The No-Name Initiative:

Unfolding Active Citizenship

Jonelle Naude

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

Executive Summary

This study contextualises itself in the current climate of South Africa amidst our journey towards greater healing, transformation and equality. I approached this study from a post-modern phenomenological perspective within the paradigm of social constructionism. The study was primarily concerned with what is needed in South Africa for greater healing, transformation and equality. Five experts and practitioners in the field of political and social sciences were interviewed. Through qualitative data analysis and further review of literature and theory, a framework (the "High Road Framework") was constructed as a proposed outline to what might be needed at present in South Africa to move forward and follow the "high road".

The study explored how the "No-Name Initiative" (NNI), a proposed facilitation process that incorporates principles of coaching and change work, might address this High Road Framework. The creation of the NNI was informed by the findings of this study, my own training in different models, extensive literature research and further consultation. The NNI has two broad functions: It provides the platform for a transformational group process, and generates the space for creating personal accountability structures. As such, the NNI is a synthesis of coaching principles (including visioning, connection, personal accountability and commitment) as well as dynamics of change work, with an emphasis on Mindell's (1989, 1992, 1995) Worldwork.

As a pilot study, three NNI facilitations were employed during 2010. The three facilitations were thematically analysed and placed against the backdrop of the High Road Framework for further analysis. The findings showed that all elements of the High Road framework were inherent in the NNI. In the final discussion, the NNI was further explored as an interface between the High Road Framework and the emerging change theory of Scharmer's (2009) Theory U, adding rigour to the research findings in this paper. Moreover, in keeping with the social constructionist nature of this study, the framework was further informed and developed by the experience and analysis of the NNI facilitations. This resulted in an adapted version of the High Road framework.

From this study then emerged a possible framework for what is currently needed in South Africa to move forward (High Road Framework) as well as a proposed first-phase group process structure (the No-Name Initiative) to meet the framework's objectives.

Referencing

This work should be cited as follows:

Naude, J. (2011). *The No-Name Initiative: unfolding active citizenship*. Practitioner research paper presented at the Global Coaching Community (GCC) Rainbow Convention, Cape Town, 11–14 May 2011. Cape Town: GCC Rainbow Convention.

Acknowledgements

Thank you to all the interviewees (in Part One) and the participants (in Part Two) for their contributions to active citizenship in South Africa and to this research.

I also want to acknowledge the following people for their open hearts and minds, and the gift of their time and energy, expertise and ideas, for the sake of more dialogue, connection and active citizenship:

Sharon Johnson; Nokukhanya Nobuhle Mncwabe; Prof Janis van der Westhuizen; Prof Mohammad Karaan; Fatima Dike; Dale Williams; Anelle Naude-Lester; Shahieda Jansen; Zwelethu Jolobe; Anna-Rod Rage; Glenda Wildschut; Community Action towards a Safer Environment (CASE); and the Zolani Centre Nyanga.

Sibongiseni Myana and Stephen Mentor deserves special an acknowledgment as they have both been instrumental in running the No-Name Initiatives in Nyanga and Hanover Park. They went out of their ways to secure venues and invite participants, and danced between co-facilitating and translating during the NNI processes. These men are models of true leadership and living with an open heart.

Thank you to the GCC Rainbow Convention for creating a professional process, amidst great challenges, to give voice to the Pods research. I am in particular grateful to Nick Wilkins for his editing excellence, Emma Tyrrell for her continued support, and the Convention's Research Advisory Board for their sterling advice and feedback.

Finally I want to give special thanks to the Global Coaching Community for allowing the South African coaching community an opportunity to collaborate and share coaching research in a professional and supportive environment. Because of this, an African voice will be heard within the growing body of knowledge of coaching literature – and this makes my heart sing.

Jonelle Naude

The No-Name Initiative – Unfolding Active Citizenship

1. Introduction and research purpose

1.1 Background

Late in 2009, I became aware of a compelling inner voice. All around me in South Africa, I saw people feeling disempowered and apprehensive of where we were heading as a country. It is similar to the stomach-turning feeling you get when you sit on a train and suddenly realise that it is going in the wrong direction. This annoying little feeling had a voice, and it said: "Do you want to remain on the sidelines, worried about what you see around you; or do you want to jump in and actively take part in the co-creation of a healthy country? Are you going to be a passive bystander or a change agent?" Arnold Mindell (1989, 1992, 1995), the father of process psychology and Worldwork, compares working in the presence of true, vulnerable, heart-wrenching diversity and transformational dialogue to sitting in the fire: "Creating freedom, community and viable relationships has its price. It costs time and courage to learn how to sit in the fire of diversity" (Mindell, 1995:17).

As coaches, we hold coaching as a powerful transformational tool that could be used in both individual settings and groups (Whitworth, Kimsey-House and Sandahl, 1998; Whitmore, 2006). I believed that coaching would somehow be at the heart of the answer to this quest. I also assumed that in its current form of practice it would be neither viable nor possible to engage the largely poverty-stricken population of South Africa. As such, I explored a combination of principles true to coaching as well as large-group change work (Mindell, 1992; Block, 2007; Owen, 1992).

I decided to "jump in the fire", and what followed was a rich journey of discovery, despair, hope, transformation, resilience, love and power. Above all I discovered an affirmation that our country, our people, are worth sitting in the fire for. Maybe we are not the rainbow nation after all, maybe we are a phoenix ...

1.2 The current climate: cloudy with a chance of thunderstorms

The list of challenges in South Africa is extensive, and much of it seems to point to social, political and economic risk, for example: " ... country-wide vehement and at times violent popular protests regarding inadequate municipal services, corruption, crime, inefficient government administration, poverty ... " (Venter, 2005). Our deeper issues seem to include a declining morality and resistance to

political accountability from our leaders, and increasing economic inequality (Southall, 2010). Our politics of social justice and liberation have morphed into mechanisms of personal advancement and accumulation (Pityana, 2010).

Declining political accountability, coupled with a non-active civil society, can have devastating results. According to Pityana (2010:3), Chairperson of the Council for the Advancement of the South African Constitution (CASAC), South Africans have become "passive spectators" and the "notion of active citizenship has been lost".

There is growing consensus that the major risk factors are caused by a lack of relationship between government and civil society (Thomson, 2004; Labuschagne, 2010; Pityana, 2010). One of many contributing factors could be that our dominant discourse in South Africa is that of a top-down power distribution from government to civil society. The government and ruling party promised many things to the people or for the people, locating the power within government (Pityana, 2010). It would seem that we now need to have government be in relationship with civil society, and approach transformation as an equal partnership in terms of accountability and responsibility.

This seems to align with Block's (2007) notion of "civic engagement". According to Block, we need to redirect our questions away from the dominant discourse, to that which explores our possibility and our capacity to transform. In conjunction with this, we need to enhance commitment and accountability. This implies commitment and accountability from every citizen – all sharing ownership and responsibility in our journey forward.

Another concept that keeps emerging from our rhetoric is our desperate need for unifying structures. Former president Mandela first spoke of the "RDP of the soul" (Villa-Vicencio, 2007). The "RDP of the soul" referred to the need for a common set of values in our country's changing landscape ("RDP" stands for "Reconstruction and Development Programme", which was instituted by government after democratisation to address the socio-economic impact of apartheid). The charter of positive values was to be debated across the country (including ethical values such as human dignity and equality; freedom, the rule of law and democracy; material well-being and economic justice; family and community values; loyalty, honesty and integrity; harmony in culture, belief and conscience; respect and concern for people; and justice, fairness and peaceful coexistence). This was a very novel idea, that was never rolled out successfully, and never caught on with the majority of South Africans.

Sport, as a unifying structure, has done well in building moments of togetherness and goodwill during the Rugby World Cup of 1995, and again with even greater success during the FIFA World Cup of 2010. Many positive and hard-working initiatives germinated and developed within the last 24 months, directly and indirectly linked to the positive energy that the FIFA World cup generated. It is my contention that we now need to harness this goodwill so that it does not just become a fleeting moment of hope. We need to weave this potential into the very social fibre of our nation.

In Pityana's (2010) words: " ... there are dark clouds above us; we cannot ignore them. As we approach the fork in the road, you can help us ensure that we do not lose our way."

1.3   Research purpose

This study explores two questions:

1.   What is currently needed in South Africa on our journey towards greater healing, transformation and equality?

2.   How does the No-Name Initiative address these needs?

This paper is structured as a two-part series. The first part explores the question: "What is currently needed in South Africa?" The data are discussed in conjunction with relevant literature. The second part explores the application of a group process that draws on principles of coaching, process work and large-group facilitation. Here the emergent themes are compared and discussed against the backdrop of current theory of change and transformation, as well as the original findings (structured as a framework) of Part One. This augments into a rich discussion with further reference to the new-generation change theory, Theory U (Scharmer, 2009).

In an attempt to explore the first question, five open-ended qualitative interviews were conducted with experts in the field of political science, psychology and transformation work. From the data an initial framework was created of "what is needed in South Africa on our healing journey" (referred to in this study as the "High Road Framework"). Literature was consulted, and a creative process followed which incorporated the data, literature, consultation with colleagues, and personal training and studies, to finally produce a proposed group facilitation process – the No-Name Initiative (NNI).

In an attempt to explore the second question, a pilot study was undertaken. Three NNI facilitations were employed during 2010. The processes that emerged during the three facilitations were analysed against the backdrop of the High Road Framework. A final discussion explores how the NNI

addressed and supported the High Road Framework, as well as how the NNI relates to the emerging change theory of Theory U (Scharmer, 2009).

This study also aims to place coaching philosophy firmly within the arena of social development and social upliftment in South Africa. Coaching is a powerful tool that can facilitate change, empower the marginalised, and enhance individuals' sense of responsibility and ownership (Hangrove, 1995; Mink, Owen, and Mink, 1993; Whitmore, 1992; Stober, 2006; Rosinki, 2003). Within our South African social and economic context where there is a heightened need of skills development, transfer of wealth, and equalisation, I would assert that coaching is a valuable tool to facilitate and contribute to these national objectives. Moreover, as coaching is still an emerging profession, it needs to stay aware of how and where it is needed – and how this in turns informs the development of coaching practice within the South African context.

The more I shared the idea of this initiative, the more I was asked what the name of this initiative was. At that stage I was committed not to create an agenda for this initiative other than it being an open space for dialogue. Acknowledging that there is no such thing as value-free name, I referred to it as the "initiative without name" – which over time became the "no-name initiative". This name suits the initiative well as it reflects its qualities of a "no-name brand": a generic, accessible option – without royalty or ownership.

2.   Literature review

To build a solid foundation for this study, as well as to create some context around the creation and development of the proposed "No-Name Initiative", a literature review follows that encompasses a broad overview of coaching and change work.

2.1   Coaching

Coaching has emerged from an amalgamation of (Brock, 2008) has called its "root disciplines", including philosophy, psychology, consulting, education, management, mentoring, and sports, as well as organisational development, sociology, training and facilitation, performing arts, career development, and 12-step programmes. It is beyond the remit of this paper to describe in detail what coaching entails. However, I will touch on the basic principles here, to create an appropriate understanding of, and insight into, how coaching could potentially help address South Africa's civic societal needs.

In broad terms, coaching not only uncovers what people truly value and care about, but it empowers them to put this self-knowledge into action and create the future they desire (Hargrove, 1995). Coaching helps the client to expose self-limiting beliefs, acknowledge personal in-congruencies, and integrate further self-discovery (Mink, Owen and Mink, 1993). It facilitates a process of internal change and consciousness, which in turns enables the client to make conscious choices in their lives (Whitmore, 1992). Coaching (similar to humanistic psychology) supports connection, understanding, growth and self-actualisation, choice and responsibility (Stober, 2006).

Coaching does not only focus on the understanding and managing of the self, but also addresses the self in relation to the other and the world (Whitmore, 2006). These principles of transpersonal psychology embedded in coaching (Whitmore, 2006), as well as coaching's clear systems perspective (Brock, 2008), enabled coaching to further develop elements of inter-culturalism (Rosinki, 2003). According to Rosinski, coaching draws from different disciplines and cultures to elicit underlying human potential. Rosinki (2003) further explains how coaching acts as an interface to the interconnectedness of human beings, thus connecting people and enhancing communication.

One of the attributes of coaching that allows us to access our interconnectedness, is that it addresses the client as a human being first and foremost, and only secondary to that it includes the roles and beliefs we engage with in life (Whitworth, Kimsey-House and Sandahl, 1998). Consequently, coaching has the ability to enhance both connection and communication between human beings. Coaching's roots in ontological philosophy (Sieler, 2003) further confirm its usefulness for deep change and communication. Coaching is proving to be a medium that could be used to cross cultural, racial and religious divides (Whitworth, Kimsey-House and Sandahl, 1998; Rosinki, 2003). According to Brock (2008) many anthropology models and tools have also been integrated into the practice of coaching, including constructs such as language, acceptance, change and cultural diversity.

According to Brock (2008), coaching has also been dramatically influenced by large-group awareness training (Klar *et al.*, 1990). Concepts such as commitment, breakthrough, making a difference, creating possibility/creating the future, empowerment, being/way of being, service, and integrity, accordingly all feature in coaching (Brock, 2008).

2.2   Change work

Facilitation is often used synonymously with coaching. According to Skiffington and Zeus (2003), facilitation skills are key in group coaching for change. Although they have become distinct

disciplines, the practices of team coaching and facilitation in groups will be referred to inter-relatedly in this study.

The origins of change work can be traced back to the 1950s (Emery and Trist, 1960), from where it steadily evolved to become more future-oriented and potential-focused (Lippitt, 1980). It would seem that the development of coaching and change work, while occurring in various settings, emerged from the same need – to bring the notions of human potential and desired future to the people. During the 1980s and 1990s, organisational development (OD) further transformed to create and refine methods of addressing whole systems (Bunker and Alban, 1992). Future Search (Weisbord and Janoff, 2010) was one of the first models intended for large groups which could accommodate many stakeholders at a time (Bunker and Alban, 2000). Some of the models that were to follow – each rapidly building and developing this approach – included Open Space Technology (Owen, 1992), and the Conference Model (Axelrod, 1992), as well as further methods developed by the Inter-Cultural Association (Bunker and Alban, 2005). During the 1990s these systems-level models for change were included in more popular OD practice (Bunker and Alban, 2005), and reached the status of established practice during the first decade of the twenty-first century (Bunker and Alban, 2005).

I have investigated and researched many of the change models that are used today, in my process to develop the No-Name Initiative. It is not within the remit of this study to explain each approach. I will instead name those that were considered in the creation of the No-Name Initiative's process, and three models that struck me as particularly useful will be discussed in more detail.

The following models were considered:
- Appreciative Inquiry (Ludema *et al.*, 2003).
- The World Café (Brown, 2002).
- Peter Block's Civic Engagement (Block, 2007).
- Scenario Planning (Schwartz, 1996).
- Open Space Technology (Owen, 1992).
- Whole-scale Change (Dannemiller Tyson Associates, 2000).
- Worldwork (Mindell, 1992).

All these models and methods have been used with success at community level, in business, at national level, and in international and multi-cultural settings (Bunker and Alban, 2005). Many of them have been used in combination to serve in different settings (Bunker and Alban, 2005). These large-group processes hold much value for communities with high diversity or conflict, as they encourage all the voices within the system to be heard, and also manage the differences within the

group (Bunker and Alban, 2005). In my review of these methodologies I found additional support for Bunker and Alban's (2005) observation that new-generation, large-scale change models share the following characteristics:

- they facilitate communication amongst diverse groups and/or stakeholders;
- they create platforms for all the voices in a system, including the marginalised, to be heard;
- they elicit a meaningful process that works with diversity and differences without using conflict resolution strategies;
- the aim is not to resolve all conflict, but rather to find or create common ground; and
- once common ground is established, the group can move forward.

In addition to the above, I also found the following commonalities:

- they assume the basic philosophical underpinnings and principles of coaching (for example, a focus on possibility rather than problem, and a future orientation); and
- they have achieved proven success when implemented in areas where diversity is in the foreground, with or without conflict and/or violence.

The theories and models I consulted are far from an exhaustive list – these are approaches that have struck a particular cord with me, or in which I have received training. My particular interest in consulting the literature was to look for the "magic". In many a training or group process environment – whether attending as a participant or facilitating – I have had the privilege to experience moments of magic. Senge *et al.* (2007) talk about this in their book *Presence: Exploring profound change in people, organisations and society*. These are moments that could be described as sacred or paranormal. It is an awareness of the whole group that something extraordinary has happened – that something has shifted.

Sometimes this moment could be a profound silence, such as the scenario-building Adam Kahane famously experienced in his group process in Guatemala (Kahane, 2010). It could be an intimate exchange of brutal honesty and acknowledgement that bridges years of resentment and blame in an instant (for example, the work of Arye and Audergon (2006) in Croatia), and which brings the whole group to surrender. Attempts have been made to explain this phenomenon as Gestalt (Koffka, 1935) or self-organisation (Kauffman, 1996), and yet it seems beyond these explanations. Some change workers refer to "it" as spirit (Owen, 1992), while others call it the sentient level (Mindell, 1995). I will not attempt to fully understand this phenomenon here. However, I do know that it exists and is accessible when the right environment is created and facilitated.

The following models have all demonstrated the potential to access this high plane of group consciousness, in greater or lesser degrees: Worldwork, Civic Engagement and Open Space Technology. Among the three, Worldwork seemed to excel in acknowledging and addressing the "magic" (see Sentient level discussed below 2.3.5.). Although the No-Name Initiative relies most heavily on the process of Worldwork, certain elements of Open Space Technology and Civic Engagement were also incorporated.

2.3   The No-Name Initiative

The No-name Initiative (NNI) is a transformational group process that supports personal responsibility and accountability.

The NNI is a facilitation process which aims to:

1.   provide a platform for a transformational group process; and
2.   generate the space for creating personal accountability structures.

The NNI is a synthesis of coaching principles, including visioning, connection, personal accountability and commitment (Whitworth, Kimsey-House and Sandahl, 1998), as well as dynamics of change work with an emphasis on Worldwork (Mindell, 1989; 1992; 1995). The NNI group process does not seek to produce solutions, but aims to create dialogue, understanding and change. The sense of "resolution" often reached during such a process, is therefore on an emotional level rather than a practical level. This process supports the belief that once we feel heard and understood as human beings, it then becomes easier to let go of our own opinions and invite change and transformation. From the new emotional field, change and practical solutions becomes easier.

Sections 2.3.1 to 2.3.11 below provide an introduction to the major principles and concepts (based on coaching, Worldwork, Civic Engagement and Open Space Technology) that form the foundation and heart of the NNI process.

2.3.1   The right people at the right place

Whichever people attend the group process are believed to be the right people there. This is a principle repeated throughout many change work models, including Open Space Technology (Owen, 1992) and Worldwork (Mindell, 1995). In effect this means that, regardless of whether the group consists of five people or 500, the process will go ahead on the assumption that everyone is there who should be there.

2.3.2   Law of two feet

When you feel you are not engaged, contributing, or learning, move to another place. This concept keeps each participant "in choice". You choose to engage or choose not to. This is usually not only a huge relief for a participant, but keeps the container from leaking. Amongst the different voices and stakeholders we include a "I don't give a hoot" voice. Participants agree to stay aware of their impact on the rest of the group; accordingly, each participant stays in full choice and responsibility (Owen, 1992).

2.3.3 Dreaming

Before the group process starts, people are asked to share their dreams (in this case, for South Africa) with each other. Psychological concepts used in the co-active model such as dreaming, metaphor and visioning (Whitworth, Kimsey-House and Sandahl, 1998) are used in a directive step here. This invites "high dreams" (Centre for Right Relationship, 2005) into the group space without having to "do" anything with them. Civic Engagement (Block, 2007) refers to such future visioning as creating an "alternate future".

2.3.4 Show the system to itself

The group is an entity greater than the sum of the parts: The group process itself relies on Worldwork, which sees the group as an energy or entity in its own right (Centre for Right Relationship, 2005). As such, the facilitators listen to the "being" of the group itself: the space or the energy that is created by the group. The facilitators stay aware of the emotional "climate" or "weather" (Mindell, 1995) in the room (for example, is it calm and peaceful with a sense of resolution? Is it dark, stormy and apprehensive? Is there a sense of hopelessness and of being overwhelmed?).

The more precise the facilitators are in noticing the emotional or energetic "weather" in the room, the more clearly it can be reflected back to the group. The purpose is to constantly show the system to itself. This brings a sense of relief (as the system is being heard), as well as an opportunity for change. Showing the system to itself echoes the work of Senge *et al.* (2007) and their Theory U (Scharmer, 2009), that will be explored in the discussion in Section 5.

2.3.5 Track the three different levels of communication

The facilitators also stay aware of and track the three different levels of communication in the group (Mindell, 1995):

- *Intellectual* – Participants talk about the facts of the matter, they analyse, or engage in intellectual debate.

- *Emotional* – Participants talk about their emotional experience, how it effects them, or what touches them.
- *Sentient/oneness* – Participants become aware of what connects them, rather than what separates them. They have a sense of oneness or sameness, and perhaps they even connect to higher dreams and purpose. The facilitators keep the group aware of the different levels they are communicating, and invite them to step more and more into the emotional and sentient level as it unfolds.

2.3.6   Deep democracy

Then the facilitators also listen through the lens of Deep Democracy, a principle forming the backbone of Worldwork. It is a term coined by Mindell (1992) to explain that one voice in the system is as important as another – independent of strength or quantity. Democracy usually includes diversity, but favours the majority. Deep Democracy supports both mainstream and marginalised voices as equals. Further, it assumes that through the expression and authentic communication of all the different voices the wisdom of the system can start to emerge. It is especially the expression of marginalised voices and the acknowledgement of hidden discourse that hold potential to facilitate change (Arye and Audergon, 2006). Facilitators might, for example, ask certain participants "What is not being said?", or "Which voice is missing or not speaking?" This is an active role for the facilitators, as different voices need to be supported at different times.

2.3.7   Identify different roles and voices

The facilitators identify the different roles as these emerge through the process. There might be hidden voices in the group that are not represented by individuals, but still carry presence in the room. A "ghost role" is the name given to this presence that we can feel but not see (Mindell, 1992). For example, the "hijacker" or "terrorist" might be a ghost role in the room when no-one is occupying that voice, but the anticipation of its presence is felt. A "time spirit" (Mindell, 1992) is a construct which has been present through time and which has an impact on the group. The legacy of apartheid is a good example of a time spirit when the group is clearly influenced by this construct. Such roles or constructs, when present, are made "visible" to the group, and participants are invited to step into these roles and occupy them.

2.3.8   Stepping into, not over, hotspots

When conflict and emotion escalate (often referred as a "hotspot"), it is important to stay with the emotional or hidden voices. Careful facilitation helps unfold the process, so that the group can cross the edge they have come to. This is also what Mindell refers to when he talks about "sitting in the

fire" (Mindell, 1995). Crossing the edge is a transformational experience. Groups sometimes have to spend a lot of time in this uncomfortable space before they are ready to step over and change becomes available.

2.3.9   Acknowledging double signals

A double signal is a secondary message (verbal or non-verbal) that is incongruent with the primary message (Mindell, 1992). Often the person communicating the double signal is unaware of her/his conflicting message. The secondary message is often unconsciously communicated through non-verbal behaviour. It can be frustrating and unsettling for the receiver of a double message, as the primary message cannot be trusted. Double signals, when identified and acknowledged, have the potential to unlock new dimensions to a relationship, and invite more understanding and change (Mindell, 1995).

2.3.10   Working with rank – double signals

A useful concept that will be used throughout this study is "rank" (Mindell, 1992). Rank refers to a level of status derived from diverse sources of privilege and power such as social, psychological, economic, moral, cultural and educational, to name a few. According to Mindell (1992), rank is often unconscious, and it readily coincides with the dominant culture, dominant discourse or the "majority". A connection could thus be drawn between rank and the current dominant power discourses, as well as with the "hidden" power discourses (Foucault, 1981). Rank refers to an attitude or set of beliefs (Mindell, 1992) about ourselves and others in the context of our (the dominant) culture. As rank is often portrayed through discourse, it is my contention that discourse is therefore a valuable tool, with the measure being the presence of rank.

Different kinds of rank are embedded in constructs such as spirituality, emotional fluidity, morality, sexuality, gender, beauty, age, ethnicity, and social status (Mindell, 1995). As such, an individual could have high rank in some areas and low rank in other social constructions. This can cause internal conflict if rank often gives rise to incongruent massages that are evident through "double signals". According to Mindell (1995), a primary signal is the message we intend to communicate, while the secondary signal is unconscious or unintended (often non-verbal) behaviour. This give rise to the "double signal".

In Worldwork, a major focus is to uncover double signals, allow them to come to the conscious, and acknowledge them. Clarifying and taking ownership of these double signals often unlocks a breakthrough in communication and understanding for all parties in the relationship. It can also defuse destructive emotional escalation.

The discourse of "low rank" often involves defensiveness and attack (Mindell, 1992). The focus is on the person of higher rank, often including overt or covert blame and resentment. Low-rank discourse is also typically consumed in its own powerlessness and victimhood. The emotional field of low-rank discourse can be quite overwhelming, and individuals engaged in this discourse often appear powerless, overwhelmed, inarticulate or disconnected. Low-rank discourse could evolve to incorporate mainstream values – in order to relate to the powerful. However, this ends up creating more feelings of inferiority as the individual becomes aware of self-betrayal of values and colluding with the "enemy".

By highlighting these dynamics of low-rank discourse during dialogue and making them conscious, individuals/groups can overcome this by remembering that their identity is greater than their current experience of lower rank.

Privilege and power is often related to abuse and misuse. A dominant discourse in western society is the desire for equality. This often leads only to covert power and privilege. The key here is not to magically wish power and rank away – but to learn how to acknowledge it and have it be overtly present during dialogue and communication. As Foucault (1980) argued, power can be productive and should not be seen only as repressive: it is by studying the underlying dynamics fuelled by power, that change can become possible (Burman *et al.*, 1997).

By identifying and acknowledging power discourses, hidden discourses and rank, individuals are allowed to step out of the discourse in which they are stuck, and see the rank for what it is: a specific power discourse attached to a specific construct. Once we own our rank and privilege, it becomes easier to communicate in an open and honest way.

2.3.11 Personal accountability and commitment

In the second part of the NNI process, the participants are supported in a personal process that enables self-reflection and the generation and creation of ideas in which they can become personally responsible for the future they want to create in South Africa. Accountability structures are put in place, which is followed by a personal commitment ceremony. Commitment and accountability are major foci in any coaching process (Whitworth, Kimsey-House, and Sandahl, 1998; Whitmore, 2006; Brock, 2008). In the NNI the focus is on personal accountability, as well as ownership and responsibility of your part in the system.

3.   Practitioner research methodology and approach

This is a typical qualitative explorative study. According to Mays and Pope (1993), the goal of qualitative research is the development of concepts that can aid our understanding of social phenomena, with a strong focus on meaning, experience and the perceptions of the participants. This study's meta-philosophical grounding is in social constructionism, which breaks with conventional conceptions of social problems by analysing them as a social process of definition, rather than a fixed definition of meaning (Gergen, 1974).

This study is grounded in a post-modern phenomenological perspective. Within the paradigm of social constructionism, the approach of the researcher is typically a phenomenological interpretive approach. Phenomenology is concerned with the study of the experience from the perspective of the individual (Burr, 1995; Stanley and Wise, 1993). The researcher interprets the phenomenological experience of the individual, and consequently the researcher also plays an active role in the research. As such, the researcher becomes a visible part of the research, rather than being an invisible observer (Stanley and Wise, 1993). Because this study also represents practitioner research, the practitioner therefore becomes the researcher, and the researcher is the practitioner – one intertwined state of being.

It can also be construed that within this phenomenological approach, we go one step further: the practitioner becomes one with the system. As such, the boundaries between researcher, practitioner and phenomenon (the system) becomes less clear, as each is informed – and transformed – by the other. She (the researcher/practitioner) is a witness, and at the same time actively engaged. She surrenders to it, while being an ally for change. There is a soft focus on the system, and an expansive awareness of the unfolding process. Moreover, there is an attitude of being at service, and a willingness to be a vehicle for the system to express and change itself (Scharmer, 2009).

As explained in the Section 1, this study consists of two distinct parts:
- *Part One*. The first part is concerned with exploring the current reality in South Africa and the emerging need to facilitate greater healing and equality.
- *Part Two*. The second part explores the value of the No-Name Initiative in an attempt to address these emergent needs.

In both Part One and Two I make use of qualitative interpretative thematic analysis to analyse the data. Interpretative thematic analysis focuses on identifiable themes and patterns of behaviour, thought and living (Benner, 1985; Maxwell and Miller, 2008). The data capturing and finer details of analysis in this study took on slight differences in Part One and Part Two.

For Part One, the recorded interviews were transcribed. I typically approached the data by familiarising myself with the contents and allowing the themes to emerge. This was done by reading the transcribed data numerous times, and repeatedly listening to the audio interviews. Emerging themes were identified and sub-themes were established. By referring back to literature I could make further interpretations. Finally the literature was interwoven with the findings which added rigour and validity to this qualitative process. The themes were structured to organise a framework of "what is currently needed in South Africa". This framework was then used in Part 2 from which to explore the usefulness of the No-Name Initiative.

For Part 2 written recordings of the facilitation processes were collated including my own notes on reflection of the facilitations. This data were approached much in the same way as in Part 1. Themes and sub-themes were allowed to emerged and develop through a progressive and layered process which included immersing myself in the data and reading through and reflecting on the data repeatedly. This resulted in a both condensing as well as cumulative effect. Keeping the themes in mind, the data was then placed next to the framework that was created in Part 1. As such, the data were now viewed in relation to the framework exploring how the data answered to the framework. In the final stage more literature were consulted, with a particular focus on Theory U (Scharmer, 2009), and integrated into the final discussion of the themes and findings.

4. Practitioner research activity

4.1 Part One

In the first part of the study, I took a meta-view of South Africa and its journey towards healing, transformation, and equality. Five open-ended, semi-structured, qualitative interviews were conducted. Qualitative interviewing refers to an in-depth, semi-structured form of interviewing (Mason, 1996). The interviewer or interviewee may also diverge and pursue an idea in more detail, or even create a new idea (Britten, 1995).

Interviewees were selected guided by the following criteria:
- I wanted to access a multidisciplinary body of knowledge and expertise, stretching across political science, social science and practitioner research.
- I wanted a diverse group of interviewees in terms of gender and race.

The final group included:
- a South African black male lecturer and researcher in political science at the University of Cape Town;

- a South African coloured female psychologist and researcher in a senior position at the University of the Western Cape;
- a South African white female psychologist and change work practitioner working in the NGO field;
- a South African black female practitioner and researcher working with the African Transitional Justice Research Network and Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation; and
- a Norwegian white female researcher and political artist currently engaged with the Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation.

During the interviews I asked typical coach-like questions such as:

1. where are we now on this journey?; and
2. what is needed to move forward?

Interviewees were encouraged to share their own vision of South Africa as well as their biggest fears. The interview agenda ranged from enquiring about personal experiences to expert advice, from personal agency (of the interviewee) to their reflection of the system as a whole (being South Africa in this case). A loose framework of the interview questions is available in Appendix A.

Interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim. I familiarised myself with the data, by re-reading it several times, pondering on it, immersing myself in the data, and allowing themes to emerge. Through interpretative thematic analysis (Benner, 1985), major themes were allowed to emerge from the data. The data were analysed using the parameters of coaching and change work. As the main purpose of the data was to guide and inform the creation of the next part of the project, the data were handled in a way that would allow access to the content, as well as deeper underlying themes.

Interviewees gave their verbal consent to be quoted and referenced in any research that should emerged from the interviews. For the sake of this discussion, the interviewees are kept anonymous, to minimise bias on account of the researcher as well as the reader. However, all the interviewees consented to be quoted as necessary.

4.2 Part Two

From the analysis of Part One, an initial framework was created of what was needed in South Africa on our healing journey. Literature was consulted and a creative process followed which incorporated the data, literature, consultation with colleagues and friends, personal training and studies to finally

produce the No-Name Initiative as a proposed group facilitation process. In an attempt to explore the second question, a pilot study was undertaken.

For the purpose of the pilot, I contacted colleagues, established NGO's, and many community centres to spread the word of the NNI. I made it know that the NNI is a voluntary endeavour and open to anyone who is interested. It was explained that the facilitation aims to engage people in dialogue around important issues (for that community). The group generates a relevant and urgent topic to work with whilst the process allows for the expression and deepening of the different voices and emotions in the room. The contact persons were responsible for securing the venue (usually a community centre) and inviting possible participants. The contact (or someone appointed by the contact person) and I would typically spend some time together before the NNI, so that he/she felt comfortable to co-facilitate and/or translate as needed. The number of participants per facilitation ranged from six to 40. I worked from the assumption that the people who attended were those who were meant to be there (applying "the right people at the right place" principle). I also provided refreshments for participants during the process.

Three pilot NNI facilitations were carried out during 2010:
1. 12 July 2010 – NNI in association with Community Action for a Safer Environment (CASE) in Hanover Park (co-facilitated by Stephen Mentor from CASE).
2. 14 July 2010 – NNI at the Zolani Centre – Nyanga (co-facilitated by Sibongiseni Myana).
3. 13 October 2010 – NNI organised by Sibongiseni Myana for youth of Nyanga – Nyanga (co-facilitated by Sibongiseni Myana).

The NNI has two broad functions: It provides the platform for a transformational group process, and generates the space for creating personal accountability structures. As such, the NNI is a synthesis of coaching principles (including visioning, connection, personal accountability and commitment (Whitworth, Kimsey-House and Sandahl, 1998) as well as dynamics of change work with an emphasis on Worldwork (Mindell, 1989; 1992; 1995).

Four hours are typically set aside for an NNI process, although the group ultimately decides when they are finished. In all three pilot NNI facilitations carried out during 2010, my co-facilitator was a volunteer facilitator from the relevant community, who also acted as translator.

The processes that emerged during the three facilitations were transcribed and analysed against the backdrop of the framework from Part One.

4.3   Rigour, reliability and validity

Basic strategies to ensure rigour in the qualitative research included systematic and self-conscious research design, data collection, interpretation and communication (Mays and Pope, 1993).

Mason (1996) suggested that the foremost method to ensure retest reliability in qualitative research is to maintain meticulous records of interviews and observations, and by documenting the process of analysis in detail. Accordingly, for Part One of this study the interviews were recorded and transcribed by myself. Each step of the process was documented. For Part Two, careful notes (mostly verbatim) were taken by an assistant throughout each NNI process. After each facilitation I made my own notes on the process, narratives and underlying themes. It was a major drawback for the research that the group processes were not recorded. However, the presence of a video camera seemed to have an impact on the group process. Consequently, I chose purity and authenticity within the group process over rigour in qualitative research methods. Future recommendations for similar practitioner research would be to alternate process with and without video recording, so as to build a library of further research material.

4.4   Ethical considerations

All interviewees in Part One gave their consent to be referenced and quoted as necessary. For Part Two, individuals have been kept confidential within this study. This typical group process allows individual to explore voices that they would not normally access, nor necessarily agree with after such a process. All participants, did, however write down their names and contact details, and gave their consent to be contacted in the future.

From a coaching perspective all participants were seen (and treated) as naturally, creative, resourceful and whole individuals (Whitworth, Kimsey-House and Sandahl, 1998). However, I propose that a post-NNI structure, supporting the growth and active citizenship of the participants, could be a beneficial addition. Although the participants were invited to the Facebook page of the NNI, most participants did not have internet access. A "second-wave" process or structure could certainly enhance the ethical responsibility of the NNI.

5.   *Practitioner research findings*

5.1   Discussion Part One: interview data
(A): "75 per cent of the population do not have access to your life".

The focus of this section is to highlight the biggest challenges for South Africa in its current predicament and to let the data suggest how we can proceed to address these challenges. For me, the above quote encapsulated the five interviews in one powerful, potent sentence.

During Part One, I (the "coach") typically played the role of a coach-like interviewer, practitioner-researcher, and a voice to the system (in this case the community of experts). Through thematic analyses (Maxwell and Miller, 2008), the major themes were allowed to emerge from the data. The data were analysed using the parameters of coaching and change work. In this section the themes will be discussed and linked to relevant coaching or change work literature where appropriate. As the main purpose of the data was to guide and inform the creation of the next part of the project, the data were handled in a way the would allow access to the content, as well as deeper underlying themes.

For the sake of this discussion the interviewees were kept anonymous, to minimise bias on account of the researcher as well as the reader. However, all the interviewees consented to be quoted as necessary.

The primary objective of the in-depth interviews was to gain expert advice and recommendations on what is needed in SA to facilitate greater healing, transformation and equality. The emphasis was to gain information not merely from literature, but by being in dialogue and relationship with other South Africans. On working with the data, a secondary objective developed namely to uncover and highlight the implicit power relations, dominant discourses and hidden discourses (Foucault, 1981). After all it is the many different voices in SA that we all need to hear and process to truly be in relationship with one another. This means we need to acknowledge not only the many personal physical voices, but also the different implicit "voices" of the system, that carries power narratives of privilege and power, victim and survivor, love, unresolved emotions and of course, politics.

5.1.1 South Africa: The current climate

I will first give an account of what the current status of South Africa is perceived to be, as portrayed through the interviews. There was a general consensus that South Africa is at some kind of "crossroad". In fact, all interviewees used the word "crossroad" to describe where we were as a country. The meaning of this crossroad slightly differed in the interviews which could be summarised in the following perspectives:

- We are completing the process of the re-engineering of state structure and law, but we have not reached consensus on how to deal with unequal income distribution.

- We are confronted with a choice of taking the moral high road as a country or the moral low road.
- We are stuck at this crossroad, as we do not have the political leadership to have us choose our path.
- We are in crisis, and the fundamental fabric of our society, the family, has been damaged.

The overarching theme of a crossroad can be explained by the phenomenon of the "edge" in Worldwork (Mindell, 1995). An edge could partly be explained as a "communication block that occurs when an individual or group, out of fear, represses something that is trying to emerge" (Mindell, 1995:41). From the data it is suggested that the phenomenon many South Africans are trying to repress is the growing awareness and accompanying discomfort that our current situation is not acceptable. (K) explained: "There seems to be an acknowledgement that transformation is necessary; however, there is a reluctance to engage with what this means in practical terms. If the playing fields are to be levelled, invariably networks of privilege and preference have to be dismantled. This is not an easy or pleasant process for anyone: for those accustomed to privilege, there is a sense of "reverse unfairness"; for those now privileged, there is resentment of the constant questioning of competence."

There is a growing awareness of what needs to happen, accompanied by apprehension or fear typical of an edge in a system. Interviewees all agreed that there was a need for South Africans for reach consensus before real change is possible. This need for consensus was often emotionally loaded with a sense of urgency. (Z) explained that all citizens had to come to a point where they are in agreement that the current inequality is "wrong and has to change". Although inequality is often acknowledged in South Africa, it has not yet reached a general consensus that it is not acceptable. (Z) compared this with how apartheid came to an end – it could only end once people agreed that it was wrong. (Z)'s explanation supports the concept of an active civil society. It also expresses a dream for our dominant discourse to transition from a passive "This is bad" to an active "No, we will not take this anymore". (Z): "This asks of people at an 'ordinary level' to start saying that we will do things differently – and lead a process of change".

5.1.2   *South Africa as a double signal*

From the data it seems as if South Africa's journey, even its very identity, is loaded with double signals (Mindell, 1992). Contradiction and paradox are not foreign to us in South Africa. As Sipho Pityana noted in his address to the Council for the Advancement of South African Constitution (Pityana, 2010):

"There are few countries in the world about which the *Financial Times* could offer two such apparently contradictory editorials, within one month of each other: the one very positive, acclaiming South Africa's impeccable hosting of the FIFA World Cup; the other decrying the lurch towards secrecy and media suppression, and using the word 'Zimbabwe' to underline the seriousness of their reading of the situation."

Some examples in the study data of these double signals include the following:

- In post-Apartheid South Africa, space and opportunity were opened up for all to receive education and the workplace was deracialised. However, according to (Z) it was only a minority of people who could access this, and the majority of South Africans are still "locked in the cycle of poverty". There is evidence of a double signal from government here: previously disadvantaged people are considered equal citizens in law, but are not given enough means to access their core civil rights and privileges. As one interviewee explained (K): "While the official narrative speaks of a reconciliation process that is largely concluded, this is clearly not the case as far as poor and politically marginalised citizens are concerned".

- Another example of a double signal that emerged from the data was "memorialisation" . Memorials have been erected to pay respect to and to remember the suffering of many due to apartheid. According to interviewees, many of these memorials have been treated as flagships of South Africa directed at tourism. Many memorials (like Robben Island) are expensive attractions to view, and not accessible to the poverty-stricken majority of South Africans. As (A) explains: " ... those who actually need to be memorialised are not included". The question is who is (currently) using these memorials, and who should be?

- Even the concept of ubuntu, as practised in South Africa, has delivered double signals. One interviewee explained (K): "The rhetoric in South Africa does not correspond to action: we hear of ubuntu as a guiding principle of our cultures. And yet, we are hostile to refuge seekers; our leaders plunder the coffers intended for the destitute and desperate; our teachers are more truant than students; our public servants serve with a perceptible hostility rather than humility ..."

From the perspective of Deep Democracy and Worldwork (as discussed in the Literature Review in Section 2 above), a double signal tends to create frustration, anger, and even hopelessness for the receivers. According to (K), in South Africa we are currently seeing more indicative behaviours of frustration and anger such as violent crime, xenophobia, and service-delivery protests. Double signals not only need to be identified and acknowledged for the sake of more congruent communication and alignment, but their exposure has the potential to create better understanding and the deepening of relationships (Mindell, 1992).

5.1.3 The struggle between power and love

The above-mentioned double signals remind one of the struggle between "power and love" that world-renowned scenario facilitator Adam Kahane (2010) grappled with in his book *Power and Love: Solving tough social and organisational problems*. Kahane (2010) refers to "power" as the self-actualising will to grow and develop with regards to the individual. On the other hand, "love" refers to the drive towards unity and oneness, and the highest regard of the system. Kahane explains that power needs love, and love needs power, to be generative in nature and reach their full potential – for love without power and power without love becomes degenerative processes.

Throughout the data there is a tension between power and love. This theme is particularly evident in references to where South Africa succeeded and failed during the last 17 years: either being in the soft glow of love, without enough personal urgency and will to follow through, or with special reference to where political agenda and the desire for efficacy had overridden social awareness and acknowledgment of the system.

For example, South Africa had negotiated a transition from apartheid in which both power and love fuelled this successful process. This produced strong structural (legal and procedural) transformation, as evident in the writing of a new state Constitution, and the inauguration of a constitutional democracy. One interviewee commented (Z): "By implication it is a top-down way of doing things ... The thinking was used that if you can change the structures first, that created better conditions for you to change the social, economic legacy of apartheid." Signs of power pushing ahead and leading the process become more evident. Another interviewee commented (K): "However, the pace of legal transformation has not been matched in the economic and social spheres; with a result that poverty, politics, public discourse remain racialised".

The latter could be seen as an example of where power abandoned love in an attempt to move forward too quickly. When this happens, there is not enough time for the majority of the system to respond and adapt to the change. This creates an edge in the system (Mindell, 1989; Centre for Right Relationship, 2005), that some have crossed, but in front of which most are stuck. Often the majority respond in resentment, split off from the forerunners and form their own new system – on this side of the edge. When we increase love, and therefore our awareness of the whole system, then our regard for the system overrides our thirst to enforce the change (power). We allow time for the whole system to be heard, and change becomes more available to the whole system (Kahane, 2010).

These tensions between love and power were also mirrored by the interviewees' personal accounts and underlying struggles. The following "voices" were created from the data to encapsulate the

tension between power (personal will and agency) and love (for the greater good of the system), from both the previously privileged "voice" as well as the previously disadvantaged "voice":

- The power-dominant voice of the previously privileged seem to say: "We are giving as much as we can, we are working *pro bono* and sourcing international funding to do good work here. What more do you want? Government has to take responsibility." For example, (S1) commented: "... we are trying to have jobs and employ people"; "I don't think that society can sustain the needs – we are relying on overseas funds here. (We need) morality in leadership so that the wealth actually comes down to the person on the ground."

- Contending to be heard is the love-dominant voice from the previously privileged, saying: "We know we need to balance the scale, and we really want to. We can change even more – take everything we have."

- The power-dominant voice of the previously disadvantaged rings: "You owe us! We still have much less than you, will have to work much harder to repay the debts!" (S1) noted: " ... strikes and demonstrations, people are fed up and want a better standard of living." While the voice of love from the previously disadvantaged says: "We do want to take responsibility and ownership for our future. We just need more access to the resources we need, and goodwill from our previous oppressors".

The above streams of discourse illuminates the conflicting and contending voices of love and power within our South African rhetoric. By uncovering and acknowledging these voices it becomes easier to recognise them and help dispel their the implicit assumptions. Only then we can begin to truly hear each other (Arbinger, 2006).

5.1.4 Looking back: the Truth and Reconciliation Commission

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) played a big role, nationally and internationally, in declaring South Africa's desire and willingness to look at our ugliness, feel the pain and aim to heal. However, according to the study data, the TRC also had many failures. These failures are helpful to acknowledge, as it brings our awareness and attention to possible mistakes as it guides the way forward.

In the very design and mechanics of the TRC, there was a double signal. According to (A), the TRC had a legal brief to serve as an opportunity to create amnesty for individuals. Although truth-telling was involved, this was never the sole purpose of the TRC. The double signal here was inviting the victims to bear their souls and tell their horror stories, while their perpetrators were the real focus of the exercise according to the real agenda of creating amnesty.

The TRC focused on individual cases of violence/abuse. The problem here is that most people suffered from structural indirect violence such as poverty, involuntary re-location and general inequality. As (Z) noted: "the majority of people in this country were victims of structural violence – and that was not before the Truth Commission ... ". All too often double signals – when not acknowledged – lead to frustration and anger. According to (A), this is also what happened in the aftermath of the TRC: "... the mandate has been individualising guilt ... it has been an unbalanced representation of what had been happening ... For me, the TRC bought about more anger ..."

This is not only an example of a double signal, but more importantly, it marginalised abuse. Only victims of direct violence had the privilege to engage in the TRC process. The other victims had no voice. As such these victims, suffered even further "abuse" by not being heard. As (A) pointed out: " ... (the violence) had to be connected to murder and killing, gross violence, and what is gross violence when you say that removing someone from their house is not included?"

Another problem highlighted in the data was the inaccessibility of the TRC reports. (A) asserted: "We should have an accessible short version ... nobody has read it, most don't even know how to get hold of it." This also poses a double signal: Victims were engaged in a challenging process that had the opportunity to heal but also to re-traumatise. Not having an accessible reference to the proceedings could have been interpreted as insensitive (even cruel). On the one hand government were saying: "you and your story is important to us"; but on the other hand they were saying: "It is not important enough to make your story known to others in an accessible way".

The rest of the system (South Africa) did not have access to the written reports of the TRC in such a way that they could engage with the material. According to interviewees there was (and still is) a need for the healing process to take place on a systemic level – not just individual. Although the TRC was broadcasted on national television, a reference was desperately needed that people could engage with in their own time and readiness. In truth, the system, South Africa, has not yet had a chance to heal itself – as the approach has been fragmented and strewn with double signals. Moreover, 17 years later there are still voices that need to be heard by all. (S1) commented: "but it (the TRC) was almost like this once-off thing in history, ... why aren't we all listening to it ... it is something that needs to happen at a community level".

The final double signal in terms of the TRC to be discussed here, had to do with reparation. Many victims were offered acknowledgment of their suffering combined with financial reparation (for those who qualified). However, according to most victims their reparation fell far short of what they had expected. As I (K) explained: "For many South Africans, recognition of their suffering was not

akin to an acknowledgement by those who benefited from the system. For this reason, those who were deemed to qualify for reparations were disappointed by the scale and timing of the payments: is R30 000 really sufficient to compensate for sustained and systematic violation of one's rights?"

By acknowledging the above double signals we gain some insight to what might be bubbling away under the surface of our rainbow nation. It is the often unconscious emotional field that could be our biggest doorway to transformational dialogue (Mindell, 1995).

5.1.5   Looking ahead

Interviewees discussed what they thought was necessary in South Africa to further healing, transformation and equality – in other words, to take the high road as a country. The major themes that emerged are discussed below. Towards the end of the discussion, a framework is created that encompasses the major themes of the discussion.

(a)   Follow-up processes of communication and building community

Four out of the five interviewees agreed that a process was needed to follow-up the TRC, and that such systemic pain of a whole nation cannot be addressed in a once-off individual-focused initiative.

Two major foci of such a follow up processes emerged as:
- enhancing communication and understanding; and
- building community.

(S1) suggested: "A new form of community therapy like Barette (is needed): Getting together in a group – not imposing anything on these people, just ask: what is your problem today?" (Z) agreed: "There is an important need for people to just begin to air it all out – let it all hang – ugly as it may be. There is definitely a need for that". But the needs seems to go deeper than just communicating and gaining better understanding; there is also a hunger for more caring and connection. (S1) explained: "If we are not reaching out to each other, and communication, and listening to each other's pain and understanding it. If we do not listen to each other we stop caring about each other".

More data suggested that the way forward is for civil society to engage in organic group processes, where we talk openly, air emotions, and understand each other better. (A) noted: "To engage, how to reach people – and it is not about sitting and doing conferences – for who are doing those?" It speaks of a process where nothing specifically is brought in from the outside, but where the group itself decides what is needed and what is important. (S1) explained: "The coming together through dialogue and open forum is needed – people understanding each other". (S): "... (we need to) sit in

round discussion and start to understand each other ...” Z concurred: “(That) would get people talking – that is always important – talk at a serious level”.

(b)   Crossing the divide

One of the greatest barriers to open communication and building community in South Africa is the geographic divide of rich and poor as (Z) noted: “The hard truth is that ... poor people live far, far away. The wealthy people live near the amenities ... We know this, but don’t talk about it.” The data suggested that ways to overcome this typical South African challenge is through (a) acknowledging this fact and talking about it, and (b) being in relationship with each other, even when it is hard.

- *Acknowledging what is*. One interviewee gave an example of how challenging this divide can be. (S1) explained her personal process as she visited a pregnant friend living in severe poverty. From her own perspective, the need was so great that she could not comprehend where to begin or what to give and do. However, she gathered herself, focused on her friend, and simply asked what she wanted. S1: “you can either walk away from it and get totally overwhelmed by the situation, or you can just be with it”. She decided just to be with it and respond to her friend and not get overthrown by the situation. In other words S1 chose to “stay in relationship” with her friend.

- *Being in Relationship*. The key in being in relationship seems to be in “being with” or “staying with” the struggle in the relationship. Accepting openly and honestly what is hard about the relationship and choosing to stay anyway. (S2) explained: “We (need to) learn that relationships are not just about loving and caring, but relationship is about many other uncomfortable things”.

  One interviewee shared a story of a workshop she attended that illustrates staying in relationship even when it is uncomfortable: One of the facilitators (a white woman) had chosen an African song to open the workshop. As the whites sang with their hearts open, happy to be in community with their black colleagues, they suddenly became aware that their black colleagues were not appreciative – on the contrary they were outraged. A black man shared with the group what had happened: the words of the song told the story of African people burying their dead. Not surprisingly, the black people felt outraged that the white people could sing this with no insight, respect or sensitivity. Of course, the whites had no idea what they were singing. However, in this moment they decided to be in relationship with each other and not walk away. They voiced their feelings, however uncomfortable, they apologised, however embarrassed, they gained more understanding, and grew from the experience. Being in relationship is a choice to stay even when it is hard and to engage even when uncomfortable.

  According to S1 the need to get out of our individual or geographical corners and be in community is imperative for our healing as a nation. S1: “Many other studies have shown that

strong community involvement is one of the most important indicators of health. So for us to be a healed nation we have to be in community, and to be in community we actually have to move beyond the streets that make up our suburbs. We have to cross the economic barriers. And we need to be in the community of SA which means embracing all the cultures and all the economic levels, and actually having supposedly less ourselves. But we will be enriched by what we learn."

- *Caring and empathy*. Another crucial element needed in our community is " ... greater empathy and compassion", as (K) noted. According to interviewee (S1) we can only achieve this by being more in community – in relationship – with each other: "You don't need TRCs at high level – you need every single person in the street having the experience with someone else, in a culture that you don't necessarily know." Similarly (K) asserted: "We should have greater tolerance of those who may hold dear values that are foreign to us". The pattern that comes to light here is that the more we are in community with each other, the more we care about each other, the more we choose to stay in relationship. It is therefore up to every South African to choose to be in relationship with other South Africans across cultural and economical divides.

(c)   Acknowledging rank and power discourse

In South Africa we tend to value equality above all else. The strive towards equality is a dominant discourse in all of Western society and subsequently, privilege and power is often related to abuse and misuse. Often this emphasis only leads to covert use of power and privilege. The key, according to Mindell (1989), is not to magically wish power and rank away – but to learn how to acknowledge it and have it be overtly present during dialogue and communication. As Foucault (1980) argued, power can be productive and should not only be seen as repressive: it is by studying these underlying dynamics that power fuels, that change can become possible (Burman *et al.*, 1997).

The need for more awareness and transparency of rank and prejudice was evident throughout the data. In other words, we need to become aware of how we all, at times, act in a biased or racist way. It is not about becoming faultless, it is about becoming more aware of our biases and assumptions. For example, it is not surprising that white, previously privileged South Africans would occasionally revert to privileged thinking and condescending behaviour. As an interviewee (A) bravely asserted: "And I also know, I am acting as white European racists sometimes. It is really difficult, I am a white European and from there is it very close to believe that because I have access to money somehow ... and then criticise somebody that is in a ditch and does not have it. But I am on top of it so how can I understand that ... someone who cannot get up?"

At the same time, it is also not surprising that previously disadvantaged black South Africans would sometimes default to resentment and victimhood. By acknowledging this without further blame, it allows individuals to see that it is only a specific power discourse attached to a specific construct. Once we own our rank and privilege it becomes easier to communicate in an open and honest way.

Surviving oppression or abuse also creates power and rank – often covert power. With victimhood or survivorhood comes a certain heroic status (Mindell, 1992). This type of rank is difficult to acknowledge, as it is not part of the dominant discourse and often becomes entrenched in mechanisms of political will. However, when this power is not acknowledged it blocks clear and honest communication from all parties involved.

Rank does not only have to be acknowledged, it needs to be used constructively. People holding rank in a certain domain can use that to create change. For example, Kulumani won a court case against the government for a presidential apology to the victims of apartheid who had not received their promised reparation. (A) explained: "Small things like this add to the picture of what we want – more victim engagement, more community engagement – I like the word 'survivor' engagement better". People with a lot of rank are powerful agents in facilitating more dialogue, connection and forgiveness. As Kahane (2010) explained, that it is often those who are part of the problem that have the power to become the biggest part of the solution.

(d)   Emotional and practical structures

From the data it was clear that a process is needed to facilitate more healing, release, forgiveness and acceptance. However, it was also asserted that in addition to emotional work, we need to put in place structures and resources to support the process. This is another example of how power and love is needed to work in relationship with each other. We need love to facilitate the healing process, but power to move into action and move forward. In the co-active coaching model (Whitworth, Kimsey-House and Sandahl, 1998) this relates to one of the five contexts that are always present for coaching to happen: deepening the learning and forwarding the action. These two concepts work together like yin and yang: helping the client to heal and gain self-knowledge and insight, while also moving into action and apply the learning.

(e)   Ownership and activism

Another theme in the data was the call for greater activism and sense of personal ownership from South Africans. This not only entails more active citizenship on a systems level, but also a need for a greater ownership and responsibility on an individual level.

A common thread through the interviews was the desire for South Africans to "awaken" to their own resourcefulness and creativity, a sense of self-empowerment at grass roots. (A) advised: "You have to be self-driven; instead of waiting and asking 'when is my turn?', you ask 'what can I do to create this?'". (Z) agreed: "The question for the youth is always when is OUR time. But you have to work to get this time, you can't just wait. You have to go out there and get it."

There is a need for people to take ownership of their own lives and own communities. It is suggested that as individuals take ownership and become more empowered, it creates a chain reaction for others to do the same: transformation that started on an individual scale spreads through the system and changes the system. One interviewee, (Z), compared this to the Black Economist Movement in the 1960s: "The BEC movement said that actually, YOU can take ownership of your existence. This informed a series of community-based initiatives."

Z: "(We need something that) could create a chain reaction. It is the small fights – everyday battles – but in the grander scheme of things they become important. Everybody (is) doing their own small bit – and growing it."

We need to heal and move forward. (A) explained: "You cannot get stuck in conflict and forget that you have a life before and after. (You need to learn) how to deal with that process, and how to look and step away and not look at yourself as your miserable little life".

A major focus of coaching is for the client to access a sense of ownership and responsibility, not only for their own whole life, but also in relation to others (Whitworth, Kimsey-House, and Sandahl, 1998; Whitmore, 2006; Brock, 2008). In addition, change work on a systems level includes another dimension – ownership of your part in the system. Block (2007:19) explains: "To acknowledge that we have participated in creating, through commission or omission, the conditions that we wish to see changed. Without this capacity to see ourselves as cause, our efforts become either coercive or wishfully dependent on the transformation of others."

(f)   It feels simple

A significant moment echoed through all five of the interviews. Once interviewees accessed their own creative ideas about what was needed in South Africa and how that could facilitated, they became aware of the simplicity of what was needed. Every interviewee commented at some point in the interview that "it could be so simple", or "it was so simple", or "maybe it is simple". When we access our creativity in relationships with others, the journey forward does not have to be difficult or complicated. In fact, there seems to be a significant clue in the sense of clarity and simplicity that the

interviewees accessed. The interviewees all seemed to go beyond intellectual problem solving, and "felt into" the phenomenon. They were sensing and being informed by their creative ideas, rather than cognitively "thinking it up". A coaching approach, typically helps individuals (in this case the interviewees) tap into their own creativity and momentarily escape the limitations of their usual linear thought process (Whitmore, 2006). This unfolding, emerging nature of the creative process relates to some of the stages in Scharmer's Theory U (2009). This will be discussed in more detail in Discussion Part Two (Section 5.2 below).

(g) The dawn of a "new community"

Throughout the data there are references to the struggle in South Africa of cultural heritage vs. our "South African-ness". The data suggest that South Africans of all races often tend to socialise separately outside of the workplace. Moreover, cultural correctness and pride is often derived from not "mixing" or socialising with other cultures/races. An opinion is offered that this is because there are several overt and covert insinuations – even from government and other people in positions of power – that some South Africans are not deemed to be South Africans. There is a collective fear that our South African heritage is conditional, and that these conditions might change at any time. Therefore we often root ourselves in our ancestors' culture and heritage.

According to (S2), we need a framework that would allow for both. She explains: "I am Muslim and I hold onto who I am, I've got my own identity. But we also integrate, I have to be civic-minded according to our Islamic ethos – I feel I am able to do both." It is therefore a willingness, as well as access to a framework of thought, that allows you to be both. More than that, the data also point to a more transpersonal approach and the recognition that we are all part of the same system. (S1) explained: "... the awareness that me in my big house sitting with all my wealth, and you sitting with nothing being poor, makes us both poor".

"The awareness that while there is one person suffering in SA we are all suffering." This is an eloquent example of taking ownership on a systems level, as referred to above. This aligns with Kahane's (2010:132) viewpoint: "Our capacity to address our toughest social challenges depends on our willingness to admit that we are part of rather than apart from, the woundedness of the world."

However, stepping into ownership also brings the challenge of change. One interviewee (S1) explained that she had made so many internal shifts lately that she does not feel at home in her own community anymore. Her values have changed. Although she was proud of these changes, it also presented her with sadness and a sense of loss. This is significant in many ways. She had discovered a new perspective on what is needed in South Africa, while her community is still entrenched in their

"old" ways. This makes her a possible change agent in her community. At the same time she is also a member of a new emerging community of people who are seeking new ways of being with each other in order to have South Africa succeed.

From the above, it seems as if a framework for establishing a duel identity is a healthy structure to facilitate the development of cultural heritage as well as our South African-ness. However, from there we need to be willing and open for both to be informed and transformed by the other. The two identities cannot live in isolation from each other. We cannot hope for the something better while we are still clutching onto the old way. We need to "let go" and bravely risk the possibility of loss, so that ultimately we can be informed by each other and be transcended into a new community of South African-ness.

In this discussion, the central themes that emerged from the interview data were presented. These themes can be seen to form a "framework" of what needs to be facilitated in South Africa in order for us to move in the direction of greater healing, transformation and equality. As such this new framework, according to the data, could serve as a guiding structure in creating and following the figurative high road in South Africa. Referring to the "high road" here not only points to a "morally proper way of doing something" (Merriam-Webster's Online Dictionary, 2011) but more importantly it refers to the high road within the context of scenario planning (Schwartz, 1996).

Table 1   The High Road Framework
(a) Meta-view: a process is needed that enhances understanding, builds community and active citizenship.
Elements
(b) We need to cross the divide through:
(c) Acknowledging rank and power discourse.
(d) Create emotional and practical structures.
(e) Ownership and activism.
(f) It feels simple.
(g) Dawning of a new community.

In summary, this suggested new framework, the High Road Framework, drawn from the above research findings and discussion, consists of the elements outlined in Table 1. This framework was used in Part Two of this research project, during the analysis stage of Part Two, as a loose structure

from which to view the data that were gathered from the pilot NNI facilitations. As such, evidence of the above elements that emerged from the data in Part 2 will be discussed in Part Two of this paper.

5.2 Discussion Part Two – the No-Name Initiative

During Part 2 of this research project, I (the "coach") typically played the role of the facilitator (of the group processes), practitioner-researcher and a channel of what wanted to emerge from the different systems (the groups and South Africa at large).

A four-hour group process was designed as an attempt to implement the suggestions that emerged from the interview data in Part One. Themes from the data, literature reviews, personal training and studies, as well as further expert consultation were incorporated to finally design the No-Name Initiative (NNI). As mentioned earlier, the NNI has two broad functions: It provides the platform for a transformational group process, and generates the space for creating personal accountability structures.

5.2.1 Overview of facilitations

A brief overview will be given of each of the three facilitations to provide some context for the discussion to follow:

(a) NNI 1 – "Drugs in the Community"

The group identified the following stakeholders:
- drug lords;
- community leaders;
- police;
- NGOs;
- youth;
- parents;
- mothers; and
- absent fathers.

It was a very small group which resulted in having only one person representing each stakeholder at the start of the group process. As the process built momentum, it became very dynamic with participants changing from one stakeholder's perspective to the next. Voices were heard from the "mothers" who felt alone and confused in how to deal with their teenagers, right through to "absent fathers" feeling demoralised, guilty, not coping and disempowered. As the process progressed there

were more honest emotions and feelings coming to the surface, being heard, and begin processed. "Communication" came out on top as the greatest need between all of the stakeholders, and different options were explored on how to increase communication and mutual support between police, NGOs and community leaders.

(b)   NNI 2 – "Xenophobia"

The group identified the following stakeholders:
- government;
- church leaders;
- foreign nationals;
- South African citizens;
- mediators; and
- business leaders.

The group process signified much of the current reality in South Africa. During the first hour of this process, the voices of South African citizens were marginalised and an intellectually-driven debate emerged between the business leaders, government and church leaders. The South African citizens were continually "put down" and blamed by voices with more "power" and "rank". This "current reality" was reflected back to the group. This helped the group change from the current *status quo* and communicate differently. The South African citizens became more empowered to have their voice heard. The process reached a hot spot when the citizens finally could access their underlying emotional field of hopelessness, lack of self-belief and disempowerment. They did not know how to access or use many of the support systems available to them, but more importantly they did not believe they actually had what it takes to succeed in South Africa. Their anger and frustration was only a mask for a deep underlying lack of confidence and self-belief. By acknowledging this, the feeling in the group could change from blame to moral support and understanding.

(c)   NNI 3 – "Gangsterism"

The group identified the following stakeholders:
- gang members;
- youth;
- parents;
- community leaders; and
- police.

The group consisted predominantly of teenagers and a few young adults. The contending topics were "teenage pregnancy" and "gangsterism", and finally the group reached consensus on the topic as "gangsterism". During the first phase of the group process, the gang members dominated the discussion. They held all the power. All the other stakeholders (except for the youth), were conversing intellectually, most of them entrenched in victim discourse. The voice of the youth was absent. After this was highlighted to the group and became clearer, the youth could start accessing their true feelings of being overwhelmed and confused. The community's focus shifted from blaming the "outside aggressor" to a more inward reflection on how to help our youth. As the youth accessed their voice, they became aware of their own rank and power: in their hands they held the future of their own communities.

5.2.2 Discussion

Below the findings are discussed in relation to the High Road framework. As mentioned earlier the data from Part 2 were thematically analysed and then placed next to the High Road framework for further analysis. The High Road framework served only as a loose structure for this discussion. In keeping with a social constructionist approach, freedom was allowed for new themes to emerge as the data and framework met each other. As such, some elements of the framework were developed further in this discussion, and some new elements or sub-elements were derived. The new adapted High Road framework is presented towards the end of the discussion.

On analysis, it became apparent that the NNI process showed resemblance to Scharmer's (2009) Theory U (developed from his work with colleagues Senge, Jaworski and Flowers in their book *Presence*, 2007). This powerful change theory encompasses a wisdom that stretches far beyond linear thinking and popular change theory. It is beyond the scope of this study to explain Theory U in full here. However, as the discussion unfolds below, certain references will be made to Theory U where applicable. For reference Theory U is outlined briefly in Figure 1.

Figure 1 Theory U

Each of the stages diagrammed in Figure 1 could further be explained as follow:

- *Downloading* – This is the way we usually take in information, viewing the phenomenon through the lenses of our own beliefs, judgements and worldviews.

- *Seeing* – This is when we suspend our judgement and we transfer our attention to the phenomenon.

- *Sensing* – This phase entails redirecting our attention and awareness to tune into the whole system.

- *Presencing* – We let go, and connect to the stillness or the source.

- *Crystallising* – We let the process unfold or emerge; we are being drawn into the future.

- *Prototyping* – We co-create the future as we contextualise what is emerging.

- *Performing* – Integrate and transcend to the bigger system.

The discussion of the Part Two research findings in relation to the High Road Framework follows below. This discussion is augmented by further reference to literature with a particular focus on Theory U.

(a)   A Process that enhances understanding, builds community and active citizenship

The meta-view of the High Road Framework finds evidence in most of the elements of the framework as discussed below. It is called a "meta-view" in the framework as it forms part of the purpose of the framework. Without this foundation the framework could not stand on its own. As such enhanced understanding, building community and active citizenship weaves like a golden thread through the rest of the discussion.

(b)   Crossing divides – Acknowledging what is and being in relationship.

The specific NNI facilitations in the pilot did not specifically consist of participants from very contrasting economic backgrounds. This would be a big emphasis for future NNI facilitations. In this pilot, however, the participants did demonstrate bridging the divides of emotional barriers such as fear, anger and even hate. During NNI1, participants could work through their anger directed at the drug lords to acknowledge their own feelings of being overwhelmed and lack of support and skills. For a moment they could see drug dealers also as parents choosing to make money in this way to support their families – however "wrong" it seemed. In NNI2, the South Africans citizens could finally move through their hate and anger directed at foreign nationals, when they acknowledged their own sense of shame and powerlessness. In NNI3, gang members, parents and community

leaders found a way through their frustration, anger, and blame, to see that they were all struggling with the same dilemma – not feeling safe in their own homes.

These processes did not aim to deliver practical solutions or long term resolutions. It did create moments of "community" or "coming together". In these moment the "roles" fell away and the participants became aware of their sameness as human beings, how they struggle with the same issues. I propose these are moment when the sentient level (Mindell, 1995) was reached by the groups. It is also in these are moments in which greater empathy and caring unfolds. In relation to Theory U, this happens when the participants succeed in suspending their own judgements and paying attention to what is really going on ("Observing"). Moreover, participants start tuning their awareness in to the whole system (instead of their own perception or thoughts). This also coincides with Level 3 listening that co-active coaches employ when they coach (Whitworth, Kimsey-House and Sandahl, 1998). From here it becomes possible to connect with the source or intelligence of the system – similar to the eye of a storm. It is a point where both nothing and everything lives. Presencing often has a profound effect on the group – it might be felt as a shift in the emotional field or even on a deeper level. Mindell (1995) refers to the sentient level to explain a place of connection where human beings are overwhelmed by their oneness rather than their separateness. It is my contention that this sentient level becomes available to the system once "presencing" has been reached.

(c) Acknowledging and working with rank and power

The group process could be seen as a group practice of deconstruction. Deconstructing discourse is the most available method to identify and acknowledge rank. This is an active role for the facilitators.

Deconstructing power discourse

Foucault (1981) famously brought our attention to the study of discourse and how the dominant discourses of our societies enjoy their popularity due to being embedded in power and rank. It is especially "unnoticed power" (Foucault, 1966) and often unconscious power, that pose a problem when not brought to the surface. As described earlier, by uncovering and clarifying the different dominant discourses (such as power and privilege or victim/survivor-hood), it highlights its cultural constructionist nature. In this way you are deconstructing (Thornton, 2000) the phenomenon (discourse) to make known how it is constructed by mechanisms of power. That which was once seen as the "truth" becomes clearer in its reality of being just another perspective. Dominant discourse is only powerful so far as it is kept unchallenged by its relations to power. By its very nature, dominant discourse excludes, and it is only by deconstruction that the hidden voices and perspectives can be

known and articulated. In other words, deconstruction opens up a discursive space for the marginalised.

One of the methods used to practice deconstructing in the NNI was to show the system to itself. The example of NNI2 (Xenophobia) will be used to illustrate "showing the system to itself".

The dialogue started off with the foreign nationals locking horns with the South African citizens. Business leaders, government and church leaders systematically joined the conversation. Within 20 minutes, the dialogue had moved away from the foreign nationals and South African citizens to centre around the business leaders, church leaders and government. It was a predominantly intellectual debate about who is at fault and who is doing what. It was the people with power and with political, economic and moral rank dominating the discussion. There was a implicit assumption and consensus that "they" know best. The foreign nationals and South Africans were not accessing their own rank. They were simply giving their power away so that the people with "real power" could decide their fate. The dialogue was paused, and power discourse was pointed out to the group. The group agreed how the same dynamic was playing out in South Africa every day. The South Africans and foreign nationals agreed how they had to take ownership of having their voices be heard, whilst the "leaders" reflected on how they needed to listen more and talk less.

We resumed the dialogue. This time around the foreign nationals found their voice.

Foreign nationals: "If you protect us and let us stay in this country we can help. We can help educate others in our skills and help in skills development and even job creation."

Business leaders: "We will be willing to channel some of our funds into more skills development."

Government: "Those are all good ideas, but what we don't understand is that there are already so many programmes running. We have erected job centres in many areas helping people to get jobs already."

Foreign nationals: "Maybe South Africans are just lazy. We work hard and we make it happen. That is why people want to employ us. If they worked harder, they would be getting the jobs. It is a free market."

Another power dynamic was emerging. Although the foreign nationals had found their voice, they were still entrenched in the power discourse of political authority and were now aligning with

government whilst making South Africans wrong. Again a big voice was missing – that of the South Africans. The dialogue was paused again, and this was reflected back to the group.

As we resumed the process, the South Africans found their voice:

South African citizens: "You have to go, there is no place for you here. If you don't go, we will kill you. Our families need to eat."

The South Africans are making threats from their emotional field, but they are not acknowledging the emotion or expressing it. They were prompted to pause and get in touch with what they were experiencing. (According to Theory U, they were invited from the Downloading phase into the Observing phase).

Facilitator: "Tell us how you are really feeling at the moment?"

South African citizen: "I am angry!! People tell me I am lazy. They say were are hateful and violent. But I am not. They come here and take our jobs. I just don't know how to get to the places that government say they have made for us. I don't understand the system. I don't know how to enter it. It feels as if I can't do anything. And then when I see them take my job ..."

Facilitator: "So what are the real emotions here? It sounds like you feel powerless and hopeless?"

SA citizen: "Yes, I don't really think I can do it, I don't know how. I can't provide for my family, I can do nothing ..."

A silence fell on the group. The sense of hopelessness and powerlessness was felt throughout the group. No-one spoke. After some time I asked the whole group: "Can you hear that these people are crying out for your help underneath their anger?" Different groups commented on how surprised they were and how they felt sorry for these people. Many made a link between how the experience of past oppression might have led South Africans to feel this disempowered. A new understanding became available to the whole group of the South African citizen's underlying emotional field of shame and disempowerment.

From here the South Africans started moving towards a constructive dialogue with all the parties, and discussed ways to access more resources. By deconstructing the mechanisms of power discourse, the South Africans and foreign nationals could reclaim their voices and take their place in the dialogue.

Furthermore, the South Africans had to access their true emotional field, and dare to be vulnerable, before they could access their real power in this dialogue. Once they admitted they felt powerless and ashamed, it opened the space for them to access their psychological rank as survivors of previous oppression. From there they could engage in a creative process with the rest of the stakeholders, all owning their rank and working together to generate a way forward.

Showing the system to itself also corresponds to the "presencing" phase of the powerful change theory, Theory U (Scharmer, 2009). This is the deepest place of connection with the system. We can see into the energy or source of the system. Here we also become a medium for the source to express itself. Another way of explaining this process could be that the system "shows itself, to itself". When this happens, there is a shift to a next level of understanding, even clarity. This phenomenon is well articulated by Zukav (quoted in Wheatley, 2006:37): "The effect of perception is immediate and dramatic. All of the wave function representing the observed system collapses, except the one part, which actualises into reality." In Scharmer's (2009:147) words: "The boundary between observer and the observed collapses and the observer begins to see the system from a profoundly different view: a view that includes himself as part of the system that is being observed".

Once the system is shown to itself and acknowledged, it becomes something "real" to collaborate with. We can then co-create with the system from within the system and bring about the change that the system needs. This is the process of Realising.

Identifying hidden power

Identifying hidden rank is another way to make the system known to itself. In the language of Theory U, it is to move from Downloading into Observing and Sensing. This would allow the participants to access the phase of Presencing. The following is an excerpt from NNI3:

Parents: "You kill our children, and plunder our neighbourhoods. we are too afraid to go out of the house after dark. You might be shot right in front of your own door. You are the evil in our country."

Gangster: "Well, you can keep on telling yourselves that. Listen, booitjie, (to Youth) come with us and we will keep you safe. You will know you have us to look out for you."

Boy walks over from youth to gangsters.

Gangster: "See – he knows it is true. The police can't help you – they are more corrupt than anyone. When someone is shit – do they come? No, they wait for us to do their dirty work for them."

Parents: "That is true – when I tell the police they are selling drugs on our street corner – they never come, they think the gangs will sort themselves out. They wait until the blood has been spilled. I think they are helping some of the gangs. The whole lot of them are corrupt."

Parents: "Yes, but I don't want my kids to be in the gangs – we want to keep them safe. The gangs are not safe! Just last week they shot a kid in our street. They think they own the neighbourhood."

Gang: "So who provided you with that pair of Nikes? Who gets the goods here for you to buy for cheap? You can never afford to buy it in the shops. We bring it to you – we bring it to the neighbourhood so that you can afford it. We look after you. You can't imagine a life without us. Everything you get here, we help bring in."

By now emotions have escalated. People feel frustrated and no one is really feeling heard. The group of "gang members" are lounging back in their seats. The other groups are all standing, almost leaning forward as they are confronting the gang. The gang is clearly holding the power and rank in this dialogue. All the groups are giving their power away to the gang. Their frustration is building as well as the other stakeholders' sense of powerlessness and overwhelm.

Dialogue is paused. The facilitators asks the whole group the look – as if they are bystanders – at everyone's body positions. What does it tell them? They acknowledge that the gangs are holding the power in terms of money, coercion, access to violence and lawlessness. They are asked to think about what rank they might have in their lives – to access their personal power. (the dialogue continues)

Police: "OK, yes, some of us have gone bad. But most of us really want to keep our communities safe, and get rid of these gangs that torture our communities. The big problem is we have to fight them within the law – for them they can do anything. It makes it hard, but we won't give up. We need to work together, we need more help, we don't have enough men."

Parents: "But we really need to protect our children and keep the drugs off our streets."

Gangs: "Well, your children want new cellphones and the bucks. Can you give it to them? Heh, no, but we can and we do. That is what they want, isn't it? Come, guys, come, this is where you get it, and we look out for each other here ..."

Facilitator: "So where is the voice of the youth? You are just standing there like puppets, this is about YOU."

Youth: "Yes, I do want all those things. My mom doesn't have money for that. For us that is what is important, But I know that is bad. And I want to be better. It is hard, I am just a teenager, but I also want to do the right thing. It's like two voices going on in my head. My friends are all in gangs – so they want me to be."

Community leader: "But you have a choice. Especially you youth – you need to choose which road you are taking. You are the future of this country. How do you think this country will look if you all decide to be in gangs? Then we are going down! You have to choose and then stick with it. You are the future."

Quiet.

Pause.

Facilitator: "So what do you think is going on right now in this group? what is the weather like?" People comment that it feels like something is now different. Where the gang was holding the power, the youth is now holding the power with this choice. They are the future But you have a choice. Especially the youth of this country – what they decide will have an impact on all".

Youth: "Well, we get that we really have a lot of responsibility. But it is difficult with all these things going on."

Youth: "We are the youth. We are the future, we have to start thinking about that."

Some kids walk back from gangs to youth.

Youth: "We will need help from our parents to help us do the right thing. We also need places to go after school, where it is safe. Otherwise the gangs come and try and they won't leave us alone."

Youth are prompted to make specific requests to different parties and a discussion follows. (Dialogue continues.)

The gang is now more silent, has lost some of its members; other parties talk about how they can help each other make positive changes.

It was only when the system became aware of itself – that the youth's voice was missing – that the process could move into a more Observing and Sensing phase.

(d) Access the creativity and resourcefulness of the system

According to new-generation systems work, and more specifically Worldwork (Mindell, 1992) and Organisational Relationship and Systems Coaching (Centre for Right Relationship, 2005), a system has its own creativity and resourcefulness (also called "intelligence"). When the system is given the opportunity to see itself and unfold its process, the intelligence can emerge from the system. This is also related to the phases of Presencing and Crystallising in Theory U. An example of this happened directly after the South Africans got in touch with their underlying emotions of shame and disempowerment. As they started a dialogue with government, the system created and produced what was needed in the moment: a new role emerged – that of the mediator:

SA citizen (directed to Government): "You need to show us how we can be part of the system. We don't understand how to be part of the system. The SA you talk about is not something we see – we can't feel it. We just see our towns full of drugs, gangs and violence. How do I get what you talk about? A better education, money?"

A new voice emerges – the voice of the "mediator".

Mediator: "So it sounds like there is a gap between what government is doing and building – and informing you about how to access it etc. So we need to talk about this and find solutions ... "

The mediator brings the SA Citizens and Government together in dialogue. They start coming up with some ideas towards solutions.

Church leaders: "I have a desire to be part of the conversation. Help where I can and support this process. This is good, we are understanding more about how we all feel."

Foreign nationals: "I am scared but hopeful. I hope the government and SA citizens can come up with something that will work. At the end of the day we all want the same things. Food, safety and life for our children. We don't mean harm. We want to be part of the rainbow nation."

Government: "So come join the talks, maybe you can help."

The creativity and resourcefulness of the system, when it is allowed to emerge, makes the process easy – even simple. This phenomenon seems to resemble what the interviewees got in touch with during their interviews, when the future suddenly seemed simple and easy. This happens when we emerge ourselves with the system, and get out of our own way. According to Theory U, this is when we move out of Downloading, into Observing, Sensing and ultimately Presencing. Here we can surrender to the innate intelligence of the system and let it unfold through us (Crystallising).

Just as an example of what is possible, I will share some of the ideas that were generated by this group in the final minutes of their dialogue (a phenomenon that happens according to Theory U through the stages Crystallising and Prototyping):

- Service centres in each community that spread information about all the different government services available and how to access them, provide access to computers and telephones, and have volunteers giving guidance on job applications, how to use the internet, etc., etc.
- Refugees and immigrants need to give a certain amount of volunteering hours in these centres as part of their integration schedule.
- Church leaders help with fundraising and volunteering at centres.
- Business leaders re-commit to a drive towards supporting community initiatives, and sponsoring the start-up of at least 50 new initiatives per year.

If these are the type of possibilities created in this group – these possibilities also exist in the greater system of South Africa. New-generation systems work demonstrates how a small change anywhere in the system also has an effect on the global system (Wheatley, 2006).

(e) Enhancing communication and empathy

The above example in NNI2 (Xenophobia) clearly illustrates how empathy is increased by the acquiring of greater understanding in such a process. When different voices are allowed to speak, and stakeholders are reminded of their own rank, it becomes easier for even the most vulnerable voices to speak out. This brings a shift about in the system.

This was also evident in NNI1 (drugs in the community). Once the "voice of the mothers" became aware of what the underlying fears and struggles were, they could share those with the group. It is also worthy to note that before the mothers could access their underlying emotion, they first had to find their own "voice". When they were speaking as "parents" they stayed in an intellectual level. Once they accessed the voice of the "concerned mother" they had also found a mouthpiece for their real emotions.

Parents: "Yes, I worry, I worry – I don't know. I try to tell my boy what to do. He wants this and that, he wants a new phone, the jackets. But I can't buy all that for him. I work all day, all day, just for the food. But they are young, they only want, want, want."

Parent: "Yes, my daughter also wants nice things, and the nice boys. I am very afraid for her – the boys that come to her, they are not good – they have all these clothes and watches, I think she is with the wrong crowd."

The facilitator points out that the "parent's voice" seems to have become a "the concerned mother's voices". After some probing, more "mothers" speak:

Concerned mothers: "I have to do all of this alone. I don't know where my husband is. I work all day to provide for my children. I don't know how to deal with my kids, they don't listen to me ... It feels like I have no power."

The emotional field in the group changes to sadness and despair.

Concerned mother: "I am also looking after my family on my own. My husband just drinks. He drinks all day and then he is mean to the children. I do everything. He drinks away all the money ... "

Silence.

Their desperation and sense of being overwhelmed became more apparent to the group as they got in touch with their emotional field. Their vulnerability created more intimacy in the group. This not only created better understanding of their situation, but also generated greater empathy from the other stakeholders. Suddenly there was more support for the mothers, and new creative ideas emerged on how to support them.

Furthermore, by being that vulnerable, the rest of the group could now work together to empower them. This created a shift of focus (and power) away from the drug lords and back to the mothers. On a certain level this is community healing in action: taking the focus and therefore the power away from the aggressor by empowering the other and strengthening the community.

(f) Creating structures for practical and emotional change

The second part of the NNI entails personal work as well as working in pairs. Once the group process is debriefed, participants spend time on their own reflecting on what they are ready to take from the

experience, and furthermore what they are ready to commit to. Participants have a choice to work alone or in pairs to create their commitment, specific actions and accountability structures. This means that each participant identifies who will help them in staying accountable, so that there is another source of support in their commitment.

The commitment ritual (also a structure to lock in commitment and action for the future) in the three NNI facilitations ranged from letting red balloons loose as a symbol for each participant's commitment, to making commitment cards. Participants commented how positive they felt about being able to make a change. They explained that it felt good to realise you don't just have to wait for others to change, but you too can make a difference. In this sense, participants felt empowered and became more than active citizens. One could say they became pro-active citizens.

(g) Ownership and activism

Increased ownership and activist spirit runs like a golden thread through the discussion. All the specific examples will not be accounted for here, nor be repeated again from the above excerpts. However, it is worth mentioning that an increased sense of ownership is what participants commented on most after the facilitations. This newfound sense of ownership also seemed to bring about a sense of purpose and pride. After one commitment ritual (as we let the commitment balloons free to take flight at the end of the NNI, each balloon containing a participant's commitment), one participant commented: "I hope my balloon flies all the way to another country so that people there can see what I am – what we are – doing here!"

(h) Dawning of a new community

By the end of all three NNIs, participants expressed how they felt more connected to the other participants. Some explored ways of staying in touch and/or helping each other stay committed to their cause. One participants use the metaphor of being a bearer of light as he leaves the venue, lighting others' flames of action and responsibility wherever he goes. In this sense, the group represents the dawning of the new community, and each participant a possible change agent and ambassador for this new community.

From the above discussion it seems as if the NNI did address all elements in the High Road Framework. Keeping in line with social constructionist paradigm, the framework was further informed and developed by the experience and analysis of the NNI facilitation. Drawing from the above discussion, the High Road Framework now accommodates the elements outlined in Table 2.

Table 2	The High Road Framework (adapted)
(a)	Meta-view: a process is needed that enhances understanding and builds community and active citizenship.
Elements	
(b)	We need to cross the divide through:
(c)	Acknowledge rank and power discourse.
(d)	Access the creativity and resourcefulness of the system.
(e)	Enhancing communication and empathy
(f)	Create structures for practical and emotional change.
(g)	Ownership and activism.
(h)	Dawning of a new community.

6. Conclusions and recommendations

6.1 Conclusions

My personal journey in designing and launching the NNI pilot has been a rich and fulfilling one – and not without its challenges. Being a white South African woman seemed to pose some challenges in this process. Many overtly (or covertly) questioned my agenda and judged the "appropriateness" of this endeavour.

For me, these were the true moments of "sitting in the fire" (Mindell, 1995). I learned that through acknowledging this suspicion in the moment, it gave more opportunity for transformational dialogue. As such, each encounter – interviewing experts, talking to colleagues or acquaintances about the NNI, setting up NNIs, and facilitating the NNIs – became transformational conversations in their own right. The common denominators for these conversations were (a) having a heart at peace and not at war (the intension to understand let go of your own assumptions and not to be too attached to your own view or winning the conversation (Arbinger, 2006); (b) having courage to ask the hard questions; and (c) staying in the conversation, however uncomfortable it seemed. I learned how to better utilise the construct of being a "white woman in South Africa" by going to the heart of underlying assumptions, being a vehicle of apology and witnessing, and engaging in meaningful (often transformational) conversation.

Of course there are many factors (including rank and power discourses) that needed to be acknowledged – factors already mentioned in the body of this work. Being privileged (through history and in current reality), asked of me to fully accept it and own the responsibility that accompanies it. Often, we do not know how to be with our own privilege and rank. We try and "give it away" or compensate for it to relieve our own discomfort. Still other times we misuse it to dominate others and get our own way. In my opinion, the real lesson is to fully accept it and then use it, with the utmost awareness of your impact, to the greater good of our society.

More than this, I had to remember that it "is never personal". Our view of the world and those around us are influenced by our projections that result from beliefs and our interpretations of our experiences. At the same time, by acknowledging this, we can be powerful allies for each other to help facilitate greater awareness of our own lenses through which we view each other and our world.

In summary, this study explored two distinct research questions. The first question (Part One) was concerned with what is currently needed in South Africa for greater healing, transformation and equality. Five experts and practitioners in the field of political and social sciences were interviewed. What followed was the first draft of a framework (High Road Framework) that could support South Africa's journey to follow the high road (Schwartz, 1996).

Part Two of this study explored how the No-Name Initiative (NNI), a proposed facilitation process that incorporates principles of coaching and change work, might address this High Road Framework. The three pilot facilitations were thematically analysed and placed against the backdrop of the High Road Framework for further analysis. The findings showed that the NNI did indeed address the elements of the framework. On further analysis, the NNI seemed to exhibit principles of the new generation change theory, Theory U (Scharmer, 2009). The discussion was augmented by integrating further literature on Theory U which added rigour to the results. Finally the findings in Part 2 informed further refinement of the High Road framework to produce an adapted High Road Framework (towards end of 5.2.2. Discussion).

This phenomenological explorative study provided a qualitative glance and an exploration of a possible framework for what is currently needed in South Africa to move forward (High Road Framework) as well as a proposed first-phase group process structure (the No-Name Initiative) to meet the framework's objectives.

6.2 Recommendations for further research

A major limitation of this study is that the NNI facilitations were not video recorded. More depth and detail could be derived from an analysis of data that include visual footage. Also, the data used for Part 2 of this research project only included three NNI facilitations. Although it is a qualitative study, a bigger sample in gathering data would have contributed to more validity and rigour.

Being an explorative study, by its nature this was only a look down the "rabbit hole". More research is needed that would help develop the NNI into a rigorous theoretically grounded, empirically sound model for transformational dialogue and active citizenship in South Africa. My specific recommendations for future research include to following:

- NNI facilitations to be video recorded to produce a database for future research.
- More in-depth qualitative research on NNI process.
- More qualitative research involving the participants experience of the NNI process.
- Quantitative research on NNI facilitations, focusing on participants' accounts of the experience.
- Longitudinal studies following participants journey over years.
- Underpinning the NNI more rigorously in philosophy and theory.
- Further development of the High Road Framework.

Finally, from a practitioner's perspective, I would like to propose a second wave, a follow-up process to the NNI. This would entail a structure that could support participants of NNIs to connect with each other once they have participated in a NNI. This would provide them more accessibility to support each other in their commitments, future actions and their new found sense of active citizenship. Ideally this could take the form of a structure (a metaphorical container) to grow and nurture the sense of new community that has dawned during NNIs.

To conclude I refer back to Pityana's (2010) words: "... there are dark clouds above us; we cannot ignore them. As we approach the fork in the road, you can help us ensure that we do not lose our way ...". Some would argue that we have already "lost our way". I would argue it does not matter where we are. What matter is where we are going. We can choose right now, in this moment. We can choose to be passive or active citizens. Better yet, we can choose to be pro-active citizens.

Bibliography

Arbinger Institute (2006). *The Anatomy of Peace: Resolving the Heart of Conflict*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Arye, L., and Audergon, A. (2006). Transforming conflict into community: post-war reconciliation in Croatia. In Totton, N. (ed.), *The Politics of Psychotherapy: New perspectives*. London: Open University Press/McGraw-Hill.

Axelrod (1992). Citation classic: How to promote cooperation. *Social and Behavioral Sciences, 44*:10.

Benner, P. (1985). Quality of life: A phenomenological perspective on explanation, prediction, and understanding in nursing science. *Advances in Nursing Science*, 8(1):1–14.

Block, P. (2007). *Civic Engagement and the Restoration of Community: Changing the Nature of the Conversation*. Booklet based on the "Building Accountability and Commitment" workshop offered by Designed Learning.

Britten, N. (1995). Qualitative interviews in medical research. *British Medical Journal*, 311:251–253.

Brock, V. (2008). *Grounded Theory of the Roots and Emergence of Coaching*. Unpublished DPhil dissertation. Maui, HI: International University of Professional Studies.

Brown, J. (2002). *The World Café: A resource guide for hosting conversations that matter.* Mill Valley, CA: Whole-Systems Associates.

Bunker, B.B., and Alban, B.T. (eds.). (1992). Large group interventions. Special issue. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 28(4).*

Bunker, B.B., and Alban, B.T. (1997). *Large Group Interventions: Engaging the whole system for rapid change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bunker, B.B. (2000). Managing conflict through large group methods. In Deutsch, M. and Coleman, P.T., (Eds), *The Handbook of Conflict Resolution: Theory and practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bunker, B.B., and Alban, B.T. (2005). Introduction to the special issue on large group interventions. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 41(1):9–14.

Burman, E., Kottler, A., Levett, A., and Parker, I. (1997). Power and discourse: culture and change in South Africa. In Levett, A., Kottler, A., Burman, E., and Parker, I. (Eds), *Culture, Power and Difference: discourse analysis in South Africa*, (pp.1–14). Cape Town: Zed Books.

Burr, V. (1995). *An Introduction to Social Constructionism*. London: Routledge.

Chown, M. (2007). *Quantum Theory Cannot Hurt You: A guide to the universe*. London: Faber and Faber.

Dannemiller Tyson Associates (2000). *Whole-Scale Change: Unleashing the magic in organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Emery, F.E., and Trist, E.L. (1960). Socio-technical systems. In Churchman, C.W., and Verhulst, M. (Eds.), *Management Science, Models and Techniques, Volume II*, (pp. 83–97). London: Pergamon.

Foucault, M. (1966). *The Order of Things*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1981). The order of discourse. In Young, R.J.C. (ed.), Untying the Text: a post-*structuralist reader*, (pp.48–78). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Gergen, K.J. (1994). *Realities and Relationships: Soundings in social construction*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hargrove, R. (1995). *Masterful Coaching: Extraordinary results by impacting people and the way they think and work together*. San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer.

Kahane, A. (2004). *Solving Tough Problems: An open way of talking, listening, and creating new realities*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Kahane, A. (2010). *Power and Love: Solving tough social and organizational problems*. Cape Town: Tafelberg.

Kauffman, S. (1996). *At Home in the Universe: The search for the laws of self-organization and complexity*. First edition. Webpage: www.amazon.com/Stuart-Kauffman/e/ B000AQ3P38/ ref=ntt_athr_dp_pel_1.

Klar, Y., Mendola, R., Fischer, J.D., Silver, R.C., Chinsky, J.M., and Goff, B. (1990). Characteristics of participants in a large group awareness training. *Journal of Consulting Clinical Psychology*, 58(1):99–108.

Koffka, K. (1935). *Principles of Gestalt Psychology*. New York, NY: Harcourt Brace.

Labuschagne, P. (2010). War veterans and democracy in South Africa: "a wolf in wolf's clothing"? *Strategic Review for Southern Africa*, June.

Lippitt, R. (1980). *Choosing the Future You Prefer*. Washington, DC: Development.

Ludema, J.D., Whitney, D., Mohr, B.J. and Griffin, T.J. (2003). *The Appreciative Inquiry Summit: A practitioner's guide for leading large-group change*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Mason, J. (1996). *Qualitative Researching*. London: Sage.

Maxwell, J.A., and Miller, B.A. (2008). Categorizing and connecting strategies in qualitative data analysis. In Hesse-Biber, S.N and Leavy, P. (eds), *Handbook of Emergent Methods*, (pp. 461-477). New York, NY: Guilford.

Mays, N., and Pope, C. (1995). Qualitative Research: Rigour and qualitative research. *British Medical Journal*, 195(311):109–112.

Merriam-Webster's online Dictionary. Retrieved from the world wide web: www.learnersdictionary.com/ search/high%20road on 9 April 2011.

Mindell, A. (1989). *River's Way: The process science of the dreambody*. New York, NY: Viking-Penguin-Arkana.

Mindell, A. (1992). *The Leader as Martial Artist: An introduction to deep democracy; techniques and strategies for resolving conflict and creating community*. San Francisco, CA: HarperCollins.

Mindell, A. (1995). *Sitting in the Fire: Large Group Transformation Using Conflict and Diversity*. Portland, OR: Lao Tse.

Mink, O.G., Owen, K.Q., and Mink, B.P. (1993). *Developing High-Performance People: the art of coaching*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Owen, H. (1992). *Open Space Technology: a user's guide*. Potomac, MD: Abbott.

Pityana, S. M. (2010). Strong civil society: a condition for good governance. In *Address to Council for the Advancement of South African Constitution (CASAC)* at Inyathelo Conference, 15 November 2010.

Rosinski, P. (2003). *Coaching Across Cultures: New tools for leveraging national, corporate, and professional differences*. Boston, MA: Nicholas Brealey.

Scharmer, (2009). *Theory U: Leading from the future as it emerges*. Cambridge, MA: Sol.

Sieler, A. (2003). *Coaching to the Human Soul: Ontological coaching and deep change, Volume I: The linguistic basis of ontological coaching*. Blackburn, VIC: Newfield Australia.

Schwartz, P. (1996). *The Art of the Long View: Planning for the future in an uncertain world*. New York, NY: Currency Doubleday.

Senge, P., Scharmer C.O., Jaworski, J., and Flowers, B.S. (2007). *Presence: Exploring profound change in people, organizations and society*. London: Brealey.

Skiffington, S., and Zeus, P. (2003). *Behavioral Coaching: How to build sustainable personal and organizational strength*. North Ride, NSW: McGraw-Hill Australia.

Southall, R. (2010). The South African development model: hitting against the limits? In *Strategic Review for Southern Africa*, November.

Stanley, L., and Wise, S. (1993). *Breaking Out Again: Feminist ontology and epistemology*. London: Routledge.

Stober, D. R. (2006). Coaching from the humanistic perspective. In Stober, D.R., and Grant, A.M. (Eds), *Evidence-Based Coaching Handbook: Putting best practices to work for your clients*, (pp. 17–50). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Thomson, A. (2004). *An Introduction to African Politics*, second edition. London: Routledge.

Thornton, R. (2000). Finding culture. In Nuttall, S. and Michael, C-A. (eds), *Senses of Culture: South African Culture Studies*, (pp. 29–48). Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Venter, A. (2005). A comment on current political risks for South Africa. In *Strategic Review for South Africa*, November.

Villa-Vicencio., C. (2007). The RDP of the Soul: Building a charter of positive values. In *Rethinking South Africa's Development Path*, (pp.150–154). The Centre for Policy Studies.

Weisbord, M. and Janoff, S. (2010). *Future Search: Getting the whole system in the room for vision, commitment and action*, third edition. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Wheatley, M. J. (2006). *Leadership and the New Science: Discovering order in a chaotic world*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Whitmore, J. (1992). *Coaching for Performance, a practical guide to growing your own skills*. San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer.

Whitmore, J. (2006). Coaching profile: Driving force. *Coaching at Work*, 1(6):32–35.

Whitworth, L., Kimsey-House, H., and Sandahl, P. (1998). *Co-active Coaching: New skills for coaching people toward success in work and life*. Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black.

Appendix: Interview guideline

Current status of South Africa

- Taken into account South Africa's history and our journey towards democracy and greater equality and healing, where would you say we are now in this journey? i.e. What do you believe the current status of South Africa to be?
- What do you think is needed right now for our country to move forward, and to facilitate more healing?
- What do your think about the TRC?
- Where did it fall short?
- What would be an ideal follow-up process, engaging more South Africans?
- Ideally, what would the focus/agenda be of such a process?

Scenarios

- What would be your ideal future, your vision, for South Africa (don't worry about sounding realistic or logical here)?
- What needs to happen for this to come true?
- In terms of scenario planning, what would be the worst outcome for South Africa in the next five years?
- What would enable this scenario to come true?
- What do you think is most likely to happen in SA in the next five years?
- And what would enable that outcome?

Building the future

- What is the shift you would like to see happen in our country's collective consciousness?
- To enable that, what is the internal shift that would need to happen for you?

Name:

Position/affiliation:

Consent for above contents to be quoted in future proposals: YES / NO

Consent for above contents to be used for future research: YES / NO