maxwell, 2005), and building profiles (Seidman, 1998). We used a grounded theory approach (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) and examined how various literatures cited in this article informed analysis.

Questions that explored participants’ pre-course conceptions guided our analysis. We considered students’ changes in thinking about supporting adult development and any plans they had for using this learning in their future leadership. We explored patterns across categories in pre- and post-surveys and interview data by writing analytic memos (Maxwell & Miller, 1998), developing codes, and creating displays (Miles & Huberman, 1994) from occurrences of the codes, which we then analyzed for changes in participants’ conceptions about supporting adult development. We conducted within- and cross-case analyses of the 12 participants’ interview data in relation to these codes.

Initial analytic memos (Maxwell, 2005) helped us track participants’ experiences and hone later analytic questions. Prevalent codes that emerged from preliminary analysis of data in relation to supportive practices included: initial conceptions of adult learning, new ways of thinking about adult development, connections
between adult developmental theory to leadership practice, support and challenge for facilitating adult development, LTL activities and content that assisted in developing new conceptions during LTL, creating safe spaces for talking and reflection, and strategies for transfer to future practice. (Please see Appendix E for a detailed overview of our coding matrix.) We developed the following analytic questions that guided the second phase of analysis of the salient concepts and themes from individual interviews and across all the cases: (a) What were participants’ perceptions of supporting adult development before the course? (b) What kinds of practices did they think supported adult development? (c) What were participants’ perceptions of supporting adult development after the course? (d) What kinds of practices would support adult development in their view after the course? (e) What helped in developing a new understanding of how to support adult development in the LTL course? (f) How did conceptual change influence participants’ ideas about their future practice? (g) What ideas did they share for supporting adult development in their future practice?

We attended to descriptive validity by having all interview and survey data transcribed verbatim. To attend to interpretive validity, we cross checked codes (Miles & Huberman, 1994) and discussed our interpretations with each other to incorporate alternative interpretations. We attended to theoretical validity by examining data for both confirming and disconfirming instances of themes (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Since this is a qualitative study, the findings were generalized to the participants only. However, as Maxwell (2005) emphasized, findings may have important implications for similar cases.

To address our dual roles as researchers and instructors, we made clear to participants that we would not be examining any data until after final grades were submitted. In addition, we explicitly stated that we would not know who completed pre/post surveys and that participation was entirely voluntary. We did this in order to consider and to attend to the ethical implications of our roles as teachers and researchers and any influence this might have had on participants’ comfort levels. For example, we made clear that they were not being evaluated for their knowledge/learning during interviews; instead, we explicitly stated that we wanted to learn about their experience. We purposefully conducted interviews after the course was over and after final grades were submitted. None of the members of the teaching team were instructors for them in other courses after completion of this course.

Limitations of this work. It is important to recognize some potential limitations of this study and the steps that were taken to address them. The Teaching Fellows assisting the instructor conducted all of the interviews except for one. Teaching fellows were not able to conduct this interview due to scheduling. All interviews were conducted after final grades were submitted and participants were aware of this. Teaching Fellows collected pre- and post-course survey responses and these were placed in
sealed envelopes to enable the participants to express their views comfortably. All surveys were stored in an administrative assistant’s office and not returned to the instructor or teaching fellows until after final grades were submitted. The institution’s Research Ethics Board’s prior approval for the study was obtained prior to conducting the research and the steps to ensure participants’ voluntary consent and confidentiality were approved by the Board. While participation in this study provided students with the opportunity to further articulate their learnings and plans for their future leadership practice, we also acknowledge that there is a possibility that their involvement in this study might have motivated them to improve their performance in the course.

Findings

Overall, students’ conceptions of supporting adult development changed significantly over the course of the semester, as evidenced by their responses to questions in the pre- and post-surveys and in the post-semester interviews. In this section, we discuss three main themes related to students’ self-reported changes in conceptions of supporting adult development, which they attributed to their learning in LTL. Students reported: (a) a deeper understanding of the importance of recognizing that adults make meaning according to different developmental levels; (b) a realization that adults need different kinds of supports and challenges to learn and grow, and (c) an understanding of concrete and practical applications for using adult development theories taught in LTL to lead adults in their work. In the next section, we discuss what we discovered from pre-survey, post-survey, and interview data for each of these themes.

Understanding the Significance of Developmental Levels in Adult Learning. The pre- and post-course data suggest that the principles of adult development and transformational learning meaningfully shaped participants’ thinking about engaging in adult development as leaders. Constructive-developmental theory (Daloz 1983, 1986, 1999; Drago-Severson, 2004a, 2004b; Kegan 1982, 1994, 2000; Kegan & Lahey, 2001, 2009), in particular, brought about a powerful awareness of the diverse developmental orientations that adults bring to learning contexts and the ways these mindsets may shape their learning and professional growth. Accordingly, the idea of a holding environment (Drago-Severson, 2004a; Kegan, 1982) that recognizes and responds to individuals’ different ways of meaning making to facilitate their professional development was an important component of this realization. In the following section, we discuss the specific ways in which the concepts of constructive-developmental theory and holding environment informed participants’ ideas about supporting adult development in their future leadership practice. As an example that resonates with what we learned from most participants, we offer the following.

I saw education as learning theories, knowledge, and meeting people. Now [after the course] I
see education as growing, changing, holding [larger] perspectives... I can learn anything by reading, but to grow, we need more than reading. (Deniz, English teacher in Turkey).

As Deniz suggested in his statement above, true adult development requires more than reading or self-teaching. Deniz reported that his understanding about the ways that adults learn and grow changed as a result of LTL. Our analysis of survey and interview data revealed that students progressed from a general and all-encompassing belief that all adults can learn to a complex understanding of how adults at different developmental levels learn and grow, consistent with the current emphasis in the literature on the importance of recognizing and supporting adult learning and growth in our schools (Donaldson, 2008; Guskey, 1999; Mizell, 2007). In this section, we discuss how students developed a deeper appreciation for attending to adults’ different developmental orientations.

For example, before the course, Anne stated that as a leader she “communicates [her] belief in [the] responsibility of [adults’] own learning,” and that she, herself, has a “belief in all adults as learners.” Similarly, Brooke explained that supporting adult learning means “to encourage and promote the desire to learn, grow, and set goals throughout adulthood.” Matt discussed adults as “unique individuals.” For him, supporting adults meant helping them to “us[e] uniqueness to draw insights into content and life that only they can draw and shar[e] those insights with other people.” Deniz’s prior concept of supporting adult development meant “supporting adults so that they are competent enough to take care of their own problems [that originate] from their beliefs, philosophies, and outlook on life.” Similarly, Svetlana stated that supporting adults meant helping “adults develop new ways of thinking” and “assisting adults to gradually become able to learn on their own and in groups (through group consultations/discussions about experience) so that they can continuously improve their practice” (student’s emphasis). Finally, Kristen believed that supporting adult learners meant “enabling adults around me to want to be learners, to help adults realize what areas they would like to learn about and help them understand their own individual needs.” It is important to note that before LTL, most of these participants had pre-conceptions about what it means to support adult development. They believed that adults can learn, but placed great emphasis on self-directed learning. This idea became more complex for these students as they learned what it means to support adults at varying developmental levels.

In the post-survey, students showed evidence of understanding that adults make meaning with different ways of knowing. For example, Tawanda, a special educator, said she learned how important it is to “try to recognize what stages of development people are in and work with them [to
create] holding environments so they can grow.” She continued, “My thinking has changed in that now I realize that not everybody is in the same stage of development; . . . adults can still develop and grow in terms of their professional lives.” Similarly, Margaret affirmed:

Now I get that we are all in one stage [of development] or another, that although personality is important, I can’t dismiss people as “not getting it.” Now [after LTL], I can be more compassionate with myself and others as being in a stage that will morph as we are supported and challenged [to grow throughout our lives].

Matt, like Margaret, came to believe that his learning would help him support others on their own learning “journey” and increase his self-awareness. In his words, “Understanding and identifying different meaning-making systems can help to examine behavior of self and others.” He also noted that LTL helped him in his leadership since it “allowed [him] to identify that people make meaning in distinguishable, understandable ways.”

In the post-course interviews, students discussed their new understanding of adult development in light of Kegan’s (1982) constructive-developmental theory. For example, Tawanda, Kristen, and Margaret (teacher-leaders in various educational contexts) emphasized that adults are at different stages in terms of their developmental capacities, and as Margaret explained, she did not see these stages as “fixed parts of [people’s] personalities.” In other words, she learned that adults can move through different stages of development as they learn and grow.

Deniz, a high school teacher and an IT specialist at the time of the course, said that before LTL, he “saw education as learning theories.” However, after LTL, he had a new perspective on education. Education, for him, is about “growing,” “changing,” and “holding perspectives.” Deniz said that he no longer believes that “knowledge telling” is an effective way to support growth as a leader.

We noticed that some participants also expressed concerns about the casual use of constructive-developmental theory to understand people’s meaning making. Matt and Deniz, for instance, voiced their sensitivity to the “danger” of using constructive-developmental theory to categorize people. Matt was apprehensive about labeling people as different types of knowers because he thought that “putting people into slots” (developmental stages) would inhibit an in-depth understanding and appreciation of a person’s “talent, abilities, and perspectives.” As he explained,

You’re not [going to] look at somebody as a label. So, again I go to the map, helping people identify where they are on the map, but allowing them to take the journey, and allowing it to be
whatever journey they want it to be.

Matt recognized the importance of using this theory to support adults rather than label them.

All of these students shifted their conceptions of what supporting adult development means in some way. Nearly all emphasized the importance of understanding that adults make meaning in developmentally different ways and that as leaders, they must provide appropriate supports and challenges for adults with varying ways of knowing.

**A Powerful Realization: Adults Need Different Supports and Challenges.**

When you think of schools, you think of children’s learning, but you never think of adult learning. But adults are learners. And that’s something that I realized in this course, that it’s important to comfort…support, and challenge the students as well as the adults. (Elizabeth, social studies teacher in U.S.)

The second major theme to emerge relates to students’ realization that adults need different kinds of supports and challenge in order to grow. As an important outgrowth and extension of their realizations about developmental diversity, participants came to understand that—as leaders—they would need to provide differentiated supports and challenges in their contexts to scaffold adult development and growth. The following discussion highlights the various supports and challenges participants discussed as promising practices to support the professional development of adults with diverse developmental orientations, capacities, and needs.

Overall, students moved from naming professional development exercises or experiences (e.g., in-service, lectures, seminars) as the chief way to support adult learning to a deeper understanding of the need to provide adults with varying supports and challenges for them to learn. Initially, almost all of the participants stressed the significance of providing “encouragement,” “opportunities,” and “support” to facilitate adult learning. However, at the end of the course, the majority of the participants (10 out of 12) believed supporting adult development encompasses appropriate developmental supports and challenges.

Significantly, the course structure and the class culture modeled this type of deliberate differentiation and the establishment of a holding environment for adult learners. Students explained that they experienced in these structures a balance of support and challenge meant to advance their learning. For example, students collaborated and reflected on questions posed by the instructor about supporting adult growth. Such exercises offered students the opportunity to expand their ideas about best practices for adult learning. In addition, convening discussions challenged their assumptions and provided new ideas to manage complex situations. Similarly, the instructors modeled the four pillar practices—teaming, collegial inquiry, providing leadership roles, and mentoring—that
constituted Drago-Severson’s learning-oriented leadership model (2004b, 2009), and provided detailed verbal and written feedback based on students’ individual meaning making and way of knowing. Such feedback invited students to confront their assumptions and examine multiple perspectives on adult development, with evident results given their evolving understanding as demonstrated through our investigation.

For example, the pre-survey asked, “What do you think supporting adult learning means?” and “What kinds of practices do you think can support adult learning?” Most students initially responded that professional development in their schools or workplaces focused on new perspectives, continued learning, and goal setting. In addition, several students stated that supporting adult development meant supporting teachers or other professionals to be more self-directed.

Margaret, an adult literacy teacher, explained: “to support adult development is to listen to a teacher’s goals and objectives and give opportunities to meet them.” Likewise, Tawanda, a special educator, explained that supporting adult learning meant, “helping adults develop their professional skills.” When asked in the pre-survey about practices that would support adult learning, Brooke stated that it is necessary for adults to have “intrinsic motivation” to grow and that this can be “encouraged through professional development.” These sentiments, while important, demonstrate a cursory definition of supporting adult development compared to the understanding evidenced in the post-surveys.

In response to post-survey questions, however, 7 out of 12 students specifically described how LTL enabled them to value different supports and challenges in support of adult learning and development. For instance, Anne, a former science department chairperson, explained that prior to LTL, she saw teachers who were not trying new strategies and offered to help them learn and develop their practice, but she believed that they were simply “resisters” who were opposed to new ideas and change. As a result of LTL, however, she considered “resistance as a signal for [her own] reflection on how [teachers] are making meaning of the experience, [as] a signal of poor or inappropriate supports and challenges, or a period for capacity building.” She developed a new realization about her colleagues’ response to change, in light of constructive-developmental theory and her new knowledge of adults’ ways of knowing. She began to look at it in terms of their existing capacities to adopt new instructional strategies, the challenges that they faced in learning new skills, and the supports that they needed to incorporate innovative practices in their work. This shift in perspective helped Anne to broaden her own response to her colleagues’ concerns about change and she began to consider it as an opportunity as a leader to involve and support others in the change process rather than leaving them out of this journey. In this way, Anne clearly demonstrated a change in her conception of what it means to support
adults in their learning.

Interview data also suggested that students learned about balancing supports and challenges, as consistent with the concept of a holding environment. Several students reported learning strategies to support adults with different ways of knowing. For example, Brooke, Kristen, and Svetlana (former teachers and leaders in diverse educational contexts) emphasized that inquiring about learners’ own ideas, needs, and ways of understanding should be the first step in providing relevant supports and challenges. For Brooke, “supporting adult development” meant “finding the right supports and challenges for people by inquiring rather than assuming other people’s needs.” It is “important,” Brooke shared, “to have dialogue about what people want and need in their own professional development growth mode or personal growth mode in order to help them.” Brooke and Kristen focused on structuring a sharing space and carving out “time” for dialogue.

In her interview, Elizabeth talked about using “varied” strategies to support people at “different stages and levels of learning.” She experienced a “comforting environment” in the course where she felt that the students “as learners were growing,” but she also believed that if people are “very comfortable in what they’re doing, they’re not learning anything new. So they need to be challenged. So it’s creating that sort of environment that will foster increased learning.”

It is interesting to note that Anne and Margaret, both aspiring school leaders, showed complimentary shifts in their understandings of supporting adult development after LTL. Prior to the course, Anne primarily provided challenges to adults, while Margaret provided supports. After the course, however, both of them demonstrated a more balanced emphasis of supports and challenges. Anne thought of supporting adult learning as “providing processes and more concrete steps” as a leader to support the development of teacher interns and their mentors in her future programs. At the same time she understood that providing challenging learning situations is also an important “part of the equation.” In her words,

In this class, I learned a lot about how to support the needs of different [developmental] levels and that [adults are] just like kids. I think a lot about my own teaching in high school. Not all kids learn alike, and it is interesting to see that adults are the same way—that all adults learn differently. But, by creating a variety of opportunities for learners, then everyone should be able to find appropriate challenges and supports.

Interview data reinforced that students learned that adults need different forms of support and relevant challenges. For example, Tawanda emphasized that adult development takes place in a supportive “holding environment” that nurtures people’s growth through effective supports and challenges. She explained, “I will try to recognize what stages of development people are in and work with them in
their holding environments so they can grow.” Elizabeth also acknowledged that she gained a deeper understanding of developmental theory and its application in educational contexts. She emphasized the “importance of modeling” in LTL as a support to her learning. She noted that it was helpful to see the instructors model pedagogic principles and approaches aimed at facilitating adult learning. For her, LTL provided an opportunity to “witness” the theories underpinning adult development as well as learn about various “possibilities” for promoting adult development.

Matt, who was a teacher and aspiring school administrator when LTL began, felt that learning in LTL equipped him with a “greater toolkit of ideas” to “put these theories into practice.” He told us, “I also see different possible uses for [practices] I was already aware of as well—such as journaling—and how those types of activities can fulfill different needs for people.”

**Practices to Support Adult Development.** I hope that I will be able to grow myself and help others grow. (Margaret, Spanish teacher)

The third prevalent theme from our analyses suggests that the students in LTL moved from making general statements about the importance of a supportive environment to describing specific practices they will use in their future leadership work. Participants’ ideas for future leadership practice reflected their recognition of the importance of providing developmentally appropriate scaffolds and challenges to create a variety of learning opportunities for learners with different developmental orientations and needs. Most participants shared their aspirations about creating safe holding environments to nurture their own and their colleagues’ professional development through collaborative reflective practice. These learning environments, they explained, would engage adults in dialogue and reflection with their peers and encourage them to: (a) reflect on professional strengths and needs, (b) ask analytical questions about practice, (c) obtain constructive feedback on work, (d) invite colleagues to examine assumptions guiding particular professional behaviors, and (e) contemplate alternative ways of thinking about and responding to professional challenges to continuously improve and maximize professional practice.

In the pre-surveys, students discussed the role safe environments play in adult learning. For example, Tawanda advocated “creating an environment where adults want to and can learn...welcoming accepting settings.” For Amy, supporting adult learning meant “providing an environment and structure that allows adults to be comfortable and honest...helping them to make sense of past experience and encouraging them to change” (student’s emphasis). Matt expounded on that idea by stating that practices that support adult development include “conversation, reading, practicing experimenting, and creating comfortable learning environments.” He added that it is important to “provide encouragement, companionship, and one’s own
experiences with the journey.” Ozgur also discussed the environment and said “it means providing a non-threatening environment for adults, which stimulate[s] and ease[s] their growth and learning new skills, knowledge, perspectives, so that they have better control of their lives.” Similarly, Svetlana emphasized that it is critical to “create environments where adults can regularly (a) ask questions of themselves and others about their practice, (b) consider more than one way of action or way of thinking about their dilemmas at work, and (c) obtain feedback on their work.” The students’ ideas became much more specific in the post-survey at the semester’s end.

During the end-of-course interviews, for example, participants described plans grounded in the theories, practices, and strategies they experienced in LTL. These examples demonstrate the ways in which students envisioned using reflective practice, dialogue, and writing in their future practice as school leaders. Anne, a former science chairperson who was working with teacher interns, believed that writing, sharing, and reflecting would help the interns articulate their thoughts about teaching. She discussed the importance of creating a safe space for people to collectively think about improving practice. In Anne’s view, “writing” and “talking” about ideas would be an effective support in terms of providing “processes and more concrete steps.” She also acknowledged that it can often be a challenge to “have people articulate” their thoughts. Since Anne was serving as a leader in a teacher education program for mentors and teacher interns, she planned to encourage the interns to “think aloud” about the lessons they have “co-taught.” She hoped that in time, the interns would be “able to do those things on their own, and take some ownership of that.”

Elizabeth, a high school social studies teacher and aspiring teacher-leader, also believed that small group discussions helped people feel more “comfortable” and “willing to share” than large ones. She planned to start a “teacher network” at her school to engage the teachers in reflective discussions about their lessons. She was aware that she needed her principal’s support to initiate a study group of teachers in her school system. Elizabeth also planned to team with other history teachers for “reflective practice” with her peers:

In terms of organization, I’m really hoping, if I can get a couple people…in my school, that’ll be wonderful. But it’s [necessary] to make the first initial connections; I think that’s the key, both with my principal as well as regional principals. And then from there, hopefully convince them of the importance of this reflective practice and how effective it can be.

Elizabeth wanted to work with her principal and other regional principals to build inter-institutional “connections” to foster reflective practice throughout her school system, and she also planned to invite adults with different ways of knowing to write
in small groups to express themselves comfortably. She felt this would be one way to provide both supports and challenges to help learners reach advanced developmental stages.

Kristen, former co-chair of language arts, hoped to work in a leadership position in a school system where two component schools merged into one campus. She envisioned her leadership role in terms of helping the school system through the transitional phase of the merger. Her plan was to introduce “reflective practice” to help teachers from both schools to “come together” and discuss ways to “improve” their practice. She believed it would be a “fantastic opportunity to introduce reflective practice on a formal scale, bringing the two schools together to engage in reflective practice would be enormously helpful,” especially in the transition. She planned to initiate convenings where she would first model reflective practice by offering her own case for discussion and seeking others’ “comments” on it. She thought that “by showing them” her own example, she would be able to “create trust” with her colleagues and invite them to share their own leadership experiences through case-based learning.

Deniz hoped to work as an assistant principal and project manager at a school in Turkey. As a leader, his major goal was to “improve instruction” in his school. His plan was to use reflective practice teams to enhance the performance of teachers. He aspired to create a safe, stimulating, and challenging environment of “trust” and “shared decision making” in order to facilitate open dialogue. Deniz wrote, “The first step is to build the shell. The best shell is based on trust, shared decision making, and self-disclosure.” He planned to develop an online discussion forum to encourage reflection and sharing among teachers at his school.

Like Deniz, Svetlana planned to use collaborative reflection to facilitate adult growth and development. Previously, Svetlana worked in a leadership position at several religious education centers, and she now aspires to be an academic. She planned to support adult learning through collective decision-making and “systematic reflection.” Svetlana now believed it was “important” to consult people about the content as well as the “processes in which they want to engage.” This strategy would distribute decision-making “responsibility” among adults. In a parent-teacher meeting, for instance, she thought that this strategy would involve everyone in “deciding on how the class should look.” Svetlana was aware that her thinking was “different” and that she should not be “afraid to be presenting it.” She felt that using “systematic reflection in staff meetings” at her school would help teachers collectively reflect on issues in their practice.

Amy, who aspired to a leadership role at an art museum, valued the group learning experiences in the convenings because they involved constructive dialogue and reflection around specific tasks. Amy planned to use art creation as a professional development tool for teachers because she believed that “making art is a source
of self-renewal for arts educators.” Moreover, Amy planned to promote reflective practice among educators through writing, art, and convenings to help teachers “build relationships” with each other. She explained:

Before this class, any thinking I had about adult learning was derived from my own experience—mostly traditional practices, workshops, seminars, et cetera—and generally remained nameless. I didn’t really know what it meant when people were learning/transforming [her emphasis]. Now I understand, to some extent, the kind of change in thinking that can/does happen.

Matt and Tawanda hoped to create a collaborative “reflective space” for discussions concerning teachers’ challenges. They believed that through collective thinking, teachers could find ways to address issues in their professional practice. Matt emphasized the importance of “listening” and “learning about the culture of the school” as a future school leader. In addition, it would be essential to “understand the people” he would be working with and to “understand” himself “in relation to the work and people.” Building “strong connections” with others would also be critical to exercising leadership in support of adult development, he explained. “Creating a space [to] help people interact” with each other in relation to their practice was a crucial piece of his new understanding. Initially, he put more emphasis on “particulars”; however, “transitioning to a place that’s less with the particulars and more with creating the space” constituted a “shift” in his meaning making about supporting adult learning. Further, he felt it would be essential to find time in the day for “personal and collaborative reflection” on professional practice.

Tawanda wanted to work as a special education administrator in the future. She explained, “If we are better learners, then our students become better learners.” As a leader, she planned to create conditions where teachers could critically examine their practice and learn from their “mistakes.” She envisioned a “security zone,” modeled after LTL convenings, where teachers could talk about professional issues without fear and develop solutions to address the problems.

Reverend Sue also developed thoughtful ideas in relation to her practice as a church leader. As she discussed her new perspective on leadership in support of adult learning, she explained that her leadership would be grounded in reflective practice, entailing “self-dialogue,” “self-evaluation,” and “self-reflection.” Sue underscored how constructive-developmental theory helped in her personal development, and she developed an awareness of the demand for self-authorship in her leadership role and the importance of being “reflective” about her practice.

Similarly, David, a parish rector, intended to employ his learning to support the professional development of clergy. “Deeper connections between
work and reflection are vital,” he explained, and he planned to initiate an “interfaith” group with “clergy colleagues of different religious backgrounds—Roman Catholic, Lutheran, Jewish, maybe even Muslim—to engage together in dialogue, reflection, and learning” to develop deeper connections. He anticipated that these meetings might lead to collaboration among certain ministries and “build bridges” among people in the context of larger political conflicts, civil divisions, and religious misunderstandings. As he noted:

...Because those are not easy bridges to build among Jews, Christians, and Muslims. And it’s somewhat remarkable when you can do it. And then...to encourage these people to see their monthly meetings as a kind of work and a kind of place of learning. ...I think...people would be given to it because they’re pretty thoughtful people.

While most participants highlighted reflective writing and journaling in their future leadership practice, Margaret emphasized the use of free writing to facilitate teachers’ thinking and development. She planned to lead a “free writing group” of teachers at her school. Margaret believed in transforming people through shared professional development where adults grow together. As she explained, “I hope that I will be able to grow myself and help others grow.”

Ultimately, all but one student-participant described specific, course-related practices that they planned to use in their future leadership. As described above, these practices included: (a) reflective practice, (b) the creation of safe learning spaces, (c) engaging adults in dialogue and using writing as tools for professional development, (d) inviting colleagues to engage in discussions on personal leadership challenges and instructional practices, (e) collaborative inquiry to improve leadership practice, (f) the importance of offering both developmentally appropriate supports and challenges to help adults grow, and (e) providing developmentally appropriate written feedback on assignments. Students not only learned about these practices through course readings and discussion, but also experienced them as part of the course structure.

Summary

Using case examples, we discussed three themes: (a) changes in students’ conceptions of supporting adult development as a result of LTL, (b) their new understanding that leadership for adult development requires attending to a diversity of ways of knowing and a balance of supports and challenges, and (c) how specific LTL course components inspired their future work as leaders. Below we summarize these three themes.

Overall Conceptual Change. In surveys and interviews, all participants noted changes in their conceptions of supports for adult development as a result of specific LTL practices. Their
post-course understandings showed a shift from general beliefs about the importance of a supportive environment for adult learning to naming concrete practices for supporting adult development, such as journaling, teaming, mentoring, and reflective practice. They also shifted from a general belief that all adults can learn, to a more complex understanding of how adults at different developmental levels learn and grow differently.

Supporting and Challenging Adult Learning. Participants developed a new perspective on adult development after participating in LTL. At the end of the course, 10 students viewed supporting adult development as a “balanced mix of supports and challenges.” Several emphasized their most fundamental lesson was the complementary nature of appropriate supports and challenges in response to individual needs and developmental stages.

Ideas for Future Practice. The students learned that as leaders, they can support adult growth by considering the diverse ways in which adults make sense of their professional experiences, as suggested by constructive-developmental theory and the three ways of knowing most commonly found in adulthood. This understanding has important implications for supporting adult development within and beyond school communities. All participants grounded their future action plans for supporting adult development as leaders in theories and practices from LTL. Three priorities emerged from their new understandings of adult growth: (a) promoting reflective practice, (b) creating safe learning spaces by developing trusting relationships, and (c) using dialogue and writing as tools for professional development. One participant noted, “I definitely see the role of the community as really critical in regards to supports, to have other voices . . . [and] ideas . . . and also as a forum to practice your own thinking and articulate your own beliefs.”

Discussion and Educational Implications

Educational leadership faculty and practitioners in K-12 schools emphasize the need to develop programs that effectively support leadership development (Donaldson, 2008; Lugg, 2006) and address the complex challenges of twenty-first century leadership. Such programs will improve leadership practices, illuminate the problems and possibilities of leadership preparation, and better train and equip educational leaders. The contemporary K-12 school environment requires complex leadership skills from adults engaged in teaching and learning. Recent literature calls for the creation of contexts where adults can reflect in order to support adult growth (Ackerman & Mackenzie, 2007; Firestone & Riehl, 2005; Kegan & Lahey, 2009; Osterman & Kottkamp, 2004).

This investigation offers insight into how course structure, content, and pedagogy can prepare educational leaders to build contexts that support adult development. Theories of adult development and growth were the centerpieces of LTL. Participants found that learning about these theories and
experiencing the practices in LTL were supportive to their own leadership development. They planned to transfer their learning and experiences to their future leadership contexts. This research demonstrated that the conceptual shifts in these aspiring leaders resulted in the evolution of their professional goals. In addition, they articulated a vision for creating nurturing environments to promote adult development in the workplace.

Literature indicates that collaborative reflective practice among school leaders supports leadership development and learning (Brookfield, 1995; Daloz, 1986; Drago-Severson, 2004b, 2009; Kegan, 1982; Osterman & Kottkamp, 2004). Writing assignments in LTL asked students to write about their personal leadership experiences and to use theories presented in class for reflecting on their own thinking, actions, and assumptions. In addition, case-based learning, or convening around personal cases, was an effective modeling tool for students in LTL. Similarly, examining various theoretical frameworks for adult development in the collaborative exercises enabled students to unpack their assumptions and integrate theory into practice. We found that thinking together with colleagues about appropriate supports and challenges was most important for our students.

Our hope is that this study will impact the design of university preparation programs for educational leaders as well as leaders in other contexts such as churches and after-school programs. In addition, we suggest that these kinds of developmental opportunities be priorities when considering district policy and socialization processes. Socialization into leadership commences in the initial phase of school leaders’ “education career” (Normore, 2004, 2007, p. 9) and continues throughout their professional trajectories (Normore, 2007). The interaction between experienced and aspiring leaders in LTL offered an important socialization opportunity to consider multiple perspectives from diverse contexts. Learning from alternative perspectives on their leadership, the challenges they encountered, and their actions helped them to better address the complexities of leadership.

We believe school leaders’ increased attention to supporting adult development will enable them to serve more effectively and compassionately. They will have the necessary skills to discuss, diagnose, and address various problems confronting their communities. Our research shows that when leaders in a university classroom reflect on their leadership and apply theoretical ideas to enhance it, they feel less isolated and better able to take risks. Future research stemming from this study will investigate how, if at all, school leaders from three LTL cohorts 2003-05 are actually using ideas gleaned from LTL in their current work contexts.
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Appendix A: Course Topics and Reading List

The readings and interactive exercises in class centered on the following topics:


- Various theories of adult learning (Belenky et al., 1986; Daloz, 2000; Levine, 1989; Levinson & Levinson, 1996; Levinson et al., 1978; Marsick & Sauquet, 2000; Meier, 2002; Moller & Pancake, 2006; National Staff Development Council, 2005; O’Neil & Marsick, 2007; Osterman & Kottkamp, 1993a, 1993b, 2004; Rogers, 2002; Rooke & Torbert, 2005; Rossiter, 2002; Schön, 1983; Sheehy, 1995; Schwarz, 2002; Parks, 2005; Wagner et al., 2006; Yorks & Marsick, 2000; York-Barr, et al., 2006).


- Essential elements for creating positive learning environments for adults—providing appropriate supports and challenges (Arnold, 2005; Kegan & Lahey, 2001a, 2001b, 2001c; Drago-Severson, 2004c; Elmore, 2005b; Isaacs, 1999; Senge et al., 2000).


- The importance of caring for one’s own development and learning while caring for the learning of others (Ackerman, Donaldson, & Van Der Bogert, 1996; Ackerman & Maslin-Ostrowski, 2002b, 2004; Boyatzis & McKee, 2005c; Donaldson, 2008; Drago-Severson, 2004b).
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Appendix B: Pre-Survey Sample Questions

Context: Leadership For Adult Learning and Development Background

1. Please describe your work context and your role/position (including how many years you have worked there).

2. (a) What kinds of professional development activities have you participated in at work and/or outside of work?

   (b) What were these experiences like for you?

3. (a) If you have or previously had a role related to providing opportunities for adult learning and growth in your work context, can you please explain the kinds of opportunities you provide for others and the practices you employ?

   (b) In what ways do you think these opportunities were effective?

   (c) Why?

   (d) In what ways do you think they were ineffective? Why?

4. How would you rate your comfort level with the kinds of growth and learning practices that exist in your workplace? Please rate your comfort level on a 1 to 5 scale, where 5 = very comfortable and 1= very uncomfortable.

   1  2  3  4  5

5. How would you rate the effectiveness of the kinds of growth and learning practices that exist in your workplace? Please rate effectiveness on a 1 to 5 scale, where 5 = very effective and 1= very ineffective.

   1  2  3  4  5
Current Conceptions of Leadership for Adult Learning and Development

1. (a) At this point in the course, what do you think supporting adult learning means?

   (b) What kinds of practices do you think work to support adult learning?

2. (a) At this point in the course, what are your conceptions of supporting adult development?

   (b) What kinds of practices do you think support adult development?

3. Looking back at your own professional career work, or learning experiences, what stands out for you as a particularly powerful situation (where you were exercising leadership in support to other people’s development or someone else was doing it for you)? Please explain.

4. How would you describe your approach to leading in support to another person’s development?

5. At this point in time, what questions, puzzles, or dilemmas related to leadership in support to adult development do you have?

6. Knowing what you know now about leadership in support of transformational learning, which components of our course do you think will be most helpful to you and why?
Appendix C: Post-Survey Sample Questions

Future Work: Leadership For Adult Learning and Development Background

1. Please describe your hopes for your future work (including context and your role/position).

2. (a) What kinds of professional development practices do you plan to implement at work to better support adult learning and development?
   
   (b) How do you think they will work?
   
   (c) Why do you want to implement them?
   
   (d) What challenges do you face in terms of implementing these practices?

AT-100 Course Learnings and Applications to Your Leadership Practice

1. Please name a few of the more important learnings that you are taking away from your experience in AT-100, especially as these relate to your thinking about how to support adult growth and development.

2. What are your current ideas about how to best support adult learning and development in your workplace?

3. How, if at all, do you feel that your learnings in AT-100 have influenced your understandings of what leadership in support of adult learning means? Can you please explain how, if at all, your thinking has changed?

4. How, if at all, do you feel that your ideas about robust practices for supporting adult learning and development have changed?

5. Which specific course components (lectures, readings, case writing, papers, guest speakers, films, convenings, in-class exercises) were helpful to you and why? Please be as specific as possible as to which components were helpful to you and how they were helpful. Thank you.

6. In what ways, if any, have the ideas discussed in AT-100, or the course itself, helped you to change your thinking about what supporting adult development means?

   (a) In what ways do you think these opportunities were effective?
(b) Why?

(c) In what ways do you think they were ineffective? Why?

**Current Conceptions of Leadership For Adult Learning and Development**

7. (a) At this point, what do you think supporting adult development means?

(b) What kinds of practices do you think work to support adult development?

(c) Why do you think they work?

8. (a) At this point, what do you think will work well in your practice of supporting other people’s development?

(b) Why do you think this is important?

9. Looking back at your learning experiences in AT-100, what, if anything, stands out for you as a being a particularly powerful support for your learning? Please explain.

10. Looking back at your learning experiences in AT-100, what, if anything, stands out for you as a being unhelpful, difficult, or confusing to your learning? Please explain.

11. At this point in time, how would you describe your approach to leading in support to another person’s development?

12. At this point in time, what questions or puzzles or dilemmas related to leadership in support to adult development do you have?
Appendix D: Interview Guide Sample Questions

LTL Course Learnings and Applications to Your Leadership Practice

1. What do you see as a few of the more important learnings that you are taking away from your experience in LTL, especially as these relate to your thinking about how to support adult growth and development?

2. What are your current ideas about how to best support adult learning and development in your workplace? Ask about workplace? Please ask why?

3. How, if at all, do you feel that your learnings in LTL have influenced your understandings of what leadership in support of adult learning means? Can you please explain how, if at all, your thinking has changed?

4. How, if at all, have you changed your ideas about former practices that you may have employed or participated in that were aimed at supporting your own or other people’s learning and development after participating in the course?

5. Which specific parts of the course (lectures, readings, case writing, papers, guest speakers, films, convenings, in-class exercises, and feedback) were helpful to you and why? Please ask about how the specific components were helpful. Thank you.

6. In what ways, if any, have the ideas discussed in LTL, or the course itself, helped you to change your thinking about what supporting adult development means?
   (a) In what ways do you think these opportunities were effective? Why?
   (b) In what ways do you think they were ineffective? Why?

Future Work: Leadership For Adult Learning and Development Background

1. Please describe your hopes for your future work (including context and your role/position).

2. (a) What kinds of professional development practices do you plan to implement at work to better support adult learning and development?
   (b) How do you think they will work?
   (c) Why do you want to implement them?
   (d) What challenges do you face in terms of implementing these practices?
# Appendix E: Code Matrix

Table A1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Etic codes</strong></th>
<th><strong>Emic Codes</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership in support of adult learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constructive-Developmental Theory (CD-T)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significance of knowing about different types of meaning-making systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What helped in learning?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guest speakers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E Ideas for Future</strong></td>
<td>“Complaining” vs. “Constructive” discussions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Practice</strong></td>
<td>“Support and Challenge.” “Speaking up.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging teachers in</td>
<td>“Asking Good Questions.” “Conversations.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conversations</td>
<td>“Reflective practice.” “Self-dialogue.” “Self-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a Holding</td>
<td>“Understanding people.” “Personal” and “</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment to nurture</td>
<td>“Collaborative reflection.” “Journaling.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adult growth</td>
<td>“Connections with people.” “Creating a space” to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“help people interact.” “Systematic reflection.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Staff meetings.” “Trust.” “Self-reflective.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Reflective” practice based on “theory”-CTD.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Talking.” “Reflection.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Collective experience.” “Supportive learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>environment.” “Holding Environment.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>