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Abstract

Absent or ineffective leadership often has catastrophic complications for modern organisations. It is thus not surprising that over the past twenty years, a noticeable explosion of interest in leadership development in organisations has been observed (Hernez-Broome & Hughes, 2004). In recognition of this, businesses are looking more and more at strategies to improve the skills and effectiveness of leadership within their organisations. Allan Gray, a South African Investment firm has been no exception.

This study explores leadership development on the Allan Gray Leadership Development Programme (AG LDP). It aims to evaluate the effectiveness of this programme eighteen months after its initial implementation provided for and funded by Allan Gray. In so doing, it establishes that the AG LDP is effective at developing leadership skills and competencies required by today’s fast changing and uncertain business environment.

The study shows that the programme does provide the skills and capabilities required by today’s organisation. It further shows that the programme has to date been effective in developing leadership in line with the organisation’s intentions.
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1. Introduction

The world today has increasingly become more unpredictable and complex. Rapid advancements in technology, increased globalization and availability of vast amounts of new knowledge, have made it impossible for business leaders in the in 21st Century to keep up to date with these advancements on an ongoing basis. Traditional leadership, characterized by control, measurement and prediction, assumes that what the future holds is known to those concerned and thus works off the premise that someone always has ‘the answer’ (Sull, 2006). This assumption is drastically flawed if one considers the rate at which change happens in the world today. The uncertain future thus calls for a new way of thinking about leadership; one that favours collaboration and collective capacity over individualism. Leadership can thus no longer be considered an individual pursuit. Whilst still effective in certain contexts, this notion of leadership is long outdated. Present and future leaders thus need to be able to deal with high levels of uncertainty and ambiguity if they are to succeed in today’s organisations (April et al., 2000).

To survive and thrive in today’s turbulent times; organisations need to increase the focus on leadership and leadership development. Effective leadership within an organisation is viewed to be the key driver of the overall performance and success of today’s organisation; an absence of it will more than likely result in failure to meet business goals and objectives (Vardiman et al., 2005; Hernez-Broome & Hughes, 2004; Bass, 1990 as cited by Tirmizi, 2002). This increased demand has led to significant research and numerous theories in the fields of management and leadership development. These efforts have produced many differing views of how to develop effective leaders. Nevertheless, much of the literature agrees that the answers to this question remain specific to the organisation and the context in which it operates (Vardiman et al., 2005; Hernez-Broome & Hughes, 2004). Weiss and Molinaro (2006) further warn against an overemphasis on generic leadership models that place too much emphasis on personal traits and characteristics of individual leaders. It is thus critical for organisations to gear their leadership development initiatives with a focus on organisational change and improvement within their particular organisation.

In recognition of these identified challenges, Allan Gray, a South African Investment Management company has developed a formal leadership development programme centred on
its 5Es leadership model, to equip its leaders with the necessary tools and skills to successfully achieve current and future organisational improvements and outcomes in these uncertain and ambiguous times. Furthermore, the executives of Allan Gray have identified effective leadership as the key “success factor” in the long-term sustainability of the organisation. This view is supported by Leskiw and Singh’s (2007) view that leadership development has increasingly become a critical and strategic imperative for organisations in the current business environment.

1.1. Problem statement and motivation for research

Allan Gray Limited, established in 1974, is the largest privately owned investment management firm in Southern Africa. Their clients are made up of institutional investors, principally retirement funds, medical aid schemes and endowments, and individuals. These clients invest through either segregated accounts or collective investment funds. The Allan Gray Head Office is in Cape Town and is currently staffed by over 580 people. They also have an office in Johannesburg; Botswana and Namibia.

Allan Gray established the Unit Trust Management Company in 1998 and it was around that time that the company opened their doors to the ‘man on the street’. This was the launch of their ‘retail’ business called Allan Gray Investor Services. Prior to this, they were largely institutionally focussed; managing funds such as pension funds and medical aid schemes of larger institutions. This decision to grow and diversify the business sparked massive growth in the business over the next ten years which included an increase from an average of around 100 employees to over 500 employees. This exponential growth naturally came along with a significant number of changes and challenges. With operational units now becoming the dominant business area within Allan Gray, the movement from essentially an individually focussed business, where decision-making and subsequent accountability was given purely to individuals, to the formation and focus on teams, was a natural consequence. This resulted in opportunities for leadership positions within the organisation. So-called ‘specialists’ were promoted into leadership positions with little consideration for whether they were suitable candidates or not. This would prove to become one of the greatest learning curves for senior managers within the business as they realized the importance that strong leadership plays in the success or failure of a business in today’s very competitive business environment.
After identifying the critical nature of the problem and recognizing the role that effective leadership would play in the success of the business in future, Allan Gray executives realized that some serious action needed to be taken to avoid inevitable failure in future. As a result, in 2006, the executives commissioned the Human Resource specialists to design and implement a leadership development programme aimed at equipping the organisation’s leaders with the necessary and relevant leadership skills to increase the effectiveness of leadership within the organisation.

This study aims to provide initial research into the impact of a leadership development programme at Allan Gray, eighteen months after its initial implementation. It will provide a critical analysis of the development programme’s effect on both individuals and the organisation, evaluated against a predetermined set of objectives decided upon by the executives of the organisation. It will discuss the context of the programme, its structure, the process by which it is delivered and its outcomes.

1.2. Research Questions

This report will therefore focus on two key questions:

1. Does the AG LDP effectively provide leadership skills and capabilities required by today’s organisation?
2. Did the AG LDP develop participants’ leadership capabilities?

1.3. Research Hypothesis

This report will have the following primary hypotheses:

- The AG LDP effectively provides leadership skills and capabilities required by today’s organisation.
- The AG LDP has to date been effective in developing leadership in line with the organisation’s intentions.
2. Literature Review

2.1. Leadership

There is increasing evidence that leadership plays a critical role in how organisations successfully meet performance objectives (Bass, 1995; Vardiman et al., 2006). Today’s organisations operate in a highly complex and rapidly changing environment brought about by the rapid change in business, technology, global communication and in human values. (Fairholm, 2004; Hay & Hodgkinson, 2006; Cacioppe, 1998). There is increased recognition that traditional organisations, characterised by traditional management theory of control, prediction and measurement are thus limited in describing the “hows” and “whats” of operating in a collective environment (Hay & Hodgkinson, 2006). It is thus not surprising that the last two decades have witnessed an increase in interest in leadership development in organisations (Hernez-Broome & Hughes, 2004).

Whilst conducting research into “what great managers do”, Marcus Buckingham and the Gallup Organisation (2005) found that there are as many leadership theories, definitions and styles as there are leaders. Tirmizi (2002) & Bryman (1996 in Hay & Hodgkinson, 2006) suggest that the evolution of leadership theory could be categorised into three eras; trait theories – concerned with the identification of a leader’s traits, behavioural theories – concerned with identification of behavioural styles of leaders, and contingency theories – concerned with a focus on fitting behavioural styles to situational factors. Bryman (1996 in Hay & Hodgkinson, 2006) further adds another phase of leadership theory which he describes as “new theories of leadership” which is concerned with a focus on the articulation of a vision. Hill (1998 in April et al., 2005) provides a useful framework on changed theoretical assumptions within the field of leadership.

Table 1 below illustrates the shifts in leadership theory from the trait era in the 1940s to the contingency era in the 1960s and then towards a more transformational theory in the 1980s. More recently leadership theory has tended towards credibility and the soul which, according to April et al. (2005), is a more personal definition of leadership. The role of leaders is perceived to be more facilitative and being a catalyst rather than controlling and organising. These shifts in leadership theory could be viewed as a necessary response to the changing business landscape which has become increasing more complex and unpredictable.
### Table 1: Transitions in leadership theory as adopted by April et al. (2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World-view</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A controllable, predictable world</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtonian Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation as a machine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for the future, regard for the present and understanding of the past</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of the leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, control and organise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership power base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steward, teacher, designer, facilitator and catalyst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positional power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities of the leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referent power (and positional power)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyse a problem, solve it, sell the solution to others and manage the implementation of the solution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulate a vision and create an environment that enables the achievement of the vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follower role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followers as a means of production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followers as the key source of information and creativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of wisdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followers and the organisational system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome of leader-follower interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliant followers dependant on the leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attainment of profit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed, empowered followers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit as well as stewardship of employees, the organisation and society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many believe that history is shaped by the leadership of great men (Bass, 1990 in Tirmizi, 2002). Trait theory is the ‘great man’ theory of leadership, where a leader was an individual gifted by heredity and possessed unique qualities that differentiated him from his followers (Dorfman, 1996 in Tirmizi, 2002). In the 1950s the focus shifted from what leaders are to what leaders do. This was characterised as the behavioural approach. Three types of leadership behaviours - task-oriented behaviours; relations-oriented behaviour; and participative leader behaviours - were revealed. These could be used to differentiate between effective and ineffective managers (Yukl, 1998 in Tirmizi, 2002). Contingency theories of leadership in the 1960s considered how the effectiveness of leader behaviours and styles of leadership were transformed by situational factors (Tirmizi, 2002).

Following the contingency era, by the 1970s bureaucracies came under heavy criticism for stifling flexibility, creativity and innovation. By then most organisations had been subject to a number of hierarchical flattening and downsizing exercises aimed at creating leaner structures designed to enable greater levels of agility and responsiveness (Speechley, 2005). Subsequently, the 1980s witnessed the emergence of a more transformational and charismatic leadership style. Whereas traditional leadership was focussed on transactions between leaders and followers in order to achieve goals through rational and controlled strategies, transforming leadership, by contrast, is more complex and potent (King, 1994). A leader stimulates followers to change their motives, beliefs and capabilities so that the followers’ own interests and personal goals become congruent with the organisation (Bass, 1985 in Hay & Hodgkinson, 2006). Similarly, charismatic leaders have the ability to formulate and articulate an inspirational vision to their followers (Conger et al., 2000 in Hay & Hodgkinson, 2006).

Hay and Hodgkinson (2006), however, go on to argue that this conceptualisation represents a particular way of thinking about organisations and managerial work which they describe as “systems control” thinking. They further argue that systems-control orthodoxy tends to promote a rather mechanistic view of organisational and managerial work. They suggest that an alternative way to think about leadership is through the adoption of process-relational thinking which recognises that managers like everyone else are “continually striving to make sense of numerous crosscutting and conflicting goals and purposes” (2006, p.146). It involves a shift from seeing the organisation as a goal pursuing entity as suggested by a systems-control perspective to seeing it as “ongoing patterns of meaning-making and activity brought about as… people in relationships to others and to their cultures” (Watson, 2005, p.6 in Hay & Hodgkinson, 2006).
Table 2 below highlights the contrasting features of a systems-control leadership perspective with a process-relational one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systems-control perspective of leadership</th>
<th>Process-relational perspective of leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on leaders as persons</td>
<td>Focus on leadership as a process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on followers</td>
<td>Focus on collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership as separate to management</td>
<td>Leadership as integral to management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitarist perspective</td>
<td>Pluralist perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational goals clear, given and fixed</td>
<td>Organisational goals ambiguous, constructed and constantly changing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Comparison of systems-control and process-relational leadership perspectives

The shifts illustrated in Table 2 support the notion that leaders should be developed with the view to enhance their capability to lead in the complex and inclusive environment in to which today’s organisations have evolved.

2.2. Complexity – Leading in times of Ambiguity, Uncertainty and Change

In the last few years, the world has witnessed rapid change in business, technology and global communications (Cacioppe, 1998). The emerging environment in which leaders operate today has become more complex and intense. This places greater pressure and demands on leaders (Weiss & Molinaro, 2005). An increase in both local and global competition is forcing organisations to be more adaptable and deliver quality products and services to customers in a timely and unique fashion (Leskiw & Singh, 2007). Workplace changes such as the increased participation of women in the workplace, significant increase in information and the boundaryless organisation further contribute to today’s ever changing working environment (Paauwe & Williams, 2001). At the same time, our society has lost confidence in the ability of science and technology to solve problems (Cacioppe, 1998).

In more recent years, an even stronger movement towards teams and flatter organisational structures has been observed (Speechley, 2005). He refers to the term ‘complex virtual teams'
(CVTs) to describe these cross-functional, geographically dispersed, culturally diverse, multi-lingual and multi-disciplined teams. This has increased the demand for stronger leadership skills at more levels within the organisation (Leskiw & Singh, 2007; Klagge, 1997). This increased presence of teams in the workplace emphasizes empowerment resulting in a completely different management role and leadership style (Leskiw & Singh, 2007). Speechley (2005) argues that leaders often lack the skills, tools and techniques to meet the new challenges they face. Some of these challenges include:

- how to build a team at a distance;
- how to achieve engagement and commitment at a distance;
- how to remain target and results-oriented;
- how to create an inclusive environment – not unintentionally exclusive;
- how to identify and manage boundaries
- how to communicate

According to Klagge (1997, p.355), “the advent of the quality movement in the early 1990s brought about several new challenges to organisational managers”. The notion, collectively known as total quality management (TQM), has changed the focus of managerial activities and in most cases, the hope of meeting these challenges rested squarely on managerial creation and maintenance of high-performing teams (Klagge, 1997). Today’s organisational managers thus require leadership skills to develop high performing teams and to cover the wider spans of control left as a result of downsizing and flattening of organisational structures (Klagge, 1997).

Given this increase in levels of complexity, ambiguity, uncertainty, change, and strong movement towards teams within organisations, a more collaborative and relational approach to leadership is required. During times of turbulence and change it is critical to engage the commitment of employees in the context of a shared vision and set of values (April et al., 2005). April et al. (2005) argue that for managing change, the notion of transformational leadership as opposed to the western paradigm of transactional leadership is particularly relevant. They further suggest that transactional leadership views the leader and followers as very much separate entities with separate needs. Transactional leadership involves exchanges between leaders and followers in order to achieve objectives through rational and controlled strategies (King, 1994; April et al. 2005). By contrast, transformational leadership views the needs of
leaders and followers as more interdependent and involves relationships of mutual trust between leaders and those being led (April et al. 2005).

Avolio & Bass (1990 in April et al., 2005) identified four primary behaviours that make up transformational leadership:

1. Idealized influence – having a clear vision and a sense of purpose. Leaders are able to gain the respect and trust of their followers by showing them that they can achieve more than they thought possible.
2. Individualised consideration – paying personal attention to the needs for achievement and growth of followers by creating a supportive environment through mentoring and coaching.
3. Intellectual stimulation – stimulates followers’ efforts through soliciting new ideas and new ways of doing things.
4. Inspirational motivation – inspiring, motivating and generating enthusiasm by providing meaning and challenge to their followers’ work.

Hay & Hodgkinson (2006) however argue that the traditional conception of the ‘heroic’ leader who possesses magical powers that may be seen to spellbind followers to act in ways desired by the leader thus becomes problematic as it has the tendency to over-emphasise the ability of the individual leader. Heifetz & Laurie (2001, in Hay & Hodgkinson, 2006) support this notion and suggest that the leader is not somebody who has all the solutions at their disposal but rather somebody who asks questions. Hosking (1988, in Hay & Hodgkinson, 2006, p.152) further suggests that “viewing leadership as a collaborative process of interaction provides for a more grounded notion of leadership”.

This call for a more collaborative approach to leadership comes as organisations and communities are required to respond to an environment of perpetual change and complexity that is not comprehensible to any one individual. Given the unpredictability of the external environment in which organisations operate, approaches to leadership based on Taylorian principles which involve analysing, dividing and conquering are proving to be ineffective and obsolete (April et al., 2005). Order based on predictable system and procedure needs to give way to one keyed to collaboration and relationships (Fairholm, 2004; Hernez-Broome & Hughes, 2004). As a result, there has been a call for strong leadership, encapsulating a more human
approach to change the long standing “over managed and underled” problem being experienced within organisations (Cacioppe, 1998). Today’s new theories of leadership no longer only define what a leader does but rather see leadership as a process that engenders and is the result of relationships. These relationships focus on the interactions between both leaders and collaborators, instead of focussing solely on the competencies of leaders (Hernez-Broome & Hughes, 2004).

Despite the advances made in field of leadership, there is still no one ‘right way’ to be an effective leader. It is thus more useful to try and identify recurring themes in the area of leadership, in particular, those aspects that are considered critical in the enactment of leadership in these times of uncertainty and change (April et al., 2005). New theories of leadership focussed on relationships begin with, and are largely dependant on, how leaders are able to lead themselves (Goleman, 1998; Hernez-Broome & Hughes, 2004; Elmuti, 2004). April et al. (2005) suggest that “awareness” underpins all that leadership is about; and that awareness of self and others is the critical foundation needed to enhance the effectiveness of a leader. Atwater & Yammarino, 1992, 1997 in Moshavi et al., 2003) concur that individuals who are self-aware are thought to be more effective leaders than those who are less self-aware. Similarly Velsor & McCauley (2004) argue that when leaders expand their capacity to manage their thoughts feelings, and actions, it enables them to develop positive and trusting relationships and to take initiative in important aspects of roles that help people work together in productive and meaningful ways. They further suggest that self-management capabilities for leaders include:

- Self-awareness – understanding what impact their strengths and weaknesses have on others, on their effectiveness in various roles and on reaching their goals, the ability to balance conflicting demands, the ability to learn, and leadership values.
- Ability to balance conflicting demands – learning to not let the conflicts overwhelm them, but rather to understand the root cause of those conflicts, and to develop ways and means for balancing or integrating them.
- Ability to learn – a person with the ability to learn does not resist the need for new approaches and does not get caught in habitual behaviours or outdated skills.
- Leadership values – resilience and strong personal drive are needed to overcome challenging organisational goals and an optimistic attitude supports both individual and group efficacy.
Today most authors agree that leadership is about connecting with and empowering others through mutual trust between leaders and their followers (April et al. 2005). Fundamental to the achievement of these relationships is the leader’s ability to self-lead, which is strongly driven by the leader’s level of self-awareness (Kets de Vries et al., in April et al. 2005). England (2002) argues that self awareness is the first step to greater integrity and self leadership, both of which are vital to the leadership of others according to Velsor & McCauley (2004).

Goleman (1998) found that highly effective leaders were distinguishable by high levels of emotional intelligence (EQ). Despite the fact that there has been relatively little empirical research examining the relationship between emotional intelligence in the workplace and effective leadership (Gardner & Stough, 2002), many authors (e.g. Stein & Book, 2000 in Sivanthan & Fekken 2002; Morden, 1997; Hoffman & Frost, 2006; Kets de Vries, 2004) concur that emotional intelligence is critical to leadership effectiveness. Whilst Barling et al. (2000) argue that there is currently no consensus about the exact nature of emotional intelligence, Salovey & Mayer (1990) and Goleman (1995 in Barling et al., 2000), suggest that emotional intelligence comprises five characteristics, namely:

1. understanding one’s emotions;
2. knowing how to manage them;
3. emotional self-control;
4. understanding the emotions of others; and
5. relationship management

Sivanathan & Fekken (2002) suggest that there is a conceptual overlap between these personal, social and emotional abilities that make up emotional intelligence and the four aspects of transformational leadership behaviours relying heavily on the leader’s personal, emotional and social skills (Bass & Avolio, 1994 in Sivanathan & Fekken, 2002). Similarly Dulewicz & Higgs and Alimo-Metcalfe (1999 in Leban & Zaulaf, 2004) tentatively propose that there could be a relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership. Their comparison is illustrated in Table 3.
**Table 3: Linkage between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional intelligence factors (Dulewicz &amp; Higgs)</th>
<th>Transformational leadership factors (Alimo-Metcalfe)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-awareness</td>
<td>Individual consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional resilience</td>
<td>Decisive, achieving, determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Involves others in values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal sensitivity</td>
<td>Networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>Change management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
<td>Accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness and integrity</td>
<td>Intellectual versatility (integrity/openness)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the traditional bureaucratic organisation, there has been a long standing assumption that the top leaders have all the answers and that those at the bottom have to do little more than their job (Bowerman, 2003). The move towards learning organisations has been brought about by the realisation that in uncertain and rapidly changing times, it is no longer possible for one person at the top to ‘figure it all out’ (Senge, 1992 in Limerick et al., 1994). Furthermore, organisational learning has increasingly been adopted by organisations that are interested in increasing competitive advantage and effectiveness during these times of high uncertainty and change (April et al., 2005). Dodgson (1993, p. 377 in April et. al, 2005) describes organisational learning as “the way firms build, supplement, and organise knowledge and routines around their activities and within their cultures and adapt and develop organisational efficiency by improving the use of broad skills of their workforces”.

The ability to adapt to change within organisations has to start within each individual and their assumed ways of behaviour, their thinking paradigms and their inherent energy. It is therefore imperative that leaders at all levels in organisations understand and are knowledgeable of the ways in which their organisations learn, and what behaviours are necessary to facilitate learning (April et. al, 2005). To facilitate learning, Senge (1994) argues that leaders should stimulate dialogue which provides a process for recognising and dealing with patterns of behaviour which hamper team learning. Through engaging in dialogue, people learn to think together in the sense of occupying a collective sensibility, in which the thoughts, emotions, and resulting actions belong to all as opposed to one individual. Suspending one’s assumptions through this
process allows for the understanding of context and of others. This however requires a deep sense of awareness and acceptance of self (Senge, 1994), which could be seen as Goleman’s (1998) emotional intelligence discussed earlier.

Modern day organisations have become extremely complex. They are filled with ambiguity, uncertainty and constant change which require leaders to observe whole systems while sensibly setting boundaries around the aspects of the system they choose to address. It is no longer possible for leaders to accomplish leadership tasks by virtue of their own leadership capacity. Rather, individuals and groups together need to carry out leadership tasks in a manner that integrates differing perspectives and recognises interdependence and areas of shared work (Velsor & McCauley, 2004). April et al. (2004) concur that leaders must understand the relationships that exist between the parts, the dynamics of the connections, and their interdependence. It is in the ‘interaction’ that the whole becomes greater than the sum of its parts. Norgaard (1996 in April et al. 2005, p.68) further suggests that “as we move from thinking ‘I’ to thinking ‘we’, from thinking of personal goals to thinking of team goals, our organisations, communities and families are transformed”. Mintzberg & Gossling (2002 in Elmuti, 2004) refers to these modern effective managers as “collaborative managers with open perspectives on business and on life in general”. Elmuti (2004) uses his Five Dimensions Model to illustrate the characteristics which collaborative managers possess:

1. Managing self – deals with intrapersonal skills which determine how well the individual knows him or herself and how aware he is of, and controls his own feelings.
2. Managing relationships – is concerned with interpersonal or collaborative skills. These interpersonal skills involve building and maintaining relationships over periods of time with people who are different from oneself.
3. Managing organisations – deals with analytical skills, as leaders need to make rational decisions.
4. Managing context – deals with the exposure to the world’s of others within and across boundaries, as this is considered to bring insights to one’s own world and thus makes us wiser to the world.
5. Managing change – deals with personal as well as organisational change and a key factor for the success in the ever-changing world of business depends on the way in which the leader reacts to the change.
The leadership required by today’s organisation comprises many forms of transformational leadership and is based on a more personal approach to leadership; one based on ‘credibility and soul’ as described by April et al. (2005). It goes beyond people management to the inspiration of others through a highly personal state of being which includes an ability to embrace and deal with high levels of uncertainty, ambiguity and complexity (Heijnis, 2006). It requires leaders to be facilitators and catalysts for change by formulating a clear and compelling vision for followers (Bryman, 1996 in Hay & Hodgkinson, 2006) and displaying a commitment to ongoing, collaborative learning. The starting point to this kind leadership is a deep awareness of self and others (McCarthy & Garavan, 1999; April et al., 2005). Tichy & Devanna (1986 in Johnson, 2002: 243) suggest that these leaders “revitalise organisations by recognising the need for change, and enlisting the organisation in the change process”.

2.3. Leadership Development

Recent years have seen increasing interest and investment in leadership development (Cacioppe, 1998; Burke & Collins, 2005; Hay & Hodgkinson, 2006). This has been brought about by the need for effective leadership during times of rapid change in business (Cacioppe, 1998) and the change in the understanding and definitions of leadership (Boaden, 2006). Some theorists have argued that leadership development has become an organisational imperative that must be mastered if organisations are to be effective in the twenty-first century (e.g. Conger & Benjamin, 1999 in Vardiman et. al, 2006). Leskiw & Singh (2007) however argue that despite the fact that there is an increasing need to focus on leadership development initiatives; few organisations are actively growing organisational leaders as part of their business strategy. Many authors concur that long-term leadership development is often over-looked or undervalued as not being central to the success of an organisation as there is too great a focus placed on immediate short-term results and the bottom-line (e.g. Ruvolvo et. al, 2004 in Vardiman et. al, 2006; Longenecker & Fink, 2006). Longenecker and Ariss (2002 in Elmuti 2004) assert that leadership and management education is beneficial to organisations as it can help create competitive advantage for organisations through:

- exposing managers to new and better ideas which are essential in rapidly changing environments;
motivating managers to improve both their and their operation’s performance through improved skills;
- allowing time for reflection and introspection
- increasing the confidence of managers, reducing stress levels and challenging managers to think differently about their current situation;
- encouraging managers to think about their career development and setting an example for others who observe them trying to learn and improve themselves.

Despite the increased investment in leadership development by businesses (Industrial Relations, 1992 in Burke & Collins, 2005), this provisional expansion has unfortunately not been matched by sufficient empirical evidence to explain how transfer of learning may be optimally achieved (Williams et al. 2003; Burke et al., 2002, in Burke & Collins, 2005). Given the demand placed on leaders in today’s organisations, as well as the pressure to create bottom line results, the need for value-creating leadership programmes has become critical.

2.3.1. Can leadership be taught?

Historically there has been debate as to whether being a good leader is a skill, characteristic or inherent behaviour. Originally the theory that the effectiveness of a leader is determined through inherited qualities which cannot be communicated was the dominant way of thinking (Elmuti, 2004). Scholars have however come to the conclusion that leadership can be learned and taught and even if not everyone has the potential to become the most effective leaders around, every leader can still improve her or his skills through education (Elmuti, 2004).

While conducting research into leadership development best practices, Leskiw & Singh (2007) found that leaders were “made” through integrated, multi-node programs that included systematic training, top management support and action learning. Velsor & McCauley (2004) believe that “all people can learn and grow in ways that make them more effective in the various leadership roles and processes they take on”. They understand this personal development process that improves leader effectiveness to be what leader development is all about. By investigating the effectiveness of an organisation’s leadership development programme against a given set of objectives, this study will implicitly assume that leadership can be developed.
2.3.2. Approaches to leadership development

Conger (1993 in Boaden, 2006) argues that the approach to leadership development has been driven by our change in understanding and the way in which we define leadership. Fulmer (1997 in Boaden, 2006) summarised this evolution in leadership development as shown in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Listener</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme design</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Wisdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Past</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Players</td>
<td>Specialists</td>
<td>Generalists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>Style</td>
<td>Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>University campus</td>
<td>Corporate facility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: The evolving paradigm of leadership development

Velsor & McCauley (2004, p.18) assert that leader development is one aspect of a broader concept of leadership development. They define leadership development as “the expansion of the organisation’s capacity to enact the basic leadership tasks needed for collective work: setting direction, creating alignment, and maintaining commitment”. Burke & Collins (2005, p.976) describe leadership development as “a process whereby facilitators lead participants through a series of activities or mental exercises, encouraging them to reflect on learning experiences in order to promote transfer of knowledge and skills to work contexts”. Hence they argue that such programmes focus on self-awareness, changing attitudes, improving interpersonal interactions and building teams, rather than focussing on technical job skills. Velsor & McCauley (2004) suggest that today’s organisational challenges are often too complex for individual leaders to understand by themselves and thus call for individuals, groups and organisations to work collaboratively to explore, set and reset direction and maintain commitment. Figure 1 below illustrates how they view the relationship between leader development and leadership development. The horizontal axis represents development that target individuals, on the left, and development aimed at the collective on the right. The vertical axis differentiates between the development that focuses on capabilities seen as existing ‘within’
an individual or group, at the top, and development that focuses on the interdependencies ‘between’ individuals and groups, at the bottom.

The figure further suggests that the development of individuals, collectives, and connections is embedded in the culture and systems within the organisation and thereby shaped by them (Velsor & McCauley, 2004).

![Figure 1: Leadership Development Framework](image)

Given Allan Gray’s long history as an institutional investor prior to 1998, its organisational culture has been evolving, whilst its underlying fundamentals, such as adopting a ‘long term’ focus to doing business, has remained the same. A strong culture of individual accountability has always existed within the organisation as the belief is that individuals make the best decisions, but ownership for those decisions will need to be taken, good or bad. Employees have also been expected to be independent minded and avoid the ‘herd’ mentality, but take individual accountability for decisions, good or bad. Since the launch of its retail business in
1998, the culture within the organisation, in particular the retail business has been moving towards stronger collaboration amongst individuals and teams. Whilst accountability for decisions still falls to individuals, more focus is being placed on leaders connecting and recognising others through building relationships and understanding people to ensure that decisions and interventions are well explored and executed. Its leadership development initiatives are thus part of its overall business strategy and regarded as a key dimension in the future success of the business.

The executives at Allan Gray consider its organisational culture to be fairly unique and as a result have decided, as far as possible, to ‘grow its own timber’. It has a strong performance-driven culture and prefers to apply an ‘adapted’ as opposed to an ‘adopted’ approach to development initiatives. The AG LDP, and, more specifically, the 5Es model, was designed with this fundamental belief in mind. The development initiatives are thus also geared to ensuring that a culture of ongoing learning through engagement and collaboration take place. Allan Gray could thus be plotted in the upper right hand quadrant of Velsor & McCauley’s (2004) Leadership Development Framework (Figure 1) matrix.

Weiss & Molinaro (2005) also argue that organisations have relied primarily on two approaches to leadership development: the single-solution approach and the multiple-solution approach. They describe the single-solution approach as the most commonly and extensively used approach where organisations rely on one method to build leaders. The advantage of this approach is that it is easy to implement and it also ensures a level of consistency as all leaders receive the same content. They however identified some limitations that make it ineffective as a sole strategy for leadership development:

- **The over-reliance on the classroom as the primary method of developing leaders.** Mintzberg (2004 in Weiss & Molinaro, 2005) argues that leaders are not solely developed in a classroom as this form of training is seen to be too time-consuming and leaders today are too busy to attend for extended periods of time.

- **An overemphasis on generic leadership models.** Generic leadership models overemphasise personal traits and characteristics of individual leaders (Ulrich, 1999 in Weiss & Molinaro, 2005) and do not adequately address other important elements of leadership (Ready & Conger, 2003 in Weiss & Molinaro, 2005).
The multiple-solution approach utilises an array of leadership development options as it recognises the limitations associated with the single-solution approach. Organisations today have a wide range of development options at their disposal (Saratoga Institute, 1998; McCauley et al., 1998 in Weiss & Molinaro, 2005). After studying a case example of a large insurance company who implemented this multiple-solution approach, Weiss & Molinaro (2005) identified some potential limitations of this approach:

- **Lack of an overall strategy.** This results in a lack of coordination and incoherent approach to leadership development. Furthermore it also becomes challenging to see how the range of development options add value to each other.
- **Confusing among leaders.** Leaders experience the development options as a hodgepodge of discrete courses and seminars when organisations implement a multiple-solution approach in a fragmented manner.
- **Failure to generate value for the organisation.** When development options are implemented in an incoherent manner, the full investment in the initiative is not recognised.

Paauwe & Williams (2001) identified a major weakness of most corporate leadership development programmes in the past to be the acceptance of these programmes as stand alone entities and a subsequent lack of procedures and systems to integrate the programme into the strategic efforts of the organisation. There has been increased urgency for an integrated solution to leadership development efforts which has been driven by: the complex business environment, the need to deliver results on many levels, the high expectation of leaders and the need to sort through a maze of leadership development options (Weiss & Molinaro, 2005). They describe the integrated solution approach as being comprehensive, rigorous and long-term in focus and attribute three reasons summarised as the three “Ss”:

1. **Strategic.** It ensures that all development options are focussed on gaining competitive advantage for the organisation.
2. **Synergistic.** As opposed to implementing a hodgepodge of discrete development options, this approach is more synergistic as it strives to implement development options in a seamless manner so as to add value to each another.
3. **Sustainable.** It takes a long-term perspective to leadership development as it recognises that leadership development today is an evolving and iterative process that requires constant attention, focus and resources.

Ladyshewsky (2007) concurs that the use of an integrated learning strategy can promote transfer of learning outcomes into the workplace and, as a result, increase leadership and management competency. Barker-Schwartz; Boud; Boud & Edwards; Brown et al.; Graham (1991, 1988, 1999, 1989, 1996 in Ladyshewsky, 2007) emphasize the importance of an experiential focus, with coaching and reflective journaling, and goal setting to support participants in developing their leadership and management competencies. Hernez-Broome & Hughes (2004) call for leadership development practices to better integrate in the broader context of organisational business challenges and systems. While individuals may favour one or more approaches based on their personal learning style preference, only by adopting a balanced approach through integrating various learning interventions, will sustained learning be achieved (Kolb, 1984 in Talbot, 1997; Boyatzis & Renio, 1989).

In developing the AG LDP, a significant amount of emphasis was placed on ensuring that the various learning strategies were integrated and related back to the challenges experienced within the workplace. In an effort to avoid the limitations associated with a single solution approach, such as the overemphasis on generic leadership models and over-reliance on classroom style training as described by Weiss & Molinaro (2005) earlier, a multiple solution approach was decided upon. Due consideration was however given to some of the possible pitfalls and common errors in the adoption of such an approach and strategies were implemented to overcome them.

3. **The Allan Gray Leadership Development Programme (AG LDP)**

Allan Gray has experienced rapid change and growth over the past few years, particularly in the retail side of the business as discussed earlier. This has emphasized the critical need for strong leadership within the organisation as up until only a couple of years ago, there has been little leadership infrastructure and experience in place. In an effort to answer this call, the Allan Gray executives, in consultation with middle and senior management, developed a leadership model
called “The 5Es” (Energy, Engagement, Edge, Execute, and Example). This has formed the foundation of the AG LDP and represent how leaders are expected to lead across all levels within the organisation.

The 5Es act interdependently (Figure 2) and allow for simple clarification of the expectation from leaders within Allan Gray. The model combines high performance and values, which are the two cornerstones of the Allan Gray culture. It is recognised that each leader has a different personality profile and will therefore action the 5Es in their unique way. One of the Es, Example, is however not negotiable and it is expected that successful leaders will be high performers in at least two of the other Es.

![Figure 2: The Allan Gray 5Es Leadership Model](image-url)
Some key objectives of the programme include:

- Increasing the depth of leadership understanding at all levels
- Developing a consistent pipeline of highly effective leaders
- Growing and exciting leaders
- Enhancing the engagement levels of staff
- Creating an environment where staff aspire to become leaders

The AG LDP blends a combination of in-house and custom designed initiatives predominantly aimed at educating leaders at all levels about the 5Es model. A custom designed programme called the Management Development Programme (MDP) aimed at transferring critical management skills to middle managers has also recently been added to the AG LDP. Formal offerings such as MBAs, EMBAs and executive education at the world’s top business schools aimed at middle, senior and executive managers, also form part of Allan Gray’s overall leadership development offerings, but these initiatives will not form part of this study.

### 3.1. The 5Es Leadership Model

#### 3.1.1. Energy

This dimension involves relishing challenges, exuding enthusiasm and excitement about the goal; and to lift and inspire people to persevere when times are uncertain and demanding. It calls for leaders to:

- Maintain high levels of positive energy and resilience and knowing when to ‘refuel’ when required.
- Articulate a compelling and stretching vision for the team.
- Recognize and celebrate successes.
- Persist and persevere in the face of adversity.

#### 3.1.2. Engagement

The engagement dimension of the model refers to the understanding, connecting, recognizing and growing of the people around you. It calls for leaders to:
- Understand the strengths and weaknesses of people and to appropriately match people to roles.
- Engage in ongoing coaching and development of employees.
- Show appreciation for each person’s contribution and efforts.
- Empower and create opportunities for individuals to show initiative and to develop themselves.

### 3.1.3. Edge

This dimension refers to the ability and courage of a leader to make tough decisions at the right time, and to subsequently take accountability for those decisions. It calls for leaders to:

- Always base their decisions on the Allan Gray business principles and values.
- Carefully judge when to make a critical decision, when not to, and when to consult more widely, and to take responsibility for these decisions.
- Be comfortable making unpopular decisions in an effort to uphold standards at all times.
- Maintain an open and enquiring mind, and create and maintain a culture of ongoing learning.

### 3.1.4. Execute

This dimension involves getting things done despite resistance, chaos, or unexpected obstacles. It thus calls for leaders to:

- Deliver on promises.
- Focus on outcomes, not effort.
- Always seek new, effective and better ways of doing things.
- Organize, plan and find resources to get things done.
- Hold others accountable for their delivery and ensure that regular feedback loops are maintained.

### 3.1.5. Example

Leading by example and consistently living out the organisation’s values is regarded as the non-negotiable dimension of the leadership model. It asks leaders to:
- Think about the behaviours that they want to role-model and to be consistent in practicing them.
- Coach from experience – share their own journey with their employees to demonstrate and build trust.
- Only make demands of others that they are prepared to make of themselves.

Strong similarities can be drawn between the Allan Gray 5Es leadership model and what Elmuti (2004), discussed earlier, describes as the Five Dimensions Model which he uses to describe the characteristics that modern day, collaborative managers should possess. These comparisons are illustrated in Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elmuti’s Five Dimension Model</th>
<th>Allan Gray 5Es Leadership Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing self</td>
<td>Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing relationships</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing organisations</td>
<td>Edge / Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing context</td>
<td>Example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing change</td>
<td>Execution / Edge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Comparisons between the Elmuti (2004) Five Dimensions Model and the Allan Gray 5Es Leadership Model

3.2. Design & Delivery

The programme has a modular design, consisting of six 2-3 day modules, spaced approximately two months apart over one year and is normally held offsite (Table 6). Practical and reflective exercises and projects are allocated to participants during the ‘inter-modular’ period with half to full day, ‘refresher’ sessions held half way between modules. A combination of internal and external vendors is used to facilitate the various sessions. Theory is taught using a wide variety of teaching methods which include standard lecture type sessions, interactive workshops, group work, open discussions as well as active and experiential games and exercises. This is in keeping with the integrated learning strategy which as discussed earlier, is meticulous, comprehensive and long-term in focus (Weiss & Molinaro, 2005); characteristics which strongly resemble the Allan Gray culture and core philosophy. There is a strong promotion of the transfer
of learning outcomes into the workplace (Ladyshewsky, 2007) which contributes strongly towards an increase in leadership and management competency.

Each module is aimed at equipping the participants with the basic tools, behaviours and insights which form the foundation of the 5Es model. The content has been carefully selected and/or formulated to match the requirements of each of the ‘E’s of the model. A more detailed description of the content covered in the programme is attached as **Appendix 6.7**.

Given that this is the first implementation of the programme, further modules will be added to the programme and the view is to have the programme run into second and third years, with each year’s learning methodology mirroring a tertiary education approach such as the move from ‘Under-Graduate’ to ‘Honours’ and then on to ‘Masters’ level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Content and Aims</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Energy</td>
<td>Principle centred, character based, inside-out approach to personal effectives</td>
<td>• Based on the ‘7 Habits of Highly Effective People’ book, this module explores pro-activity, identifying ones mission, effective time management, interpersonal skills and how to achieve sustainable performance</td>
<td>Combination of video-based, facilitator driven discussions and includes a significant amount of reflection and skills application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Engagement</td>
<td>Mastering flexible leadership style application when growing and individual’s competency and commitment levels</td>
<td>• Based on the Gallup Organisation’s well researched Q12 climate survey, this module shows how to maximise those factors that attract and retain top performers</td>
<td>Facilitated interactive workshop • Role-plays based on leaders’ own case study challenges, with video camera based feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Edge</td>
<td>Honing decision-making skills to facilitate easier problem investigation and ultimately better problem solving ability</td>
<td>• Participants are exposed to analytical and systemic thinking skills</td>
<td>Progression from simple to more complex tools within a practical context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 &amp; 5 Execution</td>
<td>Learning the 4 Disciplines of Execution aimed at creating sustained performance</td>
<td>• Participants learn about focus, what measures to focus on, how to reinforce the message and how to achieve optimal results. • How to manage diverse staff and situations appropriately, utilising Situational Leadership skills.</td>
<td>Facilitated interactive workshop • Leaders use current employee performance contracts as starting points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning the approach to important people practices from an HR and IR perspective.</td>
<td>• Participants learn about the organisation’s approach to: Recruitment &amp; Selection; Performance Management; Industrial Relations</td>
<td>Presentations • Test knowledge integration via case studies • Interview role-plays with feedback triads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Example</td>
<td>Learning to lead by example using the organisation’s values and leadership model as guidance.</td>
<td>• Participants discuss with senior managers, what it means to be a leader and get an in-depth overview of the organisation’s 5Es leadership model.</td>
<td>Experiential team-build and personality profiling • Sharing of personal experiences • Q&amp;A session with senior managers from within the organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Modular design of the AG 5Es LDP
4. Methodology

4.1. Research Design

A combination of quantitative and qualitative methods was used in this study. A more quantitative or positivist (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001) approach was used to confirm the hypothesis that the AG LDP has to date been effective in developing leadership in line with Allan Gray's intentions.

To explore leadership development on the course and describe how the AG LDP contributes towards developing the leadership required by today’s organisation, a qualitative or constructivist (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001) approach using grounded theory methodology was used. Through conducting an extensive literature review, a view of the type of leadership required by today’s organisation was explored and identified. The content used and the approach adopted in delivering the AG LDP was then observed and compared to the theory identified from the literature review.

Quantitative research is used to measure, describe, explain and predict phenomena, confirming or predicting on the basis of the outcome. In contrast, qualitative studies study phenomena in their natural setting in all their complexity without simplifying observations (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001). Researchers become an instrument of the research process as it is their ability to interpret and make sense of the observations that leads to greater understanding (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001). Thus qualitative or constructivist research does not seek a single truth but rather acknowledges the existence of multiple perspectives.

Grounded theory is “theory building” (Saunders et al., 2003: 93) and explicitly emergent, where theory emerges from data generated through observation. In building up theory, the process of data collection and observation is iterative in that data lead to predictions; these are tested through further observation leading to focussed data collection and so on.
4.2. Data Collection

In this study, different questionnaires for first line leaders were used across a twelve to eighteen month period of the Allan Gray Leadership Development Programme. The reason for these varied questionnaires was to measure the various dimensions involved in the Kirkpatrick model, such as the initial reactions immediately after each intervention, as well as learning and transferring of learning during and after the completion of the programme. These leaders had not self-selected onto the programme, but were required to attend as a result of the leadership roles they fulfilled within the organisation. The programme was designed by the Human Resources Department in consultation with the Allan Gray executives. There were 20 participants in this cohort and each of them completed the programme, although certain interventions were not always attended by all due to leave of absence. There was one withdrawal shortly after the completion of the programme due to a role change within the organisation; however the data includes responses from this individual. These 20 participants consisted of 10 men and 10 women representing a 50 percent split of men to women. The greater proportion of participants on the programme (55%) had completed a national diploma, degree or post graduate degree prior to joining the programme as illustrated in Figure 3. Furthermore, there was good representation from all the major business units within Allan Gray’s Retail division which suggests that the quality of the interactions should be more diverse and less ‘silo’ driven, which could enhance the quality of the learning amongst the participants in the programme.

Post-graduate degree 10%

Degree / Diploma 45%

Grade 12 45%

Figure 3: Level of prior education of programme participants
Program content was centred on Allan Gray’s ‘5Es Leadership Model’ discussed earlier in this paper. An integrated approach consisting of lectures, workshops, experiential activities and work based projects was adopted throughout the programme. Interventions were spaced approximately six weeks apart. The spacing and timing of the various interventions was purposeful to minimise disruption in the work place and to provide participants with time to integrate learning and complete their work based assignments.

Various questionnaires were completed by participants:

- after each intervention - to measure the ‘reactions’ or satisfaction of participants to the training or learning experience: subject matter, schedules, facilities, relevance and practicability of applying the learning (Kirkpatrick, 1998);
- during the course of the programme - to measure the ‘learning’ in terms of increased knowledge, skills or intellectual capability and the extent of advancement or change in the participants; and
- after the completion of the programme - to measure the extent of to which the participants applied the learning and changed their behaviour and this can be immediately and several months after the completion of the programme.

Due to timing and requirements of this study, ‘after completion of the programme’, indicates two to four weeks post the completion of the programme. The various questionnaire instruments look to measure the impact of the course content on leadership development, using the 5Es leadership model as a framework. Most questionnaires were quantitative in nature, using a 1-10 rating scale, where 1 indicates a negative outcome and 10 indicates a positive result according to the objectives of the various learning interventions in the programme. Certain questionnaires invited participants to add any additional qualitative thoughts and ideas about the programme and the learning gained, which would also be captured along with the quantitative responses. The participants were informed upfront about the confidentiality of the responses and were instructed not to disclose their names or sign the questionnaires. Furthermore, the questionnaires were handed in or collected in such a way that there was no way to identify the person who completed them. This approach is supported by Kirkpatrick (1998) when he argues that if people are required to sign their response forms and as a result, have a fear of being critical, then their feedback will not necessarily be ‘honest’. Completed questionnaires were captured on to a central excel database by and experienced Human Resource Administrator.
For most questionnaires, a response rate in the excess of 90% of people who attended the various interventions was achieved. Only descriptive analyses were undertaken given the sample size.

### 4.3. Data Analysis

The data gathered during and post the various learning interventions from the 5Es programme, was analysed and measured against a set of objectives and outcomes using the Kirkpatrick (1994) model which is used to measure the effectiveness of training interventions. The model suggests a pyramid of four levels of evaluations as illustrated in Figure 4, with each consecutive level increasing the rigor and thoroughness of the evaluation (Leskiw & Singh, 2007). Given the integrated nature of the various interventions, as well as the ‘newness’ of the programme, evaluation of the programme using this model allows one to possibly identify specific areas of weakness or gaps that exist; and forms the basis for future adjustments to the programme.

Allan Gray’s core philosophy is about adopting a long-term approach to all aspects within business, including leadership development. As many authors argue (e.g. Ruvolvo et. al, 2004 in Vardiman et. al, 2006; Longenecker & Fink, 2006), long-term leadership is often over-looked and as a core part of a business given the focus on short-term ‘bottom-line’ results. This model supports the detailed level of evaluation required, looking at the effectiveness of the various interventions against the required outcomes, at more than one level, which allows for the flexibility of making adjustments to certain parts of the programme, where required, over forthcoming years as opposed to having to adopt an ‘all or nothing’ approach.
**Level 1 - Reactions**

This level measures how leaders in a training programme react to the programme and attempts to answer questions regarding the leaders’ perceptions – Did they like it? Was the material relevant to their work? According to Kirkpatrick (1994), every program should at least be evaluated at this level to provide for the improvement of a training intervention. Feedback forms based on subjective personal reaction to the training experience and post training surveys or questionnaires are good examples of evaluation tools at this level. The key question here is whether participants give honest responses. Kirkpatrick (1998) suggests that feedback forms should not be signed and handed in or collected in a way that there is a way to identify the person who completed them. He further argues that if this is made clear to participants, honest responses can be obtained. Furthermore, the participants’ responses to the programme have important consequences for learning (level two). Although a positive initial response does not guarantee learning, a negative reaction almost certainly reduces its possibility (Winfrey, 1999).

**Level 2 – Learning**

Assessing at this level moves the evaluation beyond the leaders’ satisfaction and attempts to assess the extent to which leaders have advanced in skills, knowledge or attitude.
Measurement at this level is more difficult than the reaction level (Level 1), as it requires more investment and thought. Methods include formal and informal testing, team assessment before and after the training to determine the amount of learning that has occurred (Winfrey, 1999). More importantly, methods of assessment need to be closely related to the aims of the learning and is less easy for more complex learning such as attitudinal development, which is famously difficult to assess (Kirkpatrick, 1998).

**Level 3 – Transfer / Behaviour**

This level involves the evaluation of how the leaders’ behaviour actually changes on the job as a result of their participation in the leadership development program (Leskiw & Singh, 2007). Evaluating at this level attempts to answer the questions – Are the newly acquired skills, knowledge, or attitude being used in the everyday environment of the leader? Were the relevant skills and knowledge used? Is the participant aware of their change in behaviour, knowledge or skills level? (Kirkpatrick, 1998) The participant’s input is a relevant indicator, but is also subjective, and thus needs to be measured in a consistent, defined way. 360 degree feedback at this level of evaluation is a useful tool and it need not be used before training, because respondents can make a judgment as to the change after the training and this can be analysed for groups of respondents and participants. Furthermore, self assessment can also be useful when criteria and measurement is carefully designed (Kirkpatrick, 1998). Measuring at this level is however difficult as it is often impossible to predict when the change in behaviour will occur, and thus requires important decisions in terms of when to evaluate, how often to evaluate as well as how to evaluate (Winfrey, 1999).

**Level 4 – Results**

The final and most comprehensive level of evaluation in the model proposes to evaluate the link of these changed behaviours to organisational performance by reviewing the impact of the learning has on actual organisational results (Leskiw & Singh, 2007). Frequently thought of as the bottom line, this level measures the successes of the program in terms that managers and executives can understand – increased production, improved quality, increased sales and even higher profits. Determining results in financial terms is however difficult to measure, and is hard to link directly with development programs (Winfrey, 1999). Kirkpatrick (1998) argues that there are clearly situations in which Level 4 evaluations are not appropriate assessments to use. He
suggests that it is important primarily to ascertain whether the training is likely to have a detectable effect on business results and unless the training is linked to clear business outcomes, there is no reason for a Level 4 evaluation. He also cautions against using this level of evaluation if the training contains material requires frequent changes as it might be difficult to get meaningful results.

Given the short period of time between the completion of the programme and the timing of this study, as well as the shortage of ‘bottom line’ data, a limited Level 4 evaluation was done. Performance Appraisal (PA) ratings prior to the start of the programme (baseline rating) were taken and compared to the PA ratings for participants shortly prior to completion of the programme (mid-point rating) as well as after completion of the programme (final rating). The ‘final’ ratings have not yet been finalised by the organisation and is thus considered as ‘preliminary final ratings’. PAs are conducted twice a year within Allan Gray, although only the final rating is used to determine performance bonuses. PAs serve to evaluate the personal progress of an employee against an agreed set of objectives and focus areas, which vary according to the role fulfilled within the organisation. The rating scales are as illustrated in Table 7 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.0-4</td>
<td>Exceptional performance against expected outcome/s and standard/s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0-2.9</td>
<td>Performance exceeds expected outcome/s and standard/s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0-1.9</td>
<td>Performance meets most of the expected outcomes and standards, but requires improvement in some areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-0.9</td>
<td>Performance well below expected outcome/s and standard/s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 7: Allan Gray Performance Appraisal rating scales*

The findings through this process will be used to either confirm or reject the hypothesis that ‘The AG LDP has to date been effective in developing leadership in line with the organisation’s intentions.’
4.4. Limitations

- The evaluation process took place during and shortly after the completion of the programme. Participants might not have had enough time to reflect on and gain from the learning acquired in the programme. As a result, the full impact of the programme proved to be more challenging to observe and measure.
- The process of evaluating the effectiveness of the AG LDP was largely based on subjective assessments as participants in most cases were asked to rate their view of their progress made since the start of the programme. There was thus not any true external validation of these subjective assessments. A conscious effort was thus made to remain objective and the researcher has attempted to fully explain the steps taken to ensure transparency in reporting.
- The ‘newness’ of the programme lent itself to changes being made along the way which placed limitations on the data available for the study.
- There was a limited availability of consistent before and after evaluation data which could have added a stronger element of validity to the study.
- The participants involved in the study did not self select to attend the programme. The motivation and energy to actively participate in the training and be open to learning might have been stronger for certain individuals compared to others who would not have wanted to participate if they had a choice. This may have impacted on the findings in the study.
- The study focuses on the one and only group of participants who attended the programme thus far. Given that all first line leaders attended the programme, as well as the time and resource constraints of this study, it was not possible to obtain a control group in this organisational study. The positive rating bias was however controlled by assuring participants of confidentiality and providing them with information about the evaluation process.
- Given the nature of the training, being leadership development where a significant part of the growth and development experienced is personal, variables such as the participants’ ages and work experience, might have influenced the data (Kirkpatrick, 1998).
5. Findings and discussion

5.1. Did the AG LDP develop participants’ leadership capabilities?

5.1.1 Level 1 - Reactions

Participants were asked to rate and provide feedback on the facilitator and programme through the completion of feedback forms. Feedback forms for three different workshops were obtained and observed. All three workshops were run by different facilitators. This method of obtaining Level 1 data is in line with Kirkpatrick’s (1998) recommendations, as discussed earlier. Figure 5A, 5B, and 5C below, graphically illustrate the various facilitator; programme and workshop content ratings. Slightly different questions were asked for the ‘Analytical Skills’ and ‘Coaching Skills’ interventions as it was adjusted by the Human Resources Department after the first of the three, ‘7 Habits’, workshop was conducted. This was done to include some questions about learning, which will be discussed in ‘Level 2’. It is clear from this feedback that of the three training interventions evaluated at this level, the Analytical Skills workshop (Figure 5A) has the higher proportion of lower scores. Despite the facilitator being rated very highly in terms of her ‘knowledge of the topic’, her ‘ability to explain concepts’ and ‘integrate content’ were the dimensions attracting the greatest criticism from participants. Given the nature of this workshop, the content would have a naturally higher level of complexity for leaders at this level as it involves the teaching of analytical and system thinking skills and this is validated to a certain degree by the scores given for the ‘workshop content’ component of the evaluation for this workshop. It is also possible that the level at which the content was pitched in these sessions was not necessarily appropriate for the audience and certain adjustments to the content could yield better results in future.
Some of the individuals' quotes stated on the feedback forms were:

“At most times I was confused as to what to do. Maybe psychology jargon.”

“Some terms may have been too technical.”

“Struggled to understand what questions were being asked.”

“Did not further explain difficult concepts.”

“At times the info was too technical and could not necessarily always be linked back to work.”

“Expected more in terms of structure.”

“I felt lost at times. Didn’t relate to her level of thinking.”
“Very high level and was not explained nicely.”

These quotes validate some of the assumptions around the level at which the content was pitched and the ability of the facilitator to clearly explain and bring across the relevant concepts.

The ‘7 Habits’ and ‘Coaching Skills’ training interventions were, however, rated very highly in terms of both facilitator and programme feedback/content by the participants of the programme who attended these specific training interventions (Figures 5B & 5C). An interesting observation from the ‘7 Habits’ workshop was that 100 percent of participants rated the ‘programme workload’ as ‘good’, whilst every other dimension of this intervention was rated higher (‘very good’ or ‘excellent’). This indicates that although the participants had a high regard for the facilitator and the programme content, they thought that the workload associated with this particular intervention was fairly high. This might have implications on their capacity to fulfil some of the other requirements of the programme or their day-to-day jobs.

Figure 5B: 7 Habits workshop feedback
No additional comments about the facilitator or programme and workshop content were given as part of the ‘7 Habits’ workshop, but some of the comments provided by participants of the ‘Coaching Skills’ workshop were as follows:

“Very good understanding of concepts which led to both being great.”

“She explained concepts well.”

“Extremely polite & approachable - a good coach!”

“She showed real passion for the coaching topic, well prepared and ensured everyone was actively involved.”

“Content was all integrated well.”

“Good logical flow.”

“Content simple, understandable, something you can easily relate to and make use of immediately.”

“By doing the role plays I was able to practice beforehand in a safe environment.”

“Nice plan to move ahead.”

These comments further reinforce the high ratings received for the facilitator and workshop content for this intervention (Figure 5C). It further indicates a strong appreciation for the flow and integration of the content, by the facilitator, as well as the ability and ease of use of the learning gained.
5.1.2 Level 2 - Learning

As discussed earlier, this level measures the learning of knowledge, skills and attitudes of participants. As part of the feedback forms completed immediately after the training intervention, some questions about learning from the intervention/workshop were asked. Again, feedback forms for only two interventions were observed. The reason for this, as discussed earlier, was that these questions were only included by the Human Resources Department after the ‘7 Habits’ intervention. The rating scores from the two interventions are illustrated and compared in Figure 6. Whilst neither of the two interventions were rated as not having met the expectations, the scores for the ‘Coaching Skills’ intervention are much better than those from the ‘Analytical Skills’. Whilst there was a fairly high proportion of people rated the learning according to the predefined questions as ‘satisfying’, none of them rated any questions lower than ‘good’ for the ‘Coaching Skills’, with the highest proportion of people rating the ‘Coaching Skills’ programme as ‘excellent’. A relationship between the
‘Level 1’ scores discussed earlier and these ‘Level 2’ ratings can be observed – The lower ‘Level 1’ ratings appears to have resulted in a lower level of learning. The converse similarly seems true where higher facilitator and workshop content scores from ‘Level 1’, appears to have transformed into a higher level of perceived learning by the participants.

![Bar Chart]

Figure 6: Learning feedback – Analytical Skills versus Coaching skills workshop

Some of the most important things learnt through these workshops, as stated by the participants were:

“How to provide negative feedback, how to inspire and motivate a team.”

“How to conduct a more effective one on one or team session.”

“Coaching is a two way process - the manager does not do all the feedback but both manager & employee must participate.”
“Role playing highlighted gaps in my personality that I would need to address before trying to help others.”

“The benefit of focussing on the competency rather than just key result areas is that it will ensure long term sustained improvement.”

“The relevance and importance of digging deeper and not taking things at face value.”

“The ability to question the ‘not so obvious’ reasons.”

“Structure your approach to a problem; don’t make snap decisions, even when a decision needs to be made quickly.”

“Self awareness, breaking down your thinking patterns.”

Most of these comments refer to the understanding, insight and the tools acquired, which is partly what these workshops were designed to develop within the participants. One would not expect too deep a level of insight at this point, given that these comments were given as part of the feedback immediately after the completion of the relevant training intervention.

At the end of the programme, participants were asked a series of questions about the level of confidence in the knowledge and skills (related to the 5Es model) they gained from their participation in the programme. 70% of participants rated at least ≥7 out of 10 for each question (Figure 7), suggesting that they felt very confident about most of the knowledge aspects through the programme. Most participants felt most confident about: (i) running a Q12 engagement session; (ii) explaining the 7 habits of highly effective people to someone; and (iii) explaining the 5Es leadership model without referring to any material. Conversely, they felt least confident about: (i) explaining the basic meaning behind the 4 disciplines of execution; (ii) applying the poor performance management steps; and (iii) explaining the Situation Leadership model to someone.
These findings suggest that the larger proportion of participants felt confident about the knowledge and skills they learnt through the learning interventions, as measured against the given aspects related to the 5Es leadership model. This would suggest that participants have learned what was intended to be taught and would have absorbed and know how to use the learning material. This would form the foundation to possible success on the next level of evaluation (‘Transfer’) of the Kirkpatrick (1998) model.

5.1.3 Level 3 – Transfer / Behaviour

When participants were asked to rate the degree of success they had in applying various behaviours and skills as a result of their participation in the programme, the greater proportion indicated that they have had a high degree of success in applying most of these behaviours and skills (Figure 8). A fair proportion of participants rated that they have had a moderate degree of success in applying certain skills and behaviours. Most noticeably, the use of the ‘7 Habits’ for themselves and sharing these habits with their staff, the use of the four disciplines of execution, as well as analytical thinking skills, fell into this category. A
small proportion (<12% in all cases) rated that they have had little to no success in applying
the various skills gained through the programme, whilst every participant agreed to have
had opportunities to use these skills.

![Figure 8: Proportional split of scores per behaviour or skill](image)

Participants were also asked to rate the three behaviours, ideas or skills which they most
frequently used as a result of their attendance in the programme. The results were then
mapped onto a corresponding “spidergram” which provided a picture of the participants’
responses. This type of graphical illustration displays how certain behaviours were rated
significantly more dominant than others. The results show that (i) engagement (15.52%); (ii)
coaching (13.79%); and (iii) being pro-active (13.79%), were the most frequently used skills
and behaviours, as illustrated in Figure 9A.
After categorising the behaviours, skills or ideas which were rated as the top 3 most frequently used, into the dimensions of the 5Es model, it appears that the most useful of them are associated with the ‘Energy’ (44%), ‘Engagement’ (34%) and ‘Example’ dimensions of the model as illustrated in Figure 9B. None of the top 3 skills and ideas used by each participant are associated with the ‘Edge’ dimension, whilst ‘Execution’ was only listed 3% of the time.
Findings suggest that most participants feel confident that the participation in the programme has broadly increased their knowledge and understanding of the five dimensions of the 5Es leadership model. Skills and behaviours associated with ‘engagement’ and ‘energy’ in particular have not only been applied with a significant amount of success, but each dimension has also been rated as one of the top three most frequently used to date. Furthermore, it is interesting that whilst the skills and behaviours associated with the ‘execution’ dimension of the leadership model was rated as less frequently used, it received one of the highest ratings by participants in terms of success in terms application. Similarly, the skills and behaviours associated with the ‘energy’ dimension was rated as the most frequently used, but has been applied with a lower degree of success by the participants of the programme.

Participants were asked to rate the degree of change in their own job behaviour for eleven predefined areas, as a result of attending the programme (Figure 10). All participants considered ‘increased motivation to be a leader’ and ‘greater clarity on own goals’ as the areas where they experienced the most significant change. One participant commented that...
“I felt more competent to carry through my leadership role and hence has increased my confidence”, whilst another commented that “I see myself differently now. I know that I do not need to know all the answers and that I can seek advice” when they were asked to identify some other personal changes that have occurred as a result of participation in the programme.

A large proportion (≥90%) of participants also cited ‘more commitment to the organisation’; ‘increased energy levels (own)’; feeling in control’; and ‘better team communication and trust’ as also having changed significantly as a result of attending the programme. The areas having the lowest proportion of people experiencing a significant change in their own job behaviour were ‘more effective leadership style’ (70%); ‘more proactive’ (82%); and ‘enhanced interpersonal relationships’ (85%), whilst ‘more effective leadership style’ and ‘more proactive’ had the highest proportion of participants experiencing minimal to no change in their own job behaviour, with 10% and 9% respectively.

---

**Figure 10: Change in participants’ own job behaviour**
These findings suggest that most participants experienced a significant change in their own job behaviour in terms of these eleven areas listed, even though certain areas were highlighted as having significantly changed more than others.

### 5.1.4 Level 4 – Results

As discussed earlier, the availability of Level 4 data was limited. PA ratings for participants in the programme were taken for the year prior to the commencement of the programme (baseline rating) and compared to the ratings shortly prior to the completion of the programme (mid-point), as well as the ratings after completion of the programme (final ratings). Ratings for four participants were excluded as they did not have a baseline rating and thus did not have a basis for comparison. A further three participants were excluded as a result of not having a final rating. The reasons for the absence of some of these baseline and final ratings are attributed to a participant having joined the organisation too late to have received a ‘baseline’ PA rating, or leaving the organisation before receiving a ‘final’ PA rating. The base, mid-point and final ratings for 13 of the participants were thus observed and illustrated in Figure 11.

![Figure 11: Performance Appraisal ratings for 13 participants](image-url)
There is no evidence of sustained improvement in the mean scores for the group. Only 23 percent (3/13) of participants experienced a consistent increase in ratings, year-on-year, whilst 46 percent (6/13) had an increase in ratings when comparing the baseline to the final (preliminary) ratings. Some sustained positive and negative results from certain individuals can be observed. The top three most improved attendees and those whose performance declined are outlined in Table 6 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Mid-point</th>
<th>Final (Preliminary)</th>
<th>% change from Baseline to Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person H</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>68.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person I</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>45.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person A</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person D</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>-35.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person G</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>-17.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person M</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>-12.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Movement in scores for the 3 most improved and declined

Based on a limited Level 4 evaluation of the AG 5Es LDP, findings at this level of the evaluation suggest that although certain individuals have shown some drastic positive improvement, others have declined in performance, as measured by the PA ratings scores. There is thus no real evidence that support the fact that the participation in programme has improved the performance of the group of attendees of the programme, using the individuals’ PA ratings.

It should however be noted that any rating equal to 2 or above, represents very good performance against the very high standard of performance required within the organisation. The baseline mean of 2.4 with a small difference between the best and lowest scorers (represented by the 0.28 standard deviation) thus represents a fairly high starting point for the participants to improve and excel from.
5.2. Does the AG LDP effectively provide leadership skills and capabilities required by today’s organisation?

Findings show that participants develop the skills, behaviours and insights linked to effective leadership. The participants clearly demonstrate development of the awareness of self through greater clarification of personal goals and values; interpersonal or collaborative skills through an appreciation and the engagement of others; a level of comfort in making difficult and rational decisions through the development of strong analytical and decision making skills; the ability to get things done despite the chaos and obstacles associated with today’s fast changing and uncertain business environments; and a deep understanding and appreciation for leading by example. All of these have clearly been identified in the literature as important dimensions of the leadership required by today’s modern organisation.

Allan Gray is developing leaders who fulfil the criteria of ‘modern day’ leaders as they intended to be able to integrate differing perspectives and recognise interdependence and areas of shared work (Velsor & McCauley, 2004). They also are “collaborative managers with open perspectives on business and on life in general” (Mintzberg & Gossling, 2002 in Elmuti, 2004). These leaders are facilitative and catalysts for change followers (Bryman, 1996 in Hay & Hodgkinson, 2006) and display a commitment to ongoing, collaborative learning. This leadership goes beyond people management to the inspiration of others through a highly personal state of being which includes an ability to embrace and deal with high levels of uncertainty, ambiguity and complexity.

5.3. Conclusion

Using the Kirkpatrick (1998) model, the review of the AG LDP 5Es demonstrated an increase in the various competencies linked to the 5Es leadership model. While the sample size is small and only made up of one group, as well as it being the first group to have participated in the programme, the findings from the programme were positive. This was particularly so with the learning and transferring of learning through and after completion of the programme. Given the increased investment in leadership development (Cacioppe, 1998; Burke & Collins, 2005; Hay & Hodgkinson, 2006), which often happens without
sufficient integration with the business strategy, this study suggests there was a positive outcome for the programme participants in terms of learning and the development of key leadership skills and competencies required within Allan Gray and, more broadly, in today’s complex, uncertain and fast paced environments.

Participants reported noteworthy learning outcomes and changes in job behaviour in a range of areas. As reported by participants, a deeper understanding of the leadership principles and practices was gained through their attendance in the programme. The first and most fundamental of these was the dimension of managing self, which involves leaders dealing with their own personalities before learning to organise and control the resources of the organisation (Elmuti, 2004). Through the interventions based on Stephen Covey’s ‘7 Habits of Highly Effective People’, participants reported an increase in their energy levels and motivation to be leaders, as they found greater clarity in their own goals as individuals.

There was a clear indication that participants increased their ability to apply a more flexible leadership style as part of growing the competencies of them as individuals. This has resulted in an improvement in their interpersonal and collaborative skills at work. The tools and skills gained through the Coaching, Situational Leadership and Q12 Engagement interventions have contributed strongly towards developing better levels of communication and trust between leaders and their teams. This has been achieved through the use of dialogue to engage, collaborate and build trust in their relationships with others.

The evidence suggests that through the sharing of insights and personal experiences as well as having Q & A sessions with senior executives from the organisation, the leadership model was further contextualised, allowing the participants to relate more strongly to the organisation’s approach to leadership. This could form the basis for motivating and inspiring participants to adopt a ‘leading by example’ approach which is the non-negotiable aspect of leadership within the organisation.

Given the nature of the responsibilities of first line leaders, execution or implementation becomes important as it is about ‘getting things done’ through resistance, chaos and unexpected obstacles. Allan Gray has a high performance and results driven culture so one would expect to see more emphasis on outcomes and results. Whilst the participants did not report this as a negative dimension, the level of learning in this dimension left room for
improvement in future and would be worthwhile reviewing the interventions currently used to develop these skills.

Whilst not a negative result in absolute terms, there was however, less evidence of learning and change in job behaviour which relates to the analytical and decision making aspects. In the absence of effective analytical and decision-making tools, factors such as overconfidence, optimism, selective perception, overreaction to chance events and personal experience, could strongly affect decision-making (Elmuti, 2004). Given the participants’ limited authority to make broader business decisions, they have less of a critical need for analytical and decision making skills compared to the intrapersonal and interpersonal aspects which are crucial to their day-to-day effectiveness. However, given the rate at which change happens within organisations today, those who react swiftly to these changing conditions will make better leaders and managers (Elmuti, 2004). It is thus important to review the areas of ineffectiveness within these interventions to ensure that analytical and decision-making skills are more prominently and effectively developed. This also becomes critical when attempting to equip these first line leaders with the necessary skills for more senior leadership positions within the organisation.

There is little evidence to suggest that there has been an equally positive result in terms of organisational performance to date. This could possibly be explained by the absence of sufficient ‘bottom line’ data, and the difficulty in linking hard, tangible, business results to development programmes of this nature (Winfrey, 1999). It is also important to note that this has been the first attempt at leadership development within the organisation and thus it requires some frequent changes and adjustments to the programme to find the most effective combination of learning content and interventions to achieve the desired results (Kirkpatrick, 1998).

In turning to the qualitative comments about the design and content of the programme and learning outcomes, there is strong evidence to suggest that there has been a positive transfer of learning taking place in the organisation. This is relevant to the majority of participants, despite the fact that the attendance to the programme was not voluntary.

The organisation was and is very committed to the development of its leaders for future success, making large investments in training and development and having the involvement
of senior executives presenting during certain modules within the programme. Participants, however, noted that high workloads and pressures influenced the ability to pursue their learning to the extent that they would have liked. This finding has been noted in previous studies (Sambrook & Stewart, 2000; Beling et al., 2004, in Ladyshewsky, 2007).

An important outcome of any leadership development programme should be the transfer of training and learning to the work environment (Ladyshewsky, 2007). This study has shown that the use of an integrated learning strategy can elevate leadership and management competencies and promote the transfer of learning outcomes into the work place. Making leadership development a strategic business imperative and aligning business objectives to leadership development efforts appears to support participants in developing their leadership competency in line with the organisation’s preferred approach to leadership.
6. Appendices

6.1. Workshop Feedback Questionnaire: Analytical and Coaching Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>1 - Did not meet expectations</th>
<th>2 - Satisfying</th>
<th>3 - Good</th>
<th>4 - Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Facilitator's Profile</td>
<td>Knowledge of topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offer everybody equal opportunity in participate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organised, well prepared and punctual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to explain concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Polite, non-judgemental, approachable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to integrate content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop content</td>
<td>The workload was reasonable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The content presented met my expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Edge objectives were met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The level at which the content was pitched was right for me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2. Workshop feedback Questionnaire: 7 Habits of Highly Effective People

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Facilitator's Profile</td>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creating an effective learning environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of the material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to involve participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of relevant examples and stories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitation &amp; preparation skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to explain conceptual learning environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate time was provided for all parts of the material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


6.3. Learning Feedback Questionnaire: Analytical and Coaching Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>1 - Did not meet expectations</th>
<th>2 - Satisfying</th>
<th>3 - Good</th>
<th>4 - Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>I acquired new insights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The new things I learnt will help me be more effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have been able to identify behaviours that I can implement back in my workplace as a result of the workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4. Learning Feedback Questionnaire: All learning interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent do you feel, given the training that was provided you would be able to:</th>
<th>Rating 1-4 (not at all / with great difficulty)</th>
<th>Rating 5-6</th>
<th>Rating 7-10 (will definitely be able to)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Run a Q12 dialogue session.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain what the 7 Habits are to someone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain the 5 E’s without referring to any other material.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain the basic meaning behind the 4 disciplines of execution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe how to do competency based recruiting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain the SitLead model to your staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply the poor performance management steps.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.5. Behaviours and Skills Application Questionnaire: All learning interventions

Please indicate the degree of success you had in applying the following skills and behaviours as result of your participation in the leadership development programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour / Skill</th>
<th>Rating 0 (no opportunity to use skills)</th>
<th>Rating 1-4 (little to no success)</th>
<th>Rating 5-6</th>
<th>Rating 7-10 (significant success)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of 5Es model as a framework to guide your leadership style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of coaching for improved performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment and Selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of the Q12 train-the-trainer approach in dialogue sessions with your team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absenteeism management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor performance management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of SITLEAD in effectively managing your different staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical thinking skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing the 7 Habits - with your team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of 7 Habits - for yourself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of the 4 Disciplines of Execution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.6. Behaviour Change Questionnaire: All learning interventions

Has anything changed about your own job behaviour as a result of this programme?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job behaviour</th>
<th>Rating 1-4 (minimal to no change)</th>
<th>Rating 5-6</th>
<th>Rating 7-10 (significant change)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased motivation to be a leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater clarity on own goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More commitment to the organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased energy levels (own)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased confidence as a leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling in control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better team communication / trust as a result of engagement dialogue sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better organised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced interpersonal relationships at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More proactive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More effective leadership style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.7. AG LDP 5Es – Content detail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Energy</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Edge</th>
<th>Execution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example: (2 Days)</strong></td>
<td><strong>7 Habits of Highly Effective People (3 days in total)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Situational leadership (1 day)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Effective decision-making (2 days)</strong></td>
<td><strong>4 Disciplines of Execution (1 day)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuable insights shared by senior managers regarding their own leadership journey, and an overview of the Allan Gray SE’s leadership philosophy.</td>
<td>Principle-centred, character-based, inside-out approach to personal and interpersonal effectiveness based on the work of Stephen Covey.</td>
<td>Mastering flexible leadership style application when growing an individual’s competency and commitment levels by Blanchard.</td>
<td>Based on the research by the Franklin Covey Institute, aimed at creating sustained performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content covered: ✓ Team-build session ✓ 5 E’s leadership philosophy ✓ CODI leadership journey and lessons learnt (Greg) ✓ Altruistic leadership (Ant Farr)</td>
<td>Be proactive-learning to control your responses ✓ Begin with the end in mind-developing an individual mission statement ✓ First things first-acting with integrity by focusing on top priorities ✓ Think win-win attitude of mutual benefit and respect ✓ Seek first to understand, then be understood - looking for the 3rd alternative, not compromising ✓ Leverage how to develop creative collaboration ✓ Sharpen the saw; creating long-term sustainable performance</td>
<td>Content covered: ✓ The 4 situational leadership styles ✓ Diagnosis &amp; identification of development levels ✓ Contracting for leadership style ✓ Practical application of the theory</td>
<td>Content covered: ✓ Focus on the key goals (outputs) ✓ Act on the key 80/20 activities (inputs) ✓ Keep a compelling scorecard ✓ Create a cadence of accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology: Experiential team-build and personality profiling run by Cape Leadership Sharing of personal experiences Q&amp;A sessions</td>
<td>Coaching for performance (2 days) Identifying techniques that managers can utilise to unlock staff potential.</td>
<td>Methodology:</td>
<td>Methodology: Session facilitated by Ryan Atiara from the Franklin Covey Institute.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content covered: ✓ Why is coaching important, and how is it different to counseling and mentoring ✓ What are competencies and how to identify competency gaps ✓ Practicing soft skills needed for coaching ✓ How to construct a coaching session</td>
<td>Progression from simple to more complex tools within a practical context.</td>
<td>How to construct a coaching session</td>
<td>Pre-work to identify key business objectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Methodology: Combination of video-based and facilitator-driven discussions, with lots of reflection and skills application Broken down into x1 2 days, and then 6 months later 1-day workshop Weekly follow-up emails re key principles One month follow-up meeting to check on progress and resolve stumbling blocks</td>
<td>Methodology: External vendor, Susan Mukheiber, facilitates a the practical workshop Role-plays based on managers own case-study challenges, with video camera-based feedback Q12 dialogue sessions (3 hrs): Learn how to run Q12 dialogue sessions, and maximise those factors that attract, focus, and retain high performers.</td>
<td>Managers use current staff performance contracts as starting points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Content covered: ✓ Basic facilitation skills ✓ Expected outcomes of Q12 sessions ✓ Q12 content and development ✓ Importance of Q12 for the business ✓ Dry-run through dialogue sessions 1-3</td>
<td>Industrial Relations (IR) understanding (3hrs).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Methodology: Train-the-trainer approach is used</td>
<td>Methodology:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>© Copyright UCT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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