Why capable people get stuck under *pressure.*

A leader can know what better leadership requires and still lose access to it when the stakes rise.



THE VISIBLE BEHAVIOR IS OFTEN SERVING AN INVISIBLE PROTECTION.

PRESSURE MAP™

A facilitated developmental inquiry for moments when knowledge is present but access to good judgment narrows.

01 **CAPACITY**	02 **PRESSURE**	03 **PROTECTION**
What the role now requires.	What changes when something important feels at risk.	What the current move may be trying to keep safe.

Capacity is what remains available when something important feels at risk.

PRIVATE / FACILITATED / EVIDENCE-SEEKING

The pattern may be *protective.*

Under pressure, two sincere commitments can operate at once: move toward a needed capacity and protect a valued good.

ONE ILLUSTRATIVE EXECUTIVE PATTERN

EXAMPLE - NOT AN ASSESSMENT

01

CAPACITY THE ROLE REQUIRES

Set a clear boundary early.

02

WHAT FEELS AT RISK

Reliability, belonging, or trust.

03

PROTECTIVE MOVE

Absorb the work. Delay the limit. Over-explain.

From outside, the behavior can look irrational. From inside the leader's current logic, it may feel like the safest available move.

THE QUESTION BENEATH THE PATTERN

What might this pattern be trying to keep safe?

THE PROTECTED GOOD IS NOT THE PROBLEM.

Credibility, control, belonging, competence, safety, and reliability are legitimate human goods. The current strategy for protecting one of them may simply be too rigid for the work ahead.

THE MAP IS A WORKING HYPOTHESIS.

It is co-created from a real moment in the leader's own language. Some feared consequences are outdated predictions. Others may point to a real system condition that requires organizational examination.

A four-decade intellectual lineage.

A distinct TLS application.

Pressure Map did not appear in isolation. Its roots extend through adult-development scholarship and the applied work of Robert Kegan and Lisa Laskow Lahey.

1982

Meaning-making across adulthood

Kegan's The Evolving Self described development as a continuing transformation in how people organize experience.

1994

Modern life can outrun current capacity

In Over Our Heads examined the possible mismatch between complex role demands and the meaning-making adults can presently access.

2001

Competing commitments reach a broad management audience

Kegan and Lahey translated the hidden conflict beneath sincere change goals for a broad organizational audience.

2009

The practical method is further formalized

The framework organized hidden commitments and assumptions into disciplined inquiry and evidence-producing tests.

TODAY

TLS develops Pressure Map™

TLS applies this lineage to judgment under pressure and makes the protected good explicit in the inquiry.

WHY THE HISTORY MATTERS

01 It offers a non-shaming hypothesis for persistent patterns.

02 It treats behavior as coherent before trying to change it.

03 It turns an invisible rule into a testable hypothesis.

INTELLECTUAL INTEGRITY

Pressure Map™ is independently developed by Transformative Learning Solutions and informed by adult-developmental and Immunity to Change scholarship. It is not a personality assessment, psychotherapy, or third-party certification.

TLS is not affiliated with or endorsed by Harvard University, Harvard Business Publishing, or the authors of the underlying frameworks.

SELECTED INTELLECTUAL FOUNDATIONS

Kegan, The Evolving Self (Harvard University Press, 1982).
Kegan, In Over Our Heads (Harvard University Press, 1994).
Kegan & Lahey, "The Real Reason People Won't Change" (HBR, 2001).
Kegan & Lahey, Immunity to Change (Harvard Business Press, 2009).
Kegan et al., An Everyone Culture (Harvard Business Review Press, 2016).
Harvard Graduate School of Education, "The Immunity to Change Approach."

What the work *feels like.*

Private enough for honesty. Structured enough for learning. Close enough to the work to matter.

01	**Anchor in one consequential moment**	Use a real decision, boundary, conflict, transition, or pressure event.
02	**Develop a private working hypothesis**	Use the leader's language and hold the pattern as testable, not declared truth.
03	**Design a bounded experiment**	Make the move small, safe, reversible, and protected by clear guardrails.
04	**Review evidence and widen the range**	Compare the predicted consequence with what actually happened in the work.

FACILITATION BOUNDARY

The exact prompts, inquiry sequence, and working map are intentionally reserved for the facilitated engagement.

INDIVIDUAL MATERIAL

- Worries, protected goods, and assumptions
- Developmental disclosures and reflections
- Handled within agreed confidentiality, consent, safety, and legal boundaries

WHAT SPONSORS MAY RECEIVE

- De-identified themes when minimum aggregation thresholds are met
- System conditions for examination
- Aggregate evidence patterns and recommendations

START WITH ONE CONSEQUENTIAL PATTERN.

What capacity does the work now require, and what might using it appear to cost?

RYAN M. BERG / FOUNDER & CHIEF LEARNING OFFICER
ED.D. CANDIDATE (ABD)

RYANMBERG.COM