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[B]asic ingredients of leadership are curiosity and daring. Leaders wonder about everything, want to learn as much as they can, are willing to take risks, experiment, try new things. They do not worry about failure, but embrace errors, knowing they will learn from them.¹

[T]he most successful leaders [see] their primary responsibility as unleashing the talent of others so the collective vision [can] be realized.²

International organizations, such as the United Nations and the European Union (EU), impact millions of people’s lives in conflict areas and in the developing world through their field missions in the areas of peace and security, human rights, and development.³ However, facing criticism for a wide range of issues, including allegations of corruption, low accountability, sexual abuse, waste, and ineffectiveness, these missions frequently face calls for more effective and transformative leadership. Many internal initiatives have sought to address the multiple leadership challenges associated with running missions in complex conflict and post-conflict environments, but they place too much emphasis on leadership at the executive level, already somewhat marred by political compromise, or on internal cadre members, ignoring the structural peculiarities of field

Cornelia Schneider is a UK-educated lawyer who has spent the last eight years living and working in conflict areas such as Afghanistan, Chad, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Syria, and Sudan. The opinions expressed in this article are the author’s own and do not necessarily reflect the views or opinions of any of the organizations with which she has been associated.
missions, which are marked by a multitude of contracting modalities and high mobility across organizations. They also continue to overlook junior female managers, who tend to leave mission environments more frequently than their male counterparts, often just as these female managers would be entering more senior posts.

Leadership in the field must originate at the middle management level, whose members represent and embody their organizations at the grassroots level every day. Identified talent must be empowered early on, even if the middle managers in question do not form part of an official internal pool or prescribed career trajectory. For this to occur, middle managers with intrinsic institutional values and relevant technical and executive skills must dare to assume leadership roles, which in turn requires senior managers to recognize and empower leadership amongst their middle management, rewarding courage instead of assimilation. Institutional policy in such an environment can only achieve so much; successful talent management cannot only be accomplished through standardized indicators and best practice rules that are difficult to enforce in a mission environment. Instead, talent can only be reaped consistently by means of organizational cultures that encourage senior managers to recognize existing leadership potential and foster more courageous decision-making at more junior levels—requiring talent management on an individual basis where the system falls short.

A NEW CLASS OF ROVING PROFESSIONALS

Few international organizations these days are manned by the archetypal international civil servant with a lifetime of faithful service and intimate knowledge of mandate, vision, and internal rules and procedures of their home institution. Field missions and local offices in particular are increasingly staffed by ‘roving professionals’: police officers, soldiers, lawyers, or civilian personnel seconded by their home governments; young professionals moving from posting to posting, and from organization
to organization, depending on the lengths of their temporary contracts; consultants and experts; and other staff who never obtained, or chose not to apply for, more permanent posts at headquarters. In UN peace missions, for example, the majority of serving international staff “have [fewer] than three years prior UN experience,” and EU civilian crisis management missions, in existence since 2003, are predominantly staffed by member states’ secondees. In general, it is much more common for aid and development workers these days to move between organizations, entities, and duty stations than was the case only a few years ago, and the leadership of many international organizations is often recruited externally, not grown internally. It is not surprising that this transient environment makes it difficult for international organizations to build a uniform working culture across headquarters and field missions, and over time. This challenge brings with it a whole array of management and leadership challenges, manifesting an industry that exhibits self-managed career paths rather than institutionalized talent management. In these circumstances, talent initiatives focusing on the executive level, or on those relatively few staff who move through dedicated career pool programs, fail to address the vast majority of staff in middle management positions.

FITTING IN OR STANDING OUT?

Much has been written on what constitutes leadership—not to be confused with title or status, nor with management per se (good managers do not necessarily make good leaders, and vice versa). It would go beyond the scope of this piece to elaborate on this question in detail, but few would dispute that strong leadership is closely associated with creating a vision, with looking after one’s staff, with having the courage to take decisions and changing mindsets where necessary and, time and again, with ‘inspiring’ others. In the case of value-oriented organizations such as the UN or the EU, commentators posit that leadership must be intrinsically ‘value-based,’ i.e. be a catalyst for translating the institution’s underlying values into reality.

In field offices, where client-oriented action rather than bureaucratic
paper pushing is most indispensable, the need for “leadership from staff below the political level”8 is particularly reinforced. It is true that “bureaucracies do not leave much room for spontaneous, leader-like behavior,”9 yet it is a unique and somewhat paradoxical feature of international organizations’ field operations that they are at once highly bureaucratic and yet, by necessity, decentralized enough to offer room for creativity and flexibility, even for middle managers.

On the one hand, strategic decisions that have to trickle down the chain of command, and complex procedural rules imposed by remote headquarters, mean that field staff can feel removed and out-of-touch with the central hierarchy, impeded from acting by lengthy approval or consultation processes and incomprehensible regulations. On the other hand, those willing to act and take initiative can often benefit from this distance from headquarters, and from confused mandates and reporting lines. A local head of office, for example, will usually find plenty of opportunities for demonstrating leadership qualities, be that in representing his or her organization to the local government or victims’ associations, or vis-à-vis his or her own staff.

The UN has collected examples of more junior staff that showed great courage and leadership qualities, in Rwanda during the genocide, for example, or in East Timor.10 But it does not always take a genocide to demonstrate courage. Oftentimes, ‘courage’ is about more mundane matters which staff are confronted with every day. Will managers fight for staff whose jobs are lost due to funding cuts and turn every corner to find alternative funding? Will they try to support rape victims who turn to them for help, if it is not in the agreed annual work plan? Issue a vital piece of local communication when there is not enough time to have it approved by headquarters? Find ways to run an innovative new program even if there is no contract modality that seems to fit? Much like a mediocre lawyer will only look at the black letter of the law and a good lawyer will look at how the law can be interpreted to suit his client’s needs, a good leader will look at how rules can be interpreted to allow him to engage in the activities that are in the organization’s and clients’ best interests. He will do what is clearly...
in line with the underlying values of the organization, in pursuit of a greater
goal. Unfortunately, the reality in field missions does not always align with
this leadership ideal.

**No Bread is Better than Half a Loaf?**

Much of this lack of intrinsic leadership can be traced back to
institutional cultures that reward the meek and sanction the brave, thus
weeding out initiative instead of nurturing it. “Don’t rock the boat” or
“pick your fights” lie amongst the well-meant pieces of advice that over-
eager newcomers will often receive from their longer-serving colleagues.
Middle management is easily stifled into inaction by high levels of regula-
tion, bureaucratic chains of command, and attempts to streamline all staff
members’ understanding of, and adherence to, rules and procedures. The
conservative, risk-averse practices, which they engage in as a consequence,
too often cause delays, impasses, and
unsatisfactory delivery of results. There
are few incentives for managers to show
courage and leadership by stepping
out of line and taking independent
action; the surest way not to offend any
colleagues or superiors or any known
or unknown rule is simply not to take
any out-of-the-ordinary action at all.
In an environment in the stranglehold
of a plethora of “Byzantine” rules that
are openly recognized as being “slow
and cumbersome,” “unclear” at best and at times positively “confusing,”
it is hard to imagine a single official knowing all applicable rules,¹¹ and
yet easy to see why managers might scare themselves and more junior or
inexperienced staff into inaction lest they fall foul of a rule. The threat of
*ignorantia juris non excusat*, ignorance of the law is no excuse, in this case,
then, too often seems to translate into ‘no bread is better than half a loaf.’

In these circumstances, it is a challenge to operate efficiently, partic-
ularly in the field. Complicated rules and long chains of command can
be all the more potentially debilitating the more remote one’s area of
operation. One does not need much imagination to picture a small field
office manned exclusively by programmatic staff, new to an organization,
without operational support, who might inadvertently breach numerous
organizational rules: human resource rules on notice periods for local
staff’s end of contract, programmatic rules on adequate contract modalities with subcontracting NGOs, procurement regulations on how to book a venue for a training session in town, donor budgetary rules on how project money can or cannot be spent, or operational limits on cash advances. Plenty of managers choose to wait an excruciatingly long time for clearance from their supervisors on how to proceed for every single step instead of taking a calculated risk of possibly falling foul of procedures for the benefit of advancing a project. Instead of relying on their own competence, common sense, and legitimate powers of discretion to decide if an action makes sense, they too often insist on ‘covering their backs’ by involving their superiors who, in turn, might be similarly reluctant to forego clearance from senior leadership.

Acutely aware of the challenges mentioned above, some organizations have been seeking to address leadership lacunae through targeted initiatives such as better training, more versatile and gender-friendly recruitment, mentoring and networking initiatives, and more stringent performance measuring. The UN, for example, recognized in 2000 that it had “not dedicated enough attention over the years to career development, training and mentoring or the institution of modern management practices,” and that it had to “seriously address [the alarming trend of qualified personnel leaving the organization by] rewarding excellence and removing incompetence.” Yet many of these initiatives seem to be aimed at senior management or permanent staff, and few seem to have a correlation with performance in the field. This is seemingly out of line with a reality where many organizations find themselves represented and embodied in the field by middle—often transient—management. Victim groups in Eastern Congo are, after all, much more likely to associate the UN with the local head of office who inaugurated their new community center than with Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon or a resident coordinator in Kinshasa. Managers can go for years without training unless they take initiative themselves, or happen to have an engaged supervisor. Additional institutionalized initiatives in the field of talent management
therefore cannot distract from the fact that careers within international organizations in the field continue to be essentially “self-managed,” and that individuals’ failure or success within the system is often linked to individual supervisors’ initiative and dedication to nurturing and encouraging the staff under his or her supervision.

In an environment where one faces shortages in all directions, international organizations and their supervisors therefore must have the courage to ‘brave the gap’—to bake that half loaf of bread rather than bake none at all. Staff must be positively encouraged to make mistakes and learn from them. The message must be: “initiative is valued as much as caution,” instead of setting managers up for failure. Obviously the freedom to make mistakes should not be taken as a carte blanche to engage in reckless behavior or deliberately to undermine established rules. What such an institutional approach means is that, in certain circumstances, staff and middle management must be allowed and encouraged to take decisions even in the absence of superior clearance so that the gain of empowered staff will ultimately benefit the organization. Examples of this are not just to not sanction staff who show initiative on their own accord, but to encourage junior staff to come to conclusions by themselves. Middle managers must be better equipped with skills that permit them to judge under what circumstances the use of discretionary decision-making is legitimate. In fact, they need to have a much better appreciation of the fact that vacillation may in certain circumstances be more damaging than action, and the reassurance that they may act accordingly. Organizations have to empower those who take initiative and who show leadership potential. We need more senior managers who take it seriously that, in order for them to be true transformational leaders themselves, they must in turn “convert followers into leaders.” We need more senior managers who understand that one of their most important roles is to nurture the talent below. To foster leadership, how does one identify and measure it?
SPOTTING TALENT: KNOW IT WHEN YOU SEE IT

In the private sector, financial indicators can make success, and ultimately impact, more easily measurable; help promote the accountability of managers; and make leadership more identifiable. In international organizations, results are far removed from such indicators. Human resources instead try to use alternative tools such as competency based interviews, designed to introduce ‘greater objectivity’ in recruitment and promotion, but with its own shortcomings, or elaborate performance measuring schemes that include SMART indicator criteria (asking if an indicator is Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Trackable) such as “manager completed all staff evaluations on time.” And yet no measure within a sophisticated evaluation tool will eliminate the subjective human element; it is, after all, not unheard of for staff members to receive an extremely critical evaluation from one supervisor, only to be recommended for promotion by the next. The reality is that there is no such thing as an objective evaluation, and trying to measure leadership qualities using a calculated mechanism is reminiscent of the technologies of online dating sites that use complex algorithms to find the right match for singles: they “supply everything but the spark.”

Let us imagine two line managers who both write thirty evaluations by the required deadline for staff under their supervision. The first line manager writes thirty nearly identical evaluations, attesting each and every staff member the same ‘strong interpersonal communication skills that made [him/her] a valuable asset to the team’ and pays lip service to a similar set of management skills on a pre-defined list. Line manager one is probably neither a good manager nor a good leader. Line manager two also writes thirty evaluations, but provides detailed feedback and takes the time to find examples to illustrate each point. But the performance indicator for the two line managers states “manager has completed all staff evaluations on time” not “manager has given staff honest feedback instead of rubberstamped evaluation forms,” and so both managers will have achieved full marks on delivery of the indicator.

What motivates manager two to spend all this time on evaluations? Why does he accept the possible drawback from offending a staff member whom he provides with constructive criticism? He will not gain anything—apart from possibly trouble by an aggrieved staff member complaining about an honest, but critical, evaluation. Similarly, what does a manager gain from investing himself in ensuring that somebody in- or outside of his team is recognized for his talent and gets promoted? On the face of it, not very much. These managers are motivated by “intrinsic rewards” that are hard to quantify, and difficult to measure.

Recognizing the impossibility of quantifiably measuring all leadership qualities means that international organizations have to get away from pure performance indicators. Instead, they must rely more on ‘gut feeling,’ a belief that they will ‘know leadership potential when they see it,’ and a culture of talent management inherently ingrained in managers at all levels, at all periods of the year, not just at ‘evaluation time.’ In fact, talent management in international organizations rests more on individual managers than on any system-wide effort to nurture and support talent within an organization. Those senior managers working with staff in the field should, after all, be able to spot those with natural authority and leadership ability by observing them on a daily basis—a level of insight, which no set of systematized indicators or evaluation markers could possibly replace.

In an organization where each management level automatically looks out for inherent leadership qualities in the level below, for somebody ‘with the right spark,’ there will be a mutual effect of the right kind of attitude trickling down through the hierarchy, and the right kind of people being promoted up through the hierarchy. In an increasingly mobile world, talent promotion based on value-based leadership rather than familiarity with a particular system will also be transferrable across organizations.

And what about women? It is generally accepted that women are as capable as men in leadership roles, and that having gender parity can improve organizational effectiveness. In fact, women are frequently considered as more effective in transformational leadership, which is critical to the process by which a trickling down of leadership ethos, mentioned above, occurs. ‘Traditionally feminine’ leadership styles typically focus on interpersonal skills, are more interactive and collaborative, and seek to empower subordinates, particularly important when trying to encourage a tradition of talent management. While it is undeniable that female leaders, particularly in male dominated fields, often suffer from prejudices against their competency, these insights nonetheless warrant a particular
focus on women leadership in field settings. So what is being done about women leadership in international organizations’ field missions?

**FEMALE LEADERSHIP**

The data show that women leaders in international organizations, particularly in peace and security contexts, remain woefully underrepresented. This is the case despite extensive and repeated commitments from both the UN (since 1986) and the EU (since 1995), and even though progress has been made by both organizations to increase the share of women. In UN peacekeeping operations and special political missions, however, women make up only about 29 percent of international staff. As regards senior positions within peacekeeping, current staffing is even less promising; in December 2012, women headed 15 percent of peacekeeping, political, and peacebuilding missions, and women’s share of senior positions (P-5 to D-2) was at 21 percent. In many UN (non-peacekeeping) conflict operations known to the author, female senior positions were frequently as low as 12 to 19 percent. According to a 2013 study, out of a total of forty-seven director-level D-2 and 129 D-1 positions in the field, only five D-2 and twenty-nine D-1 were filled by women. Within the EU, the numbers are not much different. Numbers of female Heads of EU Delegations have gone up from 15.1 percent in 2010, but are still a long way from parity, with 23.2 percent in 2014. Out of eleven civilian crisis missions ongoing in April 2014, none was headed by a woman. EU crisis missions now employ gender advisers and an increasing number of women—however, the overall percentage of women in missions compared to men is still low (19.4 percent in December 2012).

There are several obvious reasons why women are less likely to work in field missions. Assignments abroad, particularly in crisis areas, are obviously physically and psychologically challenging—a challenge for men as well as
women—and in addition, are difficult to combine with a partner’s career or family care, or with issues such as ageing parents at home. Opportunity costs can be high, particularly with respect to social benefits such as childcare, healthcare and maternity leave/pay; job security is low; and, on returning, career prospects might have suffered. There are also few visible female role models in this field. Entry barriers thus provide a major first hurdle (often above and beyond barriers to promotion), which might explain why few women even apply for jobs in the field. For instance, only 9 percent of the applications for UN field mission D-2 jobs were from female candidates. Out of every four candidates for UN peacekeeping posts in the field, only one is a woman; of the 25 percent of candidates who are female, most are external candidates. This seems to suggest that field posts are not attractive for women, even less so for women already in UN employment—possibly because they are afraid of ‘getting stuck’ in family-hostile environments.

On a purely anecdotal basis, it is thus not surprising that many women in international missions seem very young, seem old enough to have grown children, or seem to have made a deliberate choice to sacrifice a more traditional lifestyle for a career in conflict zones. The generation of women in their late-thirties and forties seems much less represented.

Efforts to improve the representation and retention of women in international field missions have been spearheaded by the Security Council’s agenda related to women, peace and security, as per Resolution 1325 (2000). Several subsequent resolutions (1820, 1888, 2106 and 2122) follow in the tradition of other international commitments to gender equality such as the 1979 Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, the 1995 Beijing Platform for Action, and a number of General Assembly Resolutions requesting gender parity. Resolution 1325 urges “Member States to ensure increased representation of women at all decision-making levels in ... international institutions” and “the Secretary-General to seek to expand the role and contribution of women in United Nations field-based operations, and especially among military observers, civilian police, human rights and humanitarian personnel.” The EU similarly thinks of UNSCR 1325 as the basis for policy commitments to promote the role of women in peace building and has adopted a common EU approach to the implementation of the resolution. Jumpstarted at least in part by this process, there have been a number of formal and informal initiatives targeting female staff and women leaders, at least within the UN system. Within the EU’s crisis management missions, no particular talent management program or leader development training exists for women.
In July 2010, the UN Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women) was created with the objective to coordinate all the efforts of the UN system for gender equality and the empowerment of women, including the objective of achieving gender balance within the UN system.\textsuperscript{43} UN Women also houses the Office of the Focal Point for Women in the UN, which seeks to ensure that more women are recruited and promoted within the UN system, in particular at decision-making levels. These efforts, however, seem in large part to be focused on monitoring and reporting, and are not felt specifically by many people in the field. In 2013, the UN’s Department of Field Support (DFS), the Department of Political Affairs and the Department of Peacekeeping Operations conducted a study entitled \textit{Bridging the Gender Gap in Peace Operations} in order to “better understand the barriers to attracting, retaining and advancing female staff in the field.”\textsuperscript{44} The study, of which only excerpts are publicly available, compiles and analyzes a series of data sets, some of them for the first time.\textsuperscript{45} A wide range of comprehensive recommendations that were made in December 2013 have led to a series of initiatives, such as recruitment videos which target women and networking opportunities for women leaders. These efforts also include a 3.5 minute-long video, which recognizes that “[t]he UN needs more professional women among our ranks” and which invites potential candidates to “learn about the diverse professional opportunities open to women” through “the lens of professional women working at the UN.”\textsuperscript{46} Portraying UN leaders such as Valerie Amos (Emergency Relief Coordinator for the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs), Leila Zerrougui (Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict) and Ameerah Haq (Under-Secretary-General Department of Field Support), it addresses head-on the lack of female role models for UN staff, though the ultimate reach and impact of the video will need to be assessed in the future. Another concrete result of the study was a “talent pipeline” launched in February 2014 to help bridge the civilian gender gap in peace operations.\textsuperscript{47} This effort is reminiscent of DFS’ Senior Leadership Appointments Section (SLAS), which seeks to “improve senior-level vacancy management and succession planning, with special attention to improving the representation of qualified female candidates,” amongst others, through the maintenance of a database, outreach and partnerships, and briefing and supporting of (female) candidates.\textsuperscript{48} However, the talent pipeline is aimed at director posts (D1 or D2 level positions), whereas the SLAS focuses on Under-Secretary-General and Assistant Secretary-General levels. The implementation of other recommendations of the study has not yet been announced.
Some of the specialized agencies, programs, or funds run dedicated leadership and/or career development programs; the UN Environment Programme (UNEP), for example, has a “Women Preparing for Leadership Programme” aimed at female staff. UNHCR and UNDP both allow female staff to qualify for higher levels within the professional category in less time than men. UNDP in fact launched a new Gender Parity Strategy 2013-2017, which proposes several actions to attract, retain and promote female staff, including special hiring measures for bureaus that fall below 45 percent of women, including opening candidate pools only to women as well as requirements for retirement options for men and an inclusive work culture. EU crisis missions are similarly affected by the fact that most of its positions require expertise from male-dominant professions such as policing, security, or military, which means that, naturally, more candidates for these positions are men.

Across the board, women in the field need to be better supported if they are expected to stay for protracted periods of time and assume leadership positions. Such efforts need to focus on better outreach, recruitment, retention, and advancement opportunities. Practical measures that might improve recruitment and retention of female staff could include formalized policies on duty reassignments in case of pregnancy; mentoring programs and networks for women in certain positions; and improved training opportunities targeting women. Simpler ‘quick fixes’ also exist, such as providing safer and more appropriate ablution facilities for female staff serving in remote camp locations; offering gynecologists in mission; and ensuring better access to education and hospitals in family stations. Any such measures should also be clearly communicated to candidates or potential candidates, so as to encourage higher application rates. Nonetheless, if organizations want to increase female participation under these circumstances, some kind of positive discrimination may be required. Quotas aim to put right decades of not being given fair chances, and to level the playing field. In reality, however, qualified women who lose out to men in recruitment processes have little to no recourse to enforce these policies.
UNLEASHING A LITTLE MORE BITE, NURTURING A LITTLE MORE SPARK

It is not a contradiction in terms to be a cynic and yet to be a believer in the need for, and usefulness of, international organizations. Certainly, even in the face of ineffectiveness, waste, and scandal, there is dire need in conflict and post-conflict contexts for organizations like the UN or the EU. It is this appreciation that motivates thousands of people to persevere in a system that is full of challenge, yet full of promise.

In order to keep international organizations relevant and productive, particularly in the field, quality leadership is required—leadership that is effective and inspirational. Value-driven, courage-taking leadership of these organizations is vital, and such leadership has to be provided by all levels of management. And while true leadership might be hard to breed, it is relatively easy to foster through the right kind of recruitment, training, inspiration, and encouragement.

International organizations must in the first place strengthen enabling conditions for mid-management leadership, by improving conditions that enable women managers to stay in their posts, by providing conditions for all managers to be more involved in decision-making, and by incorporating the importance of leadership—leading and letting lead—as a cross-cutting training module. Mid-management staff must be more vocal, more engaged, and more courageous in their leadership. But this risk-taking must be rewarded. International organizations, through their individual senior managers, should boost middle managers’ confidence to show leadership in the true sense of the word, bringing inspiration and good ideas to their work, having the courage to use discretion, and displaying model performance and ethical behavior—in short, unleashing ‘a little more bite’ and nurturing ‘a little more spark.’
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