What we talk about when we talk about leadership in South Sudan.

Abstract
It is important to think critically about how we develop leaders, particularly in highly unpredictable countries like South Sudan. This article gives an account of a yearlong reflective and experiential programme in Juba which sought to straddle the paradox of outside and inside: it took seriously the critical insight that leadership development needs to take greater account of endogenous experience. However, to do so we drew on methods developed elsewhere, but which prioritise local experience. The programme focused on the everyday interdependencies of group life, rather than an abstract and often idealised understanding of leadership favoured in many business schools.

Key words: complexity, reflexivity, critical leadership development, South Sudan.

Authors:

David Masua – Country Director of Windle International South Sudan based in Juba.

Chris Mowles – Professor of Complexity and Management at the University of Hertfordshire and Director of Doctor of Management (DMan) programme there.

Nick Sarra – Visiting Professor at the University of Hertfordshire, supervisor on the DMan programme and at Exeter University. Nick is a consultant psychotherapist in the NHS.

Contact: Prof Chris Mowles c.mowles@herts.ac.uk

Introduction
What kind of leadership development is possible in a country which has endured 50 years of war, then civil war, and still experiences every day violence, instability and political corruption? Is conventional scholarship on leadership, which largely derives from American and European business schools, of any relevance in the particular context of South Sudan? What kind of intervention aimed at developing leadership capacity is useful in supporting local managers cope better in societies suffering enduring and chronic existential difficulties? This article relates an experiment to develop an experiential programme for local managers in Juba to take their experience seriously. It aims to make a contribution to critical scholarship about what forms of leadership development may be most appropriate in particularly extreme circumstances.

This article is an account of a year-long programme for a group of leaders and managers carried out over three weekends in Juba from 2017-18. It aimed to support South Sudanese managers and leaders in local organisations to identify and work on themes of importance to them. It sought to encourage time for thinking about the complex business of getting things done with others, which sometimes involves questions of leadership. The programme

1

was co-designed and facilitated by the authors and staff from Windle Trust International in Juba, and drew on a multidisciplinary and group-based approach, including insights from the complexity sciences, process sociology, pragmatic philosophy and group analytic theory. These four theoretical underpinnings place a premium on the indivisibility of practice and theory, the importance of communities of inquiry in the development of knowledge appropriate to context, and the thoroughly social nature of our interdependencies.

The programme was improvisational, reflective and critical. It was improvisational in the sense that the curriculum was developed in response to the learning needs of participants as they emerged. It was reflective in the way it drew attention to the importance of reflection and reflexivity as key managerial capacities, and tried to enhance these. And it was critical in the sense that it provided a forum to investigate the often taken-for-granted contemporary assumption that whatever social dilemmas we need to explore, more or better leadership is always the answer. The programme fits broadly into the substantial minority tradition of critical management studies, or CMS, which we explore in the development management sector further below.

The article proceeds as follows. First, we locate our perspective on leadership within hat some scholars term development management literature, more precisely, within leadership development in an international development setting. Then we introduce South Sudan and its context and discuss why leadership development might have particular resonance there. Next, we describe the year-long intervention as it evolved, the principle concepts we introduced, and describe some of the key themes which arose for the participants. In the discussion section we re-examine the paradox of inside and outside: using methods developed elsewhere which prioritise local experience, reflection and reflexivity. To conclude we point to some of the limitations of this particular intervention, the limitations of the conceptual approach more generally, and outline some possible avenues for further research.

Leadership theory in a development context – outside or inside?
Previously we have made the case (Mowles, 2010) that there are broadly three tendencies in the literature on development management: reformists, rejectionists and agnostics. Reformists are the overwhelming majority of scholars who take up orthodox management prescriptions from the private sector and argue that they are relevant for managing international development initiatives. For example, Esman (1991) is a scholar who has made a 40-year contribution to development management scholarship and argues that management theory has lost many of its more technical and instrumental characteristics. He considers it a body of theories which are relevant for managing towards progressive social ends. A similar argument has been made by Thomas in this journal (1999).

The rejectionist, or critical position is broadly one which critiques management as a discipline because it extends the colonialist project (Cooke, 2004), and/or because it accompanies a neoliberal economic programme (Dar and Cooke, 2008; Wallace et al., 2013) and/or it manifests as a claim that management is a science, often termed 'managerialism' (Gulrajani, 2011). In its claim to be a science, scholars are concerned that managerialist practice is likely to cover over politics by assuming a privileged techno-rational account of

what is required in a development context and thus undermines contestation (Mosse, 2005; Mowles, 2010). Agnostics (Lewis, 2014; Brinkerhoff and Brinkerhoff, 2010) doubt that anything meaningful can be said about development management in the INGO sector, because the domain is so diverse and there is no detectable intellectual core to management theory.

By comparison with the wider domain of development management, we argue that leadership is largely under-theorised, particularly when many INGOs assume so enthusiastically that leadership training is a prerequisite for developing their own capacity and that of their partner organisations. In our prior experience as NGO leaders and consultants, they undertake leadership development without much thought about how unstable the concept of leadership is, and without much inquiry into intellectual assumptions of undertaking leadership training one way or another. It is also under-theorised relative the rich leadership literature available in wider organisational theory.

The literature on leadership in development presents a mixed picture of theory depending on whether it is understood exogenously or endogenously. That is to say, when leadership is theorised from the outside, scholars borrow adaptively from more orthodox organisational literature which reflects an unproblematised mainstream perspective: this is the reformist category which we set out above. Exogenous theory is likely to take for granted the separation of leadership from management, borrowing from Bass' (1990) distinction between transactional management and transformational leadership, to construe leadership individualistically requiring particular individual competences and visionary, often charismatic capacities, and to rest on dualisms, such as leader/follower. Lewis (2014: 135) notes that many NGOs may have a greater valency to accept less critically some of the more orthodox individualistic and charismatic leadership theories.

As an example of exogenous and reformist leadership thinking, a report commissioned by *People in Aid* about leadership in the humanitarian sector (Dickmann et al, 2010) argued that 'Leadership has long been recognised as one of the most critical factors related to organisational effectiveness' (2010: 9). It then goes on to conclude that emerging leaders need to be talent-spotted and have their individual capacities enhanced. Meanwhile Hailey and James (2002) drawing on a survey of SE Asian NGOs regard individual leaders as being particularly influential in helping NGOs learn, and ascribe to them rather idealised qualities which conform to the orthodoxy of visionary transformation. Similarly, 'transformational' leadership development in Nepal carried out by authors Sanders and Timsina (2004) for UNDP sought to: 'form(ed) a vision of themselves as leaders and focused on developing the social, self-management, and relationship skills to acquire a new leadership style.' (2004: 762).

In each of these cases there is little critical reflection on the degree to which leadership can have such exaggerated effects of transformation and whether it is indeed located in particular individuals. Even scholars who would consider themselves relatively mainstream within leadership discourse more generally have concluded: '… the role of the leader is potentially important, but it should not be exaggerated' (Knies et al., 2017). They argue that the more organisations are caught up multiple agendas involving political cut and thrust,

which is particularly pertinent to public sector organisations or NGOs, the less direct the link between leader activity and organisational performance.

However, when viewed as an endogenous activity, then theorizing leadership in the literature is more nuanced and perhaps more critical. In this journal the eminent organisational scholar Henry Mintzberg argues (2006) against the idea of separating leadership from management, and for developing local people in their own settings as human beings rather than with specific competences. Similarly, Mugisha (2015) recommends a reflective practice model which brings about endogenous leader empowerment as his preferred method of developing leaders in countries which receive development assistance, although he still cleaves to individual development. Izubara et al. (2018) argue that African countries need to focus more on endogenous concepts of leadership to make the most of their demographic dividend. This is not a call for a revival of old ways, but rather a reinvestigation of value-orientations which previously served the continent well, such as reverence for posterity, leader-as-community-proxy and respect for elders who are leading for posterity (first and third value orientations intersect). What we see in these articles is an attempt to resist some taken-for granted assumptions about what leaders could be and how they might be developed, and to borrow from local traditions and experience to do so.

Leadership development in South Sudan

South Sudan is the world's newest nation and gained independence from the Sudan in 2011 after long conflict. Yet, only two years after independence it descended into civil war, due to pre-existing political and ethnic differences that pre-date the war with the Sudan (Blanchard, 2016). There has been little progress in resolving the conflict and this has unleashed untold suffering for the people: two million people are in refugee camps across the region and close to two million in internally displaced camps. There seems to be little around which South Sudanese feel they can unite to overcome their differences. Meanwhile, the leaders of the country are mainly ex-rebels, and compound existing tensions because the predominant style of government is coercive (De Waal, 2014). Rather than leading for the common good, different factions compete to exploit national resources, and lead in an authoritarian way. This situation makes ordinary citizens feel voiceless and restive for other paradigms of exercising power in common. It may be that because of their acute sense of powerlessness the contemporary organisational focus on leadership may have particular resonance for the citizens of South Sudan.

Developing leaders in South Sudan without talking just about leadership

The curriculum we developed for managers of NGOs, civil society organisations, and government departments in South Sudan takes the advice of endogenous/critical scholarship seriously, but we understand what we were doing as a paradox of inside and outside. We intended to draw as much as possible on what was important to them, but our preferred medium was to do so in groups using methods practised and developed elsewhere. If you like, we took the participants' experience, and our own experience seriously. Our assumption is that the best place to learn about groups is in a group (Mowles, 2017). The intention was to offer an experience-based programme which was highly participative and collaborative and which would emerge from the everyday organisational

experience of participation in their places of work, as well as participation in this particular programme. At the same time we used methods which privilege reflexive engagement with experience. It differed in both form and content both action learning and the tradition of learning communities.[1] It also tried to acknowledge the shared history of conflict and trauma of almost all the participants: the overwhelming majority of participants had been made refugees for a good part of their lives and were still affected every day by ongoing conflict. Contemporary theories of leadership often draw on idealisations and inflated language which can sometimes cover over difference and conflict: inspiration, transformation, authenticity, passion. Every participant in the room had had life experience which was as far from the ideal as one could humanly imagine, and our intention was to start with this.

The invitation for the development programme was sent to 500 postgraduate Alumni of Windle Trust International and of this number about 30% are women. Only 25 people confirmed attendance but only 17 actually turned up for the first training, 5 of them women. The low number of women in attendance partly reflects the literacy rate, traditional and tribal rigid gender roles of women in the country. As a result, gender roles, women's equality and leadership became a key focus of the programme. In particular there was heated discussion about gender-based violence and men's attitude towards women as leaders (see below).

The three weekends we spent were used as a forum to reflect on our interaction together, and to make links back to their places of work or communities. We also asked participants to choose an enduring dilemma that they were engaged in at work and which would serve as something which continued to unfold to discuss with us and their colleagues each weekend. When we discussed leadership at all, this was as a social phenomenon which arises in everyday interactions with others, which thus calls out questions of ethics and values for the participants. The programme was predicated on the idea that leadership is an everyday activity which arises in groups, and is thoroughly social, relational and dialogic (Cunliffe and Eriksen, 2011). In this sense the programme sat squarely within a critical management tradition (Willmott, 1997) where abstract and idealised notions of leadership are called into question, and which usually involve reflecting on the functioning of power.

The planned curriculum was kept to a minimum, although convenors also drew on a store of thinking which has been developed at the University of Hertfordshire over the last 20 years, deployed improvisationally, and in response to the concerns and interests articulated by the participants. The majority mode of engagement was to encourage participants to talk to each other, but where we did offer seminars, we offered the following:

We gave short sociological inputs on power and its role in emergent social processes with opportunities for participants to explore their own power relationships at work. In addition, we considered our interdependence as human beings and the relationship between groups, including insider/outsider intra- and inter-group dynamics based on the process sociology of Norbert Elias (2000). Additionally there were some short inputs on the relevance of insights

---

[1] The article by Mowles (2017) makes these distinctions clear in some depth.

from the complexity sciences for theories of organising (Mowles, et al., 2008). To manage or lead in highly fluid contexts is often to be in charge but not to be in control.

The themes of reflection and reflexivity were developed throughout the three weekends since the convenors considered this to be one of the essential abilities of contemporary leaders and managers experiencing situations of extreme uncertainty (Mowles, 2015). The capacity for reflexivity can be developed in all managers and leaders so that they may better pay attention to habitual patterns of relating. This was particularly pertinent for participants when tied to their dilemma at work which they had identified in the first weekend. The case study served as a practical and live focus for them to practice greater reflexivity and perhaps become more skilful at dealing with seemingly intractable work problems.

We gave short interventions throughout the three weekends on group dynamics and the emotions that being in relation with others provokes in the workplace, which is either undiscussable or tightly controlled in most professional settings. Participants were encouraged to consider the role of envy, rivalry, loss and anxiety, amongst other emotions and feelings, and how these contribute to the uncertainty of every day organisational life. In particular, we drew on psychodynamic theory to explore trauma in organisations involving the work of Volkan (2001) amongst others. Volkan drew on Bowlby (1998) to point to the importance of secure attachment to a parent, usually the mother, in our upbringing. Disrupting this can make it difficult for us to maintain generative relationships with others later in life. Sometimes whole populations of people can suffer a trauma, such as a war or a disaster, which can then be transmitted intergenerationally, sometimes for hundreds of years (such as slavery for example). Volkan argues that some nations have a 'chosen trauma' which creates a large group identity to which people become attached in both complex and sometimes negative ways. Negatively it can make their stories about themselves very rigid and inflexible, and may provoke them into behaving in cruel ways, visiting trauma on others.

In contemporary management literature there is often an encouragement to avoid conflict by focusing on the positive (Cooperrider and Srivasta, 1987), or creating an organisation which is aligned in some kind of idealised unity. This sometimes coincides with managerial claims that particular organisational initiatives are based on evidence or best practice, which can be put forward in a way to avoid contestation. To counter these tendencies we introduced a seminar on conflict in organisations better to understand it as the inevitable encounter with difference, and as an inescapable experience in the workplace, but one which is often masked. This came to some fruition in a group discussion of wider tensions between Nilotic and Equatorian peoples, and assumptions and preconceptions. Since both groups were represented at the workshop, this proved a helpful and poignant dialogue. One could understand the negotiation of difference between participants in the group as the collective achievement of mutual recognition.

Each weekend we ran two group meetings in accordance with the methods developed at the IGA (Foulkes, 1975) without agenda and without anyone leading the group formally, which we termed the community meeting. These meetings enabled the participants to bring to the fore their own concerns and to discuss them in their own way. It also enabled further

reflection on the group of participants as a temporary organisation in itself. It usually offered a practical demonstration about what it is like to work with uncertainty, and gave unique and embodied insights into the idea that, whatever we mean by leadership, it arises in groups between engaged human beings.

In the course of weekend we offered at least one evaluative session where participants were encouraged to find other ways of thinking about the quality and value of what they had been involved in other than comparing against prereflected targets (of which there were none for this particular course). This kind of programme (where there are no 'learning outcomes') is highly unusual in the international aid domain, and equally so for the participants, who initially struggled to find ways of articulating the difference the programme had made to them. We set out some of their responses below.

What we talked about when we talked about leadership
Everything which happened on the weekends was material to work with, particularly in the community meeting. Rather than finding ourselves talking about management and leadership in the abstract, we often found ourselves exploring something every day and directly related to the group. For example, at the second weekend there was a big drop-off in numbers of attendees from 17 to seven. This provoked a good deal of discussion about the difficult working conditions in South Sudan and the urgency of conflicting demands. This was particularly the case if the participant was the sole working member of large family with multiple responsibilities, enduring sometimes authoritarian working conditions and whimsical responses of participants' managers to requests for time off to attend this programme.

Broadening this theme, participants shared views on the constraints and limitations of the current aid regime which shapes the organisations in which many of them work. The main characteristics of the regime which they found most constraining were to do with the overly-demanding reporting requirements of donors; their unrealistic expectations of linear cause-effect in turbulent conditions; hierarchical and often authoritarian working relationships in INGOs which were also permeated with racist assumptions about the capabilities of South Sudanese. Participants discussed power relationships between white and black, and between Africans from different East African nations employed in South Sudan. They also began to reflect on the relationships within the room where two white facilitators convened a development programme for an entirely African group.

In beginning to discuss inequalities in general, participants also started to explore sexual harassment in the workplace which was something every woman in the group had suffered. Each had a moving story to tell. Although the group seemed supportive of the idea that is was predominantly women who suffered from the culture of sexual harassment, nonetheless some of the men also had stories about how they too had felt compromised by more junior women offering sexual favours in return for organisational advancement. In other words, in order for a culture of sexual harassment to persist it is likely to be co-created by both men and women in different ways, although this is not to assume any kind of equivalence of power or responsibility. The topic of gender inequalities and sexual harassment also provoked disagreement in the group, which the participants started to

explore, including some of their assumptions about how men and women 'should' behave. At moments like this, the group became animated and pursued the conversation whilst remaining as a group and trying to think the issues through together. The importance of the move to collaborating in this way is an achievement of collective and relational leadership in which all the participants were obliged, sooner or later, to find a voice. It was also a contrast to the inability to expose political difference and value controversy in the South Sudanese public.

The community meeting proved a particularly generative resource for allowing emergent themes in the every day organizational experience of participants. We had a clear example of using the group as a place to think further about patterns of relationships more generally in South Sudan. At one point a minor conflict arose in the group as people disagreed about how to respond to a difficult scenario. The conflict provoked different responses in those present: some just stayed quiet as bystanders not wanting to add fuel to the fire, some took up positions, others tried to change the subject. This provided good material for thinking about how conflict arises in South Sudan and what each participants' habitual responses have been previously, and allowed for further reflection on how helpful their habits have been. They then began to take up these insights in the context of the work dilemma that they were all working on throughout the year.

The question of ethics came up again and again throughout the three weekends, as each participant offered examples of the compromises involved in being a member of a group, particularly if that group is colluding in corrupt activity. The conversation ranged over more obvious moral cases of right and wrong to explore more subtle, intractable or ambiguous situations that participants had found themselves in at work. The group gave participants a forum to explore their concerns and anxieties, which they became more confident in using as the weekend progressed. This experience of corruption within their working lives proved to be extremely complex and formed through the existential politics of survival in a traumatised new country struggling with how to achieve a large group national identity.

Brief insights into what the participants made of the programme
In general, the format and content of the three weekends disrupted the participants' expectations of being subjected to PowerPoint-dominated lectures on the nature and substance of leadership. The weekends were not facilitated in a conventional way: the currency of the weekends was conversation, not flipcharts and games. Nonetheless, they responded quickly and soon made the reflective and conversational spaces their own. Here is selection of evaluative response from some of the participants.

Participant A: Trauma as a topic has been very relevant to us in South Sudan due to the obvious reasons. I now hope to ensure that something is done about it at the work place. The session on conflict in organisation was well tackled. I have learnt the essence of coping with conflict, other than providing solutions.

Participant B: The structure was very powerful and unique. The community meetings and evaluation of the day invoked a thought process. It called for our ideas and experiences. I

thought initially it was hard to talk about certain things but as time went by, it became more useful to discuss openly and share experiences.

Participant C: It was the first training I have attended that appeared to have no curriculum; a training whose participants are asked to say anything that bothers them, which later generates discussion. Personally, I have learnt a lot from the training structure that looked unstructured but in a real sense very structured.

Pariticipant D: The setting of the structure and methods is good in the sense that it introduces the research to the core dilemma and problem he/she faces in an organisation and enables him/her to reflect on it and finds out the co-creation pattern in an organisation. Simply, the structure and methods enable the researcher to pay attention to what is happening in the organisation and rediscover himself/herself as to whether he/she is a part of the dilemma and problem.

Some participants also had critiques of the programme too: some thought that the discipline of meeting, discussing and having seminars, and repeating the whole process over and again was too demanding and required too much discipline from participants. A number were unsettled by the openness to discussing whatever came up between us because it was unfamiliar as was the unorthodox facilitation. Some participants struggled with the requirement to bring something problematic from the work setting to reflect upon. Others thought the programme should be accredited, and that the absence of a diploma may have led some to give up.

Discussion

In this article we have questioned the degree to which undertaking conventional leadership development training is appropriate and helpful in the world's newest country (and probably in many other countries where INGOs work too). Firstly we pointed to the particular and extreme conditions which prevail in South Sudan which make every day life highly unpredictable, and may be impervious to leadership theory predominantly developed in American business schools. Next, we explored how underdeveloped leadership theory is in development management scholarship more generally, and is largely silent about the extent to which even basic concepts in leadership are highly contested. Nonetheless, we claim from experience that staff in INGOs often rush into developing themselves and their partner organizations with leadership development programmes so that whcih become hard to question. Nonetheless we identified some interesting themes in the more critical literature on leadership in development, particularly when they emphasize the importance of endogenous experience, and when they deprioritize the management/leadership distinction. Mintzberg (2006) and Izubara et al. (2018) in particular encourage us to develop people as human beings living in their own contexts. However, there is still a tendency to consider that leadership is a property of particular individuals and demands particular competences. The question of exogenous/endogenous knowledge is also treated as something of a binary choice.

In developing the programme in partnership with Windle Trust International South Sudan, we were concerned to work with a paradox of inside/outside by drawing on the experience

of the participants in the programme to shape the curriculum using methods developed elsewhere which prioritise group dynamics. By encouraging participants to bring their own workplace dilemmas to study, and to pay attention to what is going on the group, the intention was to encourage participants to think that leadership, whatever we think it means, manifests itself in the everyday interactions between colleagues trying to get the work done. This in turn allows participants to reflect upon the patterns of authority and power more generally in South Sudan, and their ow particular roles in participating in them.

Ideas brought from outside included themes of complexity, power and organizational dynamics in relation to their organizational dilemmas. Key to the perspective is the idea that leadership is a group activity, which sustains and potentially transforms power relations. Change in organizations becomes a change in the pattern and quality of conversation. The weekends focused on how we co-create situations in the workplace, which is not to argue that everyone is equally responsible for what's going on. The organization is a fractal of what is happening more broadly in society and the wider patterns in South Sudan, disrespect and misrecognition leading to violence, which is also likely to show up in organizational life.

The programme also privileged reflection and reflexivity as a critical ability for leaders and managers coping with uncertainty. By the end, participants showed themselves much more skilful in talking about their work situations and reflecting on their own contribution to what was going on. They were much more aware of their own agency, no matter how limited it might seem sometimes, particularly in the wider context in South Sudan.

Participants were also able to begin to explore matters in the group which are often difficult to discuss in organisations, such as strong emotions, conflict and trauma. For many participants these proved the most valuable sessions and the most recognizing and validating. Each of the participants had very moving stories to tell about what they had been through, and which inevitably continued to affect their relationships with others. We need to be clear that there was absolutely no obligation on anyone to disclose anything – there was no 'turn-taking' in the group. We co-created space and time for greater trust and familiarity to develop where participants were free to talk about what was on their minds if they chose to do so. The group became a resource for thinking and talking about difficulties and in this sense the group became a community of inquiry in the pragmatic sense of the term. [2]

The programme was funded by a donor which seemed untroubled by the experimental and improvisational design, and by our determination not to set 'learning outcomes' in advance. This gave us freedom to draw on our experience and that of the participants. We conducted evaluative sessions, but not as they are conventionally thought of. The broad objective of the programme was to co-create opportunities for talking about topics that mattered to the participants in terms of dealing with their every day dilemmas in the organizations in which they worked. These topics sometimes involved questions of leadership, but often they

---

[2] By pragmatic we allude to American pragmatic philosophy from the classic period of Charles Sanders Peirce, William James, GH Mead and John Dewey, rather than using the word in its every day sense.

involved a lot of other things too: respect, recognition, ethics, discrimination, ethnicity, power, and so on.

Limitations of the programme
The programme was a year-long pilot experiment to find out what would make most sense in management/leadership development provision in a particularly fragile country. Three two-and-a-half day weekends with support between is only enough to scratch the surface of the needs of the participants and their organizational complexities. It also provided very little time to develop the group into an ongoing resource for when the programme finished. The effectiveness of the group was affected by fluctuating attendance and a minority of participants managed to attend all three sessions. The programme could only be sustainable if further funding was found, and if we could resolve dilemmas around accreditation and time off from work to attend.

The three weekends were particularly demanding in terms of attention and group skills for everyone. We suspect that the intense nature of the programme proved too much for some participants as our experience in the UK also confirms. It is worth noting that both convenors are group analytically trained and have run clinical groups, as well as many groups for managers in organisations, using similar methods. Encouraging discussion of conflict and trauma is not something to be undertaken lightly and may have stirred up feelings which this kind of programme is unable sufficiently to deal with. The risk is that there are very few mental health resources in Juba for any participant who wanted to seek further help in talking.

Just as in Juba, so too in the UK, a progamme which is unfamiliar to participants in terms of the mode of facilitation, its deprioritization of learning outcomes and a formal curriculum and its focus on experience, can take time to gain traction. Many participants said they felt more confident at the end of the programme than when they started. They felt better able to draw on their own reflexive resources, and on others in their workplace, to better avoid unhelpful patterns in their work. It is too early to say whether this is a phenomenon which lasts much beyond the life time of the programme.

Conclusion
In leadership and management development there is yet no equivalent to the Hippocratic oath of doing no harm[3]. It is our contention that much INGO theory and practice in leadership development, both for their own organizations and for organisations they deem partners, would benefit from greater thought and criticality. The danger of not doing so is that we act ideologically, imposing styles of thinking on other countries which have not even served us well. Good and ethical leadership is a bit like happiness: we know what it is in the abstract, and we know it when we experience it, but the moment we make it a goal, or even plan for it, it can evade our grasp.

---

[3] Harvard Business School has drawn up an equivalent code for graduates of its MBA programmes, although there no research exploring whether this has made any difference.

The programme we co-developed with Windle Trust Intl and local participants in Juba was an attempt to explore local experience in a broader theoretical context, to bring together practice and theory, and the individual in the group, the organization and society more broadly. It is too early to say what difference this has made to the participants, and there is more to be done in terms of thinking about how to consolidate and widen this attempt to privilege local experience with accompaniment.

References

Bass, B. M. 1990. "From transactional to transformational leadership: learning to share the Vision" *Organizational Dynamics* 18(3): 19–31.

Blanchard, L. P. 2016. *Conflict in South Sudan and the Challenges Ahead*. Congressional Research Service: Washington DC.

Bowlby J 1988. *A Secure Base: Parent-Child Attachment and Healthy Human Development*. Tavistock Professional Book. London: Routledge.

Brinkerhoff, J. and Brinkerhoff, D. W. 2010. "International Development Management: A Northern Perspective." *Public Administration and Development* 30, 102–115.

Cooke, B. 2004. "The Managing of the (Third) World." *Organization* 11(5): 603–629.

Cooperrider D. L. & Srivastva S. 1987. Appreciative inquiry in organizational life. In Woodman, R. W. & Pasmore, W.A. *Research in Organizational Change And Development*. Vol. 1. Stamford, CT: JAI Press. pp. 129–169.

Cunliffe, A. and Eriksen, M. 2011. "Relational leadership." *Human Relations* 64(11): 1425–1449.

Dar, S. and Cooke, B. (eds). 2008. *The New Development Management: Critiquing the Dual Modernization*. London: Zed Books.

De Waal, A. 2014. "When Kleptocracy becomes insolvent: Brute Causes of the Civil War in South Sudan." *African Affairs* 113/452: 347–369.

Dickmann, M., Parry E., Emmens B. and Williamson C. 2010. *Engaging Tomorrow's Global Humanitarian Leaders Today.* People in Aid: London.

Elias, N. 2000. *The Civilizing Process*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Esman, M. 1991. *Management Dimensions of Development*. CT : Kumarian Press.

Foulkes, S.H. 1975. *Group Analytic Psychotherapy: Method and Principles*. London: Karnac Books.

Gulrajani, N. 2011. "Transcending the great foreign aid debate: managerialism, radicalism and the search for aid effectiveness." *Third World Quarterly* 32: 199–216.

Hailey, J. and James, R. 2002. "Learning leaders: The key to learning organisations." *Development in Practice.* Volume 12, Issue 3-4: 398-408.

Izugbara, C. Tilahun, T. and Owii, H. 2018. "Fostering political leadership for the demographic dividend in Africa: relevant cultural values." *Development in Practice*, vol. 28: pp. 705–713.

Knies, E. Jacobsen, C. and Tummers, L. 2017. Leadership and organizational performance: State of the art and research agenda **in** Storey J. Hartley J. Denis J. Hart P. and Ulrich D (eds) *The Routledge Companion to Leadership.* New:York Routledge: 404-418.

Lewis, D. 2014. *The Management of Non-Governmental Development Organisations*. London: Routledge.

Mintzberg, H. 2006. "Developing leaders, developing countries?" *Development in Practice.* Volume 16, Issue 1: 4-14.

Mosse, D. 2005. *Cultivating Development: An Ethnography of Aid Policy and Practice*. London: Pluto Press.

Mowles, C., Stacey R. & Griffin, D. 2008. "What contribution can insights from the complexity sciences make to the theory and practice of development management?" *Journal of International Development* Volume 20, Issue 6: 804-820.

Mowles, C. 2010. "Post-foundational Development Management: Power, Politics and Complexity." *Public Administration and Developmen,* Volume 30, issue 2: 149-158.

Mowles, C. (2015) *Managing in Uncertainty: Complexity and the Paradoxes of Everyday Organisational Life,* London: Routledge.

Mowles, C. (2017) Experiencing uncertainty – on the potential of groups and a group analytic approach for making management education more critical, *Management Learning, v*ol. 48, 5: pp. 505-519.

Mugisha, V. 2015. "Toward purposeful individual capacity strengthening: alternative considerations for Western NGOs." *Development in Practice* Volume 25, Issue 2: 247-258. https://doi.org/10.1080/09614524.2015.1006583

Sanders, J. & Timsina T. 2000. "Decentralised transformative leadership approaches to HIV/AIDS in Nepal, 2002–2004." *Development in Practice* Volume 14, issue 6: 761-767 https://doi.org/10.1080/0961452042000283996.

Thomas, A. 1999. "What makes good development management?" *Development in Practice* 9(1&2): 9–17.

Wallace, T., Porter, F. and Ralph-Bowman, M. 2013. (eds) *Aid, NGOs and the reality of women's lives: a perfect storm.* Rugby: Practical Action Publications.

Willmott, H. 1997. "Making learning critical: Identity, emotion and power in processes of management development." *Systems Practice* 10(6): 749–771.

Volkan, V. D. 2001. "Transgenerational Transmissions and Chosen Traumas: An Aspect of Large-Group Identity." *Group Analysis*, *34*(1), 79–97. https://doi.org/10.1177/05333160122077730