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Abstract

This thesis examines the processes and practices of leadership and leadership development, in the context of post-conflict peacebuilding. The systematic literature review conducted in this thesis reveals that little is known about leadership in such a hostile context.

The research focuses on how leaders in civil society lead for peace at grassroots and middle-range levels in extremely divided societies, and how they develop as leaders in these contexts. The overarching research question is: What does leadership for peacebuilding involve and how it has been developed in the post-conflict context?

This research is an actor-focused inductive study based on empirical research into the role of civil society leadership in fostering and sustaining peace. It draws on semi-structured interviews with 32 long-standing civil society leaders in Northern Ireland, and Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The empirical research examined the characteristics of the contexts of leadership in post-conflict peacebuilding from a social identity theory perspective (Tajfel, 1974). The key characteristics found in this research are: Hostility and violence; polarisation; and depersonalisation. The research then utilises the social identity theory of leadership to explore the nature of leading for peace in terms of processes and practices. These processes are: Differentiation; integration; and political astuteness. A framework is developed to show how leading for peace interacts with context.

Finally, the research examines leadership learning and development in this context through the use of the technique of leadership journeys. Drawing on Tynjälä’s (2013) 3P model for workplace learning, a modified 3P model for peacebuilding leadership development in post-conflict contexts is proposed.
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Chapter 1  Introduction

This is a study of the nature of leadership, and leadership learning and development, in the context of post-conflict peacebuilding. It has a particular focus on how leaders at the level of civil society lead for peace in extremely divided societies, and how they develop the knowledge needed to lead for peace in violently divided societies. Although it is a common-sense matter to agree on the significance of leading for peace, very little research has been conducted to investigate it. Even less research has explored the leadership development related to it. This study aims to contribute empirically to the understudying of peace leadership in post-conflict contexts in terms of its practices, processes and the learning taking place over the participants’ leadership journeys.

1.1  Background: global, personal and research contexts

Have we been living through the third world war? This is what some political scholars have argued about the global violence we have been witnessing since the end of the cold war. For Marshall (1999, p. 1):

“The Third World War is neither an epic drama nor a glittering extravaganza designed for prime-time audiences; it is playing now in theatres everywhere……. In the Third World War there are no war heroes, no ticker-tape parades, no armistice day celebrations. There are only grief and gaunt faces, squalid camps and unplowed fields, empty classrooms and children toting automatic weapons”.
Globally, we are going into another cycle of massive violence; devastating wars in Syria, Iraq, Libya and Yemen, fragile governments in the Middle East, ethnic and tribal violent tensions in Africa, unprecedented refugee crises in Europe and continuous terrorist threats all over the world.

Figure 1-1 shows the shifts in the levels and trends of both inter-state and intra-state armed conflicts. It uses complex statistical tools developed by the Centre of Systematic Peace to calculate the summed war magnitude scores internationally. This is an aggregated measure for a comprehensive assessment of the societal effects of warfare, including direct and indirect death, population dislocation, damages and destructions in the societal networks, environmental quality, infrastructure and material damage and tangible and intangible losses (both short- and long-term) associated with general deterioration. The red-line represents the intra-state wars which seems to level up at low levels since the Second World War. While the levels of the societal wars (blue line) have been increasing dramatically until the end of the cold war, marked by the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. The declining trend of warfare both intra-state and inter-state that was seen in the mid-90s to mid-2000 has shifted back up again. The recent rise in the global armed conflicts is led by intra-state wars which necessitate a closer attention from researchers (Amaladas and Byrne, 2018).
1.1 Background: global, personal and research contexts

At such time of escalating conflicts and the threats of conflicts, knowledge about leading for peace in post-conflict contexts at the level of practices, processes and development could not be more relevant to society. We seem to have a continuing fascination for anecdotes of when the few have converted the impossible into the possible. The stories of these individuals, in the form of great philosophers, military leaders, prophets, martyrs and founding fathers, are a potent component of our human anecdotal heritage. Theorising about the concept of

---

1 UN institutions such as the World Bank has been using the data from the Centre of systematic peace in their reports.
leadership can be tracked back to the work of Plato in the West and Sun Tzu in the East (Grint, 2011); nevertheless, leadership as a concept for empirical examination is relatively recent (Yukl, 2012).

Although the field of leadership and leadership development has grown exponentially over the past 20 years (Day, Fleenor, Atwater, Sturm, and McKee, 2014; Storey, Hartley, Denis, t Hart, and Ulrich, 2017) resulting in a variety of operationalisations of these concepts in different contexts, there are some important lacunae in theorising about leadership for peacebuilding. Some scholars have recognised leadership as a significant factor in inflaming conflicts or in building peace (Ledbetter, 2012; Lederach, 1997; Peake, Gormley-Heenan, and Fitzduff, 2004). However, peacebuilding and leadership are not commonly associated in research (Amaladas and Byrne, 2018; Peake et al., 2004). On one hand, the topic of peacebuilding has been historically positioned in the academic fields of international relations, public policy and political science (Ledbetter, 2012). On the other hand, the academic literature on leadership and leadership development is predominantly positioned in the field of management studies, where many theories are rooted in the business perceptions of the West (Ricke-Kiely, 2016; Wang, Turnbull James, Denyer, and Bailey, 2014). McIntyre Miller (2016) argues for the pressing need to fill this gap. She invites the world of scholarship to expand the dialogue and discussion around peace leadership, and to connect with like-minded scholars and practitioners in leadership, peace studies, and related fields. This research is contributing to this discussion.
1.2 Definitions of conflict and post-conflict peacebuilding

On a more personal level, as a Syrian practitioner with several years of experience working close to the top leadership in the Syrian Prime Ministry I witnessed how senior leaders failed to prevent the country from falling into a devastating conflict still ongoing until now. My mind, heart and soul are into finding a way to contribute to bringing peace back to my country through learning from others who survived this difficult journey.

1.2 Definitions of conflict and post-conflict peacebuilding

Although this research has a leadership focus, it seems sensible to define the contextual terms at the outset. Therefore, I begin by defining the concepts of conflict, and post-conflict peacebuilding, as they have been used in this research, while the notion of leadership for peacebuilding used in this research is defined in chapter 3. Civil wars/conflicts, war-torn states and divided societies are all terms used to identify contexts in which societal groups have escalated their conflict violently, to reach a major disruption that dramatically affects the lives of many individuals. The dynamics of these conflicts are strongly contextual and very complex with nested causalities - political, socio-economic, ideological and religious (Lederach, 1997). The internationally adopted definition of civil conflicts is the one of Uppsala/PRIO Armed Conflict Dataset, which defines an armed conflict as a “contested incompatibility that concerns government and/or territory where the use of armed force

---

2 “The Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP) http://ucdp.uu.se/ is a main provider of data on organised violence and the oldest ongoing data collection project for civil war, with a history of almost 40 years. Its definition of armed conflict has become the global standard of how conflicts are systematically defined and studied”. 
between two parties, of which at least one is the government of a state, results in at least 25 battle-related deaths annually” (Gleditsch, Wallensteen, Eriksson, Sollenberg, and Strand, 2002, p. 619). This definition was not only used in academic scholarship but also in the United Nation official reports such as (Cockayne, Mikulaschek, and Perry, 2010). This definition was kept in mind when the contexts of the study were later chosen.

Post-conflict Peacebuilding is a term first coined by Galtung (1969) who is considered the founding father of the field of peace studies. In his seminal work, he distinguishes between negative peace, which is the mere absence of structural societal violence, and positive peace, where society puts in place the structures and dynamics needed to surface the societal divisions and works toward resolving them. Since then, the term peacebuilding has been widely used to express the transformation period/mechanisms from conflict to peace (Ledbetter, 2012). In this research, post-conflict is defined as “an overarching term to describe a long-term process covering all activities with the overall objective to prevent violent outbreaks of conflict or to sustainably transform armed conflicts into constructive peaceful ways of managing conflict” (Paffenholz, Thania, Spurk, and Christoph, 2006, p. 16).

Concepts such as "durable peace," "stable peace" and "unstable peace" have been used in many literatures to describe the state and the nature of a relationship between nations or
groups within nations. These terms refer to different phases in the development of potential conflict (Lund, 2009) as can be seen in (Figure 1-2) where the vertical axis depicts the intensity of conflict and the horizontal axis represent the duration of conflict.

![Figure 1-2 The curve of conflict (Lund, 2009, p. 295)](image)

Intra-state armed conflicts, as Figure (1-4) demonstrates, are rarely one episode of this curvilinear path, but rather are likely to progress in recurring cycles of peace and violence (El-Bushra, 2017; Lederach, 1997a). Hence, reaching a post-conflict phase would mostly mean the ending of large-scale societal conflict but not necessarily building sustainable peace. For this reason, leadership for peacebuilding could potentially play an essential role in contributing to these efforts.
1.3 The Research questions

This thesis started as a research inquiry into leadership learning and development of civil society leaders in post-conflict peacebuilding contexts. Soon, I realised that studying leadership learning and development in these special contexts would not be possible without first exploring the concept of leadership in these contexts (James and Burgoyne, 2001; Probert and Turnbull James, 2011; Turnbull James, 2011).

This is an actor-focussed study that explores the civil society leaders’ perspectives on their direct experiences in leading for peace, and to capture their learning in post-conflict contexts. Thus, the aims of these study are: First, to explore the nature of leadership for peacebuilding in post-conflict contexts. Second to explore the learning taking place over the leadership
journeys of the leaders in post-conflict contexts. Accordingly, this research attempts to address the following overarching question:

**What does leadership for peacebuilding involve and how it has been developed in the post-conflict context?**

The related sub-questions are:

- What characterises the contexts of post-conflict peacebuilding?
- What characterises leadership in post-conflict peacebuilding? How does leading for peace interact with the context of post-conflict peacebuilding?
- What are the events, experiences and processes of learning that shape the leadership development of leaders involved in post-conflict peacebuilding?

### 1.4 Positioning the research project and its contribution to knowledge

Peace and leadership are two concepts that have separately attracted enormous attention. Hundreds of academic studies have been published attempting to answer endless sets of questions about our understanding of leadership and leadership development in the public, private and third sectors and millions of dollars have been spent annually by business on programmes that promise to enhance their leadership capacity (Day et al, 2014). Yet, leadership and leadership development for peacebuilding is still an under-researched area
that needs serious efforts to explore (McIntyre Miller, 2016; Ryckman and Maves Braithwaite, 2017).

This PhD research is a multi-disciplinary study that investigates theories and practices rooted in two different research fields; leadership, leadership development and peace studies, each with distinctive terminologies and distinguished research traditions. Whilst leadership and leadership development are embedded in the business and management studies in the wider sense, peacebuilding literature is dominated by politics and international relations orthodoxies (Spreitzer, 2007). Yet, I see this study as an extension of our understanding of leadership and leadership development designed for a specific context - in this case peacebuilding, without of course, overlooking the special complexity which this context holds.

The systematic literature review conducted in this study shows how thin the literature that covers the aspects of leadership and leadership development for peacebuilding is in terms of both quantity and quality. Additionally, it highlights the gap in research that deals with leadership and leadership development that the peacebuilding field suffers from. This supports and justifies my argument about the need for holistic multi-disciplinary exploration for these matters. This research is a small contribution in this endeavour.
1.5 The structure of the thesis

This thesis has eight further chapters. In the second chapter, I start with a systematic literature review of leadership and leadership development as they have been approached in the field of peacebuilding. I systematically identify and assess these notions as they appeared in peace literature to make sense of the existing theoretical frameworks, methodological designs and concluding arguments.

In the third chapter, I review the literature concerned with the context of conflict, leadership relevant to intergroup relations and leadership learning and development from lived experiences. In this chapter, I draw on several theoretical frameworks that directly link to the possible interpretations of the data. I first review the literature that investigates group conflicts in order to understand the context of this research where I am focusing on two theories; realistic conflict theory (RCT) and social identity theory (SIT). Then, I explore the leadership theories that focus on leading through conflicts, with special attention to the social identity theory of leadership, and the leadership with political astuteness framework. Then, I interrogate the relevant leadership development literatures that can shed light on the leaders’ development over their leadership journeys in such demanding contexts.

In the fourth chapter, I present the methodology, methods and the research design in addition to the epistemological and ontological considerations and the techniques of analysis of the data.
In the fifth, sixth and seventh chapters, I present the findings about the context of post-conflict peacebuilding, leading for peace, and the leaders’ learning and development in post-conflict peacebuilding context. The fifth chapter attempts to discuss the contexts chosen for this research which are Northern Ireland and Bosnia and Herzegovina. I briefly describe the historical, political, and socioeconomic root causes of the conflicts in them, to the peace agreements that ended the conflict and the current political conflict and peace status in both contexts. Then, I analyse the leaders’ views of these contexts. Finally, I explore the leaders’ reflections on how these contextual forces impacted their leadership for peace.

The sixth chapter unpacks the notions of leadership as reflected in the data. Hence, I analyse the data on three dimensions, the contextual dimension of leadership as experienced by the participants, the action and the practical dimension of leading for peace, and the processual dimension of the leadership in the data.

In the seventh chapter, I explore the leaders’ development aspects in post-conflict peacebuilding. It derives from the data the events and the processes of leadership learning and development in such extreme context, using Tynjälä (2013) 3P model of workplace learning to structure the data.
1.5 The structure of the thesis

The discussion of these findings is presented in chapter eight where I first assess the quality and the limitations of this research. Then, I discuss the findings about context of post-conflict, the leadership and the leadership development. I finish the chapter by addressing again the research questions. Finally, I conclude with the contributions to knowledge of this research and the suggested future research.
Chapter 2 Systematic Literature Review of Leadership and Leadership Development for Peacebuilding

Because of the multi-disciplinary nature of this research, there is a need to conduct a systematic literature review that examines the key notions of leadership and leadership development as introduced in peace studies. For this, I systematically identified and assessed these notions as they appeared in peace literature to make sense of the existing theoretical frameworks, methodological designs and concluding arguments. Upon finalising this systematic literature review (introduced in this chapter), I realised that the quality and the quantity of the literature covering leadership and leadership development for peacebuilding is not sufficient to address my research questions - especially given that I am positioning this thesis primarily within the field of leadership research, not political science or international relations. Therefore, in chapter 3, I carry out a second bespoke literature review that focuses particularly on the literature that is concerned with leadership in relation to conflict and leadership learning and development (the two research inquiries that this research is interested in).

A literature review is defined as: 

“The selection of available documents on the topic, which contain information, ideas, data and evidence written for a particular standpoint to fulfil certain aims or express certain view on the nature of the topic and how it is to be investigated
and the effective evaluation of these documents in relation to the research being proposed” (Hart, 1998, p. 13).

Tranfield, Denyer, and Smart (2003) distinguish between two main types of literature review: narrative literature reviews and systematic literature reviews. Systematic reviews differ from narrative reviews (the traditional approach to literature review) by adopting a replicable, scientific and transparent process, in other words, a “detailed technology, that aims to minimise bias through exhaustive literature searches of published and unpublished studies and by providing an audit trail of the reviewers’ decisions, procedures and conclusions” (Tranfield et al., 2003, p. 209).

In their article, Tranfield et al. (2003) produce a long and detailed reflection on the differences between these two types of literature reviews. They are critical of traditional narrative reviews which “frequently lack thoroughness, and in many cases are not undertaken as genuine pieces of investigatory science. Consequently, they can lack the means for making sense of what the collection of studies is saying” (p. 207). This, they say, limits the possibility for practitioners and decision-makers to make use of these reviews to inform policies and practices, (and one might argue for academics as well if the basis of the review is not clear). These concerns are shared by Oakley (2001) who finds most literature reviews in social science selective and subjective, which is “a million miles from the notion of research synthesis as an activity governed by principles of clearly defined inclusion and exclusion criteria, systematic searching and specified methods for appraising the quality of different studies” (p. 96). For her, this chaos has resulted in different reviews about the same topic happening at the same time but including different studies and reaching different
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conclusions. In contrast, Tranfield et al. (2003, p. 207) argue for the use of systematic literature reviews by “synthesising research in a systematic, transparent, and reproducible manner with the twin aims of enhancing the knowledge base and informing policymaking and practice”. In the following section, I will outline the different types of systematic literature reviews. Then, I will explain the systematic literature review format used for the first phase of reviewing the literature for this research inquiry and why this is arguably the most appropriate for this particular research enquiry.

2.1 Systematic Literature Review

Systematic reviews first became established within the field of medicine, with the idea of evidence-based medicine. They usually aim to assess the main body of research within a particular clinical field, often over a defined period of time. According to Tranfield et al. (2003, p. 210), systematic reviews enforce the use of a number of techniques that aim to minimise bias and error. Hence, such systematic reviews are “widely regarded as providing 'high-quality' evidence” (p. 210). Furthermore, Denyer and Tranfield (2009, p. 671) encourage us to approach the systematic review as a “self-contained research project in itself that explores a clearly specified question usually derived from a policy or practice problem, using existing studies”.
Turning now to the types of reviews, *meta-analysis* is a sub-set of a systematic review. It offers a “statistical procedure for synthesising findings in order to obtain overall reliability unavailable from any single study alone” (ibid, p.209). Meta-analysis is a powerful tool to use where there is substantial and comparable quantitative evidence such as what can be found in some aspects of medicine. However, in the fields of leadership and management - which are divergent in nature, with diverse research traditions spread across both positivist and phenomenological perspectives (Denyer and Tranfield, 2009) the use of meta-analysis has not always been feasible. The problem in using this technique is that it has been seen as insufficient and infeasible when dealing with non-numerical evidence, which is widely used by interpretivists and phenomenologists in management research (Hammersley, 2001; Petticrew, 2001). In these cases of heterogeneity of ontology and data, systematic reviews using meta-analysis are not possible. I have, therefore, ruled out this approach for my own work in this thesis.

Greenhalgh, Robert, Macfarlane, Bate, Kyriakidou, and Peacock (2005) created another methodology to conduct a systematic literature review. Meta-narrative is designed explicitly for complex evidence and large data sets drawn from heterogeneous sources and sometimes disciplines. What makes meta-narrative distinctive from other approaches to systematic literature review is that it exceeds the traditional aim of aggregating the empirical evidence and/or findings of the body of studies. Meta-narrative is a methodology that dismantles each study into the primary elements of its narrative that then fit into building an overall narrative across different paradigms. Hence, the storyline in each research tradition is the initial unit of analysis. Nevertheless, they noted that it takes a whole team of researchers to undertake
such a literature review. For these reasons, the meta-narrative methodology was not the best fit for this research.

Research synthesis is another way of conducting systematic literature reviews. This is a collective term for a “family of methods for summarising, integrating, and, where possible, cumulating the findings of different studies on a topic or research question” (Tranfield et al., 2003, p. 217). Alternative methods for qualitative research synthesis (such as realist synthesis, meta-synthesis and meta-ethnography) have also been developed to compare and conclude from a collection of studies through interpretative and inductive methods. In a nutshell, realist synthesis attempts to capture then synthesise the generative mechanisms of different studies, to reach transferable knowledge about “what works for whom in what circumstances” (Pawson, 2002, p. 342). Meta-synthesis, in contrast to meta-analysis, is not strictly limited to synthesising comparable studies; rather, it is constructing “interpretations, not analyses, and by revealing the analogies between accounts” (Noblit and Hare, 1988, p. 8, cited in Tranfield et al., 2003, p. 218). Finally, meta-ethnography is used in line with a grounded theory approach where the data from different studies reflecting different accounts of a phenomenon are pooled together and open-coded inductively to provide a holistic account of the whole phenomenon (Tranfield et al., 2003). This research is using meta-synthesis to conduct this systematic literature review because the studies found through my search have not been methodological comparable. In Figure 2-1, I outline the different types
of literature review and the tools of conducting them as I understand them from Tranfield et al. (2003).

Figure 2-1 Types and tools of literature reviews adapted from (Tranfield et al., 2003)

The fragmented and multi-disciplinarily nature of the management field makes conducting systematic literature reviews particularly challenging (Tranfield et al., 2003). Hence, Denyer and Tranfield (2009) argue for the importance of developing an explicit, fit for purpose, and bespoke format of any literature reviews in order to enhance the quality and the rigour of the reviews. This is what I am going to describe in the next section.
2.2 Systematic review format for leadership, leadership development and peacebuilding.

Denyer and Tranfield (2009) suggest four principles for conducting systematic reviews of management and organisational research, and I am going to apply them for this review of leadership and peacebuilding:

*Transparency:* which covers two aspects. First, that reviewers need to be open and explicit about each and every step in the review regarding both processes and methods employed. Furthermore, the reviewer should rigorously express the links between the findings of the studies reviewed and the evidence produced.

*Inclusivity:* unlike medical science where a strict hierarchy of evidence is broadly agreed, management research (also leadership research, I would add) has a wide range of data collection and interpretation methods. Accordingly, reviewers should seek to include all the studies that fit the purpose; which are of sufficient/high quality and add to the understanding of the studied phenomena with all methodologies available.

*Explanatory:* which is similar to what Pawson (2002) introduced as a realist synthesis, using the notions of Context- Mechanisms- Outcomes to understand and aggregate reviewed studies. Extracting the underpinning reasoning about studied phenomena (i.e. leadership for peacebuilding in this research) is a crucial principle of systematic literature reviews.
Heuristic: systematic reviews in management (and leadership, I would argue) should take into account practitioners’ problems and develop better tools to deal with these problems.

Tranfield et al. (2003) offer a helpful framework and set of steps for conducting systematic literature review (Table 2-1) which I have used (along with the four principles above) to frame my first round of literature review; the one that attempts to capture the literature that concerns with leadership and leadership development in the field of peacebuilding.

Table 2-1 Stages of a systematic review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Stages of a systematic review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage I-Planning the review</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 0 - Identification of the need for a review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1 - Preparation of a proposal for a review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 - Development of a review protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage II—Conducting a review</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3 - Identification of research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4 - Selection of studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5 - Study quality assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 6 - Data extraction and monitoring progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 7 - Data synthesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage III-Reporting and dissemination</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 8 - The report and recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 9 - Getting evidence into practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Tranfield et al. (2003)

2.2.1. Stage I- Planning the systematic review

The focus of my research is leadership and leadership development in post-conflict peacebuilding context. Consequently, the first stage of the literature review aims to identify
in the most inclusive manner possible the studies that have dealt with any aspect of leadership and leadership development in relation to peacebuilding. In this stage, I delineated the relevant research territories and these are shown in Figure 2-2. This is to make explicit the literatures that I aim to draw on, enabling other researchers to replicate my approach if they wish.

As indicated previously, the systematic literature review can be regarded as a complete research project in itself. Thus, a good starting point is to propose a number of questions that this literature review aims to answer (assuming that the answers exist). I would like to emphasise that these questions are not the research questions for this thesis; however, they are the catalysts of building a rigorous literature review that helps to scan the relevant fields. These questions are:
1. What are the theories of leadership and leadership peacebuilding which scholars have incorporated in their theoretical and empirical work?

2. How do leadership and peacebuilding scholars understand the arenas of leadership and leadership structures relevant to post conflict peacebuilding?

3. What is already known from the literature regarding leadership development for post-conflict peacebuilding?

2.2.1.1 The review protocol

The review protocol is a “plan that helps to protect objectivity by providing explicit descriptions of the steps to be taken” (Tranfield et al., 2003, p. 215). For this research, I have covered both quantitative and qualitative evidence in the review because the literature spans both and each provides different insights. In principle, systematic reviews utilise, where possible, the raw data extracted from a pool of studies that match the inclusion criteria. However, in leadership and management research, raw data are rarely fully included. Instead, only partial extracts of the data are generally presented in studies. Consequently, the selection of the studies, in this situation, is not about the amount of raw data anymore; alternatively, it becomes a decision about the selection of ‘articles’ based on the kind of causal or explanatory claims made and how evidence is presented to support or refute these claims.

2.2.1.2 The criteria for inclusion/ exclusion of a study in the review

My literature review includes both empirical and conceptual studies. This does not fit completely with the basic notion of meta-synthesis as a way of aggregating findings from all conducted studies about the certain topic during a certain period of time to see the full picture
and to find out new results which are not possible to spot through reviewing the studies individually. Similarly to Rashman, Withers, and Hartley (2009), the emphasis of this review is to provide elucidation of the concepts, frameworks and typologies of leadership and its development as used in peace studies, and the identification of areas where knowledge is still lacking.

There is no consensus on criteria to assess the quality of qualitative research. However, Oakley (2001) lists a number of criteria that are most commonly cited:

1. Clear statement of aims and objectives
2. Clear description of the context of research
3. Including enough original data to mediate between evidence and interpretation (in empirical studies)
4. Explicit theoretical framework and/or literature review
5. Clear description of the sample used
6. Clear description of the method used and systematic data collection.

I have used these criteria in assessing each one of the studies included in this literature review as they have been integrated into the data extraction sheet for systematic recording of information.
2.2.1 Stage II- Conducting the review

This stage involves the process of choosing the key words, databases and the actual use of Endnotes and NVivo in conducting the reviews, with an example below.

2.2.1.1 Key words

This first literature review intends to cover all the aspects of leadership and leadership development that have been drawn on in the peace studies related literature. Hence, the keywords sets are:

| Peace* Peacebuilding Peace building Peacebuilding Post war Post conflict in combination with Lead* |
| --- | --- |
| Peace Peacebuilding Peace building Peacebuilding Post war Post conflict in combination with Lead* development |

2.2.1.2 Choosing the databases

I commenced my search using The Open University on-line library. This option gives access to 550 databases and 140 journals categorised both alphabetically and based on subjects. I chose two subjects: Management, Politics and Development Studies. From Management, I chose two sub-subjects: Management Studies and Public and Not for Profit Management (There is no sub-subject specific for Leadership Studies). The former gives access to 17
databases and 24 E-journals, while the latter gives access to 11 databases and 23 E-journals. Conflict studies is the sub-subject I chose from Politics and Development Studies, with access to 5 databases and 18 E-journals. The following table summarises all databases used from these 3 sub-subjects.

Table 2-2 The databases used from different disciplines for the first phase of literature review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Studies</th>
<th>Public and Not for Profit Management</th>
<th>Conflict Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABI/Inform Complete</td>
<td>ABI/Inform Complete</td>
<td>Academic Search Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Search Complete</td>
<td>Business Source Complete</td>
<td>BLDS: British Library for development studies at IDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMADEUS (analyse major databases from European sources)</td>
<td>Emerald Premier</td>
<td>Nexis UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business monitor international</td>
<td>Fifty lessons.</td>
<td>Science Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Source Complete</td>
<td>JSTOR</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerald Premier</td>
<td>Key Note reports</td>
<td>SwetsWise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSTOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Note reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBER (National Bureau of Economic Research) working papers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nexis UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Direct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley Online Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the last update of this review, which I conducted on 13/12/2017, the key words combinations were searched again in these data bases using the advance search tool. I followed the same protocol I used in the first systematic literature review conducted in 2014, where I searched for the different chosen keywords combinations first in the titles, then in the key words, then in the abstracts. I used this technique to manage the thousands of results.
that the search was bringing up, without putting any conditions. The logic behind this decision was that if the scholarly material does not have the keywords combination (peace* and lead* for example) either in the title, the key words, or the abstract, it is unlikely to have any of these concepts as a primary focus. Interestingly, 44 new materials were published between 2014 and 2017 giving a sign of a growing interest in the field. The new materials were reviewed using the extract criteria and integrated into the review presented in this chapter. The number of the collected materials is shown in Figure 2-3.

Figure 2-3 The review audit

The titles and abstracts reviewed according to the databases are shown in Table 2-3.

Table 2-3 The titles and abstracts reviewed according to the databases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Number of materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/INFORM Dateline</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABI/INFORM Global</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABI/INFORM Trade &amp; Industry</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities Citation Index (Web of Science)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informa - Taylor &amp; Francis (CrossRef)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSTOR Archival Journals</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSTOR Current Journals</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.1.3 Using Endnote and NVivo for this systematic literature review

After deciding on the materials (sources) that will proceed to the full literature analysis, I grouped the data on Endnote with all available PDFs linked to the references. In the second stage, I exported the whole group to the NVivo (Figure 2-4) where I set the elements of the extract sheet as codes (Figure 2-5). This technique allows me to work on each study individually first and then to look at each node (or group of nodes) across all the analysed studies.
Figure 2-4: Grouping the review materials using NVivo

Figure 2-5 Coding using the extract sheet

2.3 Reporting the review: Four types of peacebuilding leadership studies
The literature dealing systematically with the connections between leadership and peacebuilding is limited. I will return to the literature review questions later but first I noted some general themes from the review. I found four types of peace related studies concerning leadership. The first focuses on leaders as individuals in post-conflict peacebuilding contexts. The second focuses on the collective and processual approach to peacebuilding leadership. Third, the literature explores the structural aspects of leadership in post-conflict contexts, in terms of both comprehensive societal transformational approaches to peacebuilding, and the organisations that lead this transformation locally and internationally. Finally, there are the studies that cover leadership development for peacebuilding. A detailed account of each of these four types of studies follows in the next section.

2.3.1 The individual approach to peacebuilding leadership: leader-centric studies

The literature around individual peacebuilding leaders discusses the impact of the leaders on the context of conflict and post-conflict, their personal attributes, the physical cues of peace leaders, and the roles and responsibilities of these leaders. This section of the review analyses the scholarly work concerned with these four sub-aspects of individual leadership.

i) Impact of individual peace leaders on the context
The first theme that emerged from this literature review is the impact of the leaders on the duration and termination of intra-state wars and planting the seeds of peacebuilding (Croco, 2011; Prorok, 2016; Ryckman and Maves Braithwaite, 2017; Thyne, 2012; Tiernay, 2013; Uzonyi and Wells, 2015). When it comes to the impact of the leaders on the duration and termination of civil wars, few studies were found. All the included studies with this focus use empirical data to support their arguments. However, they build on different political theories and quantitative models and sometimes they reach contradicting conclusions. Detailing these theories and techniques is not the aim of this review. What matters for this review is their take on the impact of leaders on the duration and termination of civil conflicts. These studies come from a political science paradigm; thus, they use the term leaders to refer to state leaders (military and politicians) and rebel/opposition leaders (military and politicians). They are categorised around 3 notions; the impact of leaders’ incentives on war duration and outcomes, the impact of leaders’ tenure on war duration and outcomes, and the impact of changes in leadership on war duration and outcomes. In what follows, I discuss each of these three

**Leaders’ incentives:**

The first notion that attracts the attention of peace studies to leadership is the impact of the leaders’ incentives on their decisions and strategies regarding wars and how that might affect the duration and the outcome of the conflict. Croco (2011, p. 457) argues that leaders who start a conflict are “culpable” for the decision to involve their state in it. Therefore, they have
a strong incentive to “continue fighting in the face of hardship because their citizens will want to punish them if they fail to succeed in a war, they played a role in starting”. She based her research on the quantitative design of a data set of all leaders who participated in interstate wars between 1815 and 2000. Prorok (2016) builds on the concept of culpable leader as defined by Croco (2011, p. 457) “any leader who was in charge of the state when the war began or who was directly connected to the decision to involve the state in the conflict” but extended it to explore the incentives of rebel and state leaders on civil war outcomes. Based on an empirical study of data on rebel and state leaders in all civil conflict dyads (1980–2011), she similarly argues that leaders who commenced a war (on all sides) will be inclined to fight for extreme outcomes. They will most likely avoid giving political concessions due to a fear of punishment that could jeopardise their political survival and/or physical safety. This incentive to avoid punishment impacts their strategic decision-making during war and results into prolonging it.

**Leaders’ tenure:**

Thyne (2012) argues that the stability of the leaders, as measured by leader tenure, could shorten civil wars by decreasing uncertainty surrounding the credibility of commitment to peace agreements. According to this study, the longer the leader’s tenure, the more predictable their thinking and actions are for the rebel groups. Therefore, there will be higher
opportunity to reach an agreement that ends the war. Thyne empirically examines the duration of civil conflicts from 1946 to 2004 to conclude that civil conflicts are expected to be shorter in presidential governments and when leaders enjoy strong institutional powers. Uzonyi and Wells (2015) work with the same premises, where they empirically study conflict durations in relation to leaders’ tenures. They contradict Thyne’s (2012) conclusion and they argue that long-serving leaders may find it more difficult to end civil wars because of issues of trust between the fighting parties. They argue that these leaders could end the war, only if they have strong constraining domestic institutions that can guarantee the commitment to settlement terms.

**Changes in leadership:**

Considering the impact of leadership change on peace processes in civil wars, Tiernay (2013) empirically tests the effects of changes in rebel leaders. He concludes that killing or capturing rebel leaders tends to shorten civil wars. Obviously, ending the war does not mean always building sustainable peace (Hardt, 2013; Jarstad and Olsson, 2012; Lederach, 1997; Spence and McLeod, 2002). Ryckman and Maves Braithwaite (2017) also empirically examine the impact of leadership change on peace processes in civil wars but they focus on state leadership. They argue that leadership changes could lead to positive movement in the peace process for civil wars only if this is insider change.

“When a new leader comes from within the existing ruling coalition, the rebels already have some information about the new leader’s likely behaviour and the likelihood of upholding an agreement, his approach to the conflict, and his relationship with other government actors. Conversely, outsider leaders bring many unknowns to the table, and can act as shadow veto players that make it more difficult to reach a settlement.” (Ryckman and Maves Braithwaite, 2017, p. 19)
They conclude that insider changes raise the probability of both negotiations and settlements, while outsider changes may have no real impact on any of them.

ii) Peace leaders’ personal attributes

The second theme that emerged from this literature review is the work that focuses on peace leaders’ personal attributes (Lieberfeld, 2003, 2009, 2011, 2015; Reychler and Stellamans, 2005). Researching the relevant reconciliation-oriented leadership characteristics and traits, Lieberfeld (2003, 2009, 2011, 2015) analyses the personal attributes of four prominent peacebuilding leaders in four different articles; Nelson Mandela, both Abraham Lincoln and Nelson Mandela, the Chilean president Michelle Bachelet and Xanana Gusma˜o, who led East Timor’s 24-year struggle against Indonesian military occupation and became the country’s president. The focus of these four studies was to explore the influence of national leader’s personal characteristics on the national reconciliation policies. Lieberfeld (2011, p. 310) coins the term reconciliation-oriented leadership which is defined as “national political leaders, typically heads of state, whose policies prioritised repairing social and institutional relationships in the wake of violent conflicts”.

Lieberfeld hypothesises that due to personality characteristics and personal experience, some leaders are particularly oriented toward national reconciliation. To examine his hypothesis, he follows the same methodology in the four articles where he gathers biographic data
relevant to the studied leaders’ attitudes toward reconciliation from published materials, including scholarly accounts in addition to journalistic interviews (both broadcast and published) (Lieberfeld, 2003, 2009, 2011, 2015). From these biographical explorations, he argues for several characteristic and traits that are relevant to reconciliation-oriented political leaders on the ‘self-identity’ level and ‘interpersonal orientation’ level. These characteristics include a combination of a high degree of self-confidence, a high degree of emotional self-control, optimistic self-beliefs, empathy, feelings of self-efficacy, cognitive complexity, tendencies toward reconciliation, and optimism about the potential for change.

Similarly, Reychler and Stellamans (2005, p. 9) in their effort to distinguish “peacebuilding leadership from non-peacebuilding leadership”, focus on four aspects of peacebuilding leaders: their peace values and definitions, their analytic style, their change behaviour, and their motivation and personality. To achieve this, these authors followed a three steps research methodology; they, first, conducted a biographical search for people who were acknowledged as having contributed to peacebuilding processes and people who were recognised as warlords. After analysing these secondary data, a number of hypotheses were developed about the leaders’ values, analytic styles, their change behaviour and personality and motivation. Thirdly, field research was conducted in Kosovo to assess the hypotheses and to get suggestions about some aspects of peace leadership. They offer a list of 16 clusters of values, practices, traits and characteristics, that peacebuilding leaders, according to them, often have in their repertoire. These, they note, are not inclusive, but rather that different peacebuilding leaders would have a different combination and variation of these traits, skills, and practices. These include: having a futuristic and inclusive perspective of peace; getting
a full understanding of the challenge, including strengths and weaknesses; being adaptive and integrative; framing conflict in a reflexive way; being flexible themselves; selecting and working with the right people; empowering other people and supporting them, having strong relational, mediation, and wisdom skills, having an effective understanding of and use of time; acquiring non-violent methods without condemning “those who fight the just fight” (Reychler and Stellamans, 2005, p. 13); upholding a mix of international and consequential ethics; having a strong sense of purpose; finally, when it comes to the peacebuilding leaders personality, they demonstrate courage, hardiness, humility, a sense of humour, and personal integrity.

iii) Peace leaders’ physical cues

The third theme arising from my review of leader-centric literature is the leaders’ physical attributions and their impact on their emergence as leaders. (Spisak, Dekker, Krüger, and Van Vugt 2012) and Re, DeBruine, Jones, and Perrett (2013). Spisak et al. (2012) tested the impact of facial cues on leadership emergence. They followed an evolutionary social-psychological approach to study potential masculine-feminine categorisation biases during leadership emergence. The researchers use the term peacemaker to describe leaders who are more likely to be chosen in the context of reconciliation–oriented intergroup relations. They considered facial masculinity and femininity as cognitive leadership prototypes. To test their hypothesis about biosocial implicit leadership, they conducted two experiments with
unaltered and morphed facial images. In the first experiment, they used the actual faces to investigate the leader/non-leaders hypothesis to see if there is a perception of leadership Prototypicality in general. In the second experiment, they manipulated both cues of masculinity-femininity and facial sex cues (male-female) to isolate the signals most significant in predicting the outcome of mock presidential elections.

Spisak et al. (2012) suggest that, regardless of assigned sex, the more feminine a face is, the more likely it is to be perceived as a peace leader. They admit to the limitations of their research as they recognise that preferences for masculine-looking or feminine-looking leaders shifted based on the intergroup contexts, without any mention of the personality impressions of these leaders based on the facial cues. They note that these findings are consistent with social identity theory of leadership in which the leaders’ prototypes can be influenced by the intergroup relations. Interestingly, this is the only study found that deals with the concepts of leadership Prototypicality and leadership in intergroup relations.

Re et al. (2013) followed a similar research design to study the association between body size and other signs of physical strength with leadership hierarchies. They argue that signs of masculinity are not the only potential predictors of leadership hierarchies in different social contexts (wartime vs peace). There is an impact of the perceived height from the face shape. To test this hypothesis, they first assess whether the association between facial cues and perceived height and masculinity have different impacts on leadership judgments in simulated wartime and peacetime contexts. Then they test how facial cues associated with
perceived height and masculinity impact dominance perceptions. Results showed that cues associated with perceived height and masculinity (i.e. perceived dominance) are valued more in a wartime context (vs. peacetime) for potential leaders.

iv) Roles and responsibilities of peace leaders

The fourth theme to emerge from the literature is the one that examines the responsibilities and the roles that peace leaders hold as they work toward peace in their organisations, communities, and societies. In his review of the Biographical Dictionary of Modern Peace Leaders and The Biographical Dictionary of Internationalists, Boyer (1986), saw peace leaders as those who were involved in a peace movement and pacifism generally, but have to deal with difficult political decisions in different phases of their work to achieve their pacific goals. For Boyer (1986), the way the leaders chose to deal with these political challenges revealed the kind of leaders they were. Peace leaders, accordingly, are those who took the difficult decision of keeping their pacific struggle when political violence was the other factions’ choice.

Gormley-Heenan (2005, 2006) focuses on the multiplicity of roles that a leader is likely to undertake during a peace process. Studying the Northern Ireland peace process in the 1990s and the phenomenon of political leadership therein, Gormley-Heenan (2006) conducted
interviews with political elites from the parties involved in the multi-party talks process. She argues that the multiple contradictions and inconsistencies of leadership styles showed by each leader over the course of the peace talks were due to the multiplicity of the roles they had to play, rather than being able to focus on any one primary role. This fusion of leadership styles allowed the political leaders to shift and adapt to changing political conditions during the peace process “without losing face”

Sarsar (2005, 2008) identify particular roles played by peacebuilding leaders. He theoretically identifies three categories of peace leaders; top-down peace-makers, bottom-up peace-builders and peace actualisers. Peace-makers, for him, are those leaders who have the power to end conflicts, while peacebuilders are those who attempt to build long-term peace. Peace actualising leaders “embody not only the vision and strategy for peace but also have direct or indirect positional leadership anchoring and transformational leadership qualities to make a real difference. They tend to embrace a shared concept of history, moderate action, and collaborative work with the other to achieve positive peace” (Sarsar, 2008, p. 30).

The role of the international leaders to support the transformation of warlords to peace leaders is also covered in the literature by Peake et al. (2004). They conducted their research in three countries; Afghanistan, Kosovo, and Sierra Leone where they conducted a total of 30 interviews. Using a thematic approach to analysing their data, Peake et al. (2004) maintain that a shared feature among the studied cases was that local leaders who were prominent figures in the peace processes in these countries had played a central part in
prolonging their country’s conflict beforehand. The study found that the ostensible shift in leadership stance from war to something resembling peace was mainly pragmatic. It was not something intrinsic to the political leaders themselves, but it was due to international political and military strength. According to Peake et al. (2004), international pressure could support the local political leaders in seeking peace, when they otherwise may not be motivated or prepared to do so. Finally, the study highlights the lack of administrative capacity of these local leaders; “While many were well versed in the politics of conflict, they were much less conversant in the rules of the everyday practicalities of basic administration.” (Peake et al., 2004, p. 59).

Next, I am going to explore a second account of leadership as approached in peace studies literature.

2.3.2 The collective and processual approach to peacebuilding leadership

The second approach to peacebuilding leadership in the academic research looks at leadership in the wider context of political and social change. It explores peacebuilding leadership as a complex phenomenon, requiring multiple capabilities, with often contested interests and competing actors involved. Upon reviewing the peace leadership literature, five key sub-themes were identified. The first theme involved approaching peacebuilding in post-conflict contexts as an adaptive challenge or a wicked problem that necessitates adaptive
leadership. Secondly, some academic work attempts to connect post-conflict peacebuilding to notions of morality and resistance. The role of business leadership in contributing to peacebuilding is the third theme. Fourthly, women’s leadership for post-conflict peacebuilding is a strong theme in the literature. Finally, religious leadership contributions to post-conflict peacebuilding is mentioned briefly, as a theological approach to the field. It is important to note that the emerging peace leadership literature discussed above is coming largely from conceptually based scholarly work. Similarly, to the individualistic approach to post-conflict peacebuilding, this invites more empirical examination of these different conceptual frameworks. Next, I review these 5 sub-themes in more detail.

i) Adaptive leadership

Reychler and Stellamans (2005), researching peacebuilding leadership, produce the concept of the critical mass of leadership in which the influence of peace building leadership is bigger than the influence of the spoilers of the peace building process. They argue that to sustain the peace building process a critical mass of peace building leadership is necessary at all the relevant levels; international and internal. Additionally, they maintain that peacebuilding is an adaptive challenge; therefore, it requires adaptive leadership (Heifetz, 1994). The theory of adaptive leadership (Heifetz, 1994; Heifetz and Linsky, 2002) suggests that conflicts and differences can sometimes be framed and mobilised positively - as a catalyst for change and source of energy for more proactive engagement rather than a poisoning behaviour that requires containment or elimination. The theory as used by Reychler and Stellamans (2005) assumes that surfacing and opening up differences and bringing some of the tensions to light
is essential to peacebuilding work with complex adaptive challenges. Reychler and Stellamans (2005) use the work (Heifetz, Grashow, and Linsky, 2009). They argue for shifting the perspective on the problems from being conflictual and hindering (and which require an outside expert to fix) to being seen as collective challenges (which require the people with the problem to work together on resolving the issues that affect them). Leadership, in this sense, often involves surfacing intrinsic differences and “raising the temperature” (Heifetz and Linsky, 2002, p. 109) of the social situation, so that participants’ thinking and behaviour can be adapted.

For Reychler and Stellamans (2005, p. 38), leadership for peacebuilding involves changing behaviours through adaptive work. “Dealing with conflicts requires more than following standard operational procedures. There is no ‘trouble shooting manual’ that will guide leaders through a conflict. When conflict problems and conflicts arise, a peace building leader will have to guide his [sic] people to a change process” (Reychler and Stellamans, 2005, p. 38). They emphasise the importance of two processes of adaptive leadership in relation to peacebuilding. The first one is regulating the distress, as leaders need to sustain a level of discomfort in the groups involved in the adaptive change, and their disciplined attention to the peacebuilding processes, but to prevent too much distress in case of disengagement or any stray towards unconstructive side paths. Secondly, peacebuilding leaders should return the responsibility for the problems to the people involved and that are
best able to handle them; otherwise, they will not be able to overcome people’s resistance to an externally driven change. Reychler and Stellamans (2005) gave an example from Mandela’s autobiography: “I challenged them… I did not patronise them: If you want to continue living in poverty without clothes and food, then go and drink in the shebeens. But if you want better things, you must work hard. We cannot do it all for you; you must do it yourselves.” (Nelson, 1995, p. 605).

Similarly, O'Doherty and Kennedy (2013) draw on the links between peacebuilding and adaptive leadership. They base their study on a detailed case study of the peacekeeping mission in Nepal where they combine implementation of the theory of adaptive leadership with group therapy techniques. They conclude that there are fundamental similarities between psychodynamic group psychotherapy and adaptive leadership models. Gaining the required knowledge about the intersection between these two models would help specialists to support peacebuilding in different contexts. This can be especially valuable when working with leaders from fighting groups because group therapy techniques could help dealing more effectively with certain aspects of adaptive leadership such as managing trauma, distress and resistance/loss.

Another study that explicitly attempts to link the literature of peace studies to the literature from the leadership field is Kuttner (2011). In his paper, he argues that many parallels can be located between leadership theory and themes promoted in emerging fields of the
alternative dispute resolution (ADR) literature. Accordingly, he attempts to explore how leadership theory and practices can add to the conflict specialist’s set of skills. In this article, he suggests that the ADR field must consider preparing conflict specialists to incorporate leadership qualities into their work and serve as leaders, even when their leadership roles are not formal or official. He stresses that the notion of leadership must be seen “not as something embedded in an individual but rather as a process in which people create better conditions together for their situation” (p.122). The conflict-specialist-as-leader actively challenges people to pursue adaptive change. They should seek the opportunities to endorse leadership where people do not have official authority roles. Leadership emphases described in this article should not be perceived as “brought from home” (p. 123) by the conflict specialist, but rather as challenges and emphases that can be taught and cultivated. This article attempted to encourage scholars of the peace studies field to constructively engage with empirical and theoretical aspects of leadership such as transformational and authentic leadership. Yet, it is a conceptual invitation that would require empirical support.

ii) Moral leadership, and resistance

---

3 New type of conflict transformation.
The second theme that appears in peace leadership literature is the moral element of leadership. Lederach (2005) coins the concept of moral imagination which

“… rises with the capacity to imagine ourselves in a relationship, the willingness to embrace complexity without reliance on dualistic polarity, the belief in the creative act, and acceptance of the inherent risk required to break violence and to venture on unknown paths that build constructive change” (Lederach, 2005, p. 29).

Moral imagination, for him, is the exact opposite of fatalism and cynicism contempt. In this book, Lederach (2005) does not explicitly engage with methodological explanations for his research approach. However, he indicates that this book is intended for fellow practitioners in conflict transformation, mediation and peacebuilding. He builds his arguments on several accounts he had encountered through his 25 years’ experience in post-conflict peace interventions globally.

In the same stream of exploring morality in leadership for peacebuilding, Ledbetter (2012) uses a dialectical approach to conceptualise power and resistance, as mutually constitutive elements of leadership. She sets the scene for perceiving resistance as a form of leadership valuable for peacebuilding. Building on critical leadership literature such as (Alvesson and Spicer, 2012; Zoller and Fairhurst, 2007), she argues for viewing leadership as a kind of moral resistance to social dominance. Ledbetter (2012) utilises the concept of moral imagination introduced by Lederach (2005) as the second pillar of her proposition. She aims to address the question of ‘leadership for what?’. She presents an example study of the Occupy Wall Street movement and points out businesses such as Patagonia and Timberland, which embedded moral practices in their business processes. She concludes that “Expanding peace in the world will depend on enlarging our cooperative capacity through moral
consciousness, [which is] centrally necessary for moral progress to occur at the individual, organisational and societal levels” (Ledbetter, 2012, p. 20).

**iii) Business leadership for peacebuilding**

Thirdly, the exploration of peacebuilding leadership through a link with business is a theme that can be found in the peacebuilding leadership scholarship. In her work, Spreitzer (2007) investigate how the leadership practices of business organisations may nurture more peaceful societies. She comes to the field of leadership and peacebuilding from a corporate social responsibility perspective, suggesting that businesses that embrace participative leadership and employee empowerment may contribute directly to peaceful societies. She uses secondary databases to explore this matter.

In a nutshell, Spreitzer (2007) argues that when business organisations are participatory and empowering, they give a space for their employees to express themselves in open systems of governance, in addition to the skills to institute change or settle conflicts without violence. These very same skills can be used by the employees for civic and political matters to better settle disputes without violence. The author admits to the limitations of this study, such as the failure to measure the mechanisms that explain the impact of organisational leadership and empowerment practices on the civic and political peacebuilding. Ledbetter (2016) builds on the work of Spreitzer (2007) to support this participatory framework for what business leaders can do to promote peace.
Similarly, Katsos and Fort (2016) attempted to explore the link between peace promotion and ethical business leadership. They interview the Business for Peace honourees for the year 2015. The Business for Peace Foundation gives its annual award to business leaders who are nominated by Nobel Prise winners in Peace and Economics for promoting peace within their organisations and communities. These business leaders, according to the foundation manifesto, advocated for ethical business practices, build trust in their communities and lead by example; therefore, they represent the ‘ethical leadership’ qualities of peace promotion (Katsos and Fort, 2016, p. 463). The authors presented detailed accounts of the interviewees and the interviews. They argue these leaders contributed to peacebuilding by either including aspects of peacebuilding and peacebuilding explicitly in their business strategy or by supporting peace entrepreneurs or both.

iv) Women in peace leadership

Fourthly, the gender dimension of leading for peace is explored by several scholars. Although, many of the papers that covered this topic are normative, I am adding it to this systematic review because of the importance of this theme in sustaining peace according to the United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) No. 1325 on 31 of October 2000 on “Women, Peace, and Security”.

Adler (1998) argues for the strong potentials of female leadership to move toward peace for all. Peace for Adler (1998) is indivisible; it is either for all or for no one. Women’s leadership according to Adler (1998) focuses often on unifying strategies which cater for the notion of
inclusivity of peace. Hunt, Amiri, and Edmunds (2000) advanced this argument based on reflections on the experience of the 102 founding delegates of Women Waging Peace; a global network formed in December 1999 by women involved in peacebuilding efforts in ten conflict areas. Many of the delegates were reluctant and uncomfortable to be labelled as leaders because of the individualism associated with the concept of leadership that most of the researched women were culturally unaccustomed to (Hunt et al., 2000, p. 65). However, the authors came up with three lessons in leadership that could be learnt from these women’s experiences.

First, in conflict and post conflict contexts, women are not mere victims. They were often able to play key roles in leading to peace despite severe circumstances, overwhelming challenges and often enormous difficulties. Second, the women in the delegation did not see themselves as service providers for a passive audience. They insisted on the importance of engaging with people and of mobilising them to resolve their own problem. Women can create spaces for people to choose to engage. Hunt et al. (2000) denote that this notion of leadership is very consistent with adaptive leadership (Heifetz, 1994). Third, the assumed weakness of being a woman in a conflict context can be a strength. The traditional connection between capacities for peace and gender roles in the community can be used deliberately by women as central to their leadership in a conflict context. It is for women to “own” these stereotypes “and are in the position to use them strategically to further their own objectives.” (p.72)
Kidane (2014) argues that women, similarly to men, play different roles at times of war and peace, but they have unique experiences of war that need special recognition, for example, the raping of women as a tool of repression for the other fighting group. Therefore, addressing the interests of women in the peacebuilding process is crucial to have sustainable and just peace. The author claims that women’s leadership in post-conflict reconstruction is significant because of “their unique capacity to serve as a bridge to mobilise divided groups for peace” (Kidane, 2014, p. 99). Nevertheless, the stereotypical view of women as only victims could lead to excluding women from active participation in the social change needed for post-conflict peacebuilding. Thus, she argues for the importance of ensuring that gender-sensitive programs in conflict-affected areas are adopted by the government, the UN and the international community. Similarly, Stephenson (2010) argues for the linkage between feminism and pacifism. She conducted a historical inventory of women leaders who won the Nobel Peace Prize starting from the 19th century. The author tracked the connection between concerns for women's rights and for other elements of peace and social justice since the early times of women struggle.

Šiljak (2014) studied female peacebuilding leaders and their relationship with their religions in the context of Bosnia and Herzegovina. She interviewed three religious female leaders that consider their religious beliefs as core to their actions for peace. Analysing the data, she claims that regardless of how much of these females leaders’ religiosity is reflected in their peacebuilding, their femininities are inseparable parts of their leadership styles. Šiljak (2014) asserts that the interviewed women leaders seem to adopt essentialist notions of gender in
their understanding of female leadership. For them, women are ‘naturally’ more sympathetic
than men, women’s brains are ‘naturally’ multitasking, and women are ‘naturally’ more
future-oriented than men. Šiljak (2014, p. 11) concludes that “For these women, female
leadership in post-war BiH, but also in the world at large, offers a viable alternative to the
patriarchies of the past, which have led us mostly into war and destruction”. The focus on
the supposedly unique qualities of women that put them in a better place for leading for
peace is also addressed by other scholars such as Hunt et al. (2000); Cheeseman, Onditi, and
D’Alessandro (2017); Cook-Huffman and Snyder (2018).

The fear of the marginalisation and side-lining of women in the post conflict peacebuilding
processes is a legitimate inquiry that requires serious attention. However, the literature that
addressed this matter was predominantly conceptual and normative building on the notion
that women are naturally peaceful, collaborative and better in reconciliation. The efforts to
fight against the perception of women as merely victims are highly appreciated; nevertheless,
the arguments of the uniqueness of the women’s abilities to bridging division without much
supportive empirical evidence seems to be an extension of the stereotypical views of women
that the scholars attempted to fight against.

v) Religious dimensions of peacebuilding leadership

Exploring the religious dimensions of leadership in relation to post-conflict peacebuilding is
another theme in the literature, for example; Gopin (2002), Haynes (2009), Lee (2015) and
Rukuni, Zadzisai, Maxwell, and Kwaedza (2015). This literature approaches the topic of post-conflict peacebuilding leadership in two ways; first, from a theological perspective of the leadership for peacebuilding; second, the roles of religious leaders in in different context. Although this approach can be very influential, the literature tends to be very abstract, idealistic and didactic, with little description or discussion of actual practice. Thus, no detailed review is going to be presented here of this literature, or this approach.

2.3.3 The structural and organisational aspects of leadership in post-conflict peacebuilding.

The third category that emerged from the systematic literature review of peace, peacebuilding and leadership is the structural and organisational aspects of this leadership. Herein, three main sub-themes can be found; first, the leadership in the population affected by a conflict; second, leadership in grassroots peacebuilding organisations; third, leadership in international organisations involved in peacebuilding. In the following section, these three themes are covered in detail.

i) Leadership in the population affected by a conflict

The first theme in leadership structures in peacebuilding analyses the various levels of leadership in the divided society as a whole. Lederach (1997) suggests that thinking of leadership in a population affected by a conflict as a pyramid is helpful (Figure 2-6). He admits that
“An analytical perspective, such as the one proposed here, will always rely to some degree on broad generalisations that provide a set of lenses for focusing on a particular concern... In this instance, we are using lenses to capture the overview of how an entire affected population in a setting of internal armed conflict is represented by leaders and other actors, as well as the roles they play in dealing with the situation.” (Lederach 1997, pp. 37-38)

According to this layout that is often cited in the leadership for peacebuilding literature, Lederach’s (1997) framework categorises leadership into three major levels; top level leadership, middle range leadership and grassroots leadership. This framework is a key component of this research as it shown in chapter 4; therefore, a detailed review of each of these levels is introduced below.

Level I: Top-level leadership:

Lederach describes the top level as the key political and military leaders in the conflict from both government and opposition(s), or they represent themselves as such. A number of common features can be identified with this level of leadership; first, they are immensely visible with the attention paid to their actions and the media coverage that they enjoy. This high ‘visibility’ in the context of the conflict, and directly after, is highly important as an indicator for the legitimacy of these leaders, especially when in most cases there are no other sources of legitimacy (ibid). The second feature that portrays these leaders is that due to this high public profile, they are “locked to their positions taken with regard to the perspectives and issues of the conflict” (p. 40) i.e. they are mostly less flexible to challenge their almost
static viewpoints about solutions to resolve the conflict. Finally, these leaders are perceived, mainly by the international community, as enjoying almost absolute power and influence on their followers.

**Level II: Middle range leadership:**

The middle range leadership is presented as the persons that occupy leadership positions within the institutions that are not necessarily linked to or controlled by any major faction of the conflict; government, opposition groups or as such. Those might be formal leaders in sectors like education, health or business, leaders and prominent people in networks, groups and organisations that formally or informally link to religious groups, academic institutions or humanitarian organisations or people from within the identity groups of the conflict who are well known across these groups like poets, writers or Nobel Laureates. The key actors within middle range level can come from various sectors, but in my research I chose to focus on civil society leadership.

Civil society in this thesis is conceptualised as a public space between the family, the state, and the market, in which people can debate and tackle actions. So that involve any voluntary collective activity in which people come together to achieve change on a particular issue (Van Rooy, 2013). Although civil society might have strong political dimension, it does not include political parties. By this definition, civil society includes international bodies like the Red Cross or the UN and all their affiliated organisations; religious-based pressure-groups; human rights campaigns; social movements; charities; and non-governmental organisations improving health, education and living-standards in both the developed and developing nations. The primary focus of this thesis is all of these actors that have direct (and explicate) involvement in the post-conflict peacebuilding in their community both locally, regionally or nationally.
Civil society leadership in peacebuilding context tends to have a number of characteristics (Lederach, 1997); first, they are known to both top-level leaders and the broader public of grassroots which means that they are connected to both levels. Second, as their positions are not based on political and/or military power nor they are actively seeking this sort of power in most cases they are less visible with little or even no publicity. Accordingly, they sometimes are able to enjoy more flexibility of movement and actions. Third, through their professional or other types of network, civil society leaders tend to sustain relations that cut across the factions of the conflict. Hence, they are connected both vertically and horizontally across the pyramid

**Level III: Grassroots leadership:**

This level, Lederach (1997) argues, represents the masses of the society who live mostly in survival mode under the pressure of the conflict or its aftermath. Leaders here are the people who are active at the local community level; members of NGOs involved in relief project, health officials and refugee camps leaders for example. In many cases, these local communities constitute the front lines of the conflict which may make these grassroots leaders experience a first-hand deep-rooted hatred on daily basis.
Figure 2-6 Lederach’s pyramid- levels of peacebuilding (Lederach 1997, p.39)

Two general observations from this structural perception of leadership in post-conflict contexts are useful for my later research. The first is that Lederach argues that the nature of intra-state conflicts has changed massively over the last few decades as “the line of group identity in contemporary conflicts are more often drawn vertically than horizontally within the pyramid” Lederach (1997, p. 43). The vast majority of recent armed conflicts are formed eventually around ethnicity, religion or regional geography rather than class. This means that the division is cutting down across the three levels of the pyramid and not in between them. Accordingly, leaders at each level are likely to be connected up and down to their ‘own people’ and making enemies with their counterparts in the same level. The other observation is the inverse relationship proposed between the power and influence on divisions that each level of leadership enjoys and the impact of the conflict in their daily life. The top level has
the most power and influence, but the least suffering. The grassroots level is exposed to the most suffering but has the least power and influence on the peacebuilding process. This asymmetric power-impact constitutes a key dilemma in designing and implementing peacebuilding initiatives.

This framework is a useful tool to think of and approach leadership structures in conflict and divided societies. Yet, one could argue that it is too simplistic for the extreme complexity that mostly characterises mass conflicts. I am approaching this structural insight of leadership levels in conflict/peacebuilding context as a critical framework. A framework, according to Hartley and Benington (2011b, p. 9) is “not a theory. It does not seek to explain the causes of phenomena (as theory aims to do) but rather offers a structure for categorising and interpreting aspects of the phenomena”. It was important to clarify this point to say that I am not overlooking the drawbacks that could be identified in this framework such as the static nature of it which ignore the dynamic movement of leaders from the lower level to upper level with time.

ii) Leadership in local peacebuilding organisations

The second type of studies that were found in the peacebuilding literature are the ones concerned with leadership in peacebuilding organisations. At the time when the external
funding for peacebuilding process in Northern Ireland was drawing to an end in 2013, Ahmed, Byrne, Karari, and Skarlato (2013) argued for the need to explore and to understand the hopes and fears of civil society actors that had benefited from this fund. These actors are the nongovernmental voluntary community group leaders that assumed a leading role in implementing grassroots-level peacebuilding efforts following the peace accord in Northern Ireland. Accordingly, they attempt to map these civil society leaders’ first-hand experiences and their insights to assess the impact of the funding in the overall peace process in Northern Ireland. They interviewed 120 civil society leaders and funding agency development officers in Northern Ireland. The researchers eventually came to detailed conclusions about several different concerns related to dissident violence, youth indifference, and emerging forms of grassroots peacebuilding among others.

In general, this study is informative about the context of peacebuilding in Northern Ireland. However, it could be argued that this research lacks a clear theoretical framework; it is not clear what theories they are building their discussion on. The findings were more descriptive than analytical and there was no discussion to link the literature review with the empirical findings. Furthermore, the article assumed the aim of investigating the hopes and fears of the local leaders; nevertheless, it ended up in a totally different area with six key findings that seem to focus on several key issues apart from leadership for peacebuilding. This critique goes beyond this paper to the majority of papers reviewed as, once again, they have written with different research focus and traditions. However, it is still relevant to this research as an example of how leadership aspects have been approached in the field of peacebuilding and how the context of conflict was included in the study.
iii) Leadership in international organisations

Another type of leadership studies for peacebuilding is concerned with leaders/leadership in the international organisations that are normally authorised to deal with conflicts across the globe, mainly the United Nations and its affiliations. Fröhlich (2014) explores leadership in the United Nations (UN) and international organisations, with a primary focus on the role of special representatives of the UN Secretary-General (SRSGs). SRSGs are individuals “appointed for temporary positions with significant responsibilities, often related to peacebuilding efforts in conflict zones” (p.167). In this paper he summaries the history of the SRSG position, discussing well-known individual representatives like Wlodzimierz Moderow, Ralph Bunche, Pier Spinelli, and Lakhdar Brahimi. Reflecting on the nature of their diplomatic representation Fröhlich (2014), present three “dimensions of leadership” (p.183) that SRSGs are claimed to provide; first, leadership in administration which is team leadership as the SRSG has the freedom to assemble his/her team and formulate the roles, goals and objectives. Second, leadership in conflict which is the leadership practices performed by an SRSG in the effort to promote peace in a (post)conflict environment (which is mainly his/her innovative way to actively engage all the main stakeholders in a peacemaking or peacebuilding effort). Thirdly, leadership in ideas which is primarily about dissemination of the norms and the values of the UN Charter, which for Fröhlich (2014) is a key dimension of leadership in the area of peacebuilding.
Gerstbauer (2010) focuses on international relief and development NGOs that have decisively assumed the language of peacebuilding as part of their mission. In this study, the stories of three NGOs that adopted peacebuilding mandates are told with a focus on the internal factors that determined how and why they went down that road. In all three cases, the author argues that what it was labelled as “agency characteristics” (leadership, mission, and values) were influential in moving toward peacebuilding (p. 857). More specifically, the leadership helped push along and shape a process of adopting peacebuilding. Again, this is fairly informative research with strong assertions on the importance of the leader(ship) in determining the organisations’ position toward peacebuilding in a more prescriptive fashion. However, there was no use of any leadership literature. This study explicitly stresses the importance of the role leaders plays in crystalising the visions that peacebuilding organisations will follow for building peace. Hence, it adds to my initial argument about why it is essential to research and work on leadership development for peacebuilding.

2.3.4 Leadership development for peacebuilding

This fourth section aims to scope the literature about leadership development for post-conflict peacebuilding. Ricke-Kiely (2016) invited leadership development for peacebuilding to go beyond the person or position-centric models to include strategies and topics that are particular to the peacebuilding field, such as resilience, trauma healing, and other psycho-social strategies that are important for leaders in war-torn societies. Nevertheless, the literature relevant to leadership development for peacebuilding seems not to have yet explored these potential key topics.
One of the themes that emerge from the literature is youth leadership development for peacebuilding. Youth are chief stakeholders in making a better future and with youth anchoring the majority of the populations in many conflicted societies, there is a pressing need to develop young leaders (Ricke-Kiely, 2016). An example of research that explicitly claims to test the impact of youth peacebuilding and leadership programmes was the articles written by Ungerleider (2006, 2012). The author is the founder and director of the School of International Training Graduate Institute that provides Youth Peacebuilding and Leadership Programmes for teens coming from conflicted communities around the world. To find out more about the long-term impact of these programmes on when these students return home from the United States, he conducted research aiming to “determine what qualities, characteristics, and capabilities remain active in these young people after the end of these peacebuilding camps” (Ungerleider, 2006, p. 138). These youth programmes were focusing on global issues, social action, and peacebuilding between young people from communities in conflict around the world, particularly Cyprus, Northern Ireland, and Israel. The design of the programme involves a “combination of skills training, dialogue sessions, outdoors teambuilding activities, social and recreational activities, and the learning that goes on from living together in a common and positive social milieu” (Ungerleider, 2006, p. 140). These activities are normally facilitated by adult representatives from the same communities in conflict which the students come from.
In order to determine and measure the development of the three examined criteria of connectedness, coping, and collaboration in graduates of the youth peacebuilding camps, a quantitative based method was administrated among 41 former participants from Cyprus at a reunion of camp graduates for both Greece and Turkish Cypriots. Accordingly, these capacities were measured in terms of “1) deeper connection to peers from the opposite community in Cyprus, either Greek or Turkish Cypriot, 2) increased capacity for coping, when the political situation became or remained difficult in Cyprus, and 3) collaboration in follow-up activities and projects with peers from the other community” (Ungerleider, 2006, p. 138).

Ungerleider (2006) concludes his study by claiming a significant positive transformation in the graduates regarding the studied criteria which is rooted and stabilised during the first year of the camp experience. Reflecting on this claimed impact(s), some limitations can be identified. This study is entirely self-reported, and the researcher is the founder, designer and director of the programmes. Additionally, there is the absence of any theoretical framework that supports deeper analytical apprehension of the stated results. Zooming down on more detailed remarks on this study, Ungerleider (2006) considers qualities, characteristics, and capabilities as three different “questions”; however, he does not define any of them or justify the sense of this difference. In addition, he did not explain why he chose the criteria of connectedness, coping, and collaboration and how he came to a view of these capacities as the ones that ultimately will lead to successful peacebuilding.
A few years later, Ungerleider published another study about the Youth Peacebuilding and Leadership Programmes. Ungerleider (2012) did not set an explicit aim(s) to his study; nevertheless, it seems like a self-reflection account on structured dialogue; a method used in the Youth Peacebuilding and Leadership Programmes. According to Ungerleider (2012), two formats were used for developing the skills of dialogue among the participants; one for peacebuilding and another for intercultural leadership. The peacebuilding dialogue aims to understand contradictory perspectives and work toward reconciliation between communities with a history of violence. While the intercultural leadership dialogue “moves from (1) interpersonal and intercultural sharing; (2) to analysing issues; (3) to sharing personal challenges; (4) to envisioning leadership for social change; (5) to follow-on project planning” (Ungerleider, 2012, p. 386). The data in this article were taken from evaluations of the dialogue process which were filled out by 100 out of 500 students who had participated in the summer programmes that took place in 2009-2010. The reflections of these participants reveal how dialogue - effectively facilitated, as well as appropriately structured and sequenced - develops fresh perspectives and new capacities for leadership and peacebuilding.

As part of the evaluation, participants were asked to write a few sentences in response to narrative questions about: (1) their learning experience; (2) the importance of the dialogue part for them; and (3–5) their latest reflections about what they still remember from it and
how it does relate to their current life. Ungerleider (2012) argues that the participants’ responses indicate a development of trust among the participants, a better understanding of each other’s cross cultures and a new understanding of themselves and their leadership capacities. The article is mostly descriptive. It seems that the author has used a set of secondary data that has been collected for the purpose of evaluation. This may be the reason for not including enough original data. Similar concerns about the self-reporting aspect apply to this article eventually. Nevertheless, the conclusion refers vaguely to the concepts of differentiation and integration which will be mentioned later to explore the notion of leading for peace in chapter 6.

The field of peacebuilding in relation to leadership and leadership development is definitely attracting more scholarly attention, with a couple of recent attempts to review the literature that brings together leadership and peace (Amaladas and Byrne, 2018; McIntyre Miller, 2016; Ricke-Kiely, 2016). Furthermore, the great majority of the materials included (80%) were published after 2010 (33 out of 41). Nevertheless, the work on these notions has been chiefly conceptual, and did not seem to offer sufficient theorisation and empirical evidence for this research inquiry.

4 It might worth to mention here that this phase of literature review was completed in 2015 and presented in the probation report for this thesis. Then it was updated in December 2017 where these very recent reviews were looked up.
2.4 Chapter 2 Summary

This systematic literature review has been conducted to address three main inquiries about leadership for peacebuilding: The conceptualisations of leadership in peace studies; leadership structures in peacebuilding contexts; and theoretical and empirical approaches to leadership development for peacebuilding. The importance of leader(ship) in influencing the pace and directions of peacebuilding processes has been emphasised throughout the literature of peacebuilding, though without much empirical evidence. Additionally, the need for leadership development was acknowledged as a priority for peacebuilding endeavours. Figure 2-7 demonstrates my synthesis of the various findings of this systematic literature review.
The findings show that the field of leadership for peacebuilding is still under-theorised, underdeveloped and under-researched. There has relatively little literature that investigates this matter theoretically and also particularly empirically. A closer look to this literature shows that the primary academic focus is the individual approach to peacebuilding leadership (leader-centric studies). This focus revealed somewhat more and relatively better-quality studies. The empirical evidence used in these studies built on databases of international conflicts or experimental research design.

Nevertheless, the aim of this PhD study is to explore the different aspects of leadership for peacebuilding as processes and practices. Therefore, the collective and processual approaches in the literature were also reviewed. Although some studies have used several
well-grounded theories and concepts of leadership such as adaptive leadership, morality and resistance and gender elements, there are substantial limitations in the implementation of these concepts, as detailed in the previous sections. The key limitation is the lack of empirical evidence supporting the use of these theories and concepts in explaining leadership for peacebuilding. Thus, in the next chapter, I will focus on the literature that link leadership to conflict.

When it came to the structural aspects of leading for peacebuilding, Lederach (1997) is particularly useful for this PhD research because it provides a framework which is helpful in defining civil society leadership in the context of post conflict situations (explained in section 2.3.3). Finally, leadership development for peacebuilding had the least amount of scholarly attention in the literature review I undertook. Both the quantity and the quality of the studies reviewed were not as rigorous as it was hoped for. This fact reinforces the need for this PhD research to bridge this gap. This PhD research aims to contribute to this field through exploring the leadership experiences of leaders from different post-conflict contexts and analysing leadership development over their leadership journeys.

In the coming chapter, I will shed light on the leadership and the leadership development literature that deal with conflict
Chapter 3 Conflict, Leadership and Leadership Development

The conducted systematic literature review was very insightful in terms of getting a solid knowledge of the current state of peace studies field, and to identify the gap of knowledge regarding different aspects of leadership. The findings from the systematic review, presented earlier, proved limited to the aim of my research. This PhD research approaches leadership as an interactive social phenomenon that looks specifically to the process and practices of individuals and groups in situations of conflicts. The available literature in peace studies domain that explores the processual and practical aspects of leading for peace is noticeably thin in quantity and quality. Therefore, I had to conduct a second literature review hunting for theories from organisational studies domain that employed to investigate leadership and leadership development that deal with conflicts - more accurately, that deals with reconciling conflicts. The aim of this second review is to develop a theoretical framework that can link leadership and leadership development to mass scale conflicts.

Accordingly, I will first review the literature that investigates group conflicts to understand the context of my research. For this, I am focusing on two main theories; realistic conflict theory (RCT) and social identity theory (SIT). Then, I will explore the theorisation of leadership that focuses on leading through conflicts. For this, I will start with a brief review of the different conceptualisations of leadership. Then, I will explore the social identity
theory of leadership, and the leadership with political astuteness framework, because they
directly link to what is involved in leading within the context of conflicts. Finally, I am going
to interrogate relevant leadership development literature that can shed light on leaders’
development over their leadership journeys in such demanding contexts

3.1 Understanding the context of conflict

This research focuses on leadership and leadership development in the specific context of
post-conflict peacebuilding. Given how important understanding context is in leadership
teory and practice generally (Haslam, Reicher, and Platow, 2010), and for this research
especially, there is a need to examine the context of conflict and peace, and to understand
some of the origins and dynamics of conflict. Understanding the context is crucial for this
research for several reasons. First, the importance of studying the contextual factors of
leadership to better understand leadership has been raised by several scholars (Hartley and
much of the confusion in the leadership measurement literature may be caused by the dearth
of understanding and focus on contextual factors. Similarly, Jepson (2009, p. 38) argues that
“An important consequence of this lack of attention [to leadership context in research] has
been that the context of leadership has been inadequately conceptualised and empirically
explored”.

Second, much of the academic research on leadership and leadership development is built
on assumptions that largely derive from western settings and norms, such as the emphasis
on individualism, democratic values, and rationalism (Dill, Zrinščak, and Coury, 2012; Wang, Waldman, and Zhang, 2012). Nonetheless, the consideration of what are the accepted and normative assumptions of leadership is likely to vary cross-culturally (Dill et al., 2012; House et al., 2002; House et al., 1997). Therefore, the contextual factors of leading for peace will get close attention in this thesis. Hence, I will review two theories that attempt to explain intergroup conflict; realistic conflict theory and social identity theory.

3.1.1 Peace and conflict as intergroup relations

Post conflict contexts, war-torn states and divided societies are all terms used to identify a context in which societal groups have escalated their conflict violently to reach a major destruction that affects the lives of individuals dramatically. The dynamics of the conflict are strongly contextual and very complex with nested causalities; political, socio-economic, ideological and religious (Lederach, 1997). Yet, to gain a better understanding of these underpinning dynamics of conflicts on such mass scales, I am going to draw on a few lines of research inquiries that thrived in the post Second World War era; and they aimed specifically to figure out some explanations for the mass engagement and even commitment to intensive intergroup violence of that period.

Writing in the aftermath of the Holocaust Hannah Arendt proclaims that: “the problem of evil will be the fundamental question of post-war intellectual life in Europe” (cited in Kohen,
1994, p. 134). This was especially relevant for the discipline of social psychology and to social psychologists, many of whom were personally connected to the atrocities of that era. Amongst them was Tajfel who was active in the early post-war years in reuniting the children of the concentration camps with their families after losing his own family to the holocaust (Hogg, 2015). One question that concerned social psychology at that point was how people could approve and/or commit such violence to others. Researchers wondered how far this was due to group membership (Hogg, 2015). This question, 70 plus years on, still shapes my research inquiry in post- conflict/ civil war contexts. In this section, I am going to review theories and models that attempt to explain the processes of intergroup conflicts.

3.1.2 Realistic conflict Theory

Sherif’s ‘boys camp studies’ which spanned the years 1949 – 1954, showed how it was possible to induce hostility by putting pre-teenagers in groups and then manipulating intergroup relations (Sherif, 1966; Sherif and Sherif, 1969). A group for Sherif (1958, p. 350) is:

“a social unit which (1) consists of a number of individuals who, at a given time, stand in more or less definite interdependent status and role relationships with one another and (2) which explicitly or implicitly possesses a set of values or norms regulating the behavior of individual members, at least in matters of consequence to the group. Thus, shared attitudes, sentiments, aspirations, and goals are related to and implicit in the common values or norms of the group”.

This work is considered as a landmark in the field methodologically and conceptually (Hartley, 1996). Sherif (1966) argued that members of competitive groups will feel and behave negatively towards each other; especially, where the one’s gain is the other’s loss.
More graphically, Sherif (1966) showed how intergroup competition could transform the best adjusted of boys into what looked like “wicked, disturbed and vicious bunches of youngsters” (p. 58).

Some of the leading insights of Sherif and associates’ theory of realistic conflict were; first, locating the conflict in the relationships within the groups, instead of the pre-existing relations between the individuals, because they pre-screened the boys, and also made groups from boys who were not pre-existing friends. Secondly, the theory focuses primarily on intergroup competition over scarce resources within a zero-sum context where the win by one group results in loss by the other. Hence, both intergroup resentment and intra-group unity were motivated by this specific condition. Finally, the nature of the pursued goals seems to change the intergroup dynamics; superordinate goals that required interdependence among the competitive groups seemed to motivate more collaboration and fewer conflicts compared to mutually incompatible goals (Sherif, 1958).

The notion of superordinate goals is particularly valuable here because this research is mainly concerned with peacebuilding i.e. reconciling conflicts. Sherif (1958, pp. 349-350) defines superordinate goals as “goals which are compelling and highly appealing to members of two or more groups in conflict, but which cannot be attained by the resources and energies of the groups separately. In effect, they are goals attained only when groups pull together”. Based on his experiments, Sherif (1958) states that superordinate goals can effectively
reduce intergroup conflicts over time, while merely bringing the conflicted groups in contact with each other without introducing a superordinate goal is inefficient and even harmful. Sherif (1958, p. 356) stresses the role of the superordinate goals in helping the groups’ leaders justifying changing their behaviours towards the other groups:

“When groups co-operate in the attainment of superordinate goals, leaders are in a position to take bolder steps toward bringing about understanding and harmonious relations. When groups are directed toward incompatible goals, genuine moves by a leader to reduce intergroup tension may be seen by the membership as out of step and ill advised. The leader may be subjected to severe criticism and even loss of faith and status in his own group. When compelling superordinate goals are introduced, the leader can make moves to further co-operative efforts, and his decisions receive support from other group members. In short, various measures suggested for the reduction of intergroup conflict-disseminating information, increasing social contact, conferences of leaders-acquire new significance and effectiveness when they become part and parcel of interaction processes between groups oriented toward superordinate goals which have real and compelling value for all groups concerned”.

With appreciation for this pioneering work, questions could be raised about these arguments in relation to groups’ leaders: Who are they in the group? Why are these individuals considered the groups’ leaders? What kind of leadership do they practice and why? All these questions and others had to wait for a few more decades to be addressed with the social identity theory of leadership which I will come to next.

3.1.3 Social identity theory

A second attempt to explain intergroup conflict, and therefore the context of this research, was introduced by Tajfel, Turner and their associates with the idea of social identity and self-categorisation theory (Hogg and McGarty, 1990; Turner, 1985)
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; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, and Wetherell, 1987) that theorise how people define themselves in intergroup contexts and how they define their place in society according to a structured system of social categorisations (Billig and Tajfel, 1973; Tajfel, 1970, 1974; Tajfel, Billig, Bundy, and Flament, 1971; Turner, Brown, and Tajfel, 1979). Social categorisation is understood by Tajfel and Turner (1979) as “cognitive tools that segment, classify and order the social environment” p.40. While social groups aim to “provide the members with an identification of themselves in social terms. This identification is to a very large extent relational and comparative: they define the individual as similar to or different from, as “better” or “worse” than, member of other groups” (Tajfel and Turner, 1979, p.40)

Tajfel and Turner (1979) built on realistic conflict theory (Sherif, 1967). They accepted the argument that economic gains and scarce resources including power and prestige are very important conditions to explain intergroup, ethnocentrism, antagonism and conflicts. Moreover, they adopted Sherif’s (1967, p.62) definition of intergroup behavior as “any behavior displayed by one or more actors toward one or more others that are based on the actors’ identification of themselves and the others as belonging to different social categories”. A ‘group’ as conceptualised by Tajfel and Turner (1979, p. 39) is:

“a collective of individuals who perceived themselves to be members of the same social category, share some emotional involvement in this common definition of themselves, and achieve some degree of social consensus about the evaluation of their group and their membership of it”.
From their experiments, Tajfel and Turner (1979, 39) coined the concept of “minimal groups”, a methodology employed in their experiments to explore the minimal conditions required to generate discrimination between groups, in other words creating minimal criteria for ‘groupness’. The findings indicated that these artificial, trivial and ad hoc intergroup categorisations lead to “ingroup favoritism and discrimination against out-group” (p.35). Tajfel and Turner (1979) concluded that one way to understand why the allocation to groups based on identity without any interaction should affect the individuals’ behaviour, is by assuming that people define their selves in terms of group membership. The critical point here is to break with the traditional assumption that the self can only be understood as the individual in relation to other individuals and to acknowledge that we also define ourselves through the groups to which we belong (Tajfel, 1978).

In sum, Tajfel and Turner (1979) distinguish between two sorts of intergroup competitions, social and realistic competition. Social competition happens when a group member has a self-evaluation in comparison with people from other groups and acts on it. For example, in the minimal groups experiments mentioned before, the mere awareness of an out-group triggered ingroup favoritism. In comparison, realistic competition is based on self-interest over a perceived goal and represents a potential conflict. The consequences of realistic competition can lead to hostility towards the out-group from the other group. Although social and realistic competition can be conceptually different, they are often empirically associated in “real life” (Tajfel and Turner 1979 p.42). Social Identity theory introduces several further notions that seems very relevant to understand the context of this research inquiry, so I am going to review these next.
3.1.3.1 The social behaviour continuum and the social belief system framework

Tajfel and Turner (1979) distinguished between two sets of social behaviors; interpersonal and intergroup. What they call the “interpersonal-intergroup continuum” (p.35) refers to a range of social behaviors where at one extreme the interaction between two or more individuals is completely determined by their individual characteristics and interpersonal relationship with no effect at all of any social groups or categories they are members of; an example would be the interaction between spouses or old friends. Whereas at the other extreme i.e. intergroup social behavior, the interaction between two or more individuals (or groups) depends entirely on their respective membership in different social groups or categories with no effect from the individual’s characteristics or their inter-personal relationship, leading to a total depersonalisation of them; two armies in a battle zone is an example of a social behavior near to this end of the continuum. Depersonalisation affects how people feel about one another. They would perceive each other based on Prototypicality (called social attraction) rather than personal relationships or idiosyncratic preferences (called personal attraction) (Abrams and Hogg, 2010; Hogg, 2001a, 2003; Hogg and Hains, 1996; Hogg and Hardie, 1992; Hogg, Hardie, and Reynolds, 1995; Hogg and Terry, 2000; Turner et al., 1979). Depersonalisation does not necessarily have the negative connotations of de-individuation or dehumanisation (Hogg and Terry, 2000). Yet, they admit that any of
these extreme behaviors are unlikely to be found in “pure” forms in lived social situations (p.34).

Associated with the “interpersonal-intergroup continuum”, they discuss the “social mobility-social change continuum” (p.35). The social mobility-social change continuum is mainly concerned with “the individual’s belief systems about the nature of the structure of the relations between social groups in their society” (p.35). Social mobility denotes the belief system of a society that generally assumes that social grouping in the society is flexible; hence, it is possible for individuals to move between social groups that suit their preferences and capabilities. At the other extreme, the belief system of “social change” is fixed, marked with stratification and far from flexible when it comes to the nature and structure of the relations between social groups in the society. Thus, changing the membership of the individuals between different social groups including the unsatisfactory, underprivileged, or stigmatised groups is difficult and almost impossible.

Accordingly, “the major characteristic of social behavior related to this belief system [social change] is that in the relevant intergroup situations, individuals will not interact as individuals, on the basis of their individual characteristics or interpersonal relationships, but as member of their groups standing in certain defined relationships to members of the group” (Tajfel and Turner 1974, p. 35 italic is from the source). Tajfel and Turner (1974, p. 35) assert that there is a close relationship between an explicit intergroup conflict of interest and the “social change” belief system. Tajfel and Turner (1974, p. 35) observe that the nature of social behavior is not static, and it changes depending on the social belief system “Many social intergroup situations that contain, for whatever reasons, strong elements of
stratification perceived as such will move social behavior away from the pole of interpersonal patterns toward the pole of intergroup patterns. This is as true of groups that are “superior” in the social system as of those that are “inferior” in it”. The association between the social behaviour continuum and social belief system in relation to the potential intensity of the intergroup conflict and the uniformity of ingroup behaviour towards the out-group is demonstrated in figure Figure 3-1.

Figure 3-1 The social behaviour continuum and the social belief system framework adapted from Tajfel and Turner (1979)

3.1.3.2 Social status

Social status is another important notion for Tajfel and Turner (1979). For them social status is not a scarce resource like wealth; it is an “outcome” of intergroup comparison (p.43) where
“the lower is a group’s subjective status position in relation to relevant comparison groups, the less is the contribution it can make to positive social identity” (p.42). For this low status position and negative identity, Tajfel and Turner (1979) presented a number of reactions:

- **Individual mobility**: When the belief system and social structure is near what has been described earlier as “social mobility”, an individual will attempt to leave or disassociate from the lower status group to achieve upward social mobility. This individualistic approach is designed to achieve a personal, not a group solution at least in the short term. Hence, individual mobility implies a “dis-identification” with the former ingroup p.43. This strategy can eventually reduce social conflict over scarce resources; however, it negatively impacts on ingroup solidarity and does not provide a solution for negative social identity on the group level.

- **Social creativity**: This reaction does not involve any change in group social position or access to objective resources in relation to out-group; however, it is an individualistic effort that can focus on: (a) Comparing the ingroup to the out-group based on a new dimension that enhance the ingroup distinctiveness compared to the out group. (b) Changing the value assigned to the feature of the group to make it positive instead of negative; the classic example is ‘black is beautiful’. (c) Changing the out-group that the ingroup is compared with, particularly avoiding the use of a superior out-group as a frame of reference. This may explain the intensity of the social competition between subordinate groups such as lower class or ‘poor white’ racism, compared to the competition between subordinate groups and dominant groups.
Social competition: This reaction seems to intensify in societies that foster a strong social change belief system (discussed above). Here, the group members could seek positive self-identification via direct competition with the out-group aiming to reverse the relative positions of the ingroup and the out-group on relevant dimensions. Strong social stratification can inhibit intergroup competition especially between the high-status group and the low status group. Nonetheless, under some conditions, intergroup conflict can be produced despite social stratification when the dominant group begins to be perceived as a relevant comparison group.

The threat of changing groups’ social status brings us to (Tajfel, 1974) distinction between secure and insecure intergroup competitions. In societies with high stratification, social identity insecurity can affect both high status groups and low status groups providing that the competition over scarce resources implies that one group’s win is the other group’s loss. (Tajfel and Turner 1979, p.45) summarise:

“In brief, then, it is true that clear-cut status differences may lead to a quiescent social system in which neither the ‘inferior’ nor the ‘superior’ group will show much ethnocentrism. But this ‘ideal type’ situation must be considered in relation to the perceived stability and legitimacy of the system. Perceived illegitimacy and/or instability provide new dimensions of comparability that are directly relevant to the attitudes and behaviours of the social groups involved, whatever their position in the system”

Social status is a potentially useful notion to explain some aspects of the context in post conflict peacebuilding. The suggested reactions to the social status might shed some light on leadership practices for peacebuilding. A detailed discussion of these concepts will follow in chapter 8.
3.1.3.3 The process of intergroup differentiation

The final aspect of social identity theory that I wish to present in this review that is relevant to the context of post-conflict peacebuilding and to leading in it, is the process of intergroup differentiation. The act of ingroup favoritism and out-group discrimination is underpinned by a socio-psychological process called “intergroup differentiation” (Tajfel and Turner 1979, p.40). The aim of differentiation of the ingroup is to maintain or achieve a sense of superiority over the out-group on some dimensions. The hypothesis behind this process is that individuals strive to positively evaluate their own groups via ingroup/out-group comparisons which eventually leads groups to attempt to differentiate themselves from each other (Tajfel et al., 1971; Turner, 1975, 1978; Turner et al., 1979). Nevertheless, the enactment of intergroup differentiation is dependent on at least three different variables that have a major influence on a concrete social situation (Tajfel and Turner 1974).

These variables are concerned with the particular ingroup, social situation and the out-group. First, individuals should have internalised their group membership as an aspect of their self-concept. This self-image as subjectively identified with the relevant ingroup in a specific social situation is essential for intergroup differentiation. To consensually define individuals as a group by others is not enough if they do not actively internalise this membership. Although, in the long run, this consensual definition by others can become a powerful tool for a group’s formation and self-definition. Second, the social situation should allow for intergroup comparisons because as Tajfel (1959) asserts not all between-group differences have the same degree of evaluative significance and they vary from group to group and from
one social context to another (e.g. skin color attributes in the United States, language attributes in Belgium and religion in the Middle East…). Finally, the out-group should be conceived as a comparable group in the relevant social situation.

Both realistic conflict theory (RCT) and social identity theory (SIT) were pioneering efforts to explore conflicts in small groups in a socio-psychological perspective. Their internal validity and the rigorous experiments associated with both theories were widely considered as major strength factors for them. Nevertheless, it is important to critically appraise these theories to understand their potential limitations. Hartley (1996) notes that in the experiments that lead to both theories, the groups were small, closed, temporary and the subjects were pre-teenage children or university students. It is likely, therefore, that the behaviour is less constrained in different contexts where group members could choose not to engage in the conflict by leaving the group, or as adults with different personal history, they may activate alternative strategies to deal with the conflict such as negotiation, coalition or problem-solving (Hartley, 1996).

Yet, both realistic conflict theory (RCT) and social identity theory (SIT) have a strong potential in exploring the post-conflict peacebuilding dynamics. As previously explained, reaching an agreement that ends the extensive violence does not automatically lead to building sustainable peace in the society. Therefore, understanding the dynamics of societal
grouping and the raising of conflicts can help finding practices to defuse these conflicts and reverse the processes that lead to violent conflicts. Additionally, understanding the nature of group dynamics in conflicts provides a basis for understanding the role of peace leaders in promoting or intervening in group dynamics as they become established.

3.2 Leadership, setting the frame

Having reviewed the literature on group conflicts above, in order to understand the reasons why conflicts arise and the dynamics that keep them going, in this next section, I now turn to explore leadership as potentially important to reduce the conflicts.

3.2.1 What is leadership?

Given the sheer volume of leadership research and publications available, the purpose of this section is not to attempt to review it all, but to understand and appreciate the leadership scholarship that relates to conflict, reconciliation and social division. Hence, in this section, I am briefly presenting an overview of the various theoretical streams of leadership with the conceptual roots that inform them and how they link to this research inquiry. Then I am going to introduce in detail social identity theory of leadership, the notion of political astuteness and how they may relate to this research.
Grint, Jones, and Holt (2016) distil the different conceptualisations of leadership into five major approaches;

- Leadership as a Person: Who ‘leaders’ are that makes them leaders?
- Leadership as Position: Where do ‘leaders’ operate that makes them leaders?
- Leadership as a Results: What do ‘Leaders’ achieve that makes them leaders?
- Leadership as Purpose: Why do ‘leaders’ lead that makes them leaders?
- Leadership as Process: How do ‘leaders’ get things done that makes them leaders?

The authors do not claim this taxonomy to universally encompass all that has been written about leadership; however, it should cover a significant proportion of leadership definitions.

A very recent approach to leadership that may add to this review is leadership-as-practice (Raelin, 2017). The question for this approach could be articulated as: What do ‘leaders’ do that makes them leaders? “The L-A-P movement also makes the case that doing leadership is distinct from talking about it.” (P.218).

Exploring these five definitions in more detail, Person-Based Leadership resonates with the traditional view of the leader in which ‘followers’ are attracted to the leader because of his/her personal characteristics, traits or behaviours. It is largely informed by a leader-centric approach (Yukl, 2012). ‘Who is the leader?’ is the question that this stream of thoughts has tried to investigate. “a huge effort has been made to reduce the ideal leader to his or her essence” (Grint et al., 2016, p. 5). These classifications (e.g., trait approaches, behavioural approaches, contingency/ situational approaches; see Yukl, 2012) have focused
largely on characteristics of the leader (e.g., traits, behaviours, styles, etc.) and how these characteristics help him/her to be either effective or ineffective in different situations.

Under this perspective several foundational theories may be categorised, from Stogdill (1948) and Mann (1959) with their pioneering reviews of leaders’ traits, to the influential work of (Burns, 1978) and Bass (1998) with the transactional theories and the transformational theories and their focus on the leader’s characteristics such as skill, style and behaviours. Another example of this conceptualisation could include the work informed by the “full-range leadership theory” (Antonakis and House, 2013; Avolio and Gibbons, 1988; Avolio, Walumbwa, and Weber, 2009) and related individual-focused concepts. Nonetheless, this perspective has invited some criticism for leaving the followers’ role out of the formula (Haslam and Platow, 2001; Haslam et al., 2010). Moreover, it appears to neutralises the impact of the context and the effects of larger social systems within which the leaders are embedded; for example (Bratton, Grint, and Nelson, 2005; Hall and Lord, 1995; Lord, Brown, Harvey, and Hall, 2001). In this PhD research, the interaction between the context of peacebuilding and leadership is a key inquiry. Hence, the leaders-centric approaches are not the best ones to help explore this.

*Position-Based Leadership* implies a formal, mostly hierarchal structure in which the leader is the one ‘on top’; the one with the most power and the most responsibility. The power and responsibility dichotomy affords the leader a certain degree of coercion of the follower to enact his or her will (Grint et al., 2016). Grint (2005) argues that what he calls leadership-in-front exposes a serious limitation of this traditional hierarchal formal structure approach.
He re-examines the positional dimensions of leadership from a vertical approach to a horizontal approach; arguing that in-front-leaders such as fashion designers, musicians and business entrepreneurs influence masses of followers with no formal authority or power.

When it comes to Results-Based Leadership, the focus seems to be on the leaders’ achievements rather than the traits they possess. This approach emphasises the connection between the leaders’ attributes and the results achieved by the organisation (Ulrich, Zenger, and Smallwood, 1999). This could raise a question about the methods by which the results have been pursued. The argument here is about the ethicality of the processes used and the allegedly non-coercive manners that encourage followers to obey. If the processes used to achieve the results do not comply with these two conditions i.e. being ethical and non-coercive, the foundations of the claim of enactment of leadership could be shaken (Brown and Treviño, 2006).

This ethical perspective of leadership brings us to the notion of ‘leadership as purpose’ (Kempster, Jackson, and Conroy, 2011). Purpose-Based Leadership seems to add a needed light for a better understanding of leadership. Kempster et al. (2011) put forward an argument to focus on purpose as the primary differentiators of leadership. Hence, results are less important than purpose on the scale of defining leadership. This approach gives a special prominence to the ethics of leadership. Even though, “ethics are as contested as leadership but this does not mean that ethics are irrelevant” (Grint et al., 2016, p. 9) this approach indicates that understanding leadership and leadership development for peacebuilding will
involve understanding the ethics and goals of the actors involved. For this PhD research, the primary purpose of the leadership endeavors studied is building peace and preventing societal violence in post conflicts context achieved strictly in non-violent fashion.

Finally, *Process-Based Leadership* is the approach that defines leadership as a “relational concept, not a positional or possessional one” (Grint et al., 2016, p. 10). In this approach, it is argued that given the complexities of our modern world, the traditional, hierarchical views of leadership are less satisfying, for example (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995; Lichtenstein, Uhl-Bien, Marion, Seers, Orton, and Schreiber, 2006). Leadership theory, therefore, should allow for other perspectives that can account for the complex adaptive needs of organisations. Leadership, as proposed in in this approach, can be seen as “a dynamic that transcends the capabilities of individuals alone; it is the product of interaction, tension, and exchange rules governing changes in perceptions and understanding” (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995, p. 2).

In sum, in this research, the concept of leadership integrates several dimensions of what was listed above. Leadership here is perceived as a relational process in which leaders in *senior positions* of the organisations and social movements work for a *specific purpose* of building peace in divided societies via an array of activities that are *non-violent*. Although the focus of this research is on leaders as individuals and their development journeys, leadership as the subject of this study is perused mainly through their actions and organisational behaviours and not heavily relying on their expression of idealised attitudes and traits.
Now I am turning to the two notions that have a particular connection to dealing with conflict, and therefore to this research; social identity of leadership and leadership with political astuteness. Hence, a detailed review is presented for these theories/frameworks. I will start with social identity theory of leadership, then political astuteness.

3.2.1.1 The social identity theory of leadership

To understand the significance of leadership in highly contested contexts such as the ones that this research is concerned with, I will, first, explore the notion of leadership as presented in the social identity theory of leadership (Hogg, 2001b; Van Knippenberg and Hogg, 2003). Hogg (2001b) builds on the previously developed perspectives of leadership that recognise it as a relational property and process within groups. He argues for the need of an analysis of leadership that explores how leadership could emerge through ordinary social cognitive and social interactive processes that are associated with a group. Hence, he comes up with the social identity theory of leadership which is viewed as “a group process generated by social categorisation and prototype-based depersonalisation processes associated with the social identity.” (Hogg, 2001b, p. 184). The social identity theory of leadership, hence, explains leadership as a social influence phenomenon. It is considered as an extension and an application of social identity theory; the self-categorisation theory in particular and the social identity analysis of social influence (Hogg, Van Knippenberg, and Rast, 2012a; Hogg, Van Knippenberg, and Rast, 2012a; Rast III and Hogg, 2017).
Hogg and his associates add to the social identity theory of differentiation, ingroup favouritism and out-group discrimination by attempting to understand “how some individuals or cliques have disproportionate power and influence to set agenda, define identity, and mobilise people to achieve collective goals” (Hogg, 2001b, p. 188). Focusing on the intragroup processes and structures, he elaborates that the differential capability of some individuals to stamp their mark on the practices, decisions, attitudes and actions of their social groups requires a closer look. Leadership, in this sense, is a structural and processual feature of ingroups.

In short, the social identity theory of leadership views leadership as an ingroup process that rises from the social categorisation and prototype-based depersonalisation processes related with social identity (Hogg, 2001b; Hogg and Van Knippenberg, 2003). The concept of depersonalisation was introduced earlier so this section focuses on the concept of Prototypicality. Within salient groups with which members identify very strongly, leadership processes can be determined by the notion of Prototypicality. Members, in salient groups, are highly sensitive to Prototypicality which is arguably the basis of self and others’ perception and evaluation (Hogg, 2001b; Hogg and Van Knippenberg, 2003). Additionally, there seems to be a clear perceived gradient of Prototypicality within the salient group, with some members perceived to be more proto-typical than others (Haslam, Oakes, McGarty, Turner, and Onorato, 1995; Hogg, 2016; Hogg and Hardie, 1992; Hogg et al., 1995; Hogg et al., 2012). Hence, within this sort of groups, members who are perceived to be more proto-typical are viewed as to best embody the group’s values and meanings, and therefore they enjoy a differential influence within the group (Hogg et al., 2012a; Hogg et al., 2012b).
Prototypicality in social identity theory of leadership, then, is a core feature of ingroup leadership, with the most proto-typical member seems, from empirical research, to influence the less proto-typical members and to embody the behaviours that the less proto-typical members conform to. Hogg (2001b, p. 191) concludes that “prototypical members are more likely to emerge as leaders, and more prototypical leaders will be perceived to be more effective leaders”. However, mere prototypicality does not denote active leadership. Prototypical members “act as the attitudinal and behavioural focus of the group due to self-categorisation based prototypical depersonalisation processes. It is a social attraction, an associated effect of depersonalisation, that facilitates active influence.” i.e. leadership (p.196). In sum, leaders, from the social identity theory perspective, are the group members perceived as most prototypical, and therefore they enjoy a disproportionate influence, through possession of consensual status or the exercise of power, or both, over the behaviours, attitudes, and destiny of other group members. The notion of prototypicality and the explained dynamics of ingroup influence will be important in my interpretation of data on the nature of leading for peace in chapter 8.

3.2.2 Leadership with political astuteness

This PhD research is concerned with the contexts of post-conflict peacebuilding. As previously argued, post-conflict is an agreed-on terminology to describe situations where mass-scale civil conflicts reach a sort of agreement that cuts down the violence noticeably,
but this does not mean that the root-causes that led to the violence in the first, place have been fully resolved. These particular contexts requires leaders (and scholars) to think about different social groups and what they are aiming to achieve (or avoid), and to accept that leadership occurs in arenas where the interpretations of the very same proceedings may be contested, disputed or even violently resisted. (Hartley and Benington, 2011b). Therefore, giving special attention to the leaders’ political astuteness skills in these contexts is particularly important.

Presuming preexisting common goals seems to be a key component of many attempts at defining leadership (Hartley, 2017) from the very early definitions of leadership by Stogdill (1950, p. 3) that talks about “goal setting and goals achievement” to more recent publications such as Northouse (2015, p. 7) where leadership includes “attention to common goals” [italic in the source]. The entities of leadership as articulated by Bennis (2007) are leaders, followers, and common goals. This assumed unitarist perspective (Coopey, 1995; Coopey and Hartley, 1991; Fox, 1966) of organisations and societies seems to obscure and ignore the conflicted values, views and interest within them. There are, of course, scholars in the generic leadership literature who highlight the plurality of interests and views in leadership understandings but they have tended to be a minority (Hartley, 2017). For example, (Drath, McCauley, Palus, Van Velsor, O'Connor, and McGuire, 2008) have contended that leadership studies have been founded on the wrong ontology of leadership, which has hindered the development of the field. They propose that, in many contexts, assuming a commonality of purpose is inappropriate. As an alternative, they argue for an understanding of leadership which takes place in a pluralist social setting in which common goals are the
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outcome of the leadership work in coalition-building, not a condition of it. Hence, a principle task for those who practice leadership in this sense is to influence the activities of organised groups to deal with disputes and conflict in a way that helps to keep the direction, the alignment and the commitment to a common purpose. Achieving this would require leaders to have solid political astuteness skills (Hartley, 2017; Hartley, Alford, Hughes, and Yates, 2013; Hartley and Fletcher, 2008b).

Reviewing the relevant literature, Hartley (2017) has noted that there are several terminologies that explore this sort of skills in political astuteness. She notes that related concepts are: Political antennae (‘t Hart, 2011; Benington, 2011), Political skills (Baddeley and James, 1987; Block, 2016; Ferris, Treadway, Kolodinsky, Hochwarter, Kacmar, Douglas, and Frink, 2005; Riccucci, 1995), Socio-political intelligence (Burke, 2006; Hogan and Judge, 2013), Political awareness (Day, 2000b; Druskat and Wheeler, 2003; Hartley and Fletcher, 2008), Political savvy (Bryson and Kelley, 1978; DeLuca, 1999; Ferris, Treadway, Perrewé, Brouer, Douglas, and Lux, 2007; Gilley, 2005) and political astuteness (Gandz and Murray, 1980; Hartley, 2017; Manzie and Hartley, 2013; Perrewé, Ferris, Frink, and Anthony, 2000). This, of course, does not imply that they express exactly the same aspects, but they all feed into exploring the political competencies of leaders in dealing with multiple actors, goals, and stakeholders.
This PhD research uses leadership with political astuteness framework as developed by and tested by Hartley and associates because it is the most developed and has strong empirical support. Additionally, it takes into account the leader, other stakeholders, and the bigger context which are the variables that this research is investigating. They conducted the original research in the UK across the public, private and voluntary sectors (Hartley and Fletcher, 2008; Hartley, Fletcher, Wilton, Woodman, and Ungemach, 2007) with a focus on political awareness. Later research reconceptualised capabilities in terms of astuteness, not awareness, as Hartley (2017) explains that this conceptual framework is behavioural as well as cognitive and affective. Exploring the potentials of this framework, they then conducted empirical research in Australia, New Zealand and the UK with mainly senior public leaders (Alford, Hartley, Yates, and Hughes, 2016; Hartley, 2017; Hartley et al., 2013; Hartley, Alford, Hughes, and Yates, 2015; Manzie and Hartley, 2013). They proposed a five-dimensional framework of political astuteness skills that go beyond the “narrower account of ‘political skills as self-interest’ extant in some of the literature” (Hartley, 2017, p. 202). The five dimensions framework of political astuteness is presented in Table 3-1 and is derived from Manzie and Hartley (2013).
Table 3-1 Hartley and associates Political Astuteness Framework

| Personal skills | Self-awareness of one's own motives and behaviours. Ability to exercise self-control being open to the views of others, ability to listen to others and reflect on and be curious about their views. Having a proactive disposition (initiating rather than passively waiting for things to happen). |
| Interpersonal Skills | 'Soft' skills: able to influence the thinking and behaviour of others. Getting buy-in from those over whom the person has no direct authority. Making people feel valued.  
'Tough' skills: ability to negotiate, able to stand up to pressures from other people, able to handle conflict in order to achieve constructive outcomes. Coaching and mentoring individuals to develop their own political skills. |
| Reading people and situations | Analysing or intuiting the dynamics which can or might occur when stakeholders and agendas come together. Recognition of different interests and agendas of both people and their organizations. Discerning the underlying not just the espoused agendas. Thinking through the likely standpoints of various interest groups in advance. Using knowledge of institutions, processes and social systems to understand what is or what might happen. Recognising when you may be seen as a threat to others. Understanding power relations. |
| Building alignment and alliances | A detailed appreciation of context, players and objectives of stakeholders in relation to the alignment goal. Recognising difference and plurality and forging them into collaborative action even where there are substantial differences in outlook or emphasis. Works with differences and conflicts of interest, not just finding consensus and commonality. Actively seeking out alliances and partnerships rather than relying on those already in existence. Ability to bring difficult issues into the open and deal with differences between stakeholders. Knowing when to exclude particular interests. Creating useful and realistic consensus not the common denominator. |
| Strategic direction and scanning | Strategic thinking and action in relation to organizational purpose. Thinking long-term and having a road map of the journey. Not diverted by short-term pressures.  
Scanning: thinking about longer-term issues in the environment which may potentially have an impact on the organization. Attention to what is over the horizon.  
Analytical capacity to think through scenarios of possible futures. Noticing small changes which may herald bigger shifts in society. Analysing and managing uncertainty. Keeping options open rather than reaching for a decision prematurely. |

Manzie and Hartley (2013)

The dynamics of leading within intergroup relations as identified in the social identity theory of leadership, and the five dimensions of leadership with political astuteness, will be
extensively used later in this PhD to interpret the data on the processes and actions of leading for peace in post conflict contexts.

3.3 Leadership development

This section aims to review the field of leadership development to make sense of the different streams that may contribute to this research. Mapping the advances in the field of leadership development is considerably challenging for a number of reasons. On one hand, it is growing fast in both quantity and quality as the number of publications in the field is burgeoning and the attraction to apply novel and innovative theoretical and empirical lenses are prospering (Day et al., 2014). On the other hand, several writers have commented that theory, models and frameworks about leadership development are fragmented in the academic literature (Avolio et al., 2009; Hartley, 2011; Luthans and Avolio, 2003). More so, there is a degree of confusion between the literature of leadership development and management development. Alimo-Metcalfe and Lawler (2001) referred to the complications of re-labelling management development as leadership development as it fits in the leadership fascination trend.

Day (2000a) recommends that we should distinguish between leadership development and management development. Although the literature between these two areas are parallel and do overlap, there are several key differences. Just as leadership and management are dissimilar (but interconnected) concepts, their relative development has unique emphases.
Table 3-2 below summarises the differences between these fields of study as they are presented in Day (2000a).

Table 3-2 The differences between Leadership development and Management development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Leadership development</th>
<th>Management development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of capacity</strong></td>
<td>A leadership development approach is oriented toward building capacity in anticipation of unforeseen challenges.</td>
<td>Includes managerial education and training with an emphasis on acquiring specific types of knowledge, skills, and abilities to enhance task performance in management roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of challenge</strong></td>
<td>Leadership development involves building the capacity for groups of people to learn their way out of problems that could not have been predicted, or that arise from the disintegration of traditional organisational structures and the associated loss of sensemaking.</td>
<td>The application of proven solutions to known problems, which gives it mainly a training orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of authority</strong></td>
<td>Refers to those that come both with and without formal authority.</td>
<td>Focuses on the performance in formal managerial roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of processes</strong></td>
<td>Leadership processes are those that enable groups of people to work together in meaningful ways.</td>
<td>Management processes are considered to be position and organisation specific.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from (Day, 2000a)

The challenge of building a substantial review of the relevant literature of leadership development emerges from the starting point of defining the concept; is it about the individuals, the processes or both? McCauley (1998, p. 4) defines leadership development
as “the expansion of a person’s capacity to be effective in leadership roles and processes”. Brungardt (1996, p. 83) defines leadership development as “every form of growth or stage of development in the life-cycle that promotes, encourages and assists the expansion of knowledge and expertise required to optimise one’s leadership potential and performance”. These conceptualisations of leadership development keep the focus on individuals as the primary units of development. The other approach for conceptualising leadership development can be found in (Day et al., 2014, p. 68) in which they consider leadership development as “a dynamic process involving multiple individuals spanning various levels of analyses, the content aspects of this process include a variety of interpersonal factors”.

The key emphasis in much leadership development literature is on building and using interpersonal competence. For Gardner (1993), interpersonal intelligence is addressed in terms of the ability to understand people, building trust, respect, and eventually, commitments. Day (2000b, p. 585) asserts that the main components of interpersonal competence include “social awareness (e.g., empathy, service orientation, and developing others) and social skills (e.g., collaboration and cooperation, building bonds, and conflict management). The emphasis is on the social nature of this competence, and the idea that effective development best occurs in an interpersonal (i.e., social) context”. Turnbull James (2011) emphasises that leadership development also needs to be deeply embedded and driven out of the context and the challenges that leaders in the organisation face collectively.
In the following section, I consider in detail some insights of leadership development as individualistic and processual and their implications for theory and practice in relation to this research.

3.3.1 Different approaches to leadership development

3.3.1.1 Competency Models

Some of the most common models in leadership development are based on what is known as ‘competencies frameworks’ (Hartley and Hinksman, 2003; Roe, 2014). This approach is broadly derived from McClelland (1973) work that defines what an individual needs, to “qualify” for outstanding performance in a specific organisational context (p. 1). Competency, by definition, is “an underlying characteristic of an individual that is causally related to effective or superior performance in job” Boyatzis (1982, p. 21). The idea here is to define the smaller activities that need to be mastered by an individual to complete larger and more complex tasks. These small activities are usually referred to as ‘units’ and ‘elements’ in most competences frameworks, for example (Boyatzis, 1982; Roe, 2014). In designing a competency framework for leadership development, the focus is primarily on the competencies as the behaviours, skills and other qualities needed to perform effectively in leadership roles (Hartley and Hinksman, 2003; Roe, 2014).
Competency models are not without their critics. Several scholars suggest that leadership needs to be more contextually and collectively examined (Bolden and Gosling, 2006; Turnbull James, 2011). The competency models approach attempt to standardise the personal characteristics or capabilities needed for an optimum competent performance; therefore, they lose the contextualisation of the leadership development (Bolden and Gosling, 2006, p. 150; Denyer and Turnbull James, 2016).

These competencies are not context free as Day (2000a) suggests. He asserts that “In building the leadership capacity necessary continually to reinvent themselves, organisations need to attend to both individual leader and collective leadership development. Furthermore, these approaches must be linked with each other and connected to a broader organisational strategy”(p. 583). This research engages with the context of post-conflict peacebuilding as a primary factor of understanding leaders development. Since the post conflict peacebuilding is a very specific and particularly fraught context for leadership practice, we may conclude that a competency approach is not the ideal approach to explore this research inquiry.

3.3.1.2 Leaders and leadership development

Day (2000a) describes two approaches to achieve development; leaders development and leadership development. Within the views of leadership as an individual possession, development of leadership in the organisation is assumed to occur mainly through building individual intrapersonal skills and abilities or what has been labelled as Leader development (Day et al., 2014). According to this approach, the primary target for the organisation is to enhance the human capital through training and developing individual
employees with formal leadership roles or positions (Lepak and Snell, 2002). For Day (2000a, p. 584) leader development is a consequence of “a function of purposeful investment in human capital”. In this context, human capital is understood as “individual capabilities, knowledge, skill, and experience of the company's employees and managers as they are relevant to the task at hand, as well as the capacity to add to this reservoir of knowledge, skills, and experience through individual learning” (Dess and Lumpkin, 2001, p. 25). The main focus of the development strategy, in this case, is to construct the intrapersonal competencies necessary to produce an ‘accurate model of oneself’ (Gardner, 1993, p. 9). This is expected to lead to a healthier engagement, attitude and identity development (Hall and Seibert, 1992). Ultimately, ‘leaders’ should be able to use this precise self-model to perform effectively in any organisational roles.

In leadership development, however, the key focus is on building and using interpersonal competences. For (Gardner, 1993) this requires interpersonal intelligence regarding the ability to build commitments, trust, and respect, which are according to (Day, 2000a) the main interpersonal competences that are targeted by leadership development endeavours. The interpersonal competences correspond roughly to the three different dimensions of social capital as proposed by (Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998) which are: structural, relational, and cognitive.
In making the distinction between the structural and the relational dimensions of social capital, (Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998, p. 244) use the concept of the structural dimension of social capital to denote:

“the overall pattern of connections between actors that is, who you reach and how you reach them. For them, among the most significant aspects of this dimension are the presence or absence of network ties between actors; network configuration; and appropriate organization—that is, the existence of networks created for one purpose that may be used for another”.

This structure is shaped as an outcome of the commitments among all parties in a given social network (Day, 2000a). In contrast, the term ‘relational embeddedness’ (p. 244) refers to the kind of personal relationships people have developed with each other through a history of interactions. This notion emphasises particular relations people have, such as respect and friendship, that influence their behaviour, and also the norms that characterise these relations; what people have come to expect of one another. The third dimension of social capital, which Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1998) label as the ‘cognitive dimension’ refers to those resources that provide shared representations, interpretations, and systems of collective meaning among people (i.e. network ties). Embodiments of the cognitive dimension to social capital can be distinguished in the organisational vision and culture grounded on a set of shared values that produces and is a product of mutual respect (Day, 2000a). These aspects of social capital (i.e., structural, relational, and cognitive) are interrelated and not independent elements (Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998).

In Figure 3-2, I illustrate the two approaches to leadership development as explained by Day (2000).
The perception of leadership development offered within this collective view concentrates on the interaction between an individual and the social and organisational environment, so it is a more complex approach than one focusing mainly on individual leader development. Nevertheless, we cannot overlook the importance of developing a comprehensive foundation of intrapersonal and interpersonal skills. Day (2000a, p. 586) suggests that “the most value resides in combining what is considered the traditional, individualistic approach to leader development with a more shared and relational approach”. This highlights the importance of developing both intrapersonal and interpersonal capabilities, and of linking leader development with leadership development. Day and Harrison (2007, p. 361) provide a summary of the evolution of the definitions and understanding of leadership in relation to
the level of the complexity and sophistication of the organisational context and the leadership development focus (Table 4).

Table 3-3 Summary of evolution of thinking around leadership

(Day and Harrison, 2007, p. 361)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of complexity and inclusiveness</th>
<th>Definition of leadership</th>
<th>Illustrative theories of leadership</th>
<th>Levels-of-analysis addressed</th>
<th>Leadership development focus</th>
<th>Parallel level of self-concept and identity knowledge principle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Most basic, least complex and inclusive conceptualization of leadership | Leadership is role-based authority | • Trait theory  
• Leader behaviors | • Individual level  
• Top-down influence of leader on followers | • Individual skills development | • Individual self-concept  
• Personal dominance |
| Mid-level conceptualization of leadership | Leadership is an influence process between individuals  
• Roles are also important in shaping influence processes | • Leader-member exchange (LMX) | • Reciprocal dyadic influence  
• Top-down influence of leader on follower as well as bottom-up effect of follower on leader | Includes both:  
• Individual skill development  
• Relationship building | Acknowledges both:  
• Individual self-concept  
• Relational self-concept  
Able to draw from:  
• Personal dominance  
• Interpersonal influence |
| Most advanced, complex, and inclusive conceptualization of leadership | Leadership is a shared property of a social system including interdependencies among individuals, teams, and organizations.  
• Can also involve roles and influence processes depending upon situation | • Shared leadership  
• Collective leadership  
• Connective leadership | Multi-level approach (includes individual, team, and organizational level).  
• Includes both contextual influences of organizational influences on team and leadership emergence within a team.  
• Also acknowledges dyadic and individual levels | Includes all:  
• Individual skill development  
• Relationship building  
• Empowerment  
• Collaboration  
• Working across boundaries | Acknowledges all:  
• Individual self-concept  
• Relational self-concept  
• Collective self-concept  
Able to draw from:  
• Personal dominance  
• Interpersonal influence  
• Relational Dialogue |

Leaders development in the contexts of post-conflict peacebuilding is a key focus of this PhD research. The processes and events that inform their learning and development are the questions that this research attempts to address. Therefore, I will move next to aspects of learning to lead from every day experience.
3.4 Leadership development through everyday experience

A sub-category of leaders development is the learning resulting from the active interaction with the everyday challenges at the workplace. Lehtinen, Hakkarainen, and Palonen (2014) distinguish between two ways of learning which are monotonic and non-monotonic learning and development. They noted that monotonic learning is the orthodox way to approach education. Vocational training and expertise development tended to assume a predefined societal context, working life or professional practice for which development interventions should prepare participants (Lehtinen et al., 2014; Ohlsson, 2011). With the term monotonic learning, Ohlsson (2011) denotes incremental cognitive development of knowledge, which is consistent with what is already known, similar to Day’s (2000) definition of management development. Monotonic learning was traditionally considered as deeply embedded in the existing structures and practices of work environments and established professions, or relatively well-known deliberate plans and arrangements to change or develop some of the practices in these environments. These traditional conceptions of training and development could deliver good results in preparing newcomers for professions where changes are slow and incremental, and the occupational requirements have remained reasonably unchanging (Lehtinen et al., 2014).

With the turbulent environment that the leaders face in post-conflict peacebuilding contexts where the aspects of the unknown surpass the knowns, monotonic learning is not sufficient.
The need to cope with radical changes continuously happening requires non-monotonic learning which is not constrained by the previously acquired experience (Lehtinen et al., 2014). The concept of non-monotonic learning speaks to Hatano and Inagaki (1984) notion of ‘adaptive expertise’ which is defined as a concept that integrates cognitive, motivational and personality related aspects which together produce an orientation able to deal with new challenges. It also has a resemblance to the approach called “deep learning” in which he asserts:

“In the course of shifting the basis for action from innate structures to acquired knowledge and skills, human beings evolved cognitive processes and mechanisms that enable them to suppress their experience and over-ride it’s imperative for action”.

Hence, radically changing circumstances and deeply changed work requirements cannot be fully addressed using monotonic learning - based on present knowledge, skills and practices - but entail non-monotonic learning; creating a radically novel knowledge base and practices (Ohlsson, 2011).

Leading for peace, with the complexity of the context involved, requires a strong ability to cope with swift changes and pro-active and continuous creation of novel and innovative learning and development that goes beyond the previously acquired experience and prior knowledge. The leaders might have elements of incremental learning from experience, which is within an established framework (monotonic learning). However, what this PhD research is more interested in is the discontinuous learning from (lived) experience, which is when the leaders have to move beyond their established ways of thinking and acting because of challenges they encounter. This requires a non-monotonic creation of new ways
of engaging with these challenging contexts. Dealing with chaos, complex socio-political systems and emerging processes that do not follow “clockwork science” (Ohlsson, 2011, p. 13), demands new processes of leader development. The direct engagement with the context can be one of the principle ways through which leaders develop the needed knowledge and create the suitable practices to deal with the demanding and ambiguous nature of leading for peace. This is what Kempster (2006, p. 4) constructed as leadership learning through lived experience. Lived experience, is used to stress a “processual and accumulative perspective to leadership learning, where underlying influences occur as part of the milieu of everyday life”. A key to this kind of learning involves being critical of and sometime breaking with established approaches (Kempster, 2006). Thus, leadership meanings, practices and identities are assumed to develop through this day-to-day active engagement with different events and influences of the post-conflict contexts. What these developmental events and experiences are and how leaders develop abilities to lead in the contexts of post-conflict peacebuilding are key concerns of this research.

The processes of leadership development from every-day experience are fundamentally contextual because they are shaped by the range of leadership representations and observations that individuals have exposure to (Kempster and Cope, 2010). Some of the theoretical framings of the sort of events and experiences that are particularly influential on the leaders development through learning from everyday work and life are: the lifespan approach of leadership development (Avolio and Gibbons, 1988), the life-stories approach
(Shamir and Eilam, 2005), life formative experiences (Janson, 2008), crucibles (Bennis and Thomas, 2002), leadership learning through lived experience (Kempster, 2006, 2009), and noticeable people (Kempster, 2006; Kempster, 2009; Kempster, 2012). These concepts and frameworks are reviewed in the coming section.

The first framework to explore is the life-stories approach of leadership development. Through the leaders’ compilation of their life story, they put together their life experiences as a coherent whole in which they make sense of their leadership approach and their leadership actions (Shamir and Eilam, 2005). The life-stories approach stresses that what counts in leaders development is the interpretation that leaders make and the meanings they assign to their experience; the facts of the events themselves are secondary to these. Hence, the critical issue is not merely the experience but what is learned from it (Grint, 2005). Shamir, Dayan-Horesh, and Adler (2005) assert that four key themes or proto-stories accounts are distilled concerning leadership development in leaders’ life stories: leadership development as a natural process, leadership development as a learning process, leadership development out of struggle and hardship, and leadership development as finding a cause.

The lifespan approach, on the other hand, involves a mixture of factors including parental encouragement (or discouragement) and the influence of family resources, individual factors as in what way different people learn to regulate their emotions, their engagement in developmental work later, how they make sense of their life events, the context of leadership including formal and informal leadership, personal development occasions and leadership
opportunities in various settings (Avolio and Gibbons, 1988). In this approach, the critical events or what Luthans and Avolio (2003) call ‘triggers’ could contain the potential for leadership development. In their attempts at analysing these trigger events, they argue that the factors promoting leadership growth in these event are mostly subjective ((Luthans and Avolio, 2003). These trigger events can be either positive or negative, and the contextual influences have an impact on them. In sum, the Lifespan approach emphasises the events that count as formative and the life-story approach focuses on the meaning given to these events as the major factor attributing to its formative impact.

Building on these two approaches, the life-stories approach and lifespan approach, Janson (2008) coined the concept of leadership formative experiences (LFEs). Janson (2008, p. 74) defines leadership formative experiences (LFEs) as “those experiences which make a high impact on leaders, resulting in learning relevant to their leadership experiences that have shaped an individual’s leadership development as he or she develops self-concept and awareness of context”. The guiding questions for this concept are how certain experiences, out of all experiences learnt in life, stick out as being formative for leadership development, how they are remembered by leaders, and how they are processed to extract the essential lessons for them to apply to the future. He argues that

“the impact of a formative experience on a leader depends more on the meaning the leader can make of it rather than on the experience itself and because this knowledge can further help leaders develop new leaders. This approach is also consistent with the logic of sense making processes suggested by (Weick, 1995).” (Janson, 2008, p. 76).
Life formative experiences might not be limited to the personal events. They can come from a wide range of societal influences including national events that affect a whole generation of leaders (Li, 2003; Tessler, Konold, and Reif, 2004). It is important to emphasise that what matters in leadership formative experiences is the meaning leaders make of experiences. Thus, different leaders could take away different meanings from the same experience, resulting in divergent effects on leadership capabilities.

This notion of a collective event that affects a whole generation of leaders on the national levels speaks to Bennis and Thomas’s (2002) concept of ‘Era’. In their model (Figure 3-3), Bennis and Thomas (2002) established the notion of “Era” to define the context on the macro level. Era, they state, is an aspect of leadership development that deserves more attention “not because it defines individuals, but because it presents them with a shared history and culture and a specific arena in which to act” (Bennis and Thomas, 2002, p. 10). Eras differ from generation to generation and from one place to another. An era is characterised by the defining historical events and their implications. It, in some extreme cases, creates a nationwide crucible, such as the Second World War, that seems to underlie the leadership experiences of many older leaders described in Bennis and Thomas (2002) study. This notion of Era is essential for the current PhD research because it frames the collective experience of post-conflict leaders in many respects. One example is the shared experience of the complete social segregation effects in many post-conflict contexts (Belloni, 2001; Cairns and Darby, 1998). How leaders interacted with these crucibles, what kind of development they gain out of them and how it had been achieved are addressed in the next section.
Bennis and Thomas (2002) conducted their research over a three-year period interviewing more than 40 top leaders in business and the public sector. They claim that these leaders, young and old, or ‘geeks’ and ‘geezers’, were able to identify a few powerful, often traumatic, and always unplanned experiences that had changed them and opened them to different leadership potentials. They defined them as “transformative experiences through which these individuals came to a new and altered sense of identity” (Bennis and Thomas, 2008, p. 506). In their theory of the ‘crucible’ of leadership development, they assert that personal experiences fundamentally determine the development of individual leaders. For them, ‘crucibles’ are exceptional personal events that prepare leaders-in-waiting to consider their ‘calling’ to leadership. These experiences were tests that forced deep self-reflection that involving questions about who they were and what mattered to them. They assert that matters
like racial and religious discrimination produce challenging situations that people are obliged to deal with; making meaning of and learning from adverse conditions. This process is familiar to many of the individual leaders I interviewed. Alternatively, as Thomas (2009, p. 22) put it “The crucibles which led to a new or altered sense of identity were nested in family life, war-time trauma, athletic competition, or personal loss far more often than work assignments.”.

Crucibles, as introduced by the authors, seem to involve strong aspects of negativity and trauma; yet, they argued that this is less important than the sense individuals make of their ‘crucible’ experiences. The key quality that determines success in developing through the crucibles is ‘adaptive capacity’. For them, adaptive capacity includes not only critical skills as “the ability to understand the context and to recognise and seise opportunities…. but it is also the defining competence of everyone who retains his or her ability to live well despite life’s inevitable changes and losses” (Bennis and Thomas, 2002, p. 92). Hence adaptive capacity involves both political astuteness and high levels of resilience. Having lived through these challenging crucible moments and emerged stronger and wiser, leaders learn to accept failures and regard them as potentially influential sources of information and learning. Additionally, these leaders, according to Bennis and Thomas (2002), become people who seem to be more equipped to deal with chaos,

“….. not only more tolerant of ambiguity than others, they are also able to consider multiple options for a longer period. They do not rule out possibilities prematurely and so they are able to make better, more artful choices. They can tolerate the nettle of uncertainty in situations where others long for closure” (Bennis and Thomas 2002, pp.101-102).
Finally, Kempster (2009, p. 104) offers a framework that attempts to explore leadership learning through lived experience (Figure 3-4). This framework, Kempster (2009) argues, is relatively simple yet sufficiently inclusive to integrate and adhere existing theory of informal leadership development and principles of experiential learning. He advises against the over-simplicity of models and invites researchers to have a closer look at the underpinning influences that guide leadership learning and how the organisational context shapes these influences. Leadership learning should be examined at both the social interpersonal level and the individual intrapersonal level as both are argued to occur together mutually (Kempster, 2009). For this purpose, two distinctive disciplines are consulted; social psychology, including social learning, with a particular focus on self-efficacy, observational and enacted learning and self-concept with salience and schematic conceptualisation included; and sociology, encompassing structure-agency duality, identity development and situated learning.

This model draws upon several theoretical contributions. The experiential learning cycle (Kolb, 1984; Kolb and Fry, 1975) and the notion of learning as a deepening cycle of experience are particularly essential to this model. Additionally, it builds on Bennis and Thomas’s (2002) examination of “crucibles” of learning and Janson’s (2008) exploring leadership formative experiences. The five elements of this framework as explained by Kempster (2009) are;
**Leadership situation:** context and social interaction is central to this framework as it serves both as a catalyst for continuous learning opportunities and as a filter that shapes the process of situational and social learning

**Leadership experiences:** “the variety and qualitative difference of experience of leading drawn from situations enables greater development to occur” (p. 105)

**Knowledge of leadership:** what this framework seems to suggest is that knowledge is self-driven from engagement in the situation and interpretation of it. “I am not suggesting that someone’s intention to act is unmediated with a variety of possible interaction and stimuli. Rather, the outlined framework of lived experiences suggests conceptions simply provide prompts or guidelines. However, there is a growing agreement that schemas and self-concepts have a significant role in shaping behaviour” (p.105).

**Participation in leading:** the active engagement in leadership roles and associated activities creates opportunities for experiences of leading. “Through participation, knowledge of detailed nuances of leading in particular contexts is absorbed, mostly tacitly by processes of situated learning” (p.105)

**Reflection on leadership:** according to Kempster (2009) this is not limited to daily practices; instead, it is associated with transformative learning triggered by critical incidents. He concludes, finally, that there is a need for more empirical research to explore this in more detail.
Although this framework is one of the most holistic frameworks that I found in the literature that explores different aspects of leadership learning from lived experience, this PhD research focuses on the events and processes of learning to lead for peace in the contexts of post-conflict. I need to find a framework that prioritises these aspects and incorporates them with the context. Therefore, I also explored different possibilities in the professional learning approach.
3.4.1 Professional learning approach

In this research, a key phenomenon under investigation is leaders’ development from their everyday engagement with the post-conflict peacebuilding context. Hence there is a need to find a holistic model that can capture and describe the complex nature of the phenomenon of learning. This model allows for exploring the longitudinal nature of leadership development, starting from early engagement with the field of peacebuilding, moving to the processes of acquiring relevant knowledge to support their leadership for peace. Furthermore, it should integrate the personal factors of the leaders and the contextual influences with the learning and the development to understand this phenomena. Tynjälä (2013) presents a potentially useful model for this research that was adapted from Biggs (1999) in his 3-P model of learning presented in Figure 3-5.

![Figure 3-5 Biggs’ 3-P model of learning (Biggs 1987, 1999)]
Tynjälä (2013) introduced a few modifications to Biggs’ 3P model to fit with workplace learning which is often portrayed as informal learning occurring without explicit teaching. The first modification to the original model is the stress on the context of learning. While the original model presents the aspect of context only as part of the presage factors, Tynjälä’s (2013) modified model puts the context as the surrounding frame (Figure 3-6). She refers to it as the sociocultural environment which defines the possibilities and constraints of workplace learning, the notions of communities of practice, organisational learning and activity systems operating on the level of research on workplace learning, and the power and politics in workplace learning.

The second modification made by Tynjälä (2013) is that she added an additional factor between the presage and process components. The learner’s interpretation of presage factors is consistent with the view of learning as constructed, i.e. the presage factors affect the learning not directly but rather through the learner’s interpretation. The third modification to the model is that the label ‘student factors’ is replaced by ‘learner factors’ in Tynjälä’s (2013) model because, according to her, learners at the workplace are rarely in a student position. Likewise, the label teaching context is substituted by learning context because the activity of teaching is not the primary activity at work. Finally, the product component in her workplace learning model represents different learning outcomes, both wanted and unwanted. Wanted outcomes can be learning new roles, improved task performance, personal development, better problem solving, vocational or professional identity and a
stronger sense of agency. The unwanted outcomes of learning may also include poor work practices or negative attitudes toward work.

**SOCIOCULTURAL ENVIRONMENT**
- Models of work experience - Communities of practice - Organisational learning

Figure 3-6 The 3-P model of workplace learning (Tynjälä, 2013)

For this research this model is used to analyse the data concerned with leadership learning and development. Therefore, I will modify it to fit into the leadership for peacebuilding context Figure 3-7. First, the socio-cultural environment for this research is the context of post-conflict peacebuilding. Second, learners factors are changed into leaders factors. Leaders factors aim to understand the leaders’ experiences prior to joining the field of peacebuilding, their agency and commitment to peacebuilding, their motivations behind choosing to work in this challenging field, and the sense of self-confidence they had at that
early stage. Third, learning context is replaced with leadership context, leadership context aims to explore the peacebuilding leaders, personal and professional backgrounds and how they affect their presage into the field of peacebuilding. Fourth, process component is concerned with the different processes and events that contribute to the learning and development of leadership for peacebuilding. Fifth, product component is the different aspects of leadership for peacebuilding.

**SOCIOCULTURAL ENVIRONMENT: CONFLICT AND POST-CONFLICT ERA**

![Diagram: Initial 3-P model of leadership development for peacebuilding modified from Tynjäälä 2013](image)

Figure 3-7 Initial 3-P model of leadership development for peacebuilding modified from (Tynjäälä 2013)
Further modifications will be introduced to this model as reflected in the empirical findings in chapter 8

3.6. Chapter 3 Summary and Conceptual Framework

In this chapter, I have discussed the literature on leadership and leadership development that relates to the research questions. This literature review established that leadership and leadership development are better not seen in isolation from their social and political contexts. This organic interactive relationship between leadership and its contexts has been explored and emphasised by many scholars as presented earlier (for example, Antonakis, Avolio, and Sivasubramaniam, 2003; Dill et al., 2012; Endrissat and von Arx, 2013; House, Wright, and Aditya, 1997; Liden and Antonakis, 2009; Rousseau and Fried, 2001; Wang et al., 2014). What is called “leadership” exists in all countries but means different things to different people engaged in these processes in different organisational, socioeconomic, political and cultural contexts. This calls us to consider contextual variables in leadership (Haslam, et al., 2010); different streams of the research argue that leader–follower relationships cannot exist in a “vacuum” (House and Aditya, 1997, p. 445).

In the first section of this chapter, I explored the literature concerned with peace and conflict in terms of intergroup relations. The reason behind this choice was to understand what the dynamics of groups conflict are and how the literature explained these dynamics. For this, two theories were explored at length; realistic conflict theory (Sherif, 1966; Sherif and
Sherif, 1969) and social identity theory (Tajfel and Turner, 1979). In the realistic conflict theory, I first listed the central assumptions of this theory. Then I critically appraised the contributions of this theory. I mainly focused on the notion of superordinate goals as a critical concept offered in this theory to help contested groups to deal with their differences and move beyond the conflict. Moving to social identity theory, I presented a detailed account of the social behaviour continuum and the social belief system continuum. Additionally, the notion of social status and the process of intergroup differentiation as argued in social identity theory were discussed. Finally, I critically appraised the contributions of these theories. Both these theories are essential to my analysis and understanding of the post-conflict context, as presented in Figure (3-8)

In the second section, I explored the frame of leadership as it has meaning for this PhD research. I started by reviewing the different conceptualisations of leadership in the literature. This included exploring the literatures on leadership that are person-based, position-based, results-based, purpose-based, practice-based and process-based. Then, to understand the significance of leadership in highly contested contexts such as the one that this PhD research is concerned with, I explored the notion of leadership as presented in the social identity theory of leadership (Hogg, 2001b; Van Knippenberg and Hogg, 2003) and the concept of leadership with political astuteness (Hartley and associates).
Next, I reviewed the leadership development literature starting with the competency models which are foundational in thinking about leadership development. Then, I moved on to explore leaders and leadership development frameworks (Day, 2000). Next, I examined leadership development through everyday experience. In this section, I argued that leading for peace requires the ability to cope with swift changes and pro-active and continuous creation of novel and innovative learning and development, which goes beyond the previously acquired experience and prior knowledge. The review of leaders development through everyday experience included an exploration of the lifespan approach (Avolio and Gibbons, 1988), the life-stories approach (Shamir and Eilam, 2005), life formative experiences leadership events (Janson, 2008), crucibles (Bennis and Thomas, 2002), leadership learning through lived experience (Kempster, 2006, 2009), and noticeable people (Kempster, 2006; Kempster, 2009; Kempster, 2012).

Finally, to find a holistic model that can capture and describe the complex nature of the phenomenon of learning and put it in structure, I consulted the literature from professional learning. I introduced Tynjälä (2013) 3P model of workplace learning adapted from Biggs (1999). This model was chosen because it reflects the longitudinal nature of leadership development starting from early engagement in the field of peacebuilding moving to the processes of acquiring relevant knowledge to support their leadership for peace. Additionally, it integrates the personal features and factors of the leaders with the contextual influences on the learning and the development as to the understanding of the phenomena. I modified this model to fit to the purpose of this research. Further modifications will be introduced to this model to reflect the data collected for this research.
Figure 3-8 demonstrates the suggested conceptual framework that is guiding this research design, coding and analysis. The context of post-conflict peacebuilding is approached conceptually with social identity lenses. From that, leadership is explored as a social relational phenomenon guided primarily by the social identity theory of leadership and leadership with political astuteness framework. Leaders development is investigated using several concepts both from leadership development field and the field of learning in workplace. The assumption here is that context, leadership and leaders development are linked to each other; however, the type of relationship among these different concepts will be established in the findings and the discussion chapters.

Figure 3-8 The theoretical framework for exploring leadership and its development in contexts of post-conflict peacebuilding
Chapter 4  Research design, Methodology and methods

The reason for discussing research design and methodology, according to Bryman (2004), is to draw the links between the theories in use and the empirical evidence to answer the research question at hand sufficiently. With the research questions in mind, this study aims to contribute to the understanding of how civil society individual leaders make sense of their leadership experiences in post-conflict peacebuilding contexts, and how their leadership has developed over time as they engage with these specific contexts.

In this chapter, I commence by explaining the research design, the methodology adopted and the methods used. Then, I move on to explain and justify the research strategy including the chosen contexts to conduct the research, the research design and the data collection procedures. A discussion of epistemological and ontological considerations of this research follows. Then, the analysis technique of the data is introduced. Finally, I present a personal reflection on the different choices I had to make in relation to this research.

4.1  The research design, methodology and methods

This research adapted an exploratory research design with interpretive and deductive approaches. The study at hand is concerned with the long-term, developmental aspects of leaders’ engagement in peacebuilding and it assumes a processual perspective of their leadership and their leadership development. Exploratory designs and inductive analysis
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approaches are methodologically fit for novel and less theoretically mature research areas (Bryman and Bell, 2015; Easterby-Smith, Thorpe, and Jackson, 2008; Edmondson and McManus, 2007). I suggest that leadership and leaders’ development in post-conflict peacebuilding context are such areas. The inductive approach prioritises the voice of people in the interpretations of the events they have been experiencing, and that ‘native’s’ point of view is a crucial component of the analysis (Maanen, 1988).

Moreover, an interpretive approach does not denote the suspension of a researcher’s judgment. Although interpretive work gives the voices of participants an essential role as “knowledgeable agents”, the researcher is a “knowledgeable agent” as well (Gioia, Corley, and Hamilton, 2013). The researcher assumes the task of further interpreting and structuring the interpretations of the respondents in the light of both contextual factors and prior theorising (Strauss and Corbin, 1990) to develop a final emergent model. This study, therefore, used an inductive, interpretive approach aiming to explore practices and processes of leadership and leadership development in the context of post-conflict peacebuilding (Bryman and Bell, 2015; Eisenhardt, 1989; Yin, 2015).

4.1.1 Qualitative methodology and methods

This research used qualitative methods to collect the data. Qualitative methods can be especially relevant to study the phenomenon of leadership because of its multiple
dimensions, levels, dynamisms, and social constructions, which make it a very complex research topic (Conger, 1998). This research is concerned with the personal insights of the leaders and what they make of their experiences in leading for peace, and the development that happened out of these experiences. Therefore, qualitative methods seemed to be the best way to collect the data that could address the PhD research questions.

Several scholars have argued that qualitative methods offer the leadership field several notable advantages when properly employed. First, they can give an opportunity to explore leadership phenomena in substantial depth and to do so longitudinally with sufficient attention to the temporal and processual aspects of leadership (Langley, Smallman, Tsoukas, and Van de Ven, 2013). Second, they offer the flexibility to distinguish and notice unexpected aspects of leadership during the research (Bryman, Bresnen, Beardsworth, and Keil, 1988). Thirdly, they can be sensitive to contextual factors and to enable exploring leaders’ perceptions, meaning and actions in different contexts (Bryman et al., 1988; Conger, 1998; Kempster and Parry, 2011). Finally, they can be effective means to explore symbolic dimensions of leadership experiences (Conger, 1998).

4.1.2 Semi-structured interviews and leadership journeys

The research data was collected through semi-structured interviews that encompassed the descriptive accounts of respondents, based on their views and interpretations of the subject under investigation (Easterby-Smith et al., 2008). The interviews varied in duration, but all
fell in the range of 80 –150 minutes, and all the recorded interviews were transcribed verbatim. The interviews involved questions about the context in which the participants are active, first on an organisational level; then, on their wider context of peacebuilding such as their community, city or the country when the participants are leaders in organisations that are active on national levels. I followed a ‘24-hour rule’ for writing down individual notes and thoughts about each interview and then discussing them with the Open University PhD supervision team in regular research meetings. I also kept note of all post hoc discussions with the supervisors to keep a running record of the observations in the field, the participants’ interpretations, the researcher insights, and any further questions. I used these resources to modify the interview protocols for subsequent interviews, and to supplement the transcribed interviews so I recursively distil the emergent findings.

The interviews included asking the participants to build a leadership journey for their work in the field of peacebuilding leadership which is an adaptation of the developments trajectory approach used by Day and Sin (2011) and (Kempster, 2009). The leadership journey included asking the participants to plot their different roles in different organisations they worked at in their career in peacebuilding. All the participants have been asked at the set off of the interview to identify their starting point and what they thought to be the reasons behind them choosing to work for peace in extremely polarised and hostile contexts. Additionally, they were asked to indicate and reflect on what they consider as their high points in terms of reaching high leadership influence on their contexts and their low points i.e. when they felt
that they had lost their leadership influence, or when it was decreased considerably in their views. In addition to that, they have been asked to reflect on any critical incidents that had affected their thinking about leadership and peacebuilding. Furthermore, they were asked about different kind of leadership learning events or experiences both formal, like leadership programmes, and informal, like people they were influenced by throughout their career. Some examples of the resulting journeys are presented in Figure 4-1. The reason behind using this technique was to help them reflect on different phases of their leadership and leadership learning and development. The interview schedule with the leadership journey prototype are introduced in appendix 1.

![Figure 4-1 Examples of the participants' leadership Journeys](image)
Elaborating on the leadership journey method used for this research, Langley (2009) advises that phenomena with processual dimensions can be studied either by following them into the future with longitudinal designs, or by tracing them backward to capture historical dynamics e.g. retrospective interviews. A key concern of this study is to explore the leadership journey and the developmental events and processes of peace leaders; therefore, it adopted the latter strategy—similar to (Doldor, 2017; Isabella, 1990; Kempster, 2006). This approach to process is what Langley (2009, p. 410) labels as “narrative knowing” which is a form of knowing that is used to give meaning to particular events drawing on temporal linkages between these events over time.

In addition, leadership journey is a methodological tool used to help the participant to articulate some tacit elements of their knowledge in addition to explicit knowledge. The distinction between tacit and explicit knowledge (Von Krogh, Ichijo, and Nonaka, 2000) is a way of apprehending how knowledge is created by individuals, teams and organisations. Explicit knowledge can be organised and transmitted using formal languages (for instance; linguistic, mathematical, databases), and it can be articulated fairly easily. In contrast, tacit knowledge is more difficult to articulate or share, because it involves lived experience, intuitions and practical ‘know-how’ (Hartley and Benington, 2006).
Tynjälä (2013, p. 29) asserts that tacit knowledge can be surfaced and shared where “people share their mental models and reflect on and analyze them”. This may involve providing the space and the stimulus for externalisation of tacit knowledge. Both explicit and implicit knowledge are important dimensions to be drawn on for a deeper understanding of the leadership and leadership development experiences of the participants. Therefore, the use of the leadership journey method helped me in collecting rich data on the ways participants lead for peace and develop their leadership.

4.2 Data Sources and Research Procedures

In this section, I am introducing the sources of the data and the procedures of conducting this research.

4.2.1 Scoping Study, The Institute of Women’s Leadership for Peacebuilding

In the early stages of this research, I undertook a scoping study. This provided a corner stone in developing my research strategy as it contributed to my understanding and engagement in the field of post conflict peacebuilding leadership development. In January 2015, I took part in The Institute of Women’s Leadership for Peacebuilding held that year in Turkey. This one week residential women’s leadership programme was organised and delivered by CREA; a major feminist and human rights organisation based in the Global South (New Delhi) with financial and technical support from CordAid; one of the largest development aid organisations in the Netherlands. This programme had 40 participants from 14 different conflict/peacebuilding contexts where they occupied leadership positions in international or civil society organisations.
The key themes of the programme were:

- Power and Leadership: Concepts and theory
- Theories of Conflict and the linkage with different contexts
- Peace: Unpacking conceptually and women's role in peace processes
- Security: Unpacking security and women's conception of security
- Use of gender and peace-making normative and policy frameworks (such as The United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325 or the New Deal Framework for Fragile States)
- Assessing the impact: Approaches and Tools

The programme claimed a transformative women's leadership approach that aimed to “build feminist leadership to create processes of social transformation that address cultures of inequality in fragile and conflict affected contexts”. This included taking a feminist approach to analysing peacebuilding processes and women's roles therein.

By the end of the programmes I achieved two goals. First, regarding the research focus, participating in this programme validated the usefulness and relevance of this research project in several ways. The opportunity to discuss this research personally with key scholars in the field such as John Paul Lederach was reassuring as he showed clear interest in it and referred to the need for thinking of peacebuilding in more creative ways, bringing knowledge from other fields of study. Presenting the preliminary proposal for the participants and the programme providers added a practical understanding for the needs and the challenges of the leaders in their work for peace in the different contexts they are active in. Gaining access to the funding organisation CordAid who expressed interest in this PhD research project with an invitation for an internship in the CordAid headquarter in Hague- Netherland at any time.
that suited the work timetable. Second, another important asset gained from participating in this programme was the connections I built with the 40 participants who are all middle to senior leaders in their organisations from the Balkans, Afghanistan, Pakistan, India, the Middle East and all over Africa. These connections could be used for future research in the field.

4.2.2 Northern Ireland and Bosnia and Herzegovina; the two chosen contexts

This research as previously pointed out is concerned with leadership and leadership development in post-conflict peacebuilding contexts. Choosing the contexts was a critical component in the research strategy. Due to the very detailed knowledge on the historical, political, economic and social level that I had to gain before engaging in any context, there was a need to focus on very limited numbers of contexts. The initial plans were to work with three different contexts. Nevertheless, with the conflict intensified in one of the contexts (South Sudan), the time and the financial pressures of my PhD research, I decided to focus on two contexts only.

The chosen contexts for this research were Northern Ireland and Bosnia and Herzegovina. This decision was informed by both theoretical and practical factors. On the theoretical level, two sets of criteria were used to decide on the research contexts; the criteria of the conflict, and the criteria of the peace achieved. On the conflict side of argument, I was looking for contexts that have met the international criteria of civil war which is defined as “any armed
conflict that involves (a) military action internal to the metropole, (b) the active participation of the national government, and (c) effective resistance by both sides.” (Small and Singer, 1982, p. 210). This definition is widely accepted in the literature and the international community (Sambanis, 2004). Thus, the conflict in the chosen context should be civil (internal or intrastate) and not interstate or extrastate (colonial and imperial). Additionally, the state violence in the armed conflict should be reciprocated and sustained and that the war surpasses the internationally cited threshold of deaths (typically more than 1,000 in combat related events).

When it comes to the peace achieved criteria, this PhD research was best conducted in contexts with ‘mature’ peace practices. By this I mean contexts in which the peace agreements have held up for long enough so that the leaders engaged in peacebuilding have accumulated the knowledge and the experience this PhD research is keen to explore. Both Northern Ireland and Bosnia and Herzegovina had their peace agreements in the 1990s and there was no major political violence committed since. Finally, I took into account in the choice of the two countries the difference of their socio-economic indicators such as income, education and access to public services, as they were intended to help deepen my understanding of leadership and leadership development in peacebuilding processes that are taking place in different environments.
On the practical level, working with participants from Northern Ireland was an obvious choice because of the previous work I had done there, where I had already accumulated detailed knowledge about the conflict in the past and now. Additionally, gaining access to the participants in Northern Ireland was more a matter of expanding my network of contacts there rather than starting from scratch. This, in fact, left more time for me to establish the needed access and the logistics in the second context. Bosnia and Herzegovina was on the list of the Balkans countries that meet my context criteria explained above, and where the travel arrangements were within the limits of the PhD research budget. It was inherently interesting, with the complex tiers of the conflict, religiously, ethnically, politically and with the international direct involvement too.

Both Northern Ireland and Bosnia and Herzegovina constitute rich contexts to explore the conflict imperatives and dynamics in terms of social identity, and therefore, the leadership and the leadership development that took place. In chapter 5, a brief history of the war, the peace agreement and the current socio-economic indicators for both contexts are presented.

4.2.3 The Sampling strategy

The study followed Lincoln and Guba's (1985) guidelines for “purposive sampling” in choosing our participants. The sampling of participants was based on Lederach’s (1997) framework of leadership levels (chapter 2) with the focus on middle-range and grassroots leadership. The reasons behind excluding top-level leadership is that the high visibility and
the low flexibility as argued by Lederach (1997) probably makes their leadership experiences different from the other two levels of leadership because of the different challenges, constraints and ultimately purposes of leadership. Additionally, civic leadership active in the third sector and not for profit organisations played key roles in rebuilding the destroyed social fabrics in the divided societies, facilitating reconciliation processes and contributing to sustaining peace (Belloni, 2001; Guelke, 2003; Lederach, 1997). Moreover, leaders on the middle-range and grassroots level are more easily accessible in research terms.

The unit of analysis for this research that helps address the PhD research questions is peacebuilding leaders. As previously mentioned, the concept of leadership for this research integrates several dimensions. Hence, each of the approached participants has been the director of a non-profit organisation that explicitly engaged in peacebuilding processes either on local or national level for the purposes of minimising intercommunity violence and facilitating sustainable peace. To obtain multiple perspectives on leading in the contested contexts of peacebuilding, I conducted 31 lengthy in-depth interviews with 31 third sector leaders in two post-conflict countries- Northern Ireland 17 and Bosnia and Herzegovina 14.

4.2.4 Data access and data collection in Northern Ireland

With an average experience of 23 years in the peacebuilding and community relations in Northern Ireland, 17 civic leaders have been interviewed (9 males and 8 females). The data
collection in Northern Ireland happened in two phases. All the interviews have been conducted in person in different cities of Northern Ireland. Applying purposive sampling with the research questions in mind, I first consulted a senior academic connection in Queens University in Belfast who is deeply engaged in third sector activities in Northern Ireland. He sent a list of the main organisations active in peacebuilding since the Northern Ireland Good Friday peace agreement in 1998 (34 organisations in total). Intensive online research about each one of the listed organisations was conducted to understand their activities, functions, visions and more importantly for this research who were the leaders of these organisations.

For the first phase of data collection I ended up confirming 9 interviews to take place over 10 days in Northern Ireland. In the second phase of data collection, I targeted additional peace leaders that could add to the picture. They were mainly leaders mentioned by the first phase participants as their collaborators from the ‘other’ community and female leaders that I aimed to explore their experiences over the last 20 to 30 years. Spending another week in Northern Ireland I collected 8 more in-depth interviews.

4.2.5 Data access and data collection in Bosnia and Herzegovina

The sampling process in Bosnia and Herzegovina followed a similar process to the one in Northern Ireland. The purposive sampling started with consulting a senior academic connection in King’s College University in London who has led a 3 years capacity building programme for politicians and third sector activists in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Through
him, I was put in contact with the British Embassy in Sarajevo. Because of the data protection act, they refrained from sharing the contacts of the participants, but they shared a list of all registered NGOs that engaged with peacebuilding activities all over Bosnia and Herzegovina (72 organisations). From here, I conducted the same process of intensive online research about each one of the listed organisations to understand their activities, functions, visions and who were the leaders of these organisations. Nevertheless, there were a further challenge with this particular context; the language. Fortunately, most of the organisations’ websites have an English option for browsing at least the main information about the organisation’s vision, mission and principal activities. Furthermore, all the organisations’ leaders contacted spoke fluent English. 14 interviews have been conducted over 4 weeks spent in Bosnia and Herzegovina; with 19 years average years of experience for the participants. The interviews were all conducted in person in three different cities in Bosnia and Herzegovina. 10 interviews have been fully recorded while 4 participants did not allow recording.

4.3 Epistemological and ontological considerations

According to Easterby-Smith et al. (2008), the failure to identify the philosophical position that informs the connections between data collected and theory adopted is not definitely fatal; however, it can affect the quality of the research results. Social science is largely founded around two dominant philosophical underpinnings; positivism and social constructivism with associated research methodologies usually labelled as qualitative and
quantitative. Nevertheless, this simplification can cause a major confusion because “qualitative and quantitative methods may be used according to both constructionist and positivist epistemologies, and be underpinned by both nominalist and realist ontologies” (Easterby-Smith et al., 2008, p. 83). Therefore, it is important to define the terms epistemology and ontology and identify where this research project is positioned in this regard.

4.3.1 Ontological considerations

Social ontology according to Bryman and Bell (2015, p. 32) is principally concerned with the nature of reality of “social entities”. The central argument of the social ontological stance in social science is whether to consider the social entities and phenomena as external to the social actors (including the researcher), i.e. as happening and developing independently from them, or whether they are internal to the social actors and build up from their perceptions. These two positions often referred to as objectivism and constructionism or subjectivism. Nevertheless, these two ontological perspectives on social entities should not be pushed to the extreme always; especially for the constructionism argument as it can accept the pre-existence of aspects of social entities as external to the social actors; yet, the intellectual preference and focus of the researcher working within this perspective is to stress and study “the active role of individual in the social construction of social reality” (Bryman and Bell, 2015, p. 33).
In view of this understanding and reflection on the research questions, this study adopts a *subjectivist/constructionism* ontological stance for investigating the participants’ experiences in leadership and leadership development in peacebuilding context. Nevertheless, I strongly support the argument about what some scholars call “mild social constructivism” for example; (Burningham and Cooper, 1999, p. 297), where I acknowledge the pre-existence and independence of certain aspects of the social phenomena I am studying such as conflict(s). My focus, still, is on how the participants in this kind of contexts make sense of the leadership development offered to them and how do they link it to their perceptions of the contexts of conflict they are coming from.

4.3.2 Epistemological considerations

Following the ontological discussion, epistemology is the philosophical stance that informs social researchers in their decisions regarding how to examine and explore the form of reality they have chosen. Accordingly, epistemology considers the basis of how we know the world and examines phenomena including the techniques to use in collecting information, and the methods to follow in interpreting that data. There are primarily three epistemological positions in social science research: (a) positivism, (b) realism, and (c) constructionism

---

5 Constructivism and constructionism are both in use to refer to the same ontological position (Bryman and Bell, 2015)
(Bryman and Bell, 2015; Easterby-Smith et al., 2008), though many variations on these and some combinations such as post-positivism and critical realism (details in Table 4-1)

Table 4-1 Different epistemologies within social science

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epistemology</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positivism</strong></td>
<td>epistemological position that strictly follow the methods of natural sciences, and thus it lines up ontologically with the objectivist perspective (Bryman and Bell, 2015). Positivism expects the researchers to separate themselves as far as possible from the reality being inspected, and to minimise the bias in human factors in favour of the objective facts underlying the phenomena. (Easterby-Smith et al., 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-positivism</strong></td>
<td>quantitative approaches draw on scientific method but take into account some degree of constructionism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretivism</strong></td>
<td>“an antithesis of positivism” (Bryman and Bell, 2015, p. 28), it originates in a subjectivist ontological position and assumes that social phenomena are produced and shaped by subjective experiences of social actors (with the researcher included). (Bryman and Bell, 2015; Easterby-Smith et al., 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Realism</strong></td>
<td>viewed as a middle stance in between positivism and interpretivism, where it gives flexibility for the researcher in approaching social reality regarding the type of data he/she choose to collect. However, it is still grounded within an objectivist ontological position as it consider the reality as external to the social actors (Easterby-Smith et al., 2008). Nonetheless, contrasting with positivist studies which aim primarily to explain causation, realist studies generally focus on understanding associations between different aspects of phenomena. (Bryman and Bell, 2015; Easterby-Smith et al., 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical realism</strong></td>
<td>One major form of realism is critical realism. According to Bryman and Bell (2015, p. 29), “what make critical realism critical is the identification of generative mechanisms, which offers the prospect of change that can transform the status quo”. Critical realism adheres to the notion of stratification of ‘depth ontology’ where it distinguish between the ‘real’, which is the structures and the mechanisms that generate that ‘actual’ (the events people observe), and the ‘empirical’ (what is perceived of those events) (Bhaskar, 1978). Accepting this stratified ontology, critical realists recognise that “powers may exist unexercised, and hence what has happened or been known to have happened, does not exhaust what could happen or has happened” (Sayer, 2000, p.20). The assumption here is that entities (social actors) have the ‘causal potential’ to affect events in “transfactual” ways (Edwards, O'Mahoney, and Vincent, 2014, p. 11).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This means that social actors possess the ‘causal power’ to affect what happens actually and empirically i.e. they have agency.

The epistemological position adopted and appropriate to this PhD research is critical realism based on a number of considerations. Critical realism recognises the world as (objectively) existing independently from people’s perceptions. It also accepts that “part of that world consists of subjective interpretations which influence the ways in which it is perceived and experienced” (Edwards et al., 2014, p. 2). This double recognition is significant for this research. First, the imperatives of the post-conflict context are foundational in this study. They preset the mechanisms and the structures of the ‘real’ world (Bhaskar, 1978) which generate the ‘actual world’ (the leadership and leadership development events happened in space and time in this research) and the ‘empirical’ (how the leaders perceive these events).

The societal conflicts might be different in the scale, intensity, duration, the internal and external drives of the conflicts and the ways that these conflicts have been ended; however, they seem to have similar dynamics and implications. Most importantly, they have unquestionable impact of these societal processes on the leaders studied. Second, a point of interest for this PhD research is how the peace leaders (the entities) make sense of the conflict and how they take up the agency to change it. Additionally, this study sheds light on the developmental events that shaped how their leadership journeys were conducted and how
they make sense of these experiences. These dialectical aspects of agency and structure suggests the value of a critical realist approach for this PhD research.

### 4.4 Ethical Considerations

It essential for the researcher to be mindful of the need to continually observe high ethical standards throughout the research as an indication of professionalism in: (a) interacting with research participants, (b) performing data analysis, and (c) disseminating the findings from the research (Bryman and Bell, 2015; Easterby-Smith et al., 2008). Ethical considerations on the all research phases have been taken seriously. This began by seeking ethics approval for this research project from the Open University Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC). When it comes to interacting with the participants, each of them was asked to sign a consent letter explaining the aims of the research and the permission to use the data generated from the interview in this thesis and other academic publications. The consent letter format is presented in Appendix 2. Additionally, to ensure no harm comes to participants out of this research, I took the anonymity of the participants very seriously during and after the data collection. Respecting the dignity of research participants was a key practice in collecting the data, especially when they were sharing emotional and traumatising experiences. I was keen to comfort the participants when they were emotionally overwhelmed by asking if they would like to take a break. More about this aspect is reflected on in chapter 8. In the data analyses phase, I anonymised all the information that could identify any of the participants. Finally, in disseminating the research findings, honesty and transparency in communicating about the research will be fully respected and acted upon to avoid any misleading, or false reporting of research findings.
4.5 Data Analysis approach and process

The literature review I conducted highlighted the relative lack of theoretical framing and empirical evidence that explores leaders, leadership and leadership development for peacebuilding in post-conflict contexts. Because of the novelty of this research inquiry, the data was inductively analysed. This allowed for the themes, structures and then theoretical contributions to emerge from the data without forcing any pre-assumed theorisation on them. The analysis followed closely the guidelines specified for naturalistic inquiry (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) and constant comparison techniques (Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Strauss and Corbin, 1998). These methodologies granted me the basis for rigorous collection and analysis of qualitative data and determined the sampling and content emphases of later data collection. Additionally, they were useful for defining themes and aggregate dimensions through the examination and comparison of key events (Isabella, 1990).

The starting point for the data coding was to verify the quality of the interview transcripts through reading them while listening to the audio recording of each interview. This step was needed as well for me to reengage mentally and emotionally with interviews as they were conducted in real time. In the initial rounds of the coding, or what Gioia et al. (2013) call the 1st order analysis, I coded each interview separately in NVivo 10 to systematise the data coding where I kept close and faithful to the participants’ terms, notions and language. Then I re-read each interview several times, to detect similarities and differences among
participants. I relied on constant comparison of multiple participants and over time to detect conceptual patterns (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

After finishing the first 9 interviews, I began discerning codes across participants that were similar. I collapsed these codes into first-order codes, using the language of the participants that expressed similar views. I continued coding interviews in this fashion until there was no more distinct conceptual patterns shared by the participants to be found. After developing the first-order concepts (Gioia et al., 2013), I started detecting links among them. These emergent links enabled me to cluster first order categories into theoretically distinct groupings, or second-order themes (that answer the important question “what’s going on here, theoretically?”) (Gioia et al., 2013, p. 20). I then brought together the second-order themes into overarching dimensions that enabled me to finalise a theoretical framework that linked the various phenomena that emerged from the data. These 3 levels of analyses are presented for each theme in the findings chapters (5, 6 and 7). A snapshot of these practices is presented in Appendix 3.

4.6 Reflections on this research journey; Paris attacks and changing the research settings

I would like to briefly reflect on some aspects of my PhD research journey with a few sharp turns and difficult decisions that had to be made over the span of the three years needed to
complete this thesis. This PhD research originally intended to build on an earlier exploratory study undertaken during my OU Master of Research (2014). That exploratory study focused on the dimensions of leadership development offered in peacebuilding programmes, and how they were shaped by the wider context of peacebuilding in divided societies from the programme providers’ perspective. The field study for that project adopted an exploratory research design where qualitative data were collected from ten semi-structured interviews with developers experienced in designing and running peacebuilding leadership programmes in Northern Ireland, the Middle East and Africa. This PhD research, at the first year of study, had an intention to go beyond that early work to examine, in greater depth, the participants’ experiences of these programmes aiming to explore their leadership development experiences during the leadership development programmes for peacebuilding and what shapes these experiences. Additionally, my intention was to study how their views about their leadership roles in post-conflict peacebuilding deepen or change and why.

For that initial aim of the study, I proposed to use a multiple case studies research design building on 4 case studies of cross-nationality leadership development programmes designed for peacebuilding contexts. This stemmed from the argument that a multi-case studies design provides the required analyses of the context(s); the context of the leadership programme and the bigger context of peacebuilding from where the participants are coming. In addition, it allows a focus on the ongoing processes of leadership development in the programmes as viewed and experienced by the participants. I conducted a scoping study where I attended a
cross-national programme in Turkey and interviewed several participants. Furthermore, I negotiated access to four typical cross-nationality leadership development programmes for post-conflict peacebuilding conducted by International organisations (Appendices 4 and 5) which seemed to assume a universal approach to what is required to develop the leadership expected to build and sustain peace across apparently diverse post-conflict societies.

Things, nevertheless, did not work out as I had hoped. On 13th November 2015, people worldwide witnessed the horrifying events of terrorist attacks on the French capital. With over 100 killed in gunfire and blasts, many European countries raised their terror alert levels to the second highest. This meant top restrictions on granting visas for the citizens of troubled counties i.e. many participants of the first two programmes I was about to attend were denied visas to Europe. The programmes accordingly were postponed indefinitely. These unpleasant circumstances of growing fear and uncertainty put me in front of a difficult decision regarding whether to wait for the programmes to proceed or alter my research scope and design.

The decision was that it is better to have a research plan B (just in case!). The plan B research proposal was quickly adopted as plan A after the Brussels unfortunate terrorist attacks early March 2016. The mindset developed within these fraught conditions was that if the participants cannot make it to Europe, I am going to go to them in their post-conflict contexts.

\[\text{\textsuperscript{6}} \text{See; } \text{http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-34896125;} \text{ http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/what-the-different-terror-threat-levels-mean-for-london-brussels-and-paris-a6945821.html;} \text{ and } \text{http://edition.cnn.com/2016/02/03/europe/europe-threat-isis/}.\]
to explore their leadership and leadership development. Thus, fieldwork trips were planned to Northern Ireland and Bosnia and Herzegovina where 31 interviews were conducted with leaders in peacebuilding civil society in these two contexts.

4.6.1 Why I am telling this story? Reflexivity in qualitative research

Several scholars have argued that qualitative researchers are more inclined to provide detailed accounts of their research procedures and what goes in the setting they are exploring (Bryman and Bell, 2015; Easterby-Smith et al., 2008; Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007; Holland, 1999; Malaurent and Avison, 2017). In this section, arguments about reflexivity in my research are introduced.

Payne and Payne (2004, p. 191) define reflexivity as “the practice of researchers being self-aware of their own beliefs, values and attitudes, and their personal effects on the settings they have studied and self-critical about their research methods and how they have been applied, so that the evaluation and understanding of their research findings, both by themselves and their audience, may be facilitated and enhanced”. Hammersley and Atkinson (2007) argue that reflexivity should be an essential feature of the research because researchers are a part of the social world that they investigate; they cannot step above it to gain an “Olympian perspective” or move outside it to get a “view from nowhere” (Hammersley, 2004, p. 934). Therefore, researchers need to be mindful of reflexivity and recognise their relation to the issue they are studying and make use of this relation when
possible. They should keep reflecting on their own role in the research process and on the
bigger context in which it takes place. These promises of reflexivity will be revisited in the
chapter 8 when I assess the quality of this research.
Chapter 5 Contexts of peacebuilding

Several scholars have maintained that the analysis of leadership is best realised within its context (Porter and McLaughlin, 2006) and with regard to the purposes that it is intended to achieve (Manzie and Hartley, 2013). The assumption is that context shapes leadership by creating constraints and opportunities for leadership actions, while leadership actions try to reshape elements of context that bring about less divided and more peaceful societies. The chosen contexts for this research are Northern Ireland and Bosnia and Herzegovina as previously discussed. This chapter attempts to explore the contexts chosen for this research and the contextual implications for leading for peace. Hence, I commence by presenting a brief description of the historical, political, and socioeconomic root causes of the conflicts in Northern Ireland and Bosnia and Herzegovina, in addition to the peace agreements and the current political conflict and peace status in both contexts. Then, I move on to analyze the leaders’ views of these contexts. Finally, I explore the leaders’ reflections on how these contextual forces impacted their leadership in their contexts.

5.1 Introducing the contexts of Northern Ireland and Bosnia and Herzegovina

The starting point for this chapter is to get familiar with the research contexts. Hence, a brief description is presented about the origins of the conflicts, their main milestones in both
research contexts, the last peace agreement signed within them, and the current conflict and peace status. I start with Northern Ireland then I move to Bosnia and Herzegovina.

5.1.1 Northern Ireland; a brief history of the conflict, the peace agreement and the current status

This analysis will cover the last forty years of the history of Northern Ireland, with some references going further back. The last forty years are particularly relevant to this thesis because this is the period of ‘the Troubles’ (Coogan, 2015). The Troubles is a term widely used to refer to a violent thirty-year conflict in Northern Ireland that led to killing of 3,600 people. Many more have been harmed by this legacy that continued long past 1998 when the peace agreement came into force (Coogan, 2015). Cairns and Darby (1998, p. 754) maintain that “The conflict at its most basic can be seen as a struggle between those who wish to see Northern Ireland remain part of the United Kingdom and those who wish to see the reunification of the whole island of Ireland”. This section is built in four blocks; first, an outline of the development of the Irish conflict; second, the main reasons for the troubles; third, the peace process and peace agreement and fourth, a brief description of the current
status of peace and conflict in the country. Figure 5-1 shows the location of Northern Ireland, in relation to Europe and to the UK.

Figure 5-1 Northern Ireland on the map

5.1.1.1 The historical roots of the Irish conflict

History is very important in Northern Ireland peacebuilding, and it is important to understand this history to make sense of the emergence of Catholic Nationalists and Protestant Unionists as two distinct groups (Cairns and Darby, 1998). Many scholars argue the need for taking this history into account for a better understanding of the Northern Ireland conflict (Bew and Gillespie, 1999; Cairns and Darby, 1998; Coogan, 2015; Darby, 1995; Purdie, 1990). Table 5-1 summarises a number of key events between 1170 and 1916. These events are not presented as a shortened history of the conflict on the island but an attempt to identify the shifting dynamic that underpinned that conflict. Although they might seem not
directly linked to the Troubles described in the following section, they are still very vivid in collective memories of the conflicting groups as will be explored later in this chapter.
Table 5-1 Some historical milestones in the Irish conflict prior to the Troubles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1170</td>
<td>The Norman Invasion</td>
<td>More than a century after the Norman Conquest of England, Henry II of England claimed and attempted to attach Ireland to his kingdom. He succeeded in establishing control in a small area around Dublin known as the Pale. Over the next four centuries this area was the beach-head for the kingdom of Ireland, adopting English administrative practices and the English language and looking to London for protection and leadership. Several attempts were made to extend English control over the rest of Ireland, but the major expansion of English dominion did not take place until the sixteenth century. For the Irish clans who disputed the rest of the island with each other, England became the major external threat to their sovereignty and customs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1609</td>
<td>The Plantation of Ulster</td>
<td>By the end of Queen Elizabeth's reign, military conquest had established English rule over most of the island of Ireland, with the principal exception of the northern province of Ulster. The Ulster clans, under Hugh O'Neill, had succeeded in overcoming their instinctive rivalries to create an effective alliance against Elizabeth's armies. After a long and damaging campaign, Ulster was eventually brought under English control and the Irish leaders left the island for Europe. Their land was confiscated and distributed to colonists from Britain. By 1703, less than 5 per cent of the land of Ulster was still in the hands of the Catholic Irish. The Plantation of Ulster was unique among Irish plantations in that it set out to attract colonists of all classes from England, Scotland and Wales by generous offers of land. Essentially it sought to transplant a society to Ireland. The native Irish remained, but were initially excluded from the towns built by the Planters, and banished to the mountains and bogs on the margins of the land they had previously owned. The sum of the Plantation of Ulster was the introduction of a foreign community, which spoke a different language, represented an alien culture and way of life, including a new type of land tenure and management. In addition, most of the newcomers were Protestant by religion, while the native Irish were Catholic. So, the broad outlines of the current conflict in Northern Ireland had been sketched out within fifty years of the plantation: the same territory was occupied by two hostile groups, one believing the land had been usurped and the other believing that their tenure was constantly under threat of rebellion. They often lived in separate quarters. They identified their differences as religious and cultural as well as territorial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801</td>
<td>Political Union of Great Britain and Ireland</td>
<td>The next two centuries consolidated the differences. There were many risings. The Dublin based institutions of government - an Irish monarchy, parliament and government, reflecting those in Britain enforced a series of penal laws against Catholics and, to a lesser extent, Presbyterians. In 1801, to secure more direct control of Irish affairs, the Irish parliament and government were abolished by an Act of Union and its responsibilities taken over by Westminster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840s</td>
<td>Repeal movements</td>
<td>During the nineteenth century, a succession of movements attempted to overthrow the union. Some of these movements, including the Repeal movement in the 1840s and the Home Rule movement from the 1870s, were parliamentary. Others, like the Fenians and the Irish Republican Brotherhood, were dedicated to overthrowing the union by the use of physical force. It is probable that the union would have been repealed by a Home Rule act but for the intervention of the First World War. Since the 1880s, many Ulster Protestants had become increasingly concerned about the possible establishment of home rule for Ireland. They prepared for resistance. In 1912 a civil war seemed imminent, but the focus was shifted from Ulster by the start of the First World War and by the Easter rising. From 1918, Ulster Protestants increasingly settled for a fall-back position and set out to ensure that the northern counties of Ireland, at least, should be excluded from any Home Rule arrangements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870s</td>
<td>The Home Rule Movement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Easter Rising in Dublin</td>
<td>During the war, an armed rising was attempted in Dublin during Easter week, 1916. The rising failed and the leaders were executed, creating a wave of sympathy for the IRA and its political wing, Sinn Féin. In the 1918 election Sinn Féin effectively replaced the old Irish Parliamentary Party and established its own Irish parliament. The resulting War of Independence between Britain and the IRA was eventually ended by a treaty and the Government of Ireland Act in 1920.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1.1.2 Civil Rights 1969 and after; The Troubles

There is no full agreement on the precise date of the start of the Troubles as a chain of violent political incidents (Coogan, 2015). Different scholars have suggested different accounts of it, including; the formation of the modern Ulster Volunteer Force in 1966, the civil rights march in Derry on 5 October 1968, the beginning of the 'Battle of the Bogside' on 12 August 1969 or the deployment of British troops on 14 August 1969 (Fitzduff and O’Hagan, 2009; Purdie, 1990). However, the Anglo-Irish relationships have suffered a long unstable chronicle (Darby, 1995) as referred to in Table 5-1. Some of the widely cited root causes to Troubles were: the presence of ghettoisation and claims of discrimination against the Irish social group in Northern Ireland, the emergence of an Irish middle class after a number of social changes led by Westminster after the Second World War. This included the introduction of free secondary schooling system for all the population which provided the initial forces that drove the civil rights campaign in the late 1960’s (Darby, 1995; Fitzduff and O’Hagan, 2009).

The formation of the Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association in 1967 was an important date in the history of the conflict. Inspired by a worldwide non-violent movement for civil rights, they followed the model of the civil rights campaign in the United States marching, protesting, organising sit-ins and using the media to advertise minority complaints. Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association called for liberal reforms, involving the elimination of discrimination in the allocation of jobs and houses, permanent emergency legislation and
electoral abuses (Purdie, 1990). Fitzduff and O’Hagan (2009) claim that these campaigns, which found support amongst Catholics in Northern Ireland, triggered a hostile response from the state which was largely dominated by Protestants. For this relatively privileged group, these campaigns were seen as an existential threat (Fitzduff and O’Hagan, 2009). There were several attempts to negotiate some solutions in the 70’s. Nevertheless, by that time violent proceedings had developed their own momentum (Coogan, 2015).

The loyalist administration in Northern Ireland was unable to contain the growing civil disorder. In 1969, the British government sent in troops to enforce the public order. The Provisional Irish Republican Army (IRA) started a movement of violence against the British army and those who were seen to support the status quo, for example; police officers, prison officers, public servants etc. By 1972 the Westminster Parliament suspended the Northern Ireland government and replaced it with direct rule from Westminster which continued to be the case until the 1990s. The IRA campaign developed strongly from 1972 onwards. The peak of violence was in 1972 when 468 people died. It has continued since then until the signing of the peace agreement with an annual average of 100 killed (Fitzduff and O’Hagan, 2009).

Reading through this brief historical presentation, a few observations can be made. First, the conflict in Northern Ireland including the later version known as the Troubles is rooted deeply in the history of that area and it has shaped people lives over generations. Nonetheless, the dimensions of the conflict have shifted over time. Since the twelfth century until 1921, the conflict drive was essentially an Irish-English contestation and concentrated
on Ireland's struggle to secure independence from Britain. From 1921 onward most of Ireland became independent, the focus shifted to the relationships between what later became the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland bringing the conflict to become largely contained within the island of Ireland. Patterns of violence shifted again from mainly riots and clashes between Catholics and Protestants that had characterised 1969 and 1970, to an increased violence between the Provisional IRA and the British Army, with violence committed by loyalist and unionist paramilitaries. This meant a change of the nature of conflict from inter-state to intra-state in peacebuilding terms. This fluctuation in the intensity, form and duration of violence confirm with the observation made by Lederach (1997) regarding the nonlinearity of civil conflicts explained in Chapter 2.

Second, since 1969, attention has been on the relationships between Catholics and Protestants within Northern Ireland; however, the use of the terms “Catholic” and “Protestant” to refer to the factions of the conflict is as much ethnic and political as religious (Cairns and Darby, 1998). Religion or theology, more precisely, might not be the most important aspect of the conflict in spite of the theological concerns that a number of more religious population hold against each other (Cairns and Darby, 1998). Finally, the economic factors that seem to be mentioned the least, have played an important role in the conflict since the early days of the plantation of Ulster from confiscating and distributing of land to the equality demands for jobs and housing.

In summary, 'The Northern Irish problem' was not one problem; it was a tangle of interrelated problems. Darby (1995) defines them as the central constitutional problem of
the political context for the people of Northern Ireland between being part of Britain or having a united Ireland; the problem of social and economic inequalities e.g. much lower rates of employment for Catholics as opposed to Protestants, the effective bar on employing Catholics in many of the major employers in the region, as well as the effective domination of the protestant majority in state institutions such as the police; the problem of cultural identity including education including teaching the Irish language and a variety of cultural differences; the problem of security; The problem of religious disputes; and finally the problem of the impact of the conflict on the day-to-day relationships between the people who live in Northern Ireland. He argues that “All of these are elements of the problem, but none can claim dominance. Each affects the others. Any approach to change needs to take into account all elements of the problem” (Darby, 1995, p. 21).

5.1.1.3 Peace process in Northern Ireland; the Good Friday agreement and beyond

The peace process in Northern Ireland was long and difficult with both internal and external factors contributing to it. Darby (1995) presents a combination of factors that contributed to the development of this process. First, both the IRA and the UK government realised that the war could not be won militarily. Especially when the IRA engaged in politics, through its political party Sinn Fein, as an alternative way of struggle for its political goals. Additionally, there was the willingness of the Social Democratic and Labour Party (SDLP) to work with Sinn Fein in pursuing political goals by peaceful means. Second, the social and economic context was changing and many of the discriminations against Catholics were being addressed, and a legal and social infrastructure began to develop to follow up on issues
of inequality, and respect for diversity. Third, the active engagement of many within civic society; from among business, trade union, and community groups create a leverage for peace. Fourthly, the development of some small political groupings such as the Women's Coalition, allowed some new approaches on the political landscape. The Women’s Coalition, formed in 1996, offered an effective middle ground for dialogue among women, and other political parties. Finally, the change in the international context, especially with the proactive involvement from the United States government, and many US businessmen and politicians, in addition to the backing with developing peace processes from South Africa. All these factors worked together to reach Belfast or the Good Friday Agreement that was signed On April 10th, 1998.

The two core ideas behind the Good Friday Agreement according to Taylor (2006, p. 217) are; first, in the “nature of things” Northern Ireland is deeply divided between two opposing ethno-national communities; and second, that consociationalism is the only democratic form of governance that could “accommodate for such ethno-national antagonism”. Consociationalism is a political concept advocated by several highly regarded political scientists such as Lijphart (1996), McGarry and O’leary (2006b). Consociationalism, in simple terms, is a political theory that contends that in deeply divided societies with historically antagonistic ethnically, linguistically or religiously divided groups can be better govern by consociational principles. Consociational principles are: executive sharing of powers, a degree of autonomy and self-government, proportionality in public institution, veto-rights that enable each group to prevent changes that affect their vital interest (McGarry
The Good Friday agreement was a multi-party agreement signed by the British government and most of Northern Ireland's political parties, and an international agreement between the British and Irish governments. The Good Friday agreement committed the participants to "exclusively democratic and peaceful means of resolving differences on political issues". It put in place a new political system and established two major institutions: Northern Ireland Assembly and Northern Ireland Executive and political mechanisms for sharing the power in the country. It also affirmed a commitment to equality and human rights. Additionally, it put the means to deal with decommissioning of weapons of paramilitary groups and the normalisation of security arrangements in Northern Ireland (McGarry, 2001; Ruane and Todd, 1999).

Two referenda in both Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland were organised to endorse the agreement on May 22, 1998. The Agreement was endorsed in Northern Ireland by 71% of voters with the turnout for the province at 81%. In the Republic, over 94% of voters endorsed the agreement but turnout was much lower at 56%. The vote in the Republic of Ireland meant to change Articles 2 and 3 of the Irish Constitution. This was in responding to a long-lasting Unionist demand for the Republic of Ireland to remove its territorial claim to Northern Ireland which was replaced by a hope to unity subject to the consent of majorities in both jurisdictions.

What is essential to understand for this research is the role played by civil society in Northern Ireland. Guelke (2003, p. 68) argues that civil society has made a significant contribution to the process, “It is that at various junctures leading up to and during the Northern Ireland
peace process, civil society, centered on the third sector - voluntary and non-profit organisations but also including business and trade union leaders and some churchmen has played a prominent role in the province’s politics”. Nevertheless, (Guelke, 2003) highlights the dismissive attitude toward civil society role in some historical accounts of the peace process especially the ones written with an institutional and formal political focus. He explain this by the nature of Northern Ireland, which has been a deeply divided society and so some accounts appear to discount the substantial efforts of the organisations and the institutions that attempted to surpass sectarianism. In addition, the understanding of Belfast Agreement as a consociational settlement, giving a dominating role to the political’ elites (Cochrane, 2000).

5.1.1.4 Current situation in Northern Ireland

The situation in Northern Ireland has improved remarkably but has a long way still to go. On 17th May 2017, the Police Service of Northern Ireland published their annual Police Recorded Security Situation Statistics. This report provides the statistical data about Security related deaths i.e. ‘those which are considered at the time of the incident to be directly attributed to terrorism, where the cause has a direct or proximate link to subversive/sectarian strife or where the death is attributable to security force activity’ (User Guide to Security Situation Statistics Northern Ireland, 2015 p.3). Additionally, the report keeps records for related shooting incidents, bombing incidents and other paramilitary and security threatening activities. According to this report, only last year (2016-2017), Northern Ireland has
witnessed 5 security related deaths, 61 shooting incidents, 29 Bombing incidents and tens of causalities of paramilitary style assaults and shootings. Figure 5-3 compares security incidents for 2016/17, the previous year 2015/16 and ten years ago 2007/08 (annual Police Recorded Security Situation Statistics, 2017, p.2)

![figure 5-3 comparing security incidents for 2016/17, the previous year 2015/16 and ten years ago (2007/08) (Police Service of Northern Ireland, 2017)](image)

Some other non-governmental sources warn that the paramilitaries have become embedded in the society in Northern Ireland. Wilson (2016) in the fourth annual peace mentoring report gives some examples such as Detail Data’s major investigation published in April 2016 about the extent to which the paramilitaries’ activities still impact the population of Northern Ireland (Figure 5-3). In June 2016, in its observations on the UK’s report on compliance.

---

7 The Detail is an investigative news and analysis website dedicated to in-depth reporting on issues of vital public interest. “Our not-for-profit platform, established in 2011, is a multi-award winning digital media organisation committed to delivering challenging journalism” [http://www.thedetail.tv/investigations](http://www.thedetail.tv/investigations).
with the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child called on the authorities in Northern Ireland to take ‘immediate and effective measures to protect children from violence by non-State actors involved in paramilitary-style attacks’ *(Wilson, 2016)*.

The above summary of the situation in Northern Ireland, shows that the intense phase of conflict has passed but deep division and intimidation continue. I turn now to consider the second context, Bosnia and Herzegovina.

---

5.1.2 A brief history of the civil war, peace agreement and the current status in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH)

Bosnia and Herzegovina, a country only created as a nation state after the breakup of Yugoslavia, is positioned in the western Balkan Peninsula of Europe. The historical territories are Bosnia, the larger region, which occupies the northern and central parts of the country, and Herzegovina which occupies the south and southwest. Nevertheless, the current two autonomous political entities that were established by the internationally brokered Dayton Accords of 1995 do not exactly match these historical regions. The Republika Srpska (Bosnian Serb Republic), is located in the north and east, and the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, occupying the western and central areas. The capital of the country is Sarajevo and the largest regional cities include Mostar and Banja Luka (Stokes, Lampe, Rusinow, and Mostov, 1996). The geographical location with basic stats about the country are shown in Table 5-2
Table 5-2 Bosnia and Herzegovina 2016

The country context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population, million</th>
<th>3.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GDP, current US$ billion</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita, current US$</td>
<td>4,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Enrolment, primary (% gross) (2014)</td>
<td>101.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Expectancy at Birth, years (2014)</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The World Bank database
http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/bosniaandherzegovina/overview#1

Similar to the previous section, I am building an outline for the Bosnian context from the historical roots of the conflicts to the times of the war, the peace agreement, ending with the current conflict and peace status in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

5.1.2.1 The historical roots of the Balkan conflict

The war in Bosnia and Herzegovina is fairly recent. It has been globally followed and is seen in the collective memory as aggressive and complex warfare in the unstable Balkan region. Many accounts can be found to explain the roots of this conflict. Those accounts were dominated by two interpretations of the Bosnian conflict; one is the story of a civil war in which antagonism between different factions emerges for a variety of reasons. The second
is an international conflict, in which aggression from one country threatens another (Mojzes, 2016). Campbell (1998) contends that the Bosnian war has many different narratives that aimed to explain it which mainly build on one or another of these two perceptions where other aspects such as historical hatred, religious ideologies, aggressive nationalism, ethnicity, political and economic failures, and genocide were used instrumentally to support overall claims of the respective narrative. Although there is overlap between these two accounts, ‘‘civil war’ accounts make greater reference to ethnicity, historical hatred and religion than do those which focus on ‘international conflict’ by drawing attention to aggressive nationalism, economic and political developments, and the pursuit of genocide’’ (Campbell, 1998, p. 267). In both accounts, though, it was a complex war that consisted of several layers of conflict projected on to the mass destruction of the economic assets and the social fabric of Bosnia and Herzegovina (Faber and Stiglmayer, 1994; Klarić, Klarić, Stevanović, Grković, and Jonovska, 2007; Kondylis, 2010).

War erupted in the former Yugoslavia in the early 1990s following the collapse of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, founded 1945, comprising Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia, and Slovenia. After, Slovenia, Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina declared their independence from Yugoslavia in 1991, ethnic Serbs, who opposed the breakup of Serb-dominated Yugoslavia, commenced armed struggles to establish separated Serb-controlled territories in both areas, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia. At the same period, Croats and Bosniaks (Bosnian Muslims) also started fighting each other, mostly over territory. The population of Bosnian Muslims, according to the census of the 31 March 1991, was the largest ethnic group in Bosnia and Herzegovina (1.9 million, 44% of all the 1991 population). The second largest group were
the Serbs (1.4 million, 31%). Bosnian Croats (760,000, 17%) and others (all remaining ethnicities: 350,000, 8%).

To understand the background on Bosnian war, however, Mojzes (2016) lists a number of factors that in his opinion contributed directly or indirectly to the commencement of violence in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the devastating war that followed. These factors are a complex combination of historical, political and socio-economic motives that brought Yugoslavia to an end allowing the war to start. One dynamic that paved the way for the conflict to erupt claimed to be rooted in the formation of Yugoslavia after the Second World War with unsorted reminiscences of the ethnic war and genocide-like extermination that occurred during that period. Secondly, the communist suppression of any form of nationalistic expressions was argued to play a role in the feeling of injustice that exploded later. Additionally, the ethnic and the cultural differences between the heritage of Serbs, Croats and Bosniaks/Muslims fueled with patterns of propaganda such as “the Serbs claim that all Croats are fascist, genocidal…..while the Croats claim that Serbs are Byzantine, communist and prone to Bolshevik-style leadership” (Mojzes, 2016, p. 174). Muslims in their turn have been accused of aiming to establish a fundamentalist Islamic state (Mojzes, 2016). Economic reasons were accounted as drivers of the war as well, with a struggling economy after the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe and claims of exploitation from

---

all factions against other factions; the Serbs accused the Croats and other groups during Tito’s rule (seen as a founding father of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia) of keeping Serbia weak to make Yugoslavia strong while Croats and others complained about their financial resources being decided on by the central government that was perceived as Serb-run (Mojzes, 2016). In Table 5-3 there is a brief description of the main events in the Bosnia war and beyond.
Table 5-3 Timeline of the Bosnian War\(^\text{10}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1992 | - February 29\(^{th}\) - Bosnia and Herzegovina declare independence  
       - April - Bosnian Serbs begin their siege of Sarajevo |
| 1993 | - January - Bosnian Deputy Prime Minister killed by Serbian forces while on route to the airport.  
       - Bosnian Muslims and Croats begin fighting over the parts of Bosnia not already taken by Serbs. This amounts to about 30% of the original territory.  
       - The UN declares six safe zones for Muslims: Sarajevo, Tuzla, Bihac, Srebrenica, Zepa and Gorazde. |
| 1994 | - February 6\(^{th}\) - A mortar explodes in a crowded market in Sarajevo, 68 people are killed.  
       - February 28\(^{th}\) - NATO shoots down four Serbian aircraft over Bosnia, intervening for the first time since the war began (in fact, the first use of military power by NATO since its creation in 1949)  
       - March 18\(^{th}\) - Bosnian Muslims and Croats sign peace accords drawn up by the United States |
| 1995 | - January 1\(^{st}\) - Former U.S. President Jimmy Carter brokers a peace agreement between Bosnian Serbs and Muslims. Truce holds well for about four months.  
       - May 24\(^{th}\) - Serb forces refuse to remove heavy weapons from Sarajevo and as a result, NATO launches an aircraft attack on Serb ammunition depot. In retaliation, Serbs begin attacking the Muslim safe zones designated by the UN.  
       - July 11\(^{th}\) - Serbs seize Srebrenica, an estimated 8,000 Srebrenica men and boys are killed.  
       - July - Radovan Karadzic and Ratko Mladic indicted for war crimes.  
       - July 25\(^{th}\) - Serbs seize Zepa  
       - August 30\(^{th}\) - NATO air strike begins against Serbs in and around Sarajevo  
       - November 1\(^{st}\) - Peace talks begin in Dayton, Ohio  
       - November 21\(^{st}\) - Leaders of Bosnia, Serbia, and Croatia agree to a settlement  
       - December 3\(^{rd}\) - President Clinton gives the official order to deploy American troops to Bosnia  
       - December 14\(^{th}\) - The Dayton Accords are signed by the Bosnians, Croats, and Serbs. More than 60,000 NATO troops were allowed into the territories for peacekeeping purposes only.  
       - December 20\(^{th}\) - NATO takes over peacekeeping duties from UN |
| 1996 | - July - West forces Karadzic to quit as Bosnian Serb president.  
       - September - Nationalist parties win the first post-war election, confirming Bosnia's ethnic division. |
| 2002 | - February 12\(^{th}\) - Former Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic goes on trial charged with 66 counts of genocide and war crimes in Bosnia, Croatia and Kosovo. |
| 2006 | - March 11 - Milosevic is found dead in his cell in The Hague. |
| 2008 | - July 21 - Bosnian Serb wartime president Radovan Karadzic was arrested. |

\(^{10}\) Sources: BBC, Reuters and CNN
5.1.2.2 Ending the war, Dayton Accords and the current constitutional framework

During the war, numerous peace proposals were introduced and failed, mainly because of the Bosnian Serbs -who seised about 70 percent of the country by 1994- and refused to withdraw from any territory. In February 1994, the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation-(NATO) first-ever uses force in the Bosnian war as its fighters attacked four Bosnian Serb jets that were violating the UN-imposed no-fly zone over the country. Later that year, NATO launched several air strikes against Bosnian Serb targets at the UN’s request. Subsequent to the Srebrenica massacre and the Bosnian Serb attack on a Sarajevo marketplace, NATO assumed more intense air strikes late in 1995. The NATO air strikes with a significant Bosniak-Croat land offensive pushed the Bosnian Serb forces to agree to U.S. sponsored peace talks in Dayton, Ohio, U.S., in November that year. The resulting Dayton Accords established a federalised Bosnia and Herzegovina where 51 percent of the territory is a Croat-Bosniak Federation and 49 percent is a Serb republic. The agreement formally signed in December 1995 was enforced with a 60,000-member international force deployed in the country.

The Dayton Accord is considered as consociational similar to the Good Friday agreement (Belloni, 2004; Bieber, 2006; Bose, 2005; Issacharoff, 2003; Weller and Wolff, 2006). It recognised Bosnia and Herzegovina as a state of two highly autonomous entities, the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (a decentralised federation of Croats and Bosniaks) and the Republika Srpska (Bosnian Serb Republic). The constitutional and governing system is highly complex. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, each entity has its own legislature and
president. The federal institutions of Bosnia and Herzegovina supports a directly elected tripartite presidency as a head of the state, which rotates every eight months between one Croat, one Bosniak, and one Serb member. This tripartite presidency appoints a multi-ethnic Council of Ministers. The appointed chairman of the council serves as the head of government after being approved by the national House of Representatives. The Parliament is bicameral; the lower House of Representatives where the members are directly elected to the 42-seat (14 seats reserved for the Republika Srpska and 28 seats for the Federation). The upper house is the House of Peoples, with five members from each ethnic group chosen by the entity legislatures. There have been internationally led efforts to improve and simplify the unwieldy and costly constitutional structure of Bosnia and Herzegovina to enable the country to integrate into the European Union. Nevertheless, these attempts have been resisted by the country’s nationalist leaders (Cousens and Cater, 2001).

5.1.2.3 Post-war Bosnia and Herzegovina

In September 1996, the first post-accords election brought in a tripartite national presidency and an ethnically distributed national legislature dominated by nationalist parties. The post-conflict peacebuilding period was not easy for the country especially in first few years. Despite the widespread international assistance the country received, the economy remained struggling. According to the World Bank data\(^{11}\), about 50% of the workforce in the

Federation and about 70% in the Republika Srpska were unemployed. By the early 2000s, however, much of the country’s infrastructure has been rebuilt with the support of several World Bank funded projects, and some degree of political and economic reforms were achieved. Additionally, the regional economic boom of 2006-2008, led the unemployment in the country to fall below 30%. As foreign direct investment and European bank credit replaced the decreasing international aid, rates of economic growth averaged around 6%. Improved regional relations were also achieved in the early 21st century. Calls for separation from Bosnia and Herzegovina to unite with Croatia and Serbia declined in both the Croat and Serb communities due to the vanishing interest from both of those states in supporting the separatists. Relations with Croatia, specifically, warmed in 2010, succeeding Croatian President’s apology for his country’s military actions in Bosnia and Herzegovina during the war (Kivimäki, Kramer, and Pasch, 2012).

Nonetheless, many other problems have continued to interrupt the attempts of the internal integration of Bosnia and Herzegovina, delaying the possibility of accession to the European Union (EU). Although the mass violence between the Federation and the Republika Srpska remained minimal, the peace stalemate between the two entities has persisted. Struggles over changing the constitution, including provisions for a common police force, have persistently resisted resolution. Having national policies for education, mixing pupils in schools and working on policies of anti-segregation housing are all matters that are steadfastly unresolved. Underlying all these problems are the ongoing troubled relations and mistrust between Bosniaks and Bosnian Serbs. A major issue here is the Bosniak leaders demanding a federation with some central powers in Sarajevo while Bosnian Serb politicians demand a loose confederation offering the right of separation. This key disagreement has prevented
repeated efforts to draft a new constitution to replace the Dayton agreement from reaching any success (Lampe and Pickering, 2017).

These outlines of violent conflict and the gradual struggle for peace come from two different contexts. Next, I am going to articulate the similarities between them.

5.1.3 The resemblances between Northern Ireland and Bosnia and Herzegovina

As can be seen from the previous sections, each of these conflicts has its own historical and political specifications. Nevertheless, they share many similarities in term of the trajectories, dynamics and aftermath. First, both the contexts are deeply divided societies with historically antagonistic ethnically, linguistically or religiously divided groups. Second, they both have a long and complex relationship between competing ethno-national groups with their own internal dynamics and some external influences i.e. neighboring countries and the International Community. Third, although the economic factors, such as employment, housing and public budgeting structure, have often gained less attention compared to the political factors, they were important root-causes in both conflicts. Fourthly, both conflicts have ended with an internationally supported consociational agreements that gave political autonomy to the fighting groups and set the power-sharing mechanisms. Although consociationalism as a political approach helped to end the mass violence in both contexts, it could be blamed for preventing the post-conflict societal integration. The argument is that
these agreements have institutionalised the division (Kasapović, 2006; McGarry and O'Leary, 2006a). Although Northern Ireland and Bosnia and Herzegovina might have been thought of as very different contexts, they are very similar in terms of the imperatives and the dynamics of the conflict. This, one may argue, is putting similar challenges in the face of peace leaders. In the next section, I am going to explore these challenges empirically.

5.2 Leadership in context: The contexts as seen and experienced by the participants

It is important to remember that post-conflict is an indicative term because in most of the cases there is no clear line between conflict and peace. Agreements could be reached and breeched several times before reaching an agreement that holds. So, the post-conflict peacebuilding here is the efforts and the attempts to prevent ethnocentric violence and rebuild the broken societal fabric for sustainable positive peace. This section aims to explore the PhD research participants’ interpretation of the contexts of post-conflict peacebuilding they lead in. Therefore, I am interrogating the data to explore how the participants perceived the contexts they lead in. Although I have established a theoretical similarity between the two chosen contexts in terms of conflict dynamics and peace agreement structure, I present here a first order of data analysis (Goia et al, 2012) separately for each of the two contexts to examine this assumption empirically. Then I carry out the second and third order levels of analysis comparatively, in order to explore both similarities and differences between the two contexts.
The PhD data shows that there are three sets of elements of context that stand out in the work of leaders concerned with peacebuilding; first, hostile and violent environment, second, polarisation and third depersonalisation. As explained in the chapter 4 and the use of Gioia methodology, Table 5-4 depicts the emergent aggregated dimensions of the research data where the phrases in the first column show the first-order concepts (terms adequate at the level of meanings as expressed by the participants); the themes contained in the second column show the assembly of these first-order concepts into second-order analytical/theoretical themes; and the third column shows the overarching dimensions that emerged from the analysis. These dimensions will be explained in detail in the next section.
Table 5-4 Data Structure of the context: Broken/destroyed societal fabrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1- Order Codes</th>
<th>2- Order Themes</th>
<th>Aggregated Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Northern Ireland** | - Political violence is never far away in Ireland  
- Many iterations of violence  
- People were being shot on a regular basis. | Continuous threats of violence |  |
| **BiH** | - It took us two years to believe that the war had ended  
- My village was shelled by the American air jets several times.  
- The way the war ended left things unsolved  
- We are now still in a war but by different means | Complete destruction | Hostile and violent environment |
| **Northern Ireland** | - Catholic and Protestant are big terms that cover other things  
- Protestant as a power description; it’s not a religious description | Division labels are power descriptions |  |
| **BiH** | - Being Serb, Croat or Bosinak is not about religion or even national ethnicity, it is a definition. |  |  |
| **Northern Ireland** | - Much of the violence had come out of rumour  
- We lived in an environment where no-one trusted one another  
- Whataboutery- The apportion of blame all the time  
- There was a lot of blaming; they started and we only reacted | Mistrust and lack of communication |  |
| **Northern Ireland** | - Even our housing planning was centred around The Troubles  
- Segregation is normal consequence of violence iterations  
- Segregation leads to dehumanising leading to more violence | Polarisation |  |
| **BiH** | - I couldn't go back because my hometown was destroyed by the war.  
- We have two schools under one roof system | Social and geographical segregation |  |
| **Northern Ireland** | - It's victory, it's defeat |  |  |
| **BiH** | - If we don’t win we definitely lose | Zero-sum attitude to peacebuilding |  |
### Northern Ireland
- We got into a situation where it was normal for people to be killed.
- Anecdote: killing the next generation of terrorists

### BiH
- I am not a Muslim by belief or attitude, but it doesn’t matter.

### Northern Ireland
- Intra-country war is more difficult to resolve because they are more personal.
- Violence becomes normal against “them”.
- People got killed often for no more than guilt by association.

### BiH
- You are punished for where you come from.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northern Ireland</th>
<th>BiH</th>
<th>Northern Ireland</th>
<th>BiH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dehumanisation of the “other side”</td>
<td>Depersonalisation</td>
<td>Being guilty by association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 5.2.1 Hostile and violent environment

The first aggregated dimension emerging from the data is the inherited context of the time of the troubles in Northern Ireland and the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina where the present is a product of the past. These contexts were described by the participants in much detail. The aggregated dimensions of their readings of the contexts of Northern Ireland and Bosnia and Herzegovina gave an image of remarkably broken to completely destroyed societal fabrics. Next, I am presenting the data of each aspect of this data structure for both contexts.

Violence threats and danger were an everyday aspect of life in Northern Ireland as “Political violence is never far away in Ireland” (06-NI-MR-M) and “People were being shot on a regular basis” (01-NI-MR-M). This made people live in a state of emergency and tension for almost 30 years. In more detail:
“It was very much a drip feed, it was drip feed, like every day a person would be killed. And so we got into a situation where it was normal for people to be killed, not even in combat, just people out delivering pizzas. It makes it insidious, it eats into the people, it eats into the community, because we all live constantly fight or flight” (13-NI-MR-F)

In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the violence was sharp and intense over a shorter period of time leading to a nearly complete destruction of the societal, economic and political systems. This added an extra level of difficulty as “there was a horrible war. Everything is destroyed. Sometimes I say it was like Hiroshima” (01-BiH-GR-M). Life in Bosnia and Herzegovina, after the war, was a real struggle; “we had nothing, no food, no money, no jobs, no fuel, no nothing”. The way the war was ended in Bosnia and Herzegovina, driven by international powers after several world record atrocities, seemed to leave the post-war society in a state of shock, confusion and denial:

“…the way our war ended, you know, like we are all winners, but at the same time, we are all the losers. It just really kind of left those things unsolved, you know? … So that they are kind of denying, ignoring… was it a genocide or not? Are they 500 victims or 5000?“ (14-BiH-MR-F)

Thus, “it took us something like 2 years to realise that the war had really ended. We lived with the war habits for a considerable period after the accord was signed” (03-BiH-MR-F).

One scene of the life in the time of war was described as:

“we were in Goražde, the city was scattered out, so it was kind of divided. You had this one bridge over the river there. And no one could pass through that bridge because a sniper was basically killing everybody who passed there. And afterwards, during the war, they made us… Like, I think it’s still there as well as that. They made us, under the bridge, stairs. Maybe there were people would creep on their hands to cross”. (02-BiH-GR-M)

This leads to keeping the war going by different means:
“.. We are now still in a war but by different means. Politically, economically, through media, through religious communities, etcetera. So, there is no sustainable peace that is really kind of leading to the prosperity and development of the country because you made it so ethnically divided”. (14-BiH-MR-F).

5.2.2 Polarisation

Strong polarisation was argued to characterise both these post-conflict societies, where in Northern Ireland “Catholic and Protestant are big terms that cover other things” (08-NI-MR-M) and “being Protestant is a power definition” (05-NI-MR-M):

“I was born and grew up as Protestant in East Belfast, I say Protestant because although I am from an atheist family, I’ve never worshipped in a church, I accept the definition of Protestant as a power description; it’s not a religious description. I never met a Catholic knowingly until I was 18.” (05-NI-MR-M)

It was the same in Bosnia and Herzegovina, where “Being Serb, Croat or Bosniak is not about religion or even national ethnicity, it is a definition.” (17-BiH-MR-M).

Such polarisation reinforced with a complete mistrust between neighbouring communities and more social and geographical segregation where “We lived in an environment where no-one trusted one another, people didn’t go in and out the different areas... So, there was just a fear.” (16-NI-MR-F). Segregation has happened over an extended period of time in Northern Ireland. It started as a normal reaction to fear and violence;

“The segregation takes place for the very simple thing of people are trying to protect themselves, trying to protect their lives. So where we sit here, where this building is, it sits on one of those hotspots, one of those lines of division that took
place here; The Murder Mile. And on this side obviously, you’ve got a loyalist unionist community, on [the other] side you have a Catholic Irish nationalist community. And a lot of these streets would have been mixed in their time, but it simply divided out. Houses were getting burned down, happen would cross large parts of the city.” (04-NI-MR-M).

By contrast, segregation in Bosnia and Herzegovina was a product of full-scale civil wars, putting several participants in the tough experiences of seeking refuges. 12 out of 14 of the participants had to flee their houses during the war. 8 of 12 never went back to the neighbourhoods of their origins.

But then, segregation turned to be the norm of life in many aspects both in Northern Ireland and Bosnia and Herzegovina, this includes housing policies:

“From 1969, everything here was all centred on The Troubles, so even our planning, even our housing planning was centred around The Troubles. So this block of flats was built. It housed probably about 5,000 people, but it was built in a figure of eight so that all of the people could be contained within it. So there were only certain ways to come in and out of the flats, so the army could control... And the army had a watchtower here on top of the high rise flats, and the helicopter used to bring them in supplies” (13-NI-MR-F).

And schooling system

“...have you heard about two schools under one roof system in our country?... it is that children from different ethnic and religious background study in segregation of each other even though they are physically in on building/school. They even go to different schools’ playgrounds.” (13-BiH-GR-M)

This seems to reinforce the zero- sum attitude to peacebuilding which is explained by one participant as:

“... the term It's victory, it's defeat... if you are defeated, the other person is victorious, and I suddenly went, that's why we can't have a win-win in parades. We can't have a win-win in parades because the Protestant community feels any
victory for the other side is a defeat for them. And they have to get the victory, and they have to defeat the other side.” (13-NI-MR-F)

5.2.3 The social process of depersonalisation

With the extended inter-communal violence and the prolonged social and geographic segregation, there has been “certainly a whole generation of people who grew up really not knowing what they refer to as the other side. You can believe the strangest things about people if you don’t really know them” (08-NI-MR-M). This has contributed to a process of “dehumanising” as described by the same participant.

“...a good Muslim is a dead Muslim; a good Serb is a dead Serb... for them, it did not matter what you think or what do you believe. No one would ask you. You’re punished for where you come from” (05-BiH-MR-M)

The process of “dehumanising” is described in the data through a number of reflections.

First, guilt by association;

“That’s how people were shot dead...... Some were targeted because they were members of the IRA or the UVF, but more often than not it was a rumour, it was guilt by association, it was the fact that you lived in that other community”. (01-NI-MR-M).

Second, there was the continual apportioning of blame among the fighting communities or what has been sometimes known in Northern Ireland as “whataboutery” (08-NI-MR-M);

“There was a lot of blaming. It was all about blaming the other side, it was about, they started the trouble, we are just reacting to it. And we could never quite work out what the hell was going on, because you went into one community
and they said, they started it, and then you went into the other community and said, they started it” (05-NI-MR-F).

“Like for even 20 or so years, you know, we are still arguing about pure historical facts. What had happened. The massacres, the genocide, the things that were widely disputed among the people, especially of the different nationalities, mainly by those who committed that.” (14-BiH-MR-F)

Finally, there were the cases where people were seeking revenge instead of justice:

“justice and revenge are very closely linked. So people talk about justice when sometimes it is probably revenge that they’re looking for. And we’re good at revenge is the other thing.” (02-NI-MR-M)

In this chapter I analysed the contexts selected for this research both historically and as seen by the research participants. Next, I am turning to analyse the data concerned with the leadership aspects for peacebuilding.
Chapter 6  Leading for peace: What characterises leadership for post-conflict peacebuilding?

This chapter aims to unpack the notions of leadership as reflected in the PhD research data. Hence, I am going to analyse the data on three dimensions. First of all, I am looking at the data on the context level to understand the contextual dimension of the leadership as experienced by the participants. This includes the challenges which the context, as analysed in the previous chapter, posed for leaders. These challenges are crucial to understanding the actual work of leadership. In addition, I examine the contextual supportive forces that helped the leaders in their peacebuilding. The second dimension of analysis of the PhD leadership data concerns the actions and the practices. On the action dimension, I categorise the leaders’ activities and practices around several different spheres of action, then I examine the relationships between these different spheres of action. Finally, I look at the processual dimensions of the leadership in the data, where I present further data on the strategies and tactics of leading which these leaders adopted. On this dimension, the PhD data shows how the leaders needed to work with differentiation, integration and political astuteness, in order to address the leadership tasks and challenges previously described.
6.1 Contextual forces that affect leaders’ efforts in building peace

In this section, I examine how the participants have been affected by the contextual dynamics presented in the previous chapter. As can be seen in this data structure (Table 6-1), there are three main contextual factors that surfaced through the data. These ‘contextual forces’ are different from the aspects of the context I presented at the previous chapter. The aspects of context previously discussed describe general societal dynamics perceived by participants. In contrast, the aspects of context discussed here are more specific factors affecting the participants’ ability to lead for peacebuilding. These contextual factors are first, the personal level hostility that the participants have suffered specifically because of their work on peacebuilding; second, the forces that constrained or scuppered the effort of building peace both from grassroots communities-up and from political systems-down; third, the forces that helped them in their mission of peacebuilding whether that came from the society itself or were externally driven. The similarities in the societal dynamics between the two conflicts examined in the previous chapter is reflected in the way that it has been possible, in Table 6-1 below, to develop a combined analysis of the data, with common second and third order categories across the two contexts.
Table 6-1 Contextual factors that affect leaders’ efforts in building peace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Order Codes</th>
<th>2nd Order Themes</th>
<th>Aggregated Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern Ireland</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- We had been threatened and attacked many times.</td>
<td>Same group intimidation</td>
<td>Personal-level hostility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I had to leave my house overnight and never come back.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bullets in the mail.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BiH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- In my area, they thought I am a traitor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- They said everybody in my organisation is gay and they attacked us in the centre.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- My parents had to disown me, so they can live in peace in the village.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern Ireland</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- They were testing me for two years before accepting my intentions.</td>
<td>Other group(s) mistrust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Everyone was asking why you are doing this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BiH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- They thought I am a spy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Our peace initiative was refused just because I come from Sarajevo.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern Ireland</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There was no real will to work on peace.</td>
<td>Top-down pressures</td>
<td>Contextual forces that constrained building peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Politicians had a clientalist relationship with the communities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Politicians benefit from the division.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Planning without mentioning the War; Example: Improving the Image of Northern Ireland.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Public Sector avoids the discourse of war.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Working with Government was just scratching the surface - There was no elements of social justice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BiH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Politicians do not gain support by working for their people. It is enough to work against others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Getting any data from the public bodies was next to impossible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern Ireland</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Conservative society in attitudes.</td>
<td>Bottom-up pressures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- They came because they wanted to make sure that we didn't progress anything.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- We are society in opposition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BiH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- They refused to send their kids to the centre. They didn’t want them to make friends with the other kids.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- People feared from their communities’ judgment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leading for peace: What characterises leadership for post-conflict peacebuilding?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northern Ireland</th>
<th>BiH</th>
<th>Internal influence</th>
<th>External influence</th>
<th>Forces that helped to build peace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- People say this is enough.</td>
<td>- At one point just ending the war was good enough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Examples of situations that people begin to learn about happening around them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Community and voluntary sector finding their voice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BiH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BiH</td>
<td>Internal influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Influenced by EU new language came in.</td>
<td>- Looking up to the European Union as the example.</td>
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This hostility seemed to be particularly strongly practiced by the social groups to which the participants belonged. For example, (03-BiH-MR-F) who had been terrified for years after the end of the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina:

“Whenever I'm crossing that line [a check point between two fighting communities] and some people are there, I thought, oh my god, they know who I am. I'm stuck. They know. What if? And I felt that there had been a big sign saying she's Serb. I was afraid, but again, I had more willingness to do that, to do something... I was the enemy of both sides. For both sides, you know. In my area, they saw where I'm going, what I am doing. I'm a traitor. No one likes what I am doing, either side. They captured me for four times, at night, for interviews. What am I doing? They wanted me to be a spy there, to say what they're doing on daily basis, and I didn't want to do that. And my husband had a big issue with that. We had a physical attack because of what I am doing.” (03-BiH-MR-F)

This intimidation by the participants’ own social groups was combined with a lack of trust from the other groups that they were reaching out to:

“We have two offices in Birtchco and Sarajevo. In Birtchco we were trying to do activities memorialising the detainees in the concentration camps. The association of those victims, from Birtchco, they refused to collaborate with us and they gave press release where they told that we don’t have the right to make any peace activities about these crimes ... They told me they can’t trust to me because I'm coming from Sarajevo. They also think we will use that against the Republika Srpska, against the municipality of Trabenia. Also maybe we will want to make some memorials of Bosniaks in Trabenia,” (09-HiB-MR-M)

This hostility from their own identity group has created a deep emotional impact for the participants. This aspect has been repeatedly mentioned and stressed by the participants; for example, one participant was reflecting on her feeling after an incident when one of her team was attacked in a workshop she had organised for under-age soldiers:

“I start to dream about what had happened in that workshop… it was very traumatic. And I was thinking if I should continue to do this in this way or should I quit… Everything was so personal to me… because I have my own traumas
during the war, and this just triggered them for me. I don’t shame to tell you that I’m just human and I have my own traumatic experiences, and I want to talk about them, and I’m not ashamed… I started smoking when that happened. I never smoke before.” (10-BiH-GR-F)

Or 00-Pilot-MR-M had similar distress after being physically threatened because of the work he was doing:

“I was frightened. I wasn’t sleeping at night. I was distressed. I talked to lots of people about what to do and I was not happy. I was unhappy, but I was damned if I was going to give up”.

Another participant shared her experience of dealing with the missing people’s families as part of a national project of conciliation which she was leading:

“… the level of pain, and… And sadness, and… And things that we were seeing throughout those years were like really enormous. So I think it just really affected me a lot. And I couldn’t… Like I really felt like drowned out, and felt that there is nothing I can give to these people anymore. And in return, you know, I can’t… I can’t absorb anything else. Anymore. So I think the best thing was to leave… And there is always this kind of anxiety and uncertainty about it… No, it’s real, really painful.” (14-BiH-MR-F)

6.1.2 Contextual forces that constrained building peace

Leading in the contexts of post-conflict peacebuilding involve dealing with different sets of forces that can be restrictive or supportive of peacebuilding. The long process of reconciliation where “change does not happen on the top only or on the bottom only but on both” (12-NI-MR-F) and how to manage this process with all the pressures coming from both ends was a source of reflection to the participants. They mentioned a number of forces
that they felt constrained their leadership in building peace. These anti-peace forces can be divided into top-down and bottom-up. The top-down pressures are the forces that resist peace efforts coming from the upper tiers of contexts i.e. the political system on the national level, politicians at the local government level and the bureaucracy at the public administrative level. For example, (13-NI-MR-F) talked about her time collaborating with local government:

“...the councils didn't really want to do peacebuilding, but they wanted the money because it was an extra. Because we were employed permanently, we were constantly being pushed to do things the council wanted us to do, even though our vision was peacebuilding. And they were constantly just using us as another member of staff...It was money-led, there wasn't a lot of money about so the council were taking us on because we came with a lot of money” 13-NI-MR-F.

Another respondent got “into a conflict with politicians. Because they get into this clientalist relationship with the communities” (12-NI-MR-F). A number of participants mentioned the negative role played by the public administration over the time of the troubles for being too bureaucratic and acting in denial of the conflict.

In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the political system and the politicians’ performance were held responsible for the slow and sometime immobilised peacebuilding;

“The politicians are offering each other favours. If say a politician from Republika Srpska said something, then politicians from the Federation argued against what he said, immediately the rating of that politician in Republika Srpska goes up” 11-BiH-MR-M

Bottom-up pressures, on the other hand, are the peace-resistance that came from the grassroots communities, such as from traditional community leaders, where:
“Some of them came [to a major cross-communities initiative meetings] out of curiosity, and some of them came to make sure their communities weren't being marched into something they didn't want to be involved in, and some of them came to make sure that nothing progressed..., and it took years and years and years. That was a nightmare” 13-NI-MR-F

Another bottom-up pressure mentioned is the conservative culture that was preserved as very hard to change; “You can't believe how conservative this place is... See all those years, this was a very religiously, culturally, traditionally conservative place” (04-NI-MR-F). It was a society in opposition:

“I took the view that Northern Ireland was the society in opposition. Everyone in Northern Ireland was in opposition to something... all our political parties behaved like opposition parties and everybody else in society did the same thing. So I thought we needed change, that, and we decided to try and opt out of the party of opposition type rule. Because a lot of the time we would have spent our time criticising the government, condemning government on its policies.” (08-NI-MR-M)

Several cases were mentioned by the participants where people refused to take part in peace initiatives because they feared from the community they belong to:

“We tried our best, in few occasions working in the small villages in the rural areas in both the Republic and the Federation, we couldn’t convince a single woman to join us. They were afraid to be seen talking to us” (05-HiB-MR-M)

6.1.3 Forces that helped to build peace

Nevertheless, the participants mentioned an “opposite current of energy” (03-NI-MR-M) that was a huge support with their leading for peace, where “people begin to learn what's happening around them”. A few stories were mentioned where people started questioning
their beliefs about the conflict as a result of some personal experiences. Additionally, with the unbearable cost of the conflict for both communities, people had enough of the conflict;

“it would have been 93, 94, so there was a period of, where people were talking about the demographic deficit a lot, and there was a period where people were, there was a rise, I think the peace process that came from the people, you know, there was a rise in opinion who said, this is enough. We need out of this... there were the beginnings of a policy that would have been shaped eventually into a shared future, so it was... there would still have been a reluctance, as there still is, as always in policy terms, to actually say, yes, it’s really core to our business, and obtaining investment, that we get this sorted out. That wouldn’t have been said, but it would have been a voice underneath it”. 04-NI-MR-F

A strong drive for peace in Northern Ireland came from the community and voluntary sector which was “finding their voice” (02-NI-MR-M). The third sector was considered as a vehicle of change and had engaged with peacebuilding activities on a wide scale. In addition to the strong influence of the European Union as an example for moving beyond war and division and a source of a new language:

“Things like openness, transparency, that’s where all that language started to come out of certainly with the support of the European Union. For us. In the 1990s. So things like social cohesion, thinking about a society that needs to be cohesive. Now we warmed to it very quickly because we said, that’s what we haven’t had. This place has certainly not been cohesive. So social cohesion, openness, transparency, even the continental notion of subsidiarity and all of... All of that. That certainly had a big influence” (01-NI-MR-M).

In Bosnia and Herzegovina, there was a relief that no mass act of revenge was sought, on the personal and community level. There was a general acceptance for the work of the war crimes court as established in the Dayton Accords;

“What I also discovered with these people, it’s like an amazing thing, and I think it’s also something I think very cultural. And related to our kind of mentality. That regardless how many people suffered in the war, it was never a single act of revenge. Which is really something that... That helps... That once the conflict stopped there was not deepened in that sense, people taking revenge for the things. And... And we are very blessed for that.” 14-BiH-MR-F
This was in addition to the international support for building capacity for peace that the reconstruction and the reconciliation processes in the country had attracted, as referred to by all the participants from Bosnia and Hercegovina.

The contexts of post conflict peacebuilding and the contextual factors that shaped the leadership in Northern Ireland and Bosnia and Herzegovina has been analysed separately as a first order concept \(^{12}\), but then I carry out a combined or comparative second order and third level analysis which brings out strong similarities between the two contexts. Additionally, I have established the theoretical similarity between the two chosen contexts in terms of conflict dynamics and peace agreement structure in chapter 5. This provisional conclusion about the common features of the two contexts studied was empirically supported by the empirical data. Therefore, for the sections of analysis that follow, I focus on different aspects of leadership which are common across these two essentially similar contexts. In presenting this analysis, I offer a balance of quotes across both contexts. Moreover, in case there is an aspect of leadership that is specific for one contexts, I will highlight it and comment on it.

---

\(^{12}\) First level of data analysis in Gioia Methodology, (chapter 4)
6.2 The practice aspects of peacebuilding leadership (spheres of action)

In this section, I am investigating leading for peace in post-conflict contexts with regard to actions taken by the leaders (leadership as practice as discussed in chapter 3). The question in mind while analysing the data on this dimension was: what kind of activities and functions do these leaders perform in their effort of achieving peace? Over their careers, the participants have engaged in peacebuilding through working in or leading organisations or civil movements that are related to a variety of post-conflict issues. From the collected data, there are different spheres of action where the participants’ efforts have been focused. Figure 6-1 shows the five spheres of actions of peacebuilding, derived from the data.
Leading for peace: What characterises leadership for post-conflict peacebuilding?

Figure 6-1 The spheres of action of peacebuilding

**Local community level- urgent interventions**
- Taking the youth out of their locality around the time of troubles
- Supporting diversion work with street young people that were disenfranchised
- Resettling returned refugees
- Working with those who had post-traumatic stress disorder
- Committing to conflict intervention work to minimise the intercommunal violence

**Common challenges cross-communities**
- Working with minor soldiers from different social groups
- Running training programmes cross-communities
- Running community inquiries
- Organising war memorials
- Protesting against genocides and ALL crimes
- Leading in the women's rights movement
- Contributing to the racial equality strategy
- Identifying of Mass Graves
- Working with war crimes in HiB to prevent them in the future
- Working with lone parents from the conflict

**Inter-community relations**
- Implementing strategies for communication and engagement for the people who live near the fighting communities interfaces
- Leading the youth Initiative for Human Rights
- Negotiating parades in Belfast
- Working with the communities and informing practice on the ground
- Developing community relations within Republican Nationalist communities and Loyalist Unionist communities
- Taking down the peace walls in Belfast
- Establishing the community dialogue project
- Building Community relations through adult education
- Working on hate crimes with community development organisations in NI

**Connecting between the grassroots, government and politicians**
- Training senior police staff with participation of both communities
- Training local government in anti-sectarian work, and human rights education, and cultural diversity
- Working with politicians on the national strategy for the third sector
- Collaborating with authorities to release the national law of missing people
- Running Yes Campaign to support the Good Friday agreement
- informing the government on Policy-Parades commission
- Engaging with the politicians in the opposition
- Debating the future of NI

**The wider international context**
- Working at European level to develop social dimension of Europe
- Linking the national with the international in women movement in NI
- Representing women at the Forum for Peace and Reconciliation in Dublin
- Organising a big North- South conference with the support of the European Commission Office
- Working with the Organisation of security and co-operation in Europe
- Working internationally on general human right standards
- Supporting LGBT- Women human rights- Anti-Militarist in HiB
These spheres of action do not work in silos. Some participants have been active in different spheres in different phases of their careers. For example, one female leader from Bosnia and Herzegovina started her career working with humanitarian aid in refugee camps, then she led the Balkan regional organisation for identifying missing people, then she led an international project as she explained it:

“… after that I moved to the Initiative for Human Rights where I'm going to be ten years. Because I think it’s a natural process, you know, like working with the consequences of war, and the impact of the war, it just kind of naturally leads you now to be kind of sick and tired of that and turn to the future. And so for ten years working with the young people, we see tremendous impact on them” 14-BiH-MR-F

Another leader thinks that his impact on one sphere of actions brought him to work with another one;

“So I was a Presbyterian minister in a congregation and then I left that to take this post up 18 years ago [in cross- community sphere]. So there’s a sense in which I work within the community. But increasingly I suppose because of my work here I’ve been asked to be involved with government.” 06-NI-GR-M

Others have focused their efforts on one sphere of actions where they felt most influential.

“I have been here working with these neighbouring communities for 23 years now. I gained credibility. I built trust. It is only after investing all this time and effort you can say I had influence here” 03-NI-GR-M

In sum, this section looked at the different activities and functions which leading for peace had involved. These activities as emerged from the research data have been categorised into five spheres of action. The spheres of action were described and the link among them was established. Further analysis is introduced in the discussion chapter. In the next section, I am investigating the leadership processes revealed in the data.
6.3 Leadership as Process: How do the ‘leaders’ get things done?

In this section, I move from the contextual aspects and the practice aspects of leadership to its process aspects. From the research data, three main dynamics were derived. These seem to overarch the different processes of leadership as seen in the data (Table 6-2); differentiation, integration and political astuteness. I suggest from the data that leaders differentiate themselves, and mobilise other people’s differentiation from their social group, but without losing some degree of connection and that they also do this astutely. For example, you “challenge your own people” (06-NI-MR-M) without “moving too far beyond your community” (03-NI-MR-M). This dynamic of differentiation is married with another dynamic of integration where they reach out to other groups on the opposite side of the conflict, and support people in building cross-communities bridges. They challenge the divisive authority structure simultaneously with building a supportive network and creating spaces for people to meet. They do this while being politically astute, creative and sensitive to the imperatives of the context they are active in. The data shows that it is important for leaders to be politically astute in understanding their personal biases and motives, others’ biases and motives, and the wider context of conflict where all these biases and motives interact and are contested. In the following section, these three dynamics are explored in detail as they have been articulated by the participants in my research.
### Table 6-2 Leadership as Process: How ‘leaders’ do get things done?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Order Codes</th>
<th>2nd Order Themes</th>
<th>Aggregated Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changing the terms of the debate</td>
<td>Challenging the status quo; change the way that social identity is enacted</td>
<td><strong>Differentiation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good authority is challenging your own people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You cannot move too far beyond your community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You cannot turn around and just simply go and leave the work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have to do what you have to do- problematic-uncomfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging the authority-eg Global womens conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing the grouping structure from cross communities to a cross class divide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If something has to be done, so you just do it- election example.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You won’t be popular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building up a wider range of different networks with different kind of organisations</td>
<td>Building supporting environment/Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating support systems- mobile childcare example</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building safety nets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in the whole Balkan region with the Youth Initiative for Human Rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have a representative from each group in the leading team</td>
<td>Inclusive leadership that reaches out to all the conflicting groups</td>
<td><strong>Integration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We keep people involved in the discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with people who are open to change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You can’t achieve anything on your own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgement of cultural identity and history</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving the grassroots leaders the exposure on the strategic level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking different levels of actions-eg grass-roots with strategic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make the members think what is happening to them in structure terms and equality terms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putting the local issues in the wider global context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with both sides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You run an inclusive process, that you’re willing to actually engage people who are better than you.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing experiences, and sharing some principles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We did work with the Department of Foreign Affairs in Northern Ireland. We did work with policy makers. Part of it was to acclimatise them to people from the South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We worked for war camps victims from all nationalities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You’re training people for a profession. But also those people are forming relationships</td>
<td>Creating Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a space for meeting up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace summer camp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building a space for enemies to discover each other as people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create space together through the neutrality of the Third Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor soldier peace summer camp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- I naturally developed the instinct to not trust anything at first
- You have to be clear about your own biases and preferences first.
- Know your qualities
- Choosing your tactics with your background in the conflict in mind
- Changing the priority when the situation changed- the 2Ps challenges; policing and parades
- To understand the importance of the type of language used
- Doing Changes Quietly
- I rather stick in the shadow, so let young people, let others in front of you
- Thinking strategically -who do you need to influence and how
- Timing the activity to maximise the impact
- Being at the right time in the right place
- The recognition of the wider collective process
- The challenge to walk a tightrope
- If you come up against a wall, you go round it
- Getting a feel for what we should be doing
- Tell me what you want, and I will write it in the language that government understands to try and negotiate it into programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political astuteness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being aware of the different tiers of context including one ‘self</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Good leaders try to spot the right opportunities
- Use the opportunity and widen it
- Create the opportunity if you cannot find it
- Readiness to take the opportunity

- To work for peace we needed to involve the paramilitary
- Foster symbolic actions- toilet rolls example
- Taking risk when it is needed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proactivity; finding and seizing opportunity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social innovation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thinking out of the box</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.3.1 Differentiation

Differentiation, as analysed from the data, is the dynamic through which the participants find their own voice, separate from their ingroup, and act upon it, and mobilise and support people to do the same:
“Very often it’s about changing the terms of the debate, you know it’s about introducing new ideas. For example, when I was doing that, I started a project called the Anti-Sectarianism Project, and it was the first time that phrase anti-sectarianism had been used. It’s widely used now, but we ran a programme to try to help people challenge sectarianism inside their own communities and inside their own organisations.” 04-NI-MR-M

“but it’s always, you know, tell my participants do not take me or anyone as an authority, you know, who is telling you something that you have to accept, just think about it. If you agree with me, and I will be pretty satisfied that you have just thought about it. You know, that you are questioning the things, you know? Not accepting things just like that, you know? So those people who are accepting that way of thinking are not, you know, people who you can easily manipulate.” 17-HiB-MR-M

The two processes that reflect the dynamics of differentiation in the data are first, challenging the structure, and changing the way that social identity is enacted; and second, building supportive environment/ systems. Processes that are involved in maintaining this dynamic are illustrated in the 1st order concepts column in Table 6-2. Interviewees for example spoke of a notion of ‘good authority’ which involved challenging their own people:

“I think I’ve thought a bit about the notion of good authority. People who actually take a risk with their own people. You know, and who talk in more difficult terms to their own people than they do to whoever their so-called enemy or opposition might be. And who simply... You know, populism is a very bad thing in my view. You know, populist leaders in my view are not leaders at all.” (08-NI-MR-M).

However, “you can’t move too far beyond your own community, we can’t pull people too far” (03-NI-GR-M). They kept mobilising and supporting people from the other conflicted social groups to differentiate as well:

“I lead the Youth Initiative for Human Rights...what they are hearing right now from the media, what I can hear at the home, right, their parents, is something, which is completely destructive. They’re starting even more nationalistic than their parents are. Because they have that, kind of urge, energy, you know? Even you know like kind of because older people even though they’re nationalists and chauvinists they know what the real war is, and because of that, because of that...
Participants also reported their perceptions of the risk and difficulty of differentiating themselves from their own social groups, including losing relationships with family and friends, and physical harm. So, they strongly commended the importance of building supportive systems and safety nets:

“Leadership is about knowing, you build the safety net too, which is how all these networks are in some ways, you know; the Decade of Centenary Round Table allows all the groups around the table to share information, to work together and to know that, they’re being a bit edgy but actually, they are on safe ground because we are all being a bit edgy together.” (04-NI-MR-F)

In differentiation, there are evident aspects of political astuteness. For example, building alignment and alliances and reaching up to gather support also from within the political system when it is possible:

“I mean, I prefer this kind of work. For me, it is more useful to change individuals. But in practical terms, it was more efficient to change the government if possible, and work at government level. So, you keep the work going on both levels” (17-BiH-MR-M)

6.3.2 Integration

Integration is the dynamic through which the leaders try to reach out to the other social groups; for example, they create spaces for the “enemies” to meet up together. Processes that
are involved in maintaining this dynamic are shown in the 1st order concepts column in Table 6-2.

Reaching out to all the conflicting groups can be very problematic and distressing:

“I didn’t necessarily have to like the people who I worked with, in fact in many cases I didn’t, I didn’t particularly like them, I didn’t particularly want to be there, when I came down after the ceasefires when the police came, and I didn’t particularly want to work with policemen who I felt had been sort of abusive and been, you know, I didn’t have any faith in. But then there are things you need to do, and it may be uncomfortable and it may not be nice and it may be problematic, but you have to do them and that’s part of what you have to do. It isn’t easy” (03-NI-GR-M)

“you start to say I don’t work with this institution, I can’t work with that institution, you’ve got to be prepared to work with everybody and see that everybody has a contribution to make somewhere along the line. There may be people you don’t like or don’t want to work with or don’t trust, but we would always work with a wide variety of individuals, and give them the benefit of the doubt if they are saying they want to do something” (02-HiB-MR-M)

However, it seems that it was important for people experiencing the impact of conflict to see someone from the other side attempting to help:

“So it was working with refugees who came very bitter, very angry at the people who committed crimes against them. And for me, working with them. Because also, you know, just working there… very importantly, I am not Muslim … [he is Serb]. So it was very important for them to see that not all of these others… Are cleansing them up or want them dead.” (17-BiH-MR-M)

A great deal of this integration dynamic has happened through creating space for people to meet up. Whether it is in intellectual space for people to talk and debate or physical space for people to meet:

“The college was also a base that we used for really doing education work around the conflict, right. So when you’re talking about specifically conflict work,
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we would have behind the scenes political discussions…[it was used] As a space, and as a resource”. (12-NI-MR-F)

“We are physically located, a number of times we’ve talked about moving the offices, but we are located, this is a strong republican Catholic area, that’s a strong loyalist, the other side of the street. We know people in both areas, we’ve worked with people in both areas.” (2-NI-MR-M)

“Bring them here, like put them together with the all kind of nations that’s here. Because even that I really hate, you know, they have a first identity as a national identity… you bring them here, So in the end, you know, as they are kind of making friends and establishing the friendships among people you know it’s not based on the nationality or something, but it’s based mostly, you know, on the level of education, on the core values and things. You know, so they can develop that. And they’re starting to be, indirectly, kind of peer educators. The main thing is to put them together, to bring them together.” (11-BiH-MR-M)

The “spaces for people to meet” could take a number of different physical or conceptual forms, including forums, or terms of engagement, offered by the third sector:

“what I was trying to do was to use the Third Sector as a vehicle, could the two main protagonists Unionism and Nationalism create space together through the neutrality of the Third Sector on issues like unemployment, the economy, jobs, housing, childcare, the environment, disability - to work together, to understand each other better and to forge a third force between Unionism and Nationalism and in relation to the State, even though it was a contested State, obviously a contested State.” (05-NI-MR-M)

6.3.3 Political astuteness

Both processes of differentiation and integration seem to require a great deal of leading with political astuteness. For example, one participant was reflecting on his way of choosing his tactics as a leader with his background of the conflict in mind:
“05-NI-MR-M [the previous leader of the organisation] would have been much more combative with the government because again coming from the sort of background that he did, didn’t cost him a thought like to battle it out in public. You know, with the government. Whereas coming from the sort of background that I came from you’re likely to be more careful. In terms of you always believe there can be consequences, you know? So therefore as I say there are tactical differences there”. (08-NI-MR-M)

The participants demonstrated their political astuteness through a wide set of views, examples and reflections that analytically I have aggregated into three themes. First, there was being aware of the different tiers and layers of context, including first-hand knowledge of realities at the front-line:

“I suppose from then on it’s always thinking about if you’re doing something who do you need to influence and how, and some of it has been quite by chance, it’s a matter of following up opportunities. We made contacts with people because we were at events where things were happening, when disorder was happening and we could talk to them about it. Not because we’d seen it on the media but because we knew what was going on, we knew the situation on the ground. And you’d have a chat with them about it, and often you’d do it strategically, you’d consciously go and look them out.” (02-NI-MR-M)

This included being aware of oneself and one’s own biases:

“With my own story, of course, you can’t put away your subjectivity in that way because I’m expressing my opinion but I have learnt to be aware of this subjectivity” (11-BiH-MR-M)

The second theme is proactively finding and seising and shaping opportunity:

“Other things then created smaller spaces that maybe developed into bigger spaces, but I mean that’s what happens as you, as an opportunity arises where spaces opened up and you either, you take that space and try to broaden it and
A third theme concerns being innovative and alert to symbolic power and action on the level of initiatives. One participant decided that “to work for peace we needed to involve paramilitary” (12-NI-MR-F) which she felt was a starting point for one of the most effective initiatives in containing and controlling inter-community violence in Belfast. Another example on the level of activity was fostering symbolic actions with toilet rolls:

“So if we were campaigning for an increase in financial support for local parents, and there was very little in terms of welfare support. One campaign we did is we sent a roll of toilet paper, 26 rolls of toilet paper, to the Prime Minister’s office in Downing Street. One from every lone parent group in Northern Ireland, to symbolically represent the pathetic increase in welfare funding that they got. You see, so it's making symbolically… You know, there are things we did symbolically like that...” 12-NI-MR-F

“As part of that project, I interviewed all key leaders that work on the peace process and I reflected on my experience in relation to their experiences… I wrote a book about this and it was a great exercise for me to deepen my understanding for myself and for the context of peace here in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Additionally, the book created a discussion on media on the national level about what did peace meant directly after the war and what does it mean now. This, I guess, was a good way to get attention for what we do and to gain influence.” 09-HiB-MR-M

Nevertheless, participants said that it was important to be aware of the consequences of the risks taken;

“It was so scary, believe me. I wouldn’t necessarily recommend it, I think there are softer ways of doing it, you don’t have to jump off the plank.” 04-HiB-MR-F
"I think it’s almost like a seesaw, you know a seesaw on a children’s playground. So the more your credibility goes up on this side the lower it becomes on the other side. So within this community the higher profile I had here and the more acceptance I had within the – not only this community but the wider Catholic community probably the less I had in my own. Because of perception, I think well if they like him, we’ve got to hear him… First of all I came to accept that that was going to be the case to some degree and I wouldn’t let it worry me. I wouldn’t start trying to increase my credibility in my own community by doing things here that were detrimental to what…If we were doing something good and positive here there were learning outcomes that I could share with my own community.”
(06-NI-GR-M)

To sum up

This chapter has presented in depth my research data on the nature of leading for peace. I established three dimensions (or foci for analysis) for investigating the data. First, I analysed the data based on the contextual aspects that helped or hindered the leaders’ efforts in building peace. Second, I analysed the data based on the spheres of action they engaged with in order to build peace. Finally, I looked at the processes of leading for peace where three overarching processes emerged from the data; differentiation, integration and political astuteness. In the discussion chapter (8), I will draw all of these together by offering a conceptual model for understanding the elements of leadership context, practice, and process typical of these post conflict leaders and how they addressed the leadership tasks and challenges they faced. Before doing so, however, in the next chapter I will analyse the data concerned with the participants’ leadership learning and development.
Chapter 7  Leadership development and learning

This chapter aims to explore leaders’ views of their own development in post-conflict peacebuilding context. It attempts to address, from the data, the events and the processes of leadership learning and development in such extreme context. In this chapter, the use of leadership journeys as a methodological instrument to collect the data seems particularly rewarding. It resulted in rich data and deep reflections by the participants on their overall experience in leading for peace. To structure and analyse the data, I use 3P model; Presage, Process and Product modified from Tynjälä (2013) (figure 3-7). The model is operationalised to best reflect the data. My rationale in operationalising the model is that in chapter 6, I analysed the different dimensions of leadership for peacebuilding which sit in the Product component of the model. In this chapter, I analyse the data around the other components of the model to understand the learning and development that brought about the leadership for peace building as defined in the previous chapter.

The starting point in this chapter is a reminder of the analysed data in terms of Product component i.e. leadership for peacebuilding. Then, I investigate the sociocultural framing where I explore the particularities the post-conflict context in relation to leadership learning and development. Then, I explore the Presage component of the model, where I examine the prior knowledge and experiences of the participants, their backgrounds and their motivations. Next, I analyse the Processes that fostered their leadership learning, and cover
both informal learning and formal development. Finally, I explore the emotional aspects of the participants’ leadership and learning journeys.

7.1 Leadership for peacebuilding as a Product of learning and development

In the previous chapter, the three main processes that were found to be specific for leading for peace are differentiation, integration, political astuteness. Additionally, the spheres and arenas for peace leadership action were summarised first as tackling the challenges that directly related to the conflict in the conflictual societal groups separately and the horizontal and vertical the endeavours of bridging with other groups, both horizontally and vertically; and thirdly as the efforts on the international level. This processes and practices are the Product component of the modified 3P model modified from Tynjälä (2013). The Product component remains open for other aspects comes from the leaders’ reflections on their personal learning and development.
In the next sections, I will investigate the data to find out how leaders developed these understanding, processes and practices of leadership for peacebuilding.
7.2 The context of conflict as a socio-cultural environment of peace leadership learning and development

Tynjala (2013) defines sociocultural environment in terms of the possibilities and constraints of workplace learning, including technical–organisational environment, communities of practice and organisational learning. In this PhD research, the participants refer to a different, much deeper and more distressing socio-cultural environment for their leadership learning and development. What was learned from the previous chapters was that context of leading for peace is characterised by hostility and violence, polarisation and depersonalisation. These dynamics seemed to shape the leadership processes, practices and development, according to the participants. The data suggest that the same contextual factors that shaped the participants leadership seems to influence their development on the sociocultural level because the sociocultural influence of conflict seems to be part of the lives of the people:

“I grew up in a family that were all involved in the conflict in terms of they would have been in prison, in terms of them being involved in the political violence. So I grew up in the context of understanding some of the legacies of people becoming involved in violent conflict, and the same people had also moved towards believing that non-violence was the way forward, political means were the way forward” (16-NI-GR-F).

“….. you live with these divisions in every aspect of your life, from the schools where kids get educated in segregation to jobs to the political system. You learn how to find your way in such a context. Actually it is not easy because the division is embodied in us. The biggest challenge, I think, is to be aware of this and learn how to deal with it” (05-HiB-MR-M)
The learning experiences that seem to be closely related to leading in post-conflict peacebuilding is learning from hard experiences. This could be due to the nature of the experiences that leaders in post-conflict peacebuilding go through. The experience of adversity beyond what is experienced in non-conflict situations seems to give them confidence in their abilities to deal with extremely difficult situations and made them resilient. These hard experiences as mentioned by the participants can be argued to be specific to the conflict context if not in their intensity then in their frequency. For example, one participant who was an ex-political prisoner reflected on his time in prison as a learning process:

“...that was one of the learning experiences, you know, that, especially if you're, and I was locked in a cell with guys, you know, 20, maybe 24 hours a day, some people you didn't like, but you had to be able to... You couldn't ring the door and say listen I don't like him can we separate... You had to live with that person and you had to deal with how you feel.....So I think it's a huge learning experience and one of those things where, and especially where there are loads of strong characters with strong personalities and big personalities all together in these places...... They used to call prisons universities, Republican universities, universities of life” (03-NI-GR-M)

Another example of these experiences is the impact that one participant mentioned about having her home attacked:

“...... I certainly felt so unsafe that I could have participated in that. And I suppose it was definitely a catalyst for me in terms of understanding the work that still needed to be done around peace and peace building....So at that point it was the first time that I thought about being actively involved in some way. And so I was part of a group that was supporting families that experienced trauma because of that. And my experience at that time was I was really new to the work, really new to just how much work still needed to be done. And I was also, I'm sure, traumatised myself, and experiencing...Had needs myself in terms of being supported and all the rest. So I was very much involved as a participant at that sort of point.” (16-NI-GR-F)

Similarly, the reflection on time spent in a concentration camp offered by another participant;
“to me [being in the concentration camp] was constant learning and to say once you get over that idea of, you know, that you’re not afraid of anybody because you’ve done it and you came through it okay, then that gives you a confidence in a way…… it’s a huge learning.” (05-HiB-MR-M)

The conflict socio-culture should be kept in mind in the coming sections where I am analysing the data concerned with leadership development experiences and events.

7.3 Presage: Leaders’ factors and leaders context

The second element of the 3P model (as modified and developed for the use of this PhD research from Tynjälä (2013) is Presage with two main elements; leaders’ factors and leader context. The presage phase is the period of time before the participants were engaged in peacebuilding work but where fundamental developmental processes took place, often at an early age for most participants. According to them, these developmental experiences deeply impacted their awareness of themselves, other people and their contexts of war and peace. These leaders’ factors involve understanding who these people are and where they are coming from, and how they see their personal story. First of all, I start with a description of the participants’ first steps into the field of peacebuilding and how their awareness and skills developed in the early stages of their peacebuilding work. This section then moves on to investigate the motives that the participants mentioned behind their engagement in the field.
The leaders came from a wide range of educational and professional backgrounds. In Table 7-1, all participants have been listed with their introduction to the field as they recall it and when that was.

Table 7-1 Presage: Starting Points in Peacebuilding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Starting point; engagement in peacebuilding</th>
<th>X years ago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01-BiH-GR-M</td>
<td>I volunteered for the youth centre in my city directly after the war to bring kids from all backgrounds to know each other</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-NI-MR-M</td>
<td>When I started, the work I was doing would not have been called peace building. It would have been called working with the community, or it might have been called community relations, but it was all done under the umbrella of adult education.</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-BiH-GR-M</td>
<td>I started as a participant in an international project working on transitional justice and journalism</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-NI-MR-M</td>
<td>In that early days, I was an Anthropologist researching the phenomenon of parades in Belfast</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-BiH-MR-F</td>
<td>I co-founded a Women NGO with focus on human rights</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-NI-GR-M</td>
<td>My engagement would be called community relations sector... just after being released from prison</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-NI-MR-F</td>
<td>I was managing different diversionary activity for young people in West Belfast,</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-HiB-MR-M</td>
<td>When the war broke out, I was a Historian in a Yugoslavian university [name].</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-NI-MR-M</td>
<td>I learnt my politics at university in student politics and I worked in a socially relevant job in local Government in the public sector helping poor people with their entitlements to benefits and social security, so in the welfare rights business before coming back to Northern Ireland</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-HiB-MR-M</td>
<td>Student politics in Serbia was the gate brought me to engaging with post-war peacebuilding</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-NI-GR-M</td>
<td>I was a Presbyterian minister in a congregation and then I left that to work in a Catholic community. At the beginning, the focus was community development then building relations among communities</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-NI-GR-M</td>
<td>I started Working with youth anti-social behaviour against other communities</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-NI-MR-M</td>
<td>I had a historical studies background and I started with youth development organisation; working with young people who’d left school. Generally, with little or no qualifications, and helping</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-HiB-MR-M</td>
<td>I started working for a youth organisation in my home town working on resettling people who fled because of the war, then political journalism</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-BiH-GR-F</td>
<td>I am a psychologist working only with people with post-traumatic stress disorder. Then started a project to work with minor soldiers</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-NI-MR-M</td>
<td>I was a youth social worker who worked with violent young people on the streets</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-BiH-MR-M</td>
<td>I started working for a youth organisation in my home town working on resettling people who fled because of the war, then political journalism</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-NI-MR-F</td>
<td>I got involved in student politics, and in the Civil Rights Association. In my first year, I was elected as first year students’ representative.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-BiH-GR-M</td>
<td>I was working in a youth NGO that worked against social and educational segregation.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-NI-MR-F</td>
<td>I was involved with the local government as a community relations officer and I was responsible for training and supporting all the staff within local government in Belfast. Training them in anti-sectarian work, and human rights education, and cultural diversity.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-BiH-MR-F</td>
<td>I was 21 when the war occurred in Bosnia, and I just happened to start working for this organisation delivering humanitarian aid.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-NI-GR-F</td>
<td>I started with political activism with peace people against violence</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-BiH-MR-M</td>
<td>I was organising exchange programs between young people from France and Germany, and later the international organisations where I worked was with Franco German youth office which is there to finance exchange between civil society actors of France and Germany.</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-NI-MR-F</td>
<td>I started my work in an organisation that was supporting volunteers to engage in all sorts of voluntary activity, both in the community and voluntary sector and with statutory organisations. And my job was to align the interests of individuals who were coming forward to volunteer, with volunteering opportunities.</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-BiH-MR-F</td>
<td>I started with a work which aims to educate women in the fields which they need in their personal or professional lives.</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-NI-GR-F</td>
<td>I worked at that time on a specific research project with a loyalist ex-prisoner’s organisation. It was looking at the impact of prison on loyalist ex-prisoners’ children, there had never been any research done about the consequences for these families.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I just happened to start working for this international organisation delivering humanitarian aid.

I started in Student politics in the university as an elected student representative

Starting point engagement in peacebuilding

I was the leader or coordinator of a very innovative project amongst violent young people in Moss Side, Manchester. And I lived and worked in the neighbourhood of Moss Side, and we developed a program of work with street-based gangs over a five years period.

Exploring Table 7-1 above, we can extract some overarching themes. Several participants had their first work experiences in the social change domain working on community development, supporting women and youth and tackling socio-economic challenges like poverty, equal access to public services and capacity building for the less fortunate. All these activities were consciously used as means to bring people from different sides of the conflict together. The bigger umbrella that covered (sometimes in a post hoc way) all these kinds of activities was called community relations in Northern Ireland;

“When I started 35 years ago, the work I was doing would not have been called peace building. It would have been called working with the community, or it might have been called community relations, but it was all done under the umbrella of adult education. And we worked with trade unions, and we worked with community organisations. We worked with women’s groups, and a lot of what we did was popular recreational education and hobby style activities. But we were always interested in trying to get people to engage with the sectarian divide in Northern Ireland, and because we worked with both Catholics and Protestants, we tried to engineer situations where we would do exchange work, between two women’s groups or between trade unionists or whatever.” (01-NI-MR-M)

In Bosna Herzegovina, it was called post-war reconciliation process;

“There was a period where there was a lot of talking about post-war reconciliation. A lot of the activities that we did was to bring women from different ethnicities to work together on life matters that directly concern them.
The idea was that this can build some kind of more sustainable ground for people to see beyond the conflict.” (03-BiH-MR-F)

This was important for them on a personal level as many participants in both contexts have explicitly mentioned that they had never knowingly met an individual from the other faction of the conflict before then.

“it was a youth organisation in my city offering different activities to young people like sports training, entertainment with peace education indirect messages. The most important part of it was to bring these young people to meet each other… have you heard about two schools under one roof system in our country?... it is that children from different ethnic and religious background study in segregation of each other even though they are physically in on building/school. They even go to different schools’ playgrounds. I had my education in one of this schools”. (13-BiH-GR-M)

“I was born and grew up as Protestant in East Belfast, so I say Protestant because although I am from an Atheist family, I’ve never worshipped in a church, I accept the definition of Protestant as a power description; it’s not a religious description. I never met a Catholic knowingly until I was 18.” (05-NI-MR-M)

In other cases, it was a way to be introduced to the suffering of the “others”;

“I was 21 when the war occurred in Bosnia, and I just happened to start working for this organisation delivering humanitarian aid. So for me that was a really life change because I was very privileged because unlike the... Like 90% of population in Bosnia and Herzegovina I was able to move. So I was moving in places, because most of the people were just sieged. In their cities, and villages, and pretty much, you know, which is now very also difficult to... To imagine without mobiles, without emails, because that technology didn’t exist at that time. So they were like very rare information, and they really didn’t know what’s going on in a city next to them. So in that kind of the environment and settings, me being able to travel around and see suffering of the people, on all sides, was really a lifetime experience that I pretty much believe it determined me in the future what I would like to do, and it’s like, you know, peace. Or anything, you know, like by preventing conflict.” (17-BiH-MR-F)
Others expressed an early exposure to politics during their university studies, for example through student politics, such as 12-NI-MR-F, 11-BiH-MR-M, 06-NI-GR-M and 05-NI-MR-M when they were elected for representative roles. This early exposure taught them some key skills that they needed for their later career in peacebuilding such as “debating”, “campaigning” “working towards collective interests of the students” and “understanding power mechanisms” even if it was on a small scale like student university politics.

Journalism as a profession that required a strong involvement in the public domain was a starting point for a couple of participants;

“I first started to work on local radio. In my first year, when I started to learn about journalism… I was involved in a project which was about transitional justice in Balkans, in Bosnia particularly… I took part as a member in that project [transitional justice], and started to investigate and write about issues, or about things that we wanted to talk about… At that point, I realised that you can't go away from what had happened on day-to-day basis in politics in media, and to hear about war, to hear about peace. it wasn't a new term for me. But it kind of gave me an outlet, a window, so I can contribute, you know? I wanted to push young people to seek for knowledge, for answers” (02-BiH-GR-M )

History and historical studies were, as well, backgrounds for different thinking for participants like 08-NI-MR-M who learnt the history of “republicanism in Ireland” and interpreted it differently from being an “Irish Catholic” monopoly;

“The main narrative that I grew up with was an Irish nationalist one. It was anti-British. It was pro-Irish independence. Its whole identity was Irish. So our history as told to us by your grandmother and people would have concerned… It would have been about previous times of violence or conflict. And so that would have been the background. But I have this passion for history from very early age so I learnt that the interesting thing is that republicanism as a European type… As an almost French revolutionary type philosophy, comes to Ireland through people that aren't from an Irish catholic background but are predominantly from an
Ulster Presbyterian background. So if you look at the republican heroes, you know, if you look at the historical heroes for a lot of republicans and people from that republic and nationalist background, from the year 1798, they’re actually all protestants, you know […] So I probably was different in that I was interested in history, and therefore came to understand some of these things.” (05-NI-MR-M)

Or else when one participant sought to bring his historical and professional engagement in French-German reconciliation to contribute to the context in Bosnia and Herzegovina;

“My focus was on French-German reconciliation after the Second World War. All what I had worked on France and Germany which was rather abstract for me, […] But when I was confronted here with these direct consequences of the war, and this had something of course it was two things. For me first of course, for me it was very interesting as a historian and as a citizen to look at the process which is not already finished but which is ongoing. And where you say you can contribute yourself perhaps to something.” (15-BiH-MR-M)

Being an experienced researcher seems to bring some participants to more critical views of their context from an early age;

“I suppose my anthropological background is you get information from diverse sources, and particularly from learning about the situation as it unfolds on the ground… That training I think was important, particularly in some of the key things I think of from anthropology in terms of notions of truths rather than truth, the multiplicity, that everything is subjective to some extent, lack of objectivity”. (02-NI-MR-M)

In another case, research was the gate through which some participants entered the field of post conflict peacebuilding;
“So that was the piece of work I started becoming involved in, looking at the legacy issues around conflict in that research way really… And it was looking at the impact of prison on loyalist ex-prisoners’ children, there had never been any research done about the consequences for these families. You know, within the republican community there was a sense of acceptance and almost kind of pride that your family member had served in prison, in the loyalist community it was very different. [...] So I spoke with children... Adults who were children in the 60s and 70s when their families were imprisoned, all the way up to the more recent imprisonments, and just talked about some legacies.” (16-NI-GR-F)

When it comes to the underpinning motivation that drove the participants into working for peacebuilding, there were aspects of “the enthusiasm of youth” and a rejection of the context of conflict they lived in;

“….. we had a strong sense of being pioneers of something very radical. But carried forward on the enthusiasm of youth, not being able to see the risks. Doing it here confidently before the times got difficult...” (00-Pilot-MR-M)

Or even feeling guilty and holding a sort of collective responsibility for what their own social group did;

“... I don’t know. I have some... I have a feel of guilty... for example. That genocide in Srebrenica, was committed by Serbs, and in some way traditionally I belong to that people... Some kind of collectively responsibility... I had the awareness of this thing in myself one or two years ago. I really have that responsibility. I know that I didn’t do nothing, I’m not guilty, I didn’t kill anyone. But in the name of some god and some religion which my father was born with... Like I have that curse and I need to do this, and that is the only right.” (10-BiH-GR-F)

However, the overarching theme that all the participants shared as their personal commitment was a strong social consciousness, an inspiration for values like fairness, and an exposure to ‘others’ at a human level. These motivated them to commit to peacebuilding and to refuse violent social division;
“if you say to me, when you started, my main driving force is what I’d call civil and human rights, equality, and inclusion, and diversity. So that’s where I started in the 70s, and if you looked at it, it wouldn’t have looked like peace building in the beginning. And when we were negotiating the peace agreement in 1996, 1998, it was those values that guided us in our negotiations with the different parties”. (12-NI-MR-F)

“Because when you travel and when you see how people suffer, those enormous human losses on every side that you see, that the ordinary people are the ones who are suffering the most, and they are very much driven by politicians, religious officials, [...] It really kind of makes you feel, you know, like angry. And you kind of developing the strong sense of feeling injustice towards these people who were like just seduced, you know, like by those national rhetoric, national speeches, the stories about being jeopardised by someone else and so on”. (14-BiH-MR-F)

When the leaders were asked to reflect on what might be the factors that have contributed to this early social consciousness leading to the engagement in the field, they mentioned several personal context justifications, in addition to the accumulated educational and organisational contexts mentioned previously.

A first dominant factor that was mentioned repeatedly by the participants was family influence. This influence was positive in many cases like coming from a mixed family “My father is Serb...My mother is Croatian.” 10-BiH-GR-F. Or parents’ influence “[my mother] taught me never to hate even when ‘they’ killed my father” 09-HiB-MR-M. This interviewee considered his mother’s struggle to raise two kids alone under war circumstances a reason for his “respect and work for women rights as a main drive for building peace” 09-HiB-MR-M. Other participants shared a reaction to negative family experiences like a grandfather in prison; “my grandfather in prison for 18 years. My grandmother was badly impacted. She died very young
because of stress I believe” 16-NI-GR-F. The family influence was not limited to parents’ and grandparents’ experiences, it included children as well as for a participant who got involved in violence when he was 14 and at the age of 17 he was sent to prison for 13 years and as he said:

“I think in a way when you’re involved in a conflict you become quite blinkered… I had children and I don’t want them or anybody to go through the process, the things that I’d gone through” (03-NI-GR-M).

Here below are some further examples from the data.

“I grow up in Yugoslavia, I have 13 years when war started here… I don’t know I have example in my family… My father. Like Serb. He always told I will never go anywhere from here, this is my country, this is… This is my city. I was born here. We’re all born here, what are you talking about? What Serbs, what Croatians, what Muslims? We are all the same, we are one… I just learned that is the right thing”. (10-BiH-GR-F)

“My mother was involved in voluntary work. So I suppose that. I think came from a sense of being brought up in a value system where an unequal society is very unfair, and there needs to be more equality for everyone to benefit”. (12-NI-MR-F)

The second factor that was presented by participants as contributing to the early social awareness was some specific personal experiences that participants have identified. These experiences were essential in shaping their reaction to the conflict and encouraged them to actively engage in peace efforts. Participants talked about them as “another conversion experience” (06-NI-GR-M) and “an eye-opener and life changing experience” (06-HiB-MR-M):

“Probably from the age of 11. I had a school teacher who was a refugee in our country… she told us about why she was here and why she was waiting to go to immigrate to Canada and it was because all her family had been killed in a war. She was Jewish and all her family had been killed in war. I just thought that was wrong…So, I took that on board as a personal thing. I didn’t want to be free to kill.” (14-NI-GR-F)
A third, final remark on the presage element in term of leadership is that most of the participants claimed that they were unaware of their leadership potential and that they did not have leadership aspirations at this stage of their development:

“When I began in that field I guess I was, well I don’t guess, I know, I was 29 when I started doing that, and I certainly didn’t see myself as a leader, more importantly nobody else see me as a leader. But when I got to be 34, I became a director of that organisation, which meant I was a leader. Again, nobody would have used that term” (01-NI-MR-M)

“So I never in a million years thought I was ever going to get elected. And I tell you how bad it was, right? I used to wear very multi-coloured stuff, you know, all in one suits and ……. And I suddenly discovered that I was chair of the large umbrella organisation. And I had to have meetings with government, and the head funders, and everything else. And I had no appropriate clothes. So my first… It was I had to go down and buy myself something that resembled a suit, or something, that's how ridiculous it was” (15-BiH-MR-F).

This initial avoidance of the idea of leadership could be explained by its connotation within the field of peacebuilding as striving for power and formal authority.

7.4 Process: leadership development and learning

A Fourth element of the 3P model modified from Tynjälä (2013) is learning process. In this research I am analysing the different processes of leadership development and learning in the selected conflicted contexts. In the 3P model, the nature of learning processes are
identified by descriptions of different work activities through which learning processes take place, such as by doing the job itself, through reflection on one’s own work, through collaborating and interacting with other people, by participating in networks and tackling new challenges, and by participating in formal learning activities, including reading books. All these activities have been mentioned by the participants. In this section, I will explore their views on the development and learning processes throughout their leadership journeys. Nevertheless, as the data shows these processes are not separated from each other. They overlap and complement each other in most of the cases. One example for this is learning from doing the job, learning from mistakes and learning through reflecting. These three processes seem to be conceptually distinct, but they can occur together in practice:

“Just day-by-day, dealing with a problem every day or dealing with an issue or, you know, you can’t run to a bloke and say how do you deal with this, you need to say sometimes you make mistakes, you learn from the mistakes you made. You think… you reflect… You know if you can imagine 60 or 70 nights of trouble in a row you begin to get effective in what you need to do and how you need to deal with it.” (03-NI-GR-M)

However, for the sake of accuracy and rigor and to allow for as much depth of analysis as possible, I will accept this separation in demonstrating the learning processes as shown in the data.

7.4.1 Learning by Doing

The first process that was mentioned repeatedly by the participants and highly regarded as one of the essential development mechanisms is learning by doing; this is for them a “day-
Leadership development and learning

by-day” (06-HiB-MR-M) process “of doing the job” (10-NI-MR-M). It is very “organic” (04-NI-MR-F) and embedded in the job itself.

“Out of my experience, for instance, you don’t learn how to kind of work on peace, you know? Either you do it, either you don’t. What is crucial is doing it, not talking about it, and not just thinking about it. You have to do something. In other words, move out, away from plans, from strategies, from dreams, into actually making things happen” (14-BiH-MR-F)

“I mean I now deliver more leadership training than I’ve ever had. I deliver more than I’ve had, which indicates I think that I have learnt it on the job. I learnt it from doing and from thinking and reflecting. And the only formal leadership training I have done I think was in that Open University management diploma in the late 1980s.”(05-NI-MR-M)

7.4.2 Reflection on One’s Own Practice

The second process of learning is learning through reflection on one’s own work. Being “reflective and self-critical” (13-BiH-GR-M) is a key character that all participants with no exception endorsed. This includes reflecting on the position from the conflict as a whole;

“you reflect on why you were there and what happened and did you do it simply as a reaction to this or do you believe .. Am I a Republican simply because I was born one or do I believe the Republican sort of analysis and therefore you have to look at that and go, consider it all and go okay, and I also believe that I could have been born on the other side of the Common Road, 25 yards within, I’d have a completely different perspective of what the conflict was about.”(03-NI-GR-M)

And the daily process of reflecting on day-to-day activities;
"Right, how do I do my reflection? I get involved in situations very emotionally, very passionately. So I feel things in the situation .... But I also have a habit, I don’t know where it comes from, maybe it is the academic habit, maybe it’s a religious habit, of constantly questioning what does this mean, how do I make sense of this, what have I done right, what have I done less well? So I do a lot of that on my own, just as a natural habit of, you know, you engage and then you feel, see, you think, you reflect, and then you move on... I’ve found it very helpful to do [reflection] with others. Not through very systematic ways. I’ve used friends a lot [to help reflection], from outside the situation" (00-Pilot-MR-M)

The process of reflection is particularly significant for learning from mistakes

"The second thing is you act, and keep reflecting, because you make lots of mistakes. I’ve made lots of mistakes as well as successes. You have to agonise your way through the mistakes and work... And it is agonising, this whole period, when I could resolve the person’s thing.” (16-BiH-MR-F)

"... So you move out and do something, you get involved, you make mistakes, but you absolutely have to persist. And for me that’s the critical thing, this commitment to a long term process means that there’s no going back. There is only movement and reflection and learning.” (10-NI-MR-M)

7.4.3 Learning through Collaboration

The third learning process that was specifically important for the participants was learning through collaborating and interacting with other people. These may be people that my interviewees interacted with at work especially in the earlier stages of their peacebuilding work:

“I learnt from [a name] a lot, yes. Learn from him, just watching him doing stuff and talking to him... He used to turn up to meetings in [Organisation Name], with big housing associations and councils and just argue the point, and do the work as well. And I suppose to be honest with you, there are people who are experts but also they have this ability to help people around them to grow”. (4-NI-MR-F)
“There is this guy who is my guru, even today. He was a freelancer. And he showed up in the first days when we started this NGO. And everything I know I owe to him... Because I worked with him as his translator and I learnt everything... And I think that he really also opened a lot of doors for me. Put me in the context with a lot of people and really helped enhancing my... My interests, my knowledge, and enabling me to perform.” (14-BiH-MR-F)

It seems that working with people from other contexts was also important because they brought different attitudes and mind sets

“The American trainers brought us “can do” attitude. Whereas we found working with people here, a lot of people, particularly people on the left, like to spend their time theorising and introducing complexity, and problematising everything, and nothing would get done. Whereas the Americans would listen to this and say, well look, let’s just do it you know, and they had an energy about them....... I’m listening to myself now, and realising one thing I keep emphasising is when you get that sort of cultural difference between people, it’s always an opportunity to learn a different way to see things, a different way to do things.” (01-NI-MR-M)

“I learnt from Danish people very golden lessons... These people really have this ability to take care of themselves. So It is first it’s you, and then it’s your family, and then it’s your work. Well, you know, my work was always in the first place. And it’s funny, you know for the first month, I thought that they were going to fire me, and that I just didn’t feel like I’m productive enough. Why I wasn’t thinking that I’m productive enough, because I was just working normal working hours from nine to five. While here I would work weekends, until four o’clock in the morning.” (14-BiH-MR-F)
7.4.4 Learning through networks

Participating in networks and tackling new challenges was another learning process that helps some participants in their contexts as being part of a network seems to motivate people and to challenge their thinking. For example, one participant gave an account about learning to empathise with the “other side” from being involved in a network called “women in black”:

“Why we are determined to visit places where Bosniaks kill Serbs, for example in Sarajevo? Because in one time in Belgrade I was working with my friend [Name deleted]. We were both Women in Black members at that moment, she said she can’t understand how Bosniak victims do not have any empathy with Serb victims... Before that I have never thought like that. And I thought, you know, you just have one side. And from that side I understand her side. She’s from Serbia. And she feels the responsibility for what is happening in Bosnia and Herzegovina. But also I’m from Bosnia and Herzegovina, I should also feel the responsibility for that, my people and myself, I live in Bosnia and Herzegovina and I need to go in that places”. (09-HiB-MR-M)

7.4.5 Learning through formal programmes and activities

Participating in formal learning activities is another learning process that the participants have benefitted from in various stages of their careers. The formal programmes the participants take place vary considerably; from part-time Masters degrees in management, human rights or community development to professional leadership programmes for peacebuilding in a range of varieties. In some cases, there was strong criticism for the content of these type of programmes mainly because some of them failed to relate to the realities of the participants:
“I have participated in a number of trainings, but not that useful at all. I'm very sceptical of it. I was mainly a learning person. And I read a lot. So reading books on leadership. It was helpful. It just was one of these typical, ordinary things, you know. It was generic training. So what I passed through were mainly typical capacity development, NGO sort of trainings. They didn't reflect the challenges we need to deal with in conflict context.” (17-BiH-MR-M)

“I've done my Masters, but I mean the Masters I've done really isn’t relevant to the work, I mean it hasn’t sort of; it hasn’t made me more effective in the work that I’m engaged in… You get your Masters done or you already have it and you can go okay... It’s just means somewhere along the line people have this sense of you’re an activist therefore you need some sort of direction and to be able to say hold on a second, I understand all the concepts, I understand all the principles, I understand all the theory, but we deal first and primarily with practicalities and what you need to do to address it.” (03-NI-GR-M)

However, the majority of the participants have indicated the relevant value of this learning process. They talked about several elements that they can recall clearly from their experience with professional leadership development that they had; first was the theoretical aspect of the programmes which was useful for some participant and less relevant to others.

“So they sponsored the course and they sponsored people from different parts of the community and that gave me the theoretical framework for management and leadership on top of my practical experience. So I found that very intellectually liberating that what I had been doing from practice was now put into a theoretical framework, and I remember the leadership elements of that management course in particular as very helpful at understanding the concept of leadership, the leader, the led, the task, the context, I still use when I conceptualise leadership challenges and issues.”(05-NI-MR-M)

The element that was essential for them all was people they interacted with as both the educators and the other participants that they share that experience with.
“I went to the Salzburg Seminar in Austria for two weeks… And that took me up another level in terms of global leadership with colleagues from other conflict countries, then Central Europe was beginning to stir, Latin America and there was some Africans, Egyptians, Palestinians, Israelis and that gave me, even though it was only for two weeks, it gave me an international flavour and a context within which my Northern Ireland practice to take a higher step […] So I know out of the Salzburg group in 1989, so that’s 30 years ago, I’m still in touch with five of them, you know, so that’s the network.” (05-NI-MR-M)

The other element that was with value for the participants in these programmes is the notion of space. It was valuable in two ways:

- **space for thinking**

“That was to go to Boston for three months with people from a range of different sectors… and that was very good quality interaction with Harvard, with the John F. Kennedy School of Government. Both those were really important in terms of shaping my sense of… I realised if you wanted to achieve stuff, you had to do it in partnership. But also just in terms of broadening perspective and creating space to think, and creating intellectual resources to use in the future.” (04-NI-MR-F)

- **space to escape day to day work**

“it was very simplistic, but again that opportunity helps lift your practice from the day-to-day important to the more theoretical and intellectual approach to what work you’re doing, how you describe, even just how you describe it in the bus to the next meeting, how you describe it in a round table to your hosts makes you think about what your role is and you how you play it. And then when you come home you do things differently” (05-NI-MR-M)

“I always find that I would have moments of creativity when I was out of this place, because in your day to day job, if you’re very busy, or you think about the day to day, and then I would get on a plane to go somewhere, and suddenly I’m sitting on the plane, and all these ideas, bubbles, pop into my head, I suddenly think I know, I’ve got a great idea, I want to turn the plane around and go back and do this now, because this is a great idea.” (01-NI-MR-M)
Finally, from an outcome perspective, participants reflected on the capabilities fostered with the help of these programmes. Some of these outcomes were intrapersonal capabilities like courage, confidence and living with uncertainty:

“I learnt about how to live with uncertain feelings, psychological as well as rational feelings, and to reflect on them critically, emotionally, how to survive. This cultivates strange things like courage. You’ve got to have courage. Courage when you’re frightened” (00-Pilot-MR-M)

“It sort of gave you confidence in the potential of your own leadership… I suppose it’s preparedness to take risks, and that you’re thinking was strong enough to hold that risk. I suppose an experience of talking through what issues were with people who were probably on the same level as you, and that the arguments made sense, people were persuaded, you were influential within the group, so it was practising that all the time” (04-NI-MR-F)

Other outcomes of these programmes where technical capabilities like training skills:

“I went on several programmes in United States. It was like training for trainers, and especially learning the skills. I went to Toronto for the course on transitional justice at the ICTJ. The senior fellowship program, for sure, it was really great experience in conflict prevention and conflict resolution.” (14-BiH-MR-F)

7.4.6 Learning from reading and writing books

Another source of learning was reading. Participants have mentioned a number of books that influenced their thinking and helped them making sense of their realities or just “keep sane” (13-NI-MR-F) in the stressful experiences they encountered.

“I think it’s all those things. It is people, it is definitely books. You have to read, you have to have an understanding of the wider world. We’re always very careful to say that learning from one place doesn’t necessarily translate to another. But learning from one place tells you a lot… Understanding colonialism will tell you something about the world.” (08-NI-MR-M)
In other cases, participants wrote books reflecting on their experiences:

“I was writing a book, so I was downloading the experience and the information, so momentarily I wasn’t exercising the influence, but I was considering it, reflecting on it.” (05-NI-MR-M)

“I interviewed all key leaders that work on the peace process and I reflected on my experience in relation to their experiences… I wrote a book about this and it was a great exercise for me deepen my understanding for myself and for the context of peace here in Bosnia and Herzegovina” (09-HiB-MR-M)

7.5 Emotional aspects and wellbeing

The emotional impact of leading for peace in these difficult contexts, on the leaders’ general wellbeing and how it reflects on their development as leaders seems very prominent in the empirical data. This aspect has been repeatedly mentioned and stressed by the participants in the research. Dealing with these intense emotions combined with the negative impacts on the leaders’ general wellbeing may be a significant part of their learning process. As one of the participants said:

“U.S. forces bombed my home, by plane, bombed our homes. And that was something that produced a lot of negativity. I couldn't say, well, yes, but there are still good people. As a Muslim, can’t you see? And you're questioning, like, what's happening to my friends who are Muslims? Have they abandoned me? Or, you know, you're questioning everything. All your life, like, what is this violence for? And then war stopped but the negativity lasted. I deal with this every day. Bottom line; you need to learn how to let go” (03-BiH-MR-F)

Another participant shared her experience leading an organisation working for the families of the missing people in the war:
“[A]t some point, we were everything to these people, and in return we never get any supervision or anything. We didn’t have any kind of mental tool to let it out and... And everything was coming... And I think, you know, like it just maybe depends from the person to person. I think that I was receiving all that very personally because I did... And even today, I very much care about these people. And I think that I was like kind of really struck by that personally and the other way and I think that’s why I am like get pretty much destroyed by that.” (14-BiH-MR-F)

Smoking, drinking and other addictions were mentioned often by the participants as the ways they use to help them dealing with the challenging contexts they are leading in:

“…what I used to do was, I used to drive... I had two young children at the time, and I used to drive to an off-licence before I went to facilitate those meetings in the evenings and get myself a bottle of wine because I knew they would go on until about 12 o’clock at night, and then I would have to go home and just... It was the only way, because I knew... They were really bad, I mean, they were really bad, because people were so suspicious, even when they were in their own community. Now the ultimate goal was that they would make up at some stage, but that didn’t happen for years and years and years” (13-NI-MR-F)

Summing Up

To recap, this chapter has aimed to explore different aspects of leadership development in the data. At this stage of the analysis, I used a professional learning model to help analyse the data. Using the modified 3P model, I first addressed the product component of the model as the dimensions of peacebuilding leadership explored in chapter 6. Then I addressed the sociocultural component of the leaders development. I argued from the data that this sociocultural environment is synonymous with the context of conflict described in chapter 5. Hence, it holds the same dynamics of violence and hostility, polarisation and
depersonalisation. Then, I investigated the events and the processes of leadership development in this context based on the presage and the process that resulted in the leadership dimensions presented in chapter 6. In the next chapter, the threads of this research, including context, leadership and leadership learning and development will be further discussed and integrated with each other.
Chapter 8 Discussion

As I explained in the chapter 4, this research is inductive in nature. Accordingly, I am very keen not to force the data into any pre-selected theory or framework. Instead, I am using theories and frameworks to explore, illuminate and explain different aspects of the findings. I will first assess the quality of this research. Second, I will use the social identity theory to interpret the context of post-conflict to understand its dynamics and how that might affect peacebuilding leadership. Third, I will discuss the different dimensions of peacebuilding leadership. This includes the contextual dimensions of leadership as described by the participants, the spheres of action surfaced in the findings and the processual aspects of leadership emerging from the data. Fourth, I will discuss those aspects of the findings concerned with leadership learning and development. Finally, I will address the research questions and summarise how these questions may be addressed.

8.1 Assessing the quality of the research

Malaurent and Avison (2017) encourage researchers in writing up their findings, to give a thorough account of the research process to allow readers to assess their conclusions in context. This is especially important for measures of research quality that will be reflected on in detail in this section. According to Finlay (2002, p. 211), most qualitative researchers should attempt to “be aware of their role in the (co)-construction of knowledge….. They will
try to make explicit how intersubjective elements impact on data collection and analysis in an effort to enhance the trustworthiness, transparency and accountability of their research”. Hammersley (2004) argues in favour of researcher’s reflexivity, for what he considers as a fundamental and a straightforward reason; research is a multifaceted, challenging and complex activity which is difficult to be reduced to a set of pre-defined rules. Thus, determining how best to do it needs continual reflection on “what has been done, how successful it has been, and how best to pursue it further” p. 934. Taking all of these into consideration, reflexivity becomes a key virtue in research. Accordingly, the starting point of this discussion is to reflect on strengths and weaknesses of the thesis from a methodological point of view. For this, I will start by assessing the research design and then its different components, the validity criteria of evaluating this research, and finally I will present a personal discussion of the research journey.

As discussed in chapter 4, the research design for this study was exploratory, qualitative, largely inductive and actor-based. This research design aimed to explore the context of post-conflict peacebuilding; leadership as experienced and practiced; and leadership development as experienced and practiced. The study built on talking to individuals about their experience of leadership at grassroots and middle range levels of Lederach (1997) pyramid of peacebuilding shown in Figure 2-6. The research was carried out in two diverse contexts (Northern Ireland and Boznia Herzegovina) in order to explore and compare the differing meanings the leaders make out of these experiences. Part of the research design was to go to
interview people in their own contexts, because of the assumption that these specific experiences of leadership should be understood in the context and not separated from it. This research design has many strengths that added enormously to this research inquiry, and some weaknesses that I had to be alert to over the course of conducting, analysing and discussing this study.

This research can be argued as pioneering because it hacks a path through the jungle of peacebuilding leadership literature (Hartley and Benington, 2010). The systematic literature review conducted in chapter 2 has shown the relative lack of theorisation and empirical research on leadership for peacebuilding, and related questions in the post-conflict context. In addition, very little research has been conducted actually in the people’s context. This PhD research is first-hand, in and from the field. It is not based on secondary data or solely conceptual, or people reflecting on their own experiences as we saw in chapter 2. Choosing to go to the post-conflict contexts i.e. Northern Ireland and Bosnia and Herzegovina for several long visits to collect qualitative data, instead of choosing to do quantitative research, or even conducting skype interviews, added considerable originality, depth and richness to this research.

Being immersed in the research field and spending time in both Northern Ireland and Bosnia and Herzegovina was very important to my gaining a deep understanding for the contexts physically and emotionally as well as intellectually. My research engagement included living in an apartment in Sarajevo where the walls are still covered with bullet holes, visiting the
memorials of the civil war and the First and Second World Wars with a Bosnian historian to see, feel and understand the mostly forgotten links among these wars and their effects on the ethnical conflicts in the country, spending time in Sarajevo Tunnel that linked the city to the airport which was the only connection to the city with the outer world for 3 years, and taking to people I met randomly about their experiences of the war and the peace as they lived them.

Similarly in Northern Ireland, I went to what my local companion, who is a retired professor from Belfast, called his “special tour” in the parts of Belfast that had witnessed the worst chapters of the conflict such as the Shankhill Road and Falls Road, where I saw the murals on both sides of the conflict, peace walls and gates, the flags on lampposts and how people see the same situation from completely opposite perspectives. I sensed the same smell of misery painted in different colours. Even the business park between the conflictual areas, where several peacebuilding organisations are based, has two different entrances, one from each side. For years, people from each area refused to use the entrance from the other side.

Creating spaces, as seen in chapter 6, has both metaphorical and literal meanings in leading for peace. The physical awareness of the spaces that I gained in both contexts was essential to be able to engage with the concepts of the space and action mentioned repeatedly by the participants. Furthermore, while many may think that these conflicts are from the past, the hostile environment is still evident and I witnessed this personally on two occasions. These hints of ethnographic study, though it was not the original intention, support the participants’ claims about the context of post-conflict presented in chapter 5. I would definitely encourage
future researchers of leadership and peacebuilding not to divorce their research from its physical context.

Another point of reflection is the number of contexts chosen for the study. As explained in chapter 4, there were three main criteria for the choice of contexts of conflict; first, that the conflict is consistent with the internationally accepted definition of civil war; second, that the conflict was ended with an agreement that make a starting date for the post-conflict peacebuilding efforts; thirdly, that the peace agreement had hold long enough to accumulate the experiences of leading for peace that this research is concerned with; finally that it was safe for the researcher to visit and carry out the research. The initial plan was to cover three contexts. However, one of these contexts that had been under active consideration, South Sudan, erupted into another spiral of civil war and violence and the Foreign Office advised against all travel to this country. Given this and the time and resource pressure, I had to take a pragmatic decision of doing two contexts only. Yet, working in two contexts instead of one has granted this research several advantages, broadening and deepening my understanding of the contexts of post-conflicts, and strengthening and enhancing the external validity of the conclusions.

An alternative option I considered early in designing this research was to interview the 40 peacebuilding leaders I had made contact with in my scoping study in Istanbul (see chapter 4) from post-conflict areas from all over the world. The reason behind choosing instead to work with and visit a much smaller number of contexts was my aim and need of having a
deep historical understanding of the studied contexts. Conducting this research with dispersed leaders from all over the world would have resulted in detaching from the physical and geo-political context which I have shown is very fundamental to understanding leadership and leadership development for peacebuilding.

When it comes to the choice of research methods, semi-structured interviews had several strengths in collecting the data to address the research questions, especially given the degree of engagement, empathy and openness the participants showed towards me and these research questions. In fact, on many occasions these interviews seemed to be cathartic for the participants. This may be explained by my being an insider/outsider researcher, both internal and external to the contexts of the research at the same time (Benington and Hartley, 2004). I am internal to war experience in both an intellectual and emotional sense, because I am Syrian and my parents and whole family still live in Syria. However, I am also external to the direct context of their particular conflicts in Northern Ireland and Bosnia and Herzegovina. In my view this helped them to talk more freely, easing their reservations, and reducing the degree of political caution that they would have needed to talk to someone from the same context of conflict.

Being Syrian seemed to allow me to build a bond with the participants quickly. Several reasons lead to this observation. First, many the participants in the interviews drew on the
similarities and differences between their own context of conflict and the Syrian context as they saw it. Second, they expressed personal appreciation about my research being focused on the topic of peacebuilding in the middle of the ongoing war in my country. Third, many committed to almost twice the time I had asked for the interview; the interviews average length was 115 minutes instead of the 60 minutes that I had asked for. This seemed to indicate a high degree of rapport and trust. Finally, they all asked questions about my family in Syria and empathised with me personally about being away from the family and by sharing some similar personal experiences which they went through at the time of war. This connection and empathy was very useful for the research. It encouraged the participants to open up to more depth and detail in the interviews, and to share personal emotional accounts of their different leadership and leadership development experiences. My interpretation of this positive attitude towards me and the research is that I was seen as “one of them”; a future peacebuilder ‘to be’ in Syria.

Leadership journeys is a further method I used to collect data in this research. The use of the leadership journey tool as a prompt for the interviews added value to this research in several ways. First, it encouraged the interviewees to think temporally and give attention to processes. Second, it helped them to link their learning from previous experiences and events with their later ones. Third, it gave them a holistic means to look over their experiences as a whole. Fourth, it helped them articulate their tacit knowledge and draw out some elements of explicit knowledge from it. Finally, this technique goes beyond the widely-used analysis of a single leadership development programme; (for example, Carroll and Nicholson, 2014; Foster, Angus, and Rahinel, 2008; Goodhand and Sedra, 2010; Kennedy, Bathurst, and
Carroll, 2015; Nicholson and Carroll, 2013) to seek a retrospective view of their leadership learning and development over time.

Nevertheless, both methods had some weaknesses that needed attention during the different stages of the research. The semi-structured interview to start with has the weakness of being self-reporting. This leaves the possibility of “performance” when the individual calculates his/her presence in front of others to fulfil a certain role (Goffman, 1959). In addition there is the risk of causal attribution bias, particularly “internal vs external attribution” (Hewstone, 1989, p. 30) where people evaluate their own behaviour highly, and diminish the importance of other people’s behaviours. Additionally, there was the challenge for me and the research of how to deal with emotions which came up from the participants during the interviews. For example, some participants cried in remembering some of the intense experiences they went through which was very draining for them and made some interviews very intense for me. The leadership journey had some drawbacks as well. For example, it took some time to design and to make decisions about whether to put score or not on the y axis and what the x axis was. In addition, some participants were more comfortable using the technique than others, so in a couple of cases I had to help the participants draw the lines by listening to what they were saying, making suggestions to them and then checking with them that they felt that the line was in the right place.
These potential weaknesses were dealt with at different stages of this research. The risk of performance and attribution bias were addressed starting from the sampling process through detailed online examination of the participants’ CVs and their organisations. This detailed investigation of the participants prior to contacting them, attempted to approach the people that strictly met the criteria I set in the research design (chapter 4). Furthermore, asking the participants to draw their leadership journeys as part of the interviews helped me to examine the historical context and significance of the arguments they presented, in addition to putting them in a more structured way.

I undertook the interviews in phases and this allowed me to adjust the sample as I went along. For instance, in the first of the three phases of data collection in Northern Ireland, the majority of the participants were male leaders. In the second phase of data collection, I corrected for this by contacting more female leaders from the same context to ensure greater diversity and therefore greater representativeness of the sample. Although I did not analyse the data by gender, it was valuable to ensure the sample included leaders with different characteristics. For the same reason of ensuring diversity of experiences, I interviewed leaders from different ethnicities, regions and age groups in both contexts. Finally, although there was no deliberate intention to conduct 360 degree investigation of the participants, in practice, because of the small size of communities of peacebuilding organisations in both contexts, many interviewees were colleagues or line managers at some point in the past so people reflected on each other’s experiences even though they did not know that I was interviewing them.
When it comes to the data analysis, I have conducted thematic analysis using the Gioia methodology (Gioia et al., 2013) as explained in Chapter 4. On reflection, there have been different options for how to conduct the analysis. For example, I could have focused on the temporal dimensions of the data, especially through the use of the leadership journey technique and ended up with much richness of the data on these dimensions. Alternatively, I could have done narrative analysis to focus on of the attributions and constructions the participants assigned for their leading for peace. Another approach would have been to examine this research from a leadership identity work perspective. However, I chose to work with research questions that were foundational (what people do, why and how they learn it) because the field is still under-researched and there was a need to cover the bases first. Therefore, I focused on the themes and meanings and not the temporality or discourses.

I turn now to consider the validity of the research. Different types of validity measurements are commonly used across disciplines to assess the quality of the research inquiry at hand. Some scholars note that these term have different definition in different disciplines (Guest, MacQueen, and Namey, 2011; Winter, 2000). The types of validity that are mostly used to assess qualitative research are internal validity and external validity. Some scholars argue that using this language is very quantitative driven (Corbin and Strauss, 2008; Guest et al., 2011). Lincoln and Guba (1985), for example, invited the qualitative research community to use different sets of terms such as credibility—which refers to the “confidence in the truth...
of the findings, including an accurate understanding of the context” (Ulin, Robinson, and Tolley, 2005, p. 25). Other terms that are used as an alternative language to the validity concept includes representative, plausible, confirmable, credible, worthy, relevant and trustworthy (Winter, 2000). Morse, Barrett, Mayan, Olson, and Spiers (2002) argue against coining alternative terms for the qualitative research inquiries because it might risk sideling the field from mainstream science and would affect it is legitimacy. In this research, I will keep the use of the terms internal and external validity. Internal validity refers to “whether the research process is consistent and carried out with careful attention to the rules and conventions of qualitative methodology” (Ulin et al., 2005, p. 26). External validity or what is “commonly referred to in both the qualitative and social science literature as generalisability” (Guest et al., 2011, p. 84). It is used in this research to denote to the extent to which the findings of the research would work in other social settings (Bryman and Bell, 2015).

To ensure internal validity I followed the Gioia methodology which was adopted to guarantee a rigorous research design where I systematically and explicitly analysed and interpreted the data, as can be seen in the findings in chapters 5, 6 and 7. Additionally, this research can be argued to have high external validity because it was conducted in two real life contexts where participants were asked about their natural experiences in their natural environments, not for example just in a laboratory. Furthermore, this research has reasonable analytical generalisability (Hartley, 2004; Yin, 1994) because of the rigorous research design and methodology that I have explained here. The detailed examination of the leadership and leadership development processes in Northern Ireland and Bosnia and Herzegovina can
reveal processes of leading for peace that may be proposed as general to other post-conflict contexts. Hartley (2004, p. 331) explains that “…knowledge about the processes underlying the behaviour and its context can help to specify the conditions under which the behaviour can be expected to occur”. In this research, the processes, the practices and the development of the interviewed leaders shaped by the contextual forces (contingencies) of the two chosen contexts is expected to occur in other post-conflict contexts.

Finally, I would like to briefly reflect on the emotional aspects of conducting this research which I believe to have relevance to this chapter, sharing the views with scholars such as Hasselkus (1997, p. 81) who emphasise “positioning” the researcher’s experience. By so doing, I am hoping to highlight some of the underpinning assumptions and dynamics that influenced my intellectual, cognitive and emotional engagement with this research. Additionally, it illustrates how my own subjective experiences have influenced the decisions made to identify and conceptualise the research problem and questions (Willis and Jost, 2007).

Research in general, even in the most benign organisational contexts, can be a demanding process both intellectually and emotionally. Dickson-Swift, James, Kippen, and Liamputtong (2009) note that research can be emotionally draining and exhausting, and it can lead to researcher burnout. In more difficult and unstable contexts like the ones chosen
for this research, the ambiguity and demand on intellect and emotion can multiply. The ambiguity here is on two levels, first is the ambiguity that comes as a normal component of any organisational research regarding issues of design, gaining access and ethical considerations. The second level of ambiguity is the one provoked by the current global uncertainty, volatility and violence. As I previously mentioned, the terrorist attacks in Europe in 2015 reshaped the research design as a whole. In addition, being a Syrian national travelling from and to the UK added a new level of challenge. Resilience was a key virtue that had to be learnt and practiced from the early stages of this research.

In spite of the positive experience of data collection from my good relationship with the participants, I felt a greater pressure to keep the interviews professional when it got too emotional for some participants. In a few occasions the participants cried while sharing with me the tough experiences they had been through. This occurred especially when I asked them to reflect on the low points of their leadership journey and the learning behind those. Hartley (2004) observes that while the researchers go through a lot of training in research methods, they are taught very little about how to handle their own emotions in doing research. Similarly, Owens (1996, p. 65) suggests that researchers should be trained for such emotional interviews because he considers them “risky” for the researcher and for the quality of the research. I cannot claim that I had a specific training as such. Nevertheless, being embedded myself in the current war situation in my country through close contact with my family and other people still living in Syria, and through daily media briefings, helped me in turn to share empathy with the participants. Additionally, with 4 years’ experience as a practitioner in a senior position in Syria and 5 years’ experience as a researcher in the UK, I
have developed a strong sense of resilience that helps me dealing with these risky contexts. Furthermore, the close support by my supervisors kept the balance right during the data collection period. Having said that, I would definitely encourage researchers intending to work in similar contexts to undertake sufficient training in resilience in conducting research, to prepare them to handle the required emotional labour and to seek professional support (e.g. supervision, coaching, counselling) while doing the research.

Overall, having examined the strengths and weaknesses of the research design and methods that I used, I can conclude that the research was undertaken with reasonable care to sampling, to research design, to methods of analysis, and to taking care of myself as a researcher in a demanding research context. It is therefore a reasonable position to have confidence in the findings, and to generalise from this research. I now turn to exploring those findings and their significance to address the research questions.

8.2 Using social identity theory to interpret the context

In this research, the contextual dynamics and structures of the societies in conflict have been shown to be critical to understanding the leadership exercised in peacebuilding. The context is considered central to this thesis because it is a feature that shapes the whole way that participants talked about and enacted their leadership and leadership development
experiences. Therefore, the starting point of this discussion is the contexts in which leadership is happening. I look at the context of post-conflict peacebuilding through two lenses; the historical analysis of the conflicts, and the contexts of conflicts as perceived and interacted with by the peace leaders.

Writing an even-handed account of these conflicts was very challenging because most documentation about those conflicts are highly contested in some elements, some aspects of language and even some ‘facts’. For example, the question of who are the heroes and who are the criminals in the conflict is different for different communities. The history itself is constructed and disputed in peacebuilding context. Therefore, I examined the major historical events that are directly related to the conflicts with some sensitivity to these contested issues. From this work I aimed for a relatively neutral and even-handed view of the history and structures of these contexts, but aware that different communities might interpret these issues differently. This historical analysis of the chosen contexts was combined with the view of the contexts as perceived by participants. These views were inevitably subjective.

The contexts of post-conflict peacebuilding (which I analysed in Chapter 5) have several characteristics that seem to have impact on leading for peace. In this section, I am going to discuss these characteristics. First, those societies where there are intensive and often extensive conflicts are loaded with predefinitions of individuals and groups. As analysed in the data (chapter 5) people were perceived, treated (and sometime harmed and killed) based
on the social group they belonged to regardless of their personal manner or opinion. Hence, the data supports an intergroup social behaviour perspective (Tajfel, 1974) where people perceive each other based on their group membership rather than on their individual characteristics (Figure 3-1). Factors like geographical and social segregation, political and power struggles using divisive labels, along with mistrust and lack of communication, may explain this intergroup social behaviour even years after signing peace agreements in both contexts. This intergroup social behaviour can be associated with an active process of depersonalisation between social groups. Depersonalisation affects how people feel about one another as perceptions become based on perceived prototypicality rather than idiosyncratic preferences or personal relationships (Hogg, 1992; Hogg, 2015; Hogg and Abrams, 1993; Rast III and Hogg, 2017). Depersonalisation can explain themes like “dehumanisation of the other side” and “being guilty by association” as seen in the PhD findings.
Second, the findings suggest social belief systems that lean strongly towards the (less flexible) social change end of Tajfel and Turner’s spectrum which ranges from social mobility to social change (Figure 3-1). This might explain the hostility that the participants suffered from both ingroup and out-group (this aspect is discussed in more detail in the next section). The process of intergroup differentiation helps to shed more light on how this works. The act of ingroup favoritism and out-group discrimination is underpinned with a socio-psychological process of “intergroup differentiation” (Tajfel and Turner 1979, p.40). The aim of differentiation of the ingroup is to maintain or achieve superiority over the out-group, on some dimensions. The hypothesis behind this process is that individuals strive to positively evaluate their own groups via ingroup/out-group comparisons which eventually
leads groups to attempt to differentiate themselves from each other (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel et al., 1971; Turner et al., 1979). This PhD research has reinforced the external validity of social identity theory in explaining the contexts of societal conflict, beyond their original experimental settings. Additionally, it helps to explain why the participating leaders continue to be alert to conflict dynamics even after the conflict is meant to have died down.

Thirdly, the findings document the severe conditions of hostility in which the participants are exercising leadership, with accompanying intense pressure mentally, physically and emotionally. The intergroup social behavior with a social change belief system that surfaced in the data in both contexts might explain some of the contextual factors that affected the leaders’ efforts in building peace, such as personal-level hostility from same group intimidations or other group(s) mistrust and bottom up pressures that resisted the peacebuilding.

To summarise, the context of post-conflict peacebuilding in which the participants were working was continuously moving and reshaping. It was never static but a dynamic that could change fast at times, very slow at other times and was reported to feel deadlocked many times. In broader terms, this thesis adds to the body of literature about the significance of context in leadership and human affairs. Context is often discussed as though it is stable, factual, neutral, unambiguous and to an extent static. However, in this research the context
was and had been dynamic and sometimes volatile, complex, contested and argued over even with the language used to describe it. This research has been undertaken in a challenging context with both the legacy of violence and a continuing underlying threat of violence re-erupting, and therefore it might be argued that this context is unusual or even exceptional. However, analysis of extreme cases can sometimes identify processes which are present in less extreme environments but are less visible. I would want to argue from this research the value of conceptualising the context as dynamic and volatile, not static (Endrissat and von Arx, 2013; Hannah and Parry, 2014; Hannah, Uhl-Bien, Avolio, and Cavarretta, 2009). It also highlights (and this was evident in the leadership journey analyses) that leadership influence may wax and wane according to changes in the context.

The structures and dynamics of post-conflict context which emerged from the findings are consistent with social identity theory. This theory particularly provides an explanation for the dynamics of ingroup, out-group and intergroup relations in violently divided societies which emerged from my empirical study. Social identity theory was adopted for this research inductively and somewhat retrospectively when I was analysing the data and came to realise that it would provide a plausible explanation of the mechanisms behind the leadership experiences reported by the participants. Hence this theory was not initially used predictively but it was deployed post-hoc.

I noted in chapter (5) that the three themes which predominated in how the participants described the context in which they worked were depersonalisation, polarisation, and the
hostile and violent environment. As shown in Figure 8-1, these three mechanisms interacted with each other. The use of social identity theory in this research helps to explain why conflict continues. It goes beyond the description of conflict offered in the introduction (El-Bushra, 2017; Lederach, 1997a; Lund, 2009), see Figure 1-3, to provide a theory not just of what but of why this is happening. I conceptualised this interaction of different context elements in Figure 8-1. I derived this from my research as a framework that helps to explain not only societal conflict but also the further social and psychological processes which make it difficult to foster sustainable positive peace in divided societies (Galtung, 1969, 1985, 1996). This PhD study of micro leadership processes also adds insight into macro social processes. The decline or eradication of war or war-like conditions in macro terms does not mean that this necessarily leads to “post-conflict” conditions - which may help to explain why conflicts do not immediately decline after power-sharing agreements but continue to flare up repeatedly.
Hogg (2015) suggested that social identity theory can explain ethnic conflicts and civil wars, whereas I am using social identity theory for explaining the context of continuing division and intergroup tensions in post-conflict peacebuilding. Furthermore, Hogg (2015) talks about the potential of social identity theory conceptually, but my research has used this framework to explain post-conflict contexts which have been studied empirically. Moreover, this PhD study is based in real-life settings, not in laboratory experiments.

The ways that these extreme conditions impact on leading for peace is discussed in the next section.
8.3 The different dimensions of leading for peace

This section follows the arguments developed in the previous sections where I established that social identity theory may be a suitable explanatory framework to understand the contexts of post-conflict peacebuilding and the contextual forces of leading in those difficult contexts. In this section, therefore, I explore the links between the social identity theory of leadership and the data about leadership in my empirical research. In this section, I discuss the different dimensions of leading for peace. I will first of all look at the contextual dimension of leadership as described by the participants. Then, I turn to discuss the spheres of actions surfaced by the data. Following these sections, I explore the processual aspects of leadership as they emerged from the data.

8.3.1 The contextual dimension of leading for peace

The contextual forces that, from my research findings, affected the leaders’ efforts in building peace were presented in chapter 6 which involve personal-level hostility with ingroup intimidation and out-group mistrust. Then, there were the forces that constrained peacebuilding both on the level of the grassroots community, and on the level of the macro-systems (politicians and governmental bodies for example). Finally, I analysed the internal and the external forces that helped to build peace. The social identity theory related literature
seems to offer potential explanations to these contextual imperatives of leading for peace in highly-divided societies such as those selected for this research.

8.3.1.1 The Black Sheep Effect

The first element of the experience of personal level hostility, as reported by leaders in the findings, was same-group intimidation. Most of the participants mentioned being harassed, attacked or forced to leave their communities by their own social groups due to their peacebuilding activities. This seems consistent with what Marques and Paez (1994, p. 38) call the “black sheep effect” and is consistent with a social identity interpretation of this phenomenon. The black sheep effect means that the group harshly evaluates the ingroup member who is seen by them as stepping outside the social norms of the group. They may be perceived by group members as an anti-norm deviant. Sometimes this judgement is even harsher than for an out-group member taking the same position.

Marques and Paez (1994) offer a number of explanations for this group dynamic. One is that this ingroup hostility towards those whom they might consider socially undesirable group members is a strategy to remove from the group those ingroup members who might contribute negatively to the group’s social identity. The data included accounts from participants that were pressured to leave their homes by their own social group due to their peacebuilding activities. Another explanation is in terms of group-cohesion, where the group member who diverges from the group’s modal opinions are purged to protect social group uniformity. This might explain the data that indicated that some of the participants were disowned by their own families. However, this may not be the complete explanation because
other participants were not purged from their own group (some were viewed with suspicion but the prediction of a purge is too extreme for the data from my study). However, this is an area which deserves further study. Finally, the “black sheep” effect might be attributed to ‘out-group homogeneity’ as it entails more differentiation between the ingroup and out-group (Marques and Paez, 1994). The most repeated theme by the participants was that they were accused of being traitors to their communities. Regardless of what is the reasoning that underpinned the black sheep effect in post conflict peacebuilding, the physical and mental hostility provoked by same group members appears to be a pressing contextual condition that peace leaders had to deal with.

8.3.1.2 Mistrust from other social groups

The reported black sheep effect in post-conflict peacebuilding context appears to be paralleled with a second element of personal hostility that peace leaders experienced which was mistrust from the other social groups. The peacebuilding leaders reported that they were seen by other social groups as ‘spies’. Peace leaders for other social groups are out-group leaders. From a social identity theory perspective, they would be considered by the other social groups as highly untrustworthy and non-ingroup prototypical (Hogg et al., 2012). Out-group leaders, according to (Duck and Fielding, 1999, 2003) would not presumably attract much support from the group members, especially under high group membership salience. Further research has replicated this finding with several paradigms and in different contexts,
e.g. (Alabastro, Rast III, Lac, Hogg, and Crano, 2013; Cheng, Fielding, Hogg, and Terry, 2009; Subašić, Reynolds, Turner, Veenstra, and Haslam, 2011). My PhD research findings have uncovered the depth and intensity of the personal hostility which peace leaders experience from other social groups, and added to the body of knowledge about the dynamics which generate these negative projections.

8.3.1.3 Bottom up and the top down constraints on peacebuilding

My PhD research also examined various forces in the context which supported or constrained peacebuilding leadership. When it comes to the forces that constrained peacebuilding, the data indicated bottom up forces when people at the grassroots communities level refused to engage in peacebuilding actions. The same intergroup differentiation dynamics (ingroup favouritism and out-group discrimination) between social groups in post conflict context may explain this apparent resistance to peace that the peace leaders in this research have described. For the top-down anti-peace forces, the participants gave extended accounts of the toxic role that certain politicians played. For example, the participants in both contexts argued that some politicians used existing social and economic divisions for political gain and that they resisted attempts to change the status quo. As explained in chapter 5, both the Good Friday agreement and the Dayton accord were consociational settlements. Hence, they both politically institutionalised the societal division. This could be interpreted, from a social identity theory of leadership perspective, that the politicians as the prototypical leaders of the social groups, constrain peacebuilding efforts because it might threaten the group uniformity (Hogg et al., 2012a; Hogg et al., 2012b).
8.3.1.4 Positive forces for peacebuilding systems

Finally, the data suggested forces that helped building peace. Some of these forces were internally driven, especially when the voluntary and the third sector, (which were often a vehicle for cross social groups), started to be more active and influential. However, external forces supporting the peace efforts were also essential in both countries, as they seemed to go beyond the internal divisions within the conflict, to something bigger. This insight is particularly valuable for this research because it suggests a more contextualised and a more systems approach to leadership. Leaders alone cannot overcome all the problems/challenges that have been articulated in this research. There have been contextual forces that supported and enabled that leadership. This speaks to an approach to leadership which is not about heroic leaders alone but rather the interplay between context and leadership. It is also where political astuteness comes in because being able to analyse (read) and interpret the different interests of different groups was found to be critical to effective leadership.

8.3.1.5 Leading against the grain

It worth remarking that although social identity theory related studies could predict the black sheep effect in small group settings that is not much remarked on in the wider leadership literature. Much leadership literature has been preoccupied with the leader being popular, liked, respected and able to ‘sell’ ideas to followers (Antonakis and Day, 2017; Northouse, 2018) This PhD study provides a counter-intuitive finding in terms of the leadership
literature. Leadership in this study is leading not only with agreement but also with disagreement. The need to reach out to people who disagree with the leader as Heifetz (1994) argued is more than just handling the disagreement. In this context, leaders might be killed or harmed. With no structures or hierarchies to help the leaders, and few institutional supports for them, leading for peace is leading against the grain. Nevertheless, while social identity theory can explain why conflict between groups occurs and is sustained, it is less good at explaining how such conflict is overcome, so this is where a detailed study of what leaders actually do and how they subjectively conceptualise their peacebuilding work now becomes really crucial to explore.

8.3.2 The practice dimension of leading for peace: spheres of action

Leading for peace, from the data in this research, involves purposeful actions to go beyond the boundaries of the conflicted social groups (Figure 6-1). The data shows that the participants were active in several spheres. The first sphere of action in which the participants focused their effort was on local issues that require direct attentions and interventions. This included working with violent youth, resettling refugees or dealing with “interface” violence. The second sphere of action was working with local communities to develop and improve the quality of life through dealing with cross-communities challenges.

---

13 Interface area: an expression used in Northern Ireland to describe the “the intersection of segregated and polarised working class residential zones, in areas with a strong link between territory and ethno-political identity”. (Jarman, 2006)
like poverty, housing and unemployment. For example, they initiated professional education programmes or developed support for women and children that was designed to deal with these matters across communities. The third sphere of action, the data suggested, involved activity on and among divided communities to build relations between them, for example, working to find missing people regionally, or designing and implementing a strategy for engagement for the people living near the interfaces of fighting communities. Fourth, there was the sphere of action that aimed to create connections between grassroots, governmental bodies and politicians, for example, in Northern Ireland the engagement of the Yes campaign for signing the Good Friday agreement, providing training for anti-sectarian work, or in Bosna and Herzegovina providing human rights education, and cultural diversity for governmental agencies. The final sphere of action documented here is the international domain, where leaders seek support from international bodies (financially and in capacity building), and to put the national conflict in the wider international context (for example, working on the EU involvement in the peacebuilding with the international vision of human rights). These activities are consistent with the characteristics of middle range leadership mentioned by (Lederach, 1997) previously (chapter 2). The leaders aim to create connectivity with both top-level leaders and the broader public of grassroots which means that they are connected to both levels. Additionally, they tend to have more flexibility of movement and actions compared to top-level (Lederach, 1997).
The research findings suggest that these spheres of action can be conceptualised in term of “arenas of contestation” (Hartley and Benington, 2011a); The participants have been leading for peace in several interconnected “arenas” locally, where they engage with one community at a time about a specific issue; horizontally, where they focus on an issue that has interest across-communities, or targeting the relationships among and between communities (working with communities and on their relationships); vertically (as in the fourth sphere of actions) in ways that connect the upper tier of authorities to the lower ones; and finally when they widen the perspective from the local and link it to the international. These multiple arenas (Hartley and Benington (2011a, p. 210) illuminate the polycentric leadership where the inherent challenge “of constructing a degree of consensus in a diverse and pluralistic society across a range of arenas is a formidable task”. This research shows that the leaders had to work in a variety of overlapping arenas of contestation, whose goals and agendas conflict with each other, not just with their own groups. The definition of “arena”, in this research, is infused with a social and political meaning rather than simply a spatial sense, as Hartley and Benington (2011a, p. 210) view arenas as “not only about physical spaces” but about “social process of mutual influence between a variety of stakeholders…..as spaces and flows of people, ideas, problems, legitimacy and resources” (p. 211).

Quite a lot of leadership literature seems to assume that there is a single unit or group being influenced (Coopey, 1995; Coopey and Hartley, 1991; Drath et al., 2008; Fox, 1966; Hartley, 2017), whereas my research shows that peace leaders need to work in a number of overlapping and competing arenas. Applying the concepts of spheres of action and leadership arenas has a great potential for future researchers to build and communicate a
greater awareness of the complex nature of the everyday dilemmas and challenges facing peace leaders. Applying this perspective of arenas better reflects the sense of dynamism and the degree of contest over ideas and activities which is often inherent in leadership, particularly in the everyday experience of leading for peace, which I will discuss in the next section.

Moreover, in these practices of opening up cross-community spheres of action, it seems, from the data, that peace leaders were mobilising and influencing people to engage in what Sherif (1958) called superordinate goals. These are the goals which are “compelling and highly appealing to members of two or more groups in conflict but which cannot be attained by the resources and energies of the groups separately. In effect, they are goals attained only when groups pull together” (Sherif, 1958, p.349-350). Sherif’s work was based on working with young boys in American summer camps, but in my research this concept of superordinate goals has been applied to natural social settings. Examples of leaders applying the concept of subordinate goals are tackling poverty, unemployment or basic rights by using socio-political vehicles such of the third sector, or the social dimension of the EU in Northern Ireland, or leading social movements for human rights and social justice in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Leading for peace seems to be enhanced by creating superordinate goals, not just finding them. This is a significant part of the work of leaders, in my research findings.
8.3.3 The processual dimension of leading for peace

Moving now to the processual aspects of leadership, the findings from this research indicated three core dynamics for leading for peace; integration, differentiation and political astuteness. The data suggests that leading for peace demands a great deal of differentiation from their own group. The peace leaders found ways to step away from the prototypicality (defined and discussed in the paragraph below) of their groups and demonstrate their differences from the ingroup, but without losing the connection with their own group. They also mobilised and supported others from their ingroup or/and out-group to differentiate and critically think about their group prototypicality. Simultaneously, they demonstrated the dynamic of integration through which the leaders seem to reach out to others in the other social groups and open spaces (literally and metaphorically) for people from different social group to meet up and find shared interests. Both differentiation and integration were found, in my research, to require an elevated level of political astuteness.

These three dynamics were interconnected in my research, and they appeared to reinforce each other. As seen in the data, the leaders behaved in ways which indicated that they tried to be politically astute to understand their personal biases and motives, others’ biases and motives, and the wider context of conflict where all these biases and motives interact and contest with each other. Leaders differentiated themselves from their social groups but astutely with a high level of personal and interpersonal skills. They needed to read people and situations and to build alignment and alliances in their endeavours to integrate with others from other social groups. They did this having in mind a clear strategic direction.
towards limiting the violence and growing a healthy and sustainable peace with consistent scanning for all the challenges and the threats of falling back into conflict.

As demonstrated in chapter 3, leadership from a social identity perspective approaches the phenomena of leadership as a group-member-based influence process (Hogg et al., 2012a). The social theory of leadership builds on the notion of group prototype where “The prototype is configured to capture both ingroup similarities and intergroup differences, in such a way as to maximise the meta-contrast of intergroup and intragroup differences. The prototype is that position within the group that has the maximum meta-contrast.” (Hogg et al., 2012a, p. 262). The leader from this perspective represents the group prototypicality where “effective leadership rests increasingly on the leader being considered by followers to possess prototypical properties of the group.” (Hogg et al., 2012a, p. 263). The leaders, according to social identity theory (explained in chapter 3) demonstrate and promote strong intergroup differentiation. Accordingly, they demonstrate and support high degree of differentiation with the out-group and integration with the ingroup. Leading for peacebuilding in post-conflict context appears from my PhD research to involve an inverse use of dynamics of social identity theory of leadership. They demonstrate and support others towards differentiation with their ingroup and integration with other out-groups.
Another crucial dynamic surfaced in the findings is leading with political astuteness. Leaders in hostile and violent environments like post-conflict context seems to pay a great deal of attention to what Hartley and Benington (2010, p. 41) call multiple layers of context, including the national, political and policy context; the regional and local context; and the internal organisational context. Peace leaders lead beyond as well as with societal division, with a variety of stakeholders who mostly have conflictual interests and goals. The political astuteness, as seen in the findings, included reading people and situations – interpreting the context at each of these layers while also assessing their interconnectedness. This sensitivity to the interests, goals and values of self, others and wider context, and acting upon them, appears from my research to be valuable in leading for peace in volatile, uncertain and conflictual societies. It is not only important to achieve goals, but it also helps the leaders to deal with the previously mentioned violence and hostility.

**To recap,**

Investigating these three dimensions of leadership in post conflict peacebuilding, the findings show a strong interaction between them. When the leaders were demonstrating differentiation, integration and opening up cross-community spheres of action to mobilise and influence people to engage superordinate goals, they were leading with a high sense of political astuteness. In fact, the nature of leading for peace as emerged from the findings seems to be similar to the concept of “Taking Whole” in the ancient Confucian- period book The Art of War (Sun Tzu, Denma Translation, 2007). Taking Whole is essentially about including the perspectives and interests of others in the victory. It is not just about someone
winning and somebody losing. It is not simply bringing the other person to one’s side but to bring him or her to something larger than either side. In that way, Sun Tzu argues, there is no residue from the conflict and leaders can build something greater from that victory. This will create the opportunity to go beyond the usual cycle of aggressive response to the conflict which only leads to escalation and more destruction for everyone. For Sun Tzu, the source of all this skilful action of taking whole is the leaders’ knowledge; knowing all the details of the situation, of the context, of the opponent, and very importantly knowing oneself. Figure 8-2 shows the interaction between the dynamic of the contexts presented in chapter 5 and the processes and practices of leading for peace introduced in chapter 6. Leading with political astuteness is central to this framework because it is the pivotal point where leaders match up their practices, processes and the contexts to optimise their opportunities and minimise their risks.
8.4 Leadership learning and development in post-conflict peacebuilding contexts

In this section, I aim to discuss the learning and development aspects of leading in the context of post-conflict peacebuilding. As established in the previous sections, leading for peace, as seen from the data, requires the ability to cope with extreme contexts. The findings in chapter 7 showed that the leadership knowledge and practices were mostly contextually developed. Accordingly, this section attempts to highlight the situated particularities of leadership development in the post-conflict peacebuilding context by discussing a number of themes.
that are relevant to leaders in this context. Therefore, I examine the developmental and learning events and process that shaped the participants’ leadership using the 3P framework modified from Tynjälä (2013) [figure 3-7]. This section starts with exploring the socio-cultural environment (the context of learning and development). Following, I will discuss the presage component. Next, the process component is examined. Finally, a recap and concluding remarks are presented.

The findings suggest several overarching themes to explore the leaders development in post-conflict peacebuilding context. These key themes were structured around Tynjälä’s (2013) 3P model: presage, process and product. The model was operationalised to explore the data as explained in detail in chapter 7. In this research, this model was followed in reverse order i.e. starting with the Product component first. Then I analysed the data according to the sociocultural framing, the presage component, and the Process(s) component. The Product component in this research is the previously established arguments of leadership for peacebuilding as a situated relational process that builds on and derives from the social identity theory of leadership practised across several arenas or spheres of action. The primary processes that in this PhD research were found specific for leading for peace are differentiation, integration, political astuteness and creating superordinate goals. While the practices of leading for peace were summarised by tackling the challenges that directly related to the conflict in the conflictual societal groups separately and the horizontal and vertical endeavours of building the societal relations between them including the efforts on
the international level. More aspects of the product component are surfaced from the data as resulting from analysing the learning process. These interpersonal and intrapersonal capabilities will be referred to in Figure 8-4 later in this section.

8.4.1 The conflict and the post-conflict context as a sociocultural learning environment

A fundamental concept that Tynjälä’s (2013) 3P model stresses is the sociocultural environment and this is particularly salient in the research presented here. Sociocultural environment according to her defines the possibilities and constraints of workplace learning including technical–organisational environment, communities of practice, and organisational learning. In my PhD research, the participants seem to refer to a different level of their contexts as their socio-cultural environment. The findings suggest that being immersed in a context of violent conflict is a significant aspect of the participants’ sociocultural environment because they refer to it so regularly. As noted earlier, the contexts in which peacebuilding occurred were seen by the participants as hostile and violent, polarised and depersonalising. These dynamics deeply impacted their leadership and their leadership development and learning. Hence, leadership and leadership development in post-conflict peacebuilding seem to support the Kempster and Stewart (2010, p. 208) conclusions about “The interrelationship of the contextual nature of leadership learning in leader-led relationships and the enactment of leadership practice suggests that one informs the other”. I endeavour to explore the role of these socio-culture environments on the leaders’ development through the concepts of ‘era’ and ‘crucibles’, terms coined by Bennis and
Thomas (2002). This model relates helpfully to the PhD findings because it explores the leaders’ development contextual elements not only on the personal level but also at the collective level, as I will now examine.

On the collective level, the Bennis and Thomas (2002) model establishes the notion of “era” to characterise the wider or macro context of the leader. Era, they suggest, is an aspect of the leadership context that presents the individuals with a shared culture and history and a particular arena (or arenas for my research) in which to act (Bennis and Thomas, 2002). An era is characterised by the defining historical events and their implications which are shared among many members of a group or population. In some extreme cases, it creates a nationwide crucible such as the Second World War that seems to shape the leadership experiences which many older leaders described in Bennis and Thomas (2002) study. This notion of era is valuable for my research because it frames the collective experience of the interviewed leaders in many respects. It helps to explain the similar experiences that the participants had and the consistent reflections they gave. One example is the shared experience mentioned by most of them of not knowingly meeting a single person from the other social group before adulthood. This is an experience that can be explained to a large extent by the segregation effects of the conflicts. Other examples for this sociocultural environment are the repeatedly mentioned experiences by the participants of violence and destruction they had to live through as part of belonging to divided societies.
On the individual level, for the leaders I interviewed, the contexts of the post-conflict peacebuilding appear to offer an enormous supply of “crucibles” for the leaders’ development, considering the levels of hostility, polarisation and depersonalisation they suffer. Crucibles for Bennis and Thomas (2002) are exceptional personal events that prepare leaders-in-waiting to consider their ‘calling’ to leadership. These experiences were tests that forced deep self-reflection involving questions about who they were and what mattered to them. The PhD findings show many examples of the violence and intimidation that the leaders repeatedly mentioned as part of their context of leadership and their development. Thus, the learning process that seems to emerge from the data and consistent with the notion of crucibles is learning through having to cope with hardships.

The fundamental qualities that seemed to develop out of going through and emerging from these hardships (crucibles) were political astuteness and what appeared to me to be high levels of resilience. The PhD findings suggested that having lived through these challenging crucible moments, leaders developed the ability to understand the different layers of context and to recognise risks and to seize opportunities. Additionally, they seemed to learn to accept some of their failures and regard them as potentially valuable sources of learning about context, interests or other people. The capabilities that had been developed through the conflict and post-conflict crucibles seem to be consistent with the concept of ‘adaptive capacity’ (Bennis and Thomas, 2002, p. 92) explained in chapter 3. Nevertheless, it is important to remember that sometimes what matters in leadership development experiences is the meanings leaders make of them rather than the experiences themselves, because “two leaders could undergo the same experience but take away different meanings from the experience, resulting in differing effects on leadership capabilities.” (Janson, 2008, p. 76).
Reflection on the experiences to make sense of them seems to be a critical leadership development process in my PhD findings. This aspect will be discussed in detail, later in this section.

This PhD research also found that leadership learning and development is not context-free. In my research, leaders learnt and developed through continuous interaction with their wider contexts. On the whole, much leadership literature talks about the everyday experience as benign, mundane mostly routinised, not with many risks and threats to life (Avolio and Gibbons, 1988; Janson, 2008; Kempster, 2006; Kempster, 2009; Kempster, 2012; Kempster and Cope, 2010; Shamir and Eilam, 2005). What are everyday experiences for my PhD participants is entirely different from most of what the leadership literature covers. However, while my research has taken place in an extreme context there may be generalisable findings from this, in that more routine leadership development is also shaped by continuous interaction with contexts. While peace-time leadership development may not have threats to life, there may be other risks such as threat to reputation or ego, which require careful attention to a dynamic context. It underlines the need for leadership development to pay attention to helping leaders to “read the context” that they are working in.

Another interesting observation, in my research, is that leaders appeared to have normalised even the most extreme experiences, such as escaping their home, losing family members or being physically attacked, as noted in chapter 7. Therefore, sociocultural knowledge is
essential to understand leadership development because it frames these leaders’ learning over their leadership journeys. It is the barometer and compass that guides their leadership in these difficult contexts especially when the leaders is intently leading in disagreement with, and against the grain of this sociocultural knowledge. This aspect of leadership development seems absent from much current academic investigation of leadership development. Referring to and building on the leaders’ sociocultural knowledge can be crucial to enhance the outcome of any leadership intervention. Future research is invited to investigate this area further.

8.4.2 Presage; the starting point of leading for peace

The second point of the leadership development discussion is presage which has two main components; leaders factors and leaders context. These two factors are interconnected and they feed to each other in the findings. For example, when the participants gave accounts of their prior knowledge and experiences, this could be coded as both a leader factor and a context factor, because the contextual factors linked to this personal knowledge and experiences. For example, family influence could have been regarded as a leader factor or a leader (personal) context. The Presage component, aimed to explore from the data who those people are? Where are they coming from? How do they see their personal motives entering the field of peacebuilding? Hence, with the notion of ‘era’ in mind (Bennis and Thomas, 2002), Leaders factors in this research aim to understand the leaders’ experiences prior to joining the field of peacebuilding, their agency and commitment to peacebuilding, their motivations behind choosing to work in this challenging field, and the sense of self-
confidence they had at that early stage. Third, learning context is replaced with leaders context. Leaders context aims to explore the peacebuilding leaders, personal and professional backgrounds and how they affect their presage into the field of peacebuilding

The participants talked about aspects of their personal backgrounds, for example, their family, religious understandings, political surroundings and some of the powerful experiences they had witnessed or went through during their early life. In Figure 8-3, I demonstrate these aspects. The leaders considered these aspects of their backgrounds as essential to why they understood their contexts of conflict differently compared with their own social groups. These experiences had influenced them to struggle for peace instead of maintaining or aggravating the war.

A more profound investigation of these findings showed that a core element that the leaders claimed to put them on the road of peace was a sort of inspiration, motivation and commitment they expressed that evolve around social consciousness and ethical aspiration for fairness and social justice. This suggested drive or ‘calling’ for their engagement in the field of peacebuilding could have a number of explanations. For some of the leaders, it had a direct connection with their faith or spirituality, which some of them had talked about. Other leaders had early work experiences that were associated with experiences of social change and engagement with the public domain; for instance, in community development or
journalism. A key feature of the experiences of some of these individuals was the exposure to the ‘other groups’ as victims or fellow-sufferers of deprivation, rather than as adversaries. Other leaders had an early intellectual engagement with the history of the conflict or with political practices and this engagement equipped them with different tools of thinking. This phase of the participants’ life (largely pre-leadership) was characterised by high enthusiasm, lack of confidence and low sense of direction.
Figure 8-3 Presage as seen in the findings
Through their life experiences, the leaders seemed to construct a view of their life experiences as a coherent whole in which they made sense of their leadership approach and their leadership actions in the context of conflict and post-conflict peacebuilding. Shamir and Eilam (2005) stress that what counts in leaders’ development is the interpretation that leaders make and the meanings they assign to their past experience and that the facts and the events themselves are secondary to these. The key meaning the findings seem to suggest is that all the different accounts of presage set a trajectory for the leaders to see the “others” i.e. the other group, in a different way from the established view within their social groups at that point. This seemed to pave the way for a kind of differentiation from their own group. This exposure to or engagement in practices that support ‘different thinking from the social group’ seems an important characteristic of the leaders’ ‘presage’. Whether these findings are interpreted as a calling or commitment that the leaders developed at an early age for the reasons they gave and acted upon, or as an attribution that they created about themselves to make sense of how they were motivated, the key point seems to be that the contextual references they gave as influences of their presage phase such as family, education and crucial life experiences served to start their differentiation from their social groups.

The findings show that the leaders in my research claimed to develop a strong sense of purpose and commitment from an early stage in their careers as peacebuilders. More precisely, they said that they entered the field of peacebuilding due to these deep personal insights about social consciousness, justice, equality and so on. Accordingly, leadership (as a conceptual category) at this stage seemed to have much less personal salience for the participants or even to be an aspired identity (Kempster, 2009) because they claimed that
they had no great desire to become leaders and their presage phase revolved around building peace rather than leading as such. Leadership in this study was seen more as an aspired commitment rather than a primary ambition - a commitment for a greater good that facilitated the integration efforts they later demonstrate in their leadership. This has resonance with leadership development as “finding a cause” as a proto-story account (Janson, 2008). The sense of commitment to a cause or a goal, rather than “an aspiration for leadership” as mentioned by (Kempster, 2009, p. 66), could be derived from the fact that leading for peace came with a high price physically and emotionally in most if not all cases.

There are two theories that might offer an explanation to this claim of evolving from cause to leadership; one is that the participants in my research were exceptional people in their qualities and their traits so they stand out from other people and are therefore natural born leaders. This could be supported as a theory by reference to the heroic leadership literature (Allison and Goethals, 2013; Allison, Goethals, and Kramer, 2016; Lowney, 2010). The second possible explanation is that they developed a specific identity that enabled them to stand somewhat apart from their social groups (while still connected to them). The findings from this research cannot be used to rule out that these were exceptional people with exceptional qualities. However, when they talked about their differentiating experiences (in what I have called the presage phase), they mentioned their circumstances, their motivations and their surroundings rather than their own characteristics such as traits or behaviours. Therefore, in my PhD research, the heroic approach to leadership is less plausible than the
identity work approach to leadership development. This fits in with the leadership literature which has largely eschewed the heroic approach to leadership, as noted. Furthermore, these participants actively refused the heroic notions of their leadership as seen in the findings.

8.4.3 Processes of learning and development

I turn now to the middle element of the 3P model, i.e. the Processes of learning how to lead for peace. I intend to cover both informal and formal development. Tynjälä (2013) states that workplace learning is considered as experiential, social, situated and practice bound. This is consistent with what Kempster (2006) argues for leadership learning through lived experience or as it is conventionally referred to the ‘school-of-hard-knocks’ or the ‘university of life’ (Davies and Easterby-Smith, 1984; Grint, 2007; Yukl, 2006). Learning by doing, as demonstrated in the findings seems to dominate the participants’ views of their own development. Kempster (2009, p. 105) asserts that active engagement in leadership roles and associated activities creates opportunities for the experiences of leading “through participation, knowledge of detailed nuances of leading in a particular context is absorbed, mostly tacitly by processes of situated learning” p.105. Nevertheless, mere interaction with the context is not enough to develop leadership. The essential issue cannot be only ‘experience’ but what is learned through experience, because learning of leadership is not just learning a body of theoretical knowledge – episteme – and not simply seised by replicable skills – techné – but rather including practical wisdom – phronesis as Aristotle implied (Grint, 2007). Leaders development in this sense is an interaction of “thinking, doing and being” (Day and O’Connor, 2003, p. 16).
Learning by doing was associated in the findings with learning from mistakes and through reflection on one’s own work. Through this conscious reflection, sometimes with colleagues, participants seemed to make sense of their experiences. The findings suggest that the practice – perhaps even habit - of reflection helps the leaders to digest the everyday (and in this research, not so everyday) experience and internalise it as implicit knowledge and reproduce it as practical wisdom (Grint, 2007). Hence, reflecting on the everyday experiences in post-conflict peacebuilding is a process of creating knowledge (Kolb, 1984) as well. This creation of new knowledge through leadership experience could support the argument presented earlier about the non-monotonic nature of leadership development in post-conflict peacebuilding context (Ohlsson, 2011) where people engage with context then they learn from it.

Another core source of leadership development that appeared very relevant in the findings was observational learning via collaborating and interacting with other people. The participants gave accounts which talked about colleagues or work partners they particularly learned from, especially in their early stages of trying to lead for peacebuilding. These people seemed to have the ability and the willingness to support the leaders in their development. Other accounts given by the participants were about the influences of the people who were senior to them. These people seem to act like their “gurus” or their “personal coach”. What seems very significant in the findings is the emphasis that many participants placed on the
role played by people coming from outside of the geographical context. A different way of thinking, different behaviours and different attitudes were some of the explanations that were given for the significance of these external people’s contributions to the participants’ development.

Research in the workplace learning area has indicate that learning at work vary from merely informal, where learning takes place unintentionally, to more structured and formal practices, where working people “teach” their colleagues or “become taught” by them (Billett, 2004, 2011; Tynjälä, 2013; Tynjälä, Häkkinen, and Hämäläinen, 2014). In leadership development, the impact of observational learning could be conceptualised through the contact with notable people within particular situations (Kempster, 2006).

Interacting with notable people active in the same or similar contexts of post-conflict peacebuilding could provide a framework of understanding about appropriate leadership in these particular contexts. Additionally, it may help shape an individuals’ identity development “through associating with such notables” (Kempster, 2006, p. 13) though identity work was formally outside the remit of this research.

Participating in formal leadership development programmes for peacebuilding was explored as well. The findings suggest that formal leadership development for peacebuilding had significant value in part by offering the participants a safe space physically and mentally in which to reflect on their context and their leadership. Interacting with leaders from similar challenging contexts appears to create a sense of safe and supportive environment for the
participants. Most importantly, the participants stressed what sounded like elements of a personal therapeutic approach which enabled some catharsis for them for the difficult emotional tensions which leaders were ‘carrying’ (James and Arroba, 2005). The view of the leadership development programmes as personal therapeutic interventions has been presented by Swan (2009) from a feminist perspective (Smolović Jones, Grint, and Cammock, 2014). The content of these leadership development programmes, nevertheless, appears to have had less impact on the participants. This may be explained by the fact that much of the leadership content in leadership development for peacebuilding has been largely derived from generic leadership development literature which does not directly relate to the contexts and purposes for leadership development for peacebuilding. This PhD research has not directly examined this though it is a plausible explanation. This is why I would invite future research to explore in depth the content and practices of leadership development programmes for peacebuilding.

Finally, the emotional impact of leading for peace in these challenging contexts on the leaders’ general wellbeing and how this reflects on their development seems very prominent in the findings (although the 3P model does not directly address emotional aspects of learning). The role of emotions in learning processes and leadership development through lived experiences has emerged as a prominent (though not sought for) theme in the PhD findings. In this research, the participants emphasised the continual emotional struggle they had to manage over the course of their career in peacebuilding. In addition to that, the ability
to recognise, surface, and sometimes control and deal with one’s own emotions is an essential aspect of political astuteness (Hartley et al., 2015). Therefore, I am suggesting adding a further component into the 3P model, which is the emotional aspects of leadership development. It is presented within Figure 8-4, at the bottom of the figure, to emphasise that emotional aspects seem to be present, on the basis of this research, in all stages of learning and development and so need to be made explicit in any model. From the limited research on emotions and wellbeing in this PhD thesis, the emotional component seems to be crucial to the general wellbeing of the leaders. It is worth stressing that this collection of data about emotions has not been undertaken systematically because I did not directly enquire into it. Nevertheless, it came strongly and insistently through the data. Had I focused on this I might have unearthed more, so this research may be the tip of an iceberg and is worth exploring in greater depth in future research.

In Figure 8-4, I present the full modification of the 3P model to reflect leadership development and learning in post-conflict peacebuilding as interpreted from the findings in my research.
To sum up

This section attempts to examine the different aspects of leadership learning and development in post-conflict peacebuilding. I argued that leadership development in these
contexts is fundamentally situational where the non-monotonic learning happened primarily from the direct engagement with the challenging situations and reflecting on them to make sense of these formative experiences. Concepts like crucibles, learning through lived experience, live formative experiences and notable people seemed to be very beneficial to shed light on the different interpretations of the findings from leadership development perspective.

8.5 Addressing the research questions

This research project began with a dissatisfaction about the literature on leadership for peacebuilding, particularly given the prevalence of fragile and conflicted states around the world and the observation that in post-conflict societies, conflict does not simply extinguish on the signing of a peace agreement. Accordingly, this research aimed to address the following overarching question:

**What does leadership for peacebuilding involve and how it has been developed in the post-conflict context?**

The related sub-questions are:

- What characterises the contexts of post-conflict peacebuilding?
- What characterises leadership in post-conflict peacebuilding? How does leading for peace interact with the context of post-conflict peacebuilding?
What are the events, experiences and processes of learning that shape the leadership development of leaders involved in post-conflict peacebuilding?

Having conducted empirical research in two different post-conflict contexts, I can now summarise how these questions may be answered.

In relation to the first question, the research found a number of features that characterised both contexts (Northern Ireland and Bosnia and Herzegovina). These features were derived both from the historical and documentary analysis and from the interviews with leaders at the grassroots and middle levels. The three overarching characteristics of context in these post-conflict peacebuilding contexts are: hostile and violent environments, polarisation, and depersonalisation. These dynamics interact with each other and work in connection. The theoretical framing that seemed to resonate well with the emerging themes was social identity theory. The contexts of post-conflict peacebuilding studied in this research suffered from damaged or completely destroyed social fabrics, with high levels of intergroup hostility. Given the robustness of the research, explored earlier in this chapter, it is possible to argue that the findings are sufficiently generalisable to suggest that these characteristics will occur in other post-conflict contexts too.

These contexts also showed strong polarisation on the social group level, due to social and geographic segregation and historical power struggles. The secondary data analysis showed
that these features had been in existence for many years. The research findings suggest that people were perceived, treated and sometimes harmed or killed, based just on their belonging to one social group or another, even in the supposedly peaceful contexts following the signing of a peace agreement. This has resonance with intergroup social behaviour (Tajfel, 1974) where people perceive each other based primarily on their group membership rather than their personal characteristics.

Intergroup social behaviour with high degrees of violence and polarisation is also found in this research to be associated with an active process of depersonalisation between social groups. Depersonalisation affects how people feel about one another, as perceptions become based on perceived prototypicality rather than idiosyncratic preferences or personal relationships (Hogg, 1992; Hogg, 2015; Hogg and Abrams, 1993; Rast III and Hogg, 2017). The process of intergroup differentiation sheds some light on these dynamics. The act of ingroup favoritism and out-group discrimination is underpinned with a socio-psychological process of “intergroup differentiation” (Tajfel and Turner 1979, p.40).

Turning to the second question, the research examines the forms and processes of leadership in this particular and in some ways highly specific context of post-conflict peacebuilding. When it comes to leadership, this research interprets leadership for peacebuilding as a situated relational process that builds on and derived from the social identity theory of leadership. It suggests that differentiation, integration and political astuteness are core
processes in the leading for peace. These three processes are interconnected, and they can reinforce each other.

Leading for peacebuilding in post-conflict contexts appears to both support but also invert the social identity theory of leadership. It supports the theory in that it approaches the phenomena of leadership in post-conflict peacebuilding as a group-member-based influence process. However, on the other hand, leadership in this context also demands differentiation from the leaders as they step away from the prototypicality of their groups and demonstrate their differences from the ingroup without losing the connection with the group. They also mobilise and support others from ingroup or/and out-group to perceive and act towards others in terms of communal goals and/or personal characteristics rather than in terms of group membership. They also demonstrate the integration dynamic through which the leaders seem to reach out to others in the other social groups and open spaces (literally and metaphorically) for people from different social group to meet up and find shared interests.

Both differentiation and integration were practiced with political astuteness. This research suggests that the peace leaders benefit from being politically astute to read, understand and act upon their personal biases and motives, others’ biases and motives and the wider context of conflict where all these biases and motives interact and contest. Arguably, this helps them stay alive in a context where threat and harm can still be prevalent. Political astuteness may
contribute to their being able to sense how much differentiation and how much integration to show. In an entirely different context, Alford et al. (2016) show that political astuteness helps public managers keep in the ‘zone’ of effectiveness in working with elected politicians, being neither too close nor too distant from them, but also that this is a zone of overlap, not a firm boundary line, and that it is dynamic and contextualised. The research here also suggests a zone which has to be judged in a dynamic way as to what will be effective with particular groups in particular contexts at particular times.

In my research, leaders differentiated themselves from their own social group but astutely through using personal and interpersonal skills, among other capabilities. The research drew on the work of Hartley et al (2015) and Hartley and Fletcher (2008) and found many of the capabilities in their political astuteness framework were present in this peacebuilding context. The peacebuilding leaders reported that they needed to read people and situations as well as to build alignment and alliances in their endeavours to integrate with others from the other major social groups. They had to keep in mind a clear sense of strategic direction towards limiting the violence and growing a healthy and sustainable peace, and they combined this with consistent scanning for all the threats and challenges and threats of falling back into extended and growing conflict. This sensitivity to the interests, goals and values of self, others and wider context, and acting upon them, appears to be valuable in leading for peace in volatile, uncertain and conflicted societies not only to achieve goals but also to protect the leaders from the previously mentioned hostility
On the practice level of leadership, leading for peace seems to involve purposeful actions to go beyond the boundaries of the conflictual social groups. The data shows that the participants have been leading for peace in several spheres of action; locally, as in the first sphere of action, where they engage with one community at a time about a specific issue; horizontally, as in the second and third spheres of action, where they focus on an issue that would be of interest across communities or targeting the relations among and between communities (working with communities and on their relations); vertically, as in the fourth sphere of action, that connect the upper tier of authorities to the lower one and link local to the international.

It seems from the findings that leaders are mobilising and influencing people to engage in “superordinate goals” that can only be attained when groups pull together (Sherif, 1958, p.349-350). Some such superordinate goals, for example, might be to tackle poverty, unemployment using the third sector of the social dimension of the EU or to lead the social movement for human rights. The concept of superordinate goal in these contexts is similar to the concept of “Take Whole” in The Art of War (Sun Tzu, Denma Translation, 2007). It is essentially about including the perspective and interests of others in the victory. It is not just about you winning and somebody losing. It is not simply bringing the other person to your side but to bring him or her to something larger than either side. In that way, there is no toxic residue from the conflict and they can build something greater from that victory.
Therefore, they aim go beyond the usual cycle of aggressive response to the conflict which only leads to escalation and more destruction for everyone.

Turning to the third research sub-question, the research found a variety of ways in which peacebuilding leaders had experienced leadership development. In my research, leading for peace requires a pro-active and continuous creation of novel and innovative learning and development that goes beyond the previously acquired experience and prior knowledge. Hence, it supports a non-monotonic creation of new ways of engaging with the challenging contexts. This research suggests a strong sense of commitment, experiential, reflective, ad hoc leadership development. Leadership learning and development, in this sense, is a complex phenomenon that does not follow a linear path from one source to another. Instead, it is complex process that build on personal interaction with a mixture of sources and in the heart of them is experiential learning. Additionally, leadership learning and development in the context of peacebuilding did not follow an upward trajectory all the time. The most value that the formal leadership development programmes in this context offered – as seen by the participants themselves - is to provide a safe ‘space’ for the leaders physically (as it takes them out of the conflict areas, and mentally and emotionally (when they involve support from peers and facilitators). This research offers a modified 3P model of leading for peace learning and development that links the era of conflict to leaders development from their presage into the field of peacebuilding to their process of learning and, finally, the product of their leadership
Overall, this research has broken a new ground in examining leadership and its development in the context of conflict and peacebuilding, and provided important empirical insights where little existed previously.
Chapter 9  Conclusions

This PhD research project was motivated by a dissatisfaction with the academic literature on leadership for peacebuilding, particularly given how limited this literature is in both quantity and quality. Leadership, or the lack of it, can play a crucial role either in accelerating intercommunity violence or contributing towards peace (Lederach, 1997). Serious efforts are needed to investigate the contexts, practices, processes and development of leadership to undertake the long-term and delicate work of peacebuilding. This PhD research aimed to explore the context and nature of civil society leadership for peacebuilding in these post-conflict contexts, and the processes and practices of leadership development and learning.

In recent history, there have been several countries/societies that went into mass societal conflicts and managed to find their way out of civil war and towards peace and reconciliation. This research explores two of these examples: Northern Ireland, and Bosnia and Herzegovina. These contexts were selected for two reasons. On the one hand, the conflicts in these two contexts met the international criteria of civil wars. On the other hand, the peace agreements in both of them have held up for long enough that the leaders engaged in peacebuilding have accumulated sufficient knowledge and experience of some progress towards peace that this research is keen to explore. Although each country’s conflict has its own historical and political characteristics, they share many similarities in term of their
trajectories, dynamics and aftermath. This research is an actor-focused study based on empirical research into the role of civic leadership in creating and sustaining peace. It draws on semi-structured interviews with 31 long-standing third sector leaders in Northern Ireland and Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The research started by examining the characteristics and the context of post-conflict from a social identity theory perspective. Then it utilised the social identity theory of leadership, leading with political astuteness framework, the concept of leadership arenas and superordinate goals to explore the nature of leading for peace in post-conflict context, on the levels of processes and practices. For this, it suggested a framework to show how leading for peace interacts dialectically with the context of post-conflict peacebuilding. Finally, it explored the processes and experiences of leadership learning and development in the post-conflict context where it produced a modified 3P model of peace leadership development.

9.1 Contribution to knowledge

This PhD thesis makes five main contributions to knowledge. It adds both theoretically and empirically to the literature that addresses leadership and leadership development in general, not only in the context of post-conflict peacebuilding. While the research has taken place in these difficult and often hostile contexts, the thesis has insights to offer more generally to understanding leadership processes and therefore also how leadership development can be encouraged.
First, much research on leadership, whether exercised by elected politicians, organisational leaders or civic activists, has been conducted in relatively safe societies, such as the USA or in Europe. It can be argued that Western leadership theory and academic research has taken insufficient account of the contested pluralism inherent even in stable societies, let alone leadership in the context of bitter dispute and violent division such as occurs in conflictual and post-conflict societies. This PhD investigated an important, yet little-researched area concerned with leading for peace at the civil society level. In this research it was found that leadership in a hostile and dangerous environment (which can continue for some considerable time after peace has been declared) seems to provide insights which come from this context but which have, I suggest, more general underlying processes. In post-conflict societies there are many pressures which peacebuilding leaders encounter on a personal and an intergroup level. Leadership and leadership development in these aggressive and intimidating environments are very different in nature from those that most of the leadership literature has explored. This PhD research is offering a way of understanding theses extreme contextual imperatives in relation to leadership and leadership development. While this is an extreme context, worthy of study in its own right, the research has relevance for the processes of how leadership is exercised in milder, but still pluralistic contexts, where there are sometimes highly divergent and competing interests even where the context is fortunately more benign.
Second, the systematic literature review demonstrated that the somewhat meagre literature concerned with peace leaders focuses perhaps too narrowly on leader-centric approaches – the leaders’ traits, and personal characteristics - and there is a danger that this reinforces false assumptions about their heroic work in peace movements and activities (courageous though they often are). My research shows that there is a need to pay attention to leadership processes and practices – how leadership is actually exercised in complex and contested context, not just the backgrounds or personalities of particular individuals. Even in these extreme contexts, the research showed the need to consider not only the actions of individuals but also how they perceived and worked within and beyond their own social groups. Furthermore, the peacebuilding leadership literature has been predominantly conceptual rather than empirically based, and it over-relied on biographical accounts rather than other forms of knowledge. My own research, presented in this thesis, contributes to the existing peace leadership literature in two ways; it extends the examination of peace leadership beyond individualistic characteristics, illustrating the value of examining the processual aspects of leadership, particularly in relation to context. Additionally, this research is based on in-depth detailed empirical evidence of leading for peace and its development, where empirical research is still all too rare in studies of leadership for peace.

Third, this research draws on but challenges and suggests a modification to social identity theory as a way to analyse and explain in depth the dynamics of intergroup dynamics. The context of post-conflict peacebuilding enables new insights to be drawn from this theory. I say more about the inversion of social identity theory as my fourth contribution but first I want to suggest, on the basis of this research, that social identity theory can be applied
beyond the behaviour of small groups that it was originally based on. My research suggests that it can be deployed to understand the grouping behaviours and dynamics of divided societies. The continued existence of ingroup and outgroup behaviours helps to explain why conflict often continues long after a peace agreement is signed. In that sense, the idea of “post-conflict” societies is misleading. This research shows that peacebuilding is needed well after formal hostilities have ceased and that leaders will have to continue to navigate the complex dynamics of “us” and “them” long after peace treaties have been signed.

Importantly, my PhD research analyses how peace leaders have to work out, with considerable deftness and sensitivity, how to remain connected to their own side when they reach out to the other side. Cries of traitor or spy have to be handled courageously and astutely. The reports from the peace leaders in this study shows that they need acute political antennae to handle the shifting and sometimes volatile dynamics between groups, and therefore to move continuously between differentiation and integration in their own group. This is not a fixed position but a dynamic balance (perhaps akin to the dynamics of riding a bicycle up a steep, unmarked and unstable track)

Fourth and significantly, my research offers a nuanced reading of the complex processes of civil society leadership for peace as involving, to some extent, an inversion of the social identity theory of leadership. As discussed earlier, the social identity theory of leadership constructs leadership as a dynamic feature of group membership i.e. occurring as a dynamic within a particular group. It builds on the notion of prototypicality where the leaders are
those who are perceived by their own social group as demonstrating the core characteristics of that group. Leading in this traditional social identity view is mainly about leadership exhibiting higher levels of differentiation from other groups, through that prototypicality within their own group. The leaders in this traditional view of social identity theory show (and support) strong differentiation with the out-group and strong integration with the in-group. However, it is a striking finding of my own research that not only was this effect not found, but its opposite was apparent. In my research, leading for peace often implies reversing these dynamics because peace leaders, seem to support differentiation with and from their ingroup, and integration with the out-group, in order to achieve superordinate goals which go beyond the binary divisions of the civil conflict, paving the way for peace.

Finally, the contribution of this thesis concern leadership development and learning. The contexts in which peacebuilding occurs are hostile and violent, polarised and depersonalising. These dynamics deeply impacted on leadership development and learning. Leaders learned and developed through continuous interaction with both their immediate and wider contexts. On the whole, the academic leadership literature has drawn on the everyday experiences of leaders as formative but treats these as benign, mundane, mostly routinised, and with few risks and threats to life. Everyday experiences for the peacebuilding leaders in my research was entirely different from that part of the academic literature. However, and paradoxically, one interesting observation from my research, is how far those leaders in peace-building contexts seemed to have normalised even the most extreme of these experiences, such as escaping from their home due to threats to life, losing family members through attacks, or being physically attacked themselves. Seen through external
eyes these are far from mundane. Consequently, understanding this kind of sociocultural knowledge is, I would argue, essential to understanding leadership development because it frames these leaders’ learning and their development over the course of their leadership journeys. This PhD research therefore offers a modified 3P model of leading for peace, and learning and development, that links the era and arenas of conflict to leaders’ development, from their presage into the field of peacebuilding, to their processes of learning and, finally, to the product of their leadership.

Overall, these reflections on the contribution of my thesis, show that far from being an esoteric context, or one which is unfortunate to have to study, in fact there are many insights which are relevant for pluralist societies without overt levels of conflict. In sum, the thesis contributes to the generic leadership literature as well as the literature on leadership for peace-building.

9.2 Future research

This PhD research has made considerable strides in its contribution to understanding leading for peace in post-conflict context, and it has implications for leadership in pluralist societies more generally. However, given the scarcity of research on leadership for peacebuilding, this research has had to pioneer ways of conceptualising this type of leadership and leadership context, and to develop new methods for research. Inevitably, there is further
work to be done. Five suggestions are made here for future research, though the field is still wide open.

First, the research findings showed that the participants exhibited considerable discomfort in applying the term “leader(ship)” to themselves, and they preferred alternative terms like ‘influencer’ or ‘energiser’. Additionally, they seemed to resist any heroic painting of what they had been doing and achieving. Moreover, the findings suggested a sense of self-deprecation regarding their roles and the outcomes of civil society sector as a whole in many cases. This is in spite of the fact that many of them have been genuinely innovative in their peacebuilding initiatives and have risked their lives for their work and apparently have sacrificed their mental and physical well-being for it. All of this has resonance with the concept of servant leadership (Greenleaf, 2002; Šiljak, 2014). Future research using the lenses of servant leadership theory might explore further and as yet unknown dimensions of leadership processes in the context of peacebuilding.

Second, the use of the leadership journey as a tool for collecting the PhD data provided a vibrant picture of the learning and the development the leaders accumulated over their life experience in the role of peacebuilder. This tool has been used in this thesis in an exploratory fashion. It was designed to help to surface the tacit knowledge of the participants and help transform it into more explicit knowledge which could be articulated to me as a researcher. I mainly utilised it to structure the interviews and to stimulate reflections from the
participants on their different leadership developmental experiences in relation to each other. The data which emerged from use of this tool are promising.

The leadership journeys could have been used in a richer way than I was able to deploy within the constraints of this thesis and my research time. They have a potential to reveal novel knowledge on leadership development in relation to time and context, had they been analysed temporally. They showed how leadership influence waxed and waned in relation to changes in both context and in leadership experience and skill. They showed that the interpretation of leadership actions can be richly analysed in relation to what has gone before as well as what the leader confronts at a particular time (which tends to be under-emphasised in many accounts of leadership which sometimes focus exclusively on the immediate challenges facing the leader). They showed that leaders rated their influence as going down as well as going up, which is at odds with some leadership narratives which imply that the leadership journey is one of progress forwards through time. In my PhD research, I see the effects of context not just individuals – with leadership journeys reflecting setbacks and defeats as well as progress, and leadership learning being stimulated by mistakes and failures as well as by success. This is a rich area for further research.

Third, leading in the intimidating post-conflict context (facing both ingroup hostility and out-group resistance) appears to leave a powerful emotional impact on peace leaders. In this
PhD research, the emotional struggle and the deteriorated general wellbeing of the leaders were recurrent themes of their leadership experiences. Part of this emotional labour could be attributed to the social identity struggle because “being a fringe-group (peripheral) member in one's group can cause individual pain (e.g., depression) and societal damage (e.g., violence)” which produces “self-uncertainty” (Hohman, Gaffney, and Hogg, 2017). However, the detailed investigation of this aspect of leadership in relation to the peace leaders and how it affects their general wellbeing goes beyond the purpose of this research. Future research is needed for these aspects of leadership for peacebuilding, in part to understand this better, and in part to devise ways to protect the well-being of peace leaders.

Fourth, the modified 3P model of leadership development deployed in this research, concerned with presage, process and product, was helpful in organising the data and structuring them in relation to understanding how leadership capabilities were acquired and enhanced over time. Nonetheless, the framework omits emotional aspects of learning and development. The role of emotions in learning processes and leadership development through lived experiences has been as well a recurring theme in the PhD findings. The exploration of this component opens another door for future research.

Fifth, I would suggest further research which goes beyond the two countries my research looked at, such as the conflicts in Africa, South America, and the Middle East. That will need to take account of and explore possibly different assumptions about leadership, civil society, in and out groups and so on. The research conducted here could be replicated
elsewhere but paying attention to these cultural and institutional differences. This suggested future cross-national research would help to test the generalisibility of the ideas and findings presented in this thesis.

The focus of this research is very timely. The rise in violent fragmented identity conflicts has caused a substantial increase in global disruption. Additionally, in post-conflict societies, conflict does not simply extinguish on the signing of a peace agreement. Exploring the leadership processes, practices and development for peacebuilding is my PhD’s modest contribution to addressing aspects of these painful current global challenges.
References


Grint, K., Jones, O. S. & Holt, C. (2016) ‘What is leadership: Person, result, position, or process, or all or none of these?’, in Storey, J., Hartley, J., Denis, J.-L., T’


Appendix 1 The Interview Schedule

Interview estimated time is 60 minutes

1- **Background (5 minutes)**
Brief description of the aim of the study, give a structure for the interview and sign the letter of consent.

2- **Activity: (15-20) minute with the participant**

First, we will start with building a timeline for you career as a leader in peacebuilding context;

![Leadership experience over time](image)
In this chart (the above chart to be shown to the participant), I am trying to plot you leadership journey over the period you have been active in peacebuilding (related!) work.

Together, we will create a timeline of your leadership experience and then we will reflect on different parts of this timeline in relation to your leadership development.

Let us start with some background questions;

- When did you start working in Peacebuilding? (S1)
- What was your role when you started?
- When did you start working for the current organisation? (S2)
- What is your current role?

Now, we will move to spot on some key events in your career in Peacebuilding;

- What (and when) would you say the milestones of your career in peacebuilding? (M₁)
- What and when were the highlights of your career (best moments- success stories) - High points? (H₁)
- What and when were the worst times of your career (challenging situations, failures) - Low points? (L₁)
- Have you participated into any formal leadership development events (education programmes, workshops …) ?
- What of these events you think as important in your career progress, when have been happened? (D₁)

The final stage of this activity is to map out your estimation or your leadership influence (formal and informal) for each point we spot on the time axes. We will start from the current time and will move back.

- On a scale from 0-10 what would you say your current level of you leadership influence, knowing that 0 is no influence at all and 10 is full influence?
Appendix 1 The Interview Schedule

- How much was it when you start in your current organisation? S2
- What about when you started your career in PB? S1
- How much will you give each of the milestones you pointed out? Ms
- What about the peaks of your career? Ws
- The bad times? Fs
- Finally formal developmental events? Ds

---

**LEADERSHIP EXPERIENCE OVER TIME**

Leadership experience over time

An example for chart resulted from phase one

**S1** Start working in PB
**S2** Start working at the current organisation
**L1, 2…** Low points; Challenging situations, Failure
**H1, 2…** High points; Success situation, Wins
D1, 2… Leadership development events- Programmes
M1, 2… Career milestones

3- The reflection on the leadership experience timeline (40 minutes questions)

These questions will use the mock chart presented above.

➔ From S1 to F1, it seems that your leadership influence decreased, what happened?

• Why you think you leadership influence has decreased according to what you have mentioned? (How do you know?)
• How that affect your work in peacebuilding?
• What did you learn from that?

➔ After this period, you enjoyed a noticeable increase of leadership influence; from F1 to M1 then to W1. What has changed?

• Again, how do you know that your influence has increased over that period of time?
• How did this increase affect your work in PB?

➔ In 2003 you mentioned a formal leadership development event, what was that event about?

What did you found specifically useful and relevant to you in that programme?

Do you think that programme has impacted your leadership influence in your job? How? Why?
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→ After that, you suffered another drop of leadership influence (from D2 to F2)? What do you think were the reasons?

→ What D2 (the second development event) was about?

- It seems that participating in this event did not help you leadership influence trend, why do you think this?
- How that affect you role in PB?
- What did you learn from that?

→ In 2009 you changed organisations (S1), why did do decide to make this transition?

- This movement does not seems to affect your leadership influence, why?
- What was the most challenging issues that you faced during this transition?
- What were the lesson leaned?

SAME FASHION OF QUESTION WOULD BE REPATED OVER ALL TRANSITIONS THAT THE TIMELINE SHOWS

Rounding up

Reflecting on this chart as a whole, what do you think are the key sources of leadership development (planned or emergent) that helped you to increase your leadership influence in your work in PB?

THANK YOU
Appendix 2 Consent form for persons participating in a research project

**Leadership Development for Peacebuilding as Experienced by Participants**

Name of participant:

Name of principal investigator(s): Loua Khalil

1. I consent to participate in this project, the details of which have been explained to me, and I have been provided with a written statement in plain language to keep.

2. I understand that my participation will involve recorded interview and I agree that the researcher may use the results as described in the plain language statement.

3. I acknowledge that:

   (a) the possible effects of participating in this research have been explained to my satisfaction;

   (b) I have been informed that I am free to withdraw from the project at any time without explanation or prejudice and to withdraw any unprocessed data I have provided;

   (c) the project is for the purpose of research;

   (d) I have been informed that the confidentiality of the information I provide will be safeguarded subject to any legal requirements;

   (e) I have been informed that with my consent the data generated will be stored on the Open University servers and will be destroyed after five years;
(f) if necessary, any data from me will be referred to by a pseudonym in any publications arising from the research;

(g) I have been informed that a summary copy of the research findings will be forwarded to me, should I request this.

I consent to this interview being audio-taped/video-recorded  □ yes □ no  
(please tick)

I wish to receive a copy of the summary project report on research findings  □ yes □ no  
(please tick)

Participant signature:  Date:
Appendix 3 A snapshot of the data analysis

Practically, the first coding practice aimed primarily to explore the research respondent; in which the coding was conducted following the below codes throughout all the interviews;

**What leadership- For Whom?**  
An attempt to map out the influence (leadership) that the participants have experienced throughout their career. It aims to answer the following question:

What do the participants do to promote peacebuilding?

The answer should come up through reflecting on their roles, activities and functions; where,

- **Participants' Roles**  
  Their positions in different phases of their career in Peacebuilding.

- **Participants' Activities**  
  What do they do?

- **Participants' Functions**  
  What are the underlying purposes of their actions?

This structure was satisfying for the first round of data analysis but shortly Gioia Methodology was adopted for the data analysis. According to Gioia Methodology, the coding process in the first phase should keep up with the participants' opinions and the codes should hold their language. Subsequently, I recoded all the interviews I have done before (9
in total) so I guaranty a systematic and consistent approach. Hence, with research questions in mind and using the Gioia Methodology explained earlier, the data has been analyzed from the beginning to the end with attention to three aspects widely;

1. Context; what does the data tell us about the context of post conflict peacebuilding in Northern Ireland first and in BiH second? How these contexts affected the participants (leaders?) and why?

2. Leadership; what does the data tell us about leadership as practices and discourses? How does the context affect the leaders? How do leaders affect the context?

3. Development; what does the data tell us about learning? How do the participants learn to lead in their contexts peacebuilding?

Starting from the 1st order analysis where the aim was to keep close and faithful to the Participants’ terms, notions and language every code was labeled by adding one word initial. These words have been developing over the time while coding starting from context, leadership, roles, activities, functions, learning, programmes then hardship and wellbeing were added. An important but temporary code used throughout the coding process was ‘NOT SURE’ code referring to excerpts of data that felt important but it was not immediately clear to where they belong. Although these word initials were meant to be used as umbrella terms that help labeling the data without forcing any theoretical framework at this stage, it was important to define what was meant by each one of them from the beginning and keep that definitions to the end. Constructing clear definitions was needed for keeping consistency all through the coding journey. All the initial words and their suggested definitions were kept
on a memo file in Nvivo as shown in figure [5-1]. Below are these words with their preliminary definitions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>An overarching term that cover all the external factors relevant to conflict and peacebuilding that have affected the participants on personal, organisational or macro (national) level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>All the conscious/ intended/ planned actions (in the wider sense of the word) that conducted by the participants to (mobilise people to) change/ improve the context towards more peace and less violence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Experiences that they share that impact their thinking, behaviours or attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmes</td>
<td>Planned leadership learning with formal platforms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardship</td>
<td>Forceful incidents that left emotional impact on the participants on a long term (including what they considered as low points in their career)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wellbeing</td>
<td>Physical, mental and emotional aspects of the participants’ experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles, Activates, Function</td>
<td>As defined above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 4 The initial data collection and analysis action plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Highlight</th>
<th>PLAN</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>ACTUAL (beyond plan)</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>COMPLETE</th>
<th>COMPLETE (beyond plan)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Oct

**Collaboration with Cordaid**
- Applying for Women leadership institute for Peace and security (scoping study)
- Negotiating access for the Institute as a researcher
- Programme 0: Participating Women leadership institute for Peace and security
- Negotiating access to CordAid organisation
- Internship with CordAid Women Leadership
- Programme 1: GCSP- LD for PB (Mid-range LS)
- Materials preparation
- First round of analysis
- Programme 2: CordAidLD for PB (Mid-range LS)
- Materials preparation
- First round of analysis
- Programme 3: CordAid LD for PB (Grassroots LS)
- Materials preparation
- First round of analysis
- Programme 4: LD for PB (Grassroots LS) Phase 1
- Materials preparation
- First round of analysis
- Programme 3: LD for PB (Grassroots LS) Phase 1
- Materials preparation
- First round of analysis
- Collaboration with Sweden Institute
- Applying for The Young Leaders Visitors Programme for MENA region
- Negotiating access
- Programme 4: LD for PB (Mid-range LS)
- Materials preparation
- Full materials analysis

### PhD Project Planner

**Year 1 Oct 14- Sep 15**

- PhD Project Planner

**Year 2 Oct 15- Sep 16**

- PhD Project Planner

**Year 3 Oct 16- Sep 17**

- PhD Project Planner
Appendix 5 The initial (but later abandoned) cases/programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhance your understanding of sustainable peacebuilding and leadership styles</td>
<td><a href="http://www.gcsp.ch/Courses/Enhancing-Leadership-for-Peacebuilding-7th-Senior-Level-Course-on-Peacebuilding">http://www.gcsp.ch/Courses/Enhancing-Leadership-for-Peacebuilding-7th-Senior-Level-Course-on-Peacebuilding</a></td>
<td>Geneva Centre for Security Policy - GCSP</td>
<td>16 - 20 November 2015</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Institute of women leadership for Peacebuilding</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cordaid.org/en/topics/womens-leadership/about-topic/">https://www.cordaid.org/en/topics/womens-leadership/about-topic/</a></td>
<td>CREA and CordAid</td>
<td>February 2016</td>
<td>Turkey (Potentially)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The young leaders visitors programme for MENA region (Middle East and North Africa)</td>
<td><a href="https://eng.si.se/mena-leaders-to-meet-in-sweden/">https://eng.si.se/mena-leaders-to-meet-in-sweden/</a></td>
<td>Swedish Institute - SI</td>
<td>3 weeks in May 2016 and 1 week in November 2016</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>