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GROWING LEADERS IN EMERGENT MARKETS: LEADERSHIP ENHANCEMENT IN THE NEW SOUTH AFRICA

Kurt A. April
Amanda R. April
University of Cape Town & Ashridge

South Africa has unique challenges. Thirteen years since becoming democratic, it is still going through its own unprecedented change in joining the global economic network and moving from Apartheid to democracy and from a closed to an open community. These political and sociological changes have also infiltrated business and therefore management education in South Africa, bringing demand for new approaches. At the Graduate School of Business, University of Cape Town, the authors adapted their traditional MBA teaching approaches to become more creative. This article summarizes the main themes within a core MBA course that have been guided by their new learning design, growth-stages methodology, a multipronged plan for moving management and leadership students through the growth stages by using ideas from systems thinking, scenario planning, coaching and mentoring, and organizational learning. These Western constructs are being complemented by African knowledge, which the authors are slowly developing and integrating into the traditional business school curricula.
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During Apartheid, the South African–ruling National Party government segregated the races and education along ethnic lines, creating world-class institutions for the White communities while people of color were left with minimum, inferior, underresourced higher education institutions that were geographically placed so as to purposefully inconvenience their members and displace them from the main city centers. Equal access to institutions of higher education did not exist in South Africa pre-1994. Financial
institutions up until the mid-1980s were prohibited from providing student loans to people of color, and given the ethno-economic segregation existent in the country, a university education was exclusively reserved for White people and the elite.

Apartheid, among other things, was also a socially engineered, inhumane system of treating people with differential rank, with no interaction between the ethnicities (bar the “master-servant” relationship that existed in many White households), and this affected everybody’s understanding of their identity, self-worth, self-esteem, and role in society. The University of Cape Town (UCT) was one of only two White universities that defiantly educated a handful of people of color and, post-1994 under the new dispensation, could more explicitly encompass democratic institutional tenants into many of its policies, processes, work practices, and curricula.

**NEW MODEL FOR A CONTEXT-RELEVANT BUSINESS SCHOOL**

During the 1990s, South Africa went through a healing process in which unfamiliar ethnic groups came together on national, regional, and local levels to come clean in what they participated in and did not participate in, reconcile each other’s differences (real and perceived), and collectively embrace a new future in which all would benefit from the country’s resources and wealth—the most public of which were the televised Truth and Reconciliation (TRC) hearings. Unfortunately, the TRC was left focusing on mainly political healing but on the broader level missed the business arena (the site where most cross-ethnic interactions occurred).

At the end of the 1990s, the greater UCT community and stakeholders of the business school were exerting pressure on the school to become more contextually relevant, to increase its output of leaders of color, and to partake in business healing and to address the real, private needs of South African individuals who were finding it difficult to continue to relate to the unquestioned use of Anglo-American literature that did not acknowledge their indigenous thought system and the limited perspectives it provided for the emerging context (Blunt & Jones, 1986, 1992; Jackson, 2002; Kamoche, 1993, 1997, 2000; Nzelibe, 1986; Seddon, 1985; Whittington, 1993). During Apartheid, White institutions prepared White students for senior roles in the top echelons of society and corporate South Africa, mainly blue-chip companies (South Africa’s equivalent of Fortune 100 companies). This clearly stifled the incentive to understand the African worker and affected the kind of curricula content that existed inside the Graduate School of Business (GSB). At risk of exaggeration, the school essentially was a “Harvard in Africa,” with mainly North American and European content and minimal local content. By 2001, the school purposefully embarked on a new initiative to start developing such material and comparative materials from
elsewhere in the developing or transitional world on a systematic and sustainable basis.

THE GSB

With four decades of success in business education, the GSB is part of South Africa’s oldest (founded in 1829), leading, and internationally acclaimed research university—UCT. The only African school in global 100 rankings, the GSB recently moved up the *Financial Times* Top 100 global business school rankings to 52nd position (from 66th in 2006 and 82nd in 2005). The school’s flagship program, the MBA (Figure 1), exists in four forms: full-time (FT), part-time (to be discontinued), modular (MOD), and executive programs.

The GSB has 22 resident faculty with annual contracts (of which 16 are South African nationals, 2 are American, 1 is German, and 3 are British) and 81 part-time faculty without annual contracts (who fly in from the United States, Canada, United Kingdom, Spain, Germany, the Netherlands, Japan, India, and South Africa, including 25 from other departments in UCT). The faculty are supplemented by 45 administrative staff.

In 2006, 57 students were accepted into the FT MBA and 49 into the MOD MBA. Of these, South Africans constituted 79 of the 106 students, other Africans (Botswana, Liberia, Malawi, Ghana, Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Zambia, Nigeria, and Namibia) constituted 14, and the rest of the class was made up from students from outside of Africa. Western Europe traditionally makes up the bulk of this group, with North Americans a recent addition. With average ages of 31 and 33, respectively, the FT class averages 8 years prior work experience, and the MOD class averages 9 years (11% of the accepted students had 3 years of management experience, the school’s minimum requirement; 60% of the students had more than 6 years of work experience).

The gender balance of both classes was one third female. However, the racial profile of the classes differed significantly (for the FT class: 67% White, 9% Colored, 18% African, 7% Indian, 0% Asian; for the MOD class: 33% White, 14% Colored, 33% African, 16% Indian, 4% Asian). These statistics are very significant given that pre-1994 there was negligible representation of African (local and from other parts of Africa), Colored (mixed race), Indian (was classified differently from other Asians during Apartheid), and Asian delegates on any of the programs at the GSB.

CROSS-VERGENCE

The GSB decided to pioneer a new model of a business school in Africa, one that was both international in orientation and suited to countries where there are simultaneous imperatives of sociopolitical transformation, international competitiveness, and economic development—essentially a hybrid, or
Figure 1: Structure of the Graduate School of Business Full-Time MBA Program

- Our minimum required hours for an MBA year is 2,400 hours (min) & 3,000 hours (maximum)
- Excluding pre-MBA, the MBA course below amounts to 2,450 hours
- 120 hours is equivalent to 20 2-hour class sessions (40 hours) plus 80 hours of group/individual work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-MBA (50 hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Orientation Week (30 hours/3) | CLL I (30 hours/3 credits) | CLL II (50 hours/5 credits) | CLL III (20 hours/2 credits) | CLL IV (10 hours/1 credit) |

| TERM 1: JAN – MAR (480 + 60 + 60 = 600 hours/60 credits) |
| Strategy (120/12) |
| Economics (120/12) |
| Decision Analysis (120/12) |
| Accounting (120/12) |

| TERM 2: APR – JUN (520 + 50 + 30 = 600 hours/60 credits) |
| Technology & Operations Management (120/12) |
| Finance Management (120/12) |
| People Management (120/12) |
| Marketing (120/12) |
| Research Report I (40 hours/4) |

| TERM 3: JUL – SEP (570 + 20 + 10 = 600 hours/60 credits) |
| Strategic Change & Growth (120/12) |
| 2 Electives (240/24) from streams (e.g., social enterprise; innovation; strategic growth; product development; doing business in emerging markets; managing & leading global markets) |
| Company Analysis I (100/10) |
| Research Report II (110/11) |

| TERM 4: OCT – DEC (640 + 10 = 650 hours/65 credits) |
| 2 Electives (240/24) from streams (e.g., advanced leadership; advanced marketing; management accounting; investment; mastering strategic change; advanced corporate finance; starting your own business; etc.) |
| Company Analysis II (60/6) |
| Research Report III (340/34) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business, Government and Society (BGS) – 100 hours (10 credits)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BGS I (60 hours/6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGS II (30 hours/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGS III (10 hours/1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 Core Courses @ 12 credits each = 108 + CLL @ 14 credits + BGS @ 10 credits = 132 core credits (53% of MBA credits)
Electives are 4 @ 12 credits = 48 credits (20%); CA is 16 credits (7%) and Research Report/Dissertation is 49 credits (20% of MBA credits)
Total = 245 (100% of MBA credits)
**SHIFT AT THE GSB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREVIOUS IMPLICIT &amp; EXPLICIT ASSUMPTIONS</th>
<th>NEW IMPLICIT &amp; EXPLICIT ASSUMPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and incremental improvement of the status quo</td>
<td>Large proportion of society display resourcefulness and want to be entrepreneurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation of harmony &amp; stability/equilibrium (maintaining order)</td>
<td>Leaders identified by the quality of people’s interactions, rather than their position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedding prospective managers &amp; leaders in the existent paternalistic hierarchy (unquestioning acceptance of socio-economic order)</td>
<td>Cultivate healthy constructive dissent and critical questioning for constructive purposes (systemic view)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for big business &amp; corporate life (business-only focus)</td>
<td>All work to enhance to make processes more fulfilling, in all aspects of society (business, public sector &amp; civil society)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job focus (“work as suffering, for which one is rewarded”)</td>
<td>Lifestyle focus (“work as purpose, rewarding in itself”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear emphasis on skills training for managerial and leadership roles</td>
<td>Managers and leaders can have solutions, but also rely on communities of interest &amp; networked intelligence (all voices have contribution to make)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers and leaders must have solutions &amp; provide answers (dependency on the system and leaders)</td>
<td>People are interdependent, and all are active participants in the process of enhancing others (inclusivity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring distinct differences between leaders &amp; followers. Intolerance for the ‘other’</td>
<td>Values democratic processes, honesty and shared ethics. Seeks the common good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence highly valued (“one leads on one’s own”). Leadership defined by individual success</td>
<td>Interdependence the highest form of maturity –requires social-, emotional-, spiritual- and traditional intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivating strong appreciation for risk management (encouraging risk-averse behaviour)</td>
<td>Cultivating a strong appreciation for socio-political systems of organisations (encouraging multiple forms of power usage from individuals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal forms of communication and interacting (excellence in debate)</td>
<td>Communication is crucial with a stress on dialogue &amp; conversation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2:** Previous Assumptions Shifted to New Set of Program Assumptions

NOTE: GSB = Graduate School of Business.

cross-vergence, model (Harvey, Carter, & Mudimu, 2000; McFarlin, Coster, & Mogale-Pretorius, 1999; Mellahi, 2000). This model, based on the anthropological roots of acculturation theory (Ralston, Gustafson, Cheung, & Terpstra, 1993; Ward, Pearson, Entrekin, & Winzar, 1999), sought to synergistically integrate and balance Western and African cultural and economic ideology. The school believed that only by taking this cross-vergence route could it equip future business leaders with the knowledge, depth, and vision for the common good that was needed to steer South Africa and other developing societies to success, with accompanying positive developmental impacts, both at home and on the international stage. The GSB therefore set in motion the redesign of its MBA programs, by first addressing the underlying assumptions on which the curricula were based (Figure 2).
It was acknowledged that all courses in the MBA should begin their own transformation toward hybridization of content and approaches, and four key course areas would be the areas of significant leverage. As a result, to date, the GSB is the only business school in Southern Africa that has made communication, learning, and leadership (CLL), business, government, and society (BGS), entrepreneurship, and sustainable development explicit parts of its core curriculum. Up until 2000, the leadership course on the MBA (taught to an average of 20 students each year, who all chose the elective course) consisted of traditional material, which still makes up the core content of many other business school leadership curricula (e.g., motivating the firm’s human capital, executing strategic change, reward system design, decision making, team building, strategic negotiation, corporate culture, and strategic organizational design). In 2001, we turned the elective leadership course into a core foundation course (CLL) that every MBA student has to complete, which is purposefully holistic and focused on all aspects of development—emotional, spiritual, intellectual, physical, and social (what is termed “growing the whole person”; e.g., Herman & Schmidt-Wilk, 2005; see Figure 3).

**LEADERSHIP ENHANCEMENT**

When at the school, students are immersed in the learning experience, which includes daily intensive interaction with syndicate groups and lots of personal face time with professors in syndicate sessions. An important part of the learning experience is the proximity and extended availability (e.g., evenings and weekends) of the faculty. Our pedagogy is premised on our belief that we are engaged in leadership enhancement—rather than leadership skills development. Given their work and societal experience, we believe that our students are already leaders in their own right and that we are therefore not in the business of transferring basic leadership skills to them (e.g., we teach them Socratic dialogue techniques that enhance their ability to engage others more deeply and build relationships, as opposed to solely teaching them how to communicate in business). We also believe that through our new context-relevant curricula, we are enhancing and enriching their leadership capabilities and, therefore, their effectiveness in the lives of their families, communities, and society as a whole. For this reason, *leadership development* is a less appropriate term to us. This notion filters into our classrooms and syndicate sessions in many ways, specifically in that lectures and syndicate sessions are facilitated events during which leaders are learning from leaders through the sharing of societal and workplace experiences, and professors and lecturers act as some of the leaders in the room at any one time. This, in turn, leads to much more interaction and sharing of experiences from the variety of contexts, cultures, insights,
SELF MASTERY

- Provide a pathway for students to explore their authentic selves, and authentic living
- Encourage students to be vulnerable, therefore more able to learn about themselves
- Establish bases/pillars for continuous self-development throughout their lives
- Encourage personal responsibility-taking for their future well-being, careers & lives

COMMUNICATION & DIALOGUE

- Engender an openness to learning
- Expose students' worldviews to difference
- Develop inter-cultural team competence
- Encourage students to be comfortable in uncertainty, trust themselves to step into the unknown
- Get students to embrace the power of diversity, and the richness that inclusion presents
- Provide skills for effective networking

TRANSFORMATIVE LEADERSHIP

- Integration of the personal- and the organisational
- Help students unearth their personal, non-trivial purposes
- In addition to thinking about efficiency, and effectiveness, we encourage students to think about what it means to be responsible
- Shift virtues and private character into inclusive community values

LEARNING GOALS

PERSONAL LEADERSHIP

- Self leadership
- Self organisation
- Self reflection
- Personal scenarios

INTRA-PERSONAL LEADERSHIP

- Dialogue skills
- Creating space for dialogue
- Storytelling
- Personal scenarios

INTER-PERSONAL LEADERSHIP

- Collaborative enquiry
- Re-scripting
- Awareness of others
- Developing discernment

LEARNING DESIGN

(Design of CLL course)

- Macro- & micro changes in the world (social, political, technological, environmental, and economic; and its impact on leadership)
- Leadership vs. management debate (drive students to a personal definition around leadership; explore the global shift to shared leadership construct)
- The practice of being a reflective practitioner (adaptive; innovative; ethical; motivated; combining specialisation & generalisation; trends in leadership; crises in meaning; search for purpose, social identity & flow)
- Cultivating a learning outlook/cURIosity through leveraging one's formative events; lessons from defining moments and people one has encountered in life
- Developing judgement/discernment (reframe reality; personal values; instrumental repertoire)
- Conscious and shadow/unconscious processes (ego states; individuation; chaos theory & complexity science)

TEACHING PRACTICE

(What actually gets taught)

- Social attractiveness, attribution and prototypicality within groups
- Enable disparate discourses to commingle
- Metacognition (students deep awareness of their cognitive and emotional processes, and their ability to control these)
- Metaskills (personal skills needed to step back & examine themselves, the secondary processes, the irrational/subconscious processes that influence their feelings, behaviour & actions -- and how these affect others)
- Mental models, and organisational constituents that contribute to flawed mental models
- Conversation and dialogue vs. debate and discussion; questioning & listening strategies
- Anxiety-containment paradox
- Power and politics within personal networks and organisational life
- Embracing uncertainty and living with ambiguity

- Emergent pattern recognition
- Creating new historical narratives & horizons of significance that bring causes closer together/things that matter
- Non-trivial authenticity (in which history, or the demands of nature, or the needs of fellow human beings, or the duties of citizenship, or the call of God, or something else of that order crucially matters)
- Diversity & Inclusion (racism; gender; broader dimension of diversity; individual/psychological-and organisational diversity; links to innovation; networked teams & professional networks; change management)
- Servant- and moral leadership; stewardship
- African leadership – explore African ways of leading and managing social groups (including organisations)
- Significance of understanding context/levers of change
- Process-intensive approaches within legislative models
**Figure 3:** The Multipronged Process From Personal to Intrapersonal and Ultimately to Interpersonal Leadership  

**NOTE:** SWOT = Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats.
and backgrounds of the student body. The school began using a mix of systems thinking, action learning, philosophical, managerial, and psychological approaches, and scenario thinking techniques to help individuals to integrate their own prior experience (work and personal), theory, relationships (work and personal), personal purpose, and workplace discourses into a coherent and actionable leadership and management philosophy.

Growth-Stages Method

Our growth-stages methodology takes cognizance of the work of a number of leading theorists (Figure 3), the majority of whom are Western, and the case studies we use tend to be African. But as we develop new content, no doubt this list will change to be more “African heavy” over time. The methodology consists of three stages that we separate out as distinct stages (for academic purposes), but, in reality, they overlap quite a bit and occur concurrently (as opposed to sequentially). The term growth is used on two fronts. First, the actual CLL teaching content is considered a “living curriculum that grows” in the sense that it is reinvented on a regular basis by curriculum designers, faculty, alumni, and students. The course content is continually updated and methodologically enhanced by way of continuous research, scanning, and practice, and about 30% of the content is totally replaced each year. Second, CLL is based on the premise, inspired by a Cashman (1998) quote, “The missing link in leadership development is growing the person to grow the leader. As we grow, so shall we lead” (p. 18), that students have to begin with self-leadership and then grow their influence outward toward other leadership, team leadership, organizational leadership, and finally societal leadership. In essence, it is growth from the “stage of independence” (immaturity), to the “stage of intradependence” (maturity enablement), and ultimately to the “stage of interdependence” (maturity). This is quite challenging for our students, who were all essentially trained in industrial economics tenants (from primary school, through high school and university, and even in the workplace) and are now called on to:

- Engender an openness to be true learners (as opposed to typical MBA posturing in class and being in the know all the time)
- Let go of some of the false reins of personal control (and ultimately control, in the traditional sense, in their organizational lives)
- Make conscious that which has previously been unconscious (personal inhibitors and assumptions that caused them to be less than fully effective)
- Risk venturing into personally uncertain and uncomfortable areas (when letting their guards down and coming out from behind their organizational personas)
- Take responsibility for their own futures (and not depend on other people or organizations to create it for them)
• Embrace difference and the other (to expand their mental models and worldviews)
• See change as a constant

Given the nature of our ambitious goals, it is very hard to causally determine whether our inputs and interventions directly led to change in each student. At best, we have emerging qualitative and anecdotal evidence to go on, but these data strongly show the success of the CLL approach in equipping students with the skills, confidence, and outlook to handle complex problems in diverse organizational and sociopolitical environments. We are particularly pleased when we see such evidence in their written work in which they appear to achieve greater self-awareness and other awareness, deeper insight into their individual responsibility as stewards of both resources and values that enhances the common good, and an appreciation of the importance of context. Examples of comments are shown below. As of 2006, we intend to follow up, with alumni with at least 2 years of post-MBA experience, with focused questionnaires that were first administered while they were students on the CLL course. (The questionnaire has already been piloted, specifically relating to stewardship behavior.)

The CLL course is a must in a new South Africa. I have learned and grown in a way I never thought possible. South Africans need a platform to say exactly how they feel about race in our land today. This is that platform. This culture of open communication must continue to be encouraged.

You caused some interesting eye-openers for me. The newfound responsibility is daunting and exciting at the same time. I had very interesting and open discussions with my wife the last 3 weeks. With a good friend I also discussed the issues you raised. Certainly with my wife we discussed our values and more specifically how we transfer them to our children.

A uniquely powerful experience that has changed me forever. Certainly not what was expected from a leadership course. It was so unexpectantly personal and challenged me deeply about being authentic and living congruently, and even my partner is commenting on how I am now “showing up” differently.

I am still amazed about the amount of mindblocks/assumptions/mental models that you made visible and that I was not aware about. It gives me a lot of new ideas to think about and further develop myself. And thanks for your open and vivid description of life as a Colored person under Apartheid.

I truly appreciate the honesty and openness that was created within the CLL class. I feel privileged at having been a part of, and having the opportunity to be a part of your class. I believe without any doubt that this class has offered the most value out of the MBA. Strangely, I feel more African, and more proud to be so... I would never of thought a year ago that I would say that the “soft stuff” is the hardest of the lot.
Three key faculty are responsible for the design and delivery of CLL during the MBA year (FT) or during the 2-year period (MOD/PT), and they bring in up to 6 other faculty and guest speakers to supplement their teaching and 1 learning support tutor per MBA program and 2 coaches and 2 mentors.

The following subsections highlight the three key constructs: the self-mastery stage, the communication and dialogue stage, and the transformative leadership stage, that govern the methodology (Figure 3) and that are independently discussed.

**Self-Mastery Stage**

The self-mastery stage (Figure 3), focused on personal leadership, consists of four key dimensions: self-leadership, self-organization, self-reflection, and personal scenarios. Each is discussed in detail below.

Mastery (Figure 3) on CLL requires us to assist students to transcend their natures and to rise above their present circumstances (Covey, 1997) to achieve heightened levels of authenticity (Figure 4) and self-mastery (psychological

---

### Figure 4: Values Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHENTICITY: LIVING YOUR PERSONAL VALUES</th>
<th>Legend: Rate each value according to the following legend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>1  I consider the value important, but it is not yet reflected in my daily life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMBITION</td>
<td>2  I have started demonstrating this value in my life, and I am making some progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELEVANCE</td>
<td>3  I regularly demonstrate this value in my life, and I am making good progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEARNING</td>
<td>4  I regularly demonstrate this behaviour and I am making significant progress in mastering this value in my life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTIVE DISSENT</td>
<td>5  I have mastered this value in my life, and I am mentoring others in doing the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREATIVITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHALLENGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENJOYMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INNER HARMONY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOVING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEPENDENCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TIME | WEALTH |
| AMBITION | POWER |
| RELEVANCE | RISK |
| LEARNING | SECURITY |
| CONSTRUCTIVE DISSENT | LOYALTY |
| CREATIVITY | RECOGNITION |
| CHALLENGE | SERVICE |
| ENJOYMENT | EQUALITY |
| DIFFERENT | LEAVING A LEGACY |
| INNER HARMONY | FAMILY |
| LOVING | FRIENDSHIP |
| INDEPENDENCE | HONESTY / INTEGRITY |
mastery, emotional mastery, intellectual mastery, spiritual mastery, and the convergence of these). It is our belief that if they do so, they can source new areas of human motivation and leverage much more of their personal potential.

The CLL course seeks to maximize learning through exposure to multiple perspectives and worldviews (Figure 5) by emulating contextually relevant human social interactions in social structures people know as reality, through simulating South African society and organizational life by way of role-playing and acting, case studies, guest speakers, visits to industry, interviewing senior executives in their workplaces, and deep personal dialogue about key personal dilemmas (e.g., perception of reverse discrimination, unconscious privilege, spiritual separation, leader-employee distance, etc.). This exploration is intended to force students to think about and take accountability (Figure 5) for implementing personal change. We try and structure such change as intentionally recursive (i.e., that students make choices about future desired states after weighing the consequences as best they can and then revisit their choices over and over throughout the course). This is where alumni and guest speakers are critical to our learning process because they extend the reflection on the recursive process beyond the MBA period. They bring into the classroom and onto our electronic chat and blog dialogue forums their social experiences and

Figure 5: April’s Self-Analysis Framework—“Seeds of Influence”
societal and organizational insights on the challenges and usefulness of continuing the processes started during CLL (i.e., being reflective practitioners).

**SELF-LEADERSHIP**

During the self-leadership aspect, the students are exposed to the changing context of business and personal life in the 21st century globalized world (i.e., technical, societal, economic, political, and personal changes and the accompanying challenges that this uncertainty and ambiguity bring; Figure 5). We draw in the multiple insights gleaned from the works of research institutions such as Gallop, Hay Group, YSC, McKinsey, Saratoga, CCL, Aspen, PTI, AfriForum, Omega, and the Strategic Leadership Council, complemented with the personal experiences of guest speakers, alumni, and the teaching faculty’s own consulting experiences. Such exposure usually results in students expressing gaps between where they currently are personally and what they want to be. This experience elicits a number of personal and work-related complaints from them.

We require that they then develop a complaints list: a list of every personal and work complaint, a description of the pay-off for having each complaint, and a description of what their lives, environment, or relationships would become if they (a) do something about overcoming the complaint or (b) do nothing about the complaint. Finally, we ask them to make an adult choice in favor of either a or b. In this way, we hope to encourage mature choices and responsible action that begins the process of shifting students’ loci of control (Figure 5) and stops them from thinking of themselves as “victims” in the world and/or “slaves to capital markets,” to becoming cocreators of their futures.

This complaints exercise is followed up by our requirement that students craft personal vision statements and personal plans (which are open to continuous change) for the futures they desire and what success would look like in such a globalized world. We are very eager for students to pursue the unearthing of their personal vocation and purpose in life, and we provide them with exercises and practical reflective guidelines for doing so.

The idea of being called does not mean that a person is being singled out for a special mission, only that there is a special resonance in one’s life that will find its fullest expression and connection with a larger whole within the context of which one is feeling called. (Spangler, 1996, p. 48)

The main works we draw on to achieve this are Fourman (2005), Cashman (1998), Barrett (1998, 2006), and a values questionnaire we provide (part of which is shown in Figure 5).

The values document serves as the pillar for self-leadership and enhancement (hence its central position in Figure 5), as we encourage our students to
lead from a purposeful values center or core. The cornerstone exercise of the self-leadership stage is the April2 Self-Analysis Framework (Figure 5), which contains 12 key areas for personal development (which we term “seeds”) and which students have to use to complete a 30-page assignment on themselves. For each of the 12 seeds, students have to source an academic definition and what researchers or academics claim the stumbling blocks and means to overcome them are, and how to further enhance seeds that are already well developed (enablers). We insist on only the use of empirically researched academic journals (not popular literature), and students discover that what they are looking for is not often found in management journals but mainly in psychology, psychiatry, medical science, education, sociology, and philosophy publications. The purpose is dual here: Not only are the students working on their own personal development, but they are also learning important research techniques and spanning disciplines for the rest of their studies (and life). Using appropriate literature, students then have to describe quite deep and personal experiences that show their gaps per seed and the practical actions they are going to take (short term and long term) to overcome their stumbling blocks and enhance their enablers.

Students, we believe, are empowered in this manner to make mature choices (Figure 5) that are sometimes tough but always in conjunction with trusted personal stakeholders such as family members, best friends, and current colleagues and to draw in as much independent material as possible to the reflection and sense making (which they have to include as appendices in their assignments). In addition to intellect and skill, we believe that our context requires managers and leaders who are consciously intelligent about their values and principles, purpose, identity (Edmondson & Nkomo, 2001), ethics, moral responsibility, and uniqueness they bring into this world (moving beyond being mere emulators of previous apparent success). We are also quite pedantic about referencing in their assignments, requiring the Harvard referencing technique for all their assignments. The assignments produced for the personal leadership aspect serve as the bases for coaching and mentoring interventions.

STUDENTS CAN, AND MUST, SELF-ORGANIZE TO GROW

The sole pursuit of order without its requisite stresses, particularly in African transitional societies, is at best an illusion, and the assumption that order will make our lives more bearable, less stressful, and thus healthier only works, if it works at all, for those who benefit from the order—usually those on the top of the societal, political, or organizational pyramid and usually only for a while (April, Macdonald, & Vriesendorp, 2000). There is a price to pay (Burgess, quoted in Kelly, 1994, p. 92) which is not immediately obvious: order and control spawn dependency and complacency, kill initiative,
inventiveness, resourcefulness, and creativity, depress morale, and take the joy out of work and living. Henning (cited in Block, 1993, p. xiv) likens corporations to authoritarian religious organizations governed by three basic principles: compliance, watching (checking on compliance), and trying harder in the face of breakdown or failure. None of this does much for the human spirit, and the result is that people eventually do not care about the work they do or how they have succumbed to an unexamined, below-potential life.

Increasingly, leadership theorists are “speaking the undiscussable” (Bohm, 1985) and noting the huge paradox of seeking order and harmony (traditional business school approach) and the new knowledge that equilibrium is not what we should be pursuing. Stacey’s (1996) views on the informal “shadow” side of the organization and Jung, Adler, and Hull’s (1981) “unconscious shadow” side of the individual being are sources of double-loop creativity and learning; that is, learning what challenges and modifies existing norms, procedures, and ways of doing things and a growing body of literature on irrational, “deviant” emotional aspects of organizations and people (Fineman, 1993; Pascale, 1991) are cases in point.

We have learned much through what we term our immersion principle at the business school. We set basic guidelines for our courses and encourage students to make sense (for themselves) of their course loads, their curricula, the environment. In CLL, we provide few to no answers to their personal problems and development. We merely frame the questions and provide useful tools for them to discover, unearth, and choose their own answers. Within the business school, syndicate groups are semiautonomous units tasked to produce high-quality assignments, projects, reports, and results in a timely fashion. The syndicate groups, who meet daily for a number of hours, decide, for themselves, how to tackle the assignments and projects, seek imaginative solutions, assign work to individual members, implement decisions, allocate resources within the group, and manage group disagreements and relationships. Total learning systems (Hudson, 1999) therefore lead toward excellence, meaning creation, and deep relationships (Figure 5) within the framework of the group syndicate process.

Letting go of unconscious transference (Figure 5) and the well-established assumptions and practices above is both uncomfortable and daunting for our students because they may not be able to predict what they are going to get and where they will end up. And as a result, they fight, buck, complain about our loose system, and often act out of ego states. We draw on the work of Berne (1996) to assist with this. However, experience has taught us that it is turbulence, being out of equilibrium and in equilibrium at the same time, that makes the system robust and strong, and students are made more aware of the real paradoxical nature of leadership: Instead of falling into the Western trap of trying to solve the irreconcilable, they should recognize paradox as a feature of human existence, they should turn to their network
(Figure 5) for support and to express their fears, and they have to learn to live creatively with the tension that accompanies it. At the business school, we believe that the challenge for the leaders—our students—is to let go of the actual architecture of the result without letting go of what they do care about, what they get, and where they end up: the values, the principles, the moral responsibility, the vision that undergird the result. Essentially, we encourage the development and enhancement of this “being orientation” (something they take into their lives that is not necessarily something they do in the course).

**SELF-REFLECTION**

In South Africa, the clash of an African (being) versus a Western (doing) approach to life is becoming more prevalent. The Western business culture, typified by phrases such as “Don’t just sit there, do something,” is in stark contrast to the African business culture of “taking the long view.” Busyness, our Anglo-Saxon heritage teaches us, is a badge of honor and something one proudly displays, but sadly, our experience informs us, this behavior often leads to frustration, despair, and burnout. Achieving life balance (Figure 5)—taking time out for ourselves, for our full vacations, for reflection, and for participating in religious ceremonies—appears difficult. As educators, we have the responsibility to reflect this growing reality and provide a balance to the traditional objective, debate, and discourse approaches that students get and with which they are so comfortable, and introduce content purposefully drawn from the subjective, dialogic, and presentational. So we use theatre and role-play, visualization, portraiture and drawing, clay modeling in teams, music in the classroom, journal writing, and poetry; we take walks and mix socially with the students in their pubs, on the squash courts, and at other social and sporting events. All this activity is to raise self-awareness, provide processes for reflection, encourage students to find ways to enhance their spirituality and intuitive senses, and teach them how to listen to the signals their bodies and the universe send them to indicate when they are agitated, sad, happy, angry, tired, energized, unhealthy, and so on. Essentially, we hope to break the cycle of busyness and show them that not all learning takes place within the confines of a classroom.

Academically, the term **reflection** is generally used as a synonym for higher-order mental processes (Butler, 1994; Mezirow, 1990; Rigano & Edwards, 1998; Schön, 1983), and we present it to the students as such, assisting them in becoming mindful, able to critically take in the details of life around them—a sight, a facial expression, others’ feelings, their own assumptions and presumptions, finding flow in their life, and achieving balance. We draw on the works of Ekman (2003), Agel (2001), Csikszentmihalyi (1990), and Tolle (1997) for this. The use of journal writing has also emerged as a
significant introspective tool for promoting individual reflection for personal professional growth (Barclay, 1996; Daudelin, 1996; Marsick, 1990), and we make extensive use of journal writing, critical incident logs, and personal development plans. These provide the bases for development conversations with (a) mentors (alumni and business managers external to the school) who focus on the sociopolitical dimensions of the students’ personal growth (i.e., enhancement of their business competences) and connectivity to sources of power and social networks (Figure 5) in the contexts of their professions, and (b) coaches (trained, accredited coaches and psychologists from our in-house Centre for Coaching) who explore more of the psychosocial dimensions and help students connect with their intrapersonal resources for dealing with external challenges and opportunities. From both the mentor and coach perspectives, clear purposes and expectations and access to skilled mentoring and coaching support are required for inexperienced journal writers to avoid superficial and nonreflective entries, and to overcome the uncertainties and frustrations associated with acquiring new skills.

It is important that lessons learned from journal writing are used in the development of personal scenarios (see below) to encourage ownership of the reflective process by the participant. Critical self-reflection has much in common with the action learning approach of Revans (1978, 1982). As part of the CLL course requirement, we ask our students to consider five base questions of reflection (Cashman, 1998, p. 20) and to continuously make journal entries with regard to them (see Table 1).

As a result, we hear our students commenting on the fact that they are able to redefine the boundaries in their lives to ones that are more acceptable to them, and they find themselves thinking, feeling, leading, interacting, achieving, and maturing emotionally (Figure 5) in more positive and fulfilling ways.

PERSONAL SCENARIOS

A scenario is a tool for ordering one’s perceptions about multiple, alternative future environments in which today’s decisions might play out. In

---

**TABLE 1**

Five Base Questions of Reflection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflective questioning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is really important to me?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do I really want to live my life?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What gives passion, meaning and purpose to my life?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can I make even more of a difference?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can I live connected to these inner values?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE 1: Five Base Questions of Reflection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflective questioning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is really important to me?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do I really want to live my life?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What gives passion, meaning and purpose to my life?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can I make even more of a difference?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can I live connected to these inner values?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
practice at the business school, scenarios resemble a set of written stories resulting from personal, reflective conversations (with the guidance of a mentor and/or coach), built around carefully constructed plots. The process requires students to draw on experience to understand the current situation, attempt to reframe their current path (personal and career) toward future goals or visions, suggest action steps to themselves, and then reinterpret the future goals in light of the positive and negative consequences of the proposed course of action. Personal scenario planning—in which students map out their own stories—enables individuals to imagine, and prepare for, discontinuous change through systematic and recognizable phases.

At the school, unfortunately, we have seen a few students who, aside from the inability to think of what they want for themselves, are also reluctant to articulate a forward-thinking vision. As Baker Miller (1986, p. 109) describes, “If you do not know what you want, you can avoid taking the risk to get it”. Knowing what they do not want also gives them little direction for action. When students let other people decide what they want (parents, teachers, and professors), it absolves them from ever taking responsibility (transference) for not getting where they wanted to be (Figure 5). And so they are back at knowing what they do not want (vs. what they do want) and blaming others (external locus of control) when they get what they did not want, thus reinforcing the closed loop. It is the illusion of a safe existence and fertile ground for the development of victims. They have traded in their deepest longings for a dependence on caretakers whose commitment they have no control over, thus inculcating a learned helplessness. This has serious implications for their future careers and life goals.

Vision is essentially about hope that a transformation is possible. Students have to come to grips with (a) the knowing where they want to be at some point in the future, and (b) the help that they can receive in getting there. They are therefore encouraged through the use of the resources (special syndicate rooms, faculty, and coaches) and tools (journals, electronic conversational banks, future searches, early morning personal topic meetings before lectures, frameworks) to visualize different kinds of futures and are encouraged to design and implement carefully planned, high-involvement, individual change strategies (i.e., personal scenarios around seven thrusts: communication, personal skills and renewal, ethics and accountability, collaboration, and systems—process improvement). These must be clear and can be very specific, for example, individuals can develop a personal strategy by identifying a vision (the “where”), the values (the “how”), and critical success factors (the “what”) to bring about the desired change. This inner mastery focuses students’ diverse intentions and aspirations into purposeful flows (Cashman, 1998, p. 22; Csikszentmihalyi, 1990) where increased effectiveness is a natural result.
Communication and Dialogue Stage

The communication and dialogue stage (Figure 3), focused on intrapersonal leadership, consists of four key dimensions: dialogue skills, creating space for dialogue, storytelling, and personal scenarios, which are discussed in detail below.

Communication and conversation (Figure 5) are often seen as tools for announcing and explaining change, preparing people for the positive and negative effects of change (Jick, 1993), increasing others’ understanding of and commitment to the change (Beckard & Pritchard, 1992; Morgan, 1988), and reducing confusion about and resistance to change (Kotter & Schlesinger, 1987). Kanter, Stein, and Jick (1992) and Broodryk (1992) maintain that communication as a change tool provides access to information and indigenous knowledge, creates understanding, and builds trust. We believe that, in addition, it fosters an appreciation for diversity of perspectives, validates others’ experiences, and provides the conduit for serious commitment to cooperation—a democratization of voices and emotions (Giddens, 1994).

At the business school, we engage students in change communication in three forms: (a) writing about change when reflecting on academic cases and personal good or bad change experiences, (b) acting out simulations of real-world events and debriefing this in facilitated groups, and (c) understanding that change is a phenomenon that occurs within communication, conversation, and dialogue, based on the Ford and Ford (1995), Zohar (1997) and April (1999), getting students to dialogue deep personal issues in a one-on-one setting.

For students, though, change communication is sometimes uncomfortable and difficult to master because it is about insight as the source of action—it requires individuals to move beyond individuality. Robert Haas (in Bennis, 1996) observes,

> It’s difficult to unlearn behaviours that made us successful in the past. Speaking rather than listening. Valuing people like yourself over people of different genders and cultures. Doing things on your own rather than collaborating. Making the decision yourself instead of asking different people for their perspectives. There’s a whole range of behaviours that were highly functional in the old hierarchy that are dead wrong in flatter, more responsive, empowered organizations. (p. 16)

Furthermore, we all bring basic assumptions, mental models that we developed from our early childhood days, our life experiences and socialization, our peers and family, our education and reading or pictures—about how the world operates, our own self-interests, and so on. We unconsciously hold these assumptions so deeply that we become identified with them and will...
defend them with great emotion and energy when they are challenged (April, 1999). So in the CLL course, we involve the students in role-play presentations and theatre or drama to depersonalize the issues and make it more comfortable for students to talk about difficult issues and openly admit to their classmates their lack of knowledge to solve a particular issue. To prepare students for this, we teach them, using Socratic and mindful techniques in group exercises, how to dialogue, which really consists of four key skills:

1. **Suspending judgment.** Because our way of thinking creates what seems like ultimate “truths,” it is difficult for us to stay open to alternative views. When we suspend judgment (hermeneutic listening), we see others’ points of view, hold our positions lightly (listening without providing solutions too soon), and build a climate of trust and safety. As people learn that they will not be judged wrong for having varying opinions, they feel free to express themselves fully.

2. **Identifying assumptions.** When we do not look at the underlying belief system behind our judgments, we make decisions that lead to disappointing results. Only when we peel away the assumptions and expose our mental models and construction of thought can we see what might be giving us trouble: some “incoherent” thought.

3. **Listening.** We focus on developing our capacity to stay present and open by listening and perceiving at more subtle levels to the meaning arising at both the individual and collective levels. This means that we spend quite a bit of time teaching students and assisting them to practice the art of hermeneutic listening as opposed to the often well-developed evaluative and interpretive listening techniques.

4. **Inquiring and reflecting.** By learning how to ask appropriate questions that lead to new understanding, we accelerate our collective learning. We gain awareness of our thinking processes and the issues that separate and unite us.

**CREATING SPACE FOR DIALOGUE AND CONVERSATION**

To be more conducive to dialogue, 21st-century schools have to create spaces that are “less formal,” special places with whiteboards, charts, and other thinking tools and more natural lighting (Dixon, 1998, pp. 103-104) than traditional conference and lecture rooms. Studies have also shown that the availability of community common rooms actually serves to increase team member collaboration (Wild, Bishop, & Sullivan, 1996). At the business school, we have transformed our student common room and other rooms. We now have one massive common room for all on-campus students. Students see each other every day—around their post boxes, around microwave ovens, and around the tea and coffee dispensers—relaxing in lounge sofas and sitting around circular tables arranged so as to facilitate conversation. Our in-house Brig (recreational area) has been purposefully designed in such a way as to facilitate social interaction and dialogue.
STORYTELLING

As many people who have tried to play informal leadership roles in organizations, quietly influencing from below (Badaracco, 2002), will recognize a power structure in which status and positional power wield strong influence can strongly undermine informal leadership roles that can potentially alter or undermine the paradigm of the dominant power group. Those who pose a challenge to the status quo, rather than being appreciated as a potential source of innovation, may be labeled as maverick or deviant and personally suffer in terms of belittlement, backlash, or exclusion from the inner core of an organization. To preserve dominant views that opposites cannot coexist without dysfunctional conflict, students often resort to game playing, or what Argyris (1990) terms “defence routines” and Goleman (1997) calls “psychological defence mechanisms”: repression, denial and reversal, projection, isolation, rationalization, sublimation, selective inattention, and automatism (De Board, 1978; Menzies Lyth, 1988; Willcocks & Rees, 1995). We notice that the model likely to triumph is that which accords with the dominant logic (Western management approaches), and subsequently narratives or stories regarding individualistic, formal, and directive leadership tend to be legitimized.

For informal leadership to be allowed to play an effective role, the constructs of hierarchy and consequently positional power would seem to need to be fundamentally dislodged from traditional mental models. In some African cultures, storytellers have a central place in society, similar to the way in which journalists are regarded in Western societies (Mbigi, 2005). Storytelling occupies a special place in the hearts of Africans, whose oral tradition goes back centuries (Christie & Mhlope, 1996; Khoza, 2006). Storytelling as a leadership skill, therefore, is the tool in our CLL curriculum for showing students how to use other forms of power. In Africa, some modern authors (Solomon Mutsvairo, Yvonne Vera, Njabulo Ndebele, Mathopi Motloatse) have rediscovered the power of African storytelling and are seeking ways to restore it to its previous glory through four types (Mbigi, 2005) of stories.

1. **Fables.** Fables are imagined, nonreal stories mainly about the baboon and hare. They provide the initial stage in moral instruction and development in African culture and are often punctuated by didactic poetry in which the audience participates.

2. **Histories and myths.** Histories and myths help make sense, through recurrent reality-based themes, of the universe and some of the seemingly unanswerable questions connected to life (e.g., the creation, the struggle for self-discovery and identity, battles, warriors and heroes, love, self-sacrifice, wisdom, and maturity).

3. **Instruction and exhortation.** In African culture, storytelling (as opposed to direct moral slogans) is the primary method of instruction in raising
children, entrenching values and cultivating character (e.g., trustworthiness and generosity are valued above opportunism and selfishness).

4. **Symbolism and praise singing.** Symbols are important in Africa for communicating beliefs and securing identity through the culture of ancestors. The youth also receive heritage lessons during artistic rituals and ceremonies, and traditions are put on display and reaffirmed.

We encourage students to deepen their connectedness (Figure 5) through informally telling stories all day and to use language that is abstract, evangelical, and even poetic to integrate their African heritage with the dominant Western business identity. They also post stories on the electronic repository in the form of blogs. We have formal storytelling sessions in class—even faculty and guest speakers have to tell their personal stories—and we ask students to formally write short stories in our course. In this way, we intend to help students get beyond the devaluing prejudices that we all hold and open themselves to “deeper relationships” (Figure 5) that true teamwork can be built among groups. Together students develop this. It is the classic way of creating shared vision, designing a community, a meaningful future, a coherent group, so that all may feel safe to contribute because the stories are never personal—unless, of course, someone wants to become personal.

We find that our students allow themselves, in storytelling sessions, to be affected by others, others’ stories, others’ lives, which ordinarily they would not necessarily tolerate. The lessons learned, therefore, are not restricted to the story itself but include the interaction of different people with the story. It is a time in which students (and faculty) can allow their minds to travel, to teach themselves about language and culture (remembering that there are 11 official languages in our country), about differences in perceiving reality, about who they were, and so on (usually 12 to 17 different countries are represented on our courses).

As a young democracy, we also have the responsibility of growing and developing (telling and writing) our own South African stories (workplace, community, social, and individual). Personal feedback and trust then become natural processes. Trust is considered here to be emotionally based but with a cognitive component and depends on the belief in the reliability of oneself or the other person or group. It can only be given by each person rather than be demanded. New stories are created by present behavior, and students are kept accountable (Figure 5) by their peers (i.e., they watch each other for congruence between the stories told and people’s lives). This often comes up during mentoring and coaching sessions. Without this type of dialogue and interaction as input, individuals will not develop a rich enough level of content, not just about events but about the systemic structures and mental models (Figure 5) that exist below the surface. Hawkins (2002), Mphahlele (2002), Cleveland (2002), and Buscaglia (1982) are the texts drawn on for this aspect of the storytelling stage.
As part of the CLL course, we monitor the levels of feedback, both electronically and through weekly “forums of interest” or “communities of interest and practice” (Brown & Duguid, 1991; Fischer, 2001). One such forum, for example, is the diversity forum, where students, and sometimes invited faculty, meet once a week for an informal lunch or dinner and usually invite a prominent guest from industry to join them. These are students who, through storytelling, have found others with whom they enjoy conversing about value systems, moral responsibility, social consciousness, and the role of diversity in the school and in the workplace, minority and majority viewpoints, human nature, and so on. New connections are found, and students get new understandings of the interrelatedness of their existence in South Africa and abroad. Inclusive storytelling is, often, the time in which such comments emerge: “I did not know what it was like in the shanty-towns/projects,” “I did not know that you felt that way about me,” “I was unaware of the reason why other people in this country were so angry,” “I now understand the hurt and guilt I am carrying around,” “I did not realize the impact of language and the use of certain words on other people’s self-confidence.” Storytelling, we believe, is where students really discover each other as citizens—hence, it is integral to our leadership enhancement process.

Transformative Leadership Stage

The transformative leadership stage (Figure 3), focused on interpersonal leadership, consists of four key dimensions: collaborative enquiry, awareness of others, rescripting, and developing discernment, each of which is discussed in detail below.

COLLABORATIVE ENQUIRY

Collaborative reflective enquiry forms a bridge between individual learning and the responsible organization, and students are guided into practicing generative learning—what Argyris and Schön (1974, 1996) call “learning to learn” and Bateson (1972) calls “double-loop learning.” Instead of simply learning to do what they have always done a little better, the third stage—transformational leadership—requires the reexamining of everything the students do. At this level, students must become collegiate leaders and also compassionately serve (Figure 5), liberate their peers to become system thinkers, understand and be empathetically appreciative of the context within which they practice their leadership roles, garner the courage to live a moral and ethical life (Figure 5) and encourage others to do the same, collaboratively redefine old categories and change standards of judgment (so necessary in a country that endured 300 years of Apartheid), and gain understanding of
relationship networks (Figure 5) and the power of sufficiently empowered energies for strengthening democracies. The collegiate leader is a natural relationship builder who seeks to grow classmates through building an inclusive sense of belonging. The collegiate leader needs consensus to actively serve others with authority, but knows the power of shaping consensus rather than simply waiting for consensus to emerge. (This was true for Gandhi, King, and Mandela, whose works we draw on here, who set out to serve and ended up leading. Yet what attracted followers was the passion they demonstrated in the act of serving.)

We instill in students the fact that people respond better to you when they have a sense that you compassionately care about them, share their pain, identify with their suffering, and want to help meet their need (Figure 5). They are more likely to be moved by your passion for change when they feel caught up in what Buber (1958) calls a “current of reciprocity.” The power to lead as a servant comes from the realization by one’s followers that they can move from being victims of circumstances to being participants in creating new circumstances. Given that transformative leadership requires a hybrid mix of collegiate and servant leadership, it therefore is a form of leadership at the highest level of maturity (Figure 5) of the three stages and therefore demands courage. We ask students to complete a character self-assessment, with the aid of a questionnaire we developed based on tenants from positive psychology, and then ask them to conduct 360-degree reviews on their classmates’ characters. From that they then have to develop a 30-page assignment.

The courage we seek to instill in our students is not physical courage but rather a moral courage and a new determination to use “soft power” as opposed to “hard power.” According to Nye (2004), hard power, based on coercion, refers to the ability to use economic and military might to influence and even coerce (the ability to get others to do what we want), whereas soft power, based on attraction, refers to the ability to attract and influence through the flow of information and the appeal of social, cultural, and moral messages (the ability to get others to want the same things we do). Hard power often results in conformity, which, in organizational life, we often mistake for union. Physical courage differs from moral courage in that “nature pushes you to do so” (Kidder, 2005, p. 25), whereas moral courage is the readiness to face the pains of social disapproval while feeling the ease of one’s conscience. Physical courage, the lowest form of courage, also decays under the intense demands of combat or strain, whereas moral courage grows by the doing of deeds that require us to put it into practice. We encourage our students to begin cultivating the habit of doing the right thing and exercising responsible leadership for the common good through community projects (i.e., before making any decision or taking any action that affects a
community, to ask themselves, “What does it mean to be responsible as a leader in making this decision or doing this act?”

AWARENESS OF OTHERS

Students behave the way they do for good reasons: those behaviors have usually served them well in the past. Their tendency to include or exclude themselves in groups and to want to lead others or want to be led, and their longing for intimacy or just the opposite, have grown out of adaptive responses that made sense in their past (Schutz, 1994). But how rigidly do they adhere to these tendencies? Can they adapt their behaviors to different circumstances, the requirements of the new situation? Or have they become rigid in their ways? Old tapes are being replayed—“parent tapes” and “voices of authority.” Meanings held by individual students cannot be taken for granted because they are composed of expectations about “what they think” and “what should be”; even to the point where “what is” becomes conditioned by “what should be.” Ignored meanings lead to the withdrawal of commitment because people value meanings they have formed together—therefore making continuous feedback necessary. After a group assignment or project is completed, faculty require that a written evaluation be made, by the students, of the process—usually focusing on the group as a whole (using a framework we have developed for them) rather than on individual performances. We also get students to reflect on, and write about, a personal experience in which they partook when difference was not valued and to critically analyze why they chose not to act (see appendix). In addition, we ask them to go out of the school (on the street, in a workplace setting, at a restaurant) and conduct a 1-hour interview with someone they do not know and who is different from them (they can choose the difference dimension—values, ethnicity, sexuality, schooling, socioeconomic background, gender, way of thinking, functional background, etc.). In the interview, they ask the following questions:

1. What has been your experience in your current, or previous, organization as a person who is different (e.g., by gender, nationality, age, etc.)?
2. What are the kinds of things that have happened in your workplace, your industry, or the country that have caused you to feel uncomfortable?
3. How have you handled, or are handling, these situations?
4. What has this meant for how you work now (and how you will work)?
5. What is the difference between the type of conversations you engage in at home or with friends and what you feel comfortable talking about at work?

In addition to capturing the interviewee’s responses, after doing the interview, they are encouraged to spend time asking themselves, and writing their responses to, the following:
1. What, if anything, surprised me about this conversation?
2. What was my personal level of comfort while I was conducting it?
3. What did I learn?
4. What additional questions did this interview raise for me?

**RESCRIPTING**

The idea behind generating awareness is to bring out the unexpected relationships and fundamental causes that have been hidden underneath the noticeable and significant symptoms that everyone sees. The school uses a number of personality assessment instruments to aid the process of awareness generation (e.g., the Myers-Briggs Personality Indicator, the Enneagram, the Learning Style Inventory, and the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description). What we tell our students about these instruments is,

What is important about these instruments is not so much that they will tell you who you are and ‘explain’ or ‘excuse’ you, but rather that they provide you with a vocabulary to describe differences, and present them as gifts that you all bring to a group.

Our school benefits from having all types; however, this shared leadership and diversity also causes stress in the system if students and faculty are not mindful of the “traps.” By being mindful of the traps of assessment, the practical value of such instruments is that when two or more students clash over how to do something, it may have something to do with the way in which they take in and process information rather than with who is right and who is wrong. And thus their task is not so much to quibble over whose leadership to follow but rather to rescript their understanding that some kinds of tasks come more natural to some of them than to others (at this time in their careers), and this may be a way to divide the work or call on someone’s strengths.

Three sets of skills will help them with understanding the larger system and their role in it: introspection (rather than accusing others, examine how they, themselves, may have contributed to a problem), reflection (stepping back and becoming more aware), and inquiry (asking questions to test assumptions; April et al., 2000). These skills will allow them to rescript, and instead of looking for a place to put blame, they agree on the basics (the task, the process). They search for common ground, they experiment, they doubt their own infallibility, and they treat differences as a group responsibility. Understanding the implications of this diversity of networks helps them to understand why multiple realities exist, how relationships evolve and dissolve, and how and why new ones form. It also focuses on the roles that different relationships play and how they function within the operation of the entire system.
DEVELOPING DISCERNMENT

The demands of the organizational life and the MBA course make it difficult, and sometimes painful, for students to create the space for deep learning. Painful moments are good times to learn, and as faculty we design “quasi-painful moments” in the classroom or create “safe spaces” for students to unearth previous painful moments. We therefore encourage students to journal during, or in thinking about, painful moments, around a number of questions: “Why did I react so strongly to this person?” “Why did I raise my voice?” “Why did my palms sweat?” “Why was I uncomfortable?” “Why does she or he seem to have so much authority or power over me?” Of course, the students have to notice these things before they can reflect on them, and for this we do initially skill them in the theory and practice of metaskills, metacognition, and secondary processes, drawing on the work of Mindell (1995). The focus of their energy on others, though, needs to be redirected to themselves. Instead of “Why did she behave so aggressively?” they should be asking, “What was it about her aggressive behaviour that triggered something in me?” “Who does she remind me of?” “Where has this happened before?” and “How often is this happening to me?” “Stepping back” or “going to a higher viewing point” always provides a different perspective (Beerel, 1998, p. 124). For the CLL course, we have drawn from Deeprose (1995), Hudson (1999), and Flaherty (1999) to develop our particular approach.

Feedback is critically important to this aspect of the student-development process, and so we invite our students to involve their key stakeholders to be part of their school lives whenever possible (e.g., spouses, children, family members, the school, and the community are part of the system, and we often see students’ children and family members at the school with them—this is encouraged). As faculty, we expect this of our students—it is part of their responsibility as leaders.

Conclusion

The 21st century world of business is characterized by continuous change that can appear to overwhelm our structures of intellectual thought that make sense of the world (Marris, 1974, pp. 15-18). Traditional curricula at business schools, particularly those in emerging economies, need to adapt their curricula to match the burgeoning reality of a new world. Creative activity and responses, needed to engender new structures, grow out of the relationship between individuals and their work and the interactions between an individual and other human beings. Because complex problems require more knowledge than does any single-person possess, it is necessary that all involved stakeholders participate, communicate, collaborate, and learn from each other. Sociological and psychological distances and diversity between
people, and their communities, are important sources for social creativity—and business schools need to seek to close such distances. Adaptation takes time and is not just a rational process; it will always involve a degree of emotional and spiritual acceptance on the part of those affected. At the GSB of UCT, we believe that our immersion principle is a relevant context in which to prepare South Africa’s leaders and other leaders (particularly from emerging economies and developing countries) for continuous change. We encourage further research at other business schools, even collaboratively with ourselves, into aspects of our growth-stages management education methodology that are still emerging and developing: the reintegration of African philosophy into the business lexicon and practices, the role of identity in leadership legitimacy, the mitigating effects of incongruent values on personal discretionary effort, and servant and responsible leadership as the way forward for countries struggling with dualistic imperatives such as sociopolitical complexities found in emerging and developing countries.

Appendix

Diversity Was Not Valued

Critically describe an encounter you experienced that involved behaviour or conversations in which diversity was not valued. The following are examples:

A colleague engaged in conversation or behaviour that was inappropriate (e.g., racist jokes, sexist remarks), and no intervention (either by me, or by someone else) was made into the situation.

An individual was excluded from an important conversation, an event or activity because of feelings that the person’s presence would make others uncomfortable. The exclusion was based on the person’s “difference.”

In your description of the incident, note how the situation got started and what the background was. The following questions will assist you in constructing your description.

1. What made me uncomfortable enough about this situation to recall it clearly?
2. What made me NOT intervene?
3. What surprised me about it?
4. How did I handle it? What did that mean for my relationships with others?
5. How could I have handled it differently? What would that have meant for my relationships with others?
6. What do I intend to do about it in the future?
7. Write down anything else that you may feel is relevant to this, or similar, situation(s).
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