

**DEVELOPING LEADERS IN A DEVELOPING COUNTRY:
FIELD NOTES FROM IFRANE, MOROCCO**

M. Duncan Rinehart, PhD

Human Resources Development Program
School of Humanities and Social Sciences
AlAkhawaynUniversity
P.O. Box 104, Avenue Hassan II
Ifrane 53000, Morocco
d.rinehart@au.ma
Phone: 212-35 86 24 27
Fax: 212-35 86 24 77

Kawtar Chriyaa

School of Humanities and Social Sciences
AlAkhawaynUniversity
P.O. Box 104, Avenue Hassan II
Ifrane 53000, Morocco
k.Chriyaa@au.ma
Phone: 212-35 86 24 27
Fax: 212-35 86 24 77

Please address all communications regarding this paper to Duncan Rinehart

DEVELOPING LEADERS IN A DEVELOPING COUNTRY: FIELDNOTES FROM IFRANE, MOROCCO

Abstract

Developing leaders in developing countries using American approaches can encounter problems with differences in cultural and leadership styles. This qualitative case study provides a first-person account of the development of an American style leadership development program in Morocco. It also draws on the findings of Project GLOBE to provide an analysis of the adjustments that are needed to adapt the American leadership development approach to Morocco. Cultural dimensions of power distance, in-group collectivism, future orientation, and uncertainty avoidance combined with self-protective and participative leadership styles seem to influence the adjustments needed.

Introduction

The need for skilled and effective leaders is considered by some to be one of the highest priority needs in many organizations and in many countries (House, 2004; Kouses and Pozner, 2002). In the U.S., student leadership development programs often go beyond the curriculum to develop leaders through community service projects, campus organizations, workshops, mentoring (Komvies and Dugan, 2007). However literature on such programs outside of the U.S., especially in developing countries is sparse. Yet the need for leadership development may be as great in developing countries with high illiteracy, unemployment, and poverty.

How then can we develop leaders to address the development needs of much of the world? How can we develop leaders who can lead effectively in various cultural settings? Attempts to establish culturally endorsed leadership characteristics at the national, regional and global levels (Chhokar, Brodbeck, House, 2008) give us a target toward which to aim our leadership development efforts. But of course it's not so simple. The difficulties include working with the leadership as it traditionally and currently is in a society, while developing leaders toward a more widely supported "should be" – fitting what is aspired to with what currently exists. This is the essence of our efforts to establish a student leadership development program at Al Akhawayn University in Ifrane, Morocco. The university is based on the American model but is administered in more traditional Moroccan ways. Leadership development appeals to many here as a good idea, but actually establishing the program encounters many problems, some of which seem to involve fitting cultures together.

This paper attemptstwo things. First, it attempts to address the gap in the literature on leadership development in developing countries by providing first hand description of the development of a student leadership program at AlAkhawayn University in Morocco. As such, this work should be useful to practitioners who are also involved in leadership development, and to educators and researchers who are interested in a case study on this issue. Second, western approaches to leadership development may encounter problems when applied in other cultures with very different social-historical foundations for

leadership (Triandis, 2004). This article attempts to analyze how the cultural differences are being adjusted to in the beginning phase of a leadership development program in Morocco. Thus this work provides qualitative data and analysis to enhance the understanding of cross-cultural leadership.

Background

In August, 2007, Rinehart joined the faculty in the Human Resources Development (HRD) program at AlAkhawayn University ([AUI](#)). That spring he taught Leadership and Management to eleven HRD and Communications majors. Prior to joining the faculty at AUI, Rinehart taught leadership and other courses at several universities in China, and taught in the Presidents Leadership Program ([PLC](#))¹ at the University of Colorado, Boulder as an adjunct for several years. His experience with PLC in Boulder along with his work developing leadership skills among professionals in the US would prove to be a rich foundation for student leadership development at AUI, but one that would have to be modified to be effective in a very different culture like Morocco. He became aware of the need to modify western leadership development while teaching in China in 2006-2007.

While teaching leadership in China, Rinehart saw that Chinese students were accustomed to “lecture-only” teaching, memorizing notes and readings for tests, and had little if any different learning experiences. Convinced that a more effective way to teach leadership was to have students do leadership, as was done in the PLC program, Rinehart tried a project where students had to lead some needed change in the campus or community. At first this did not work well. Students simply did not do the assignment. When discussing this with Chinese colleagues, Rinehart learned that Chinese students had never done anything like this before. He also learned that as students, they can be reluctant to “change” anything since it might offend or embarrass those in charge. Finally, Chinese colleagues suggested that the students would not know how to start such a project by themselves, but would perhaps do better in small teams.

Rinehart quickly revised the project putting the students into teams, giving them clear guidance on how to select and implement a project, and discussing the assignment with university administrators who gave their approval. The results were that most of the teams developed and implemented projects with the involvement of other students, administrators, local business owners and community officials. They did some leadership. And they really enjoyed it.

Though some of the projects were very hastily done at the last minute, several had clear impact. One project resulted in police directing rush-hour traffic at a dangerous intersection near campus. Another project attempted to reduce cigarette smoking among students. Several projects collected used textbooks at the end of the semester and

¹ The Presidents Leadership Class is a well recognized and well established student leadership program (Repasky, Braum, Bundick, Murphy, 2005). It attracts top students from the US. It is intensive, experiential, and learner-centered. In addition to their normal course-work for their major and minor fields of study, PLC students take three leadership courses in their first two years, often with a community service project, do an internship during their fifth semester known as the “walkabout”, complete a leadership course in their third year, and do a senior capstone project. In addition to a small professional staff, PLC is run by advanced students who have demonstrated the skills and qualities the program seeks to develop. Thus PLC incorporates many of the best practices of exemplarily leadership development programs (CAS standards, 2003).

distributed them to poor students the next semester. (Before this the books were simply thrown away.)

The adjustments to the original assignment were needed for several cultural reasons. Chinese are collectivistic compared to Americans (Hofstede, 1980). Not only are Chinese students more comfortable doing group projects, they are reluctant to challenge the larger social order. Chinese have higher power distance than Americans (Hofstede, 1980). Compared to American students he has taught, Rinehart enjoyed the greater respect that he received from students in China even though that sense of respect seemed to keep them from questioning or challenging him in class. Higher power distance seems to explain why the students would not want to challenge the authorities by “changing” something for which those authorities are responsible. Adding to this, China does direct face work (Hofstede, 1980). Publicly pointing out an authority’s oversight is insulting and causes that authority to lose face (be humiliated). Positive facework seeks to support other’s public presentation of self (e.g. not humiliate officials publicly). In Chinese culture conflict is generally avoided (Hofstede, 1980) due in part to the loss of face that would result if confrontation occurred. When Rinehart’s students did not know how to initiate their projects, they said nothing and did nothing. Once the potential conflicts (in their view) were reduced, they were able to do the leadership.

In Morocco, the culture is of course a little different. Moroccans are considered collectivistic but in a different way. They tend to put group needs before self needs as do other collectivistic cultures but the group in Morocco and other Middle East North African (MENA) countries is the family (extended), clan or tribe (Abdalla and Al-Homoud, 2001; Bjerke, 1999). Morocco is also a high power distance country where differences in social power and thus social distance are accepted and supported in daily interactions (Javidan, House, Dorfman, 2004).

Analytical Framework

For reflecting on the cultural adjustments that must be made to start a leadership development program in Morocco, we will consider differences in cultural dimensions (e.g. power distance) and differences in implicit leadership characteristics (e.g. participative). The massive cross-cultural study of culture and leadership in sixty-two countries known as Project GLOBE characterizes Morocco as follows:

- Fits the prototype of high values² scores of Future Orientation, and high practices scores of Power Distance, In-Group Collectivism, and Humane Orientation, but low practices scores of Uncertainty Avoidance and Institutional Collectivism. “In these societies, people may aspire toward future orientation to transform the authoritarian, kinship-oriented and fragmented institutional fabric in their cultures” (Askanasy, Gupta, Mayfield, Trevor-Roberts, 2004, p.311).
- *Low in future orientation as a society practice* (six countries were lower) (Askanasy, Gupta, Mayfield, Trevor-Roberts, 2004, p.304). Future Orientation refers to planning and living for the future (high) versus acting with limited or no planning, accepting the status quo, and solving current problems (low) (Askanasy, Gupta, Mayfield, Trevor-Roberts, 2004, p.303).

² Project GLOBE studied not only societal values in 62 societies (what should be) but also societal practices (what actually is). Thus Morocco aspires to high future orientation but hasn’t achieved it yet.

- *Highest in power distance as a society practice*(no country of the 62 studied was higher) (Carl, Gupta, Javidian, 2004, p.539). Power Distance refers to the degree to which members expect power to be distributed unequally (Javidian, House, Dorfman, 2004, p.30). For instance, in high power distance societies there is limited upward social mobility. Power is seen as providing social order, information is localized, public corruption is high, access to resources and skills is limited to a few so human development is low(Carl, Gupta, Javidian, 2004, p.536, Table 17.2).
- *High in societal in-group collectivism practice* (five countries were higher) (Gefland, Bhawuk, Nishii, Bechtold, 2004, p.469). “In-group collectivism is the degree to which individuals express pride, loyalty, and cohesiveness in their organizations or families” (House and Javidian, 2004, p.12).
- *Fairly low in uncertainty avoidance as a society practice* (fourteen countries lower) (Brodbeck, Hanges, Dicksin, Gupta, Dorfman, 2004, p.622). Uncertainty Avoidance refers to the extent to which a society relies on social norms, rules, and procedures to alleviate unpredictability of future events. For instance, societies lower in Uncertainty Avoidance tend to be more informal in their interactions with others, rely on the word of others rather than written contracts, less concerned with keeping records or documenting conclusions of meetings, show less resistance to change and more tolerance for breaking rules(Sully de Luque and Javidian, 2004, p 618, Table 19.1).
- *Low in gender egalitarianism as a society practice* (three countries lower) (Emrich, Denmark, Den Hartog, 2004, p.365). Gender Egalitarianism is the degree to which a collective minimizes gender inequality(Javidian, House, Dorfman, 2004, p.30).Morocco is low so gender inequality is not minimized to a great degree.
- *Fairly high in assertiveness as a society practice* (twelve countries were higher) (Den Hartog, 2004, p.410). Assertiveness refers to “the degree to which individuals in organizations or societies are assertive, tough, dominant, and aggressive in social relationships” (Den Hartog, 2004, p.395).
- *Low in performance orientation as a leadership characteristic* but tied with France. Only Qatar was lower (Javidian, 2004, p.269). “Performance Orientation refers to the extent a leader stresses continuous improvement and has high standards of performance” (Javidian, 2004, p 266).
- *Low in visionary leadership as a leadership characteristic*. Just below France. Only Qatar was lower(Askanasy, Gupta, Mayfield, Trevor-Roberts, 2004, p.326). Visionary Leadership reflects readiness for future events, imaginativeness and vision, goal-based planning and action behavior, and ability to inspire and motivate others to work hard(Askanasy, Gupta, Mayfield, Trevor-Roberts, 2004, p.325).

In a study of the values of Moroccan managers, Ali and Wahabi (1995) note that while Morocco shares common features of other Arab societies, such as Islamic religion, Arabic language, social organizations and networks, and traditions, its cultural development was also influenced by French and Spanish occupation and subsequent close ties to European markets. They conclude that the primary values of Moroccan

managers are egocentric (i.e. aggressive, selfish, restless, impulsive, and generally not inclined to live within the constraints of society's norms) and existential (i.e. high tolerance for ambiguity and for those who have different values).

In an analysis of culturally endorsed implicit leadership dimensions (i.e. what people think of as characteristics of good leaders) in the 62 countries in the GLOBE study, Dorfman, Hanges, Brodbeck identify six dimensions: Charismatic/value based, Team oriented, Participative, Humane, Autonomous, and Self-protective (2004). These scores for the Middle East cluster in which Morocco was grouped, and for comparison, the Anglo cluster which includes the United States, are given in Table 1. This data does not, however, measure how leadership is actually practiced in these countries and clusters.

[Table 1 about here]

The setting

Ifrane is a small town in the Middle Atlas mountains about one hour drive south of Fez. The town was built during colonial times by the French who modeled it on an alpine village. Indeed, Ifrane can get heavy snows during the winter. Consequently, Ifrane does not look like many other Moroccan cities. Its appearance, continental feel, mountain climate and proximity to major cities may have influenced the former King, Hassan II to establish AlAkhawayn University in Ifrane. With its beautiful forests, low rolling mountains, and French alpine architecture, Ifrane's main industry is tourism. Not only tourists from Europe and North America, but also many Moroccans like to visit Ifrane, to escape the heat in the summer and to play in the snow in the winter.

AlAkhawayn University is the largest employer in Ifrane. AUI is based on the American model of education and the language of instruction is English. About twenty-three hundred students are currently enrolled in the three academic schools – Business Administration, Humanities and Social Science, Science and Engineering. Most students are Moroccans from the larger cities such as Casablanca, Rabat, Meknes, and Fez.

At the beginning of this project, the leadership curriculum at AUI consisted of an undergraduate course titled Leadership and Management taught in the Human Resources Development (HRD) program in the School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHSS), a graduate course in leadership taught through the Business School, and discussions of leadership included in several undergraduate organizational development and HRD courses. There was no extra-curricular leadership development available. Students who were elected into leadership positions in clubs and student government had little if any training in the skills needed to meet their responsibilities. As a consequence the functioning of many student clubs and of student government was not good (e.g. projects were not well planned but completed at the last minute or never accomplished).

Development of a leadership program at AUI: Leadership class, pilot program and Proposal

The Leadership Class

In spring, 2008, Rinehart taught Leadership and Management at AUI for the first time. Students were required to do the Leadership Learning Experience (LLE), a 45 hour service project that they initiated. They were instructed to contact local associations, who

could use their help in providing services such as literacy and language classes, and to develop and deliver those services. At the beginning of the LLE, the emphasis was on student initiative, talking with and listening to people they would work with, then designing a project/service that would meet their needs. Rinehart distributed clear detailed guidance, discussed how to start such a project with the class, and arranged a few possible projects with local associations for students who would have difficulty. The students were to start their LLE projects by the second week of the semester. Most didn't start until the fifth week. Clearly, Rinehart needed some better accountability.

Kawtar Chriyaa was among this first class of leadership students that Rinehart taught at AUI. As an HRD major at AUI, Chriyaa is very active in student organizations. Among other activities, she was the President of Hand In Hand, a Moroccan organization that raises money for projects to help the poor. From her involvement and her interest in leadership, she saw the need for programs that would help student leaders be more effective. During the spring and summer of 2008 she had initial conversations and received encouragement from student leaders (President of the Student Government Association – SGA), from the Vice-Presidents of Student Affairs and of Academic Affairs for AUI, and a few others about the idea. She discussed the idea with Rinehart who agreed to help. During that summer they met to create a pilot program to demonstrate how it might work, build some format for the program, and build some interest.

Our Data – Field notes from Ifrane

The following section will present the creation of the leadership development program from the beginning (May, 2008) until now (May, 2009). In an effort to identify how to adjust the more western approaches to leadership development to Morocco, both of the principle actors in this effort – Rinehart and Chriyaa – provide their first-person accounts of the significant events in the first two phases of this project: developing and delivering the demonstration pilot program, and creating and gaining approval for the program proposal. Though the pilot project and the Institute proposal are presented as distinct phases, the purpose for doing a pilot was to dispel doubts that were expected about this new program, and to generate support to get the proposal approved.

Rinehart's Description – the Pilot Project

In August, Kawtar Chriyaa and I discussed the format for the pilot. Our plan was to offer a series of five to six short workshops (1-1.5 hour) focused on developing specific skills needed for student leaders (SGA, clubs, projects). These workshops would be presented over two months in October and November, 2008. The stated purposes of the pilot were: 1) to improve the effectiveness of student organizations, and 2) to establish a model and readiness for a continuing leadership development program at AUI. The anticipated audience was 10 to 15 people including 10 student leaders, 3 staff, and possibly 1 faculty. We wanted a small group of committed people to help us deliver a successful pilot.

Original topics suggested by Chriyaa from her involvement in student organizations and from my role as a faculty advisor to a student club, included the following:

- Communication

- Communicating with members
 - Not all attend all meetings
 - Preparing and sending agendas and notes/minutes (records of discussions and decisions)
 - Giving advance notice
 - Getting input from those who can't /don't come to meetings
- Communicating with the larger campus community
 - Advertising activities
 - Giving advance notice (for meetings and events)
 - Publicizing accomplishments
 - Inviting involvement and input
- Planning
 - Organizing and coordinating many projects
 - Setting priorities and sticking to them
 - Allocating time and resources (money, people) to activities
- Other
 - Getting membership
 - Getting member's buy-in and follow-through
 - Running an effective meeting with good membership participation
 - Program assessment
 - Being a leader and not a boss

Fearing that this list of topics might not reflect the perceived needs of the participants and might not generate much commitment to the pilot from them since they had no say in developing the program, I asked Kawtarto arrange a meeting in mid-September of all those interested to discuss the pilot and refine the needs and the program plan.

The meeting was well attended. All the interested students and one of the interested staff came. Chriyaa introduced the idea for the pilot and for the leadership program and I facilitated the discussion of the topics. There was general agreement on the topics but also some clarifications and a few additions. Additions included:

- Creating and respecting an action plan
- Delegating – judging who to give what tasks/responsibilities to
- Crisis management
- Conflict management
- Succession planning or developing next years leaders
- What is leadership and leadership style assessment
- Developing consensus and gaining agreement for buy-in
- Listening
- Motivation – motivating members
- Stress management

It was clear that the pilot could not include all of the requested topics so I drafted the following topical plan for the workshops:

1. Being a leader not a boss – what is leadership, leadership styles, difference from management, credibility, followership, leaders developing leaders.

2. Planning a meeting – organizing many projects, setting and using agenda.
3. Running a meeting with good participation – leaders listen, communication, gaining consensus and agreement.
4. Creating buy-in for follow-through, delegating, accountability, developing future leaders.
5. Conflict and crisis – avoidance, constructive confrontation.

I committed to preparing a training proposal that clarified the pilot goals, audience, workshop plan and detailed training outline. The proposal was completed in the middle of October, delaying the start of the pilot. However a sort of parallel track emerged.

During the previous spring, the staff person responsible for student clubs, who was also interested in the leadership pilot, had asked me to do a few workshop for club presidents to improve their functioning. In early September, she and I agreed to a workshop on developing action plans since all of the clubs were required to submit these at the beginning of the year. Later in November, I prepared and delivered another of these workshops on developing buy-in to get follow-through. This topic came from the discussion during the previous workshop. Student club presidents expressed great frustration with members who didn't do what they were asked to do, or volunteered to do – they didn't follow-through. Having made the commitment to do these workshops before the program for the leadership pilot came together, and wanting to keep the pilot small and distinct (not combine the two sets of workshops) and not create confusion between the two, I tried to do both. This delayed the start of the pilot.

However the pilot did happen though it was only four workshops in November and December, and the turn-out toward the end of the semester was much smaller than desired. The delay probably resulted in some students becoming discouraged after high initial enthusiasm.

In keeping with western practices of employee-supervisor relations, I informed my Dean of progress on this pilot, usually when I met with him to discuss other matters. My intention was to keep my boss ahead of the Vice President for Academic Affairs (the Dean's boss) so that the Dean could appear well-informed and in control of his administrative domain. So far this has worked well.

Rinehart's Description - theLeadership Development Institute Proposal

During the fall semester, I had discussed with Chriyaa and promised my Dean and the VPSA to deliver a proposal for the Leadership Development Institute that would allow official administrative action and allocation of funds to formally establish the program the coming fall (2009). Our idea was to run the pilot for a semester, show that it was possible, and develop some methods that would be used in the future. Then I would write a proposal to get the program started based on the pilot and lessons learned from doing it. Due to a series of delays, (e.g. replacing the hard drive on my computer), I sent a draft of the proposal, lacking budget detail, to Chriyaa, my Dean and the VPSA in early February.

Over the next few weeks I continued working on finalizing the proposal, adding a proposed time line for the program during its first year, making revisions based on Chriyaa's comments, and trying to complete the budget. After several attempts to get the

needed budget information from administrative offices on campus (e.g. how much would a telephone connection for the Institute's office cost?), I gave-up in frustration. A staff member in one office sent me to another in another office, who sent me to a third office, who sent me to a different person in the first office. No one had the information that I asked for, or was willing to give it, or really knew who would have it. Several times one person even called the next one they were sending me to, but when I got there and explained what I needed, that person sent me to someone else.

In early April, I completed the budget and proposal as best as I could and submitted it to the Dean and the VPSA. My Dean had mentioned that AUI's budget was being worked out now for the next academic year, and thus implied that I had to finish the Institute's budget proposal quickly to not miss out on the process.

Additionally, the VPSA had mentioned to Chriyaa that he had some concerns about providing scholarship money to students accepted into the Institute's program. As Chriyaa related it to me, his concern was that we are already giving them a program and a certificate that will help them, if they complete the program. Why should we also give them a scholarship? (Note: the proposal asks for 2,000 Moroccan Dirhams or about \$250 per student per semester reimbursed at the end of each semester as an incentive to complete the two semester program – to deal with the low commitment/follow-through we encountered in the pilot.)

Additionally, in a passing conversation after another meeting, the VPSA mentioned to me that the university's new president (appointed by the King, Mohammed VI in a surprise move in late January) has a concern about the leadership program, about its relationship to a proposed honors program, which I had heard nothing about. In mid-April, I emailed the VPSA and my Dean asking them to help clarify and communicate these and any other concerns.

Several weeks later at the end of April, I was called to a meeting with both Vice Presidents and my Dean to discuss the details of starting the program. We discussed recruiting highly committed students who would complete the program, several aspects of the budget, and the importance of such an effort. Of course much of the discussion related to the budget. The approach taken by these key administrators was to cover the costs of the Institute in existing program budgets rather than set up a new cost center. Though I fought for it, the three of them opposed the scholarships, pointing out that the students were getting the program for free – not paying tuition. The meeting ended with their verbal approval to proceed. Later that week, my Dean explained the administrators' view that this leadership program is like starting a new course. The following week we ran our recruiting drive.

Chriyaa's Description - the Pilot Project

At the beginning of the fall2008 semester, I went to see the professor who taught me "Leadership and Management." I recall having talked to him, the previous semester, about the possibility of launching a Leadership Development Institute in AUI using his own experience in training with the University of Colorado, Boulder. A short meeting with Dr. Rinehart paved the way for the creation of the Institute. Following his guidelines, I started by having a look at the literature available about such programs in other universities. Because of the nature of AUI, being an American style university, it seemed just logical to be interested in what other American universities do in this issue. I took

some time looking into the material Dr. Rinehart provided and did my own little research in parallel. I looked at the literature available about such programs in other universities (Zimmerman-Oster and Burkhardt, 2001, Council on Academic Standards, 2003). Searching the internet also for literature in French and Arabic, I found a few articles (Kennedy, 2002; Javidan and Dastmalchian, 2002) and one student leadership program in Cairo, the Leadership Discovery Student Program, which was funded by a grant from Ford Foundation through the Institute for International Education (2009).³

The literature showed that, in most leadership initiatives, an array of activities ranging from a two-hour training, to a minor and/or major in Leadership were offered. This strategy seemed like an interesting one for the “AUI Leadership Development Institute” we were trying to launch. However, for this to happen, the involvement of many other people, academics and executives, was needed. Therefore, we agreed that, since we could not find any similar initiative in Morocco, we would need to organize a pilot test to be able to assess the needs on campus.

One important point that we tried to focus on was to get the administration to buy in to the idea so that we could get its full support. In fact, with Dr. Rinehart’s experience and my prior dealings with the university administration, we judged it crucial to have the full support of AUI’s executives. For that purpose, we had to work on many organizational levels. First of all, we had to find a context in which we could have the initiative. Being the head of the Student Government Association (SGA) committee of Academic Affairs, the project seemed to fit within the scope of the work of the SGA. So, I prepared a proposal to be presented to the Student Government Board.

The next step was to present the project to Dr. Belfekih, the Vice President of Student Affairs (VPSA) since he is the supervisor of SGA, then to the Dr. Bensaid, the Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA) who we thought would also be interested in the idea. Together with other SGA members, we went to meet Dr. Belfekih, on the fourth week of the semester. The meeting agenda focused on the presentation of SGA’s fall, 2008 action plan, not the Leadership Institute.

Since Dr. Belfekih is the head of the Student Affairs Office and a very experienced person, SGA tends to stop by his office when problems arise or permission is needed. During our first meeting in fall’08, the Leadership Development Institute was a part of the agenda. Interestingly enough, Dr. Belfekih approved the idea with no further comments contrary to other suggestions that he scrutinized.

I was glad that we had the implicit approval to develop the idea. However, I could not get rid of this internal anxiety that I had: was the idea perfect that he didn’t feel the need to comment on it? Is it outside of his field of work/interest? Or does he believe that the idea is too ambitious? I spent the next few days wondering about this and trying to understand his attitude.

I was hoping that the next meeting would hold the keys to the solution. In fact, even before meeting with the VPSA, I went to see the VPAA. Dr. Bensaid received me, as usual, with a large smile. I was alone since it was supposed to be a special “academics issues meeting.” Dr. Bensaid, being very close to the school deans, and more aware of what is happening at the academic level, could provide me with some “to the point” comments and practical suggestions to implement any action plan. When I tackled the

³ Subsequently we found that the MENA CSO Leadership Institute has been recently launched in Casablanca, Morocco in January, 2009 (Anonymous, 2009).

Institute issue, he had his “tell me more” look. I provided him with the information he needed to understand the idea. Dr. Bensaid is known for his honesty. Therefore, even though I was wishing his full support, I was preparing myself to hear the worst. I kept on talking about the idea of the Institute, the objectives of such initiative, and the outcomes AUI and its students could get out of it. I was trying so hard to impress him that I found myself quoting the strategic agenda of the university and the president. I noticed a smile on his face while I was talking. I felt comfortable so I went on sharing the five-year vision we had for the Institute.

“I am glad you are here to talk about long term projects. I am used to meeting SGA representatives only in case of problems,” he said.

“Yes,” I replied. “That’s the way things were... The new SGA team has a new working vision.”

“OK” was all he said.

I considered this small exchange of words as an important acknowledgment of the work we have been doing. I took the opportunity and asked him about his opinion in relation to the leadership initiative. Dr. Bensaid expressed his interest and admiration. He promised to provide his support whenever needed.

Just like expected, the idea of an AUI Leadership Development Institute(AUILDI) seemed to go along with the motto of the university, “excellence and identity,” and with its aim in “building the leaders of tomorrow.” The focus of the Institute is to provide the needed trainings in leadership primarily for AUI students, but also for the whole AUI community. A certificate will be provided upon completion of the program. A student’s CV that is enriched with a “Leadership Training Certificate” is far more attractive to recruiters. Also, there are benefits that AUI could gain from hosting the “AUI Leadership Development Institute.” In fact, under the direct supervision of the president, the VPAA’s office is trying to get accreditation. One of the criteria used to assess the university is the level of student empowerment. In this context, launching a Leadership Development Institute which would help AUI students build and improve their leadership skills could be a very valuable initiative.

One strategy we thought would be useful in order to get as much done as possible was to knock on different doors at the same time. When I was approaching the administration, Dr. Rinehart was starting another initiative with the Dean of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences. On the other hand, I checked the interest of students in having an academic program (minor and/or major) in leadership. In order to check the students’ interest in the Leadership Institute, we had to present it to them. For this purpose, I took advantage of the SGA general meeting that was organized in mid-fall. The meeting was open for all students to attend. I talked about the idea of the Institute when I was presenting the achievements of the Academic Affairs Committee. Students claimed that, if such an Institute existed, they would be interested in participating in its activities. I was supposed to see that students who are not enrolled in clubs (aka “inactive students”) were as interested as the ones who are active. Feeling the existing interest among students, I brought the issue to the United Associations meeting. This is the organization that gathers all of the club presidents. At this level, I had no doubt that the project of AUILDI is an attractive idea. Getting clubs presidents’ approval and support was expected.

For organizational purposes, I had to keep updating the board of the SGA about my advances. In the following board meeting, I had another surprise, SGA members started complaining about not including them in the pilot. I was glad to have more people interested than what was planned. I could then set the criteria of choice and pick from the large pool I had. I figured out that active students would make it easier for us to evaluate and get participants feedback. I was glad I had a group of motivated and ready-to-get-committed people. Therefore, the idea of launching such an academic program was presented to other SGA members who approved it and then it was communicated to the VPSA and the deans.

In my SGA duties, I had to meet with the deans. I took advantage of these meetings to introduce the idea of AUILDI. The reactions of deans were different than the previous ones we had. The Dean of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHSS) did not show much interest. He was not interested in hearing my five-year vision nor did he accept that we involve any academic component in the program. The Dean of the School of Business Administration (SBA), on the other hand, mentioned that it “could” be a good idea. He did not elaborate on it. I was surprised by these responses. This project, was put in the category of “long term projects” in the action plan of the Committee of Academic Affairs. I did not see the reason for such an attitude.

The next practical step was to start implementing the agreed upon pilot program. This would help us assess the needs of the AUI community and determine suitable strategies to use. For this purpose, I was in charge of contacting students who might be interested. I got in touch with active students from student organizations. I also presented the program to the SGA members. Both groups showed interest. However, in a way to keep the group manageable, Dr. Rinehart and I agreed to have a group of 8 to 12 people. We got the idea of involving professors and staff members also. It is true that the original target of the Institute was AUI students. But, nothing prevented us from widening its target group to include all of the AUI community in the future. I thought that we could get three staff members and one faculty member interested.

Soon after, Dr. Rinehart suggested a six-session program and he prepared a tentative schedule. While Dr. Rinehart would be presenting the trainings, I would be taking notes about the reactions of participants in order to use them for the evaluation part. Due to time limitations, the number of trainings had to be reduced. During the four trainings that Dr. Rinehart performed, I took notes about the reactions of the participants. Indicators such as lateness, absence, interaction with professors, and number of interventions were important for the future evaluation and assessment of the pilot.

At the end of the last session we asked for feedback from the participants. Their suggestions included:

- Start earlier in the semester
- Use more practice, role plays, case studies, simulated meetings, video cases, etc.
- Pass out all of the material at the first session.
- Extend sessions to maybe two hours.
- Ask students to pay a nominal fee, or give a deposit, or use incentives such as a certificate to get commitment and more attendance.
- Use assignments such as having small groups prepare and give a role play.
- Have students work in small groups for the semester.

- Work in different groups through out the semester then have students choose and award a best leader at the end of the semester.

Once the group had the four trainings (reduced the number because of time constraints), I had a meeting with Dr. Rinehart, in his office. We tried to briefly assess the pilot test and build upon its results. We agreed on a twelve session program but did not finalize the schedule at that point.

By the end of the semester, I presented the results to the VPSA and the VPAA. They both showed a lot of interest and support. The VPSA agreed to sign the certificates that we wanted to give to the participants by the end of the training. “These are the kind of initiative that we want our students to engage in. You have our full support” was the sentence I will remember most.

VPSA usually does not accept an idea or initiative easily. He, usually, encourages realistic and valuable proposals. His interest in the idea of the Institute is a benefit to us. It is also a sign that we are working on an idea that will benefit the university, its reputation and students.

Chriyaa’s Description - theLeadership Development Institute Proposal

During the proposal preparation phase, I had a chance to contact a few AUI professors who we thought would be able to add value to the program through delivering lectures or giving trainings. Whether they taught communication or business, they were impressed by the “special” initiative. Having a student involved in the preparation of the program made us earn lots of praise.

Executives were involved in the process since the start because they are the ones with the decision making power. When the project was first presented, the individual initiative was encouraged. The VPSA promised all needed support. He suggested that his office could take care of the guests we needed to invite for the program. This attitude encouraged us to go further with the development of the project idea.

Once the proposal was ready, it was presented to the VPSA in order for him to have a look at it and provide some insight before we could present it officially to the president of the university. One thing should be mentioned here. The president of the university is involved in most decisions that are taken. Since the idea of the Institute seemed to be a big one, he had to give his input and nothing could be done without his approval. To get the president to have a look at our proposal, we requested a meeting with Dr. Belfekih, the VPSA. I sent him the document before the meeting allowing him to read it and prepare his remarks.

On the day of the meeting, Dr. Rinehart was busy. Therefore, I had to go see the VPSA accompanied by the coordinator of AUI club activities (a person who showed her support for the program from the start). Dr. Belfekih did not have a lot of observations to make except one about the scholarship we suggested in the proposal. As a way to encourage students to participate in the program and give them additional incentive, we suggested that the ones who completed the whole program would receive a scholarship: reimbursement of book fees for the semester of accomplishment. Dr. Belfekih was skeptic about this point. He thought that we are doing students a favor already by providing the program and not charging them any fees to participate in it. This observation made me question the vision our administration had about the role of the

university. I can't deny that all our executives are people who had an important experience in education and teaching. However, when I heard Dr. Belfekih's comment I discovered that we did not share the same vision. He seemed to believe that what the university is doing, namely teaching, was enough since it is a natural, traditional role. However, I had a different view apparently.

In my view, such leadership programs are not "luxury" services that the university provides to its students. A university that strives towards achieving excellence while preserving identity (which is the motto of AUI University) should go beyond the classical role of teaching. When preparing the proposal for the program, I thought that if the university discovered that such a program could help develop the leadership skills of its students, it would allocate all the needed resources to launch the program. I believed (and still do) that students are not only the most important clients of the university but also its most important capital. In other words, a university should not base its relationship with its students on a service/payment basis since the quality of the students is a very important criterion for the measurement of the quality of the university. It is good to think in terms of duties and responsibilities (provide traditional classes in exchange for tuition) in order to make sure that the university is held accountable for the services it offers. However, if that is the only focus, the executives will provide the minimum that they promised in the contract that they signed with students: the "financial bill" that shows the payment made by the student and the courses to be offered by university. There will be no addition of free services that add to the quality of the students.

The assumption that the university will support the program was based on another point that I have to mention here. AUI is engaged in the process of getting an "accreditation" from an American agency. The long term purpose of this exercise is to reduce the high variation rate the university suffers from in terms of the profile of its alumni. AUI graduates have proven to be of very different profiles and levels. Being an AUI graduate could mean that you are a successful financial analyst in a multinational company earning more than 840,000 MDH a year or that you are a "*commerciale*" (salesperson) not exceeding 60,000 MDH a year. This lowers the reputation of AUI, and the administration strives to change it. In this process of accreditation, I met with an American lady who came to talk with different stakeholders of the university to evaluate how "American like" the university is. In one of the meetings she held with students, she explained that "student empowerment" is one point upon which the university is evaluated. In this context, I assumed that the university would be glad to encourage a student led initiative, supported by professors and staff, since it demonstrated initiative taking of students and also their empowerment to take action.

My assumptions were apparently not shared by the VPSA. During the same meeting, I noticed that, on the hard copy of the proposal he had circled the word "Institute." When I noticed that by the end of the meeting he did not mention anything about it, I asked him. His answer was not clear: "Ooh! No, that is nothing. Now that I understand that it is just a *virtual* institute, it is fine." I answered, feeling disappointed, "At this level, maybe. However, as explained in the proposal, we are aiming at it to become a *real* autonomous institute in the university. It will start small managing the program, at the beginning. In the long term, it could become a Leadership Research Institute." He did not seem to appreciate the fact that we wanted the Institute to be an autonomous entity within the university. He started suggesting points related to having it

“supervised by” some other departments. He emphasized on the point that he did not see the need for a full time coordinator since we could give this task to some other existing staff since “it does not need much work anyway.” I tried to argue that the program in its first edition, with only 30 students; would need huge launching, implementation, evaluation and follow up efforts. A busy employee would not have time for that. Dr. Belfekih did not seem to agree. He closed the discussion by the famous, “Anyway, we have to check this with the president to see what he thinks.” He promised to send the proposal to other vice presidents and introduce it in the next “executive meeting” that would take place in two weeks.

The next meeting took place the week before midterm break, on the 25th February. We had to wait until Dr. Rinehart talked with the VPSA at the beginning of April to know that the president “had a look” at the proposal. He is working on implementing an honors program and he wanted to include it in our project. This information was very surprising to me. When Dr. Rinehart first announced it to me I was disappointed to see that my expectations fell apart. This position of the direction made us decide to cancel the communication campaign we were going to launch to recruit students to the program.

I still can’t understand their reaction. I think that the university is afraid that the project will gain a bigger scope than AUI is ready to support. However, that is no reason to shut it down this way. I even started thinking that AUI is, after all, not what I thought it was. Not that I don’t like it; AUI is the best experience I have ever lived. However, I expected more from the executives. I can’t deny that if this happened in another public university, I would not have been this surprised. But I used to think that AUI is “not Morocco” and that it is different.

I tend to believe, maybe due to my education, that Moroccan administrations do not really accept ideas that come from their employees. Thinking and initiative taking are the tasks of higher level management. This is usually reflected by the “one way” communication channels that are present in those public administrations and the very rigid hierarchy that characterizes them. Now that I faced such resistance to accept the idea, I started to think that AUI is no different. I am definitely biased in my judgment since I want to see the project launched. It could have been a matter of lack of financial resources or that the project did not match with the strategic goals of the university at this exact timing. However, since no such explanation was provided, my skeptical Moroccan side took the lead, and I started to think that the university is afraid that the Institute will grow in terms of autonomy and becomes bigger than what it can handle.

I think this need for control stems for our recent history. Morocco is not a country that is known for its “respect for human rights.” In fact, in the past, in the few years right after independence (in 1956), the situation in the country was very complicated. Moroccans did not have the time to enjoy their independence, since a “cold war” between the crown and the political parties started. Each one was trying to get to the power. Citizens were trapped and their freedom oppressed. Everyone was scared from everyone. Each step to be taken by anyone of the parties had to be studied carefully. In a way to maintain itself, the monarchy tried to keep all the activities of political actors under its control to avoid any “*dérapiage*.” This strategy was inherited by the governments that followed building a fear of “being noticed and taking initiative” in the spirits of Moroccans. This situation engendered the creation of close and strict control mechanisms that made sure that no action would be taken unless it is in the interest of the rulers.

Summary

The idea of starting a leadership program at AUI emerged from the Leadership and Management class in the Spring of 2007. Both Rinehart and Chriyaa had the energy for it and saw its potential not only for AUI students but also for Morocco. Each of their stories provides first-hand detail on how they developed the pilot and proposal to lay foundation for the program and Institute. Rinehart's story provides more focus on how workshops were developed that met the needs of student leaders and on the process of developing the proposal. On the other hand, Chriyaa's story illuminates how relationships were formed with top administrators and student leaders that was necessary to start a new program in Morocco. She also provides a cultural insider's explanation of why senior administrators responded to the proposal as they did. Both accounts allow interesting analysis of the cultural differences that the Leadership Development Institute would have to adjust to.

Analysis of the cultural adjustments made or needed in this case

The following analysis of cultural influences looks at the adjustments that have been made and seem to be working, and the problems that must still be adjusted to. This analysis raises issues of validity. The principle actors in developing the leadership program at AUI are also analyzing their own effectiveness in creating it. This will be addressed at the end of the paper along with the generalizability of this case study.

The cultural adjustments that have been made and seem to be working so far are: utilizing existing relationships between Chriyaa and campus leaders, utilizing the different statuses to build credibility and support for the project, and doing the pilot as a demonstration project to show the possibilities and potential for a Leadership Development Institute. They seem to be adjusting to the low uncertainty avoidance and high in-group collectivism in Morocco. Chriyaa's activities in talking with student leaders, her role in SGA, the access that role gives her to the Vice Presidents for Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, and her involvement with the Student Activities Office staff (which support student groups) makes her a central person in the key networks at AUI. She has the relationships to influence and involve the necessary people. As a high achieving Moroccan student (4.0 cumulative grade point average, out of 4.0), with somewhat traditional values, and perhaps good family connections, Chriyaa clearly mobilized student support. With his American academic credentials and position among AUI's faculty, Rinehart may have contributed to the credibility of the effort. Rinehart's experience in leadership development, especially in China was key in deciding to do a pilot program to demonstrate how a leadership development institute might actually work at AUI.

Yet there are some problems. Some of the problems seem to also have some cultural influences. Delays in developing and implementing the pilot and developing the proposal are the most troubling. These delays appear to have several sources. The more culturally based delays come from lack of follow-through and accountability (identified by student leaders as a topic for the leadership program; e.g. with students not starting their LLE projects) and from withholding of information and assistance (e.g. getting cost estimates for budget). Intersecting with lack of follow-through is high initial enthusiasm and verbal commitment from both students and administrators followed by low

attendance by students and reluctance to officially and fully commit by senior administrators. The key cultural characteristics that contribute to the delays seem to be high power distance and low future orientation. Self-protective and low participative leadership styles may also be factors.

Procrastination, lack of follow-through, lack of accountability are common complaints by both Moroccans and by expats. Moroccan faculty and staff at AUI often explain student procrastination and lack of follow-through as “laziness.” However, it may be deeper than that. Planned meetings and events are often changed even up to the last minute. The communication of these events is given at the last minute. Changes in the events may not be communicated at all – you find out when you get there. Often meetings and events start late (30 to 60 or more minutes), waiting on some high ranking administrator to arrive. With such common occurrences, it is little wonder that students procrastinate. “Why do [an assignment] now if it is likely to change,” one student said. And there appears to be little concern or accountability for such changes and communication. It appears to be accepted as normal, even expected. One of Rinehart’s Moroccan friends often explains “One never knows,” in response to Rinehart’s confusion and surprise. Lack of planning, follow-through and accountability reflects low future orientation practice which Askanasy, Gupta, Mayfield, and Trevor-Roberts described as acting with limited or no planning, accepting the status quo, and solving current problems (rather than preventing future ones) (2004).

However, the way that differences in power are accepted and used (i.e. power distance) also contribute to the delays that have been experienced due to procrastination, lack-of follow through and lack of accountability. In Hofstede’s important study (1980), employees in high power distance societies were more dependant on their bosses, letting their boss decide and not actively discussing their concerns with the boss. This is also apparent in the dynamic between Rinehart’s Chinese and Moroccan students and himself as the teacher/authority. Rinehart felt that students expected him to tell them what to do to be leaders. They expected him to be the authoritative source of information or knowledge in the typical (for Morocco) student-teacher relationship. This was also the attitude that many students in China exhibited, where the predominant form of education is lecture and wrote-memorization.

As was the case in China, it may be that these Moroccan students were not entirely comfortable with more experiential and participative learning. In general, these students were educated in schools based on the French system, which in Morocco does not appear to incorporate newer, learner-instituted teaching methods. In a recent World Bank study of educational reform including adoption of inquiry-based learning (versus wrote memorization), student-based learning, and multiple-chance learning in the Middle-East North African (MENA) countries, Morocco ranked low, having “not even begun the process” (2008, p.182).

Similar to power distance, Dorfman and House (2004) describe authoritarian management practices in Arab countries as a “sheikocracy.”

This style is characterized by a patriarchal approach to managing that includes strong hierarchical authority, subordination of efficiency to human relations and personal connections, and sporadic conformity to rules and regulations contingent on the personality and power of those who make them (pp 63-64).

According to the GLOBE research presented earlier in this paper, Morocco measures the highest in power distance of the 62 societies in the study (Carl, Gupta, Javidian, 2004). Power distance is positively related to self-protective leadership (Javidian, House, Dorfman, 2004). Moroccan part of the Middle East cluster which also scored high on self-protective leadership as a culturally endorsed leadership characteristic. Self-protective leaders tend to retain power, not share or delegate it, and tend to protect their own image rather than pursue transparency (Cox, 2006). House notes that self-protective leadership is significantly and positively related to power distance. It is “characterized by self-centeredness, elitism, status consciousness, narcissism, and a tendency to induce conflict with others” (2004, p.7).

In an LLE journal entry one student, Meana (not her real name), explained the repeated delays she received from the director of an association where she was trying to volunteer.

And this made me reflect on the Moroccan administration. While leadership theories emphasize the idea that a leader should be efficient and coordinate the efforts of the group, Hakim, the leader in this case seems, just like Moroccan leaders, trying to emphasize his status by making people wait. I would not name his act of making me wait for 2 days rather than the agreed 30 minutes as being lazy, but rather it is derived from the notion of power dynamic in Morocco. The notion that a leader is not particularly accountable for his actions especially toward the subordinates

In addition to high self-protective leadership, the Middle East cluster which includes Morocco, scored lowest on participative leadership as a culturally endorsed leadership characteristic. Participative leadership reflects the degree to which managers involve others in making decisions. It is negatively related to power distance and uncertainty avoidance (Javidian, House, Dorfman, 2004). Low participative leadership societies would tend to expect leaders to be autocratic and directive (Brodebeck, Chookar, House, 2008, p.1042).

The response of senior administrators toward actually approving the proposal – avoiding creating the Institute as a cost center, envisioning it as another course that is offered - may well be outcomes of high power distance, high uncertainty avoidance cultural patterns with high self-protective and low participative leadership characteristics. Chriyaa seemed to see this when she described the administrators as needing to control this initiative.

These are the cultural dimensions that appear to contribute to the problems experienced thus far. Delays due to lack of follow through, commitment, accountability, information withholding, seem to have cultural origins in Morocco's high power distance, low future orientation. The initially supportive response of administrators followed by delay and constrained approval of the Institute seem to have cultural origins in Morocco's high power distance and uncertainty avoidance, and high self-protective and low participatory leadership. In contrast, the U.S. is fairly low on power distance (12 of 62 countries were lower), moderately high on future orientation (ranked 17 out of 62) and fairly low on self-protective leadership (Germanic Europe and Nordic Europe clusters lower), and fairly high on participative leadership (Germanic Europe and Nordic

Europe clusters were higher)(Javidian, House, Dorfman, 2004;Hoppe and Bhagat, 2008).These cultural gaps need to be negotiated as the project moves forward. Additionally, the American approaches to leadership development that will be used when the program actually starts in the fall of 2009 may have to be modified to work in these same cultural influences.

Adjustments of American leadership development to Morocco

American approaches to leadership development that emphasize credibility, individual initiative, strong ethical integrity, making needed social or organizational change, service to followers and to community, leaders developing leaders (Burns, 1978; Dugan and Komvies, 2007; Greenleaf, 1977;HERI, 1996; Komvies, et al, 2006;Kouses and Pozner, 2002; among others) may not be well accepted given the common practices of leadership currently used in Morocco (e.g. self-protective and low participatory leadership).Abdalla and Al Homoud (2001) analyzed GLOBE data for Kuwait and Qatar. They note that “what is desirable is largely different from what is practiced and what fits local culture” (p. 524). According to them, leaders in this region (MENA) must endorse traditional values yet lead toward the aspirational values similar to the global culturally endorsed dimensions from the GLOBE findings. These globally endorsed leadership characteristicsinclude characteristics such as: visionary, inspirational, self-sacrificing, performance oriented, team oriented, and humane oriented.The approaches to leadership and leadership development common in the U.S. (and used in the Presidents Leadership Class program in which Rinehart taught) incorporate many of these globally culturally endorsed leadership characteristics found in the GLOBE study. If in our leadership development at AUI, we focus on the aspirational (“should be”) leadership characteristics for Morocco which also fit well with the globally endorsed characteristics, our model of leadership may be successful with some minor adjustments.

Limitations

Validity

The issue of how can we analyze our own program returns us to the issue of the validity of this work. It is difficult for us to see our own cultural norms, but it is important to do so. Those norms often serve as the standards against which we judge other cultural behaviors. Rinehart’s frustration with the delays, though shared by some Moroccans, can serve as an example of this. In this study, we tried to compensate for the difficulty in seeing our own culture by using a bi-cultural team. The idea was that each would challenge the cultural interpretations of the other. This presented its own problems. As one of Rinehart’s students, Chriyaa had difficulty critiquing Rinehart’s work. And like his students in China, rather than confront, she became silent.

More central to this issue of validity is how can we critically evaluate a project that we are also creating – how can we evaluate the actions of the principle actors when we are the principle actors? Since this paper attempts to document the very current development of a leadership program in Morocco, as well as analyze that development, we feel that our experiences and first order interpretations (Brymann, 1988, Geertz, 1973) will be most useful. So that readers can know how to weigh our interpretations, we have sought to make our standpoint clear in relation to our setting and our analysis (Gadamer, 1989; Jagger, 1983) at several points in this paper.

Generalizability

The “how-to” aspects of this paper may be instructive for establishing leadership development in other developing countries where there is strain between traditionalism and modernism, and where there are collectivism, high power distance and other similar cultural dimensions. Thus this paper may have wide applicability. However, the “findings” of our analysis may not yet be generalizable beyond adding to the understanding of how key cultural dimensions like power distance play out when western and MENA societies meet, since the work is still very much in progress.

Summary

Like many societies in the world today, Moroccan culture is complex and dynamic. Efforts to accurately describe or analyze it will likely fall short. In our efforts to adapt U.S. based leadership development approaches to Morocco we have attempted to understand some key cultural differences that could affect our efforts. So far, we seem to have adjusted to the high uncertainty avoidance and in-group collectivism by establishing a culturally appropriate and solid foundation of relationships from which to launch the Institute in the fall of 2009. We seem to have identified a number of workshop topics that student leaders feel they need to be more effective with other Moroccans. There seems to be an undercurrent of discontent with Moroccan organizational culture and power relations to which change oriented leadership development approaches, like those common in American models, would appeal to. In the months ahead, we will need to adjust to the procrastination and delays associated with high power distance and low future orientation cultural dimensions and to the self-protective and non-participative leadership styles.

Concluding remarks

This paper had two purposes. First we sought to document a case of leadership development in a MENA country to help fill a gap in the literature. Second we examined some cultural adjustments that were needed to adapt a western leadership development approach so that it might be effective at developing leaders in this region.

Since this leadership development project is just starting, we have much to do and much to learn before useful lessons can be published. Yet we hope that our efforts to date have value to others engaged in similar efforts throughout the world.

References

- Abdalla, I. Al-Homoud, M. (2001). Exploring the Implicit Leadership Theory in the Arabian Gulf States. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*. 50 (4). 506-531.
- Anonymous. (2009). Media Advisory: Launch of the MENA CSO Leadership Institute January 15 in Casablanca. Beyster Institute. Rady School of Management. UC San Diego. January 6, 2009.
- Askanasy, N. Gupta, V. Mayfield, M. S. Trevor-Roberts, E. (2004). Future Orientation. In *Culture, leadership and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. House,

- R. J. Hanges, P. J. Javidan, M. Dorfman, P. W. and Gupta, V. eds. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Berger, P. and Luckmann, T. (1966). *The Social Construction of Reality: a Treatise on the sociology of knowledge*. Penguin Books.
- Bjerke, B. (1999). *Business leadership and culture: national management styles in the global economy*. Cheltenham, UK. Edward Elgar.
- Brodbeck, F. C. Hanges, P. J, Dickson, M. W. Gupta, V. Dorfman, P. W. (2004). Societal Culture and Industrial Sector Influences on Organizational Culture. In *Culture, leadership and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. House, R. J. Hanges, P. J. Javidan, M. Dorfman, P. W. and Gupta, V. eds. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bryman, A. 1988. *Quality and Quantity in Social Research*. London: Unwin-Hyman.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Carl, D. Gupta, V. Javidian, M. 2004. Power Distance. In *Culture, leadership and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. House, R. J. Hanges, P. J. Javidan, M. Dorfman, P. W. and Gupta, V. eds. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Council on Academic Standards. (2003). *CAS Professional Standards for Higher Leadership Programs*. Retrieved on January 28, 2009 from <http://www.nclp.umd.edu/include/pdfs/CAS%20Standards%20for%20Leadership.pdf>
- Cox, J. B. AlArkoubi, K. Estrada, S. D. (2006). *National Human Resource Development in Transitioning Societies in the Developing World: Morocco*. Advances in Developing Human Resources. 8:1. February, 2006. pp84-98.
- Den Hartog, D. N. (2004). Assertiveness. In *Culture, leadership and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. House, R. J. Hanges, P. J. Javidan, M. Dorfman, P. W. and Gupta, V. eds. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dorfman, P. W., House, R. J. (2004). Cultural Influences on Organizational Leadership: Literature Review, Theoretical Rationale, and GLOBE Project Goals. In *Culture, leadership and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. House, R. J. Hanges, P. J. Javidan, M. Dorfman, P. W. and Gupta, V. eds. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dugan, J. P., & Komives, S. R. (2007). *Developing leadership capacity in college students: Findings from a national study*. A Report from the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership. College Park MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs. Retrieved January 28, 2009 from <http://www.nclp.umd.edu/include/pdfs/MSLReport-FINAL.pdf>

- Emrich, C. G. Denmark, F. L. Den Hartog, D. N. (2004). Cross-Cultural Differences in Gender Egalitarianism: Implications for Societies, Organizations, and Leaders. In *Culture, leadership and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. House, R. J. Hanges, P. J. Javidan, M. Dorfman, P. W. and Gupta, V. eds. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gadamer, H. 1989. *Truth and Method. Second, Revised Edition*. Translated by J. Weinsheimer and D. G. Marshall. New York: Crossroads.
- Geertz, C. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gefland, M. J. Bhawuk, D.P. S. Nishii, L. H. Bechtold, D. J. 2004. Individualism and Collectivism. In *Culture, leadership and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. House, R. J. Hanges, P. J. Javidan, M. Dorfman, P. W. and Gupta, V. eds. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Greenleaf, R. G. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey in the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York: Paulist.
- Higher Education Research Institute [HERI]. (1996). *A social change model of leadership development: Guidebook version III*. College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences*. Beverly Hills. Sage.
- Hoppe, M. H. Bhagat, R. S. (2008). Leadership in the United States of America: The Leader as Cultural Hero. In *Cultures and Leadership Across the World: The GLOBE Book of In-Depth Studies of 25 Societies*. Chhokar, J. S. Brodbeck, F. C. and House, R. J. eds. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- House, R.J. (2004). Introduction. In *Culture, leadership and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. House, R. J. Hanges, P. J. Javidan, M. Dorfman, P. W. and Gupta, V. eds. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- House, R.J., Hanges, P.J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P.W., Gupta, V., and Globe Associates. (2004). *Culture, leadership and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- House, R.J., Hanges, P.J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S.A., Dorfman, P.W., Javidan, M., Dickson, M., Gupta, V. (n.d.). Cultural influences on leadership and organizations: Project GLOBE. Unpublished manuscript. Retrieved on November 12, 2007 from <http://www.thunderbird.edu/wwwfiles/ms/globe/Links/process.pdf>
- House, R. J. Javidan, M. 2004. Overview of GLOBE. In *Culture, leadership and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. House, R. J. Hanges, P. J. Javidan, M. Dorfman, P. W. and Gupta, V. eds. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Jagger, A. M. 1983. *Feminist Politics and Human Nature*. Totowa, NJ: The Harvester Press.
- Javidian, M. (2004). Performance Orientation. In *Culture, leadership and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. House, R. J. Hanges, P. J. Javidan, M. Dorfman, P. W. and Gupta, V. eds. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Javidian, M. and Dastmalchian, A. (2002). *Culture and Leadership in Iran: The land of individual Achievers, strong family ties and powerful elite*. Academy of Management Executive. 17:4. November, 2003. pp127-142.
- Javidian, M. House, R. J. Dorfman, P. W. 2004. A Nontechnical Summary of GLOBE Findings. In *Culture, leadership and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. House, R. J. Hanges, P. J. Javidan, M. Dorfman, P. W. and Gupta, V. eds. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kennedy, J. C. (2002). *Leadership in Malaysia: Traditional Values, International Outlook*. Academy of Management Executive. 16:3 August, 2002. pp15-26.
- Komives, S. R., Longerbeam, S., Owen, J. O., Mainella, F. C., & Osteen, L. (2006). A leadership identity development model: Applications from a grounded theory. *Journal of College Student Development*, 47, 401-418.
- Kouzes, J. M. Posner, B. Z. (2002). *The Leadership Challenge, Third Edition*. Jossey-Bass.
- Leadership Discovery Program, (n.d.). Retrieved on February 3, 2009 from <http://www.iiemena-discovery.org/>
- Repasky, B. Braum, V. Bundick, M. Murphy, M. (2005). *The Changing Face of Leadership: A Benchmarking Study on Student Leadership Development Programming*. University of Pittsburg. April 21, 2005.
- Sully de Luque, M. Javidian, M. (2004). Uncertainty Avoidance. In *Culture, leadership and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. House, R. J. Hanges, P. J. Javidan, M. Dorfman, P. W. and Gupta, V. eds. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- The World Bank, (2008). *The Road Not Traveled: Education Reform in the Middle East and North Africa. MENA Development Report*. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank. Washington.
- Triandis, H. C. (2004). Foreword. In *Culture, leadership and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. House, R. J. Hanges, P. J. Javidan, M. Dorfman, P. W. and Gupta, V. eds. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Zimmerman-Oster, K. Burkhardt, J. C. (2001). *Leadership in the Making: Impact and Insights from Leadership Development Programs in U.S. Colleges and Universities*. Kellogg Foundation Report. December 1, 2001.

Table 1: Culturally Endorsed Leadership Characteristics for Middle East and Anglo Regional Clusters. (Dorfman, Hanges, Brodbeck, 2004)

	Charismatic/ Value-based	Team Oriented	Participative	Humane Oriented	Autonomous	Self- Protective
Middle East cluster (includes Morocco)	L	L	L	M	M	<i>H</i>
Anglo cluster (includes the U.S.)	H	M	H	H	M	<i>L</i>

H or **L** (bold) indicates highest or lowest cluster of the 10 regional clusters into which the 62 countries were grouped; *H* or *L* (italics) indicate second highest or lowest cluster.