This is to certify that the
dissertation entitled

IN SEARCH OF DEVELOPMENT:
AN AUTOETHNOGRAPHIC EXPLORATION OF THE
LIBERTY HYDE BAILEY SCHOLARS PROGRAM

presented by

Ronald James Whitmore, Jr.

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for the

Ph.D. degree in Resource Development

Major Professor's Signature

10/28/03

Date

IN SEARCH OF DEVELOPMENT: AN AUTOETHNOGRAPHIC EXPLORATION OF THE LIBERTY HYDE BAILEY SCHOLARS PROGRAM

VOLUME I

By

Ronald James Whitmore, Jr.

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Resource Development

2003

ABSTRACT

IN SEARCH OF DEVELOPMENT: AN AUTOETHNOGRAPHIC EXPLORATION OF THE LIBERTY HYDE BAILEY SCHOLARS PROGRAM

By

Ronald James Whitmore, Jr.

The goal of this dissertation is to elicit insights about holistic developmental processes from my experience with the Liberty Hyde Bailey Scholars Program at Michigan State University.

This study is an autoethnography – an inquiry into the interactions among my development as a Bailey scholar (the 'auto'), other Bailey scholars and the Bailey Scholars Program (the 'ethno'), and the writing/research process (the 'graphy'). In order to connect my experience with the larger knowledge base – including the fields of education, personal growth, organizational development, leadership, and the complexity sciences – I weave my insights together with the literature that informs my understanding. As an autoethnography, this dissertation is not the definitive exposition of the Bailey Scholars Program or of development. Rather, it is my interpretation of experiences and concepts that should be interpreted from multiple perspectives. As such, I hope that my exploration speaks to the reader's own experiences with the dynamics of development.

Building on data from my experience as a Bailey scholar (including my personal notes, my past writing, and email messages I wrote), I interpret my Bailey

experience through four different conceptual frames of reference: self-selected membership; self-directed, connected development; network organization and leadership; and spiritual development. I devote a chapter to each frame, but, as a reflection of the differences among the evolution of my understanding of each frame, I approach each of those chapters differently. For example, in the first two, I lead primarily with the 'auto' in autoethnography by chronicling how Bailey impacted my perspectives over time. But in the next two chapters, I lead with the 'ethno' and summarize my current understanding by writing from an *ex post facto* perspective.

After completing an initial draft, I shared it with the Bailey community, invited comments, and created opportunities for dialogue about the issues I raised. Each chapter includes a summary of readers' responses as well as reflections on my attempts at applying what I learned as a Bailey scholar in other contexts.

I conclude by integrating insights from each of the four frames of reference into a summary of the tensions inherent in Bailey scholars' attempt at cultivating holistic development. Specifically, I explore tensions central to membership selection, diversity in community, individual-communal dynamics, stewardship of common space, the fusion of learning and doing, emergent processes, and structured flexibility. In the final chapter, I also reflect on autoethnography as a research tool and summarize my current development world view and my plans for expressing that world view in practice.

For Bodhi

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am greatly indebted to Frank Fear, my academic advisor and the chair of my research committee. Frank supported and guided me, never losing faith in my ability to navigate unconventional approaches to the degree and research processes. More importantly, Frank has been a close friend and professional mentor. Without Frank's seasoned perspective and consistent encouragement, my personal life and career would have taken very different – and far less meaningful and fulfilling – paths.

The other members of my research committee – Geoff Habron, Peter Kakela, and Terry Link – also deserve special acknowledgment. They were open to novel perspectives and strengthened my research process with their diversity of critiques and with the humanity with which they engaged my work.

Special thanks also go to my wife, Sasha, who is my first reader and critic. She has also been exceedingly patient and tolerant during times when I was more married to my dissertation than I was to her.

I am also indebted to all of the Bailey scholars who inspired, supported, and participated in my research – particularly those who made the extra effort to engage me and my writing after I completed the initial draft of my dissertation.

Finally, I'd like to thank the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources for

awarding me a fellowship to complete my dissertation, as well as the staff and Board of Directors of the NorthWest Lansing Healthy Communities Initiative, who patiently accommodated me as I tried to balance my work and research.

PROLOGUE: AN INVITATION

Consider this your invitation – an invitation to discourse, to a conversation about the dissertation that follows and the many issues it raises. Due to practical constraints, you and I may not be able to actually have a discussion. But I ask that you, the reader, approach your reading of my dissertation as if you were engaged with me, the author, in dialogue.

I make this request because I approached my research as a search for meaningful development, out of a desire to improve our collective understanding of – and action in – the world. And my dissertation is grounded in the assumption that learning and growth are products, in part, of engagement. So I will consider my research a success only to the extent that you try to engage with what I have written as if you and I were discussing it over a cup of coffee (or a pint of beer, depending on your preference).

More specifically, I ask that you try to engage the text at three levels. Naturally, I'd like you to grapple with the content, with the ideas, issues, and paradoxes that I present as part of my exploration. But I'd also like you to meta-engage; that is, I'd like you to consider the nature of my research, the autoethnographic approach I use to explore the content of the dissertation. And finally, I'd like you to engage epistemically by allowing yourself to author – either literally or figuratively – your own story about your experiences with and knowledge of development.

This will require that you read my dissertation differently than you might otherwise. If you've developed some of the same habits as I, it may be most natural for you to read using a particular lense. I, for instance, typically scan unfamiliar material, looking to quickly find the essence of what the author is trying to convey. I'm asking that you bring more of your whole self to your reading. I certainly want you to engage your intellect as you read, but I also hope that you will allow your heart, your spirit, and even your body to participate in the reading.

Sometimes the most exciting parts of an engaging conversation are what's left unsaid, like the extra-conversational connections and insights of each participant or the intuitive gestalt of the conversation that can't be captured in words. In that spirit, and as an incentive to you to approach this text more actively than passively, I refrain from always walking you by hand through my exploration. In other words, rather than always drawing clear connections between my data and my findings or making all of my conclusions explicit, I leave space in the text for you to explore and leave some of the interpretive work up to you.

So, please pour your cup of coffee or your beer, and let's begin.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1: MY JOURNEY TO BAILEY AND THIS DISSERTATION

I am obsessed with development[1]. Call it what you will – growth, improvement, or whatever – I am constantly looking for ways to help myself, others, organizations, communities, and society question assumptions, explore new ideas, try new approaches, shed old habits, realize more potential, and otherwise change for the better.

This has been a lifelong obsession, and when I was younger, people would ask, "Why seek change for the sake of change?" I wanted to shake them violently and scream: "DON'T YOU SEE HOW FUCKED UP THE WORLD IS! The vast majority of the world is poor, malnourished, and living under corrupt, tyrannical rule. Bigotry – based on race, class, age, ability, sexual orientation, or whatever – is rampant. We are annihilating our ecological systems. NEED I GO ON!?" I never said that, of course, because I think I knew intuitively that it wouldn't make any difference. Like most Americans, they were content to numb themselves with meaningless work, processed food, television, the latest cool 'stuff,' and dreams of retirement bliss, and my self-righteous arguments weren't going to change anything.

I've experimented with a variety of ways to promote development. In high school, community service was my thing – I was an officer in a service club, I ran

---

[1]"Development" and other terms are defined in a glossary included in Appendix E.

a program that delivered drunk kids home safely, and I was student body president. My methods evolved a bit in college. I continued with some community service, but I focused my energies on helping people understand the inherent unity of humanity as a means for ending the arms race. I also got religious, figuring that God must have some good ideas about how to get people on the right track. After graduation, I wasn't about to enter the rat race for the illusive American dream, so I joined the Peace Corps. I wanted to experience first-hand how most of the world's people lived and naively thought that I could help them improve their lot. I had a good time and thought I made a difference, so I went to graduate school from there to get the credentials I needed to continue doing similar work.

My graduate studies helped me critique both my assumptions about development and my efforts to promote it. I began to lose faith in paternalistic efforts to 'help' others, whether it was through community service or development projects. Such 'goodness,' which is driven primarily by the actor's need to help, as Palmer points out

> is often imposed on people who have no desire for it, people who become the objects of the actor's self-serving charity. For those recipients the experience is not one of benevolence but of violence, the violence that is done whenever someone else decides what you need without consulting you (Palmer 1990, 47).

Moreover, much of the work done in the name of service is superficial, universalistic, and too narrowly focused – it addresses symptoms rather than the roots of problems, without an appreciation for characteristics unique to the context or for the complexity of the situation. For similar reasons, I grew equally

dissatisfied with other typical remedies to our chronic problems, like technological 'fixes,' economic incentives, and policy change – they get us moving in the right direction but never seem to create any fundamental change.

I also grew skeptical of education as the panacea, especially when it is assumed that *others* are the ones who need to be educated. I often find myself and my change compatriots thinking, "If we (i.e., the enlightened) could just get everybody else (i.e., the ignorant) to understand X (i.e., the cause of the day), everything will be just fine." This may be true, but we should probably first make sure our life choices reflect that understanding (I can be an awfully righteous hypocrite), and then we need to realize that nobody likes to be told to change, especially by some crazy leftist.

I even tired of the more organic, less instrumental approaches to development. Eco-philosophers, environmental ethicists, social ecologists, ecofeminists, post-modernists, and systems thinkers all call for paradigm shifts, assuming that if world views change, behaviors and practice will follow suit (T. Berry 1988; Daly and Cobb 1989; Engel and Engel 1990; Merchant 1995; Milbraith 1989; Naess 1989; Skolimowski 1981; Sterling 1990; Tucker and Grim 1993). I had two concerns with this argument. First, it was rare to find coherent, systemic descriptions of *how* to promote paradigm shifts. Given the transdisciplinary nature of transformation processes, scholars from many different fields have explored it, but they tend to look at it through the lenses of particular fields like adult learning, community and organizational development, and leadership.

Second, I was troubled by the linearity of the argument that behavior change follows a shift in thinking. I began to see world views and behavior as mutually-reinforcing; that is, there exists a dynamic interplay between the two as both are simultaneously transformed (Argyris et al 1985; Goulet, Marković, Crocker, and Omo-Fadaka, in Engel and Engel 1990; Schön 1995). Finally, I was disappointed by how few theories of development explicitly incorporated spirituality in any meaningful, coherent way. By the time I was a grad student, I had transitioned from fundamental Christianity, through hedonism, to the Bahá'í Faith (more on that journey in Chapter 7). I became increasingly convinced that our overly materialistic and aspiritual orientations and assumptions about the nature of development are the root of many of the world's ills, and I was eager to integrate my latest spiritual quest into my professional exploration of positive change.

Disgruntled with the models of development I'd experienced and studied, I prepared to come up with a new one of my own. I used my master's thesis to develop a theoretical, holistic model of development that explicitly incorporates the role of spirituality in the growth process. My data were the writings of the Bahá'í Faith, but I developed the model using the work of Palmer (1983), Bawden (1995, 1997), and Wilber (1996, 1998). The essence of the model is situated, collaborative, transdisciplinary, holistic praxis. The development process, which is grounded in relationship (among individuals and between individuals and the rest of the natural world) and supported through organic structure, shares many characteristics of living systems at the edge between

order and chaos. Out of this process of transformation – which is not planned, engineered, or reduced to 'projects' – new, surprising ideas, action, and structures continually emerge. I called this process 'integral development,' which I explain in more depth in Chapter 3.

After finishing my thesis, I faced the challenge of trying to *experience* integral development. I now had a theoretical understanding of a complex process that can lead to positive change, but I hadn't yet found the right 'space' in which to live it. About that same time, I began participating in activities of the Liberty Hyde Bailey Scholars Program[2]. The Bailey Scholars Program was a relatively new initiative in MSU's College of Agriculture and Natural Resources (CANR) that grew out of the College Dean's concern that undergraduate education was becoming too narrowly focused on technical education. In the summer of 1994, the Dean asked a group of faculty members to design a learning program that would advance and broaden undergraduate learning in the College (Fear et al 2002, 57). The faculty group produced a design report in early 1995, which was distributed for faculty review. An implementation committee, in turn, was formed to make recommendations about how to put the program into operation. In early 1996, "The Road to Bailey: A Vision for The Liberty Hyde Bailey Scholars

---

[2]Liberty Hyde Bailey (1858-1954) was born in Michigan and began his academic career at Michigan Agricultural College (now Michigan State University). As a botanist, horticulturalist, educator, rural sociologist, poet, and founder of the discipline of landscape architecture, he had a profound impact on the development of the agricultural sciences. To learn more about Liberty Hyde Bailey, see Doberneck's "The Life of Liberty Hyde Bailey: A Brief Biography" (http://www.bsp.msu.edu/Background/BaileyBio.cfm).

Program" was produced and discussed throughout the College during the spring 1996 semester. At the end of the semester, the decision was made to initiate the Program (Fear 1997).

After another year of planning and preparation, the Bailey Scholars Program was launched in January 1998 as an elective twenty-one credit minor available to all CANR undergraduates[3]. Bailey faculty members – for whom Bailey is also a discretionary activity – include untenured and tenured faculty from across the University, academic specialists, graduate students, and adjunct faculty from outside the University. With the exception of core staff, Bailey faculty members' average appointment in Bailey is 10-20% of load (Fear et al 2000).

I wasn't drawn to Bailey out of some latent interest in undergraduate education. Rather, I was intrigued by the way Bailey scholars were bringing the Program's ethos to life. That ethos is articulated as the Declaration of Bailey:

> The Bailey Scholars Program seeks to be a community of scholars dedicated to lifelong learning. All members of the community work toward providing a respectful, trusting environment where we acknowledge our interdependence and encourage personal growth.

It quickly became clear that this ethos was manifesting as a practical ethic that closely resembled my vision for integral development. In a very inviting, collaborative, transdisciplinary, critically-reflexive way, Bailey scholars supported

---

[3]More detailed information about the origins and nature of the Bailey Scholars Program is available on the Program's web site <www.bsp.msu.edu> under "Background."

the self-directed, holistic development of both individuals and the community of scholars. They focused on connected learning – nurturing the relationships among learners, the rest of the community, and varied learning topics. They also embraced dialogue[4] as their *modus operandi* and evolved organizational structures that resembled living systems. And out of the flurry and diversity of activity, all kinds of interesting – and often surprising – insights and growth emerged.

Bailey may not have been a perfect model of integral development, but it was pretty darn close, and I was bound to learn as much about my theoretical model for development from the differences as I would from the similarities, so I was hooked. Eager to become more actively engaged in Bailey community life, in February 1999 I became a Bailey scholar[5] by sharing my original Bailey envisionment entitled "Finding a Place in the Bailey Experiment in Transcendence" (included in Appendix A). I formalized my role in Bailey during the summer of 1999 by becoming a Bailey Fellow. I assumed a mixture of administrative and scholarly responsibilities as part of a half-time appointment. During my first year in Bailey, I served as a member of the Office Management Team and the Bailey Administrative Team; I convened and served as point

---

[4]Dialogue is a form of discourse – distinct from the cultural norm of debate – in which people seek to listen and learn rather than know and advocate, ask questions rather than provide answers, explore multiple perspectives rather than embracing a single perspective, question rather than defend assumptions, and respect others rather than exert power over them.

[5]Bailey scholars are generally considered to be any undergraduate who is pursuing the Bailey specialization or any other person who has publicly envisioned a role for her/himself in the Program.

person for various initiatives and activities; I co-convened ANR 210, the first in a series of Bailey core courses; I co-presented at three national conferences; and I co-authored the essay "Bailey at Year Two" with Doberneck (included in Appendix B). As I immersed myself in the Bailey community, began experiencing profound personal growth and development, and watched other people become transformed before my eyes, Bailey quickly became one of the most meaningful aspects of my life.

Beginning with my June 2000 re-envisionment (included in Appendix C), I began a transition away from administrative responsibilities. During the 2000-2001 academic year, I served as a member of Bailey's Leadership Space; I continued to play other various leadership roles; I co-convened ANR 310, 311, and 410, the other three core Bailey courses; and I convened a regular writing circle. After two years as a Bailey scholar, I had significant experience with the administrative, pedagogical, and scholarly dimensions of the Bailey Scholars Program. Since August 2001, I haven't had an official appointment in Bailey, though, during the fall of 2001, I continued to participate in Leadership Space meetings and, on a limited basis, other community activities.

What this Dissertation Is and Is Not

This dissertation is an attempt at sharing some of what I learned as a Bailey scholar about development. To avoid any misunderstandings, let me emphatically state up front that this is *not* the definitive, authoritative exposition of the Bailey Scholars Program. And my findings are *interpretive* in nature, not

factual. This is simply a reflexive account of my experience from 1999 to 2001 as a Bailey faculty scholar, contextualized within my search for ways to make this world a better place. It is my attempt at articulating some of the knowledge that emerged from the moments when my path of development intersected with the Bailey Scholars Program and the paths of other Bailey scholars. As such, yes, you will learn a bit about me, as tiresome as that may be. More importantly, however, I hope that my story in one way or another speaks to your own experience, that you gain some insight into the unique nature of a very intriguing program and into the dynamics of development and transformation.

"But how did you get away with this?" you may ask. "This doesn't sound much like normal research, let alone the typical dissertation." If you want a complete answer to that question, I'll refer you to Chapter 2, a slightly revised version of my original research proposal, including my research design. If you prefer the *Reader's Digest* version, read on, and skip Chapter 2.

The Problem Statement

I was taught as a graduate student that the research process begins with a 'problem statement' that concisely summarizes the research subject and its scholarly merit. The typical problem statement contextualizes the research within contemporary scholarship and practice, identifies a gap in knowledge, and explains how the research will address that gap. In case I wasn't clear enough above, allow me to summarize the research problem for this dissertation:

We know that the world is going to hell in a handbasket. There are

lots of different theories about and approaches to addressing the world's problems through individual and communal development. With my master's thesis, I integrated many of these theories and approaches into a theoretical, holistic model of transformation called 'integral development.'

But there aren't many concrete, real world examples of such models, so we don't have much practice cultivating holistic development. In other words, we have limited experience with the praxis[6] of holistic development.

Therefore, it is useful to experience those models that we do have – like the Bailey Scholars Program – so that we can improve our understanding and cultivation of developmental processes.

Methodology

Since my real interest is in the praxis – or lived experience – of development, it is natural that I would seek to improve it using an autoethnological form of inquiry. Autoethnology is inquiry into the experiential interaction between the researcher and the research 'subject,' between the personal and cultural. Insight emerges from the interplay among the researcher's experience (auto), the cultural subject (ethno), and theory (ology). In this case, I'm inquiring into the interaction among my journey as a Bailey scholar, other Bailey scholars and the Bailey Scholars Program, and theories of development.

Such an approach to inquiry is grounded in the following philosophical assumptions:

Ontology: Reality is intersubjectively co-created – a product of interactions among our selves, others, and the rest of the universe.

---

[6]I understand praxis as the mutually-reinforcing interaction of theory and practice, knowing and doing, or reflection and action that characterizes our lived experience.

It is both subjective and objective, both contextual and universal, both parts and wholes. More concretely, Bailey is neither an objective entity 'out there' nor a subjective experience 'in here' (while, paradoxically, being *both* 'out there' *and* 'in here'!) – it is created in the place(s), the space(s) where people's 'in heres' connect with others' 'in heres'.

Epistemology: The universal is revealed in the particular by experiencing reality with and through others as we co-evolve. That is, we can learn about processes of development – in a general sense – through my direct, collaborative experience as a Bailey scholar with processes of transformation.

Methodology: This living knowledge manifests through critical, reflexive subjectivity; creative expression (e.g., art and writing); and engaged, collaborative action. In the case of this dissertation, that means that learning will emerge from my experience with Bailey, my reflection on that experience, the writing I do about that experience, and discourse with Bailey scholars about my writing.

Methods

So what did I actually *do*? I began by identifying – through reflection on my time as a Bailey scholar and by reviewing my 'data' (i.e., my notes, email exchanges, and my past writing) – the pivotal Bailey moments or experiences that have significantly influenced my development.

I then organized those particularly meaningful experiences into four general themes or frames of reference: self-selected membership; self-directed, connected development; network organization and leadership; and spiritual development. Exposed to these four perspectives, I hope that you are able to integrate them as a montage, a meaningful whole composed of several different, superimposed images of the Bailey Scholars Program.

I then began writing – in two different ways. On the one hand, I wrote from the heart, 'from the inside-out,' much as I would if I were journaling. Using a narrative, storytelling style, I captured some of the meaning of my journey as a Bailey scholar by detailing my pivotal moments and experiences. In the process, I tried to articulate both the joy and the pain of my journey, grappling with the tensions inherent in personal development like that which I have experienced as a Bailey scholar.

While writing from the inside-out, I also wrote from the head, 'from the outside-in,' trying to express the meaning of my experience more explicitly, in terms that others have found useful. In the process, I wove into my writing insights from a variety of fields – including education, personal growth, organizational development, leadership, and the complexity sciences – that have helped me interpret my experience.

After completing an initial draft, I shared it with Bailey scholars for their review. I did this, in part, because I wanted to honor the communal source of my insights gained as a Bailey scholar. In the course of writing, I also realized that I would learn as much from other people's response to my writing as I did from the writing itself. So I invited comments (including anonymous feedback) and convened a series of three conversations about the issues raised by my dissertation. I also met with several Bailey scholars individually to discuss my dissertation. I then integrated insights from those interactions into my final draft, being sure to credit Bailey scholars whose comments influenced my thinking.

A Brief Road Map

The four themes of my experience as a Bailey scholar – self-selected membership; self-directed, connected development; network organization and leadership; and spiritual development – are the focus of Chapters 4 through 7, respectively.

Before reading my account, I thought you might find it useful to learn more about integral development. So, Chapter 3 is an introduction to foundations and theory of integral development. If you're only interested in my account, skip directly to Chapter 4.

I conclude this research experiment in Chapter 8. I revisit the theory of integral development based on what I learned as a Bailey scholar, discuss some of the tensions inherent in Bailey's practical attempt at cultivating development, reflect on autoethnography as a tool for gaining insight into transformative praxis, and summarize my current world view and plans I have for applying that world view in practice.

Are you still with me?

In the prologue, I invited you to engage with me – through my text – in conversation. So, at the end of the first chapter, I'm naturally curious about your initial reactions. Specifically:

- What is your assessment of my experiences with different approaches to development (e.g., community service, development projects, education)?

- With which successful (or not so successful) models of improvement are you familiar?
- What do you think of my approach to inquiry? Are my research assumptions valid? Do you think this qualifies as research?
- What is your initial response to my informal, conversational approach to writing?
- What has been *your* experience with development, growth, and improvement?
- What approaches have you used to learn from or otherwise assess your experiences with development?
- How do you *feel* after reading this chapter and pondering these questions?

CHAPTER 2: IS THIS REALLY RESEARCH?

As I noted in Chapter 1, I am using this dissertation to share what I learned as a Bailey scholar about ways to make this world a better place through the dynamics of development. More specifically, my goal is to articulate some of the knowledge that emerged from my growth as a Bailey scholar about factors that contribute to holistic, transformational processes like integral development. In other words, the topic of my research is holistic development, and Bailey is the exemplar that I use to deepen my understanding of that topic. For my academic readers, the 'problem' is improving our development praxis, and the 'knowledge base' is transformational development.

I pursued my research goal using an autoethnographic methodology. Building on the plethora of 'data' from my experience as a Bailey scholar (primarily in the form of email archives, past writing, and written notes), I developed an autoethnographic interpretation of Bailey-inspired development. I organized my writing around the tensions and paradoxes inherent in four different conceptual frames of reference that I (and others) have used to interpret the Bailey experience: self-selected membership; self-directed, connected development; network organization and leadership; and spiritual development. In order to connect my experience with others' experience and with the larger 'knowledge base,' I wove my insights together with the literature that informs my understanding. After completing an initial draft, I shared it with the Bailey community, inviting comments (including anonymous feedback), and creating

opportunities for dialogue about the issues I raised. I then integrated insights from those interactions into my final draft.

My path from research topic, to problem, to knowledge base, to exemplar, to methodology was by no means linear. I am not a methodologist, and I did not pick a methodology and then use my research proposal to craft an argument to support it. In fact, I struggled for a long time with how to best approach my research. Clearly, there was no 'correct' approach, and over time, I went back and forth between a number of different options. In the end, I decided to see what methodological characteristics emerged from an exploration of the philosophical paradoxes and tensions inherent in human inquiry, contextualized by both my own and the Bailey ethos. So, rather than present a series of arguments supporting the approach I finally embraced, I will share with you that philosophical exploration and then 'locate' myself and this particular example of inquiry with a summary of my research paradigm. I conclude this chapter with a detailed explanation of how my research paradigm was reflected in my methods and of Bailey scholars' responses to this chapter.

Ontological Paradox I: The Objective-Subjective Tension

When asked about the topic of my dissertation research, I'm usually uncomfortable responding because, though I am writing about the Bailey Scholars Program, I try not to think of it or Bailey scholars as the 'objects' of my research. This discomfort comes, in part, from my desire to avoid objectifying Bailey – conceptualizing the Program as an independently-defined entity, as a

real, singular 'it' that a detached, dispassionate observer can objectively define, describe, and dissect. In other words, I am not comfortable operating within a positivist, reductionist research paradigm.

I feel strongly about this because I believe that objectification can be destructive. Life, as W. Berry (2000) argues, can lose its essence when reduced and labeled: "We can give up on life . . . by presuming to 'understand' it – that is by reducing it to the *terms* of our understanding and by treating it as predictable or mechanical" (6; emphasis in original). By identifying with the words that name our perceptions, we begin reifying the world (Reason 1993, 280). To do so, W. Berry suggests, is to "enslave [life], make property of it, and to put it up for sale" (7). "To treat life as less than a miracle is to give up on it" (10). And as soon as we give up on life, there can be, as Blake observes, "dreadful consequences":

> What seems to Be, Is, To those to whom
> It seems to Be, & is productive of the most dreadful
> Consequences to those to whom it seems to Be. . . .
>
> (Blake, W. (1966). *Complete Writings*. Oxford: 663 in W. Berry 2000, 7).

In recent years, qualitative researchers have become increasingly vocal about the myth of objectivity. Lincoln, Denzin, and Guba claim that "there is no such thing as unadultered truth" (Lincoln and Denzin 2000, 1051), that "objectivity is a chimera: a mythological creature that never existed, save in the imaginations of those who believe that knowing can be separated from the knower" (Lincoln and Guba 2000, 181). "It is also clear that there is no single 'truth.' All truths are partial and incomplete" (Denzin and Lincoln 2000, 162).

From this post-modern, constructivist perspective, there is no single Bailey reality that can be known. Bailey doesn't really exist – there is no 'it' to describe. Instead, there are multiple, individually-constructed, partial realities that people know as Bailey. And people's understanding of Bailey is shaped by their history, their values, and the interpretive lenses through which they see the world. From this perspective, there is no objective Bailey 'out there' – there is only a subjective Bailey 'in here.'

From another perspective, which is neither purely objective nor purely subjective, people's understanding of Bailey is experiential, relational, contextual, and dynamic. That is, Bailey is known by experiencing it with and through others as we all grow and develop. W. Berry (2000) captures this idea nicely:

> Life, like holiness, can be known only by being experienced. . . .To experience it is not to "figure it out" or even to understand it, but to suffer it and rejoice in it as it is. In suffering it and rejoicing in it as it is, we know that we do not and cannot understand it completely. . . .Though we have life, it is beyond us. . . .It is not predictable; though we can destroy it, we cannot make it. It cannot, except by reduction and the grave risk of damage, be controlled. It is, as Blake said, holy. To think otherwise is to enslave life, and to make, not humanity, but a few humans its predictably inept masters (8-9).

From this perspective, reality is co-created through participation – it is the fruit of a "dance between our individual and collective mind and 'what is there,' the amorphous primordial givenness of the universe" (Reason 1994, 324). "Mind actively participates in the cosmos, and it is through this active participation that we meet what is Other" (Heron and Reason 1997, 279). Heron refers to this as a subjective-objective ontology: subjective because reality is only known "through

the form the mind gives it"; objective because the knower "interpenetrates the given cosmos which it shapes (Heron, 1996, p. 11)." Further, the objectivity is relative to how it is intersubjectively shaped,

> For there is the important if obvious point that knowers can only be knowers when known by other knowers. Knowing presupposes mutual participative awareness. . . .So any subjective-objective reality articulated by any one person is done so within an intersubjective field (Heron and Reason 1997, 279-280).

It follows that Bailey is neither an objective 'out there' nor a subjective 'in here' (while, paradoxically, being *both* 'out there' *and* 'in here'!) – it is in the place(s), the space(s) where people's 'in heres' connect with others' 'in heres'. And if we expand our definition of the 'others' with whom we are in relationship, Bailey is also those spaces where people connect with larger creation, including both physical nature and immaterial spirit. And to keep things interesting, those spaces are different yesterday, today, and tomorrow – lives are connected across a "curve of time" and cannot be portrayed as a "snapshot" (Ellis and Bochner 2000, 744).

Ontological Paradox II: Autoethnography and the Self-Other Tension

If reality is truly intersubjective, "Nothing is stranger than this business of humans observing other humans in order to write about them" (Behar 1996, 5). Efforts to know the 'other' too often mute the voices of the observed; impose artificial, theoretical structure where there may not be any; and abstract the situated, grounded meaning of the other into the intellectual framework of the observer's academic field or expertise (Fine 1994, 79).

Out of concern for the dangers of 'objectifying' and 'othering,' and in the spirit of the subjective-objective ontology, some social scientists have begun to focus their inquiry on themselves in the context of their collaborative experiences. They write in the first person and make themselves the object of research, thereby breaking the conventional separation of researcher and subject inherent in traditional representational social science (Ellis and Bochner 2000, 744). In other words, they relieve themselves of the "problem of speaking for the 'Other,' because they are the 'Other' in their texts" (Richardson 2000, 931).

Some feel that there is no longer any other choice. They embrace that fact that, "As Geertz (1988) has demonstrated, all texts are personal statements;" that one cannot truly divide the personal and the ethnographic self; that it is impossible "for an author to write a text that does not bear the traces of its author" (Lincoln and Denzin 2000, 1051); that "No sharp distinctions [can] be made between facts and values;" and that the investigator is always "implicated in the product" (Ellis and Bochner 2000, 747). They argue that it is time to "question our assumptions, the metarules that govern the institutional workings of social science – arguments over feelings, theories over stories, abstractions over concrete events, sophisticated jargon over accessible prose," time to "express our vulnerability and subjectivity openly" rather than hiding "them behind 'social analysis'" (Ellis and Bochner 2000, 746-7). Some even go so far as to argue that now "we can study *only* our own experiences" (Denzin and Lincoln 2000, 636; emphasis added).

In the process, personal and professional lives become fused. Rather than seeing inquiry as a separate, privileged discipline and the self as a "troublesome element to be eradicated or controlled," investigators who embrace this approach begin to see the self as a set of resources and seek to connect their research directly to the questions they bring to their lives (Scheper-Hughes 1992 in Olesen 2000, 229). They see inquiry as "something that arises from your own self and the need to somehow fulfil your own inner self. . . .Your research is determined by your own quest" (Swantz in Reason 1996, 16-17). The pursuit of this quest satisfies "one's own thirst for knowledge at the edge of one's own world" (Marshall in Reason 1996, 18). They try to blur the lines between their scientific inquiry and their own lives, to see their research as a "quest for life" in which they create "living knowledge" (Swantz in Reason 1996, 15). In 'personal narrative texts,' for instance, researchers

> view themselves as the phenomenon and . . . write evocative personal narratives specifically focused on their academic as well as their personal lives. Their primary purpose is to understand a self or some aspect of a life lived in a cultural context. . . .The goal is to write meaningfully and evocatively about topics that matter and may make a difference, to include sensory and emotional experience, and to write from an ethic of care and concern (Ellis and Bochner 2000, 741-2).

But this need not be done in self-absorbed isolation. In fact, if we exist within an intersubjective world, that is impossible. Our own stories are interwoven with other people's experience, with theory, and with our socio-economic-historical context, all of which naturally become part of our narrative. By

> connecting the personal to the historical, the political, and the representational, the writer contextualizes the story being told. This pinpoints local conditions that require change, and thereby provides

> the grounds for moving from the particular (the singular) to the universal.
>
> In this move, the writer produces "mystory" accounts – multimedia, personal texts grafted onto scholarly, scientific, media, and popular culture discourses. . . .These narratives begin with the sting of personal memory, epiphanies, and existential crises in the person's biography. The writer moves from these moments into critical readings of those personal, community, popular, and expert systems of discourse that offer interpretations of such experiences. From these critical rereadings, the author fashions a mystory (Lincoln and Denzin 2000, 1054-5).

In other words, this approach becomes a "*continual cocreation of Self and social science*: Each is known through the other. Knowing the self and knowing about the subject are intertwined, partial, historical, local knowledges" (Richardson 2000, 929; emphasis in original).

Such accounts, sometimes called personal narratives, narratives of the self, personal experience narratives, self-stories, first-person accounts, personal essays, ethnographic short stories, or writing stories, all fall under the methodological umbrella of 'autoethnography' (Ellis and Bochner 2000, 739). Autoethnography is

> an autobiographical genre of writing and research that displays multiple layers of consciousness, connecting the personal to the cultural. Back and forth autoethnographers gaze, first through an ethnographic wide-angle lens, focusing outward on social and cultural aspects of their personal experience; then, they look inward, exposing a vulnerable self that is moved by and may move through, refract, and resist cultural interpretations. As they zoom backward and forward, inward and outward, distinctions between the personal and cultural become blurred, sometimes beyond distinct recognition. Usually written in first-person voice, autoethnographic texts appear in a variety of forms – short stories, poetry, fiction, novels, photographic essays, personal essays, journals, fragmented and layered writing, and social science prose. In these texts, concrete action, dialogue, emotion, embodiment, spirituality, and self-consciousness are featured, appearing as

> relational and institutional stories affected by history, social structure, and culture, which themselves are dialectically revealed through action, feeling, thought, and language (Ellis and Bochner 2000, 739).

Embedded within autoethnography is a tension between the self (auto), culture (ethnos), and the writing/research process (graphy). Autoethnographers vary in their emphasis on these three dimensions (Ellis and Bochner 2000, 740).

An interesting ontological tension is embedded in such personal approaches to research. It surrounds the nature of the self, or, perhaps more accurately, our 'selves.' "[T]he conception of the singular or united self is both intellectually and politically problematic. . . ." We have a "multiplicity of competing and often contradictory values, political impulses, conceptions of the good, notions of desire, and sense of our 'selves' as persons" (Gergen and Gergen 2000, 1037). According to Reinharz (1997), researchers bring many selves to their research – and create some in the process. These selves fall into three categories: "research-based selves, brought selves (the selves that historically, socially, and personally create our standpoints), and situationally created selves (p. 5)" (Lincoln and Denzin 2000, 183). Influenced by the subjective-objective ontology of quantum theory, others suggest that selfhood is simply "arrested moments artificially isolated from the flux of 'interindividual' life," that "Singular selves are simultaneously part of a commonality, sole but also several, not only islands but part of the main" (Jackson 1998, 6).

Ever since I became a Bailey scholar, I had assumed that my dissertation

research would somehow involve Bailey. But I never gave the idea any serious consideration until the fall of 2000. For some time, I struggled with how to approach a dissertation in a manner that did justice to the unique nature of Bailey and to my humanity. Finally, I decided that it was time to simply start writing. What emerged was an essay I called "My Journey To and With Bailey," the story of my quest for meaning and purpose in the context of my experience in the Bailey Scholars Program. I described what it means – to me – to be a Bailey scholar. My story is an expression of 'meaning' in two senses of the word – both in terms of how I intellectually understand Bailey and in terms of the impact Bailey has had in my life and on the dynamic evolution of my core beliefs, passions, and challenges.

Though I didn't recognize this while writing it, "My Journey To and With Bailey" is an example of autoethnography. In the first person, I wrote the story of my personal journey that led to, and was partially fulfilled by, the Bailey Scholars Program. I struggled with tensions between my many selves (e.g., public, family, religious, professional) as I grew and changed. And because I felt I needed to in order to make the story complete – and not out of any sense of academic obligation – I wove into it other people's perspectives and insights from scholarly discourse, thereby co-creating Self and other as a 'mystory.' "My Journey To and With Bailey" served as the foundation of this dissertation.

The Paradox of Scope: The Holism-Reductionism Tension

My natural bias is towards the 'big picture.' Because I see all of the different elements of life as so interconnected, I am loathe to focus my thinking too narrowly. With this study, therefore, my inclination was to try to develop a comprehensive picture of my understanding of Bailey.

On the other hand, because of my bias towards holism, many would probably criticize me for knowing very little about a great deal. I am also growing increasingly sensitive to the implicit arrogance of any effort to grasp the whole, of the assumption that one's understanding or representation can ever be comprehensive:

> We are finite human beings who must learn to accept, for example, that anything we write must always and inevitably leave silences. . . .To lament this condition and to search for a solution to these "problems" is actually to lament and search for a solution to human finitude (Smith and Deemer 2000, 891).

At a more practical level, I also recognized that this study was not going to be my life's work and that, if I was ever going to finish, I needed to narrow the parameters and establish limitations on the scope of my work.

I didn't want to go so far as to narrow my study down to a single perspective because first, I'd hate to leave anyone with the impression that Bailey is unidimensional and second, we can learn a great deal from the connections among different perspectives. I could have chosen any number of conceptual frames of reference through which to interpret my Bailey experience, so I chose those that, during my tenure as a Bailey faculty scholar from 1999 through 2001,

proved most useful and meaningful for me. It turns out there were four of them (self-selected membership; network organization and leadership; self-directed, connected development; and spiritual development), and four seemed like a reasonable number (more than one and less than infinity), so that's where I landed. With these four perspectives, I developed a 'montage' of "several different images . . . superimposed onto one another to create a picture" that, when integrated in the reader's mind, hopefully created "a meaningful emotional whole" (Denzin and Lincoln 2000, 4-5).

Contextual Paradox: The Generalizable-Relevant Tension

The role of research, it is commonly argued, is to contribute to the 'universal knowledge base' so that all can access it to improve their own theory and practice. With the rise of post-modernism, however, "The search for grand narratives is being replaced by more local, small-scale theories fitted to specific problems and particular situations" (Denzin and Lincoln 2000, 17). In other words, "postmodernism recognizes the situational limitations of the knower. Qualitative researchers . . . don't have to try to play God, writing as disembodied omniscient narrators claiming universal, atemporal general knowledge . . ." (Richardson 2000, 928).

At this tension between the two extremes of generalizability and contextual relevance, Jackson (1998) finds some interesting middle ground:

> [O]ne of the most striking ironies is that while there are no human universals that can be established on objective grounds, the fact remains that anyone's particular and limited experience of the

> world tends to have the force of universal truth. Though many religious traditions claim that the universal is revealed in the particular . . . it is perhaps truer to say that when one is most deeply involved in what is closest at hand, the entire world is experienced as being contained in that one microcosm (15).

The assumption is that the reader will be able to generalize from a highly contextualized story to his or her own lived experience:

> A story's generalizability is constantly being tested by readers as they determine if it speaks to them about their experience or about the lives of others they know. Likewise, does it tell them about unfamiliar people or lives? Does a work have what Stake calls 'naturalistic generalization,' meaning that it brings 'felt' news from one world to another and provides opportunities for the reader to have vicarious experience of the things told? (Ellis and Bochner 2000, 751).

Post-modernism gave me license to focus my dissertation on my own experience in a very specific context (i.e., the Bailey Scholars Program). On the surface, my interpretations may be most relevant to me and other Bailey scholars and people affiliated with MSU. I would hope, however, that, because I connected my own reflections with the literature and because I addressed issues that are of broad interest (i.e., membership selection, self-directed development, leadership, organizational development, spirituality, transformation), a larger audience will benefit from my work. I also hope that I was able to 'tell my story' with enough skill to inspire 'naturalistic generalization' in readers who are unfamiliar with the Bailey Scholars Program.

Epistemological Paradox: Embracing Dialectical Tensions through Critically Reflexive Writing and Engagement with the Reader

Heron and Reason (1997) suggest that the knower knows the 'subjective-objective reality' – or, perhaps more accurately, "participates in the known" or "articulates a world" – in four interdependent ways: experiential, presentational, propositional, and practical (280). *Experiential* knowing is "direct encounter, face-to-face meeting: feeling and imaging the presence of some energy, entity, person, place, process, or thing" (280). After three years as an active Bailey scholar, I have considerable, varied experiential knowledge of the Program, other Bailey scholars, and their activities.

Presentational knowing

> emerges from and is grounded in experiential knowing. It is evident in an intuitive grasp of the significance of our resonance with and imaging of our world as this grasp is symbolized in graphic, plastic, vocal, and verbal art forms. It clothes our experiential knowing of the world in metaphors of aesthetic creation, in expressive spatiotemporal forms of imagery. . . (Heron and Reason 1997, 280).

At times, I nearly abandoned the idea of trying to write my dissertation about Bailey because much of my knowledge of the Program is presentational – intuitive, felt – and therefore difficult for me to articulate. I found, however, ways to articulate this knowledge through the symbols (primarily vocal and verbal) that others have used to express their knowledge about Bailey or about similar endeavors. This is why I wove the insights of other Bailey scholars and wisdom from the scholarly literature into my writing.

Propositional knowing is knowing in conceptual terms, "knowledge by description of some energy, entity, person, place, process, or thing" (Heron and Reason 1997, 281). The bulk of my dissertation is an expression of propositional knowledge, an interpretive description (albeit partial and incomplete) of my experiential and presentational knowledge of the Bailey Scholars Program. Rather than projecting my meaning onto the Program as 'fact,' I focused on my own individually-constructed, interpretive, partial understanding of Bailey – my 'in here' – as it has been shaped by my history, my values, my world view, and my experience with others and their 'in heres.' I tried not to speak for others but integrated other perspectives that have helped shape my own. In other words, I wrote what is referred to as a 'layered text' (Lather & Smithies 1997; Ronai 1992) in which the self, the text, and the literature and traditions of social science are layered using "different ways of marking different theoretical levels, theories, speakers, and so on" (Richardson 2000, 942).

Practical knowing is "knowing how to do something, demonstrated in a skill or competence" (Heron and Reason 1997, 281). My hope is that my dissertation, as well as any manuscripts that are published as a result, will increase the practical knowledge of Bailey scholars and others, so that we can all be better colleagues and human beings.

Heron and Reason (1997) suggest that the key to expressing these four ways of knowing is critical subjectivity – "a self-reflexive attention to the ground on which one is standing" (282), "an awareness of the four ways of knowing, of how they

are currently interacting, and of ways of changing the relations between them so that they articulate a reality that is unclouded by a restrictive and ill-disciplined subjectivity" (280). Likewise, Olesen (2000) calls for 'strongly reflexive' accounts:

> The dissolving of the distance between the researcher and those with whom the research is done and the recognition that both are labile, nonunitary subjects steps beyond traditional criticisms about researcher bias and leads to strong arguments for "strongly reflexive" accounts about the researcher's own part in the research and even reflections from the participants. . . .If researchers are sufficiently reflexive about their projects, they can evoke these resources to guide the gathering, creation, and interpretation of data as well as their own behavior (229).

And Lincoln and Guba (2000) challenge us to "*interrogate each of our selves* regarding the ways in which research efforts are shaped and staged around the binaries, contradictions, and paradoxes that form our own lives" (183; emphasis added). Through reflexivity,

> investigators seek ways of demonstrating to their audiences their historical and geographic situatedness, their personal investments in the research, various biases they bring to the work, their surprises and "undoings" in the process of the research endeavor, the ways in which their choices of literary tropes lend rhetorical force to the research report, and/or the ways in which they have avoided or suppressed certain points of view (Gergen and Gergen 2000, 1027).

My strategy for remaining critically subjective was to frame my propositional knowledge in the context of the tensions and paradoxes inherent in my understanding of the Bailey Scholars Program. I used my text to honor "how complicated the world is . . . [and] how layered and contradictory [experience is]" (Lather in Reason 1996, 22). Reason (1993) suggests that dialectical, paradoxical language can be used to avoid restrictive, ill-disciplined subjectivity as well as the reification that can result from objectivism: "Dialectics involves a

recognition of the inseparability of two apparent opposites and an exploration of the interplay between these interdependent poles" (280). Using dialectics, I tried to "multiply paradox, inventing ever more elaborate repertoires of questions, each of which encourages an infinity of answers," (Rosenau 1992, 117 in Kvale 1996, 241) and tried to communicate my learning "not as a fixed truth but in a way that makes people think" (Reason 1996, 22).

Richardson (2000) suggests that the writing process is at the heart of such a critically reflexive exploration. In traditional research, the researcher writes only after having completed the research, analyzed the data, and outlined the findings. The write-up is "presumed to be an unproblematic activity, a transparent report about the world studied" (923). Autoethnographers, in contrast, see writing as "a way of 'knowing' – a method of discovery and analysis," "a method of inquiry, a way of finding out about yourself and your topic" (923). "[W]riting is not merely the transcribing of some reality. Rather, writing . . . is also a process of discovery: discovery of the subject (and sometimes of the problem itself) and discovery of the self" (Lincoln and Denzin 2000, 184). "By writing in different ways, we discover new aspects of our topic and our relationship to it. Form and content are inseparable" (Richardson 2000, 923). "When we view writing as a *method* . . . we experience 'language-in-use,' how we 'word the world' into existence (Rose, 1992)" (Richardson 2000, 924; emphasis in original). Though tormented all the while by guilt rooted in traditional paradigms, I was using writing as a method of inquiry and discovery while drafting "My Journey To and With Bailey." I continued in that vein as I

developed that original essay into this dissertation.

Autoethnography doesn't simply alter the relationship between the researcher, the world, and the text; it also creates an opportunity for transforming the relationship between the text and the reader. The accessibility and readability of autoethnographic texts "repositions the reader as a coparticipant in dialogue and thus rejects the orthodox view of the reader as a passive receiver of knowledge" (Ellis and Bochner 2000, 744). By privileging stories over analysis, the autoethnographer allows and encourages "alternative readings and multiple interpretations." She asks readers to feel the truth of her story and "to become coparticipants, engaging the story line morally, emotionally, aesthetically, and intellectually" (Ellis and Bochner 2000, 745). "The goal is to encourage compassion and promote dialogue," to foster "better conversation in the face of all the barriers and boundaries that make conversation difficult" (Ellis and Bochner 2000, 748).

Such dialogue will be possible to the extent that the writer makes herself vulnerable: "If you let yourself be vulnerable, then your readers are more likely to respond vulnerably, and that's what you want, vulnerable readers" (Ellis and Bochner 2000, 752). And that mutual vulnerability has the potential to support new levels of "social fellowship" and change within the reader (Tierney 2000, 551). By playing a more active, holistic role in their reading, readers are "stimulated to use what they learn there to reflect on, understand, and cope with their own lives" (Ellis and Bochner 2000, 741-2). In this sense, autoethnographic

methods are relationship methods, and through these relationships, autoethnographic research texts have the potential to promote individual and social change (Clandinin and Connelly 1994, 425).

Clearly, autoethnography is not for the faint of heart. On the one hand, experienced autoethnographers encourage others to take risks: "Don't be afraid to make ethnography dangerous, political, and personal" (Bochner and Ellis 2000, 42). At the same time, they warn of the demands and dangers of autoethnography:

> It's certainly not something that most people do well. . . .The self-questioning autoethnography demands is extremely difficult. So is confronting things about yourself that are less than flattering. Believe me, honest autoethnographic exploration generates a lot of fears and doubts – and emotional pain. . . .It's hard not to feel your life is being critiqued as well as your work. It can be humiliating (Ellis and Bochner 2000, 738).

It can be particularly risky to expose onself "in an academy that continues to feel ambivalent about observers who forsake the mantle of omniscience" (Behar 1996, 12). And if the researcher goes out on the autoethnographic limb and does a poor job, it can be embarrassing, even humiliating: "Efforts at self-revelation flop not because the personal voice has been used, but because it has been poorly used" (Behar 1996, 13-14).

Because I hoped that knowledge would emerge out of both my own critically reflexive, vulnerable writing as well as readers' responses to that writing, I invited Bailey scholars to read the initial draft of my dissertation. Because of the climate of trust and respect that is cultivated in Bailey, I felt comfortable exposing my

vulnerability with my fellow scholars. I invited feedback in a variety of forms – anonymously, in writing, or through dialogue sessions – and integrated reactions and new insights into my final draft. I didn't presume to capture all of the knowledge that was generated in the process; I hoped, however, to inspire reflection in others who may, in turn, be inspired to share their learning and knowledge in ways that are meaningful for them.

Axiological Paradox: The Theory-Practice Tension

Traditionally, the goal of scholarship has been knowledge-generation, so it is common to hear scholars criticize practitioners for neither informing their work with theory nor contributing to the development of theory based on their practice. However, it is equally common for practitioners to criticize scholars for neither developing their theory from genuine experience nor applying their theory effectively in practical settings.

In the middle are those who seek to be scholar-practitioners, people who value both active participation in a community of learners and active engagement in community or public life. Scholar-practitioners suggest that "we need to look at and legitimate a wider range of purposes than merely to contribute to the field of knowledge" (Reason 1996, 15). They argue that human inquiry should also "heal our relationship with each other and our world" (Reason 1996, 26), transform or change the world (Reason 1993, 281), and promote human flourishing (Heron and Reason 1997, 287-288).

Many scholar-practitioners question whether theory and practice *should* or *can* be separated (Meulenberg-Buskens in Reason 1996, 24-25). Macmurray (1957) argues that, "although you can divorce thought from action, you cannot divorce action in the world from thought" (Heron and Reason 1997, 281). Conversely, Schwandt (2000) believes that understanding is "itself a kind of practical experience in and of the world" (195-6). Participatory action researchers are some of the most adept at fusing their inquiry and practice:

> In participatory action research, while there is a conceptual difference between the 'participation' 'action' and 'research' elements, in its most developed state these differences begin to dissolve in practice. That is, there is not participation followed by research and then hopefully action. Instead there are countless tiny cycles of participatory reflection on action, learning about action and then new informed action which is in turn the subject of further reflection. . . .Change does not happen at 'the end' – it happens throughout (Wadsworth 1998, 7).

Though a practitioner at heart, I value time for learning through reading, dialogue, and reflection, so I seek to be both a good practitioner and a good scholar. For three years, I 'practiced' as a Bailey scholar, all the while using a variety of literature to better understand my experience and to improve my practice. From this fusion of theory and practice I have a plethora of 'data' (in the form of email archives, past writing, and notes) that served as the foundation of the reflective writing I did for my dissertation. My dissertation served as a mechanism through which I shared what I have learned as a scholar-practitioner in Bailey, thereby contributing to both the development of theory and the further evolution of the Bailey Scholars Program and of similar endeavors elsewhere.

Methodological Paradox I: The Detached-Engaged Tension

Positivists have long argued that the observer must be detached from the observed so that the observer doesn't influence the behavior of the observed. Heisenberg pointed out, however, that it is impossible to observe any phenomenon without influencing it. Others, like Ortega y Gasset, have gone on to argue that findings are actually *more* meaningful if the investigator actively participates in the phenomenon under investigation: "Through the actual experience of something, we intuitively apprehend its essence: we feel, enjoy and understand it as reality, and we thereby place our own being in a wider, more fulfilling context" (in Fals Borda and Rahman 1991, 4). In that spirit, I have always found it important to engage with those people and things I am investigating (or, perhaps more accurately, to limit my investigations to those people and things with whom I am engaged). This desire is behind my longstanding interest in participatory research, which is grounded in collaborative praxis. The type of research in which researchers are fully committed to and immersed in the groups they study is called "convert" research (Mehand and Wood, 1975), "opportunistic" research (Riemer, 1977), "complete-member" research (Adler and Adler, 1987), or "indigenous" research (Tedlock, 1991) (Ellis and Bochner 2000, 741-2).

Because my level and type of involvement with the Bailey Scholars Program has changed over time, I've had the opportunity to be both an engaged and a more detached scholar. I have gone from being an interested visitor, to a Bailey scholar without an official appointment, to a staff member with administrative and

scholarly responsibilities, to a co-convener of classes, to a graduate fellow, and back to a scholar without an official appointment. I hope that these different perspectives strengthened my study.

Methodological Paradox II: The Collaborative-Individual Tension

There has long been a lively tension in the Bailey Scholars Program between the individual and the community. On the one hand, each scholar pursues his or her own individualized learning journey on the path of personal growth. At the same time, Bailey is a learning community with regular community gatherings, highly collaborative decision-making processes, and a variety of opportunities for scholars to come together around shared learning interests.

This tension is brought to light when Bailey scholars seek to interpret and/or re-present Bailey for other audiences through scholarly presentations or writing. This work is sometimes done individually and sometimes collaboratively, but it has become a community norm for scholars to, at a minimum, invite comments and feedback on the scholarly work before it is shared with a wider audience. This practice has emerged, in part, because Bailey scholars recognize that "Understanding," particularly within a learning community like Bailey, "is participative, conversational, and dialogic. . . .Moreover, understanding is something that is *produced* in that dialogue, not something *reproduced* by an interpreter through an analysis of that which he or she seeks to understand" (Schwandt 2000, 195; emphases in original). It would be presumptuous for any Bailey scholar to claim that he or she produced his or her interpretations about

the Program independently.

I imagine that the individual-collaborative tension emerges in similar ways in most research laboratories[7]. On the one hand, teams of researchers collaboratively investigate a general research topic. At the same time, individual researchers pursue sub-topics of interest and develop individually-authored publications. Graduate students who are part of typical research laboratories publish their individually-authored manuscripts as theses and dissertations. Recognizing that their work was largely an outcome of collaborative effort, all or parts of those theses and dissertations are often published as manuscripts co-authored by several members of the research team.

I pursued my personalized learning journey as part of the Bailey learning community for three years. Individual Bailey scholars and the Bailey community as a whole have had a tremendous impact on my thinking and being. It would seem natural, therefore, that I would seek to pursue my Bailey research collaboratively with other Bailey scholars.

As it turns out, a collaborative dissertation is not a very practical option. Not only is it not yet permitted at Michigan State University, but it is logistically impractical. So, like graduate students in research laboratories, I crafted an individually-

---

[7]The laboratory metaphor used in this section was inspired by thoughts shared by Dr. Kim Chung during the spring 2000 participatory research course offered at MSU.

authored dissertation. But I also gave Bailey scholars an opportunity to comment on my manuscript before I defended it. And after I graduate, I plan to invite Bailey scholars to work with me to revise parts of my dissertation into a set of co-authored manuscripts for publication.

Validity Paradox

Positivists tend to be foundationalists who "argue that real phenomena necessarily imply certain, final, ultimate criteria for testing them as truthful" (Lincoln and Denzin 2000, 176). But with the development of constructivist and subjective-objective research paradigms in the social sciences, texts no longer have the authority to make claims to being "accurate, true, and complete – a 'God's-eye view'" (Lincoln and Denzin 2000, 1051):

> There is no possibility of theory-free observation and knowledge, the duality of subject and object is untenable, no special epistemic privilege can be attached to any particular method or set of methods, and we cannot have the kind of objective access to an external, extralinguistic referent that would allow us to adjudicate from among different knowledge claims (Smith and Deemer 2000, 879).

Nonfoundationalists, therefore, "tend to argue that there are no such ultimate criteria [for testing truth], only those that we can agree upon at a certain time and under certain conditions. Foundational criteria are discovered; nonfoundational criteria are negotiated" (Lincoln and Denzin 2000, 176). From the nonfoundationalist perspective, inquiry is a social process in which we not only construct reality as we go along but also "construct our criteria for judging inquiries as we go along" (Smith and Deemer 2000, 886). Validity criteria, therefore, are highly contextual:

> The scientific character or objectivity of knowledge rests on its social verifiability, and this depends on consensus as to the method of verification. . . .
>
> In this sense the people can choose or devise their own verification system to generate scientific knowledge in their own right (Rahman 1991, 14-15).

There are a variety of ways to 'negotiate' or 'construct' validity criteria for any given inquiry. One is to assess the integrity of the proposed research and of the researcher herself. This starts with the research proposal, in which the questions of 'what' and 'why' are answered before the question of 'how': "The content and purpose of an investigation precede the method" (Kvale 1996, 243). In other words, the validity of research findings can be assessed in part by the strength of the justification for the research. But a strong proposal does not a valid inquiry make. The quality of the research is also a function of the criticality of the researcher. A study might be more valid if

> The researcher adopts a critical outlook on the analysis, states explicitly his or her perspective on the subject matter studied and the controls applied to counter selective perceptions and biased interpretations, and in general plays the devil's advocate toward his or her own feelings (Kvale 1996, 242).

Criticality, in turn, is largely a function of the character of the researcher, so "the person of the research, including his or her moral integrity," is also a critical ingredient for evaluating the quality of the knowledge produced (Kvale 1996, 241). So validity testing can begin with an assessment of the research justification and the criticality and character that the researcher brings to the study.

A second way in which to 'negotiate' or 'construct' validity criteria is through

communal assessment. For nonfoundationalists, "[T]ruth arises from the relationship between members of some stakeholding community" (Lincoln and Denzin 2000, 177), so that community is the best judge of the validity of research findings based on its experience. "[C]riteria for judging either 'reality' or validity. . . .are derived from community consensus regarding what is 'real,' what is useful, and what has meaning" (Lincoln and Denzin 2000, 167). Autoethnographers, for instance, commonly do "reliability checks" by taking their work back to the community they work with and giving them a chance to "comment, add materials, change their minds, and offer their interpretations" (Ellis and Bochner 2000, 751). Such a local peer review process can be done on an individual basis or in dialogue as a group (Kvale 1996, 244). Because I am writing about a program in which many people participate, it seems appropriate that I would make it available for local peer-review. So I shared an initial draft of my dissertation with the Bailey community and integrated or appended people's comments in the final draft.

A third way in which to 'negotiate' or 'construct' validity criteria is pragmatically, by judging the effect research has on people and the world after it is completed. From this perspective, "truth is whatever assists us to take actions that produce the desired results. Knowledge is action rather than observation, the effectiveness of our knowledge beliefs is demonstrated by the effectiveness of our action" (Kvale 1996, 248). For example, truth can be determined by the critical, moral discourse texts produce, by the "empathy they generate, the exchange of experience they enable, and the social bonds they mediate"

(Jackson, 1998, 180 in Lincoln and Denzin 2000, 1054-5). Similarly, autoethnographers can judge validity by whether their writing "helps readers communicate with others different from themselves, or offers a way to improve the lives of participants and readers or even their own" (Ellis and Bochner 2000, 751). And in action (or participatory) research, "Credibility, validity, and reliability . . . are measured by the willingness of local stakeholders to act on the results of the action research, thereby risking their welfare on the 'validity' of their ideas and the degree to which the outcomes meet their expectations" (Greenwood and Levin 2000, 96). Ultimately, therefore, the validity of my dissertation research can only be tested with time by the extent to which it inspires reflection, discourse, and action in the reader.

Locating Myself and my Research: A Summary of My Research Paradigm and Approach

Denzin and Lincoln suggest that one of the investigator's first tasks is to "locate" herself and her study (Denzin and Lincoln 2000, 20). In a postmodern world, there is clearly no 'correct' location, and "We seem to be moving farther and farther away from grand narratives and single, overarching ontological, epistemological, and methodological paradigms," (Lincoln and Denzin 2000, 1047), so it is each researcher's responsibility to "come to terms with" how she situates herself in the world (Tierney 2000, 543).

Above, I have tried to 'locate' myself and my inquiry in the context of some of the paradoxes and tensions inherent in human inquiry. Allow me to summarize

where I have landed:

> I find myself in a dynamic, intersubjective reality that holds subjectivity and objectivity in fluid tension and in which our selves, others, and the rest of the world cocreate each other. Knowledge about this cocreation emerges through direct experience, in imagery, conceptually, and in practice.
>
> With my dissertation research, I articulated some of the knowledge I gained as a Bailey scholar using reflexive, autoethnographic writing. Having been actively engaged in Bailey practice for three years, I wrote from a more detached perspective, focusing on some of the theory that enhanced my understanding of my experience. Within the complex reality called Bailey, I focused on meaningful themes of my experience, hoping to speak to the universal through the particular. Since my writing consists primarily of individual reflections about a highly collaborative experience, I invited comments from the Bailey community about the observations I made and infused my final draft with the fruits of the ensuing dialogue.

At this point, I can hear the reader screaming the question: *But what did you actually do?* Clearly, autoethnography allows for an incredible diversity of approaches. The research approach I chose is relatively straightforward and is grounded in the discussion above and seven examples of recently completed autoethnographic dissertations (Crawford 1994; Garza 2000; Nakamoto-Gonzalez 2001; Perry 2001; Santana 1999; VanGunten 1999; Weil 2001).

I began by identifying – through reflection on my time as a Bailey scholar and by reviewing my 'data' (i.e., my notes, email exchanges, and my past writing) – the pivotal Bailey moments or experiences that have significantly influenced my development. Crawford (1994) took a similar approach in her autoethnographic exploration of her seven-year experience as a social worker in Australia. She reflected on her immersion as a practitioner and then organized her dissertation

around "key epiphanic moments". Ellis refers to this process as "systematic introspection" – the process by which researchers examine their own emotional and physical responses to lived experience (in Perry 2001, 222).

As I identified my pivotal Bailey experiences, I summarized the thoughts and feelings they evoked – either in shorthand or by copying excerpts from past email exchanges or writing – in word processor documents. As the number of meaningful experiences that I identified grew, general themes began to emerge around which it seemed logical to organize my insights and impressions, so I created a separate word processor document for each theme. Those themes became the four frames of reference through which I explored my Bailey experience in writing: self-selected membership; self-directed, connected development; network organization and leadership; and spiritual development. This type of coding system is similar to the one used by Santana (1999), whose dissertation was an autoethnographic account of her Americanization as a Dominican immigrant. Santana developed a "conceptual categorization" of the significant events that composed her journey of development (28).

Once I was satisfied that the catalogue of my most meaningful Bailey experiences was complete, I reviewed the experiences one frame of reference at a time. And as I reviewed them, I began organizing them in different ways – chronologically, by themes and tensions that seemed to be common among them, by connections to different bodies of literature, and/or by different options for how to integrate them in writing. I eventually reached a point where I realized

that further attempts at organization would no longer be productive and that the best way to present – and expand – my learning would be through writing.

Embracing 'writing as a method of discovery,' I then began writing. And I wrote in two different ways. On the one hand, I wrote from the heart, 'from the inside-out,' much as I would if I were journaling. Drawing on my own notes, email messages, and past writing (except where otherwise explicitly noted) and using a narrative, storytelling style, I captured the meaning of my journey as a Bailey scholar by detailing my pivotal moments and experiences. In the process, I tried to articulate both the joy and the pain of my journey, grappling with the tensions inherent in personal development like that which I have enjoyed as a Bailey scholar.

On the other hand, I wrote from the head, 'from the outside-in,' trying to express the meaning of my experience more explicitly, in terms that others have found useful. In the process, I wove into my inside-out writing insights from the literature that have helped me interpret my experience.

Several recent doctoral candidates took similar inside-out and outside-in approaches. Perry (2001), who wrote an autoethnographic dissertation about relationships among siblings caring for elderly parents, wrote her family story while at the same time reading memoirs about adult children involved in the care of their parents (217). In this way, she created an interactive dynamic between her writing and her reading, which gave her many voices to use to discover her

own (223). Likewise, Nakamoto-Gonzalez (2001), who used her dissertation to explore her experience as a Peruvian-Japanese multiracial immigrant, wove into her autoethnography historical research, prose, and interdisciplinary perspectives on the development of racial identity. And Garza (2000), who used critical personal narrative to examine her experience as a bilingual teacher involved in a process of collaborative inquiry, integrated theories of capacity building, teacher leadership, teacher research, systems thinking, and equity in education into her dissertation writing.

To demonstrate the complexity of the issues I explored, I used a variety of writing techniques and structures. Like Santana (1999), I used anecdotes, vignettes, and layered stories to present multiple stances, perspectives, and interpretations (27). Rather than coming to concrete conclusions, I sought to articulate the paradoxes and tensions inherent in my experiences as a Bailey scholar. When I thought that I had something 'figured out,' or when self-righteousness told me that my perspective is superior to another, I critiqued my assumptions and tried to explore the issue from other points of view. As a result, I often concluded with more questions than answers.

When my heart and my head were satisfied, when I finished integrating my emotional and intellectual insights through my writing, my plan was to share the initial draft of my text with the Bailey community. Weil (2001), whose dissertation was an autoethnographic account of her experience as a stroke victim, took a similar approach. She gave individuals who either collaborated on her study or

were part of her story the opportunity to read and to offer commentary and interpretations for the material (29). I planned a similar approach – to make the text available for review, invite public and anonymous feedback (in written or verbal form), and convene dialogues about my writing and people's response to it. I would then integrate insights that were shared into the final draft of my text.

Planning the Engagement Process

After I finished writing my initial draft, I was unsure about two things. First, I wasn't confident that it was ready to be shared more broadly. And second, if it was, I wasn't sure how I should approach sharing it with the Bailey community. For help addressing these concerns, I asked my research advisor, Frank Fear, to review my draft.

He affirmed that, with some revisions, it was ready to be shared, but he focused most of his comments on the process for sharing this draft with the Bailey community. Specifically, he felt very strongly that a diverse group of people "wrap themselves around the dissertation, spend time with it, and then engage [me] (and in some cases each other) in conversation about it." He suggested that, in a very public way, I invite targeted feedback from people from different stakeholder groups (he suggested the following groups: my research committee, Bailey faculty scholars who were involved in the Program's early evolution, people interested in processes like integral development, people who are familiar with autoethnography, and the larger Bailey community), convene a series of connected conversations in which participants decide what they want to discuss

and for how long (like the reading circles that have evolved as staples of Bailey community life), and then respond in whatever way makes the most sense to me.

He stressed a few points. First, he thought that it would be insufficient for me to simply get input, sift and sort it, and then write it up; he saw others' engagement as fundamental to my research process, as something that needed to be done to make it "whole." Second, he thought that it was critical that a boundary condition for engagement be using the conversations as an opportunity for personal and collective exploration and meaning-making rather than for validation. Toward that end, he thought that I should request that people engage in face-to-face conversation rather than provide written feedback.

Fear's suggestions were very consistent with my vision for the next steps. In fact, after completing the initial draft, I felt a strong need to engage in conversation with others about my work – I felt that I had taken my thinking and writing as far as I could alone and needed dialogue to help me take my work to the next level. My only concern about Fear's suggestion had to do with inviting different groups of people to read my dissertation through particular lenses. I felt that would be antithetical to what I was trying to do, which was to engage the reader as a whole person. I also felt that, since I generally favored breadth over depth in my research, my dissertation can't be everything to everybody. So, rather than invite individuals to read my dissertation through a particular lense, I chose to deliberately invite individuals whom I knew would bring particular perspectives to their reading.

Since neither Fear nor I had been actively participating in Bailey community life for some time, we were unsure about the best protocol to use for inviting Bailey scholars to participate in the dialogue. We decided that we'd ask another research committee member of mine, Terry Link, who has consistently been an active member of the Bailey community since 1999, to read my draft. Link suggested modifying sections in Chapters 4 and 6 that might be read as critical of some Bailey scholars. I rewrote the section in Chapter 6, which I realized could be improved, but I left Chapter 4 unchanged because I couldn't see a way to modify it while still conveying the powerful nature of the experience I was describing.

We then scheduled a meeting among the three of us to discuss how best to share my draft with Bailey, but at the last minute, Fear was unable to participate, so Link and I met. We agreed that, despite the sensitive nature of some of what I wrote, it would be inappropriate for me to ask Bailey staff members to play a 'gatekeeper' role by reviewing my draft before I shared it with the larger community. That would be antithetical to both the ethos of Bailey and to the nature of my research process. As an alternative, we agreed that I would offer staff copies of my draft before I made it public and ask them for suggestions for how to best invite Bailey scholars to engage in dialogue around my dissertation. We also agreed that, though I would stress my strong preference that people engage in face-to-face conversation, to remain consistent with my original research plan and to allow people to respond in whatever manner is most natural for them, I would also invite written comments.

Engaging the Bailey Community

In consultation with Bailey staff members, I then scheduled the launch date for a reading circle about my dissertation, and I signed up to provide an overview of my dissertation and of the engagement process during one of Bailey's Wednesday lunch hour community forums.

Next, I began extending both personal and general invitations to participate in the reading circle conversations. The general invitation to the Bailey community, which I distributed via the Bailey email listserv and in the Bailey newsletter, included:

- An abstract of my dissertation as well as a reminder that my dissertation is not about Bailey or a study of Bailey but is instead an account of some of my learning and development as a Bailey scholar
- The rationale behind the reading circle, including my desire to honor the communal source of the insights I gained as a Bailey scholar, to enhance my learning, and to provide a learning opportunity for other Bailey scholars
- A hyperlink to a copy of my draft dissertation posted in the Internet
- Information about how to make copies from a hard copy available in the Bailey office
- Options for contacting me with questions.

The general invitation also outlined the 'boundaries' for participating in the reading circle, including:

- A genuine interest in using the dialogue as an opportunity for learning, exploration, meaning-making, and growth. I noted that, though I wanted to honor critique as part of participants' learning process, I was not asking for critique or validation from reading circle participants.
- An agreement to read the entire dissertation before the initial reading circle meeting. Because I saw the dissertation as a whole, as something greater than the sum of its parts, I thought that it was important that reading circle participants digest the entire dissertation before initiating the dialogue.

I also stressed that I thought the greatest learning for everyone would be a product of face-to-face dialogue, so I preferred that people participate in the reading circle rather than sharing their thoughts with me in some other way. However, because some people learn best by writing or may not be able to participate in the reading circle, I also noted that I would welcome written (including anonymous) comments.

I invited people to leave written comments in my mail folder in the Bailey office. In the folder, I left a number of blank human subjects informed consent forms as well as an explanation of the consent choices people have if they would like to leave written (including anonymous) comments. I also placed two envelopes in the folder: one for signed informed consent forms and one for written comments. So that I wouldn't risk seeing the signed consent forms of (and thereby discover the identity of) people who wished to remain anonymous, I asked one of my research committee members to periodically check the informed consent

envelope.

I extended personal invitations to the following people[8]:

- Geoff Habron, an active Bailey faculty scholar and a member of my research committee, who is keenly interested in processes like integral development
- A Bailey faculty scholar (whom I'll refer to as Confidential A) who has been active in the community from early in the Program's development and who is interested in processes like integral development
- Terry Shaffer, a longstanding, active Bailey faculty scholar with appointments in the MSU Museum and with MSU Extension
- A Bailey faculty scholar (whom I'll refer to as Confidential C) who was active in the community from early in the Program's development through 2001
- John Duley, a retiree and community activist with an interest in processes like integral development, who became a Bailey scholar around the same time I did but who has not been active in the Bailey community since 2000
- John Hesse, a retiree from Michigan's Department of Environmental Quality, who became a Bailey scholar around the same time I did, who still plays an active role in Bailey community life, and whose envisionment I referenced in my dissertation

---

[8]Here and elsewhere I am maintaining the confidentiality of individuals who either requested it or who did not participate in the reading circle and therefore never consented to being referenced in my dissertation.

- A Bailey faculty scholar who was involved in Bailey's early development and is interested in processes like integral development but who has not been active in the community since 1999
- A graduate student who's been an active Bailey scholar since 2000 and who shares many of my research interests
- MC Rothhorn, a community member with no official connection with MSU but who is interested in processes like integral development and who had recently begun participating in Bailey activities
- An administrator in the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources who has long been an advocate for the Program and who had just been named the new Director of the Program.

I had also planned to extend a personal invitation to Richard Bawden. He is a University Distinguished Professor whose work was central to my master's thesis and who has supervised and refereed many doctoral autoethnographies. He also helped to shape Bailey during its early development, but he has not been active in Bailey community life since 1999. Before I had a chance to invite him, however, he informed me that he'd be participating.

By way of summary, I did extend invitations to individuals whom I knew would read my dissertation from the perspectives that Fear suggested: my research committee, Bailey faculty scholars who were involved in the Program's early evolution, people interested in processes like integral development, people who are familiar with autoethnography, and the larger Bailey community. I intentionally chose not to invite my fourth committee member so that he could

read my final draft from a relatively detached, fresh perspective.

The following ten people participated in at least one of the three reading circle sessions (the numbers in parentheses indicate whether the individual participated in the first, second, and/or third session): Habron (1, 3), Confidential A (1), Shaffer (1, 2), Duley (1, 2, 3), Hesse (2), Rothhorn (1, 2, 3), Bawden (1, 2, 3), Link (1, 3), Sasha Williams (1, 2, 3), who is my wife and was an active Bailey faculty scholar in 2001, and Confidential B (1, 2, 3), an instructor in the College of Education who had just been introduced to the Bailey Scholars Program. Nine, seven, and seven people participated in the first, second, and third reading circle sessions, respectively. Four participants were active Bailey faculty scholars, four were Bailey faculty 'alumni,' and two were relatively new to the Bailey community. No Bailey student scholars or Bailey staff members participated.

Reading circle sessions were held from 11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. on three successive Fridays. I provided food and drinks. I began the first session with an overview of the rationale behind the reading circle, a reminder of the boundaries for participation, and a brief explanation of my tentative plans for integrating my learning from and interpretation of the reading circle conversations into the next draft of my dissertation. I then distributed the human subjects informed consent forms, explained my intention to tape record the conversation so that I didn't have to worry about taking detailed notes, and discussed the risks and benefits associated with the group's participation in my research process. After the

participants signed the consent forms, I started the tape recorder and launched the conversation. I invited participants to introduce themselves and to share the questions or observations that came to mind as they read my draft dissertation. Over the course of the conversation, I also invited participants to note on flipchart paper themes around which they would like to engage in deeper dialogue. After the group completed the initial round of introductions, the conversation quickly took on a life of its own.

I began the second and third reading circle sessions by asking participants to suggest directions in which they'd like to take the conversation. In both cases, the dialogue quickly sparked to life and traveled in a variety of directions. After each reading circle session, I distributed a brief summary of the themes of the conversation – and re-extended the invitation to participate or otherwise provide feedback – to the Bailey community via the email listserv.

In many ways, the reading circle sessions exceeded my expectations. Each was full of rich conversation about a wide variety of issues raised by my dissertation, including:

- The power of the Bailey Scholars Program
- Application/diffusion of Bailey in other contexts
- Bailey's transition from being a movement to becoming institutionalized
- The sustainability of Bailey
- How can a program survive if its content is its process?
- What do each of us give to and take from Bailey?

- Why have some faculty scholars left Bailey?
- The power of doubting, wisdom-seeking, and the deep search for meaning
- Radical criticality
- Self-reflection
- Struggle/discomfort
- Fear
- Spirituality as right belief and practice vs. a relationship with ultimate reality
- The role struggles/crises play in nurturing spiritual development and democracy
- The relationship between the reader and the dissertation
- What is a 'good' autoethnography? How does a doctoral candidate defend one?
- Using hermeneutics to validate autoethnography.

I will explore these issues in more depth in the chapters that follow.

Over the course of the reading circle, four individuals also provided me with written feedback. At the suggestion of Fear, I asked Habron to comment on my draft dissertation before the reading circle started. He obliged and provided me with considerable structural and substantive suggestions for improvement. Williams provided similar feedback in writing. Duley requested a one-on-one meeting to discuss some of the major themes of my dissertation, and he summarized his reflections in writing for me. Finally, Confidential F sent me a

detailed email message, challenging me to consider a number of substantive issues related to both my research process and the content.

At the end of each reading circle session, the group deliberated briefly about appropriate next steps. After the first two sessions, participants agreed that they wanted more time for dialogue, so an additional session was scheduled, but at the end of the third session, participants felt that they had explored the salient issues in adequate depth and that they'd like to end on a strong note, so they agreed to bring the reading circle to a close. At the end of the third session, we also discussed appropriate next steps and agreed that I should send an email to the Bailey community that 1) announces the end of the reading circle, 2) invites written feedback and/or one-on-one meetings for two more weeks, and 3) announces that during a subsequent Wednesday lunch meeting I will share an overview of what I learned from the reading circle, explain my plans for writing the next draft of my dissertation, and invite discussion.

After I sent the suggested email, no one else provided written comments or requested to meet with me before the deadline for final comments arrived. All told, people had six weeks to provide feedback or to discuss my draft dissertation with me from the time I originally announced the reading circle until the final deadline for feedback.

Honoring Others' Expressions

As I wrote the initial draft and later integrated others' feedback, comments, and insights, I included other Bailey scholars' expressions in my dissertation. I obtained informed consent before including anybody's expression in the final draft and included appropriate attribution. I also respected any scholars' desire to contribute expressions anonymously or confidentially. This approach is consistent with the guidelines of Michigan State University's University Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects (UCRIHS). UCRIHS approved my research protocol and informed consent form before I began writing.

Having assumed that I had taken all of the necessary steps to safeguard human subjects' privacy and confidentiality, it came as a shock to receive notice from the UCRIHS Chair the day before the first reading circle session that he had received an anonymous inquiry from a member of the Bailey community. Specifically, the individual was concerned with the number of Bailey community members mentioned in my dissertation and with the apparent inclusion of quotes from Bailey scholars' writing.

The last thing I wanted to do was to violate human subjects' rights (or University or federal policy, for that matter), so I took this inquiry very seriously. After carefully rereading my draft dissertation and consulting with my committee members, I responded to the UCRIHS Chair within three days. The complete text of my response is included in Appendix D. I began my response with an

explanation of the autoethnographic, interpretive nature of my research. I stressed that, because my research is not a study of Bailey, neither the Bailey Scholars Program nor Bailey scholars (other than myself) are the subjects of my dissertation, and most of my data in the initial draft were from my own writings and notes. I noted that I did not conduct interviews or distribute surveys, so my use of human subjects' data in my original draft was limited. I also explained the steps I was taking to obtain informed consent from individuals who participated in the reading circles or provided me with written feedback.

While rereading my draft dissertation, I did find a few examples of oversights or possible errors in judgment. In my response to the UCRIHS Chair, I detailed these and noted steps I was taking to correct them:

- In Chapter 4 of my original draft, I included an excerpt from a Bailey scholar's essay in my draft dissertation without first getting informed consent. I had been trying to get in touch with this Bailey scholar to request informed consent for almost a month without any success. I had assumed that I could leave the excerpt in my draft dissertation while waiting for consent because the essay was published on the Bailey web site at one point. I immediately removed the excerpt from the draft of my dissertation that was available to Bailey scholars for review and committed to include it in my final draft only if I were able to get informed consent[9].
- In the dialogue included in Chapter 4, I saw how the reader might get the

[9]It turns out that the individual in question was *not*, in fact, comfortable having the excerpt included in my dissertation, so it is not included in this draft.

impression that I was quoting people. If I was, I clearly should have requested informed consent from the people I quoted. I did not, however, include either quotes or excerpts from written correspondence in that section. In fact, much of the text of the dialogue is pulled from my own past writing. To avoid future misunderstandings, I replaced Chapter 4 in the copy of my draft dissertation that was available for review by Bailey scholars with a revised chapter that clarifies the nature of the interpretive writing in that chapter.

- In Chapter 5 of my original draft, I made reference to a participant's observation about a course. I recognized that, from a strict interpretation of UCRIHS policies, I probably should have asked for informed consent from that course participant, which I had not done. I removed that reference from the draft of my dissertation that was available to Bailey scholars for review and tried to get in touch with the course participant to request informed consent.
- In another section of my original draft of Chapter 5, I included a quote without first asking for informed consent. I had originally included the quote in a Bailey essay I wrote in 2000 and then pulled the quote from that essay to include it in Chapter 5 of my dissertation. Because I was pulling the quote from a secondary document, I didn't think to get consent, which was an oversight on my part. I removed the quote from the draft of my dissertation that was available to Bailey scholars for review and requested informed consent from the person I quoted.
- In Chapter 6, I draw heavily on a series of conversations of the Bailey

Leadership Space without requesting the participants' informed consent. My writing in that section is based on a table that *I* created based on the group's conversations. Moreover, I felt that this section is simply a summary of my recollection of conversations at an open meeting, so it was not necessary to ask permission or get informed consent.

- Also in Chapter 6, I pulled directly from minutes of a Bailey Administrative Team meeting without asking for permission or informed consent from meeting participants. I assumed that, since I wrote the minutes and because the minutes were from an open meeting and were shared with the entire Bailey community, informed consent was not required.
- Also in Chapter 6, I quoted from an essay that is published on the Bailey web page that I co-authored with another Bailey scholar and cited the co-author by name. In the original draft that I made available to Bailey scholars for review, I neglected to provide proper citation for that essay in the bibliography. I corrected that error in the copy of my draft dissertation that was available to Bailey Scholars.
- I also removed my draft dissertation from the Internet. I had originally posted it on the Internet to make it easily accessible to Bailey scholars who were interested in reviewing it, but I subsequently learned that documents posted on the Internet are considered *published* documents. It was not my intent to publish my dissertation in its draft form, so I removed it from the Internet.

In my response to the UCRIHS Chair, I also committed to meeting one-on-one

with seven individuals who were involved in experiences that I referenced in Chapters 4 and 6. I wanted to clarify for them the nature of my research and to discuss with them the issues it raises related to informed consent. I also wanted to make sure they were comfortable with how I presented events in which they participated.

Two days after I sent my response to the UCRIHS Chair, he contacted me a second time about another anonymous inquiry that had been made. This time, a question was raised about why I was using a version of my informed consent form that did not bear the official UCRIHS approval stamp. The Chair noted that, though the second inquiry was relatively minor – even though he was impressed with my response to the first inquiry – when he receives more than one inquiry for any given research project, it raises 'red flags' for both him and the rest of UCRIHS. He suggested that I review all relevant UCRIHS documents, instructions, and procedures to guarantee that I am conducting my research in a manner consistent with UCRIHS policies. He also noted that UCRIHS would be reviewing the two inquiries and my responses during its regularly-scheduled meeting two weeks later.

I took the UCRIHS Chair's advice and reread in detail my draft dissertation, a variety of UCRIHS policies, regulations, and instructions, and my original and renewal UCRIHS applications. I also consulted with my research committee members again. As I was preparing my second response to the UCRIHS Chair, he notified me that he had received a third anonymous inquiry. This time,

somebody was concerned about my use of a tape recorder during the first reading circle. He also noted, however, that he thought that my informed consent form adequately informs the subject that I may use audio recordings.

My second detailed response to the UCRIHS Chair is included in Appendix D. In addition to clarifying in more detail my research intent and process, my main points included:

- The informed consent form that I had been using was identical to the one that UCRIHS approved. The mistake I made was to not use a copy of the form with the UCRIHS approval/expiration stamp. The only explanation I had for this mistake is that I was not aware of the requirement to use a stamped copy. Since I had a stamped copy, it would have been illogical for me to have used the unstamped version had I understood the requirement. I attributed my ignorance to the instructions that I used to write my original UCRIHS application. In those instructions, the researcher is given the option of using forms without the stamp. When I renewed my application a year later, I failed to verify whether that rule had been changed in the revised instructions that were recently released. I reassured the UCRIHS Chair that I had started using the stamped version and that I would ask everyone who had signed the wrong version of the form to sign the stamped version. I kept both signed copies in my records.
- The working title of my draft dissertation was different from the title of my research project, which is included at the top of my consent form. In light

of the requirement to notify UCRIHS of changes in the title of research projects, I noted that some people might raise concerns about the difference in the two titles. While I suspected that the title of my dissertation may change several more times before the research project was completed, the title of my project remained the same, and I did not anticipate that it would change. I assured the UCRIHS Chair that if it did, I would be sure to submit the appropriate materials to UCRIHS.

- After tape recording the first session of the reading circle, I discovered that the latest UCRIHS instructions specify that "Taping and/or filming of subjects should be indicated in the consent form and there should be signed permission by the subject to be taped/filmed. The consent form should indicate how these materials will be used." In both my original UCRIHS application and my approved consent form, I indicated that my research data may include expressions of Bailey scholars captured on audio tape, and my consent form explains how expressions will be used. The consent form does not, however, specifically ask participants for signed permission to be taped. I attributed this error to the fact that this requirement was not included in the instructions I used when preparing my original UCRIHS application. In response to this error, I decided to abandon the use of audio tape recording. Recordings were not necessary for my research. It was never my intent to transcribe the conversations and then analyze them using standard qualitative approaches; my intent was only to record the conversations as a backup to my written notes, so that I could review comments that I may have missed in my notes. I had

not listened to, transcribed, or copied the tape recording I made of the first session, and I committed to destroying the tape in front of witnesses.

- Based on some of the feedback I had received from Bailey scholars, I anticipated that I would make the following changes in the next draft of my dissertation. 1) I will be much more explicit about the types and sources of my data. Specifically, I will note that, unless I have otherwise indicated, my interpretive writing is based on my own notes and writing. 2) To protect people's identities, I will consider writing the next draft without any allusion to the Program or the people involved. 3) I will draw clearer distinctions for the reader between my data and my interpretations. This is a particularly acute challenge when writing an autoethnography, but it has become clear that there are sections of my dissertation where this distinction is unclear for some. 4) I will clarify that my interpretations are not factual findings and should not be read as such.
- I would share both the nature of the UCRIHS inquiries and my responses to them with the participants in the reading circle. I thought that it was important that participants understand the serious nature of the inquiries and the steps I took to address potential areas of concern. I did that and, interestingly, none of the reading circle participants expressed any concern, nor did anybody want to spend time in the reading circle discussing it.

The week and a half during which I was receiving and responding to the three inquiries made to UCRIHS were very stressful. At one level, I was concerned

that I may have, in fact, made some significant errors that had resulted in harm to other people. At another level, I was fearful that the inquiries might completely derail my research and force me to start a new doctoral research project from scratch, which, given my current personal and professional commitments and obligations, I doubted I would ever do. And at a third level, I was disappointed that whoever made the anonymous inquiries didn't feel comfortable approaching me directly. I completely honored the desire to remain anonymous and held no grudge against the individual(s). But I did regret that, as a result of past experience with me or certain perceptions or assumptions about my research intent or my potential response to the concerns, the individual(s) felt a need to raise formal concerns rather than discussing them with me. The action implies a level of distrust that is disconcerting.

A week and a half after sending my second response to the UCRIHS Chair, I received the following letter from the UCRIHS Chair:

> Mr. Whitmore
>
> UCRIHS reviewed your response to the subject's complaint that was related to your dissertation draft.
>
> The committee requires that you have a consent form for every individual with an identifiable attribution in your dissertation. If you are unable to get a consent from an individual, then data attributed to that individual should be removed from your dissertation.

I read this as an affirmation of the assumptions I'd been making about the need for consent only when I used data drawn directly from other people (and not when I write interpretatively about collaborative experiences) and of the steps I told UCRIHS I'd been taking to protect the rights of human subjects. Naturally, I

was greatly relieved.

Planning the Final Rewrite

I was still troubled, however, by the inquiries and anxious to discuss my research process and my draft dissertation with the seven individuals who were involved in experiences that I referenced in Chapters 4 and 6. I wanted to be sure that, if any of them had made the inquiries, I adequately addressed their concerns in my final draft. I also wanted to surface any perceptions or assumptions about my research intent that may have affected their level of trust in me or my work.

I met individually with seven people, including:

- Michael Jensen, a Bailey faculty scholar with MSU Extension who served as Bailey's point person for technology for a few years and participated in the Bailey Leadership Space during some of the experiences I describe in Chapters 4 and 6.
- LeRoy Harvey, a Bailey faculty scholar who participated in the Bailey Leadership Space as the Bailey graduate assistant during some of the experiences I describe in Chapter 6.
- And Confidential A, Confidential C, Confidential D, Confidential E, and Confidential F, Bailey faculty scholars who participated in the Bailey Leadership Space during some of the experiences I describe in Chapters 4 and/or 6.

Jensen, Harvey, and Confidential C had not read my draft dissertation before our conversations.

During each of the conversations, I reiterated my research intent and described my research process, emphasizing that my research is highly interpretive in nature, that my pre-reading circle data were almost uniquely my own (except where explicitly noted), and that I planned significant revisions in my next draft based on the wide variety of feedback I had received to the preliminary draft.

I also made a point of explaining my approach to the sections of Chapters 4 and 6 that Link had originally identified as sensitive and that I suspected may have been the inspiration for the original UCRIHS inquiry. In particular, I noted the tension between wanting to acknowledge others' role in these significant parts of my experience as a Bailey scholar and wanting to safeguard individuals' privacy and confidentiality. I also noted that I had gone out of my way while writing to present a balanced perspective and to be self-critical and apologized if I had offended or hurt the individual with the content of this draft. I also explained the changes I had already made and was planning in my final draft (as presented to the UCRIHS Chair) to clarify my approach and protect individuals' privacy and confidentiality.

I also shared the nature of the UCRIHS inquiries and invited individuals' questions or concerns related to the rights of human subjects. In the context of that part of the conversation, I also explained that this conversation could become part of my dissertation, discussed the informed consent form, and invited them to sign it.

Each of the meetings went very well. In fact, nobody expressed any major concerns. Some were surprised that anybody had concerns. Others shared that they did have some concerns after their initial reading of my draft but that their concerns were allayed after rereading the draft, reconsidering their initial response, hearing my perspective, and understanding the steps I was taking to improve the next draft. Some had suggestions for the next draft, which I note as appropriate elsewhere in the dissertation. Confidential F, for instance, took the time over the course of two separate meetings to discuss with me in detail a number of different structural and substantive issues raised by my draft. Everybody seemed to appreciate the effort I made to meet with them individually and to guarantee that their identities/confidentiality were protected.

After completing these one-on-one meetings, and a week and a half after the final deadline for comments, I hosted a Wednesday lunch dialogue to share my experience during the reading circle and related engagement with Bailey scholars. Eleven people participated in the conversation, including Bawden, Duley, Fear, Harvey, Link, Shaffer, and Williams, plus

- Jim Oehmke, a longstanding Bailey faculty scholar and professor in the Department of Agricultural Economics
- Bob Carlisle, a local resident with strong ties to MSU who periodically attends Bailey activities and events
- Confidential G, a faculty member in the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources whom I had never met and who had just recently been introduced to the Bailey Scholars Program

- Another individual with whom I have been unsuccessfully trying to meet in order to discuss informed consent.

I began with an overview of my research and then outlined the process described above that I used to engage Bailey scholars in dialogue about my draft dissertation during the previous two months. I then summarized my tentative plans for making both structural and substantive revisions to my dissertation.

The bulk of the ensuing conversation centered around whether or not I should write the next draft without any reference to the Bailey Scholars Program. My original plan was to not mask the Program's identity but to be careful to honor individuals' preferences to remain confidential. After the UCRIHS inquiries, however, I grew hyper-sensitive to the need to protect people's identities and realized that it wouldn't be very hard for the reader to figure out who some unnamed individuals are.

Some, including Oehmke, Shaffer, and Confidential G, felt that the context is critical and that the reader should know the source of my insights so that she has the opportunity to investigate the Program in more depth. Oehmke also noted that keeping the identity of the Program confidential would leave too much room for misinterpretation; he argued that some readers may try to figure out the identity of the Program and may come to inappropriate conclusions, which could potentially do more harm than identifying the Program.

Others, including Bawden and Fear, felt that either approach could be justified but that it was critical that I be scholarly in my approach. Specifically, Fear noted that all previous articles and conference presentations about Bailey have named Bailey but that the scholarly tradition in situations like this, where a specific case is used to explore larger issues, the identity of the case is usually kept confidential but described in enough detail to give the reader a sufficient understanding of the context. However, the critical question in this case, he observed, was to identify my "center of gravity" as either Bailey or issues related to development. Similarly, Bawden argued that, whether Bailey was identified or not, the meta- and epistemic understanding of others' reactions to my draft was critical. He observed that, since my dissertation is as much about the research process as it is about the ideas I am exploring, I must describe the impact the reading circle and related engagement had on me.

After the final Wednesday conversation, my tentative plan was to remove references to Bailey. As I worked on my final revisions, however, I confronted two practical problems. First, I realized that, when describing the Program, I cite literature that specifically references the Program, so it wouldn't take much for the reader to identify the Program. I could remove those citations, but that would significantly weaken my scholarship. Second, the bulk of the people who participated in the reading circle and related conversations preferred that they be identified and that their comments be attributed to them in the final draft of my dissertation. Even without any references to the Bailey Scholars Program, it would be relatively easy for the reader to use the individuals' identities to identify

the Program.

In light of those practical problems, and after reconsidering the arguments made during the final Wednesday lunch conversation, I decided not to mask Bailey's identity. However, I also decided that, before I completed my pre-defense draft, I would contact some of the individuals with whom I met one-on-one. Specifically, I contacted the three individuals whom, based on our earlier conversations, I suspected might be the most concerned about having their identities protected. Two of the three had already told me that they were comfortable with how they were presented in my initial draft, but I wanted to check back with them anyway. By email, I explained the evolution of my thinking as described in the paragraphs immediately above and explained that, before I give a pre-defense draft to my committee, I wanted to make sure that they were comfortable with how their identities were protected. In each individual email message, I also summarized all of the references to the individual in question that were included in the latest draft of my dissertation. I also offered a complete copy of my latest draft for review and mentioned that I'd be happy to discuss any questions or concerns.

Two of the three reviewed my latest draft and told me that they were comfortable with how their identities are protected. The third also wanted to review my latest draft. I explained my time frame for completing and defending my dissertation, but the individual didn't give me any feedback before my deadline for submitting my pre-defense draft to my research committee. Since that individual was one of the two who originally indicated that they were comfortable with how they were

presented in my initial draft, I assumed that that was still the case, so I did not mask Bailey's identity in my pre-defense draft.

All told, by the end of the engagement process with the Bailey community, a total of twenty-four people had provided me with feedback about my draft dissertation, either individually or as part of the reading circle or final Wednesday lunch conversation. As a result, I had an abundance of new, rich data to include in the final draft of my dissertation.

Initially, I organized the data into 'structural' and 'substantive' categories. Structural data included suggestions from individuals about

- Clarifying particular points
- Clearly distinguishing different types and sources of data
- Stressing the interpretive nature of my research
- Improving the dissertation's coherence
- Clarifying the timing of my different insights
- Including more information about my practical application of my Bailey-inspired learning in other contexts
- More explicitly engaging the reader
- Correcting typographical and grammatical errors
- Rewording particular sections
- Making factual corrections
- Defining terms, and
- Adding a glossary.

Substantive data included comments from individuals related to the issues raised by my dissertation. These data, as Bawden and Habron pointed out, generally fell into three categories: those related to Bailey (i.e., the content), those related to my methodology (i.e., how I explored the content), or those related to the readers' connection with my writing (i.e., how readers responded to my exploration of the content).

There was never any question in my mind as to how to integrate the structural data into the final draft of my dissertation. Since they simply made my dissertation more readable without affecting its essence, I would integrate them without any explicit notation. It was more of a challenge, however, deciding how best to integrate the substantive data. The principal question in my mind centered around the extent to which I ought to distinguish between my pre-engagement insights and those gained by discussing my initial draft with other people.

I raised this issue during the final Wednesday lunch conversation. I presented three options. First, I could integrate my new insights by completely rewriting my dissertation, without making explicit the differences between my pre-engagement and final drafts. Second, I could take the first approach but use footnotes to identify revisions. Or third, as suggested by Bawden during one of the reading circles, I could leave my pre-engagement draft in tact and use prologue- and epilogue-like writing structures to highlight issues raised during the engagement process. There was general consensus during the final Wednesday

conversation that, because of the nature of my research, I should use the third option, which is what I have done.

Readers' Responses

Two themes of the reading circle dialogue are relevant to the methodological material presented in this chapter. The first relates to issues of validity and the second to readers' level of connection to my writing.

During the reading circle, Confidential B noted that one of the first questions that came to mind was "How will he defend this?" Similarly, Williams asked "How does Ron know [the material he presents in his dissertation] is true?" In response, Duley suggested that my transparent struggle for integrity validates my research because I have demonstrated that, as Palmer might say, I am struggling to be "divided no more." This mirrors Kvale's suggestion (1996) (described in the "Validity Paradox" section above) that one way to construct a study's validity is to assess the integrity of the researcher (241).

Bawden, who has read many autoethnographies as an examiner, noted that he is repeatedly faced with the question: "How do you validate personal development?" Following Bernstein, Habermas, and Gadamer, he came to the conclusion that the best option is to take a hermeneutic approach. That is, since autoethnographies are largely interpretive in nature, scholars should use validity criteria developed for interpretive research (i.e., hermeneutics). Specifically, echoing Lincoln and Denzin (2000, 177) and Ellis and Bochner (2000, 751),

Bawden suggested that autoethnographies are best validated by dialogue about the interpretation. Otherwise, he noted, autoethnographies are simply homilies, or trite, banal pontifications. Bawden went on to suggest that all dissertations should be discourses and that, in my case, I should consider adding a prologue to my dissertation with which I extend to the reader an explicit invitation to discourse and an epilogue that summarizes what I learned hermeneutically. I took Bawden's suggestion to heart and added a prologue to the dissertation as well as epilogue-like sections to each chapter.

Shaffer added that the reading circle participants can validate my research by sharing their own unique experiences, by responding in kind with elements of their own autoethnologies. This is similar to Jackson's argument (1998, 180) for pragmatic validity criteria, as measured by the empathy generated or the exchange of experience enabled by a study (in Lincoln and Denzin 2000, 1054-5).

In that spirit, I think that it is important to note how some of the reading circle participants expressed their connection to my writing. Several said that reading my dissertation prompted them to reflect on their own Bailey experiences. Hesse said that my writing "brought back memories"; Shaffer responded with a nostalgic "I was there!" when he read my description of the evolution of the Declaration of Bailey; and Habron said that my writing forced him to think about his own role in Bailey. Specifically, he noted that my dissertation encouraged him to think about himself as part of a community and that he began asking

himself questions like: "If I am part of Bailey, what do I give and take?" "What's my role in helping things go smoothly?" "How am I using my freedom?" "Have I let Bailey down?" "Am I asking the right questions and acting on them?" "What am I going to *do*?"

Others noted other types of connections they made with my writing. Rothhorn, for instance, said, "I resonated with different voices. I heard *my* voice." Similarly, Shaffer noted that Chapter 1 helped him think his way out of a corner as it relates to the paradoxes associated with doing good for others.

What do *you* think?

I recognize that this is a very long chapter, in which I present a tremendous amount of material. I hope, however, that you have been able to remain engaged, that you have found the material intriguing and thought-provoking. In the hermeneutic spirit, and as I did at the end of Chapter 1 (and will do in chapters 4 through 8), allow me to pose some questions designed to encourage you to connect with my writing:

- What is your response to the question I pose as the title of this chapter: Is this really research?
- How is this approach to inquiry similar to and different from other approaches with which you are familiar? What are its relative strengths and weaknesses?
- What is your assessment of the 'engagement' process I used to share my initial draft with the Bailey community, of my responses to the inquiries

made to UCRIHS, and of the approach I took to rewriting my dissertation based on the engagement process?

- For each of the paradoxes inherent in human inquiry that I outline, where do you 'locate' yourself?
- How does my methodology as presented in this chapter compare to your own formal or informal experiments with inquiry?
- How might you approach future inquiry differently after reading this chapter?
- How do you *feel* after reading this chapter and pondering these questions?

CHAPTER 3: FOUNDATIONS AND THEORY OF INTEGRAL DEVELOPMENT

After exploring – in both theory and practice – a variety of approaches to development (as outlined in Chapter 1), by the time I was preparing to launch my master's research, I was thoroughly dissatisfied with what I had found. From my perspective, most improvement efforts were either too paternalistic, too superficial, too universalistic, too narrowly focused, too mechanistic, and/or too materialistic to promote any significant, fundamental growth.

With my master's thesis (Whitmore 1998), I developed a theoretical model of holistic, organic evolution grounded in the teachings of the Bahá'í Faith and in the work of Palmer (1983), Bawden (1995, 1997), and Wilber (1996, 1998). I called this process of transformation 'integral development.' Integral development has transdisciplinary roots, is grounded in a particular set of philosophical assumptions, and is best described using systems theory.

This chapter is an overview of the foundations and dynamics of integral development. I'm sharing this to help you understand the frame of reference with which I was viewing development as I became a Bailey scholar. Naturally, my understanding of development has evolved since then, largely due to my experience as a Bailey scholar and to my dissertation research (Chapters 4 through 7 detail some of those changes, which I also summarize in Chapter 8). It is not critical, therefore, that you complete this chapter with a firm grasp on every dimension of integral development. So this chapter is purposefully

concise, and I do not elaborate in detail about some of the points. If you are interested in a detailed exploration of integral development, I refer you to my thesis.

Origins

Integral development is grounded in the following key assumptions (Whitmore 1998):

- Environmental degradation persists despite existing knowledge about how to steward natural resources more sustainably.
- Environmental stewardship and development practice are inextricably linked, so one root of environmental degradation is unsustainable development practice (Braidotti et al 1995; Capra 1982; Daly and Cobb 1989; Engel and Engel 1990; Goulet 1992; Merchant 1995).
- There exist alternative paradigms and world views of environmental stewardship and sustainable development (T. Berry 1988; Daly and Cobb 1989; Engel and Engel 1990; Merchant 1995; Milbraith 1989; Naess 1989; Skolimowski 1981; Tucker and Grim 1993).
- The *dynamic, systemic* nature of processes of change in paradigms, world views, and behavior are poorly understood (Argyris et al 1985; Clark 1989; Daly and Cobb 1989; Engel and Engel 1990; Fox 1995; Kothari 1990; Kuhn 1962; Milbraith 1989; Naess 1989; Roszak 1973; Schön 1995; Senge 1990; Tucker and Grim 1993).
- Spirituality is an important dimension of systemic processes of change (T. Berry 1988; Daly and Cobb 1989; Engel and Engel 1990; Gottlieb 1996;

Korten 1995; Rasmussen 1993; Rockefeller and Elder 1992; Roszak 1973; Schumacher 1973; Tucker and Grim 1993).

The goal of my master's thesis, therefore, was to articulate a framework for understanding spiritually-inspired, systemic processes of transformation, out of which emerge more sustainable environmental and developmental theory and practice.

Relevant Systems Theory

Before I introduce the philosophy of integral development, I think you'll find a brief introduction to systems theory useful. According to Bawden (1997):

> To the systems theorist, a system is an organised, coherent, whole entity, which has, or can be assumed to have, properties which are unique to it as a whole entity. More formally stated "a system is a group of interacting components (subsystems) that conserves some identifiable set of relations with the sum of the components plus their relations (i.e., the system itself) conserving some identifiable set of relations to other entities (including other systems)" (Laszlo and Laszlo, 8) (2).

While systems can be useful intellectual constructs, it is important to remember that "Systems are not objective realities of Nature; they are subjectively defined by human observers" (Waelchli 1992, 5) and that "Systems are tools of understanding devised by human minds for understanding situations. . . .They are arbitrary constructs" (Vickers 1983, 7).

'System' derives from the Greek *synhistanai* ("to place together"). Therefore, "To understand things systemically literally means to put them into a context, to establish the nature of their relationships" (Capra 1996, 27). Systems theory is

useful for synthesizing and integrating, for considering the relationships among the parts and the whole, for seeing networks and patterns of connection, for considering both established structure and dynamic processes, and for contextualizing phenomena in their environment (Capra 1996; Senge 1990; Sterling 1990).

'Emergent properties' are those characteristics of a system that are unique to the level of organization of the whole system, are not exhibited in its parts, and cannot be explained as the sum of its parts (Checkland 1981; Laszlo 1994). A cell, for instance, cannot be understood at the level of the nucleus, an organ cannot be understood at the level of its cells, an insect cannot be understood at the level of its organs, an agroecosystem cannot be understood at the level of insects, and a food system cannot be understood at the level of agroecosystems.

It is important to distinguish between 'emergent properties', 'emergence', and 'evolution'. As explained above, emergent properties are those characteristics of a system that are unique to the system at the level of the whole ensemble. An emergent property, therefore, is a *state* or level of new complexity. Evolution, on the other hand, is a dynamic *process* of development. Evolutionary processes create emergent properties. The use of 'emergence', therefore, is often confusing. It is usually used synonymously with 'evolution' in the context of the evolution of new 'emergent properties'.

A 'holarchy' describes the hierarchical[10] relationships of a system to its sub- and supra- systems (i.e., the system's internal and external linkages with the system components and the wider environment or context). Wilber (1996) popularized the term 'holarchy', which was originally developed by Koestler (1967) to represent the way in which 'holons' (the designation he uses for systems) are nested within and around one another. Koestler argues that the term 'system' inadequately describes what people refer to as systems because a system is simultaneously both a sub- and supra-system. According to Wilber (1998), "There are no wholes, and no parts, anywhere in the universe; there are only whole/parts," or holons (100). I tend to use the more popular term 'system' when referring to single holons, but I prefer the succinct 'holarchy' to the more cumbersome 'systemic hierarchy.'

'Chaos' is stochastic (i.e., intrinsically unpredictable) behavior in deterministic systems (Clayton and Radcliffe 1996, 24)[11]. Deterministic systems are characterized by cybernetic networks of feedback communication and control.

---

[10]Unlike most fields in which hierarchy is used to describe vertical organizational or power relationships, systemic hierarchy is usually used in the sense of horizontal 'nestedness'. If a given system is 'nested' within its environment, and that system's subsystems are 'nested' within it, there exists a systemic hierarchy. In two-dimensional space, such a hierarchy can be depicted using a series of horizontally-arranged concentric circles, which clearly distinguishes it from vertical power hierarchies. Three dimensionally, 'nestedness' can be conceptualized as a Russian *babuschka*, with the outer figurine containing another figurine, which contains a third, and so on.

[11]It is important to distinguish chaos from randomness or anarchy. Systems scientists call randomness 'noise', while chaos is considered to be deterministic and patterned. The qualitative features of a chaotic system are predictable, yet its behavior is totally unpredictable.

Systemic stability is maintained through self-balancing (negative, stabilizing, deviation attenuating) feedback, while self-reinforcing (positive, amplifying, deviation amplifying) feedback creates systemic instability. In living systems, multiple (hundreds, thousands, millions) of these cybernetic feedback loops interlink into complex, nonlinear networks. Periodically, due either to internal change or external influences, the tensions between negative and positive cybernetic feedback reach a heightened enough state to create chaotic behavior in systems (Bawden 1997, 3). These critical points of instability are called 'bifurcation points' (Capra 1996, 136). At a bifurcation point, a system may either restabilize into its original form, collapse, or restabilize into a new, usually more complex system exhibiting new emergent qualities.

It is natural for developing systems (including living systems like a cell or an agroecosystem, as well as evolutionary systems, with which I am obsessed) to exist in a state somewhere between order and chaos (Waldrop 1992). This state is referred to most commonly as 'dynamic equilibrium,' though systems in this state are also commonly referred to as being in a state 'far from equilibrium' or in 'disequilibrium' or 'nonequilibrium' (Capra 1996, 181; Clayton and Radcliffe 1996, 25). It is also natural for these systems to periodically reach bifurcation points, where they evolve, disintegrate, or return to their original state. In living systems, spontaneous evolution is called 'self-organization' (Capra 1996, 85).

Integral Development

The theory of integral development is grounded in a holarchic ontology. It assumes that we exist within a diverse yet interdependent and unified holarchic network, which Wilber (1996) calls the Kosmos. The Kosmos consists of domains of matter (the cosmos), of life (the biosphere), of the mind (the noosphere), and of the divine (the theosphere). These Kosmic domains interact both internally (i.e., within individual systems) and externally (i.e., between systems within the holarchic network). Intra- and inter-systemic connections are maintained through 'self-transcendence' (Jantsch 1981, 91-92), or, more simply, 'love', the universal holarchy's cultural and biological glue (Maturana and Varela 1987, 246-247). In other words, integral development assumes that reality has material, living, intellectual, and spiritual components, all of which are interconnected and interdependent, both within and between individual systems (e.g., people, communities, organizations, plants, animals, or ecosystems).

Epistemologically, integral development assumes that knowledge is an emergent quality of the internal and external interactions among the cosmos, the biosphere, the noosphere, and the theosphere. These interactions are sometimes referred to as praxis – the reflexive, divinely-inspired actions of living systems. In other words, we (and the rest of our Kosmic compatriots) learn through the interactions among our bodies, thoughts, feelings, and spirit – and those of other people and beings.

Methodologically, because knowledge emerges from the interactions among

Kosmic domains and among different systems, integral development assumes that comparable levels of attention and nurturing energy focused on each of those domains, as well as on the relationships among them and other systems. In practical terms, this implies that systems should seek balance and harmony among their material, living, intellectual, and spiritual components and that effort should be made to improve communication and to strengthen communal bonds.

Kosmic diversity, combined with the constant interactions within and between systems and the knowledge generated by those interactions, puts holarchies in a state of dynamic equilibrium. Stability is provided by the structure created by intra- and inter-systemic relationships, both formal and informal. Chaos, in turn, is fueled by weak or broken-down intra- and inter-systemic connections and communication as well as by praxis and the knowledge it generates. During periodic destabilizing bifurcation points, systems sometimes disintegrate or evolve into new systems with higher states of complexity. Development, therefore, is a gradual process of holistic, holarchic evolution. Out of this process of evolution – which is not planned or engineered – new, surprising, unpredictable ideas, action, and structures continually emerge.

In other words, development is a natural, emergent quality of the dynamic interactions between internal systemic components and among different systems. We humans can fuel these processes by nurturing ours and each others' material, living, intellectual, and spiritual dimensions; by improving communication through techniques like dialogue; by strengthening relationships

through fellowship, egalitarian organizational structures, and communion with natural systems; by growing comfortable living within a state of dynamic equilibrium; and by learning to appreciate the periodic upheaval caused by systemic evolution.

I think that it is important to note, at this point, how dramatically different integral development is from other theories of and approaches to development:

- It is *situated* within a particular holarchic context rather than being grounded in universalistic assumptions.
- It focuses on *relationships* within and among systems rather than focusing on particular systems or parts of those systems.
- It encourages *transdisciplinary* and *systemic* approaches rather than approaches that are superficial, multi/inter/disciplinary, or reductionist.
- It explicitly integrates the *spiritual dimension* of development rather than focusing uniquely on material development.
- It *integrates theory and action* as praxis rather than focusing uniquely on learning or behavior change.
- It *focuses on process* rather than on finite projects.
- It *trusts development to emerge naturally* rather than attempting to instrumentally manufacture development with simplistic (yet presumptuous) designs, plans, and goals.
- It recognizes development as an *eternal process* rather than placing temporal parameters on it.

CHAPTER 4: SELF-SELECTED MEMBERSHIP

Arguably, we live in a meritocracy (Arrow et al 2000). That is, people's 'success,' as demonstrated by pay and privilege, is largely a function of their merit as measured by cultural standards like GPAs, test scores, resume-building activities, academic degrees, and the like. From an early age, we're taught that if we do all the right things – listen to our teachers, study hard, do community service, etc. – we'll get into a good college, land a good job, and have enduring access to the fringe benefits of middle-class existence.

In many ways, my life is a testament to meritocracy. It never hurt that I am a white, middle class, male. But, as part of my lifelong quest for 'improvement,' I also learned to master the meritocratic game. Throughout elementary, middle, and high school, I got straight As, I aced standardized tests, I was a successful athlete, and I put in countless volunteer hours in student government and for various community service projects. My 'merit' was rewarded with various awards and ultimately with admission to an Ivy League college. The pattern repeated itself from there – I excelled according to established criteria, and I was rewarded with acceptance into the Peace Corps, promotions, admission into my graduate program of choice, and graduate assistantships I sought. Superficially, our system of meritocracy has always worked well for me.

Below the surface, however, merit-based success has taken its toll. In high school, by trying to be the perfect student, the perfect student body president,

and the perfect athlete, I became perfectly depressed. Like Tompkins (1996), I had become a "terrified performer," and school, "although it taught me to succeed in its own terms, also stunted and misshaped me for life" (xvii). Eventually, I had to see a therapist to begin reconciling my culturally-driven expectations with reality. It was a fantastic paradox: by playing by society's rules and enjoying remarkable success, I had managed to make myself miserable.

I still didn't learn, however, that the 'right thing' wasn't necessarily right for me. I went to college because it was the cultural expectation, not because I had any career aspirations or a burning desire to learn. I was successful because the only path I knew to follow was that of duty, responsibility, and diligence.

But I was also a tremendous failure because I was living someone else's life – not one that other individuals (e.g., parents or teachers) directly imposed on me, but one that I had allowed my culture to impose upon me. My devotion kept me from exploring much outside the classroom, so there was little balance in my life. And the disparity between my merit-based standards and my ability kept growing, so my depression deepened. My misery, in turn, kept potential friends away, which reinforced what had become a vicious cycle. Several times, I came very close to dropping out. Similar patterns repeated themselves in the Peace Corps and graduate school. I worked hard and climbed the ladder of success, but I often sacrificed more meaningful aspects of life – friendships, cultural experiences, joy – along the way.

Then I ran into the Bailey Scholars Program. This chapter is about my own experiences in the Bailey Scholars Program with the antithesis of meritocracy – self-selected membership. Those experiences dramatically altered my understanding of 'admission' into a community or program as well as the significant influence that process can have in individuals' and communities' development.

To convey the nature of my experiences with self-selected membership, I have used my personal notes, my past writing, and email messages I wrote to construct conversations between myself and others. The text of these conversations does not include actual quotes from any similar conversations that may have taken place. Instead, the conversations are vignettes designed to capture my interpretation of a variety of experiences over a period of time. All of the names of individuals are fabricated.

A few important notes about the formatting of the constructed conversations: My voice is presented in plain, left-justified text, and unspoken reflections are [bracketed]. Others' voices are *italicized* and, if part of a conversation, indented. To give you a sense of the temporal evolution of my perspectives, the thoughts shared under each time-specific heading are characteristic of my thoughts at that time.

I conclude this chapter with a summary of what I've learned from my experience as a Bailey scholar with self-selected membership, how readers responded to

the ideas shared in this chapter, and how I've applied my learning in other contexts.

Introduction to Self-Selected Membership

November 1998: The Invitation

What do you mean "come on over and hang out"?

Just come on over to the Bailey space in Wills House – during class, Wednesday lunch, a reading circle – really, whenever. Spend some time, meet some people, and get a feel for Bailey.

But people don't know me from Adam. I can't just walk in off the street and start hanging around. Don't I have to go through some kind of admissions or screening process? I sent you my resume – shouldn't people look at that before inviting me to hang out?

To be honest, I had to chuckle when I got your resume in the mail. We made a fundamental decision early on NOT to select Bailey scholars using traditional criteria like GPAs, test scores, letters of recommendation, and the like. In fact, we decided not to select people at all. We don't choose Bailey scholars – people choose Bailey.

How does this work in practice?

An interesting system of self-selection has evolved. Potential student and faculty Bailey scholars are asked to learn about the Program, meet Bailey scholars, decide for themselves whether or not there is a good fit, and then share with the Bailey community their interest in becoming a Bailey scholar. Student scholars in the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources are admitted to the "Specialization in Connected Learning," and faculty scholars who have a funded appointment at MSU have percentages of their time bought-out for participation in the Program.

But how do you make sure there's a good fit?

We've found that people figure out rather quickly whether Bailey is good for them and they are good for Bailey. We trust that individuals – not some kind of selection committee – can make that decision best for themselves.

Aren't you worried about being overwhelmed with new Bailey scholars? How many people can a program like this handle?

As is the case in most communities – and we consider Bailey a community, a learning community – we trust that it will reach a natural equilibrium. In fact, what we're finding is that Bailey is certainly not for everyone. Many people aren't comfortable in Bailey – some even find it threatening.

I can see why. We live in a meritocracy, and many people – myself certainly

included – make tremendous investments in building records that demonstrate their merit. If someone comes along and says "None of that matters anymore," it feels like the rug has been pulled out from underneath you. And if you are part of the privileged class that defines the criteria for success – that serves as gatekeeper – I can see why the Bailey approach might be threatening.

> *We assume that there are many people out there who may have been less successful in that system, or who find it somehow inadequate, that are affirmed – even liberated – when the rules are changed.*

I must say that there is a part of me that finds it incredibly refreshing to be accepted as a whole person and not just as a hard worker who has mastered the system to his benefit. I think I'll try hanging out in Bailey and see if there is a good fit.

<u>Fall 1998 Reflections: Where else has self-selected membership been used</u>?

[As a student of adult nonformal learning, I am familiar with the work of folks like Lindeman (1961), Freire (1989), Knowles (1990), Horton (1990), and others, who suggest that adults learn best when they are self-motivated and assume responsibility for their learning. I have also been involved in various workshops and informal classes that had self-selecting participants. But I have never before heard of or seen an example of self-selected membership in a formal academic or professional setting.

[My curiosity piqued, I'm combing the literature to see if I can find other, similar examples. I'm quickly learning that most of the literature about 'self-selection' focuses on the biases of self-selecting research subjects or the self-selected diets of people and other organisms. In the realm of education, there are also many references to self-selected reading as a tool for improving literacy education or allowing students to self-select projects or work groups as a tool for increasing student motivation.

[But I've only found a few examples of formal educational programs (and none of other types of professional programs) that use self-selection as a mechanism for admission. In the 1960s, adult education programs in Great Britain (and elsewhere) commonly used self-selection as the only admission criterion (Stock 1993). More recently, in Minsk, Belarus, Dr. Oleg Davydenko supports a club for adolescents who work alongside him as agricultural genetics researchers. He has learned to allow the students to self-select and to discover for themselves whether or not they have an aptitude for genetic research (Subotnik 1995). And at the Technological Centre for the Galilee in Israel, teenagers self-select to work on their own original research projects, many of which are of master's degree quality (Freeman 1999). Based on her research of gifted children, Freeman has developed "Freeman's Sports Approach" to guided self-selection. Just as students who are talented and motivated can select themselves for sports, she argues, academic facilities and programs should be available to all for advanced studies.]

November 1998: Wednesday Lunch

Hey Ron, come on in. Help yourself to some soup and bread, and grab a seat somewhere around the table. We'll be starting in a few minutes. Oh, let me introduce you to a few folks. This is Jerry, a faculty member in Ag Econ, and this is Suzanne, a student scholar in horticulture. They're just coming out of an Academic Affairs working group meeting.

[These people are awfully friendly and welcoming. And it's interesting that students and faculty both serve on working groups together. The way people are talking and laughing as they sit down to eat makes this place feel more like a family reunion than a meeting on a university campus. I wonder where the soup comes from – does the university foot the bill for this?]

Let's get started, folks. Welcome to Bailey. These Wednesday lunches are opportunities for Bailey scholars and friends to get together informally each week to learn about each other, to explore interesting topics, or to discuss issues related to the Bailey Scholars Program. Special thanks to Louis for bringing today's soup and to Olivia for the bread. The soup and bread sign-up list for future lunches is making its way around the table. We've got at least one new face around the table today, so let's begin with a round of introductions.

[This is certainly a diverse group of people. And yet they seem to get along together really well. They seem to share a common bond of some sort. Not the

kind of bond I've seen among fraternity members – the kind that is inward-looking and exclusive. There's something else that binds these people together. . . .Oops, it's my turn to introduce myself.]

Hello, my name is Ron Whitmore, and I'm a grad student in RD, putting the finishing touches on my master's thesis. I'm writing about the systemic nature of transformational change and, specifically, the spiritual dimension of development. I guess I'm here because I've heard that Bailey is experimenting with whole person development, which sounds similar to my research interests. Thanks for having me.

> *Welcome, Ron. Bailey is experimenting with a number of things. As a matter of fact, if you polled the folks around the table, you'd probably find that everyone is drawn to Bailey for a different reason. What we share in common, however, is a commitment to the spirit of the Declaration of Bailey, which is hanging from the ceiling along the edges of the walls: "The Bailey Scholars Program seeks to be a community of scholars dedicated to lifelong learning. All members of the community work toward providing a respectful, trusting environment where we acknowledge our interdependence and encourage personal growth."*

[That must be it. That's what's different about this group and makes this space feel so inviting. People are here because of a commitment to a set of principles – lifelong learning, creating a respectful and trusting environment, and balancing

personal growth with interdependence. This sounds really interesting. I think I'll try a few more of these Bailey gatherings.]

Spring 1999: Introduction to 'Envisionment'

OK, so I've been hanging around for a while, and there seems to be a good fit. Is there some way I can officially become a Bailey scholar?

The system that has evolved for faculty scholars – and because we try to blur the distinctions among Bailey scholars, all non-undergraduates are considered faculty scholars – is called 'envisionment.' Most simply, it is a personal statement of how an individual's journey intersects with Bailey – how Bailey contributes to individual development and how the individual, in turn, will contribute to Bailey's development. You'll notice that a few people have signed up to share their envisionments during coming Wednesday lunch conversations. Why don't you get a sense for the process and then think about developing your own envisionment.

Spring 1999: Envisionment of a Retired State Employee

As most of you know by now, two years ago I took an early retirement from the state. With all of my hobbies – woodcarving, fishing, gardening, and landscaping – I have never been bored since leaving the work force. Nevertheless, something seemed to be missing and Bailey has helped me discover what it was. It can be summed up in just two words – "BEING CONNECTED" again. My hobbies, in a large part, are things that I do entirely alone. Although

everyone needs to spend time alone (the amount of personal time needed varies among individuals), personal relationships are critical to one's happiness. . . .

On Monday, I posted nine [issues that I dealt with during my 29-year career in state government] on the wall here in the Commons area as part of the Interest Share Fair. This is giving me a chance to see which issues might be of greatest interest. So far, it appears that Fish Consumption advisories in the Great Lakes and Health Assessment at Superfund Sites have the most names on the sheets but that may change before the week is up. This is going to be very helpful in prioritizing which case studies [I should prepare for the Bailey community first]. . . .I look forward to being a part of the Bailey community and ask for guidance in how I might best make a difference as a new member of the Bailey Program (Hesse March 17, 1999 envisionment).

<u>Spring 1999: Envisionment of a Faculty Member from a Michigan College</u>

I can't really remember when I started thinking and participating with Bailey Scholars. It seems that the openness and honest conversations about teaching and learning during the Bailey Scholars Reading Program, the Summer Colloquy and the Bailey Celebration seemed to kindle my interests over time. I enjoyed the disparate points of view that I heard as a regular participant. Reading The Courage to Teach *(Palmer 1998),* A Feeling for the Organism, The Life and Work of Barbara McClintock *(Keller 1983), and* Into the Wild *(Krakauer 1996) were sources of intellectual pleasure. However, the culture that seems to surround and percolate in Wills House is what actually "lights my fire." Shared*

humanity and generous commitment to learning that characterizes Bailey faculty is contagious and everything that I try to help my students/beginning teachers experience. . . .Finding colleagues like these Bailey Scholars is exactly what I'd always hoped academia would be all about!

I bring to Bailey what I have found, and hope to find more of, with Bailey faculty – consciousness about our work as scholars and teachers. The focus of my scholarship and teaching is on studying the connections between espoused and enacted theories. I'm continually amazed at the ideas and the critical reflection that Bailey faculty and students bring to living their values (K. Fear envisionment).

Spring 1999: Reflections on My Own Self-Selection

[This idea of self-selection is really powerful. On the surface, from a conventional perspective, it is 'fluffy' – there are no standards used to 'sort the wheat from the chaff,' as it were. But as I hear other prospective Bailey scholars' envisionments, I realize how much more meaningful a self-selected admission process can be. Rather than simply laying out their professional credentials to demonstrate their worthiness, people are drawing from their whole selves – professional and personal, intellectual and emotional, material and spiritual – to make connections between their individual journeys and the Bailey Scholars Program. Becoming a Bailey scholar isn't like entering a typical academic program or joining a club – it is more akin to laying the foundations for a relationship or investing in a new friendship.

[I'm spending more time on my envisionment than I ever have on any job or academic application. I can't just list all of my achievements and experience – I have to dig much deeper and explore the nature of the draw I feel toward the Program. This is making me feel vulnerable, however, in a way I've never felt in a professional context. When applying for jobs, I always feel like I'm being judged or evaluated, which is a bit unnerving. But this is different. I'm not the least bit fearful of what others would think of what I share in my envisionment – in a short time, I have developed a deep sense of trust for Bailey scholars and the communal space they have created at Wills House. What I'm really afraid of is what I may find as I explore the depths of my being, my true motivations, my sense of value and worth underneath the facade of titles and accomplishments. I'm not used to digging that deep.

[Here's a sample of what's emerging (my complete original envisionment is included in Appendix A): "Ever since I first heard about the Bailey Scholars Program, I have wanted to be a part of it. It is the first organization that I have encountered that not only espouses many of the principles and values that I hold most dear but is also able (or at least trying) to translate them into reality through practice. I hope to spend most of my life working in support of communities like Bailey. . . .

["By focusing on *learning* and *transformation* rather than on grades and evaluation and by creating an *egalitarian*, *interdependent* organization in which all are learners, scholars, partners, and friends, Bailey is demonstrating the

synergistic effects of creating true *community*. . . .

["[My tenure as an undergraduate at Dartmouth College] was a relatively miserable experience (though my academic records may indicate otherwise) because of the great disconnect I felt between how I was spending my time (reading and writing but not thinking very much in order to make the grade) and who I really was. . . .My undergraduate experience was one of the most disempowering experiences of my life in large part because I never connected it with who I was and who I wanted to be. One of the things that excites me about Bailey is that it is potentially very empowering for all involved. . . .

["Although my experience at MSU has been for the most part positive, some aspects of it bring back memories of my disempowering time at Dartmouth. Some courses, for instance, have proven totally irrelevant and disempowering because I was treated as a depository into which the professor's knowledge and wisdom could be poured. Moreover, I always find it interesting yet discouraging how the process of becoming a student somehow disempowers professionals who have a wealth of experience and knowledge to share. I am looking forward to joining the Bailey community in which I will be professionally re-empowered while also learning how to contribute toward creating an environment that empowers others. . . .

["I am tired of simply 'working' and would like to spend my time *serving*; I am tired of feeling like a lonely cog in a machine or a unit on an organizational tree

and dream about being part of a *team*; I am tired of reporting my activities according to predefined objectives and tasks and would rather be facilitating a process of *organic change*; I am tired of being evaluated solely for my ability to think, write, and read-between-the-lines and would like to feel the rewards of *balanced* intellectual, emotional, relational, and spiritual *development*; and I am tired of watching the world spin its wheels on the way to disaster and would like to help it *emerge* its way into something better."

[Interestingly, on the other side of vulnerability, I am finding new confidence and a new voice. When invited to bring my whole self to the table, parts of me that have been dormant for some time all of a sudden come alive. Having grown up as a privileged white middle-class male, I've never really understood the meaning of the term 'liberation,' but now I think I am beginning to. Ironically, I feel like I'm being liberated from the very conventions that safeguard my privilege, like standardized tests, GPAs, and access to elite educational opportunities. The path that is opened to me when I'm evaluated by those measures doesn't appeal to me because it isn't my path. It is a path someone else defined as successful. Bailey is liberating me to discover and follow my own unique path in the company of others on similar journeys.]

From Self-Selection to Participation

1999-2000 Academic Year: Evolving Roles

[I've continued to attend Wednesday lunch conversations, participate in reading circles, and otherwise 'hang out' in Bailey through the summer of 1999. My level

of involvement has intensified, however, since I was appointed as a Fellow in September 1999. Because the former Assistant to the Chair became the new Academic Learning Coordinator, I and two Bailey faculty scholars assumed some of the Assistant to the Chair responsibilities. Along with the Chair and the Administrative Assistant, we compose the Bailey Administrative Team, which grapples with issues related to the leadership, management, and administration of the Program. I was given a half-time appointment, and I am to devote half of my time to administrative duties and half to scholarship. As is common in Bailey, my specific responsibilities have been left undefined, as we expected them to naturally emerge and continue to evolve with time.

[With this new appointment, I'm beginning to understand the significance of the time that Bailey buys out for its faculty members. As a Bailey scholar without an appointment, I could spend whatever free, volunteer time I had in Bailey activities. That time was rather limited, however. My appointment, on the other hand, has carved out a significant chunk of my professional time that I can devote to Bailey activities. It has made a tremendous difference in both what I am gaining and what I am contributing as a Bailey scholar.

[Specifically, during my first official year in Bailey, I am serving as a member of the Office Management Team, which includes the Chair, the Academic Learning Coordinator, and the Administrative Assistant and is responsible for keeping the basic infrastructure of the Program functioning smoothly; I serve as point person for various initiatives and activities; I am co-convening ANR 210, the first in a

series of Bailey core courses; I am co-presenting at three national conferences; and I have co-authored the essay "Bailey at Year Two" (included in Appendix B).

[Beginning with my June 2000 re-envisionment (included in Appendix C), I have begun a transition away from administrative responsibilities. This shift is motivated by at least three factors. First, I recently began working half time as the coordinator of a community development initiative in Lansing and don't think I can handle two different jobs with heavy administrative responsibilities. Second, I want more time to focus my energies on Bailey as the topic of my dissertation research. The third reason, which is closely related to the first two, is that my first year and a half as a Bailey scholar have had a profound, liberating effect on me. Driven by my lifelong drive to 'do my duty,' it is the norm for me to play the 'coordinator' role in most of my personal and professional activities, and that has certainly been the case in 2000. I have found it incredibly refreshing, however, to not play that role in Bailey. I have certainly been playing leadership roles, but I've also, for one of the first times in my life, been able to focus as much on my own passions as I have on helping others pursue theirs.

[The outgoing Program Chair has affirmed my proposed reorientation, but we haven't discussed the specifics of what that transition would look like, and I've been assuming that my level of appointment would remain the same regardless of the roles I play. To clarify this, I'll have to prepare a formal change in the nature of my appointment as soon as the new Director gets settled.]

The Limits and Tensions of Self-Selected Membership

Winter 2000-2001: The Limits of Self-Selection

Dear Bailey Leadership Space: I would like to propose that my roles in Bailey be formally changed. I would like to shed my administrative responsibilities and focus on my scholarly work (primarily my dissertation about Bailey) and otherwise have the same freedom as other Bailey faculty scholars to serve Bailey in ways that complement my journey of development. I am interested in focusing on writing, reading circles, convening courses, being part of dialogues about leadership and management, and playing various leadership roles on ad hoc groups that organize around issues, events, and conferences.

As you know, because I am not an MSU faculty member, my appointment has always been funded through a combination of Graduate School fellowship dollars and an assistantship. Since I have completed my course work and no longer need an assistantship, I propose that I be given an adjunct faculty appointment in Bailey at a level consistent with other faculty appointments and with the level of my involvement and contributions. There is some precedent for doing this for Bailey faculty scholars who otherwise have no connection to MSU; they must first, however, get a funded appointment in another campus unit. But there is no precedent for having Bailey be a faculty scholar's only connection to MSU – Bailey faculty scholars all have an administrative 'home' in some other unit. Since Bailey is all about new approaches and new ways of doing things, I am proposing a new learning opportunity for the community.

We greatly appreciate all of the contributions you've made, Ron, to Bailey and the journeys of Bailey scholars. We also appreciate your desire to remain actively engaged with Bailey. We cannot support your proposal, however, for several reasons:

- *Though anybody is free to self-select as a Bailey scholar, there has never been any guarantee that people without any affiliation with MSU can get compensated as Bailey faculty members.*
- *Institutional constraints limit Bailey's flexibility, and we must be strategic about when, where, and how we push the institutional limits and try to change the larger system of which we are a part.*
- *Not all Bailey faculty members are compensated for their Bailey time, and most put in much more time than is being bought-out.*
- *Bailey faculty appointments, with few exceptions, have decreased in percentage over time and will continue to do so.*
- *You have been getting paid far more than other Bailey Fellows, and we can't justify continuing to support you at the same level.*

[Is this really happening? They aren't being this blunt, but I feel like two clear points are being made: First, it is not a priority to make Bailey accessible to non-MSU people, despite how meaningful the Program is to them or how much they may be contributing. And second, Ron hasn't been pulling his weight (i.e., he hasn't been doing what he was hired to do), he's overpaid, and he's not worth going to bat for.

[I feel like my world view had been shifted with a two-by-four. Naively, perhaps, I thought that Bailey was one of the few places around where people could be supported in their efforts to find those spaces where they are both contributing and becoming more whole. Being a Bailey scholar has been a truly liberating experience for me, but I guess I've been taking it for granted and/or assuming that it is more than I thought. Part of the Bailey ethos seemed to always be 'anything is possible,' particularly when it came to supporting people in their developmental journeys, but I guess I finally discovered the limits to what is possible. I've bumped rather abruptly into administrative, political, and fiscal realities and am feeling dazed by the experience.

[I now realize that I was being presumptuous – even selfish – with my proposal and the assumption that I could be supported for all of the time I spend on Bailey-related activities. I had begun to see Bailey as an entitlement, as something I deserved because it was meaningful for me and because I have a lot to offer.

[This has forced me to take a hard look in the mirror, and I'm not sure anymore what I see. Am I really an honest, service-oriented, authentic, person of integrity seeking to find those places where my gifts can meet the world's needs, or have I been self-serving, self-absorbed, self-righteous, and abusive of a good thing? Am I just a dreamer with totally unrealistic ideas for what is possible and no understanding for life's built-in constraints? Should I stop assuming that things could/should be done differently and just acquiesce and conform?]

Spring and Summer 2001: Some Tensions of Self-Selected Membership

[During the fall of 2000, I continued to play other various leadership roles; I co-convened ANR 310 and 311, the second and third core Bailey courses; and I convened a regular writing circle.

[Since January, as I originally arranged with the former Chair, I have been supported with Graduate School fellowship dollars as a Bailey Fellow. During the spring and summer of 2001, I am serving as a member of the Bailey Leadership Space; I've co-convened ANR 410; I continue to convene a regular writing circle; I'm helping to prepare a conference presentation; and I'm assisting with other various Bailey activities, like a retreat and a dialogue about the Bailey re/envisionment process.

[During both summer Program retreats and the community conversation about the re/envisionment process, I've been trying to spark conversation about some of the issues raised by the messy nature of my appointment as a Bailey scholar. Questions I've posed to the community for consideration include:

- Is there any part of the Declaration of Bailey that limits Bailey to being an undergraduate specialization in the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources at Michigan State University?
- Who is a Bailey scholar? Is it anyone who sees a connection between their journey and the community's ethos, or is it just people who have an official MSU connection?
- What is the community prepared to do to make it possible for anyone who

is drawn to and making contributions to the Program – whether they are affiliated with MSU or not – to be able to engage actively in Bailey community life?

- Given a limited budget, how truly 'self-selecting' can we allow potential Bailey faculty scholars to be?
- What are the potential risks and benefits of decreasing Bailey's fiscal dependence on MSU by raising money to strengthen its community connections?
- As the number of Bailey faculty scholars and their appointment levels drop (as they were in 2001), how are we going to recruit new faculty scholars?
- How should we decide who does and does not have a Bailey faculty appointment, and at what level?
- Are appointment issues simply administrative 'problems to be solved' by staff, or are they community learning opportunities that require thoughtful deliberation?

These questions have fueled some interesting conversations, but in the end, the community has not made adjustments to the Bailey self-selection and appointment process.]

Fall 2001 and Beyond: Self-Deselection

[In the meantime, I explored every avenue proposed by the Bailey Director to be appointed as a Bailey faculty scholar. First, I got myself appointed as an adjunct faculty member in my home department. But then I was told that I was not able to receive an appointment in Bailey because there was no funding associated

with my appointment. I then tried to have funding for some consulting work I was doing channeled through my home department so that, administratively, it looked like my adjunct appointment was funded. It turns out that that approach would have been illegal, so I abandoned it.

[I've done my best to remain engaged for a while after my funding ran out in August. Through the fall semester of 2001, I've continued attending meetings of the Leadership Space and a few community activities here and there. However, I'm increasingly feeling like I am not making any contribution (and that things might even improve if I disengaged). Moreover, I'm finding it more difficult continuing to volunteer my time. My wife's income has recently decreased dramatically, she's now pregnant, and I'm still only working half-time, so financial concerns have given me a new sense of urgency to finish my doctoral degree and move on with my life. I continue to do volunteer work, but I have to make difficult decisions about where to focus my energies. I'm reminded once again of the impact an appointment can make that 'carves out' some of one's professional time. Since January 2002, I have only participated in a few Bailey activities.]

Things I've Learned from Self-Selected Membership

By way of summary, my experience in Bailey with both self-selection and self-deselection has taught me the following:

The literature suggests that **when people self-select into programs,**

organizations, or learning environments, their learning, development, and satisfaction can be greatly enhanced (see references to Freeman 1999, Freire 1989, Horton 1990, Knowles 1990, Lindeman 1961, Stock 1993, and Subotnik 1995 above).

Self-selected membership in formal educational or professional settings is rare. In my literature search, I only found a few examples of formal educational programs (see Freeman 1999, Stock 1993, and Subotnik 1995) – and none of other types of professional programs – that use self-selection as a mechanism for admission.

'Fit' is an important element of self-selected membership. It seems to work well in Bailey to have people explore that fit by spending time learning about the Program, meeting Bailey scholars, reflecting about what they can give to and take from the Program, and then publicly sharing their interest in becoming a Bailey scholar.

Self-selected membership, because it requires the selectee to articulate her own unique fit with Bailey, **can make people feel vulnerable**. It is sometimes much easier to answer standardized application questions than it is to explore one's sense of identity and purpose.

Self-selected membership can also be liberating. Bailey scholars often bring parts of themselves to Bailey that have lain dormant for some time. There can

be tremendous power in defining for oneself the terms of one's participation in a community.

The maintenance of a hospitable, inviting, safe space in Bailey seems to facilitate the acclimation process for people who are exploring their fit with Bailey.

A diverse range of people is drawn to Bailey. In this chapter, I noted how undergraduates, graduate students, MSU faculty members, a retiree from state government, and a faculty member from another institution – all with different backgrounds and interests – are Bailey scholars. And though I don't emphasize it in this chapter, when viewed from socioeconomic, ethnic, political, religious, and many other perspectives, the Bailey community is highly diverse. Most seem to be drawn more because of their unique, personal connection to the Program's ethos, as articulated by the Declaration of Bailey, than for reasons that might normally draw people to a community, like shared backgrounds, interests, or goals. In other words, Bailey is about 'unity in diversity' rather than 'unity through conformity.'

Relatively few people are drawn to Bailey. As noted above, Bailey has never been overwhelmed with people interested in joining the Program. (In Chapter 6, I demonstrate that there have never been more than 100 active Bailey scholars at a university with more than 55,000 students, staff, and faculty.) This may have as much to do with the level of commitment it requires as it does with the

discomfort some people feel with the Program's ethos or selection process.

Self-selected membership and egalitarianism seem to complement each other nicely in Bailey. People self-select into the Program as Bailey scholars, and though distinctions remain among Bailey scholars because of the nature of the University environment, effort is made to blur those distinctions. In most programs, in contrast, people are selected and admitted with a particular rank that distinguishes them from more senior or privileged members.

Because official appointments backed by appropriate compensation help to 'carve out' a portion of people's professional time, **there can be a tremendous difference between the contributions made to Bailey by volunteers and people with official appointments**.

Environmental realities, including administrative policies and fiscal constraints, **can limit the extent to which Bailey can allow people** – especially those with tenuous connections to the University – **to truly self-select into the Program**.

Bailey scholars have it within their power to change those environmental realities by changing their environment. The appeal of the Declaration of Bailey clearly extends beyond the University, and the Program would likely benefit from greater involvement from off-campus scholars, so Bailey scholars could explore the possibility of making Bailey more than an undergraduate specialization at MSU. For instance, Bailey could decrease its fiscal dependence on MSU and

strengthen its community connections by raising money to purchase the time of Bailey scholars who have no affiliation with the University.

It is an ongoing challenge to decide how to determine the level of each self-selecting Bailey faculty scholars' appointment. Should all appointment levels, for instance, be equal? Or should they be based on past contributions, or forecasts of future contributions? How do you factor in someone's salary level or history and the impact that can have on Bailey's limited budget? Should these questions be answered differently for faculty members and graduate students?

Because self-selected membership can be such a powerful and meaningful experience for Bailey scholars, **the Bailey community needs to be particularly mindful about how it makes decisions about faculty appointments**.

Readers' Responses

Several participants in the reading circle noted that they enjoyed the informal, dialogistic style I used in this chapter.

Several also commented on the inviting nature of the Bailey community. Link noted that Bailey is special because people are allowed and encouraged to connect in ways that are unique to their individual interests and developmental journeys. He drew an analogy between Bailey and a soup that can be tasted in different ways.

Rothhorn noted that part of what makes Bailey so welcoming is the food that is commonly available at events, most notably Wednesday lunch sessions. He reminded the group that someone had added "through food" at the end of the version of the Declaration of Bailey that is hanging in Bailey's meeting space and lamented that I didn't include "through food" at the end of the version of the Declaration that I included in my dissertation.

Confidential A raised a question about the role of fear in selection and advancement processes. She sees a brightness in Bailey that doesn't shine elsewhere due to the pervasive culture of fear. Link attributed the brightness to the trust that commonly develops among Bailey scholars that helps people overcome their fears. Confidential B observed that Bailey students, in contrast with other students who seem to be willing to compromise their integrity to get their collegiate certification, don't fear expressing their views. Confidential B noted that he is drawn to Bailey, in part, because of this distinction between his students and Bailey students.

A considerable amount of the reading circle conversation also focused on why some Bailey faculty scholars have disengaged from Bailey. Bawden shared that the process of crafting his own autoethnography about his Bailey experience took him away from Bailey. Through reflection, he realized that, given his limited time, other opportunities promised to be richer than his Bailey experience. He grew impatient with Bailey's growing lack of radical criticality as it gradually evolved from an exploratory process into an institution. Specifically, he was

disappointed that Bailey scholars stopped asking critical questions like "What do we mean by learning?" and "How do I know I've changed?"

Bawden then raised the question: "Why did other faculty leave?", and Shaffer noted that similar questions had been raised during the recent "appreciative discovery" process in Bailey. Echoing Bawden's comments, both Shaffer and Duley suggested that Bailey has lost the excitement of struggling to start a new program. Shaffer added that Bailey is in greater need of new challenges and ideas than it is of new people.

Bawden suggested that the lack of criticality and growth is not unique to Bailey; rather, Bailey has simply become a microcosm of U.S. society and universities. He observed that, during the 1960s, the U.S. (and particularly the college campuses) were on the cutting edge of criticality, but today, universities no longer help people deal with the complexities of modern life or with moral judgments. Duley observed that the 1960s 'radicals' left universities and entered political life or became community organizers. And Shaffer posed the question: "How do we nurture the next generation of radicals?"

My Bailey-Inspired Experiences with Self-Selected Membership

Influenced largely by my powerful experience with self-selected membership as a Bailey scholar, I have attempted to apply the theory of self-selection in other contexts. Specifically, I have tried to create opportunities for a diverse range of people to explore their 'fit' as part of different development activities.

Recognizing that this makes some people feel vulnerable, much of my effort has focused on creating inviting, hospitable, safe, egalitarian environments.

My first deliberate experiment with self-selected membership was in my neighborhood in downtown Lansing. Most of my initial energy went into creating welcoming, comfortable settings in which people could get to know one another and develop bonds of trust. I began by inviting neighbors to our house and then started organizing monthly get-togethers in different homes around the neighborhood. When a critical mass of people began attending the get-togethers, we began to publish a monthly newsletter. And as soon as the get-togethers became more like meetings, we formed a neighborhood watch and incorporated as a neighborhood association. Since then, we've organized a number of neighborhood improvement projects and hold an annual neighborhood barbecue.

Participation has always been voluntary and self-selecting: participation in activities is open to anyone in the neighborhood, and people become members of the neighborhood association Board simply by attending two consecutive meetings. Board members are not elected, and we have no officers; people assume necessary leadership roles on an ad hoc basis. As a result, participation is diverse and includes a good racial, socio-economic, age, and religious mix. Over time, as people's sense of ownership for the neighborhood has grown, more and more people have begun assuming leadership roles to help plan activities and as neighborhood watch coordinator, newsletter editor, and

coordinator of our flower planting program.

Buoyed by my small successes with volunteers in my neighborhood, I tried similar tactics when I was hired to coordinate the NorthWest Lansing Healthy Communities Initiative. One of my first responsibilities was to convene working groups charged with translating a set of very general recommendations for strengthening the area into detailed action plans. Rather than have working group members nominated or appointed, I had them self-select. I extended a general invitation to the ~100 people who had participated in the 'Summit' where the recommendations were drafted. To try to improve the fit between individual interests and foci of the working groups, I also extended some directed, individual invitations to people who had expressed interest during the Summit in particular issues. In this manner, each of five working groups, plus a Coordinating Team responsible for synthesizing and advocating for the plans produced by the working groups, were formed.

I made it easy for people to participate by holding meetings at convenient times, by providing meals, and by focusing participants' energies on their creative work rather than on organizational maintenance (I facilitated the meetings and prepared and distributed minutes and draft action plans). To maintain an egalitarian atmosphere, I never encouraged the groups to select any officers. Participation in each varied over time, but each group maintained a 'critical mass' and developed enough cohesion to be able to meet productively on four to eight occasions and to produce draft action plans.

One product of the work of the working group that focused on leadership development was the Community Leadership Lounge. The Lounge is grounded in the assumptions that formal leadership training is already readily available but that there are relatively few informal opportunities for community leaders to learn from each others' successes and challenges. To make participants feel more welcome and comfortable (and to get them out of the 'meeting mind set'), the Lounge is hosted in rooms that resemble family rooms, with couches, fireplaces, and no meeting tables. Participants in monthly Lounge sessions are strictly self-selecting; the sessions are free, open to the public, and do not require any advance registration. On average, eight to twelve people participate in each session, which is the ideal size for a rich conversation in which everyone has a chance to participate. Each Lounge session has a pre-determined theme, but there is no agenda, and the facilitator's role is to simply maintain the quality of the learning environment and not to direct the conversation or to lecture, so conversation is free-flowing. The Lounge has been operating successfully in Lansing for two and a half years and has been replicated in Jackson.

I feel that my experiments with self-selected membership outside of Bailey have been relatively successful. I attribute much of my success to lessons I learned from Bailey about the importance of the quality of the invitation, the accessibility and ease of participation, and to the quality of the hospitable, safe, egalitarian environments created for participants.

However, I think that it is important to note that, because I have been dealing

strictly with volunteers, their contributions of time and energy have been limited. Knowing this, I have focused my energies on creating environments that make it easy for people to contribute. The downside to this approach, of course, is that some participants tend not to develop a strong sense of ownership for the activity or process (although, interestingly, as seems to be the case for many Bailey scholars, others seem to develop a stronger level of commitment than they might otherwise because of the confidence they develop in the quality of the process or activity). In my own neighborhood, I tried to address that by gradually diminishing my leadership responsibilities and inviting others to assume leadership roles. And with the NorthWest Lansing Healthy Communities Initiative, I eventually encouraged the Coordinating Team to incorporate the Initiative as a nonprofit organization and to transform itself into a Board of Directors.

What do *you* think?

Now that you've read my take on self-selected membership and been exposed to other people's responses to my perspectives, I'm very curious about your assessment of self-selected membership and the method I used to explore it, as well as your own experiences with it. Specifically, I have the following questions for you:

- Do you think self-selection is a practical 'admissions' tool? What are its strengths and weaknesses relative to other – particularly merit-based – approaches to selection and participation? Under what circumstances is self-selected membership most appropriately used?

- What do you think of the dialogistic style I used to explore my experiences with self-selected membership in Bailey? Did I effectively convey the tensions and paradoxes inherent in self-selection?
- Have you ever self-selected into a community or organization? If so, how did your experience compare to those in which someone else selected you based on merit?
- Are you part of organizations that might be able to use self-selected membership as an entry method?
- How do you *feel* after reading this chapter and pondering these questions?

CHAPTER 5: SELF-DIRECTED, CONNECTED DEVELOPMENT

One of the dimensions of Bailey that originally intrigued me the most was the idea of 'self-directed, connected development.'[12] After Bailey scholars self-select into the Program, they are then encouraged to explore – more holistically than they might otherwise – their personal developmental journey. As I expressed in my original Bailey envisionment, this struck me as a very powerful concept. Having allowed myself to be directed by cultural norms and expectations for so long, I was thrilled to find a program whose explicit goal is to support participants in their unique, self-directed journeys of development.

Because I hung around Bailey for nearly a year and then had fairly specific, Program-driven responsibilities during my first semester as a Fellow, I was exposed to the theory of self-directed, connected development long before I actually experienced it myself. I quickly learned that, during the early development of the Bailey Scholars Program, a fundamental intellectual shift was made away from the 'teaching paradigm,' in which the focus is on teachers, content, and teaching products, toward the 'learning paradigm,' in which the focus is on learners and their learning process (Barr and Tagg 1995).

In that spirit, Bailey scholars try to support each other on their individual journeys

---

[12]Self-directed learning has been practiced and investigated for years as a tool for improving student motivation, learning, and self-discipline (Abdullah 2001). It is distinct, however, from the explicitly *connected* nature of self-directed development encouraged in the Bailey Scholars Program.

of development. Community support is provided at those points where individual journeys intersect with each other and/or converge during community gatherings, courses, events, projects, meetings, reading and writing circles, etc. Bailey, therefore, becomes the place or space in which individual Bailey scholars pursuing personalized journeys learn in collaboration with and directly from others in a community environment. By 1999, Bailey scholars began using the expression 'self-directed, connected development' to describe this dynamic.

Because Bailey is an academic specialization for undergraduate scholars, student scholars' self-directed, connected journeys are more formalized than are faculty scholars'. Student scholars work with the Academic Learning Coordinator to map out (and then modify as needed) a learning plan that includes nine credits of Bailey core courses plus the 'middle twelve' credits (a combination of electives that supports the learning plan) and co-curricular learning experiences (e.g., conference presentations, service-learning, Bailey outreach).

As an expression of the transition from the teaching to the learning paradigm, effort is made to blur the distinctions between Bailey student and faculty scholars. Though the distinctions among student and faculty scholars are clearly never erased, faculty scholars try to shed their status as experts, authorities, or teachers, while student scholars do the same with their status as neophytes or empty vessels. In Bailey courses, for instance, though some student and faculty scholars assume responsibility as course conveners, everyone is considered a partner, co-learner, and co-creator. Detailed syllabi and course calendars are

not prepared in advance by faculty scholars for Bailey core courses; working from a skeletal syllabus that summarizes the goals of the course, scholars instead co-create each course anew.

In this chapter, I describe a sampling of my experiences with self-directed, connected development that I think capture some of what's unique about Bailey. To reconstruct those experiences, I use my personal notes, my past writing, and email messages I wrote. I conclude this chapter with a summary of what I have learned from Bailey about self-directed, connected development and how I've applied that learning in other contexts.

Spring 2000: ANR 210

After a semester as a Fellow, I felt that I couldn't serve the community well in either my administrative or scholarly roles without experiencing first-hand a Bailey course, so I asked to co-convene ANR 210 during the spring 2000 semester. I was one of six co-conveners, including two student scholars and four faculty scholars, in a class of twelve students.

I was immediately struck by the potential inherent in Bailey's semi-structured approach to courses. Rather than 'getting down to business' or concentrating on what we'd *do* as a class, we (i.e., all of the co-learners in the class) decided to first get to know each other. Each member of the class was invited to spend some time sharing something about their lives. Surprisingly, what started as a simple attempt at helping people get to know each other ended up consuming

three or four weeks of the class' fifteen week semester. For many, this was the first time in their academic lives when they had been asked about themselves and their journeys, and once the flood gates were open, people felt free to share highly personal stories. Not everyone thought this was a good use of time, but I think that this sharing process helped us create a solid, relational foundation on which to build during the rest of the semester. Rather than knowing each other as anonymous classmates, we now knew each other as confidants and friends.

Our personal sharing also helped us identify shared learning interests. So once everyone had a chance to introduce themselves to the class, we quickly organized into subject-focused learning groups. In the spirit of connected learning, each group agreed to explore their topic in depth and then share their learning with the whole class.

Again, the course created a new learning experience for me. For most of my life, I had viewed money and financial matters as distasteful, dirty and of interest only to people who are overly materialistic, even greedy. I have always managed money well, but, fearful of its corrupting potentialities, I have never been interested in making lots of it and never spent too much time thinking about how to use the money I had. I surprised myself, therefore, when I chose the 'financial management' learning group in 210. I was even more surprised when I found myself scanning the Internet for resources about values-based financial management. As a result of some preliminary conversations with my learning group, I quickly realized that my prejudices about money were limiting my

thinking and the possibilities for creative uses of my money. Over the course of that semester, I disinvested from the stock market, I shifted my savings into a community development credit union, I joined Coop America (a nonprofit cooperative working to create sustainable financial alternatives), and I began tracking my family's income and expenses using Quicken software. Having started the semester with a disdain for financial matters, this was a rather dramatic shift for me. I may never have embarked on this path without my experience in 210.

There was at least one other way that my 210 experience significantly shifted my thinking and being. After a conveners' meeting a few weeks into the semester, I summarized my new insights in an email to the other conveners:

> **Conveners or facilitators?** [During our conversation yesterday,] the question was also raised: Are we conveners or facilitators? We felt that the answer to this question would depend on the context. For instance, if our role is to make sure students get a proper introduction to Bailey, we might play more of a facilitating than a convening role. On the other hand, if our role is to help maintain the 210 learning space, we might play more of a convening role. We also noted that the extent to which we play the role of facilitators or conveners is also a function of the extent to which the student scholars accept and take responsibility for their own learning, which is, in turn, a function of the extent to which the conveners give them that responsibility – in other words, it's a two-way street.
>
> **What is Bailey?** Out of that conversation emerged the question: What constitutes a good introduction to Bailey? Creating a learning space out of which anything can emerge? Practicing the ethic implied in the ethos of the Declaration of Bailey? . . . .Grounding our experience in the syllabus?
>
> **Bailey is evolving**: We then realized that it may not be possible to introduce people to Bailey because Bailey is not static – it is dynamic and continually evolving. In fact, the learners in 210 are

co-creating Bailey through their experience together. Perhaps then, the best introduction to Bailey that we as conveners can provide to the new Bailey scholars is the 210 experience itself.

But Bailey is also grounded: Although 210 is largely an emergent process, we should also remember that the 210 learning space does not exist in a vacuum. It is part of Bailey, which, though we oftentimes have trouble describing it, *is* grounded in a set of assumptions about learning, an ethos embodied by the Declaration of Bailey, and a practice ethic. There is a purpose for 210, therefore, beyond simply creating an emergent learning space.

The role of the syllabus: We then asked: If Bailey is grounded yet continuously evolving, and 210 co-learners play an important role in fueling that grounded evolution, then what role does the syllabus play in the 210 learning experience? In some ways, the syllabus is a record of past experiences in 210. If that is the case, then should it be used as a guide for the 210 experience this year, or is it perhaps more useful as a tool to help us reflect about our experience this year? It is likely that many things will emerge out of our experience this year that are not in the syllabus. If we use the syllabus as a guide, that emergence may be limited to the principles, assumptions, practices, questions, and outcomes described in the syllabus. But if we experience 210 together; reflect on that experience; document the principles, assumptions, practices, questions, and outcomes of that experience; and *then* compare our documentation with the syllabus (which documents past experience), we accomplish at least two things – we give the new Bailey scholars an opportunity to understand Bailey as part of their own lived experience, and we create an opportunity for the entire Bailey community to benefit from the new scholars' emergent learning process.

In other words, my experience in 210 taught me about the complexities of student-teacher relationships in learning-centered environments; the varying levels of responsibility assumed by learners; the differences between syllabus-based and situated, experience-based learning; and the paradoxical tension between conserving a community's ethos and evolving the community through continual co-creation.

I shared elements of my new learning with the rest of the class during my anonymous midterm reflections. I noted that, without even looking at the course syllabus together as a class, our experience had largely embodied the essence of the syllabus. For example, as the first paragraph of the syllabus suggested we might, we were collaborating in "designing and carrying out a set of connected learning experiences" that focus on "self-development" and "social and ethical development" using "transdisciplinary approaches". We were also emphasizing "active, increasingly self-directed, group-based, and reflective learning." We also seemed to have embraced the assumptions about learning that are outlined in the syllabus, including: each learning journey is legitimate (we affirmed each other's journeys while sharing our passions); learning together accelerates learning and growing (we organized into learning groups); some of life's most powerful learning experiences are associated with emergent learning (none of us could have forecasted that we'd be learning what we were); and we are more likely to engage in 'stretch' learning if the learning environment is inviting, hospitable, supportive, nonjudgmental, and open. I also noted that we were well on the way to achieving the course objectives outlined in the syllabus: to help each learner develop belief in self; to enhance our capacity for connectedness; and to aid the quest associated with discovering and clarifying our passion.

In my final course and self-assessment, I described how 210 had helped to free me from my habit of starting each new experience with preconceived notions and expectations. I wrote that 210 had

> liberated me from business as usual, from my normal habits and modes of operation, and, most importantly, from my out-of-context expectations. Because ANR 210 is such a unique learning experience, I entered it with few expectations. And as a result, lots of great things – none of which I expected – happened, and I was rarely disappointed. . . .One of the many things that our experience in 210 taught me was to appreciate the world and people for what they are rather than to try to mold them into what I think they should be.

Summer 2000: Connecting the Empirical with the Theoretical

I used my June 2000 re-envisionment statement, entitled "Affirmation," to briefly summarize the profound impact my 210 and Bailey experience was having on my thinking (the complete re-envisionment is included in Appendix C). Here are some excerpts:

> I'm learning . . . that self-directed learning in a community of learners can really work. I have learned the value in trusting the right things to emerge at the right time when people are invited to learn what, when, and how they'd like. Though I have understood this concept intellectually for some time, I didn't actually 'get it' until experiencing 210 this past spring. . . .
>
> One could reasonably ask: "Why should I and other Bailey scholars have the freedom to pursue our passions? Aren't we encouraging people to be egocentric and self-indulgent?" There is always, of course, the danger that self-directed learning will degenerate into selfishness and self-centeredness. But, as we have seen in Bailey, it usually doesn't. On the contrary. When given the opportunity and freedom to express their true selves as members of a learning community, people flourish – they demonstrate new levels of selflessness, they are ennobled, they contribute to others' learning and to community life, and they behave responsibly, respectfully, and non-judgmentally. I would suggest that they are simply expressing more fully their authentic sense of Self – they are being true to the connections and relationships they share with each other and larger creation.
>
> Contrary to what the Academy assumes, I would suggest that what's most important is who each of us *is*, not what we know. In my daily work, I can't pull theories out of my pocket and apply them

> in every situation in which I find myself. All I can count on bringing with me is me – my integrity, my values, my ethos, and my ethics.
>
> It becomes extremely important, therefore, who I *am*. And a large part of who I genuinely am comes from inside – not from what others tell me I should or could be or do. And therein lies the magic of Bailey. It is one of the few community spaces that I know where people are encouraged to pursue their passions, to learn life's lessons from the inside-out, and to trust good things to happen when people are liberated to be and become their authentic Selves.

As I prepared my 2000 community re-envisionment, I reviewed past reading and drew insights from a series of recent Bailey reading circles and affirmed that this Bailey approach to balancing personal growth with interdependence has scholarly 'merit.' Palmer, Youngblood, and Wilber each suggest that larger processes of development are rooted in individual integrity and transformation. Palmer (1998) writes that "good teaching cannot be reduced to technique; good teaching comes from the identity and integrity of the teacher" (10). Similarly, Youngblood (1997) writes "I believe that if the world is to change, it will be an inside-out process for every single person" (27). Wilber (1996) articulates a similar view:

> Gaia's main problems are *not* industrialization, ozone depletion, overpopulation, or resource depletion. Gaia's main problem is *the lack of mutual understanding and mutual agreement in the noosphere* about how to proceed with those problems. We cannot reign in industry if we cannot reach mutual understanding and mutual agreement based on a worldcentric moral perspective concerning the global commons. And *we reach that worldcentric moral perspective through a difficult and laborious process of interior growth and transcendence*. A global map won't do it. A systems map will not do it. An ecological map will not do it (311) (some emphases in original, some added).

And in the movie *Mindwalk*, which is based on Capra's work, a poet summarizes

a day-long conversation about the web of life and politics by saying "Healing the universe is an inside job."

The scholar who, in my opinion, is most articulate in describing the importance of connecting individual, self-directed journeys with each other is Moffet (1994). When I first read *The Universal Schoolhouse* during the summer of 2000, I felt as if Moffet was describing the Bailey approach, even though he is not familiar with Bailey, and his work was only recently introduced to Bailey.

He suggests that 'outside-in' approaches to change, like legislation, policy-making, or reform, are not sufficient to address the world's problems: "Crime, poverty, addiction, poor health, overpopulation, and pollution cannot be eradicated by legislation or adjudication alone" (70). What is required for fundamental change is a shift in individual and collective consciousness:

> [E]ven the most nitty-gritty problems – poverty, divorce, pollution, addiction, poor health, crime, international conflict – are solved by higher consciousness, because solutions for them all depend on people developing more inner strength and relating to each other more maturely. Perceiving personal growth and interpersonal relating as the common denominator of problem solving is itself an advance in consciousness (66-67).

"The mind-set and soul state of those making and interpreting laws are paramount. Solutions require some shift in consciousness, which will coincide with a curing of the culture" (70).

According to Moffet, such a shift in consciousness is a spiritual process that, in one sense, is deeply personal, and in another, profoundly communal:

> [A]s people solo out from the herd mind – the race spirit, the group soul – they not only start to think for themselves and take responsibility for themselves, they enter on a personal spiritual path unique to each that nevertheless entails joining increasingly expansive memberships of humanity and nature (15-16).

Though personal, spiritual development doesn't have to be self-centered. In fact, though people may experience stages of selfishness, ultimately, they develop a better understanding of their connections with the rest of the web of life:

> Human evolution may spiral, but it never merely circles. Public education has to go right on through the consequences of personal freedom and out the other side.
>
> The evolutionary purpose of liberty may be to force human beings, through the very adversities it causes, into a more spiritual consciousness. Spirituality is connectedness. The more spiritual a person, the more he or she identifies with the rest of humanity and nature and sheds feelings of boundaries. The more we identify with others, the better we treat them. This explains how highly developed individuals become necessarily more moral. Selfishness indicates an early stage of individualism, and one outgrows it by going forward, not backward (70-71).

To avoid egocentrism, Moffet suggests that individuals pursuing their passions connect with others through a network of self-directed yet connected learners:

> Paradoxically, the way to bring everyone together is to let them go their own ways – together, in the same communal learning network (xviii).
>
> Crisscrossing and collaborating in this network, individuals make personal choices while influencing each other. The interaction grounds individualization in a social field and helps personal development become spiritual, because at the same time that self-direction is inducing self-knowledge, reciprocity is generating empathy (49).

Naturally, this requires profound changes in educational structure:

> Letting different students do different things at the same time will entail radically restructuring the procedures of education. It means,

> for example, mixing ages, learning modalities, and subjects – in other words, abandoning standardization of both the subject matter and the learners. It is the *ensemble* of such changes we should consider and how they interact to make each other more feasible. Making education more personal, for example, actually becomes easier to do if it is made more social at the same time, for both will make learning more *relational*.
>
> The strategy is to individualize and pluralize at the same time, that is, coach personal decision making but orchestrate the plurality of personal choices so that everybody is teaching everybody else and all learn enormously more than they would if herded through a common course set at a common denominator. We could then trade the pseudo-order of "scope-and-sequence" for the reality of how people actually learn, which is from inner agendas acted on through communal means (51; emphasis in original).

Moffet, I believe, captures the essence of Bailey's approach to development: self-directed, connected development, which energizes a creative process out of which emerges new theory, new forms of practice, better human beings, and, ultimately, a better world.

Fall 2000: ANR 310

During the fall of 2000, I was eager to see if further Bailey course experiences corroborated my newly developed, deeper understanding of self-directed, connected development. That semester, I co-convened the second and third Bailey core courses: the three-credit ANR 310 and the one-credit ANR 311. In 310, I was one of four faculty co-conveners in a class of four students, and in 311, I was one of three faculty scholar co-conveners in a class of three students.

ANR 310 during the fall 2000 semester broke from Bailey tradition. Previously, 310 was a subject-centered seminar course supporting the exploration of specific

topics in a collaborative, emergent style of learning. In contrast, during the fall of 2000, co-learners in each section of 310 were allowed to choose the focus of their course and to collaboratively decide what to learn, what learning approach to take, how to organize their learning, and how to assess and grade their experience.

Things started out a bit slowly in 310. We began by brainstorming potential learning topics and by trying to organize them in a way that accommodated everyone's preferences. Nothing we discussed, however, seemed to generate much excitement in the group.

After a couple weeks, we decided to change course. Rather than start with learning topics, we decided to take some time to share something about our passions. By doing this, we made a fundamental shift in orientation away from issues related to the class – which is something 'out there' with which none of us yet had any connections – and toward ourselves and each other. In other words, we began operating from the 'inside-out' instead of 'outside-in.' Not surprisingly, things then began to click.

Once we warmed up to ourselves and each other, a plan quickly fell in place for how to build and reinforce connections among each others' passions through a weekend trip. During an overnight stay outside a rural town, we connected with one co-learner's passions with dune buggy racing, farming, and family life. The next morning, we experienced another co-learner's primary passion – fishing.

And later that day, we got a taste of two co-learners' interests in horticulture through a tour at Mawby Vineyards on the Leelenau peninsula. And finally, during an overnight stay at Interlochen, we had the opportunity to connect with another co-learner's interests in art and nature.

ANR 310 gave us eight course participants an opportunity to connect with people whom we might never have otherwise. As I reflected on the experience, I grew to realize that the depth of our connections was largely a function of the nature of the experiences we shared together. By going on a trip together, we got to know each other outside the confines and norms of the classroom, outside of our routines, and sometimes outside of our comfort zones. We all got to experience each other as people – who get a little crazy playing fussball, who laugh and share stories around a campfire, who get silly while playing hackey-sack, and who get a little cranky at times – rather than as students or faculty members.

This helped me begin to think of Bailey courses less as typical university classes and more as a few among many 'connecting spaces' that are created through Bailey. Each Bailey scholar is on an individual life quest. And yet each scholar is also part of an interconnected communal network. Bailey classes are simply chunks of time carved out of their schedules to create and enjoy points of connection within that network. From that perspective, I became less and less concerned with what we *do* in Bailey classes and more concerned with helping to create a space that allows co-learners to start where people *are* and to see what happens. What emerges in classes is then unique to the moment, the place in

which each of the co-learners find themselves on their quests, and the places they go (practically and figuratively) together.

Fall 2000: ANR 311

As was the case with ANR 310, ANR 311 was approached differently during the fall 2000 semester. Traditionally, 311 had been subject-focused, but starting during the fall 2000 semester, 311 co-learners were given the freedom to decide what and how to learn.

Unlike 310, the co-learners in 311 quickly discovered a mutual learning interest and settled on a method for exploring that interest. Each of the six co-learners was interested in learning more about genetic engineering. However, each co-learner was interested in learning about a different aspect of it. We decided, therefore, to pursue our individual sub-interests outside of class and to use our class time to engage in dialogue about the issues raised by our individual research. In other words, we developed a very practical model for self-directed yet connected learning.

And it worked incredibly well. Co-learners worked hard outside of class, and in class, we maintained a very respectful, responsible climate out of which emerged some great dialogue. I was particularly impressed with the critical, transdisciplinary nature of the students' learning and with their openness to new perspectives and to their own processes of growth and change.

On a more personal level, I surprised myself with my own learning. As was the case in ANR 210, my thinking about a particular topic (biotechnology, in this case) was fundamentally changed. Though I had been skeptical of genetic engineering for some time, I had never before taken the time to think about it deeply. 311 gave me that opportunity, and by the end of the class, I had articulated a concise argument against its use in agriculture. Even though I had a long-standing interest and involvement in sustainable agriculture, it is likely that I would never have done this if it weren't for this ANR 311 course experience.

Coincidentally, I had a similar experience in ANR 310 that semester. In addition to organizing the weekend trip, the class also organized a short web-design course. Again, even though I had long been interested in learning more about web design, I never took the time for it until ANR 310. By the end of the semester, I surprised myself by developing my own web site.

Similarly, while we were brainstorming interests early in the semester in 310, I expressed interest in learning more about the growing global democracy and alternative media movements. Though we never pursued these topics in class, by simply being asked about my interests and by taking some time to identify them, I was motivated to pursue them on my own. Within months, I had subscribed to a number of alternative journals and was monitoring developments within the global democracy movement. Again, given the hectic pace of my life, I doubt that I would have ever taken these steps without the prompting I received as a Bailey scholar.

Spring 2001: ANR 410

Eager to experience the complete cycle of Bailey core courses, I co-convened ANR 410 during the spring 2001 semester. 410 is supposed to be a convocation experience for Bailey student scholars that encourages both a retrospective and a prospective assessment of each scholar's journey and development. I was one of two faculty co-conveners in a class of five students.

We spent the early part of the semester sharing our thoughts related to questions like: Who am I? Who have I been? Who do I want to be? For whom am I living? As was the case in 210 and 310, this helped us begin to 'gel' as a group. It also prompted us to use the course to support each other in the development of individual projects that somehow captured our learning and development as Bailey scholars.

It was interesting to watch the development of these projects. One co-learner used her graphic design skills to capture the Bailey essence through art. Another completed a web page that would serve as his student-teaching portfolio. And another, who is a gifted writer, developed her story as a Bailey scholar.

I'll never forget the moment during the middle of the semester when one of the student scholars gave herself permission (with lots of encouragement from her classmates) to articulate her journey through dance. Her eyes lit up as she realized that she didn't have to write yet another college paper and could instead

use a lifelong interest to creatively express her learning. She developed a beautiful dance and performed it at the end of the semester before an audience that included her parents and boyfriend. The heartfelt, moving performance brought the student, her parents, and much of the rest of the audience to tears. I saw it as a metaphor for her entire liberating, holistic experience as a Bailey scholar.

Our journey together in 410 wasn't always smooth. For most of the student scholars, this was their last semester in college, so their focus was on friends, job searches, and just getting through this last semester. Motivation, therefore, was sometimes an issue, which manifested as a lack of initiative or leadership from the students.

This was compounded, in part, by the assumptions I brought with me to our shared experience. I assumed that, since the students had been Bailey scholars for some time and were by now comfortable taking charge of their learning experiences, they would provide most of the leadership in the course. I was also sensitive to the fact that I am by nature a highly self-directed learner and that my natural inclination is to help 'shepherd' things along, to help groups move in the direction of their 'goal.' As a result, when convening Bailey courses, I am always faced with a dilemma: Should I be myself and thereby model self-directed learning and leadership, or should I hold my tongue and free up the space for others to come forward and take leadership roles? I tended to choose the latter approach in 410, but since the students weren't in the right space to provide

leadership themselves, there was often a void of leadership, which sometimes left us feeling like we were directionless.

Connections Outside of Courses

Based on my experience in Bailey core courses, as I described it above, it is relatively easy to facilitate self-directed, connected development within the structure of a college course. Courses carve out a time and space for scholars to learn about each other, encourage each other on their journeys, and find points of connection among their journeys.

More informal, ad hoc connections among individual journeys are also commonly made outside of class. For instance, Bailey community members gather on a weekly basis for lunch on Wednesdays, and these forums are frequently used by individual scholars to share elements of their journey and to invite dialogue among other scholars about issues that the journey raises. Similarly, reading or writing circles and ad hoc working groups or conference preparation teams serve as points of convergence among individual scholars' journeys of development.

There are also precedents for more structured, deliberate attempts at forging connections among scholars' journeys. For the first few years of the Program, for example, there was an annual Bailey 'Share Fair' during which community members were invited to write their interests on large sheets of paper taped throughout the Bailey commons and to sign their name under others' interests. This was originally designed as a mechanism for choosing topics for ANR 310

and 311 courses but evolved into a way for all Bailey scholars to better connect their interests.

As part of the Bailey undergraduate specialization, student scholars are also required to share their learning with the community at different points along their journey. Some will work together to organize a 'study abroad' or 'middle twelve' sharing event that features highlights from a number of different scholars' journeys, while others will post reflections on a web site, put some sort of creative expression on display in the Bailey commons, or make a more formal presentation.

Summer 2001: Revisiting Re/envisionment

Envisionments are another example of more structured, deliberate attempts and forging connections among Bailey scholars. In 1998, when new faculty scholars began joining Bailey, a tradition was started of inviting entering scholars to share an envisionment statement in which they outlined their interest in becoming a Bailey scholar and the contributions they anticipated making as part of the community. In 1999, envisionments and re-envisionments were formalized as part of the faculty appointment and re-appointment process, so faculty scholars were expected to share a re/envisionment on an annual basis. In 2000, re/envisionments were expected and encouraged but decoupled from the formal appointment process. Some faculty scholars attested that the re/envisionment process provided a highly-valued opportunity to reflect on one's own past and future journey and to connect deeply with others. For these faculty scholars,

re/envisionments were a source of inspiration and encouragement and helped the Program document its impact on people's lives.

Other faculty members, however, chose not to share re/envisionments. When probed about their concerns with the process, they explained that they found the re/envisionment process intimidating, overwhelming, and burdensome. In addition, because re/envisionment had been connected with the formal faculty re/appointment process, some viewed it more as an administrative report than as a tool for exploration. Moreover, some scholars found the term 'envisionment' alien or threatening.

Intrigued by these tensions, during the summer of 2001 I convened a series of community conversations about the Bailey envisionment and re-envisionment process during Wednesday lunches, through the Internet, and with an ad hoc working group. Out of those conversations emerged the following proposals:

> **From re/envisionment to sharing expressions**: Rather than requiring annual re/envisionments, Bailey scholars should encourage and invite one another to share expressions of their life journeys as a means of connecting with the Bailey community and other Bailey scholars.
>
> **A community offering**: Opportunities to share these expressions should be viewed as an offering the Bailey community makes to each Bailey scholar. The community offers hospitable, trusting, respectful spaces to support and nurture Bailey scholars' life journeys.
>
> **Supporters**: Since faculty scholars don't have an Academic Learning Coordinator and the structure of learning plans to support them in their journey, each faculty scholar should have the opportunity to form teams of Bailey 'supporters' to nurture their growth and development.

Individual choice: While all Bailey scholars – student scholars, staff, faculty scholars, graduate fellows, etc. – are encouraged to share expressions, individuals should choose whether they will share an expression, and if they do, they will choose how they will express themselves (e.g., through dance, art, video, audio, Internet, writing, etc.), what they will share (e.g., a middle-twelve experience, an update on a project they're working on, a personal story, etc.), and when, where, and with whom they will share it.

Multiple uses: Recognizing that Bailey and most Bailey scholars are part of a larger institution, Bailey scholars should be encouraged to use their shared expressions to demonstrate the Program's value to others and to further their professional development. Student scholars, for instance, could use expressions to develop their learning plans, and faculty scholars could use expressions to facilitate tenure and promotion processes.

Decoupled from appointment: The expression process should be completely decoupled from the faculty re/appointment process.

New faculty: Within a year of their appointment, new student and faculty scholars should be invited to share a 'welcoming expression' to connect their journey with the Bailey community.

Connecting self and community: The Bailey Scholars Program is one of the few places where people are encouraged to pursue their learning interests, where people are liberated from the 'you can't do that' attitude so prevalent in other organizations and institutions. Bailey scholars are also encouraged to serve the Program by connecting their learning interests with community needs. The assumption is that people will be most productive and fulfilled – the Program will be best served – if people are serving in ways that are meaningful to them. This unique characteristic of Bailey should be preserved. It requires, however, that we remain vigilant about making the Program's needs known and that we all be more attentive to helping each other connect our journeys with the Program's development.

In other words, a more informal, ad hoc approach to connecting individual learning journeys was proposed.

Interestingly, since these proposals were adopted, which was nearly two years ago as of this writing, only a few faculty members have come forward to offer

anything resembling the traditional Bailey re/envisionment. For some, including myself, this is seen as a tremendous loss for the community – there was tremendous benefit to 'nudging' people to reflect more deeply about themselves than they might otherwise. On the other hand, this may simply be part of the natural evolution of the Program toward less formal, more natural modes of sharing and connecting.

Things I've Learned from Self-Directed, Connected Development

By way of summary, my experience in Bailey with self-directed, connected development has taught me the following:

It was an affirming, empowering experience for me in Bailey to make the mental shift from fulfilling other people's expectations (in school and at work) to pursuing my own, self-directed journey of development. Bailey gave me the permission, the opportunity, and the encouragement that I'd rarely had before to explore who I am, to discover and develop my passions.

Bailey scholars' development can be very meaningful, and sometimes life-changing. It certainly was for me, and several of the students in the ANR 410 class that I convened expressed similar sentiments through their class projects.

Self-directed, connected learning in Bailey is not usually self-centered or selfish. Instead, once encouraged and given the space to explore their whole, true selves as part of a community, people usually become more self-less and

more responsible, respectful community members. From a spiritual perspective, what they're actually doing is expressing their understanding that their 'self' extends beyond their individual human identity to include the entire community of life:

> When the inner life is attended to on a daily basis, it does not breed narcissistic preoccupation or indulgence but instead the opportunity for a deep meeting at the intersection of inside and outside. All the mystics and sages affirm the Delphic Oracle's admonition, "Know thyself," and live true to your authentic nature. Inward awareness is not only important to provide a kind of centerpoint but also because it reveals the intersection of our individual depth with a more universal depth. The universe lies not only about us but also within us; the outside can reveal the inside and vice versa (Hart 2001).

Stages of selfishness are sometimes part of one's natural course of development from individualism toward a greater understanding of interdependence (Moffet 1994).

Self-directed, connected development in Bailey is different from self-actualization. The key difference is Bailey's communal dimension, which forces people to confront the reality of their interdependence: "Authenticity begins as a courtship with our interior and ends as communion with the world" (Hart 2001). And as Moffet suggests, communal interaction grounds self-actualization in a social field so that while self-direction is generating self-knowledge, reciprocity is generating empathy.

Some 'nudging' is sometimes helpful to encourage Bailey scholars to further their learning and development. Most people are by nature resistant

to change and growth. As a Bailey scholar, however, it is difficult to avoid new learning opportunities, whether as part of a course, during an intriguing Wednesday lunch dialogue, or as part of a working group.

Because their developmental journeys are less formalized and structured, **Bailey faculty scholars tend to share less about their journeys publicly with the larger community than do student scholars**. For example, a much smaller percentage of faculty scholars have shared re/envisionments or made presentations about elements of their learning journey than have student scholars, who are required to share insights from their middle-twelve courses and are typically encouraged to share their developmental journey as part of their ANR 410 experience.

It is very helpful for me to formalize – or at least articulate – my developmental journey. The two envisionment statements I wrote for Bailey were very challenging but forced me to think deeply about the personal and professional path I was on.

There is a plethora of opportunities embedded within regular Bailey community life for individuals to connect with one another, like courses, Wednesday lunches, working groups, events, reading or writing circles, conferences, displays, presentations, retreats, or chance meetings.

The 'connected' aspect of self-directed, connected development can take

many forms. Oftentimes, particularly within courses, it is 'shared' in the form of a group project. At other times, it is a brief connection point as part of a conversation or subject-centered dialogue.

The connections among Bailey scholars' development journeys often catalyze or accelerate both communal and individual growth. I witnessed this first hand in each of the Bailey courses I co-convened.

Self-directed, connected development in Bailey can greatly expand individuals' network of acquaintances, colleagues, and friends. I met most of the Bailey scholars I know by being forced to get to know them in a class, while preparing for a conference presentation, or while serving on a working group together.

I now see Bailey courses more as 'connecting spaces' within the Bailey network of learners than as university classes. Bailey classes are chunks of time carved out of scholars' schedules to create and enjoy points of connection within the Bailey network. They are often spaces for reflection and dialogue about the issues that pervade our lives but tend to talk about infrequently.

Conveners play a critical – yet highly challenging – role in Bailey courses. They are responsible for the maintenance of the hospitable, respectful, supportive, trusting, nonjudgmental, and reflexive quality of the learning space – all without having undue influence over the direction of the course and while

encouraging all co-learners to assume convening responsibilities for the shared experience.

As a convener, I struggle with the extent to which I should be myself in Bailey courses. By nature, I am highly self-directed and am comfortable playing a lead role. Part of me thinks that I should exhibit those natural traits as an example to others. There's another part of me, however, that sees value in making sure space is available for others to play leadership roles.

I found it invaluable to have a regular opportunity to engage in dialogue about my convening experiences with other Bailey conveners. Though in this chapter I only alluded to converners' meetings during my experience with ANR 210, I gained some of my most valuable insights from conversations among conveners throughout my tenure as a Bailey scholar.

It is important to have at least two conveners in Bailey courses. In the sections of ANR 210, 310, 311, and 410 that I co-convened, there were 6, 4, 3, and 2 conveners, respectively. A diverse array of conveners helps to balance convening and learning styles and increases the likelihood that students will develop a rapport with one or more of the conveners, thereby increasing their comfort level and enhancing their learning.

Bailey's shift from teaching to learning is fundamental. As I experienced in each of the courses I co-convened, it creates the space for self-directed,

connected development by freeing both faculty and students from deeply ingrained norms, assumptions, and expectations about learners and learning.

It is useful to start new Bailey learning experiences without preconceived notions and expectations. To clarify, I did start each Bailey course with high expectations for the *quality* of the experience. However, I tried not to begin each course with an expectation for *what* would actually happen.

At the beginning of a Bailey course, **it is helpful as a convener to be explicit about the assumptions I hold about the roles of students and conveners in the course**. I learned – particularly in ANR 410 – that it is not safe to assume that other conveners and students in the class understand my role the same way I do.

Beginning a Bailey course with personal sharing can help to blur the distinctions between faculty and student co-learners. This is particularly the case for course conveners, as Hart (2001) observes:

> The space, flow, and vitality of a classroom change when conscious vulnerability is present in the teacher. By moving out from behind the protection of certainty, curriculum, and role, the teacher invites the student to do the same. Vulnerability does not mean becoming passive or giving power away; it means being open to possibility, which opens the wisdom space.

It is easier to treat others as equals if you know them as complex, whole human beings rather than as people attached to anonymous titles.

Beginning a Bailey course with personal sharing can also help co-learners quickly identify shared interests around which they can organize their learning. It helps co-learners make the basic shift from operating from 'outside-in' to 'inside-out,' from being part of a subject-centered class to sharing fifteen weeks of connections among the diverse developmental journeys of whole people.

Less is sometimes more when developing syllabi for emergent Bailey courses. A blank course calendar does wonders for encouraging learners to take responsibility for their learning. It also gives the co-learners permission to situate their learning in the here and now – to start where they are and allow the course to develop in a way that is unique to the moment and the place in which the co-learners find themselves on their developmental journeys. In this way, "each students' emerging self is the curriculum" (Hart 2001).

Emergent learning is inherently unpredictable. Scholars in Bailey courses commonly discover and explore new interests or learn about things they had never before considered investigating.

Actively sharing individual interests – through trips, activities, demonstrations, and the like – **can enhance learning and strengthen co-learner bonds in Bailey courses**. Sometimes people have to get out of their normal environment to be able to get to know each other as people rather than as students or teachers.

Many Bailey scholars seem to find it liberating to be able to express their learning and development in a variety of ways. I haven't counted, but I wouldn't be surprised if Bailey scholars have produced more posters, pieces of art, web pages, and other alternative forms of expression as part of the Bailey journey than they have written papers.

The relative lack of structure in Bailey courses sometimes decreases students' motivation. As I experienced in ANR 410, this may be particularly true if students have a large number of competing responsibilities or priorities during a particular semester and/or if they never connect well with the direction the course takes.

My Bailey-Inspired Experiences with Self-Directed, Connected Development

As possible, I've tried to apply what I've learned in Bailey about self-directed, connected development in other contexts. Specifically, I have tried to

- Encourage others to deliberately explore and share their interests
- Focus more on emergent learning than on specific content-based outcomes
- Create a diversity of opportunities for individuals to connect their developmental journeys with each others'
- Behave more as a convener of learning spaces than as a formal leader of organizations and programs
- Create opportunities for reflection and dialogue.

I've been a bit surprised by how difficult it has been. In the spring of 2000, I participated in an experimental participatory research course. I thought that it would be a natural opportunity to apply the theory of self-directed, connected learning. A simple way to do that would be to treat the course as a participatory research experience, with each of us serving as both subjects and objects of the research. Specifically, I (and others) suggested that each course participant explore her specific interests as they relate to participatory research, that we deliberately connect those individual explorations in small groups and through class activities, and that we trust that exciting learning and growth emerge from that process. In that spirit, my focus was on maintaining the quality of the collective learning space and on creating space for reflection and dialogue.

In many ways, the experiment was a disaster. Some, who thought that it was more important to learn *about* participatory research than experience it individually and in class, resisted the decentralization of course activity. I was also surprised to find that the class participants, who were a mix of graduate students and faculty members, had a difficult time assuming responsibility for their own learning. I surmised that, because they had been part of top-down academic environments for so long, they had trouble operating in an environment in which no one assumed formal leadership roles and took responsibility for course direction. The tensions created by the different assumptions embraced by course participants about the nature and direction of the course, in turn, spoiled all prospects for creating a climate of trust among the

learners in the class, which fueled a vicious downward cycle, out of which we were never able to escape. The lesson I learned was that self-directed, connected learning cannot be imposed on people; it only works to the extent that people embrace its assumptions about the nature of learning and development and are willing to risk not knowing where their developmental journeys might take them.

The Community Leadership Lounge was my second experiment with self-directed, connected development outside of Bailey. Taking the lessons from the participatory research course to heart, I was careful to be explicit about the assumptions behind the Lounge, and, perhaps as a result, it has been more successful. My experience with the Lounge has confirmed for me that, if you are able to create a safe space for reflection and dialogue, and if you specifically ask people to share their experiences and relate them to others' experiences, there can be significant – often unforeseen – developmental benefits. On more than one occasion, I have seen 'light bulbs' turned on in participants heads during conversations, and it isn't uncommon to find a participant steeped in thought as a result of someone else's insightful comment. Participants have also noted how Lounge conversations have helped to shift their thinking and/or encouraged them to approach some of their work differently.

What do *you* think?

Interestingly, none of the Bailey scholars who read my draft dissertation commented on the content of this chapter. I'm not sure why, but because of the

lack of conversation I've had about it so far, I'm particularly interested in your response to my experience with self-directed, connected development. Specifically, I'm curious about your assessment of self-directed, connected development and the method I used to explore it, as well as your own experiences with it. I have the following questions for you:

- What are the merits and deficiencies of self-directed, connected development relative to more traditional and other alternative approaches to learning and development? Under what circumstances is self-directed, connected development most appropriately encouraged?
- What is your assessment of how I conveyed my experience with self-directed, connected development? Did the anecdotes I shared give you a good sense of the power of some of my experiences?
- Have you experienced self-directed, connected development? If so, how did your experience compare to other opportunities for learning and growth?
- Are there opportunities in your life to apply some of the principles of self-directed, connected development?
- How do you *feel* after reading this chapter and pondering these questions?

IN SEARCH OF DEVELOPMENT: AN AUTOETHNOGRAPHIC EXPLORATION OF THE LIBERTY HYDE BAILEY SCHOLARS PROGRAM

VOLUME II

By

Ronald James Whitmore, Jr.

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Resource Development

2003

CHAPTER 6: NETWORK ORGANIZATION AND LEADERSHIP

Only a few Bailey scholars, namely the Chair/Director, the Academic Learning Coordinator, and the Administrative Assistant, have Bailey as their administrative 'home.' Every other Bailey scholar's administrative home is his or her academic department or unit. For student scholars, Bailey is an academic specialization that complements their major. And Bailey 'buys out' a percentage of faculty scholars' time from their home units that frees them up to devote time and energy to Bailey activities. For most Bailey scholars, therefore, Bailey is not the focal point of their activities. In other words, Bailey is better described as a dynamic *network* of connected, self-directed scholars than it is as a typical organization or community.

This networked dimension of the Bailey Scholars Program has both intrigued and troubled me for some time. Given my longstanding scholarly interest in systems dynamics, I was seduced by the theory of network organization and fascinated with its practical evolution in Bailey. With all of my mind, heart, and soul, I wanted to experience a real world example of a decentralized, self-organizing system, and I thought I'd found one in Bailey.

At the same time, I found that operating within such a networked system was incredibly challenging. Theory, naturally, didn't always apply in practice, and much of what we experienced couldn't be explained by the literature. After three years as a Bailey scholar, I still struggled to understand why things evolved the

way they did and what lessons I and others could learn.

This chapter, therefore, was the most difficult chapter for me to write. On the one hand, I was constantly struggling with the tension between what, based on my understanding of systems and networks, I *wanted* to believe and what I *actually* experienced. And on the other hand, I struggled with writing about something I didn't completely understand. As a result, this chapter went through several phases of rewrites and reorganization before I finally decided on its current form. There are three main sections: First, I provide an overview of the theory of network organization and leadership. Next, to give you a sense for the dramatic nature of Bailey's organizational development over a short period of time, I present my interpretation of the chronological evolution of management, leadership, and organization in Bailey. And finally, I summarize my observations about network leadership and organization based on what I learned from Bailey's evolution. I conclude this chapter with a summary of how readers responded to this chapter and of how I've applied my learning in other contexts.

As was the case in chapters 4 and 5, my principal sources of data include my personal notes, my past writing, and email messages I wrote. In this chapter more than in others, however, those data were generated from highly collaborative experiences. Specifically, the chronology of Bailey's evolution is based largely on a series of Leadership Space meetings. After I shared my initial draft with the Bailey community, Confidential D and Confidential F, both of whom have a longer history with Bailey than I do, also helped me to make some

factual corrections in the chronology.

I think that it is important to remind you at this point that my research is highly interpretive in nature. As I emphasize in Chapter 2, autoethnography was developed in response to the problems inherent in distinguishing between research data and interpretation. So what you're reading is *my* interpretation of events and experiences that can and should be interpreted from multiple perspectives. That is why it is critical that I shared my initial draft with the Bailey community – and that I invite you to develop your own interpretations from my writing – so that you and others have an opportunity to inform my interpretation with yours.

Because this chapter captures the most intellectually challenging dimensions of my Bailey experience, you'll see that this chapter is quite different from the previous two and dramatically different from the chapter that follows. Whereas I lead in the other chapters primarily with the 'auto' in autoethnography, with the *holistic* impact Bailey had on my life and direction, in this chapter, I lead with the 'ethno', with how Bailey has impacted my *intellectual* understanding of network organization and leadership. And, whereas in Chapters 4 and 5, I walk you through the temporal evolution of my perspectives, I wrote this chapter from an *ex post facto* perspective, as a summary of the state of my understanding today. As a result, it reads less like a story and more like a traditional academic paper.

So, with those prefacing remarks in mind, I invite you to digest my reflections on

network organization and leadership in the Bailey Scholars Program.

Theory of Network Organization and Leadership

Because of Bailey's unusual networked structure, Bailey scholars have looked to the organizational development literature that uses the theory of the complexity sciences to better understand self-directed, connected development networks like those in Bailey. Wheatley broke ground with *Leadership and the New Science* (1992). I originally read Wheatley as part of a Bailey reading circle right after completing my thesis and just as I began to participate in Bailey activities. At the time, Wheatley's writing reinforced what I had learned in my thesis and gave me an intuitive sense for the nature of Bailey.

Like Moffet (1994), Wheatley recognizes a need for new structures to accommodate the unique nature of networks of self-directed individuals:

> If organizations are machines, control makes sense. If organizations are process structures, then seeking to impose control through permanent structure is suicide. If we believe that acting responsibly means exerting control by having our hands into everything, then we cannot hope for anything except what we already have – a treadmill of effort and life-destroying stress (23).

But, Wheatley suggests, structural models that can help us avoid the treadmill are not available – they have to be created contextually:

> I no longer believe that organizations can be changed by imposing a model developed elsewhere. So little transfers to, or even inspires, those trying to work at change in their own. . . .The new physics cogently explains that there is no objective reality out there waiting to reveal its secrets. There are no recipes or formulae, no checklists or advice that describe "reality." There is only what we create through our engagement with others and with events (7).

In fact, Wheatley, building on the work of Weick (1979), suggests that, "Acting should precede planning . . . because it is only through action and implementation that we create an environment" (37).

Engagement with others, with action, and with events is so important because fundamental to each unique structure are the relationships that characterize it:

> A quantum universe is enacted only in an environment rich in relationships. Nothing happens in the quantum world without something encountering something else. Nothing *is* independent of the relationships that occur. I am constantly creating the world – evoking it, not discovering it – as I participate in all its many interactions. This is a world of process, not a world of things (Wheatley 1992, 68; emphasis in original).

If organizational structures are grounded in relationship, a shift in orientation – away from objectification and imposition, toward process, facilitation, and an openness to new information derived from self-awareness and reflection – is required:

> To live in a quantum world, to weave here and there with ease and grace, we will need to change what we do. We will need to stop describing tasks and instead facilitate process. We will need to become savvy about how to build relationships, how to nurture growing, evolving things. All of us need better skills in listening, communicating, and facilitating groups, because these are the talents that build strong relationships (Wheatley 1992, 38).

> But an organization can only exist in such a fluid fashion if it has access to new information, both about external factors and internal resources. It must constantly process this data with high levels of self-awareness, plentiful sensing devices, and a strong capacity for reflection (Wheatley 1992, 91).

Such relationship-based, context-specific structures are as dynamic as the relationships and context: "Structures emerge, but only as temporary solutions that facilitate rather than interfere" (Wheatley 1992, 16). In other words,

"Organization emerges in response to need" (Wheatley 1992, 91).

Structures are strengthened to the extent that participation is diversified: "We need a broad distribution of information, viewpoints, and interpretations if we are to make sense of the world" (Wheatley 1992, 64). Similarly, "[T]he more participants we engage in this participative universe, the more we can access its potentials and the wiser we become" (Wheatley 1992, 65).

As the title of her book suggests, what Wheatley is describing is a different model of leadership, one that facilitates a reflective process – which is contextually-situated, relationship-based, and fueled by action and the influx of new people and information – out of which new (and temporary) forms of organization emerge.

Wheatley suggests that, paradoxically, the dynamic non-equilibrium created by evolving relationships, the inflow of new information, changing contexts, new learning, and constantly evolving structure *strengthens* an organization's sense of identity:

> Openness to environmental information over time spawns a firmer sense of identity, one that is less permeable to externally induced change. Some fluctuations will always break through, but what comes to dominate the system over time is not environmental influences, but the self-organizing dynamics of the system itself. High levels of autonomy and identity result from staying open to information from the outside (92).
>
> In response to environmental disturbances that signal the need to change, the system changes in a way that remains consistent with itself in that environment. The system is autopoietic, focusing its

> activities on what is required to maintain its own integrity and self-renewal. As it changes, it does so by referring to itself; whatever future form it takes will be consistent with its already established identity. Changes do not occur randomly, in any direction (94).
>
> Self-reference is what facilitates orderly change in turbulent environments. In human organizations, a clear sense of identity – of the values, traditions, aspirations, competencies, and culture that guide the operation – is the real source of independence from the environment. When the environment demands a new response, there is a reference point for change (94).

Thus, freedom and order become

> partners in generating viable, well-ordered, autonomous systems. If we allow autonomy at the local level, letting individuals or units be directed in their decisions by guideposts for organizational self-reference, we can achieve coherence and continuity. Self-organization succeeds when the system supports the independent activity of its members by giving them, quite literally, a strong frame of reference (95).

Such openness to information and self-organization creates a state of non-equilibrium that makes change and growth possible (Wheatley 1992, 78). But to continually capitalize on opportunities for growth, organizations must

> invite conflicts and contradictions to rise to the surface, . . . search them out, highlight them, even allowing them to grow large and worrisome. We need to support people in the hunt for unsettling or discomfirming information, and provide them with resources of time, colleagues, and opportunities for processing the information. . . .
>
> We can encourage vital organizational ambiguity with plans that are open, visions that inspire but do not describe, and by the encouragement of questions that ask "Why?" many times over. . . .No longer the caretakers of order, we become the facilitators of disorder. We stir things up and roil the pot, looking always for those disturbances that challenge and disrupt until, finally, things become so jumbled that we reorganize work at a new level of efficacy (Wheatley 1992, 116).

In such an environment, individuals "can have enormous impact. It is not the law

of large numbers, of favorable averages, that creates change, but the presence of a lone fluctuation that gets amplified by the system" (Wheatley 1992, 96). And with this idea I return to the role of leadership, of people acting – from the inside-out – to help others organize.

I think that many Bailey scholars read Wheatley too early. The network structure of Bailey was still emerging in early 1999, so for many, Wheatley was describing something they had never seen. Later, other authors with a similar message seemed to have more impact, to make more intuitive sense to many Bailey scholars. During the summer of 2000 reading circle, several Bailey scholars read Youngblood's *Life at the Edge of Chaos* (1997) and Hock's *Birth of the Chaordic Age* (1999). In preparation for some conferences, several Bailey scholars also read Zohar's *Rewiring the Corporate Brain* (1997) that summer. All three books mirror Wheatley's earlier arguments, presenting them in a slightly more digestible format.

What impressed me most about Youngblood was the way in which he integrated spirituality into the equation: "Spirit makes the greatest contribution to productivity, followed by mind, and finally by the physical body" (157). In this respect, he picks up where Wheatley left off – with the profound impact that individuals can have on the evolution of a living system. He introduces the notion of "personal leadership," which is about "people taking responsibility for leading their own lives, for establishing their own authentic identities" (202). He raises the question: "If you do not know who you are and what you want out of

life, how can you take responsibility for it?" (206). His answer: "When people live authentically, they become the authors of their own life stories – they assume power and authority over their lives" (212).

Hock makes similar points by introducing the chaord (chaos + order), which is an organizational form that mimics living systems that dwell at the edge between order and chaos. He suggests that "The organization of the future will be the embodiment of *community* based on *shared purpose* calling to the *higher aspirations of people*" (6; emphases in original). According to Hock, the organization of the future – chaordic organization – "is about releasing what people desire in the depth of their being – the passion they have for it – the integrity they bring to the attempt" (2). Hock, like Youngblood, suggests that "from no more than dreams, determination, and liberty to try, quite ordinary people consistently do extraordinary things" (17). Therefore, "The first and paramount responsibility of anyone who purports to manage is to manage self. . ." (69) – "In truth, there are no problems 'out there.' And there are no experts 'out there' who could solve them if there were. The problem is 'in here,' in the consciousness of writer and reader, of you and me" (78).

Zohar is even more explicit about the role of spirituality in organic development. Zohar suggests that "In any human being or in any human organization, real change requires a fundamental shift at each of the three levels of the self" – the mental, the emotional, and the spiritual (11). At the foundation, according to Zohar, is the spiritual level, "that deep layer of the self from which we are in

touch with questions of meaning and value" (10). The thrust of Zohar's argument, therefore, becomes that we are in dire need of genuine organizational transformation, and that "all fundamental transformation is ultimately *spiritual* transformation, spiritual in the very broadest sense as issuing from the level of reflection, meaning, and value" (18; emphasis in original). Zohar suggests that only "quantum organizations" can fuel this spiritually-driven transformation.

I will take a closer look at the role of spiritual development in Bailey in Chapter 7, but I include these observations by Youngblood, Hock, and Zohar here to stress the importance of the vital connection between individual meaning, passion, integrity, and authenticity and the success of networked organization and leadership.

By way of summary, here are the important elements of network organization and leadership that I gleaned from the work of Wheatley, Youngblood, Hock, and Zohar:

- A strong *frame of reference* and sense of identity
- Self-directed *individuals pursuing meaningful passions* with integrity and authenticity
- Keen attention to *process*, with a focus on listening, communicating, and facilitating
- A constant *influx of information* from external sources and from learning that emerges from self-awareness and reflection
- A constant *influx of new, diverse people*

- *Strong relational connections*
- Regular *unsettling disturbances*, conflicts, and contradictions, which are often the result of the influx of information and people
- *Context-appropriate structure* that naturally emerges from active, ongoing engagement.

The Evolution of Organization, Management, and Leadership in Bailey

The extent to which Bailey has resembled a network organization has varied over time. This is not to say that Bailey has been better or worse during different phases in its evolution. It is only to say that Bailey has changed over time to accommodate, as Wheatley and other students of the complexity sciences would predict, changes in the elements listed immediately above: its dominant frame of reference, the nature of individual developmental paths, process, the influx of information and people, the nature of relationships, the nature of disturbances, and its context.

In the summer of 2001, the Bailey Leadership Space was grappling with issues related to the nature of Bailey's organization and leadership and, with my prompting, decided to chart the evolution of Bailey's leadership entity[13] over time. The Leadership Space compared changes in

---

[13]I use 'leadership entity' to refer to all of the groups over the course of Bailey's organizational evolution that have grappled – either theoretically and/or practically – with issues related to Bailey's leadership and organizational development. Specifically, leadership entities are those listed in the sixteenth row of Table 1, including Governance and Administration, the Leadership Group, the Bailey Administrative Team, and the Leadership Space.

- Critical characteristics of Bailey
- The leadership entity's purpose
- Participation in the entity
- Entity meeting frequency and timing
- The entity's meeting location
- The nature of decision-making in the entity
- Documentation of the entity's activities
- The status of other Bailey working groups
- The Bailey Chair/Director
- Bailey staff support
- The mechanism for dealing with Bailey management issues.

In other words, the Leadership Space was trying to describe the organizational, managerial, and leadership structure that had evolved as Bailey and its context changed. At the time, based on my notes from those conversations, I developed a chart summarizing that comparison, which I shared in the Leadership Space.

I have since adapted that chart to include measures of some of the elements Wheatley et al would consider important. Specifically, I have added comparisons of

- My subjective assessment of the dominant Bailey frame of reference
- My assessment of the relative level of attention to process, as measured by the level of communication from formal Bailey leaders to the rest of the community and the number of community learning events like retreats
- My assessment of the relative influx of information, as measured by the

number of reading circles, Bailey scholar participation in conferences, and personal learning shared with the Bailey community

- The influx of new, diverse people, as determined from draft Program personnel budgets (which indicate faculty appointment levels), from email communications from the Academic Learning Coordinator announcing student scholar entry and graduation, and from lists of subscribers to the Bailey email listservs at different points in time
- My subjective assessment of unsettling disturbances, conflicts, and contradictions
- My subjective assessment of the nature of relationships among Bailey scholars.

I have also added rows for some of the specific responsibilities that have been assumed in Bailey over time, like supporting academic affairs and scholarship. The final version of the chart is in Table 1.

Below, I draw on the information summarized in Table 1 to briefly describe my understanding of the evolution of organization, management, and leadership in Bailey. In the following section, I then share some observations about network organization, leadership, and Bailey.

	1998 - Spring 1998	Summer 1998 Transition	Fall 1998 - Spring 1999	Summer 1999 Transition	Fall 1999 - Spring 2000	Summer and Fall 2000 Transition	Spring - Fall 2001	2002
Dominant Frame of Reference	Develop an undergraduate specialization to develop 'whole students'	Declaration of Bailey	Declaration of Bailey	Declaration of Bailey	Declaration of Bailey	Declaration of Bailey	?	?
Physical Home	121 Ag Hall; Wills House	Wills House	Wills House	Wills House	Wills House	Move to Ag Hall	Ag Hall	Ag Hall
Unsettling Disturbances, Conflicts, and Contradictions	First cohort of students	'Emergence' concept embraced		Assistant to Chair became ALC; others assumed various responsibilities; philosophical shift toward networked organization		Chair transition; move to Ag Hall		
Responsibility for Scholarship (e.g., conferences, Book Nook, reading circles)	Chair and graduate assistant	Chair and Asst. to Chair	Chair and Asst. to Chair	Chair and ALC	Chair, ALC, and Fellow	Ad hoc	Ad hoc	Ad hoc
Influx of New Information	High	High	High	High	High	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
Influx of New, Diverse Faculty Scholars	High (+~16 active faculty scholars); all were new and most had large appointments		Moderate (net +~2 = ~18 active faculty scholars; ~2 FTEs); ~16 course conveners		Moderate (net +~3 = ~21 active faculty scholars; ~3 FTEs); ~18 course conveners	Low (net ~6 = ~15 active faculty scholars; ~3 FTEs); fewer tenure-stream faculty and ~6 active grad fellows; ~20 course conveners	Low (~15 active faculty scholars; ~2.5 FTEs); ~15 conveners	Low
Influx of New, Diverse Student Scholars	Low (+~15)		Low (+~17 = ~32 total)		Moderate (+~22 = ~54 total); more courses & need for conveners	~54 - 4 graduates = ~50	Moderate (+~20 - 11 graduates = ~59 total)	High (+~27 - 14 graduates = ~72 total)

Table 1: The Evolution of Organization and Leadership in Bailey

	1996 - Spring 1998	Summer 1998 Transition	Fall 1998 - Spring 1999	Summer 1999 Transition	Fall 1999 - Spring 2000	Summer and Fall 2000 Transition	Spring - Fall 2001	2002
Nature of Inter-relationships	Strong bonds	Strong bonds	Transition	Transition	Strength of weak ties	Strength of weak ties	Strength of weak ties	Strength of weak ties
Attention to Process (communication, community learning)	High	High	High	High	High	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
Chair/Director	Former department chair; strong background in organizational development and leadership	Recognized need to mentor prospective chairs				New Director	Styles, preferences, needs not accommodated	
Staff	Administrative Assistant; Academic Coordinator; two ½-time graduate assistants; technology student worker; office student worker	Administrative Assistant; Academic Coordinator; ½-time Assistant to the Chair; ½-time public relations graduate assistant; technology student worker; office student worker	Administrative Assistant; Academic Coordinator; ½-time Assistant to the Chair; ½-time public relations graduate assistant; technology student worker; office student worker	Administrative Assistant; Academic Coordinator; ½-time Assistant to the Chair; ½-time public relations graduate assistant; technology student worker; office student worker	Administrative Assistant; Academic Learning Coordinator; technology student worker; office student worker; BAT member responsibilities: budget and personnel; connections; academic and student affairs; administration and scholarship; not covered: asst. to ALC, faculty journey; PR	Administrative Assistant; Academic Learning Coordinator; office student worker	Administrative Assistant; Academic Learning Coordinator; non-scholar graduate students hired; office student workers; faculty technology support; no fixed leadership responsibilities for scholars	Administrative Assistant; Academic Learning Coordinator; scholar graduate assistant graduated; office student workers; College staff support for technology; no fixed leadership responsibilities for scholars

Table 1 (cont'd).

	1996 - Spring 1998	Summer 1998 Transition	Fall 1998 - Spring 1999	Summer 1999 Transition	Fall 1999 - Spring 2000	Summer and Fall 2000 Transition	Spring - Fall 2001	2002
Mechanism for Dealing with Program Management Issues	Chair, Admin. Assistant, graduate assistant	Chair, Admin. Assistant, Asst. to Chair	Chair, Admin. Assistant, Asst. to Chair	Chair, Admin. Assistant, Asst. to Chair	OMT	OMT	OMT	OMT
Status of Working Groups	Many 'designed' working groups to develop different aspects of Program		Standing, 'designed' working groups		Fewer, more short term, ad hoc, 'emergent' working groups		Mostly ad hoc, 'emergent' working groups focused more on learning than making Bailey work	CCT and ad hoc, 'emergent' working groups
Responsibility for Academic Affairs (including recruitment, orientation, curriculum, Share Fair, graduation)	Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Student Entering Working Groups		Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Student Entering, with support from Academic Coordinator and Asst. to Chair		ALC, with help from Academic Affairs Working Group	ALC, with help from ad hoc working groups	ALC, with help from ad hoc working groups	CCT and ALC, with help from ad hoc working groups
Formal Leadership Entity	Governance and Administration		Leadership Group		Bailey Administrative Team	None	Leadership Space	None
Purposes of Formal Leadership Entity	Reporting, connections, social		Mentoring; tension between read & think vs. think & do		Think & do; bad name: it provided leadership, not administration		Tensions: decide & do vs. learn & explore, mgmt vs. leadership	N/A
Nature of Decision-Making in Formal Leadership Entity	Working groups given action items; no decisions made	Chair wanted help with decision-making	Frame issues for community; no decisions		Frame issues for community		'Fires' to put out; some decisions, some framing	N/A
Participation in Formal Leadership Entity	Reps. from each working group; open to all (may have appeared otherwise)		Open and inviting; six 'regulars'		Fixed; all invited regularly but not attractive		All invited initially; not fixed: six 'semi-regulars'	N/A

Table 1 (cont'd).

	1998 - Spring 1998	Summer 1998 Transition	Fall 1998 - Spring 1999	Summer 1999 Transition	Fall 1999 - Spring 2000	Summer and Fall 2000 Transition	Spring - Fall 2001	2002
Formal Leadership Entity Maintenance	No agendas or minutes		Agendas; minutes shared with community		Agendas; minutes shared with community		Agendas and minutes sporadic; none shared with community	N/A
Formal Leadership Entity Meeting Frequency	Monthly		Friday afternoons (bad for some); 2x/month		Wednesday afternoons; 2x/month		Irregular	N/A

Table 1 (cont'd).

1996 - Spring 1998

I had very little connection to Bailey before late 1998, so this description of the organizational and leadership structure of Bailey before then is based on what I've gleaned from others in a variety of contexts over a period of time, including Leadership Space conversations and comments from readers of my initial draft.

The primary focus during this period was to launch the newly-conceptualized Bailey Scholars Program. A former department chair with a strong background in organizational development and leadership was asked to facilitate the development of this new program and to serve as its first Chair. He, in turn, hired an Administrative Assistant; an Academic Coordinator; two graduate assistants to help with leadership, administration, and public relations for the program, including outreach materials and a newsletter; and two student workers to help with technology and administration. A group of College faculty members, composed primarily but not uniquely of those who had been involved in the Bailey design and implementation teams, was also invited to help conceptualize the Program.

The faculty met on a regular basis to engage in dialogue about the Program in light of relevant literature and related academic models. As they gained momentum, they formed a number of working groups to focus on developing different dimensions of the Program. A 'Governance and Administration' group, composed of representatives from each of the working groups, also met on a monthly basis to hear reports from and to delegate action items to working

groups. The Governance and Administration group functioned relatively informally (without agendas and minutes), didn't make programmatic decisions, and focused largely on strengthening connections among faculty members and their activities. Before the Program had a physical home in Wills House, faculty met in various places across campus and off campus. Because of their small numbers and the intense, exciting nature of their work, I'm told that many members of this initial group of Bailey scholars developed a strong sense of community (though some are careful to note that it took a while before some of the faculty who were new to Bailey to feel like they were part of the community).

As the Program's launch date approached, and faculty recognized the number of issues that needed to be considered before the first cohort of students joined the Program, they increased the number of working groups. Several of these working groups, including Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Student Entering, continued to meet through the 1998-1999 academic year. Both the Academic Coordinator and a graduate assistant supported these working groups. After the first cohort of students entered the Program in the spring in 1998, faculty invited students to join the working groups and to give their input about the Program's development.

As is characteristic of the Chair, and as would remain a consistent hallmark of his tenure, the Chair communicated with the new Bailey scholars frequently (usually by email) about programmatic and scholarly issues.

Summer 1998 Transition

Some adjustments in the Program's leadership were made during the summer of 1998. To bring her title more in line with her emerging role, the graduate assistant who was providing programmatic and administrative leadership became the 'Assistant to the Chair.' Around this time, the Chair also made it clear that he wanted help with decision-making and that it was time to begin mentoring prospective Chairs to assume formal leadership roles in the future.

A couple important intellectual shifts also occurred in mid-1998. For instance, during a spring semester retreat, draft Bailey bylaws had been abandoned in favor of developing a simple 'Declaration of Bailey' that embodied the Program's ethos. Student scholars played a significant role in shaping the Declaration.

It was also during this time that the 'emergence' concept was first embraced, which freed people from the cultural impulse to plan everything ahead of time and allowed them to trust things to develop naturally. This is one of several examples over the course of the Program's development of the influence the Chair and the Assistant to the Chair had on Bailey scholars' intellectual development. Both made a habit of combing relevant literature, sharing selections with the Bailey community, convening reading circles, stocking the Bailey Book Nook with articles and books, and identifying interesting conference opportunities. This tradition has continued but decreased over time as the Chair's focus shifted and the Assistant to the Chair assumed new roles and responsibilities.

Fall 1998 - Spring 1999

The 1998-1999 academic year marked the first significant influx of new Bailey scholars. During the fall of 1997, the first cohort of about fifteen student scholars was recruited. The process used was the community's first formal experiment with 'self-selected membership.' The first cohort of Bailey student scholars enrolled in the first section of ANR 210 during the spring semester of 1998. During the 1998-1999 academic year, the number of student scholars rose to approximately thirty-two, and prospective faculty scholars from on and off campus were also actively invited to investigate Bailey.

During the fall of 1998, the Bailey 'Leadership Group' was created. Its expressed purpose was to mentor people who were interested in playing leadership roles in Bailey. The Leadership Group was not a decision-making body; rather, it explored leadership issues and helped the Bailey community 'frame' issues related to the Program's development. Not surprisingly, therefore, the Group commonly experienced a tension between 'reading and thinking' and 'thinking and doing.' Communication from the Group to the rest of the community was transparent – it worked from agendas and shared minutes from its meetings with the community.

Participation in the Leadership Group was open and inviting, and six faculty scholars, including the Chair and the Assistant to the Chair, participated on a regular basis. The Group met twice a month on Friday afternoons, which was not convenient for everyone who was interested in participating.

Summer 1999 Transition

During the spring of 1999, the Academic Coordinator, whose role was to support student scholars in the development and pursuit of their learning plans, announced that she was going to step down. Through a community learning process, a new position was developed, called the Academic Learning Coordinator (ALC), and the Assistant to the Chair was chosen to fill that position.

With the Assistant to the Chair position vacated, another community learning process was initiated to fill that leadership gap. Four faculty scholars, one of whom had participated actively in the Leadership Group, and two of whom were graduate students and new Bailey scholars (I was one of the two), expressed interest in filling the yet-to-be-defined position. Over the course of several weeks, these four 'candidates,' the Chair, the outgoing Assistant to the Chair, and the Administrative Assistant engaged in a number of conversations about both the nature of the new position(s) and each candidate's fit.

In the end, rather than make the difficult decision to select a single Assistant to the Chair, each candidate was invited to assume leadership responsibilities related to her or his interest and to join the Chair, the ALC, and the Administrative Assistant in forming a new working group called the 'Bailey Administrative Team,' or BAT. In the process, the group made a transition in thinking from 'we need people to help the Bailey Chair' to 'we need people to help the Bailey community grow.' This shift in thinking was reflected in the nature of responsibilities that each member of BAT assumed. The outgoing

Assistant to the Chair retained her responsibilities related to the Bailey budget and personnel; a veteran Bailey faculty member assumed responsibility for nurturing Bailey 'connections;' another veteran who had served on both the Academic Affairs and Student Affairs Working Groups assumed leadership responsibilities related to academic and student affairs; and I was appointed as a ½-time Fellow with half of my time devoted to administrative responsibilities and half to scholarship. The other graduate student never participated actively in the Bailey Administrative Team. Some areas of leadership that had previously been assumed by staff no longer were, including support to the Academic Learning Coordinator, support to the faculty learning journey, and public relations.

Fall 1999 - Spring 2000

During 1999, there was a fairly steady flow of incoming Bailey faculty scholars. And as new cohorts of Bailey student scholars were welcomed and before the first Bailey graduation in the spring of 2000, the size of the student scholar population also gradually increased. As the Bailey community grew, it was no longer possible for every Bailey scholar to know every other Bailey scholar. What had once been a small community bound by relatively strong, intimate ties had become a large community bound by, as the Chair was inclined to call it, the 'strength of weak ties.'

The Bailey Administrative Team met twice a month, usually on Wednesday afternoons. It worked from agendas and shared meeting minutes with the rest of the Bailey community. And though all Bailey scholars were invited to participate

in BAT meetings, only the established membership participated on a regular basis.

BAT was very issue-oriented. In fact, it was probably misnamed, because it assumed much more of a leadership than an administrative role. It would consider community issues and, depending on the nature of the issue, take action or frame the issue for community-wide consideration. BAT met throughout the 1999-2000 academic year but did not meet during the summer of 2000.

I (and others) observed that BAT suffered from a bit of an identity crisis throughout its nine-month existence. Some of the persistent tensions within the group were captured during a December 1999 meeting. Observations BAT members made at that time included:

- In BAT, there are diverse ways of thinking about leadership and diverse ways of leading. Some focus more on connectedness within community while others are more self-directed and like to 'run with the ball.'
- BAT leadership is a two-way street. That is, though BAT can lead by proposing ideas to the Bailey community, it also has the responsibility to lead by listening attentively to the community.
- Much of the 'work' that BAT does is conversational in nature, so it is important to spend time around the table in dialogue. At the same time, it may be possible to do more of our 'work' independently and to spend less of our time on FYI/informational items during meetings.

Starting in the fall of 1999, issues related to Program administration and management, which had formerly been handled by the Chair, the Assistant to the Chair, and the Administrative Assistant, were now handled by the newly-formed and highly task-oriented 'Office Management Team,' or OMT. OMT was composed of the Chair, the ALC, the Administrative Assistant, the student worker responsible for technology, and me.

Summer and Fall 2000 Transition

The summer and fall of 2000 were marked by two simultaneous and significant transitions. One was a change in formal leadership. During the spring, the founding Chair announced his intention to step down so that he could focus on his scholarship, which he felt he had neglected for far too long for the sake of his administrative responsibilities. Having made his announcement early in the spring, he assumed that a new Director would be on board by the summer, and he made other commitments accordingly. The process used to select the new Director, however, took much longer than expected, so the new Director did not officially start until October 1.

So, as the outgoing Chair began focusing his energies elsewhere during the summer months, and without the incoming Director able to focus her energies on Bailey before October, a gap in leadership was created. This was exacerbated by the fact that BAT had ceased to meet, I was jettisoning my administrative responsibilities so that I could focus on scholarship, the student worker who had

provided technical support for the Program graduated, and there were few active and functioning working groups providing any programmatic leadership. The bulk of leadership responsibilities during this time fell on the shoulders of the Administrative Assistant and the already overburdened ALC.

The ALC, in turn, was struggling to meet the needs of the growing student scholar population. More and more students were becoming Bailey scholars, but relatively few had graduated, so the number of student scholars was steadily rising. This meant that she had more students to work with on a one-on-one basis and that there were more courses and course sections to manage and for which to find conveners. By that time, the Academic Affairs Working Group had also disbanded, so the ALC had to convene ad hoc groups of scholars for assistance with activities like orientation, recruitment, and graduation.

The outgoing Chair and the ALC had traditionally been the source of most of the new information flow into the community (by sharing relevant scholarly literature and conference opportunities with the community) and the source of the bulk of communication to the community. As the Chair's focus shifted and the ALC's burden increased, both the flow of new information into the community and the level of communication to the community decreased.

The second major transition during this time was the Program's physical move from Wills House to the new annex in Agriculture Hall. Despite having made both practical and scholarly cases against such a move, the Bailey community

was given no choice but to move from its original home to new office space. The move and the subsequent settling-in phase took enormous amounts of individual and community energy at a time when the Program's formal leadership was already overtaxed.

Spring - Fall 2001

Given the difficult situation she inherited, the new Director wasn't able to focus on issues related to leadership and management until late 2000 and early 2001. She began by inviting people to form a new Bailey leadership entity. What emerged was something called the 'Leadership Space.' The membership of the Leadership Space was never fixed, but regular participants included the Director, the ALC, the Administrative Assistant, a former member of the Leadership Group, a former member of BAT who had responsibility for community connections, the faculty scholar whose new appointment included technology support for Bailey, and me.

The new leadership entity was called the Leadership Space, in part, because I was very vocal about what the new leadership entity should look like. Specifically, I thought that the new entity should be less of a 'group' or committee with fixed membership and more of an open space in which people engaged in dialogue about issues related to management and leadership. What I failed to realize, however, is that it is difficult for many people to develop a sense of commitment to something so amorphous and that both the Bailey community and the new Director needed a group of scholars that devoted its time to both

dialogue about larger issues *and* action to address Bailey's specific management and leadership needs.

Unfortunately, the Leadership Space began meeting without ever clarifying its role, and each regular participant seemed to have a different understanding of its purpose. The tensions between those who wanted the Space to be a place for decisions and action and those who wanted an opportunity to learn and explore were never resolved or balanced to anyone's satisfaction. To complicate things, the group's attention sometimes jumped from one programmatic 'fire' to another that required immediate attention (e.g., budget, appointment, and reporting deadlines). Moreover, because membership was not fixed, some regular participants didn't seem to develop a strong sense of ownership or commitment to the Space, so their participation was sporadic. Participants also never established basic mechanisms for maintaining structure and continuity, like regular meeting times, agendas, and minutes. In short, the Leadership Space never functioned very well, and certainly never met the needs of the new Director.

Because the Leadership Space was not meeting the needs of either the Program or the Director, the Director took steps on her own to keep the Program functioning. Early in 2001, she hired two undergraduate student workers as well as two new graduate students, neither of whom were Bailey scholars, to provide programmatic support and to support the ALC. The graduate students both left after one or two semesters. In their stead, the Director hired a graduate student

faculty scholar to support the Program.

During this period, the amount of time committed to the Program by active faculty scholars was also decreasing. Since peaking in 2000, both the number of active faculty scholars and the size of their appointments (i.e., the amount of their professional time purchased by Bailey) had begun to gradually decline. The number of student scholars, in contrast, continued to rise. The burden of management and leadership, therefore, fell increasingly on the shoulders of the staff. Given those dynamics, and because the Leadership Space was struggling, the few remaining Working Groups focused more on learning than on the Program's upkeep, and few faculty scholars had formal leadership responsibilities, Bailey was led and managed primarily by paid staff during most of 2001. As a result, over time, the locus of leadership shifted away from the Leadership Space and individual Bailey scholars and toward staff and the Office Management Team, composed of the Director, the ALC, the Administrative Assistant, the technology support faculty scholar, and the graduate assistant.

And as the bulk of the responsibility for keeping the Program running shifted to paid staff, the level of communication from the formal leadership (including the Leadership Space, which did a very poor job of keeping the community abreast of its deliberations) to the rest of the community declined. There was a series of community retreats organized during the summer of 2001, during which a variety of issues were discussed, but there was limited follow-through, so they did not have any significant impact on the Program's evolution.

2002

My participation with Bailey in 2002 was peripheral, so these observations are based on what I've gleaned from communications over Bailey's email listservs and comments from readers of my initial draft.

At the end of 2001, the Leadership Space, having never served the Director or the community very well, was laid to rest. Since then, no new formal leadership entity has been established, the graduate assistant graduated and found a new job, and College technology support staff time was purchased when the faculty scholar who had assumed responsibility for Bailey's technology was transferred off campus. The Office Management Team and the Curriculum Connections Team, which was formed to reconsider the Bailey curriculum, were the only remaining elements of organizational structure, and OMT met only sporadically. Ad hoc Working Groups are formed on an as needed basis to organize scholar recruitment, graduation, and other activities and events. The size of the student scholar population continued to grow in 2002, and a few new faculty scholars seemed to bring some new energy to the Program.

Things I've Learned about Network Leadership and Organization

In light of some of the theory of network leadership and organization outlined above, my experience with Bailey's managerial, organizational, and leadership evolution has taught me the following:

Bailey as a Network

The Bailey community has consistently existed as a network united by a shared frame of reference. The Declaration of Bailey – as Bailey's frame of reference – has played a significant role in uniting a diverse range of Bailey scholars through a shared sense of identity. Because Bailey is not the focal point of most Bailey scholars' activities and is instead a space in which they connect with other Bailey scholars on their individual developmental journeys, Bailey is better defined as a network than as a typical cohesive community or organization. Ever since the growing number of Bailey scholars made it difficult for every Bailey scholar to know every other Bailey scholar, Bailey as a whole has been a network grounded in the strength of weak ties rather than a cohesive community bound by the strength of strong ties.

Nodes of the Bailey network include both individuals and communities of practice. Even though the Bailey community as a whole is not a cohesive group, there have certainly existed cohesive sub-communities within the Bailey network. Wenger (1998) would call these "communities of practice," self-generating social networks within a network, community, or organization. A community of practice is characterized by mutual engagement of its members, a joint enterprise, and, over time, shared routines, rules of conduct, and knowledge. Some communities of practice in Bailey are temporary, like courses, working groups, and reading or writing circles, while others, like those grounded in friendships or ongoing working relationships, are more permanent. So, rather than simply describing Bailey as a network of individuals, it is probably more

accurate to describe Bailey as a network with multiple nodes, including both individuals *and* communities of practice.

Capra (2002), following Wenger (1998), suggests that the more people are engaged in communities of practice, and the more developed and sophisticated the communities are, "the better will the organization be able to learn, respond creatively to unexpected circumstances, change, and evolve. In other words, the organization's aliveness resides in its communities of practice" (109).

Management, Leadership, and Structure

Like any organization, the Bailey network has included administrative/managerial support, leadership, and both designed and emergent organizational structure. I find it useful to clearly distinguish among these three elements. Managerial or administrative functions are those that are required to keep a program operating, like the office support that an Administrative Assistant provides, technical support, bookkeeping, personnel management, reporting, processing paperwork, and some external relations.

Leadership functions, in contrast, are those that help people organize to 'make things happen.' Examples of leadership in Bailey include joining or convening a working group, participating in or facilitating a dialogue, helping to organize an event, convening a course, preparing a paper or conference presentation, or convening a reading or writing circle. In other words, to be part of a Bailey community of practice is to play a leadership role.

A few important points about leadership: First, there are both formal and informal forms of leadership. Examples of formal leaders in Bailey include staff members and conveners of courses or communities of practice. Informal leaders exhibit leadership in less overt ways, like as a member of a community of practice. Second, many who assume administrative or managerial roles also often play key leadership roles. And third, good leadership requires good managerial support – it is very difficult to organize people, for instance, without functioning copiers and computers or access to organized budgets and phone lists.

Organizational structure provides the framework in which administrative functions are performed and leadership is exhibited. Importantly, there are both designed and emergent structures. Designed structures are formal, semi-permanent structures that support the basic functioning of the organization and provide stability. Emergent structures are created by self-organizing communities of practice and are flexible, adaptive, and evolving (Capra 2002, 120-121). Examples of designed organizational structure in Bailey include courses, (semi-) permanent working groups, the leadership entity, the Office Management Team, and regular community gatherings like Wednesday lunches. Examples of emergent structures include ad hoc working groups, reading and writing circles, conference preparation teams, and social or collegial networks. Most Bailey organizational structures – both designed and emergent – can be characterized as communities of practice.

Bailey Management

Management functions in Bailey have consistently been handled by paid staff members. The Chair/Director, the Administrative Assistant, student workers, the Academic Learning Coordinator, and a graduate student or the Assistant to the Chair have consistently provided administrative support for Bailey. Since 1999, those staff members responsible for management functions have organized as the Office Management Team.

Bailey Leadership

A networked form of leadership evolved in Bailey by 1999. While we were working on *Bailey at Year Two* during the fall of 1999, Doberneck and I suggested that Bailey had evolved a networked mode of operation. Specifically, Bailey had become

> a diverse, horizontal network of self-directed individuals and self-organizing groups that continually refocus and reorganize to explore shared interests and meet new challenges. Semi-permanent working groups, for instance, self-organize to address issues related to academic affairs, student affairs, technology, administration, etc. Similarly, learning circles are periodically organized for shorter time periods to explore ideas and challenges that emerge within the community. Working groups, learning circles, and individuals often raise questions or issues for community consideration during community gatherings like the weekly Wednesday lunches or on the Bailey online dialogue web site.

In other words, by 1999, Bailey community life largely revolved around the activities of both designed and emergent communities of practice.

Doberneck, in turn, clearly distinguished between different forms of leadership and suggested that a form of 'network leadership' had co-evolved with the

emergence of Bailey's networked operations. We captured her ideas as follows:

> Network leadership stands in marked contrast to both hero leadership and shared leadership. Hero leadership is the familiar mode in which the strong leader makes decisions *independently*. In shared leadership, which is far more participatory, collaborative, and *dependent* in nature, every member of the organization contributes to and buys-into the decision-making process and implementation. Network leadership, on the other hand, is characterized by loosely-coupled organizational sub-groups. These sub-groups operate in a collaborative mode and are networked with the other sub-groups and individuals in the organization, but the degree to which they involve every member of the organization in decision-making is a function of the issue or task at hand. Because this mode of leadership is *interdependent* in nature, its success is largely a function of the level of trust maintained within the organization that individuals and sub-groups will act responsibly.

Some implicit 'principles of network leadership' have evolved in Bailey over time. Underlying the activities of Bailey's network of communities of practice and the theory of network leadership are some principles that, based on my experience, many Bailey scholars have embraced but have not always been made explicit. They include:

Discernment: Bailey scholars, and particularly those in formal administrative roles, are regularly (though not always consciously) choosing the appropriate level at which community decisions should be made. Some of these choices are relatively easy. For instance, the entire community doesn't need to be involved in decisions about buying office supplies, but community members should be invited to weigh in on curricular changes. Other choices are more difficult. For example, should community members be invited to help draft the Program's annual report, or should the community help shape the annual faculty scholar appointment

process? This 'sifting and sorting' of community issues has at different times and for different issues been done by the Chair/Director, the leadership entity, and/or OMT.

Safe Space: In such a large, diverse network like Bailey, it is important to have spaces in which important and sometimes difficult community issues can be raised and discussed. As Laiken (2001) points out, it is important to take time for reflection in the midst of the flurry of activity:

> The paradoxical outcome for an organization is a case of slowing down in order to speed up. Decision-making is improved, effectiveness is increased, and overall productivity and work satisfaction are enhanced through systematically incorporated periods of collective reflection (2).

Forums like the leadership entity, Wednesday lunches, and retreats have traditionally provided safe spaces for collective reflection in Bailey.

Participation: For issues that are deemed worthy of broader community consideration, the invitation has traditionally been extended to the entire community to participate in the deliberation process. Each scholar who has a strong interest in a particular issue thereby has the opportunity to provide her input. This same principle has usually been applied to the Bailey leadership entity so that anyone interested in 'the big Bailey picture' and/or the discernment process can be involved.

Dialogue[14]: Most community members try to use the principles of dialogue rather than debate when deliberating about a particular issue, whether in a small working group or at a larger community gathering. That is, people

---

[14]I borrowed here directly from the work of LeRoy Harvey, a Bailey scholar who has studied and practiced dialogue extensively.

seek to listen and learn rather than know and advocate, ask questions rather than provide answers, explore multiple perspectives rather than embracing a single perspective, question rather than defend assumptions, and respect others rather than exert power over them.

Trust: Because not every Bailey scholar can be part of deliberations about every community issue, and because no one ever really knows how the deliberations of a community of practice might evolve, Bailey scholars have grown increasingly comfortable with ambiguity and have learned to trust each other and the emergent nature of Bailey process (following Zohar 1997, 51).

Transparent Communication: Because not every community member is able to participate in every community of practice that may interest them, it is critical that the process of discernment, programmatic developments, and the activities of various community's of practice remain transparent. The level of trust maintained within the community is largely a function of the level of administrative transparency. Since all Bailey scholars have email access, and because not all scholars frequent the Bailey commons or Bailey gatherings on a regular basis, email is usually the best way to communicate with the entire community.

Respect: Because Bailey is a secondary activity for most Bailey scholars, they have limited time and energy to devote to it. It is important, therefore, to respect their time by making good use of it. In that spirit, it is common for the leadership entity or a community of practice to first frame an issue by identifying the key issues or decisions related to a particular

topic before bringing those key issues or decisions back to the larger community for consideration.

Honor: When a community of practice and the larger community have invested time and energy into making decisions or developing Program policy, it is critical that the work be honored by implementing those decisions or that policy.

These principles – discernment, safe space, participation, dialogue, trust, transparent communication, respect, and honor – as Wheatley suggests (1992, 38), are a reflection of the importance of process in networked organizations.

The principles of network leadership are commonly expressed in practice as a 'network etiquette' in Bailey. The activities of Bailey's communities of practice seem to be most effective when they are inviting and transparent yet guided. When organizing around a particular issue or event, Bailey scholars begin by extending an open invitation to others to participate in the process. The nature of the invitation is important. The most effective invitations are concise and provide some background about the issue, state the purpose of the process, explain how long the process might take, and specify a 'reply by' date and 'reply to' individual. Often, people are given the opportunity to participate in a variety of different ways – in person, by email or telephone, in writing, or on the web. Public invitations are commonly supplemented with personal invitations from the group's convener to individuals whom the convener thinks might make valuable contributions.

As the community of practice takes shape, meeting times are announced publicly and frequent updates are provided – by email, on the web, at community gatherings – to keep everyone 'in the loop.' In cases where the community of practice is deliberating about an issue of concern to the entire Bailey community, it will frame the issue by identifying the key issues to consider or decisions to be made and then leave it up to the larger community to make a final decision.

I've observed that the most effective issue-focused communities of practice are 'guided' by one or more individuals who assumed responsibility for 'shepherding' things along, facilitating meetings, keeping the rest of the community informed of progress, and bringing the task at hand to closure.

The transaction costs associated with network leadership in Bailey are sometimes too high. While the Bailey principles of leadership and network etiquette sound good in theory, it is sometimes simply not practical to practice them. Given the urgency of a particular matter, there is not always enough time to invite community deliberation – network leadership is rarely very efficient and can often be downright cumbersome. And at different points in Bailey's evolution, there have also not always been enough people available to invest time and energy in every issue that deserves reflection and dialogue. There is also the question of how many times any given issue should be reconsidered by the community. If, for instance, the community went through a lengthy process of developing a policy, and if two years later the community has evolved to a place where that policy may no longer be appropriate, should the community

engage in another lengthy deliberative process, should some other mechanism be devised for creating a new policy, or should the policy just be left unchanged?

Network leadership is necessary but not sufficient. For a network like Bailey to function, network leadership is clearly needed. However, it is not the only form of leadership that is needed. There is still a need, for example, for a formal hero leader in the Chair/Director position to energize continuing programmatic development, serve as a catalytic agent for others to play leadership roles, and reconcile external constraints with the community ethos, among other things. Similarly, shared leadership is commonplace in Bailey's communities of practice, which often operate in a highly collaborative mode.

Bailey scholars have a variety of different leadership styles, skills, and preferences. Because people have a variety of different leadership styles, skills, and preferences, there are many different ways to help people organize to get things done. Leadership styles are not, by nature, 'better' or 'worse.' I have observed, however, that some are better-suited for particular situations or roles.

I have noticed, for instance, that network organization and leadership is not natural or intuitive for most people. Those who prefer hero or shared leadership, in particular, find network leadership counterintuitive and oftentimes uncomfortable. Not all Bailey scholars, for example, are well-suited to observe network etiquette as the formal 'guide,' 'shepherd,' or convener of a community of practice – they may not be comfortable communicating with the whole Bailey

community by email, they may not have the facilitating skills to keep a group on task, or they may not be organized enough to keep the larger community 'in the loop.'

These same individuals, however, may be gifted informal leaders. In word or deed, they may inspire other scholars to try something new or at helping others see a situation in a new light. Or they may prefer and thrive in shared leadership settings, like in as a member (but not a convener) of a community of practice. An ongoing challenge in Bailey is to help scholars find and play the types of leadership roles that they prefer or for which they are best suited.

The number of faculty scholars available to play leadership roles has not kept pace with Bailey's need for leadership. When the Program was relatively new (1997-1999), there was a sizable cadre of faculty scholars available to do the challenging work associated with developing a new program. The number of faculty scholars only increased by a small margin over the next few years, however. In 1998 and 1999, there were 16-18 active faculty scholars (with appointments totaling about 2.0 'full time equivalents,' or FTEs), many of whom both served as course conveners and provided leadership roles in the community. Faculty activity peaked during the 1999-2000 academic year when there were approximately 21 active faculty scholars (with appointments totaling about 3.0 FTEs). During the 2000-2001 academic year, several tenure-stream faculty scholars began to decrease their Bailey activity. A number of new graduate students became active faculty scholars that year, so the number of

active faculty scholars and FTEs remained about the same. By the fall of 2001, however, many faculty scholars decreased their level of activity, so there were only about 15 active faculty scholars.

As the number of active faculty scholars leveled off and began declining, the number of student scholars increased dramatically. In the spring of 1998, there were about 15 student scholars. That number went up to approximately 32 in 1999, 54 in 2000, 59 in 2001, and 72 in 2002.

So, as the number of student scholars increased, there was not a corresponding increase in the number of active faculty scholars. Faculty scholars, therefore, tended to focus more of their limited time on critical activities like convening courses than on playing programmatic leadership roles in other communities of practice. Moreover, by 2001, a large number of active faculty scholars were graduate fellows, who tended to focus more on convening courses and scholarship than they did on Program leadership. Together, these disturbances created a significant leadership gap. In practice, this meant that there weren't always people available to devote time and energy to new community issues, to organizing events, and to playing other leadership roles.

The bulk of formal leadership in Bailey has been provided by staff members. Even when there were more permanent working groups, formal leadership roles have usually been played by a Bailey staff member. Specifically, the Chair/Director, the Assistant to the Chair, or a graduate assistant

typically convenes permanent, ad hoc, and issue-focused working groups. The few exceptions have been reading circles and course convening.

This is not inherently good or bad. It implies, however, that the Bailey staff roles are extremely important. Given the nature of Bailey, staff members should be competent managers and administrators and able to play formal network leadership roles. In other words, their actions should reflect a clear understanding of the principles of network leadership and network etiquette.

They should also be sensitive to at least two dangers. The first danger is having community discourse dominated by the few voices of people playing formal leadership roles. The second danger comes from having too much overlap between the loci of both management and leadership in the community. If the frame of reference of the formal leaders, for instance, centers primarily around Program maintenance, the community may inadvertently lose touch with its ethos of innovation.

It has been a challenge in Bailey to match leadership roles and staff responsibilities with individual interests and passions. One of Bailey's greatest successes, in my opinion, is that it provides a space in which individuals are able to explore those parts of their lives that they may never otherwise explore. In many ways, Bailey is Hock's organization of the future that releases "what people desire in the depth of their being – the passion they have for it – the integrity they bring to the attempt" (Hock 1999, 2). In such organizations,

with "no more than dreams, determination, and liberty to try, quite ordinary people consistently do extraordinary things" (17). In theory, therefore, it seems plausible that Bailey's leadership needs could be met by scholars playing leadership roles that interest them and that complement their developmental journeys.

In practice, however, because Bailey has experienced a dearth of faculty scholars available to play leadership roles, because for most scholars Bailey is a marginal activity where they want to focus primarily on activities of high interest, and because some leadership roles are preferred over others, many leadership roles have either gone unfilled or been assumed by Bailey staff. In organizations that are the administrative home for most of its members (which, I assume, is the case for most of the organizations that are studied by the network leadership theorists), it might be easier to fulfill the organization's leadership needs through each member's pursuit of her individual interests.

Luckily, Bailey has often been blessed with staff who are keenly interested in Program development, management, leadership, and organization and who are willing to 'pick up the slack' as necessary in times of need. This was certainly the case with the original Chair and Assistant to the Chair. They both, for instance, actively convened communities of practice and supported scholarly activities on top of their administrative responsibilities. I'm sure there were many cases, however, when there were significant mismatches between staff interests and the work they were doing.

After the summer of 1999 transition, I chose to do less than the original Assistant to the Chair had. I was not being lazy or shirking my responsibilities. Rather, I embraced wholeheartedly the theory of dispersed network leadership and the idea that people make the best contributions when doing work that is in line with their passions. I also failed to recognize the level of need for staff to assume leadership roles outside of their interest domain. So I simply chose not to do things that I felt should be community responsibilities and focused on things of interest to me. For instance, I assumed that if scholarship is a community priority, all Bailey scholars should 'feed' the Book Nook, convene reading circles, and help prepare conference presentations. At the same time, it was my impression that the members of BAT who were given responsibility for academic affairs and connections never quite felt at home with their new responsibilities and therefore never embraced them with vigor.

As a result of these dynamics, even though it looked like Bailey had more staff available during the 1999-2000 academic year to play leadership roles, less was being done by several of us in formal leadership roles. Unfortunately, the net result was that the same two people – the Chair and the former Assistant to the Chair (now the Academic Learning Coordinator) – continued to pick up the slack. This was particularly unfortunate for the ALC, who by 2000 had to rely uniquely on ad hoc groups to provide leadership in areas related to her responsibilities.

Things didn't get any better after the 2000 transition. BAT disbanded and I shed all of my formal leadership roles, so Bailey was left with the new Director, the

ALC, and the Administrative Assistant, who ended up shouldering the bulk of leadership responsibilities in the community. Two graduate students were hired in early 2001 to help meet the community's needs, but their impact was short-lived because neither remained with the Program more than a year.

Bailey Structure

Organizationally, the general trend in Bailey has been from more to less organizational structure – particularly 'designed' structure – and from less to more staff support. Because the number of faculty scholars leveled off, and as more of their time and energy were devoted to convening courses, fewer were available to play additional leadership roles. This was reflected, in part, in Bailey's evolving organizational structure. From 1997 to 2002, the Bailey organizational structure passed through the following stages:

- Many 'designed' working groups connected through a Governance and Administration group and supported by the Chair, an Administrative Assistant, an Academic Coordinator, two graduate assistants, and student workers.
- Several semi-permanent, 'designed' working groups (e.g., Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, the Tech Team); some ad hoc, 'emergent' working groups; and a Leadership Group that framed community issues, all supported by the Chair, an Administrative Assistant, an Academic Coordinator, the Assistant to the Chair, a graduate assistant, a technology student worker, and an office student worker.
- Fewer semi-permanent, 'designed' working groups; more ad hoc,

'emergent' groups that organize around specific issues or events, like an Open House, a graduation celebration, web page design, a conference presentation, or a retreat; the Bailey Administrative Team that framed community issues; and the Office Management Team that focused on administrative issues, all supported by the Chair, an Administrative Assistant, an Academic Learning Coordinator, BAT members, a technology student worker, and an office student worker.

- No permanent, 'designed' working groups; fewer ad hoc, 'emergent' working groups, the struggling Leadership Space, and OMT, all supported by the Director, an Administrative Assistant, an Academic Learning Coordinator, graduate students/assistants, a faculty scholar responsible for technology support, and office student workers.
- Few ad hoc, 'emergent' working groups, the Curriculum Connections Team, and OMT, all supported by the Director, an Administrative Assistant, an Academic Learning Coordinator, a College staff person responsible for technology support, and office student workers.

Based on the community dynamics described in this chapter (especially the shrinking faculty scholar to student scholar ratio), this devolution – from many active groups through which scholars can provide programmatic leadership to a small number of ad hoc groups and the Office Management Team – seems necessary and appropriate. It is the emergent product of active, ongoing community engagement and therefore, as Wheatley (1992) would suggest, suited to the nature of the community's current state of development: "Structures

emerge, but only as temporary solutions that facilitate rather than interfere" (16). "Organization emerges in response to need" (91). The Bailey community has demonstrated incredible organizational flexibility and adaptability, as one might expect from a developing network.

Bailey's Development

'Unsettling disturbances' in Bailey have either sparked new creative activity or impeded its development. As Wheatley (1992) suggests, the natural dynamics of a networked community supply all the conflicts and contradictions necessary to keep a network like Bailey growing healthfully. As new people and ideas flow into the community – as long as communities of practice are allowed to naturally emerge and there are plentiful spaces for reflection and dialogue – conflicts, contradictions, and disconfirming information disrupt the status quo enough to prompt change and reorganization (116). There are many examples of this disorderly yet creative dynamic in Bailey's evolution.

But two of Bailey's major transitions – the formation of BAT in 1999 and the simultaneous Chair/Director transition and physical move in 2000 – were such significant disturbances that they slowed the Program's development. Both, as noted above, left leadership gaps, and the second left a leadership gap at a time of excessive need. By the end of 2000 and early 2001, therefore, the little leadership available was devoted more to keeping the Program functioning than to nurturing its development in new directions.

It has been difficult to 'grow' Bailey's networked community without a continuous influx of new ideas, new community members, and new leadership. As Wheatley (1992) suggests, a steady flow of new information either from external sources or from community learning has proven vital to Bailey's health and development: "[A]n organization can only exist in such a fluid fashion if it has access to new information, both about external factors and internal resources" (91). Sources of information in Bailey have included the literature, insights from reflexive dialogue, and the fresh perspectives and insights of new community members.

Though a number of Bailey scholars have shared relevant literature with the rest of the community, the bulk of it has come through the original Chair and the original Assistant to the Chair turned ALC. After the Chair/Director transition in 2000, and as the workload of the ALC increased, the influx of information in the form of articles and books has decreased.

But, as Wheatley (1992) suggests, new information isn't enough: "[An organization] must constantly process [new information] with high levels of self-awareness, plentiful sensing devices, and a strong capacity for reflection (91). In that spirit, reflexive dialogue has been another major source of new ideas in Bailey. Bailey community life is pervaded with dialogue – in courses, during Wednesday lunches, in reading circles, during retreats – and as far as I can tell, the depth of that dialogue has remained fairly consistent over time.

A third source of new information in Bailey is new community members. Wheatley (1992) stresses the importance of new people and the fresh ideas and perspectives they bring: "We need a broad distribution of information, viewpoints, and interpretations if we are to make sense of the world" (64). "[T]he more participants we engage in this participative universe, the more we can access its potentials and the wiser we become" (65).

Bailey is blessed with a constant influx of new student scholars, each of whom helps to shape the nature of the Bailey community. Student scholars, however, are in most cases even more limited than faculty scholars in the amount of time and energy they can invest in Bailey outside of classes (for example, at Wednesday lunches, at retreats, or as part of working groups). Moreover, most student scholars have less life and professional experience and have had less exposure to different ideas and perspectives.

Traditionally, therefore, the bulk of new information infused into the Bailey community has come from faculty scholars. But as the number of faculty members leveled off, fewer people have been bringing new ideas and perspectives to influence Bailey's development. In addition, as leadership roles in Bailey have gradually shifted from faculty scholars to staff, faculty creativity has less influence over programmatic decision-making.

Under these circumstances, it is difficult to continue to develop and evolve a program. The pressures on staff members are largely conservative pressures –

it is usually easier to do things the way they've always been done than to try something new. Moreover, there are a number of external forces that tend to discourage innovation. There is tremendous pressure, for example, to conform to supervisors' expectations and to administrative protocols, whether they are in line with the community's ethos or not. There are frequently opportunities for growth at those points of tension between a program's ethos and its external constraints, but to take advantage of them, it requires extraordinary vigilance and patience with the high transaction costs of network leadership. When it is taking all of one's time and energy to simply keep a program operating, it is nearly impossible to take the extra steps required to also keep it evolving.

Is network organization and leadership a realistic option? I love the theory of network organization and leadership. If it was up to me, everything would operate as a network. But, unfortunately, as is often the case with me, my idealistic theory is difficult to translate into practice. In fact, I would now go so far as to say that I have never really seen network organization and leadership really work, and I'm skeptical that it can in most situations.

Why this dramatic change in perspective? First, relatively few people seem to be comfortable operating as a network. Most people have never seen anything other than hero leadership and many prefer shared leadership, so network leadership is commonly both unfamiliar and counterintuitive.

Second, network leadership requires extraordinary leadership skills, which seem

to be rare. Formal leaders within networks must be able to energize continuing programmatic development, serve as a catalytic agent for others to play leadership roles, practice the principles of network leadership, observe network etiquette, and reconcile external constraints with the community ethos – usually while also assuming responsibility for program management. In my experience, there are few people who can do this effectively and live any sort of balanced life.

Third, it is difficult to facilitate the constant influx of new people. Recruiting new community members can be a slow process, especially if it takes some time for people to understand a unique program's ethos and if their involvement requires additional time and energy on top of an already full personal and professional life.

And finally, unless a network is blessed with an abundance of members who are comfortable providing network leadership and are able to do so in areas that are aligned with their interests and passions, it is difficult to continue evolving the community.

Readers' Responses

Duley's first reaction to this chapter was that he didn't like it. But then he realized he didn't like it because it was telling, in his words, the "hard truth." When he originally engaged as a new Bailey scholar, he reflected, Bailey was a movement, similar in nature to the civil rights and peace movements that he has

been part of for many years. Duley observed that, over time, Bailey's 'elders' slipped away, and the movement gradually became institutionalized. He stressed that this tends to be the natural evolution of most movements and that the leadership is not to blame. He wondered out loud, however, about how to make a successful shift from a movement to an institution?

On a related note, Shaffer observed that the Declaration of Bailey became "institutionalized" when it was written down. He suggested that the creative, reflective *process* of writing it was more important than the final *product* and observed that the community stopped wrestling with community-defining ideas. "The people didn't leave," he asserted. "Ideas quit coming." Bawden supported that perspective with the adage: "Once a vision becomes a mission, that's good night."

Confidential F raised a similar question about institutionalization: Can organizations remain complex, adaptive systems over time or do all organizations follow a similar, linear path of evolution toward institutionalization? Strongly desiring to believe that institutionalization is not inevitable, he suggested some ways in which evolving networks can remain dynamic and vibrant over time. He asked, for instance, whether an essential part of growing a network is to have intellectual nodes? Specifically, would Bailey have followed the same path if it consistently had individuals, communities of practice, and people in leadership roles who assumed responsibility for maintaining the influx of new ideas and for encouraging Bailey scholars to examine their experience in light of

those ideas? That question led him to reflect on the role of 'strange attractors' – in physics, magnetic forces or basins of activity that pull activity toward them and create coherence (Wheatley 1992, 133-134) – in forming and maintaining communities of practice. He suggested that "nothing just happens," so people or ideas are needed to serve as the strange attractors that bring people together around shared interests. Formal leaders, he suggested, play a critical role in promoting the vitality of communities of practice in dynamic networks by either serving as strange attractors themselves, cultivating other strange attractors, or, at a minimum, allowing them to exist.

My Bailey-Inspired Experiences with Network Organization and Leadership

I have not always been so skeptical of network organization and leadership, and I still believe that its theory can improve practice, so I've tried to apply what I've learned in Bailey about network organization and leadership in other contexts. Specifically, I have tried to

- Support the development of networks of independent individuals and communities of practice connected by shared interests
- Clearly distinguish management, leadership, and organizational structure
- Hire highly competent staff
- Centralize management functions in the hands of key staff and decentralize leadership throughout networks
- Support the expression of individuals' unique leadership styles, skills, and preferences in both formal and informal leadership roles

- Match leadership roles and responsibilities with individual interests and passions
- Encourage the context-appropriate formation of both designed and emergent structure
- Act in the spirit of the principles of network leadership, including discernment, safe space, participation, dialogue, trust, transparent communication, respect, and honor
- Observe the rules of network etiquette
- Use unsettling disturbances as opportunities for growth, and
- Support a continuous influx of new ideas, new community members, and new leadership into networks.

My first attempt at applying the theory of network organization and leadership was with the Participatory Research Network (PRN) at MSU. I was a founding member of what started from the beginning as a loosely-structured network with multiple individual and communal nodes united by a common interest in participatory research. To a limited extent, individuals and self-organizing communities of practice pursued their unique sub-interests (e.g., individual research projects, a participatory research bibliography and library, a participatory research course) and connected their progress with the larger network. I and another Network co-founder assumed the roles of volunteer Network co-coordinators, and I deliberately tried to apply the principles of network leadership and observe network etiquette in that role.

For most of its life, the PRN was strictly volunteer-driven, which made it difficult for some people to commit large amounts of their time, energy, and leadership skills, though in retrospect, I'm amazed at how much volunteers invested in the Network. At one point, the PRN received a grant to pursue a number of its goals. The grant was used initially to pay individuals who were playing key leadership roles (e.g., developing the PRN web site, organizing a speaker series, managing the library, organizing a regional conference) and later was used to hire a Network coordinator, so the grant helped overcome some of the challenges associated with developing a network of volunteers.

From the beginning, there was a tension within the Network between those who were content to allow the Network to evolve naturally and organically without any specific structural goals in mind and those who wanted to institutionalize the PRN at MSU with formal management, leadership, and organizational structures. Not surprisingly, those who were by nature more comfortable with network leadership (like myself) tended to compose the former camp, and those who preferred stronger communal ties and shared leadership (like the other co-coordinator) were drawn to the latter. Arguably, the tension was healthy for much of the life of the Network, but because the Network was relatively small, the Network was eventually stymied by and then destroyed by differences between the two camps.

A contributing factor to the PRN's demise was the limited influx of new ideas, people, and leadership. Early on, the size of the Network increased at a

reasonable rate, which kept the Network energized with new energy and perspectives. But as the activities of the PRN increased, its focus was narrowed, which made it less attractive to people who had related but broader interests. This dynamic, in turn, fueled the ever-present tension between organic evolution (which would have accommodated the influx of people with diverse perspectives) and structured institutionalization (which required that the PRN limit the scope of its activities).

Eventually, the sense of safety and trust within the Network deteriorated as a result of the Network's basic tension. And then, simultaneously, both I and the other co-coordinator assumed new professional roles and had to step back from our leadership roles in the PRN. No one else stepped forward to play a central leadership role, but after a while, grant money was used to hire a Network coordinator who was new to MSU and the PRN. The new coordinator, in some ways, exacerbated the Network's tension because he clearly favored a broader Network scope, network leadership, and more organic structure. Had the coordinator possessed the necessary leadership and management skills, which, in my assessment, he didn't, he may have been able to salvage the PRN. But not long into his tenure, the PRN died a quiet death.

During the same period when I was supporting the evolution of the Participatory Research Network, I was also trying to cultivate connections among residents within my downtown neighborhood. I never explicitly suggested to my neighbors that we organize as a network, but I operated under the assumption that we

would. And in many respects we have. Our initial focus was on strengthening ties among neighbors united by a shared interest in cultivating a sense of community in our neighborhood. For a while, I organized monthly get-togethers in neighbors' homes. After a while, I grew tired of organizing the monthly get-togethers and suggested that people organize around interests on their own (e.g., movie nights, book clubs), but no one has ever taken the initiative to self-organize in that manner.

Eventually, as we began planning more sophisticated activities and publishing a newsletter, we used emergent structures like ad hoc committees to organize ourselves, and a variety of people stepped forward to assume both formal and informal leadership roles related to their interests. As the scope of our activities grew (along with our need for funding), it soon made sense to create some formal structure by incorporating as a neighborhood association and forming a neighborhood watch. Importantly, we created minimal structure in response to need rather than because that was the way all of the other neighborhoods did it. We have never, for example, held Board elections or elected officers, preferring instead to allow the Board to self-organize, to encourage leadership by rotating meeting facilitation, and to start each meeting by collaboratively creating the agenda.

Our approach to organization and leadership was tested in 2002 by a developer who wanted to build an office building in our neighborhood that most residents didn't support. Through our established networks and organization, we were

able to respond quickly and strategically, and we successfully stopped the development. That 'unsettling disturbance', which turned into a big neighborhood victory, seems to have strengthened residents' sense of ownership and sense of control and power over our neighborhood's destiny.

My neighborhood network is by no means perfect, however. As was also the case with the PRN, my neighborhood has always been dependent on my network leadership (I very consciously apply the principles of network leadership) and my management (e.g., bookkeeping, compiling newsletter information, maintaining the mailing list). In the spirit of freeing others to exert leadership in ways that are natural for them (and because I don't think anybody else has the organizational capacity to keep on top of things), I am content to continue managing neighborhood affairs. I am becoming increasingly vigilant, however, about encouraging others to assume leadership roles as I reduce my leadership responsibilities. An ongoing challenge, however, is to maintain the influx of new people and ideas – our Board is composed of a core group of committed residents, but people periodically show signs of burnout and frustration.

In contrast to my experiences with both the PRN and my neighborhood, I have played a formal, paid leadership and management role in the NorthWest Lansing Healthy Communities Initiative for the last three years. Ironically, despite my explicit attempts at operating the Initiative as a network, because I both provide strong leadership and am a paid staff person working primarily with volunteers, my attempts at creating an interconnected network have been relatively

unsuccessful. It has certainly helped to apply the principles of network leadership and to observe network etiquette (people seem to really appreciate the open, participatory, conversational, transparent, and respectful approach I use), but my overbearing leadership has left little room for others to assume leadership roles.

As a result, rather than creating an interconnected network with a variety of connections among multiple nodes, I have created an organizational structure that looks like a wheel, with me at the hub and a mix of individuals and designed and emergent structures connected to me but not to each other. The nodes of the wheel, which include volunteers, working groups, program development teams, and institutional partners, are organized by interest but demonstrate only limited levels of actual self-organization or leadership (I convene, facilitate, and organize the follow-up to each meeting).

My success with cultivating an ethos of network leadership and organization among my staff has also been limited. I have tried to hire people who are highly competent and self-directed and can therefore operate comfortably in a networked environment. I also encourage staff to organize their work in a way that complements their interests, preferences, styles, and other life priorities. Though everyone appreciates my flexibility, of the five people I've hired, only two have been comfortable operating independently and consistently take initiative to assume leadership roles. And of those two, one abused the freedom I gave him to operate independently. The rest have required much more guidance and

support and, as a result, have become liabilities for the Initiative as much as they've contributed.

On the bright side, the Initiative's network has continued to grow. The Initiative is characterized by an ongoing visioning-planning-action process, so there is a relatively consistent influx of new ideas and people. As existing programs evolve and as new programs are developed, new energy is infused into our work.

To summarize, my experiences with network organization and leadership in the Participatory Research Network, my neighborhood, and the NorthWest Lansing Healthy Communities Initiative have been a mixed bag. I have sometimes been successful at applying the principles of network leadership, observing network etiquette, creating and sustaining networks, adapting organizational structure to network needs, and decentralizing leadership. But, because, as I noted at the end of the "Things I've Learned" section above, relatively few people are comfortable operating as a network, network leadership and management skills seem to be rare, and it is difficult to maintain a consistent influx of new people and ideas, I remain skeptical about the applicability of network leadership and organization in many contexts.

What do *you* think?

Now that you've read about my experiences with network organization and leadership and been exposed to other people's responses to my perspectives, I'm very curious about your assessment of network organization and leadership

and the method I used to explore it, as well as your own experiences with it. Specifically, I have the following questions for you:

- What is your assessment of the theory of network organization, as presented in the first section of this chapter?
- What are the merits and deficiencies of network organization and leadership relative to other models of organization and leadership? Are there circumstances when network organization and leadership are more appropriate than others?
- What is your assessment of how I conveyed my experience with network organization and leadership? How was your response to this more academic chapter different from your response to Chapters 4 and 5?
- Have you experienced network organization and leadership? If so, how did your experience compare to your experience with other models of organization and leadership?
- Are there opportunities in your life to apply some elements of network organization and leadership?
- How do you *feel* after reading this chapter and pondering these questions?

CHAPTER 7: SPIRITUAL DEVELOPMENT

The quest for spiritual development has been a consistent thread throughout my life and was particularly intense when I first discovered the Bailey Scholars Program. And since Bailey claimed to cultivate 'whole person development', which I presumed included spiritual development, I was anxious to explore the spiritual dimension of Bailey scholars' growth. This chapter summarizes my experience with that exploration.

I begin by describing my pre-Bailey spiritual journey. Next, I describe the principal, most meaningful aspect of my exploration into spirituality in Bailey. I then summarize my Bailey-inspired observations about spiritual development. I conclude this chapter with a brief description of how readers responded to this chapter and of my post-Bailey spiritual journey.

As in Chapter 6, I wrote this chapter from an *ex post facto* perspective, as a summary of the state of my understanding today of my lifelong spiritual journey. And as was the case in the previous three chapters, my principal sources of data include my personal notes, my past writing, and email messages I wrote. And again I'll emphasize that this chapter is *my* interpretation of events and experiences that can and should be interpreted from multiple perspectives. That is why it is critical that I shared my initial draft with the Bailey community – and that I invite you to develop your own interpretations from my writing – so that you and others have an opportunity to inform my interpretation with yours.

This is the shortest of the four thematic chapters of my dissertation because, though I had a variety of different experiences in Bailey related to spirituality, only a few had any significant impact on my understanding of spiritual development. For instance, even though I was part of a team of Bailey scholars that made a presentation at a national conference on spirituality in work and higher education, that experience did not alter my perspectives on spiritual development. I focus this chapter only on my Bailey experiences that *did* alter my perspectives on spiritual development.

My Pre-Bailey Spiritual Journey

I was raised a Lutheran but disillusioned by the inconsistencies I perceived between what my fellow parishioners espoused and how they lived their lives. It seemed like people were Lutheran simply because that was how they were raised or because it was the socially-acceptable practice. I didn't sense any passion, any genuine desire to search or grow.

Convinced, as I was, that the answers are 'out there,' that there is a right way to live a life, it is not surprising that in the midst of my miserable college years I became a fundamentalist Christian. My reasoning was simple: I need to be a good, responsible person; God, whose presence I had consistently felt in my life, has provided some clear guidelines for how to do that; the 'rules of the game' are laid out clearly in the Bible; so all I had to do was learn the rules and follow them.

It worked for a while, but ultimately, this reasoning simply reinforced my

perfectionistic tendency to establish unrealistic expectations for myself. Once again, due to the discrepancies between how I was living and the rules I was trying to live by, I made myself miserable. I also, by the way, grew increasingly impatient with the intolerant, close-minded, self-righteous, patronizing attitude of my 'brothers and sisters,' who, as possessors of the 'truth,' condemned anyone who chose not to embrace their faith. And, for the first time, I began to question the sanctity of a book written fifty-plus years after a teacher's death and edited multiple times by men whose interest was not necessarily the world's salvation.

Hedonism 'saved' me. After I graduated and left for Cameroon to serve in the Peace Corps, I decided to free myself from the chains of fundamentalism, and, not surprisingly, I went from one extreme to another. Playing by a new set of rules – those established by my fellow volunteers and Cameroonian culture – I sought fulfillment through hard work, alcohol, and sex. I had a great time, but because I was building on a rather shallow foundation, it didn't last for long. As soon as I left my Cameroonian home, work, drinking buddies, and girlfriend, I felt an immense emptiness in my soul. The lesson I learned was that I can't afford to neglect the spiritual dimension of my life.

Yet, because of my disappointment with both popular Lutheranism and Christian fundamentalism, I was determined to renew my spiritual search with passion and intelligence but without intolerance. The next 'right answer' became the Bahá'í Faith. Consistent with my liberal tendencies, the Bahá'í Faith espouses social values like universal education, gender equality, and economic justice, and it

also tries to avoid the pitfalls of institutionalization by stressing the importance of individual investigation and by developing a decentralized, clergy-less organizational structure. The Bahá'í Faith is also a deeply spiritual religion, which satisfied my need for fulfillment.

Bailey Dialogues about Spiritual Development

When I became a Bailey scholar, the Bahá'í Faith was still one of the most significant dimensions of my life – I had just written a master's thesis that drew heavily on Bahá'í teachings, and I was a leader in the local Bahá'í community. And because I was still excited about what I had learned from my thesis, particularly about the spiritual dimension of organic processes of development, I was eager to explore the spiritual dimension of the Bailey Scholars Program.

My understanding of spiritual development at the time was based on my thesis research. In my thesis, I defined 'spirit' as "animating force(s) distinct from, yet interacting with, material and intellectual existence." Spirituality, I suggested, can be understood ontologically as a nonmaterial way of being, epistemologically as a way of knowing or a form of intelligence, and methodologically as a set of rituals or practices. In my concluding chapter, as part of my description of integral development as a holistic process of transformation, I noted that activities like prayer, meditation, fellowship (with people and natural systems), study of sacred teachings, dialogue, service, and sacrifice promote spiritual development.

Building on a conversation initiated earlier about issues of spirit as they relate to whole-person and whole-community development within the Bailey Scholars Program, I convened a group of Bailey scholars during the fall semester of 1999 to explore how to engage in dialogue about the spiritual dimension of the Bailey whole person development model. I was particularly interested in looking at ways in which spiritual development – as an integral part of whole person development – was or could be explicitly encouraged in Bailey. Consistent with the arguments I laid out in my thesis, I felt that, if we are going to claim to support whole person development, we should be more deliberate about integrating spirituality into the Program. Four faculty scholars joined me in forming an ad hoc 'spiritual development' group, including Duley, Link, and Harvey.

Interestingly, some thought that the conversation was inappropriate at a public university. Others feared that I and others would use the conversation as an opportunity to proselytize. And, not surprisingly, those of us engaged in the conversation struggled with how to share our thoughts, feelings, and beliefs about spirituality, religion, and meaning outside of our families, spiritual communities, and close circles of friends.

The conversations didn't last very long and concluded with a recommendation to expand Bailey's 'Five Questions' to include questions that are less self-centered. The Five Questions include:

- Who am I?

- What do I value?
- What is my worldview?
- How do I learn?
- How do these connect in my life?

These Five Questions had evolved as one of Bailey's fundamental 'touchstones,' along with 'threads of social and ethical development,' 'agriculture and natural resources themes,' and 'transdisciplinary analyses and approaches,' that served as the foundation of Bailey scholars' development. These touchstones were frequently highlighted at the time in course syllabi, particularly for ANR 210, and used as launching points for course activities.

The ad hoc 'spiritual development' group agreed that common among most religious and spiritual systems was an emphasis on transcending self, cultivating love for other people and creatures, and growing in awareness of the interconnectedness and interdependence of reality. And since these principles are embedded in the Declaration of Bailey, the group felt that the Bailey community should consider integrating them more deliberately into one of Bailey's fundamental touchstones. The issue was considered during a few different community conversations, but in the end, the Five Questions were left unchanged.

Spiritual Development Through Authentic Selfhood

In retrospect, I think that Bailey scholars' reluctance to change the Five Questions was rooted in an understanding that self exploration and development is not necessarily egocentric. I struggled with this until the summer of 2000,

when, as I detailed in Chapter 5, I began to realize that a focus on self doesn't have to be selfish. In fact, as Youngblood (1997), Hock (1999), and particularly Zohar (1997) and Moffet (1994) suggest (see Chapters 5 and 6), some of our most profound impacts on the world can come from a focus on our own authentic development and from an understanding that, because we are intimately connected with the rest of the web of life, by growing ourselves in a community learning environment, we are growing the world.

And that's when I returned to Palmer. During the summer of 2000, the Bailey reading circle also read Palmer's *Let Your Life Speak* (2000). Palmer's message is simple, yet it touched me profoundly:

> Before you tell your life what you intend to do with it, listen for what it intends to do with you. Before you tell your life what truths and values you have decided to live up to, let your life tell you what truths you embody, what values you represent (3).

Palmer urges his readers to seek what Frederick Buechner calls "the place where your deep gladness meets the world's deep need" (16). Like Moffet, he stresses that

> self-care is not a selfish act – it is simply good stewardship of the only gift I have, the gift I was put on earth to offer others. . . .
>
> If we are unfaithful to true self, we will extract a price from others. We will make promises we cannot keep, build houses from flimsy stuff, conjure dreams that devolve into nightmares, and other people will suffer – if we are unfaithful to self. . . .
>
> the movements that transform us, our relations, and our world emerge from the lives of people who decide to care for their authentic selfhood (30-31).

And that's what Bailey's Five Questions are all about: discovering and growing

individuals' authentic selfhood.

And by encouraging that exploration in a community learning environment, in which they can connect with others who are undertaking a similar exploration, Bailey promotes spiritual development rather than egocentricity. From Palmer's perspective, these sorts of connections are fundamentally spiritual in nature. He calls them the "live encounter of right action,"

> an encounter between the inward truth of the actor and the inward truth of the other that penetrates all external appearances and expectations. If the actor lacks self-knowledge, the live encounter will never take place, and the action will be trapped in externals (Palmer 1990, 71).

In fact, many connection points among Bailey scholars include elements of spiritual practices, like fellowship, dialogue, service, and sacrifice. And in the spaces created by these connection points, Bailey scholars can explore issues related to meaning and values that pervade our lives but that we are rarely encouraged to examine in academic settings. Bailey scholars' development – including, in many cases, their spiritual development – is an organic, emergent outcome of this process. Again, Palmer (1990) summarizes this concept nicely:

> Paradoxically, as we enter more deeply into the true community of our lives, we are relieved of those fears that keep us from becoming the authentic selves we were born to be. Community and individuality are not an either/or choice, any more than life and death are. . . .[P]eople who know that they are embedded in an eternal community are both freed and empowered to become who they were born to be (156-157).

Importantly, while Bailey explicitly seeks to encourage personal growth, it is not explicit about what growth may look like. Because growth is seen as an

organically emergent property of the Program, personal development is not planned and programmed, and there are no specific benchmarks, objectives, or goals used to measure Bailey scholars' progress. Specifically, spiritual development has never been a goal of the Bailey Scholars Program. If it were, I suspect that there would be no end to the academic and bureaucratic wrangling over what that meant, how to do it, and how to assess whether or not Bailey scholars had reached adequate levels of transcendence, and the 'spirit' of spiritual development would get lost in the process. Thankfully, that has not been the case, and some people, myself certainly included, do attribute elements of their spiritual development, including an enhanced sense of connectedness, meaning, and value to their lives, to their Bailey experiences. Which brings me to one of my favorite Bailey paradoxes: by not explicitly encouraging spiritual development as a dimension of scholars' whole person development, Bailey may actually be doing *more* to promote spiritual development.

Readers' Responses

Participants in the reading circle expressed, as Confidential A put it, "pleasant surprise" to see that I had included spiritual development in my dissertation. Link, for example, appreciated my "deep search for meaning and wisdom." At the same time, though they were happy to see that I wrote about my spiritual journey, Williams and Duley were disappointed. "I wanted more," lamented Williams, and Duley called this chapter "flat."

Reading circle participants spent a fair amount of time discussing alternative perspectives on the nature of spirituality. Bawden, for instance, defined spirituality as that which he considers to be adequately mysterious, as the dimension of his operational context about which science doesn't have – and he doesn't want – any answers. Duley, in turn, who is an ordained Presbyterian minister who studied under Neibuhr and Tillich, defined spirituality as the experience of the transcendent as imminent, as a relationship with ultimate reality that frees you to experience yourself as accepted. Similarly, Link defined spirituality as communion (with, for example, loved ones or nature) that is experiential and mysterious. Duley, in turn, stressed that spirituality is not just feeling good, that it can be unsettling. Similarly, Rothhorn raised the question: "What's the spiritual context of fear and struggle?"

In general, reading circle participants affirmed my argument that Bailey, without an overt objective to do so, encourages spiritual development. According to Link, for example, Bailey creates an environment that nurtures people toward spiritual communion. Confidential B referred to that environment as a nurturing, accepting place where Bailey scholars have freedom of expression. He also noted that all Bailey student scholars seem to be looking for meaning for or direction in life. He observed, for instance, that all of the graduating seniors alluded to their faith in their final community presentations. Similarly, Williams, who sees spirituality as the search for meaning, sees that search as a common thread among most Bailey scholars' developmental journeys. Following Maturana, Bawden shared a similar perspective using different language. He

views spirit is an innate, embedded element of the Bailey experience, as a critical part of the process of each Bailey scholar's process of "bringing forth a world." Similarly, Shaffer believes that spirit is what sustains Bailey: "It's what happens in the spaces – that's where spirit is."

Despite the central role that spirituality seems to play in Bailey scholars' experiences, they continue to struggle with how to describe it. Rothhorn observed that it is easier to talk about religion than spirituality, so many conversations about spirituality quickly turn to religion. Williams, in turn, noted that it is difficult to discuss spirituality without being reductionist, without discussing matters of the head, heart, body, and soul separately. Rothhorn agreed, suggesting that one has to approach spirituality with the heart rather than the head. He added that the reading circle (and by extension, I think, my dissertation) are limited in that way and that it is very difficult to explore the holistic reality of life in the Academy. Building on that perspective, Link observed that, while science tends to focus on the details, spirit focuses on the whole. Bawden, in turn, suggested that it's the dialectic between the two that's important and that is at the root of strong philosophical positions grounded in both a rational argument and a deontological sense of 'rightness.'

In light of the rich reading circle conversation about the nature of spirituality, Duley took me to task for focusing so much of my writing on a critique of religion. He thought that much of this chapter read as if spirituality is simply "right belief and practice." Specifically, he said that "You have not accepted yourself as

accepted by God without having to do or be something special." And the moment he told me that, I knew that he was right. At the intellectual level, I've recognized that truth for some time. But, due largely to my ongoing struggle with perfectionism (as I describe it in Chapters 1, 4, and 7), I have yet to fully operationalize that understanding in my daily life. Yet I am making progress, and I attribute much of that progress to Bailey. For one of the first and only times in my life, as a Bailey scholar I experienced a sense of being accepted simply for who I am – without judgment or expectation. That experience, in turn, helped me to be less judgmental of myself and others, which creates the space described above that nurtures people's growth and development.

Several reading circle participants thought that the Bailey community should do more to explicitly encourage spiritual development. Link, for example, observed that Bailey scholars need to learn how to engage in discourse about spirituality and suggested that Bailey scholars create an environment in which conversations about spirituality are welcome and that spirituality be made part of Bailey course content. Habron added that spirituality could be integrated into course content in the same way the community has made explicit the need for colearners to discuss different ways of knowing and multiple intelligences.

In response, Bawden shared his experience during the 1960s with work he did with undergraduates that was inspired by Rogers, Maslow, and Knowles. He and his colleagues explicitly encouraged spiritual development, and as a result, "people smiled a lot more." The students could not, however, explain their

experience. And from Bawden's perspective, that is not acceptable in the Academy because the Academy is about both development *and* scholarship. Development that leads to enlightenment is great, but according to Bawden, "You don't need the Academy to get enlightened." From his perspective, therefore, Bailey and similar academic programs should connect enlightenment and development.

My Post-Bailey Spiritual Journey

Through Bailey, I found the language to articulate and the courage to pursue authentic selfhood. That pursuit is helping me to free myself from the chains I embraced from an early age, from the 'ideal' life, from the 'right thing,' from the pursuit of perfection as defined by others. The profound irony, of course, is that the drive to liberate myself from the chains of perfectionism is fueled by perfectionism. That will probably be a paradox that I carry with me for the rest of my life.

Not surprisingly, the insights I gained as a Bailey scholar into spiritual development also led in part to my third and latest disengagement from a religious community. By the summer of 2000, I could no longer bear to allow myself or my life to be defined from the outside-in, by someone else's interpretation of what life is all about. I could no longer accept things as truth, ritual, or tradition without questioning them. Moreover, to the same extent that I found the space for growth I needed in Bailey, I was not finding it in my local Bahá'í community. I began to feel smothered by the dark side of community

grounded in 'deep ties,' like conformity, homogeneity, and group think. I found myself having to work harder and harder to motivate myself to participate in Bahá'í activities. Finally, I asked myself, "Why are you doing things that you don't want to do and don't have to do?"

Once I opened that door in my mind, a more critical view of the Bahá'í Faith also emerged. I began to see that, despite its own spiritual teachings to the contrary, the Bahá'í Faith had fallen into many of the same traps as other religions, creating the environment I found so distasteful as a Christian fundamentalist – one of self-righteousness, condescension, close-mindedness, and top-down control. This was particularly disappointing since some of the most fundamental principles of the Bahá'í Faith include religious unity, independent investigation, and decentralized administration.

I haven't been an active Bahá'í since 2000. Interestingly, I've neither embraced another religious-spiritual system nor returned to hedonism since then. In fact, I've done very little to deliberately nurture my spiritual development or otherwise fulfill myself. I guess I'm still wary of seeking or embracing another 'right' answer out there. Obsessed as ever about physical health and intrigued by tools that help to unite body, mind, and spirit, I have been dabbling with yoga since the fall of 2001. I have otherwise been focusing on being a good husband, father, land steward, neighbor, activist for peace and justice, colleague, and community leader.

I'm fairly content, but I worry about whether I'm stagnating or otherwise falling into habits that threaten my integrity. I'm at a crossroads, however, which I suspect will relaunch me on a very holistic path of development. By the end of 2003, I hope to finish my doctoral degree and will have fulfilled my current work contract. In other words, I will be free to strike out on a brand new leg of my lifelong journey. I simply hope that I am faithful to my authentic self and that I am able to find places where my deep gladness meets the world's deep needs.

What do *you* think?

More than in any of the previous chapters, I'm very anxious to hear your thoughts.

- With which spiritual traditions are you familiar?
- What is your assessment of the idea of 'spiritual development through authentic selfhood'?
- With which reading circle participants' comments do you relate? With which do you take issue?
- What has your spiritual journey looked like? Where do you anticipate it will go from here?
- Can you relate to any elements of my spiritual journey?
- How do you *feel* after reading this chapter and pondering these questions?

CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSIONS

The goal of this dissertation is to elicit insights from my experience as a Bailey scholar about ways to make this world a better place through the dynamic praxis of development. More specifically, my objective is to articulate some of the knowledge that emerged from my experience as a Bailey scholar about factors that contribute to holistic developmental processes like integral development.

It seems fitting, therefore, to conclude with insights related to both the theoretical and practical dimensions of development praxis – and about inquiry into that praxis. I begin by comparing and contrasting the *theory* of integral development and Bailey. I then focus on the tensions inherent in Bailey's *practical* attempt at cultivating transformative processes. Next, I reflect on autoethnography as a tool for gaining insight into development praxis. And I conclude with readers' general responses to my draft dissertation and a summary of my current world view and of plans I have for applying that world view in practice.

Bailey and Integral Development

Since my interest in integral development originally led me to Bailey, I thought that it would be interesting to compare and contrast the theory of integral development and Bailey. Table 2 summarizes the similarities and differences between the two.

	Integral Development	Bailey
Goals	The emergence of sustainable development practice through spiritually-inspired, systemic processes of transformation	The development of an interdependent community that encourages personal growth in a respectful, trusting environment
Ontology	Reality has material, living, intellectual, and spiritual components, all of which are interconnected and interdependent, both within and between individual systems.	People are multi-dimensional and interdependent.
Epistemology	Learning is an emergent quality of transdisciplinary praxis – the interactions among our bodies, thoughts, feelings, and spirit and those of other people and beings.	Learning is an emergent quality of collaborative, transdisciplinary praxis.
Methodology	Systems should seek balance and harmony among their material, living, intellectual, and spiritual components, and effort should be made to improve communication and to strengthen communal bonds.	Clearly articulated ethos. Diverse, self-selected, and egalitarian participation. Communal support of the inviting, safe Commons. Encouraged pursuit of self-directed, connected developmental journeys. Personal sharing among scholars.
Dynamics	A state of dynamic equilibrium is created by the interactions within and among systems. Formal and informal structure – grounded in relationships – provides stability. Chaos is created by praxis, knowledge-generation, and weakened relationships. During periodic destabilizing bifurcation points, systems sometimes disintegrate or evolve into new systems with higher states of complexity.	There is a regular influx of new scholars and new ideas. The network of scholars and communities of practice is supported by management staff, guided by the principles and etiquette of network leadership, and connected through designed and emergent structure. Unsettling disturbances both encourage and impede communal development.
Outcomes	Evolution and development – as evidenced by the emergence of new, surprising, unpredictable ideas, action, and structures – are natural, emergent qualities of the dynamic interactions between internal systemic components and among different systems.	Emergence of new, surprising, unpredictable changes in individuals, communities of practice, and the Program.

Table 2: Bailey and Integral Development

Integral development and Bailey share some key characteristics. Both presume the existence of – and support the development of – holistic, interdependent networks and therefore focus on interrelationships and communication. Both networks also tend to exist in a state of dynamic equilibrium marked by periodic destabilization that can either impede or support the network's development. And growth and transformation are emergent outcomes of the dynamics of both networks.

There are also some key differences between integral development and Bailey. Integral development, for instance, has a more specific goal (i.e., transformation of development practice) than does Bailey, whose goal is the maintenance of conditions and processes that support individual and communal development. The Bailey community trusts that if development practice needs to be transformed it will be a natural outcome of the conditions and processes that it supports.

Integral development is also more specific about the holistic nature of reality and specifically emphasizes balancing spiritual development with the development of other dimensions of systems. Bailey's experience demonstrates that the different dimensions of holistic development need not necessarily be made explicit. Instead, the Bailey community trusts that people will develop in ways appropriate for their context and their level of development.

Though both integral development and Bailey stress interdependence, integral

development is more all-encompassing than Bailey, which focuses primarily on the interdependence of people.

Self-selected membership, the regular influx of people, and the formation of communities of practice are important elements of Bailey's dynamics. Integral development doesn't address issues related to community formation.

Finally, the Bailey experience has more insights to offer than does integral development into the practical aspects of sustaining a healthy environment, maintaining open lines of communication, strengthening bonds within the network, managing and structuring a network, and providing leadership within a network.

Clearly, though integral development led me to Bailey, and though integral development and Bailey share some key characteristics, my dissertation became more than a practical exploration of integral development. My dissertation really became the next step in my lifelong quest to make this world a better place through the dynamic praxis of development. And one of the principal lessons that I learned during that stage in my journey is that much of development praxis is about embracing its inherent tensions. Which brings me to the next section of this chapter, in which I describe the tensions of Bailey praxis.

Some Tensions of Bailey Praxis

A premise of my dissertation is that theory is most useful when wedded with practical experience as praxis. That is why I chose to further investigate the theory of integral development through my reflections on my practical experience as a Bailey scholar.

In this section, I attempt to capture some of the principal insights I gained in the process. In Chapters 4 through 7, I've already summarized my insights into self-selected membership, self-directed connected development, network organization and leadership, and spiritual development. Rather than repeat myself here and risk boring both of us (you, the reader, and me), I will instead organize my thoughts around some of the central tensions that seem to be inherent in Bailey community life and, presumably, in many attempts at cultivating other forms of dynamic transformation.

The Power and Limitations of Self-Selected Membership

Self-selected membership can be a powerful tool. Learning and development can be enhanced when people self-select into learning environments. Self-selection can even be liberating for people who have had few opportunities to define for themselves the terms of their participation in a community. And if a portion of a self-selectee's time is 'bought-out,' she has more freedom to both pursue the interests that drew her to the community and make greater contributions to the community.

And yet, self-selected membership in formal educational or professional settings is rare. There are some clear practical reasons why self-selected membership isn't more common. Administrative and fiscal constraints, for instance, usually create very real limitations on the type and number of people that a program, organization, or community can accommodate. Fixed budgets, for example, limit the number of self-selectees and their appointment and compensation levels. Bailey has maneuvered around some of these constraints by giving faculty scholars partial appointments. But that practice presents a new set of challenges. For instance, if a self-selectee is somehow compensated for her contributions, how is her level of compensation determined? And should that question be answered in the same way for each person?

I suspect that there are other, less practical reasons why self-selected membership is rare. The prestige associated with a position, for instance, is directly correlated with how competitive the selection process is. So if a self-selecting program is operating within a competitive, meritocratic environment, there are strong disincentives for participation. This may be particularly true for untenured tenure-stream faculty at a university who are under tremendous pressure to demonstrate their merit by publishing peer-reviewed manuscripts and winning competitive grants within their field.

Self-selected membership, especially if one is asked to justify her self-selection, can also be threatening. Some people are more comfortable empowering others to make decisions about what they may or may not do than they are exploring

and articulating their sense of identity and purpose as it relates to their suitability for a particular program or community. Not everyone is comfortable with the level of vulnerability that self-selection may require.

Some of these challenges associated with self-selected membership may explain, in part, why Bailey has struggled to attract a steady flow of faculty scholars. Most people, for example, already have full-time responsibilities and may simply not have room in their lives to add another significant commitment. Or they may simply be turned off by the trade-off between rigor and integrity in a self-selecting community.

There are probably several other reasons – completely unrelated to self-selected membership – why Bailey hasn't been overwhelmed with faculty members interested in becoming Bailey scholars (or, as reading circle participants wondered, why some Bailey faculty scholars have disengaged). And they are worthy of some careful consideration because the number of faculty scholars available to play leadership roles has not kept pace with Bailey's need for leadership, and it has been difficult to support Bailey's ongoing evolution without a continuous influx of new faculty scholars and new leadership.

Unity in Diversity

By becoming Bailey scholars, people are embracing the principles embodied in the Declaration of Bailey: lifelong learning; a respectful, trusting environment; interdependence; personal growth. In this respect, Bailey scholars are united by

a shared ethos or frame of reference.

Yet each Bailey scholar is drawn to the community and its ethos for different reasons. In other words, the 'fit' that is explored through the self-selection process is unique and personal for each Bailey scholar. As a result, there tends to be tremendous diversity in the range of Bailey scholars and their activities.

Individual vs. Community

Closely related to the 'unity in diversity' tension is the individual-community tension that pervades Bailey. One way this tension manifests in practice is as self-directed, connected development. Many Bailey scholars find it affirming and empowering to be given permission – and to be encouraged or even 'nudged' – to pursue their own authentic, self-defined path of development. Moreover, Bailey actively supports individual development by asking scholars to formalize – or at least articulate – their developmental journey and by allowing them to express their learning and development in unconventional ways. Due largely to this encouragement and support, Bailey scholars commonly experience very holistic, meaningful, and sometimes life-changing personal growth.

To keep self-directed development from running amok, from devolving into selfish, self-centered indulgence, Bailey facilitates connections among scholars and their developmental journeys. There is a plethora of connecting points in Bailey, from a passing conversation, to temporary communities of practice like courses, working groups, and reading or writing circles, to more permanent

communities of practice like friendships and ongoing working relationships. My experience suggests that the quality of the connections among scholars is partially a function of the level of personal sharing among scholars and of the level of shared activity. High quality connections among Bailey scholars' personal journeys often catalyze or accelerate both communal and individual growth. But perhaps more importantly, by pursuing individual development as part of a community, by facing the reality of their interdependence, scholars grow to understand that 'self' extends beyond their individual identity, so they commonly become more self-less and more responsible, respectful community members.

In theory, when communities succeed at supporting individuals' authentic pursuit of their passions and identity – and at connecting individual journeys with one another – the community's organizational needs are easily met. The individual community members are highly motivated, they understand clearly their responsibilities to the community, and they find ways to simultaneously meet both community and individual needs.

In practice, however, this has not always been the case in Bailey. One challenge has been that, on their way to understanding their interdependence, individuals sometimes go through phases of individualism or selfishness and therefore neglect their communal responsibilities. Bailey's networked nature presents additional challenges. Because for most scholars Bailey is a peripheral activity, they have a limited amount of time and energy to devote to it, so they tend to

want to spend the time they have on activities of high interest. This, in turn, is compounded by the fact that Bailey has experienced a dearth of scholars available to play leadership roles in the last couple years. Additionally, network leadership is uncomfortable for many people, so they struggle to match their leadership preferences with Bailey's needs. As a result of each of these challenges, many leadership roles have either gone unfilled or been assumed by Bailey staff, and some community needs have gone unmet.

Stewardship of the Commons

The quality of Bailey's 'respectful, trusting environment' – sometimes referred to as the Bailey Commons – seems to play a critical role in community life. The welcoming, hospitable nature of the Commons makes prospective Bailey scholars feel comfortable. The physical and temporal space created by the Commons provides nearly limitless opportunities for Bailey scholars to connect their individual developmental journeys. The Commons 'homey' feeling helps to strengthen relationships among Bailey scholars. Learning seems to be facilitated by the egalitarian collegiality within the Commons, making it possible for Bailey scholars to sometimes explore deep issues related to their values and meaning. Regular, transparent communications within the Commons strengthens Bailey scholars' sense of belonging. Bailey scholars actively join communities of practice because of the Commons' participatory, collaborative nature. The 'groundedness' of the Commons makes it easier to trust the ambiguity and unpredictability of emergent processes. And the safety of the Commons – coupled with the quality of the dialogue within it – makes it possible

to have frank conversations about sometimes difficult personal and programmatic issues.

How is the quality of the Commons maintained? Who takes responsibility for its stewardship? In theory, the answer to these questions is paradoxical: no one and everyone. All Bailey scholars share responsibility for – and most have a strong commitment to – safeguarding the integrity of Bailey's respectful, trusting environment. Yet no individual(s) are 'in charge' of maintaining the Commons.

In practice, however, this isn't always necessarily true, especially as the burden of both formal and informal leadership has gradually shifted toward staff members. It is often staff rather than other community members who keep the physical Bailey space clean, invite and welcome visitors, actively facilitate connections among scholars, convene communities of practice, frame and facilitate deliberations about challenging issues, communicate with the community, and otherwise tend to the Commons.

This is less true in the Commons that is created in Bailey courses. Yes, staff members do play a critical role as course conveners, but courses are also one of the places where many other student and faculty scholars play active leadership – and stewardship – roles. And challenging roles they are. Fundamentally, the principal challenge is to find balance in the 'no one-everyone' tension. Conveners ultimately have responsibility for Bailey courses, but part of that responsibility is to help everyone in the course take leadership roles as active,

equal co-learners and stewards of the course Commons. This often means striking a balance between modeling good leadership and 'learnership' while also leaving space for others to exhibit leadership and develop their own learning styles.

From my experience, a number of practices help to maintain the quality of the Commons in Bailey courses. One is to have at least two conveners in each course so that there is some level of diversity in leadership styles, learning preferences, and personality characteristics represented. Another is for the conveners to be explicit about the assumptions they hold about the roles of students and conveners in the course. A third is to encourage personal sharing among course co-learners, so that some of the barriers created by differences in age, title, and experience begin to break down.

Praxis

The stewardship of the Commons, in part, makes Bailey praxis possible. Bailey praxis is the mutually-reinforcing interaction of theory and practice, knowing and doing, or reflection and action that permeate Bailey community life. It is the fusion of – and tension between – active learning and thoughtful reflection in Bailey courses, of content and process in networked leadership, or of policy implementation and insights from the literature in the leadership entity.

The central tension in Bailey praxis seems to be between dialogue and action[15]. Dialogue permeates Bailey community life – in classes, reading and writing circles, Wednesday lunches, and conveners' meetings. At the same time, there is a tremendous amount of activity in Bailey. Classes take trips, do research, invite guest speakers, plan events, and so forth. Many Bailey scholars are very action-oriented and are drawn to Bailey because of all the interesting things going on. They sometimes grow impatient with Bailey's 'cumbersome' process. Others find that there is very little space for dialogue in their lives and are drawn to Bailey because it provides regular opportunities for thoughtful conversation. They, in turn, are sometimes exasperated with Bailey's frenetic pace of activity.

Emergence

As I explained in Chapter 3, emergent properties are those characteristics of a system that are unique to the system at the level of the whole ensemble. They are characteristics of a different state or level of new complexity. Evolution, on the other hand, is a dynamic process of development. Evolutionary processes create emergent properties. 'Emergence,' as commonly used in Bailey, refers to the evolution of new emergent properties – the process of change that results in a new level of complexity or a new system.

---

[15]I recognize that, particularly in the context of a discussion of praxis, the distinction between dialogue and action is artificial and reductionist. Dialogue, for instance, is a form of action, and action requires ongoing communication and reflection. I discuss them separately simply to punctuate the tensions between them inherent in praxis.

Starting in 1998, 'trust emergence' became somewhat of a Bailey mantra as people began to recognize and appreciate the outcomes of ethos-based praxis within the Bailey Commons. As Bailey scholars tried to live the Declaration of Bailey by fusing dialogue and action within a respectful, trusting environment, the Bailey Scholars Program gradually evolved – oftentimes in very surprising ways. Rather than developing and implementing a strategic plan, Bailey scholars 'made the path as they walked it,' as Horton and Freire (1990) might say. Examples of surprising, emergent characteristics of the Program include self-selective admissions, the Declaration of Bailey, and new and evolving organizational structures.

It is not easy to trust emergence. I, and many other people, as products of a culture driven by clearly-defined goals, objectives, and plans, have trouble 'going with the flow' without expectations and preconceived notions about outcomes. We want to know where we're going. We want to control or direct the process. We aren't used to operating within ethos-based, respectful, trusting environments that try to place equal value on both action and reflection, so we are slow to trust other people and organic processes.

When we are able to 'trust emergence,' there are often some clear benefits. In the classroom, for instance, emergent learning partially frees conveners from the burden of control and enables learners to situate their learning – to ground it in their current life context. Emergent learning also leaves room for surprise and discovery, for learners to discover new interests, to explore new facets of their

identity, or to learn about things they had never before considered investigating. This can be particularly powerful when classes explore challenging social or political issues. Students who may never enroll in a class or attend a lecture about race, class, or gender, for instance, may openly explore issues related to inequality in a class of trusted colearners whose learning path naturally moved in that direction.

It isn't always safe, of course, to trust emergence, and sometimes when we do, emergence proves untrustworthy. Graduation ceremonies must be planned, scholars must be recruited, and budgets must be developed. While elements of emergent design can be integrated into these activities and others like them, they also require goals, plans, and direction.

It is also important to remember that emergence isn't anarchy. Emergence is most trustworthy when the process is ethos-driven, when people actively steward critical elements of the Commons, and when the delicate tensions of praxis are balanced. It sometimes takes more effort – though different sorts of effort and skill – to trust emergence than it does to develop a strategic plan.

Structure vs. Flexibility

The tensions inherent in emergent development are related to another consistent tension in Bailey community life: the tension between structure and flexibility. As noted immediately above, it usually works best to 'trust emergence' when structure and flexibility are well balanced.

This is certainly the case in Bailey courses. On the one hand, blank course calendars and shared responsibility for learning leave colearners free to map out their own unique, situated, collaborative learning journey. On the other, ethos-inspired principles and basic course requirements articulated in the syllabus, along with a regular meeting schedule and conveners who assume some level of responsibility for the quality of the shared experience, provide the required structural framework for learning. If colearners err on the side of excessive freedom and flexibility, they risk wasting time due to lack of organization or losing motivation due to lack of rigor and progress. If, in contrast, colearners err on the side of excessive organization and structure, they risk eliminating opportunities for unplanned, surprising learning and growth.

To some extent, the principles and etiquette of network leadership represent a healthy balance between structure and flexibility. They are applied most successfully, for instance, when there is enough structure – including skilled formal leaders – to provide an adequate number of safe spaces for discernment and dialogue, to convene and support communities of practice, to maintain transparency through open communication, to respect the community's time, and to honor communal decisions. Flexibility is also requisite, however, to allow for self-selecting participation in communities of practice, to accommodate the high transaction costs of network leadership, and to trust the emergent nature of community deliberations.

Similarly, formal staff leadership positions require an appropriate structure-

flexibility balance. When I was a Fellow, I made the mistake of favoring flexibility over structure in the definition of my roles and responsibilities. Embracing the theory of network leadership and self-directed development, I focused most of my energies on community needs that intersected with my interests. I failed to recognize, however, the community's need for structured leadership from staff. That is, Bailey needed staff to assume formal leadership roles that were otherwise going unfilled. And since I didn't always do that, the burden fell primarily on the Chair/Director and the ALC. As a result, the flexibility of their roles and responsibilities was minimized, which made their work less fulfilling, which, in turn, negatively impacted the community.

The tension between structure and flexibility is also present in Bailey's organization. Again, balance seems to be the key, and that 'balance' has looked different during various stages in Bailey's development. And there have probably been times when things were out of balance. For instance, in 1999 and 2000, Bailey seemed to have outgrown some semi-permanent, designed working groups that continued to meet but were no longer meeting Bailey's needs. It was around that time that more emergent, ad hoc working groups, which were flexible enough to adapt to quickly changing needs and circumstances, became the norm. At the other extreme, during 2001, while the Leadership Space was struggling along as one of the two remaining pieces of semi-permanent organizational structure, Bailey's organizational needs far outpaced the capacity of the existing structures.

Reflections on the Research Process

I feel very lucky to have stumbled upon autoethnography. It turned out to be very well-suited to both my world view and to inquiry into my lived experience with the praxis of development as a Bailey scholar. Autoethnography gave me permission and the tools to explore the interplay among my experience, the Bailey Scholars Program, and the theory of development praxis.

Before I began writing, my understanding of authoethnography's philosophical assumptions was mostly theoretical. After having completed the writing and having *lived* the theory, I embrace those assumptions even more wholeheartedly. Specifically, based on my experience as a Bailey scholar and as an inquirer into the nature of Bailey's dynamics, I believe ontologically that social reality is intersubjectively co-created, that Bailey is constantly created through the interactions among Bailey scholars, that it is simultaneously an objective 'thing' Bailey scholars know and love and a subjective experience unique to each Bailey scholar.

I have also confirmed for myself epistemologically that much can be learned about processes of development – in a general sense – from the specific, contextually situated, unique experiences of Bailey scholars. Bailey isn't a model to be replicated elsewhere or from which we can generalize truths that are applicable in all contexts, but elements of universal principles of development praxis are revealed through Bailey.

And finally, methodologically, I have witnessed the emergence of insight and knowledge from varied levels of engagement, reflexive subjectivity, and written expression. As Lincoln, Denzin, and Richardson suggest is possible (see Chapter 2), writing became for me a way of knowing, a method of discovery and analysis of both myself and the Bailey Scholars Program. When forced to reflect on my experience and to capture it in words, I found that I was able to articulate what I learned as a Bailey scholar in ways I never had before. In the process, I had to confront the tensions and paradoxes inherent in much of Bailey life. And because I was writing about my active engagement from a temporal distance, I was able to examine previously-held beliefs more critically and to be much more open to seeing multiple dimensions of Bailey's tensions.

Perhaps most importantly, however, this autoethnographic writing process confirmed for me the limits of individual experience and reflection and the importance of critical dialogue. After completing the initial draft of my dissertation, I felt like I had just begun to scratch the surface of the well of knowledge generated by Bailey and looked forward to the deeper insights that would emerge from conversations among Bailey scholars about my work. And I was not disappointed. The rich nature of the reading circle dialogue helped me bring my thinking to a new level and resulted in significant revisions and additions to my initial draft.

Though I embrace the philosophical underpinnings of autoethnography more fervently now than ever, I found that I altered my writing methods somewhat from

how I originally proposed. For instance, I originally thought that my 'inside-out,' journal-like writing would be much more creative than it turned out to be. Specifically, I thought I'd be more playful and inventive with different writing techniques. But I quickly realized that what emerged as I wrote is simply a product of who and where I am at this point in my life. And who I am is *not* a creative writer and *not* a great storyteller. Who I am *is* someone who is most comfortable with the big picture, the gestalt. So when I reflect on past experiences, the details escape me, but what sticks with me is the larger meaning I derived from the experience. So, rather than try to be something I'm not (and probably write a bunch of garbage in the process), I tried to produce a quality product the way I know how.

Probably because I have so much formal schooling, the heady, outside-in writing came much more easily for me. At the same time, however, I found myself resisting the academically-trained voices in my head telling me that I should integrate more literature-based insights into my writing. Was I simply being lazy, or was there something to my resistance? I'll let you decide. Here are the arguments I devised against pouring through the literature to find theory that supported or contradicted the 'findings' emerging from my writing:

- In the spirit of autoethnography, I should only include references to literature that I was exposed to as part of my experience as a Bailey scholar. The fatalistic side of me would add that the literature that I needed crossed my path when I needed it.
- This dissertation is not intended to be a definitive study of transformation

processes, integral development, or Bailey. Rather, I see it as an opportunity for dialogue, to connect with other people's knowledge and favorite literature.

- In that light, it is more important that my writing connect with you – my reader – than with the literature. You will be more engaged to the extent that I am writing authentically rather than academically. And the more citations I crowd into my writing, the more prone your eyes are to glaze over.
- I'm interested in *practical* examples of holistic development because the world desperately needs them. Connecting with more literature won't necessarily make it any easier for me or others to apply what I've learned in practical settings.
- I don't need to justify or legitimize my learning with citations from the literature. My learning is my learning, regardless of what the literature may or may not say. Tompkins, writing about her own experience with autoethnography, feels the same way: "Now I realize that this refusal to read about my subject *was* my subject. It came from a need to finally trust myself. It was to my own experience that I needed to turn for enlightenment" (Tompkins, xii; emphasis in original).
- There's always more literature that is potentially related to my findings. I have to stop some time, and now is as good a time as any.

Readers' Responses

Over the course of the three reading circle sessions, participants made a number of comments that were related more to my whole dissertation than they were any individual chapter. I summarize those comments here.

A couple people expressed appreciation for the work I'd done. Link remarked that my dissertation is unique as a reflection on one's whole time as a Bailey scholar. Similarly, Confidential A noted that it is nice to have articulated what is intuitive for her. I observed that several reading circle participants, while reading my draft dissertation, were reminded of how much they value Bailey, how important it is to them that it thrive, and how they'd like to apply lessons from their Bailey experiences in other contexts. For example, on a few different occasions, reading circle participants raised questions like: "What is the future of Bailey, and is it sustainable?" Along similar lines, Confidential A noted that she wished she knew how to bring Bailey's spirit elsewhere, and Habron expressed the desire to use his Bailey experience to help a variety of communities function well.

Duley made some interesting observations regarding the nature of communities. He suggested that community is a gift that is given when people work together toward a common goal. He stressed that community should not be the goal, that it can't be intentionally fabricated. Instead, community forms naturally when people focus on a common ethos rather than on themselves or on the community. Duley observed that Bailey was so successful in allowing

community to form that, when he first connected with Bailey and embraced its ethos, he was immediately accepted. He cautioned, however, that based on his experience, communities typically get in trouble as soon as they have to create structures to maintain it.

Bawden shared some reflections on the "content-process challenge" in programs. He observed that, when the process is the content (as is arguably the case with Bailey), few people grasp it. Moreover, it is difficult to point to anything (other than the program's zealots) that demonstrates its value; "It's not circumspect. There's nothing to circumscribe," he observed. He noted that an innovative program he directed at the University of Hawkesbury survived by connecting students to off-campus communities. In that way, the program became about people developing 'out there' rather than students developing 'in here.' Shaffer responded by suggesting that Bailey, because it is embedded in the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, is a combination of content and process. From his perspective, the relationship between people and natural resources plays a critical role in grounding Bailey scholars in 'reality.'

Bawden responded by noting that the centerpiece of the Declaration of Bailey is lifelong learning, not natural resources, and that lifelong learning can be "incestuous." He thinks that a term like "betterment" is more appropriate as an organizing theme because it brings with it some level of critique and engagement. Duley added that, in that spirit, service learning forces people to confront their values through encounters with the world and reminded reading

circle participants that the connected dimension of Bailey extends beyond other Bailey scholars to include people and communities outside Bailey and MSU. Link suggested that perhaps "for the common good" should be added to the Declaration of Bailey.

From Past to Future Practice and Inquiry

In the spirit of autoethnography, rather than conclude my conclusion with recommendations for other people's future research and practice, I am going to conclude instead by articulating my current world view, which both emerged from my past (especially my Bailey) praxis and portends my future endeavors.

So now, without further ado, allow me to present "Development According to Ron":

> Cultural transformation is fueled by faith in and the cultivation of authentic selfhood. Selfhood, in the genuine sense, is not individual. An expanded understanding of self – that is, a physical, intellectual, emotional, and spiritual understanding – ultimately leads to a greater understanding of the interdependence of creation, of one's relationships with the rest of the complex web of life. As this understanding grows, creation becomes less of an objective reality 'out there' or a purely subjective reality 'in here' – and more of an intersubjective experience that is co-created by our selves, other people, and the natural world.
>
> Authentic, intersubjective selfhood is expressed in those places where individuals' deep gladness meets the world's deep needs. Those places are nexuses – links, connections, or points of engagement – within self-selecting communal development networks that are driven by self-directed yet connected praxis. 'Praxis' simply describes that state of unified reflection and action – that is, learning and doing – in which humans exist. Nexuses of authentic selfhood are cultivated through fellowship, sharing, dialogue, reflexive criticality, meditation, creative expression, communion with nature, service, sacrifice, and other forms of

> praxis that integrate and harmonize the material, cognitive, affective, and divine dimensions of creation.
>
> Communal development networks tend to be united by a shared, value-driven vision or frame of reference and support inviting, nurturing environments in which superficial distinctions are blurred. They are contextually-situated and tend to resemble the living, self-organizing systems of which they are a part and that exist in a state of dynamic equilibrium at the edge between order and chaos.
>
> Dynamism is fueled by the constant influx of diverse individuals, new knowledge, and individual and communal praxis. Stability is maintained by leadership – exhibited as discernment, collaboration, trust, transparent communication, respect, honor, and stewardship of the nexuses, the networks, and the frame of reference – and by the situation-appropriate, flexible, responsive managerial and organizational structures that evolve out of communal praxis. Individuals, and the communal development networks of which they are a part, continually evolve in ways that cannot and should not be pre-determined and planned. Out of these evolutionary processes emerge new, surprising forms of practice, structure, theory, and levels of consciousness, all of which, ultimately, transform individuals, communities, organizations, cultures, and the world.

In my original draft, that was it. That was the end of my dissertation. I had originally planned to write an epilogue in which I described a pipe dream Williams and I have for how to express that world view in practice, but I ran out of steam and figured that the articulation of my world view was enough. But Williams and Duley wouldn't have it. During the reading circle, they insisted that I conclude with a concrete example application of this world view, with an answer to the questions "Where does this lead me in practice? What might this world view look like in practice?" I'm glad they were so adamant because I really did want to begin getting my future plans down in writing, and my defense process will allow me to get some initial feedback from people about the feasibility of those plans. So here goes.

Williams and I have been calling our pipe dream for the next stage in our lives "the Commons." In the most general sense, the Commons is a physical place, a space designed to both bring people together and to encourage individuals to find ways to unite their deep gladness with the world's deep needs. The concept for the Commons is inspired largely by Bailey but also by other innovations like Highlander Folk School in Tennessee, Schumacher College in England, the White Dog Café in Philadelphia, and Greystone Inn and Bakery in New York City.

Some key characteristics of the Commons, not all of which it may initially have but toward which it will be striving, include:

The Commons should be welcoming, inviting, and comfortable. People should feel drawn to the Commons, whether by its physical appeal, the activities it sponsors, or by the opportunities it offers for learning and growth. The decor should be warm and friendly yet beautifully accented by the work of local, multi-cultural artists. There should be a space and amenities for everyone, whether you are drawn to coffee shops, pubs, bookstores, family rooms, cybercafes, or patios. And people of all ages and abilities should feel accommodated. There should be toys and a play space for children, and people with physical disabilities should be able to maneuver easily. Populations that are underrepresented within the membership should be actively recruited.

The Commons should be alive with activity. It should be open from early in

the morning until late at night, providing fresh, healthy food and beverages, space for meetings and other gatherings, and a full schedule of learning and entertainment opportunities like lectures, film screenings, poetry readings, concerts, and plays. The Commons should serve as an incubator that inspires people to generate and act on new dreams and plans.

Participation in the Commons should be open to anyone. A sliding scale membership and pricing system should be implemented, including opportunities to earn discounts with volunteer work in support of the Commons. Members should receive discounts on products and services offered by the Commons. Because a primary goal of the Commons is to promote growth and service, fees should not be charged for responsible use of the space or facilities, though there may be admission fees for concerts and performances to cover the costs of the musicians and artists.

A variety of forms of learning and development should be encouraged. The Commons should be equipped with a library, a book store, computer equipment, art and music studios, a meditation room, and a performance stage. And it should sponsor lectures, panel discussions, training workshops, short courses, study circles, book clubs, classes, and retreats. I wouldn't be surprised if it eventually birthed an unschool for both children and adults.

The free and critical exchange of ideas and genuine dialogue should be promoted. Debate should be discouraged. My natural inclination is to make the

Commons an incubator for progressive, left-wing ideas and activists, but I know (at least intellectually) that society will be better served if all perspectives are welcome. We need to learn to listen to and learn from people who embrace different views and values than we do, so none of us are served if people from all points on the political spectrum don't feel welcome in the Commons. Toward that end, deep listening, critical reflection, and other dialogue techniques should be encouraged and, as necessary, taught or institutionalized in practice. The cultivation of deeper understanding, informed by a variety of perspectives, should be the overriding goal.

Members should be encouraged to actively pursue – and to share insights from – their developmental journeys. Members should be matched with partners or mentors who support them in their journeys, staff time should be dedicated to helping members develop and follow-through on developmental plans, and 'sharing time' should be set aside on a regular basis. Naturally, a variety of forms of sharing – written, oral, artistic, technology-based – should be encouraged.

Connections among members of the Commons should be actively cultivated. Staff time should be committed to facilitating the formation of communities of practice and to training members of those communities with convening skills. Mechanisms should be created to foster collaboration among members with similar interests. And groups of members who don't know each other and aren't necessarily aware of any common interests should be

encouraged to join minimally-structured 'courses' whose agendas are allowed to organically emerge.

Fellowships should be provided to people who would like to carve time and space out of their lives to pursue new areas of growth or service. Fellowships could be used, for example, to buy-out part of a professional's time so that she take a mini-sabbatical to launch a new community project, by a new parent to spend more time with his new child, by an artist who needs to cover her basic living expenses while completing a project, or by a member who simply wants to play a more active role in the leadership or management of the Commons.

Grants and a revolving loan fund should be used to support entrepreneurial activism, sustainable business development, and other investments in individual and community development. I wouldn't be surprised if the Commons eventually birthed a charitable foundation and a community development credit union.

The Commons' physical home should reflect an appreciation for the interconnectedness and interdependence of creation. A participatory charette could be used to develop the original design. Ideally, the Commons should be built (or renovated) and furnished with recycled, nontoxic materials. It should be warmed, cooled, and powered by non-polluting technologies like wind turbines, photovoltaics, and solar panels. It should have a closed waste stream,

including comprehensive composting and grey water systems. To the extent possible, it should be capable of producing its own, organic, multi-ethnic food with gardens and greenhouses on the property or roof-top. Food that isn't produced on the premises should be purchased from small, local, organic farms. It should be within easy walking distance from a major bus line and be equipped with lots of bike racks. Discounts on food, merchandise, and services should be given to people who don't drive to the Commons.

The Commons should be structured as a cooperative non-profit organization governed by the principles of network leadership. Designed structures should include a member-elected, term-limited Board of Trustees as well as a variety of committees, working groups, and program development teams. Commons operations should be transparent, and a variety of opportunities should be provided for members to provide input into – and to play active roles in determining – the Commons' development. There should be no limit to the number, type, and nature of emergent structures created by self-organizing members of the Commons.

All members of the Commons should be expected to play leadership roles well-suited to their interests, skills, and preferences. Naturally, some will play formal leadership roles, while others will play informal roles. Everyone, however, should be encouraged to be responsible stewards of both the Commons and their own developmental journeys.

The Commons should be managed by paid staff, including but not limited to people with explicit responsibilities for personnel, facilities, programming, technology, administration, finances, supporting individuals in their developmental journeys, cultivating connections among members, introducing members to new ideas and approaches, and other key dimensions of the Commons.

'Employees' of the Commons should include paid staff, interns, AmeriCorps volunteers, and apprentices. Effort should be made to have the staff reflect global cultural diversity. Staffing decisions should be made with two goals in mind: 1) to meet the needs of the Commons and 2) to create as many living wage jobs that promote employees' personal and professional development as possible. All paid staff should receive full benefits, including health, profit sharing, and savings plans, and management staff should not make more than four times the wage of the lowest paid employee. And all employees should be required to spend ten percent of their work time pursuing their own developmental journey.

Sources of income would include grants; loans; memberships; sales at the café, pub, restaurant, and book store; contracts from government and human service agencies for job training and other services; and eventually consulting fees. It is critical that the Commons be able to generate enough income itself to sustain core operations and that it not be dependent on any single source of income. As a non-profit, revenues that exceed expenses should be used to

provide fellowships and grants.

My vision for the Commons, in short, is that it foster cultural transformation through the creation and support of networks of people seeking authentic selfhood. By bringing a diversity of people, ideas, and activity together in a hospitable, mindful, leaderful, and flexibly-structured environment, I hope that the Commons fosters individual and communal evolution out of which emerge elements of a better world.

What do *you* think?

I began this dissertation with an invitation to discourse about the many issues it raises. I hope that you have taken that invitation seriously, that you have tried to engage with my writing as part of your own genuine search for meaningful development. More specifically, I hope that you have engaged at multiple levels – that is, with the content, with my autoethnographic approach, and as the author of your own story about your experiences with and knowledge of development. In that spirit, I conclude with a final series of questions designed to encourage multiple levels of engagement:

- What insights into to the dynamic praxis of development did you gain from my dissertation?
- What is your assessment of my development world view?
- What is your assessment of the Commons? Will it be attractive to people from a variety of different socioeconomic and cultural backgrounds? Does it need to be in a large enough metropolitan area to be able to sustain

itself with the requisite human and financial resources? Can enough people with an appreciation for network organization and with network leadership skills be found to keep the Commons growing?

- What is your final assessment of autoethnography as an approach to inquiry? Has your assessment changed as you read through my dissertation?
- Might your approach to future inquiry change after reading my dissertation?
- In your experience with developmental processes, have you seen the same tensions that I describe in this chapter?
- What's your development world view?
- Would you like to help me create the Commons?
- What would your autoethnography look like?
- How do you *feel* now that you've arrived at the end of my dissertation?

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: FEBRUARY 1999 ENVISIONMENT

"Finding a Place in the Bailey Experiment in Transcendence"

Ever since I first heard about the Bailey Scholars program, I have wanted to be a part of it. It is the first organization that I have encountered that not only espouses many of the principles and values that I hold most dear but is also able (or at least trying) to translate them into reality through practice. I hope to spend most of my life working in support of communities like Bailey. I expect that, as a part of Bailey, I will be able to contribute toward creating a systemic learning environment and, in the process, better prepare myself for participating in other, similar communities in the future.

Below, I have tried to articulate my vision for finding a place in Bailey from five different perspectives: Bailey and Transcendence, Bailey and My Research, What Has Led Me to Bailey: A Bit about My Background, Bailey in My Personal Learning Plan, and Engaging Bailey.

Bailey and Transcendence

In part, I am attracted to Bailey because of its *transcendent* qualities:

Transcending Disciplines and Careerism: The Self-Directed Learning Plan encourages Bailey scholars to bridge their personal and professional goals by initiating a *lifelong* process of *holistic* life planning. As is already being discussed in the Commons, I think that it is a great idea if all Bailey

scholars (including faculty) develop their own learning plan if they haven't already. These plans have the potential to free Bailey scholars from the oftentimes narrow, self-centered, and unfulfilling track of discipline-focused, career-based decision-making.

Transcending Objectivism: In every dimension – its administration, courses, research, and service – Bailey is moving away from treating subject material, students, and faculty as objects. Rather, Bailey is by definition *participatory* in most everything it does. In fact, it could easily be characterized as an experiment in *participatory research*.

Transcending Uni-Dimensional Growth: The Whole-Person Development Model encourages not only *intellectual* growth, but also *emotional*, *physical*, *social*, *spiritual*, and whatever other kind of growth one can think of.

Transcending both Theory and Practice: By injecting the thought that emerges from reading circles, Wednesday lunches, and colloquys into the normal activity of classes, research, and service, Bailey scholars integrate theory and practice as *reflective praxis*.

Transcending Individualistic Competition and Hierarchy: By focusing on *learning* and *transformation* rather than on grades and evaluation and by creating an *egalitarian*, *interdependent* organization in which all are learners, scholars, partners, and friends, Bailey is demonstrating the synergistic effects of creating true *community*.

Transcending Leadership: The *collaborative*, *consensual* decision-making processes Bailey uses empowers everyone as a leader and contributor.

Transcending Egocentrism, Technocentrism, and Ecocentrism: Bawden describes four world views from which only the one – *holonocentrism* – can each of the others be adopted. Bailey is developing such a subjective and holistic world view that embraces the whole rather than only the reductionist "self" of egocentrism, the objectivist "machine" of ecocentrism, and the reductionist and objectivist "part" of technocentrism.

Clearly, when I use the word "transcend", I use it to mean both rising "above" and moving "across". We can all vertically transcend outmoded ways of thinking and doing as well as we can transcend horizontal gaps between us and in our understanding. I also like to think of transcendence in the context of *systemic emergence*. When systems emerge, they both transcend and include their predecessors. I think this fits Bailey rather nicely – Bailey somehow manages to remain inclusive while stretching the frontiers of contemporary teaching, learning, and scholarship.

Bailey and My Research

Interestingly, Bailey also resembles very closely the systemic process of "integral development" that I described in my master's thesis. I developed a theoretical model of this process that was grounded in the writings of the Bahá'í Faith and the work of Parker Palmer, Richard Bawden, and Ken Wilber. It is the mutually-reinforcing internal (i.e., the realm of the head and the heart) and external (i.e., the realm of action and observation) drive by both individuals and communities toward greater self-transcendence – that is, toward the evolution and

manifestation of the unifying spirit of creation. This evolutionary drive is a process of meditative, consensual, integrated, and epistemic praxis. In the process, relationships among individuals and between individuals and the rest of the organic world are strengthened. Balanced material and spiritual development emerges out of these complex, systemic interactions.

In my dissertation research, I hope to engage in and document this process of integral development with a community committed to horizontal organizational structures, balanced spiritual and material development, consensual decision-making, critical learning, and individual and community transformation. The Bailey community is a natural candidate for my research.

What Has Led Me to Bailey: A Bit about My Background

I was born and raised in California but haven't spent much time there since I took my first conscious step on my learning journey. That journey began at Dartmouth College, where I subjected myself to a crash course in the status quo. It was a relatively miserable experience (though my academic records may indicate otherwise) because of the great disconnect I felt between how I was spending my time (reading and writing but not thinking very much in order to make the grade) and who I really was. I survived only because I was able to spend three of my eleven quarters off-campus (two in foreign study programs in Germany and Hungary), because of the rare moments of classroom-induced excitement, and because I knew there wasn't much else for me to do without the piece of paper they'd give me if I survived for four-years. In 1991, I completed

my very un-Bailey-like experience with a degree in history with a specialization in international studies. My undergraduate experience was one of the most disempowering experiences of my life in large part because I never connected it with who I was and who I wanted to be. One of the things that excites me about Bailey is that it is potentially very empowering for all involved.

Needless to say, I was anxious to leave Hanover and get onto something more relevant and interesting. Of the many possibilities that I considered, the only one that genuinely interested me was the Peace Corps because it was in line with my interests in serving and in immersing myself in another culture. Without going into all of the details, I had a wonderful time as an aquaculture extension agent, volunteer leader, and trainer for the Peace Corps in Cameroon and Gabon. In contrast to my Dartmouth experience, my time with the Peace Corps was incredibly empowering because I was given the opportunity and responsibility to make the most of a challenging experience. (In fact, I felt so empowered in Cameroon that it was there where I adopted my fashionable(?) yet functional hair style.) If it weren't for a broken bone in my hand, I would probably still be in Cameroon working with farmers and drinking palm wine.

By the time I came back to the States (1994), I was convinced that I wanted to pursue a career in international agricultural development and knew that I needed another credential (i.e., a master's degree) to do it. With unpleasant memories of my undergraduate years still fresh in my mind and committed to life as a practitioner, I was not looking forward to returning to the world of academe. After

a great deal of research, however, I was lucky enough to find a department called Resource Development at MSU. Of the many academic programs I looked at, it was the only one that embraced interdisciplinary scholarship, dealt with cross-cutting issues of development and the environment, and called its graduates "scholar-practitioners". Better yet, it was at one of the few schools in the States with strong programs in international development. adult learning, and sustainable agriculture, my primary interests at the time. I enrolled in RD in 1996.

I got more than I bargained for in Resource Development and at MSU. Thanks to the friendship and mentorship of some fantastic faculty (most of whom are already Bailey scholars), my graduate experience has been (with a few exceptions) exciting and transformative. One of the best learning experiences of my life was the process of writing my thesis because, like my time with the Peace Corps, I was given the opportunity and responsibility to face a very challenging endeavor; moreover, I was doing research about a topic that I find extremely interesting and important. Many of my courses have also been good learning experiences because I was engaged on equal terms in a collaborative exploration. In fact, I'm so happy here that I am sticking around to get a PhD, which is something I would never in my wildest dreams have expected to do before coming to MSU.

Although my experience at MSU has been for the most part positive, some aspects of it bring back memories of my disempowering time at Dartmouth.

Some courses, for instance, have proven totally irrelevant and disempowering because I was treated as a depository into which the professor's knowledge and wisdom could be poured. Moreover, I always find it interesting yet discouraging how the process of becoming a student somehow disempowers professionals who have a wealth of experience and knowledge to share. I am looking forward to joining the Bailey community in which I will be professionally re-empowered while also learning how to contribute toward creating an environment that empowers others.

Outside of the formal classroom, I keep myself busy with a variety of other things. During one of my short stints in California after the Peace Corps, I met and married Sasha Williams, who has a degree in ethnic studies, is working on a degree in music, and is hoping to combine her two areas of interest doing work to bring people of diverse backgrounds together through the arts. Sasha and I recently bought a home in an area of downtown Lansing targeted as a "Renaissance Zone" and are working with our neighbors to start a neighborhood organization. We are also both very active in the local Bahá'í community.

Since coming to MSU, I have worked in the management office of the Bean/Cowpea Collaborative Research Support Program. I have also been heavily involved with the Michigan State Sustainable Agriculture Network (formerly known as the Sustainable Agriculture Discussion Group) and just began my second year as the Network's coordinator. I am also a founding member of the MSU Participatory Research Network, have served as the

Resource Development representative to the Council of Graduate Students, and am on the Advisory Council of Ecological Agriculture Services, a non-profit organization that helps young people find apprenticeships on farms. I also am currently or have been a member of Michigan Integrated Food and Farming Systems (MIFFS), Michigan Agricultural Stewardship Association (MASA), East Lansing Food Coop, Growing in Place Community Farm, the "University in Transition" Colloquy organizing committee, and the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources Graduate Committee. On a more personal note, I am a vegetarian and vermiculturalist, and I enjoy swimming, backpacking, music, gardening, film, and volleyball.

Bailey in My Personal Learning Plan

I recently updated my *curriculum vitae* and came up with the following as an objective: "To serve as a member of a collaborative team that is working to nurture the holistic development of community learning systems." I am tired of simply 'working' and would like to spend my time *serving*; I am tired of feeling like a lonely cog in a machine or a unit on an organizational tree and dream about being part of a *team*; I am tired of reporting my activities according to predefined objectives and tasks and would rather be facilitating a process of *organic change*; I am tired of being evaluated solely for my ability to think, write, and read-between-the-lines and would like to feel the rewards of *balanced* intellectual, emotional, relational, and spiritual *development*; and I am tired of watching the world spin its wheels on the way to disaster and would like to help it *emerge* its way into something better.

In the short term, this means that I would like to be part of the Bailey Scholars Program; learn more about and practice participatory research; spend as much time keeping my spirit healthy through prayer and meditation as I do keeping my body healthy through exercise; serve my spiritual community; spend time with friends and family, make new friends, and think about enlarging my immediate family; play an active part in the integral development of my new neighborhood; create a model of permaculture in my new yard; serve as an apprentice on a farm; and find a community with which I can do my dissertation research.

In the longer term, my dream is to work closely with Sasha as part of a rural learning community that is nurturing integral development somewhere in the less-industrialized world. I also hope to be able to raise children somewhere where English isn't spoken and gardens are more common than televisions.

Engaging Bailey

I see a number of ways in which I can directly contribute toward Bailey's development. For starters, I would hope that my experience with development, adult learning, and program coordination will prove to be useful assets for Bailey. As a resident of downtown Lansing and the coordinator of the MSAN, I can also help Bailey scholars interested in urban or agricultural development make connections for internships or other experiential components of their learning plans.

There are also at least three dimensions of the Bailey Model that I am interested

in exploring more explicitly with the Bailey community. The first is its systemic nature. I have found (particularly through my master's research work) that systems concepts help me to simplify and understand dynamics and processes that are otherwise nearly incomprehensible. I am interested in applying some of these concepts that I understand theoretically in a very practical setting. I hope to begin by participating in the reading circle discussing Wheatley's *Leadership and the New Science*.

The second dimension of Bailey that intrigues me and that I would like to explore with the Bailey community is its spiritual dimension. I am interested in exploring with Bailey scholars questions like: What is spirit? What gives us meaning? How do we nurture our own spiritual development? What does the spiritual dimension of the Bailey learning model look like? How can we facilitate the balanced material and spiritual development of the Bailey community and its members? Jim Bingen recently shared with me some information he found at the AAHE meeting about the "Education as Transformation" project, a national project on religious pluralism, spirituality, and higher education. Perhaps Bailey could connect with that initiative, as well.

Both systems and spirituality fit very well within the participatory paradigm that Bailey embraces, which is the third dimension of Bailey that I am interested in exploring in greater depth. The Participatory Research Network is currently developing a concept paper for a course designed to critically examine and practice participatory research. I think that Bailey and its scholars have a great

deal to offer such a course.

And finally, like Diane, I am excited to see what else naturally emerges out of my experience with Bailey. My expectation is that I will be surprised by both how much I am able to contribute and how much I gain as part of the Bailey community.

APPENDIX B: BAILEY AT YEAR TWO: EVOLUTION OF THE LIBERTY HYDE BAILEY SCHOLARS PROGRAM

Ron Whitmore and Diane Doberneck[16], January 2000

This is the third in a series of essays chronicling the evolution of the Liberty Hyde Bailey Scholars Program, an undergraduate specialization within the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources at Michigan State University. These essays are the product of an ongoing process of reflecting upon and learning from the experiences of Bailey student and faculty scholars. The first essay, "The Road to Bailey" (March 1997), describes the early development of the Program. The second, "Introduction to Bailey" (January 1998), describes Bailey as it was conceived by faculty scholars as they welcomed the first cohort of student scholars into the Program. Now, after two years of 'real time' experience, this essay is an attempt at capturing the essence of what the Bailey Scholars Program has become.

---

[16]Though the essay has two principal authors, all members of the Bailey Scholars community were invited to share suggestions and reflections. The authors would like to acknowledge the particularly thoughtful contributions made by Pat Burkhardt, Marquita Chamblee, Frank Fear, John Hesse, and Howard Person. The authors also drew upon a variety of previously-prepared pieces about the Bailey Scholars Program, including Frank Fear's essays "The Road to Bailey" and "Introduction to Bailey", John Duley's essay "The Bailey Scholars Program: Its Ethos and Ethic", a paper by Frank Fear, Diane Doberneck, Kristie McElhaney, and Pat Burkhardt entitled "Students and Faculty Growing Together: How Might it Be?", the essay "What We Have Learned about Space – The Liberty Hyde Bailey Scholars' Learning Experience", a 1998 presentation entitled "Taking the Leap: One Groups's Journey from the Teaching to the Learning Paradigm", and a 1999 presentation entitled "Building a Learning Community: The Bailey Scholars Experience at Michigan State University".

As with most valuable learning experiences, the development of the Bailey Scholars Program is marked by a number of creative tensions. These tensions arise between hallmarks of the Program and the set of challenges created by each hallmark. These Bailey hallmarks are fundamental shifts away from traditional structures, pedagogies, and models of leadership toward the creation of a **Self-Selecting Community** whose members embark on **Learning Journeys** supported by **Network Leadership**. This essay briefly describes these shifts and the challenges they have presented and concludes with some reflections about how the Program's creative tensions fuel its evolution.

Self-Selecting Community

The first Bailey hallmark is its structure. Unlike most academic programs, Bailey is not, nor is it structured like, a department, an institute, a center, or a residential program. In fact, as much as it is an academic program, Bailey is a **community**[17]. It is a community united by a **shared ethos**, which is articulated as the Declaration of Bailey:

> *The Bailey Scholars Program seeks to be a community of scholars dedicated to lifelong learning. All members of the community work toward providing a respectful, trusting environment where we acknowledge our interdependence and encourage personal growth.*

By coming together around this shared ethos, Bailey community members strive

---

[17]For the remainder of the essay, the Bailey "community" refers to the collective of people who participate in the Bailey "Program", which includes the community but also includes its academic requirements, organizational structure, budget, and other non-human components.

to create a **safe, hospitable learning environment** (called the Commons[18]) grounded in **collaborative practice**. Bailey scholars value this learning environment because it is a place where they are **respected**, **listened to**, and **affirmed**, where they are **trusted** and given **responsibility**, and where they feel **connected** both professionally and personally.

The **physical space** in which Bailey is housed has proven critical for creating a community learning environment.[19] Bailey's home is Wills House, a converted residence built in the 1920s in the northwest corner of campus. Unlike most academic buildings, because it was once a residence, Wills House is inviting, hospitable, comfortable, and personal. Bailey scholars have also designed it to be inclusive, accessible (scholars have 24-hour access), and flexible enough to accommodate a variety of learning experiences in large and small groups.

The Bailey community is unique in that it is **open**, **accessible**, and **voluntary** – Bailey scholars **self-select**. No one is "around the table" who does not want to be, and everyone who would like to be is welcome. Undergraduate students in the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources (CANR) become Bailey **student scholars** by investigating the Program, connecting with community

---

[18]Bailey scholars use the "Commons" to refer to a physical place (the main meeting room in Wills House, where the Program resides), an event (for example, a community meeting), and a cultural way of relating.

[19]The Bailey learning space is discussed in detail in the September 1999 essay "What We Have Learned About Space — The Liberty Hyde Bailey Scholars' Learning Experience" (http://www.bsp.msu.edu/bailey/commons/space.htm).

members individually and at open houses, sharing with the community their interest in the Program by completing an application, participating in roundtables designed to model the Bailey learning model, deciding whether or not to join the community, and then celebrating their entry into the community at a welcome dinner. The Bailey community does not choose new student scholars – new student scholars choose Bailey.

Bailey **faculty scholars** join the community through a parallel process marked by investigation, connection, sharing, participation, decision, and celebration. Faculty scholars include not only tenure-stream faculty from a variety of different departments in CANR but also non-tenure-stream faculty, faculty from other colleges, adjunct faculty, staff members, graduate students, and community members not otherwise affiliated with MSU.

For most Bailey scholars, Bailey is not an administrative "home" – for student scholars, it is an academic specialization, and for faculty scholars, it complements their primary research, teaching, and outreach responsibilities. Despite how much they value the learning space created by Bailey, scholars consistently stress the importance of their academic homes as intellectual and administrative mooring points. Therefore, Bailey is not a *deep* community cemented with *strong* ties; rather, it is a **network community** bound by the **strength of weak ties**.

Some Challenges of Self-Selecting Community

Bailey scholars are learning the value of – and how to nurture – a self-selecting network community. Community development, however, is not without its challenges, particularly in an environment that sometimes creates disincentives for participating in community life. Both student and faculty scholars are continually **"crossing boundaries"** between their Bailey lives and their larger University lives – networks are only as strong as the connections among their members, which sometimes suffer due to conflicting loyalties. Moreover, in a research-intensive institution like MSU, faculty are often rewarded more for publications and grantsmanship than they are for innovative undergraduate teaching. The Bailey community is an encouraging and nurturing environment for non-tenured junior faculty, but ironically, they often take the greatest risks by becoming Bailey scholars. For some faculty members, the **barriers to entry are simply too high** – there are people who would like to join the Bailey community, but, due to competing responsibilities in their home departments, they are unable to.

Conversely, because the Bailey community has no mechanism for screening new scholars, the community runs the risk of having people join for predominantly individualistic reasons. Maintaining a community of self-directed learners requires keeping 'self' and 'connection to others' in dynamic balance.

The rich **diversity** created by making the community open and accessible has proven to be a tremendous asset, but it can also be a source of challenges.

Collaboration, even within a homogeneous group, is difficult. So when a group is composed of individuals with diverse learning, teaching, leading, interpersonal, and organizational styles, as well as diverse levels of enthusiasm, of comfort in network organizations, and of interest in community building, the challenges are compounded. The Bailey community continues to struggle with **working and learning in diversity** and with avoiding the natural tendency to devolve into comfortable sub-communities of scholars who share preferences and styles.

Learning Journeys

The second Bailey hallmark is its pedagogy. During the early development of the Program, a fundamental intellectual shift was made away from the teaching paradigm, in which the focus is on teachers, content, and teaching products, toward the learning paradigm, in which the focus is on **learners** and their **learning process**. The ethos of the Bailey community (i.e., the Declaration of Bailey) becomes a living ethic in its learning process, which is ongoing, self-directed, connected, transdisciplinary, and holistic.

Each Bailey scholar – whether student or faculty member – is encouraged to consciously engage in a **self-directed lifelong learning journey**. Like a helix, this journey is simultaneously linear and cyclical – that is, forward **developmental** progress is made as scholars repeat a **cycle of learning** in which they envision, prepare, do, gather, reflect, connect, and then re-envision. And because the journeys are their own, scholars generally maintain a high level of **enthusiasm** and **motivation** along the way.

Each scholar's journey is formalized in the form of a **learning plan** (in the case of students) or **envisionment** (for faculty). To begin mapping-out their learning journeys, Bailey scholars address **five questions**: Who am I? What do I value? What is my worldview? How do I learn? and How do these connect in my life? Learning in the Bailey community, therefore, is **inside-out** rather than outside-in, which accommodates the fact that scholars are often at different places along their learning journeys.

Though originally conceptualized as a program for undergraduates, it has become clear that Bailey is as much about **faculty development** as it is undergraduate development. Though their journeys are sometimes less formalized and are more closely linked with Program leadership, faculty scholars also engage in learning journeys. Many faculty scholars cite Bailey as their one respite, the place they come to refocus and re-energize for the rest of their work and lives.

Paradoxically, Bailey scholars engage in *individual* learning journeys while ***connected*** with other scholars – the Bailey Commons is the point at which individual journeys converge, where Bailey scholars learn with, from, and through others in community. Student learning journeys consist of nine credits of Bailey core courses (ANR 210, 310, 311, and 410), which are collaboratively organized around **shared learning interests**, as well as the Bailey "middle twelve" credits (a combination of other courses that support the learning plan) and co-curricular

learning experiences (e.g., internships, service-learning, Program outreach, etc.), all of which can be either individual or collaborative learning experiences. Regardless of the nature of their learning, however, Bailey scholars reconnect their learning with the larger community. Some recent examples of scholar-initiated reconnections include a wild game dinner, a study abroad presentation, a dialogue about learning through the loss of a loved one, and a holiday heritage dinner.

Not surprisingly, the questions and issues that arise out of self-directed yet connected learning journeys related to **agriculture and natural resources** are complex and therefore require **transdisciplinary** reflection. This reflection is facilitated by the fact that, because Bailey is a college-wide program, community members have diverse backgrounds and expertise. Moreover, Bailey scholars frequently invite people from outside the Bailey community to share their expertise and experience. When these different perspectives are brought to the table together, scholars are challenged to question their views, and, in the process, they develop new respect for other disciplines and ways of thinking. Bailey scholars commonly refer to this process as **stretch learning**.

Because both student and faculty scholars are undertaking learning journeys, effort is made to **blur the distinctions** between Bailey students and faculty. Faculty scholars try to shed their status as "experts", "authorities", or "teachers", while student scholars do the same with their status as "neophytes" or "empty vessels". In any given class, working group, or reading or writing circle, all **share**

responsibility for both specifying the content and facilitating the process. In Bailey courses, all are equal partners, co-learners, and co-creators. Detailed syllabi are not prepared in advance for Bailey core courses – courses begin with a **concept paper**, which is prepared in advance by the community and describes the learning goals of the course, and a skeletal **syllabus**, which is a distilled version of the concept paper and serves as a guide for deciding how to approach those learning goals. With those two documents, scholars collaborate to create each course around mutual learning interests.

Because Bailey learning journeys are so colorful (scholars may play the role of student, intern, friend, visitor, host, leader, servant, neighbor, colleague, etc. at different points along their learning journeys), a **flexible** yet **responsible** model of **learning assessment** had to be developed for the Program. Bailey scholars are held **accountable** for their learning, but effort is made to match the mode of assessment with the goals of the learning experience and the preferences of the learner and the faculty convener(s). In ANR 210, for example, a combination of **self- and peer-assessment** has been used during the last two years.

Ultimately, the goal of Bailey learning journeys is **whole-person development**. Though part of an academic program, the developmental, inside-out, connected, and transdisciplinary nature of Bailey learning journeys also challenges scholars to examine their **values** and how they make **meaning**. The hope is that Bailey scholars will **balance** their **intellectual** and **professional** preparation, which is commonly driven by external rewards, with the development of their **character**,

identity, **integrity**, and **spirit**, which fuels **intra-** and **inter-personal** development and is primarily a function of intrinsic motivation.

Some Challenges Along Learning Journeys

Such an unconventional approach to learning is not without its potential pitfalls. Intuitively, self-directed, connected, transdisciplinary, and holistic learning seems like it would be a natural success. But in practice, it is more difficult than expected and can be frustrating, uncomfortable, and overwhelming for those involved. In the classroom, for instance, its success is very often a function of the learning topic and the temperament, courage, humility, commitment, sincerity, and skills of the people at the table. Similarly, because Bailey scholars are often at different places along their learning journeys, and the Bailey Commons is the point at which individual journeys converge, it is difficult to accommodate these differences while maintaining a climate of inclusivity. Bailey scholars continue to grapple with these and other tensions associated with encouraging self-directed learning in a community learning environment.

Network Leadership

A third Bailey hallmark relates to issues of leadership, management, and organizational development. Organizationally, the Bailey ethos has become a living ethic through network leadership. Network leadership stands in marked contrast to both hero leadership and shared leadership. Hero leadership is the familiar mode in which the strong leader makes decisions *independently*. In shared leadership, which is far more participatory, collaborative, and *dependent*

in nature, every member of the organization contributes to and buys-into the decision-making process and implementation. Network leadership, on the other hand, is characterized by **loosely-coupled** organizational sub-groups. These sub-groups operate in a collaborative mode and are networked with the other sub-groups and individuals in the organization, but the degree to which they involve every member of the organization in decision-making is a function of the issue or task at hand. Because this mode of leadership is *interdependent* in nature, its success is largely a function of the level of **trust** maintained within the organization that individuals and sub-groups will act **responsibly**.

Network leadership has evolved as the *modus operandi* in the Bailey community because it is a diverse, horizontal network of self-directed individuals and **self-organizing** groups that continually refocus and reorganize to explore shared interests and meet new challenges. Semi-permanent **working groups**, for instance, self-organize to address issues related to academic affairs, student affairs, technology, administration, etc. Similarly, **learning circles** are periodically organized for shorter time periods to explore ideas and challenges that emerge within the community. Working groups, learning circles, and individuals often raise questions or issues for community consideration during community gatherings like the weekly **Wednesday lunches** or on the Bailey **online dialogue** web site.

Normally, the members of self-organizing Bailey groups are not selected – they **self-select** through a process of envisionment and reflection designed to find the

best "**fit**" between the needs of the community and individual interests and skills. In the last year, the community has hired a new Academic Learning Coordinator and Administrative Assistant, and, though somewhat constrained by the requirements of the larger administrative structure of the University, both positions were filled with the question of "fit" in the forefront of the community's mind.

Network leadership also makes it possible to keep the number of paid staff members to a minimum. Bailey currently operates with the support of 4.5 faculty/staff FTEs (full-time equivalents). The Program Chair devotes 0.6 FTEs of his time to Bailey and 0.4 to his home academic department, in part, because the Bailey Administrative Team emerged as the working group that addresses programmatic policy questions.

Some Challenges of Network Leadership

Once again, innovation is not without its challenges. For example, striking the balance between communal privileges and individual responsibilities is a consistent source of tension in the community. Network leadership – despite its obvious strengths – can also be cumbersome and frustrating. It is also counterintuitive and uncomfortable for those who prefer hero or shared leadership. Moreover, the community commonly finds itself having to reconcile its ethos and ethic with the administrative realities (e.g., having to do with budgets, hiring, etc.) of the larger institutional environment of which it is a part – this phenomenon is referred to in Bailey as **boundary crossing**. Consistently,

however, the University leadership has been supportive and encouraging. Without such support, the Program would never have been able to flourish as it has.

Learning from the Creative Tensions

In many ways, the Bailey Scholars Program has become a **living laboratory** for the development of and experimentation with new models for self-selecting community, learning journeys, and network leadership. And, as is typically the case when things are done **"outside the box"**, tensions arise.

Bailey scholars have several options for how to respond to the tensions within the Program. They could ignore them, hoping that they will magically disappear, or they could try to resolve them, hoping that Bailey will become the utopia they imagine it to be. A third option, with which most Bailey scholars are growing more comfortable, is to identify the tensions, reflect upon them, and then frame conversations around them. As scholars' understanding of the tensions grows, some of the tensions gradually become less problematic and even disappear, while others never go away, but the community grows to appreciate them for the opportunities for stretch learning they create.

This approach is possible because Bailey scholars, especially faculty, strive to be **reflexive** about their Bailey experience. That is, they are continually reflecting upon and evaluating both the Program and their own role within the Program. As an aid, scholars often draw upon the **literature base**. Interestingly,

however, because Bailey scholars generally act and then reflect, the literature often helps scholars understand and articulate what Bailey is doing and becoming rather than serving as a guide (or as a framework) for the journey.

Another reason for the success of the Bailey approach is because reflexivity is coupled with **dialogue**. In dialogue, the focus is on learning rather than on the subject or the participants, on listening and reflecting rather than speaking, on humble inquiry rather than persuasion, and on suspending judgment rather than making a case. When practiced most artfully, dialogue creates a **synergy** out of which emerge ideas that no single individual brought to the conversation along with new levels of understanding. Bailey scholars like to remind each other that "It's not what you bring to the table as much as it is what happens when you get there."

Bailey scholars are learning to trust and depend on these **emergent surprises**. In fact — and this is still very counterintuitive for some – Bailey does not establish goals or develop a strategic plan for fear that the very act of strategically aiming for desired outcomes would stifle creativity and the organic development of the Program. As a result, Bailey never "arrives" – it is where it is, in a continuous process of **dynamic evolution** as the different perspectives and interests of scholars influence and change community life and practice.

And as time passes, people come and go, and circumstances change, the Program's hallmarks, challenges, and tensions are likely to change. In fact, this

essay is simply a snapshot framed by a few people at the end of 1999. Bailey is already different from the Bailey described in these pages. The learning never ends.

APPENDIX C: JUNE 2000 RE-ENVISIONMENT

"Affirmation"

I originally prepared a much longer essay for my re-envisionment, but in the end, I realized that I can summarize what I have to say in just a few points. Time permitting, I will elaborate a bit on each of these points during the Wednesday lunch when I share my re-envisionment.

Passion: I am drawn to Bailey because it is a laboratory for my principal passion: creating and nurturing spaces in which people – both individually and collectively – increasingly reveal their capacities. As a Bailey scholar, I am learning more about innovative and transformational approaches to development than I have from any class I've taken or from any other work I've done.

Inside-out: What I'm learning is that self-directed learning in a community of learners can really work. I have learned the value in trusting the right things to emerge at the right time when people are invited to learn what, when, and how they'd like. Though I have understood this concept intellectually for some time, I didn't actually 'get it' until experiencing 210 this past spring.

Life's Lessons: To appreciate inside-out development, I have to learn to suspend my expectations and judgment. Normally, when I approach any experience, I frame in my mind the 'ideal' process and outcome, and I have a tendency to be judgmental of anything or anyone who does not live up to it.

Bailey – and particularly my experience in 210 – has taught me that this approach is destructive and disturbs the natural process of emergence. 210 was one of the few experiences in my life that I began with few specific expectations, and as a result, I was pleasantly surprised – and amazed! – by what naturally emerged.

Liberation: In addition to liberating me from destructive tendencies, Bailey has given me the freedom to explore different dimensions of myself and to wear new hats. For example, I recently realized that Bailey is the only space in my life where I am not (formally or informally) serving as 'coordinator'. At home, in my neighborhood association, in the Participatory Research Network, and, until very recently, in my local Bahá'í community, I am the person keeping tabs on everything.

Authenticity: One could reasonably ask: "Why should I and other Bailey scholars have the freedom to pursue our passions? Aren't we encouraging people to be egocentric and self-indulgent?" There is always, of course, the danger that self-directed learning will degenerate into selfishness and self-centeredness. But, as we have seen in Bailey, it usually doesn't. On the contrary. When given the opportunity and freedom to express their true selves as members of a learning community, people flourish – they demonstrate new levels of selflessness, they are ennobled, they contribute to others' learning and to community life, and they behave responsibly, respectfully, and non-judgmentally. I would suggest that they are simply expressing more fully their

authentic sense of Self – they are being true to the connections and relationships they share with each other and larger creation.

Contrary to what the Academy assumes, I would suggest that what's most important is who each of us *is*, not what we know. In my daily work, I can't pull theories out of my pocket and apply them in every situation in which I find myself. All I can count on bringing with me is me – my integrity, my values, my ethos, and my ethics.

It becomes extremely important, therefore, who I *am*. And a large part of who I genuinely am comes from inside – not from what others tell me I should or could be or do. And therein lies the magic of Bailey. It is one of the few community spaces that I know where people are encouraged to pursue their passions, to learn life's lessons from the inside-out, and to trust good things to happen when people are liberated to be and become their authentic Selves.

During the visit with the folks from the University of Wisconsin, Rick Brandenburg described Bailey as a place where people learn things that can't be taught. I realize that none of the above insights is particularly profound or groundbreaking. But they are things that can't be taught, and they are significant when – off the written page and in someone's life – they have been internalized. Thank you all for supporting me in my learning.

~

And then there is the question of what my role in Bailey will look like as I pursue my passions and try to learn life's lessons. The most I can say at this point is that I would like to continue doing many of the things I've done this past year, including convene classes like 310, 311, and/or 410; learn about the administration, management, and leadership required to keep a place like Bailey ticking; and be involved in the scholarly dimensions of the Bailey experience. Otherwise, I am flexible, I would like to serve Bailey as best I can, and I look forward to what emerges.

APPENDIX D: MY RESPONSES TO UCRIHS INQUIRIES

March 23, 2003

Dr. [Chair of UCRIHS],

Thank you for taking the time on Friday to discuss my dissertation research and the inquiry from a Bailey scholar. As you requested, I am writing to explain the steps I have taken to protect the rights of human subjects.

I would first like to explain, however, the unique nature of my research. My research is an autoethnographic interpretation of my experience as a Bailey scholar in the context of my academic and professional interest in development. That is, my research is an inquiry into the interactions among my experience as a Bailey scholar (the 'auto'), other Bailey scholars and the Bailey Scholars Program (the 'ethno'), and theories of development (the 'graphy'). Importantly, my research is not *about* the Bailey Scholars Program, nor is it a study *of* Bailey. And neither the Bailey Scholars Program nor other Bailey scholars are the subject of my dissertation. The subject of my study is the interaction between my experiences, Bailey, and the knowledge base. Most of my dissertation, therefore, is interpretive (rather than data-based) in nature.

The nature of autoethnographic research raises challenging issues related to the protection of human subjects' rights. Specifically, it requires making clear distinctions between data and interpretation. As I explained in my UCRIHS

applications, I consider my human subjects' data to be expressions of Bailey scholars (eg, quotes from conversations, excerpts from writing, etc. Importantly, I have not conducted any interviews or asked people to complete any surveys.). In that spirit, I have taken pains to request informed consent from people whom I have quoted directly. Moreover, since I have invited Bailey scholars to comment on my draft dissertation (anonymously if they prefer), in my Bailey mail folder, where I've invited people to leave written comments, I have left a number of blank informed consent forms along with an explanation of the choices people have if they would like to leave written comments. To date, I have signed consent forms from twelve people whose writing I quoted in my draft dissertation or whose voices I recorded during a discussion about my draft dissertation.

The number of consent forms is relatively low (as I forecasted in my UCRIHS application) because the bulk of my research is interpretive in nature. That is, most of the text of my dissertation consists of my interpretation of experiences I had as a Bailey scholar. And that interpretation includes summaries or descriptions of conversations, meetings, or other collaborative learning experiences. Most of my experiences, of course, involved other people, so there are references in my text to other Bailey scholars (though I never mention people by name unless I'm quoting them or citing their published work). I have not, however, requested informed consent from people who participated in events that are referenced in my text. My assumption has been that, when I do not include collected data (eg, quotes) in my text, it is not necessary to have consent.

Three of my research committee members (all of whom are Bailey scholars) have reviewed my draft dissertation, and none raised any concerns about human subjects or informed consent (other than to verify that I had received consent for excerpted writing) because they understand the unique nature of my research.

When you contacted me about the inquiry from a Bailey scholar, I reread my draft dissertation to see if I could find anything that might be considered a violation of human subjects' rights. I found a few examples of oversights or possible errors in judgment

1) In the "Spring 1999Introduction to Envisionment" section of Chapter 4 (p. 64), I included an excerpt from a Bailey scholar's essay without first getting proper informed consent. I have been trying to get in touch with this Bailey scholar to request informed consent for almost a month now without any success. I assumed that I could leave the excerpt in my draft dissertation while waiting for consent because the essay was published on the Bailey web site at one point. To be on the safe side, I have now removed that excerpt from the draft of my dissertation that is available to Bailey scholars for review and will only include it in my dissertation if I am able to get informed consent.

2) In the third paragraph of the "The Limits and Tensions of Self-Selection" section of Chapter 4 (p. 72), the reader might get the impression that I am quoting someone. If that was a quote, I clearly should have requested informed consent. That paragraph, however, is neither a quote nor an excerpt from

written correspondence. Rather, it is my own summary of the main points from a meeting of the Bailey leadership group. In fact, much of it is pulled from an email that *I wrote* to another Bailey scholar.

That said, I can understand why some people might think that I should have consulted with everyone who was part of that leadership group meeting before including this summary in my draft dissertation. My assumption has been that I have simply summarized my recollection of the main points of a conversation at an open meeting, so it is not necessary to ask permission or to get informed consent.

I am taking steps to prevent any misunderstandings and to guarantee that I am taking appropriate steps to protect subjects' rights. First, I have replaced Chapter 4 in the copy of my draft dissertation that is available for review by Bailey scholars with a revised chapter that clarifies the nature of the interpretive writing in that chapter. Second, I will contact everyone who participated in the referenced meeting to discuss my research and the issues it raises related to informed consent.

3) At the beginning of the sixth paragraph of the "Fall 2000ANR 310" section of Chapter 5 (p. 94), I make reference to a course participant's observation about a course. From a strict interpretation of UCRIHS policies, I probably should have asked for informed consent from that course participant, which I have not done. I have removed that reference from the draft of my dissertation that is available

to Bailey scholars for review and am trying to get in touch with the course participant to request informed consent.

4) In the third paragraph of the "Things I've Learned from Self-Directed, Connected Development" section of Chapter 5 (p. 103), I included a quote without first asking for informed consent. I included that quote in a Bailey essay I wrote in 2000 and then pulled the quote from that essay to include it in Chapter 5 of my dissertation. Because I was pulling the quote from a secondary document, I didn't think to get consent. That was an oversight on my part. I have removed that quote from the draft of my dissertation that is available to Bailey scholars for review and will request informed consent from the person I quoted this week.

5) In the "Evolution of Organization, Management, and Leadership in Bailey" section of Chapter 6 (p. 119ff), I draw heavily on a series of conversations of the Bailey leadership group without requesting the participants' informed consent. That section is based on a table that *I created* based on the group's conversations. Moreover, I felt that this section is simply a summary of my recollection of conversations at an open meeting, so it was not necessary to ask permission or get informed consent.

That said, I can understand why some people might think that I should have consulted with everyone who was part of those leadership group conversations before including the table and interpretation in my draft dissertation. I will contact everyone who participated in the referenced conversations to clarify any

misunderstandings and to discuss my research and the issues it raises related to informed consent.

6) In the fourth paragraph of the "Fall 1999-Spring 2000" section in Chapter 6 (p. 127), I pulled directly from minutes of a Bailey Administrative Team meeting without asking for permission or informed consent from meeting participants. I assumed that, since I wrote the minutes and because the minutes were from an open meeting and were shared with the entire Bailey community, informed consent was not required.

That said, I can understand why some people might think that I should have consulted with everyone who was part of that meeting before including the excerpt from the minutes in my draft dissertation. I will contact everyone who participated in the referenced conversations to clarify any misunderstandings and to discuss my research and the issues it raises related to informed consent.

7) In the "Bailey Leadership" section of Chapter 6 (p. 137), I quoted from an essay that I co-authored with another Bailey scholar and cited the co-author by name. That essay is published on the Bailey web page. In the original draft that I made available to Bailey scholars for review, I neglected to provide proper citation for that essay in the bibliography. I have since corrected that error.

As you can see, there are a few cases where I may have made an error in judgment, but I assure you that I have not made any deliberate attempt to violate

the rights of human subjects. And in those cases where I have been in error or where there may be misunderstandings, I am taking pains to right the situation.

In addition, I have also removed my draft dissertation from the Internet. I had originally posted it on the Internet to make it easily accessible to Bailey scholars who were interested in reviewing it, but I have since learned that documents posted on the Internet are considered *published* documents. It was not my intent to publish my draft dissertation in any form at this time, so I have removed it from the Internet.

I appreciate the attention you're giving to a very serious inquiry and want to do all that I can to guarantee that I am protecting subjects' rights. Please let me know if you have any questions about my research or if you have recommendations for how I can best protect the rights of human subjects.

Regards,

Ron Whitmore

April 2, 2003

Dr. [Chair of UCRIHS],

Thank you for your thoughtful phone call last Tuesday and for your follow-up call on Monday this week. I appreciate the thoroughness with which you pursue UCRIHS inquiries and the thoughtful suggestions you shared for how best to address concerns that have been raised. As you suggested, I reread the UCRIHS handbook and instructions and reviewed my original and renewal UCRIHS applications. For the sake of clarity, I have organized this response into four sections.

I. Regarding the inquiry about my use of an unstamped informed consent formThe informed consent form that I had been using is identical to the one that your office approved on June 17, 2002. The mistake I made was to not use the copy of the form with the UCRIHS approval/expiration stamp. The only explanation I have for this mistake is that I was not aware of the requirement to use a stamped copy. Since I had a stamped copy, it would have been illogical for me to have used the unstamped version had I understood the requirement. I attribute my ignorance to the instructions that I used to write my original UCRIHS application in April 2001. In those instructions, the researcher is given the option of using forms without the stamp. When I renewed my application, I failed to

verify whether that rule had been changed in the revised instructions that were released in early 2002. As I explained during our phone conversation, I am now using the stamped version, and I will ask everyone who has signed the wrong version of the form to sign the stamped version, and I will keep both signed copies in my records.

II. As I was reviewing UCRIHS documents, I came across two additional potential areas of concern. No one has shared concerns with me about either of these issues, but, as I did in my response to your initial inquiry, I would like to bring them to your attention to demonstrate how seriously I take the protection of human subjects. (Notel identified these two areas before our latest conversation on Monday, 3/31, during which you mentioned an inquiry about tape recording.)

1) The current working title of my draft dissertation is different from the title of my research project, which is included at the top of my consent form. In light of the requirement to notify UCRIHS of changes in the title of research projects, some people might raise concerns about the difference in the two titles. While I suspect that the title of my dissertation may change several more times before the research project is completed, the title of my project remains the same, and I do not anticipate that it will change. If it does, I will be sure to submit the appropriate materials to UCRIHS.

2) On Friday, March 21, I convened a discussion among Bailey scholars about my draft dissertation as part of my research project. After presenting an overview of my research and how I would use the discussion as data in the next draft of my dissertation, I used my consent form to discuss the human subjects issues associated with my research, invited questions, and asked participants to voluntarily sign the consent form and indicate how they would like their identities protected. I also explained that I would like to tape-record that conversation so that, if I wanted to quote anyone directly, I would be able to do that accurately. And I specifically asked if anyone had concerns about having the conversation tape-recorded, which no one did. Once I had collected all of the consent forms, the discussion began, and I taped the entire discussion.

The latest UCRIHS instructions specify that "Taping and/or filming of subjects should be indicated in the consent form and there should be signed permission by the subject to be taped/filmed. The consent form should indicate how these materials will be used." In both my original UCRIHS application and my currently approved consent form, I indicate that my research data may include expressions of Bailey scholars captured on audio tape, and my consent form explains how expressions will be used. The consent form does not, however, specifically ask participants for signed permission to be taped. I attribute this error to the fact that this requirement was not included in the instructions I used when preparing my original UCRIHS application.

As you indicated when we spoke on Monday, since my informed consent form

indicates that I may include expressions captured on audio tape, I have probably taken sufficient steps to protect the rights of human subjects. Nevertheless, I have decided to abandon the use of audio tape recording. Recordings are not necessary for my research; it was never my intent to transcribe the conversations and then analyze them using standard qualitative approaches. My intent was only to record the conversations as a backup to my written notes, so that I could review comments that I may have missed in my notes. I have not listened to, transcribed, or copied the tape recording I made on March 21, and I will destroy the tape in front of witnesses.

III. To put my efforts at protecting the rights of human subjects into better perspective, I would like to share with you more details about my research intent and process. My intent is to articulate what I have learned about development through my experience as a Bailey scholar. Unlike most qualitative studies, I did not collect data from other people (eg, with surveys, interviews, etc.) as part of my research. Instead, I reflected on my experience, captured my learning in writing, and informed my insights with the literature. Because my research is hermeneutic in nature, it would be incomplete without first giving others (preferably those who have some insight into the object of my interpretations) an opportunity to discuss it with me. In that spirit, I have invited Bailey scholars to provide me with feedback and/or engage in conversation with me about my draft dissertation.

My research process is characterized by six successive steps. First, I assembled my data, which were almost uniquely my own notes, email messages I wrote, and my past writing about the Bailey Scholars Program. In those rare cases where I assembled pre-existing data from other people, I asked for their informed consent (except in those cases that I've already brought to your attention). Second, by focusing on pivotal moments in my development as a Bailey scholar, I arranged the data into major themes of my experience as a Bailey scholarself-selection; self-directed, connected development; network organization and leadership; and spiritual development. Third, I wrote essays about those four themes (which became the four substantive chapters of my draft dissertation) by weaving relevant scholarly literature together with my data-based interpretation. Fourth, I framed those interpretive chapters with an introductory chapter, a methodology chapter, a literature review, and a concluding chapter. Fifth, following a long tradition of shared expressions and reading-centered dialogue among Bailey scholars, I shared this draft dissertation with Bailey scholars and invited community members to join me for a "reading circle" about my draft dissertation. The reading circle is designed as both a learning opportunity for the Bailey community and as an opportunity for me to take my thinking and writing to the next level (that is the step I am currently in). I have also invited written feedback, including anonymous feedback. I am being very careful to request informed consent from everybody who either provides written feedback or participates in the reading circle. Finally, I will incorporate what I learn from the feedback and the dialogue into the draft of my dissertation that I will defend.

There are two points that I'd like to emphasize about this research process. First, the number of my human subjects, from whom I have obtained data, is very low. In this and my previous email message, I've explained my efforts at obtaining informed consent from those subjects. Second, my dissertation is still in draft form. As I have done on several previous occasions with other writing about my experience as a Bailey scholar, I am in the process of sharing it with the Bailey community to create learning opportunities for both me and other Bailey scholars. I am not defending this version of my dissertation nor publishing it. Given how much I've already learned since I made this draft available, I anticipate that my final draft will be significantly different.

IV. Based on some of the feedback I have already received from Bailey scholars, I anticipate that I will make the following changes in my next draft. 1) I will be much more explicit about the types and sources of my data. Specifically, I will note that, unless I have otherwise indicated, my interpretive writing is based on my own notes and writing. 2) To protect people's identities, I will try to write the next draft without any allusion to the program or the people involved. 3) I will draw clearer distinctions for the reader between my data and my interpretations. This is a particularly acute challenge when writing an autoethnography, but it has become clear that there are sections of my dissertation where this distinction is unclear for some. 4) I will clarify that my interpretations are not factual findings and should not be read as such.

As we discussed on the phone, I shared both the nature of the inquiries you've received and my responses to them with the participants in the reading circle. I think that it is important that participants understand the serious nature of the inquiries and the steps I am taking to address potential areas of concern. Interestingly, none of the reading circle participants expressed any concern, nor did anybody want to spend time in the reading circle discussing it.

As always, please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions or concerns. I am as anxious as you to guarantee that human subjects' rights are protected.

Regards,

Ron Whitmore

APPENDIX E: GLOSSARY

Academic Learning Coordinator: the advisor to Bailey student scholars

ANR 210: a three-credit seminar that is the first in a series of courses required for Bailey student scholars

ANR 310: a three-credit seminar required for Bailey student scholars

ANR 311: a one-credit seminar that was required for Bailey student scholars through 2001

ANR 410: the final three-credit seminar required for Bailey student scholars that is designed as a convocation experience that encourages both a retrospective and a prospective assessment of each scholar's journey and development

Autoethnography: autoethnological writing

Autoethnology: inquiry into the experiential interaction between the researcher and the research 'subject,' between the personal and cultural. Insight emerges from the interplay among the researcher's experience (auto), the cultural subject (ethno), and theory (ology).

Bahá'í Faith: a global religion established in 1844 and based on the teachings of Bahá'u'lláh, which are grounded in the unity of God, religion, and the world's people

Bailey Administrative Team: the 1999-2000 iteration of the Bailey leadership entity that discussed issues related to the leadership, management, and administration of the Bailey Scholars Program

Bifurcation point: point of systemic instability. At a bifurcation point, a system may either restabilize into its original form, collapse, or restabilize into a new, usually more complex system exhibiting new emergent qualities.

Biosphere: the domain of life

Chaos: intrinsically unpredictable yet patterned behavior in systems characterized by networks of feedback communication and control

Communities of practice: self-generating social networks within a network, community, or organization

Convener: a Bailey scholar who assumes responsibility for maintaining the quality of the learning environment in a Bailey course

Cosmos: the domain of matter

Development: the realization of potential; growth

Dialogue: a form of discourse – distinct from the cultural norm of debate – in which people seek to listen and learn rather than know and advocate, ask questions rather than provide answers, explore multiple perspectives rather than embracing a single perspective, question rather than defend assumptions, and respect others rather than exert power over them

Emergence: the evolution of new emergent properties

Emergent properties: those characteristics of a system that are unique to the level of organization of the whole system, are not exhibited in its parts, and cannot be explained as the sum of its parts

Envisionment: in the Bailey Scholars Program, envisionment is a personal statement of how Bailey contributes to individual development and how the individual, in turn, will contribute to Bailey's development

Governance and Administration: the first Bailey leadership entity that focused on delegation of responsibility and strengthening connections among faculty members and their activities

Hermeneutics: interpretive research

Holarchy: the hierarchical relationships of a system to its sub- and supra-systems

Holon: system

Integral development: spiritually-inspired, systemic processes of transformation, out of which emerge more sustainable environmental and developmental theory and practice

Kosmos: the integration of the cosmos, the biosphere, the noosphere, and the theosphere

Leadership entity: the groups over the course of Bailey's organizational evolution that have grappled – either theoretically and/or practically – with issues related to Bailey's leadership and organizational development. Leadership entities have included Governance and Administration, the Leadership Group, the Bailey Administrative Team, and the Leadership Space.

Leadership Group: the second Bailey leadership entity that, during the 1999-2000 academic year, explored leadership issues as a way to mentor people interested in playing formal leadership roles in the Bailey Scholars Program

Leadership Space: the 2001 iteration of the leadership entity

Meritocracy: a system in which people's success, as demonstrated by pay and privilege, is largely a function of their merit as measured by cultural standards like GPAs, test scores, resume-building activities, academic degrees, and the like

Middle twelve: twelve credits of electives that support a Bailey student scholar's learning plan

Noosphere: the domain of the mind

Office Management Team: the body responsible for keeping the basic infrastructure of the Bailey Scholars Program functioning smoothly

Praxis: the mutually-reinforcing interaction of theory and practice, knowing and doing, or reflection and action that characterizes lived experience

Share Fair: a Bailey activity during which community members were invited to write their interests on large sheets of paper taped throughout the Bailey commons and to sign their name under others' interests

System: an organized, coherent, whole entity, which has, or can be assumed to have, properties which are unique to it as a whole entity

Theosphere: the domain of spirit

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abdullah, M. (2001). *Self-Directed Learning*. Bloomington, Indiana: ERIC Digest.

Argyris, C., Putnam, R., and Smith, D. M. (1985). *Action Science*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Arrow, K., Bowles, S., and Durlauf, S. (2000). *Meritocracy and Economic Inequality*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Barr, R. and Tagg, J. (1995). From Teaching to Learning – A New Paradigm for Undergraduate Education. *Change, 27*(6), 13-25.

Bawden, R. (1995). *Systemic Development: A Learning Approach to Change*. Occasional Paper. Centre for Systemic Development, University of Western Sydney.

Bawden, R. (1997). *The Community Challenge: The Learning Response*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Community Development Society, Athens, GA.

Behar, R. (1996). *The Vulnerable Observer: Anthropology That Breaks Your Heart*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Berry, T. (1988). *The Dream of the Earth*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.

Berry, W. (2000). *Life is a Miracle: An Essay Against Modern Superstition*. Washington, D.C.: Counterpoint.

Bochner, A. and Ellis, C. (1996). Talking Over Ethnography. In Ellis, C. and Bochner, A. (Eds.), *Composing Ethnography: Alternative Forms of Qualitative Writing* (pp. 13-45). Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Braidotti, R., Charkiewicz, E., Häusler, S., and Wieringa S. (1995). *Women, the Environment and Sustainable Development: Towards a Theoretical Synthesis*. London: Zed Books.

Capra, F. (1982). *The Turning Point: Science, Society, and the Rising Culture*. New York: Bantam.

Capra, F. (1996). *The Web of Life: A New Scientific Understanding of Living Systems*. New York: Anchor Books.

Capra, F. (2002). *The Hidden Connections: Integrating the Biological, Cognitive, and Social Dimensions of Life into a Science of Sustainability*. New York: Doubleday.

Checkland, P. (1981). *Systems Thinking, Systems Practice*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Clandinin, D. and Connelly, F. (1994). Personal Experience Methods. In Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 413-427). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Clark, M. (1989). *Ariadne's Thread: The Search for New Modes of Thinking*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Clayton, A. and Radcliffe, N. (1996). *Sustainability – A Systems Approach*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Crawford, F. (1994). *Emic Social Work: A Story of Practice*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

Daly, H. and Cobb, J. (1989). *For the Common Good: Redirecting the Economy Toward Community, the Environment, and a Sustainable Future*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (2000). *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (2000). Introduction: The Discipline and Practice of Qualitative Research. In Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 1-28). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ellis, C. and Bochner, A. (2000). Autoethnography, Personal Narrative, Reflexivity. In Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 733-768). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Engel, J. R. and Engel, J. G. (1990). *Ethics of Environment and Development: Global Challenge, International Response*. London: Belhaven Press.

Fals Borda, O. and Rahman, M. (1991). *Action and Knowledge: Breaking the Monopoly with Participatory Action Research*. New York: Apex Press.

Fear, F. (1997). *The Road to Bailey: A Vision for The Liberty Hyde Bailey Scholars Program*, [Online]. Available: www.bsp.msu.edu/Background/BaileyRd.cfm [2003, October 3].

Fear, F., Gerulski, C., Latinen, L., and Woodward, D. (2000). Fusing Competence and Character: Celebrating Postmodern Expressions in Higher Education, [Online journal: *Journal of College and Character*]. Available: http://www.collegevalues.org/articles.cfm?a=1&id=373 [2003, October 3].

Fear, F., Bawden, R., Rosaen, C., and Foster-Fishman, P. (2002). A Model of Engaged Learning: Frames of Reference and Scholarly Underpinnings. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, *7*(3): 55-68.

Fine, M. (1994). Working the Hyphens: Reinventing Self and Other in Qualitative Research. In Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 70-82). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fox, W. (1995). *Towards a Transpersonal Ecology: Developing New Foundations for Environmentalism*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Freeman, J. (1999). Teaching gifted pupils. *Journal of Biological Education*, *33*(4): 185-190.

Freire, P. (1989). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Garza, E. (2000). *Building capacity for an integrated bilingual program: An autoethnographic study*. Unpublished dissertation, The Fielding Institute, Santa Barbara, CA.

Gergen, M. and Gergen, K. (2000). Qualitative Inquiry: Tensions and Transformations. In Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 1025-1046). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gottlieb, R. (1996). *This Sacred Earth: Religion, Nature, Environment*. New York: Routledge.

Goulet, D. (1990). Development ethics and ecological wisdom. In Engel, J. R. and Engel, J. G. (Eds.), *Ethics of Environment and Development: Global Challenge, International Response* (pp. 36-49). London: Belhaven Press.

Goulet, D. (1992). Development: Creator and Destroyer of Values. *World Development, 20*(3): 467-475.

Greenwood, D. and Levin, M. (2000). Reconstructing the Relationships between Universities and Society through Action Research. In Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 85-106). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hart, T. (2001). Teaching for Wisdom. *Encounter, 14*(2): 3-16.

Heron, J. and Reason, P. (1997). A Participatory Inquiry Paradigm. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 3(3): 274-294.

Hock, D. (1999). *Birth of the Chaordic Age*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Horton, M. and Freire, P. (1990). *We Make the Road by Walking: Conversations on Education and Social Change*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Jackson, M. (1998). *Minima Ethnographica: Intersubjectivity and the Anthropological Project*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Jantsch, E. (1981). *Unifying Principles of Evolution. The Evolutionary Vision: Toward a Unifying Paradigm of Physical, Biological, and Sociocultural Evolution*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Knowles, M. (1990). *The Adult Learner: A Neglected Species*. Houston: Gulf Publishing Co.

Koestler, A. (1967). *The Ghost in the Machine*. New York: Random House.

Korten, D. (1995). *When Corporations Ruled the World*. West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.

Kothari, R. (1990). Environment, technology, and ethics. In Engel, J. R. and Engel, J. G. (Eds.), *Ethics of Environment and Development: Global Challenge, International Response* (pp. 27-35). London: Belhaven Press.

Kuhn, T. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An Introduction to Qualitative Interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Laiken, M. (2001, November 1-3). *Managing the Action/Reflection Polarity: A Path to Transformative Learning*. Paper presented at the Fourth International Conference on Transformative Learning: Multiple Currents: Expanding the Boundaries of Transformative Learning, Toronto.

Laszlo, E. (1994). *The Choice: Evolution or Extinction? A Thinking Person's Guide*. New York: Putnam Books.

Lincoln, Y. and Denzin, N. (2000). The Seventh Moment: Out of the Past. In Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 1047-1065). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lincoln, Y. and Guba, E. (2000). Paradigmatic Controversies, Contradictions, and Emerging Confluences. In Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 163-188). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lindeman, E. (1926). *The Meaning of Adult Education*. New York: New Republic.

Maturana, H. and Varela, F. (1987). *The Tree of Knowledge: The Biological Roots of Human Understanding*. Boston: Shambhala.

Merchant, C. (1995). *Earthcare: Women and the Environment*. New York: Routledge.

Milbraith, L. (1989). *Envisioning a Sustainable Society: Learning Our Way Out*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Moffett, J. (1994). *The Universal Schoolhouse: Spiritual Awakening through Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Naess, A. (1989). *Ecology, community and lifestyle*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nakamoto-Gonzalez, S. (2001). *The new invisible other in America: An autoethnographic and life review approach. Engaging the study of multiracials from the realm of general systems theory as it pertains to the recognition of spirituality*. Unpublished dissertation, The Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, CA.

Olesen, V. (2000). Feminisms and Qualitative Research At and Into the Millenium. In Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 215-255). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Palmer, P. (1983). *To Know as We Are Known: Education as a Spiritual Journey*. San Francisco: Harper.

Palmer, P. (1990). *The Active Life: A Spirituality of Work, Creativity, and Caring*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Palmer, P. (1998). *The Courage to Teach: Exploring the Inner Landscape of a Teacher's Life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Palmer, P. (2000). *Let Your Life Speak: Listening to the Voice of Vocation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Perry, J. (2001). *Sibling Relationships and Care of Parents: Deconstructing Memoirs and Personal Narratives*. Unpublished dissertation, University of South Florida, Tampa, FL.

Rahman, M. (1991). The Theoretical Standpoint of PAR. In Fals-Borda, O. and Rahman, M (Eds.), *Action and Knowledge: Breaking the Monopoly with Participatory Action-Research* (pp. 13-23). New York: Apex Press.

Rasmussen, L. (1993). Cosmology and Ethics. In Tucker, M. and Grim, J. (Eds.), *Worldviews and Ecology*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press.

Reason, P. (1993). Reflections on Sacred Experience and Sacred Science. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 2*(3): 273-283.

Reason, P. (1994). Three Approaches to Participatory Inquiry. In Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 324-339). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Reason, P. (1996). Reflections on the Purposes of Human Inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry, 2*(1): 15-28.

Richardson, L. (2000). Writing: A Method of Inquiry. In Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 923-948). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rockefeller, S. and Elder, J. (1992). *An Interfaith Dialogue: Spirit and Nature: Why the Environment is a Religious Issue*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Roszak, T. (1973). *Where the Wasteland Ends: Politics and Transcendence in Postindustrial Society*. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books.

Santana, J. (1999). *Americanization: A Dominican Immigrant's Autobiographical Study of Culturual and Linguistic Learning*. Unpublished dissertation, New York University, New York, NY.

Schön, D. (1995). Knowing-in-Action: The New Scholarship Requires a New Epistemology. *Change, 27*(6).

Schumacher, E. (1973). *Small is Beautiful: Economics as if People Mattered.* New York: Harper & Row.

Schwandt, T. (2000). Three Epistemological Stances for Qualitative Theory. In Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 189-213). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Senge, P. (1990). *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*. New York: Doubleday.

Skolimowski, H. (1981). *Eco-Philosophy: Designing New Tactics for Living.* Boston: Marion Boyars.

Smith, J. and Deemer, D. (2000). The Problem of Criteria in the Age of Relativism. In Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 877-896). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sterling, S. (1990). Towards an ecological world view. In Engel, J. R. and Engel, J. G. (Eds.), *Ethics of Environment and Development: Global Challenge, International Response* (pp. 77-86). London: Belhaven Press.

Stock, A. (1993). *Lifelong Learning: Thirty Years of Educational Change.* Nottingham, England: Association for Lifelong Learning.

Subotnik, R. (1995). An Alternate Route to Talent Development in Science. *Gifted Child Today Magazine*, *18*(5): 18-21, 24-25.

Tierney, W. (2000). Undaunted Courage: Life History and the Postmodern Challenge. In Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 537-553). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tompkins, J. (1996). *A Life in School: What the Teacher Learned.* New York: Addison-Wesley.

Tucker, M. and Grim, J. (1993). *Worldviews and Ecology.* Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press.

VanGunten, D. (1999). *Positionality: A Case Study of the Shifting Identities of a Subsitute Teacher.* Unpublished dissertation, The University of Toledo, Toledo, OH.

Vickers, G. (1983). *Human Systems are Different.* London: Harper and Row.

Wadsworth, Y. (1998). What is Participatory Action Research?, [Online journal: *Action Research International*]. Available: http://www.scu.edu.au/schools/gcm/ar/ari/p-ywadsworth98.html [2003, October 7].

Waelchli, F. (1992). Eleven Theses of General Systems Theory (GST). *Systems Research, 9*(4): 3-8.

Waldrop, M. (1992). *Complexity: The Emerging Science at the Edge of Order and Chaos.* New York: Touchstone.

Weil, A. (2001). *The Best of Times: An Autoethnography of a Cerebral Vascular Incident.* Unpublished dissertation, Drexel University, Philadelphia, PA.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wheatley, M. (1992). *Leadership and the New Science: Learning about Organization from an Orderly Universe*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Whitmore, R. (1998). *Transforming development practice and environmental stewardship: A systemic exploration of spiritually-inspired development in the Bahá'í Faith*. Unpublished thesis, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.

Whitmore, R. and Doberneck, D. (2000). *Bailey at Year Two: Evolution of the Liberty Hyde Bailey Scholars Program*, [Online]. Available: http://www.bsp.msu.edu/Background/year2.cfm [2003, February 13].

Wilber, K. (1996). *A Brief History of Everything*. Boston: Shambhala.

Wilber, K. (1998). *The Eye of Spirit: An Integral Vision for a World Gone Slightly Mad*. Boston: Shambhala.

Youngblood, M. (1997). *Life at the Edge of Chaos: Creating the Quantum Organization*. Dallas: Perceval Publishing.

Zohar, D. (1997). *Rewiring the Corporate Brain: Using the New Science to Rethink How We Structure and Lead Organizations*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.