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Introducing the Manual

Purpose and Background

Purpose

In a world in which inequality is growing and where poverty, prejudice, and oppression are the dominant reality of well over two billion people, most from marginalized groups and communities in the Global South, "social justice" and "leadership" are both of critical importance. Not surprisingly, both of these are complex and challenging—not only to achieve, but even to define. Yet people in many different contexts around the world, using a wide range of strategies, are demonstrating the courage and commitment necessary to create solutions to social injustices. And in so doing, they are challenging dominant concepts about how leadership is developed and exercised.

In the above context, this manual supports the further development of new leaders committed to social justice, broadly defined. More specifically, as a tool for facilitators of workshops and other education and training events, it shares resources—session designs, exercises, handouts, short readings, and other materials—that were developed through our work on Leadership for Social Justice Institutes organized at the request of the Ford Foundation International Fellowships Program.

Background

In 2002, the Ford IFP secretariat in New York asked the Advocacy Institute and the School for International Training (SIT) to develop a Leadership for Social Justice Institute for their first group of fellows. At that point, IFP had only recently begun its innovative and massive effort to identify, select, and provide graduate study support for over 4,000 people from socially and economically marginalized communities within twenty countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, as well as from Palestine and Russia. The program sought current or potential leaders from those
communities, including people from indigenous and minority communities, women, and disabled people. It also encouraged fellows to choose any field of study relevant to their interests, and allowed them to choose to study in Europe, North America, or other parts of the Global North, in their own countries, or in other parts of the Global South.

Once core elements of this ambitious fellowship program were off the ground, the IFP leadership began to focus on ways to ensure that this very disparate group of fellows would be given opportunities to develop or enhance their leadership capacities and build networks that would allow them to be yet more effective agents of social justice. The pilot Leadership for Social Justice Institute, held on the SIT campus, was a one-week activity for 37 fellows from seven countries, with interpretation for speakers of English, Spanish, French, and Russian. Building on that experience, the Advocacy Institute, SIT, and IFP worked together to expand the Leadership for Social Justice initiative—adding an online community (which grew out of an expressed need from fellows) to support networking, and continually testing new models and approaches to scale up the institutes, with a goal of serving the growing number of fellows.

Between 2002 and 2006, the Advocacy Institute and SIT engaged nearly 1,000 fellows in LSJ Institutes, working together and in various types of partnership or support roles with other institutions. In the process, we tested other venues in addition to SIT—in other countries (the Netherlands, Thailand, Mexico, and England) and elsewhere in the United States (Arkansas and Washington, DC). We tested different combinations of language mediums, including institutes with only one language. And we tested different sizes of institutes, the largest of which had 155 fellows. However, beyond the search for viable ways to scale up, the most fundamental questions driving our design process were the following:

- What are the different “leadership” (defined broadly) functions and roles involved in “social justice” (also defined broadly)?
- What are the core competencies (awareness, knowledge, and skills) that are common to most if not all of those functions and roles?
- What benefits are there to building networks among the fellows, especially across national and regional boundaries?
- Within the limits of one-week institutes, what objectives should we set for competency and network building?
- What methods are most appropriate for achieving those objectives?
- How can the institutes most effectively stimulate or support other, especially ongoing, activities that have similar objectives?

An overview of how the institutes and other activities evolved in response to these questions, and a discussion of our evolving answers, can be found in Appendix A. The authors of this resource manual will also present a much more thorough analysis of the functions, roles, challenges, and
competencies of social justice leadership, grounded in case studies and literature reviews, in a forthcoming book.

This resource manual focuses on sharing elements of the institutes that may be utilized by others involved in the design and delivery of similar programs. In doing so, we are very aware that there will be few if any other situations where a reader will be faced with the task of designing a week-long leadership and network-development program for an international, multilingual group of graduate students in multiple fields connected by a common commitment to social justice. Indeed, as IFP moves into its next phase and focuses on financially and logistically feasible options for serving the more than 3,000 additional fellows still “in the pipeline,” it will be shifting its approach to institutes or other activities that are more local (national or subregional) in focus.

Thus, the core of the resource manual consists of relatively detailed designs and corresponding resource materials for each of the core modules that were part of the 2006 institute in Washington, DC, as well as for several modules that had been successful in earlier institutes but which did not fit into the 2006 institute’s agenda. We believe that one or more modules, in different combinations, will be useful to program developers and facilitators of IFP’s new decentralized LSJ programs and in other contexts, including various types of graduate fellowship programs, leadership development programs, and staff development programs within social justice oriented organizations. Where possible, we provide notes about ways that a module might be adapted to such contexts.

To demonstrate one model of how these various modules were sequenced and integrated into a whole, the resource book also includes a detailed description of the design for the 2006 institute in Washington, DC.

**How This Manual Is Organized**

**Modules**

The training program is divided into eight modules with separate but complementary themes. The first seven are set in a sequence that allows participants in multiday workshops to systematically develop wide-ranging social justice leadership competencies as well as professional relationships with other participants based on mutual support, exchange of information, and the possibility of future collaboration. The eighth module, Action Planning and Synthesis, provides activities undertaken by participants on each day of the workshop, to enable them to consider and contemplate the themes of the other modules and to factor those lessons into plans for future action. The learning modules are as follows:

- **Module 1: Community Building**
- **Module 2: Networking**
- **Module 3: Participants’ Achievements**
- **Module 4: Leadership for Social Justice—Concepts and Practice**
- **Module 5: Global Policy—Issues and Advocacy**
- **Module 6: Intercultural Communication**
- **Module 7: Managing Transitions**
- **Module 8: Action Planning and Synthesis**
Module Purpose and Background
At the beginning of each module, we explain why the module is being undertaken and why the competencies discussed therein are useful for social justice leaders. Furthermore, we describe insights and lessons learned through our experience with LSJ Institutes from 2002 to 2006.

Module Summaries
In order to give facilitators a quick, easy-to-grasp snapshot of each module, we provide the following information:

Objectives—Describes what participants will learn or how they will otherwise benefit from taking part in the module.

Sessions—Provides the name of each session and sequence of sessions comprising the module.

Time—Outlines how long the entire module will take.

Readings—Identifies literature included in the manual that participants should read before taking part in the module. Also includes readings that facilitators and participants may consult for further knowledge on subjects covered in the module.

Special Preparation—Refers to groundwork and preparation that facilitators must make before conducting the module.

Facilitators’ Notes—Refers to key learning points facilitators should stress, special difficulties facilitators may face in conducting the module, and ways that a module might be adapted to a variety of learning contexts. Also provides alternative training ideas and approaches that facilitators may consider.

Sample Design
Each module includes a sample design that is based on training designs and agendas from LSJ Institute agendas between 2002 and 2006.

Resources and Activities
Each module contains activities that facilitators may use to assist participants in developing certain competencies for social justice leadership. Each activity includes a description of what to do, materials needed to conduct the activity (such as flip charts or overhead projectors), and special preparations facilitators should make prior to the activity. Modules also include resources that provide facilitators with techniques and information on subjects including introducing or concluding a module; conducting discussion panels, debriefing sessions, or poster sessions; and facilitating discussions on readings, films, or other literature used in the module.
### Leadership for Social Justice: A Sample Multi-Day Institute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Name &amp; Objectives of Module</th>
<th>Sessions</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Community Building</strong>&lt;br&gt;1. To welcome workshop participants and establish learning community norms&lt;br&gt;2. To begin making connections within thematic groups&lt;br&gt;3. To learn about participants and the social justice challenges they face</td>
<td><strong>Community Building</strong>&lt;br&gt;1. Opening Plenary&lt;br&gt;2. Thematic Group Meeting/Establishing Norms&lt;br&gt;3. Story Circles</td>
<td>Day 1&lt;br&gt;1 hr 30 min 2 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Networking</strong>&lt;br&gt;1. To learn about the value of networks; to describe the basic elements of a network and how effective leaders use networks&lt;br&gt;2. To discuss current networks, including goals and needs that guide expansion&lt;br&gt;3. To identify specific processes for building one’s own network and helping others do the same, including the function of brokering</td>
<td><strong>Networking</strong>&lt;br&gt;1. Introduction to Networking&lt;br&gt;2. Network Mapping</td>
<td>30 min&lt;br&gt;1 hr 30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Participants’ Achievements</strong>&lt;br&gt;1. To learn about and celebrate participant achievements in social justice work&lt;br&gt;2. To provide participants with the opportunity to share their social justice work with other participants though discussions and poster sessions</td>
<td><strong>Participants’ Achievements</strong>&lt;br&gt;1. Panel Presentations&lt;br&gt;2. Poster Session&lt;br&gt;3. Thematic Group Meeting&lt;br&gt;4. Case Stories: Presentations and Discussion</td>
<td>Day 2&lt;br&gt;1 hr 30 min 1 hr 30 min 1 hour 2 hrs (opt.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Understanding and Strengthening Social Justice Leadership</strong>&lt;br&gt;1. To create opportunity for meaningful engagement with a social justice leader&lt;br&gt;2. To identify and discuss broad issues and trends related to participants’ social justice leadership work&lt;br&gt;3. To develop a collective and critical understanding of social justice leadership&lt;br&gt;4. To identify and discuss leadership development challenges and opportunities</td>
<td><strong>Understanding and Strengthening SJL</strong>&lt;br&gt;1. SJL Context and Challenges&lt;br&gt;2. SJL: Some Difficult Questions and Answers&lt;br&gt;3. SJL: Sharing and Synthesis</td>
<td>Day 3&lt;br&gt;1 hr 30 min 1 hr 30 min 1 hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Global Policy: Issues and Advocacy</strong>&lt;br&gt;1. To increase participants’ awareness and knowledge of how people such as themselves, who are concerned with social justice, can be engaged in shaping the policies of global institutions like the World Bank and U.S. govt.&lt;br&gt;2. To provide participants with contacts and confidence in becoming engaged—now or in the near future—through international networks that involve individuals, CSOs, and governments in the Global South</td>
<td><strong>Global Policy: Issues and Advocacy</strong>&lt;br&gt;1. Module Introduction&lt;br&gt;2. CSO Panel&lt;br&gt;3. Field Visit&lt;br&gt;4. Debriefing Session</td>
<td>2 hours&lt;br&gt;1 hr 30 min &lt;br&gt;Day 4&lt;br&gt;8 hours&lt;br&gt;1 hr 30 mi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Leadership for Social Justice: A Sample Multi-Day Institute - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Name &amp; Objectives of Module</th>
<th>Sessions</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6      | **Intercultural Communication**  
1. To increase understanding of the process and importance of intercultural communication  
2. To identify crucial variables that affect intercultural communication  
3. To review a model (practical framework) of the communication process  
4. To discuss strategies and ways to improve intercultural communication abilities  | **Intercultural Communication**  
1. Introduction and Role Playing  
2. Group Exercise: Facilitators of Communication  
3. Improving Intercultural Communication  | **Day 5**  
1 hour  
1 hour  
30 min |
| 7      | **Managing Transitions**  
1. To facilitate understanding of the process of cultural re-entry  
2. To help participants explore and plan their post-training transition processes  
3. To enable participants to identify different kinds of resources and the role these resources play in social justice work  | **Managing Transitions**  
1. Cultural Re-entry  
2. Skills for Transitioning  
3. Resource Mobilization  | **2 hr 30 min**  
1 hr 30 min  
1 hour |
| 8      | **Action Planning & Synthesis**  
1. To practice examining social justice issues using multiple perspectives and levels of analysis  
2. To identify strategic ways to understand and build networks  
3. To develop individual and collective action plans to help fellows prepare and strategically think about their future social justice work  | **Action Planning and Synthesis**  
1. Group Action Plan  
2. Synthesis and Strategies  
3. Final Plenary: Reflections on Learning  
**Action Planning Activities**  | **Day 6**  
1 hr 30 min  
1 hr 30 min  
1 hour |

* Based on various institutes between 2002 and 2006, especially the June 2006 LSJ Institute in Washington, DC.
Module 1: Community Building

1.1 Community Building: Purpose and Background

Community building is a critical component of global social justice leadership. As networks around social justice issues develop, social justice leaders must find ways to build common purpose among potentially disparate groups, identities, and causes. In our LSJ Institutes, we introduced community building skills through the experience of building community among the institute’s participants. That community was comprised of social justice leaders different in their professional roles, national origins, fields of study and action, and views of social justice, but with great potential for common purpose and action.

Community building was always a theme of the first day of activities in all of the LSJ Institutes. Within the larger purpose of fostering community building awareness and skills, the immediate purposes of this series of events was to help fellows get to know each other, to establish an atmosphere of sharing of intellectual and life experience, and to develop a sense of mutuality toward common goals of social justice.

We found that we needed to build community at several levels, depending on the composition of the particular group. The first level was the participant group as a whole. LSJ Institutes ranged in size from 37 to 155 fellows. Some institutes were regionally focused, while others included participants from all world regions. Some functioned in multiple languages with simultaneous interpretation, and others were held in one language with many participants speaking that language as a second or third language. No matter which configuration, three things seemed to happen when such a group converged. First, they felt a deep sense of commonality as they learned about each other and their social justice work. Second, they were excited to have the opportunity to get to know all of the others present. Third, they became aware that there were barriers to overcome in order to achieve the goal of building a network across difference. The community building module set the tone for and supported the later work by helping build communication, sharing,
and a sense of common purpose and celebration.

The second level of community building needed to take place at the thematic group level. In the later, larger institutes, we developed thematic groups, each of which brought together about 20 to 25 participants from several countries around a sector theme, such as education, health, or the environment. Each individual group also had to work together, and was excited to do so, but needed the usual opportunity to establish connections and direction. In the community building module, we spent time helping the thematic groups connect, establish norms, and share ideas. Three major sessions comprised the community building module:

**Opening Plenary:** This activity provided a ceremonial and celebratory introduction to the LSJ Institute. We introduced the key organizational dignitaries and facilitators, who welcomed the group in various ways. We established a participatory tone by asking representatives of the country groups present to show and share the meaning of their flag. Participants became aware of the rich diversity in the room and gained a deeper understanding of why they were together at the institute.

**Thematic Group Meeting:** This meeting continued the introductions at a more personal level and allowed participants to discuss suggested ground rules for the institute that would allow for respectful and open sharing of ideas. At this session, we also reviewed the purposes and activities of the institute and engaged participants in thinking about what lay ahead and what they could expect from the week. By enabling participants to understand the goals, objectives, and methods of the institute, and by providing them with guidance on how to draft and complete individual action plans, this session helped participants begin to shape their own goals for learning for the week.

**Story Circles:** This session was a critical component of the module, allowing participants to share experiences of social injustice and discover commonality of purpose, as well as discuss how social injustice takes different shapes in different contexts.

### 1.2 Community Building: Module Summary

**Objectives:**
1. To welcome workshop participants and establish the norms of our learning community
2. To learn about and celebrate participant achievements in social justice work
3. To learn about participants and the social justice challenges they face

**Sessions:**
1. Opening Plenary 1 hour, 30 minutes
2. Thematic Group Meeting 2 hours
3. Story Circles 2 hours

**Time:** 5 hours, 30 minutes

**Readings:** Participants were not provided with resources on community building prior to the module. Since it is essential for trainers to build community among participants for learning purposes, many resources on training and adult education contain suggested activities for community building. Here are some we have used as references, but you should feel free to seek out others that are pertinent to your groups:


**Special Preparation:** Facilitators will need to ensure that presiding dignitaries are briefed for the opening plenary.

**Facilitators’ Notes** (for opening plenary and thematic group meetings): The sessions described above were particular to the composition of our groups. How a facilitator carries out these pieces depends upon many factors, including composition and size of the group, whether or not the group members know each other, and amount of time available.

In one of our institutes, we found that celebratory sharing in the opening plenary was very helpful. However, a facilitator could establish the same tone in very different ways, including the use of videos, music, dance, or visuals produced by participants. Facilitators may choose not to use subgroups (our thematic group design) at all if the entire group has fewer than 30 participants, or if participants are all working in a common thematic area.

In another institute, in which we used a later, more evolved design, we had limited time for norm setting, so we built on norms that had been established in earlier institutes rather than starting from scratch each time. If a workshop or institute has more time and smaller groups, facilitators can take the time to build norms in a more participatory way, furthering a stronger sense of community by consensus. Resource 1.4.1 provides additional suggestions for norm-setting processes.

In the final session of our community building module, we often used story circles (explained in Activity 1.4.2). The success of this session was highly dependent on the facilitator’s skill in establishing the nature of experiences to be shared, as well as on the willingness of participants to share experiences that might be deeply painful to relate. Story circles can be challenging to execute when participants are not speaking their native languages. However, the benefits—if the activity is done well—are a deep sense of shared purpose and commitment to dealing with the social justice issues identified through personal sharing. A story circle should be used only if facilitators clearly understand its rationale and how to carry it out.

Getting to know each other’s histories and experiences with social injustice is an important component of developing a community of motivated social justice leaders. Other ways to do this might be through an evening coffee hour, where participants could share poetry, song, art, or essays based on their experiences. The histories might also be shared throughout the week in plenary sharing of “case stories” presented by selected participants who volunteer to discuss an experience they have had with a social justice struggle. This latter approach worked well for us at institutes where we did not use story circles.

We also learned that allowing adequate informal time for participants to connect stimulated this kind of interpersonal sharing spontaneously.
# 1.3 Community Building: Sample Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 hour, 30 minutes</td>
<td>Opening Plenary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Welcome from director of hosting organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Welcome from participating or presiding dignitaries, if any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Welcome and program overview by program organizers, trainers, and staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Group introductions of participants by country and thematic group[1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>Session 1: Thematic Group Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Individual introductions of participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review of institute objectives, philosophy, agenda, and process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Information session on action planning (see Module 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Explain objectives of action planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Inform participants how action planning is incorporated into the institute and how action planning activities are woven into the modules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hand out action planning activities and worksheets and allow participants to peruse them; inform participants of timelines and deadlines for drafting individual action plans; answer questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Developing working norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>Session 2: Thematic Group Activity—Story Circles (see Activity 1.4.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# 1.4 Community Building: Resources and Activities

## 1.4.1 Resource: Developing Working Norms

**Time:** 30 minutes

**Materials:** Easels, chart paper, and felt pens

**Rationale:**
Participants in a workshop should develop their own working norms because this process empowers them at an early stage in their collective learning experience, allowing them to have greater control over and more investment in the learning process. It enables them to work together, reach consensus, and create rules for respectful communication. It brings down boundaries between individuals, makes groups more socially cohesive, and makes it more likely that groups will develop into effective, self-managing teams.

**Process:**
Many participants, depending on background and past training, will have been through processes like this, but many will have not. Group facilitators, prepared with a list of suggested working norms, should first explain, or elicit from group members, the rationale for developing working norms. Then facilitators should elicit norms from group members, ensuring that all members

---

[1] Throughout the institute, participants will be working in thematic areas of their interest, including education and art, environment, gender, governance/human rights, health, and poverty and development.
have the opportunity to make suggestions. The following suggested norms may be useful, especially if there are time constraints. These norms are based on what was effective for thematic groups in the many institutes.

**Suggested Working Norms:**

1. We will work to be a learning community. Everyone is a learner, resource, and guide. Participants accept responsibility to be/act as such.

2. In working to accomplish our objectives, we will move at a speed appropriate for the whole group’s learning.

3. We will make every effort to be fully present and leave our work behind.

4. We will help ensure equitable and full participation.

5. We will listen actively by listening to understand before we disagree.

6. We will respect one another’s feelings and ideas.

7. We will know and act accordingly: there is no such thing as a dumb question.

8. We will work to move out of our comfort zone by expressing our ideas and feelings.

9. We will respect and maintain confidentiality.

10. We will cooperate with the group so that time is not wasted; this includes being on time and refraining from sub-chatter.

11. We will enjoy one another, have fun, and learn from each other’s culture.

**1.4.2 Activity: Story Circles**

**Time:** 2 hours

**Materials:** none

**Rationale:**
Story circles are an opportunity for participants to get to know each other more closely and to learn from each other’s work by sharing thoughts, ideas, feelings, and experiences openly. In this activity, we define a “story” as a participant’s narration of a real and personal experience relevant to his or her social justice work. These stories should celebrate participants’ achievements in social justice work, highlight social justice challenges faced by each participant, and enable participants to devise interventions and solutions where practicable. Participants are asked to gather in a perfect circle to create an egalitarian and democratic ambiance, furthering open, unrestricted communication.

**Process:**
   a. Story circle sessions are oral.
b. Each story circle should have 8–10 participants and one facilitator.

c. The facilitator has a special responsibility. S/he has to inform participants of the guidelines, ensure that participants adhere to these guidelines throughout the activity, and keep the process moving.

d. Ask participants to sit in a perfect circle. This enables everyone to see one another and be seen by the other participants, creating a democratic ambiance. If this standard is not met, make adjustments. Inform participants that equal participation is an important part of story circle methodology, and that story circles are practiced according to democratic principles.

e. Provide participants with some thoughts about the importance of listening: “In story circles, active listening is very important. Do not think about your story while someone else is telling her or his story. You will not enjoy what others have to share, and your listening will not be as attentive as it should be. You do not have to like other people’s stories, but you must respect their right to tell their stories and be heard. Above all, trust the circle to bring your story to you.”

f. Explain the theme of the story circle. This enables people to understand the reason for calling the story circle together.

g. Let the group know that after the story circles are finished, they will report back to the larger group what they have heard. In their report, they may be as creative as their imaginations allow, using skits, role plays, mime, dance, or any method of communication they deem effective. The group will have 15 minutes to create its report, and the report should be about 2 minutes in duration.

h. Provide participants with ground rules for the story circle:

   i. No note taking while listening to stories; this is about active listening.

   ii. Everything in the group is confidential. Only the storyteller can tell her/his story to others. Participants may not. Otherwise, confidentiality is violated.

   iii. Hold questions and comments until everyone has told her/his story.

   iv. Keep each story to no more than 3 minutes; it can be shorter.

   v. Go clockwise.

   vi. Tell the story of something you were directly involved in, not an opinion, nor lessons learned, nor a mini-talk on social justice.

   vii. Have the person who has just told a story serve as timekeeper; for the first storyteller, the facilitator can serve as timekeeper.

   viii. The timekeeper should signal the storyteller when there is one minute left;

   ix. Participants do not have to tell a story. When it is their turn, they may pass. The process will eventually return to the person who has passed. In short, they will have another chance to tell a story before the process is completed.
x. After the storyteller has finished, take a moment of silence between stories.

xi. After each person has had a chance to tell a story, allow time for people to digest what they have heard. Initiate dialogue so that participants can share thoughts and learn from each other’s experience.

i. Start the circle by telling one another first names and places of residence. The person who starts introduces herself/himself first and then asks the person on his/her left (clockwise) to go next. This approach has three advantages: the group experiences the practice of taking turns moving around the circle; it saves time determining who goes next; and it gives less-extroverted people a chance to speak.

j. Monitor the process to ensure compliance with the rules and the spirit of the circle, facilitating a process of respect, sharing, learning, and understanding.

2.1 Networking: Purpose and Background

The ability to consciously develop and sustain personal and professional networks is a key competency of anyone in a leadership role, especially those from marginalized communities. The reasons include the need for (a) personal support, including encouragement from peers facing similar challenges and mentoring from more experienced leaders; (b) exchange of information, knowledge, contacts, and so on; and (c) collaboration, in the form of working together on projects ranging from research to program development to advocacy. (See “Presentation Notes” for further amplification of these points.)

Most leadership development programs, including the first LSJ Institutes, simply emphasize the importance of networks and assume that they evolve naturally. And of course they do. Given this importance, however, it is surprising that few if any programs provide any specific training to enhance the awareness and skills of “networking.”

“It seems to me that making strategic alliances across national borders in order to treat HIV among the world’s poor is one of the last great hopes of solidarity across a widening divide.”

– Paul Farmer

Below is a highly interactive process created by LSJ facilitators to fill the gap. It proved consistently effective with groups of 20–25 fellows from multiple countries that were about midway through their one-week institute. The design involved (1) a short presentation and discussion, (2) three rounds of visually “mapping” the participants’ networks, and (3) wrap-up, highlighting ideas generated by the participants during the preceding activity. Notes at the end of this section explain how the process might be adapted for other contexts.
As the institutes grew, facilitators switched to (1) forming small peer support groups that met throughout and (2) asking fellows to write individual action plans that included network development. See the action planning module for this process.

### 2.2 Networking: Module Summary

**Objectives:**
1. To encourage learning about the value of networks by describing the basic elements of a network and how effective leaders use networks
2. To provide opportunities for each participant to discuss her/his own current networks, including goals and needs that can guide their expansion
3. To identify specific processes for building one’s own network and helping others do the same, including the function of brokering

**Sessions:**
1. Introduction to Networking  
   Time: 30 minutes
2. Network Mapping  
   Time: 1 hour, 30 minutes

**Readings:** There are no pre-readings for this module. Readings for facilitators or participants seeking a deeper understanding of the material include:


**Special Preparation:** Two facilitators and a large room with lots of open floor space
2.3 Networking Module: Sample Design

*Activity 2.4.1* contains detailed instructions for this entire sample design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Session 1. Introduction</strong></td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>Resource 2.4.2 (presentation notes) provides content and materials (overheads and PowerPoint slides) for presenting an overview of networking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Session 2. Mapping Your Networks</strong> (Activity 2.4.1)</td>
<td>1 hour, 15 minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 1: Prior Links—Identifying &amp; observing existing links</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participants identify and observe networks to which they already belong, including how these networks came into being, how members maintain (or do not maintain) them, and how participants benefit from them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2: New links—Establishing new links</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participants consider how they came into contact with one another, whether and how they might benefit from new networks, and how they can stay in touch with one another. Participants also examine similarities and differences in how linkages are created by different people, especially those from different countries or regions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3: Future links—Brokering new links</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Each participant is now asked to “broker” one connection between two people in that participant's network who are not yet connected but who might benefit from being so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wrap-Up: Discuss and synthesize learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conclude with “lessons learned” about skills and/or approaches used.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 Networking: Resources and Activities

**2.4.1 Activity: Network Mapping**

**Time:** 2 hours

**Materials:**
- Presentation notes (Resource 2.4.2) and overheads or PowerPoint presentation (Appendix E)
- Two heavy sheets of paper or “nodes” for each participant; ideally, half should be white paper circles (about 18 inches in diameter) and half should be smaller (about 9–12 inches) and/or a different light color such as yellow
• One spool of blue ribbon for every three participants
• One spool of red ribbon for every three participants
• One spool of yellow ribbon for every six participants
• Multiple marking pens, scissors, and tape

Rationale:
This activity should help participants become consciously aware of the networks to which they belong and consider how membership in these networks can enhance their personal and social justice goals.

Process:
Upon entering the workshop room, each participant should be given one of the larger “node” sheets, with instructions to write her/his name on it with a large marking pen and then hold on to it until further instructions are given.

1. Introduction (25–30 minutes)
Objective: Establish common terminology and expectations; introduce key concepts such as those in the presentation notes (Resource 2.4.2) and overheads or PowerPoint presentation.
Method: Brief presentation, using overheads and examples from the experiences of presenter(s), and questions and answers related to the clarification of material (i.e., no new topics at this point).

2. “Mapping Your Networks” (60–75 minutes)
Objective: Identify and learn from the experience of networking.
Method: Three-round activity. To prepare:
- All tables and chairs are pushed back to create a large open space.
- The facilitator helps participants to visualize the floor as a map of the world, indicating which sides of the room are north, south, east, and west (the longest section of the room should be east-west) and demonstrating where the major continents and oceans are located.
- Participants are spread around the room, roughly corresponding to the global region from which they come. They then place the circles on the floor, as close as possible to the place that corresponds with their country.

Round 1: Prior links
• Spools of the blue ribbon, scissors, and tape are spread around the room. Participants are asked to see if any others in the room were part of their “network” (as defined during the presentation) prior to the institute. If there is another such participant, they should show that connection by stretching a length of ribbon between their two node circles and taping an end to each. Participants are asked to repeat this process for up to a specified number of the most important prior connections. (Note: With a group of 25, we have typically limited the number to four. This is partially due to time constraints. However, it is important to stress that this is a learning exercise, and thus not all links need to be shown. Moreover, it should

---

1 The specific colors of these spools of ribbon are not important. They should simply be different and contrasting colors.
be stressed that of course everyone has significant networks outside of IFP, including those participants who in this round do not connect to any of the other participants (typically because they are the only participants from their country or region or, where there are others from the same country, from a particular year’s fellowship cohort).

- Once the ribbon connections are complete, the participants are asked to step to the edges of the room and observe the map at this stage.

- Upon observing the various links, a facilitator selects and "interviews" a representative sample of participants, focusing on those whose connections may help the group discover answers to questions such as:
  - What are the different ways in which participants came into contact?
  - How have they stayed in touch?
  - Have they benefited from the connections, and if so, how?
  - Are there significant similarities and differences in the way linkages were created by different people, especially from different countries and/or regions?

Since most prior contacts will be within the participants’ own countries, processing might then focus on the size of the social justice community in that country, the type of interaction facilitated by local fellowship program staff, cultural norms about networking, and other factors. Where there are prior contacts that cut across countries or regions, processing should identify how these came about. Throughout the process, a second facilitator lists "lessons learned" about skills and/or approaches on a flip chart.

**Round 2: New links**

- Any remaining spools of blue ribbon are collected and replaced with spools of red ribbon.

- Participants are asked to repeat the same process of connecting circles between people, but this time they are to show linkages with people they have met since the beginning of the institute and with whom they expect to remain in touch. Participants are asked to show only the most important links, up to a specified number. (Note: With a group of 25, we have again typically specified four links. This round is the longest, since nearly every participant will be able to connect to the maximum number specified.)

- Once the ribbon connections are complete, the participants are again asked to step to the edges of the room and observe the map at this new stage.

- A facilitator again selects and interviews connected participants, attempting to involve those who were not involved in the previous round, especially those who did not have any connections to map in that round. S/he should focus on identifying one or more new connections within a region, across regions, and between a participant and a resource person, and seek answers to a similar set of questions:
  - What are the different ways in which participants came into contact?
  - Do they plan to stay in touch, and if so, how?
  - Have they benefited from the connections, and if so, how?
  - Are there significant similarities and differences in the way linkages were created by different people, especially from different countries and/or regions?

"Lessons learned" about skills and/or approaches are again noted on a flip chart.
Round 3: Future (brokered) links

- Any remaining spools of red ribbon are collected and replaced with spools of yellow ribbon.

- Each participant is now asked to "broker" one connection between two people in their network who are not yet connected but who might benefit from being so. They may choose two people in the room or one person in the room and one who is not. In the latter case, the broker uses one of the second set of circles (distinguishable because they are smaller and/or a light color); s/he first writes the person's name on the node and connects it to her/his own circle. The new brokered connections are then connected by yellow ribbon.

- One facilitator repeats the process of interviewing a sample of participants with new connections, including some of the connections between people who are in the room and some that are not. The discussion focuses on questions such as:
  - Do the people who have been linked and/or the person who has been linked to someone outside the room see potential benefits of being connected, and if so, what are they?
  - In the case of those who are connected with someone outside the room, specifically how will the broker connect the other participant with the person not in the room?

"Lessons learned" about skills and/or approaches are again noted on a flip chart.

3. Wrap-Up (15–20 minutes)
Objective: Synthesize learning
Method: Facilitator who has recorded the "lessons learned" reads them (or a sample of them) back to the group. Other ideas are added from participants' experiences from other contexts.

2.4.2 Resource: Presentation Notes, Overheads, and Slides

In preparation for the presentation that begins this module, read the following notes and review any slides that you may wish to project during the presentation.

Slides: Appendix E (PowerPoint presentation) (overhead presentation)
Begin by emphasizing that everyone is part of social networks—in fact, multiple networks that have emerged through different aspects of our lives, such as family, neighborhood, school, work, and so on. Relatively few people, however, are particularly aware of the nature of those networks or consciously seek to enhance them. The reason for conducting this session is to increase participant awareness of these networks and to possibly facilitate new connections.

Introduce the two basic elements of any network [slide 1], social or otherwise (e.g., a computer network). These two elements are:

1. “Nodes”—in social networks, these are people,

2. “Links,” or connections between nodes—people who know each other and are willing to assist each other in one or more ways

In a network, every node is linked to at least one and often many other nodes.

Point out how networks of activists use networks in transnational campaigns to address the global origins of social injustice. You may wish to reference the groundbreaking case studies and analysis of Keck and Sikkunk [slide 2].

Next, identify some of the main functions of personal networks, pointing out that these can be formal or informal [slide 3]. We focused on three functions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) <strong>Personal Support</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal support most often consists of friendship, but it can also involve other types of supportive relationships on either a short-term or ongoing basis (for example, mentoring). One of the most difficult parts of social justice work is coping with the ongoing challenges and frustrations inherent in any effort to change the powerful forces that support injustices. It is similarly difficult to withstand efforts to be co-opted by these forces. Thus, personal support networks are often essential for sustaining successful social justice leaders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(2) <strong>Exchange</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exchanging information, knowledge, ideas, contacts, and other resources is perhaps the most common activity enabled by networks. One person may ask one or more others in her/his network for resources related to a specific need or interest, through methods ranging from informal personal contact to electronic Listservs. Or a person with information or other resources s/he thinks may be of interest to others may circulate it via an equally wide range of methods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(3) <strong>Collaboration</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often growing out of exchange actions, which also help network members to identify others with common interests, complementary resources, and so on, networks can enable different members to work together on common tasks that are best accomplished by more than one person. Such tasks might include joint research or publications, the creation of a new organization or program, sharing of limited resources (technical, financial, etc.), and advocacy campaigning focused on a specific policy and/or institution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is then helpful to draw connections between personal and organizational networks. Time permitting, it is useful to reference Clark’s summary of three organizational forms—the traditional
unitary ("U") and multidivisional ("M") forms of organizations, and the newly emerging network ("N") form [slide 4]. There are nearly always informal networks, consisting of people located throughout and sometimes outside of the U and M forms, that are critical for going around the formal procedures to get work done. The N form reflects a recognition and formalization of this type of cross-divisional communication and collaboration.

Next, introduce the concept that individuals play multiple roles within networks. The typology created long ago by Schon [slide 5] is helpful for raising this awareness. Given limited time and the relative importance of the various roles, we focused on only one—the broker—both in the presentation and then in Round 3 of the mapping activity. Time permitting, ask participants to read the two additional quotes from Schon about the roles of networkers [slide 6].

Throughout the presentation, it is helpful to highlight the cultural dimensions of networks—an issue that is directly addressed in Round 1 and Round 2 of the mapping activity. Since the bridging of differences is one of the functions of effective networkers, one focus should be on understanding that norms and approaches may be different in other cultures.

### 2.5. Networking Module: Adaptations for Other Audiences

The portion of the above design that focuses on general concepts of networking should be relatively easy to adapt to many different audiences and training contexts. However, the “network mapping” design, as presented, is very audience specific. It assumes, at a minimum, that (a) participants are from different parts of the world, (b) some have been in a position to connect prior to the institute or training event, and (c) prior to this particular session, some but not all have had the opportunity to connect with yet more but not all other participants.

Below are thoughts about two ways the mapping could be adapted for audiences that do not meet these criteria. While in no way comprehensive, these thoughts are shared with the hope of stimulating others’ creativity.

First, while the “map” need not be geographical, it is helpful to have the nodes placed around the room in some pattern that stimulates learning. For example, instead of continents and countries, the clustering might represent different work units within an organization, or different organizations within a coalition. If facilitators do not have a clear idea of how these clusters should be organized prior to the exercise, they may, with the help of participants, determine and arrange the nodes during the first round of mapping. For example, if some participants have had the opportunity to form links prior to the institute or training event, they might be asked to identify those people and then negotiate an organic pattern that locates them as close as possible to the most dense set of nodes of which they are a part.

The latter example is illustrated here. The ten nodes and interconnecting links in the diagram represent all five of person #1’s links and all three of person #2’s links; we can assume that most if not all of the others have additional links with people not represented here. The illustration suggests where the densest set of nodes is for persons #1 and #2, and thus where they might end up placing their nodes in relation to the others.
Second, while it is instructive to have three rounds,² the key is to have participants observe network growth. Where prior and current links (rounds one and two, above) do not make sense, the first round of mapping could represent current links and the second and final round could go more deeply into brokering and other ways of expanding those links. In that case, it might be necessary to constrain the number of links mapped in the first round to those of a certain quality. For example, the instruction might be to show links only where two people have actually worked (or discussed working) on a project together. In the second round, each participant might choose one of those projects, if ongoing, or a new project that they wish to work on, and then find people with whom they are linked in order to broker new links with others who might make a substantive contribution to that project; those contributors might be other people in the room or people in someone else’s larger network.

² In fact, where time and audience permit, a facilitator might find it possible to identify four phases in the participants’ network development and have a corresponding number of rounds. We imagine that more than that would become tedious.
Module 3: Participants’ Achievements

3.1 Participants’ Achievements: Purpose & Background

A fundamental precept of the LSJ Institutes was that participants bring significant insight on how to address and make a positive impact on issues of social injustice. With this in mind, this module was created to enable participants to understand the nature of each other’s work and achievements, and to spur connections between participants with similar fields of expertise, mutual interests, common geographical/regional links, or other ties. In this module, participants were encouraged to share their work through stimulating panel presentations and mobile poster sessions. LSJ fellows enjoyed sharing their work, engaging and interacting with colleagues, and understanding one another’s interests, challenges, and accomplishments.

Participants were required to prepare their presentations before arriving at the institute. This involved a series of interactions between facilitators and participants very early in the planning stage of the institute. Fellows from previous institutes were also involved in this pre-planning stage, working with facilitators to create the guidelines by which participants shared their achievements. This gave fellows more representation in the learning process, making them feel more invested.

In general, participants shared their achievements in two ways: panel presentations and poster presentations. These two methods required different types of preparation. For panel presentations, participants were asked to write papers that gave details on their social justice work. They prepared these papers following specific guidelines and sent them to facilitators within their designated thematic groups. Once a paper met the guidelines, it was uploaded to an online Web portal where other participants (including alumni) were able to view it. Then the members of each thematic group, using predetermined criteria, selected a number of papers to be shared in presentations at the institute.

In the panel presentations, presenters discussed the content of their papers, delving into their work on social justice issues and exploring the direction in which their social justice endeavors were heading. The presentations allowed many participants to discover that they faced challenges, regardless of region or context, that were quite similar to those faced by their colleagues, and to consider new strategies that might positively influence their work.

“We cannot seek achievement for ourselves and forget about progress and prosperity for our community... Our ambitions must be broad enough to include the aspirations and needs of others, for their sakes and for our own.”

– Cesar Chavez
For the poster presentations, fellows prepared visual representations of their work before coming to the institute. During the session, poster presenters discussed the social justice work reflected in their displays while other participants moved freely about the exhibit area, learning about the wide variety of social justice issues presented. These mobile presentations allowed participants to engage with one another and facilitated the formation of networks of common interest.

In some of the earlier LSJ Institutes, participants shared their work in ways other than through panel and poster presentations. One such way was through case story discussions (included as session four in this module). Using participant papers (case stories) as starting points, participants were encouraged to engage in dialogue and personal reflection and to use a structured, analytical framework (included here as Resource 3.4.2) to understand the issues and challenges faced by colleagues. Though this approach focused less on the achievements of individual participants than did poster and panel presentations, the activities included in the session enabled participants to effectively examine wide-ranging topics—issues, challenges, contexts, strategies, tactics, and leadership considerations—that affected their social justice work, and allowed them to appreciate and understand the work of the other participants. For facilitators with the time and inclination to include more detail and structure in their exploration of participant experiences, this session is an additional option that provides valuable learning opportunities for participants.

3.2 Participants’ Achievements: Module Summary

Objectives:
1. To learn about and celebrate participants’ achievements in social justice work
2. To provide participants with the opportunity to share their social justice work with other participants through discussions and poster sessions

Sessions:
1. Panel Presentations
2. Poster Session
3. Thematic Group Meeting
4. Case Story Discussions

Time: 2 hours (optional)

Readings: Participants were required to read the papers selected for presentation prior to arriving at the institute. Thematic group facilitators interacted with participants through e-mail Listservs in the months preceding the institute to remind them to do so.

Special Preparation: On the arrival days prior to the workshop, participants should be given space and materials to finalize posters so that they will not have to take time to do this once the workshop officially starts. Facilitators should provide flip charts, colored markers for flip charts, and other office/classroom supplies requested by participants.

Facilitators’ Notes: It is recommended that posters be grouped by thematic group, and that trainers develop a guide sheet for participants to enable them to take notes on selected posters. This will help facilitate more focused discussions in follow-up thematic group meetings.

Concurrent with the activities in the participants’ achievements module, workshop participants are expected to continue networking-related activities in the Action Planning Handbook.
3.3 Participants’ Achievements: Sample Design

On the two arrival days prior to the institute, participants are given space and materials to finalize posters (they will not have time to do this once the institute officially starts).

1 hour, 30 minutes

**Session 1: Panel Presentations**
Thematic group meetings: interactive panel presentations and discussion. Discussion of social justice issues in thematic areas, using three fellows’ papers in each thematic group as a focus/launching point. ([Resource 3.4.1](#))
(We recommend that the process of this discussion be left up to group facilitators; some may wish to do formal interactive presentations; others may want to split the group into subgroups for subgroup discussions on selected illustrative issues, for the sake of more depth.)

1 hour, 30 minutes

**Session 2: Poster Session**
Interactive poster presentations. ([Resource 3.4.2](#)) provides poster presentation guidelines for presenters and guiding questions for participants.

1 hour

**Session 3: Thematic Group Meeting**
Brief meeting to debrief and discuss what people drew from the poster session in relation to their individual thematic work.
- In small groups, participants discuss significant new insights or perspectives gained during the participants’ achievements sessions. Based on this discussion they will identify two insights or perspectives to be shared with the thematic group. ([Resource 3.4.1](#))
- In thematic groups, participants share ideas.
- Facilitators summarize the key points.

2 hours

**Session 4: Case Story Discussions**
Discussion of social justice issues in thematic areas using three participants’ papers (case stories) as starting points. ([Resource 3.4.3](#)), Analytical Framework for Case Stories, provides guiding questions for presenters and discussion topics for participants.
- Sharing of case stories – 10 minutes
- Clarification questions – 5 minutes
- Individual reflection – 20 minutes
- Dialogues in thematic groups – 30 minutes
- Each group shares their answer to one of the seven questions – 45 minutes
- Summarize major lessons learned – 10 minutes

---

3 On the afternoon of day 1 or the morning of day 2, participants may be given guidelines for their participation in the participants’ achievements module.
4 Based on time availability, participants may express their ideas using artwork.
3.4 Participants’ Achievements: Resources and Activities

3.4.1 Resource: Guidelines for Panel Presenters

Before the Panel Presentation

- Check with your group facilitators and the other presenters to find out the exact procedure your thematic group will follow. Facilitators will get back to you with a suggested time to meet with them and the other presenters on the day prior to the opening of the institute.
- Visit the room where you will be presenting and get familiar with where things are. You will also need to check out any equipment you might be using.
- Arrange your thoughts in order, from the most important to less important points you would like to cover. Be prepared to leave out lesser points for more important ones if need be.
- Prepare your talking points in an order that corresponds to your flow of ideas.
- It might be a good idea to write the main points of your presentation on ONE page and hand it out to fellows before the presentation to help them follow your points.

During the Presentation

- Plan your presentation for 10 minutes. The group facilitators will give you signals to let you know how much time you have left during your presentation.
- You might not be able to cover every single point in your paper. Think about the core message that you would like to share with the other fellows. Make sure that the rest of the points serve this core message.
- Please do not read your paper out to the fellows. Please do not read bullets off PowerPoint slides if you plan to use them.
- Although it is fair to assume that fellows will have read your paper before the session, we encourage you to summarize it in the beginning of your presentation. This summary may include points such as an introduction to the problem/issue the paper is covering; an outline of the paper structure, data collection, and analysis methodology used; or any other point you feel is important. Remember that the purpose of the summary is to engage the other fellows in your topic as quickly as possible—not to provide information that might overwhelm them.
- Using stories to illustrate your main points is always a good methodology. Think about whether you might be able to use one or two stories in your presentation. Given time limitations, make sure to tell these stories in no more than one minute.
- Remember that English is not the first language of many people in the room. You will need to consciously speak loudly, clearly, and slowly to ensure that everyone is able to follow your presentation.
- It is also fair to assume that not everyone is necessarily familiar with your topic. Try to simplify your points and avoid using jargon or acronyms.
- People are more willing to listen to those who talk from both their hearts and minds. Expressing passion in addition to the intellectual structure of your presentation helps people to identify with what you are saying and feel its importance. Think of what really excites you about this kind of work!
- Based on your presentation, what is the one question that you would like to sincerely seek the help of this group of experienced people to collectively find answers to? This is your opportunity to get needed help from the group.
3.4.2 Resource: Guidelines for Poster Presenters

Please use the following guidelines during your participation in the poster presentation session as a presenter and participant:

As a Presenter

The poster presentation session is divided in three rounds of about 30 minutes each. During one of these 30-minute rounds you will conduct your poster presentation. This will entail standing next to your poster and interacting with people who are interested in your topic. Each participant should have a poster presentation schedule with times and locations. Please review the schedule carefully to identify your allotted poster presentation time.
As a Participant

Poster presenters should visit as many poster presentations as possible during the two 30-minute slots when they are not presenting. Like you, your fellow presenters have invested a significant amount of effort in preparing these poster presentations, so your participation is not just a source of mutual learning but also recognition of their work.

Questions for participants

As you go to the different poster presentations, you may find it helpful to consider the following questions:

What is the main question(s) or hypothesis in the presentation?

What is the most important learning or insight?

What implications do the findings from some of the poster presentations have for your own work or area of interest?
3.4.3 Resource: Analytical Framework for Case Stories

Please draw upon insight gained during case story presentations to discuss the following questions:

• **What was the central issue/problem in the case story, and what caused this issue/problem? How was it addressed?**
  - Strengthening the organization, sector, or coalition?
  - Having the issue addressed primarily as a policy issue among people who make policy? or
  - Making the issue a political one that has to be addressed in election campaigns and/or by high elected officials who are placed on the spot?

• **Who are the key players? What strategies and tactics were used (where applicable) to_______:**
  a. Prepare core constituencies to sustain support from those who are strongly committed?
  b. Strengthen support from casual or passive supporters?
  c. Win over those who are not yet engaged?
  d. Reduce the intensity of those who are opposed?
  e. Identify unlikely supporters—those who would surprise the policy makers?
• **How were other parts of civil society engaged?**
  Consider the following components of civil society:
  o Media
  o Professional associations
  o Those who appear to be at the periphery of civil society
  o Other parts of civil society

• **How was popular education used to_____:**
  o Disseminate information
  o Receive feedback
  o Create media

  Did it effectively use the symbols of culture and/or humor, ridicule, shame, or blessing to convey its message?

• **What are the local and global dimensions in this case?**
ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK FOR CASE STORIES, PAGE 3

- What strengths did the storyteller display? How would we characterize the storyteller’s leadership? Did others exhibit strengths or leadership?

- Which of the storyteller’s strengths can we apply in our own work? Do we already possess some of these ourselves?
Module 4: Leadership for Social Justice—Concepts and Practice

4.1 Leadership for Social Justice: Purpose and Background

An important goal of leadership capacity building for individuals who represent marginalized groups is to provide a broad platform for understanding the nature of leadership within the context of social justice work. This module on social justice leadership was developed to facilitate that understanding. The module is divided into three broad sessions: 1) Context and Challenges, 2) Some Difficult Questions, and 3) Sharing and Synthesis. Together, the sessions are intended to help the participants critically think through the meaning, nature, and challenges of social justice leadership by drawing upon the real life story of an accomplished social justice leader and upon their own experience.

In the first session of this module, LSJ Institute organizers invited accomplished social justice leaders to engage with the fellows as guest speakers and resource people. Generally speaking, these individuals had worked at different levels and with a variety of stakeholders in their social justice work. In the last two institutes, organizers made efforts to invite individuals from the Global South. The rationale for this was to allow participants to connect with an accomplished individual in the field of social justice work at a personal level. Engagement with the guest speakers/resource people took two different forms: 1) a presentation by the speaker relating to their work, with emphasis on local global linkages; critical success factors of their initiative; and their personal developmental journey as a leader and other complexities that surrounded the evolution of their work; and 2) a conversation between the fellows and the speaker/resource person through a question-and-answer session. This conversation was usually very frank and comprehensive.

In the very beginning of their work on these institutes, program developers were aware that, due to the context in which leaders of marginalized and disadvantaged groups operate, leadership for social justice involves attention to some unique issues and questions. In addition, organizers were sensitive to the fact that discussions on social justice leadership should provide space for raising questions about the nature of leadership in general. Thus, in the second session of the social justice module, they emphasized the multidimensional and complex nature of social justice.

“If you are neutral in situations of injustice, you have chosen the side of the oppressor. If an elephant has its foot on the tail of a mouse and you say that you are neutral, the mouse will not appreciate your neutrality.”

– Desmond Tutu
leadership. This included discussion and efforts to understand the variety of forms that this kind of leadership takes. The session recognized that the conventional boundaries of the leadership field must be challenged in order to embrace emerging learning from the practice of social justice leadership. This session design created opportunities for sharing and learning at multiple levels, including individual reflection and plenary discussions.

In the third session, participants examined leadership behaviors and traits (Activity 1.4.2) of a social justice leader, using video presentations and the frameworks for analysis brought forward in the first two sessions. This provided further opportunity for further discussion, allowing participants to synthesize new insights and construct their own personal models of social justice leadership.

4.2 Leadership for Social Justice: Module Summary

Objectives:
1. To create opportunity for meaningful engagement with a social justice leader
2. To identify and discuss broad issues and trends related to participants’ social justice leadership work
3. To develop a collective and critical understanding of social justice leadership
4. To identify and discuss leadership development challenges and opportunities

Sessions:
1. SJL: Context & Challenges 1 hour, 30 minutes
2. SJL: Some Difficult Questions & Answers 1 hour, 30 minutes
3. SJL: Sharing & Synthesis 1 hour

Time: 4 hours

Readings:

This reading outlines the definition of, approach toward, and assumptions on social justice leadership held by the institute designers. It was prepared with special attention to the nature, requirements, and competencies of social justice leadership and was meant to provide a starting point to raise and address some key questions about social justice leadership.

For further reading on leadership in general and on leadership for social justice, consult the annotated bibliography in Appendix B.

Special Preparation/Facilitators’ Notes: Facilitators found the following to be helpful in making the sessions effective:

a) Identifying guest speakers able to meaningfully communicate and engage with participants
b) Providing a thorough briefing to the guest speakers/resource people well in advance of the institute
c) Providing participants with a list of broad questions and issues of interest
d) Providing participants with reading material in advance, and encouraging them to review materials before and after the session
e) Carefully planning logistics pertaining to scheduling, group work, and movement of people
### 4.3 Leadership for Social Justice: Sample Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 1: SJL—Contexts and Challenges</th>
<th>1 hour, 30 minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guest Speaker</strong> (Resource 4.4.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Introduce the guest speaker.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Invite the thematic group representatives to give introductions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Invite the guest speaker to share their thoughts and offer reactions to the ideas/issues forwarded by the thematic groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Invite 6—8 questions from the audience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Close.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 2: SJL—Some Difficult Questions and Answers</th>
<th>1 hour, 30 minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Introduce the session.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Outline the following questions about understanding and developing social justice leadership:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Are leaders born or made? How are they made?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o In what ways is leadership a values-based process?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o How do culture and other contextual contingencies impact social justice leadership?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o How can we deal with ethical issues in pluralistic, diverse leadership environments?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o How do social justice leaders build and articulate their vision?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explain the next steps.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review the video case in plenary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Divide in three subplenary groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Answer the above questions about SJL using Gandhi’s example and relating it to participants’ present or future work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Making of a Social Justice Leader video case: Gandhi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Individual reflection about the case. Using the reflection sheet provided, participants note key highlights from the video case.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 3: Understanding SJL—Sharing and Synthesis</th>
<th>1 hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Welcome and describe process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discussion of Gandhi video case study. (Activity 4.4.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Groups briefly share their learning and present their questions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Facilitators summarize the key lessons learned and comment on all questions raised by participants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Synthesize by highlighting broad insights and conclusions based on speaker session, video case, small group reports, key readings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Offer final thoughts on leadership development challenges and opportunities for participants to draw upon Gandhi’s case.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evening Assignment**

• Upon reading the assigned article, answer the following questions:
  o What kind of leadership did the keynote speaker practice over time?  
  o How do you relate the ideas in the article to your own leadership?  
• Review readings on global policy and the social justice leadership article.

---

5 The speaker will be briefed about LSJ Institute objectives.
4.4 Leadership for Social Justice: Resources & Activities

4.4.1 Resource: Engaging with a Guest Speaker

**Time:** 1 hour

An important element of this module is the participants’ engagement with a social justice leader. To make guest speaker sessions more effective, facilitators should:

1. Provide a thorough briefing to the guest speakers well in advance of the institute.
2. Choose guest speakers with a demonstrated ability to meaningfully engage with participants.
3. Provide speakers with a list of broad questions and issues of interest to the fellows.
4. Carefully plan logistics pertaining to scheduling, group work, and movement of people.
5. Provide some reading material in advance and encourage participants to review it before and after the session.

**Proposed Broad Areas of Focus for the Speaker**

In order to ensure that the selected social justice leader links her sharing (talk) with the participant’s work and issues, the speaker can be asked to focus on the following:

- How did he/she first identify his/her area of work?
- What key factors contributed to his/her personal development as a social justice leader?
- Comment on emerging issues and trends related to the six (or selected) institute themes (e.g., environment, poverty).
- What major challenges are social justice leaders increasingly facing in the present global context?
- Offer general advice and insights related to leadership development and effectiveness based on their rich experience.
4.4.2 Activity: Gandhi Video Case Study

Understanding Social Justice Leadership: Sharing and Synthesis
Small Group Discussion: Gandhi Video Case Study

**Time:** 30 minutes

**Materials:** Gandhi (1982), DVD or video
Attenborough, R., producer and director. Motion picture: United States: Columbia Pictures.

**Special Preparation:** Prior to this discussion, facilitators should organize a showing of the movie to participants. If there are time limitations, facilitators may choose a shorter excerpt.

**Questions for Discussion:**

1. In what ways was Gandhi’s leadership values-based?

2. What role did cultural and contextual factors play in defining Gandhi’s leadership?

3. Can you relate your work to Gandhi’s leadership story? How did he build his story?

4. Identify three key insights gained from the SJL speaker, the required reading, and the video case.

5. Compose two questions that help clarify and strengthen your understanding of social justice leadership.

6. Choose a group representative to share insights gained and questions generated (using two separate charts).
5.1 Global Policy: Purpose and Background

This module is based on a series of understandings:

(a) Many of the problems facing marginalized communities in the Global South are rooted in the global policies of the most powerful nations of the North and the international finance and security institutions that they dominate.

(b) There are ever-increasing numbers of NGOs, coalitions, and campaigns that seek to influence those decision makers who formulate such policies.

(c) Long-term success will require a yet larger advocacy effort, in which leaders of the communities most affected by the policies play a central role in defining goals and strategies.

While workshops organized anywhere in the world can help expand the advocacy efforts and build the leadership noted above, this module had the advantage of being held in Washington, DC—the epicenter for much global policymaking and advocacy. This allowed institute planners to directly engage participants with key actors in the World Bank, the U.S. government, and civil society organizations that seek to influence the policies of these institutions.

Preceded by pre-readings and an introductory session, and followed by a debriefing session, a variety of interactions with such actors constituted the module’s primary activities. Initial interactions were on-site, involving a panel (typically three people) of civil society advocates chosen to represent a range of different advocacy approaches—for example, policy research and advising, lobbying, and contestation (legal, mobilization, etc.). Subsequent interactions took place

“It is people who are the objects of globalization and at the same time its subjects. What follows logically from this is that globalization is not a law of nature, but rather a process set in train by people.”

– Tarja Halonen
during a full day of visits that added exposure to the work settings of advocates and policy makers. Morning visits took place in the offices of another civil society organization. Afternoon visits were with representatives of the policy institutions. About half of the participants began with an overall briefing by the civil society group in the World Bank; they then met in smaller groups with program officers in different departments corresponding with their thematic focus. The other participants began with an overview of foreign policymaking with the staff of a top-ranking U.S. senator and then attended meetings with officials from other U.S. government agencies.

Suggestions for adapting the module to other sites are included in section 5.2, under “Alternative Training Ideas and Approaches.”

5.2 Global Policy: Module Summary

Objectives:
1. To increase participants' awareness and knowledge of how people such as themselves, who are concerned with social justice, can be engaged in shaping the policies of global institutions and governments
2. To provide participants with contacts and confidence for becoming engaged—now or in the near future—through international networks that involve individuals, CSOs, and governments in the Global South

Sessions:
1. Introduction to Global Policy  2 hours
2. Civil Society Organization Panel  1 hour, 30 minutes
3. Visits to CSOs, International Organizations, and Government Agencies  8 hours
4. Debriefing Session  1 hour, 30 minutes

Time: 13 hours

Materials: Computers with Internet access, transportation to site visit locations

Readings: Participants should read the following before taking part in this module:


Participants should also look at the web sites, including policy documents, of the CSOs, World Bank department, or U.S. government agency with which her/his group is scheduled to meet.

Special Preparation: In advance, all panelists and visit hosts should receive a copy of the module overview, pre-readings, participants' bios, and a logistical-support briefing.
Facilitators’ Notes: Participants should be formed into groups of 10–15 for visits to advocacy organizations and policy institutions. In Washington, we created two such groups within each of the larger thematic groups. Formation of the groups and the introduction of the module should be done early enough so that participants have adequate time to read the common readings (below) and do web research on the organizations they will visit.

Alternative Training Ideas and Approaches: This specific design is dependent on being in or near an international policy center (Washington, DC; New York City; Geneva; etc.) or in a city where the headquarters of at least one such international institution is located (e.g., UNEP in Nairobi or the Asian Development Bank in Manila). However, most national capitals in the Global South have offices of the World Bank; regional development banks; UN agencies; bilateral aid offices of governments, especially the policy-dominant G8 nations; embassies of these countries and others, including countries that are emerging as major challengers to these policies (e.g., Brazil and India); and a number of civil society advocacy groups that focus some or all of their work on these global institutions—all of which might be candidates for panels and visits.

5.3 Global Policy—Issues & Advocacy: Sample Design

**First Day**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session 1: Module Introduction (Activity 5.4.1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>Review the module's objectives and methods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Check to see if participants have done Web site readings assigned on the first day of the institute and/or if they need any help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Select one or two participants in each subgroup to handle the opening (introductions of specific participants in attendance, initial questions) and closure (expressing thanks) for each CSO/institution visited. These or other participants should agree to write a brief report of information and insights gained from each visit and post it to the general group Listserv.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session 2: CSO Panel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 hour, 30 minutes</td>
<td>Past program participants handle introductions and closure (providing a model for the participants who will do this during visits).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Each presenter speaks for 10 minutes (politely stopped if they reach 15 minutes) about:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) The organization's context (when founded; mission and programs, especially efforts to influence policy; number of staff; sources of funding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) How s/he became involved in policy work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Two key &quot;lessons learned&quot; about influencing global policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questions and dialogue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4 Global Policy: Resources and Activities

5.4.1 Activity: Global Policy Introduction

**Time:** 1 hour, 30 minutes

**Initial Discussion** (45 minutes):
Use the questions at the end of Jeff Unsicker’s “Introduction” to guide an initial discussion of why global policy is important and what information, knowledge, skills, or contacts participants feel they personally need to become directly engaged.

**Small Groups** (45 minutes):
1. Break participants into small groups of two or three—where possible, from the same country or region. (These dyads or triads should be identified in advance.) Have the groups stay in the same room so that you can give a series of directions to everyone at once.

2. Give the groups 10 to 15 minutes to brainstorm participant answers to the first discussion questions (5 minutes for each participant’s responses):
   - Which specific policies of which global institutions most directly impact my community?
   - To what extent are the impacts positive and/or negative?

3. Check to see if there are any major questions or any confusion. Then give the groups 10 minutes to choose one specific policy that is relevant to at least one participant in the group, and see how many of these discussion questions they can answer:
   - What actors (CSOs, other organizations, government units, and/or coalitions) in my country and globally are working to influence these specific policies?
   - What types of “engagement” do they choose?
   - To what extent are those actors transparent, accountable, and representative in relation to the communities most directly impacted by global policies?
   - What specific opportunities do I have to participate—as an individual and/or as part of a CSO or my government?
   - What do I have to contribute or how might my studies and experiences allow me to “add value” to these efforts?

   Where they cannot answer the question, ask them to identify what kind of information, knowledge, skills, and/or contacts they might need to do so.

4. Reconvene as a whole group. Take 5 minutes to allow two or three of the small groups to share the process and results of their discussions. Depending on the group's ability to complete the above, allocate any remaining time to repeating the final two steps. Answer questions and address any confusion about concepts.
In light of the above, preview the actors (CSO representatives) who will be participating in the upcoming panel. Identify some of the global institutions and policies in which they are engaged. Ask participants to think about any "lessons" they might hope to learn from the panelists that would be relevant in helping them (a) share with others in their community and networks and (b) apply in their own work.

### 5.4.2 Activity: Global Policy Debriefing Session

**Time:** 1 hour, 30 minutes

**Materials:** Flip charts, felt pens

Form three or four small discussion groups, each with one facilitator and four or five participants from each of the subgroups.

Give each group 30 minutes to briefly share with the others their general experience and impressions from their CSO and World Bank/U.S. government visits, and then to identify the most important information and key lessons gained from each visit, recording them on one flip chart sheet per organization (i.e., each subgroup will produce four sheets). Assign one participant to send a report on each CSO/government organization visited, by e-mail or through a Listserv, to the other participants.

Reconvene for synthesis. Cluster the flip chart sheets according to each organization visited. For the next 30 minutes, go over the subgroups' input. Begin with the sheets for one organization; ask one subgroup to review the content of their sheet, and then invite the other subgroups to add (but not repeat) points from their sheets on that same organization. Repeat this process with each of the other three organizations, rotating which subgroup makes its comments first. Encourage the participants who have agreed to send Listserv reports to take careful notes. At the end of each session, assist these reporters by giving them the sheets that are relevant to the visit about which s/he is reporting.

Spend the next 15 minutes focused on personal synthesis. In dyads, ask each participant to think back to the global policies s/he identified during the module introduction as having the most impact on her/his community, and to consider the following questions:

- Have I learned anything in the past two days that would lead me to refine or even change my thoughts about the most important global policies?
- What are my ideas now about my specific opportunities to participate—as an individual and/or as part of a CSO or my government?
- What are my ideas now about what I have to contribute? How might my studies and experiences allow me to “add value” to the efforts?

Finally, reconvene for 15 minutes to generate and discuss ideas on how thematic groups or larger network groups might support the engagement of participants in influencing global policy.
Module 6: Intercultural Communication

6.1 Intercultural Communication: Purpose and Background

In order for international collaboration for social justice to work well, leaders must have the ability to communicate across cultural and other dimensions of difference. For this reason, LSJ Institute designers included a module on intercultural communication skills in many of the institutes. This module helped participants develop relationships during the institute itself and build awareness of what additional skills they might continue to develop after the institute. LSJ Institutes presented wide-ranging opportunities for multinational, intercultural collaboration and networking on social justice issues. Through their structure and process, the institutes encouraged this collaboration on-site, and also cultivated an awareness of the importance of continued post-institute collaboration for tackling social justice issues that have global dimensions.

This module was not included in every institute. Early institutes had at least one activity on intercultural communication, similar to those in the sessions included in this manual. Later on, as the design focused more on thematic groups and global policy, institute planners sometimes chose not to include this module. While some individuals were very interested in developing intercultural communication skills for their professional development as leaders, others felt that they had already moved to a certain level in this realm and wanted to prioritize other needs. Facilitators should determine whether to include this module in their trainings based on group members’ needs, prior experiences, and level of expressed interest in working on communication skills.

The session outlined here is one way to build awareness of intercultural communication skills and help participants identify their own strengths and weaknesses in this area. The activity of building common definitions and descriptions of good intercultural communication skills—represented in a group collage—was also a communication event in and of itself. It continued the work of the community-building module by supporting participants in practicing good communication skills and establishing collaborative relationships and products.

“There are cultural issues everywhere—in Bangladesh, Latin America, Africa, wherever you go. But somehow when we talk about cultural differences, we magnify those differences.”

– Muhammad Yunus
6.2 Intercultural Communication: Module Summary

**Objectives:**
1. To increase understanding of the process and importance of intercultural communication
2. To identify crucial variables that affect intercultural communication
3. To review a model (practical framework) of the communication process
4. To discuss strategies and ways to improve intercultural communication abilities

**Sessions:**
1. Module Introduction and Role Playing 1 hour
2. Group Exercise: Facilitators of Communication 1 hour
3. Strategies to Improve Intercultural Communication 30 minutes

**Time:**
2 hours, 30 minutes

**Readings:** There are no pre-readings for this module. Recommended readings include:

**Special Preparation/Facilitator’s Notes:** In this module, both staff and participants will conduct role plays. Facilitators should take time before these exercises to rehearse with one another, so that role plays will be interesting, informative, and accessible to the participants.

6.3 Intercultural Communication: Sample Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 hour</th>
<th><strong>Session 1: Module Introduction and Role Playing</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>The Importance of Intercultural Communication</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Staff Role Plays</strong> (Activity 6.4.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Participant Role Plays</strong> (Activity 6.4.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 hour</th>
<th><strong>Session 2: Group Exercise—Facilitators of Communication</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Group Collage and Short Presentations</strong> (Activity 6.4.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The following handouts may be used to provide participants with thoughts on what groups can do to enhance intercultural communication: Characteristics of High-Performance Multicultural Teams (Resource 6.4.4) and Roles &amp; Behaviors for High Team Performance (Resource 6.4.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 minutes</th>
<th><strong>Wrap-Up: Action Strategies to Improve Intercultural Communication</strong> (link here to PowerPoint presentation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Conclusion</strong> (Activity 6.4.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4 Intercultural Communication: Resources & Activities

6.4.1 Activity: Staff Role Play—Communication Content & Context

**Time:** 30 minutes

**Learning objective:** To understand the importance of content (what is said) and context (how and where it is said) in the intercultural communication process.

**Process:**
Step 1: Introduce the concept of content and context in the communication process by suggesting that in some cultures, what is said (content) is most important, while in others, the introductions, process, location, and group composition (context) play a significant role in determining and adding meaning to what is conveyed.

Step 2: Introduce the purpose of the role play and ask participants to observe the content and context cues.

Step 3: Conduct role play.

Step 4: Ask participants to share the cues that they have observed. List both kinds of cues on a flip chart and say a few words about the effect of these cues.

6.4.2 Activity: Participant Role Play—Communication Content & Context

**Time:** 30 minutes

**Learning Objective:** To practice identifying content (what is said) and context (how and where it is said) in the intercultural communication process in small groups.

**Process:**
Step 1: Divide participants into small groups of 5–7 individuals to role-play a situation focusing on context and content issues. In each group, two participants (with different cultural backgrounds) volunteer to role-play. The remaining participants act as observers. Their assignment is to observe the role play and identify its content and context (gestures, physical proximity, side issues, efforts pertaining to respect or directness).

Step 2: Conduct role plays (about 5 minutes) using the following scenario: This is an initial meeting between a community organization representative and an official from a funding agency. The purpose of the meeting is to establish a working relationship and some reporting procedures for the first phase of the project.

Step 3: Ask observers to share information gathered around content and context issues.

Step 4: Provide a brief summary about the importance of context and content issues in intercultural communication.
6.4.3 Activity: Facilitators of Communication

**Time:** 1 hour

**Learning objective:** To identify actions that individuals, groups, and organizations can take to facilitate the process of intercultural communication, enabling people from different cultures to create shared interpretations, meanings, and expectations in their communication with one another.

**Process:**
Step 1: Give instructions and describe process.
Step 2: Form small groups.
Step 3: Small groups identify the factors that facilitate effective intercultural communication.
Step 4: Participants prepare a collage with their team name on top (visual presentation using pictures, symbols, etc.) to represent their list of facilitators.
Step 5: Groups make a 3-minute presentation to the other groups.

6.4.4 Resource: Characteristics of High-Performance Multicultural Teams

**A meaningful mission and clear goal.** Our work together stimulates much more support and commitment when it's in the service of something that matters to the people involved. In addition, clarity of team goal and purpose is important.

**A clearly defined performance outcome.** Above all, being on any team is about furthering the organization or community in some way. The basis of the team experience is a well-defined performance outcome.

**An understanding of different cultural norms and their impact on communication, problem solving, and conflict.** Understanding these norms and using them to help separate personal and cultural differences is critical to team functioning.

**A set of shared values.** What is universally true about people is that we all need, want, and value being treated with dignity and respect. What is less clear among different groups is how dignity and respect are measured or shown. Setting out clear examples of respectful behaviors agreed upon by all team members is essential.

**Maintaining balance between task and relationship roles.** All teams benefit from carefully balancing content and process aspects of their work. Steadfastly maintaining this balance is an important characteristic of effective, pluralistic teams.

---

6 Adapted from Gardenwartz and Rowe (2003).
**Strong individual commitment of members.** One critical determinant of high-performing teams is a strong commitment from each individual to complete and excel at his or her own assignments. Also vital to group goal achievement is a willingness to help others.

**Sensitive leadership.** The leadership role, whether shared or individually performed, is approached sensitively and strategically.

**A desire for individual and collective growth.** Part of the intrigue and frustration of the team phenomenon is that we have to merge our skills, competencies, ideas, values, and priorities with others. Figuring out how to do that well is a complex undertaking. Although team members’ skills and knowledge may be complementary, aligning priorities, making decisions, and solving problems can sometimes expose areas of friction.

**Openness to new experiences and processes, both interpersonal and task oriented.** Being a learner, open to new experiences, is in our best interest as individuals and as team and community members.

**Use and presence of humor.** While having fun together in the process of task accomplishment is not absolutely necessary, it adds immeasurably to the experience of working together; in fact, it is an important determinant in creating more tenacity and follow-through in meeting performance objectives.

### 6.4.5 Resource: Roles & Behaviors for High Team Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Roles &amp; Behaviors</th>
<th>Maintenance Roles &amp; Behaviors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>____ Ask clarifying questions</td>
<td>____ Encourage the participation of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ Share information</td>
<td>____ Give useful feedback in nonthreatening ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ Initiate discussion</td>
<td>____ Offer support of various kinds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ Propose possible solutions</td>
<td>____ Listen to the viewpoints of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ Summarize the content of the meeting</td>
<td>____ State what is needed from other team members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ Find out the facts</td>
<td>____ Demonstrate an openness and willingness to risk different points of view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ Identify clear goals and objectives</td>
<td>____ Observe interactions of fellow team members’ behaviors in the group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ Determine action plans</td>
<td>____ Suggest that the team deal with disagreement and revisit the norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ Diagnose problems</td>
<td>____ Give the group feedback about behaviors on the team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ Set up monitoring and evaluation processes</td>
<td>____ Relieve tension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ Assign tasks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ Volunteer for tasks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4.6 Activity: Wrap-up – Improving Intercultural Communication

**Time:** 20 minutes

**Materials:** [PowerPoint presentation](#)—Improving Intercultural Communication

**Learning Objective:** To provide a session wrap-up and introduce action strategies to improve intercultural communication.

**Process:**
Step 1: State that the strategies suggested here are only a few that might be available, and that their effectiveness will be determined by the individual and cultural background of the communicators and the situation.

Step 2: Introduce the following strategies:
- Reserve judgment
- Do “beat around the bush”
- Practice indirect communication
- Be patient
- Share your feeling and ideas
- Paraphrase for understanding

Step 3: Summarize the main points of the session:
- The communication process
- Content vs. context in communication
- The concept of filters, facilitators, barriers
- Verbal vs. nonverbal communication
Module 7: Managing Transitions

7.1 Managing Transitions: Purpose and Background

The main purpose of this module is to prepare participants to transition to the next stage of their careers, whether returning back to their countries of origin, continuing with further graduate study, or moving into international jobs. The participants in the LSJ Institutes were undergoing various types of transition, but the most common type involved fellows returning to their home countries after significant periods of time studying in another country. Thus, the main focus of program facilitators was on accommodating this group need. This module was designed to make participants aware of the stages of re-entry and of the culture shock that might confront them; to enable them to examine the life skills they would need for the transition phase; and to encourage them to think about how they could mobilize resources to aid in this transition.

Alumni facilitators were encouraged to take the lead on this module, and pre-institute planning involved several alumni who had returned to their homeland, moved on to further studies, or transitioned to international work. Part of their tasks involved identifying institute participants who had already made the transition to the post-fellowship phase and could help conduct institute sessions on managing transitions. Once participants were identified who had made this transition successfully, and who had the experience necessary to help conduct the managing transitions sessions, they were contacted on the first day of the institute. Those who had started the re-entry process were allowed to share the challenges they faced and the various skills that were useful in helping them overcome these challenges. There was much sharing, and participants who had not begun to transition to the post-fellowship phase engaged in some very rich and informative interactions with the alumni facilitators who had begun the post-fellowship transition. These discussions, along with the various structured activities included in this module, gave participants a greater awareness of the challenges they would face as they made their transitions, and provided participants with

“Open your arms to change, but don’t let go of your values.”

– The Dalai Lama
opportunities to deliberate on how to manage their transitions home and begin or resume their social justice work.

7.2 Managing Transitions: Module Summary

Objectives:
1. To facilitate understanding of the process of cultural re-entry
2. To help participants explore and plan their post-training transition processes
3. To enable participants to identify different kinds of resources, including financial resources, and the role that these resources play in social justice work

Sessions:  
1. Cultural Re-entry 2 hours, 30 minutes  
2. Managing Transitions 1 hour, 30 minutes  
3. Resource Mobilization 1 hour 

Time: 5 hours

Readings: none

Special Preparation: For the cultural re-entry and life skills sessions, workshop training coordinators will be responsible for contacting facilitators who have gone through a "re-entry process" back into their own organizations and cultural contexts, after completing prolonged education or training. In LSJ Institutes, these facilitators included program participants from previous years.

Facilitators' Notes: It is important for facilitators to recognize that many participants are not sure what they want to do when they return home, and that many do not know whether international work is a viable option for them. The fellows are at different stages of thinking concerning their post-fellowship phases; it is important for facilitators to focus not only on fellows who are at the end of their fellowships, but also on those who might be in earlier stages.

In the planning stages, it is very important to involve fellows who have already been through a re-entry process. Because they often have busy schedules, however, it may be difficult to get significant input from them prior to the institute. It is therefore recommended that they be contacted about this on the first day of the institute.

Alternative Training Ideas: An alternative to the above-mentioned process is to let participants prepare papers on the re-entry process and present these papers in panel or group presentations. A second alternative, which was used at LSJ Institutes in 2006, is to use program alumni rather than program participants as panelists and facilitators leading panels and discussions on re-entry and managing transitions.

Fundraising: In some LSJ Institutes, fellows were given the opportunity to focus directly on fundraising as an aspect of resource mobilization. In one session, for example, an IFP program
officer provided fellows with training on how to access and use the Foundation Center database. This tool, which provides users with valuable information on thousands of philanthropic organizations that fund social justice initiatives, is provided by the Ford Foundation to all of its program alumni. Clearly, not all organizations will have access to this resource; program facilitators should consider the needs of participants and the resources available to them when determining the extent to which they include activities on fundraising in this module.

7.3 Managing Transitions: Sample Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 hours, 30 minutes</th>
<th>Session 1: Cultural Re-entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plenary: (15 minutes)</td>
<td>Brief talk from facilitator on the following aspects of cultural re-entry, after living, working, or studying outside of one’s culture:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What is re-entry?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Stages of re-entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Re-entry styles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Challenges of re-entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator stories and small group discussions: (1 hour, 30 minutes)</td>
<td>Divide groups by region, if participants come from various regions of the world. Assign 2–3 participants to each of these groups (try to ensure a regional match between facilitator and group).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Facilitator stories: (15 minutes) Program alumni or others who have been through re-entry tell stories of their own transitioning from one culture to another; participants listen and ask questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Interactive session: (30 minutes) Fellows work in groups of 3–5 and discuss, with facilitators, the following questions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What personal and professional challenges do you expect upon returning home?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What do you see as the greatest personal and professional challenges you will need to overcome?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- In what ways have you changed and how can these changes be advantageous and disadvantageous?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reflection on learning: (25 minutes) Fellows will be given questions to reflect on and respond to in small groups (see Resource 7.4.1). Small groups report on the major learning from this session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Identifying challenges: (20 minutes) Each subgroup identifies 2–3 major challenges that fellows may face in post-fellowship transitions to share in plenary in the next session.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Action Planning Activity: (45 minutes) See Module 8 (Action Planning and Synthesis).

Distribute personal and professional planning charts, discuss how to complete, and give participants time to work on them. Participants must complete and return the charts at the final action planning session.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 hours, 30 minutes</th>
<th>Session 2: Managing Transitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Skills for managing transitions: | Group discussion: (25 minutes) Identify some of the skills that are critical in helping to manage transitions. (Begin by identifying skills from the previous
stories that were helpful in managing the storyteller’s transitions.)

Questions for consideration:
- What skills have you gained from your studies that can help you in post-fellowship transition?
- What resources have been helpful in this process?
- Subgroup discussion: (20 minutes) Each subgroup identifies critical skills that would be helpful in dealing with the major challenges identified earlier. In the upcoming plenary, one person from each subgroup will present (for 2 minutes) the challenges, as well as the skills that are critical in helping to overcome these challenges.
- Plenary: (40 minutes)
  - One representative from each group presents the challenges of re-entry and the skills for overcoming these challenges.
  - Open forum: A panel of individuals who have been through cultural re-entry receives questions about post-fellowship (or other experience) transitions.
  - Conclusion: One panelist gives a concluding story about managing post-fellowship transition and embarking on/resuming their social justice work.

1 hour

**Session 3: Resource Mobilization**

**Activity 1:** (1 hour) A small-group discussion (3 to 5 people) on resource mobilization (see Activity 7.4.2).
- Narrative on personal successes in resource mobilization
- Participant success stories on resource mobilization
- Elements of success/resources enabling success
- Successful resource mobilization for communities; parallels between individual resource mobilization and community resource mobilization
- Tips for success in resource mobilization
### Cultural Re-entry: questions for consideration

1. Have you started to contact people/organizations within your country/region?

2. What resources have been helpful in the process?

3. Do any of you have any expertise in dealing with cultural challenges facing citizens returning to their country after study abroad?

4. What will it be like to return home?

5. What will your job be like?

6. How have you changed?

7. How will you fit in back home?
7.4.2 Activity: Resource Mobilization

**Time:** 1 hour

**Materials:** none

**Process:**

1. Begin with a narrative like this (we used this with the Ford fellows):

   "Each one of you is a success story in mobilizing resources. Many of you have successfully raised funds, recruited volunteers, or secured other resources for your organizations. You have all succeeded in convincing a large, well-regarded organization like the Ford Foundation to fund your personal education. Reflecting on your success stories, let us draw guidelines to help us in future resource mobilization and fundraising activities."

2. In small groups (such as triads) discuss the following:

   a. Identify the elements that made one of your projects a success. These elements might include:
      - Responded to a real need(s)
      - Fit with a donor’s program
      - Past record was evident
      - Possibility for a strong return on investment, high possibility for positive future actions in the area of social justice, ability to do what you promise to do, etc.

   b. What are some of the resources you used to succeed in this project?
      - Relationships
      - Volunteers
      - Information
      - Reputation (record)
      - Money

   c. Is there a difference between your success story and that of a whole community? If so, what are these differences?

   d. What tips you can give to others on how to achieve a similar success story?

**Role of facilitators:**

- Using an accelerated reporting technique, report the groups’ findings.
- Advise groups on the fundraising cycle and how to assemble successful proposals.
- Distribute handouts on resource mobilization and the fundraising cycle, and provide Internet resources on fundraising.
Module 8: Action Planning & Synthesis

8.1 Action Planning & Synthesis: Purpose and Background

Practitioners of advocacy and strategic thinking understand the importance of careful, thorough, strategic action planning for effective social justice work. At the IFP LSJ Institutes, the approach to action planning was guided by the following assumptions:

- It is important to carefully identify the nature of problems that we want to address as well as the various variables that contribute to these problems and the levels at which these occur.
- Identifying and using individual and collective resources and networks strategically facilitates the movement of advocacy efforts.
- Careful consideration of obstacles and opportunities and planning of specific activities and steps to achieve our personal and professional goals is important.

LSJ Institute originators saw the institutes as extremely important opportunities for participants to learn about each other’s interests and strengths, and as platforms on which we could explore ways to draw upon the knowledge and experience of the entire group to further each participant’s individual social justice work. The overall purpose of the module was to help participants, through individual reflection and dialogue with other participants, to reflect on their future as social justice leaders and to develop an action plan that would enable them to pursue this future.

Action planning work was encouraged by efforts of some of IFP’s international partners at the country level. For example, some of the partners in the West Africa region used the LSJ Institute’s back home action plans, developed in the earliest institutes, as part of their in-country orientation and re-entry activities. These back home action plans evolved into our more recently developed individual action plans, included in this guide as Activities 8.6.1–8.6.3.

In general, action plans recommended by LSJ organizers have two basic components. The first component focuses on the nature of the work that participants plan to do. This component encourages participants to think about the issues they want to work on, articulate their vision, and consider some strategic steps they need to take to realize this vision. The second component provides participants with ways to reflect on, understand, and manage the transition from the training phase to a new phase of life and work in their home countries.

In more recent institutes, LSJ facilitators incorporated a third component, designed to facilitate the strengthening and maintenance of networks that aid participants in working together to achieve their goals and promote social justice.

“Activists must be pro-active. It is only by creating and implementing our own agendas, rather than fighting defensive battles, that social change is achieved.”

– Randy Shaw
The Activists Handbook

The Activists Handbook
8.2 Action Planning & Synthesis: Module Summary

Objectives:
1. To practice examining social justice issues using multiple perspective and levels of analysis
2. To analyze the leadership role and its effectiveness
3. To understand the challenges involved in re-entry into home countries and pursuing social justice agendas
4. To identify strategic ways to understand and build networks
5. To develop individual and collective action plans that help participants prepare and strategically think about their future social justice work

Activities: Unlike the other modules, the majority of the action planning module does not occur as a sequence of sessions on a particular day. Instead, it is organized as a series of self- and group-paced activities that progress over the course of the entire institute, building on each other and culminating on the final day in the form of functional individual and group action plans. Because many of the themes of the action planning module overlap with subject matter covered in prior modules, participants will have completed much of their action planning while participating in these modules. However, in order to create thorough, detailed action plans, participants will need to devote a significant amount of individual time and effort, outside of these sessions, to these activities. (Activities are included in Section 8.3 of this manual.)

Sessions: Apart from the action planning activities occurring throughout the institute, there are three sessions in this module, shown below. These include not only the final session on group action planning, but also the closing sessions of the institute. These sessions provide participants with a way to reflect on what they have learned, and conclude by discussing ways participants can initiate and strengthen social justice advocacy work.

1. Group Action Plan 1 hour, 30 minutes
2. Synthesis and Strategies 1 hour, 30 minutes
3. Final Plenary: Reflections on Learning 1 hour

Time: 4 hours

Materials: none

Readings: There is one required reading for this module:

Facilitators’ Notes: The action planning activities assume that participants have been studying/training away from their home countries, or at least away from their work. The set of
activities presented here may be adjusted in different ways. For example, the three sessions presented here may be used separately for individual and group action planning, application, and synthesis respectively.

**Special Preparation:** The success of the session depends upon identifying and orienting participants with effective and relevant stories. Given the global and diverse nature of our institutes, program facilitators were careful to give regional, gender, and thematic balance to the case stories we selected. We recommend that participants be asked to volunteer their stories in advance of the institute. It is also important to prepare and orient the storytellers so that they are clear, succinct, and effective in their communication. While some people may need little guidance, other would greatly benefit from this orientation. This preparation may happen before and during the first few days of the institute.

### 8.3 Action Planning: Sample Activities

#### Day 1: Activities for Networking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Action Planning Handbook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic Group Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking Module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder of Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Days 2–4: Exploring Networks and Forming Peer Support Groups

### From Action Planning Handbook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day 2 Morning</td>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td>Further explore your network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>By midday on day 2, participants should have a list of 6–10 people with whom they might like to join in a peer support group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2 Lunch</td>
<td>Step 5</td>
<td>Form peer support groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Give participants time to mingle and find people on their lists. Any two participants can initiate a group. They will then identify another one or two participants who wish to join their group. Once there are four, the group will gather around a table and register with one of the staff members. Facilitators will then help match remaining participants with a group that needs another member or form new groups. The process will end once everyone is part of a group and all groups are registered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 1–Day 3 Evening &amp; Informally</td>
<td>Step 6</td>
<td>Peer support group meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>With the other members of your peer support group, identify one or more times when you will all meet to talk about each other’s backgrounds and all of the elements in parts 1–3 of the individual action plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Days 1–5: Drafting an Individual Action Plan

### From Action Planning Handbook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day 2 Evening</td>
<td>Step 7</td>
<td>Learn how to utilize resources made available by IFP Alumni Affairs (for IFP LSJ Institute participants only).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2–Day 5 Individually</td>
<td>Step 8</td>
<td>Draft individual action plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft all three parts of your plan, building as appropriate on: experiences and ideas you had prior to the institute; new input from different formal and informal experiences during the institute, especially the stories of alumni and others who have gone through the post-fellowship transition; and support from your peer group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If you decide to initiate or participate in any network action following the institute (see Handbook Section 4), include these activities in your individual plan as well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Day 5-6: Finalizing Your Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>Step 9</td>
<td>Incorporate insights about transitioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This will be the topic of the institute sessions on initiating and managing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>transitions—personal re-entry, life skills, and resource mobilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>Step 10</td>
<td>Share action plan with support group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Give a copy of your draft plan and/or verbally present it to the other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>members of your support group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Receive suggestions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As appropriate, provide suggestions to the others—especially with regard to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>making the plans realistic and specific.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>Step 11</td>
<td>Finalize your action plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Do any redrafting that you wish based on your peers’ input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First, finalize the parts that you will submit to the workshop facilitators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Everyone must submit part 3. Parts 1 and 2 are encouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(As these may be more personal, you may decide whether to also submit one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>or both of them.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 8.4 Action Planning & Synthesis: Sample Design

| 1 hour, 30 minutes | **Session 1: Group Action Plan**  
The primary outcome should be a specific and agreed-upon action plan for sharing key information, contacts, resources, and ideas from participants’ time at the institute. It is anticipated that the main, though not exclusive, audience will be the members of the network group that corresponds with your theme. The thematic group will be encouraged to consider other ways that some or all of its members will contribute to the network more generally.  
Two examples:  
- Initiating dialogue among and making a resource folder (bibliographies, course syllabi, articles, web sites, etc.) for fellows and alumni who are doing research on a common topic of interest, such as HIV/AIDS or microcredit.  
- Initiating a system by which different members of your group volunteer to maintain contact with different global advocacy organizations and alert all other members when one organization has identified a specific policy issue or begun an advocacy campaign that may be of interest to others.  
A representative of each group will be asked to make a very short report on the group’s plans in the plenary session that follows. |
| 1 hour, 30 minutes | **Session 2: Synthesis and Strategies**  
• Thematic groups share their respective action plans (30 minutes)  
• Short question/answer/clarification opportunity (15 minutes)  
• Panel presentation (45 minutes)  
  - Overall strategies for implementation of individual and collective action plans  
  - Suggestions on initiating and strengthening social justice advocacy work |
| 1 hour | **Session 3: Final Plenary: Reflections on Learning**  
• Concluding remarks  
• Institute evaluation |
8.5 Action Planning: Peer Support Group Formation

8.5.1 Activity: Peer Support Group Formation Guidelines for Facilitators

Peer Support Group Formation Guidelines

Day of Arrival
1. Remind participants on arrival day to read the Action Planning Handbook and start thinking about peer support group formation.
2. Distribute extra name tags for participants and explain the process of the group formation.

Day 1, Morning
1. During the morning opening plenary, inform participants about the peer support group formation activities and outcomes.
2. Emphasize that participants should use the Monday morning activities, particularly the poster presentation interactions, to identify possible participants for their peer support group.
3. Describe the lunchtime activity, in which participants identify and/or connect with previously identified individuals who will be part of their peer support group.
4. Participants start the process of getting into groups.
5. LSJ staff are available to facilitate the movement of this process, answer questions, and compile any completed groups.
6. Complete groups bring their nametags to a staff member to staple and keep.
7. LSJ staff randomly distribute ungrouped participants into groups.

Day 2, Afternoon
1. Create an opportunity for participants to complete the peer support group formation process.
2. Participants gather in the plenary room.
3. Peer support groups that are complete gather to talk among themselves and set meeting times for the duration of the institute.
4. Individuals with incomplete groups have been randomly distributed into groups and given the opportunity to connect and talk among themselves.
8.6.1 Resource: Individual Action Plan, Part 1

Name: ______________________

INDIVIDUAL ACTION PLAN—PART 1

Note: See page 9 of the Action Planning Handbook for alternatives to use in place of or in combination with this narrative format.

1. **What problems, social injustices, or issues do I want to address as I finish my fellowship?** What is the nature and scope of each problem? What are the sources of each problem? Are the problem and its sources local, national, and/or global?

2. **What is the solution that I want to help create?** Will I do this by joining an existing organization or coalition? Helping initiate a new one? What role(s) do I hope to play in the process? What capacities and resources have I developed through my studies and previous experience that will help me? Which capacities do I still need to develop? What support do I need?
**8.6.2 Resource: Individual Action Plan, Part 2**

Name: ________________________

INDIVIDUAL ACTION PLAN — PART 2 (FORM)
Plan for transitions to (a) family, community, and culture and/or (b) work and career:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Challenges anticipated</th>
<th>Resources/means for overcoming challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Name: ________________________

INDIVIDUAL ACTION PLAN — PART 3

3. How do I hope to engage with the network of IFP alumni in my COUNTRY?

3.1. At what stage of development is our alumni association?

3.2 How might participation help me to overcome challenges and/or achieve my social justice goals? How can my participation help others?

3.3 Is there a specific network action that I hope to join or initiate? If yes, what?

3.4 Who will I work with most closely and/or need to maintain regular contact with? (Please give names.) Have we made any specific agreements about how we will do this?

4. Do I hope to actively participate in one or more GLOBAL THEMATIC network groups that are relevant to my interests and goals? If yes, which one(s)?

4.1 At what stage of development is the relevant group?
### Individual Action Plan, Part 3 - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.2.</th>
<th>How might participation help me to overcome challenges and/or achieve my social justice goals? How can my participation help others?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Is there a specific network action that I hope to join or initiate? If yes, what?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Who will I work with most closely and/or need to maintain regular contact with? (Please give names.) Have we made any specific agreements about how we will do this?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.</th>
<th>Are there any other AD HOC network groups that I might wish to help create within the larger IFP network? If yes, what are they? Will the group be part of a country or global thematic network or some new combination?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>How might participation help me to overcome challenges and/or achieve my social justice goals? How can my participation help others?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Is there a specific network action that I hope to join or initiate? If yes, what?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Who will I work with most closely and/or need to maintain regular contact with? (Please give names.) Have we made any specific agreements about how we will do this?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A: Leadership for Social Justice in the Ford Foundation International Fellows Program

Jeff Unsicker, Aqeel Tirmizi and Roberto Mugnani

According to Joan Dassin, Executive Director of the Ford International Fellowship Program (IFP), the concept of “leadership for social justice” and even its acronym, “LSJ,” have become integral to the discourse regarding goals and methods of the fellows, alumni, international partners, board and others who make up the IFP community. While the unique values and path breaking orientation of IFP within the world of international fellowship programs created the context for such a development, the catalyst was a series of Leadership for Social Justice institutes. In 2002, working closely Dassin and her IFP colleagues, SIT and the Advocacy Institute developed the first pilot institute for 37 Fellows on the SIT campus. During the next four years, they organized or supported another 13 institutes with nearly 1,000 participants, in ways that were characterized by continuing innovation regarding locations, themes and partner relationships, and responsive to the need for scaling up to meet the growing demand as the fellowship program rapidly expanded.

This paper describes the theory and practice of the LSJ institutes and an online community that grew out of the institutes. It addresses goals, strategic decisions, assessments of process and outcome, and lessons learned. This is preceded by a brief overview of the background and orientation of the Ford International Fellowship Program. The paper concludes

7 www.fordifp.net
8 www.sit.edu SIT is the higher education division of World Learning, an NGO founded in 1932 as the Experiment in International Living. The SIT Graduate School programs, begun 1964, and have always been distinguished by a deep commitment to practice-centered learning and preparing professionals for work in international and intercultural service. Today it offers seven master’s degrees (including sustainable development, conflict transformation, social justice in intercultural relations, and management of mission-driven organizations) and many non-degree programs for professionals and activists in the field. In addition, SIT Study Abroad offers over 70 semester and summer programs in over 50 countries, mostly in Africa, Asia and Latin America, for undergraduates at US colleges and universities.
9 www.advocacy.org “Founded in 1985 by former Federal Trade Commission Chairman Michael Pertschuk and former Common Cause President David Cohen, the Advocacy Institute (AI) has helped social justice leaders in the U.S. and abroad work more effectively for change through support in building advocacy skills, networking with other activists, and one-on-one coaching. AI has worked with leaders from more than 2,500 nonprofits and NGOs in over 60 countries, tackling critical human rights issues, addressing imbalances in power, and helping to build and sustain social movements in countries including South Africa, Palestine, Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, Macedonia, Ukraine, and the former Soviet Union. AI was a powerful force in building and sustaining the tobacco control movement within the United States and abroad, and more recently its domestic work included stewardship of the Ford Foundation’s flagship Leadership for a Changing World awards program” (www.iscvt.org/d/ai_isc_pressrelease_091806.pdf). In 2006 it merged with Institute for Sustainable Communities and became the Advocacy Center at ISC.

**The Fellowship Program**

Again according to Dassin, the International Fellowships Program represents the Ford Foundation's

... most significant recent investment in higher education and training. The program was specifically created to identify and provide educational opportunities for highly talented, socially committed individuals from groups and communities with limited access to higher education, so that they, in turn, would be better equipped to promote social justice in their home countries and communities.¹¹

Launched in November 2000 with a ten-year, $280 million commitment – with a subsequent commitment of additional funds based on early performance – that will award over 4,000 fellowships for graduate study (primarily masters and doctoral degrees) in the fellows' home countries or anywhere else in the world.¹² While its scale is impressive, the most unique aspects of the program have to do with its vision of affirmative action and social justice. The initiative is based on three premises: (1) new generations of leaders with "direct knowledge of their societies' worst problems and inequities and a sense of moral urgency about them"¹³ will individually benefit from post-graduate study; (2) their social commitment and leadership potential will strongly motivate them to use their education for the betterment of their communities; and, (3) and "the 'social returns' on investment in an individual's education [will be] quickly compounded if those individuals are connected to one another and to others in reinforcing networks that strive for a common purpose, such as promoting social justice."¹⁴

Through a decentralized, bottom up process involving partner institutions and advisory groups, each country has developed context specific criteria for which groups and communities will be prioritized based on their historical exclusion from higher education opportunities. These include "indigenous peoples in Mexico, women in Muslim areas of West Africa, and people from minority ethnic groups living in remote areas of Vietnam." In fact, "poverty, gender and coming from or living in remote or rural areas" are the most common criteria across all countries."¹⁵ An extensive outreach and selection

---

¹⁰ To be electronically published through the SIT website.
¹² By the end of 2004, nearly half of the Fellows had been selected. Of those, more than 200 had completed degrees, more than 1,050 were currently enrolled, and the remainder were in a degree admissions process. Fellows had enrolled in nearly 400 universities in 40 countries -- about a third in the U.S. and Canada, a third in Europe, the U.K. and Australia, and a third in home countries or regions. (Dassin, J. and M. Zurburchen [2005]. "Scholar Activists." *Ford Foundation Report*. Winter, 35-37: 36)
¹⁵ Dassin (2005): 4
process has resulted in Fellows who indeed have significant commitment and leadership potential and who, while often needing some pre-fellowship support, have gained admission to and succeeded in quality universities around the world in programs ranging from the social sciences and professions (community development, education, public health, social work, law, etc.) to natural science and fine arts to interdisciplinary fields (women's studies, disability studies, etc.).

**The Pilot Institute, 2002**

In January, as soon as the first cohorts of IFP Fellows had been selected and begun their studies, the Advocacy Institute and SIT were asked to organize a week-long, residential learning experience for those fellows – and do so in less than seven months. The combination of the two organizations’ experiences, along with SIT’s rural Vermont campus for a venue, made it possible to quickly plan and facilitate a unique and well-received program for 37 Fellows in June 2002.16

During the planning process, the Advocacy Institute recommended "leadership for social justice" as the institute’s theme. All agreed and in that context the planners focused on the awareness, knowledge, skills and contacts that the Fellows would need both individually to be more effective social justice change agents when they completed their studies and returned home, and collectively to become a social justice network that provides mutual support and inspiration to its members and provides opportunities for global level action.

The planners reviewed the available information about this first group of Fellows and rapidly conducted a needs assessment survey asking participants to provide additional information about themselves, their previous experiences and current studies, and what they hoped to gain from the institute. These steps identified exciting opportunities but also a difficult set of challenges, many reflecting the diversity inherent in the IFP design. Four of these challenges were:

**Language differences.** Consistent with its mission, but unlike most other international fellowship programs, IFP does not require Fellows to speak English. To do so would eliminate many of the strongest prospective Fellows from marginalized communities. Spanish, Portuguese, French and Russian are already the second or third language for many persons in Latin America, Senegal and Russia; to also require English would dramatically limit the pool of strong candidates. But this also meant that the institute would need multilingual materials and simultaneous interpretation between all of five language groups.

**Physical ability differences.** Not surprisingly, a significant number of Fellows represent disabled communities. In addition to accommodating the special needs of persons with physical mobility challenges, three of the 37 participants were blind or had significant sight loss, requiring materials in several different languages to also be produced in Braille.

**Differences in fields of study.** IFP’s approach is to fund study in any professional or academic fields that Fellows believe will best prepare them to contribute back to their communities. As a result, the fields ranged from the social sciences to the natural sciences, and from academic research to professional practice.

16 Also present were at least 15 observers from the Ford Foundation (including President Berresford), the IFP Board, the IFP headquarters and the Institute of International Education in New York, and partner organizations in each of IFP’s three regions (Africa/Middle East, Asia/Russian and Latin America) responsible for recruiting and placing Fellows.
**National/regional differences.** As is the case with any inclusive international event, the participants brought with them very different histories, cultures and concerns. Among IFP Fellows, these differences were manifested in many ways, including comfort level with the term “social justice” (at least one international partner indicated that it was too politically sensitive for use within its country; in other countries, it was central to the political culture), the way that “leadership” is viewed, and styles of communication and social relationships.

In response to these differences, the institute planners sought ways to create a respectful and supportive environment that would “celebrate diversity” and maximize participation by all involved, but also went further to recognize that addressing the complex causes of social injustice requires the awareness, knowledge and skills for communication and collaboration across differences (scholars and activists; civil society, government and the academy; specialists in journalism, public health and agronomy; Peruvians, Senegalese and Vietnamese; local, national and global).

In addition to the ability to communicate and collaborate across differences, the planners sought to develop a common understanding of the many other competencies of “social justice leadership” – and of the underlying frameworks upon which the understanding is built. At the same time, while recognizing the importance of such an understanding for guiding what (and what not) to include in the institute’s program, the planners faced two realities that required them to allow this to evolve through experience and dialogue with the Fellows and others in the IFP community. First, the concepts of leadership and social justice vary with some of the differences noted above – i.e., to some extent with different fields of academic knowledge and professional practice and to a very significant extent with different national and regional contexts. Second, even the literature in leadership studies offers very limited insights into the competencies of leaders in the IFP relevant contexts – i.e., non-Western societies, non-corporate organizations that are led in various ways by persons from the communities in Africa, Asia, Latin America, the Middle East and Russia that have been marginalized by the Western, corporate-dominated globalization process.17

In addition to all of the above considerations, the planners sought to determine the best ways to connect to but not duplicate the academic and professional foci of Fellows’ graduate studies – i.e., to provide new “value added.” And, last but not least, the planners sought to find a balance of depth and breadth in terms of how much of collective and individual learning is feasible within the time constraints of one week.

With the above as context, the objectives for the pilot institute were stated as:

- Provide an opportunity for networking, relationship building and learning among Fellows
- Highlight and reaffirm the Fellows’ commitment to social justice work
- Strengthen and enhance the leadership and advocacy skills of the participants
- Recognize and celebrate the participants’ roles as IFP Fellows
- Identify areas for future cooperation and collaboration among Fellows, and
- Solicit Fellows’ suggestions for future leadership events and contributions to IFP.

---

17 A set of understandings and frameworks that emerged through the planners’ reflections on their own social justice work and the experiences and dialogues within the institutes are discussed in the final section of this paper on “Conceptual Analysis.” A more thorough discussion, based on additional literature and field research, is currently being prepared by a team of SIT faculty.
To achieve the objectives, the pilot institute included a combination of activities that involved reflection, new experiences, dialogue and skills training – with attention to both a formal agenda and allowing substantial time for informal interactions. The formal agenda included, in the following order:

- half-day devoted to helping the Fellows meet and learn about each other
- session on intercultural communication
- day focused on exploring the Fellows’ past and future social justice work
- day focused on “leadership challenges”
- day of short workshops (each participant attended three) focused on skill areas identified in the needs assessment, such as strategic planning, communication and advocacy
- half-day of dialogue with the IFP leadership about “where to from here?” and
- closing session focused on reflection, synthesis and evaluation

In addition, significant attention was paid to the informal processes. Some recreational activity and substantial open time was built into the agenda for Fellows to interact. Three time slots were designated for optional meetings among Fellows in order to facilitate discussions begun in the sessions or on new topics of concern to them. A closing dinner on Thursday evening was extended at the Fellows’ request to allow them to perform cultural songs, dances and similar activities.

Evaluations shared anonymously in writing and publicly in the final session (partially captured in a video documentary that IFP filmed during the week) suggested that the institute had provided a powerful experience for most if not all of the participants. Among the most dominant themes of the Fellows’ comments were:

- it was moving to learn that problems faced at home were similar to those in other countries, and that there were others all over the world with deep commitments to addressing those problems, and
- many had re-evaluated their predominantly negative connotation of “leader” (based on political and other role models) and begun to say that they must be leaders.

The Fellows also suggested, in very strong terms, their desire to have a mechanism for continuing communication among them and between them and other IFP Fellows who would follow them.

**LSJ Institutes, 2003-2006**

Several months after the pilot institute, staff of IFP, the Advocacy Institute and SIT met to review the experience and discuss possible next steps. The outcome was a second one-year grant for AI and SIT to provide two additional institutes in 2003 – and to initiate an online community. Based on that experience and follow up meetings, a third one-year grant was made for four more institutes in 2004. Following those, IFP convened a “consultative group” of representatives of international partners and institute alumni from each of the three regions to reflect on experiences to date and emerging needs; as a result, yet another one-year grant supported four yet more diverse institutes in 2005 and early 2006, and following those another one-year grant supported the continuation of three of those models in 2006. IFP then decided to transition responsibility for LSJ institute programming to some of the IFP alumni associations that were at different stages of formation in each of the 22 countries.
For an overview of the pilot and thirteen additional institutes, see Table 1. It provides information about each institute’s date, location, size, diversity of participants, official language(s) and the role of AI/SIT and other partners. The data suggest a pattern of ongoing innovation, experimentation and significant changes.

18 Notes re: the Table 1:

- “Primary responsibility” and “Support” columns could both include IFP Secretariat. In particular, Ashok Gurung was an active co-planner and often co-facilitator for the 2002 and 2003 institutes; Joyce Malombe played the same role for the institutes from 2003 onward. Tricia Callender was active in the 2006 institute planning and delivery.

- **Acronyms:** AI is Advocacy Institute. KdK is Kontakt der Kontinenten (Contact Across Cultures), a Dutch training group and conference center. CIESAS is Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social (Center for Research and Higher Education in Social Anthropology). ASF is the Asian Scholarship Foundation. Nuffic is the Netherlands Organization for International Cooperation in Higher Education. ISS is the Institute of Social Studies in The Hague.
Table 1. LSJ Institutes. 2002-2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Primary responsibility</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Language(s)</th>
<th>Total Fellows</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Asia</th>
<th>Latin America</th>
<th>Russia</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 July 2002</td>
<td>SIT, Vermont</td>
<td>AI, SIT</td>
<td></td>
<td>English, Spanish, French, Russian</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 July 2003</td>
<td>SIT, Vermont</td>
<td>AI, SIT</td>
<td></td>
<td>English, Spanish, Portuguese</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 August 2003</td>
<td>KdK, Netherlands</td>
<td>AI, SIT, KdK</td>
<td>Nuffic</td>
<td>English, Spanish, Russian</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 January 2004</td>
<td>Oaxaca, Mexico</td>
<td>SIT, AI, CIESAS</td>
<td>CIESAS, IIE, Mexico</td>
<td>English, Spanish, Portuguese</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 July 2004</td>
<td>Chiang Mai, Thailand</td>
<td>SIT, AI</td>
<td>ASF</td>
<td>English, Russian</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 July 2004</td>
<td>SIT, Vermont</td>
<td>SIT, AI</td>
<td></td>
<td>English, Spanish, Portuguese</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 August 2004</td>
<td>KdK, Netherlands</td>
<td>SIT, AI, KdK</td>
<td>Nuffic</td>
<td>English, Spanish, French</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 June 2005</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>SIT, AI</td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 June 2005</td>
<td>The Hague, Netherlands</td>
<td>ISS</td>
<td>Nuffic, SIT</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 June-July 2005</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>University of Arkansas</td>
<td>SIT</td>
<td>English as a second language</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 February 2006</td>
<td>Oaxaca, Mexico</td>
<td>CIESAS, LA partners</td>
<td>CIESAS, IIE, Mexico</td>
<td>Spanish, Portuguese</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 June 2006</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>SIT, AI</td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 July 2006</td>
<td>Birmingham, UK</td>
<td>University of Birmingham</td>
<td>British Council, SIT</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 2006</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>University of Arkansas</td>
<td></td>
<td>English as a second language</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the sections below we describe the principles, rationale and motivations behind these changes in detail. Many of the changes were choices, in many cases based on inherent tensions or trade-offs that were addressed in different ways at different points in the institutes’ evolution. These include:

**Scale.** Following the pilot institute, IFP set a goal of having every Fellow participate in an institute at some point in her/his Fellowship period. With a rapidly expanding pipeline of Fellows (growing to 400-500 per year), it would be necessary to substantially increase the size of each institute and/or create many more institutes. There were some concerns that the power of the pilot institute, with just 37 Fellows, could be realized with larger numbers. But there was also a limit to the number of points in the various academic calendars of the Fellows when they could be available. Moreover, there were limitations regarding the availability of AI/SIT resource persons to facilitate institutes and, perhaps even more limiting, the availability of IFP staff from headquarters and other partner institutions to represent the program at multiple institutes per year. The responses varied. In 2003, we expanded from one to two institutes and, as indicated in the “Total Fellows” column in Table 1, we about doubled the size of each of those institutes. In the 2004, we doubled the number of institutes to four. In 2005 and 2006, we created an annual institute in Washington, DC that about doubled the size of previous institutes, while smaller institutes were offered in other sites.

**Cost.** Global meetings are expensive, especially strongly facilitated, multilingual institutes. IFP’s executive and board leadership were constantly faced with evaluating the trade-offs of investing in institutes versus expanding the total number of Fellowships. In that context, the institute planners and all others involved sought ways to control costs – ideally with no or limited loss of impact of an institute on Fellows. One significant cost area that was subject to some control was location of institutes – since travel costs can vary significantly depending on venue and where a Fellow is located (for studies or, later, as an alum). Moreover, in the post 9-11 political reality in the U.S., visa costs for U.S.-based institutes were growing in terms of both the time investment of both Fellow applicants and staff support and the costs of rescheduling when a visa application was denied. Thus cost reduction was a significant though not the only factor behind decisions to organize four of the institutes in Europe (the Netherlands and the U.K.), since many Fellows were already studying there and travel costs from Africa and parts of Asia are less than they are to the United States. The high cost of simultaneous interpretation was also an important variable; as noted below, these costs also factored into other decisions.

**Language(s).** The corresponding column in Table 1 indicates the pattern of moving from having interpretation across four languages at the pilot institute, to different combinations of three languages at most of the 2003 and 2004 institutes, to English and Spanish-Portuguese (“Portuñol”) only institutes in 2005 and 2006. Cost was a factor in those decisions. However, the choices were equally or perhaps primarily based on efforts to address another inherent tension. First, and of course, there are significant limitations to the level of substantive communication among Fellows without a common language, forced to depend on interpretation during formal sessions and at all other times informal, non-simultaneous translation by peers or solely nonverbal communication. Yet there were different opinions, within and between IFP, SIT, the Advocacy Institute and others involved in planning the institutes, about the trade-offs between those limitations – and particularly their impact on the “depth” or “rigor” of the

---

19 On the other hand, the cost of housing, meals and related costs (including professional services such as simultaneous interpretation) at different venues were also significant. Thus while the travel costs within Europe may be less, in many or most cases they might be offset by lower daily costs/participant at a venue with higher transportation costs (e.g. Mexico, Thailand or the SIT campus).
institutes—versus the loss of the *global* awareness and connections that was significantly enhanced through multilingual institutes. The decisions regarding the 2005-06 institutes reflected a commitment to deepening communication among the participating Fellows.

**Primary responsibility.** The corresponding column in Table 1 indicates the level of experimentation regarding what organization(s) assume responsibility for planning and facilitating institutes. The Advocacy Institute and SIT continued as the co-facilitators of most institutes, but in 2003 and 2004, they worked with two Dutch institutions to organize an institute in the Netherlands. Nuffic is responsible for managing the placements of Fellows who choose to study in mainland Europe and was well equipped to provide travel, visa and other logistical support for the first off-SIT campus institute. Kontakt der Kontinenten provided both a conference center as venue and a team of international trainers to co-facilitate with AI and SIT. In 2004, CIESAS played both a co-facilitation and, with IIE Mexico, a Nuffic-like support role for the first institute in Oaxaca. ASF played the same support role for the institute in Chiang Mai. CIESAS is both a university and the IFP partner in Mexico responsible for Fellow selection, orientation and advising. In 2005 and 2006, two universities (Institute of Social Studies in the Netherlands and the University of Birmingham in the U.K.) provided the primary planning and facilitation of institutes, with SIT serving as resource to them; in the latter case, the British Council performed the support functions. The Council manages the placement of all Fellows studying in the U.K. During 2005 and 2006, an English as Second Language program at the University of Arkansas was asked to integrate LSJ content into four week and longer ESL programs for Fellows who wished to learn or improve English, with SIT serving as a resource during the first year.

**Timing.** While this tension is not reflected in the Table 1 data, another set of trade-offs had to do with the advantages and disadvantages of participating in an institute at different points in a Fellowship. Most of the participants in the pilot institute and in the 2003-04 institutes had just completed the first year of academic programs that were typically two (for master’s) or more (for doctorates) years in duration. In 2005-06, there was a much greater emphasis on selecting participants toward the end of their academic programs. And, the ultimate decision to have alumni associations organize LSJ programs will result in most participants to be Fellows who have recently completed their studies and returned home.

**Constants**

Despite the many changes, several of the planning considerations noted in the discussion of the pilot institute—i.e., ongoing attention to identifying the concepts and competencies of “leadership for social justice,” not duplicating but rather adding value to the Fellows’ studies, and attempting to prioritize and balance multiple learning needs within the scope of one week—remained constant from 2003-2006. Among the results were ongoing innovations in the institutes’ agenda, content and activities, described below. However, it is essential to discuss one other constant that was central to the evolution of the institutes:

**Building the capacity of IFP Fellows and Alumni to take over responsibility for the LSJ initiatives.** One of the primary motivators for SIT and the Advocacy Institute in taking on their LSJ roles was the opportunity to help build networks of the Fellows (even more so as they become Alumni) have the potential to become unique and powerful global forces for mutual support, information exchange, learning, international collaboration and advocacy. Moreover, from the outset, the planners recognized the fact that, even if the IFP Fellowship program were

---

20 Some of the differences of opinion regarding this trade-off reflected different definitions and understandings of these terms.
to be extended beyond its ten-year grant, it would necessarily be a finite period. If leadership for social justice leadership institutes or other learning activities were to be sustained over the long run, the Alumni networks would need to assume responsibility.

In that context, the institute organizers experimented with multiple ways to help build the global leadership for the networks. First and foremost, the institute designs provided multiple opportunities for the participants to take on leadership roles. For example, the pilot institute participants initiated the idea of a cultural night; at each subsequent institute, a committee of participants would be formed at the outset of the institute to plan and facilitate the cultural night. Many of the formal parts of the agenda provided more substantive opportunities to exert leadership -- from a session on leadership models inviting participants to present case studies of their own experiences to a closing session being co-planned and facilitated by a team of participants.

During 2003, the organizers facilitated a process through which participating Fellows identified "Network Groups" based on mutual interests and identified volunteer coordinators to moderate online community groups in each of those areas. Most of the Network Groups had sub-groups by language and, where possible, bilingual Fellows who participated in two of those sub-groups were asked to volunteer as information brokers to assist with exchange of information. At each succeeding institute, efforts were made to orient new Fellows to the Network Groups and to encourage new leadership. In 2003 and subsequent years, institutes also provided space for Fellows from each represented country to learn about and provide input regarding plans for country-level Alumni organizations.

For each of the 2003 and 2004 institutes, the organizers recruited two to four Fellows who had participated in an earlier institute ("institute alumni") to work with the facilitation team. They arrived several days prior to the institute and joined the team for its final meetings and then took on various roles, from advising the cultural night committee, co-training participants in the multiple uses of the online community, and supporting clusters of participants in various Network Group areas. Several of the 2003 institute alumni with strong potential for higher-level leadership were invited to serve again, along with new institute alumni, at a 2004 institute.

In 2005, by which time there was a significant number of Fellows who had finished their studies and became IFP Alumni and were most often back in their home countries, the organizers switched to recruiting solely from this pool. At the same time, SIT and the Advocacy Institute began planning a new, much larger institute model, to be held in Washington, DC. The model provided the opportunity to provide Alumni with a much more substantial role in institute planning and facilitation. Moreover, the model could only be implemented with a substantial number of Alumni in such roles. That is, in order to scale up – as well as to begin a greater amount of control over to Alumni – the model involved (1) forming five "thematic groups" linked to the topic(s) of one or more of the ongoing IFP Network Groups, each with 20-30 persons, (2) having the majority of the institute activities took place in those smaller groups, and (3) staffing each group with two Alumni facilitators with expertise in the thematic area and one facilitator from SIT or the Advocacy Institute.

To secure Alumni facilitators with the requisite competencies, the organizers created an open application and rigorous selection process, which generated over 40 applicants for 12

---

21 Examples of Network Groups include: Poverty and Development; Disability and Development; Education; Environment; Gender; Governance; Human Rights; Humanities, Arts and Social Development.

22 The IFP Alumni who had not yet returned home were those who had been funded for a master’s degree program and, on the basis of their performance, had received university or third party support to pursue a doctoral program. These alumni were also eligible for selection.
positions. In addition to the institute and several days of pre-meetings just prior to the institute, the Alumni facilitators also participated in a week of institute planning and facilitation training that took place four months prior to the institute.\(^{23}\) The designed allowed the Alumni to gain new skills in advance of the institute; to receive personal and ongoing mentoring from highly experienced facilitators; to play a central role in all of the major design decisions; to engage online with their thematic groups’ participants in the several months prior to the institute; and to not only provide leadership in the smaller groups but also in the plenary sessions.

A similar process was repeated in 2006 for the yet larger Washington, DC institute and thus a total of 14 Alumni facilitators selected from nearly 100 applicants. Two of the previous year’s facilitators were asked to serve again in order to provide leadership among their peers and to assume still larger responsibilities in the institute. Had another institute taken place in 2007, SIT was considering phasing out one of the faculty facilitator positions and using the resources to have one of the experienced Alumni spend the full spring semester at SIT, dividing her/his time between the roles of co-director of the June institute and visiting lecturer in its regular curriculum.

IFP Online

Along with the institutes, SIT worked with IFP and Fellows to develop an online community that could support pre-institute and, on an ongoing basis, post-institute communication among Fellows. As noted above, during the pilot institute Fellows emphasized the need for such a system. Shortly before the second institute, when it became evident that IFP secretariat plans to create elements of an online community would be not be in place, SIT offered to extend multilingual, web portal software that it had recently acquired for the Fellows’ use. Initially named “LSJ Online,” it has continued to provide some level of communication, added listserves to increase that level, added new services (e.g., job postings and access to fundraising resources), and, in the process, was renamed “IFP Online.”

Innovations

With each new round of institutes and new institutions assuming various primary and support roles, a number of innovations supplemented or replaced elements in the pilot institute’s agenda and process noted on page 5. Two of these have already been mentioned:

The formation of interest-focused Network Groups, culminating in such foci becoming the core unit of organization in the 2005-2006 institutes; and

The creation of IFP Online and its use for pre-institute work by participants (more specifically, for doing introductions and sharing academic work) and for ongoing communication among the Fellows and Alumni across all of the different institutes.

Among other innovations were:

Presentation of Fellows’ academic and professional work. From 2003 onward, Fellows were encouraged to share papers or other examples of their work with their peers – both at an institute and via postings on IFP Online. When thematic groups became more formal in 2004, space was created for a limited number of Fellows to present papers in the format of a conference panel. The 2005 and 2006 institutes in Washington, DC significantly expanded this

\(^{23}\) Two Alumni facilitators were also selected, through the same process, for the institute for which ISS had primary responsibility and they also attended the weeklong planning and facilitator training week.
sharing by formalizing the panels but also requiring every participant to present a paper in a large panel board session; the approach was subsequently adopted for the institutes in The Hague and Birmingham. (Specific guidelines for both forms of presentations are included in the LSJ Capacity Building Resource Manual.)

Visits to organizations and institutions. Stimulated by an organizational fair initiated by KdK at the third institute, the idea was fully developed during the fourth institute by CIESAS colleagues in Oaxaca. Participants were clustered in groups and spent the better part of a day traveling to the sites of indigenous NGOs and civil society organizations (CSOs) located in the city and surrounding villages. The response, despite logistical challenges, was very positive. From that point forward, all institutes allocated a significant portion of the week to visits. In Thailand, the focus was similar to Oaxaca, concentrated on local CSOs in Chiang Mai city and surrounding villages. The most extensive visits were arranged through the institutes in Washington, DC. The institutes’ venue was explicitly chosen to allow participants to meet with representatives of global policy institutions and international advocacy CSOs that seek to influence their policies. There was a half day of preparation prior to the visits, including (1) readings related to global advocacy networks and strategies and discussions of policy issues of direct relevance to the Fellows’ fields of practice and home countries, and (2) a panel presentations in each thematic group, involving representatives of CSOs with different advocacy strategies, ranging from policy research to lobbying to confrontation. The following day, in over 12 different sub-groups, each Fellow visited the office of another advocacy CSO and then had a series of meetings in either the World Bank or the U.S. legislature and executive branch units involved in foreign affairs. (Specific guidelines for planning global policy advocacy visits are included in the LSJ Capacity Building Resource Manual.)

Resource persons and role models. The Washington, DC institutes and many of the 2004-2006 institutes involved one or more resource persons chosen to not only provide stimulating input and engage in dialogue about leadership and social justice but also, where possible, to serve as a role model for the Fellows. These included a Brazilian CSO leader who was serving as the director of Action Aid in Washington, DC and a Senegalese economist/activist with extensive experience both in CSOs in her home country and in the U.N. and other international agencies. (Specific guidelines for organizing such sessions are included in the LSJ Capacity Building Resource Manual.)

New structured activities. Many different activities were introduced or re-introduced in different institute designs. One of the most powerful community-building activities of the pilot institute was a social justice “story circle” introduced by the Advocacy Institute. It was used again in some of the following institutes, and readapted for use in the large Washington, DC institutes. In response to participant requests, SIT developed a highly visual and participatory workshop on networking that was used in a number of institutes during 2003-04, but did not fit well into the design of the large DC institutes. On the other end of the spectrum, we experimented with “open space technology” in one institute and it proved so complicated that it was never considered again. (Specific guidelines for the story circles, the networking workshop and other structured activities are included in the LSJ Capacity Building Resource Manual.)

Action plans. While an objective of the institutes was to help the Fellows to become more effective – individually and in collaboration with others – in the future, different institutes adopted various informal and formal processes for structuring this process. One factor was the stage of the Fellowship process when participants were invited to an institute; as noted above, over time, this shifted from after the first year of studies to near or soon after the end of studies. The two Washington, DC institutes involved the most formal, structured process of setting action plans – including plans for making and/or coping the transition from studies to back home.
(Specific guidelines and forms for the action plans are included in the *LSJ Capacity Building Resource Manual.*

**Evaluation and Lessons Learned**

As was the case with the pilot institute, participant evaluations of all of the subsequent institutes have been very positive over-all. One indicator of effectiveness is reported achievement of the intended outcomes. Table 2, lists those outcomes, as they were articulated from 2004-2006, and presents comparative data for each institute for which there is data.²⁴ LSJ institutes 5-8 and 12, on the left, were facilitated by SIT and the Advocacy Institute, with co-facilitation by KdK in LSJ 7. LSJ 9 and 10, on the right, were facilitated by ISS and the University of Arkansas, respectively.

*Table 2. Participant ratings of outcomes on 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest) scale.²⁵*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Thailand LSJ 5</th>
<th>SIT LSJ 6</th>
<th>Neth LSJ 7</th>
<th>DC LSJ 8</th>
<th>DC LSJ 12</th>
<th>Hague LSJ 9</th>
<th>Ark. LSJ 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better understanding of social justice leadership</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better understanding of social justice</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better appreciation of own leadership capacity</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened professional networks</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared to participate in IFP Online</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed effective action plan</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced commitment to social justice</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-all average</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²⁴ Unfortunately, the other institutes during the final two years (LSJ 11, 13 and 14) were organized by other institutions that chose not to include these ratings in their evaluations.

²⁵ We present and discuss the possible implications of these ratings with full recognition of their statistical and methodological limitations.
The particularly high ratings (in all but one case) for “enhance commitment to social justice” are notable, given what may be the most important outcome possible within the context of a week-long institute.

**Trade-Offs.** To some extent, the ratings also speak to some of the trade-offs discussed earlier in the paper. For example, the relatively lower ratings for LSJ 9 and 10 certainly reflect the fact that in each case it was the primary responsibility institution’s first institute and the learning curve involved. Such is one of the trade-offs of getting the benefits of the new insights from additional partners. Likewise, while efforts to provide all Fellows with an international LSJ institute experience resulted in experiments in scaling up the size of the institutes, the relatively lower ratings for the LSJ 12 institute – by far the largest of any institute – may suggest the limits to this approach.

The trade-offs of the decision to limit institute languages to English or Spanish-Portuguese during the final two years is difficult to evaluate. A comparison of the ratings for outcomes that would most likely reflect depth and rigor – “better understanding of social justice leadership” and “of social justice” – reveals that the ratings were higher for the multilingual LSJ 5 and 6 institutes in Thailand and the SIT campus than they were for the English-only institutes in Washington, DC and the Hague. (However, as already indicated, the DC ratings might be more a result of the size of those institutes and the latter might more a result of the fact that it was the first time the ISS had organized an institute.)

Another perspective on the impact of the language decisions is on the diversity of participants; see four columns on the right of Table 1. Most dramatically, the decisions resulted in very low participation of Latin Americans in the Washington, DC institutes and thus limited opportunities to interact with global policy institutions and advocacy CSOs – the number Latin Americans fluent in English limited their involvement to only 4% of the participants in 2005 and 3% in 2006. At the same time, the Washington, DC participants from Africa and Asia lost out on the opportunity to compare and contrast their own experiences with the quite different political contexts, social justice movements and leadership paradigms of Latin American nations.

Likewise, while the Spanish-Portuguese only institute in Oaxaca included 20% of the participants from Africa, they were all Portuguese-speaking Mozambicans. The Latin Americans and Mozambicans alike lost the opportunity to learn about the politics, movements and paradigms of the rest of Africa and Asia.

Another implication is that, during the final two years of the LSJ institutes, Fellows from Senegal, Russia, Egypt and Palestine who are not fluent in English had only one option – to do the ESL cum LSJ program in Arkansas.

**IFP Online.** As noted above, the system was rapidly initiated with the present portal software in order to have an online community in place for the second year of the LSJ institutes. While the software, developed by international development practitioners, provided many benefits (multilingual interface, spaces for all participants to upload their own documents, etc.), it also proved to be much slower and less user friendly than would be necessary to a fast “take off.” However, in the intervening years the LSJ staff have worked
with the software developers and our own IT department to make numerous improvements (it is now much faster and more attractive); most importantly dozens of listserves have been added and, though not integrated with the portal and thus relatively labor intensive, these provide a more user-friendly system of communication than available through the web portal.

The portal was limited to the function of an online directory and an archive for LSJ related documents. The latter was especially useful for participants to access institute information and share the papers they would present at the institute. More recently, IFP Secretariat-initiated content – including access to fundraising resources (donor data, online training, etc.) through the Foundation Center and to international job listings – have been valuable additions to the portal.

Despite this progress, SIT continues to believe that IFP Online would be best served if it were to transition to newer online community software (much of it available as open source) that would be significantly faster, more user friendly and effective.

**Transitioning responsibility for LSJ to the IFP Alumni.** The decision to make this transition after the first five years of the LSJ initiative is a bold move in a direction consistent with the long-standing vision of SIT and the Advocacy Institute. Some of the country-level alumni associations have matured to the point that, with adequate resources, they have the potential to build on the content and processes developed during the first phase of the initiative and reinvent LSJ institutes or other program forms in creative ways that are deeply connected to their own experiences. The production of the *Leadership for Social Justice Capacity-Building Resource Manual* is one tool for them to use in that process.

On the other hand, there are at least two trade-offs of possibly significant proportions. The first is simply the loss of connection between the different initiatives, resulting in lost opportunities for mutual learning and a breakdown in evolving dialogue about the concepts and competencies of leadership for social justice. The second and related trade-off is the potential breakdown in the development of a global IFP network based on “dense linkages” that can sustain issue-focused sub-networks (Poverty, Health, Education, Environment, etc.) and connect to global movements and coalitions for social justice. If the IFP secretariat and alumni directly address those challenges, they can certainly be overcome.

**Conceptual Analysis**

As noted at multiple points in the preceding text, one of the most challenging – and important – dimensions of the LSJ initiative is related to fundamental conceptual questions about “social justice leadership.” Do change processes that focus on “social justice” require leadership roles and competencies that are significantly different from those required in other contexts? More specifically, what different types of change processes should be described as focusing on social justice? What different forms of organization -- from loose networks to formal institutions -- support these processes?

---

26 The following section draws directly on portions of an article co-authored by Unsicker, Tirmizi and David Cohen.
Do leadership requirements vary among these processes and organizational forms? Do the leadership requirements vary across cultures and national contexts? What are the implications of these differences for leadership in global initiatives to address transnational sources of injustice? And how do we facilitate development of individuals who practice leadership in the social justice contexts?

Throughout the process, we struggled with the fact that among this diverse group of fellows, representing many nationalities, cultures and sub-cultures and many different fields of study and practice, there are significant differences in how social justice and leadership are understood. Of course, this is the same diversity that is more or less common to all global initiatives. Thus we suspect that the lessons we have been learning may be applicable in many other contexts.

In response to different understandings of "social justice," we concluded that there is no single definition to which we could all agree and that indeed, in some languages and national contexts, the term itself has connotations that may generate misunderstanding and distrust. Thus rather than divert our collective attention to word choice or definition, our approach has been to focus on shared values and commitments to ending global problems such as

- poverty and other forms of economic inequity,
- racism, sexism and other forms of discrimination,
- breaches of human, political and cultural rights,
- environmental degradation and other challenges to a sustainable world, and
- war, crime and other forms of violence

– recognizing that all of the above do the most harm to the least powerful populations in the global community.

These are complex problems that have no simple solutions. Effective responses will likely require long-term efforts that (1) include a wide range of different strategies and activities -- from policy making and implementation to efforts to influence the policy makers and implementers through providing information from research, collaboration, lobbying, public pressure, protest and yet more confrontational methods, (2) are initiated and carried out by a range of different types of institutions, organizations and less formal associations and (3) take place in many different local, national and global contexts. When appropriate and possible, communication, mutual learning, trust and collaboration across those differences or boundaries can multiply the impact of any one. Viewed this way, the diversity of the Fellows is transformed from a problem to a potential strength -- if they develop the capacities to be cross-boundary communicators, mutual learners, trust builders and collaborators and if they can determine when it is appropriate and possible to use those capacities.

Therefore, as discussed earlier in this paper, one of the key functions of the Leadership for Social Justice institutes was to provide opportunities for each Fellow to learn about the experiences of others in different cultures and political-economies, types of organizations, levels of intervention, etc. and to explore ways that such knowledge can inform each Fellow’s own work. Another key function was to help all Fellows build a common set of basic concepts and

---

27 Our colleagues in Vietnam were especially helpful on this point.
28 In addition to facilitating introductions and providing ample space for informal, person to person interaction, we have utilized the structured process of "story circles" and developed an interactive "networking" workshop that helps Fellows visualize their existing and potential networks and explore the roles of network brokers in expanding their expansion.
knowledge regarding ways to link their past experiences, nearly always local or national, with those of others that can inform interventions at the regional and global levels.²⁹

Are the competencies implicit in the previous paragraph – that is, the ability to learn from differences and analyze the connections between local and global issues – some of the key competencies of social justice leaders? That, of course, depends on how one defines "leader" and "leadership." In our interactions with the Fellows, one of the most significant observations is that even many of those who have the most experience in what we might describe as leadership frequently do not view themselves as leaders or have aspirations of becoming leaders. There are at least several reasons for this.

To some extent, the tradition of collective leadership in certain cultural contexts makes it difficult for leadership to be recognized or named.³⁰ More generally, many of those who influence events and outcomes toward social justice do not wish to set themselves apart from the group. They choose in operational terms to emphasize collaboration and cooperation, which in turns leads to cohesive community building. They specifically reject the dominant discourse on leadership that has focused on the individual, or on a charismatic leader -- and, in the case of may Fellows' experiences, those individuals are the self-interested, often corrupt political leaders who abuse power and often work closely with powerful corporate and multi-national interests.

A closely related reason is the paucity of positive associations with leadership -- for example, Richard Cuoto (2002) referring to leadership as a "gift" and Harry Boyte and Nancy Kari (1996)³¹ to it as "public work."

Yet another reason some Fellows reject the concept of leadership because they associate it only with what Howard Gardner (1996) describes as "direct leadership" when many of them aspire to careers in academia, the arts and other less recognized forms of "indirect leadership."

In response to the above, after the first institute, we decided it would be helpful to formulate and share with Fellows our own working definition for leadership: A value-driven process concerned with and focused upon influencing others, often but not exclusively through developing direct relationships, to effect meaningful, positive change, including influencing and changing power relationships in communities, institutions, and society.

This definition emphasizes the process and outcome perspectives to approaching social justice leadership. From the process perspective, individuals who practice it are often centrally located at the heart of activity, initiative, or cause rather than at the top; they derive their energy and abilities from their association with others using inclusive and empowerment approaches. In other words, defining leadership as a process "...implies that a leader affects and is affected by followers. It emphasizes that leadership is not a linear, one-way event, but rather an interactive event" (Northouse 2004). Moreover, roles and responsibilities change by the nature of the mission and tasks involved. From an outcome perspective social justice leadership focuses on effecting changes that address people's perceptions about their own power and how to use this

²⁹ Among the methods that have been utilized for this purpose are "case stories" of Fellows own experiences, organizational visits, and structured dialogues. Case stories have proved to be an effective method of communicating lessons of from the work of social justice and social change. Stories inspire and stories that hard lessons from which we can learn. Case stories also provide the rich material that will lead to more detailed and comprehensive case studies—the staff of life for academia..
³⁰ This appears to be especially true of the Fellows from indigenous communities in Latin America, but also Asia and Africa. And, once again, our colleagues in Vietnam and elsewhere in East Asia have pointed to the very different conceptualization of leadership in cultures influenced by Confucian ideas.
³¹ See also Boyte (2004).
power to tackle the causes of poverty, inequality, discrimination and other forms of social injustice.

Attention to power is central to our understanding of leadership. According to commonly accepted definitions, a person has power if he or she is able to make or influence decisions that bear on the strategic and tactical actions of a group or community (e.g., Bacharach and Lawler 1980). In reality, power is a very complex notion, which is multi-dimensional and multi-layered in nature. It can either facilitate or dominate the ability of individuals and groups to achieve their goals. Therefore social justice leadership is concerned with understanding, dealing with and using power responsibly. This includes those who practice indirect leadership, where knowledge is an important source of power.

Returning to Gardner's ideas, we have found it useful to help Fellows view leadership as both direct and indirect or, following the language proposed by Aqeel Tirmizi (2004), as both social leadership and conceptual leadership.

- Social leaders are typically engaged in leader-constituency exchanges that are characterized by some form of direct contact and communication. Such leaders operate in groups, communities, organizations, networks and political settings. Executives, managers and key staff of NGOs, community organizations, corporations, and governments are some examples of social or direct leadership roles.
- Conceptual leaders often do not directly interact with their followers. They lead indirectly through means such as creating and promoting new information, ideas and values. Academics, journalists, poets and musicians are examples of roles that can allow persons to be indirect or conceptual leaders.

Combining these distinctions with those of local to global leadership, we have encouraged Fellows to locate their current work and future goals in terms of a simple matrix (Figure 1). The arrows indicate that the social and conceptual and the local and global are in fact each ends of continuums and that in practice some (and many of the best) leaders move up, down and across these distinctions.

Figure 1

32 The four-dimension typology (power-over, power-with, power-to, power-within) developed by Jo Rowlands (1997) is one useful way of approaching the concept of power in the context of social justice leadership
We have frequently asked groups of Fellows to name persons who fit into the global boxes. The most commonly named social leaders have been Mahatma Gandhi, Martin Luther King, Mother Teresa and Nelson Mandela. The most commonly named conceptual leaders invariably include Paulo Freire and different religious leaders, including Jesus and Mohammed. (We have pointed out that most of those named are good examples of how leaders often move between the social and conceptual dimensions. Gandhi and King did not just lead social movements; their writings have influenced generations of social justice leaders. Freire did not just write about literacy and empowerment; he also organized programs in Brazil and internationally, through the World Council on Churches. And Jesus and Mohammed, during their own lives, were major social leaders.)

We have then asked Fellows to locate their own leadership or potential leadership. They almost always place themselves in one of the local boxes. While the location is usually correct – and appropriate for the current stage of their professional development – we encourage them to visualize ways to become engaged further along the continuum toward global. While we of course do not suggest that each Fellow should expect or desire to be another Mother Teresa or Freire, we emphasize that in a time when the policies of international institutions increasingly impact the lives of local people everywhere in the world, effective social justice leaders must be able work with and through global networks, alliances and coalitions that seek to influence those policies.

At other points during institutes, we have shared with Fellows a complementary “taxonomy” that provides another way to understand different leadership roles in social justice movements:33

- **Visionaries** lift the horizons of others, setting goals that have never before been imagined or seen as realistic. Visionaries challenge the conventional view of the possible, aim high, take risks, and rethink priorities.

- **Strategists** sort out that part of the vision that is realistically attainable, and develop a road map to get there. Strategists anticipate obstacles and provide guidance to insure that the movement remains headed in the right direction.

- **Statespersons** carry the movement flag. They are the “larger than life” public figures that embody authority and trust. Statespersons radiate credibility for the movement far beyond its core supporters.

- **Experts** ensure that all new discoveries and public policy positions are well reasoned and grounded in facts. They possess special skills and knowledge that lend credibility to and back up the positions.

---

33 The taxonomy was initially developed by Michael Pertschuk, a Co-Founder of the Advocacy Institute, with David Cohen. Pertschuk drew ideas from the case history of advocacy campaigns that challenged entrenched special interests. Over time, in Advocacy Institute domestic and international workshops and reflection sessions, including some in early 2005, the taxonomy has been further amplified by the work of David Cohen, Kathleen Sheekey, Kay Armdorfer, Sharvell Becton, Maureen Burke, Rosa de la Vega, Theresa Gardella, Sofia Quintero and Nader Tadros.
Outside Sparkplugs operate outside of conventional, political (or other) establishments, free of the ties that bind “inside” players, and capable of holding our governments and other organizations up to their own rhetoric of mission and commitment.

Inside Advocates occupy seats of power or establish an open door to them, intuit the approaches and arguments that resonate with policy makers, and press them in ways that are not easily dismissed. They are skilled negotiators, and positioned to influence key policy makers.

Cultural Activists use theater, poetry, film, art and story to convey struggles that challenge power, give people identity and serve to provide popular education.

Strategic Communicators are public teachers, masters of the “sound bite” as the concentrated encapsulation of potent messages. They translate complex scientific data, complex public policy, and basic concepts of truth and justice into accurate, powerful metaphorical messages.

Movement Builders are the quiet heroes of any successful movement. Movement Builders reach out to draw in new allies; they recruit new activists. They bridge generations, link local with national, even international advocacy, and create space for the knowledge gained through experience to be passed on.

According to the taxonomy’s developers, social justice leaders in any or all of the roles need the ability to play three critical functions: interpret, glue and connect. They interpret the different worlds they move in to each other. They glue their core constituencies and sectors so that they hold. They connect different people in different institutions to add influence and power to their efforts (Cohen et al 2001).

Another of our approaches to helping Fellows understand social justice leadership encourages them to not only consider the different roles through which they effect change (noted above), but also the characteristics, behaviors and strategies that leaders need to perform them effectively. LSJ Institute sessions have most often asked Fellows to identify what they think these are based on their many different experiences. The paper by Tirmizi (2004) provides one general synthesis of the input of IFP Fellows at past institutes and another group of emerging leaders (Leadership for Environment and Development [LEAD] Fellows in Pakistan). For example, personal characteristics frequently identified by the Fellows include intelligence, humility, integrity, confidence and self-regulation. Behaviors and strategies frequently identified include vision and strategy development, networking, conflict negotiation and resolution, coalition building and collaboration, teamwork, communication, and providing a global outlook.

As we have reflected on our work in progress, we recognize that, as with all inquiry, it is inevitably based on a number of assumptions. One assumption that we make consciously is that social justice leadership is by definition based in some standard of morality and ethics. We presuppose a positive view of leadership. In other words, social justice leaders are people who inspire in us, help shape us morally, spur us on to
purposeful behavior – either in a small, day-to-day way or on the world’s larger stage (Coles 2001).  

For us leadership is action accompanied by critical reflections. As Friere (1976) observes, “human relationships with the world are plural in nature.... Men (and women) relate to their world in a critical way. They apprehend the objective data of their reality through reflection -- not by reflex.”

The focus of our continuing efforts in our leadership development initiatives is on creating a learning space for our participants and ourselves where we all critically engage in dialogues and deep reflection. Following Coles (2001), we hope that these circles of human connectedness that we create through our work will continue to grow, touch, and inform the lives of individuals and of the communities to which we belong.

---

34 We believe that even those who take neutral approaches to understanding leadership in some ways are concerned with moral and ethical aspects of leadership. For example, Gardner (1996), while arguing that he takes a value neutral approach to leadership, acknowledges his interest in moral leadership.
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Leadership Theory and Practice


This paper, by Bass and Steidlmeier of the SUNY Binghamton Center for Leadership Studies, attempts to rebut criticism of transformational leadership from libertarians and other groups that have underlying philosophical traditions rooted in individual emancipation. Such critics suggest that transformational leadership is immoral because it appeals to emotion rather than reason, is undemocratic, and manipulates followers into acting against their own best interests. The authors argue that these critics fail to distinguish between transformational leadership, which is firmly grounded in moral foundations (in both Eastern and Western traditions), and pseudo-transformational leadership, which may be unethical, deceptive, and manipulative. They contrast transformational leadership with pseudo-transformational leadership across each of the four components of transformational leadership (idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration), demonstrating that rather than being unethical or self-aggrandizing, true transformational leaders “identify the core values and unifying purposes of the organization and its members, liberate their human potential, and foster pluralistic, and effective, satisfied followers.”


In this book, the authors posit that effective organizational leaders must be able to analyze and make sense of daily and workplace situations by looking at them holistically through various lenses. They advance a “four frame” model, suggesting that leaders think about and address problems and challenges using structural, human resource, political, and symbolic frames. Leaders may choose one, some, or all four approaches as circumstances dictate.

Chrislip and Larson discuss the collaborative response of local business, civic, and religious leaders, as well as leaders of nonprofit organizations and neighborhood groups, to the profound physical, social, and financial decay of Newark, New Jersey, that began in the late 1960s and continued through the early 1980s. Though each group had its own perspectives and interests, they designed and implemented community-wide collaborative initiatives that added thousands of new housing units, built a badly needed supermarket in a low-income neighborhood, instituted one of the world’s most successful urban garbage recycling programs, and created programs that addressed child care, health services, education, crime, and unemployment. From this case, the authors distill four principles that characterize collaborative leadership, asserting that collaborative leaders: 1) inspire commitment and action, 2) lead as peer problem solvers, 3) build broad-based involvement, and 4) sustain hope and participation.


In this paper, the authors study and attempt to determine the specific communication strategies charismatic leaders use to facilitate social change, and to determine how and why the interaction between these leaders and followers can generate social change. Treating charismatic leadership as a series of social process rather than as set of characteristics, they utilize semiotic analysis and Lewin’s (1951) three-phase model describing the process by which social norms and values change (frame breaking, frame moving, and frame re-aligning phases), studying the type of language used in the speeches of 14 20th century US presidents (both charismatic and uncharismatic presidents) and comparing language patterns used with each president’s effectiveness (based on multiple criteria) in facilitating social change. They studied communication strategies including negation, inclusion, abstraction, and consensus building and concluded that the leaders employed a “predictable, consistent set of linguistic techniques to break down, move, and re-align certain beliefs of their followers.” These techniques, the timing by which each was employed to most effectively facilitate change, and the reasons for employing each strategy at particular times in the change process are critical in enabling leaders “to simultaneously construct and destroy what people know and believe,” affirm identity, and facilitate trust and consensus building. Understanding effective communication patterns that have advanced social change in the past is one way that contemporary social justice leaders can learn to construct communication strategies facilitating positive change today.


Using data from four Kellogg Foundation studies that review Kellogg-funded leadership development programs in the United States, Latin America, the Caribbean, and southern Africa, the author (the foundation’s vice president for programs) summarizes the organization’s findings on what comprises “cutting-edge” thinking and best practices in leadership effectiveness, development, and education. The article does not attempt a full analysis, but rather seeks to describe major themes, including significant leadership challenges for the 21st century; skills, abilities, and attributes necessary for future leaders; and ways organizations can cultivate leadership.

This paper revisits a 1992 article written by the author in which he deconstructed contemporary conceptualizations of leadership, referring to leadership as a “social myth.” Using attribution theory and research on the “cause” of outcomes (as he did in his 1992 article), he explores the thesis of the earlier article in the aftermath of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks in the U.S., asserting that groups ritualistically “invent” leaders in times of instability or uncertainty to give themselves feelings of stability and control. The flawed process of reality construction and the illusory reality they create serves as a social defense, and “deskills” them in terms of emotions and mindfulness. The undiscussability of the myth they have created leads to “self-sealing non-learning about the myth,” and a paradoxical “pull towards magical or charismatic leaders.” The author asserts in this article that 9/11 triggered leadership myths about George Bush, Tony Blair, and Osama bin Laden, and that these have blinded people to the real precipitating causes of the event, led to palliative, rather ethiological solutions, and preserved the existing world social system. To truly understand the causes of 9/11 and to address the shadow dynamics that “continue to haunt the world order,” people must collectively lead and manage social processes, “embracing mindfulness” and “working together to define and achieve meaningful goals” for all.


The authors, professors of management at Syracuse University, apply the radical humanist perspective to the concept of leadership, deconstructing it to try to “unravel its hidden assumptions, internal contradictions, and repressed meanings.” Asserting that leadership is a myth, a social defense, and a flawed process of reality construction reified in our collective unconscious to “repress uncomfortable needs, emotions, and wishes that emerge when people attempt to work together,” the authors contend that our acceptance of and reliance on this construct leads to a massive “deskilling” of society, as people helplessly accept the uncontrollable, alienating social forms of the workplace. The authors then explore ways that this construct can be reframed, suggesting that discourse on leadership must promote a greater awareness of “covert and undiscussable power and authority dynamics in an organizational context.”


Hailey, cofounder of INTRAC and professor at London City University’s Cass Business School, and James, a principal capacity-building specialist at INTRAC, examine research on leadership development in NGO capacity building. They explore the attributes and characteristics of NGO leaders, study the contextual issues NGO leaders confront, and examine “the challenges of developing a new generation of NGO leaders.” NGOs, they assert, face management challenges quite distinct from those of government or business, rooted in their social change mission; their role as bridges between donors, beneficiaries, and other constituencies; the limited resources to which they have access; and the often volatile circumstances under which they operate. Though leadership in both the for-profit sector and the public sector have been the subject of much study, leadership for NGOs has not been researched in great depth. The authors call for further research on the roles and responsibilities of NGO leaders as well as on the skills and competencies needed for leadership, and for active campaigns to develop leadership capacity in the NGO world. Averring that leadership in NGOs is typified by high staff turnover that frequently leads to “programmatic dysfunctionality and organizational collapse,” they assert that systems
must be put in place to keep organizations strong and enable them to sustainably address problems and challenges facing their marginalized constituencies.


House’s path goal theory of leader effectiveness, defined and described in this 1971 article, is still being studied, taught, and applied more than 35 years after it was written. The theory states that subordinate motivation, satisfaction, and performance are a function of a leader’s ability to provide a clear path for the subordinate to follow. In the article, House analyzes wide-ranging dimensions of leader behavior (such as initiating structure, consideration, authoritarianism, and closeness of supervision) in terms of path goal variables such as valence and instrumentality. He identifies situational moderators on which these dimensions are contingent and suggests ways that his propositions can be used.


The editors of this book document eighteen rural development projects they deem successful, including the contexts of the projects and the leadership strategies that made each effective. Each project is presented in the words of its originator or manager. Chapters include:
- The Grameen Bank and rural credit in Bangladesh (Muhammad Yunus)
- The Orangi Pilot Project uplifting a periurban settlement in Karachi, Pakistan (Akhter Hameed Khan)
- Plan Puebla: an agricultural development program for low-income farmers in Mexico (Heliodoro Díaz Cisneros)
- The CAMPFIRE Program: community-based wildlife resource management in Zimbabwe (Simon Metcalfe)

Whether approached individually or cumulatively, the chapters provide advice and wisdom on how to promote desirable forms of rural development, and provide hope that undesirable conditions can be alleviated through plans, strategies, persistence, and leadership.


The authors, professors at the University of Rhode Island, ask and attempt to answer the following questions:
- What keeps oppression in place?
- What resources enhance human welfare and weaken oppression?
- How can oppression be challenged and interrupted?

In answering these questions, they provide social justice leaders with useful tools to analyze and confront the forces and challenges they face. The succinct yet thorough summation of how oppression is maintained provides a useful “big picture” look at what keeps oppression in place, and the method they suggest social justices leaders embrace—“organizing on the local level with real allies to effect small wins that encourage political participation”—offers a proven pathway that social justice leaders can use to challenge the status quo.


In this article, Reeves-Ellington, a professor in the SUNY Binghamton School of Management, examines ways that leaders and managers of for-profit organizations think about social
responsibility and the assumptions underlying this thinking. He asserts that managers and transactional leaders (in Western countries) think about their work as “dichotomies of choice,” in which they either “earn money for their companies” or act as do-gooders who give money away. Transformational leaders, on the other hand, are able to think more holistically, viewing their organizations in terms of the societies and cultures in which they operate. They are thus able to find opportunities to interact continuously, pragmatically, and more empathetically with this wider environment. Using vignettes about Apple Computers’ Steve Jobs and John Scully to compare the two types of leaders, and the metaphors of “shaman” and “action researcher” to describe purposes and roles of the transformational leader, the author demonstrates how differing assumptions regarding a leader’s role help determine the culture of an organization and its relationship with wider society.


The authors, professors of sociology and social anthropology at Hebrew University in Jerusalem, argue that a leader’s influence comes not just from traits and behaviors, but from another source—the leader’s life story. A leader’s life story provides followers with information about the leader’s traits and behaviors; provides a leader with a self-concept from which he or she can lead; and is, in its telling, an important leadership behavior. Interviewing 16 organizational leaders and reading 10 autobiographies of recognized political, military, and business leaders, the authors distilled central themes of leadership development—processes these leaders used to make sense of their roles as leaders. They found the following four leadership development proto-stories to be the most common: 1) leadership developed as a natural process, in which leaders described their ascension as inevitable, effortless, non-contingent, and non-situation specific; 2) leadership resulted from struggling and coping with difficulty; 3) leadership came through learning and self-improvement; 4) leadership came as the author found a sense of direction through a particular cause. This article is interesting for prospective leaders wishing to consciously consider how they make sense of their own life stories, and for students of leadership interest in understanding the stories of others. Which facets of their own experience do leaders select (and omit) in order to render their life stories coherent, and to validate and justify themselves as leaders?


In this book, the author, director of the Center for Leadership and Change Management at Wharton (University of Pennsylvania), examines nine instances of decisive leadership in diverse contexts, including business, politics, government, military, and development. In each chapter, he tells the story of an individual leader and draws lessons from the actions and decisions of each, forming practical guidelines that “can be used in everyday management, whether in a company or community.”

Cross-cultural Leadership Theory

Using Misumi’s PM theory as their conceptual framework and examining the perspectives of two ethnic groups—whites and Pacific Islanders in New Zealand—the authors (from New Zealand) analyzed the effect that the ethnicity of leaders and followers had on leadership prototypes (the ways in which leader behaviors are “attended to, encoded, and recalled” in the minds of followers). They explored the extent to which these varying, culture-based prototypes led followers of the ethnic groups to experience different levels of leadership and different levels of satisfaction with their leaders. The 156 participants in the study (99 white people and 57 Pacific Islanders), who came from four New Zealand companies, filled out 26-item questionnaires that enabled researchers to test how their perceptions of leadership varied by ethnicity. The findings indicate that the ethnicity of followers, and the corresponding conceptions of leadership to which they ascribed, did affect perceptions of leadership (particularly task-related leadership) and the extent to which followers were satisfied with the leaders under whom they worked.


In this book—edited by three professors (one U.S. American, two French) of organizational management—African, Asian, European, North American, and Latin American authors present 15 different viewpoints on how national culture in particular contexts affects leadership development programs. Written largely to inform business managers, human resource managers, leadership development consultants, and organizational behavior consultants on how to understand the complexities of business leadership in wide-ranging contexts, it nonetheless provides useful information for anyone interested in the ways that norms and behaviors in local/national cultures can alter organizational environments. In some chapters, authors provide possible solutions for managers/leaders working in those societies.


This book, though generally focused on business management, contains many chapters pertinent to people, including social justice leaders, who are interested in understanding various aspects of cross-cultural leadership. Some useful chapters include:

- Goal setting, performance appraisal, and feedback across cultures
- Cross-cultural leadership
- Women joining men as global leaders in the new economy
- Cross-cultural communication
- Trust in cross-cultural relationships


This article summarizes the results of Hofstede's six-year research project examining the national cultures of 40 nations, in which he sought to define criteria by which these cultures differ. The four criteria, or “dimensions of culture,” that he developed are Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, Individualism-Collectivism, and Masculinity-Femininity. His seminal model, and the four dimensions of culture within, have been used by scholars, managers, and leaders in business, government, and civil society and academia to understand the impact of national culture on motivation, work performance, and other workplace issues for over 25 years.

This book reports the results of the first two phases of the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE) research program, a 10-year cross-cultural program designed by a multicultural team of researchers to “conceptualize, operationalize, test, and validate a cross-level integrated theory of the relationship between culture and societal, organizational, and leadership effectiveness.” Between 1994 and 2004, (including three full years of data collection), 170 scholars worked to study the relationship of societal culture, organizational culture, and organizational leadership in 61 nations, surveying over 17,000 middle managers in three industries. Referred to by many in the field of cross-cultural studies and leadership as “the Manhattan Project of cross-cultural research,” the GLOBE program is doing much to further our understanding of how culture influences leadership and organizational behavior. Though the chapters of the book were written by many experts, the book is not an anthology of previously written articles; it is a seamless whole covering the multiple aspects of theory underpinning the program, integrated with the data and findings of the researchers. This 800+ page tome is an essential resource for researchers in cross-cultural leadership.


This study examines the leadership characteristics of New Zealand’s two largest cultural groups, the Maori and the Pakeha (people of European heritage), and the extent to which leadership characteristics are contextually embedded in each culture. Analyzing followers’ perceptions of leader behavior in 37 participants (19 Maori and 18 Pakeha) by using a Multifactor Leader Questionnaire, the authors find significant differences in the ways Maoris and Pakeha New Zealanders perceive their leaders. Maoris, from a more collectivist culture than Pakehas, find their leaders to be more transformational than Pakehas perceive theirs to be. Maori collectivist culture gives Maori followers higher levels of respect, trust, loyalty, and obedience to authority than their Pakeha followers, and these followership values facilitate a process in which Maori leaders exhibit a greater number of transformational characteristics than their Pakeha counterparts. This study tentatively suggests (the small sample size necessitates further research) that culture does have an impact on leadership practice in New Zealand, and that those interested in leading Maori/Pakeha cross-cultural groups will succeed as leaders to the extent that they adopt leadership behaviors that recognize this cultural diversity.


Smith, a professor emeritus of social psychology at University of Sussex, and Peterson, a professor of management at Florida Atlantic University, have written many articles on cross-cultural leadership in the last 20 years. In this chapter of the *Blackwell Handbook*, they conduct a literature review, analyzing wide-ranging themes in cross-cultural leadership. These themes include:

- Tests of the predictive validity of U.S. leadership theories in other parts of the world (including transformational leadership, GLOBE, performance contingent leadership, and event management)
- Models of leadership developed and tested in other countries (including Misumi’s PM theory, Sinha’s NT theory, etc.)
- Studies of leadership in actual multicultural work teams
• Analyses of strategic leadership in global and multinational organizations

This chapter serves as an excellent introduction to cross-cultural leadership—one that would be a good starting point for students interested in making sense of a large field comprised of hundreds of studies.

**Africa**


Kurt April, academic director of the Graduate School of Business in Cape Town, South Africa, is the author of two books on leadership and serves on the board of the African Leadership Institute. In this article, he maintains that conversation, communication, and dialogue are not merely tools that leaders can use within a change process—not things that merely occur in the context of change. Instead, he asserts that the reverse is true—that change is communication-based and driven, and that communication, conversation, and dialogue are the contexts in which change occurs. In order to produce intentional change, he argues, leaders must “deliberately create, through dialogue and conversation, a new reality or set of social structures.” This article provides a useful model of individual growth stages through which prospective change agents must pass if they are to facilitate intentional transformational change through dialogue and conversation. The article also provides guidelines leaders can use within their organizations to create and encourage feedback, promote community common spaces and dialogue-based communities of practice, and foster individual learning and self-reflection. In organizations where true conversation and dialogue occur, he argues, it is possible for coworkers to be “real” in ways that truly allow them to “coalesce around issues of shared concern,” to “move forward to successful resolution of those issues,” and to bring more of themselves and their energy to their work each day.


Banutu-Gomez, a Gambian-born professor of management at Rowan University, New Jersey, examines leadership practice in the government of the Gambia, using information gathered through interviews with 20 senior Gambian government officials. From the data, the author finds five “sets of leadership practices” that enhance government effectiveness: 1) Traditional African Leadership Practice, 2) Shared Vision, 3) Accountability, 4) Patriotism, and 5) Openness to Change. He melds these practices together to form the “TOSAP model,” and suggests that the model could be used elsewhere on the continent to understand African leadership practice. The model has the following underlying values: commitment to family, respect for elders, mentorship, motivation, transparency, ownership, commitment, partnership, and trust. The paper’s main weaknesses are that the author does not provide much data that allows readers to see how he arrived at his conclusions, and that the paper is more prescriptive than descriptive or analytical. The author’s discussion of dimensions comprising African leadership practice is nonetheless interesting.

Drawing on the recent history of the cotton farmers movement in Mali, Bingen, a professor of political science, international development, agriculture, and African studies at Michigan State University, examines critical issues related to the development and sustainability of rural leadership in sub-Saharan Africa. In order to move forward with progressive rural change and development in an era of political and economic change, he asserts, both individual leadership and a more general capacity for leadership are needed. In this article, he examines the background, emergence, and current role (as of 1996) of the Union of Cotton and Crop Producers (SYCOV), including the context in which it operates, the characteristics and roles of its leaders, leader-member relations, organizational processes, and current and future challenges. He suggests the need to compile “leadership social histories” in order to deepen appreciation of the relationship between societal forces and the roles of individual leaders and “help fashion a richer, less personalistic approach to the phenomenon of rural leadership.


The authors, from the Graduate School of Business at Northern Territory University in Darwin, Australia, compare and contrast Western models of leadership (and the assumptions and implicit values underlying Western leadership theory) with East Asian and African models of leadership and their underlying assumptions and values. Using Hofstede’s well-known dimensions of national culture model, the authors show that the prescriptions for organizational management provided by Western theories will often not apply in East Asian and African cultural contexts. Though written to inform business administrators and corporate human resource managers, the article is useful to anyone interested in understanding how cultural norms influence the way organizations in different societies operate. Its analysis of African, East Asian, and Western cultural influences on leadership practices and its comparison of how leaders using these paradigms of leadership manage authority, uncertainty, and relationships is a useful starting point and discussion starter for readers interested in learning more about the less prescriptive, less functionalistic, more relationship-oriented models of leadership found in Africa and East Asia.


In this conference paper, Bolden and Kirk describe the experiences of 300 African participants in a Pan-African leadership development program (InterAction), discussing participant meanings and connotations of leadership and examining the impact, through participant stories, of the program on participants and their families, workplaces, communities, and societies. Though the discussion of the connotations of leadership in this paper is similar to that found in another paper by the authors (Kirk and Bolden 2006, also included in this annotated bibliography), the authors’ examination of the InterAction program’s impact and the model of leadership identities and processes they propose merit consideration by those interested in understanding, creating, and facilitating leadership development programs for leaders coming from African and other marginalized contexts.


Doria Daniels, a professor of Educational Psychology at University Stellenbosch in South Africa, is a proponent of service learning and a supporter of indigenous models of education and
leadership for the transformation of South African civil society. In this two-year qualitative, ethnographic study, she investigated the capacity of 16 poor, mostly illiterate women for community building and leadership. Structuring the study as a collaborative inquiry, Daniels negotiated with the women involved to create a process that would be mutually beneficial, securing access to their community in exchange for a series of workshops for the women. In addition to interviews and observation, the researcher involved participants in the process as photographers and artists—“recorders of their own worlds”—thus providing them a greater-than-usual degree of authorship in describing how they viewed the community and their roles in it. The findings of the study, presented as individual stories shown with visual data, provide recognition of the leadership and development contributions these women make and of the challenges they face. Such findings are rarely presented in what the author calls South Africa’s patriarchal society, especially when the women studied are largely poor and illiterate.


Using a cognitive, cultural psychological framework and examples from his work in rural South Africa, Andrew Gilbert, professor of psychology at Rhodes University (S. Africa), examines the dynamics of the clash between local knowledge (the interpretive frameworks and knowledge derived from taking part in the everyday activities of a community of practice) and exogenous knowledge during periods of social transformation. The extent, at a cognitive level, to which this conflict leads to negative outcomes (domination, damage to self-esteem, and the “loss of familiar metaphors, models, and tools for thinking”) or becomes a constructive force for change depends on what happens during the “dislocation,” or period in which local people engage in new activities originating outside the local context. Fascinating in its discussion of where human cognition resides and of the structural differences between local knowledge and formal reasoning, the article shows leaders, social change agents, and other interested readers why, from a psychological perspective, local knowledge must be explicitly acknowledged and activities constructed in ways that give local stakeholders time and space to safely “explore options and make choices” in times of change, so that they can gradually, if they so choose, alter their practices to incorporate outside knowledge.


This Praxis Paper, by Rick James of INTRAC Malawi and a team of researchers from CORAT Africa in Kenya and CDRN in Uganda, provides readers with a highly practical, very readable report on the findings of their study on African leadership development conducted from 2002 to 2005. Interviewing 45 NGO leaders in the three countries, the team sought to discover participant perspectives on leadership, the nature of the leadership change process they had experienced, and factors promoting and hindering change in their leadership behavior. The report, filled with insightful and interesting quotes from participants, provides rich detail on many realities that civil society leaders in these countries face, including:

- The absence of coherent, consistent leadership philosophies to guide them in their endeavors
- Their “congested” lives, which give them insufficient time to reflect and learn
- The tougher realities faced by women, who defy cultural expectations when they assume leadership roles
The impact of HIV/AIDS on organizations

The study examines and cogently presents the processes of leadership change in the participants, including catalysts and triggers of change, the personal characteristics that make leaders open (or closed) to change, and factors reinforcing change. This study is very useful for NGO leaders, for capacity-building trainers and facilitators, and for others interested in understanding leadership development processes in Africa or elsewhere.


Luchien Karsten, of the University of Groningen, Netherlands, and Honorine Illa, of the University of Ougadougou, Burkina Faso, reflect on the importance of language in organizations and discuss how particular cultural backgrounds influence the applicability of management concepts. Suggesting that Western literature about management knowledge has neglected the development of management concepts originating in other parts of the world, they focus on Ubuntu, a management concept derived from a southern African traditional worldview that stresses collective contribution, solidarity, acceptance, dignity, stewardship, compassion and care, hospitality, and legitimacy. The word Ubuntu comes from a Xhosa expression meaning “a person is a person through other persons.”

In the first part of the concept paper, the authors discuss language in organizations, asserting that management constructs a discourse—a “connected set of statements, concepts, terms and expressions” that “frame meaning and socially construct reality for themselves and the other participants” in the organization and transmit values and principles at the core of the organization’s culture. The storyline constructed by management, however, does not always appeal to the emotions, logic, or ethos of the employees, and may not mobilize them into effective networks for knowledge sharing, team learning, and consensual cooperation. Management by Ubuntu, in which management and staff constantly converse and consult with one another, enables employees to feel part of a community, redefining the workplace discourse. Because it operates with a humanistic view of people rather than a strictly strategic one (in which people may be called human resources) and stems from a worldview congruent with those of the workers, management by Ubuntu may, according to the authors, bridge the gap between official and unofficial organizational cultures, facilitating a new performance attitude, or habitus, in organizations. This habitus, the authors assert, could be promising for South African business, leading to a “regulated improvisation in which tradition and creativity intersect to create new knowledge.”


Drawing from stories, conversations, and interviews with 300 African leaders (from 19 African counties) who participated in the InterAction leadership development program, Bolden and Kirk, leadership researchers from Exeter and West England, U.K., provide an account of “insights, meanings, and connotations” about leadership in Africa from a social constructionist perspective. In an effort to contribute to the debate about the role of leadership for social change in Africa, they engage with study participants as “co-inquirers” into the meanings of leadership, look at how participants “enact these meanings to bring about wider social impact within their communities,” and discuss implications and insights gained through engagement in a leadership development process.

The author, a Zimbabwean development consultant, wrote this working paper for the IDS to describe the values, processes, and lessons learned by fellows and facilitators at a series of “leadership for change” seminars held in Zimbabwe in the late 1990s. The programs, in which workshop organizers encouraged a grounding in African reality, confidence in Afro-centric leadership, and personal commitment to change, were designed to facilitate open-mindedness, motivation for action, and strategic thinking, and to allow participants to develop and practice analytical skills for leadership, management, and planning. Through individual “leadership challenges” (a tool developed by Kouzes and Posner in the early 1990s), participants were encouraged to actively implement plans developed at the workshops, allowing them to see immediate benefits from lessons learned there. In addition to describing such processes and lessons learned from the program, the author discusses the 10 major values underlying his concept of African “leadership for renewal,” which aims to promote positive change in Africa.


The authors, from the U.S., South Africa, and Kenya respectively, attempt to show the relevance of the positive psychology movement and a model they call positive organizational behavior (POB) to the current South African political, economic, and social context. In particular, they focus on the role hope can play in addressing the South Africa’s ills. In a previous study, the authors defined POB as “the study and application of positively-oriented human resource strengths and psychological capacities that can be measured, developed, and effectively managed for performance improvement in today’s workplace.” They identified confidence (or self-efficacy), hope, optimism, subjective well-being (or happiness), and emotional intelligence as such strengths and capacities. Recent studies, the authors assert, show that the POB dimension of hope carries across cultures, and “significantly relates to performance outcomes.” In order to facilitate hope and enable such outcomes at all levels of society, they offer suggestions and practical guidelines for developing and advancing hope, including systematic, culturally contextualized human resource development interventions (hope training), goal setting, self-reflection through discussions with role models, the coaching and mentoring of coping and hopeful strategies (through leadership development programs), and “regoaling” alternative paths through experiential exercises. They insist that they are not advocating hope as “idle chatter and wishful thinking,” but as a needed shift in the organizational thinking of South African leaders.


This book is the memoir and life story of 2004 Nobel Peace Prize winner Wangari Maathai, the founder of the Green Belt Movement, an organization that has planted over 30 million trees across Kenya over the last 30 years, restoring indigenous forests while assisting rural women by paying them to plant trees in their villages. Drawing from her childhood in the 1940s to the present, the book tells of Maathai’s education, family life, struggles, run-ins with the oppressive Kenyan government, and successes in reshaping sustainable development and human rights in Kenya. The memoir allows readers to observe the evolution of her thought and work; to understand the personal traits, characteristics, and motivating factors that propelled her toward leadership; to observe her role in many critical moments; and to examine the strategies she used to address the many challenges she faced.

The author, Mpho Makwana, is chief executive of the Marketing Federation of Southern Africa, a business management strategist, a former Business Day columnist, and a member of various corporate and nonprofit boards. In this short essay, he surveys many leadership challenges facing a new generation of South Africans, reviewing events and trends in South Africa’s 10 years of independence and commenting on what these portend for the nation’s future. Asserting that leadership must be “rooted in being relevant to the market in which it operates,” he advocates a model of scenario-based leadership (developed by Louis van der Merwe) that recognizes the need to effectively interpret, discuss, and think about organizational goals, taking into account the six factors of the PESTEH model (political, economic, social, technological, environmental, historical). He proposes a system of innovative, values-based leadership that calls for private and public leaders to “reflect on the meaning of family,” to “bring the voice of the child into the boardroom,” and to pursue each day working “towards creating a new reality every day.”


Chiku Malunga is a Malawian development consultant working with Capacity Development Consultants (CADECO) in Blantyre, Malawi. Noting that “leadership development from an African cultural perspective is often conspicuous by its absence in most discourses and initiatives,” he describes aspects of leadership and leadership development in pre-colonial and modern rural Africa, especially those deriving from Ubuntu, a Bantu perspective and cultural worldview. He examines the five main principles of Ubuntu, which were originally practiced at the village and community level: (1) sharing and collective ownership of opportunities, responsibilities, and challenges; (2) the importance of people and relationships over things; (3) participatory decision making and leadership; (4) patriotism; and (5) reconciliation as a goal of conflict management. He then explores how these values can be usefully applied to leadership development, and encourages African leadership practitioners to “dig deeper into who they are” and engage in greater introspection, to “reawaken their own and Africa's leadership capacity.”


The author, a professor at the University of Pretoria, writes on the importance of knowing and understanding the heritage of African leadership as Africa moves into a “re-awakening” or “renaissance” period. While acknowledging that leadership practices and processes are not uniform across the continent, he suggests that there are core themes that form the basis of a continent-wide understanding on the topic of leadership: (1) leadership is a group phenomenon, (2) leadership is needed to facilitate goal-directed behavior, and (3) leadership by nature creates hierarchy. He examines three periods in African history that have made an impact on Africans’ self-concept—the pre-colonial era (which he calls the “African religious era”), the colonial period (the “Christian era”), and the modern era (“globalization”), and explores the changes in leadership practice during these periods. Drawing from what he deems to be the positive leadership contributions from each of these periods, he offers suggestions for leaders on good governance, accountability, sharing of information, and, above all, the use of African traditional practice as the basis for leadership.

This book, a compilation of essays by a diverse group of over 20 South African academic and business leaders, surveys the economic, social, and political landscape of the nation, examines issues in contemporary leadership, and explores ways that South African organizations can develop leaders for the future. The authors look at the nature of South African leadership, delve into whether it is different from “Western” leadership, and attempt to look into the future, offering ideas on who will lead the “continuing transformation” and how this can be done effectively. Written primarily for business leaders, it nonetheless presents a useful starting point for anyone interested in seeing leadership from a South African perspective. Much of the value of this aptly named book is in its format, in which multiple contributors provide multiple voices as they discuss and attempt to make sense of leadership-related issues in a changing society.


Mutabazi, a Rwandan-born professor of intercultural management at Ecole de Management Lyon, France, defines the common social principles underlying traditional leadership education in six African countries; analyzes the values and skills traditionally possessed by effective leaders in an African context; and comments on how African leaders must employ management styles that acknowledge African norms and values, not just management styles imported from the West. Of particular interest is his case study showing how a Congolese businessman in the Kivu region started a 75-person cheese-making company, integrating the “African social mindset” into the administration of his company and interweaving principles of community spirit and sociability (which the author defines as African values) with the demands of a productive company (and many Western values he had learned in European business schools).


In this case study, Mutabazi and Derr observe multicultural team management at a Senegalese company that uses both local Senegalese and expatriate French management, concluding that the conflicts, misunderstandings, and difficult team relationships found there stem from a clash between the African “Circulatory Management Model” and imported Western models. The Circulatory Management Model, which utilizes principles and rules centered on integrated collective action, sociability, community, relationality, and social profit, is contrasted with Western models based on rationality, individual development, and economic profit. The authors assert that the problems and challenges faced by the management team studied can be found throughout Africa, and that the lessons learned from this study—on the importance of recognizing differences between cultural and business models, acknowledging different managing methods, investing greater resources (and time) to building team spirit, giving team members time to express their perceptions of work projects, and integrating members of the team—can be applied not only in business but in any organization comprised of multicultural teams.


The author, Hellicy Ngambi, is professor in the Department of Economic and Management Sciences at Unisa’s Graduate School of Business in South Africa. In this article, she asserts that
the African continent’s common cultures, beliefs, norms, values, history, folklore, mythology, social identities, philosophical thought systems, expectations, hopes, aspirations, experiences, and other factors have influenced the development of an “African village” leadership perspective that is distinct and more relevant to Africa than the Western leadership models so frequently applied there. She examines traditional African leadership approaches by using case studies of the Zulu chieftancy, the Akun system of Ghana, and the Fungwe chieftancy; identifying traditional leadership behaviors and characteristics; drawing lessons from these on how to strengthen communities and community leadership; and commenting on their relevance to modern society and African business leadership.


The authors, with funds from South Africa’s National Research Foundation, co-launched the African Change Leadership Research Project in 2001 to learn about how leaders and organizations (businesses, generally) have responded to changes in South African society since the end of apartheid in 1990. Using a case research method to examine the “why and how of change” in 12 South African organizations, they attempt to address the following (and many other) questions:

- How have leaders in South Africa reacted and responded to challenges in post-apartheid South Africa, and how have they applied who they are to changing and leading their organizations?
- Is there something different about leading change in an African context?
- What are the best practices, and how are leadership principles applied in dealing with change in the South African context?

Though their research is still underway, they preliminarily posit that multiple leadership roles have emerged to facilitate the nation’s transformation, the five most significant of which are hope dealer, excellence promoter, field facilitator, change embracer, and diversity architect. They conclude that the most successful organizations are those that have simultaneously managed to respond both to the global marketplace and to local realities.


This paper, by Professor Stella Nkomo of the University of South Africa Graduate School of Business, analyzes organizational studies literature in order to identify images and representations of African leadership and management. She asks, “How is ‘African leadership and management’ portrayed in organisation literature?” and “What are the possibilities for rewriting ‘African leadership and management’ in organisation studies?” Though she finds a scarcity of texts, materials, and reference to Africa in these studies, she nonetheless places available information into four categories: management development studies, national cultural analyses (using Hofstede’s typology), historical African management and leadership (usually depicted as precursors to “scientific” management theory), and new African management philosophies. The paper deftly critiques Western notions of leadership in Africa, especially how the majority of Western authorities construct simple, homogenizing “African” leadership models, rather than studying the many diverse cultural constructions across the continent. Nkomo calls for a “re-writing” project and a search for African leadership, in which Africans of different locales will
need to reflect and “wrestle with questions of identity” to find a path that is “involved, humane, and responsible” and “fosters human development, the collective good, and societal possibilities.”


Festus Obiakor, a Nigerian-born professor in the Department of Exceptional Education at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, argues that African leadership in the post-colonial period and “post-dictatorial” period has been, and continues to be, conducted according to European-centered frameworks brought in with colonial-period educational systems. Comparing the adequacy with which educational systems in different historical periods facilitated a “patriotic, nationalistic” African leadership, Obiakor shows that only in the pre-colonial period did this happen. In order to facilitate greater pride in African history, encourage adherence to valued traditions, re-establish cultural continuity, and elicit confidence in an African leadership grounded in African culture, he advocates the following: revamping school curricula to incorporate African-centered problem solving, partnership building, and collaboration and consultation; involving scholars and educators of African origin in a continent-wide effort to build educational systems; and encouraging Africans to foster their own leadership talent by designing African-centered leadership programs.


The author, a Ugandan lawyer, associate professor, and director of the Makerere University Human Rights and Peace Centre in Kampala, examines the rule and persona of Uganda’s Yoweri Museveni, who spearheaded the “new breed” of African leaders seen in the early 1990s as “young, dynamic, and willing to break discredited predecessors taboos.” Like Paul Kagame in Rwanda, Meles Zenawi in Ethiopia, and Isias Aferworki in Eritrea, Museveni dominated the popular and intellectual imagination of his country. A veteran of an armed liberation struggle, Museveni was viewed in the West as a pragmatic believer in free market economics and a determined, development-minded, progressive pan-Africanist leader. In this article, the author describes Museveni’s path of ascendancy to leadership and the way he carried out a series of progressive economic and political reforms. These accomplishments, the author argues, distinguish Museveni as a “more effective leader than the rather dismal African average,” but not as a great leader. Unfortunately, the author asserts, Museveni’s regime, like those of old-breed leaders, has exhibited many of the ills of “bigmanism,” including corruption, patronage, exploitation of ethnic divisions, and the use of state power to squash opposition. Even worse, Museveni has frequently used violence as a strategy, pursuing militarily adventurous policies that have done more to harm Uganda’s security and wreak havoc on its neighbors than they have to enhance security. This article is interesting in its analysis of trends in African political leadership and of its study of the traits and behaviors of Yoweri Museveni, a complex, popular, and controversial figure in modern African politics.


Roberts, a professor of anthropology at St. Mary’s College of Maryland, carried out an ethnographic inquiry over a seven-year period from 1993 to 2000 (when he was a Monitoring and Evaluation consultant) examining linkages between leadership and the success of Rodale International Senegal’s program in regenerative agriculture. His analysis of the actions and
The attributes of Rodale's staff demonstrated why the individuals in the organization, and the organization itself, were viewed as leaders in Senegal's agricultural sector during this period. As its reputation grew, Rodale received more donor money and grew larger, causing a change in the way the organization operated. Though the NGO was able to continue doing effective work, it increasingly had to rely on community-based organizations to orchestrate participation with intended beneficiaries, reinforcing patterns of stratification and hierarchy common among national and local NGOs. This article provides food for thought on how NGOs, including those with talented, strong leadership and vision, must recognize changing work practices, values, beliefs, and norms during periods of success and adapt to these changes to ensure continued success.


Jill Sperandio, a professor at Lehigh University and a U.K. native, taught in Ugandan secondary schools in the 1960s, returning to Uganda in 1997 to undertake research into the state of girls’ education and the development of programs for girls. Recalling that the schools she’d taught in provided many opportunities for girls from rural backgrounds to see women in leadership roles, she wondered how these opportunities had shaped the lives of the women who had experienced them, how they believed their secondary education had empowered them, and how well the schools had succeeded in developing the leadership potential of these girls. Furthermore, she sought to learn whether modern schools provided opportunities for developing leadership potential and in what ways these schools did, or did not, facilitate this development. Surveying hundreds of current students and teachers and attending meetings of 1960s girls’ alumni associations, she discovered that modern Ugandan schools were less likely to link moral and academic education than their 1960s counterparts. She found that the schools that were most effective in educating young girls were those that promoted gender equality through rules, regulations, school philosophies, and mission statements; apportioned leadership opportunities equally among girls and boys; sensitized teachers to the special needs of secondary school girls; and actively promoted an understanding of possibilities open to women.


The author, of South Africa’s Milpark Business School, explores how Ubuntu, a system of indigenous African values, is being used to affect “real world” management practices in South African business in order to enable greater organizational efficiency and effectiveness. The paper draws from Lovemore Mbigi’s “African tree” model (1995), which explains African management, empowerment, and transformation through Ubuntu. Using Mbigi’s definition of Ubuntu as a “collective personhood and collective morality” derived from value sharing, communal enterprise, and leadership legitimacy, the author asserts that organizational leaders in South Africa should relate to employees in ways that express values of Ubuntu in order to develop an inclusive, representative culture, thereby creating a positive, empowering climate that develops knowledge, skills, and abilities and makes the workforce more motivated and productive.

This article, like many in post-apartheid South Africa, attempts to show how businesses can benefit by crafting an organizational culture based on local values rather than imposing a foreign organizational culture on employees. The Ubuntu-based business culture proposed by the author (and observed, to a small extent, in South African society) is an inclusive culture that “enables everyone to be nurtured in a cohesive, yet diverse, unit.”

Williams, a professor of philosophy at Spelman College, describes traditional governance and political structures in pre-colonial Africa and the impact of colonization on these structures, contrasting these with the glorified conceptions (which he deems inaccurate and misplaced) that Diaspora Africans (mostly African Americans) have of the leadership of bygone African royalty. His discussion of the relationship between chiefs and subjects in the Bafut Kingdom of pre-colonial Cameroon, especially of formal practices that enabled the citizenry to “authorize, critique, and sanction the ascension of a ruler, his/her continued reign, and the selection and ascension of his/her successor,” provides insight into the system of checks and balances, democratic processes, and values that defined relations between citizens and leaders. Diaspora Africans, he feels, are generally not aware of such structures, or of those in other pre-colonial African societies. Instead, they are aware of “imagined” societies led by strong kings and queens. His examination of how German colonial administrators co-opted traditional Bafut governance structures, leading chiefs to exploit their own people and to become more vicious and autocratic, shows that these leaders are not necessarily the ones idealized in popular lore—that the authority of these leaders, and of leaders in any context, is socially constructed. To understand their heritage, he asserts, Diaspora Africans should study the social processes that created and maintained structures of pre-colonial African society.

Asia


The authors, professors at the Indian Institute for Management and Birla Institutes in Kolkata, India, attempt to provide insight into the nature of transformational leadership, positing that true transformational leadership includes a spiritual component rarely mentioned in the writings of Western leadership scholars who are grounded in the “cognitive-scientific-secular-rational” leadership approach. Using the spiritual psycho-philosophy of India, particularly the Yoga-Vedanta framework, and drawing from the writings of both Western thinkers and Indian “realizers,” they look beyond transformational leadership for business or political success, observing instead the transcendence, consciousness, spirituality, transformation, and ethics of “truly transformed leaders of humanity.” Spiritual transformational leadership, they assert, addresses the “true needs” or “higher purpose” of men; is guided by essential, rather than circumstantial, ontologies and epistemologies of transformation; and can only be provided by leaders aware of a consciousness higher than the “body-mind centered ego.”


Wen-Chin Chang, of the Academia Sinica in Taipei, Taiwan, examines the unique leader-follower relationship among Kuomintang (KMT) Chinese, a group comprised of organized Nationalist refugee soldiers and their families who were driven from China by the Communists in 1949 and established communities in northern Thailand based on illicit drug trafficking. After providing the reader with a detailed description of the actors involved and of the unique socio-cultural context in which this leader-follower relationship existed, the author analyzes the relationship, the
cultural dimensions underpinning leader authority and follower subordination, and the types of interaction and reciprocity occurring among the actors. Using a theoretical framework derived from past studies of patron-client relations, he demonstrates that the leader-follower interactions of this group are rooted in both Han Chinese culture and the local native ethos of the long-distance caravan trade, and that they are quite dissimilar to leader-follower interactions noted among Han Chinese in other contexts. Particularly interesting is his discussion of how and why KMT leaders developed a ritualistic, symbol-laden, Confucian “quasi familial” system of interactions in order to retain Chinese cultural identity, promote a strong community, establish a strong presence, and engage economically in a turbulent region.


Using data gathered through interviews from four Pakistani NGOs, Lubna Hashmat, a Pakistani program coordinator in the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, examines the challenges NGOs and their leaders face during times of organizational growth. These challenges include developing and maintaining technically competent teams; developing systems, policies, and procedures; ensuring that organizational learning is recorded and consolidated; meeting the needs of an increased number of stakeholders; and ensuring program and organizational sustainability. She narrates how leaders of each of the four NGOs adapted differently, using varying levels of expertise in organizational management to develop strategies to address these challenges.

She posits that the effectiveness of organizations in handling this change depends vitally on how leadership is exercised in the organization, particularly in how leadership responses are “linked with management competence and not only to commitment and dedication.” She asserts that such competence allows organizations to be more internally (than externally) driven and thus more in control of the change process.


Jyuji Misumi’s PM theory, developed in Japan over a 25-year period beginning in the early 1960s, is one of very few well-known, highly regarded leadership theories developed outside of the U.S. or Europe. The theory posits that leaders must address two functions in order to maximize their effectiveness: 1) performance, or task accomplishment (forming and reaching group goals) and 2) maintenance (maintaining good working relations between those working on a task). Misumi asserts that measures of leadership are contextual (not universal), that different criteria for leadership must be developed in each new setting, and that performance (P) and maintenance (M) are not independent of each other, but completely interwoven. In his studies, he has shown that leaders high in both P and M are more effective than those with one, the other, or neither. In this article, Misumi and Peterson summarize the development of PM theory, reviewing 25 years of Misumi’s research and providing an overview of other studies related to this research.


This paper, by a professor of political science, women’s studies, and Asian studies at Kansas State University, examines key variables in the rise to political prominence of national South and Southeast Asian female political leaders; assesses advantages or disadvantages that being a
woman provided for each; explores the impact women have in the politics of these regions; and predicts the prospects for future female leadership in these regions. Of particular interest is the first part of the paper, which describes the avenues by which these women assumed leadership roles. Looking at the experiences of such leaders as Aung San Suu Kyi, Benazir Bhutto, Corazon Aquino, Indira Gandhi, and Sirimavo Bandaranaike, the author examines how they were able to use their high social class, education, wealth, family ties, association with independence movements, and/or association with martyred male family members to gain access to power, and how the structure of their respective political systems affected what each could accomplish during their time as leaders.


This short report, by a professor at the TA Pai Institute of Management in Manipal, India, describes a presentation he made at the European Business Ethics Network’s conference in 2000. In the report, the author describes the diverse leadership and ethical traditions of India, derived from social and political institutions, mythology, and religion, their influence on the modern psyche of India, and the extent to which these traditions are woven into the fabric of Indian organizations. In the presentation, he sought to convince those gathered that it was important to understand these traditions, to help develop trust and mutual understanding between expatriate businesspeople and their Indian partners and clients. He cited the ethical leadership of the Bhagavad Gita, the Machiavellian-like statecraft of Kautilya’s Arthasastra, the democratic leadership of Thiruvalluvar’s Kural, the compassionate, sensitive leadership of Ram in the Ramayana, and the pragmatic leadership of the Krishna legend as pervasive influences on thinking about leadership and ethics. He suggested that as women gain more influence in society, mother goddess legends may affect their leadership behaviors. He also mentioned modern influences of American, French, and Soviet revolutions, the ethos of democracy, and the ways in which traditional views have helped followers to develop trust in leaders and to support democratic processes.


The author, who has worked in Bangladesh for Action Aid and other development organizations, prepared this paper, a condensed version of his master’s thesis, for the London School of Economics Centre for Civil Society’s Working Paper series. He analyses many facets of NGO leadership in Bangladesh and the U.K., particularly the challenges NGOs face in developing second-line leaders, and examines NGO leadership through the lens of various leadership theories, particularly those with trait-based approaches. Particularly interesting are the author’s discussion of the qualities needed for effective NGO leadership (which may differ from those needed for business or political leadership), his examination of the unique challenges NGO leaders face, and his recommendations on developing second-line NGO leadership.


Sinha and Suar, professors at Xavier Institute of Social Service and Indian Institute of Technology, respectively, bring their backgrounds in rural development (Sinha) and social and organizational psychology (Suar) together to study leadership and participation in Indian community forestry. Their study tests (a) whether participation and leadership styles vary in
communities using indigenous community forest management (ICFM), crafted community forest management (CCFM), and joint forest management (JFM); and (b) whether leaders’ styles, members’ psychosocial closeness with the leader, and leaders’ attributes influence people’s participation in forestry projects. In surveys with 397 members of 17 forest protection units in forest-dependent communities in Orissa, Jharkand, and West Bengal, they found that participation was highest in ICFM units, and also high in CCFM units, where leaders’ styles were predominantly participative (almost 75% in both), but much lower (only 34% with participative styles) in JFM communities, whose leaders were more frequently deemed “authoritarian” or “manipulative.” Members in all communities felt more psychosocial closeness with participative and charismatic leaders, and felt that these leaders had more personal virtues and relationship-maintenance skills than their authoritarian and manipulative counterparts.


J. B. P. Sinha, professor of psychology at the A.N.S. Institute of Social Studies in Patna, India, developed a theory of leadership known as the nurturant task-oriented model in 1980. In this model, Sinha posits that the leader-subordinate relationship and the subordinate orientation toward work are different in an Indian cultural context than they are elsewhere in the world. He says that the task characteristics are less crucial in Indian organizations than in organizations elsewhere, and that subordinates in India view work first through the lens of the leader-subordinate relationship, and secondly through the work itself. In this context, many leaders have developed a style Sinha defines as “nurturant,” in which a leader must “care for subordinates, show affection, take personal interest in their well being, and cultivate their growth.” To be effective, a leader must make this nurturance contingent upon the effective task accomplishment of his subordinates. In this article, using data gathered in 30 studies by Sinha and his coworkers between 1980 and 1984, he examines the meaning and structure of this style and compares its effectiveness in various settings with that of authoritarian and participative styles of leadership.


Tirmizi, currently a professor in and chair of the Department of Organizational Management at the School for International Training (Vermont, U.S.), developed a model of leadership drawn from surveys and a series of workshops conducted in 2001, when he was a faculty member at the Lahore University of Management Sciences (Lahore, Pakistan). In the first survey, 160 respondents were asked to describe the “traits and behaviors of leaders they considered effective in organizational settings.” In a later survey, 120 respondents answered the same questions, and took part in workshops in which they were asked to reach consensus on a list of five effective leadership behaviors. From their data, and from tests of the results in two later pilot studies, the author developed the 6-L framework, which includes the following six behavioral dimensions of leadership: (1) lends a vision, (2) leads and encourages change, (3) leverages learning and development, (4) looks out for others, (5) lauds achievement, and (6) lives by example. This model is unique in that it was specifically conceived and designed to explain leadership practices in Pakistan, a country where indigenous leadership models had not been developed. The author calls for more leadership research and the “development of new frameworks in Asia and other understudied regions of the world.”
In China, a high power distance traditional society with strong hierarchical values, where managers and employees often think that deference to authority is useful to their organizations and themselves, organizational leaders are often viewed as “heads of household.” In the West, such structures are viewed as autocratic and impersonal, characterized by domination and submission. In China, however, leaders as heads are thought to use their power in ways that nurture, support, and assist employees. In this article, by Chinese and American professors in Hong Kong and Shanghai, the authors hypothesize that traditional values, specifically those in which leaders act as heads of household, can be useful when they strengthen the bonds between employees and managers, and that these values “do not obstruct modern, effective ways of working.” Surveying 200 manager/employee pairs (400 people in total) in Shanghai organizations, the authors found positive, though not significant, correlation that employees were more likely to apply effort, ideas, and abilities for mutual benefit for more traditional managers than for managers with less traditional values. They found that traditional managers were significantly more likely to apply such efforts for mutual benefit than were less traditional managers, and that overall, traditional manager/employee pairs were more likely to work together for one another’s mutual benefit than were less traditional pairs. The interaction facilitated in the traditional pairing, they hypothesize, may result in stronger leader-employee interpersonal relationships, and may in some cases have a stronger impact in determining productivity and worker satisfaction than such variables as flexibility and autonomy.

This article, by the head of the Department of Education at the University of Hong Kong, attempts to explain how the application of Western moral leadership models—and the exclusion of Chinese values-based and ethical models—has influenced educational policy issues in Hong Kong. He suggests that Western moral models, which have been “predominantly concerned with abstract theories and concepts to understand the nature of morality and to define ‘good’, ‘right’, ‘ought’, and ‘obligation,’” and Western management models, which over-rely “on bureaucracy and rationality,” have harmed relationships between school heads and teachers, and made educational reforms that require active support from teachers slow and difficult. He believes that school leaders should more frequently conceptualize their goals in the concrete, practical, ethical humanism of Confucian (and other Chinese) models, which call for concrete forms of behavior rooted in Confucian person-to-person relationships. He suggests that these leaders “revive and re-employ these old values” to meet new needs. This article is useful in its explanation of the cultural, philosophic, and linguistic roots of Chinese moral leadership theory, and in the way it contrasts the cultural roots of Chinese moral leadership theory with Western moral leadership theory.

This article, by the head of the Department of Education at the University of Hong Kong, attempts to explain how the application of Western moral leadership models—and the exclusion of Chinese values-based and ethical models—has influenced educational policy issues in Hong Kong. He suggests that Western moral models, which have been “predominantly concerned with abstract theories and concepts to understand the nature of morality and to define ‘good’, ‘right’, ‘ought’, and ‘obligation,’” and Western management models, which over-rely “on bureaucracy and rationality,” have harmed relationships between school heads and teachers, and made educational reforms that require active support from teachers slow and difficult. He believes that school leaders should more frequently conceptualize their goals in the concrete, practical, ethical humanism of Confucian (and other Chinese) models, which call for concrete forms of behavior rooted in Confucian person-to-person relationships. He suggests that these leaders “revive and re-employ these old values” to meet new needs. This article is useful in its explanation of the cultural, philosophic, and linguistic roots of Chinese moral leadership theory, and in the way it contrasts the cultural roots of Chinese moral leadership theory with Western moral leadership theory.

Middle East

This article, by the head of the Department of Education at the University of Hong Kong, attempts to explain how the application of Western moral leadership models—and the exclusion of Chinese values-based and ethical models—has influenced educational policy issues in Hong Kong. He suggests that Western moral models, which have been “predominantly concerned with abstract theories and concepts to understand the nature of morality and to define ‘good’, ‘right’, ‘ought’, and ‘obligation,’” and Western management models, which over-rely “on bureaucracy and rationality,” have harmed relationships between school heads and teachers, and made educational reforms that require active support from teachers slow and difficult. He believes that school leaders should more frequently conceptualize their goals in the concrete, practical, ethical humanism of Confucian (and other Chinese) models, which call for concrete forms of behavior rooted in Confucian person-to-person relationships. He suggests that these leaders “revive and re-employ these old values” to meet new needs. This article is useful in its explanation of the cultural, philosophic, and linguistic roots of Chinese moral leadership theory, and in the way it contrasts the cultural roots of Chinese moral leadership theory with Western moral leadership theory.
The authors, from the Arab Fund for Social Development and Kuwait University, respectively, attempt to (1) examine Qatari and Kuwaiti leadership traits/behaviors and implicit leadership theory from a culturally conscious perspective, (2) assess how the demographic characteristics of managers in the two countries influence their perception of what comprises an outstanding leader, and (3) examine the extent to which the measures of the Culturally Endorsed Implicit Leadership Theory (from the GLOBE study, 2001) are valid in the Arabian Gulf region. After examining the ways in which recent wide-ranging social, economic, and historical influences have altered work environments and regional culture, they discuss how local influences, including collectivist values, tribal traditions, power hierarchies, and other factors affect leadership styles. Using questionnaires, interviews, and analyses of previous research findings, they are able to accomplish the three goals of the study. Their findings enable them to explore the largest dilemma facing leaders in the region—how to balance the need for change (to be part of the modern world) with the need for stability (rooted in values and traditions of the past). This is a valuable study that provides keen insight into the organizational psychology of Gulf Arab managers, leaders, and followers.


This article examines the interrelationships between societal culture, organizational culture, and organizational leadership in Iran, using the GLOBE leadership instrument and data from 300 Iranian managers. In the study, the authors compare their findings with those of GLOBE studies in other nations and develop a model of leadership highlighting seven dimensions of leadership that reflect the cultural values of Iranian society.


In this essay, the authors introduce the journal's issue on leadership and culture in the Middle East, which includes five articles that follow the introduction. While the opening and concluding articles focus on methodologies used and implications of cross-national comparative research, the three central articles look at values and practices of leadership in four Middle Eastern societies—Iran, Turkey, Kuwait, and Qatar. The authors compare the findings of these studies, using Hofstede's and GLOBE's dimensions of national culture to examine and contrast societal and organizational practices in the four nations. Some of the differing cultural practices—those relating to language, ethnic background, and economic and social institutions—account for differences in implicit leadership theories, while others, such as a common faith in Islam, account for similarities.


In 1974, Khadra, a professor of public administration at the University of Jordan and an advisor to the Kuwaiti civil service, developed a model depicting the dynamics of political leadership in the Arab world through historical, political, and cultural analysis. In later years, he extended the analysis into social and organizational contexts. In his “prophetic-caliphal model,” he proposes that four dimensions specific to Arab culture—personalism, individualism, lack of institutionalization, and the great man predisposition—explain how and why leaders and subordinates think and behave as they do. He maintains that from these elements arise two sub-models of leadership—the “prophetic” and “caliphal” models—depending upon subordinate
perceptions of leader attributes. In the prophetic model, subordinates motivated by love of the leader and a desire to identify with his vision and goals moderate their personalism and individualism for the good of the organization enabling organizations to function effectively. In the caliphal model, subordinates less enamored of their leader’s qualities are motivated by fear and coercion to perform their duties. In this study, the author uses data from five different surveys given to groups in Amman, Jordan, to provide empirical evidence that the four dimensions exist. He then looks at the implications of the model, especially at the negative aspects of the four dimensions, and suggests the need to “reduce the negative aspects of personalism and individualism, reduce dependence on a great man, and strengthen teamwork and institutionalism.” This article is of benefit to those interested in understanding the importance of culture in determining how leaders and followers relate to one another. It is particularly interesting to those who wish to understand how the Arab leader-follower culture may influence organizational, social, and political processes in Arab societies.


In various Western studies, researchers have identified consultation, rational persuasion, inspirational appeals, and ingratiation as four of the most common strategies leaders use to influence subordinates. In this inquiry, Pasa, a professor of management at Bogazici University in Istanbul, conducted two studies to examine the ways Turkish organizational leaders influence subordinates, theorizing that the above strategies, while applicable in a Western context, do not necessarily apply in a Turkish context, where cultural dimensions of high-power distance and collectivism are more prevalent. In his first study (using 24 recent MBA graduates as participants), he concludes that the strategies are not commonly used in Turkey—that Turkish leaders more commonly use position-based power (40%) and promises to share responsibility (20%) when trying to get subordinates to perform. In his second study (which had 336 participants from 12 companies), he reinforces these findings and recognizes secondary methods by which leaders influence subordinates, including pressure-control, rationalizing and involving, social exchange, and legitimizing. His findings demonstrate that leaders from collectivistic, hierarchically arranged cultures use different influencing strategies to accomplish the goals of their organization.


In this study, the authors, from the Department of Management at Bogazici University in Istanbul, study which leadership behaviors are most commonly accepted and practiced in Turkish organizations. Through surveys, focus groups, and interviews with employees of four Turkish companies, they try to grasp the dominant values in Turkish organizations, ascertain which leadership behaviors are observed within Turkish organizational culture, and understand what Turks perceive to be universal behaviors of effective leaders. Following a thorough literature review that explains dimensions of culture and theories of leadership, they provide a highly informative report on Turkish organizational values, the relationship between these values and perceived leader behavior, and ideal leader behaviors prevalent in Turkey. This is a valuable study in a country where not many such studies have been conducted.

The author, a female Palestinian development manager formerly of the Ma’an Development Center in Palestine (and currently at the Carter Center in the U.S.), examined the thoughts and perceptions of seven Palestinian women NGO leaders on the following issues:

- the extent to which they perceive themselves to be shaping Palestinian civil society
- the factors contributing to women’s rights in Palestine
- the factors promoting or hindering women’s participation in civil society
- the defining characteristics of a leader
- who should be leading Palestinian civil society

Of significant interest are the themes that emerged relating to what comprises a successful leader. Each of the women interviewed spoke of the importance of a vision, a thirst for knowledge and experience, knowledge of the political and social environment, and family support. This thesis is an interesting exploration of the infrequently heard attitudes, values, and thoughts of women who lead organizations in a society where hindrances to such leadership are many (including poor access to education, patriarchal and conservative cultural constraints, constraining societal views of a woman’s accepted role, and lack of family support for women in the workplace).


This essay, by a French professor of management at the University of Lyon, explores the role that the army plays in the development of the elites who run the businesses and government of Israel, and how the army shapes the pioneering spirit of future leaders in Israel. Army culture, the author asserts, is so pervasive throughout Israeli society that it is inescapable. It serves as a melting pot for waves of immigrants coming to the country (“the nation’s quintessential social and cultural integration system”), is the biggest school in the country, and inculcates a set of common national, Jewish, and civic values including “love of country, loyalty and dedication, solidarity with the world’s Jews, and identification with the Jewish people’s past and the Zionist ideal.” Moreover, this experience facilitates workplace egalitarianism; informal, effective communication between coworkers; quick decision making; and extensive professional networking. Scholars and students of leadership will find this short article interesting in its description of how one organization within a society can so pervasively facilitate values and behaviors that enhance leadership, innovation, and public-spiritedness in a society. Regardless of whether one approves or disapproves of its mission, there can be little doubt that the Israeli army’s role in establishing a common set of leadership expectations for followers and leadership models for managers has strongly helped define the Israeli workplace, and may be responsible for many of the economic, social, and political successes of Israeli society as well.


The authors, from Helwan University School of Management in Giza, Egypt, and Bradford University School of Management, in Bradford, U.K., respectively, studied the suitability of Bass and Avolio’s transformational/transactional leadership model—which is North American in origin—in Egypt, a Middle Eastern country. Using questionnaires on leadership effectiveness given to managers and subordinates in ten Egyptian banks, including public sector banks, joint ventures,
and private investment banking companies, they sought to measure Bass and Avolio’s eight factors of leadership (four aspects of transformational leadership, three aspects of transactional leadership, and laissez faire), and two other factors that they felt were relevant to the Egyptian context. From their responses, they identified seven leadership factors (eliminating three using the principle components analysis method) pertinent to the Egyptian context: positive leadership, reluctant decision making, enthusiastic leadership, bureaucratic leadership, social integration, authoritarian leadership, and individual consideration. In this article, the authors discuss how geography, history, social structures, Islam, and other cultural factors produce leadership styles that, in comparison to Western styles of leadership, are more authoritarian and “personalized,” less democratic and “socialized,” and more concerned with bringing about social integration. Of the seven leadership factors deemed relevant to the Egyptian context, only three—reluctant decision making, enthusiastic leadership, and individual consideration—showed patterns of response similar in both Egyptian and North American contexts, indicating that culture does have a strong impact on leadership styles, that people in different cultural contexts define effective leadership differently, and that more culture-specific studies of leadership are needed to determine effective leadership models for specific locales.

**Latin America**


The author, a professor at Catholic University Andres Bello in Caracas, Venezuela, analyzes the way local actors work to achieve local goals in a globalized world, mobilizing internal forces and working with alien actors (national and global) to successfully—or not successfully—achieve their ends. She looks briefly at the challenges, risks, and opportunities of globalization that are facing leaders in localities she refers to as “extractive reserves”—the community of rubber tappers in Brazil’s Rio Acre and the Pemon indigenous mining community of the tepuyes region of Venezuela—observing that “underneath globalization, history depends much on the leaders of local projects.” She asks, “What kind of people engage in local leadership amidst the global forces acting on them?” and concludes, after watching how different types of local, national, and global actors interact with one another in each locale, that there are ways that local leaders can organize their territory to preserve group identity, establish communal regimes, self-manage local resources, practice self-government and policing, and socially organize their communities with autonomy, provided they “set up stable social structures to manage the global in the local.” Though she does not prescribe a particular leadership approach that will achieve this goal, the observations she makes about these two communities provide lessons and options for leaders in communities that face external forces driven by globalization.


In this essay, Velma Garcia-Gorena, a Smith College professor of government, examines the campaign of the Comité Antinuclear de Madres Veracruzan, a group of upper-middle-class mothers and self-styled protectors of children, the family, and society, who emerged in the late 1980s to oppose Mexico’s Laguna Verde nuclear power plant.* She analyzes the group’s activities, tactics, achievements, and failures; delves into why they chose to mobilize politically as
mothers rather than citizens; and discusses the benefits and limitations of this strategy. Did such a strategy reinforce the traditional sexual division of labor in Mexico, as some feminist theorists would argue? Or did it, and the years of experience in the struggle, result in a “renegotiation of gender boundaries,” as the author concludes, enabling the women involved to develop as individuals and as leaders? This essay is interesting to those curious about the role motherhood plays in structuring women's opportunities for leadership.

*The author began this research in 1989, conducting interviews with the leaders of the Madres Veracruzanas during a Ford Foundation postdoctoral fellowship for U.S. minorities. For more information on this case, readers may consult the author’s 1999 book, Mothers and the Mexican Antinuclear Power Movement, published by the University of Arizona Press.


This article, by faculty members in the Education and Human Ecology departments at Montclair State University (New Jersey, USA) asks the following question: How does a leader with commitment to social justice foster authentic participation, and how does it look? The authors then describe the manner by which community leaders successfully encourage such participation by community members in a Caracas, Venezuela, community center, creating an "urban sanctuary" that provides improved social, educational, cultural, and recreational services in a "socially devastated," poor neighborhood. In the study, the authors show that such sanctuaries are not created through programs and services imposed from the outside, but from those evolving through participatory, democratic processes in which leaders listen and facilitate, suggest and implement, and create trusting environments while engaging the local community in authentic participation. They suggest that good leadership for social justice is about creating critical conditions and safe spaces for educational transformation, not about choosing what to teach, how to teach, and to whom to teach. The role of leadership, they assert, is to facilitate the opportunity for empowerment, not to "deliver" it.

Marginalized Communities in North America


In this three-year study, a team of 10 U.S. university researchers (including white and African American men and women) conducted a phenomenological study that looked into the lived leadership experiences of 106 university students of color (including African American, Asian American, and Latina/o men and women), attempting to identify salient themes of these experiences. Themes they discovered were "disdain for the label of leader; the personal costs of holding leadership positions; the different experiences in predominantly White, multiracial, or same-race groups; group loyalty over individual needs; gender differences in leadership experiences; and lack of campus staff and faculty role models.” To better serve the needs of young leaders of color, they recommended that university leadership development program professionals use language that embraces collaboration rather than hierarchy, encourage more collaborative approaches to leadership, create on-campus role-model programs, and provide more training in cross-cultural competency and gender/racial equity issues for white students.

The authors, African American women working at Central Florida University (one as a professor and the other as an administrator), describe a collaborative program designed by facilitators and participants to (1) help identify, develop, and improve the knowledge and leadership skills of the participants, all of whom were African American women; (2) provide a network and the resources to facilitate increased personal power; and (3) develop strategies that would enable them to exercise greater influence on the university’s institutional climate. During monthly one-hour group mentoring sessions, the participants employed the Africentric social, cultural, and spiritual values of Kwanzaa’s Nguzu Saba (Seven Principles) to guide them in developing collaborative relationships and shared leadership. Using the Nguzu Saba, the participants learned to view leadership as more spontaneous, more emotionally expressive, more sensitive to the interdependence of people, and more accepting of group concerns than what is expressed in Eurocentric leadership development models. According to the authors, these lessons enabled them to “confirm and affirm the existence of a different reality insofar as the development of their talents and abilities as leaders were concerned” and to “contribute to a heightened sense of empowerment” as they engaged in new roles within the academy. This article is useful to readers who are interested in learning how people can and do utilize heritage and cultural values to develop and affirm themselves as individuals and as leaders.


The author, a professor and assistant director of the Native Indian Teacher Education Program (NITEP) at the University of British Columbia and a member of the Shuswap Nation (in British Columbia), identifies and examines valued qualities and behaviors of Native American leaders through a literature review and unstructured interviews with three British Columbian tribal elders. In the article, she helps readers understand various characteristics and processes of Native American leadership, such as connection to the people, wisdom, humility, personal integrity, service orientation, and the leader’s role as facilitator. Providing clear contrasts between the Native American perspective and Western leadership paradigms, this article provides strong insight into a tradition of leadership infrequently studied by scholars. Though directed at an audience primarily concerned with understanding and improving education for Native Americans, this piece is of great value to anyone interested in learning about or understanding marginalized and/or indigenous models of leadership.


The authors, from the U.K. and Australia respectively, draw upon archival sources of correspondence and statements by Martin Luther King Jr. to analyze the extent to which he personified the four characteristics of transformational leadership. After a short literature review on transformational leadership, they carefully and clearly deconstruct the ways in which he displayed 1) idealized influence, 2) inspirational motivation, 3) intellectual stimulation, and 4) individualized consideration. This article not only demonstrates how King personified these characteristics, but also skillfully defines and presents what the characteristics are and how they contribute to transformational leadership. It provides a good introduction to the concept of transformational leadership.

In this report, the authors, professors in the College of Education and Human Development at the University of Texas San Antonio, study the life stories of eight Texas social justice leaders (six Hispanic and two white, seven of whom work in educational administration) in an attempt to facilitate better understanding of how community social justice leaders form their social justice perspectives and how they practice social justice. Each of the leaders studied is recognized by the authors as a “bridge person” who has “maintained their viability” by “communicating effectively between and among groups” on behalf of marginalized people in their communities. Rather than providing readers with a short summary of what they learned, the authors use 16 (of the 20 total) pages in the report to provide detailed and colorful interview excerpts from the leaders, allowing readers direct access to their powerful and thought-provoking stories. The authors emphasize the following themes relating to how the leaders formed their social justice perspectives: early orientation to social justice, vivid personal experiences of marginalization, and early recognition and support. They examine other themes relating to how the leaders practice social justice: lifelong commitment to social justice and equity, conceptualizing educational administration as a mechanism for social justice, incorporating a social justice focus into the preparation of educational administrators, and practicing social justice without bitterness. Most interesting in this article is the exploration of factors that lead individuals to develop a commitment to social justice, and the questions they pose to readers. To what extent are direct personal experiences a prerequisite for developing such a commitment? How and to what extent can sensitivity be developed in people and groups who haven’t had marginalizing experiences?


Focusing on Latino gender research in mass political participation, public opinion, community politics, and elite politics in a U.S. political context, Montoya et al. review literature that pertains to the work being done at the intersection of gender and Latino politics. They examine Latina leadership and involvement in community politics, discussing how Latina community leaders stress collective, nonhierarchical, consciousness-raising, less-formal leadership. They also look at Latinas in elected office, noting the ways in which Latina politicians mobilize political support by using traditional family networks and cultural resources as “political resources for action.” This article is short and not especially detailed, but provides a good introduction into issues surrounding Latina community and political leadership.


Using leadership categorization theory and relational demography theory, the author, a consultant and professor of management at New Mexico State University, examines the effect of a leader’s Hispanic ethnicity on followers’ leader-behavior perceptions. Leadership categorization theory posits that people use prototypes summarizing the most common aspects of a follower’s concept of leader when determining the extent to which an individual is a leader. Relational demography theory suggests that certain demographics, including ethnicity, have a significant impact on how people work together and perceive leaders. In this study, 335 Hispanic and Euro-American students from New Mexico State University took part in a mini-leadership scenario, with a follow-up questionnaire, testing whether they gave leaders of their own ethnicity (Hispanic or
Euro-American) and preferred leadership style (directive or participative) higher satisfaction and effectiveness ratings than leaders of the other ethnicity and leadership style. The results were that both groups perceived Hispanic leaders to be equivalent, in terms of leadership, to Euro-American leaders, and that participants strongly preferred leaders who exhibit leadership styles that match their prototype to those who did not. Hispanic participants did not exhibit a preference for directive leadership (common in Hispanic cultures that are characterized by high power distance and uncertainty avoidance), perhaps because they were generally young, educated, second- and third-generation Mexican Americans acculturated to U.S. American leadership expectations. This study is most interesting for its literature review and effective summaries of leadership categorization theory and relational demography theory.

Women, Gender, and Leadership


In this chapter of the Blackwell Handbook, Nancy Adler notes the increasingly important role women are playing as business leaders, examines the assumptions underlying the way organizations view women leaders, and shows how these assumptions influence the way organizations utilize women in leadership roles. She develops a matrix, using the following three questions, to identify these assumptions:

1) Do women lead in similar ways to men?
2) If men and women lead differently, whose leadership style is more effective?
3) Do the differences in leadership style advantage or disadvantage the organization’s overall effectiveness and competitiveness?

She concludes that the extent to which organizations acknowledge the differences, not the superiority or inferiority, of female or male leadership styles; the way they integrate and leverage the diversity women leaders bring; and the way they create synergy based on the unique leadership styles both men and women bring to an organization will affect the overall effectiveness and competitiveness of the organization. Though this chapter is written to provide corporate leaders with a framework for understanding the role women do, will, and should play in global business, social justice leaders would do well to consider the questions the author asks, and to consider how they can benefit by combining women’s and men’s perspectives in innovative, synergistic ways.


This article, by researchers in the University of London’s Department of Geography, examines perceptions and behaviors of women as household leaders, using case studies in Guatemala and Botswana. In the first part of the article, the authors examine the context for such women in Guatemala, where gender norms appear hard to change and the perception of women as household heads is overwhelmingly negative. There, women heads are seen as being immoral and sexually promiscuous, unable to care for children, and responsible for high levels of crime,
violence, and the “perverse socialization” of children. In the following section on women household heads in Botswana, the authors look in more detail at the leadership processes occurring within each household. They show that while some women adopt egalitarian forms of leadership that empower junior household members, many more assume leadership styles similar to those of men, reinforcing social norms of male privilege and giving males residing in their homes more space and less housework than their female counterparts.


The author, Florence Denmark, is a professor of psychology at Pace University (New York) who has been studying women and leadership for over three decades. In this paper, she reviews leadership research that focuses on women as leaders, concentrating primarily on two early 1990s books on influential North American female leaders but including other sources as well. Most interesting is her short analysis on how the differing ways in which boys and girls are socialized (and the resulting role assignments and behaviors considered acceptable for each gender) affect how men and women perform, and are perceived, as leaders. Also of value is the author’s discussion, based on a study of her own, of empowerment, and the extent to which men and women leaders exhibit characteristics deemed empowering by their subordinates.


In this book—a series of theoretical essays and case studies edited (and mostly written) by a group of professors at Smith College—the authors examine how gender and modern society’s changing perspectives on it have influenced notions of leadership and power. The essays, which explore women’s leadership in grassroots organizations, politics, business, international organizations, and sports, enable readers to consider the extent to which entrenched beliefs about gender roles and power inhibit the ways they (and most people in society) define and think about women in leadership roles. The book challenges modern leadership theorists, feminist scholars, and others to develop new ways of thinking about questions of female power and leadership.


In this paper, Uma Jogulu and Glenice Wood of the University of Ballarat (Australia) School of Business review major leadership theories, exploring whether these theories have helped or hindered the advancement of women into positions of leadership and management. Beginning with the “Great Man” theory of the 18th and 19th centuries, and examining theories on leadership traits/characteristics, behaviors, styles, and gender differences as well as situational theories and contemporary theories, the authors demonstrate that these theories did not significantly consider or discuss the role of women in leadership until the 1990s. The absence of women in this discourse, they aver, has contributed to a widespread culture in which men have dominated in leadership and management and women have not been viewed as appropriate for such roles. Recent studies, however, have shown that women are more likely than men to possess the qualities required of transformational leaders, which are better suited to the “flatter organizational structures of today.” As yet, this literature has not significantly influenced the advancement of women into senior leadership and management positions. The authors believe, however, that as such evidence becomes better known (and as women continue to advance in mid-level professional and management positions), greater numbers of women will move forward into such positions.

In this article, the authors examine the extent to which gender role expectations constrain the perceived and real effectiveness of women leaders. In the overwhelming majority of previous studies, they note, subjects surveyed or interviewed perceived masculine styles of leadership to be more effective, causing a paradox for female leaders: If they utilize a stereotypically assertive and cool masculine leadership style, their male subordinates will dislike them. If they use a stereotypically warm and nurturing feminine style, they will be liked but not respected. From experiments involving college-aged and middle-aged men, the authors discover that through genuineness, in which women leaders convey themselves mindfully rather than in leader role-scripted manner, they can minimize, or even eliminate, the degree to which masculine leadership traits are perceived as incongruent. This study is unique and important in how it examines leader genuineness, and in how it offers a fresh perspective and possible solution for women leaders who are interested in resolving gender role conflict that constrains their effectiveness.


In this paper, the authors, from Harvard University and the University of Michigan, compare cultural attitudes toward gender equality and women’s leadership in 55 societies, drawing on evidence from World Values Surveys done between 1995 and 1999. Acknowledging that social structural and institutional barriers have to varying degrees hindered women in each of the societies from attaining positions of political power, the authors attempt to control for these factors and focus more closely on the role that political culture plays in the process. How and to what extent do attitudes toward women as political leaders, in post-industrial, post-Communist, and developing nations, hinder their empowerment? To what extent are traditional attitudes in these societies a barrier to the election of women to higher political office? To what extent are these attitudes fading among the younger generation in post-industrial societies? The authors develop a series of propositions to answer these questions, and use the data to test the propositions, offering insights on wide-ranging cultural attitudes toward women’s leadership and gender equality, and concluding that secular trends and changes in values associated with the process of modernization are likely to result in greater political parity for women.


Previous leadership studies suggest that stereotypically masculine behaviors and characteristics (such as independence, rationality, aggressiveness, competitiveness, and emotional control) further task accomplishment, while stereotypically feminine behaviors are more relationship oriented and less instrumental in promoting high performance in organizations. In this article, the author, a professor in the Department of Management and Entrepreneurship at Xavier University, develops a model, based on previous research, which asserts that an androgynous leadership style that integrates sex-role identities deemed to belong exclusively to either men or women can be more effective in promoting high performance than a masculine style. The article, which the author acknowledges is only a preliminary foray into the study of “androgynous leadership,” provides clear definitions of terms and concepts relating to sex-role identity, easy-to-read summaries of how masculinity and femininity are most frequently conceptualized, and a thought-
provoking model that allows readers to consider how sex-role identities are formed, how they influence leadership style, and how they affect individual expectations and organizational outcomes.


The author, a professor of sociology at Stanford University, uses expectation states theory to demonstrate that it is status beliefs within the gender system, and not gender stereotypes themselves, that hinder women from more frequently emerging as leaders in U.S. society. She describes how gender status beliefs create “networks of constraining expectations and interpersonal reactions,” and discusses how, in mixed-sex or gender-relevant contexts, gender status beliefs “shape men’s and women’s assertiveness, the attention and evaluation their performances receive, ability attributed to them on the basis of performance, the influence they achieve, and the likelihood that they emerge as leaders.” Most fascinating is her discussion of how gender status beliefs develop and become established as consensual—perpetuating and preserving gender system hierarchies that bring into question the legitimacy of women as leaders, “penalizing assertive women leaders for violating the expected status order, and reducing their ability to gain compliance with directives.” This article provides deep insight into how people in the United States (and elsewhere) create social hierarchies, and the expectation-states framework used by the author is a practical tool by which one can recognize the extent to which biases and hindrances to advancement faced by women (and other status-devalued groups) are rooted in status beliefs, rather than in stereotypes themselves.


This essay examines the sexual division of labor in Japan and the extent to which gender boundaries inhibit women from advancing to positions of management and leadership in Japanese companies. It examines the process of “commitment screening,” in which managers in Japanese organizations apply criteria—which differ for men and women—to determine the suitability of junior employees for long-term employment and promotion. Though the article does not discuss theories of leadership or management, it provides an interesting look at the hurdles that confront Japanese working women, who must do more than their male counterparts to become “core members” of their organizations, and to convince managers of their worthiness for promotion. This essay is interesting to those curious about how gender roles in a particular culture can influence or determine what kind of leadership opportunities are available, and to those interested in finding ways to further such opportunities for women.


The authors, professors in the Department of Education Leadership and Policy Studies and Florida International University, provide an extensive literature review that analyzes how women lead in the fields of business and education. They examine the relationship between leadership and gender, feminine and masculine leadership styles, factors affecting the development of female leadership styles, trends influencing women in education, and barriers to female leadership in educational institutions. Particularly interesting is a section on how women can act as transformational leaders in the field of education and what female educational leaders have done in this role as change agents. The authors conclude by recommending various ways that
gender bias can be overcome in order to enable a larger number of women to have more and greater opportunities at leadership.


This chapter in Useem’s Leadership Moment examines the leadership activities of Nancy Barry, who left a prestigious career at the World Bank to head Women’s World Banking, an NGO that provides small microfinance loans to low-income women around the world. By choosing an organization that matched her vision of how development should be conducted, applying principles of local autonomy and sustainability, and unifying people with disparate worldviews behind common goals, she did much to expand the reach and effectiveness of Women’s World Banking. Furthermore, she drew attention, resources, and powerful allies to her cause, creating more awareness of and opportunities for microfinancing, spurring women’s entrepreneurship, and alleviating poverty for many women and children around the world.

Educational Leadership


From a broad review of literature on social justice, equity, and leadership in the context of educational administration, the authors, professors at University of Wisconsin and Syracuse University, develop a framework (for use in educational administration preparation programs) designed to prepare educational leaders to think, act, and lead schools in socially just ways. The framework seeks to:

1. Facilitate a critical consciousness in these leaders, in which they learn to “embody social justice consciousness within their beliefs and values”
2. Develop within them a knowledge of “evidence-based” practices for creating equitable schools
3. Ensure that they have practical skills to enact justice

In the framework, the authors suggest ways that critical consciousness, knowledge and practical skills can be conveyed and assessed, through curricula (what content is taught), pedagogy (how content is delivered), and assessment oriented toward social justice. With minor alterations (though the authors do not state this), this framework is adaptable for leaders and leadership development educators in fields other than educational administration.


The author, a professor at the UNITEC Institute of Technology in Auckland, New Zealand, reviews and critiques Western notions of educational leadership and calls for a change in the way these theories are constructed. She explores how factors such as social class, race, gender, ethnicity, and cultural worldview affect educational leadership; discusses limitations in the way dominant, universal, normative models of education have been conceptualized; and suggests a “multi-voiced approach to educational leadership and management.” Next, she attempts to
uncover the contradictions and complexities Maori women educational leaders face, looking at their historical, social, economic, and professional circumstances and discussing their right to define their own realities and contest the prevailing notions of the “universal educational leader.” Finally, she develops a practical (and intriguing) framework for Maori indigenous leadership, based on principles and guarantees of the 1840 Treaty of Waitangi and on values/processes deemed useful in three recent studies of aboriginal and indigenous values.


The author, Andy Hargreaves, is chair in education at Boston College’s Lynch School of Education. In this piece, he contrasts the “rational, linear, hierarchical, secretive, and controlling” educational leadership of his childhood days with a model of educational leadership evolving today. Whereas leadership in the past was practiced by “authoritarian, even wounding” principals, in a world of “power over” rather than “power with,” the author’s model of “sustainable leadership” proposed in this article is organized according to seven principles that promote sustained learning, enduring success over time, social justice, shared mission, systems thinking, personal growth and professional development, diversity, and school capacity building. These ideals of leadership and the author’s discussion of each will be of interest to leaders, scholars, educators, and others inside and outside the field of education.


Larson, a professor of administration, leadership, and technology at NYU and Murthada, a professor of education at Indiana University Indianapolis, conduct a literature review on leadership for social justice that attempts to “articulate the images, dispositions, and practices for enhancing social justice in education.” They ask:

- How has leadership theory for social justice been defined and advanced in educational leadership?
- What does leadership for social justice within a context of inequity require?

The literature discussed includes the research of scholars (including Paolo Freire, Amartya Sen, and Martha Nussbaum) in the fields of education, community organizing, social activism, economics, and law and ethics, and is sorted into three strands: (1) deconstructing existing logics of leadership, (2) portraying alternative perspectives of leadership, and (3) constructing theories, systems, and processes of leadership for social justice. Collectively, the research provides a broad vista into what leadership for social justice, both inside and outside the field of education, entails and requires. Prospective social justice leaders would do well to read and understand this article and the sources presented within.
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