

# CGIAR GENDER AND DIVERSITY PROGRAM

---

## **EXECUTIVE SELECTION IN THE CGIAR** Implications for Gender and Diversity

Prepared by:  
NANCY J. ALLEN

# Table of contents

<b>Table of contents</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>Acknowledgments</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>I. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. The challenge</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>III. The Data</b>	<b>7</b>
A. APPLICANT POOL	7
1. Discussion of the data	7
2. Expanding the applicant pool	8
B. PROCESS HIGHLIGHTS	10
1. Strategic and Leadership Considerations	10
2. Nominations process	15
3. Professional assistance	18
4. Board and search committee composition	20
5. Incumbent Involvement	23
6. Internal candidates	24
7. Staff participation and community involvement	27
8. Gender and diversity considerations	32
<b>IV. Conclusion and summary of recommendations</b>	<b>37</b>
A. ADVICE TO CENTERS UNDERTAKING A SEARCH EFFORT	37
1. Clarify strategy	37
2. Review and apply the current literature on leadership	37
3. Ensure diversity and quality of the search committee	38
4. Expand the quality of the applicant pool through all means possible	38
5. Pursue nominations vigorously	38
6. Employ a professional external search consultant	39
7. Involve the staff at various points in the search and selection process	39
8. Consider a leadership assessment and diversity awareness workshop	40
9. Maintain due diligence	40
B. ADVICE TO CANDIDATES	40
1. Develop a “constellation of allies.”	40
2. Resist pressure to apply for positions that are not suited to your leadership experience or technical skills	40
3. Accept questions regarding gender and diversity with equanimity.	41
C. BUILDING A FOUNDATION FOR THE FUTURE	42
<b>Appendix A: List of Interviews</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Appendix B: Profile of CGIAR Center Boards</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Appendix C: List of Abbreviations</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>About the Author</b>	<b>48</b>

# Acknowledgments

On behalf of the CGIAR Gender and Diversity Program, I wish to express deep appreciation to the four Future Harvest centers whose search and selection processes are reviewed in this study—CIFOR, ICRAF, IITA, and ILRI. The centers entrusted us with a tremendous amount of internal information, some of it quite sensitive; we hope that this report sheds enough light on the topic to merit that trust.

We especially thank the directors general and board chairs of the four centers for their permission to produce this report and include their names in it; for the generosity with which they shared their time and documents; and for the candidness of their personal communications.

This process provides a beautiful example of transparency in the CGIAR—and underlines commitment to improving how we all work with gender and diversity.

Thanks, too, to consulting researcher Dr. Nancy Allen for her professionalism, understanding of organizations, and dedication to helping us excel.

Vicki Wilde, Program Leader  
CGIAR Program on Gender and Diversity

# I. Introduction

The appointment of a new chief executive is one of the most important moments in the life of an organization. In 2001, not one, but four Future Harvest centers -- CIFOR, ICRAF, IITA and ILRI -- appointed new directors general. Each of the centers selected a male candidate, three of whom were citizens of the United States. The lack of diversity was perceived by some within the CGIAR (and others outside the CGIAR) as a surprising, and even disappointing result. At the CGIAR mid-term meetings in Durban, South Africa the current CGIAR Chairman, Ian Johnson, described the result as a “tragedy of the commons.” Others, however, have praised the Boards of Trustees urging that they ‘not be criticized, but applauded for making tough decisions that were not symbolically correct, and that they knew might be critically received.’ **Most observers deeply respect the choices made by each center, yet still wish to understand why gender and national diversity appears to be so hard to achieve within the CGIAR.**

To help all concerned better understand this issue, the CGIAR Gender and Diversity Program elected to do a comparative study of this critical organizational process. This paper studies the four cases in order to identify common lessons for the improvement of gender and diversity in future search and selection processes within the CGIAR. The core of the research was conducted at the CGIAR Mid-Term Meetings in Durban, South Africa in May 2001, at which time personal interviews were conducted with most of the Board Chairs, incoming Director Generals (DG), outgoing DGs, a few center directors and some additional board members. These initial interviews were supplemented by telephone discussions and e-mail correspondence with a number of other individuals. This interview data was complemented by a review of formal written reports and other documents provided by the centers.<sup>1</sup>

The diversity issue proves to be more profound than most observers might have imagined. **At two of the centers, IITA and ILRI, there were no female applicants for the Director General position at all. None of the centers were working from applicant pools rich in gender diversity. In contrast, the applicant pool included a large percentage of developing country nationals – more than half the applicants at most centers.** Two centers, CIFOR and ICRAF, did short-list a female candidate, neither of whom was ultimately selected. IITA and ILRI, appointed directors general of di-

---

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix A for a list of interviews and other contacts.

verse ethnic heritage. These appointments should both be celebrated as diversity gains for the CGIAR system.<sup>2</sup>

The stark structural reality of the applicant pool has been glossed over by some observers in favor of a more critical focus on the board dynamics that chose in favor of male candidates. A sound analysis requires a careful look at both the structural realities of the candidate pool and the behavioral complexities of the final selection decision. ***The centers must seek both to increase the number of qualified women and developing country nationals who apply and assure that those who do apply are fully and fairly assessed.*** This paper is an attempt to identify leverage points for improving both those efforts.

The search and selection process must be understood in the context of the complex organizational landscape in which individual centers operate. The gender and diversity dimension of the director general appointment is one issue among many. CGIAR centers are under a number of internal strategic pressures as they balance the demand to be dynamic research organizations as well as significant development actors. Most centers are operating under extreme resource constraints and sometimes in demanding geographic locations. An additional strategic pressure arises from the current CGIAR reorganization, which seeks improved integration at the system-wide level and therefore decisions that serve the interests of the “commons,” as well as individual centers. These strategic pressures have combined to increase demands on leaders in the system.

---

<sup>2</sup> Identity and the meanings people attach to them are complex. There seems to have been limited recognition of the fact that the incoming DG of ILRI is a citizen of Uruguay and honors a mixed Latin and European heritage. Likewise, there has been little recognition of the fact that the new DG at IITA is of Tanzanian and American heritage and personally identifies himself as an “African.”

## II. The challenge

Why has gender and ethnic diversity been so difficult to achieve at the senior level within the CGIAR? Diversity is, of course, a challenge far beyond the CGIAR, the numbers of women in top leadership positions are low in most organizations, in the public and private sector.<sup>3</sup> The data and trends are somewhat more positive in non-profit institutions. For example, in the United States, the number of female college and university presidents (a leadership position with many parallels to international research management) has increased from 9.5 percent in 1986, to 19.3 percent in 1998 according to the most recent survey of college presidents by the American Council on Education (Chronicle of Higher Education, 2001).

Nonetheless, most statistics continue to prompt dismay. A recent International Labor Organization (ILO) study cites a 1995 survey of Germany's largest companies in which it was found that only one to three per cent of top executives and board members are women; in Brazil, a 1991 survey of major corporations revealed that only around three per cent of top executives were women. In the United States, the phenomenon is well documented:

“Women now make up 50% of managerial and specialized professional positions in organizations in the United States. Yet even with those positive trends, the dearth of women in top leadership roles is striking. Catalyst, a research organization on “glass ceiling” issues, recently released their 2000 census of Fortune 500 companies. It revealed that women comprise only 12.5% of corporate officers and 6.2% of the highest-ranking corporate leadership positions with titles such as chairman, vice chairman, chief executive officer, or chief operating officer. Women of color make up only 1.3% of corporate officers. There are only two women CEO's in the 500 largest corporations and six among the top 1,000. Women are even more sparsely represented in top leadership positions in companies of the new economy.” (Merrill-Sands and Kolb 2001, p. 1)

The term *glass ceiling* was coined more than 20 years ago to capture precisely this phenomenon. Originally, the term *glass ceiling* was introduced to suggest invisible barriers constructed by men to impede women's advancement to the executive floor. The analysis in the intervening years has been extensive, and the term is now used whenever someone tries to explain why women have not risen to the most senior ranks in organizations for whatever reason, structural or behavioral, tangible or intangible. Although useful, the term *glass ceiling* is thought

---

<sup>3</sup> Comparable data for developing country nationals in positions of leadership in multinational firms or foreign subsidiaries is less available. Available data on developing country nationals in international organizations is difficult to compare.

by many gender specialists to be too simplistic to capture the current phenomenon.

According to one leading scholar of gender relations, a more appropriate metaphor might be:

“... the kind of cross-sectional diagram used in geology. The barriers to women’s leadership occur when potentially counterproductive layers of influence on women – maternity, tradition, socialization – meet management strata pervaded by the largely unconscious preconceptions, stereotypes and expectations of men. Such interfaces do not exist for men and tend to be impermeable to women.” (Schwartz 2000, p.108)

The story in the CGIAR is perhaps more sobering than even the *glass ceiling* label would suggest. As one might expect, the proportion of women decreases as one moves up the organizational ladder. However, women are poorly represented not merely at the highest level of the organization, but throughout the senior ranks. As of August 2001, women represent just 17.8% of total internationally recruited staff, and hold only 7.5% of senior management positions (DDGs/Directors and Research Program/Administrative Heads). The picture is decidedly more positive for developing country nationals with a far more equal distribution of scientists from developing country (World Bank Part II countries) and developed country origins (World Bank Part I countries). Still, according to the latest *CGIAR Trend Data on Gender and Diversity* (October 2001), internationally recruited staff members from developing countries are underrepresented in the ranks of senior management.

Most readers are familiar with the social and organizational factors that are known to mitigate against women’s career advancement, as individuals and as a class: career interruptions due to childbearing, child-rearing and elder care; primary attention to family over career in employment; and, educational and career choices that limit by professional discipline and experience access to positions of policy-making influence (Wells 2001, Costa 2000). Added to these now well documented “facts” of female labor force participation, are the more difficult explanations arising from early socialization and societal assumptions about women in leadership. It is this latter body of research that more effectively addresses why ambitious women in relevant professions continue to be so severely underrepresented in organizational positions of authority.

Virginia Valian synthesizes much of this research in a book entitled: *Why So Slow: The Advancement of Women*. Valian draws on experimental research in social psychology as well as many other sources to

show that **women and men operate with deeply embedded “gender schemas” rooted in childhood experience and culture that restrict the ability of men and women to visualize women in leadership positions.**

At the same time that gender research improves the documentation of perceptual bias against women as leaders, another body of management research identifies the increasing demand in modern organizations for leadership skills identified as supportive, nurturing and relational. Additionally, research finds that women are often rated more highly in these and other areas of leadership, thought to matter greatly for executive success. Recent research shows that women are rated high in general leadership effectiveness by supervisors, peers and, particularly, subordinates and that they excel in people-oriented leadership skills, orientation to production and attainment of results (Kabacoff 1998, Wells 2001, Merrill-Sands and Kolb 2001).

It is important to note that much of this recent leadership research is founded on the advantages of 360-degree performance evaluation, and, therefore, involves assessments by individuals, and in the context of close relationships and active work. The context in which DG selection takes place is one in which perceptions and group interaction effects have a potentially important influence on the outcome.<sup>4</sup> **Management research proves that women are strong leaders, gender research suggests that people still do not believe it.**

At this point, it is important to reconsider why diversity matters. Diversity matters because, handled well, it improves how organizations work and what they accomplish by bringing a variety of perspectives to decisions and actions. This understanding is already shared by many within the CGIAR system. In a recent document compiled by the CGIAR Gender and Diversity Program, directors general identified the following “motive forces” for improving organizational diversity:

- Responding to changing workforce demographics.

---

<sup>4</sup> Valian (2000) cites a 1990 laboratory study in which people’s facial reactions were monitored in observations of men and women (trained to use identical scripts and styles) acting in various configurations of leadership, co-leadership and non-leadership. No matter which role women played they received more negative facial reactions than positive ones. The opposite was true for males. Queried at the end of the experiment, participants rated trained males as having greater ability, skill and intelligence, while females were rated as too emotional, relative to males. As leaders or co-leaders, women were perceived as bossy and dominating relative to the males. “Yet, in answering questions designed to measure any explicit bias against women, the naïve participants expressed none. They may have been sincerely egalitarian in their overt beliefs, but their facial reactions and personal evaluations revealed their underlying beliefs.”

- Enhancing innovation, creativity, and problem solving.
- Enhancing operational effectiveness.
- Promoting social justice and equity.
- Excelling in performance and industry reputation.
- Improving retention of high quality staff.
- Strengthening collaborative modes of working.
- Gaining broader access to clients, beneficiaries, investors, and other stakeholders.
- Increasing access to funding.
- Improving scientific quality.
- Increasing institutional footprint through participatory programs.

### III. The Data

#### A. APPLICANT POOL

##### 1. Discussion of the data

Very few women applied for the position of Director General. No female candidates applied to IITA or ILRI, despite sincere efforts in the nominations process. ICRAF received nine applications from women (13% of the applicant pool), five or six of whom had relevant qualifications but only one of whom was ultimately included on the medium-list. CIFOR received only three (4%) applications from women. The paucity of women applying for the DG position is not what educational trend analysis would lead one to expect in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. According to a CGIAR study of these trends "... the pool of qualified women in the natural sciences is growing rapidly. ... In the biological sciences relevant to Center research, women earned 20 percent of the doctorates in the early 1970s, 40 percent by the early 1990s; in the socio-economic disciplines, the percentages increased in the same period from 15 percent to 35 percent." (Joan Joshi et al (2000), p. 13)

**Table 1. Composition of Applicant Pool**

	Total Applicant Pool				Short -List			
	Female	Male	South	North	Female	Male	South	North
<b>CIFOR<sup>5</sup></b>	3 (4%)	78 (96%)	50 (62%)	31 (28%)	1	3	1	3
<b>ICRAF</b>	9 (13%)	61 (87%)	36 (51%)	34 (49%)	1	2	0	3
<b>IITA<sup>6</sup></b>	0 (0%)	14 (100%)	N/A (52%)	N/A (48%)	0	3	0	3
<b>ILRI</b>	0 (0%)	33 (100%)	15 (45%)	18 (55%)	0	4	1	3
<b>System Totals</b>	12 (6%)	186 (94%)	N/A Esti-	N/A Esti-	2 (14%)	12 (86%)	2	12

<sup>5</sup> There may be some small inaccuracy in these numbers, as CIFOR deemed its initial applicant list (69 applicants) as providing insufficient diversity and sought further nominations and applications totaling either 81 or 83, depending on when the final tally was taken.

<sup>6</sup> IITA provided data on the national origins of its nominations list, not its final applicants. Forty-eight percent of IITA's nominees came from North America, Europe and Oceania; while 52 percent came from Asia and Africa.

			mate: >50 %	mate: <50 %		)		
--	--	--	----------------	----------------	--	---	--	--

In contrast, developing country nationals applied in relatively large numbers to all four centers. They formed more than 50 percent of the applicant pool at three of the centers. But many of these applications quite clearly were not relevant to the position. In the end, only a few of the applicants from developing country nationals received long-list consideration.

The common perception among many long-time CGIAR board members and directors is that many of the serious developing country applications fall short in just one or two areas usually related to “lack of international exposure.” The impact of limited international experience was identified most clearly in the areas of fundraising and multi-regional experience. Fundraising has always been an important skill at senior levels in the CGIAR, but acute financial pressures in the CGIAR make it one of the most important selection criteria in recent DG selections.<sup>7</sup>

The difficulty some centers experienced in identifying “appointable” candidates prompts the question of whether the director general position is uniquely difficult to fill. There is no doubt that the post is a demanding one. One external search consultant asserted that the director general position was more difficult to fill than comparable executive positions in leading development organizations, because of the added dimension of scientific and academic qualifications. Nonetheless, both professional recruitment consultants confirmed that the applicant pools -- and the very quick sort to a long list of about 12 -- were in the end quite typical of executive searches with which they have been involved.

## 2. Expanding the applicant pool

Identifying ways and means to expand the applicant pool is a fundamental goal of this study. This is discussed at various points throughout the paper, with special emphasis on the nominations process. This section highlights a few immediate issues relating to open recruitment practices.

---

<sup>7</sup> The author had the opportunity to review summary written assessments on all applicants at two of the centers. This limited examination suggests that there may be a need to examine some perceptions regarding developing country nationals. There is a need to determine more precisely why “possible” candidates from developing countries do not become “probable” candidates, i.e., why they do not make the cut to the medium-list. It is only with improved understanding that appropriate solutions can be designed.

**(a) Question assumptions**

The assertion that an insufficient number of qualified women and developing country nationals exist to fill top jobs must be questioned. There may, of course, be valid exceptions such as the oft-cited problem of finding women in livestock research. Still the assessments are sometimes clearly colored by perceptions, as exemplified by the statement that “women are much harder to find in forestry than in agriculture” versus the opposite conclusion from a staff member that “there are lots of women in forestry.” Boards need to share and question their assumptions amongst themselves and with staff. It is not wise to assume as one center may have that “most viable candidates are already on our mailing list.” Women may be hard to find, and they may be even harder to persuade but every effort needs to be made to improve the pool of qualified applicants.

**(b) Widen the net through open recruitment efforts**

Most centers advertised in the *Economist* and a few other relevant journals. The definition of relevant additional journals was more expansive in some centers than others, with CIFOR being notable for its inclusion of regional journals that they hoped might “widen the net” for southern candidates. Likewise, CIFOR may have been more progressive in its use and management of Internet-based recruitment than other centers. Some, but not all, of the centers availed themselves of the database of women candidates maintained by the Gender and Diversity Program of the CGIAR.

There is widespread skepticism in the system about the benefits of advertising, professional recruiters and employment databases -- and to date there is little evidence that these open recruitment methods bring in qualified candidates. However, the financial cost of a wider search effort is almost certainly marginal when weighed against the cost of missing a highly qualified candidate. It is worth continuing the effort to “widen the net” in future searches, with a persistent attempt to document the effectiveness. In this context, added attention needs to be paid to the promotional quality of the announcements. Enlisting communications specialists as well as human resource specialists to review DG position announcements might increase their pull.

## B. PROCESS HIGHLIGHTS

---

The search effort was highly standardized in all of the four centers, beginning approximately one year in advance of the anticipated appointment. The centers developed candidate profiles; circulated search notices, including a request for nominations and applications, to the center's mailing list; placed advertisements in international and regional media; canvassed staff for suggestions; tracked nominations; and, as might be expected word-of-mouth followed its well-worn pathways. In time, short-listed candidates were brought to the respective centers and to field sites and offices, delivered seminars, met with staff, interviewed with the board and engaged in various social functions and finally, boards made their decisions.

The question remains: could any elements of the search process and the selection process be improved in the interests of gender and diversity? The paper explores that question in a review of eight critical process issues: (1) strategic and leadership considerations; (2) the critical nominations and short-listing process; (3) professional assistance; (4) board composition; (5) incumbent involvement; (6) internal candidates; (7) staff participation and community involvement; and finally, (8) ways in which gender and diversity considerations may have entered the decision process.

### 1. Strategic and Leadership Considerations

The CGIAR Reference Guide: *Choosing a Director General: The Search and Selection Process*, opens with the advice that the search is:

“most likely to be accomplished with success and ease, if an internal planning process is already in place. ... A strategic plan will help a board to refine its sense of leadership qualities and experiences needed in a new DG.” (*CGIAR Board Manual*, 1997. “Choosing A Director General: The Search and Selection Process,” p. 2)<sup>8</sup>

The imperative to begin and conclude a search with organizational clarity, strategic foresight and team consensus is reinforced throughout the private sector literature on executive selection (Charan 2000, Taylor and Sessa 2000, Ward 2000, Zwell 1998). With some exceptions, these four CGIAR search efforts were not marked by the “exhaustive mapping phase” that is recommended by these executive selection consultants.

---

<sup>8</sup>This study did not explore strategic planning at the respective centers. It is clear, however, that strategic issues were more salient for some boards and some decision-makers than it was for others.

There is a nearly universal understanding amongst board members and center staff that ***the selection of a director general is by definition a strategic choice with long-term impact for the center and the system.*** Nonetheless, although strategic considerations were implicit at many levels in the search and selection process, institutional strategy was not discussed as frequently or explicitly in interviews, as might be expected.<sup>9</sup>

### **(a) Developing a Candidate Profile**

The effort to develop a candidate profile was, in some cases, the primary strategic exercise. The profile of the candidate was developed at most centers in an iterative and consultative process between board members, the incumbent DG and search committee members. Much of the final discussion was conducted by e-mail. This yielded position announcements of varying promotional quality, but in most cases appears to have been a reliable reflection of shared strategic priorities with some implications for “leadership.” This profile was then used to make cuts to long-list and eventually short-list decisions. The criteria did not appear to change appreciably at any of the centers in the course of the search. Final deliberations, certainly and appropriately, involved additional and more nuanced considerations.

It is important for boards to ask at this earliest stage of search analysis, whether any of the strategic or discipline-based considerations incorporated into the profile or position announcement limit the applicant pool unnecessarily. Do cultural or strategic commitments surrounding, for example, animal science versus veterinary science, between global forestry policy and community forestry, between irrigation systems design or watershed management, between social or biological science needlessly limit the applicant pool in gender or diversity terms? Are gender or national biases evident in any of these strategic choices? It is beyond the scope of this paper to make any judgments in that regard, but ***centers beginning the search process should take a look at whether strategic or discipline-based considerations that may limit the pool of qualified candidates, are really strategic priorities.***

Leadership criteria emerged in the profiling process, more clearly at some centers than at others. All centers used the word “leader” or “leadership” in position announcements or during various discussions, but it is not clear that board members shared an active definition of leadership. Despite the extensive literature on leadership available in the popular business press, the boards did not generally frame their assess-

---

<sup>9</sup> This could be an artifact of the manner in which questions were asked. Still the point remains that this was not voluntarily raised at the anticipated level of frequency.

ment of candidates in the language of leadership literature -- even though this literature translates well to the non-profit sector.<sup>10</sup> The very latest critique from venerable scholars of leadership, Warren Bennis and James O'Toole is that **CEO selection failure can be attributed largely to lack of attention to leadership:**

“In short, boards reap what they sow. They pick the wrong CEOs because they pay no heed to real leadership as a selection criteria. What then is real leadership? The answer today is the same as it's always been. Leadership is a combination of personal behaviors that allow an individual to enlist dedicated followers and create leaders in the process. Real leaders, in a phrase, move the human heart. And there's the problem. The ability to move the human heart is difficult for most people to talk about.” (Bennis and O'Toole 2000, p. 172)

The result, these authors argue, is that boards often concentrate on technical skills that are simpler to identify and on which the selection is more easily defended. In some of these four CGIAR case studies, a concentration on technical qualifications was evident, with a focus in some cases on apparently narrow differences in the quality of a publications record. **The degree of sophistication with which different board members appear to be able to sort technical qualifications from leadership competence varied considerably. Virtually everyone is likely to benefit from further reading or training in leadership.**

Leadership research is infamous for its swings between personality theories and more mundane administrative considerations. However, in the last decade the definition of leadership has coalesced around a series of traits including: creating a vision; developing “followership” and nurturing leaders; implementing vision; following through; achieving results and team playing (Kabacoff 1998). In these four case studies, there was some tendency to focus on leadership as a singular quality, sometimes defined around vague notions of “dynamism” or visionary capacity. The strategic analysis undertaken at the outset of the search process should be used to identify **which leadership traits are most required in the particular organizational circumstances and given anticipated strategic challenges.**

More specifically, nearly twenty years of leadership research supports the finding that an individuals' ability to build relationships and get results are critical to leadership success. As summarized, by Michael Zwell (1998):

---

<sup>10</sup> This is in sharp contrast to the literature on “governance” and board composition, which differs radically between the private and non-profit sectors.

“Hundreds of studies have been conducted to determine what traits and characteristics, known as competencies, best predict performance. ... the competencies of influencing others and results orientation differentiate superior from average performers in almost every position.” (Zwell 1998, p. 2)

Far less well understood, however, is how to test for these competencies. More worrying still, “the traditional interview process is unlikely to assess candidates well on these criteria.” Again, according to Zwell:

“Research has shown that the traditional interview has little correlation (less than .2) with actual job performance. It is usually inadequate because it is based on emotional attraction – “who do I like best?” – rather than an assessment of traits and characteristics that actually predict performance.” (Zwell 1998, p. 2-3.)

***The diversity implications of a “who do I like best?” assessment are obvious.*** Far less obvious, is how to test for strategically-defined leadership competencies. It is never easy, but there is a simple rule-of-thumb on which competency-based interviewing assessment rests. That rule-of-thumb is: ***“past behavior is the best predictor of future behavior, past results are the best predictor of future results.”*** This is an axiom with which all search and selection committees at all levels of center organization should become familiar.<sup>11</sup> Interviewers can then phrase questions to elicit past performance. For example, the question “How would you develop and strengthen relationships in national research organizations?” becomes “Can you describe your experience in developing and strengthening relationships in national research organizations?”

It is not entirely clear from these case studies in what manner different definitions of leadership entered the decision. The absence of informed discussion is not evidence of the lack of influence of leadership assumptions. Individuals continue and will continue to make judgments deeply influenced by their own social and cultural heritage. Leadership touches deep roots in most cultures and societies and with intriguing anthropological exceptions (e.g., Malagasy, Minangkabau) most of these images of leadership are identified with men.

### **(b) Strategic fit**

The pivotal decision in executive selection is the degree to which a candidate’s leadership competence and other qualifications meet the strate-

---

<sup>11</sup> Regrettably, this research did not explore the interview question process in depth. The author investigated whether any interview questions were overtly discriminatory – they were not. The full set of interview questions were available from ILRI and these were well designed to elicit historically-based competencies.

gic needs of the organization. This is often identified as the “strategic fit.” At some of the centers, the final decisions are reasonably well explained – although by no means fully explained -- by the Board’s assessment of the candidate’s “strategic fit.”

At ILRI, the board expressly used a “strategic fit” methodology in its final deliberations. This was described as a serendipitous rather than a planned process, introduced during the final deliberations by a board member recently exposed to the methodology in another organization. This involved graphing the candidates’ perceived competence and capacity to bring the organization closest to its short-term and long-term strategic goals. The board is said to have found this enormously useful, convincing and ultimately decisive, leading to a decision in which they place great confidence. At ICRAF, the final contenders were perceived in the minds of the majority to differ most greatly on the leadership issue of “commitment to the organization’s strategy” and “passion for the organization’s mission.”<sup>12</sup> Additionally, ICRAF’s long-term strategy is heavily informed by the global promise of ICRAF’s Southeast Asian programs, the success of which is attributed in large part to the newly appointed Director General. This, along with other factors, contributed to the conclusion that the appointed candidate was the most capable of forwarding the organization’s strategy, which the board identifies as a strategy for continuing change.

At IITA, the two final candidates contrasted sharply in the extent to which they proposed organizational and strategic change. The board was apparently not inclined to vote for significant strategic change. CI-FOR’s decision is least well explained by strategic fit because final board deliberations involved fundamental and very basic questions that arose late in the process. But, even here, the decision seems to have turned finally on whether the Board was willing to risk dramatic change.

It is important to insert a note of caution here derived not from these case studies, but from general research indicating that technical methods can mask biases and sometimes serve to legitimize them. Almost any executive selection methodology, involves a substantial degree of difficult and subjective assessment of leadership competence, an area in which the research shows over and over again that women are judged differently than are men (Merrill-Sands and Kolb 2001; Valian 1999). Any centers inclined to use such methods should be encouraged to do so – discipline and rigor are advised. However, board members must remain aware of the unconscious assumptions that can enter leadership

---

<sup>12</sup> It is interesting to note in Kabacoff (1998, p.1)’s 360-degree evaluation research that: “women tended to score higher on leadership scales measuring an orientation toward production and the attainment of results. Men tended to score high on scales assessing an orientation towards strategic planning and organization vision.”

assessments and the legitimation of such biases in the use of ostensibly objective methodology.

Given the broad conviction in the literature that sound strategic analysis and the resolution of strategic and political conflict are fundamental to successful selection -- boards are behooved to go beyond simplistic assessments of the desire (or lack of desire) for change and to ensure that the selection criteria remain clearly and strategically defined throughout the process. Boards also need to make certain that distinctions between “strategic fit” and a “cultural fit,” are fully recognized, and that the final decision is not based around vague issues of “comfort” with a candidate. These points were at issue not just at centers that were choosing between males and female candidates, but at other centers as well. Finally, boards need to “recognize that real leaders are threatening:”

“Without realizing it, many boards are adverse to outsiders who threaten to shake things up. Given the opportunity, a sufficient amount of dirt, gossip, and speculation can be adduced to undercut any truly exciting candidacy.” (Bennis and O’Toole 2000, p. 175)

## 2. Nominations process

### (a) General

By all accounts, ***nominations and the keen pursuit of nominees continue to yield the greatest number of qualified applications***. Only one center provided hard data in this regard, but the evidence is clear in that case. Right from the launch of the nominations process, however, women may be held to a higher standard than men. The staff and boards of Future Harvest centers, often seemed intent on identifying women who are “superstars,” while remaining content with male nominees who are strong representatives within their technical fields. This might be in part because boards are aware of the public scrutiny that will attach to their choices and so may fear a mistake or worry about incurring a charge of “tokenism.” Individuals must consider carefully whether in attempting so hard to make the “perfect” nomination whether they are eliminating “perfectly possible” candidates from the outset.

***A large number of women and developing country nationals were nominated for director general positions at all four centers. However, women consistently declined the nominations, as did many developing country nationals.*** Although, these nominees were not tested by the full selection process, many of them were said to be strong, viable candidates. Indeed, most Board Chairs, and all incumbent DGs spoke very, very highly of one or more individual women or developing country nationals, whom they claimed

to have personally approached. It was beyond the scope of this study to track nominees and their expressed reasons for declining, but this remains one of the most intriguing aspects of the study. It suggests that **there may be a pool of diverse candidates capable, but not persuaded to consider assuming a leadership position in the CGIAR.**

The reasons why women declined were largely a matter of speculation on the part of interviewees. The most often cited reasons were complications of spousal employment<sup>13</sup>, expressed satisfaction with current position, and the recent promotion to a rewarding position as well as other family considerations. The reason for declining nominations among developing country nationals was less clear although one board member, a developing country national, asserted that ‘they will not accept nominations, because “they do not believe it is sincere, do not believe that they will ever be selected.”’

There appears, for the most part, to have been only routine effort to pursue nominations, especially if a formal letter of decline was received. In most cases, a formal letter of decline was assumed to be the end of the story. And yet all indications are that **a formal contact letter to a woman in a challenging and satisfying job is unlikely to prompt serious consideration.** The only female DG in the system, Meryl Williams of ICLARM, advises that only the persistent influence of a respected colleague induced her to consider the position. A recent hire in the system at a lower, but still senior, level in the center required three phone calls before the scientist agreed to consider an application. Men share similar stories of the necessity of personal contact – but this may be particularly powerful for women. It is also important to remain aware that **outstanding women are in high demand and CGIAR centers must compete for their serious attention.**

It may be that word-of-mouth influences more rarely reach women, perhaps because friends and colleagues do not readily picture women as leaders, or their personal and family lives are assumed without investigation to mitigate against assuming a leadership position. A woman’s marital status and parental commitments were a matter of easy speculation in these case studies. And understandably so, as women continue to be the primary caretakers of children and aging parents. Nonetheless, a woman must be given the opportunity to state her own choices in these matters, instead of others assuming them on her behalf. **It is not fair**

---

<sup>13</sup>Spousal employment issues were raised repeatedly in many contexts in the course of these case studies. This is a very real issue for the CGIAR and one which has not been fully addressed.

***to visit personal or societal assumptions about family and career onto “career-primary” women.*** <sup>14</sup>

Both female candidates in this case were contacted personally by important participants in the search and selection process – the Director General in one case and multiple board members in the other case. Indeed, in one case the candidate was approached multiple times and “invited to join the short list.” Diversity advocates recommend just such affirmative effort. However, two cautions must be highlighted. First, in enthusiastic pursuit of candidates, high expectations can be raised. Search committee members and others in contact with the desired candidate must guard against “promising the job.” Second, in any search, mistakes can be made. At almost every center, there was one candidate perceived at the outset to be imminently appointable, but who was readily dismissed from further consideration after a seminar or an interview. Nobody is a “sure bet.” Stream-lining the process for diversity’s sake is recommended – however, full reference checks, complete interviews, and staff input are all part of the process and must be executed with “due diligence.”

---

<sup>14</sup> See Felice N. Schwartz (2000). “Management Women and the New Facts of Life,” p. 104. She argues: “Management women range from those whose careers come first ... to those who try to balance career and family equally. The male corporation dislikes both extremes. The first seem too masculine, the second seems lacking in commitment. ... Smart, competitive *career-primary women* are effective managers and serve as beacons for the younger women companies need. *Career-and-family women*, on the other hand, are willing to trade ambition for the flexibility to raise their families. This willingness to forgo advancements but still give their best can greatly upgrade middle management.”

### **(b) Staff input to the nominations process**

Centers differed considerably as to when, how and how keenly, they called on staff to help with nominations. What seems consistent, however, is that staff appreciate the opportunity to participate at this level and that they can be an excellent source of contacts outside the bounded networks in which Future Harvest centers traditionally operate. There appear to be few downside risks to engaging staff in the nomination process and this should be encouraged enthusiastically. Indeed, in the effort to expand the applicant pool, more innovative methods for eliciting staff input should be considered.<sup>15</sup> Junior scientists and active mid-level professionals may still enjoy a “strength of weak ties”<sup>16</sup> that have been lost in the more closed networks in which some senior managers and board members have become deeply embedded. Staff are a low-cost resource in this regard and should be contacted early and enthusiastically in the effort to expand the applicant pool.

## **3. Professional assistance**

### **(a) Professional search manager**

There is a great deal of skepticism in the system about the value of professional search consultants. At the two centers, ICRAF and ILRI, where professional consultants were employed, individuals acknowledged initial doubts but advise that they are “now convinced” of the wisdom of employing an external consultant. The primary skepticism is based in the conviction that professional recruiters do not expand the applicant pool in a significant manner. Indeed, there is little evidence that the professional recruiters expanded the applicant pools to any large degree at ICRAF or ILRI. The personal and professional networks in which boards and centers are embedded continue to provide the most viable candidates. Still, even one or two additions to the pool of qualified candidates can be important gains.

***Professional search consultants can make vital contributions to the quality and integrity of the search efforts*** as they did at ICRAF and ILRI. IITA did not employ a search consultant, while CIFOR engaged the services of a former board member as search manager.

---

<sup>15</sup> The author attempted to solicit ideas about possible candidates both in the formal interviews and in informal discussions with staff at ICRAF and ILRI. It was interesting to note that staff members often needed time and the stimulation of others to go beyond standard suggestions, not unlike brainstorming sessions.

<sup>16</sup> See Granovetter (1973).

Reference Checks. Reference checks are a key part of the selection process and can be particularly well managed by the professional search manager. In one case, tight personal ties between search committee members and candidates were said to have made reference checking “awkward.” In addition, the presence of a professional recruiter avoids any excuse that reference checks need not be fully explored because “all of us knew (the candidate) quite well, knew the quality of (the candidate’s) work.” While personal networks may be the most important avenue for the identification of candidates and referees, “closed networks” based in long-time ties may not be the most effective means for eliciting balanced input.

One of the consultants is reputed to have been extremely skilled in his ability to elicit candid references. Sensitive issues were raised about this process at ICRAF and the consultant was able to document precisely whom he had contacted for each candidate. The consultant in discussion with the search committee chose not to contact designated referees if supervisors, colleagues or subordinates could be identified and contacted. For two of the candidates, contacts with supervisors, colleagues and subordinates within the CGIAR were possible and in both these cases, those individuals, rather than external referees were contacted.<sup>17</sup> It is interesting to note that current research shows that the least biased evaluations of leadership come from subordinates (Kabacoff 1998, Valian 1998), and so using evaluations from subordinates is to be recommended for both women and men.

Fresh, but experienced voice. Professional consultants come with interesting comparative experience and can provide useful insights and checks on the process. However, the professional consultant should never be permitted to unduly influence the selection according to experts. First, it is not their responsibility and if it becomes so it can be a signal that the board process has become unraveled.

Managing and legitimizing the process. Professional search managers have a contractual obligation to cross the “t”s and dot the “i”s. Additionally, they are likely, if not obliged, to keep clear and excellent documentation of the search process. They are an invaluable resource if there becomes a need to check the process, not simply because they have the documentation but because it is in their best interest to be responsive to current and possibly future clients. While they are not neutral observers, their observations, insights and documentation can lend important legitimacy to the process.

---

<sup>17</sup> There seems to be a general agreement that references from designated referees are of marginal value. Still, in the interest of “due diligence” there may be a need to consider a more thorough review of both named and unnamed referees.

## **(b) Use of human resource personnel**

Human Resource (HR) managers were involved in a very limited fashion at all four centers. This is not unusual in executive selection according to the Center for Creative Leadership:

“Top level executives ... don't always use effective resources. For example, these executives reported that they seek the advice and counsel of senior human resources professionals only 36 percent of the time.” (Sessa, 2001)

Yet, this same research goes on to show that including a human resources professional can improve the selection dramatically.

HR personnel were generally asked to review the announcement for promotional and other personnel considerations and the HR Manager at ICRAF was consulted in an advisory capacity at the outset of the search effort and was asked to manage the review and selection of an external recruitment manager.

***HR personnel in the CGIAR have received some of the most extensive training and sensitization on gender and diversity issues and should be considered a valuable professional resource.*** Successful HR managers are by necessity discreet and so the notion expressed at one center that the HR manager could perhaps not be entrusted to protect the confidence of candidates and the process is either an unfortunate assessment or an unfortunate appointment. The decision not to involve HR personnel (or more commonly the benign neglect of HR) may also involve gender biases worth exploring.<sup>18</sup> This type of assessment reflects the low status still accorded to HR in most organizations – an awkward, gendered interaction effect in which low status positions are filled by women, while female dominance of a position continues to confirm its low status.

## **4. Board and search committee composition**

Formally, the most important influence in executive selection is the Board of Trustees. It is also, for this reason, that executive selection research remains incomplete, as the “process has traditionally unfolded behind closed doors. (Lorsch and Khurana, 1999)” Any number of internal issues can influence the Board in its final decision including its relationship with the current executive; the professional competencies represented on the Board; individual conflicts of interest; philosophical, personal, cultural, and strategic divisions within the Board; and, of course, the composition of the Board in gender and diversity terms. The

---

<sup>18</sup> Human Resource Managers in the CGIAR are predominantly women, only two centers employ male HR managers.

diversity profile of the boards under study appears in the following table. (See Appendix B for a board profile of all 16 centers.)

**Table 2. Profile of Center Boards  
(Based on Board Membership in 2000)**

Center	Board Chair		Nationality			Gender		
	Nationality	Gender	North	South	North/ South	Male	Female	Male/ Female
<b>CIFOR</b>	N	M	8	6	1.3	7	7	1.0
<b>ICRAF</b>	N	F	8	7	1.1	12	3	4.0
<b>IITA</b>	N	M	9	8	1.1	14	3	4.7
<b>ILRI</b>	N	M	7	4	1.8	8	3	2.7
<b>Mean (all CG)</b>	-	-	<b>7.5</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>10.2</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>2.6</b>

The gender and diversity profile of the Board is no guarantee that the Board's choice will favor candidates on grounds of diversity. And, virtually all Board members and senior-level women in the system insist emphatically that that is how it should be. Still, there were very clear differences in how men, women, younger men, younger women and individuals from different countries spoke about each other and about women candidates. **Board diversity matters profoundly.** The inclusion of women in these decisions was invaluable. It was very clear in the ICRAF case that while the decision was virtually unanimous, that individual board members did not necessarily make the decision with the same set of considerations in mind. The presence of seven women on the CIFOR board lends important legitimacy to the choice of a male candidate.

Boards also need to consider the diversity profile of the search committee. **The search committee's role in identifying candidates, courting candidates and short-listing candidates is fundamental to the entire process.** At ICRAF, the search committee was more diverse than its overall board in gender terms. At CIFOR, the search committee was far less diverse in gender terms than its overall board.

Research on executive selection also suggests that organizations try to improve the teams for executive selection by involving subordinates (Sessa and Taylor 2000). In Sessa and Taylor's simulation studies, in-

volving a subordinate improved the success<sup>19</sup> rate to 75% from an average of 45%. However, in their interview sample, subordinates were involved in selection decisions only 10% of the time.

Future search committees may wish to consider including a staff member on the search committee, exercising due caution in terms of diversity interests, strategic insight, and personal discretion.

### **Accountability**

There have been some calls to hold boards accountable for the diversity outcome of the Director General selection. It is beyond the scope of this study to comment on board accountability, except to note that ***board diversity matters, as does past experience on boards and in leadership positions.***

There is little consensus among senior staff within the CGIAR about the composition of an ideal board. There are those who assume categorically that “the only useful” board members are academics because they are in the position to judge the relevance and value of the research work being conducted at centers. There are equally as many who assert that academics are not able to understand the complexities and fund-raising pressures of the typical Future Harvest center and therefore provide largely irrelevant direction to centers. There are those who are deeply resistant to non-traditional Board members, such as those from the private sector. These differences, of course, reflect the strategic contradictions embodied in organizations that strive to be leading research organizations as well as important development actors.

The DG selection process differed from board to board, but this seemed to be a function of many factors including issues at the center level, within the search committee as well as overall board functioning. There are no silver bullets in the effort to balance “sage advice” with “fresh voices.” It has been easier to improve diversity at the board level than at the center level because board members need not pass the same level of scrutiny as is required for professional appointments. It may, however, prove helpful to ***check future board nominations more carefully for an identifiable and positive track record on matters of gender and diversity.***

The various CGIAR reference guides for Boards of Trustees could be improved by addressing diversity more directly and by recognizing the sensitive cross-cultural interactions that diversity generates.

---

<sup>19</sup> Success was pre-defined in the simulation design.

## 5. Incumbent Involvement

The involvement of the incumbent Director General is a topic on which almost everybody proved to have categorical opinions. The most common views expressed in the CGIAR were that “the incumbent DG should have no part in the process” or at most “a limited advisory role.” Both external consultants, too, took the position that the incumbent’s involvement should be limited to advisory functions and that this was typical of their experience with non-profits and NGOs. The underlying assumption appears to be that the incumbent DG will compromise the possibilities for change in the organization.

In the four cases studied, all four incumbents provided valuable nominations. Beyond that, they spanned the spectrum from complete withdrawal from the process (ILRI) to continuous and influential involvement (CIFOR). The Director General at IITA retained an active advisory role at the process level, but despite his presence during final deliberations very clearly did not influence the final decision. At ICRAF, the outgoing Director General was influential in the particular circumstance in which five strong internal candidates applied for the position of Director General, but he did not participate in final interviews and the formal selection decision. At CIFOR, the incumbent DG (by his own account and that of other participants) remained highly involved, clearly contributing to virtually every meeting and decision of significance in the process. There is no indication that he dominated the process to anyone’s dissatisfaction – there were other very influential and critical players in the CIFOR search and selection process. Some have suggested, that given CIFOR’s relative youth, the continuing dependence on the first Director General at CIFOR was to be expected and, perhaps advisable.

Interestingly, this issue is a far less controversial topic in the private sector, where incumbent CEOs are assumed to be involved<sup>20</sup>:

“... the incumbent CEO is expected to drive the succession process most of the time ... Any CEO worth his salt will want to participate in succession.” (Ward 1999, p. 1)

Indeed, planning one’s succession is considered a part of the CEO function. While there are certainly cases in the private sector where Boards seek strongly to limit the role of the CEO, this is usually when the Board is signaling serious dissatisfaction with the CEO’s leadership and management of the organization.

---

<sup>20</sup> CEO selection or succession in the corporate world occurs most often in the context of a Board of Directors, in which the CEO and fellow directors are often active members of the Board. CGIAR centers are governed under Boards of Trustees that exercise a more limited but essential oversight role.

These case studies did not provide any startling revelations on incumbent involvement, except to emphasize that interaction of a board with the DG is a unique organizational relationship, negotiated between unique individuals. There is little reason, therefore, to change the counsel of the CGIAR reference guide on director general selection:

“While the outgoing Director General’s perspective on the position and skills required is unique and valuable, his or her focus may be on the past, and his or her vision of the future limited. If appropriate the search committee should use the outgoing Director General’s time, knowledge and skills as they are available and needed, but he or she should not be perceived as being directly involved in the selection process.” (*CGIAR Board Manual*. 1997. “Choosing A Director General: The Search and Selection Process,” p.9)

Still Director Generals are part of the “dominant coalition” instrumental in maintaining the current structure of the CGIAR. In the interest of change, therefore, there is likely to be a continuing interest in closely managing the incumbent’s influence on the search and selection process. Additionally, the board may wish to take into careful consideration the incumbent’s known history on gender and diversity as they negotiate the boundaries for his or her involvement.

## 6. Internal candidates

This latest round of DG appointments was notable for the appointment of “internal candidates”<sup>21</sup> at both ICRAF and CIFOR. ICRAF was noteworthy for the large slate of internal candidates – five individuals -- that applied for the Director General position. Conventional wisdom circulating among board members at the onset of the search process was to “avoid internal candidates.” The advice is apparently premised not on any perceived lack of capacity on the part of internal candidates, but because internal candidates have not often in the past been successfully appointed. Additionally, the consequence of a failed application can be damaging personally, and often leads to the departure of a highly competent senior staff person and so caution is certainly to be exercised in advising internal candidates. The traditional assessment that internal candidates find it difficult to surmount the extremely detailed knowledge available about them in the center or in the system is echoed in the executive selection literature:

---

<sup>21</sup> Internal candidate is defined narrowly here as a candidate from within the center. A somewhat broader definition of “internal candidate” would include candidates from within the CGIAR. Historically, there appears to have been considerable movement from center to center, with a number of current and previous DGs having come directly from (or at some earlier point in time from) another CGIAR center. More reflection on the CGIAR as a relatively closed network/internal labor market might prove to have interesting implications for gender and diversity.

“Our data suggest that internal candidates for the top jobs are perceived in a balanced light -- as having both strengths and weaknesses. Outside executives are viewed with a greater concentration on their positive attributes. Thus, there is a preference for choosing the candidate who “looks” best, which, in many cases, is the outside person.” (Sessa 2000)

Management research does not argue categorically either for or against internal candidates. There is, however, evidence from private sector research that CEOs who are appointed from outside the firm are more likely to change policies and strategies than are insiders. Thus the choice between an insider and an outsider is a strategic decision that usually, but not always consciously, reflects the desire for change in the organization. Recent corporate literature is supportive of the search for leadership from within internal ranks, and this conviction is embodied in the increasing focus on planned succession. The pretext for this recommendation is that today’s managers are said to have gained valuable leadership experience not available in earlier eras when organizations were more likely to be autocratically managed from the center. Future Harvest centers need to review their own management structures to determine whether they are affording staff, including women and developing country nationals the opportunity to practice leadership.

Some people interviewed for this study have suggested that internal candidates had an unfair edge, especially in light of the high levels of staff participation that characterized these search processes. History in the CGIAR does not support this supposition. Nevertheless, a closer look at the role of staff participation is merited, and this paper discusses staff participation further in the next section.

### **Grooming candidates for leadership positions**

Many diversity proponents retain a guarded view towards internal candidates. Internal candidates are presumed to reflect an institutional structure that is weak on diversity, and the selection of an internal candidate often perpetuates that status quo. Nonetheless, gender and diversity advocates are also acutely aware of the need to develop leadership from within in order to enable women and other minorities to accede to positions of leadership in this future.

In this light, there are suggestions that the system should become involved in “grooming” programs or even more targeted “succession planning.” These ideas are certainly worth exploring but need to be entered cautiously with a full awareness of the implications for the organization, especially for relatively small organizations such as Future Harvest centers. This is not to say that the system and centers should not develop mentoring capacity, continue to support leadership training, fundraising

education, and grant writing skills workshops, but at this stage in organizational development these should continue to be offered as part of general career development.

## 7. Staff participation and community involvement

The CGIAR respects staff involvement in executive selection. The Board reference guide on director general selection advises:

“The staff perspective on the needs of the organization is valuable. Because of their daily involvement in the center’s work and constant exposure to the internal and external relationships that make up the operating environment of the center, staff may see factors that might be missed by board members.” (*CGIAR Board Manual*. 1997. “Choosing A Director General: The Search and Selection Process,” p.8)

The premise of this statement was evident in many interviews. Board members do not necessarily have keen insight into the working concerns of active center scientists and managers.

Although every Board Chair emphasized the point that the director general selection is “finally, the board’s decision and the board’s responsibility” there was, nonetheless, resounding agreement among long-time CG staff and board members, that “a center can not appoint a director general that is not acceptable to the community.” As another board member put it “at the end of the day, the DG must work well with the staff.” It is very important to distinguish, however, between those cases in which center staff overwhelmingly support one candidate (preference for one does not imply opposition to the others) and those cases in which staff are predominantly or vocally opposed to a candidate. These are completely different cases, and the latter should indeed be treated with special caution. In the former case, the board has a clear opportunity to consider the non-preferred candidate and perhaps make a “diversity-positive” decision.

In discussing the actual process at the respective centers, many board members felt it necessary to insert the qualification that staff input was not influential but merely “congruent” with board opinion. The opinion of the author is that **staff input was influential at all centers.**

Each of the centers to a greater or lesser degree, earlier or later involved the community in the search and selection process. Staff participation occurred primarily at two points in the process: in the nominations process and during the final selection week when staff have an opportunity to meet candidates and share their appraisal of candidates with board representatives. At most centers this was designed into the process from the outset, while at one center it was somewhat belatedly, but then very formally organized, perhaps in the formality over-emphasizing staff’s roles as “evaluators” rather than as one source of respected feedback. With small differences, staff input to selection was usually organized around three or four designated organizational groups who met at

some length, approximately one hour, with the candidate and then reported back to the board or a panel of the board, usually orally. Centers differed in the extent to which they provided groups with guidelines or rules of facilitation. Community participation at IITA was unusual in that it included a spouses' group that performed a lengthy qualitative and quantitative assessment of the respective candidates. The decision to widen participation beyond direct employees was based on the premise that IITA is more than a research center: it is a community in which researchers and their families must work and live together.

The matter of staff participation is a critical and fascinating one from a gender and diversity perspective. There is a well-recognized sociological understanding that organizations tend to reproduce themselves in their own image. This generates the concern that increased staff participation will simply reinforce a status quo in which males dominate – the system forever favoring male candidates from developed countries. This is a reasonable worry but good structural analysis must be able to explain change as well as constancy<sup>22</sup> and in focusing on the forces for change, the picture becomes more complicated.

The clear implication embodied in the assumption of simple reproduction is that the impetus for change must therefore be assigned to another group – in this case the Board. A number of participants raised very serious questions about whether boards or staff groups are greater forces for change in matters of gender and diversity. The evidence from these cases is mixed and incomplete. But the analysis favors **widening and deepening participation as a way to improve diversity. The decision to involve the staff must take into account cultural patterns within the particular center and boards need to remain mindful and honest about their own diversity of thought.**

Future Harvest centers are organizational systems in transition, and the numbers of developing country nationals and women increase as one goes deeper and wider in the organization. There are balanced voices, reactionary voices and isolated, but passionate, pleas for change among them. Expanding participation will engage the experience of the younger men and women who are learning to work effectively in diverse teams.

---

<sup>22</sup> See Gudmund Hernes (1976). "Structural Change in Social Processes." *American Journal of Sociology* Vol. 82, no.3. As captured in the abstract in this classic on structural change: "Models of structural change should be able to explain constancy as well as change, must combine micro- and macro level analysis and must encompass endogenous sources of change. It is necessary to distinguish among three levels of structure of a system: output structure, parameter structure, and process structure. With these concepts four basic types of change processes can be identified: simple reproduction, extended reproduction, transition and transformation."

Studies on men and women in science suggest a dividing line in attitudes toward women in science based on age (Zuckerman 1991, p. 122). Those younger than 50 today tend to be more comfortable in working with women scientists.

The worst possible outcome in the case of staff participation is for the board to assume that participation (or limiting participation) implies consulting the directors alone. Organizations are almost always subject to the formation of a “dominant coalition.”<sup>23</sup> The dominant coalition is often, but by no means always, consonant with senior management, certain disciplinary backgrounds, and often exclusive of women. In Future Harvest centers, these are often the only individuals in the center with whom board members have had any consistent contact. Furthermore, there may often be a strong alliance between the dominant coalition within the board and the dominant coalition at the center that may further limit the possibilities for change. Boards will keep talking to this group, whether staff participation is organized or not. It is this group, although there are fine exceptions individually and collectively, that is most likely to impede change at the systems level. It is for this reason that staff participation should be widened and deepened. Recent management research also suggests that including others, especially subordinates, dramatically improves selection decisions (Sessa and Taylor 2000).

Staff input to the selection decision cannot be expected to have the same strategic consideration that is provided by the overview concerns of the board. The value of the input will be improved to the extent that the community shares a strong sense of organizational mission and strategic sensibility. It would be helpful for centers to look at their record on staff

---

<sup>23</sup> The *dominant coalition* is a “group of key decision makers whose influence on the system is greatest (Miles & Snow 1978).” In his 1980 classic on organizational change, Michael Beer argues: The job experiences, skills, cognitive orientation, personality, and values of these key people predispose them to perceive certain aspects of their environment and not others. Thus they define the environment and the organization’s strategy in a way that is consistent with who they are as individuals, with their own self-concepts. Similarly, they are likely to model and reinforce behavior consistent with their own self-concept just as they are likely to select and promote people like themselves. ... All of this suggests that one cannot understand a social system without knowing who the *dominant coalition* is (they may not always be the obvious people on the organization chart) ... The importance of the *dominant coalition* also suggests that any major attempt to help organization adapt to changes in people and environment must include helping the dominant coalition understand how their own predispositions and behaviors have shaped the social system in functional or dysfunctional ways. ... Major organizational transitions invariably involve some fairly profound self-examination and change by the *dominant coalition* or they involve replacement of the dominant coalition. ... The board of directors can also play an important role by stimulating this process or by becoming directly involved in it. (Beer 1980, p. 36)

participation in general as they contemplate participation in an executive search.

Those centers with a stronger record of staff participation in previous matters are likely to manage input to the director general selection more confidently and responsibly. There are centers in which it is clear that strategic direction has been more broadly participatory and centers where it remains more noticeably the property of a dominant coalition. Belated or awkward organization of staff participation does not foster a sense of strategic partnership between management, staff and board and, perhaps, in one case, fuelled a need on the part of staff to make their voices heard more loudly than was comfortable for some members of staff and board.

How then to engage staff in a manageable and useful fashion? There are no infallible procedural guidelines for staff participation and future search committees are advised to seek further details from other centers and through the study of other participatory processes and exercises. The purpose of staff participation is not for the staff to select a Director General but to share their valuable insights. This study suggests that the board:

- Express as clearly, sincerely and early as organizational and cultural history allow, a message of respect for staff input.
- Keep staff apprised of the manner in which their participation will be solicited. Consider more creative ways than have been used in the past, perhaps at the level of search committee, in the early development of the candidate profile, creative nominations procedures, and lastly in the selection process. Engage where appropriate, human resource professionals to manage these participative efforts. Concerns that the staff will become overly and politically involved in “who the new Director General will be” to the exclusion of productive work is a signal of other pathologies in the organization. It can happen, but those issues require managerial and leadership attention at various points in the organization.
- Invite lively participation by staff at seminars. This is valuable for the institution and for the candidate. This is their first effort at “working together” and should be witnessed by the Board.
- Keep it simple. The scheduling of candidate meetings and “report backs” to the Board should be clearly defined. Groups should be instructed to select a facilitator and reporter, but perhaps should be allowed to choose their own form of feedback.

- Be mindful of attaching too much credibility to single opinions that are gathered outside the participatory process. There is a particular pitfall in assuming that a representative of a minority group speaks for her entire class.
- Take the time to assess what is heard, fully mindful of the overall strategic goals of the organization and mindful of the bias in evaluation that still exists profoundly within staff ranks.

In the end, the decision is emphatically the Board's responsibility by governance design, but staff input can be a valuable addition to the search and selection decision.

## 8. Gender and diversity considerations

### (a) General

All of the centers and their Boards of Trustees were conscious of gender and diversity considerations as they began their search process. At ICRAF this was voiced as “strong desire for a diversified canvas,” with a repeated commitment to the philosophy ‘that the final selection would not be based on diversity criteria.’ At CIFOR diversity concerns took active form when the initial applicant pool and long list were deemed inadequate on diversity grounds and a renewed search began in “near desperation.” ILRI sought to ‘make every effort to attract (diverse) candidates ... but also sought ‘not to compromise the integrity of the competition through the introduction of biases favoring any one group.’ At IITA, informants discussed sensitively and specifically the many women and developing country nationals that were nominated, contacted, and considered but acknowledged forthrightly that at a certain point that gender and diversity considerations gave way to the challenge of identifying three outstanding candidates of any nationality or gender.

Numerous informants spoke strongly to the effect that it would be a “disservice and sign of disrespect to appoint (a candidate) on gender and diversity grounds.” This opinion seems to be held most passionately by women, but the fear of “tokenism is strong among all observers and participants in the process. The fear of being used as a token candidate may be one of the the main reasons that women and developing country nationals did not apply in greater numbers for the DG position. ***The fear of tokenism is well founded and all new searches must guard against it – any suggestion of tokenism hurts the individuals involved, the center and the system.***

The insistence on not allowing the final decision to be influenced by gender or diversity criteria was very pronounced. ***Board members at almost every center stated in one way or another ‘that our job is to select the best candidate, regardless of gender or race.’ It is a position of perceived non-discrimination to which most individuals hold very strongly.*** Likewise, most people in the system also adhere to the affirmative commitment that if two candidates are deemed equal one should favor the candidate that offers improved diversity. Nonetheless, it is a rare case in human decision-making when two individuals viewed under a comparative lens will be judged equally. Despite calls to appoint the best candidate regardless of gender, such a decision may be harder than most would like to admit. ***Gender research argues forcefully that “gender blind” assessment is nearly impossible.***

Consider a study publicized in the *Economist* under the subtitle “Women really do have to be at least twice as good as men to succeed.” The *Economist* reports on a ground-breaking study of scientific peer-review first published in *Nature* by two biomedical researchers (Wenneras and Wold 1997). The authors demonstrate that post-doctoral fellowships in the biomedical sciences in Sweden were awarded not on scientific merit or productivity-based competence, but on the basis of gender or acquaintance with a reviewer. Writes the *Economist*:

“...the difference was so great that in order to get the same competence score as a man, a woman would need either to know someone on the committee, or to have published three more papers than the man in *Nature* or *Science*, the two journals with the highest impact – or 20 more papers in good specialist journal. It is often joked that a woman has to be twice as good as a man to do as well: Dr Wenneras and Dr Wold found that she would need to be on average, 2.5 times as good on their measures to be rated as highly by reviewers. This could partly explain, why although women receive almost half the PhDs in biomedical fields; more women than men leave at all later stages. ... Dr Wenneras and Wold reckon that their results could account entirely for the large numbers of women who have left biomedical research in Sweden. This, if true is not only unfair, but a waste of public money.”  
(*The Economist*, May 24, 1997, p. 79)

This result and similar findings are based in the far less nebulous (and supposedly objective) arena of technical and scientific achievement. How more profound the possibility of bias in the case of the squishy stuff of leadership.

In general, within the CGIAR, the concern for diversity is far more pronounced in regard to national origin than it is in terms of gender. There is a ***wide-spread commitment to the position that an organization dedicated to poverty reduction should someday be headed by nationals from poor countries.*** One center was quite explicit that its desire for a rationally diverse pool of candidates was paramount over gender concerns. The goal of national diversity is essential to the future of the CGIAR, but on occasion seems to mask a lack of awareness of the deeply rooted and persistent problems of gender inequity.

### **(b) Evidence of Discrimination**

There was no evidence of *overt* gender discrimination in any of the four director general selection processes. This said, the legacies of a gender- and race-divided world were not absent from the process – they were not widespread, not obvious, nor necessarily intentional, and may not have been decisive in the final outcome. However, as leading gender specialists argue:

“most of the barriers that persist today are insidious – a revolution couldn’t find them to blast away. Rather, gender discrimination now is so deeply embedded in organizational life as to be virtually indiscernible.” (Meyerson and Fletcher, p.127)

Certainly, both female candidates were encouraged to apply because they were women or because in the one case, she was a developing country citizen. Diversity advocates encourage precisely that affirmative effort. Neither woman, however, was a “token” candidate. Both women were regarded by most participants as fully “appointable” and as extremely desirable and strong candidates. In one case, the candidate enjoyed exceptionally strong support within the Board of Trustees. Nonetheless, neither woman was appointed.

Although process factors and strategic considerations were different at each center and probably more influential in the final decision, there are suggestive similarities surrounding the assessment of women’s interpersonal skills, and particularly communication style.

***Communication style was assessed in very gendered terms.*** Emphatic communication behavior that might be disregarded in men was highlighted in derogatory terms in the case of women. This was evident for short-list candidates as well as long-list candidates. This finding receives strong support in the literature on perceptions of assertiveness. In experimental studies, for example:

“an assertive leader appears to arouse a certain amount of resentment in other group members, even when the leader is male. For male leaders, though, the negative reactions they receive are more than offset by positive reactions. Men end up with a net gain. For female leaders, on the other hand, the negative reactions outnumber the positive ones. Women end up with a net loss.” (Valian 2000, p. 130-131)

Likewise, Epstein (1991) cites studies of lawyers to conclude:

“Women are often placed in a double bind. Ironically, women who a decade ago were regarded as not tough enough to engage in courtroom debate, are now considered *too* uncompromising when they engage in adversarial exchanges. Women who smile a lot in interaction with their male colleagues are regarded as insufficiently serious, but when they do not smile, men fault them for being “stiff.” (Epstein 1991, p. 255)

***Communication style issues seemed to become a basis for more broadly negative assessments of women.*** Negative inuendo seems to rise quickly to the status of confirmed fact in the case of women and high credibility is attached to negative opinion about women. This played loudly both in the case of final candidates and ear-

lier candidates who did not receive short-list consideration. Some negative information may have a strong basis in fact and also be consequential for the organization. Certainly, negative information needs to be regarded seriously because mistakes can be made in the drive to include diversity on the candidate list. But board members and staff members need to become much more deeply sensitized to the manner in which they identify, verify and judge negative information in all search and selection processes.

In contrast, ***negative information about men may simply be overlooked or marked as an area for growth and development.*** Negative information was also mentioned in the case of male candidates but did not seem to reach the level of private concern amongst board members, nor certainly the circulation in the public hallways that it did in the case of women. It is questionable whether a woman could survive, for example, basic questions about decision-making style or managerial experience that men seem to rise above.

Finally, ***negative evaluations appear to be very sticky.*** Negative assessments seem to follow women up the career ladder. In the case of women already in the CGIAR, this information seems to follow them from center to center. This is in part because there are so few women in the system and the actions of any single woman are the subject of scrutiny and regular discussion. Boards and centers need to become acutely aware of this phenomenon.

It is not clear what weight, the search committee or boards gave these communication and interpersonal style issues, or whether they discussed if these impeded or advanced the possibility of “getting results” and “building relationships.” Was there a solid track record that provided better information on leadership potential than the fist on the table, the stiffness of the smile, or the sharpness of the response?

There is a suggestion from these case studies that differences of opinion can run along national lines. It may be that some developing country nationals are less comfortable with the concept of women in leadership positions than are their “northern” counterparts. This adds yet another layer of cross-cultural complexity to board interactions. Addressing the differential causes and remedies for gender inequity and nationally-based inequity remains a challenge for the system, as a whole.

It is interesting to note that the DG search process at other centers in the past have apparently exhibited a broadly similar outline to that of CIFOR and ICRAF. The selection process came down to the wire with a critical choice required between a leading female and male candidate. In

those cases, the male candidate was also selected. Those decisions were more isolated in time and have not received the same scrutiny as the recent selections, and this study made no attempt to investigate those cases. ***Stories abound of recruitment decisions at many levels in the CGIAR, in which close competition between two strong candidates is decided in favor of the male candidate.*** It raises the question: Is there a pattern at Future Harvest centers that favors the selection of men over women, and do those decisions share roots in how individuals throughout the system assess the leadership potential of women?

## IV. Conclusion and summary of recommendations

This paper has highlighted the significant challenge the CGIAR faces, and will continue to face, as individuals seek to improve gender and national diversity at senior levels in the system.

There are still far too few qualified women and developing-country nationals applying for senior positions. This situation is unlikely to change without further exploration of its causes and continuing experimentation with improved recruitment practice. The few women and developing-country nationals who do apply face unique challenges in the short-listing and selection process. The centers must ensure that these individuals do not encounter barriers based on conscious or unconscious assumptions about leadership, or the place of women and developing country nationals in top positions.

This section reviews the study's major recommendations aimed at improving recruitment practice and reducing barriers, with special emphasis on the need for decision-makers to become sensitized to matters of gender and diversity. Most of these recommendations focus narrowly on the executive hiring process, as there is an immediate need in the CGIAR system to address these issues. However, the most significant changes are likely to come from the longer-term efforts that will make Future Harvest centers, attractive employers for women and developing country nationals

### A. ADVICE TO CENTERS UNDERTAKING A SEARCH EFFORT

#### 1. **Clarify strategy**

The boundaries of the applicant pool and the final selection decision are governed by strategic definitions and visions. The more clearly and sharply this is defined, the more precisely leadership qualities and technical competencies can be outlined in the director general profile. In the final selection, a good "strategic fit" can be identified, analyzed and defended. It is also important to review at the earliest stage of the process, whether strategic or discipline-based considerations limit the pool of qualified candidates unnecessarily on gender or national lines.

#### 2. **Review and apply the current literature on leadership**

Leadership is a complex concept that is often reduced to singular qualities or cultural images that inform the decision process quite uncon-

sciously. There is an extensive literature on leadership that has coalesced in the last decade around a series of leadership traits, including: creating a vision; developing “followership” and nurturing leaders; implementing the vision; following through; achieving results; and, team playing. Additionally, recent management research proves that women are rated strongly in general leadership effectiveness and excel in particular areas of leadership. The strategic analysis undertaken at the outset of the search process should be used to identify which of those leadership skills are most important for the center’s future. Boards should review interview questions to ensure that they elicit information from the individual’s past leadership experience. Additionally, boards should enquire about the candidate’s record in developing leaders and mentoring women and developing country nationals.

### **3. Ensure diversity and quality of the search committee**

The diversity profile of the board is inherited at the onset of the director general search process. However, the board has the opportunity to carefully choose the members of the search committee to improve the organization’s record on gender and diversity in recruitment. The search committee’s role in identifying candidates, courting candidates and short-listing candidates is fundamental to the entire process. Consider including, if capacity exists and candidate confidentiality can be assured, a human resource professional with gender and diversity training on the search committee.

### **4. Expand the quality of the applicant pool through all means possible**

There is widespread skepticism in the CGIAR (and in executive selection literature) about the benefits of open recruitment and to date there is little evidence that broad-based advertising, internet listings, professional search consultants, or candidate databases bring in significant numbers of qualified candidates. However, the cost of improved open recruitment is almost certainly marginal when weighed against the cost of missing a highly qualified candidate. Added attention needs to be paid to the promotional quality of the announcements. Communications specialists as well as human resource specialists should review director general position announcements. Search committees are advised to avail themselves of the database of women candidates maintained by the Gender and Diversity Program, early in the process rather than when concerns about the diversity of the candidate pool are already mounting.

### **5. Pursue nominations vigorously**

Nominations and the keen pursuit of nominees continue to provide the greatest yield in terms of qualified applications. This study suggests that there may be a pool of diverse candidates capable, but not persuaded, to

consider assuming a leadership position in the CGIAR. Outstanding candidates, particularly women, are in high demand and CGIAR centers must compete for their serious attention. A single, formal contact letter to a woman or developing country national in a challenging and satisfying job is unlikely to prompt serious consideration. Search committee members, DGs, staff members, professional search consultants should all be encouraged to personally contact nominees and encourage the candidate to consider a formal application. Search committee members and others in contact with the desired candidate must remain on guard against “promising the job.” Likewise, search committee members must avoid encouraging candidates to apply simply to improve the appearance of the applicant list.

## 6. Employ a professional external search consultant

Professional search consultants can make vital contributions to the quality and integrity of the search effort during the process, and in documenting the process for later review. Professional search consultants are often skilled at reference checks and can avoid the complications of reference checking within a closed network of candidates, colleagues and search committee members. The search consultant should be encouraged to solicit references from current or former subordinates as the executive selection literature suggests that these assessments are among the most reliable and contribute to improved selection. Include gender and diversity considerations as an explicit part of the consultant’s contract in order that this topic remain a central consideration throughout the process.

## 7. Involve the staff at various points in the search and selection process

The CGIAR respects the valuable insights staff can bring to the executive selection process. There may be a risk, however, that increased staff participation will reinforce a status quo that favors males from developed countries. In the course of this study, serious questions were raised as to whether boards or staff groups are greater forces for change in matters of gender and diversity. The evidence from these cases is mixed and incomplete, but the analysis favors widening and deepening participation, tempered by the judgment of boards. The **worst possible outcome in the case of staff participation is for the board to assume that participation implies consulting the directors alone**. It is this group, although there are fine exceptions individually and collectively, that is most likely to impede change at the systems level.

**8. Consider a leadership assessment and diversity awareness workshop for board members**

This gathering should include a review of relevant leadership literature, with an introduction to competency-based interviewing skills and other means of measuring leadership skills. This same workshop should include an introduction to gender and other biases in leadership assessment and some discussion of the cross-cultural differences in which this discussion takes place on the board.

**9. Maintain due diligence**

The entire process should be undertaken in a posture of “due diligence.” This involves reviewing carefully the CGIAR manual on “Choosing a Director General” and asking at every step in the process whether the search committee or the board has done everything possible to improve the search and selection process, and whether they have considered the gender and diversity implications at each stage. Due diligence should be monitored by the search committee and the board in consultation with professional consultants.

**B. ADVICE TO CANDIDATES**

---

**1. Develop a “constellation of allies.”**

There are few individuals, regardless of gender or ethnic origins who accede to positions of leadership without the foundation of a strong network of professional and personal support. This was reinforced in this study by both men and women. This network of support is often more difficult for women and developing country nationals to access because of their “outsider” status. This network of support includes friends and mentors that can help an individual assess his or her suitability for a leadership position, the support of colleagues inside and outside the system to promote one’s nomination and candidacy, and, finally, the support of influential advocates within the Board of Trustees. Women and developing country candidates are encouraged to develop political and personal support networks, inside and outside their immediate organizations, if they aspire to leadership positions.

**2. Resist pressure to apply for positions that are not suited to your leadership experience or technical skills**

This paper and many other documents advise search committees and recruitment specialists to pursue applications from women vigorously. Women already in leadership positions are regularly approached to consider appointments to head other organizations. These women advise others not to succumb to the pressure to apply if one’s skills and experi-

ence are not fully suited to the position, suspecting that their applications are encouraged merely to improve the composition of the applicant pool. This is a level of creeping tokenism, which is dangerous for individuals and organizations. Each party in the exchange – search committees and possible candidates have a responsibility to maintain the integrity of the applicant pool to fully qualified candidates.

**3. Accept questions regarding gender and diversity with equanimity.**

Boards and other selection committees are advised to ask questions to elicit a track record on issues of gender and diversity. Women often feel compromised by such questions, fearing that a strong response will marginalize them as a “women concerned primarily with women’s issues,” rather than as a leader concerned with broader issues. Additionally, women and developing country candidates often fear that these questions harbor discriminatory intent. These fears are not necessarily unjustified, but as these questions become more common and sincere, women and developing country nationals may actually harm their candidacy by appearing lukewarm on these issues.

## C. BUILDING A FOUNDATION FOR THE FUTURE

---

There is not likely to be a single path for improved diversity at the director general level within the CGIAR. This paper is a small step in the process. The greatest improvements will come from supporting the foundations of solid organizational development work within the CGIAR based in diagnosis, dialogue and experimentation. In this regard, an obvious path is the continuing support of the work of the Gender and Diversity Program and the many efforts at diversity improvements at the center level.

In addition to its on-going efforts to improve diversity in the CGIAR, the Gender and Diversity program is actively focusing on issues of recruitment and career advancement through a number of new efforts that seek to:

- document the pool of female scientists on a regional basis;
- diagnose retention and mobility patterns within the CGIAR;
- determine whether recruitment agencies and professional headhunters can be used to expand the recruitment “net” for senior-level women;
- develop a mentoring program to improve the career opportunities for nationally recruited staff; and,
- investigate other elements of future career development programs.
- It is such diagnostic and experimental efforts that will be at the foundation of long-term improvements. The CGIAR could support these efforts further by updating current board manuals to make clearer reference to issues of gender and diversity and to continue to include diversity training during regular orientations of new board members.

# Appendix A<sup>24</sup>: List of Interviews

## CIFOR

---

Jagmohan Maini, Board Chair

Walter Falcon, Board Member (by telephone)

Francisco Reifschneider, Board Member (by telephone)

Jeffrey Sayer, Outgoing DG

David Kaimowitz, Incoming DG (informal conversation)

Bo Benggston, External Consultant (by telephone)

Norman Macdonald, Director

Ken MacDicken, Director

## ICRAF

---

Lucie Edwards, Board Chair

Eugene Terry, Board Member

Wilfred Mwangi, Board Member

Bob Scholes, Board Member

Anette Reenberg, Board Member (by telephone)

Pedro Sanchez, Outgoing DG

Dennis Garrity, Incoming DG

Patrick Shields, External Consultant (by e-mail correspondence)

---

<sup>24</sup> Methodological note: The author combined commonly accepted qualitative research methodology with training and experience in management to make the assessments in this paper. Like all data sets, there may be mistakes of fact and judgment. To the fullest extent possible, the author used accepted qualitative research notation to identify when informants are expressing personal opinion, speculating, quoting others, stating “fact”, interpreting “facts,” etc., in order to sort out as objectively as possible facts, perceptions and well-considered opinion. Likewise, concerted effort was made on more controversial topics to double check, corroborate, and qualify accounts from single individuals. The nature and size of the sample (not fully comparable across centers) and interview protocol (the same questions were not always asked) did not allow for statistically-based content analysis of interview notes.

Jacqueline Ashby, Candidate for DG

## ILRI

---

John Vercoe, Board Chair

Wilfred Mwangi, Board Member

Hank Fitzhugh, Outgoing DG

Carlos Sere, Incoming DG (by e-mail correspondence)

Gerry Bourier, External Consultant (by e-mail correspondence)

## IITA

---

Enrico Porceddu, Board Chair

Eugene Mrema, Board Member

Masa Iwanaga, Board Member

Lukas Brader, Outgoing Director General

Peter Hartmann, Incoming DG (by e-mail correspondence)

## OTHER

---

Vicki Wilde, CGIAR Gender & Diversity Program Leader

Meryl Williams, Director General, ICLARM

Martha Stone, Board Chair, ICRISAT

Anne-Marie Izac, Director ICRAF

## Appendix B: Profile of CGIAR Center Boards (Based on Board Membership in 2000)

Center	Size						Board Chair		Nationality			Gender		
	By Charter/Agreement			Actual (in 2000)			Nationality	Gender	North	South	North/South	Male	Female	Male/Female
	Total (max)	CG-nom	HC-Mem	Total	CG-nom	HC-Mem								
<b>CIAT</b>	17	3	4	14	3	3	N	M	9	5	1.8	9	5	1.8
<b>CIFOR</b>	17	3	1	14	1	1	N	M	8	6	1.3	7	7	1.0
<b>CIMMYT</b>	18	3	3	18	3	3	N	M	10	8	1.2	15	3	5.0
<b>CIP</b>	12	3	2	10	2	2	N	M	5	5	1.0	6	4	1.5
<b>ICARDA</b>	18	3	3	16	3	3	N	M	8	8	1.0	15	1	15.0
<b>ICLARM</b>	13	3	2	12	2	2	N	M	6	6	1.0	6	6	1.0
<b>ICRAF</b>	15	3	1	15	2	1	N	F	8	7	1.1	12	3	4.0
<b>ICRISAT</b>	15	3	3	15	3	3	N	F	8	7	1.1	11	4	2.7
<b>IFPRI</b>	16	8	1	14	7	1	N	M	8	6	1.3	8	6	1.3
<b>IITA</b>	17	3	3	17	3	3	N	M	9	8	1.1	14	3	4.7
<b>ILRI</b>	15	3	2	11	2	2	N	M	7	4	1.8	8	3	2.7
<b>IPGRI</b>	15	4	1	15	4	1	S	M	7	8	0.9	10	5	2.0
<b>IRRI</b>	15	3	2	15	3	2	S	M	6	9	0.7	12	3	4.0
<b>ISNAR</b>	14	4	1	13	4	1	S	M	6	7	0.9	9	4	2.3
<b>IWMI</b>	20	4	2	15	3	2	N	M	9	6	1.5	12	3	4.0
<b>WARDA</b>	14	3	6*	12	3	4*	N	M	6	6	1.0	9	3	3.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>13N+3S</b>	<b>14M+2F</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>MEAN</b>	<b>15.7</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>14.1</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>10.2</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>2.6</b>

**CG-nom** = CGIAR-nominated; **HC Mem** = Host country member

\* Nationals of member states

## Appendix C: List of Abbreviations

CGIAR research	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Re-
CIFOR	Center for International Forestry Research
ICRAF	International Center for Research in Agroforestry
IITA	Institute for International Tropical Agriculture
ILRI	International Livestock Research Institute

# Bibliography

Beer, Michael. 1980. *Organization Change and Development: A Systems View*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Bennis, Warren and James O'Toole. 2000. "Don't Hire the Wrong CEO." *Harvard Business Review* (May-June): 171-176.

Borokhovich, Kenneth A., Robert Parrino, and Teresa Trapani. 1996. "Outside Directors and CEO Selection." (April).

Charan, Ram. 2000. "How to Lower the Risk in CEO Succession." *Leader to Leader*, no. 17.

CGIAR. 2001. *Trend Data on Gender and Diversity in the Future Harvest Centers, 1995-2001*. Washington, DC: CGIAR Gender and Diversity Program.

CGIAR. 1997. "Choosing A Director General: The Search and Selection Process." *Reference Guides for CGIAR International Agricultural Research Centers and their Boards of Trustees*, No. 5. (August). Washington, DC: CGIAR Secretariat.

CGIAR. 1997. "Creating a Well-Balanced Board." *Reference Guides for CGIAR International Agricultural Research Centers and their Boards of Trustees*, No. 3. (August). Washington, DC: CGIAR Secretariat.

*The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 27 April 2001. "Struggling for a Balanced Life as a President."

Costa, Dora L. 2000. "From Mill Town to Board Room: The Rise of Women's Paid Labor." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 14, no.4: 101-122.

Epstein, Cynthia Fuchs. 1991. "Constraints on Excellence: Structural and Cultural Barriers to the Recognition and Demonstration of Achievement." In *The Outer Circle: Women in the Scientific Community*, edited by Harriet Zuckerman. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Granovetter, Mark. 1973. "The Strength of Weak Ties." *American Journal of Sociology* 78: 1360-1380.

Granovetter, Mark. 1985. "Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness." *American Journal of Sociology* 91: 481-510.

Hernes, Gudmund. 1976. "Structural Change in Social Processes." *American Journal of Sociology* 82, no. 3: 513-547.

International Labor Organization (ILO), *World of Work*, February 1998 (no.23). "Will the glass ceiling ever be broken? Geneva: International Labor Organization.

Joshi, Joan, Vicki Wilde and Adrian Masters. 2000. "Gender and Diversity in the CGIAR: A New Baseline." *Gender & Diversity Program Working Paper*, No. 25 (October). Washington, DC: CGIAR Gender and Diversity Program.

Kabacoff, Robert I. 1998. "Gender Differences in Organizational Leadership: A Large Sample Study." Paper Presented at the Annual American Psychological Association Convention, San Francisco.

Lorsch, Jay W. and Rakesh Khurana. 1999. "Changing Leaders: The Board's Role in CEO Succession." *Harvard Business Review*: 96-105.

Merrill-Sands, Deborah and Deborah M. Kolb. 2001. "Women as Leaders: The Paradox of Success." *CGO Insights*, No. 9. Boston: Center for Gender in Organizations, Simmons Graduate School of Management.

Meyerson, Debra E. and Joyce K. Fletcher. 1999. "A Modest Manifesto for Shattering the Glass Ceiling." *Harvard Business Review* (January-February): 127-136.

Miles, Raymond E. and Charles C. Snow. 1978. *Organizational Strategy, Structure and Process*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Sanders, Lisa. 2001. "Wanted: Equal-Opportunity Executive Recruiter." *The New York Times*.

Schwartz, Felice N. 2000. "Management Women and the New Facts of Life." *Harvard Business Review on Work and Life Balance*. Boston: Harvard Business Review Paperback.

Sessa, Valerie I. and Jodi J. Taylor. 2000. *Executive Selection: Strategies for Success*. Jossey-Bass. (Full text not available during period of research.)

Taylor, Jodi and Valerie I. Sessa . 2000. "Executive Selection: Bequeathing a Legacy of Talent." Originally printed in *Executive Talent* (Fall). Available via [www.aesc.org/executivetalent](http://www.aesc.org/executivetalent), website of the Association of Executive Search Consultants.

Valian, Virginia. 2000. *Why So Slow?: The Advancement of Women*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Ward, Ralph. 1999. "Boards and CEO Succession." *Ralph Ward's Boardroom Insider* (July). Available via [www.inc.com/leadership-and-strategy/articles](http://www.inc.com/leadership-and-strategy/articles), website of inc.com

Wells, Susan J. 2001. "A Female Executive is Hard to Find." *Society for Human Resource Management Online Magazine: HRStaffers.com*. (17 September).

Westphal, J.D. and E.J. Zajac. 1995. "Who Shall Govern? CEO/Board Power, Demographic Similarity, and New Director Selection. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 40: 60-93.

Zuckerman, Harriet, Jonathan R. Cole and John T. Bruer (Eds.). 1991. *The Outer Circle: Women in the Scientific Community*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Zwell, Michael. 1998. "Using Competencies to Hire the Right CEO." *Directors & Boards* (Summer).

## About the Author

Dr. Nancy J. Allen is an *economic sociologist*, specializing in formal organization and institutional development. She received her Ph.D. from Harvard University, in a joint degree of the Harvard Business School and the Department of Sociology. She also holds an M.B.A. from the University of Santa Clara and a B.S. in Arabic and Middle East Studies from Georgetown University. Dr. Allen has worked in the private sector, and more recently in the public sector. From 1994 to 2000, she worked for the Harvard Institute for International Development as an economic advisor at the Ministry of Finance in Indonesia. In Indonesia, she specialized in foreign direct investment, trade and industrial policy, and export manufacturing, always maintaining a broad focus on issues of institutional development. In the period after the East Asian economic crisis, she developed additional expertise in areas of competition policy, bankruptcy law, civil service reform, as well as corporate and public governance.

She is currently working as an independent consultant, based in Nairobi, Kenya. Her current clients include the CGIAR Gender & Diversity Program (consulting on a variety of international human resource policy issues) and the Rockefeller Foundation (consulting in matters of institutional and organizational development).