

Dear Survey Participants,

I promised you feedback within 30 days of when our Professionalism Survey closed. We realized that including as many open-ended questions as we did would complicate summarizing results, and it has, but the complication is worth it. Your responses are telling us that the focus of the survey –diplomatic service professionalism-is timely and provocative.

What immediately struck us is the diversity of views and understanding about what is even meant by “profession,” professionalism,” professional education vs. training, and professional development, not to mention the distinction between diplomacy and the Foreign Service. The term “core values” also raised questions and presented a quandary for some.

In this context, I want to clarify what we had in mind when we created the survey. The following definitions are taken either from Webster’s New Collegiate Dictionary or they are drawn from current usage, as we understand it:

Profession: a) a calling requiring specialized knowledge and often long and intensive academic preparation, as medicine, law, theology, engineering, teaching, etc. b)the whole body of persons engaged in any such calling c)loosely, any occupation -- **The oldest profession** prostitution: a jocular usage. (I include Webster’s New World Dictionary reference to jocular usage for those of you who have heard the saying that “diplomacy is the world’s second oldest profession.”)

Professional: *adj.* 1a) of, engaged in, or worthy of the high standards of, a profession b) engaged in one of the learned professions c)characterized by or conforming to the technical or ethical standards of a profession 2a) participating for gain or livelihood in an activity or field of endeavor often engaged in by amateurs such as sports or artistic endeavors **–n.** 1) a person practicing a profession 2) a person who engages in some art, sport, etc. for money, esp. for his livelihood, rather than as a hobby

Professionalize: to cause to have professional qualities, status, etc.

Professional education vs. training- as suggested in the definition of profession above and as generally understood today—professional education refers to a longer term course of study and experience, which is certified, and defines that which is central to the practice of a profession, either at the onset or as part of renewed certification process; training refers to a shorter-term, skill-focused learning experience, which is also certifiable, and is designed to provide specific knowledge and ability to operate in a more narrowly defined function or area of expertise, e.g. heart surgery vs. medicine; basic composition vs. writing; visa law vs. the full range of consular affairs; use of the new SMART messaging system vs. the ability to gather information, synthesize and analyze it in writing, highlighting its relevance to current US foreign policy priorities

Professional Development: a defined and purposeful combination of professional education, training , experience and seasoning appropriate to the enhancement of one’s standing and capability over the course of a career in a given professional field.

Values: the social principles, goals, or standards held or accepted by an individual, class, society, corporation, organization, etc. In our understanding, “core values” are those few values purposefully communicated and embraced above all by the collective of a particular organizational grouping and/or corporate culture, such as “Honor, duty and country” as several graduates of West Point noted, or as a former Air Force Officer noted, “-----”

As noted, it will take us more time to summarize appropriately responses to the open-ended questions, but results from the closed questions provide important background information. Most significantly, we had a ___% response (1,727 responses from _____addressees), which is considered a very strong for any survey effort. Interestingly, responses have also been well distributed among the largest groups of respondents, whether officers or specialists. We would have liked a larger AID response, given its numbers, but the almost 200 officers who replied have provided a rich range of views and much food for thought. Here is Zoomerang’s tabulation of who responded overall:

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>Grades 7-4</u>	<u>Grades 3-1</u>
GENDER:	56% male 44% female	66% male 34% female
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	801	926
FS GENERALIST CONES:		
Consular-	9%	12%
Economic	7%	11%
Management	9%	12%
Political	8%	15%
Public Diplomacy	10%	11%
LARGEST SPECIALIST GROUPS RESPONDING		
OMS	16%	0%
AID	13%	9%
IM Mgt	10%	5%
DS/Special Agent	6%	7%
UN LANGUAGE S YOU CAN WORK IN		
Arabic	8%	12%
Chinese	10%	12%
French	39%	44%
Russian	12%	18%
Spanish	58%	57%
EQUATE FS WITH DIPLOMACY? (600 responses of 801)		
Yes	85%	
PROFESSIONALLY PREPARED FOR TENURING? (192 responses of 801)		
Yes	85%	
CONSIDER YOURSELF PROFESSIONAL? (926 responses of 926)		
Yes		98%

SENSE OF MISSION? (771 responses of 926)

Yes	87%
-----	-----

ITEM**Grades 7-4****Grades 3-1****AGENCY CORE CORPORATE VALUES? (481 responses of 801)**

Yes	68%
-----	-----

FS CORE VALUES? (435 responses of 801)

Yes	60%
-----	-----

FS CORE VALUES? (683 responses of 926)

Yes	71%
-----	-----

AGENCY CORE VALUES? (635 responses of 926)

Yes	69%
-----	-----

HAVE YOUR READ AND DID INSIDE A US EMBASSY ACCURATELY REFLECT THE REALITY YOU HAVE ENCOUNTERED? (402 responses of 801)

Yes	52%
-----	-----

IS THE MISSION OF THE FS AND YOUR AGENCY THE SAME? ((523 responses of 926)

Yes	72%
-----	-----

HAVE YOUR TAKEN THE REQUIRED FSI LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT COURSE? (662 responses of 926)

Yes	80%
-----	-----

At first glance, these results are quite positive. However, when we start drilling down we see the number of people in each group who did not answer many questions and upon reading the follow-up, open-ended comments, we note that these do not always align with responses noted above, e.g. many said yes we have core values, but then could not name them, or named negative values or cited precepts or otherwise provided an extremely wide range of other answers, all of which suggests—as good number of respondents noted—that there are, in fact, no purposefully communicated core values that distinguish either Foreign Service Officers or Specialists or employees of the Department of State or the Foreign Service. Interestingly, a significant number of Mid-level AID respondents consistently cited five or six AID “guiding operating principles,” which they used to distance themselves from the Department of State. We are seeing the same dynamic play out for questions involving your agency’s mission and most especially your profession and its requirements. Those responsible for the required Leadership and Management course may share our dismay at how participants have responded to a request for their three most important “take-aways” from the course.

With this preview, we hope you appreciate why we think it wise to take a bit more time to digest the full range of your responses as part of the feedback process. Our current thinking is to provide summary descriptions of your collective views related to each of the open-ended questions as soon as possible, starting with the Mid-Level responses to Question 7, “What is your profession and what are its requirements?” Thus far, your responses have shown significant diversity in both naming the profession

and citing its requirements, a provocative finding for those interested in strengthening diplomatic service professionalism.

We will be sharing your anonymous raw responses with select members of the AAD Professionalism Advisory Group and Steering Committee and encourage those of you interested in this issue to view them yourselves at the following website: _____.

In addition, AFSA will be organizing a number of professionalism focus groups to comment on and feed into the AAD report preparation process, and I invite anyone interested in participating in one of these groups to contact us at _____.

We look forward to being back in touch as soon as possible.

INITIAL FINDINGS

AFSA MID-LEVEL OFFICER (MLO) SURVEY

A copy of the twenty questions AFSA posed in its Mid-Level Survey is attached. This is not a scientific, professional survey, but rather one better described as a “sounding out” of AFSA members. This said, of 557 MLO responses (compared to 350 ELO responses), there was close to an equal response from males and females and from each of the five cones. Initial MLO response analysis focuses on five questions:

(Q6) Do you consider yourself a professional?

(Q7) If so, what is that profession and what are its requirements or qualifications?

(Q11) Does the FS have core values? If yes, what are they and how have they been communicated to you?

(Q12) Does the Department of State/your agency have core values? If yes, what are they and how have they been communicated to you?

(Q19) Have you taken the required FSI leadership and management course? If yes, what are your three most important “take-aways”?

Questions 6 and 7: There is no collective sense of professional identity beyond the fact that 98% of this MLO sample sees itself as “professional.” Beyond that, they identify their profession in several distinct ways: “diplomacy” or [being a] “diplomat,” Foreign Service/FSO/FS Generalist or the respondent’s conal function or job. Few people seem to have an understanding of the word “profession” or “professional” as distinct from “job,” e.g., medicine vs. GP or law vs. prosecutor. What “profession” means and/or what qualifies one for the “profession” is viewed and explained in very diverse ways. Many people define their profession by their cone or job or conflate the two. Responses to Q7 vary in emphasis and language by cone, but responses across cones fell into three distinct categories of the profession’s “requirements or qualifications:” 1) personal attributes, 2) skills and 3) knowledge. A relatively small number of people in each group see the Foreign Service exam/entry process and EER precepts as relevant to conveying professional status. A significant group in each cone has chosen not to answer one or more of these questions, some without explanation, others because they do not understand them and others because they find them outrageous or “bizarre” or waste of time. A few in each cone also welcome the questions as timely and/or important. **In short, responses reveal no common professional identity, shared standards or defined professional entry qualifications, a comfort to those who believe that anyone can be a diplomat.**

Questions 11 and 12: According to the State Department’s current Performance Report and its Strategic Plan, the Department’s core values are as follows: loyalty, character, service, accountability, community and diversity. Significantly, one third to almost half of respondents from each cone either do not think there are core values, are unsure/unclear about whether there are, think maybe there are but cannot name any, or name negative values, e.g. *“Cover your backside!”*~ *“They have neither been articulated nor communicated well.”* **Such responses suggest that neither the FS nor the Department of State has core values, which by definition are deeply inculcated in the corporate culture and all employees. Six or less in each cone know about and name the values cited in the Strategic Plan, thus indicating that there is no intentional or purposeful link between this Plan and the corporate culture.** Conal differences suggest that officers do not hold common core values, and values serve no purpose for building cohesion in the officer cadre. Several people in each cone mention a “laminated Biz Card” with the Department’s values and strategic goals, “which is older but still relevant,” at least to them. The detailed analysis of responses reveals an institution with no core values or culture.

Question 15: 84% of 550 respondents have taken the required course(s). 419 responded to the follow up question about “take-aways.” **Required training seems to be having a positive impact among MLOs, notwithstanding considerable criticism,** which varies by cone. Responses regarding the three most important “take-aways” fall into several discernable patterns—1) positive “take-aways,” some of which fall into discernable clusters and others which are more randomly distributed; 2) constructive criticism noting how the courses can be improved; 3) negative “take-aways” associated with cynical or dismissive comments, as well as unintended negative lessons respondents drew from the course, e.g. *“dysfunctional management is rampant.”*~ *“We don’t practice what we preach.”*~ *“Can’t remember.”*

Zoomerang Survey Results

2010 Survey for Foreign Service Grades 1, 2, & 3

Response Status: Completes

Filter: No filter applied

Dec 30, 2011 9:47 AM PST

1. What was your date of entry into the Foreign Service?

938 Responses

2. What is your gender?

Male	610	66%
Female	314	34%
Total	924	100%

3. What is your career track/specialization classification?

State Generalist-Consular	111	12%
State Generalist-Economic	103	11%
State Generalist-Management	112	12%
State Generalist-Political	137	15%
State Generalist-Public Diplomacy	98	11%
State Specialist-Diplomatic Security Special Agent	66	7%
State Specialist-Diplomatic Courier	2	0%
State Specialist-Security Engineering Officer	13	1%
State Specialist-Security Technical Specialist	8	1%
State Specialist-Office Management Specialist	3	0%
State Specialist-Health Practitioner	13	1%
State Specialist-Medical Technologist	1	0%
State Specialist-Medical Officer/Psychiatrist	3	0%
State Specialist-Facilities Manager	15	2%
State Specialist-Financial Management Officer	25	3%
State Specialist-General Services Officer	10	1%
State Specialist-Human Resources Officer	12	1%

State Specialist-Construction Engineer	5	1%
State Specialist-Information Management Specialist	49	5%
State Specialist-Information Management Technical Specialist	11	1%
State Specialist-Regional English Language Officer	2	0%
State Specialist-Information Resource Officer	3	0%
State Specialist-Printing Specialist	0	0%
U.S. Agency for International Development	81	9%
Foreign Commercial Service Officer	19	2%
Foreign Agricultural Service Officer	20	2%
International Broadcasting Bureau	4	0%
Other	0	0%
Total	926	100%

4. In which of the following United Nations languages can you work?

Arabic	88	12%
Chinese	92	12%
French	325	44%
Russian	132	18%
Spanish	420	57%

5. In what other languages can you work (please specify)?

609 Responses

6. Do you consider yourself a professional?

Yes	909	98%
No	17	2%
Total	926	100%

7. What is that profession and what are its requirements or qualifications?

872 Responses

8. What drew you to this line of work?

888 Responses

9. What keeps you in the service or is driving you out?

898 Responses

10. Do you have a sense of mission?

Yes	787	87%
No	114	13%
Total	901	100%

11. Does the Foreign Service have core values?

Yes	618	71%
No	258	29%
Total	876	100%

12. Does the Department of State/your agency have core values?

Yes	577	69%
-----	-----	-----

No	260	31%
Total	837	100%

13. What is the mission of the Department of State/your agency?

784 Responses

14. Is the mission of the Foreign Service the same as that of the Department of State/your agency?

Yes	557	72%
No	217	28%
Total	774	100%

15. How well is the Department of State/your agency adapting to global change as an institution? Please cite examples to illustrate your perspective.

770 Responses

16. How well does the Department of State/your agency prepare leaders to manage change? Institutionally? Globally?

783 Responses

17. How specifically does the Department of State/your agency contribute to national security?

753 Responses

18. How has diplomacy changed since you entered the Foreign Service?

783 Responses

19. Have you taken the required FSI leadership and management course?

Yes	710	80%
No	178	20%
Total	888	100%

20. Please feel free to provide us with any additional observations or comments you may have.

349 Responses

MID-LEVEL PROFESSIONALISM SURVEY ANALYSIS

QUESTION 6: Do you consider yourself a professional?

QUESTION 7: If so, what is that profession and what are its requirements or qualifications?

Background:

In 1957 Samuel Huntington made the case for military “officership as a profession” in his book The Soldier and the State. Huntington defined professionalism in terms of expertise, responsibility and “corporateness.” He also acknowledged “the diplomatic service” as a profession, one possessing “a high degree of specialization of labor and responsibilities within [it]... which renders a collective service to society as a whole.” However, he left definition of the profession to the diplomats. We were interested to see how serving officers define their profession and what qualifies one for it.

Since, to AFSA’s knowledge, neither State nor the Foreign Service personnel system has ever named or defined diplomacy as a mission or professional heart of either institution, nor established professional education norms for qualifying anyone as a “professional diplomat” or a “diplomatic professional,” we were prepared to accept “no defined requirements or qualifications” as the response for those who saw themselves as diplomats. The following is an analysis of the responses received from FSOs (Analysis of Specialists will follow.), first an impression of the collective picture and then a more detailed analysis by self-identified conal affiliation.

COLLECTIVE IMPRESSION:

A disclaimer: this is not a scientific, professional survey; it is better described as a “sounding out” of AFSA members on twenty questions addressed to Foreign Service Officers and Specialists in ranks 3-2 and 1. This analysis is focused exclusively on the FSO responses to the two questions identified above. Because of the open-ended nature of Question 7, tabulation is necessarily notional rather than statistically precise.

Our overall impression is that there is no “collective” beyond the fact that the majority of FSO’s in all cones see themselves as “professional” and they identify “diplomacy” or [being a] “diplomat” as their profession. Other significant choices, which vary by order in different cones, include Foreign Service/FSO/FS Generalist or the respondent’s conal function or job. Few people seem to have an understanding of the word “profession” or “professional” as distinct from “job,” e.g., medicine vs. GP or law vs. prosecutor. What “profession” means and/or what qualifies one for the “profession” is viewed and explained in very diverse ways. A few people in each cone provide a definition of “profession” but do not then answer the question with regard to themselves. Many people define their profession by their cone or job or conflate the two. Many say they are a “diplomat” and also identify their cone; others see their profession as being their conal specialty. The way in which people address the questions varies in emphasis and language by cone. All cones, however, spoke to three discernable categories of “requirements or qualifications:” personal attributes, skills and knowledge, so we have sorted and looked for “clusters” along these lines.

A relatively small number of people in each group see the Foreign Service exam/entry process and EER precepts as relevant to conveying professional status. A significant group in each cone has chosen not to answer one or more of these questions, some without explanation, others because they do not understand them and others because they find them outrageous or “bizarre” or waste of time. A few in each cone also welcome the questions as timely and/or important.

CONSULAR CONE SAMPLE: 100 of 109 officers (65 male) self-identified as “consular cone” responded to the following questions:

Question 6: Do you consider yourself a professional? 95% Yes 5% No

Question 7: If so, what is that profession?

Diplomacy/diplomat=46
Conal function: Consular Affairs/consular officer =26
Foreign Service/FSO/FS Generalist=16
Law/Engineering/Public Health/Translator/Educator=9
International development/public administration=2
International relations=1
No profession named=8

Question 7: What is that profession’s requirements or qualifications?

N.B. In hindsight, this question should probably have read “What is required to qualify or be certified as a member of that profession?” However, most—if not all— seemed to understand what we were aiming for. Responses below and for other cones are without attention to whether the respondent identified diplomacy, conal function or foreign service as his/her profession:

41 provided no response or comment to the question.

6 listed the FS exam, FS commission, evaluation precepts or getting hired by State as conveying professional status, whether for diplomacy or FS or Consular Affairs.

PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES:

Adaptable/flexible: 12	Honesty/probity/integrity/trustworthy=7
Desire to serve/sacrifice/duty=6	Culturally-aware/sensitive=6
Tactful/diplomatic/socially capable=6	Have good judgment/common sense=6
Patient=4	Quick learner and actor=3
Worldwide available/live in foreign places=3	Dedicated/committed=3
Open-minded/objective=3	Strong patriotism/patriotic=3
Have empathy/compassion=3	God complex=1
A leader/have emotional intelligence/critical thinker/humor/intellectual curiosity=1 each	

SKILLS or SKILL SETS:

Interpersonal skills=17	Management skills=13
Communication skills=11	Leadership=8
Synthesize/analyze/assess info=10	Foreign Language skills=8
Represent/representation skills=6	Active listening=3
Writing=3	Negotiation skills=3
Customer Service skills=2	
Media /mentoring/intellectual/IT/cross cultural/conflict resolution skills=1 each	
Any skills that help promote US interests=1	

KNOWLEDGE/UNDERSTANDING

Immigration/visa/consular law=9	Broad knowledge/education=9
International experience=4	US policies/interests/policy process=5
“Understanding” of foreign affairs/policy=5	Foreign cultural/area knowledge=3
International relations/world affairs=3	US history/culture/constitution=2
Management/resource management theory=2	
International law/organizational development/public finance/budget process=1 each	

OTHER COMMENTS OBSERVATIONS:

28 described a current job vs. a profession and its requirements or qualifications.

3 declined to answer, saying “AFSA should know.”

1 said “*qualifications are defined by law, where not self-evident.*”

Several expressed confusion or lack of understanding about the question (“*Huh?*”; “*What’s the point?*” “*Not sure I understand.*”); **2** asked why AFSA was doing this; another said he was “*not interested in the career, only the job;*” **1 or 2** did not answer the question but instead provided the definition of a profession, e.g., “*a job for employees who are subject to a clear and fair set of rules that has rewards for those who succeed and punishment for those who fail—disbarment, loss of license;*” **1** asserted “*medicine or law are professions. Any other use of the term is just self-promotion;*” another wrote, “*I am not certain I would consider myself a professional, especially after serving with some of the newer FSO’s who have entered since the exam requirements were changed;*”

one respondent wrote the following:

*I am a professional diplomat. Being a professional US diplomat requires the following: *faithful adherence to the US constitution and its principles*loyalty to the administration*modeling the highest levels of workplace professionalism and courtesy* possessing exceptional character and judgment*Demonstrating superior oral and written communications in English and other foreign languages*Having the ability to tell America’s story and to listen and interpret foreign interlocutors*Ability to analyze (sic) what is happening and clearly and concisely report to Washington*Willingness to serve anywhere in the world*Maintaining awareness of US and world events*

ECONOMIC CONE SAMPLE: 97of 102 officers (59 male) self-identified as “economic cone” responded to the following questions:

Question 6: Do you consider yourself a professional? 100%

Question 7: If so, what is that profession?

Diplomacy/diplomat=59

Foreign Service/FSO=13

Conal or job function: econoff/bureaucrat/civil or public servant=10

Other profession: law/engineer/military/public health/business=15

Economist =5

Policy Management/Policy Analyst =2

No profession named=6

Question 7: What is that profession’s requirements or qualifications?

23 provided no answer to the question.

2 listed the FS exam, as conveying professional status.

PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES:

Good judgment=10

Tactful/diplomatic =8

Team player=5

Cool in crisis=4

Cultural sensitivity/understanding=4

Curious/curiosity=3

Competent=2

“Trained”=2

Integrity/insight/professional attitude/high energy/high intelligence=1 each

Adaptable/flexible=8

Foreign and diplomatic experience=5

Broadly educated/well read=6

Able to influence/persuasive=4

International awareness=4

Self-confident=3

Interested in foreign cultures=2

Exhibit grace=2

SKILLS or SKILL SETS:

Quick analysis and reporting skills=20
Negotiating skills=11
Oral and writing skills=8
Management skills=6
Representation/represent =4
Active listening=3
Policy formulation=2
Advise=2
Technology skills/export promotion/administrative= 1 each

Communication/interpersonal skills=17
Foreign Language skills=10
Cross-cultural communication skills=6
Advocacy skills=5
Synthesize and assess info=4
Networking skills=3
Service=2
Leadership skills=2

KNOWLEDGE/UNDERSTANDING:

Cultural/regional studies/understanding=15
Professional degree, e.g. law, engineering=8
U.S. policies and interests=5
Academic degree (any) =3
Continuing professional education/business/accounting & math/development/
agriculture/diplomatic norms/how to work in the USG and in Washington=1 each

Politics/economics and finance=12
International relations/order/affairs=8
History/geography=5
U.S. history=2

OTHER COMMENTS OBSERVATIONS:

20 described a current/conal job vs. a profession and its requirements or qualifications.

Several expressed outrage at the question: *“What do you mean? I’m a professional diplomat.”* (however, no further definition nor response); *“What kind of question is this? I’m a diplomat.”* (but no further definition nor explanation); **“BIZZARE QUESTION! Of course we’re professionals. Diplomacy is an art that takes many years to master. It’s not like we’re McDonald’s employees and anyone can do it. If we have to ask this question of ourselves, I think we’re having our own identity crisis and not putting our best face forward for the American people. (While we’re at it, we should conduct a PR campaign so average-Joe American knows and appreciates what we do too!)”** (no further helpful definition nor description for his advocated PR campaign.)

Cynicism raised its head: *“Lie well. Convince others crappy US policy is good policy.”*

One noted, *“It (diplomacy) does not have any pre-set requirements or qualifications, though it helps to be well-read, have a great curiosity about the world, and the skills to deal with people from many different cultures.”*

One provided the qualifications for each of his three professions: *“Foreign Service Officer: college education, analytical skills, writing, public speaking, intercultural functionality. Attorney: specialized education/law school, research and writing, analytical skills and public speaking. Military Officer: college+specialized skill education, leadership, ability to train and supervise subordinates, discipline, commitment to higher cause.”*

Another former military officer now in the Foreign Service named the military and business as his profession with the following comment: *“I was a military officer and business executive. The military profession has a code of conduct, required professional education and training for entrance and career progression. I have an MBA and have completed several technical training courses for my business career.”*

A not-uncommon response conflates the respondent’s job with his profession: *“I am a diplomat. I am required to represent my country abroad and inform American policy makers of conditions in the country where I am posted. This includes being informed and knowledgeable about my host country’s economic, political, cultural, social and historical conditions and be able to speak the language used by my host country to communicate with people from all walks of life.”*

MANAGEMENT CONE SAMPLE: 103 of 112 officers (76 male) self-identified as “management cone” responded to the following questions:

Question 6: Do you consider yourself a professional? 96% Yes 4% No

Question 7: If so, what is that profession?

Diplomacy/diplomat=33
Conal or job function: =30
Foreign Service/FSO/FS Generalist=13
Other profession: law/engineer/ business/ “professional manager”=18
Public Administrator/Public Service=3
Policy Management/Policy Analyst =2
No profession named=12

Question 7: What is that profession’s requirements or qualifications?

34 provided no answer to the question.

10 cited the FS exam/orals/commission or precepts as conveying professional status.

PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES:

Flexible/adaptable=7	Quick learner/smart/intelligent=7
Good judgment=6	“Willing to serve/sacrifice”=6
Culturally sensitive/multicultural=5	Integrity/honest/good character=4
Good net-worker/people person= 4	Leader/vision=4
Tactful/diplomatic=3	Curious=3
Interested in international/world affairs=2	Efficient=2
Strong/ Courageous=2	Dedicated/Committed=2
21/patient/multi-tasker/fair/”not entitled like some”/strategic & tactical thinker=1 each	

SKILLS or SKILL SETS:

*A number of people listed Leadership and Management skills together and others only one or the other, so since they are distinct, we have counted each word separately.

Interpersonal skills=9	Leadership skills*=8
Communication skills=7	Foreign Language skills=4
Listening/Active listening=3	Writing =3
Speaking/public speaking skills=3	Analytical skills=3
Quick problem solving skills=3	Representational skills=2
Mentoring skills=2	
Time management/advocacy/synthesize info/networking/budget and resource mgt/negotiation/organizational skills=1 each	

KNOWLEDGE/UNDERSTANDING:

Diplomatic history and international finance=3	finance, budget reg’s and process=3
Broad/general education=3	Management/supervision=3
Human Resource management=2	How DOS operates=2
US law and USG reg’s=2	
“Understanding”/experience/training/military service/international law/area studies=1 each	

OTHER COMMENTS OBSERVATIONS:

36 described a current job or conal function vs. a profession and its requirements or qualifications.

5 said they did not understand the questions: “??Huh Operations?Management?;”
“Frankly, I don’t understand the question. Sorry.”; “Not sure what the question means, but I have a law degree and passed a state bar, so that means “a professional” to me.

1 responded that the definition of diplomacy as a profession “*depends on the job*” because he’s “*a jack of all trades.*”

2 noted the significance of the Foreign Service Journal: “*I have heard it said that a profession should have a journal or publication to facilitate peer review. I think the AFSA FSJ serves that purpose.*”; “*Diplomat-Select group with controlled entry into the field. The profession has a professional body and in-house journal and conducts self-policing of its members.*”

One complained that “*this question requires much more time to answer than I have as a Management coned Officer.*”

Another defined professional qualifications as “*doing any diplomatic work that furthers the interest of the United States.*”

One lamented: “*I am a professional diplomat. In an extremely simplified form, the primary hallmarks of a diplomat (but unfortunately not a US diplomat) are: a highly developed ability to communicate in more than one foreign language; a highly nuanced ability to communicate effectively in English; very skillful in negotiation; deep knowledge of diplomatic law and history with a concomitant understanding of general and military history; and able to live and work in difficult overseas environments.*”

POLITICAL CONE SAMPLE: 131 of 136 officers (89 male) self-identified as “political cone” responded to the following questions:

Question 6: Do you consider yourself a professional? 99% Yes 1% No

Question 7: If so, what is that profession?

Diplomacy/diplomat= 86
Foreign Service/FSO/FS Generalist= 26
Conal or job function: = 4
USG generalist=1
Another profession: academia/ law= 10
Iran-shenas=1
No profession named=15

Question 7: What is that profession’s requirements or qualifications?

31 provided no answer to the question.

9 cited the FS exam/orals/commission or EER precepts as conveying professional status.

2 indicated this is a good question but they do not know or there aren’t any.

1 cited age 21, a US citizen and compliance with the Foreign Service Act of 1980.

1 noted that there are no set requirements or qualifications to be a diplomat, while another asserted that a college degree is the only requirement.

PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES:

Culturally sensitive/understanding/tolerant=17	Flexible/adaptable=15
Good judgment=10	Curious=6
Tactful/diplomatic=4	Interested in int’l affairs=4
Experienced=4	Cool/quick in crisis=3
Well read/broadly intelligent=3	Integrity=3
Patient=3	Creativity=2
Multilingual=2	Committed/dedicated=2
World wide available=2	Right temperament=2
Humor/cosmopolitan/common sense/principled/disciplined/honest/takes initiative/leadership and management awareness/decisive/critical thinker/leader/persuasive/pro-active/ethical=1 each	

SKILLS or SKILL SETS:

Speaking and writing skills=23	Communication/interpersonal skills=23
Analytical and reporting skills=20	Foreign Language skills=19
Advocate and explain (both directions)= 9	Negotiate/Negotiating skills=9
Represent/representation skills=8	Management skills=7
Synthesize and assess info=6	Think creatively=5
Cross-cultural communication skills=5	Leadership skills=3
Listening skills=2	Policy formulation skills=2
Net-working skills=2	
Mentoring/hard work/strategic planning/public diplomacy/administrative skills=1 each	

KNOWLEDGE/UNDERSTANDING:

Foreign cultures and area studies=12	U.S. history and culture=8
Broad knowledge of int'l relations=8	Broadly educated/broad knowledge=8 U.S.
policies/interests/priorities=7	University degree=6
Geography and history=5	Finance/economics/trade=3
International law=3	U.S. Government=2
Political-Military Affairs=2	Environment, Science & Technology=2
Women & Minorities=2	
Security/human nature/bilateral and multilateral affairs/social sciences =1 each	

OTHER COMMENTS OBSERVATIONS:

50 described a current job or conal function vs. a profession and its requirements or qualifications.

Rather than answer the question, one officer defined a profession as follows: *"A profession is a vocation requiring specialized skills and training. It usually includes an element of acting for others who are unable to act for themselves due to their lack of comparable expertise."*

One who identified his profession as Foreign Service observed: *"Strong written and oral skills, analytical skills, interpersonal skills, judgment. Leadership and management of people should be a requirement, but our system still does not really place incentives in that direction."*

Several respondents wrote that before they joined the Foreign Service, they were professionals, e.g. law, political science professor, etc.

One respondent defined requirements this way: *"Diplomacy is my profession."*

[Requirements/qualifications for this profession is] *"To be a diplomat."*

For some passing the exam defines the profession: *"While missing several attributes of a modern profession, it does have an entrance exam and generally recognized standards of promotion.";* *"The exam process, along with continued association with the Foreign Service, places us in a unique category—much like members of the legal or medical profession. Educational background should not be a criterion, but at least one successful tour overseas (been there, done that, with or without the T-shirt) should be a basic milestone for full entry into the profession."*

The most thoughtful and comprehensive response came from someone who identified being a Foreign Service Officer as his profession: *"Requirements are knowledge of cultures (especially American culture), language, politics, economics, systems, beliefs, narratives/self-perceptions, history, psychology and motivations of people as groups and individuals; knowledge of financial and personnel management, ability to think creatively; need to be pro-active type who can get ahead of curves and be very strategic in thinking; knowledge of how Congress appropriates money, ability to brand, pitch and sell ideas to the administration, the Hill, your fellow teammates, your*

staff; knowledge of the appropriations and legislative cycles; courage to try new things and take tolerable risks if it's the right thing to do and benefits others (be a leadership example); need to be personally highly adaptable with healthy coping mechanisms to stress and adversity; need to be positive and optimistic person/force who can influence others positively; need to have tenacity and persistence; need to have extremely high professional ethics and standards; need a ferocious work ethic. Need to read and write quickly and accurately; need good listening skills; intellectual curiosity, need judgment to know what you need to know and the ability to ask others what you don't know. NEED TO KNOW THAT SERVICE TO OTHERS IS PARAMOUNT AND HONORABLE."

PUBLIC DIPLOMACY CONE SAMPLE: 92 of 98 officers (56 male) self-identified as "public diplomacy cone" responded to the following questions:

Question 6: Do you consider yourself a professional? 99% Yes 1% No

Question 7: If so, what is that profession?

Diplomacy/diplomat/"field diplomacy" = 42
Foreign Service/FSO/FS Generalist= 16
Conal or job function: = 22 (PD/PR/PA/marketing/communications)
Another profession: sociology/teacher/journalist=3
Management/sales/admin=3
Int'l relations/foreign affairs=2
Curator/political economist/lawyer=1 each
No profession named= 7

Question 7: What is that profession's requirements or qualifications?

26 provided no answer to the question.

6 cited the FS exam/or EER precepts as conveying professional status, but one noted "*but it (the exam) proves nothing.*"

3 addressed "profession" rather than answer the question, e.g., "*We had a thorough discussion of this at the War College last year. It seems that professional political scientists regard the self-policing aspect as one of the prime criteria. Professions set their own rules and create and maintain a body of knowledge. There are (or should be) clear rules governing behavior.*" Another responded: "*Set of agreed on requirements and consistently held standards at a high level of performance depending on knowledge, skills and higher education.*"

1, self-identified as a "diplomat," responded: "*professional*" means this is where you want to be and what you want to do as opposed to transistional(sic) or in a job until you find another."

PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES:

Adaptable/flexible=10	Culturally sensitive/cross-cultural=9
Quick intelligence/smart/good mind=7	Honest/integrity/trustworthy/ethical=6
Curious=5	Team leader/team player=3
Creative=3	Good judgment/common sense=3
Diplomatic/have tact=2	Loyal/supportive of US policy=3
Takes initiative=2	Persuasive=2
Engages/knows how to engage=2	
Have courage to dissent/"interested in."/tolerant/leader/resourceful/competent/patient/ tolerant of ambiguity/persevering/emotionally intelligent/foreign language aptitude/ high energy/"have an understanding of.."/ "be a generalist"/ competent=1 each	

SKILLS or SKILL SETS:

Explaining=6	Written and oral skills=5
Analytical and assessment skills=4	Foreign Language=3
Program Management/Administrative skills=3	Representation skills=3
Communication skills=3	Leadership skills=3
Management=3	Advocacy skills=2
PR/Marketing skills=2	Networking/engagement skills=2
Mentoring/modeling behavior skills=3	Negotiating skills=2
Interpersonal skills=2	
Cross cultural communication/active listening/promoting/problem solving/policy formulation/time management/planning/advising on public affairs/program development/bureaucratic skills=1 each	

KNOWLEDGE/UNDERSTANDING:

World history & cultures/China/area studies=9	U.S. history/culture/arts=7
Broad knowledge/knowledgeable=6	U.S. foreign policy goals/themes=4
Experience=4	International relations=4
A Masters degree=3	Media=3
PD programming=2	Int'l trade/economics/finance=2
"Training"=2	
Motivating others/knowledge of conal specialization/internet technology/marketing/the USG/"understanding of governments"/environment, science, technology and labor/understanding of social media=1 each	

OTHER COMMENTS OBSERVATIONS:

34 described a current job or conal function vs. a profession and its requirements or qualifications.

1 observed, *"Requirements, qualifications, unfortunately, unclear."*

The following cri-de-coeur captured an undertone less explicit in some other responses: *"I'm PD officer. (sic) I believe that the PD cone in the State Department is functionally 'broken.' I did my last PD job in 2003. I'll never go back. If I went back, my chance at promotion would be 20X higher than what I'm doing now. It's a strong indication of how badly things are broken in the PD cone that I'd be happier ticking out of the Foreign Service in a few years doing than have another PD job at any point in my career. I used to mentor new PD officers coming into the Department and now decline because I believe that PD is so screwed up that I can't give incoming officers any positive feeling about the new cone they're joining."*

In contrast, another wrote: *"I am a diplomat, a profession that requires broad but detailed knowledge both of current policy and world events and of the broader trends of history, as well as the ability quickly to grasp, based on a solid intellectual foundation, new details of culture, society and technology. I must be equally at home speaking with a traditional head of state at the most formal royal court in the world and a roomful of schoolchildren in a developing nation. I must be able clearly, simply, and persuasively to articulate the larger ideals of the United States and the details of its foreign policy for the region in which I am working and more generally. I have to be able to think quickly, rationally, and strategically; equally, I have to be able to plan over the long haul. I have to be prepared for change, whether that means moving every two or three years or serving with equal conviction under very different administrations."*

MID-LEVEL PROFESSIONALISM SURVEY ANALYSIS

QUESTION 11: Does the Foreign Service have core values? If yes, what are they and how have they been communicated to you?

QUESTION 12: Does the Department of State/your agency have core values? If yes, what are they and how have they been communicated to you?

Background:

According to the State Department's current Performance Report and its Strategic Plan, the Department's core values are as follows: loyalty, character, service, accountability, community and diversity. If these are taken seriously, taught, exemplified and play a meaningful role in the corporate culture, most officers should be able to name them. We thought asking about "core values" would provide important insights about our corporate/institutional culture.

Another reason to ask about core values is to compare and contrast answers with a Senior Seminar research project conducted ten years ago, which also asked these questions of three different groups of Senior, Mid-level and Junior Foreign Service Officers. The JO's in 2000, who had just completed A-100, should now be represented in the survey's mid-level cohort. The three groups showed dramatic differences in 2000, and we were curious to see how participants in this survey would respond. A full copy of the 2000 findings is attached, but key points follow:

Core Values Matter: Senior officers uniformly asserted the importance of core values as the qualities and attributes that define a corps or a corporation and the way each conducts its business. They cited the Marines (Honor, Courage and Commitment), West Point (Duty, Honor, Country) and Motorola (The Motorola Way) as values-based organizations.

Mid-level and junior officers ...agreed about their importance for a number of reasons:

- "Meaningful core values build cohesion."
- Core values infuse work with "meaning that transcends the mundane."
- Core values "attract recruits who already embody them."
- In large and/or mobile organizations, "core values increase efficiency" because employees within the organization who do not know each other "can make certain assumptions about one another" based on shared values.
- Core values "infuse and reflect the spirit of an organization."

No Agreement on What the Values Are

FSOs did not agree on whether their institution has core values or if it does, what they are; there were pronounced differences among senior, mid-level, and junior officers on this issue. All but two senior officers interviewed believe the Foreign Service has "core values;" however, this group was split fifty-fifty on whether the Department of State has them. Close to half of mid-level and junior officers were unsure whether State or the Foreign Service has core values. One person thought our evaluation system reflected core values, suggesting that perhaps they were embodied in the precepts.

Appendix I contains a consolidated list of the "core values" identified by respondents. Agreement on values declines as seniority declines. Of those who believe core values exist, all agreed that they are not articulated but rather that they are "absorbed by osmosis" or "by example." Senior and junior officers identified values that are positive; a substantial number of mid-level officers identified values that are negative.

The list of ascribed values betrays confusion about the definition of the word "value." Whatever the definition, however, twenty out of forty-eight of mid-level officers interviewed believe neither State nor the Foreign Service has core values. Among those who believe core values exist, many of the "core values" cited are negative:

"CYA," "Look out for yourself, no one else will;" "Don't rock the boat;" "Rank has privilege but not accountability."

The core values most cited by Junior Officers were "hard work," "equal opportunity employment (EEO) or fairness," and "teamwork" in that order.

A single mid-level officer pointed out that in fact the Department of State does have formal core values; they have been published on page seven of the Department of State Strategic Plan (See Appendix II). Compare this list with the list in Appendix I and draw your own conclusions....

Today's sample displays confusion about the meaning of "core value," in even greater numbers than in 2000. A substantial number in all cones describe their work or work related functions, e.g. represent and defend USG interests, rather than naming values such as integrity or loyalty. Although wide margins in all cones claim the Foreign Service and the Department have "core values" (a closed question), close to 50% of consular, management and Public Diplomacy cone officers then cannot name them or express uncertainty about their existence or give negative comments and values in their comments. Interestingly, economic and political cone officers

respond less negatively. The only values frequently mentioned by all cones, however, are “honesty/integrity” and “service.” “Professionalism” is mentioned in both categories of positive responses, but given the confused responses to Questions 6 and 7, one can have no confidence that the word means the same thing to different people. It is interesting that the current survey’s mid-level cohort, many of whom would have been entry level officers (junior officers) in 2000, continue to frequently cite “hard work” as a core value (the same as ten years ago), perhaps more suggestive of a drone culture than one that is inspired and inspiring.

COLLECTIVE IMPRESSION:

A disclaimer: this is not a scientific, professional survey; it is better described as a “sounding out” of AFSA members on twenty questions addressed to Foreign Service Officers and Specialists in ranks 3-2 and 1. This analysis is focused exclusively on the mid-level FSO responses to the two questions identified above. Because of the open-ended nature of the second parts of Questions 11 and 12, tabulation is necessarily notional rather than statistically precise.

One third to almost half of all the cones either do not think there are core values, are unsure/unclear about whether there are, think maybe there are but cannot name any, or name negative values, e.g. “Cover your backside;” “kick down, kiss up;” *stifle enthusiasm and reward political hacks.* “They have neither been articulated nor communicated well.” “This sounds negative, but the core values I see are 1. Take care of yourself because no one else will; 2. Watch your back; 3. Don’t help anyone, but yourself; 4. Don’t trust anyone, especially your own colleagues; and 5. Expend as much energy and resources as necessary to fight other USG agencies for they are the enemy. As negative as this sounds, I have seen each point demonstrated time and again at different posts.” Such responses suggest that neither the FS nor the Department of State has core values, which by definition are deeply inculcated in the corporate culture and all employees. Six or less in each cone know about and name the values cited in the Strategic Plan, thus indicating that there is no intentional or purposeful link between this Plan and the corporate culture. Conal differences suggest that officers do not hold common core values, and values serve no purpose for building cohesion in the officer cadre. Several people in each cone mention a “laminated Biz Card” with the Department’s values and strategic goals, “which is older but still relevant,” at least to them.

Note the differences in responses to Question 11 (Foreign Service core values) and Question 12 (Department of State core values) from the five cones, an analysis of which follows:

CONSULAR CONE SAMPLE: Of 111 (65 male) self-identified as “consular cone,” **105 responded to Question 11**, of which 80 (76%) said YES, the FS has core values and 84 provided comments. Of these comments, 39 were negative; 24 referenced the Consular Bureau’s Leadership Principles*; 28 described work-related activities perceived to be valued by the Department, and 19 named “core values.” 3 named the core values cited in the Strategic Plan. ***CA Leadership Tenets/Principles:** Inspire, model integrity, practice 360 degree diplomacy, lead by example, develop the next generation, communicate, build great teams, delegate authority not responsibility, learn constantly, follow courageously.

Foreign Service Core Values		Job-related core values	
Integrity/honesty	11	EER Precepts	11
Service/serve others	4	Represent/promote USG interests	6
Professionalism	3	Service	6
Leadership	3	Hard work	3
Equality/fairness	2	Help public/Amcits	2
Intellectual rigor	2	Communicate effectively	2
Diligence,objectivity,patriotism, dedication,cooperation,idealism		Professiionalism,excellence,support current administration, open debate,	
learning	1 each	FS mission statement, follow instructions	1 each

103 responded to Question 12, of which 82 (80%) said YES, the DOS has core values and 88 provided comments. Of these comments, 26 were negative, 15 referenced the Consular Bureau's Leadership Tenets*; and 40 referenced their FS answers (positive and negative) as valid for the Department, with some being more explicit than others that "the FS is the Department;" others disagreed. 2 cited values named in the Strategic Plan. 6 offered personal statements.

Department of State Core Values		Job-related core values	
Integrity/honesty	3	Service/serve the public	3
Belief in diplomacy	3	Promote USG interests/value	3
Values in the Strategic Plan	2	Integrity, professionalism, mission	
Service to others, mentoring,		Statement, diplomacy, protect	
Discipline, Honor	1 each	Americans, "depends on the Sec"	1 each

COMMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

"I'd like to say yes [the FS has core values], but I'm not sure I can define them. There are certain things we as an organization aspire to, but which are too often honored in the breach. I think most of us would like to think the Service has a certain 'esprit de corps,' a feeling that we're all in this together, facing the same hardships and the (sic) reaching the same goals. But, then I see too many individuals operating for themselves and think that, while my view is only a hope, an ideal, rancor all around has become a core value—I may be a cog in this vast machine, and the machine would undoubtedly continue to run without me, but if I can keep the squeaks and creaks out of at least the part of that machine, something has been achieved."

"Flexibility to the point of having no moral compass or spine. This has been communicated via socialization."

"You are AFSA and you know that CA has core values. Why are you asking this question?"

"DOS is too diverse to have or communicate core values."

"Loyalty, Character, Service, Accountability, Community and Diversity. [named in the Strategic Plan]As a consular officer I strive to act in accordance with the Bureau's leadership tenets: inspire, model integrity, practice 360 degree diplomacy, lead by example, develop the next generation, communicate, build great teams, delegate authority not responsibility, learn constantly and follow courageously. I have a print out of the consular tenets and hear/read them regularly. I have a laminated biz card with the Department's values and strategic goals (older copy-still relevant)."

ECONOMIC CONE SAMPLE: Of 103 (59 male) self-identified as "economic cone,"

101 responded to Question 11, of which 69 (71%) said YES, the FS has core values, and 82 provided comments. Of these comments, 39 were negative; 38 described work-related activities perceived to be valued by the Department, and 25 named "core values." 9 made personal statements about the FS without answering the question.

Foreign Service Core Values		Job-related core values	
Integrity/honesty	10	Promote USG interests/values	10
Service/serve others	8	Service in the job	8
Dedication/duty/idealism	8	Hard work	5
Teamwork	5	World wide availability/FS needs	5
Excellence/intelligence	4	Professionalism	5
Professionalism	3	Mission first/responsive	5
Learning	3	Objective/truth to power	4
Objective/non-partisan	3	Precepts, sacrifice	3
Flexibility, respect, leadership		Sacrifice	3
Sacrifice, "the mission"	2 each	Loyalty to Secretary/President	2
Discipline, patience, country,		Competence, flexibility, diversity,	
Independence, community	1 each	Best of the US, training, discipline	1 each

99 responded to Question 12, of which 54 (57%) said YES, the DOS has core values and 68 provided comments. Of these comments, 26 were negative; 24 referenced their FS answers (positive and negative) as valid for the Department, with some being more explicit than others that “the FS is the Department,” (without regard to its numerical minority in Washington); others disagreed; no one acknowledged the Civil Service as part of the Department. 28 named core values listed below; 1 named the Constitution; 5 cited “*support for the administration’s foreign policy*”; 2 cited values named in the Strategic Plan, and 3 offered personal statements.

<u>Department of State Core Values</u>		<u>Job-related core values</u>	
Integrity/honesty	4	Promote USG policies/values	8
Service	4	FS Precepts	2
Support the Secretary, loyalty,		Mission, hard work, leadership,	
Community	2 each	Non-partisanship, competing	
Duty, diversity, mission, respect		points of view	1 each
Powell’s card	1 each		

COMMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS

“They [State] have too many core values to know which ones are really core.”

“I’m not sure what “core values” mean—sounds very touchy feely.”

“I’ve asked this question for 10 years, and still don’t know the answer.”

“The phrase “core values,” which has swept American institutions in the last ten years, is trendy and therapeutic. I would prefer to talk of our common oath, to defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies. Picking five happy sounding buzzwords for a hallway poster does not assist our shared commitment to common goals.”

“I have not heard of any nor seen any promoted as part of professional development at FSI or at any embassy. Core values are notably missing from FSI A-100 “training.””

“Up until five years ago, I would have said that we believe that US security depends on an open handed and rule- based approach to addressing global threats such as poverty. I think that these values are diminished by diplomats serving in war effort(s).”

MANAGEMENT CONE SAMPLE: Of 112 (76 male) self-identified as “management cone,” **110 responded to Question 11**, of which 79 (72%) said YES, the FS has core values, and 89 provided comments. Of these comments, 42 were negative; 24 named “core values.” and 22 named job related activities or characteristics. 4 referenced Sec. Powell’s cards, 2 referenced the Strategic Plan and 3 said we used to have values in the past. 5 made personal statements about the FS without answering the question.

<u>Foreign Service Core Values</u>		<u>Job-related core values</u>	
Integrity/honesty	15	Promote USG interests/values	8
Service/serve others	12	FS Precepts	5
Professionalism	6	Support each other	4
Loyalty	4	Hard work, job skills	4 each
Dedication/commitment	3	Service, speak truth to power,	
Sacrifice, diversity, flexibility,		Support foreign policy agenda	2 each
Leadership	2 each	Promote dialogue, Pride in US,	
Innovation, teamwork, diplomacy,		Protect AmCits, get more for less	1 each
Patriotism, intellectual integrity,			
Fairness, FS Journal inserts	1 each		

106 responded to Question 12, of which 70 (69%) said YES, the DOS has core values and 73 provided comments. Of these comments, 26 were negative; 32 referenced their FS answers (positive and negative) as valid for the Department, with some being more explicit than others that “the FS is the Department,” (without regard to its numerical minority in Washington); others

disagreed. 21 named core values listed below; 1 named the Constitution; 5 cited “*support for the administration’s foreign policy*,” 6 cited values named in the Strategic Plan; 2 cited Consular Leadership Principles, and 3 said “core values” changed according to the Administration.

<u>Department of State Core Values</u>		<u>Job-related core values</u>	
Integrity/honesty	9	Promote USG policies/values	3
Service	5	MPP’s	2
Loyalty, diversity,	2 each	Bureaucrats, good relations,	
Patriotism, diplomacy, pride,		Fairness, support for each other	1 each
Professionalism	1 each		

“When I joined the Foreign Service in 1982 I was told that this was a quasi-military organization, with world-wide availability requirements. I was also told that it was a rank-ordered service where seniority was respected. I left the FS in 1997 and returned as an officer in 2003. In my A-100 class few of those previous FS values were emphasized.”

“Pixie dust and manipulation. A-100 explained the promotion process as “pixie dust” i.e. not transparent. Witnessing the manipulation of the awards process. Officers spending weeks grooming their EER’s at the expense of the job requirements.”

“I think we just absorb them. Sec. Powell took the trouble to define them and we all had little cards—remember? One is the responsibility to speak the truth and guide our political masters with good advice, even if they don’t want to hear it.”

POLITICAL CONE SAMPLE: Of 137 (89 male) self-identified as “political cone,” **136 responded to Question 11**, of which 100 (76%) said YES, the FS has core values, and 106 provided comments. Of these comments, 29 were negative; 49 described work-related activities perceived to be valued by the Department, and 34 named “core values.” 10 made personal statements without answering the question; 2 referenced the past; 1 referenced the Strategic Plan: *“State and USAID have core values enumerated in the Strategic Plan. FS values are implicitly derived from those values but not explicitly communicated: loyalty, character, service, accountability, community and diversity.”*

<u>Foreign Service Core Values</u>		<u>Job-related core values</u>	
Integrity/honesty	23	Hard work	10
Service	10	Loyalty to Pres/Administration	10
Loyalty	7	Professionalism	9
Dedication	6	EER precepts, service, mission,	
Excellence/intelligence	5	Promote USG interests/values	6 each
Professionalism, patriotism	4 each	WW availability, rep best of US	5 each
Teamwork, flexibility		Inquisitiveness, discipline	4 each
Objectivity/Non Partisan	3 each	Democracy, competence, adaptability	3 each
Discipline/deference, diversity	2 each	Rigor, leadership, fairness, diversity	2 each
Courage	1	Oath, humor, up or out, selfless,	
		Teamwork, integrity, caution	1 each

134 responded to Question 12, of which 87 (69%) said YES, the DOS has core values and 91 provided comments. Of these comments, 22 were negative; 46 referenced their FS answers (positive and negative) as valid for the Department, with some being more explicit than others that “the FS is the Department;” others disagreed. 32 named core values listed below; 1 cited the Strategic Plan, and 5 felt the core value was to obey and support the Secretary and/or the hierarchy. 1 cited the FAM and the FS precepts and 1 only stated, *“If core values equated to core precepts that would be sad.”* 18 made personal statements that did not answer the question.

<u>Department of State Core Values</u>		<u>Job-related core values</u>	
Loyalty	5	Promote USG policies/values	7
Intelligence/intellct’l honesty	3	WW availability	2
Service	2	Professionalism, collegiality, hard	

Patriotism, diplomacy, pride,	work, advocacy, service,
Fairness, diversity, duty, courage,	consultation, incrementalism,
Excellence, honesty, caution 1 each	mission, comity 1 each

COMMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS

"I don't like the term 'values,' as I don't see the way we do our job as built around a particular ethical construct, although ethics are a motivator and a limit on our actions. However, the Foreign Service has expectations which we should adhere to: Duty to country-Placing the team/organization ahead of the individual-Transparency and honesty in how we operate inside the USG (sic) These tend to be learned in the first few years of service, or not at all."

"It's all in the oath we take: We serve the country (the Constitution), and by extension the people of the United States. That is really the only meaningful way it has been communicated to me. We also serve the government, but that's only a subset. At the point we feel the latter conflicts the former, it is our job to speak out within the system to correct the problem. If that doesn't work, conscience and ethics dictate that we leave the system-though not all of us have the courage to do that-and try to fix it from outside."

I'm not sure what the official Department's answer would be to this, but I associate our core values with the promotion precepts: Leadership, management ability, interpersonal skills, etc. These are distributed and explained in detail every year at EER time."

"I'd like to think that there is among the better practitioners in our Service a shared sense of commitment to the mission and a willingness to endure hardship and, when necessary, separation from family to accomplish it. That esprit de corps that I sensed as an ELO has abated—I find less of it the longer I'm in, and more concern about promotions and lining up career-enhancing assignments."

"Self-sacrifice in the sense of working for the accomplishment of broader national interests; a strong, underlying belief in America's core democratic values; and the sense of mission mentioned above. [Questions 9 and 10] My Army service instilled these values in me, though I suspect that most of us in the Foreign Service believe in the same general value system."

"There are a few sets [of core values] floating around but they are non-standard and largely ignored. Nothing codified like the military uses. Some Ambassadors and bureaus just make up their own."

PUBLIC DIPLOMACY CONE SAMPLE: Of 98 (56 male) self-identified as "PD cone," **97 responded to Question 11**, of which 69 (72%) said YES, the FS has core values, and 77 provided comments. Of these comments, 40 were negative; 34 described work-related activities perceived to be valued by the Department, and 19 named "core values." 9 made personal statements without answering the question, and 1 referenced the Strategic Plan.

Foreign Service Core Values		Job-related core values	
Integrity/honesty	14	Promote UGS interests/values	10
Service	6	Service	7
Loyalty	5	Hard work	9
Dedication/duty	4	Collegiality/support each other	5
Patriotism	4	Keep US image strong	5
Professionalism, diversity,		Teamwork	4
Sacrifice, diplomacy, serious	2 each	EER Precepts	3
Truth to power, excellence,		MPP	3
Competence, intelligence, valor	1 each	Integrity, leadership, professionalism,	
		Policies, support for administration	2 each
		Fairness, mission, respect, more	
		with less, results	1 each

96 responded to Question 12, of which 60 (64%) said YES, the DOS has core values and 69 provided comments. Of these comments, 36 were negative; 32 referenced their FS answers (positive and negative) as valid for the Department. 30 named "core values" listed below; 1 referenced the Consular Leadership Principles. 1 named the values in the Strategic Plan, and added *"Not often communicated outside of A-100 and the Diplopedia. Core values are not to be*

confused with “core precepts,” which form the criteria for tenure and promotion and evaluate such skills as leadership, management, interpersonal, intellectual, communication and substantive knowledge. There are reinforced every year through the EER process.” This analysis shows that many people do not understand the difference between evaluation criteria and “core values.”

<u>Department of State Core Values</u>		<u>Job-related core values</u>	
Service	3	Hard work	2
Loyalty, integrity, excellence	1 each	Precepts	2
		Leadership & Management	2
		Flexibility, mission, diversity,	
		Excellence, mutual understanding,	
		Defend US foreign policy,	
		Democracy & human rights	1 each

COMMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS

“We all stab each other in the back and try to climb over each other’s carcasses to the top.”

“I believe so but they are not as ingrained in the newbees as I would like to see.”

“I wish it still did. It’s become a bureaucracy without a solid foundation. We’ve lost our sense of direction, daring and personal and professional responsibility.”

“Foreign Service institutional culture is strong, begins in A-100 and continues throughout career.(sic) The core values are integrity, sacrifice, truth-seeking.”

“I’ve heard of them. I’m sure they’re very educational to whatever FS-05 & -04 are coming in and sound great on paper. I could not tell you what they actually are but I’m quite sure I could fake it if I had to. I probably read them via cable whenever they first came out.”

“I think so, but would be hard pressed to list them. I think that Consular Affairs has gotten this part right...and that their approach should be replicated at least as far as applicable to PD.

“We used to. They got lost somewhere.”; “i (sic) once saw them on a poster in Seoul. No where else.”

Again, the values have not been explicitly communicated, but I would agree that State has basic, core values.”

“Core values at the individual level are winner take all self-promotion in pursuit of assignment and promotions; at institutional level, State is all about maintaining “dialogue,” which is code for helping the host country promote its interests in Washington.”

INITIAL FINDINGS

AFSA ENTRY-LEVEL OFFICER (ELO) SURVEY

A copy of the twenty questions AFSA posed in its Entry-Level Survey is attached. This is not a scientific, professional survey, but rather one better described as a “sounding out” of AFSA members. That said, of **350 ELO responses** (compared to 557 Mid-Level Officer responses), there was close to an equal response from males and females and from each of the five cones. Response analysis has focused on ELO grades 7-4. We have been able to sort responses by cones and/or collectively. This summary highlights initial, collective impressions.

Collectively, respondents can all work in at least one UN language (French/Spanish: 261; Arabic/Chinese/Russian: 97). (Q4) **When asked what attracted them to the Foreign Service(Q6), 15 mentioned something having to do with diplomacy; the rest gave the following reasons: service, travel, lifestyle, adventure, secure job and benefits, exciting career, live and work overseas, be more than an accompanying spouse, help Americans abroad, use language and cultural skills.**

Asked in a subsequent question (Q7), **93% said that they equated the Foreign Service with diplomacy, but purposeful preparation for such a career varied widely.** Of the 291 who commented on how they prepared for diplomatic service (Q7), 70 indicated that they had not prepared at all or that they have relied on A-100 as preparation. The good news is that the other 221 cited an impressive array of academic, overseas, working and foreign language experience. This said, while such background is certainly welcome and may be indicative of ability to function in a foreign environment, it does not mean that it specifically prepares anyone for the reality of Foreign Service work or diplomacy in practice. For example, 18 people listed Peace Corps by itself or in combination with IR degrees; these are both valuable intellectual and experiential assets to bring to State, and yet how do these backgrounds translate into the realities of work defined by conal specialties and the national and international institutional context that ELOs actually encounter? **The diversity of respondents’ backgrounds and experience begs the question of whether State integrates this in a way that forges a diplomatic cohort into a whole greater than the sum of the functional parts respondents bring to the table?**

Responses indicate that although recruited as “generalists,” ELO early training focuses overwhelmingly on preparation for “functional specialties”. About a third responded critically to this situation, with not a few expressing surprise or frustration that A-100 provided little or no diplomatic context beyond a session each on diplomatic history and protocol. Hence, it was note-worthy that a surprising number of respondents mentioned these segments as the training that best prepared them for their first assignment. (Q9) The majority mentioned ConGen and parts of A-100 (e.g. “courage under fire,” cable writing) or the whole course itself, in that order, followed by language and/or functional training.

ELO expectations five years out seem realistic and highly identified with conal specialization (Q11). 82% of 345 respondents feel/felt professionally prepared for tenure (Q14), and 95 provided additional comments, of which 40 were negative about the process and critical of some of the officers being tenured compared to others who weren’t. **Questions about role models and core values (Q15, 16 & 17) raise many serious issues about State’s corporate culture and the distance between “talk” and “walk”, “rules” and “realities.”** Positive role models exist and are even named, but “mentoring” doesn’t serve many and numerous negative models and examples detract from those who are positive. Based on responses received, **the suggestion is that there is no core, corporate culture; negative examples thrive in an environment perceived to be “every man for himself.”** Finally, respondents’ definitions about “diplomacy”, “foreign policy” and “what they are doing” (Q 18) **reveal an astounding diversity of thought but little common core of understanding and common definition or lexicon.** Some criticized the AFSA survey as “useless;” we found it very revealing.

Zoomerang Survey Results

2010 Survey for Foreign Service Grades 4, 5, 6, & 7

Response Status: Completes

Filter: No filter applied

Dec 30, 2011 9:49 AM PST

1. What was your date of entry into the Foreign Service?

806 Responses

2. What is your gender?

Male	447	56%
Female	356	44%
Total	803	100%

3. What is your career track/specialization classification?

State Generalist-Consular	74	9%
State Generalist-Economic	57	7%
State Generalist-Management	71	9%
State Generalist-Political	68	8%
State Generalist-Public Diplomacy	80	10%
State Specialist-Diplomatic Security Special Agent	50	6%
State Specialist-Diplomatic Courier	4	0%
State Specialist-Security Engineering Officer	7	1%
State Specialist-Security Technical Specialist	12	1%
State Specialist-Office Management Specialist	130	16%
State Specialist-Health Practitioner	1	0%
State Specialist-Health Technologist	0	0%
State Specialist-Medical Officer/Psychiatrist	0	0%
State Specialist-Facilities Manager	15	2%
State Specialist-Financial Management Officer	3	0%
State Specialist-General Services Officer	15	2%

State Specialist-Human Resources Officer	6	1%
State Specialist-Construction Engineer	3	0%
State Specialist-Information Management Specialist	78	10%
State Specialist-Information Management Technical Specialist	10	1%
State Specialist-Regional English Language Officer	0	0%
State Specialist-Information Resource Officer	0	0%
State Specialist-Printing Specialist	1	0%
U.S. Agency for International Development	101	13%
Foreign Commercial Service Officer	11	1%
Foreign Agricultural Service Officer	3	0%
International Broadcasting Bureau	0	0%
Other	1	0%
Total	801	100%

4. In which of the following United Nations languages can you work?

Arabic	44	8%
Chinese	58	10%
French	219	39%
Russian	69	12%
Spanish	325	58%

5. In what other languages can you work (please specify)?

438 Responses

6. What attracted you to the Foreign Service?

784 Responses

7. Do you equate the Foreign Service with diplomacy?

Yes	681	85%
No	117	15%
Total	798	100%

8. If you answered no to Question 7, why did you decide to join the Foreign Service?

166 Responses

9. What entry-level training (A-100, etc.) best prepared you your first assignment?

760 Responses

10. What training was most important to you after your entry level training?

738 Responses

11. What position/title do you envisage having in five years? What do you expect to be actually doing and where do you expect to be doing it in five years?

769 Responses

12. What position/title do you envisage having and what do you see yourself doing ten years from now?

750 Responses

13. What are your professional development goals over the next 10 years?

695 Responses

14. Do or did you feel professionally prepared for tenuring into the Foreign Service?

Yes	653	85%
No	113	15%
Total	766	100%

15. What role models do you have for your Foreign Service career? To whom do you look for inspiration?

704 Responses

16. Does the Department of State/your agency have core corporate values?

Yes	496	68%
No	238	32%
Total	734	100%

17. Does the Foreign Service have core corporate values?

Yes	405	60%
No	274	40%
Total	679	100%

18. How do you define diplomacy? How do you define foreign policy? How do you define what you are doing?

571 Responses

19. Did you read the book Inside a U.S. Embassy before joining the Foreign Service and was it helpful to you?

Yes	410	53%
No	367	47%
Total	777	100%

20. Did Inside a U.S. Embassy accurately reflect the reality you have encountered?

Yes	272	52%
No	254	48%
Total	526	100%

21. Where did you hear about the book (check all that are applicable)?

AFSA Website	129	19%
Foreign Service Journal	117	18%
State Department Website	121	18%
Colleague	89	13%
Family member	26	4%
University/college	43	6%
Other (please specify)	318	48%

22. Please feel free to provide us with any additional observations or comments you may have.

266 Responses

ENTRY-LEVEL PROFESSIONALISM SURVEY ANALYSIS

QUESTION 16: Does the Department of State/your agency have core values? If yes, what are they and how have they been communicated to you?

QUESTION 17: Does the Foreign Service have core values? If yes, what are they and how have they been communicated to you?

Background:

According to the State Department's current Performance Report and its Strategic Plan, the Department's core values are as follows: loyalty, character, service, accountability, community and diversity. If these are taken seriously, taught, exemplified and play a meaningful role in the corporate culture, most officers should be able to name them. We thought asking about "core values" would provide important insights about our corporate/institutional culture.

Another reason to ask about core values is to compare and contrast answers with a Senior Seminar research project conducted ten years ago, which also asked these questions of three different groups of Senior, Mid-level and Junior Foreign Service Officers. The JO's in 2000, who had just completed A-100, should now be represented in the survey's mid-level cohort. The three groups showed dramatic differences in 2000, and we were curious to see how participants in this survey would respond. A full copy of the 2000 findings is attached, but key points follow:

Core Values Matter: Senior officers uniformly asserted the importance of core values as the qualities and attributes that define a corps or a corporation and the way each conducts its business. They cited the Marines (Honor, Courage and Commitment), West Point (Duty, Honor, Country) and Motorola (The Motorola Way) as values-based organizations.

Mid-level and junior officers ...agreed about their importance for a number of reasons:

- "Meaningful core values build cohesion."
- Core values infuse work with "meaning that transcends the mundane."
- Core values "attract recruits who already embody them."
- In large and/or mobile organizations, "core values increase efficiency" because employees within the organization who do not know each other "can make certain assumptions about one another" based on shared values.
- Core values "infuse and reflect the spirit of an organization."

No Agreement on What the Values Are

FSOs did not agree on whether their institution has core values or if it does, what they are; there were pronounced differences among senior, mid-level, and junior officers on this issue. All but two senior officers interviewed believe the Foreign Service has "core values;" however, this group was split fifty-fifty on whether the Department of State has them. Close to half of mid-level and junior officers were unsure whether State or the Foreign Service has core values. One person thought our evaluation system reflected core values, suggesting that perhaps they were embodied in the precepts.

Appendix I contains a consolidated list of the "core values" identified by respondents. Agreement on values declines as seniority declines. Of those who believe core values exist, all agreed that they are not articulated but rather that they are "absorbed by osmosis" or "by example." Senior and junior officers identified values that are positive; a substantial number of mid-level officers identified values that are negative.

The list of ascribed values betrays confusion about the definition of the word "value." Whatever the definition, however, twenty out of forty-eight of mid-level officers interviewed believe neither State nor the Foreign Service has core values. Among those who believe core values exist, many of the "core values" cited are negative:

"CYA;" "Look out for yourself, no one else will;" "Don't rock the boat;" "Rank has privilege but not accountability."

The core values most cited by Junior Officers were "hard work," "equal opportunity employment (EEO) or fairness," and "teamwork" in that order.

A single mid-level officer pointed out that in fact the Department of State does have formal core values; they have been published on page seven of the Department of State Strategic Plan (See Appendix II). Compare this list with the list in Appendix I and draw your own conclusions....

Today's sample displays confusion about the meaning of "core value," in even greater numbers than in 2000. A substantial number in all cones describe their work or work related functions, e.g. represent and defend USG interests, rather than naming values such as integrity or loyalty.

We asked the same two questions concerning cores of both Mid-level (MLO) and Entry-level (ELO) officers. (See also the MLO analysis.) Recognizing the time-frame (c. 2000) from which the MLOs originated, we hoped today's ELOs might present a more positive profile in response to the core value questions. This is not the case. Where 60% of the total number of MLO respondents to the survey responded to the core value questions, only 42% of the ELOs did. And where almost all the MLOs who responded "yes" or "no" to the closed questions also responded to the follow-up questions of naming the values and describing how they were communicated, just a little over 50% of the entry-level officers did the same. "Yes" responses as to whether State has core corporate values by ELOs varied by cone from 55-72%; "yes" responses by ELOs as to whether the Foreign Service has core corporate values ranged from 52-68%.

Significantly, about half of the responses in each ELO cone were negative. Such responses either asserted the lack or absence of core values, expressed doubt about them (which suggests they were not operationally meaningful), named negative values or confessed confusion about the meaning and/or intent of the question. Shocking were the stark references in each cone to bosses who scream, use vulgarity and otherwise behave badly.

The brightest spot was among the self-identified Consular Officers, almost 20% of whom referenced the Consular Leadership Tenets and asserted that these constituted the Department of State's core values, although far fewer referenced them with regard to FS core values. 4-10 people in each of the other cones also referenced the Consular Tenets. 4-8 people in each cone mentioned evaluation precepts or "core values stressed in the oral examination" as corporate core values.

A striking difference with the year 2000 survey, and in contrast to the 2010 MLO responses, is the number of ELOs who do not distinguish between the Foreign Service and the Department of State. In fact, a few even took exception to the two separate questions, asserting that it was undesirable or bad to distinguish between the Civil Service and the Foreign Service and/or the Department of State, a stark difference with attitudes in 2000, which suggests an ongoing evolution in efforts to promote equivalency between two personnel systems.

Only one or two ELO officers in total repeated or recognized as "core values" the core values named in the Department of State Strategic Plan. Economic, management and political cone officers named more "core values" than did consular and public diplomacy officers, but only two values named in any one cone were repeated more than once or twice: "service" (3-5) and "integrity/honesty" (3-4). Many values named once or twice were the same as those listed by MLOs (See the detailed MLO analysis.), but ELO responses clearly favor job-related functions or activities, e.g. promote US interests and values. Attention getting was the repeated reference to "respect for hierarchy" and "corridor reputation" in each cone, as well as impatience with peers perceived not to be held accountable for poor performance.

The following provide a sense of ELO responses:

"They are on the website, but they are not communicated on a regular basis. The consular leadership tenets are inspiring and a good resource for our values and goals. I keep them posted on my office wall."

"Would it matter? I think unbridled narcissism (sic.) is the rule." "Corridor reputation is what was stressed most in A-100." ~ "As a person in their early 30's, I can say that my peers and i hope that much of this corporate culture and corporate values that exist at dos will change thanks to our influence. i see many of the corporate values as negative."

"What is a corporate value?~ "Define "corporate" values vs. values or "public" values. Weird question."~ "The Department is not a corporation."~ " Since I don't know what "corporate values" means, either they don't have them or they are not well communicated."

"I think the state department as a whole has a corporate culture, but I don't know what it is."~ "Not sure. I have met only highly ethical people."~ "It seems that different elements of DOS each have(sic) their own "core corporate values; while there may be an overall mission statement for the Department, it is not clear that there are core values that apply to all of its employees."~ "A murky area. Should I focus on my oath to protect and defend the Constitution? Defending the Administration? Defending a vague collective memory of "old school diplomacy?"

"Honestly, this will sound terrible, but I think we have a major "culture of complaining" in the FS. Clearly this is not a "core corporate value" but it exists and is the closest thing I can think of to such a value. Not a good thing..."~ "More so than the DOS as a whole. Values are best demonstrated in the guise of mid and senior level officers. Those officers I most admire: always have a logical reason for their actions, invite honest debate, manage up appropriately, manage down with an eye toward protecting and developing skills of subordinates, display professionalism and tact and maintain their integrity."

Finally, we'd beg to differ with the person who wrote, *"By the way, these questions are not well-written to elicit useful information."* The responses reveal a great deal.

To quote just one of many books on the subject, *Leadership Is an Art*:

“Shared ideals, shared ideas, shared goals, shared respect, a sense of integrity, a sense of quality, a sense of advocacy . . . must be explicit. . . . We must work to maintain these values. Successful corporations tend to become institutions. Institutions foster bureaucracy, the most superficial and fatuous of all relationships. Bureaucracy can level our gifts and our competence. Tribal elders must insistently work at the process of corporate renewal. They must preserve and revitalize the values of the tribe. They nourish a scrutiny of corporate values that eradicates bureaucracy and sustains the individual. Renewal comes through genuine service to others. It cannot come about through a process of mere self-perpetuation. Renewal is an outward orientation of service, rather than an inward orientation of maintenance.”

Core Values Matter

Senior officers uniformly asserted the importance of core values as the qualities and attributes that define a corps or a corporation and the way each conducts its business. They cited the Marines (Honor, Courage and Commitment), West Point (Duty, Honor, Country) and Motorola (The Motorola Way) as values-based organizations.

Mid-level and junior officers familiar with the concept of “core values” agreed about their importance for a number of reasons:

- “Meaningful core values build cohesion.”
- Core values infuse work with “meaning that transcends the mundane.”
- Core values “attract recruits who already embody them.”
- In large and/or mobile organizations, “core values increase efficiency” because employees within the organization who do not know each other “can make certain assumptions about one another” based on shared values.
- Core values “infuse and reflect the spirit of an organization.”

No Agreement on What the Values Are

FSOs did not agree on whether their institution has core values or if it does, what they are; there were pronounced differences among senior, mid-level, and junior officers on this issue. All but two senior officers interviewed believe the Foreign Service has “core values;” however, this group was split fifty-fifty on whether the Department of State has them. Close to half of mid-level and junior officers were unsure whether State or the Foreign Service has core values. Only one person thought our evaluation system reflected core values, suggesting that perhaps they were embodied in the precepts.

Appendix I contains a consolidated list of the “core values” identified by respondents. Agreement on values declines as seniority declines. Of those who believe core values exist, all agreed that they are not articulated but rather that they are “absorbed by osmosis” or “by example.” Senior and junior officers identified values that are positive; a substantial number of mid-level officers identified values that are negative.

The list of ascribed values betrays confusion about the definition of the word “value.” Whatever the definition, however, twenty out of forty-eight of mid-level officers interviewed believe neither State nor the Foreign Service has core values. Among those who believe core values exist, many of the “core values” cited are negative:

“CYA,”
“Look out for yourself, no one else will,”
“Don’t rock the boat,”
“Rank has privilege but not accountability,” and
“Everything is negotiable.”

The core values most cited by Junior Officers were “hard work,” “equal opportunity employment (EEO) or fairness,” and “teamwork” in that order.

A single mid-level officer pointed out that in fact the Department of State does have formal core values; they have been published on page seven of the Department of State Strategic Plan (See [Appendix II](#)). Compare this list with the list in [Appendix I](#) and draw your own conclusions. The list of reasons junior officers came into the Service ([Appendix III](#)) this year offers further insights. Notice in particular that eleven junior officers joined to “serve their country” and only four junior officers listed service as a Foreign Service core value after initial training.

To return to the point made earlier about the need for better and more systematic communication with the troops, it appears that the Strategic Plan core values list was not arrived at through a process that involved significant employee buy-in and has not been incorporated as a meaningful component of our corporate culture. Given that virtually no one believed such a list existed, it is clear that, thus far, no effort has been made to relate these values to daily work and life at the Department of State. The discrepancy between ascribed values and observed behavior was a source of harsh criticism from many officers. As someone said, “What people say and what I see do not match.”

A number of officers voiced the following sentiment in different ways: Every organization has a distinct culture that shapes its work environment, and the most successful ones inculcate a “shared vision” and well-defined “common institutional values.” If this is true, the Foreign Service and the Department of State appear to be “values challenged.”

Symptomatic Cynicism

A few people consider cynicism a serious cultural issue and symptomatic of a breakdown of core values. Most officers acknowledged that proximity to power politics breeds a certain amount of cynicism and that’s OK, even healthy in our business. (As one noted, “We are not playing in Goldilock’s sandbox.”) On the other hand, “unrelieved cynicism becomes corrosive,” and the perception of this troubles some observers.

One senior official believes that the prospect of ambassadorships for FSOs damages senior Service leadership. In this person’s view, appointments for career officers should be capped at deputy chief of mission (DCM). Once officers accept an ambassadorship, they should have to resign from the Service and play only in the political process.

Another official believes that “Foreign Service cynicism is but a mask for the idealism underneath.” In the wake of Foreign Service downsizing, speculated another, “cynicism is a rational defense to preempt being hurt by an institution one no longer trusts do to the right thing.” Cynicism is passed on to new employees constantly — within the first few weeks of A-100 for junior officers, not to mention the more sustained doses younger mid-level officers receive at every turn. Based on junior officer comments, mentors need to keep their own disappointments to themselves and inspire younger officers to feel they can contribute and help forge a brighter future for the Foreign Service and the country it serves. They want to feel inspired and needed, not like fools for having joined.

Draw on Idealism

A rich vein of idealism still runs through the Foreign Service; we need to draw on it and reawaken its spirit by engaging especially younger officers in the challenge of long-term institutional renewal. The Foreign Service Oral History Project would like to serve as a resource in this regard. As a depository of institutional history and folklore, it is ready to share its documentation of “Foreign Service unsung heroes,” men and women who dared, who took initiative, who led and who made a difference.

The project believes it could help respond to the needs of officers who have expressed a desire for “more than a technical orientation to their new profession.” “Without ignoring the warts, or playing Pollyanna,” the project would like to expose new officers to more diplomatic and foreign policy history: “Officers need to see themselves as inheritors of a diplomatic tradition of noble (not to be confused with elite) proportions.” A number of junior officers expressed a desire for just such content in A-100. A number of junior officers professed “no knowledge of foreign policy or diplomatic history,” and advocated a “quick course” in the topic based on books or a reading list to be provided in advance to new recruits. Officers need to be connected with the best of the Service’s commendable history and be challenged to help prepare it to meet the future.

FSOs care deeply about their country and its role in the world. Self-interest aside, all expressed genuine concern that U.S. foreign policy — irrespective of administration — can only be as strong as its foreign affairs and diplomatic

institutional infrastructure. Senior officers share a passionate belief in the value of diplomacy in forging a better world, and younger officers want to feel the same. But to do this, they need a better understanding of what the diplomatic profession entails and what it takes to be a good diplomat in the twenty-first century.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I — CORE VALUES

A. Positive “core values” mentioned by senior, mid-level and junior FSOs

GROUP I				
	TOTAL	Senior	Mid-level	Junior
Service to nation/ patriotism	29	22	3	4
Personal Integrity/ honesty	15	13		2
Professional Competence/ make it happen/Effectiveness	14	11	2	1
Loyalty	13	9	3	1
Intellectual Integrity/ objective advice	12	12		
GROUP II				
	TOTAL	Senior	Mid-level	Junior
Hard Work	10	4	1	5
Sacrifice	9	6	3	
Excellence/quality	8	7		1
Promote America’s Interests Abroad/Liberty, Equality, Free Market	7	3	3	1
EEO/Inclusiveness	7	2		5
Intelligence	7	6	1	
Respectful/respect	7	3	2	2
Commitment/dedication	6	2	1	3
Sense of nobility about work/heroic service/pride	6	6		
Good Interpersonal skills/ communication skills/persuasiveness	5	2	2	1
F.S. Ethos/esprit de corps	5	3		2

F.S. family/help each other	5	2	1	2
Teamwork	5			5
Worldwide availability	4	4		
Leadership	4	4		
Oath of Allegiance	4	4		
Curiosity	4	4		
Gentlemanly culture/patience, eloquence formal politeness	4	3	1	
Precepts/BEX 12 dimensions	3	1		2
Perspective	3	3		
Cooperation	3	1	2	
Courage	2	1	1	
Discipline	2	1	1	
Duty	2	1	1	
Honor	2	1	1	
Trust	2	1		1

GROUP III (one mention each)							
	Senior	Mid-level	Junior		Senior	Mid-level	Junior
Altruism	1			Adaptability			1
Decency	1			Dissent	1		
Learning			1	Value added to Amcits			1
Adventure	1			Bipartisanism		1	
Discretion	1			Humor			1
Merit			1	Unflappability	1		

NEGATIVE VALUES MENTIONED	Total	Sr.	Mid- Level	Jr.
Look out for yourself, no one else will/self-interest/individual careerism	5		2	3
Reluctance to coordinate with non-State/Look down on other agencies	3		2	1
Maintain status quo/don't rock the boat	3		2	1
Should be merit but isn't	2		2	
Self-promotion/empire building	2		2	
Conflict avoidance	2		1	1
Castes	2			2
Thinking rather than doing	1			1
Political result over problem solving	1		1	
CYA	1		1	
Either flexibility or high tolerance for excuse making	1			1
Gossip/corridor rep	1			1
Kiss up, kick down	1		1	
Deference	1		1	
Consensus over individual initiative	1		1	
Process over result	1		1	
Do nothing rather than risk	1		1	
Take credit for subordinates good work and blame them for bad	1		1	
Rank has privilege but not accountability	1		1	
More with less	1		1	
Territoriality	1		1	
Get used to it; it won't get any better	1			1

APPENDIX II — OFFICIAL CORE VALUES

Text of the Department of State's

2000 Strategic Plan Values Statement

The men and women of the Department of State, at home and overseas, have a distinct responsibility to represent and advocate the interests and people of the United States in the rest of the world. The International Affairs Mission Statement is the map of what we aim to accomplish; this Values Statement articulates the guiding principles for us as individuals and as an institution.

Impact: Our work significantly advances the interests of the American people at home and abroad.

Expertise: Language and cultural skills, area expertise, management ability, and international experience are critical to our role as the lead U.S.G. agency overseas; our skills help others representing the United States do their jobs more effectively.

Discipline: We faithfully execute policy regardless of personal views; members of the Foreign Service are ready to serve worldwide as needed.

Dissent: The constructive, thoughtful expression of divergent views strengthens the formulation and execution of foreign policy.

Diversity: We strive for a merit-based workforce that is excellent, reflective of the American people, and confident that solid, mission-related performance is rewarded.

Partnership: Our effectiveness as an institution is heightened by the unique mix of skills and experiences that our Civil Service, Foreign Service, and foreign national colleagues bring to the workplace.

Commitment: We are dedicated to America's leadership in the world and to the effective conduct of international relations; we take the long-term view that comes with a career, not merely a job.

APPENDIX III
Junior Officer Reasons for Entering the Foreign Service in 2000

Adventure/travel/exotic vacations	18
Service/useful work	11
Work on foreign policy/international relations	11
Prestigious/excellent caché/mystique	6
Learn/personal growth	4
Lifestyle	4
Bored with previous job	4
Learn a foreign language	3
Expose children to world	2
Constant change	1