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According to Workforce 2000, a survey report on corporate responses to demographic and labor force trends, traditional minorities (defined as people of color, immigrants, and women) will compose up to 80 percent of the United States corporate workforce by the year 2000. This displays a significant change from earlier years, where the workforce was dominated by white American males. Because of this changing ethnic and racial mix of employees, companies are becoming more concerned with ethnic diversity and the changing needs of both individuals and companies. Though these companies are concerned, not much has been done to address the growing need to prepare leaders for leading and working in a diverse society. This is where American higher education needs to take charge, as one of its goals is to prepare students for citizenship and working collectively for the good of society. The Jepson School of Leadership Studies of the University of Richmond has recognized this goal and is taking on the challenge of preparing students for leading in a diverse society.

**The Eisenhower Grant**
Knowing that a project of this type would require significant funding but recognizing the need for the topic to be addressed, the Jepson School, led by Dr. Gill Hickman, applied for and received support from the Dwight D. Eisenhower Leadership Development Program. With this assistance, plans for the project began to move forward. The project's plan, consisting of four objectives, was soon developed. These objectives, as cited in the project's proposal, are as follows: to create a task force which brings together faculty and student affairs professionals from several campuses to help develop educational programs concerning leadership development and diversity, for minority and non-minority students; to design and pilot test modules that combine leadership theoretical and experimental strategies to help prepare students for leadership in a diverse environment, as part of the Foundations of Leadership course; to create a multicultural leadership development program that will increase the pool of minority and non-minority students prepared for leadership roles in diverse settings; and to disseminate information about the diversity course modules and the student leadership development program to leadership educators. During the spring semester of 1994, the first objective of the project was achieved as a task force was brought together to discuss teaching leadership in a diverse society.
The Role of the Task Force

A task force, entitled "Teaching Leadership for a Diverse Society," was formed to create a prototype to provide leadership students with both academic and practical leadership experiences in ethnically diverse environments. The task force, still an active group, is made up of members of the Jepson School of Leadership Studies faculty, student affairs professionals from the University of Richmond, a faculty member from the Virginia Commonwealth University, and three students from the University of Richmond (see appendix I).

The task force held its first meeting in the spring of 1994 and had one other meeting during the course of the semester. Additional task force meetings will be held during the summer of 1994. The current goals of the task force are to develop course materials and learning exercises geared toward leadership and diversity, to conduct research projects on the topic, and to address the questions cited in the abstract (see appendix II). Before the first meeting, a time line was established that outlined the group's goals during the semester (see appendix III). Once the time line was established, task force meetings began. During the first two meet-
ings, the task force worked together to develop materials that would "ensure that students address both the intellectual and experiential questions raised when considering leadership of multi-ethnic groups" (Hickman, proposal). These materials, once completely developed, will become the course materials for a section of the Foundations of Leadership course to be taught in the Fall of 1994. This course will focus on diversity and leadership and will include students from both the University of Richmond and the Virginia Commonwealth University. Dr. Gill Hickman, a leadership professor in the Jepson School and Dr. Creighton-Zolar, a sociology professor from VCU, will team-teach the course. In addition, the information collected by the task force will be used in other sections of the Foundations course to insure that the topic of leadership and diversity is addressed in all introductory leadership courses.

The first meeting of the task force took place in March of 1994 (see appendix IV). The task force got off to a good start as it discussed issues of cultural diversity, the meaning of the word "minority," the proposed course focusing on diversity and leadership, the collection of course materials, the goals of the task force, and what the task force needed to do in order to achieve its goals. The Eisenhower Grant and abstract was also
explained and the task force’s research project discussed. The meeting was a productive one as all members left feeling good about the project and knowing what they needed to do in order to get the project off to a good start.

The second task force meeting went as well, if not better, than the first (see appendix V). The meeting started with a guest--Mr. Gabe Demola--a sophomore from one of the current Foundations of Leadership classes. Mr. Demola shared an idea that he developed during his Foundations class about teaching leadership to a diverse society. His idea basically calls for an experiential section of the proposed course which would expose students to a real-life diverse leadership settings (see appendix VI). The task force members used a large portion of the meeting to discuss the issue and decided to develop the idea and explore it further. There was also discussion two possible guests for future task force meetings-- a consultant from the College of William and Mary and a guest speaker from the Ethel Corporation. These guests would be called upon to attend a task force meeting over the summer and assist with the development of the new Foundations of Leadership course. The meeting ended with a general discussion as to where the task force was headed over the sum-
mer. This meeting was very productive in that it gave direction to the project and to the task force members.

Though the task force was able to meet only twice during the semester, the meetings were still very relevant as they "got the ball rolling" for the project. The task force now knows its goals and where it is headed. With this out of the way, the task force needs to concentrate on tapping into resources such as the consultants from William and Mary and the Ethel Corporation and putting the final touches on the course to be taught in the fall. In addition, the task force must begin to think about developing its own research projects for additional information, developing a leadership development program to address the issue, and disseminating literature created by the task force.

**The Foundations of Leadership Course**

As stated earlier, one of the goals of the task force is to develop materials for an introductory leadership class to be taught this fall. The materials necessary for the class include literature, class exercises and projects, and research data completed by the task force. Materials cover a variety of
contexts and touch upon all of the leadership modules. When integrating
the literature, class exercises and projects, and research, it should be
noted that the materials need to be distributed over all contexts and
modules, not conglomerated into a single section. Also, the materials
need to be limited as there will be many other topics that must be covered
in the course--the section on diversity is only a small facet of the course.
Because of the time constraints, the following literature, projects, and
research should be focused upon in the Foundations of Leadership course
focusing on teaching leadership for a diverse society.

I. The literature picked by the task force to be relevant to the class
included the following:

I. Diverse Voices of Leadership: Different Rhythms and Emerging Harmo-
nies, Kathleen Allen.

II. Developing Diversity in Organizations, Ann Morrison

III. Winning with Diversity, Sharon Nelton

IV. Shedding New Light on Diversity Training, Ronita Johnson and Julie
O'Mara

V. Challenging the Barriers to Opportunity, Ann Morrison
**summaries of the articles will be distributed to the task force before May 15**

II. *The class exercises and projects relevant to the class included the following:*

I. An outside project where students have to observe leaders in the midst of diversity (see appendix VI). Students would be required to fulfill an outside "learning laboratory" experience. The class would be divided into four groups, with each group targeting one of the four major contexts. Each group would visit their particular cite for at least ten hours, observe the leadership in a diverse setting, and write a paper and make a presentation to the class during the time their particular context was being studied. Thus, theories would be discussed, learned, and applied.

II. Each student has to find an individual that leads in a diverse setting. It could be a college administrator, a professor, a businessperson, etc. in any context. They should interview them with the same questions asked in Research Project A, located below. The student should then submit an analysis of the results, including recommendations on how the situation could be improved.
III. The research included the following projects:

I. Research Project A: This first research project will include interviewing pairs of **individuals** (leader-follower relationship) who have worked together in an effective, cooperative, and trusting multicultural relationship. The student must make sure that a variety of contexts are included in the research (for example, leader-follower relationships in a university setting, in a corporate setting, in a political settings, etc.). Questions that should be asked include the following: (1) Under what circumstances did you begin to work together? (2) Describe your initial thoughts and feelings about working with this person versus your current thoughts and feelings. (3) Was there tension because of your differences? What accounted for the change? (4) What are the key elements that made the collaboration successful? (5) What do you think are the most effective means to developing cooperation, trust, and collaboration between colleagues from different racial or ethnic backgrounds? (6) What activities can students practice in the classroom to learn to establish effective relationships between people from different racial or ethnic backgrounds?

II. Research Project B: Interview **groups** that have worked together in a effective, cooperative, and trusting relationships. The student must make
sure that a variety of contexts are covered. The same questions that were asked in project A should be asked.

III. Research Project C: Interview pairs of individuals who have failed to work together in effective, cooperative, and trusting relationships (One of the two pairs individuals may be interviewed). The student must make sure that a variety of contexts are covered. The following questions should be asked: (1) Under what circumstances did you begin to work together? (2) Describe your initial thoughts and feelings about working with this person. Was their tension before the project began or did it develop over time? (3) What types of activities and projects did you engage in with this individual? (4) What are the key elements that made this collaboration unsuccessful? Was it ethnically-related or was it personality-related? (5) What could you have done to make the situation more favorable? What could the other person have done to make the situation more favorable? (6) What do you think are the most effective means to developing cooperation and trust between colleagues from different racial or ethnic backgrounds? (7) What activities can students practice in the classroom to learn how to establish effective relationships between people from different racial ethnic or racial backgrounds and deal with negative relationships of the same type.
IV. Research Project D: Interview groups that have failed to work together in effective, cooperative, and trusting relationships. Make sure that a variety of contexts are covered. The same questions that were asked in project C should be asked.

Together, the literature, class exercises and projects, and research will provide a strong base for the course. As the course proceeds, the professors will have to alter the readings, assignments, and projects as necessary.

A Personal Note: Tying the Project to Leadership

In retrospect, participating in this project taught me so much about myself as a leader and about the theoretical aspects of leadership I have learned about over the past two years. I will first describe how the project related to the courses I have taken in the Jepson School, including core, context, and competency courses, and will then discuss in the next section how I have personally and intellectually grown through this project.

History and Theories of Leadership
This course examines how the history of leadership is shaped by great men and women. In this class, I learned how to critically evaluate many different types of leadership theories, drawing from a body of literature from various fields, including psychology, political science, and history. Basically, I was taught how leadership scholars go about constructing theories of leadership and how they gain a basic understanding of the processes underlining this theory building. The theories covered include the trait, behavioral, and contingency theories, in addition to power and influence approaches, multiple influence theory, and transformational leadership theories. I also learned about the difference between leadership and management theories and analyzed cross-cultural approaches to the study of leadership.

The History and Theories of Leadership course probably relates the least to my project than any other course I took in the Jepson School. This is true because I wasn't really shadowing a leader in a situation where I could watch and learn how the leader embodied certain theories. There was no emerging leader that I could analyze to illustrate any of these theories, but there was some information from the course that I could draw into my project. One relevant piece of information I gained con-
cerned transformational leadership. In this course, we looked at several current theories of transformational leadership. I believe this applies to the project because, when looking at training leaders to change society in order to make it more adaptable to diversity, it is obvious that some degree of transformational leadership must be occur. As frequently noted, such leadership occurs when "one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise each other to higher levels of motivation and morality" (Bennis, 57). In a case such as training leaders for a diverse society, this type of leadership should be utilized as both leaders and followers must engage with each other, realize that they have a shared purpose (as they must if they are working in the same company, for example), and work collectively to achieve the goal. Transformational leadership could produce results such as these. Other relevant facts gained from this course include managerial versus leadership theories (obviously leadership theory should be utilized in this type of situation as major change and transformation is necessary), situational theories of leadership (the type of leader necessary in a given circumstance depends on the different situation and the varying degree of necessity), and the cross-cultural study of leadership theories (the different theories are cross-cultural and extend across many boundaries).
Critical Thinking and Methods of Inquiry

This course concerns thinking critically, exploring questions from a variety of perspectives, making persuasive arguments, and determining whether arguments are cogent or fallacious. In addition to learning and practicing the above skills, I also learned how to use the research and research methods in several disciplines (especially the scientific method). In sum, the class taught me how to develop my ideas, use my imagination to create vision, and critically and analytically think.

Relating what I learned in this course to my senior project is easy because it so readily applies. In any project where research and analysis is done, knowing how to critically think and analyze arguments for validity and soundness is very important. When I was researching literature, having these critical thinking skills were vital. I could easily determine what was relevant and what was not and which arguments were fallacious and which were cogent. I also learned how to do research scientifically in this course, which helped me in my data collecting and analysis. Having the skills I developed in this course helped me do a more complete, accurate, and valid job in researching the topic of teaching leadership for
a diverse society. As a result, the information and materials collected for the course are relevant and accurate.

*Leading Groups*

Having the knowledge I gained in this course helped me a lot during this project. *Leading Groups* focused on the development of groups and the understanding of how groups function. As a student in this course, I learned much about my leadership skills in the context of group work, in addition to how interpersonal communications skills can be utilized to increase group development and productivity. I also learned about terms such as group structure, status hierarchy, norms, group cohesiveness, roles, and group conflict, and practiced applying them in many different situations. In addition, the class covered topics such as leadership strategies for spurring functional conflict, resolving intergroup dysfunctional conflict, group decision making, leaderless groups, and group effectiveness as related to leader-follower relations.

Having to assist in putting together a task force and observing how the task force interacted and responded to each other was a learning lab for
this course. I was really able to see how the theory I learned in this class relates to practice. After assisting in putting together and participating in the group's activities, I was able to see how conflict can arise, even in the group's beginning stages (scheduling conflicts, communication problems). In addition, after observing the group's development (from a group with no objectives and goals to one with lofty aspirations and ways to achieve the means), observing leadership emerge within the group (Gabe Demola took a leadership role in asserting his ideas for the task force), analyzing leader-follower relations (for example, between Dr. Hickman and task force members), experiencing a small degree of intergroup conflict (intense discussion over the course groups project, amount of literature and class exercises that should be included in the course), and witnessing group decision-making (meeting times, goals and objectives of the group), I was able to really pull into the project what I had learned in this course.

In all of these activities, I knew theory that assisted in my analysis of the group and how progressed. Knowing a lot about group development, interpersonal relationships, group roles, and intergroup conflict assisted me in my role as a leader and a follower within the task force. Participation in this project also enabled me to practice theory and reinforce concepts and terms relevant to leadership.
This course focuses on the moral responsibilities of leadership and how moral values and assumptions shape the concept and practice of leadership. In this class, I learned a lot about developing moral imagination and vision, analyzing the moral obligations of leadership, shaping the moral environment, understanding different moral perspectives, and presenting and critiquing moral arguments. I also learned that the definition of ethics includes the examination of good and evil, right and wrong, and justice and injustice in individuals and human relationships. In addition, I was taught that it is the leader's responsibility to form a compelling vision and motivate people to bring about necessary moral change.

It is obvious that the objectives of this project relate to what I learned in this course. My knowledge of ethics and leadership helped me recognize that there is something wrong with the fact that the leadership school, and society in general, does not prepare citizens for leading and working in a diverse society. In this course, I was taught that when faced with a dilemma—especially a dilemma in which the morality is questionable—it is the leader's responsibility to bring about change. In my view, there is
something wrong with a society that does not address the changing needs of a diverse world. As a student of leadership, I know that a change has to occur and that students need to be prepared for leading diverse groups. If a change does not occur, our society will never learn to deal with the change that this shift to multiculturalism will bring to a group. In essence, less will be accomplished and groups and organizations will begin to flounder because the communication and interpersonal relationships that make a group or organization work will break down.

Other Leadership Courses

Many of the context and competency courses related to my project and assisted me in carrying out the project, but one stood out in particular—Leadership Within Political Systems. In addition to teaching me how leadership is practiced within political systems in both America and other countries, differentiating between types of transformational and transactional leadership, analyzing political leadership in a variety of situations through case studies, and studying the state government and problems that need to be addressed within the community, I learned much about higher education and what needs to be done about preparing a student for citizen-
ship and leadership. In the *Leadership Within Political Systems* course, I did an individual research project on whether higher education--the University of Richmond in particular--properly prepared its students for citizenship (which includes diversity awareness and the ability to work within a multicultural society). In completing my research, I distributed surveys and analyzed current research on the topic. The results of my project were somewhat disturbing as the findings indicate that higher education institutions need to do more to address this problem (see appendix VII). Knowing this information and seeing it in the form of numerical statistics made me feel even stronger about the objectives of the task force and the need for the topic of teaching leadership in a diverse society to be addressed.

Though other context and competency courses, especially the *Leader as a Change Agent* and *Decision-Making for Leaders*, applied to my project and helped me during the course of my project, the one that most applied was *Leadership Within Political Systems*.

**Personal Growth through the Senior Project**
Participating in this project was a very valuable experience for me. In addition to teaching me more about leadership and reinforcing what I already learned in my leadership coursework, participating in the project gave me experience working within and leading a task force (something I surely will have to do later in life), completing research, and working with a professor in a mentor relationship. Participating in the project also gave me confidence that I am capable of working within a task force and contributing valid ideas.

In addition, participating in this project taught me more about a topic that I feel strongly about and that I know needs change and improvement. I feel that by working on this project, I made a difference—at least in a small way—and that even after I am gone, the project will contribute much to solving the problems posed by leadership and diversity.

**Where To Go From Here?**

Though we have achieved the first two objectives of the project—developing a task force and designing a Foundations of Leadership course that tests the materials we have developed—much lies ahead for the task force and the project. Not only does the task force have to continue meeting in
order to discuss the issues, tap into the resources that will be made available, and decide upon other courses of action, but all course materials also need to be fully decided upon and developed. This will take much of the task force’s time over the summer, as there is a lot of material to review and many resources to consult. In addition, the last two objectives of the project must be discussed and put into action. These last two objectives are creating a multicultural leadership development program that will increase the pool of minority and non-minority student prepared for leadership roles in diverse settings and to disseminate information about the diversity course modules and the student leadership development program to leadership educators. Once the task force addresses the issues it must deal with over the summer, it will be able to refocus its energies to tackle these last two objectives.
Teaching Leadership for a Diverse Society
Task Force Phone List

Dr. Gill Hickman (Coordinator of Task Force and Professor of Leadership Studies-University of Richmond)
287-6097

Tammy Bradley (University of Richmond Student Representative)
282-5243

Dr. Tinina Cade (Assistant to the Vice President for Student Affairs and Director of Multicultural Affairs-University of Richmond)
289-8277

Dr. Ann Creighton-Zolar (Professor of Sociology in the Department of African-American Studies-Virginia Commonwealth University)
367-1384

Yoke Eto (University of Richmond Student Representative)
281-7962

Dr. Candine Johnson (Director of Athletic Advising and Advisor to the Multicultural Student Union-University of Richmond)
289-8382

Dr. Stephanie Micas (Associate Dean of the Jepson School of Leadership Studies-University of Richmond)
287-6082

Dr. Marc Swatez (Professor of Leadership Studies-University of Richmond)
289-8008

Brooke Taylor (University of Richmond Student Representative and Research Assistant)
281-7966

Dr. Thomas Wren (Professor of Leadership Studies-University of Richmond)
287-6098
4. To create a multicultural leadership development program that will increase the pool of minority and non-minority students prepared for leadership roles in diverse settings. *(Funding for this component will be sought during the second round of Eisenhower grant applications for 1994-95).*

**QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED**

It is the intent of this project to provide course materials and experiential exercises, as appropriate, for the modules in the Foundations of Leadership Studies course. These materials should help address the following issues.

1. How does the leadership studies program equip minority and non-minority students to lead multi-racial and multi-ethnic groups? What do we want students to know and experience with regard to this process?

2. How is leading diverse groups different from leading relatively homogeneous groups? What elements of the leader-follower relationship vary?

3. How do expectations of the leader vary in diverse groups? How can these expectations be met by a single leader who is answerable to a diverse constituency, whether it occurs in a political, organizational or community-based context?

4. How do the routes to leadership positions differ for various racial or ethnic groups? What needs to be done to help assure that members of various racial or ethnic groups attain leadership positions?

For example, Ann Morrison (1992) states that several problems need to be addressed so that people of color and women reach leadership positions:

- Prejudice: treating differences as weaknesses;
- Poor career planning;
- A lonely, hostile, unsupportive working environment for non-traditional managers;
- Lack of organizational savvy on the part of non-traditional managers;
- Greater comfort in dealing with one’s own kind; and
- Difficulty in balancing career and family.
APPENDIX III

TIME LINE: TEACHING LEADERSHIP FOR A DIVERSE SOCIETY

PHASE I: Spring 1994

January 1994 Preliminary meetings begin

February 1 General research; gathering of information

February 11 Letter to task force completed; first meeting date set

February 18 Meeting with Dr. Creighton-Zolar (11am); Literature and additional information for each module researched and determined

March 4 Research initiated to identify activities and exercises that fit each module

March 7 First task force meeting (11:30am); Meetings determined for the rest of the semester

March 11 Integration of research

March 18 Spring Break

March 25 Integration of research

April on Task force continues to meet; data for course analyzed

PHASE II: Summer 1994

*Task force continues to meet
*Director of William and Mary program comes to UR for consultation with task force and Dr. Hickman
*Collection of data and research concluded; materials (readings and activities) collected; course restructured and syllabus formed.

PHASE III: Fall 1994

*Recruitment of VCU/UR students for course
*Course, team taught by Dr. Hickman and Dr. Creighton-Zolar, begins
Teaching Leadership for a Diverse Society:  
Task Force Meeting Agenda  
March 7, 1994, 11:30am  
Jepson School Conference Room

I. Welcome and introduction of task force members
II. Explanation of Eisenhower Grant and abstract
III. Discussion of project and task force goals
IV. Discussion of process for identifying and developing materials for course
V. Explanation of research project
VI. Closing and discussion of future task force meetings
Teaching Leadership for a Diverse Society
Task Force Meeting #2 Agenda
April 13, 1994, 11:30am

I. Welcome

II. Sharing of information and pooling of articles

III. Discussion of other resources (College of William and Mary and the Ethel Corporation)

IV. Discussion of research and course

V. Where do we go from here?
The other day in class we, the students, generated ideas on ways to improve a center city school suffering from problems such as disunity, apathy, drugs, alcohol, violence etc. During our open discussion, I was struck by the creativity and thoughtfulness of the ideas, and the vigor and force in which these ideas were presented. The excitement grew as each group contributed their ideas and expounded further on the ideas offered by other students. There was fire in everyone's eyes, a curiosity and desire to achieve something that I had not seen before in any other class. But suddenly it was time to go and conversation quickly shifted to weekend plans.

I questioned the motives of the people in our class. Why did they respond with such excitement? I thought about everyone's future and it occurred to me that they would probably join the regular work force, and the problems we attempted to solve in class would still be left unsolved.

Wouldn't it be incredible if students in the foundations class were given the opportunity to apply the basic theories, which they learn in class to real life situations. Through this invaluable experience, students would be exposed to the world of service, a world rarely visited by students of a different major. They would have the opportunity to improve society in some way, by constructing a reasonable and workable program which would be followed through to implementation. As it stands now, students observe leadership in the workforce and learn through observance. This is good, but perhaps it would be more beneficial to the student if they learn through experience in an organizational context, such as service, an organization which the leadership school cadets too. Experience through service strongly exemplifies the vision of the school.

As it stands now, theories are not retained by the students. They move through the foundations class by working in a group and regurgitating facts. Experience, however, would be indelibly etched in the student's mind. It would be something which a student would apply to the rest of his life. Also, the experience might set a fire within a student. A calling, perhaps to serve the community. Those undecided about majoring in leadership would have a good idea about what they are getting into. Leadership is a phenomenon which in my opinion, is very difficult to explain in a text book. Experience, on the other hand, may invite those who never really considered leadership to use their skills in ways they've never dreamed.
To: Dr. Richard Morrill  
From: Brooke Taylor  
Re: Students, Politics, and Citizenship  
Date: March 24, 1994

Thank you for asking me to be a special research assistant for your study focusing on the current political attitudes of University of Richmond students and whether students are being adequately prepared for citizenship. After completing my preliminary research, I have concluded that the political attitudes of Richmond students, in addition to the political attitudes of most American students, must be altered. I have also concluded that UR less than adequately prepares its students for citizenship. I have reached this conclusion after analyzing student surveys from various institutions, including the University of Richmond, and after reading literature on the current political attitudes of college students and on higher education and how it prepares students for citizenship. As a researcher and as a future leader in the field of higher education, this information concerns me. If higher education institutions are not preparing their students for citizenship and are not encouraging their students to be politically aware and active, the institutions are, in essence, failing. The mission of a college or university is not to just educate students in math, science, and grammar. Though educating intellectually is obviously an important goal, preparing students for the real world and teaching them how to make a difference in society, to engage in politics and use politics for improvement, and to give back to their community is also relevant. Colleges and universities need to focus on changing the attitudes of students and preparing them for citizenship. If this is neglected, a future generation of leaders will emerge that do not know how to deal with the complexities of a changing and very misdirected society.

Before I outline my solutions to this problem, I want to share some of my research findings with you. I will begin by looking at literature by some prominent political leadership scholars, including Ernest Boyer and E.J. Dionne, in addition to a publication by the Kettering Foundation. I will then analyze a survey conducted by the Leadership in Political System's "Higher Education and Citizenship" research group. Lastly, I will compare the findings of a survey of University of Richmond freshmen and seniors and will look at them both in relation to each other and to comparable schools.

The literature on the subject of college student attitudes and their preparation for citizenship was slightly alarming. According to many scholars, the American higher education system is deteriorating because it is failing to address the needs of society, to make students politically aware and involved, to prepare
students for service to society. Ernest Boyer, president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, in an article titled *Creating the New American College*, stated that higher education's commitment to service seems to have diminished. In Boyer's words, "What I find most disturbing is the growing feeling that higher education is a private benefit, not a public good" (Boyer, 1). This statement indicates that higher education institutions are not addressing society's problems in the manner that is presently necessary and that students are more concerned with themselves and their own goals instead of the goals of society as a whole. In other words, colleges and universities are not preparing their students for citizenship as service to society. Adding to this problem is the issue of whether students are politically active and aware enough to become citizens that are able to give back to their community and work for improvement. E.J. Dionne, in *Why Americans Hate Politics*, states that "there is a world-wide revolution against political systems-not just particular ideologies but systems of professional politicians and their governments" (Matthews, 1). This revolution, combined with the doubt and mistrust Americans feel about the ability of government to improve society and the knowledge that politicians are "framing political issues as a series of false choices" has contributed to the lack of interest college students show for politics (Dionne, 11). In addition, higher education institutions are not providing the necessary forums for this political consciousness to develop. According to David Matthews, president of the Kettering Foundation, "college students believe that most everything they have learned about politics makes them believe that politics is not about solving problems or acting on the ills of society-it is individualistic, divisive, negative, and often counterproductive" (Matthews, 1). The problems pointed out by Boyer, Dionne, and Matthews indicate that colleges and universities must work to restructure the way in which students develop into politically active and aware citizens and, ultimately, how the students are prepared for citizenship as service to society.

Additional information about college students and their attitudes and development can be found in surveys conducted at the University of Richmond. The first survey I analyzed was conducted by the Leadership in Political System's "Higher Education and Citizenship" group. The survey targeted all four classes of current University of Richmond students. The students were randomly selected for the survey. The results of the survey were somewhat disturbing. Firstly, on questions concerning citizenship (which as a student of leadership I define as actively engaging in activities with the betterment of society as a chief goal), some students were confused about the actual meaning of the word. Though some respondents stated that citizenship had to do with service to society and loyalty to the community, many stated that the definition of citizen-
ship was legally belonging to a country or knowing a country's customs. In fact, one senior, after being at the University for over three years, stated that citizenship is "being in a country and knowing its history and customs." The second aspect of this survey that concerns me is the responses to the question of whether UR prepared or is preparing them well for citizenship. Nearly everyone stated that Richmond did not prepare them well or that it shouldn't have to prepare them because they were previously prepared by parents, schools, and other forms of socialization. The last disturbing aspect of this survey is about politics and being politically active on campus. Most of the respondents, from all classes, said that UR is not a politically involved campus and that students are not concerned about engaging in political activity.

What does this survey tell us? Firstly, it tells us that many students at the University of Richmond do not associate service to society, community awareness, and political activity with citizenship and that more needs to be done to make students aware of their commitment as citizens. Secondly, the survey tells us that administrators need to make students conscious of the significance of how their college years shape their beings, prepare them for society, and mold them into individual citizens. Lastly, it is obvious that something needs to be done about political consciousness at the University of Richmond. There is either ignorance in the area of politics or extreme apathy when it comes to political activity at the University of Richmond.

The second survey I analyzed focused on the 1993 University of Richmond senior class (63% of the class responded). The students were asked various questions and the answers to the questions were compiled and compared to the answers of students at comparable schools. A few of the questions asked concerned politics and preparation for citizenship. Question 31 asked about the satisfaction level of student voice in college policies. Almost 10% of those surveyed at UR were "very satisfied" with the voice they were given in college policies and 33% were "generally satisfied." In comparison, 9% of comparable schools were "very satisfied" and 31% were "satisfied." Concerning preparation for citizenship, 31% of UR respondents were "very satisfied" and 42% "generally satisfied" with their opportunities to secure leadership positions on campus. Comparable schools did not respond to this question. Similarly, 22% of UR students were "very satisfied" and 46% were "generally satisfied" with their opportunities to participate in university leadership programs. Comparable schools also did not respond to this question.

This survey gives us insight into how UR prepares its students for citizenship. By comparing UR to other schools and analyzing the numbers, I was able to draw two major conclusions from the survey. Firstly, though UR did better than comparable schools in the satisfaction level of students concerning their
voice in college policies, the fact still remains that less than half of the respondents were satisfied with the voice they were given in college policies. Though the numbers are relatively high and their is obviously not a major problem in this area, UR should strive to increase student participation in college policies, at least at the level where over three-fourths are satisfied. With the resources the university possesses, this should not be a difficult task. Secondly, I concluded that UR is doing well in the area of providing leadership opportunities and programs for students (73% and 68% of students are above the satisfaction level in the respective areas). This tells us that the university needs to continue to provide these leadership opportunities and programs for students, as they are an integral part of preparing students for citizenship and leadership.

The last survey I analyzed was the questionnaire for incoming freshmen. By looking at the 1989 freshmen responses and the 1993 senior responses, I was able to draw some conclusions about how the university prepared students for citizenship. I found the following information relevant to our area of focus: in their four years at UR, students have become increasingly interested in both volunteerism and community service and in the climate for minority students and the small degree of ethnic diversity at UR. The comparison of the surveys show that the number of students volunteering during their college years increased by over 20% and that over 65% of seniors were dissatisfied with the climate for minority students and the ethnic diversity of the institution when only 38% were concerned about promoting racial harmony four years earlier.

This survey is more promising than the other two because it displays that UR is doing an adequate job of preparing students for volunteerism and for recognizing the virtues of ethnic diversity. These are two very important aspects of preparing a student for citizenship, as proper citizenship concerns service to the community and awareness of differences. What this survey should tell UR administrators is that they need not focus on creating community service opportunities for students and diversity training for teaching students about citizenship. It is obvious that though UR is not excelling in both of these areas, it is at least doing a good job in trying to address the issues and bring them into focus at the University (This is displayed by the large number of community service opportunities on campus and the high number of programs, lectures, and debates dedicated to increasing diversity and diversity awareness on campus). What UR needs to do is focus on teaching students how these and other activities relate to citizenship and how the practice of these activities increases the development of citizenship in society.

Looking at all of the surveys and analyzing readings by leadership scholars, it is obvious that something has to be done about changing student attitudes and preparing University of Richmond students for citizenship in society. The key
problems are that students are unsure of the true meaning of citizenship and that they are not developing into politically active and aware citizens that can use politics as a tool to improve society. As the University strives to improve itself and become more competitive with other institutions, it needs to put these issues at the top of its agenda. The question arises as to how these issues should be addressed and how the problems that come with these issues should be solved. After much research and thought, I have designed a feasible plan that would at least begin to address some of these issues. I will outline my plan in the following paragraphs.

My plan focuses on both of the problems indicated above. As a response to the problem of students failing to develop into politically active and aware citizens that use politics as a tool to improve society, I propose that a core course entitled "Politics, Citizenship, and the American College Student" be implemented as a requirement for graduation. I propose that this be a 1-credit-hour class that meets once a week for the duration of the student's college career. In this course, current events would be discussed, solutions to problems posed, issues debated, and the role of the college student in relation to political action, analyzed and discussed. This course would not only develop students into citizens by showing them that they can make a difference and contribute to their society through politics, but is would also increase their knowledge of current events and national and world politics. I believe this course would be at least a step in the right direction.

I pose a similar solution to the second problem of generally improving the student's development as a citizen. This solution is mandatory practical and theoretical service learning for college students. This type of requirement is already installed in the Jepson School and is effective in teaching students citizenship through practical community service and reflection in the classroom. This 1-credit-hour course would be entitled "Service Learning" and would be required for graduation. The student would have to take the course, consisting of mandatory community service hours in conjunction with a theoretical and discussion-oriented course, for one year. This requirement would not only assist the community by providing it with much needed volunteers, but would also develop students as citizens by exposing them to a variety of different cultures, displaying to them how they can serve society as citizens, and, most importantly, providing them with the discussion of citizenship and the community that was lacking in previous volunteer experiences.

These ideas would at least begin to solve the many problems associated with higher education and the preparation of college students for citizenship. Of course, much work needs to be done in the development of these proposed courses. If these ideas are acceptable to you, I will begin the process of form-
ing a task force to look into the possibility of developing these courses. Relating the problem to James MacGregor Burns' book *Leadership*, reform leadership, a type of transforming leadership, will have to occur within the task force. This type of leadership demands "participation of a large number of allies with various reform goals, commitment, persistence, and courage" (Burns, 169). With your cooperation and help, I believe reform leadership can occur and our system of higher education improved. Please send me a memo in response to my research findings and suggestions for solutions.
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Literature Integrated into the Modules of Leadership

Summaries and Articles Included ★
Module I. Introduction and the Concept of Leadership

This module includes an analysis of the issues, the goals, and the study of leadership. It also defines leadership, gives historical conceptions of leadership, and defines many modern theories of leadership. Concerning the implementation of diversity and leadership, the definition of diversity and other relevant terms and concepts must first be established in this introductory module. Articles on this subject must be implemented in order to explain these terms and concepts and how they relate to the Foundations of Leadership course.

Secondly, this module will basically answer the question of why we need to teach leadership for a diverse society. Articles will give statistics, examples, and case studies illustrating the need for diversity awareness and training in modern-day society.
This article begins with a case study of how a small company has built a successful work team by learning how to manage a diverse workforce and implementing a "diversity training" program. This "diversity training" includes teaching employees how to deal with customers from a variety of cultures in addition to teaching them how to deal with co-workers from diverse backgrounds.

Companies began to recognize the importance of diversity training after the publication of Workforce 2000, a report from the Hudson Institute. This publication reported that white males make up a minority of the work force and that 85 percent of the net-growth in the work force will be minorities in the next decade. This report caused companies to recognize that they must foster an environment in which workers of all kinds can flourish and, given opportunities to reach their full potential, can give top performances to a company. As time goes on, executives are becoming more willing to invest in diversity training because of this shift in demographics and because of developments in the market place (more diverse customer base)

If companies want to start managing diversity, the following ideas will help them take action:
1. Assess the company's needs: identify diversity problems through surveys, focus groups, etc.
2. Learn all you can: get exposure to people not like you
3. Curb your assumptions
4. Build diversity into your leadership team
5. Expect backlash
6. Make continuous improvement in communicating a goal
7. Expect and plan for problems between groups of employees
8. Look for ways to adjust your company to the workers

Implementing these steps can help a company thrive and enjoy the present changes instead of becoming overwhelmed and letting the changes harm productivity.
Winning With Diversity

By Sharon Nelson

When Jane Umanoff and Allen B. (Bo) Parsons started a bakery and catering company 15 years ago in New York City, most of their employees were aspiring actors and dancers, mainly white native-born Americans, who worked for them part time.

As the bakery began to grow, however, they found they needed a full-time work force. The first person they hired was a Haitian cleaning man. When they needed another employee, the cleaning man suggested another Haitian. And so it went. "Our original [full-time] staff was quite incredible," recalls Umanoff, who, like Parsons, is white and American-born. "They were very, very smart, dedicated, ambitious people."

The company, Umanoff & Parsons, now does $2 million worth of business a year and has 35 employees. About 90 percent of them are foreign-born—from Haiti, Trinidad, Jamaica, Grenada, the Dominican Republic, and Russia. And that suits Umanoff and Parsons, a husband-wife team, just fine.

Like many business owners throughout the country, they are finding that the labor pool is changing—the ranks of women, minorities, and immigrants are increasing, and those of white males are declining. But Umanoff and Parsons found that they could recruit excellent workers by extending their search beyond the traditional white male candidates. And because they learned early, by trial and error, how to manage a diverse work force, they have built a successful and extremely loyal team.

Other small companies are starting to manage for diversity in a more deliberate way. Debi Kelly, human-resources director for Trader Publications, in San Diego, says that her company has two main concerns. One is creating effective teamwork among its 230 employees, whose makeup now includes whites, blacks, Hispanics, and Asians. The other is managing relationships with customers, who are also growing more diverse.

Trader publishes a variety of magazines that carry classified advertisements for vehicles, boats, houses, and other items. A female employee took offense recently when a client, a male car dealer from the Middle East, demanded to be waited on by a male. As she usually does, the woman began to photograph the vehicle that the man wanted to sell. He tried to pull the camera away from her. A fracas ensued, and police were called.

"It got way out of control," says Kelly. Even though the customer was not in insisting that a man wait on him, he intended no insult, she says, and if the employee had understood more about his culture, she could have handled the situation differently.

Trader wants to address any problems it may have in dealing with diversity, Kelly says. Training to help employees...
Strategies for managing diversity are more important than ever.

The evolution of what were niche markets—Hispanic, Asian, and African-American, for example—into very large mainstream markets is "the compelling force that's causing a lot of executives to say, 'We need to pay attention to this. We need to do something about it,'" says Ann M. Morrison, who directs research in leadership diversity at the Center for Creative Leadership, in La Jolla, Calif., and is the author of the book The New Leaders: Guidelines on Leadership Diversity in America (Jossey-Bass, $25.95).

The report showed that white males are already in a minority in the workplace, and it forecast that 85 percent of net growth in the U.S. labor force throughout the rest of the century will be women who are minorities, or are white men, or are immigrants. Workforce 2000 gave impetus to "managing diversity," a concept that had already begun to take hold in some large corporations. Managing diversity meant, and still means, fostering an environment in which workers of all kinds—men, women, white, black, Hispanic, Asian, Native American, disabled, homosexual, straight, elderly—can flourish and, given opportunities to reach their full potential, contribute at the highest level, can live top performance to a company.

As Trader Publications shows, executives are becoming more willing to invest in diversity not only because of the demographics of the labor force but also because of developments in the marketplace. "If the work force is changing, the customer base is changing, and that's where the clout is for them," says Morrison. "And ways to do that are to move nontraditional managers into decision-making levels where they are visible and where they have a chance to have an impact on the products and the services and the markets." By nontraditional managers, Morrison means those who are female or nonwhite.

Companies everywhere are beginning to feel the change that the Hudson Institute predicted. More than half of the 578 companies responding to a survey conducted in April by the Olsten Corp., a temporary-personnel company based in Westbury, N.Y., reported increases in the numbers of women, racial minorities, immigrants, and the disabled in their entire work forces and in their management ranks.

Programs for people with disabilities are expected to increase dramatically, however, as companies act to comply with the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990. Regulations to bar discrimination in the hiring, promotion, and compensation of the disabled went into effect for companies with 25 or more employees on July 26 and will be extended to businesses with 15 to 24 workers in 1994. (See "Disability Rules Target Job Bias," in the June 1992 issue of Nation's Business.)

Three years ago, the U.S. Department of Labor launched an initiative designed to shatter the "glass ceiling"—artificial barriers that prevent qualified minorities and women from advancing into middle and senior levels of management. In a report issued last year, the department said that its study of nine of the largest American companies found that each had a point beyond which minorities and women had not advanced and that the
glass ceiling existed at a much lower management level than first thought.

Now the Labor Department is turning its attention to smaller businesses. Its Office of Federal Contract Compliance is responsible for seeing to it that companies with federal contracts do not discriminate in employment decisions on the basis of race, sex, color, religion, national origin, disability, or veteran status. Most federal contractors are larger companies, but Labor Secretary Lynn Martin reasons that small businesses of today will be the big companies doing business with the federal government tomorrow; if they begin to take action now to dismantle their own glass ceilings, they will have the basic systems for compliance in place when they are ready to become federal contractors.

In August, the Labor Department and the Small Business Administration announced a joint effort designed to help small businesses eliminate discrimination. "We will create a network of small and medium-sized businesses to disseminate model approaches to breaking the glass ceiling, " says Martin.

Lewis Griggs, the San Francisco-based executive producer of the "Valuing Diversity" film series, says it's in the "bottom-line self-interest" of any business owner to address the issue of diversity. A small-business owner himself, he says: "Don't I want greater diversity inside my organization to help attract more diversity, just like I want it to help sell to my diverse market? And don't I want my management to be more diverse so that I can manage diverse people better?"

The first message Sondra Thiederman wants to get across to business owners is that diversity is manageable and that they can manage it. Thiederman is the president of Cross-Cultural Communications, a San Diego-based training firm, and is the author of Profiting in America's Multicultural Marketplace (Lexington Books, $24.95).

Thiederman says she gets calls from executives who seem frightened by the prospect of addressing the diversity issue. "They're afraid they'll say the wrong thing and offend somebody. I really like to reassure everyone that if your heart is in the right spot, if you genuinely do value these people or even genuinely realize they're who your workers are—whether you like it or not—that your approaches are apt to be fairly safe. You're not apt to make a mistake. If in your heart you're respecting it and you are being racist, it's going to show."

The experts also caution against letting the tough economy stop you from launching a diversity program. "People say it's just such an awful time, and I say this is the time to plan," says Ann Morrison. "This is the time to structure the kinds of things that you can do now and the kinds of things that you will do." Then you'll be ready when the growth starts and there are more jobs, promotion opportunities, and money, she says. "If it isn't planned now, it won't happen later."

If you want to start managing diversity effectively in your company, here are eight ideas to help you take action:

1. Assess your company's needs. In her book The New Leaders, Morrison advises conducting an organizational audit to determine which, if any, diversity problems exist and which need attention first. You can identify problems by using surveys, interviews, focus groups, or a combination of methods.

2. Learn all you can. Get exposure to people who are not like you, Morrison advises. One reason that stereotypes develop, she says, is that "people don't spend enough time with people who are different." Because it's a natural tendency to associate with people like yourself, you may have to take deliberate steps to meet and learn about people who come from different backgrounds. For example, join some local organizations that have more of a cross section of people than the groups you now belong to.

3. Curb your assumptions. Morrison says it's not unusual for a male business owner to assume that a woman will put her family first and won't want a position of power and, consequently, for the owner to base career decisions for her on his biased assumptions.

Your business becomes a victim when you harbor prejudice, she warns. Instead of being objective, you will be making "dysfunctional" decisions that can harm your company.

"Really look at how to make decisions about people and their careers in a way that's more objective, in a way that..."
The Rising Tide Of Older Workers

As you take steps to do a better job of managing diversity in your company, keep older workers in mind. You'll have to anyway, because the work force is growing older.

In 1970, the median age of employees was 28; by the year 2000, it will be nearly 40. Fifty-one percent of the work force will be between the ages of 35 and 54, and 11 to 13 percent will be over 55.

The biggest impact of these changes may be felt by small businesses. More than two-thirds of newly hired workers age 65 or older are hired by firms with fewer than 25 employees, according to a recent U.S. Small Business Administration study.

"The work force may be more stable and experienced, but perhaps less adaptable or mobile," David Jamieson and Julie O'Mara write in their book Managing Workforce 2000 (Jossey-Bass, 1991, $27.50).

The authors say that an older work force will bring with it changes in worker motivation, younger people managing older people "to a greater extent than ever before," declining career opportunities at the top levels of companies that may force companies to reconsider hierarchical structures, and an increased emphasis on health care.

"Reward systems will reflect the values of economically stable older workers, who may prefer sabbaticals, perks, and time off to salary increases or other financial incentives," say Jamieson and O'Mara.

Employers who think of older workers as "outdated" may have to rethink that view. Lynette Larkin, president of Larkin Industries, a $5 million die-cutting and foil-stamping company in St. Paul, Minn., admits that she prefers workers between the ages of 30 and 50. Workers over 50, she has found, don't "want to learn anything new or change."

Nevertheless, when she and her husband started their company in 1976 as entrepreneurs in their early 20s, they depended heavily on a friend and mentor who was in his 50s and a part-time employee of 45 to provide the experience they lacked and to coach them in business.

A company needs both older and younger workers, says Joan Kelly of the American Association of Retired Persons (AARP), based in Washington, D.C. "It's the mix that makes it work." Some companies that have downsized by giving older employees incentives to leave are now realizing that they have lost the "company memory" and some of their best employees, says Kelly, manager of AARP's Business Partnerships program.

"Age is not the qualifying factor," Kelly says. "It's the experience and ability to do the job." But she adds that older workers who want to stay in the work force must be responsible for keeping their skills up to date.

Managers at a seminar on diversity sponsored by the American Management Association were asked to determine how a manager might deal with "George," a supervisor. In this case, two subordinates need shoring up in different deficiencies. George wants to offer training to Howard, whom he describes as "young, energetic, and a quick learner," instead of Jim, who, although he is an expert in his field, is described as "too old" and therefore unlikely to learn. Because money is tight, George can't send both men for training.

The seminar participants agreed that George's manager needed to talk to him about his biased attitude about age.

They also pointed out that the employees' strengths and weaknesses were complementary, so Jim could train Howard in his area of deficiency and Howard could help Jim with his. That way, the group pointed out, the company could enhance the performance of two good employees and save dollars at the same time.

Like these managers, businesses increasingly need new solutions to problems within their employees. The key is finding out old attitudes.

Says Kelly: "Age is not the only thing that matters. It's not the only tool that's needed. It's also the one you've got to work hardest on."

"You have to be afraid and concerned that you're going to lose the best employees," says Howard. "You have to be afraid that they're going to be working with cases of diversity; you must also plan for the development and promotion of your nontraditional workers.

If a company finds it difficult to keep women and minorities, says Morrison, it may be because "they have no visible sign that it's possible to succeed in that organization. There's no one up there who looks like them."

The Stockton Record, a newspaper in Stockton, Calif., has more than 390 employees and serves a county that is 67 percent white and 33 percent minorities. "We have truly one of the most diverse work forces you'll ever find," says publisher Orage Quaries III, who is black. He firmly believes that diversity must reach into the top leadership of a company. In addition to Quaries, the executive committee of the Record consists of another black male, two white females (one is the paper's executive editor), one Hispanic male, and three white males. "We make a concentrated effort to make sure that every committee that we put together reflects our work force and reflects the community," Quaries says.

Fostering diversity at the top was essential to overcoming a lack of trust at Umanoff & Parsons. Years ago, says Bo Parsons, he and Jane Umanoff were seen by their Haitian workers as the "rich, white owners [who] didn't care about them."

To solve the problem, says Umanoff, "we changed our style of management." Naming blacks or Caribbeans as department managers, they learned, was not enough, because the managers still felt they had no authority. "What we had to do," says Umanoff, "was give people authority, responsibility, and accountability. It doesn't matter what race or color you are, that's what you need in order to do your job and feel good about it."

The senior leadership team at Umanoff & Parsons now includes four Caribbean immigrants, one of them a woman. Third in command after the two owners is Jean-Baptiste Brouard, a civil engineer who fled Haiti in 1980. He joined the company at the bottom doing such low-level chores as taking cakes out of pans and glazing baked goods, and he worked his way up to operations manager.

Promoting upward movement of the company's workers, Umanoff cautions, doesn't happen "by magic." It has meant
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Promoting upward movement of the company's workers, Umanoff cautions, doesn't happen "by magic." It has meant...
providing education in supervision for the employees so that they can succeed at their jobs.

“What happens is that everyone becomes more devoted to the company, and it becomes less Bo’s and my company and more ‘our’ company,” says Umanoff.

5. Expect backlash, and take steps to minimize it. Many organizations that have instituted diversity or affirmative-action programs have received adverse reaction from employee groups, particularly white males.

Backlash can’t be avoided altogether, but you can curb it by taking the following actions:

- Include white men at all levels of decision making—including decisions about diversity. Morrison says that most of the 16 model organizations that she researched for her book make efforts to include white men in the task forces, committees, panels, and other groups that are looking at problems and deciding what kinds of changes could be made to solve them.
- Keep everybody, including white men, informed. According to Morrison, there is a perception among white men that all the opportunities—the promotions, the better assignments, the merit pay, and bonuses—are going to women and nonwhites. “And that’s simply not true in most organizations,” she says.

Counter that perception with facts. With a little digging, Morrison says, you can present the information illustrating the pay scales and showing that a lot of white males are still getting promoted.

Try to dispel fear, advises Orage Quarles. It’s important that employees realize that they’re still going to be rewarded on merit. “And that has nothing to do with the color of your skin,” he says. “In approaching diversity, you make a commitment to be reflective of your community. [Employees] then make their own commitments as to how far they want to go with your company.”

- Avoid stereotypes. “I believe that if it is not OK to make jokes about women, blacks, or Asians, it’s not OK to make jokes about white Anglo-Saxon males either,” says Sondra Thiederman. She says she has been in meetings where various groups are being very respectful of one another until someone mentions the white male and others respond, “Well, you know what they’re like.”

When we put down the white male and make him “the new victim,” she says, that makes him “more defensive than he needs to be.”

- Give recognition. “The white men who have been advocates of diversity and to the bottom of the problem. An interpreter was brought in to improve communications between the two sides.

According to Debi Kelly, the human-resources director, the meetings gave the Mexicans an opportunity to voice their feelings that the crew leader was giving preferential treatment to others when tasks were assigned.

The crew leader was able to explain why he gave what were seen as better jobs to the people he chose. A bilingual employee was appointed to continue to serve as an interpreter for the crew leader to facilitate communication.

Once the employees and the crew leader had a chance to communicate, says Kelly, “they worked things out. It’s been fairly quiet [at the warehouse] for a while.”

When you’re managing people who come from a variety of backgrounds, communication is not easy, says Jean-Baptiste Brouard of Umanoff & Parsons. “You have to be very strong in psychology and sociology and be an understanding person.”

7. Expect problems between groups of employees. Jane Umanoff and Bo Parsons thought that because their Haitian workers had been such victims of oppression in their native country, they would naturally be more compassionate toward other workers, especially black workers. Not so. Once the Haitians became a majority, Umanoff says, they began to treat the Senegalese dishwashers “like slaves.”

In meetings with employees, Umanoff and Parsons began to emphasize the spirit of teamwork for all employees, and they began to increase the diversity of the company.

Some problems can develop out of innocence. Sondra Thiederman recalls one potential disaster that was headed off by a training session she conducted for a hospital. A shy Filipino nurse raised her hand and said, “I have a question, and I think it’s a silly question.” Assured that no questions were silly, she asked, “Is ‘nigger’ a bad word?”

“She’s not a minority group, and we were trying to be very sensitive,” she says. “She was very, very embarrassed.”

But Thiederman asks with a shudder, what if the Filipino woman had used the word while on the job?

8. Look for ways to adjust your company to your workers. Traditionally, employees have been expected to conform to the company. If a person wanted to work for a company, he or she had to fit in.

“We do the opposite,” says Bo Parsons. “The culture of our company becomes who works for it. It’s very, very employee-oriented.”

More and more employers are beginning to consider flexible management systems to accommodate the needs of diverse workers. This means not only flexible time but also job sharing, different reward and benefit systems, and other measures that appeal to different workers.

Instead of being overwhelmed by the changes, business owners like Umanoff and Parsons are thriving on them and enjoying the challenges that they present.

Parsons observes with relish that the waves of immigration are accelerating. Right now, he says, the Russians are coming. He advertised for a bookkeeper recently, and of the 80 resumes he received, half of them were from Russians.

“This is like overnight,” he says.

Next, he predicts, it will be people from what was once Yugoslavia. He and Umanoff are ready for them.

Are you?
Diversity is discussed under such labels as civil rights, affirmative action, reverse discrimination, sexism, quotas, and racism. The passion inherent in these matters keeps them alive because it motivates people to take action. The same passion, however, is also a formidable stumbling block to change. Because diversity is such a sore spot, many executives have reluctantly accepted that saying and doing nothing about diversity is the best bet because what you say and do can be held against you. And because of this feeling, many companies in the past have done nothing to address diversity issues and diversity taining.

This article addresses diversity terminology in length, as it is important in understanding diversity problems. The following are relevant terms:

- **black** - used in this book but "African American is also used.
- **minority** - still used but it often seen as offensive because it implies a lesser status. Is also ambiguous in that it sometimes includes women.
- **people of color** - may be a more accurate term to describe African-Americans; is more acceptable than "minority."
- **non-traditional** - used to describe white women, women of color, and men of color.
- **ethnicity** - preferred to the term "race" because it highlights cultural differences as well as physical differences.
- **diversity** - controversial is that it is often used as an alternative to affirmative action, which has taken on negative connotations because of its imposition of "quotas" (means to integrate various layers of the US workforce). Most people define diversity as an appreciation of differences that may impact an organization's performance.

This article also addresses how approaches to diversity have evolved. Basically, because of the current economic situation, people have abandoned many aspects of affirmative action to distinguish diversity as a separate concept. Business performance is emphasized as a reason for diversity rather than the moral imperative. In illustrating the total evolution of the concept of diversity, a variety of approaches taken over the years can be described. Researchers Kim and Palmer outline the following approaches: the golden rule, assimilation, righting of the wrongs, the cultural-specific approach, and the multicultural approach. In finding the best approach, perhaps the most promising combines the multicultural with the righting of the wrongs approaches.
Diversity is discussed under such labels as civil rights, affirmative action, reverse discrimination, quotas, racism, and sexism. The passion inherent in these matters keeps them alive because it motivates people to take drastic action. For example, the 1963 marches, riots, and sit-ins that preceded President Kennedy's advocacy of what was to become the 1964 Civil Rights Act illustrate the dramatic, often passionate actions that have led to significant changes. That same passion, however, is also a formidable stumbling block to change. The deep emotions with which many people approach the diversity issue interfere with their ability to share the information they have, to influence others with logic and sensitivity, and to win over potential allies. As the debate over the most recent civil rights bill flared, even stating one's position on so-called quotas was seen as politically disastrous. One corporate executive requested anonymity before making the following remark, as reported by Fulwood (1991, p. A1): "The rhetoric is so damn hot. A lot of political jockeying is going on, and there's nothing we could say or do that would be in our best interest. So we're remaining mum until the matter is settled." This message is one that many executives and others across the country have reluctantly accepted: saying and doing nothing about diversity is the best bet because whatever you say or do could be used against you. Avoiding controversy is a basic business principle in many organizations, particularly when it involves the complexity and emotionalism of diversity. It is difficult to solve problems concerning differential treatment of people of color and white women when such problems cannot even be discussed. This reluctance to speak out or stand out on diversity matters has kept many organizations from making progress on diversity.

It is risky to address diversity. The organizations in our study that have tried to foster diversity have witnessed painful if not traumatic confrontations among their managers and other employees. A basic point of polarization relates to responsibility. As discussed by Edsall and Edsall (1991), differences between whites and blacks are attributed by some to blacks themselves and attributed by others to the whites who largely fashioned our society. The controversy over whether people of color de-
The term minority is also somewhat ambiguous in that it sometimes includes white women; people of color is currently a more acceptable term. There is apparently no term that encompasses people of color and white women as a group. Even though they share a common distinction in being different from white men and, as we will see, are generally underrepresented in management, they are usually kept separate from each other through phrases such as “women and minorities.” The term non-traditional as applied to managers is used throughout this book to encompass white women, women of color, and men of color, understanding that differences among these groups may be as significant as the recognizable difference from white men that they all have in common. The terms race and ethnicity are also debated. Ethnicity is preferred here because it highlights cultural differences as well as physical differences and because it is the more acceptable term in sociology and anthropology. Use of the word ethnicity does not imply that skin color or other physical characteristics have a lesser effect on how people are treated than does their cultural background.

Even the term diversity is confusing and controversial. The word was not used in human resource circles until a few years ago, but it now pops up regularly in phrases such as “valuing diversity” and “managing diversity.” Diversity is often viewed as an alternative to affirmative action, which has taken on negative connotations because of its association with the government’s imposition of “quotas” and failed attempts to integrate the various layers of the American workforce. To make diversity a more innovative and appealing idea, some people are reluctant to define diversity as anything more than an appreciation of differences that may improve an organization’s performance. These people are reluctant to include the notion of integration or adequate representation in the definition for fear that diversity will come to be viewed as little more than a new label for affirmative action. Yet any reasonable definition of diversity must include integration itself, not simply an awareness of its value. People with diverse backgrounds and physical characteristics must be integrated into the teams that plan and carry out an organization’s activities so that their ideas and skills are used and not merely acknowledged.

The meaning of diversity fluctuates partly because the concept is still evolving, and under rather difficult conditions. More people are vying for jobs today than when affirmative action was first introduced. The consequence of making existing jobs available to more people (who may not have been allowed to compete for those jobs without affirmative action) is that jobs are being lost by white men. In previous years, when jobs seemed more plentiful, this loss was not so keenly felt. The current economic situation, however, has made affirmative action a greater sacrifice. Some advocates of diversity have therefore abandoned many aspects of affirmative action to distinguish diversity as a separate concept. Business performance is emphasized as a reason for diversity rather than the moral imperative that permeated the affirmative action movement. Advocates of diversity also emphasize skills and abilities to avoid the problem that affirmative action came to mean hiring or promoting members of covered groups who are less qualified than their white male cohorts. By making diversity seem as different from affirmative action as possible to avoid the problems and mistakes that occurred in the past, this strategy creates its own set of problems, as we shall see later.

The evolution of the concept of diversity can be illustrated by describing a variety of approaches that have been taken over the years, each of which incorporates different assumptions. Five approaches were recently described by Jean Kim (1991) of Stanford University at a conference on diversity. Her model is a more complex version of the three paradigms described by Judith Palmer in 1989. The approaches outlined by Kim and Palmer are the golden rule, assimilation, righting the wrongs, the culture-specific approach, and the multicultural approach.

In the golden rule approach to diversity, the idea is to treat each individual with civility, prescribed in the Bible as “Do unto others as you would have them do unto you.” According to this approach, the only important differences are individual differences. And since everyone is special and different, everyone should be appreciated and treated the same. Prejudice and systemic oppression are not recognized; individual responsibility
and morality make diversity work. While this approach has a great deal of merit, its major flaw is that the golden rule is applied from one's own frame of reference, without regard for the traditions and preferences of the other person. Moreover, the assumption that sex or racial differences are no more important than such individual differences as baldness or extroversion is insulting to those who have encountered discrimination all of their lives. Because of this, the pretension of "color blindness" and ignoring sex differences in this and the next approach weaken both as viable approaches to diversity.

The second approach, assimilation, calls for shaping people to the style already dominant in an organization. This approach has created considerable conflict for individuals who feel they must abandon their preferred style, companions, dress, or values while they are working. The conflict of "biculturalism" as described in the research of Ella Bell (1988) and others may be particularly difficult for nontraditional employees such as black women, who are expected to adjust to an environment dominated by white men. Assimilation is now generally regarded as a dysfunctional business strategy in this country because the resulting homogeneity may stifle the creativity and breadth of view that is essential to compete in today's market.

Righting the wrongs is an attempt to address the historical injustices that have systematically put at a disadvantage members of specific groups, such as Native Americans, Hispanics, and women in general. These groups are targeted, often one by one, as they reach a critical mass in an organization, to be hired, promoted, and rewarded more equitably. This approach to diversity is closest to the affirmative action concept, but more attention is given to understanding and taking advantage of the unique characteristics of each group to improve the organization's performance. Because group differences and histories are accentuated, a "we versus they" tension often increases the backlash and infighting that interfere with progress.

The culture-specific approach is frequently used to help prepare employees for an international assignment. Employees are taught the norms and practices of another culture so that they can adjust their behavior for that environment; however, little attempt is made to generate an appreciation for the values of that culture. The goal may be to help employees fit in on a superficial level, without any substantive change being involved.

Finally, the multicultural approach involves increasing the consciousness and appreciation of differences associated with the heritage, characteristics, and values of many different groups, as well as respecting the uniqueness of each individual. In this approach, diversity has a broad meaning that encompasses sex and ethnic groups along with groups based on such attributes as nationality, professional discipline, or cognitive style. In contrast to the assimilation model, this approach assumes that the organization must change and that the norms must accommodate a wide range of workers. The explicit goal is to strengthen the organization by leveraging a host of significant differences. Polarization is a lesser problem because so many groups and types of differences are recognized and because self-knowledge and interpersonal skills are often emphasized along with education about other groups.

Some may argue that the multicultural approach should be divided into two approaches, one in which valuing diversity is central and one that actually manages diversity. Roosevelt Thomas (1991), for example, distinguishes between the two in Beyond Race and Gender, noting that empowerment must be built into an organization's systems in order for those systems to work naturally for everyone; the goal of valuing differences may not go far enough to ensure that the core culture and systems are changed. Thomas and others have attempted to define the elements and goals of a multicultural approach (or approaches), but the definitions remain disturbingly vague. One problem pointed out by Palmer is that this approach is so new that no proven methods or even a common language is uniquely associated with it. Another problem is that many aspects of the multicultural approach are not unique but rather extensions of other approaches. Attempts to distinguish this approach from others instead of acknowledging the overlap seem to add to the ambiguity.

Finding the Best Approach to Diversity

It is tempting to argue that, at least in theory, the multicultural approach is the highest evolutionary stage of and the best approach
to diversity. Capturing the unique contributions that everyone has to offer because of his or her background, affiliations, talents, values, or other differences is a worthy goal that is undoubtedly linked to the overall performance of any organization. Other approaches put limits on the types of differences recognized or the means to incorporate them, potentially limiting the positive returns that diversity can yield. In practice, however, the multicultural approach remains largely a mystery. How can we distinguish the extent to which people of color, for example, are advancing because they have been empowered versus because they have benefited from affirmative action? While the theory inherent in the multicultural approach is sound, little guidance is given on how to actually carry it out.

One can argue that the techniques for implementing the multicultural approach can be found in the other approaches. An analysis of how the multicultural approach compares with the other approaches, especially the approach of righting the wrongs, reveals that the differences among them are exaggerated. As noted earlier, the main reason for this exaggeration may well be the perceived need to build distance between a diversity effort and previous affirmative action activities to avoid the stigma attached to the latter. Yet affirmative action is not obsolete because prejudice is not obsolete. Prejudice is still a formidable barrier for nontraditional employees. It would be shortsighted to abandon affirmative action practices in the hope that integration will now occur naturally.

Perhaps the most promising approach to diversity is one that combines the premises and practices of several of the approaches outlined, particularly the goals of the multicultural approach and the affirmative action types of practices in the approach of righting the wrongs. We do group people and assume differences from one group to another. Pervasive stereotypic assumptions about the differences of some groups have a tremendous impact (far greater than assumptions about many individual differences) because they continue to limit opportunities for the millions of individuals in those groups. It would be dysfunctional to discontinue the effort to address large groups of white women and people of color, who have a long history of struggling for equal treatment. An extremely broad definition of diversity is needed for long-term results, but we must avoid spreading too thinly the resources required to ensure progress for some by doing too little for everyone.

The most frightening aspect of moving too hurriedly from affirmative action for targeted groups to promoting the diversity in everyone is that this becomes an excuse for avoiding the continuing problems in achieving equity for people of color and white women. These issues cannot be postponed any longer, even though there are others with differences also worthy of attention. We need to pass through this lengthy, frustrating introductory course in diversity in order to make any meaningful headway in fostering a broader version of diversity. That is why, in our research, we specifically addressed the issues of differential treatment based on sex and ethnicity and the most promising options for solving the problems experienced by people who are different in these respects from white men. While we do not expect that all other differences can be addressed in the same way, we do expect that increasing the acceptance and use of these differences in the upper levels of the workforce is a necessary step in making substantive headway toward diversity in its most encompassing form.

Affirmative action practices should not be limited to recruitment; they should also be used to achieve the goals of multiculturalism that involve developing the potential of all people so that they are able and willing to contribute at the highest possible level. Diversity is needed at the top of organizations just as much as it is needed at the lower levels. One can argue that diversity at the leadership level is necessary to achieve diversity throughout an organization. “Managing diversity” sounds a bit presumptuous, perhaps conveying an image of white men at the top regulating their employees’ affairs from afar. Meaningful diversity involves sharing control with people who are “different.” Leadership diversity helps ensure that control is indeed shared and that progress is stimulated by pressure from those above and across as well as from those below.

Despite these complex considerations, we must proceed to make diversity a firmer reality at all levels of our organiz-
tions. The risks are substantial, including the emotional pain and drain, the political vulnerability, and the personal alienation that accompany many pioneering efforts to encourage continued evolution. We must ask ourselves, “Why?” And then we must figure out how. Part One of this book addresses the question of why the painful process of diversity is needed. The remaining parts focus on how diversity can be achieved, particularly within the leadership ranks of organizations, using as guidelines the lessons from its evolution so far.

Part One examines the rewards that organizations can reap as they take on the difficult and risky challenge of promoting diversity. The substantial benefits of leadership diversity that attract senior executives can be achieved only by overcoming formidable barriers that have accumulated over time.

Readers who are knowledgeable about diversity issues will already be familiar with the potential benefits and the sizable challenges involved in diversity, which are discussed in the first two chapters. Chapter One describes the benefits our research uncovered, often the reasons top management gave for undertaking a diversity effort. Chapter Two discusses the scope and severity of the problems that currently exist in organizations, highlighting the results of our study concerning the barriers that prevent people of color and white women from advancing into senior management posts.

Finally, Chapter Three introduces a model that links the major advancement barriers to key factors in leadership development, a fundamental goal of any leadership diversity effort. This model explains how the barriers deprive many nontraditional managers of the opportunity to develop their leadership capacity in a balanced way.
Module II. The Elements of Leadership

This module includes an analysis of what is involved in the leadership process. The characteristics of a leader, the characteristics of followers, and the leader-follower interactions are focused upon in this module. Issues such as gender, race, and multiculturalism are often discussed in length.

This is a particularly important module for the implementation of teaching leadership for a diverse society into the Foundations of Leadership course. In the integrative literature, visions of multicultural leaders and the status of black leaders today are discussed. Implications of member role differentiation and case studies concerning the roles of multicultural leaders and followers are also given in the literature.

When looking at diversity and leadership, this module really means answering the question of what the characteristics and roles of leaders and followers in a diverse setting should be and how these interactions should be professionally handled.
"Challenges and Opportunities..Black Leadership"-Campell Rock

This article polls some of the most successful African-American leaders for their visions of the challenges and opportunities facing African-Americans as we enter the new century. They give prescriptions for successful leadership in the 20th century. Some of the leaders polled include Governor L. Douglas Wilder of Virginia, Mayor Sharon Pratt Dixon of D.C., Professor Barbara Jordan of the University of Texas, and Congressman William Gray III of Pennsylvania.

Seeing and understanding the perspectives of these black leaders and knowing what these leaders feel needs to be done to address the challenges of black leadership will help students understand the status of black leadership and their visions for the future.
The Challenges and Opportunities Facing African Americans In The 21st Century
The Visions of Black Leadership

by C.C. Campbell-Rock

In keeping with the mission of THE BLACK COLLEGIAN Magazine’s 20th Anniversary Commemorative Issue—that this collector's item edition would offer signposts and pathfinders to guide African Americans into the 21st century—we polled some of the most visible, most successful role models and leaders among us for their visions of the challenges and opportunities facing African Americans as we enter the new century. Here, then, are prescriptions for success in the 21st century from the minds of the following visionaries...

Governor Lawrence Douglas Wilder
Commonwealth of Virginia

We, as Americans, must recognize that along with the rights integral to the freedom we cherish come certain responsibilities; chief among these, accountability. Accountability means controlling one’s own destiny, not looking for excuses to fail, making the most of the precious freedom for which others have made the ultimate sacrifice and, finally, forever doing one’s individual part to carry on the fight for human rights and for human dignity at home and abroad.

How can we begin to tackle such problems as drug addiction, gang violence, drop outs, and teen pregnancy, when our society is so woefully lacking in role models in the home, community, and media?

More than ever before, our young people need the influence of positive role models, individuals who can inspire in them, a respect for the past and a longing for a better future. We all need to work for a society of absolute inclusion, rather than preying on the self-serving politics of racial division and hatred.

But I believe that we have every reason to be optimistic for the future. The hour has arrived for strengthening the foundation of American values. The voice of reason and the hands of action must reassert themselves, to save this generation and to provide direction and stability for the next, to begin building for a better tomorrow.

These voices are ours. These hands are ours. Now, let us put both to work to make the future ours.

I commend THE BLACK COLLEGIAN Magazine and all who are committed both to its spirit and to its dreams. May they carry you, your generation, and our nation to the heights of greater understanding among all people in this nation and throughout the world, and an everlasting commitment to the betterment of the common good.

Mayor Sharon Pratt Dixon
Government of the District of Columbia
Washington, DC

When I was a child coming out of high school a number of years ago, President Kennedy said, “Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country.” Sadly, many years later, my daughters who came out of high school along with many of you heard a different message: “Are you better off today than you were four years ago?” As President Reagan made clear, the ethic of the 1980s had become one of indulging only in short-term, personal interests—one of determining success by what we gain instead of what we give. Consequently, almost every problem we have today can be traced to this ethic.

You are now in the position to determine the ethic of the 21st century. You can help our country regain a sense of individual responsibility to the larger group, instead of merely to the larger personal gain. It is therefore imperative that you choose to lead by example—that you go about your lives and professions practicing, not preaching, what must be done to improve the quality of life. As African Americans, your personal, hands-on involvement in your community and in your government can make America great again.

Chuck D
Public Enemy
New York, NY

I think the lack of networking amongst the people with different skills—what few skills that we do have available in our community—is the
major challenge facing us. I don’t think everyone knows the same thing at the same time, and that’s where mass media comes in.

We’ve got too many areas that are just not in contact with each other. Black Philadelphia is different from Black New York, which is different from Black Tupelo, Mississippi. So, I think we need something that reaches out from our perspective and tells us what’s going on in each one of our areas at the same time.

We need something like a CNN, but a Black News Network, a BNN, which would combine all of the above, to let everybody know there are people out there who can do and there are people out there who are doing.

We need to be paid back by the government and subsidized in a lot of areas, but with a game plan that will work for everybody.

If we don’t get reparations and we’re not able to build Black elementary schools and high schools and establish a foundation of information, then we’re not going to be able to fix the problems. You can’t fix a motor if you have no tools.

But, I’m a realist. I know forty acres and a mule, with interest, ain’t gonna happen. So, you try to come up with something to pull a network together. I’m also realistic enough to know that if we don’t do certain things, it’s not going to get better. We have to understand that we have to take back what’s owed, but that can only come with collective effort.

A BNN is a move for the 21st century. And that network being subsidized by the government could be a step toward reparations being paid to Blacks . . . us being able to educate ourselves about ourselves and everybody else on where we’re coming from.

If you know government is not going to change, I think the churches and community organizations have a responsibility to become more Black. That’s how you’ll be able to teach a curriculum inside the community.

Black churches must realize we’re in a state of war and take a more aggressive stance on educating the community.

The bottom line is networking and understanding the need for a network and understanding the need for unity, within a teamwork frame. We’ve got to play ball with each other. And the ones who don’t want to play ball: Yo, bench ‘em!

Professor Barbara Jordan
The Lyndon B. Johnson
Centennial Chair in National Policy
L.B.J. School of Public Affairs
University of Texas at Austin

The challenge which faces African Americans as we go into the future is the same challenge that has impacted us and faced us in the past and in the present. It is the challenge of inclusion.

There remain the areas of activity which persist in excluding Blacks. Our representation has only been token representation. When we look at the Fortune 500 companies and their chief executive officers, when we look at the presidents of major corporations, when we look at these arenas of activity which remain enclaves of white, Anglo-Saxon Protestants, we know that there are places where African Americans remain excluded.

So, the challenge is one of inclusion. Why is it that we have continued to face the scourge of discrimination and segregation in employment, social arenas, business and managerial capacities? It is the scourge of color which excludes us. We know that, historically, African Americans warned America that the problem of color would be the most intractable, the most difficult one to manage.

I believe that the response of African Americans has to be a political response, because politics is the gateway to empowerment. Therefore, it becomes absolutely essential for African Americans to coalesce with those people who can change their minds and expand the total blanket of inclusion for this country.

But something has to happen before political empowerment, and that’s economic empowerment. You cannot be successful in the political arena if you do not have the dollars and cents which contribute to the various things which are indicators of success.

I believe that, over time, we will be able to coalesce in a unified way; those African Americans who have been successful, will reach out, expand, draw in those who have not always been as successful, and as a unified and cohesive group prod and pricking the consciousness of America, we will be able to, at some point, finally get behind those things which have been done which keeps us on the outside of American life.

Education remains the key to both economic and political empowerment. That is why the schools which are in charge of educating African Americans have, perhaps, the longest, the greatest, the deepest challenge of all to get into the minds of young African Americans so that they recognize opportunity will come to those who are prepared.

I believe that education will be the base, the absolute, undeniable base for the accomplishment of economic and political empowerment. If those three challenges are met, I feel that the overwhelming challenge of inclusion will be responded to affirmatively and positively by African Americans.

Once the overwhelming and undergirding challenge of inclusion is met, we can then say with celebration and conviction, ‘America is truly the land of free people and the home of justice.’
The challenge for Black people, as we go into the 21st century, is one of being prepared for opportunity. Although racism is a very serious problem, the primary problem in the Black community is poverty and the results of poverty. Some of those results we see manifested as undereducation and uneducation.

The 21st century, which is nine years from now, will necessitate people who have information, and information is largely acquired through formal education. People who are not educated and not going to be a desirable component of the workforce of this country.

The workforce in America by year 2000 will be over 50 percent nonwhite and female. Corporate America will not be able to maintain its worldwide competitive position, especially with Japan and, to a lesser extent, with Germany, unless nonwhite people and women are brought into the workforce. But we cannot be brought into the workforce if we are not trained. And we will not be trained if we do not get a college education.

Of all of the generations of Blacks we have produced in America, no one has had a greater opportunity and no generation has had a greater challenge than this current generation. We are not going to change our relative status with quotas. We are going to change our relative status with being able to compete, one-on-one, with every other ethnic and racial group in this country.

If we do not decide to do that and if we do not prepare ourselves as a community to do that, especially those who are in college, we will not survive in America.

Bishop George Augustus Stallings, Jr. Founder, Imani Temple & African American Catholic Congregation

The greatest challenge facing the African-American community is preparing a race of people to take charge of its own destiny, moved by the genius of its culture to reach full maturity in every aspect — spirituality, economics, politics, culture, education and psychology — and to understand that we must name and claim ourselves, and through self-determination and empowerment to take ownership and control over our lives.

That first agenda is our goal and the objective must begin with an educational process, that we as African Americans must know our heritage, research our roots, because it is in that rootedness of our African identity that we come to understand who we are and to whom we belong.

But the one question I constantly asked African American students on my college and university visitations was, 'Who are you and to whom do you belong?' It's a question of identity. And in order for us, as African Americans, to take charge of our own destinies, we have to answer, 'Who are we?'

In order for that identity to be known, we've got to understand our heritage, our ethnicity, our development of an Afrocentric consciousness, and then we can begin to change the masses. Until we undergo that educational process of self-discovery, we will constantly be a people who are dependent on someone else and live by someone else's definition of us.

Another objective is economic empowerment. We have in excess of $350 to $380 billion dollars a year in our hands, yet we spend only five percent of that with another African-American person. We have to begin to support ourselves economically; let that dollar turn over more than one time in the Black community.

We've got to begin to change the economic picture in our community. Which means, we've got to not only invest in our own professionals, persons with businesses, but also put our money in Black banks, Black press. Black institutions, so that we can control that dollar and truly compete with the ninth richest nation in the world, as far as gross national product.

We have to invest in our young people. That investment takes place when we give them a sense of who they are, which will enable them to hold their heads up high and make the necessary sacrifices and investment in themselves.

The hope and salvation of America is in the African-American community. What better segment of the African-American community than those who are on the college and university level to affect changes with this renewed, Afrocentric approach to life.


Whatever one thinks of the wisdom of American involvement in the Persian Gulf, African Americans in the Persian Gulf were involved at top levels from Colin Powell on down. They
commanded units, did jobs that took sophisticated technical know-how, and in general achieved a level of responsibility unparalleled in our history. That’s progress, and a timely starting point when we consider the mixed bag of opportunity and obstacles faced by African Americans as we approach the 21st century.

There are examples of progress in civilian life, too. Over the last fifty years, African Americans have seen incomes increase, health and life expectancy improve dramatically and education levels soar. Examples abound of African Americans who have taken advantage of the new opportunities, whether Doug Wilder, the governor of Virginia, or the hundreds of thousands of African Americans who are not celebrities, working as doctors or lawyers, or as engineers with companies that wouldn’t have let them in door a generation back.

But there are worrisome signs, too. Most of that progress came before the last two decades; the record since THE BLACK COLLEGIAN began publishing is one chiefly of stagnation. A third of African-American families are poor—triple the rate for white families. ...Throughout the 80s, while reading scores of African Americans went up, the number of African Americans getting college degrees went down eight percent.

Last year, the number of young African-American men in prison — 609,690—was greater than the total number of African-American men of all ages in college. And during the 100-hour ground war with Iraq, more African-American males were killed in American streets than in Kuwait.

How do we confront this mixture of opportunity and obstacle? First, African Americans must realize the fight for equal opportunity is not over. Section 1, while we should fight for programs from Washington that can help give African Americans a fair shake, this is a battle we’ll have to win for ourselves.

Roy S. Roberts
Manufacturing Manager,
Cadillac Motor Division
General Motors Corporation

Education is what separates vision from wishful thinking. Quality education is not just a Black challenge. It is everybody's challenge. Studies show that the greatest influx of new workers in the 21st century will come from women and minorities. This presents our people with a great opportunity. The question is, ‘Will we be prepared to take advantage of it?’

Today, three out of five African-American males drop out of school... 700,000 American children graduate from high school functionally illiterate... and there are more African-American males, between the ages of 18 and 24, in prison, than are in this nation’s colleges and universities.

That’s a national tragedy...a waste of resources. Haven’t we worked too hard to prove our first-class status to let our children inherit a second-class nation?

Every American needs to share the dream and join the campaign for both improved education and a better blending of all minorities into the American workplace.

Whether or not a young person shares the dream and aspires to greatness is in the hands of the individual, his family, and the role models who shape his values. Whether or not a competitive education is available is in the hands of society.

John E. Jacob
President & CEO
National Urban League

The National Urban League has challenged the nation to achieve parity for African Americans by the year 2000. It is essential that we face this challenge now when half of all Black children grow up in poverty, when Black unemployment rates are two-and-a-half times those of whites, and when our life expectancy is seven years behind that of whites.

We are approaching a window of opportunity that can transform our future. This nation is facing two simultaneous revolutions—a demographic revolution and an economic revolution. More of our total population is composed of African Americans and other minorities than ever before.

Economically, America is competing in a global marketplace in which technology has changed the nature of national prosperity. Yesterday, natural resources made a country wealthy; today, it is human resources—the brain power of educated people capable of mastering new technologies and new ways of thinking.

The National Urban League has called on America to establish an Urban Marshall Plan to develop our skills as a nation. If we invest in America's human capital, in our minorities, we will make our country economically competitive and solve the urban problems at the same time.

Martin Luther King III
Commissioner, Fulton County, Georgia

During the Civil Rights Movement, a generation of college students rose up and helped lead a nonviolent movement that put an end to segregation and a misguided war in Vietnam. Today, history is calling on this generation of students to rise up and help
us put an end to apartheid, hunger and deprivation, military conflict, and an end to the arms race for all time.

It is time for this generation of Black students to rise up again in a magnificent display of solidarity, time to seize history by the reins, as our brothers and sisters are doing in South Africa and around the world, time to wage an unconditional war, not on any nation of people, but on poverty, racism, and violence. It's time to put an end to bigotry and brutality and to join together in the spirit of nonviolence until we create a new world order based not on military superiority, but on moral excellence and a decent life for people of every race and every nation.

In nonviolence, we do have power—a great untapped power that young people have used to overthrow tyrants, stop wars, and revolutionize their societies. It's the same power Mahatma Gandhi used to bring the sun down on the British empire and create the world's largest democracy. It's the same power a 25 year old preacher named Martin Luther King, Jr. used to fight racial injustice wherever he found it.

Let us, with love and courage, pick up the torch of nonviolence and carry it forward with unrelenting passion and commitment, until the dream is made real in America, in South Africa, the Middle East and all over the world.

U.S. Congressman Ronald V. Dellums 8th Congressional District, California Former Chair, Congressional Black Caucus

The challenge for African Americans in the 21st century is to reevaluate the way we look at problems. So often we choose which battles to fight based on whether it is considered a "Black" issue. Every issue that touches our lives, positively or negatively, should concern African Americans and needs to be addressed by our institutions.

I have always believed the priorities of any country can be determined by the way it spends its money. For too long, the African-American community has not made its voice heard when these important decisions are made.

In 1990, the Congressional Black Caucus introduced a comprehensive budget proposal that established a long-term commitment to alleviating the suffering of the most disadvantaged and powerless among us. The alternative budget called for an end to the permanent war mentality that plagues our country. To my surprise, however, it was mostly white-led, progressive organizations that jumped to support the CBC budget.

It is also important that we recognize those issues that affect us in a disproportionate way. Racism still remains as an obstacle in the way of progress. The drug culture continues to siphon away some of our strongest and brightest young people.

The answer is not to throw up our hands in frustration and wait for someone else to solve the problem. We must get involved in every step of the process where decisions are being made. If we leave it up to others to establish the new world order, we should not be surprised when our interests are ignored.

Dr. Benjamin L. Hooks Executive Director/CEO NAACP

Education will continue to be the key that can open the doors of opportunity for African Americans as we move into the next century. Increasingly, we will see Black faces in unaccustomed positions of power, influence, and leadership as this nation moves closer to what it has to be if it is to retain its role in tomorrow's world—a truly integrated and multiracial society.

There is simply no other way not with minorities comprising an increasing share of the nation's workforce.

Of course, there will be temporary setbacks; racism and prejudice do not give way easily. However, it will be through the power of our trained minds that we will overcome these obstacles. This has been the story of our experience in this country. This will continue to be our story. We have no reason to be anything but confident about the 21st century.

Dolores R. Spikes President Southern University System

The projected demographics of America for the 21st century present both challenges and opportunities for African Americans. In many areas of the nation, political gains, in terms of elected and appointed officials, will continue to increase. Alliances with other minority groups can provide an even mightier political force, locally, regionally, and nationally.

The picture does not yet seem as bright on the economic side. Here, African Americans will have to use

Continued on page 156
political gains and muscle to insist that a much greater percentage of African Americans has the opportunities, resources and support network to attain levels of educational achievement necessary for competitiveness and productivity in the workforce.

African Americans must be fully "educated" in the sense that education prepares one not just for a job, but also for a quality of life that speaks to one's cultural and aesthetic growth, well-being, both physically and mentally, ability to engage in lifelong learning, development of a sense of service and commitment to the uplifting of all mankind, as well as to one's successful engagement in a career.

A technology and information-based 21st century can ill afford an underclass, particularly an underclass that is disproportionately represented by minorities. Avoidance of this dilemma will clearly depend on educational and economic gains.

The stages must be set now so that the curtains may rise on tomorrow.

---
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We believe that the single most thing Black people must achieve in the 21st century is to recapture retention of the mind, an autonomous mindset, one that is regenerative and self-generating. It is the mind, historically, that has been the chief instrument in the elevation and empowerment of a people.

Money? In the Black psychology of money, money goes in and out of our hands like a phantasmagoric dream. It's a new attitude toward money that we must make paramount. We need mind over money. If we decide to stay away from movie houses and department stores for a while, many of them would have to close. This worked well in Montgomery to change white minds as well as ours when we decided to stay away from busses.

Which leads us to power, where right away we run up against a mental condition, our dependency complex. As Carter G. Woodson wrote more than half a century ago in The Miseducation of the Negro, "Any people that has been in the same political party for fifty years (speaking then of Blacks and the Republican Party) without getting anything out of it, deserve to be oppressed."
Since that time, we have been in the Democratic Party for fifty years.

Our dependent mindset interlocks with everything else we do. In the family, we are challenged to regain and retain control of our children’s minds. We must care for our own “fragile-care infants” (crack babies to you) and our own foster children.

Finally, Black unity has to grow out of a new Black social mindset. Presently, we equate unity with unity of opinion, when what we must have is unity of race or struggle; even when there can be no unity of opinion, understanding that race—not class or gender or whatnot—is the quality that cuts through everything else in our oppression.

We need unity across the living generations, reviving in children respect for adults and parents and grandparents, resurrecting through discipline a sense of self-sufficiency, of self-initiative and self-control. We must rekindle respect for Black people generally, because only in learning to love one another can we truly learn to love ourselves.

We must relinquish our simplistic desire to be accepted by our white oppressors. We must propagate and sustain continual Black stands on major issues of the day, breaking out of our reflexive fixation on the simple tactics of social work-styled remediation to assume our rightful place at the forefront of those who propose to create the social designs that reshape a tentatively emerging world.

Earl G. Graves
President, Earl Graves LTD
Editor & Publisher
Black Enterprise Magazine

We have moved away from a supportive community-based lifestyle toward a more complex urban environment that places a high priority on individualism and technology. And in this transformation, our demand for quality education has lost some of its fervor.

If you believe I am in error, I suggest you look around you at the status of the education we are providing our young people—particularly our young Black males.

In many of our urban areas, the high school dropout rate for Black males is nearly 40 percent. The college enrollment of Black males is dropping and, sadly, there are more Black men in prison than on college campuses. The leading cause of death for young Black males between the ages of 18 and 25 is homicide.

Unless African Americans begin to care more about the quality of education our young people are receiving in the public schools, far too many of these schools are going to continue to shortchange our children.

As I travel across this country, I am encouraged by a rising tide of concern about our schools. The number of business education initiatives between 1984 and 1988, rose by 234 percent—from some 42,000 to over 104,000. They run the gamut from curriculum development and teacher training to scholarships and grants for equipment. They involve a number of the nation’s leading firms such as Kodak, IBM and Pepsi-Cola.

These business people are motivated not only by a sense of social responsibility, but also by the reality that by the year 2000, roughly half of all new workers will be minorities and women. And if our children do not have the education to answer the needs of industry and business, they will be in trouble.

Many of our social clubs, fraternities, sororities, professional groups, our businesses and mostly our churches, are also beginning to provide more and more tutoring, mentoring, and other services to aid our young people.

All these efforts and the many others taking place in so many different places convince me that African Americans will answer the call to restore the meaning of education to our young people.

We have answered challenges before. We will do it again. This is a struggle we cannot afford to lose.

Kenneth I. Chenault
President, Consumer Card & Financial Group Services
American Express Company

I think the increasing diversity of the workforce and society in general—meaning that the “minority” population will become the majority by the year 2000—gives us the critical mass necessary to gain a fair amount of political and economic leverage.

Every type of institution is going to have to deal with African Americans, not only because of the long-time social inequity and fairness issues, but just because of our sheer numbers. I think that we are going to be able to play a more dominant role because institutions and companies will not be able to function without utilizing minorities—they will have no choice.

From a challenge standpoint, we have not moved forward enough on the educational side and the income side, so we are going to have to substantially improve educational opportunities for African Americans at every level, and the African-American com-
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The challenge we face is simply the question of 'How can we as a people reaffirm our commitment to succeed as a people rather than individuals?'

The opportunity is to take advantage of a tremendous increase in the Black population as a force not only in the United States, but around the globe, and to marshal those resources in a way that will help us become more competitive in the '90s.

We are one of the fastest growing populations in this country. We're gaining political power by the fact that we vote as a bloc, and we're becoming dominant as elected officials in major Black and urban markets. So we've got a lot of positives going for us; it's just a question of can we mobilize those positives.
The Status of Black Leadership: Implications for Black Followers in the 1980s by King Davis

The purpose of this article is to explore a range of basic questions that help to expand the conceptual framework for understanding the historical, current, and future direction of black leadership, followership, organizations, and movements. The following questions are posed in the article:

1. How is black leadership defined and to what extent do the parameters and characteristics of black leaders differ from those black followers, organizations, and movements?
2. What confluence factors appears to be related to the growth and development of black leaders, followers, organizations, and movements?
3. What issues and factors tend to influence the black leadership role?
4. What is the nature of the relationship among black leaders, followers, and organizations?

In discussing these questions, the following are described: definitions of major terms and concepts, factors giving rise to black leadership status, factors that link black leaders, followers, and organizations, the status of the black movement, and factors that influence black leadership performance.

The author reaches two interrelated conclusions during the article. On one hand, the myriad of inequities that have historically precipitated black social change movements continue. The form of these inequities has changed in that they are less overt while remaining pernicious. On the other hand, there have been substantive changes in all phases of the black movement: many traditional black leaders have died; alternative leaders have not yet attracted and sustained a following; followers have declined numerically, and in some instances, have attached themselves to organizations whose strategies are more conciliatory than confronting. The black movement, however, is far from dead. As long as oppression persists, it is likely that the black social change movement will continue to function, even though it changes form and direction. The question for this decade is not whether the black movement will survive, not what form and ideological direction it will take.
The Status of Black Leadership: Implications for Black Followers in the 1980s

KING E. DAVIS

Almost since the start of involuntary immigration of West Africans to the North American Continent, a confluence of economic, political, ethical, and racial inequities have created a climate for, as well as stimulated the growth and development of, forms of black leadership, followers, organizations, and movements. Concomitantly, this same set of inequities served to stimulate debate and confusion regarding the overall functions of black leaders, the goals of black organizations, and the extent to which black people participate as followers. As a result of these polemics, black leaders, followers, and organizations, while needed and supported by black populations (Hinds, 1979; Kerner, 1968; Ross, 1978; and Theoharis, 1978),

Some critics of black leaders (Washington, 1978) promulgate the generalization that black leaders, followers, and organizations are "communist inspired." This generalization has been used to rationalize unconstitutional governmental investigation, surveillance, and disruption. In numerous instances, surreptitious efforts have been made (such as those authorized by J. Edgar Hoover) to discredit black leaders (most notably Martin Luther King, Jr.), reduce their stature among their followers, and destroy their organizations ("As Charges Mount Against the FBI," 1976; Gayle, 1980; McClory, 1979; and Washington, 1978). Some observers (Clark & Wilkins, 1973; Washington, 1978) propose that the covert activities of the FBI con-
tributed directly to the deaths of several black leaders.

The United States Constitution, nonetheless, supports and encourages private citizens to organize and petition the government for change (Nelson, 1968). The realization that government officials, charged with protecting constitutional rights and guarantees, could ignore the constitutional rights of black leaders, followers, and organizations underlies the fear that often surrounds efforts by blacks to organize.

Faced with these dilemmas of unconstitutional opposition, black leaders, followers, organizations, and movements were profoundly changed between 1968 and 1980. The most significant events in this recent history are the death of Martin Luther King, Jr., the shift in ideologies from protesting to conciliatory, a drastic change in the amount and source of operating capital (Davis, 1980), the intrusion of the FBI into activities of black organizations, and the ascendance of materialistic values and the doctrine of individualism.

PURPOSE AND SUBSTANTIVE QUESTIONS

The purpose of this essay is to postulate and explore a range of basic questions that help to expand the conceptual framework for understanding the historical, current, and future direction of black leadership, followership, organizations, and movements.

1. How is black leadership defined and to what extent do the parameters and characteristics of black leaders differ from those of black followers, organizations, and movements?

2. What confluence of factors appears to be related to the growth and development of black leaders, followers, organizations, and movements?

3. What issues and factors tend to influence the black leadership role?

4. What is the nature of the relationship among black leaders, followers, and organizations?

Definitions of major terms/concepts

Stogdill's work (1974) reminds us that there are innumerable definitions of leadership and suggests the need to offer tentative definitions of black leadership, followership, organizations, and movements.

Black leaders are able to identify and respond to the problems, policies, conditions, and needs that determine (or are inimical to) the quality of life of black people. As a result, such leaders are able to develop, implement, and evaluate probable solutions, as well as stimulate a following of black people who are moved toward eliminating or modifying the problem, policies, conditions, or unmet needs. This definition of black leadership is similar to the general definition developed by Burns (1978), who stresses the importance of conceptualizing leadership as a reciprocal relationship between leaders and followers, circumscribed around the meeting of needs. Based on Burns's leadership typology (transforming vs. transactional), one can conclude that while leaders in the society at large may fit either type, the needs and experiences of the black population may dictate a greater emphasis on transformational leadership, with high moral standards.

Weber's treatment of leadership (see Cofer, 1971), while it emphasized charisma and authority, also defined leadership as basically a functional relationship between leaders and followers. In that Weber proposed that the leadership role derived from the followers' basic beliefs about the goals that were proposed for achievement, however, Weber's view differed from Burns's.

Black followers, on the other hand, are stimulated by, and sensitive to, a problem, policy, condition, or need that influences (or is inimical to) the quality of life of black people. As a result, these followers voluntarily respond to and follow the direction charted by (or mutually arrived at with) black leadership. Implied here is the notion that black followers must have the opportunity to select among leaders. Burns (1978) and Stogdill (1974) imply that there are some endemic problems associated with the leader/follower relationship in those instances where the leader is self-appointed, appointed by groups outside the followers, or motivated by factors other than the needs of the followers.

Black organizations are viewed as the formalized mechanisms through which the relationship, interaction, support, energies, resources, plans, activities, and philosophies of black leaders and followers develop collectively toward the achievement of identified goals and needs.

Black movements represent the combined activities, responses, resources, and plans of several organizations, groups of followers, and leaders aimed generally at eliminating a problem, policy, or condition (i.e., segregation) that is viewed as inimical to the quality of life of all black people in the country or within a given region.

FACTORS GIVING RISE TO BLACK LEADERSHIP/STATUS

Gunnar Myrdal (1944) has proposed that the American propensity to form and join associations is not circumscribed by race. In fact, he found that blacks tended to be more frequent participants in specific social organizations and associations than whites. While Myrdal's classic treatise does propose a relationship between Americanization and participation, we must look further for an understanding of what factors give rise to the development of black leadership.

Burns (1978) proposes a complex of factors that relate to leadership development. He suggests that such factors as personal motivation, awareness of societal need, early psychological experiences, and family characteristics combine to stimulate a desire for leadership on the part of a prospective leader. Stogdill (1974), in his review of the literature on leadership, identifies six different perspectives that are viewed as explanations for leadership development.

While Burns and Stogdill focused on leadership development in the larger society, Thompson's (1963) assessment of black leadership development identifies two major factors: the leader's recognition of unmet social needs and the persistence of inequity in the distribution of opportunities.

Each set of factors cited by Burns (1978), Stogdill (1974), and Thompson (1963) helps to expand our perspective on the personal and societal factors that influence leadership. It appears that at least four interrelated factors help explain why specific persons are selected for: leadership roles in black communities.
The first of these factors is the absence of political equity (Thompson, 1963). Political equity involves a complex set of issues and conditions related to one's right to vote, opportunity to hold public office, or be assured equitable representation in accord with the laws of the nation. Governmental analysis (Kerner, 1968) established that black populations were often denied access to the political arena, and black populations were denied the most basic rights accorded to American citizens under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. It is hypothesized that there is a direct correlation between the extent (and activity) of black leadership, followers, and organizations and the degree to which black populations have equitable or reasonable access to the political system (that is not to suggest that there would not be a process of black leadership and a distinct cadre of black followers in a system in which rights were distributed equitably). One could surmise that the concerns of black leadership, in a more equitable system, would be with substantially different issues.

While there have been significant and visible increases in various aspects of black access to the political institutions of U.S. society (e.g., elected officials, increase in registered voters), black leaders continue to educate followers about the need for efforts to ensure that their gains are not dissipated by conservative policies (Williams, Note 1). The continued presence of political inequities is a prime factor in the maintenance of black organizations such as the Voter Education Project and the Joint Center for Political Change (Thompson, Note 2).

A second factor giving rise to black leaders and followers is the absence of adequate economic opportunity. Only minimal changes in the distribution of wealth in the United States have occurred since the mid-1940s (Brimmer, Note 3). While there has been an increase in the income of black populations, Hill (1981) points out that significant black progress is more an illusion than a reality. Government studies (Coleman, 1977) point out the continuation of serious inequities in economic status between blacks and whites.

A third fact is continued violence against black people and a failure on the part of government to respond to the need for police protection in black neighborhoods (Kerner, 1968; Conyers, 1981).

The fourth factor giving rise to black leadership is the historical absence of access to public accommodations. Racially segregated schools, parks, and transportation (most overt in Southern states) were the most visible inequities in the society and became the primary stimuli for the emergence of such black leaders as Martin Luther King, Jr., his civil rights followers, and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC).

While the absence of access to public accommodations (now largely resolved) was a significant issue that helped to solidify black leadership and followers, the tendency to characterize black community problems in relationship to this singular issue may have inadvertently skewed the civil rights movement, and its leadership, from other substantive issues. For example, if black leaders and followers (as well as white supporters) tend to conceptualize the major dilemmas of the black population in terms of public accommodations, whenever the semblance of these rights are obtained (right to vote, school integration, nonsegregated transportation) the thrust of leadership and organization becomes blunted and the willingness of individuals to function as followers subsequently declines.

Since other substantive issues that face black populations are less visible, black leadership may experience a considerable decline in following after concrete goals are achieved. For example, in the historical Brown vs. Board of Education, the five suits in the case were conceptualized as a problem of separate and yet inherently unequal school facilities, resources, and opportunity (Jones, 1979). It seems appropriate to view the Topeka case multidimensionally and to include as a major problem the concentration of decision making, since the apportionment process did not allow for black participation in an equal or fair manner, which in the ultimate local authority to decide regarding the distribution of school resources and facilities. To a great extent, this concentration of decision making has not changed in Topeka or in other cities that were characterized by segregated school systems.

Each of the factors cited here suggests that a key to understanding the historic development of black leadership and followers has been the failure of the U.S. government (and society) to provide black citizens with rudimentary rights, guarantees, and protections covered by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights (Kerner, 1968). In effect, representative government has failed historically to meet the human needs and civil rights of blacks, thus stimulating the need for alternative leaders and movements within the black population.

This major expectation helps clarify the linkage between black leaders and their followers and organizations and why black leaders, oriented toward social change, continue to emerge. One could hypothesize that the nature of black leadership, followers, organizations, and movements would change logically in direct proportion to substantive changes in the distribution of resources and the long overdue implementation of constitutional guarantees.

**FACTORS THAT LINK BLACK LEADERS, FOLLOWERS, AND ORGANIZATIONS**

Given the relative constancy of institutional inaccessibility and the invertebrate maldistribution of resources and decision making, reciprocal expectations between black leaders and followers may have changed only minimally over the past 350 years. While one cannot deny that the interrelationship between leaders and followers and the process of leadership development appear to be universal in all human groupings (Burns, 1978), there seems to be a unique role demanded of leadership in groups that are oppressed, denied, or alienated from those societal institutions that determine the quality of life (Hamilton, 1981). The leaders of oppressed groups are faced inevitably with the formidable goals of social change and redistribution of decisions and resources (Burns, 1978) while leaders of numerically, militarily, and economically dominant groups have a less formidable task of managing resources and opportunities in such a way as to maintain the status quo.

Few studies have examined in detail the nature of the dynamic internal relationship between black leaders and followers. A few studies (Thompson, 1963; Bowens, Note 4) have explored the impact that personal charis-
ma has in stimulating followership. Only limited work, however, has been devoted to the identification of independent variables related to black leader-follower relationships.

The variables that are proposed here are seen as being of value in understanding the ubiquitous forces that guide, reinforce, maintain, or destroy black leader-follower relationships once they are stimulated by broader societal forces. These variables are also potentially useful in understanding shifts and modifications in such relationships. For example, it is proposed that a reduction in any one of these variables has a potential of producing significant changes in leader-follower relationships and subsequently in black organizations and movements. For example, a decline in trust between black leaders or followers is only one variable that would impair the functional relationship between black leaders and their followers and would inhibit the functioning of black organizations.

It should be recognized that the maintenance of these variables is not simply a function of black leaders, followers, or organizations. Numerous forces, some external to black communities, have the potential for enhancing or reducing these interactive variables and thus the qualitative nature of the relationship between black leaders and followers. Several writers highlight these variables and more clearly identify their relationship to changes in the direction of the black movement as well as the relationship between black leaders and their followers (Gayle, 1980; Hamilton, 1981; Staples, 1976; and Washington, 1978).

The nature of the relationship between black leaders and followers is believed to be influenced by a complex of variables:

1. Identification of mutual problems and a resulting sense of injustice;
2. Group identity and need for a sense of community;
3. Mutual support;
4. Mutual respect;
5. Mutual trust;
6. Shared expectation of change;
7. Communication patterns and methods;
8. Recognition of the need for reciprocity;
9. Recognition of interdependency;
10. Shared world view.

STATUS OF THE BLACK MOVEMENT

While considerable controversy surrounds the current status of the black social change movement, the general opinion appears to be that the black movement for social change has altered its strategies, foci, and lost its momentum (Newman et al., 1978).

The focus of the black movement from the 1940s through the 1970s was toward elimination of the barriers to black access to public services. Supported by extensive media exposure, the black movement appeared raucous, forceful, and overwhelming. It could not be ignored. The movement had the effect of stimulating heterogeneous participation since it promised active involvement and observable results in improving the quality of life of blacks.

The black social change movement succeeded in eliminating overt oppressive barriers that had plagued black Americans for centuries. Simultaneously, the black movement generated similar movements for rights among the aged, women, Chicanos, Native Americans, and Asians. The key to understanding the black movement, then as well as now, was the role played by a cadre of black leaders whose charisma and vision stimulated many others to follow. Following 1970, the black social change movement abandoned its confrontational strategies. Black leaders and their followers marched rarely after 1970. Militant black men and women stopped carrying weapons and shouting for black power. Gone were the oratory, charisma, vision, and the publicity. The black movement became significantly less visible, less vocal, and more intensely involved in building political and economic power at the local level. The black leadership role became equated with political leadership (Williams, Note 1). Black gains became equated with increases in the numbers of black office holders. Some observers attribute the significant shift in the black movement to a decline in black leaders.

For example, Brown (1981) suggests that the black movement, as previously known, is near extinction. In his analysis, Brown asserts that the inactivity of the black movement in 1981 is related to an absence of moral and intellectual black leadership, chosen by black people. Brown's essay concludes that blacks are now a leaderless people; therefore, there are no organized followers. Current "black leaders" according to Brown have been chosen by white elites, these black leaders lack the vision and commitment for social reform. Brown espouses the position that power is the most dynamic ingredient in the relationship between leaders and followers. Thus, the black movement, if it is indeed inactive, has become so because black people have failed to use their power creatively, collectively, or accurately in the selection and monitoring of leadership.

Washington's (1978) conclusion is similar to that of Brown's (1981), while her interpretation of the causes of the phenomenon differs. Washington's careful analysis of the status of the black movement attributes its character to the insidious activities of the FBI. She also proposes that the major impact of the FBI's activities has been to decrease the number, assertiveness, and effectiveness of black leaders. The secondary impact of FBI activity has been to reduce the extensiveness of black participation.

In a 1980 survey of its subscribers, Black Enterprise (Clemmons, 1980), sought to determine whom blacks identify as their leaders. In addition, the journal's staff sought to determine the extent to which blacks participate in traditional black organizations. The results of this survey suggest that there is no unanimity among blacks surveyed relative to their identified leaders. Other than Jesse Jackson, who was chosen by 33% of the respondents, black persons did not identify one leader. The study also suggests that blacks no longer participate in any significant degree in traditional civil rights organizations.

Stogdill's (1974) descriptive work can be used to support Washington's and Brown's observations. According to Stogdill, organizational dormancy is a frequent occurrence in social movements that experience a precipitous change in leadership. Until new leadership emerges, organizations and groups curtail their external activities and invest more energy in forming a protective internal unit designed to ensure organizational survival. The emphasis on socio-political development
Leadership and strategies have resulted in extreme hostility as well as resistance and aggression (Lincoln, 1967). These feelings have erupted in numerous acts of violence aimed at local and national black leaders. The shooting of Vernon Jordan is the most recent in a series of attacks on black leaders.

The alleged involvement of the FBI in the deaths of several black leaders (Washington, 1978), the general failure of the courts to prosecute persons for violence against blacks, as well as the historical use of violence as a means of resisting social change, seems to have created a climate that reinforces violence against blacks in general. As a result, one can predict that the level of violence aimed at black leaders on the national and local levels is likely to increase.

Jeff (Note 5) suggests that violence against black men and women has been used systematically to curtail their efforts to promote social change. As conditions within the economy result in a decrease in real income and jobs, attacks on black leaders tend to increase. Ginsburg's work (1969) implies that violence against blacks has been prevalent in the United States for an extended period. Ginsburg concludes, however, that such violence is often indiscriminate and based on psychological as opposed to economic factors.

During the years from 1960 to 1980, numerous charismatic local and national black leaders died prior to their chronological period of highest influence (Washington, 1978). In each instance, the deaths of these leaders (most notably, Malcolm X, Martin Luther King, Jr., Whitney Young, and George Wiley), left organizations without leaders who had similar influence on their followers, supporters, or detractors.

In some instances, while black organizations simultaneously experienced significant increases in funds (occasioned by a leader's death) and major declines in subsequent years (Davis, 1976; Palmer, 1977), at least two organizations (Southern Christian Leadership Conference and Welfare Rights Organization) did not seem to recover and have not produced leaders or movements of the same or similar intensity. The deaths of Howard Thurman, Roy Wilkins, J. Phillip Randolph, and Elijah Muhammad also produced profound changes and gaps in their organizations and the overall black movement.

The loss of significant black leaders over the past 20 years has had a profound influence on the number of black followers and supporters and has left black organizations with a leadership crisis (Burns, 1976, and Stogdill, 1974). At no other point in their history have blacks had such a cumulative loss of significant national leadership, covering the ideological spectrum, in such a short period of time. Obviously this loss, when combined with the incarceration of such activist leaders as Huey Newton, Stokely Carmichael, Rap Brown, and Angela Davis, forces a period of readjustment and realignment of black leadership, followers, organizations, and the thrust of the black movement.

It is this current period of adjustment and realignment that is interpreted as the black leadership crisis. As used here, the term crisis is consistent with the conceptualizations of Caplan (1974), Burns (1978), and Stogdill (1974). A crisis is a phase of development in which there is a potential for enhanced functioning or dysfunction. The postcrisis direction that is taken depends on the capacity of the
organism to withstand temporary dislocation, excessive stress, and the extensive insufficiency of its support system. Given the historical strengths of the black movement, one could reasonably predict that this current crisis will be resolved in the direction of an emergence of new black leaders.

The black leadership role has also been influenced by the way in which other related issues have been handled. On one hand, some black leaders have historically been selected by whites (or predominantly white media) and given the responsibility for increasing the participation and compliance of other blacks (followers) with the status quo. Simultaneously, other black leaders were self-appointed or "chosen" through a somewhat informal group process and were charged with the responsibility of devising proactive methods and strategies to challenge the system in which rights were abrogated. The latter leadership posture included the effort to increase the probability that other blacks (followers) would oppose the extant system and contribute to its demise and replacement by a more equitable order. These two widely divergent approaches to the development of black leadership provide the basis for the trichotomous ideological approaches to social change that characterize black movements: assimilation, protest, and nationalism.

To some extent, these three philosophical perspectives and tactical idioms continue to be reflected in black leadership styles and organizational climate of the 1980s.

The third factor that influences the performance of black leadership is the adequacy and sources of their financial support. In recent years, the annual revenue of traditional black organizations has not kept pace with inflation. (Davis, 1980). In other instances, the organizations have experienced drastic reductions. For example, in the period between 1968 and 1974, the revenue of the SCLC declined by 90% (Davis, 1980). The revenue of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) declined by 49% within one year (Davis, 1980).

While other traditional black organizations have also experienced significant declines in their income, the decline in revenue for nontraditional black organizations (the Black Panthers, U.S. Core, Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC)) has been so drastic that the organizations are near bankruptcy. Besides the National Urban League, none of the traditional or nontraditional black organizations receive support from local charities such as United Way. In addition, black organizations have rarely been able to utilize payroll deduction plans to raise operating capital.

As a result of their fiscal dilemmas, numerous black organizations have been forced to curtail their programs, limit their growth, and concentrate more of the organizations' activities toward generating funds. In addition, their leaders have sought to increase the amount of their annual budget that comes from sources outside the black community. Currently, the majority of the funds to support the Urban League, PUSH, the Black Caucus, and several other black organizations are provided by corporations and government grants (Davis, 1980; Jordan, 1981; Edley, Note 6).

Interests of major funding sources influence the positions taken by some black leaders and the programs operated by their organizations. Such interests are likely to result in demands that black leadership use more conciliatory strategies that have a gradual impact on the status quo (Weingarten, Note 7). Such gradualism, however, may be incongruent with the type of transformational leadership needed by excluded populations (Burns, 1978).

Finally, the tactics employed by black leaders whose finances are provided by groups other than their followers may be inconsistent with those tactics that have been shown to promote social change (Newman et al., 1978). Thus, many black leaders appear to operate in a fiscal/philosophical/tactical dilemma in which the activities supported by their funding sources increase the schism between black leaders and their followers and decrease the probability that the needs (social change) of the followers will be met.

Threats against black leaders are compounded by the absence of viable mechanisms to ensure their physical safety and their economic independence. Given the obvious risks associated with black leadership in this country, such stress may divide the energies and resources of black leadership and direct a significant proportion of these energies away from the movement toward the assurance of a degree of personal safety.

The protracted crisis in black leadership has stimulated black followers and organizations to ponder the efficacy of singular leaders' models and the need for mechanisms for selecting, protecting, and supporting its leadership in the 1980s.

CONCLUSION

As one looks retrospectively at changes in black communities over the period between 1960 and 1980, two interrelated conclusions can be drawn relative to black movements: on one hand, the myriad of inequities that have historically precipitated black social change movements continue. The form of these inequities has changed; they are less overt while remaining persistent.

On the other hand, there have been substantive changes in all phases of the black movement: many traditional black leaders have died; alternative leaders have not yet attracted and sustained a following; followers have declined numerically, and in some instances, have attached themselves to organizations whose strategies are more conciliatory than confronting.

The black movement, however, is far from moribund. As long as oppression persists, it is likely that the black social change movement will continue to function, even though it changes form and direction. The question for this decade is not whether the black movement will survive, but what form and ideological direction it will take.

A confluence of societal conditions and events are useful in identifying and predicting the direction the black movement may take in the remaining years of this decade. The most significant condition that seems likely to influence the black movement is the increasing severity of the economic status of the nation in general and the black population in particular. Rising unemployment for black youths, men, and women will produce increasing pressure for change.

The most significant events thus far in the decade have been the election of Ronald Reagan (with the majority of black support for Jimmy Carter), the defeat of a number of liberal Democratic members of Congress, and the systematic dismantling of a number of programs and policies that provided
jobs, financial stability, and access for black populations and organizations.

Without continuing government assistance, and in some instances, protection, there is a high probability that black economic gains will quickly dissipate. Black populations interpret the conservative shift in the country as inimical to their needs. They see civil rights legislation, such as the Voting Rights Act, as imperiled, and with that threat fear the loss of constitutional guarantees gained only recently. Without protective legislation, blacks foresee direct peril to the quality of their lives and their very survival. Such predictions portend a significant shift in the dormant state of the black movement.

These economic, psychological, and physical threats against the black population suggest that many needs of blacks remain unmet. According to Stogdill (1974), Burns (1978), and Thompson (1963), the most significant stimulus for leadership arises out of such unmet needs. Given conditions in the black community, one can predict with some assurance that black populations will identify and empower new leadership. Concomitantly, potential leaders will begin to assert their plans and solidify their relationship with potential followers, thus legitimating their leadership position.

A variety of efforts will be made to identify new black leaders. While Black Enterprise, Ebony, and other publications have conducted polls to identify black leaders, it seems more probable that new black leaders will be those persons, regardless of their ratings in the polls, who can demonstrate that their plans and approaches are useful in meeting the needs of the black population.

I suggest that the black movement will be reformulated in the 1980s because of persistent unmet needs. The new movement will reflect increased participation and greater effort to form supportive coalitions. It is also likely that the black movement will be more characterized by a federation of black organizations and leaders than heretofore. Furthermore, the demands of potential black followers will stimulate new and more assertive leadership whose activities and programs must be aimed at economics as opposed to civil rights and policies. Black followers, however, will have to increase their financial support to ensure that their leaders are less vulnerable to cooptation and physical attack.

Conditions suggest that the new black movement will focus on securing economic rights, access, and employment. While the struggle to secure some level of economic parity and redistribution will take a variety of forms, black leadership and followers would be wise to build on the lessons learned from the progress black populations made in the 1960s. A review of that era shows clearly that there is a direct relationship between the level of black protest and the level of black progress. When black leaders and followers protested the inequities of their lives, conditions improved. When protest and confrontation declined and the movement focused on obtaining political office, as has occurred over the previous decade, black progress declined in direct proportion.

Given these realities, one can predict a resurgence of a black movement characterized by protest, confrontation, economic pressure, and an independent cadre of transformational leadership.
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Discovering how leaders in social movement organizations (SMOs) attain the legitimate power or "authority" to direct actions of followers is crucial to an understanding of the dynamics of social change as embodied in social movements (SMs). Since the ideology of radicals intent on restructuring societal relations precludes working in bureaucracies, an inherent respect for occupants of high status "offices" (Weber, 1946) is not a probable basis of legitimacy. On the other hand, the social scientist relying upon the concept of "charisma" (Weber, 1946) will find little guidance to interpret either the problem of succession in egalitarian radical SMOs or the nature of the distribution of authority required in groups that function without a sole, supreme leader.

A case study of four stages of organization in a lesbian-feminist community will show how adherence to principles of radical feminism prevented the maintenance of a bureaucratic structure. Throughout the process of organizing, a shifting cadre of leaders grew from within and outside of formal structures to influence policy and collective behavior. The research presented here will help demonstrate that theoretical models of leadership in democratic radical SMOs must address the members' unique commitments.

*This article is a revised version of a paper presented as the American Sociological Association, Boston, Massachusetts, 1979. The critical comments of Louis Zurcher, Trudy Heller, and Jon Van Til have improved the work's theoretical content. The data reported here are from a larger research project partially supported by an award from the Case Western Reserve University Alumni Fund.

Andrea J. Baker is assistant professor in the Department of Sociology, Ohio University-Lancaster, Lancaster, Ohio 43130.
This article addresses the question as to what it takes for a company to create and maintain a quality culture. As noted in numerous articles, the people of the United States are becoming increasingly diverse. As time goes on, companies will have to become more concerned with the changing demographics. In addition to this, companies will have to address the issue of the recruiting downslide. Research suggests that this downslide is a permanent trend because of society's changing attitudes and demographics. If this is the case, insurance companies cannot, in the future, expect to recruit as usual and succeed.

This article contends that unless the field force is included in a company's diversity program, the entire organization will never believe in-let alone succeed in-reaching its full potential in the changing American economy. It is not enough to implement a diversity program for home office employees, and then "shadow box" around the issue with the field force because they are entrepreneurs and independent contractors.

To successfully address the issue of field diversity, the insurance industry must ask itself, Who are our leaders? and, Who must they lead? These questions need to be clearly answered or companies will be doomed to spending lots of time and money without getting to the heart of the problem. The bottom line is that unless there is a strong commitment to diversity at the highest levels, no substantive change will occur.

The article goes on to discuss the characteristics of the field force and the role of the CEO in assuming and maintain the leadership role in any diversity initiative. As a suggestion to CEOs, the author concludes by suggesting that since field forces have many problems, CEOs should focus intensely on diversity. This focus will resolve many of the other problems that plague modern-day companies.
Field Force Diversity

The CEO’s Next Great Challenge

DELVIN E. BENJAMIN, J.D.
Consultant, Management Development Group, LIMRA

When asked “What does it take for a company to create and maintain a quality culture?” Nancy Austin, coauthor of *A Passion for Excellence: The Leadership Difference*, answered, “... what really sets companies apart is the quality of leadership and the way excellent leaders release the natural energy and creativity of people. Excellent companies understand that the secret weapon is people, people, people.”

The people of the United States are increasingly diverse. Figure 1 compares by sex and ethnicity the percentages of people in the United States to those tested and hired as inexperienced agents by a set of ordinary companies in the United States that use LIMRA’s Career Profile System. Males are more likely to be contracted than their numbers in the population would suggest. Whites are also more likely to be contracted, while women, African Americans, Hispanics, and Asian Americans are all contracted at rates below their representation in the general population.

In addition to being concerned about changing demographies, companies will need to address the issue of the recruiting downslide. (See “The Recruiting Downslide: Temporary or Permanent?” by Walter H. Zultowski, Ph.D., *LIMRA’s MarketFacts*, March/April 1993.) Zultowski suggests the downslide is a permanent trend because of society’s changing attitudes and demographics. If this is the case, insurance companies cannot, in the future, expect to recruit as usual and succeed.

To successfully address the issue of field diversity, the insurance industry must ask itself, Who are our leaders? and, Who must they lead? These questions need to be clearly answered or companies will be doomed to spend lots of time, money, and other resources without getting to the heart of the matter. The bottom line is that unless there is a strong commitment to diversity at the highest levels, no substantive change will occur.

There are companies, such as The Equitable, Metropolitan Life, New York Life, and Prudential of America, that have taken a strategic approach to diversity recruiting and are reaching out to ethnic minority markets.

THE FIELD FORCE

Keep in mind the old adage “There is strength in numbers.” And it is with increasing numbers that ethnic minorities are gaining power — economic, political, and social. Companies that ignore these groups today may find that those same groups will ignore them tomorrow. Chief executive officers (CEOs) must ask themselves this question: If the percentage of white people in America is diminishing and the percentage of ethnic minorities and immigrants is increasing, who are the producers in their field forces that will access these markets?
Combine field forces that resist diversification with an America expanding with Asian Americans, African Americans, Hispanics, and immigrants (see Figure 2); combine them with an increasingly interdependent global economy, and it is easy to foresee the demise of companies that blatantly ignore the opportunities presented by an ethnically diverse work force. In the 21st century, diversity will no longer simply make good business sense — it will mean corporate survival.

Tables 1 and 2 show that whether your company is in the low-income ($10,000 - $24,999), middle-income ($25,000 - $49,999), or upper-income ($50,000-plus) markets, or in the small-business market, there are enough ethnic minority prospects to go around.

It is difficult to imagine a company that wouldn't benefit from gaining access to 30 million African Americans with a buying power of $278 billion; or 22 million Hispanics with a buying power of $184 billion; or nearly 75 million Asian Americans with a buying power of $97 billion (U.S. Bureau of the Census). (For more demographic information, statistics, and a step-by-step diversity plan from a field perspective, see "Agency 2001 — A Demographic Odyssey," Managers Magazine, August 1992.)

The U.S. Department of Labor concluded that, by the year 2000, one out of four employees will be African Americans, Hispanics, American Indians, or Asian Americans. According to the U.S. Bureau of the Census, over the next 20 years, ethnic minorities will account for an estimated 87 percent of the overall population growth.

There are many myths about women and minority agents: They are motivated by service rather than money; they can't close the sale; they can't handle rejection; and a host of other myths. The myths about sales activity have successfully been diffused (see Tables 3 and 4). Given enough time and enough numbers in the field force, I believe other myths about ethnic minority agents will also be eliminated.

There is growing evidence that diverse employee teams tend to outperform homogeneous teams of any composition. For example, recent studies by academic organizations and the Conference Board confirm that...
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX/DESCE nt</th>
<th>NUMBER OF FIRMS</th>
<th>PERCENT CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>43,224</td>
<td>47,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>308,260</td>
<td>424,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>233,972</td>
<td>292,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>187,491</td>
<td>215,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnics (incl. minorities)</td>
<td>374,164</td>
<td>1,213,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All U.S. firms (incl. minorities)</td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
<td>13,700,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MALE AGENTS</th>
<th>FEMALE AGENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prospects phoned</td>
<td>Prospects phoned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold calls</td>
<td>Cold calls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointments</td>
<td>Appointments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fact-finders completed</td>
<td>Fact-finders completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing interviews</td>
<td>Closing interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figures are medians
Source: LIMRA's Career Agent Tracking Study

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALENDAR YEAR OF SERVICE</th>
<th>ALL AGENTS</th>
<th>FEMALE AGENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-year cash commissions (all lines)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>$13,712</td>
<td>$13,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>15,845</td>
<td>14,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>17,621</td>
<td>15,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth and over</td>
<td>20,249</td>
<td>17,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annualized premiums (individual lines)**</td>
<td>$23,669</td>
<td>$21,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>30,135</td>
<td>23,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>35,632</td>
<td>30,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth and over</td>
<td>42,042</td>
<td>32,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of policies (life, health, dl annuities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth and over</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data are medians from LIMRA’s Agent Production and Survival — Career Ordinary Agents
**Excludes annuities

Homogeneous groups may reach consensus more quickly, but often they are not as successful in generating new ideas or in solving problems because their collective perspective is narrower (Management Review, April 1993). Remember, “Excellent companies understand that the secret weapon is people, people, people.” Not just white people — ALL PEOPLE. They may not show up on your balance sheet now, but the ethnic minorities you recruit and sell to today may mean the difference between profit and loss tomorrow.

Who will lead?

The board of directors, CEO, or president — one or all of these entities — must assume and maintain the leadership role in any diversity initiative. For the sake of analysis, let’s look at the CEO as leader. Out of necessity, CEOs assign the responsibility for administering the diversity initiative to someone else. However, this should not be the last time the CEO is seen or heard from regarding diversity.

The person chosen for this responsibility and his or her position in the organization also sends a message about the sincerity and commitment of the CEO. Every step away from a direct reporting relationship to the CEO lowers the perceived importance of the initiative, especially in the eyes of a politically astute field force.

But even more important than who is assigned to wage the day-to-day battle is the need for the CEO to constantly carry the diversity banner.

The CEO must articulate the strategy; must make sure that he or she, as well as the board of directors and the president, are exposed to diversity training. The CEO must be present when the overall plan — including marketing and recruiting standards, the effect on manager compensation, and which activities are to be monitored — is announced.

The CEO must take every opportunity to publicly reiterate a commitment to the achievement of a truly diverse field force. He or she must hold everyone in the management chain responsible and accountable. The good news is that, as always, change means opportunity for those courageous enough to seize it, and no CEO has ever attained that lofty pinnacle without vast reserves of courage.

Today there is a lot of rhetoric about diversity. It is almost impossible to open a magazine or newspaper, listen to the news, discuss business or politics, without being bombarded by diversity issues. We all agree that it is an important issue, but are the vast majority of insurance companies simply paying lip service to diversity, or are they willing to put their time, money, and other resources behind what they say?
In its 1991 study Workforce 2000 Today: A Bottom-Line Concern, Towers Perrin resurveyed over 200 companies and noted that “Virtually unanimously, respondents agreed that the single greatest factor contributing to the increase in support of diversity issues is senior management’s heightened awareness of workforce issues and the impact those issues have on the company’s profitability and competitive position.”

Field force diversity is competing for the CEO’s attention with the need to increase field productivity, issues of pricing and profitability, and the need to bolster the financial strength of the corporation.

Many a CEO must feel like the executive who had employees waking him up before dawn one morning. One called about a problem in Detroit and asked him to get on a plane and come help him out. Before he could get dressed, another one phoned from the office across town to tell him about another problem. Within the next hour, he had three more such calls. Without breakfast he hurried out to the garage to find that his car wouldn’t start. So he called a taxi. When the taxi driver asked him, “Where to?” he muttered, “It doesn’t matter — wherever you take me they’ve got problems.”

Many CEOs will admit that their field forces have problems — lots of them. And many of those problems demand their attention. My suggestion is that CEOs focus on diversity — its solution will resolve many of the other problems. CEOs, where necessary, I challenge you to pack your diversity bags and catch the next taxi headed in the direction of your field force.

DELVIN E. BENJAMIN, J.D., is a consultant in LIMRA’s Management Development Group. Benjamin is available for consulting on this and other management development topics. He can be reached at 203-674-4314.
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Module III. The Process of Leadership

This module focuses upon how leaders influence others. It includes an analysis of understanding individuals, motivating individuals, and developing groups.

Relating to diversity and leadership, the literature in this module focuses on how leaders motivate diverse groups, understand diverse individuals, and develop groups made up of diverse individuals.

The integrative literature in this module displays how leaders develop certain characteristics and implement certain strategies when leading successfully in diverse settings. As shown by the literature, leading in a diverse setting is more challenging than leading in a homogeneous setting, so leaders must be very familiar with many ideas and concepts focused upon in this module.
Other managers we interviewed described their pride in creating a more open, flexible, responsive, and responsible work environment where people can be happier, not just more efficient or productive. Such an organizational climate is one of the less publicized benefits of successful diversity efforts.

Finally, the managers we interviewed pointed to the benefits of diversity beyond their organizations. Some managers want their organizations to be agents for change, to make the world a better place. One black administrator, for example, told us that more black men in her state go to prison than to college because, she said, the school system is failing that group. The diversity effort in her institution is aimed at getting more blacks and other underrepresented groups into educational leadership positions. The effect of this on children, she feels, will be to help them overcome their feelings of inferiority created by stereotyping and get greater benefit from the educational system.

Although some managers may argue that business has few if any obligations to the larger community, other managers insist that being a good community citizen eventually benefits their business. One white male business executive in our study expressed a very strong view about the role of business in the community and how diversity efforts can benefit both. He said, "The bigger picture we have to deal with is the minority situation in this country. [In this area] the situation is so desperate and so in need of role models, that if we in corporations can't advance minorities so they can turn around and do what needs to be done in their communities, I don't see any of us surviving."

Diversity efforts have the potential to play a significant role in solving the problems that plague organizations and society at large. Although support for diversity is increasingly tied to business issues, social responsibility is still an incentive for many executives. However, much remains to be done before diversity is fully realized and the benefits noted here can be reaped. Chapter Two reveals the extent of the gap between where we are today and where we could be tomorrow.
made issues of diversity a more immediate challenge for executives. As discussed in Chapter One, there are tremendous benefits to be had by fostering diversity in an organization, but they must be earned by successfully countering a host of stumbling blocks. The challenge of developing diversity should not be underestimated. Some of the problems have been with us for decades, while others are relatively new and unfamiliar. To find the best solutions to these problems, we need to understand.

There has been a significant reduction of some forms of racism, sexism, and other discrimination in this country. The Civil Rights Act of 1964, among other key pieces of legislation, helped reduce some of the most blatant forms of discrimination that put men of color and women in general at a disadvantage. There is evidence, however, that the force of these changes has essentially been checked in recent years, particularly with regard to the upward mobility of nontraditional managers.

In 1986, Korn/Ferry found that of 1,362 senior executives only 29 were women and 13 were people of color, a total of 3 percent at a time when women and people of color made up 51.4 percent of the workforce. According to one survey reported by Braham (1987), in 1979, blacks occupied 0.2 percent of the senior executive positions and that figure had increased to only 0.3 percent by 1985. Another survey reported by Braham (1987) showed a decrease in blacks at senior levels during the same period: from 0.4 percent to 0.2 percent. In addition, blacks have lost momentum in management overall. Blacks made up only 4.9 percent of the management ranks in 1987 compared with 4 percent in 1980 (“Debate—Affirmative Action Is Doing the Right Thing,” 1990, p. 10A).

Hispanics, too, apparently lost advancement momentum in the 1980s. In California, for example, despite an increase in the Hispanic population from 19 percent of the total state population in 1980 to 30 percent in 1989, Hispanics still made up only 7 percent of the state’s executives. Dan Cook (1989) notes that the list of only seven Hispanic presidents or chairmen of large corporations nationwide is “rivetingly short.”

Fortune magazine’s 1990 survey of 799 companies turned up only 19 women among the 4,012 directors and highest paid executives. Not much had changed since 1978, when the same survey located 10 women among 6,400 executives.

These statistics indicate that moving into middle management is still a problem for some traditionally underrepresented groups. Moving beyond middle management is an even greater problem for most nontraditional managers who confront a “glass ceiling” that limits their advancement. Although the U.S. government reports that 30 percent of corporate middle management is made up of women, blacks, and Hispanics, these groups make up less than 1 percent of chief executives and those who report directly to them (“Bias in Promotions at the Very Top Targeted,” 1990). Even if it takes fifteen or twenty years to develop a general manager, as some executive development specialists have concluded, if time were the only factor, we should have seen more advancement than this in the twenty-eight years since the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and we should have seen continued improvement throughout the period. Clearly, a lack of enough time is not the only force preventing upward mobility for nontraditional managers.

We can learn some lessons from what has been accomplished since the 1960s in reducing barriers for women and people of color. We can also learn something from the subsequent loss of some of this momentum as we confront the current situation. The problems of diversity that challenge us today are not entirely the same as the problems that confronted us as recently as the late 1980s. Our understanding of differential treatment and its consequences must continue to grow if we are to solve the problems facing us today.

A Historical Overview

In the past, a number of publicly accepted practices excluded people of color and white women from many institutions and positions of influence. Jobs were advertised separately by male or female, white or “colored,” allowing organizations to exclude people they viewed as undesirable. People of color and white women were confined largely to low-paying jobs. As recently as 1983, white men, who made up about half of the labor force,
The New Leaders held 96 percent of all the positions in this country that paid more than $18,000 a year ("Blacks in Management," 1983). In addition to job discrimination, prestigious schools denied admission to many women and people of color. Universities such as Yale and Princeton, among the schools typically considered feeder institutions for management jobs, explicitly refused to admit women as undergraduates until as recently as 1969.

In the past, racial and sexual discrimination also existed at levels of blatancy that may be hard for those who did not experience them to appreciate fully. It was socially and legally acceptable to treat blacks, Latinos, Asian-Americans, Native Americans, and other people of color as being inferior to whites and to give white men more career opportunities and preferential treatment than others. As antidiscrimination laws were passed, the resulting access to educational institutions and occupations helped people of color and white women compete more effectively. However, the university degrees and professional credentials that served as criteria for many jobs were still held largely by white men. "Lack of education" became a widely accepted explanation for the slow movement of nontraditional employees into and through management; this argument is still used today despite educational achievements that sometimes favor women over men and people of color over whites, as we will see later.

When affirmative action legislation started to take hold, it did little to address the underlying assumptions and stereotypes that plagued nontraditional managers and created the barriers to advancement that persist today. Many white male managers viewed people of color and white women as inferior in intellect, training, and motivation. When the law forced them to hire and promote nontraditional employees, some responded with what one manager we interviewed termed "malicious compliance"—deliberately appointing nontraditional candidates who were weak or ill-suited to the jobs available so that they would have little chance of succeeding. Some managers delayed taking action until the last minute, and then they had to find people to hire or promote as a "quick fix" to meet the required quotas. When these hurriedly chosen people couldn't handle the job or couldn't get the resources they needed to carry out their new responsibilities, some managers' stereotype-based prejudice became even stronger. They pointed to these specific and inevitable failures as evidence that nontraditional managers in general couldn't do the work. Many employers have since become very cautious about hiring or promoting any nontraditional managers because of such early, ill-fated attempts. The lack of enforcement of affirmative action guidelines under the Reagan administration reinforced these employers' reluctance to keep trying, and the movement toward diversity slowed considerably.

Today the legal incentives operate in a different context. There is much more diversity in the workplace and in society overall. Managers are searching intensively for competitive advantage and often turn to their human resource practices to gain an edge. Employers now have compelling business reasons to follow and even exceed the legal requirements to comply with affirmative action guidelines. Many people have become aware of cultural differences, the value and the inevitability of diversity. But prejudice continues to permeate organizations in subtle, nearly invisible forms because stereotypic assumptions have been built into their organizational norms and everyday practices. For example, in our study we found that the recruitment process may continue to screen out people of color who do not have the same background as the whites who were recruited in the past. We learned that managers routinely pass over women for special assignments because they don't want to strain the family. And we discovered that nontraditional managers don't take outside classes because they don't know about them or don't believe they will ever pay off. These systemic barriers often predetermine the choice against nontraditional managers, and even well-meaning people perpetuate unfair treatment simply by using the organization's conventional processes. This not only restrains diversity, but it also powerfully restrains individuals from contributing in meaningful ways to the organization's goals.

The Most Critical Barriers to Advancement

The most significant barriers today are the policies and practices that systematically restrict the opportunities and rewards
available to women and people of color. This is a fundamental finding of our study. We discovered twenty-one distinct barriers, which we categorized into thirteen types. These barriers are listed in Table A.8 in the appendix.

There is a remarkable consensus among the 196 managers in our study on the most critical barriers to advancement. Across industries, sectors, level and function, sex, and ethnic backgrounds, managers agree that the following six barriers are the most important.

1. Prejudice: treating differences as weaknesses
2. Poor career planning
3. A lonely, hostile, unsupportive working environment for nontraditional managers
4. Lack of organizational savvy on the part of nontraditional managers
5. Greater comfort in dealing with one’s own kind
6. Difficulty in balancing career and family

These six barriers account for more than half of all the barriers mentioned by the managers in our study. They are also repeatedly revealed in various forms and combinations in other studies that focus on career development and advancement. These include a study commissioned by the Executive Leadership Council on driving and restraining forces for black senior executives (Baskerville and Tucker, 1991); a study conducted by Catalyst (1990) on career barriers for women in management; and research by the U.S. Department of Labor (1991) for the “glass ceiling initiative.”

**Prejudice: Still the Number One Barrier**

The single most frequently mentioned barrier is prejudice. More than 12 percent of all managers’ responses described how the perception of differences as weaknesses limited advancement opportunities for white women and people of color. Prejudice is defined here as the tendency to view people who are different from some reference group in terms of sex, ethnic background, or racial characteristics such as skin color as being deficient. In other words, prejudice is the assumption (without evidence) that nontraditional managers are less competent or less suitable than white male managers; it is the refusal to accept nontraditional managers as equals. Ethnic and sex differences are sometimes used, consciously or not, to define “inferior groups” in a kind of caste system.

A survey by the University of Chicago’s National Opinion Research Center (Smith, 1990), along with other research findings, shows that stereotypes are still prevalent. This survey revealed that whites believe that people of other ethnic backgrounds are less intelligent, less hard working, less likely to be self-supporting, more violence prone, and less patriotic than whites. The Executive Leadership Council’s study (Baskerville and Tucker, 1991) found racism to be the most serious career hurdle for black executives, and Catalyst’s (1990) findings showed stereotypic preconceptions, or prejudice, to be the biggest advancement barrier women face today. Stereotypes about people of color and women in general are common among managers, and the managers we interviewed described a variety of them.

Some stereotypes apply to certain groups in particular. In our study, for example, we learned that Asian-Americans are said to be so research oriented and technically focused that they are not able to supervise people or communicate well in general. Hispanics are said to be unassertive; they “sit back” in meetings while others hurl and debate ideas. Some managers consider Asian-Americans and Hispanics “too polite” (and consequently, as lacking conviction), perhaps because of their concern for showing respect or maintaining cooperative teamwork. One white executive noted that there is also a trust barrier for Asian-Americans and Latinos, who are sometimes perceived as dishonest and corrupt. The prevailing stereotypes of blacks, we discovered, are that they are lazy, uneducated, and incompetent. Women are often assumed to be indecisive and unable to be analytical.

One Hispanic manager we interviewed pointed out how stereotypes affect business decisions. In contrast to blacks, who
are more outspoken, he said, Hispanics are quiet and shy, and they don’t disagree as much because they respect authority. Because of this, he continued, “If I had four subordinates, and I had to lay off one, I’d choose the Hispanic. The black woman would scream the loudest. The black man would meet me in the parking lot. The white man, well, maybe I’d lay him off, but I’d probably pick the Hispanic because he wouldn’t say anything.”

Stereotypes apply more generally to nontraditional managers. One example is the assumption that differences in accent or the grammar used by members of different ethnic groups mean that people in those groups are inarticulate or unconvincing in speech. Many managers perceive such speech differences as a career liability. One black director in our study who worked in a company with extensive international operations commented on the so-called language barrier that many Asians confront because of their accent. He found it incongruous that an accent was a handicap for Asians when other accents—French, British, or Australian, for example—were no handicap at all for white foreigners working in the United States. We interviewed one black administrator who worked in an educational institution and described how the stereotyping of differences serves to reinforce prejudicial beliefs. According to this administrator,

Oral language is a disadvantage for blacks. Any ghetto language is a trigger for whites—it’s associated only with black people, and it’s threatening to the general population. There is an almost visceral reaction to it. They discount what you’re saying. This is the biggest problem black people have, but not because white people have good oral language. Many don’t. They use poor grammar, they have regional accents, they make up words. . . . It’s acceptable, even endearing, for whites, but not for blacks. Blacks are seen as uninformed, threatening, at a lower level.

In some cases, it seems that no matter what nontraditional managers do, it is open to a negative interpretation. Women, for example, may be faced with contradictory expectations. The stereotypes of women include being hesitant and indecisive on the one hand and too pushy or “butch” on the other hand. A research study by Linda Carli (1990) found that women who speak tentatively and uncertainly, using such phrases as “I don’t know much about it, but . . . .” are better able to influence men. However, that approach is not acceptable in most management groups. Researchers Carol Hymowitz and Timothy Schellhardt (1986) conclude, “Top executives are quick to feel the woman who is tough isn’t being womanly, while the woman who isn’t tough isn’t worth having around.” In a study published in the Harvard Business Review (Sutton and Moore, 1985), nearly half of the male executives surveyed said they would not feel comfortable working for a woman.

Stereotypes make it acceptable among some traditional managers to ignore, disparage, or discount the qualities and contributions of nontraditional managers. As we learned in our study, people of color and white women are systematically screened out as candidates for more senior management posts when prejudice, as defined here, operates, that is, when a point of difference is highlighted as a flaw. Under such conditions, a nontraditional candidate’s accent or hair style may be viewed as a flaw, and that may be enough for rejection. As one Hispanic manager who told us he faced “real animosities” at a previous workplace said, “The fact that I graduated first in my engineering class didn’t make as much difference as the fact that I looked different.”

Clearly, however, all differences are not based on stereotypes. Nontraditional managers, like everyone else, often have very real limitations that must be considered in hiring or promotion decisions. Nevertheless, the limitations of a nontraditional manager may be a greater liability than the limitations of a white male manager. A black manager in the employee relations field gave an example of how managers tend to isolate and emphasize the limitations of a person of color without giving appropriate attention to his or her strengths. This manager was invited to sit in on a meeting to select a manager for a department in turmoil. The black candidate had proved his skill in handling a troubled environment but not his administrative abil-
ity. A white candidate had demonstrated administrative skills. Others already in the department also had good administrative skills and could handle many of the administrative responsibilities. Yet the selection panel focused on the administrative aspects of the job and chose the white manager. In effect, the black manager was compared to the white manager on the basis of his area of relative weakness, even though that may have been less relevant to the job than was his area of strength.

Prejudice prevents many managers from seeing others without the filters that turn differences into liabilities. When prejudice operates this way, flaws are imagined, weaknesses are exaggerated, and failures are attributed to the nontraditional manager's sex or ethnicity rather than to individual differences.

Managers interviewed told us that expecting less from women and people of color is a notion so pervasive that it sometimes affects nontraditional managers' perceptions of themselves.

This effect was demonstrated when the human resource staff of a large corporation in our study decided to conduct a version of an experiment that had been done in other settings to test for prejudicial attitudes toward women and people of color. The staff put together several identical versions of a generic résumé of a job candidate but attached different pictures to each copy: a white man, a black man, a Hispanic man, a black woman, and a Hispanic woman. They asked executives in the corporation to write a job description of each résumé. The manager we interviewed continues the story: "They read over the résumé and described how they would use the person described on the résumé. They assigned the two women of color to the "administrative tasks." The men of color were perceived as suitable for "real" [line] tasks. We did the same study with a group of women of color writing the job descriptions, and we got the same result. This was a sad revelation of perceptions and expectations."

This example shows how prejudice, a barrier in itself, can increase and create other barriers to advancement, such as contributing to the waning confidence and motivation that some nontraditional managers experience. In fact, prejudice is probably a contributing factor in most of the barriers we identified. By permeating policies and practices in very subtle ways, prejudice continues to deprive nontraditional managers of advocates, resources, and power. That is why, we believe, prejudice is the most often mentioned and most powerful barrier.

Poor Career Planning

The next most often mentioned barrier in our study was poor career planning and development. This is largely associated with the lack of opportunities for white women and people of color to get a series of varied work experiences that will qualify them for senior management posts. One Hispanic manager who joined a company after completing an engineering degree described the difficulty he had building a well-rounded track record. In his words, "When I signed on, I said I didn't want to be an engineer. I asked for a line assignment. I was put in engineering. I had a special assignment in a line function for a while, and I was told I did well. I asked to stay in the line. I was put back into engineering. When I got my M.B.A., I asked for a line job. I was put into engineering. They were looking out for me."

We also learned from our interviews that white male decision makers are often reluctant to assign nontraditional managers to the challenging, high-profile jobs that have rich learning potential and add credibility to a manager's track record. One manager described the problem in his organization this way: "The problem here is the syndrome of not wanting people to fail. The attitude of senior management is that we don't make bad people decisions and that we live with our decisions forever. The company wants to look good, and it won't move nontraditional managers into nontraditional positions, including higher-level jobs."

Some executives, as we have seen, have fallen into the trap of making prejudiced assessments of nontraditional managers' capability. Some executives have become reluctant to promote another nontraditional manager once an earlier nontraditional manager's promotion has been a failure. Some executives, when handing out key assignments, simply think first of the other white men with whom they have become better acquainted. In all these cases, the assignments such executives choose for non-
traditional managers from the start are likely to be less visible and less central to the core business operations than the assignments given to white men. One manager in our study concluded that as these limiting assignments accumulate, the odds grow that the nontraditional managers will be limited in terms of future promotion because they do not have the required depth and range of job experience to be considered for senior-level jobs.

Studies conducted at the Center for Creative Leadership (CCL) and elsewhere by researchers such as John Kotter (1990) of Harvard University have identified a range of assignments that appear to be important in the development of white male executives. These assignments include major start-ups and troubleshooting, sometimes overseas, as well as serving on important task forces, taking on a headquarters staff job, and receiving promotions that significantly increase a manager's responsibility. Such assignments involve autonomy, visibility, access to senior management, and control over considerable resources. They are often used as tests and rewards for the people judged to have high potential; they constitute the "fast track" in many organizations.

Other studies conducted at CCL and elsewhere have also shown that the types of assignments just described do not appear nearly as often in the track records of female executives. Reports by Patricia Ohlott, Marian Ruderman, and Cynthia McCauley (1991); Ellen Van Velsor and Martha Hughes (1990); and Ann Morrison, Randall White, Ellen Van Velsor, and the CCL (1987) have shown that women's job experience included few if any start-ups and troubleshooting assignments, domestically or overseas, and far fewer line management jobs. Whether these kinds of assignments are as important for developing nontraditional managers as they appear to have been for developing white male managers is still being addressed. In either case, however, such assignments are still being used as criteria for higher-level jobs. Therefore, the lack of experience in these kinds of assignments is a serious barrier to advancement. Reinforcing the findings of our study, Catalyst's 1990 survey of corporate CEOs shows that the lack of career planning and planned job assignments for women is a serious barrier to their advancement. Moreover,

a U.S. Department of Labor (1991) report states that "credential building experiences" and "career enhancing assignments" are often unavailable to people of color and white women.

Surveys of people of color in management confirm that the lack of prime job assignments constitutes a major barrier to their advancement as well. A survey led by Nancy DiTomaso (DiTomaso, Thompson, and Blake, 1988), for example, identified factors that hinder success for people of color. The lack of promotion opportunities and the preponderance of staff assignments were high on the list (p. 135). Managers in our study also pointed out the tendency for nontraditional managers to be in staff positions rather than in line management. Most feel that the choice was not their own to make, but a few believe that nontraditional managers are making those choices themselves, gravitating toward the human resource area and other staff functions.

In this study on people of color and white women and in our earlier study on women confronting the glass ceiling, we learned that deciding whether to accept a staff position or waiting to be offered a line job is one of the dilemmas many nontraditional managers face. They choose to accept a staff job for various reasons. In some cases, they believe they have no choice, that they will not be offered a different job if they refuse a staff job. In other cases, the immediate prestige of being the highest-ranking or highest-paid Hispanic manager in the organization, for example, may attract them. Also, promotions may be faster through a staff function than they would be in the line. Although some nontraditional managers may be perfectly satisfied with a staff role throughout their careers, those who believe that a temporary assignment in a staff function will eventually lead to a career in line management and rich prospects for advancement are often disillusioned when their careers are stalled. Without the kind of career guidance often provided by mentors or a systematic career planning program, it is easy to choose a staff job for the wrong reasons.

Most organizations have few career planning tools available to any managers. As we discovered, however, the recognized lack of mentoring for nontraditional managers makes them
particularly vulnerable to poor career decisions. A reliable mentor can help a manager determine the value of a certain job offer in relation to his or her present job, help the manager negotiate the acceptance of a staff job on the condition that the next move is into line management, help the manager know when and how to lobby for a promotion that doesn’t require relocation, and so forth. Not having a mentor who is trustworthy and knowledgeable about career mobility is a factor that further contributes to the problem of poor career development.

The relative inexperience of nontraditional managers in working toward upper-management levels within corporate settings makes career guidance even more critical. From our interviews, we learned that a lack of organizational savvy about how to get along and get ahead in the corporate world is another barrier related to career development. Many nontraditional managers, for example, do not have a good sense of what to expect on the fast track, or how to know whether they are still on or off the track, or what rate of advancement is reasonable. These and other aspects of career development may be more easily mastered by white men with more experience and a better developed network. The ability of nontraditional managers to negotiate and make decisions is hampered by their relative lack of information about how the system works and how to make it work for them.

Taking account of all these strands of evidence, we conclude that poor career development is cumulative because as a career progresses, it becomes increasingly difficult to overcome low-profile or ill-conceived assignments. Without the kinds of assignments that are considered prerequisites for senior management posts, nontraditional managers are likely to be overlooked. Thus it appears that early and continuing problems in career development are partly responsible for the discouraging situation today, a situation in which executives grumble that they can’t find enough qualified nontraditional candidates for senior-level jobs.

Poor Working Environment

The working environment for many nontraditional managers is lonely, unfriendly, and pressure packed. At the higher levels, they are still dramatically outnumbered by white men, many of whom, deliberately or not, regularly treat them differently from the way they treat their white male colleagues. Our interviews revealed that nontraditional managers are excluded from luncheons, social events, and even the friendly camaraderie that occurs in most offices. They are often a curiosity to their colleagues, who watch them closely and sometimes scrutinize their work and behavior for possible mistakes. Some people of color and women have even commented that other people withhold information from them and sabotage their work in order to undermine them. Because they are still the exception in many groups and because prejudice shapes others’ perceptions of them, many nontraditional managers find the working environment a frustrating, draining advancement barrier.

A black personnel director told us that in her corporation, “The climate is not there yet to just walk in, to be like one of the other people. Women and minorities have to be better. There’s always someone raising the bar while you’re in the air. . . . I’m tired.” This personnel director and others noted that the pressure and isolation are not only exhausting, but they also combine to create another problem that represents a catch-22 for nontraditional managers. On the one hand, when they do need help, they can’t admit it and ask for help for fear of being written off as incompetent. On the other hand, because of the pressure to be consistently outstanding and the need to avoid serious mistakes, their not asking for help can be suicide. Although white male managers may be subject to this dynamic to some extent, they do not face it in an atmosphere of prejudice. An Asian-American manager who doesn’t know what to do after receiving a key customer’s threat to sue, for example, or a black female manager who needs to take time off during a busy season to care for an ill parent runs the risk of reinforcing stereotyped attitudes in asking for help or support.

Another factor we learned about that contributes to a poor working environment for nontraditional managers is that there are few if any other nontraditional managers to be role models and mentors for those rising beyond middle management. Many managers in our study pointed out that they were dependent on white men to advise and promote them, which was often
ineffective. Ruby Keele (1986) describes the “credit theory of mentoring” that makes it difficult for nontraditional managers to get the support of higher-level executives. The theory is that to get credit and support, nontraditional managers must first demonstrate that they really do not need credit and support and that other people, skills, and contacts are available to them. Often they are not. When they are, they can be a powerful force in shaping a career. A black woman who had been in the personnel function of her company told us how she intervened to save another black employee from what she described as a racist manager. When she learned that the subordinate had been labeled a poor performer by her manager, she went to talk to the subordinate, who threatened to leave, saying she wanted to work with more blacks. “Do you want to be around blacks, or do you want to have access to blacks?” the intervener asked. “If you have money, you can go away on weekends or whatever and have access to other blacks. But as a poor performer, you can’t do that. Do you want to leave this company with the reputation of being a poor performer? Fix your performance, and then you can leave.” The woman we interviewed then went to the other black employee’s boss and insisted that he put his subordinate in the remedial action program usually reserved for designated high-potential employees. They both did their part, and the subordinate was eventually promoted.

According to managers we interviewed, white men are not usually eager to support someone with a different perspective or different values, and many find it difficult even to communicate with such an individual. One Mexican-American manager had discovered that senior managers feel they need some sort of special language to relate to him. They ask him, “What college did your father go to?” He responds, “My father is a laborer.” They feel that they can’t understand him because his experience is so different, and they use that as an excuse for not mentoring or assisting him and people like him.

We also learned that nontraditional managers often have no one to talk to about their fears, their mistakes, and the rage they feel over being treated differently from others. There is often no one to help them objectively assess their abilities and their behavior or to help them cope with the uncertainty they may feel about their role in the organization and the expectations others have of them. There is often no one to help them feel comfortable. One manager commented, “My first ten years were spent in areas where I was the only black. I had no one to talk to.” If they do seek comfort by spending time with other blacks or Mexican-American employees, for example, they may be perceived as “segregationists” who have little loyalty to the organization. Even when blacks eat together in the cafeteria, one human resource executive remarked, it is perceived as a revolution. Yet if they remain isolated, they may be seen as arrogant or resentful, and being isolated, they may not be able to perform well. Finally, as we have seen, if they try to “integrate” with white men, they are often met with stereotyping and even outright rejection.

The loneliness and unfriendliness of an organization is often magnified when nontraditional managers relocate from urban centers to smaller, less diverse towns. They can be subject to harassment. Making friends is difficult, and finding services such as hair styling may be impossible. According to our interviews, this helps explain why some nontraditional managers are very cautious about moving away from an occupation or location in which they have built a support system. If they are unsure about the level of commitment they have from their organization, some nontraditional managers are likely to reject relocations because they involve additional barriers to their advancement.

**Lack of Organizational Savvy**

The managers we interviewed told us that people of color and white women often fail to advance because they don’t know “how to play the game” of getting along and getting ahead in business. They appear to lack the preparation and knowledge that would allow them to put their experiences and their expectations in the context of their organization’s culture. Nontraditional managers don’t seem to pay adequate attention to organizational politics and the agenda of their colleagues and bosses,
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and they don’t seem to be strategic about their own career development. In some ways, all nontraditional managers share the problem of being newcomers who have been placed in management roles without any real expectation that they will advance to senior levels. Therefore, little if any effort has been made to prepare them for such advancement. In other ways, the problems seem to be distinctively different for Hispanics, for Asian-Americans, for blacks, for white women, and for other groups because of particular aspects of each group’s organizational experience.

One of the problem areas mentioned for Hispanics, Asian-Americans, Native Americans, and sometimes women in general is an inability to assert themselves and their views. Some members of these groups feel that their upbringing makes it more difficult for them to behave competitively in many business settings. A Native American manager told us about how cultural traditions get in the way of effective corporate communication. For example, we learned that when Asian-Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans show respect by not initiating conversation with older people or when they foster teamwork by not continuing to argue with a senior manager who doesn’t accept their idea, they are seen as subservient yes-people not willing to take a stand. Women with these ethnic backgrounds have an especially hard time communicating this way because they have been reared to support men and seek their approval. More than one Asian-American employee group has asked for courses in assertiveness to help them combat this problem.

The opposite problem seems to plague many black managers, who are frequently seen as too aggressive. A black woman told us about attending a conference and getting uncomfortable with the only other black attendee who, she felt, was too vocal, too confrontational, and didn’t have a need to fit in. He made others uncomfortable with him, she believed. Another black woman mentioned the defensiveness that may prompt some blacks to keep pushing for recognition and to exaggerate differences through their style, dress, and language. She said that many blacks, especially at the entry level, come into her organization assuming that the managers won’t like them. So they invest their energy in fighting their fear of the white men instead of putting it in their job or in learning more about the industry. White men and others in our study believe that some blacks are unrealistic in expecting too much too soon and don’t accept the idea of working their way up step-by-step.

Women are perceived as unwilling to take the risks necessary in business and naive about how to look out for themselves, partly because of their socialization. Managers in our study commented that women don’t know how to negotiate titles (often assuming instead that they will get the title they deserve) or how to get credit for their ideas and talents. One black woman explained that women need more of a “kamikaze attitude” to move ahead—taking risks but knowing that if you’re too vocal or confrontational, no one will want to be your manager. Blacks, she said, had made more progress in her organization than women because they had approached senior management more forcefully. “The blacks said, We are a viable people and we deserve opportunity. Here are the names of black people who have potential. The women said, We’d like you to consider us for jobs, as if they were saying, Take my life and figure it out.”

One disadvantage that seems to be common to all nontraditional groups is an inability to create and manage networks. Because their networks are not as strong as those of many white men, they don’t get as much information about industry trends and where the company is headed. Without strong networks and mentors, it is difficult to gain expertise in corporate politics; yet naïveté in this domain can easily derail a career. Managers in our study pointed to deficits in these “soft” skills related to understanding the organizational culture and context as a barrier much more often than they mentioned a lack of formal education. The fact that the managers rated such organizational savvy as more important than formal education may indicate that courses and degrees are now less relevant to success in the executive suite than they once were.

Ironically, this may be happening just as many nontraditional employees have caught up with or surpassed their white male colleagues in terms of formal education. Even in technical areas, which were most often cited as an educational deficit,
the number of people of color and women who have earned degrees is impressive. In 1989, for example, more people of color than whites graduated with a doctorate in engineering (Carter and Wilson, 1991). The number of women with technical degrees has also been steadily increasing. Women earned 27.9 percent of science and engineering doctorates in 1989, up from 20.9 percent in 1979 (Mooney, 1990). Other disciplines also provide important preparation for executive posts, particularly business administration. In this area, some nontraditional groups have made strong gains over the years. In 1990, for example, 30 percent of the students at the top twenty business schools were women (Roman, 1990).

Yet according to the managers we talked to, education is still considered a problem for some ethnic groups, particularly for many blacks and Hispanics. Economic hardship and other access problems have kept some nontraditional managers from achieving educational credentials. However, managers in our study pointed out that education is simply not valued in some cultures. One black manager in corporate employee relations said that blacks and Puerto Ricans have traditionally not gone into science and math because there are no role models for them in these areas and so they don't see opportunities for themselves in these fields.

There is also the question of whether a formal education will pay off for people of color to the same extent that it does for white men. A recent study found that white, college-educated men earn a third more than black men with equal education ("White College Graduates Make a Third More Than Blacks," 1991). Obviously, then, education does not equalize the earning power of blacks with that of whites. If young people continue to shun education for the kinds of reasons we have been talking about, the lack of formal education may remain a barrier for members of some ethnic groups.

Greater Comfort in Dealing with One's Own Kind

Consciously and unconsciously, managers, like people in general, tend to feel more comfortable around people who are like themselves. As a result, they often choose to associate with those who are like them rather than with those who are different. In the case of white male managers, this natural tendency would appear to be amplified by some of the institutionalized forms of prejudice discussed earlier. The president of a West Coast company, a white man, described the problem this way: "Cultural differences are tough for white males to deal with. We hire those who are like us; we perpetuate ourselves in the belief that it's easier to relate to someone with the same values, the same looks, the same perceptions. If anyone thinks about it, that's what they think."

Even without prejudice, then, many white male managers may be reluctant to embrace diversity. They may not intend to hire and promote candidates who are like them, but they may often favor white men because, through familiarity and comfort, white men seem to be the best people for the job.

On the other hand, discomfort with nontraditional managers, which can and often does come from prejudice, may also arise out of a simple lack of familiarity. Ethnic groups still do not mingle socially with others in many communities, so white male executives have little interaction with people of color outside the office. This social distance can create discomfort at work, perhaps because of a class issue. One white human resource executive in our study had detected a hierarchy of comfort based on class distinctions: at the top, below whites, were Asians; at the bottom were blacks and Puerto Ricans; in between were Cubans and other Hispanics. A young, black operations executive remarked at the end of her interview, "In every job I've ever had, I've had to make people comfortable with the fact that I am black. 'It's okay,' I say. 'Yeah, I am black.'" While some ethnic groups are more socially distant from white men than others because of perceived class or other issues, interaction with any different ethnic group is likely to cause many white male executives some discomfort. White men, as the dominant business group, have had less need than others to reach out to different groups by learning their language and traditions. These executives' relative insulation over the years makes it more difficult for them to relate to members of other ethnic groups.
Of course, white male executives have had considerable interaction with white women, but not as peers in business. As many managers in our study pointed out, this leads to a tendency for them to treat female managers as they treat their wives, daughters, or secretaries, in short, in what they see as familiar and accustomed roles for women. As a result, many white men still resist the idea of women being their equals as managers, and they consequently don't often support women's advancement. Many white men will probably direct most of their extra effort to help someone else's career toward those with whom they have had more experience and feel more comfort.

The natural tendency to relate more easily to people who are similar to oneself applies to everyone. This is one reason why ethnically based employee groups are active and valued. The exclusion of women and people of color from upper-management positions, however, is increasingly regarded as a significant problem because it interferes with the effective use of human potential. As population demographics shift and competition escalates, this problem is likely to get more attention from executives.

**Difficulty in Balancing Career and Family**

According to the managers we interviewed, the struggle to reconcile home and work is still largely a woman's problem, and the decisions that women must make often postpone and even preclude their advancement into senior management. Bearing and rearing children conflict with full-time dedication to a career. We learned that maternity leave is undefined or unavailable in many organizations, so women often put their jobs in jeopardy when they become pregnant. It is impossible for many women to continue to work evenings and weekends or to travel frequently once they have children, and many women don't want to. Many women wait until their thirties to have children, a time when they are expected to be proving themselves on the corporate fast track or on the tenure track in academia. Once this period is over, it is very difficult to be reconsidered as a high-potential executive candidate.

Organizations have historically provided little support for women who confront the dilemma of meeting both their career and their family needs, and we were told that there is still some reluctance to address this issue. A number of managers commented that many executives have little understanding of or sympathy for the work/family conflicts that typically fall to women to solve. One operations manager explained that as a woman with children, "You can put in sixty to eighty hours a week as a working mother, but your employees don't understand and your boss doesn't understand." As a result, personnel policies geared to a man with a wife at home are slow to change, and many women are dismissed because of their family responsibilities. Women are reluctant to speak up for what are still considered "women's issues" (maternity leave, dependent care, flexible working hours, and job sharing) for fear they will be seen as agitators or even as being ambivalent about their own career. Some women actually do become ambivalent, more interested for a while in rearing a child than in pursuing a promotion.

Competing demands represent a career advancement barrier for many women and, increasingly, for men as well. Even for women without children, the responsibility for maintaining a marriage or a significant relationship sometimes seems to interfere with work, perhaps because of societal expectations about the role of women in relationships. A human resource executive in one of our model companies told us that one woman about to get a promotion instead opted for a demotion because her husband was complaining about the amount of traveling she was doing. The executive emphasized that this kind of conflict affects women more than men even though both travel. As she put it, "We haven't had a man do that [take a demotion] in the last five years." Relocation is an even greater problem for many women in a relationship because their husbands or partners (who may be paid more than they) are not likely to accompany them on a move.

Many women's outside responsibilities make it harder for them to meet the high expectations for performance that their bosses may have for them. Household chores alone take more of a woman's time than a man's, even when no children
are involved. Data compiled by Daniel Evan Weiss (1991) reveal that women who work full time spend another twenty-five hours a week doing housework, while men spend only thirteen hours. When young children are involved, mothers spend seventeen hours a week on child care, while fathers spend only five hours. Often women also carry out many of the social obligations involved in a relationship. Societal norms may be more to blame than rigid personnel practices in organizations, but the squeeze being put on many talented women continues to drive some away and to limit the contributions of many who stay.

**Other Barriers to Advancement**

As Table A.8 in the appendix shows, we learned about a number of other barriers standing in the way of advancement for nontraditional managers, including economic restrictions and the lack of accountability for diversity. Many of these other barriers are discussed in later sections dealing with the tools and the process to foster diversity. For now, we will examine just two of these—backlash and infighting—because managers have only recently recognized them as significant problems.

“Cultural shifts bring anxiety for white men” was the headline of an article in the *Washington Post* (Duke, 1991, p. A1). The article documented the reactions of some white male managers to the changing composition of the management ranks in their organizations, particularly their feeling of being a minority in the presence of more Asian-Americans, Hispanics, blacks, other people of color, and white women. Marking historical events may also prompt backlash. The fiftieth anniversary of Japan’s attack on Pearl Harbor, for example, was anticipated with dread by many Japanese-Americans, according to Sonni Efron (1991). Japanese-Americans expected a backlash of anti-Asian animosity and hate attacks, fueled in part by resentment of Japan’s growing economic clout at a time when the U.S. economy was faltering. Susan Faludi’s 1991 book, *Backlash*, explains that backlash against women has consistently been triggered by the perception that women are making progress toward equality.

Backlash was found to be one of the ten most significant restraining forces in the advancement of black senior executives, according to an Executive Leadership Council’s study (Baskerville and Tucker, 1990), perhaps because of resentment or fear. Such feelings have prompted some white men to rebel against their organizations’ affirmative action and diversity efforts by undermining diversity practices. Some have even charged reverse discrimination. According to managers in our study, backlash has become so prevalent that it now represents the primary weakness in diversity efforts.

One view holds that backlash by white men is a natural, expected consequence of diversity. In the *Washington Post* article by Duke (1991) cited earlier, Professor William Keller of Columbia University’s school of business is quoted as saying, “The white males who have always been in a privileged class now find themselves, in effect, not receiving the kind of undivided attention that they have in the past, and that’s a real tension point” (p. A14). Author and researcher John Fernandez (1991) further explains this tension by noting that white men used to have to compete for promotions with only 33 percent of the population—other white men. After the 1964 Civil Rights Act, white men had to compete, at least by law, with the other 67 percent of the population as well. The increased competition with people of color and white women, whom many white men believe to be inferior or deficient in some way, has led to what Fernandez calls “severe psychological dislocation, and cries of unfair treatment and reverse discrimination” (p. 209). He concludes: “Corporations should recognize [backlash] as a normal reaction of people who are at risk of being displaced from a privileged power position. This is especially painful because white males, always a minority of the population, have perceived themselves to be a majority” (p. 209).

Backlash is a barrier to fostering diversity, and it is sometimes provoked by the very practices used in some diversity efforts, such as laying off white men even when they are not the “last in” employees in order to maintain the proportion of nontraditional employees. Resentment against ethnic employee groups appears to be increasing in several organizations in our study because downsizing has cut job opportunities and the “unrepeated” white men feel that employee groups have unduly influenced personnel policies. Backlash is also prompted when
nontraditional managers are given opportunities that their white male bosses or colleagues were not given, such as faster promotions or invitations to special meetings or social events. Breaking tradition by accommodating nontraditional managers in any way upsets some traditional managers.

Educational attempts have been aimed at reducing backlash by helping white male employees understand that strict fairness has seldom if ever been the sole criterion for promotion. Nevertheless, some managers in our study believe that it is unrealistic to expect to eliminate backlash because white men have lost some of their privilege and they do face more competition today; they cannot be expected to like that or even to accept it without a fight. The challenge of diversity efforts includes keeping backlash under control to hold its disruptive impact to a minimum.

Infighting occurs when one underrepresented group vies with another for power, status, and privileges. Blacks, for example, sometimes fear that other nontraditional groups will receive the best promotions or the biggest pay increases. White women are sometimes resentful that black men are given the opportunity for accelerated career development instead of them. In a kind of sibling rivalry, women and other nontraditional groups in all combinations express hostility toward others when they feel their own slice of the pie is not big enough.

At the National Urban League's 1991 convention, president John Jacob targeted infighting as the topic of his keynote address (Kennedy, 1990). He urged blacks to ally with other people of color or risk having whites pick and choose among minority groups in granting social and economic gains. Jacob, like others, believes that whites sometimes use divide-and-conquer tactics to increase friction among ethnic groups. He fears that infighting is particularly damaging to American-born blacks, who will remain at the bottom while other ethnic groups, more acceptable to whites, leap ahead economically. Other groups are growing rapidly, and some will soon outnumber blacks in the United States. The 1990 census figures show that the number of Hispanics is almost equal to the number of blacks (22.3 million Hispanics, compared with 29.9 million blacks) and that the fast-growing group, Asian-Americans, already numbers 7.2 million.

The dramatic increase in hate crimes to record levels indicates that backlash and infighting are problems in society in general, not just in organizations. Fairchild and Fairchild (1991) and others have noted that the growing diversity in the population has increased interethnic tension to the point of violence. The Los Angeles area, as most of us know from watching the violence that ensued from the Rodney King verdict, has been a hotbed of this tension. Before this much-publicized event occurred, however, other racially motivated hate crimes plagued the area: a black schoolgirl was killed by a Korean merchant, blacks and Latinos went at each other at a local high school, urban warfare broke out in Long Beach between Latinos and Cambodians, and white supremacists continued to come out of the closet. The fear of losing whatever gains have been made to another group is a powerful force that alienates people from one another. Backlash and infighting have become serious problems as recent demographic shifts have occurred in the population.

Overall, a variety of barriers keep nontraditional managers from advancing in organizations. The majority of these barriers fall into two categories. The first is historical exclusion, the fact that white men have dominated the executive ranks of most organizations for many years. Because of their socialization, their reluctance to share their power and privilege with others, and their natural proclivity to associate with people like themselves, white men keep people of color and white women from moving into their circle. The second category involves deficits in various kinds of qualifications; this makes it difficult to find and accept nontraditional candidates for executive posts. Finding women and people of color with traditionally accepted credentials (such as an M.B.A. or an engineering degree) or experiences (such as military duty or line jobs) remains elusive to many managers; yet many managers are also reluctant to accept a different set of qualifications or to provide opportunities (such as military duty or line jobs) that are open to others. These two themes amplify each other and create imposing barriers to the advancement of nontraditional managers.

The barriers to advancement have changed to some extent over time, and each level of progress has brought a new set of issues to be resolved. Until nontraditional managers began
The New Leaders to be advanced into upper management, for example, the white male executives already in place did not feel so threatened by them. Until blatant discrimination became illegal and "politically incorrect," the subtly disguised versions of racism and sexism did not have to be confronted. Until diversity began to cover a greater variety of ethnic groups, the fewer nontraditional groups in a given organization received more attention and had greater solidarity. Therefore, within any organization, the specific problems that now exist may reflect the level of progress that has already been achieved. Discovering which concerns and barriers are the most critical to employees now is an essential part of moving ahead, and it is the first step in any effective diversity effort.

Although the specific barriers to advancement differ from one organization to another, their effect is the same. Barriers to nontraditional managers prevent any organization from preparing a full cadre of potential leaders to take over in the future. That cadre must be more diverse than it has ever been, and the techniques used to develop leadership talent must also be more diverse and creative than ever before. Chapter Three addresses the need to change current models of leadership development and presents a framework for developing leadership in the context of diversity.

THREE

SETTING GOALS FOR SUSTAINED LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

Susan Woodly, a division finance manager, is being interviewed on a Tuesday morning during her visit to headquarters. Woodly is a white, thirty-five-year-old woman of German and Swiss ancestry. She is married and has one three-year-old child. The conference room on the fourth floor of the headquarters building, where she arranged for us to meet, is somewhat bare but not uncomfortable. Susan Woodly is neatly dressed in a gray suit, but she appears to be a bit nervous and rushed. As we get into the interview, she relaxes. My question to her is, "You are unusual in that you have reached a level in management that many of your counterparts have not. What is there about your characteristics or circumstances that makes you different in this regard?" She responds:

It has been very difficult for me. When I began to move up, three areas of "trial and tribulation" surfaced. The first I remember as clear as a bell, when I got a promotion in my department. In the lunchroom I overheard my colleagues, whom I considered to be friendly and supportive, complaining that I had gotten that promotion because I was a woman. That was very painful.

Next, I began feeling that I could never say no to requests for what I call "volunteer PR work." At one point I was representing AMM Enterprises on a total of five community boards. I also felt that I couldn't afford a failure, that the burden of my being a woman put me under microscopic scrutiny. I was afraid my job perfor-
be taken to resolve the problems identified. People are expecting something to happen, and they will get increasingly frustrated if they see nothing being done. In this regard, initial solutions that are fast and reasonably good will have a more positive effect than better but slower solutions. To be able to communicate a sense of urgency through quick action adds credibility to the entire process and keeps inertia from gaining the upper hand. Inertia poses the danger of increasing the cost and the difficulty of taking action later.

Many considerations go into choosing what action to take. Although this is clearly a critical step in making progress, the selection process should not be allowed to become overwhelming. There are no perfect answers, so taking any reasonable step is often better than studying the situation endlessly. Once actions, or solutions, are chosen, however, they must be supported—given a chance to work and followed up. As we’ll see in Chapter Ten, to be effective any solution must produce results.

I have been ushered into a small, tastefully furnished office and offered a soft drink by a secretary. Within a few minutes the vice president of compensation arrives, apologizes for the delay, and collects from his desk the notes he made on the interview questions. During the first ninety minutes of the interview, his responses to the questions are so extensive that my hand is aching from trying to take complete notes.

This executive is black, has an M.B.A., and has been with the company for seventeen years. He describes in detail several of his company’s diversity practices, such as the annual day-long succession planning meeting to determine who is eligible for senior management positions. He discusses the requirement imposed by top management that people of color and white women be included on the “promotable list” for each position. In addition, he describes the company’s goals in the area of representation of women and people of color at all levels and in all functions. Specifically, the company aims to have the same demographic percentage of people at each higher level as at the level below. This executive also notes how the company tracks the representation of white women and people of color in each function, such as operations, marketing, and finance, and goes on to describe the compensation guidelines that have been issued. His animated gestures reveal the excitement he feels about his own role in the diversity effort.

“What is there about these practices that makes them work?” I ask him. “That is, are certain key ingredients responsible for their effectiveness?”

He answers without hesitation, “You have to demand results. This year we sent managers’ salary recommendations back to them
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a number of times before we would approve them. There was no eq­uity in the way they assigned merit increases to blacks versus whites, for example. This sends a message to white managers: Fix it until it's right. I don't think we'll have to go through that again next year.*

The degree of emphasis that organizations place on results may separate those that succeed in their diversity efforts from the field of hopefuls. When revenue or profit is a goal of a business function, progress is regularly measured and managers are held accountable for the results. When quality improvement or cus­
tomer service is a goal, measures are devised to indicate progress, and managers are evaluated against them. When it comes to diversity, however, there is strong resistance to establishing indica­tors of progress and holding managers accountable for mea­surable results. This seems to be a major reason why many or­ganizational efforts fail.

The simple rule that "what doesn't get measured doesn't get done" applies as well to diversity efforts as to other activi­ties. However, the way that progress can and should be mea­sured is probably the most emotionally debated aspect of the diversity issue. Adopting sensible measures is necessary to over­come the resistance to focusing on concrete outcomes. The guide­lines provided in this chapter should help defuse the measure­ment debate. But first the resistance needs to be understood.

The resistance to measuring diversity comes in large part from managers' negative reactions to government regulation of equal employment opportunity. From the start, managers have resent­ed the goals and timetables the government has required. According to a number of managers in our study, those goals and timetables have proved to be disastrous in promoting the interests of nontraditional managers. Accountability for meet­ing hiring or promotion goals prompted many managers either to fill positions with unsuitable women and people of color or to withhold support from the nontraditional managers they promoted. These mismatched and unsupported individuals were seen as failures, testimony that forced integration is a sad and costly mistake. The "quotas" at the heart of government regu­lation have consequently come to represent a measure to be avoided at all costs.

The term quota is likely to raise eyebrows and heart rates among many groups of people, even though individuals define it differently. Some managers in our study think of a quota strictly as a percentage goal (we need 15 percent more Hispanic sales managers by next year), while others see it only as a sim­ple head count (three more female vice presidents). Some define a quota in relation to population statistics (the percentage of black professionals should match the percentage of blacks in the standard metropolitan statistical area, or SMSA), while others believe that any numerical goal is a quota regardless of whether or not it conforms to population statistics. Generally, we found that managers used the term quota when they objected to a mea­sure, whatever it was. The negative connotation was clear. Ac­cording to managers we interviewed, the term quota conjures up images of traditional executives in the private sector buck­ling under the pressure of government regulations, along with pictures of seemingly less qualified nontraditional managers tak­ing their reserved places in management and eroding their or­ganization's capacity to perform. Those managers are therefore reluctant to use statistical performance measures that even ap­proximate quotas.

The reaction among nontraditional managers is more mixed but no less emotional. Some insist that quota measures are the backbone of any diversity effort because the numbers have to change if progress is to occur. In fact, the affirmative action requirements for government contractors did prompt visi­ble progress, according to statistics presented by Leslie Dun­bar (1984). Between 1974 and 1980, for example, government contractors increased their employment of people of color by 20 percent in contrast to only about half that by other compa­nies. Parallel figures for the employment of women were 15 per­cent and 2 percent. Other nontraditional managers shy away from quotas because of the stigma attached to them. If these managers get promoted under a quota system, they feel that they will be perceived as less qualified or capable than their white male counterparts simply because the quota exists. Moreover,
their vulnerability to this negative attitude is sometimes exploited. For instance, sheets posted across the campus of the University of California at San Diego in 1991 by the local chapter of Young Americans for Freedom maliciously queried nontraditional students, "Were you accepted to UCSD in order to fulfill its goals?" (Smollar, 1991b).

The emotional sting of quotas is evidenced by its impact in political campaigns around the country. For example, according to Phillips (1991), controversy over the use of quotas may have given the lead to North Carolina's incumbent senator Jesse Helms over his black opponent, Harvey Gantt, in 1990. Helms emphasized that the civil rights bill then under consideration in Congress would mean that race comes before qualifications in hiring or advancement. An advertisement targeting quotas and run during the final week of the campaign may have put Helms ahead. The ad depicted a white man crumpling up a job rejection letter while an announcer intoned: "You needed that job and you were the best qualified. But they had to give it to a minority because of a racial quota. Is that fair?"

Diane Feinstein's campaign for the California governorship may also have been damaged by her announced plan to earmark government jobs for women and people of color. Her opponent, Pete Wilson, attacked the plan, indicating that such a quota is imposed at the expense of better qualified people appointed on the basis of merit. Feinstein's reaction, according to an article in the San Diego Union ("Feinstein Job Quota for Women, Minorities Decried," 1990, p. A24) was that "it is insulting to believe there are not enough qualified women to hold jobs in proportion to their numbers in the state." However, the negative connotations of a quota system may have contributed to her eventual loss in that race. President Bush's opposition to a civil rights bill that involves measures sometimes described as quotas is further evidence that many statistical measures are offensive to many people, perhaps because of the prejudicial assumption that nontraditionals are not as meritorious as white men.

Quotas based on ethnicity or sex have been justified by some people as a necessary and fair solution to past injustices and as being virtually no different from other forms of prefer-

ence that have been used and accepted for many years. Leslie Dunbar (1984) and others point to a variety of cases showing that group identity is systematically used as a criterion for selection, as when a university gives preference to applicants from certain states or to children of former graduates, when veterans receive preference for jobs and special benefits, when children of cabinet members are given help to find government jobs, or when balance is sought in putting together a political slate. Using race or sex as one criterion among several is not such an unusual practice considering the many other versions of preferential treatment that are regularly used, even among white male candidates. According to Dunbar, the rationale for using race in particular as a preferred characteristic may even be more justified than other forms. Remedial preferences for people of color are a small price to pay for the brutal discrimination they have suffered under Jim Crow laws and practices. Says Dunbar (1984, p. 67):

The preference may take away some benefits from some white men, but none of them is being beaten, lynched, denied the right to use a bathroom, a place to sleep or eat, being forced to take the dirtiest jobs or denied any work at all, forced to attend dilapidated and mind-killing schools, subjected to brutally unequal justice, or stigmatized as an inferior being. Setting aside, after proof of discrimination, a few places a year for qualified minorities out of hundreds and perhaps thousands of employees, as in the Kaiser plant in the Weber case, or 16 medical school places out of 100 as in Bakke, or 10 percent of federal public work contracts as in Fullilove, or even 50 percent of new hires for a few years as in some employment cases—this has nothing in common with the racism that was inflicted on helpless minorities, and it is a shameful insult to the memory of the tragic victims to identify the two.

As explained in the introduction to this book, the intense personal feelings with which the diversity issue as a whole is
debated make it difficult to resolve; emotions run deep, particularly in regard to statistical measures of diversity. The following guidelines should help separate the measurement issue from the powerful historical events that contribute to its emotional impact.

Create Meaningful Numerical Goals and Use Them

Numerical goals and statistical measures are needed to help managers focus on results rather than on effort or intent. If outcomes are not emphasized, it is quite possible that well-intentioned diversity efforts can cost an organization a great deal of time and money and yet not create any significant, lasting change. Numerical goals, when properly used, reinforce the idea that diversity is tied to core business objectives and, over the long term, contributes to the organization's very survival.

Many of the progressive organizations in our study have discovered alternatives to government-imposed statistical goals, alternatives that capture progress on key aspects of their diversity activities and avoid at least some of the problems associated with traditional EEO measurement techniques. These alternative goals do three things: they focus on specific levels and functions of an organization, they highlight retention and development as well as recruitment, and they sometimes separate small groups of exceptional high-potential individuals from other employees.

A number of the organizations we studied monitor personnel profiles in some detail, using level and function categories that are more specific than those required by the government for federal contractors. Instead of looking at broad categories such as "officials and managers," which may account for thousands of managers throughout the country (and beyond), they break down the profile into significant levels of management. Some organizations profile clusters of managers in certain pay grades (grades 13 to 15 compared with grades 16 and above, for example) or with certain titles (directors compared with vice presidents, or officers) or those with certain privileges (managers eligible for bonuses or stock options). Examining separate levels

Demand Results and Revisit the Goals

of management makes it possible to track the upward movement of women and people of color once they become managers. This kind of tracking is important to organizations that have the goal of advancing nontraditional managers through management layers. Some organizations also regularly look within pay grades to see whether nontraditional managers are distributed throughout the pay range (and not all in the bottom quartile of the pay range, for example) to determine whether pay is also increasing with level of responsibility.

Some organizations also monitor personnel profiles outside the management ranks but above entry level. In one organization in our study, for example, professional, technical, and sales positions are monitored to be sure that nontraditional employees are adequately represented. These are the higher-paid jobs for individual contributors, and they represent an important part of the pipeline for management roles. Furthermore, in some organizations, jobs in certain functions such as production or finance are reviewed separately if they represent historical "trouble spots" in terms of adequate representation of women or people of color or if they are exceptionally good tracks to senior management positions. Separating these types of jobs from those at lower levels or in more peripheral functions is one step in checking how well the pipeline is being filled with nontraditional candidates. Goals for these particular job categories may be different from those for other jobs in the organization. In at least one organization in our study, profile goals are not used for lower-level jobs. The hypothesis is that by concentrating only on higher-level jobs, representation in lower levels is practically assured. Until the higher-level jobs were targeted, some managers noted, nontraditional employees were hired only at lower levels.

Regional differences are also considered in setting personnel profile targets. The SMSA or appropriate recruitment region, is used as the basis for targeted personnel profiles in an organization's different plants or subsidiaries so that representation in job categories reflects the ethnic mix of the pool of candidates in those locations. It would not be reasonable for an operation in Minneapolis or Atlanta to have the same targeted profile
as an operation in San Francisco or San Antonio, at least for positions that are typically recruited for locally. At higher levels, however, the profile goals may be quite similar if candidates are sought nationwide.

Besides creating specific goals for specific groups of jobs, some of the organizations in our study also base goals on upward movement. In some organizations, personnel goals reflect the philosophy that it is just as important that nontraditional managers are being advanced to their potential as it is to assume that they represent a certain proportion of the managers in their job group. In one company, the percentages of "promotable" women and people of color in each department are reviewed annually and compared with the percentages of women and people of color in that department and in the SMSA. If, for example, the percentage of women considered to be promotable is lower than their percentage representation in the department, then a "glass ceiling" to advancement may be present. Goals would be set to increase the promotable group to more closely equal their representation.

Goals are also used in some organizations to compensate business unit heads who develop nontraditional managers and then lose them to other units. In a traditional calculation, these managers' profile numbers would decrease because of transfers, and they would be penalized under many affirmative action programs. However, in this case, they are given credit for the number of people they have developed, including those who have been transferred or promoted into other units. This modification helps keep managers from holding onto their nontraditional employees when they should be sending them away for the broadening experiences that will help them qualify for executive posts. The measurement system reinforces the kind of behavior and achievements that aid career development for nontraditional managers.

Another precaution that some of the organizations in our study take is to use statistical goals to factor hiring and promotion opportunities into their profile calculations. Managers whose profiles do not improve throughout the year because they had no turnover or new openings in their units or departments should not be penalized. Therefore, numerical goals in some organizations are based on how many opportunities existed to improve the personnel profile. Managers record who got the job when an opening existed, including the person's sex, ethnicity, and whether she or he was an internal candidate or hired from outside. These data are then distributed monthly or quarterly to upper-level managers. These goals put the responsibility where it belongs, on managers who have some control over the mix of their personnel.

Managers who leave for one reason or another also affect numerical goals in some organizations. Terminations are included in profile reports in at least one company, along with hiring opportunities and beginning and current percentage representations. Other organizations regularly calculate the percentages of nontraditional managers who leave, voluntarily and not, and compare these with the figures for white men. This information is important in determining how well the organization is retaining nontraditional managers.

Retention goals, like advancement goals, apply more significantly to a single subset of managers, regardless of their sex or ethnicity. A reasonable goal is to retain and develop those managers with the most talent and the most potential. It is possible to incorporate this consideration into some calculations by, for example, counting the number of "promotable" or "high potential" managers who leave and comparing the rates for nontraditional groups and for white men. However, in some organizations, the information collected goes beyond group numbers and into individual assessments, some of which are impossible to quantify. For example, an annual review in one company involves a total of about two thousand general managers and their direct reports. Of all those who left during the past year, the organization identifies those it wished to retain. Executives review the proportion of these in comparison with other groups, but they also consider individual circumstances in assessing reasons for departure. In some cases, the organization decides to interview high-potential managers who left so that it can interpret the data on turnover and perhaps shape the goals for the next year. Techniques such as these allow organizations to mon-
itor individuals and small groups of managers who are special in some way, as well as larger groups of managers who are special in some way, as well as larger groups of managers separated by demographic characteristics, making the measures more relevant to the development, retention, and recruitment goals of the diversity effort.

Alternative and more functional numerical measures of progress such as those just described are more meaningful to managers because they are designed by the managers and therefore better fit the organization and its diversity goals. Because of this and because they are at least partly self-directed, such measures are often more acceptable—and enforceable—than government measures. More progressive companies give managers as much input and leeway as possible in creating and reinforcing statistical goals. In one company, the human resource staff originally evaluated managers on their diversity progress. As the process and the criteria became better understood over the years, however, the managers were eventually given the responsibility of assessing themselves; since progress has been made, their self-reports are now required every six months instead of every quarter. In another company, executives are experimenting with a range instead of a specific target number of personnel profiles so that managers can regulate themselves from one period to another and still meet their yearly and long-term numerical goals.

Tailoring numerical measures to the organization’s goals and giving managers more control over them are approaches that many of our model organizations are using to take the heat out of the measurement controversy. Although the numerical goals they use are not popular with all managers because they are still difficult to attain, the techniques seem to have helped overcome some resistance to measuring outcomes, and this is a critical aspect of any diversity effort.

**Supplement Personnel Statistics with Other Outcome Measures**

The impact of a diversity effort involves far more than personnel statistics. While these are important, they are not a sufficient measure of progress, and they are not an adequate incentive for managers to pursue diversity over time. Other outcomes must also be regularly examined to complete the picture of how much progress is being made and to evaluate the effectiveness of the diversity effort. Outcomes often relevant to diversity goals include measures of productivity and profitability tied to diversity efforts; employees’ attitudes and opinions concerning their work and co-workers; and indications that the organization’s culture provides a satisfying working environment for members of both sexes and all ethnicities.

**Productivity and Profitability**

Standard measures of productivity or profitability are sometimes used in organizations to show that diversity is good for business. While these measures can be useful in demonstrating that increasing diversity does not damage the bottom line, it is very difficult to prove that diversity is the reason for a rise and fall in standard, organization-wide business. Even when one can show that the organizations that are the most progressive on diversity issues are also outstanding profit makers or leaders in quality, as many of the organizations in our study are, there is still no clear evidence that diversity rather than a host of other possible factors is the primary cause.

More specific indicators of effectiveness are often used to strengthen the link between diversity and bottom-line results. Data on turnover is probably the most frequently used indicator in this regard. Organizations that are trying to improve the retention rate of nontraditional managers often use turnover rates to gauge their progress. Comparing overall turnover rates prior to and after diversity activities provides benchmarks for judging progress, and comparing the turnover rate of one group of managers to the rates of others (blacks compared with whites, women compared with men) pinpoints who is leaving at a higher rate. Goals for reducing the turnover of nontraditional managers, who have a historically high rate of departure, are not uncommon.

Subsets of managers can also be tracked; this can be done, for example, by separately reviewing the turnover of managers
from key functional areas, those lost from line versus staff positions, or high-potential managers who may have been pirated away by competing firms. While the cost of replacing any manager is high and cuts into profits, the loss of key managers and key candidates is particularly damaging for an organization because of the significant investment that has often been made in their development. Statistics on these subgroups help monitor progress, but additional information on individual cases may also be needed to determine what particular problems are or are not being solved and why.

Data on absenteeism are also sometimes used to gauge effectiveness. Like turnover, absenteeism is expensive for organizations, and it represents a compelling reason to go forward with diversity if that expense can be cut. When diversity activities can reduce the stress and dissatisfaction that many nontraditional managers associate with the workplace, then the savings in turnover and absenteeism costs can be significant. Absenteeism, however, may be of limited usefulness at management levels because managers often travel and have considerable freedom to choose their own hours, and so it is harder to determine when they are avoiding the workplace.

Another indicator of effectiveness that is related directly to the bottom line is reduction of lawsuits. Discrimination lawsuits can be very costly, as the examples presented in Chapter One demonstrate. The Texaco case involving a $17.65 million award to a single employee is probably the most dramatic example of how much a lawsuit can cost. John Rebchook (1990) claims that fired employees win 70 percent or more of their cases that get to court, and that juries typically award $250,000 to each. To the extent that diversity efforts can reduce lawsuits, considerable expenses may be saved. Comparisons from one year to another or from one three-year period to another may indicate progress in reducing lawsuits. Organizations in which employees are being encouraged to use an internal grievance system may only monitor grievances filed with outside agencies so that managers do not feel pressured if internal grievances increase during an initial period of a year or two. The number of suits or grievances filed outside, including the number lost by the employer, may be useful measures of effectiveness and financial impact. A closer, nonquantitative examination of those cases—where they originate, and the nature of the complaint, for example—may again reveal the kinds of problems being solved or not solved in an organization.

Other measures of productivity or profitability are more difficult to link to programs on diversity. There is probably no direct evidence to link increased diversity to increased productivity, although many organizational researchers see a theoretical basis for the connection. It may be that the data now being collected by organizations will help confirm that connection. Some educational organizations, for example, are optimistic that increasing diversity among teachers and administrators will lead to increased diversity among the student body. Some educational leaders in our study are looking at the percentage of nontraditional students who graduate as a key indicator of effectiveness, along with the percentage who go on to college or to graduate school. Higher standardized test scores among students is another indicator relevant to educational institutions struggling to diversify staffs and student bodies.

The argument that diversity increases productivity and profitability is still based more on faith than on statistics. The diversity issue, however, is hardly unique in this regard. What direct evidence do we have that better customer service is directly related to the bottom line? Do we know for sure that product quality increases profits more than clever advertising? Can anyone prove that one product or market will be more lucrative than another over the long term? Businesses operate on a host of assumptions, some based on sound theoretical premises, that drive the way they spend money to make money, but few can be conclusively proved. The lack of a guarantee is hardly an excuse for not taking action.

Numerical links between diversity and the bottom line are simply not a sufficient basis for creating or evaluating a diversity effort. Although diversity activities may indeed improve managers' skill in supervising and developing their people and consequently improve their productivity, we probably will not be able to prove it. For example, performance appraisals origi-
nally developed for use in special development programs for non-traditional managers may eventually be used throughout the organization and improve the way all managers are developed and evaluated, thereby increasing their contributions to the organization. Yet statistical measures may not capture the impact of that particular change. Demonstrating results from a diversity effort can and should incorporate whatever quantitative measures are available on profits and productivity. However, other indicators of effectiveness are also needed to assess the more subtle forms of progress that can be made in organizations, in the short run and over the long haul. The fact that these changes have not yet been linked to the bottom line may say more about our methodological limits than the relationship itself.

**Attitudes and Perceptions**

Employees’ perceptions about whether they are being fairly treated are an important indicator of progress. In the first step of investigating problems, executives often discover that perceptions differ dramatically from one demographic group of employees to another. Research by John Fernandez (1981, 1987, 1991) and internal organization studies have shown that white men at all levels feel better than any other group about how they are treated in their organization. Some organizations have set clear goals to improve nontraditional employees’ perceptions of treatment, while also maintaining the good feelings of many of their white male employees. Perceived inequities and barriers can be as powerful as any that are proved to be actual; they may affect motivation, concentration, retention, health, and a variety of other factors that have effects on employees’ work.

Management consultant John Hinrichs (1991, p. 77) notes that “the impact of employee actions on a company’s financial health can be truly staggering” and that much of that impact is tied to “what goes on inside people’s heads.” Hinrichs’ study of a Fortune 50 corporation linked employee commitment—coming to work, staying with the firm, caring about deadlines and the quality of their output—with bottom-line performance areas. A survey question about employees’ intention to stay with the firm, for example, can be translated into actual cost figures. Hinrichs reports that 36 percent of employees who respond that they will probably leave the company actually do quit (compared with only 13 percent of those who say they don’t plan to leave); at an average cost of $10,000 per person, the total projected turnover cost can be calculated. Absenteeism costs can also be calculated on the basis of employees’ survey responses. Those who respond that they are not satisfied with their company have a 50 percent higher absentee rate than employees who are satisfied. With an average absentee rate of eleven days per employee per year, at a cost of $100 per incident, the total projected absenteeism cost can be computed.

Whether all executives can project exact costs that stem from their managers’ and other employees’ dissatisfaction and lack of commitment is not clear. What is clear from this analysis is that employees with lower commitment cost an organization more and that components of their commitment can be measured by employee surveys. Regularly surveying employees is a common technique for monitoring the effectiveness of diversity activities. Focus groups and interviews with current and past managers are other tools often used to tap into employee attitudes. In addition to the questions already mentioned, some specific indicators of effectiveness that should be considered in measuring perceptions of fair treatment include the following:

- How likely is it that a manager will receive an accurate and thorough evaluation of her or his work at least once a year?
- Is each manager’s pay (base and bonus) in line with his or her contributions and the pay of co-workers?
- Does each manager receive information about opportunities to advance or to increase her or his potential to advance?
- Are there any significant consequences for managers who harass or discriminate against co-workers? For managers who practice affirmative action?
- Does each manager have a fair chance of being sent to a prestigious training program? Of being assigned to a high visibility task force or project team? Of being
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reassigned laterally when advancement opportunities are limited? Of getting a line job instead of a staff job?

Some executives in our study believe that employers ought to make employees happier in their work, and would expand surveys and interviews to assess happiness. While there is probably overlap between the perception of fair treatment and what executives call happiness, the latter includes satisfaction of a personal nature as well as professional satisfaction, morale, and easy bonding with colleagues for a sense of belonging. These factors, executives argue, have as much to do with employees' potential to contribute as those dealing more specifically with their feelings about fair treatment. Since it is very difficult to determine which perceptions and feelings affect employees' level of performance or potential, all are potentially useful indicators of effectiveness.

Employees' attitudes are important because they can potentially affect their decisions to stay or leave, to invest in learning, to nurture their subordinates' learning, and so on. Increasing the pool of managers who trust their colleagues and are willing to work in partnership with their employer is a goal that may help fill an organization's pipeline to the top. Organizations may even want to tap the perceptions of potential recruits or customers with respect to diversity issues to assess the image and reputation of the organization to key audiences among the public.

Culture Change

Some executives in our study were adamant about wanting to change their organization's culture. They do not feel that they can rely on personnel profiles or even statistics from attitude surveys to assess their goal of making the culture one that values diversity as opposed to one that resists or even merely tolerates diversity. Assessing the extent of culture change is a challenging and worthwhile goal, but it is important to find indicators that will help executives know how well they are doing. As the culture changes, it may be necessary to shift indicators of effectiveness to reflect the changes already made.

Demand Results and Revisit the Goals

Many managers in our study had a hard time explaining what a changed culture would look like. Some defined a culture of valuing diversity as one that provides a better work environment for all employees regardless of their sex or ethnicity. One executive feels that in a better environment a black manager would not be reminded so often that she or he is black. Other executives suggested that a changed culture involves widespread awareness of how differences in background and culture contribute to business objectives; as a result, managers put more effort into creating and supporting diversity.

If culture change does involve changing certain values and behaviors of managers and their subordinates, then those values and behaviors should be assessed to determine how widely and how fast the culture change is taking place. It is not enough to dismiss other measures of effectiveness because they do not reach the core of the matter; one must add or substitute other indicators that come closer to capturing one's true goals for diversity progress. However, assessing culture is in itself a rather fuzzy process, and accounting for varying interpretations of the link between behaviors and values adds to the complexity of the analysis.

Evidence that increased value is being placed on diversity might be partially captured in attitude surveys. Because managers' support for diversity would presumably be reflected over a period of time in a more diverse group of direct reports and high-potential candidates, personnel profiles would presumably also partially reflect progress in this area. As women and people of color become more familiar in an organization and are thought of more often when promotion opportunities come up, promotion rates should correspond to the change. Thus, it seems that even though some numerical measures tap into only some of the more obvious attitude and behavior changes, such measures should not be abandoned.

Other indicators may supplement the more popular measures in addressing culture change, but some managers are unclear about the direction in which these indicators should go. For example, as part of the change process, will the number of diversity training programs increase or decrease? Will there be more interest in training as awareness grows, or will employ-
ees simply stop going to training programs as they outgrow the
need? How about the number of special programs, task forces,
or advocacy groups for women or people of color? It is tempt-
ing to say that these activities will become obsolete as the cul-
ture change takes hold, but at what point should they be phased
out without jeopardizing the progress already made? Even track-
ing personnel profiles is sometimes seen as a short-run solution
to diversity. Advocates of phasing out this form of monitoring
argue that increased awareness of the value of diversity should
move us away from statistical measures and from rewards such
as bonuses based on numerical measures. Two of our model
organizations have, in fact, uncoupled managers' personnel
profiles and their compensation for fear that continued empha-
sis on the numbers will interfere with real progress in changing
the culture.

These are tough issues, and they illustrate the difficulty
of defining goals that can be tracked and that may change rather
dramatically as progress occurs. No doubt some heated discus-
sions will take place in deciding what outcomes are appropriate
and what measures of those outcomes are functional. Those dis-
cussions, among task force members and management commit-
tee members in particular, are probably necessary to final agree-
ment on some realistic goals and indicators of effectiveness in
reaching those goals. The indicators should help managers de-
termine whether changes are in the desired direction. If partic-
ipation in diversity training decreases, for example, are there
other measures to assess whether this is occurring because most
employees have already been adequately trained or because
many employees who need training are refusing to attend or
because the training is not as good as it used to be?

Evaluating Specific Diversity Practices

Evaluating the effectiveness of specific practices is another sticky
issue that many managers apparently duck rather than confront.
While all the organizations in our study paid attention to some
measure of overall effectiveness, only a few attempted to evalu-
ate the effectiveness of specific diversity practices. In fact, it was
surprising how few of the managers we interviewed could give
us concrete examples of how the effectiveness of practices such
as training or developmental programs could be assessed. It
seems that very little is being done in the way of evaluating par-
ticular practices and their contribution to the organization's over-
all diversity goals.

In evaluating individual practices, there is a risk that their
ture contribution will be over- or underestimated because of the
effects of other practices and other factors that determine out-
comes. Trying to assess one practice, such as an advocacy group
or a new set of performance appraisal criteria, out of context,
can be a waste of time when other important factors are not
considered. The impact of downsizing or the appointment of a
person of color to a senior executive post may outweigh the
effect of a training program, for example. Yet it seems wasteful
to invest in diversity activities without regard for the results they
contribute. Some effectiveness measures should certainly be con-
sidered for any diversity practice, even if they have to be viewed
in light of other contextual factors.

Some managers in our study did suggest indicators of
effectiveness for training and development programs, includ-
ing relatively simple techniques such as asking program partici-
pants about the value of the experience and even asking their
bosses about any differences they noticed before and after a
program. Such inquiries can be made at different times following
a program (immediately after, two months later, and six months
later) to determine its sustained impact. Although the ratings
and comments may have to be taken with a grain of salt, they
can sometimes be helpful in deciding whether to revamp, ex-
pand, or continue a program. Gathering data for training pro-
grams that are handled very confidentially and separating short-
term or superficial "smiles test" data collected at the end of pro-
grams from longer-term impact data can also be difficult. Here
are some other suggested measures of effectiveness.

- Are department heads or business unit managers nomin-
ating more of their high-potential managers for the program
year after year, or are they increasing their spending for such
programs? This indirect measure suggests how valuable these
managers perceive the program to be.
• Are participants being promoted after completing the program? If a major goal of developmental programs is to advance the participants, then tracking their movement (perhaps in comparison to others who did not participate) may be appropriate. When promotions are limited by business conditions, adding in lateral moves and special assignments may give a more accurate picture of how participants’ careers are progressing.

• Are past participants using the networks they were presumably building during a program, and to what extent has that helped them contribute more effectively? This kind of assessment is appropriate for programs that involve a group of participants meeting together during the course of a year, with one goal being to build ties with colleagues.

• Are participants staying with the organization longer? Programs that help orient employees or managers to the organization, including internship programs or programs to employ people initially on a temporary or seasonal basis, may be assessed in terms of their effect on retention.

These are only a few of the types of indicators that may be used to assess particular practices. Although not all practices lend themselves to assessment, there are ways of evaluating many of them on their unique contributions to diversity goals. While the interaction among practices and other factors must be considered, the analysis of individual practices can go a long way in helping managers shape the diversity effort to be most effective. Because of the costs involved in a diversity effort, it seems likely that executives will begin to require that effectiveness measures be used more often to assess specific diversity tools.

Expect Results That Managers Can Deliver

The demands made on managers and executives should be consistent with the control they have over the outcomes. As mentioned earlier, during times when managers have no hiring opportunities in their unit, it may not be reasonable to expect their personnel profiles to change (unless selective layoffs or natural attrition changes the mix). Along the same lines, holding managers responsible for hiring goals in other business units or at their own level may also be unreasonable unless there are clear ways for them to recruit, transfer, or promote people into available positions.

On the other hand, some managers argue that although organization-wide profitability is equally uncontrollable by many managers, at least some of their rewards (merit pay and bonuses, for example) are typically based on that profitability. Similarly, customer service or customer satisfaction may be outside an employee’s area of control yet accepted as an evaluation criterion. Holding managers accountable for diversity results outside their own unit or department may also be justified and widely accepted, but only if managers understand how they can influence those results, say, by helping in recruitment or internship programs, by serving as mentors, or by giving more rotational assignments to their staff.

Results need to come from a variety of managers within an organization, at the top and lower levels, in line and staff positions. Tailoring at least some expectations to each manager’s sphere of control is likely to increase the efficiency of a diversity effort. Senior executives may be expected to make a few key placements on their own, but they may also be expected to influence their managers to develop and promote the non-traditional managers who report to them. Human resource managers may be expected to target recruitment sources for those managers. Line managers may be expected to participate on task forces and create nuts-and-bolts career management programs for use throughout the organization. When managers’ unique contributions can be explicitly factored into a set of overall expectations, the process is likely to be, and to be seen as, under control.

Managers’ ability to produce results should also be considered. Many organizations have made the mistake of equating ability and control. Some managers want to build a more diverse team and to treat women and people of color more fairly and sensitively, but they don’t know how. Organizations that provide human resource counseling, options for training that are not too threatening or embarrassing, or useful systems for
recruiting can help these managers improve their ability to contribute to diversity goals. Incompetence should not be tolerated; however, because it usually takes time to build diversity skills, a grace period during which new procedures or expectations are introduced may be helpful in allowing managers to learn.

Fitting expected results and consequences to managers' ability and extent of control is an important part of getting things done. Managers' success or failure in achieving diversity results is often strongly related to their perceptions of the appropriateness of the demands being made on them.

Structure a Realistic but Ambitious Time Frame

Diversity goals can be made more realistic and acceptable by expanding the time frame for achieving them, but too many extensions will only deter progress. Goals should be challenging but achievable with planning and discipline within a specific period of time. Goals set too far into the future may be as unrealistic as those set too close to the present.

Diversity plans, like many strategic plans, often rely on a dual time frame that combines long-term and short-term goals. As emphasized earlier, achieving diversity takes a long time: ten or even twenty years. For example, several years ago one company set goals for ten years in the future; the goals largely focused on targeted personnel profiles for the entire organization. Given those long-term goals, the company also set short-term numerical goals for each year, as a step-by-step progression toward the ultimate goals.

Combining short-term goals with long-term objectives makes sense. The time frames, however, require serious thought. Several managers in the company with ten-year goals, for example, complained that the length of time is dysfunctional. The company's one-year goals have never been met, they noted, perhaps because there is no feeling of urgency in achieving them. In other words, the ten-year mark may be so far in the future that it fails to motivate managers to create more immediate changes. Another problem with long-term goals is that managers have difficulty envisioning the world that far in the future, and the goals set are likely to be out of sync with the trends and events that occur between now and then.

Strategic planning around other business objectives suffers from the same problems. How can managers foresee the technology of the future or the markets or the political and social landscape that provides the context for their business? Although a degree of foresight is essential to keep a business thriving, some organizations have decreased the time horizon used for planning from ten years or more to somewhere between three and five years. While yearly goals are set, planning is often done in three-year blocks, with revisions made every third year for the coming three-year period. This kind of rolling plan may be the most effective for diversity goals and activities. It is a useful and perhaps necessary exercise to create a vision around long-term goals, recognizing that the vision may need to be reviewed as the years go by. Specific goals for that long-term vision may not be part of the planning process. Instead, shorter-term goals that lead toward the vision form the backbone of a one-year and three-year plan.

Depending on the type of goals set, other time frames may be more appropriate. If, for example, an organization-wide attitude survey is conducted every two years, the results may be used as soon as they are available to revise some or all of the diversity goals rather than waiting for every third year. There should be enough flexibility in the process to accommodate related organizational processes and unexpected events, although excuses that goals could not be met because of a moderate business downturn or recruiting problems must often be put aside to ensure continued progress.

A time frame that is too short also poses potential problems in making progress on diversity. Goals that are simply too ambitious for a given period of time spark frustration, sabotage, and distrust of the entire process. Involving managers in setting their own diversity goals and analyzing the factors that could potentially help or hurt them in achieving the goals within a certain period can help make the time frame feasible and acceptable.
Demanding results from diversity efforts is essential. The results should be as clear and as measurable as possible but not limited to personnel profile data or other strictly numerical criteria. Indicators of the effort involved in diversity and the overall process of organizational change must also be recognized as important outcomes of diversity activities. Making demands consistent with managers' spheres of control and their ability to influence both specific and overall outcomes—within a reasonable period of time—helps reduce resistance to including outcomes as an expected part of managers' roles in making progress on diversity.

The methods used to create expectations and produce results on diversity issues interact with one another, especially over time. Making headway involves many factors, some of which can be controlled. As we will see in Chapter Eleven, greater awareness of these factors can help organizations use them to advantage in building on the successes already achieved to sustain and even accelerate progress.

The human resource director has just shown a series of overhead slides to the two of us who are interviewing people in this organization. He explains that the data and recommendations concerning diversity activities have recently been presented to the executive committee. He is obviously pleased that the most recent personnel profile showed more demographic diversity than previous ones and that most of the recommendations have been approved by that group. The director is a thirty-nine-year-old Latino who is studying for an M.B.A., and he has been with the company for thirteen years. We ask him a pointed question: "Overall, on a scale of 1 to 10, how effective do you think the policies and practices now in place are in advancing women or people of color toward senior management?"

After a few seconds, he responds:

Right now, I'd say about a 6, maybe a 7. Our focus has changed over the years. We've built on our successes and our failures over the years. The earliest efforts began in the early eighties with a focus on increasing the number of black male managers. We started with a small development program for black males, and we were able to phase out this special program after about five years once we increased the pool of high-potential black males. But the chairman wanted more than "potential"—he kept asking about results. Last year he demanded that we set hard targets for putting black males into top jobs. The combination of the development program and hard targets may work well.
Module IV: The Practice of Leadership

This module includes an analysis of the competencies a successful leader must have. These competencies include critical thinking, visioning, change agent, policy making/analysis, decision-making, conflict resolution, and communication.

Relating to diversity and leadership, it is not only very important for a leader to have mastered these competencies when leading diverse groups, but it is also relevant for them to know how they must taper these competencies to fit the situation. A leader must practice these competencies in a different manner when leading diverse groups and must know what must be changes, implemented, or integrated in order to make the group more successful.

In the integrative literature in this module, the focus is on implementing a diversity strategy for organizations and groups. The many strategies offered should be used by leaders to successfully lead in diverse settings. Case studies are also integrated into the literature to illustrate points and clarify ideas.
Implementing a Diversity Strategy

Develop a team that reflects, at all levels, the markets you sell to.

BY JAMES O. RODGERS
President and Senior Consultant, J. O. Rodgers and Associates

Managing diversity in the workplace is one of the most important issues organizations face today. To manage diversity is to create an environment in the workplace that allows all employees to do their best. This entails recognizing and dealing with differences — differences such as gender, age, ethnic culture, physical ability, religion, and personality traits. While all of these differences are important, the areas of most concern for organizations are cultural differences and women in the workplace.

Many senior managers, however, are quite complacent in their views of diversity. They assume that there is no problem in their organizations based on cultural differences. For instance, they have become convinced that African Americans and whites have effectively melded into an assimilated group simply because they hear nothing to the contrary. Unfortunately, with this issue, no news is not necessarily good news.

Generally, people don’t see any problem with differences in their organizations because they have not asked the right questions. Employee surveys seldom address attitudes regarding discrimination or feelings of racism, sexism, or ethnocentrism. Most corporate cultures do not encourage open discussion of such issues. It makes people uncomfortable.

The only way to get at these undertones of discontent (what I call silent saboteurs) is to conduct an organizational scan that deliberately focuses on feelings and perceptions that may cause people to contribute less than maximum effort to company goals. This information, when reviewed with senior management, will often open some eyes and raise some questions that otherwise may have gone unasked.

A CHANGING MARKETPLACE

A number of changes face the leaders of America’s institutions (corporate, social, government, and religious) today. Some of these changes were documented in a U.S. Department of Labor report on workplace trends entitled Opportunity 2000. The report, prepared by the Hudson Institute (1988), reported the following:

1. There will be a shortage of skilled workers.
2. The average age of workers will rise.
3. More women will be on the job.
4. Fully one third of new workers will be minorities.

Add to these two more important changes: (1) the markets that make up America are more diverse and (2) competition in the global economy is growing.

All this did not occur overnight. It has been steadily evolving for years. But it is only in the past few years that people have begun to take note of these changes and considered their implications for the way we do business.

No one requested these changes. They just happened. No one is to blame. However, we are all responsible for making sure our organizations manage these changes ef-
fectively. Our ability to manage the diversity brought about by these changes will have a profound effect on our ability to compete globally.

Diversity represents both a challenge and an opportunity. It is a challenge to adjust our management assumptions and change the culture of our organizations to accommodate difference. It can also be just the opportunity that U.S. business needs in order to tap into new ideas and to use its unique and diverse people resources to recapture its place as the leader in the world marketplace.

DIVERSITY AS A STRATEGY

There is a lot of genuine interest in doing the right thing when it comes to diversity. There is an equal desire to do it in a way that doesn’t distort the goals and strategies of the organization. In the Harvard Business Review, one chief executive officer of a major corporation put it this way: “I’m concerned that the curve of progress [from affirmative action] has started to flatten relative to the effort we’ve made. I need to [learn] how to be successful in moving up competent and diverse people who are not clones of those above them.” (Jones, Edward. “Black Managers: A Dream Deferred.” Harvard Business Review, May/June 1986)

Executives and managers are seriously looking for a way to make diversity work, but they don’t necessarily know how to do it. For example, the first reaction by many executives has been, “Do something! (And make sure everyone knows that we are doing something).”

Another common reaction is, “Let’s quickly educate everybody about this new thing! (That will fix it!).” Still another reaction is to go back over affirmative action (AA) plans and results and “make sure we are doing enough.” Unfortunately, most executives lack the skills and knowledge to deal with diversity, and will choose the most common reaction: “Let’s just wait and see what happens.”

The danger of each of these approaches can be seen in the results they produce. Many organizations that approach diversity with these reactions wind up wasting time and resources and having to do “damage control” because of the negative response and backlash it creates. But there is a better way!

I recommend a more proactive strategic approach, one that capitalizes on the basic strengths of senior executives and general managers, who set and implement corporate strategy. This strategic approach will increase the company’s chances of success. It requires that leaders take the lead.

Principles of Leadership Vision and strategy determine what an organization will be in terms of products, markets, resources, and capabilities. Both involve translating the strategic direction, formulated at the top, into reality at the production level. Implementing strategy requires broad participation down through the organization — and, let’s face it, strategic change can be very threatening.

So, what has this got to do with managing diversity? Unless we can answer that question, any efforts at developing an organization where diversity is valued and effectively managed will be ineffective. Each organization must come up with its own reason for addressing diversity issues, and those reasons must be consistent with the strategic direction of the business.

But, how do you take strategic direction, formulated at the top, and translate it into reality? It requires broad participation down through the organization. And how do you go about achieving the participation necessary to implement the strategy? Again, it takes effective communication of the vision down throughout the organization.

Most strategic thinkers agree that there are five basic principles for communicating strategies within an organization.

1. A common strategic language Does everyone know what we mean when we say diversity?
2. Simplicity and specificity Can everyone understand what we are doing and why we are doing it?
3. Testing for understanding Are we sure everyone really understands what the new expectations are?
4. Repetition Are we consistently and regularly paying attention to the issue of diversity?
5. Relevance What does this have to do with our success as a business?

THE STRATEGIC APPROACH

How do you approach diversity as a strategy? First, SEE WHERE YOU ARE. An environmental scan should be conducted to determine what the current attitudes and behaviors are regarding diversity. What hurdles need to be overcome? What gaps in skills and understanding need to be filled?

Next, DECIDE WHERE YOU WANT TO BE. Clear objectives should be established and agreed to. Ask key questions such as, “What will it be like when we succeed?” and “How will we know if we are making progress?” A clear, concise statement of philosophy is drafted and leaders go on record in support of the culture change required to achieve the objective.

Then, COMMUNICATE WHERE YOU ARE GOING. Strategy is conceived by leaders and implemented by the doers in the organization. To do it well, they must understand clearly what is expected and, more important, why it is the right thing for the company to do. Strategic training (rather than off-the-shelf training) is a useful means of getting the message out in a way that is effective.

The purpose of strategic training is to give everyone a common understanding of the new strategy. It communicates not only what is expected, but why it makes sense for the company. But training alone cannot sustain the long-term changes needed to deal with diversity. Leaders must also address the practices of the company, modify the structure where appropriate, and, most important, monitor their own behavior to make sure that they are consistent in paying attention to the issue of diversity with just as much frequency and fervor as any other key strategy.
A Strategy to Diversify

The Prudential Insurance Company of America has been involved in managing diversity for a few years now. The company has diversity programs in its corporate offices and in many of its major business units. In fact, the company's chairman and chief executive officer, Robert C. Winters, has set a goal that each of the company's 100,000-plus employees receive diversity training.

In a move to make the outcome of the program more real, the compensation for business unit heads is tied into how well they manage diversity within their organizations.

One of the more active programs in The Prudential is one that was developed specifically for the company's 30,000-plus field force (including management and support staff). Booker Rice, a Prudential vice president, launched and heads the successful managing diversity program for the Individual Insurance Business Unit (IIBU).

According to Rice, "At the Prudential, diversity is clearly a part of our strategy for long-term success. It has the personal endorsement of our chairman, Bob Winters, and all the other senior executives. In fact, I am often surprised at the amount of attention our officers give to this issue. We plan to win with diversity."

Some features of Prudential's diversity plan are:
- Senior officers (including the chairman) were among the first to be educated on diversity. (Leadership)
- Clear objectives were established for each business unit. For example, IIBU has a goal of increasing the number of minorities and women in its field sales operations specifically for the purpose of maintaining access to both existing and emerging markets.
- Senior executives in all business units have openly endorsed the diversity strategy and have agreed to have part of their compensation tied to their results in the area of managing diversity. (Accountability)
- A diversity advocate (my term) has been appointed to keep diversity on the strategic agenda of the company. It is notable that this officer has a successful track record in operations and high credibility among her peers.
- Extensive research and organizational assessment has been (and continues to be) conducted with minorities, women, and agency management. (Assessment)
- Diversity training is custom designed with a large portion dealing with the strategic context. Different programs are designed for different environments. For example, the field sales program is noticeably different from the program presented to senior managers and staff employees. (Communication)
- Specific programs have been put in place to recruit, orient, and develop nontraditional agents and managers. The focus of these programs is on understanding the company's culture and how to maximize individual achievement. (Development)
- Specific efforts are underway to identify, understand, target, and nurture emerging markets and to tie staffing objectives to the market profile.
- Diversity (as a strategy) has staying power. Even when other business challenges seem to be more pressing, diversity efforts continue to be funded and supported.
- Most important, the Prudential treats its diversity strategy as a long-term process. Plans are already underway for the next two phases of the process.

Finally, MONITOR YOUR PROGRESS TOWARD THE GOAL. Objectives that have been set to define the success of the diversity strategy must be reviewed regularly to determine whether your company is moving in the right direction. Follow-up is essential. Otherwise, everyone will soon realize that the focus on diversity was just a fad.

**THIS IS NOT AN AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAM**

The good thing about managing diversity using a strategic approach: There are no bad guys. It does not assume negligence or malign intent on anyone's part. It does not give special consideration to one group over another. It does not seek to correct past social injustices. The issue is not about who is right; it's about how we can all be more effective. The goal is to develop an environment that embraces difference and in which all the players are comfortable being who they are and contributing to common goals from a base of difference.

Managing diversity must not get confused with affirmative action. Affirmative action is an externally driven process to hire and retain more nontraditional workers. Its goal is to increase the number and percentage of specific groups of people, sometimes at the expense of other groups. While it is useful in getting us to break old patterns of hiring, unfortunately it creates bad feelings in everyone involved. Some feel excluded from consideration; others resent having their achievements attributed to preference. No one wins and the company's goals are not well served.

**THE KEY TO QUALITY**

The trends in both customer and employee expectations are pushing business leaders to focus more on quality, innovation, creativity, and empowerment in the workplace. Long-term success will come only to companies that effectively develop loyal, satisfied customers and highly motivated (and empowered) employees.

Industry response to these trends cannot be business as usual, which is a sure way to:
- Lose relative market share
- Lose valuable human resources
- Be acquired by another business
- Go out of business

There is a more practical (strategic) response — one that requires companies to improve the quality of customer relations (with quality service) and to establish stronger, more effective partnerships with employees (through managing diversity).

Managing diversity must be an integral part of your overall quality strategy if it is to succeed. Your ability to continue to get industry-leading results is dependent on your ability to attract the best team of people, develop them, and manage them for maximum productivity. In an age of leaner organizations, you cannot afford to have any players who are not fully committed to the success of the team. Total quality management and other key strategies demand that companies become more effective in managing and participating on diverse teams.
Many executives are reluctant to deal with diversity because:

• They do not see the connection between managing diversity and their core business goals.
• They equate diversity with AA/EEO (equal employment opportunity) and are not anxious to get involved with another social program at the expense of other business objectives.
• They do not like to fail, and cannot see how managing diversity can ever become a successful way of doing things in their company. After all, their efforts with affirmative action have been frustratingly unfruitful.

Effectively managing diversity requires a change in organizational culture. As with any strategic initiative that involves a cultural change, managing diversity demands strong and consistent leadership. The senior executives of the company must begin by having a common understanding and a common definition.

Specific education is needed to explain the full range of issues involved in successfully leading an organization of diverse persons toward common goals. But training must treat both sides of the issue. Executives, supervisors, and managers must be educated to understand, appreciate, and manage diverse teams. Minorities, women, and other non-traditional workers must be exposed to the expectations of the dominant corporate culture so that they are prepared to assume key roles in the organization. All employees should be exposed to training on how to work together in a multicultural organization.

The approach to implementing a diversity strategy must be comprehensive. In addition to training and development, it must include accountability, reward systems, and market analysis.

THE REWARD

For companies (and individual managers) that master the skills of managing diversity, the rewards will be obvious in the long run: You get to stay in business and/or keep your job. That may sound extreme, but if you remember the two key success factors — loyal customers and motivated employees — and if you can truly envision a marketplace and workplace that is largely made up of people of difference, it should be easy to imagine the penalty of ignoring diversity.

A focus on diversity can be used as an opportunity to renew your company’s commitment to managing and leading more effectively. That is, know your customers and what they expect; hire the best people, especially those who have an affinity to your markets. One objective of a diversity strategy should be to develop a team that reflects, at all levels, the markets you are selling to.

Finally, treat each individual differently (all of us have some elements of difference) in order to treat them equally. The ability to get world-class productivity from your organization will come only when leaders, supervisors, managers, and co-workers learn to DO UNTO OTHERS AS THEY WOULD HAVE OTHERS DO UNTO THEM.

JAMES O. RODGERS is president and senior consultant of J. O. Rodgers and Associates in Stone Mountain, Georgia. The company provides strategic consulting and training for Prudential of America, Coca-Cola USA, AT&T, Cox Enterprises, and several government agencies, as well as counseling and training regarding corporate expectations for minority professionals.

Watch for These Summer/Fall ’93 Arrivals from LIMRA

The following new field publications from LIMRA reflect what LIMRA member company field managers and home office officers targeted as key industry issues in a needs-analysis survey.

More Great Recruiting Ideas — Agency building starts with active recruiting, and this idea-packed follow-up to LIMRA’s best-selling Great Recruiting Ideas contains top recruiting pointers from many of the industry’s most successful managers.

The Mentor’s Handbook — LIMRA research shows that there is a strong correlation between having a mentoring program in an agency and improved agent retention and productivity. This comprehensive guide shows how to obtain the best results from a mentor/new agent relationship, detailing some of the industry’s top success stories.

Great Productivity Ideas! — A perfect book for both new and experienced agents who continually seek to better their production numbers. This book contains more than 50 field-tested ideas from some of the industry’s top-performing agents.

Referrals: Every Time — Research indicates that referrals remain the best opportunity for securing quality production. This book simplifies the importance of referrals and reviews dozens of field-tested techniques for securing them.

The Mutual Market — Without doubt, this is the fastest-growing market today. This agent book discusses the market and the products it needs. The text includes a thorough examination of the sales process — from prospecting to closing to selling.

The Choice is Yours — Research indicates that quality selection leads to better productivity and retention. This comprehensive book — culled from more than 15 years of Managers’ Magazine articles — presents the best selection practices from top agency builders.

REPRINTS Available

Professionally produced reprints of articles appearing in LIMRA’s Marketfacts are available from LIMRA in quantities of 100 or more. Single copies of past issues of LIMRA’s Marketfacts are also available.

To order, contact Phyllis Van Gorder at 203-674-4304.
Shedding New Light on Diversity Training

BY RONITA B. JOHNSON AND JULIE O’MARA

The challenge: Train 27,000 employees of a major public utility company to create an environment in which cultural diversity improves the organization’s competitive advantage in such areas as productivity, customer service, employee recruitment, and employee retention. And do it cost effectively.

The solution: Rather than hire outside consultants, train and certify 110 line and staff employees as diversity awareness trainers.

Can people who aren’t experts in the field deliver effective diversity awareness training? Many practitioners in this area don’t think so. They believe that diversity awareness trainers must have expert facilitation skills and be highly knowledgeable about issues of diversity and cross-cultural communication—particularly because of the sensitive issues associated with such training.

But a program at Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) shows that an intensive internal-certification process can prepare line and staff employees to handle sensitive issues and effectively provide large-scale diversity awareness training.

Four key behaviors

Four key behaviors were selected for measuring the effectiveness of diversity awareness trainers. They were formulated from a review of discussions with other practitioners, observations of skills and knowledge used in diversity awareness training, and Models for HRD Practice, a book on HRD competencies and applications written by Patricia McLagan (ASTD, 1989). The final four were gleaned from a long list of competencies.

At three different points during the six-day certification process, trainees assess their performance as diversity awareness trainers by completing a self-assessment form based on the four key behaviors.

On the first day of the program, trainees review the four keys and complete a self-assessment form to determine what strengths they bring to the process and to set learning goals for the week. Each trainee has an opportunity to discuss his or her self-assessment and goals with a member of the training staff, who acts as coach and mentor for the entire six days.

On the fifth day, trainees conduct a second self-assessment and meet their coaches to discuss accomplishments and areas that need improving.

Trainees complete a third and final self-assessment after they each present a practice session on diversity awareness training.
awareness training. At the end of each session, the training staff compares the trainee's performance against the criteria of the four keys, outlining strengths and weaknesses.

**Key 1: self-knowledge.** The main criterion in Key 1 is understanding how one's personal beliefs and values may affect others.

An effective diversity awareness trainer perceives and recognizes personal values, biases, assumptions, and stereotypes as they relate to the workplace and training. He or she understands the effect of recognizing these differences.

**Key 2: leadership.** The main criterion in Key 2 is taking responsibility for championing diversity.

An effective diversity awareness trainer is able to articulate the goals of diversity awareness training and the goals of valuing and managing diversity. He or she "walks the talk," by demonstrating commitment and support for diversity initiatives.

**Key 3: subject-matter understanding and expertise.** Key 3 emphasizes understanding Affirmative Action and Equal Employment Opportunity guidelines and how they differ from valuing and managing diversity. An effective diversity awareness trainer must recognize the implications for PG&E's workforce regarding those concepts.

An effective diversity awareness trainer understands what is meant by valuing differences and can incorporate that meaning into the workplace from a bottom-line perspective. He or she understands the economic, competitive, and business reasons for managing diversity.

An effective diversity awareness trainer knows the demographic profiles of employees and customers in his or her business unit/region. He or she understands the effect of policies, systems, and practices on employees in the context of their ethnicity, gender, lifestyle, and cultural differences.

**Key 4: facilitation skills.** The main criterion in Key 4 is knowing how to communicate the exchange of ideas and knowledge in an organized, effective manner.

An effective diversity awareness trainer knows the audience in his or her business unit/region and knows how to design training based on that audience's needs. He or she provides materials, facilities, supplies, equipment, and other training aids that are appropriate to the audience.

An effective diversity awareness trainer speaks clearly, uses a variety of inflections, and shows a positive attitude toward the subject matter. He or she uses appropriate verbal and nonverbal communication techniques—such as eye contact and natural gestures. As long as they're not distracting, such techniques reinforce the trainer's words.

An effective diversity awareness trainer conveys concise concepts, objectives, procedures, instructions, summaries, and transitions. He or she uses questions that encourage participation and that test the knowledge, attitude, and awareness levels of trainees.

An effective diversity awareness trainer gives correct, concise answers in a nondefensive manner and uses trainees as resources by referring questions back to them. The trainer listens carefully to trainees’ statements, questions, and comments.

An effective diversity awareness trainer maintains control of classroom situations by appropriately handling difficult trainees. He or she provides a focus for the group by stating, restating, clarifying, and summarizing information.

An effective diversity awareness trainer manages the training situation by staying on the topic, getting closure on the topic, and limiting the time allotted to discussing the topic. He or she constructively manages conflict between trainees and between himself or herself and trainees.

**Certification**

Candidates for certification as diversity awareness trainers are nominated by their business-unit/region managers and human resource managers.

The initial selection is based on characteristics that are thought to contribute to success. Nominees tend to be people who value diversity, think fast, handle conflict well, have strong communication skills, and enjoy good reputations in their business unit/regions.

Because first impressions may be critical in dealing with diversity issues, nominees exhibit behavior that indicates that they'll be able to handle such matters in a businesslike manner. Those basics, along with a good course design and materials, enable people who may be new to the classroom to deliver diversity awareness training. It's a stretch for some employees. But the human benefits and low cost of having internal employees provide this kind of training make the effort worthwhile.

The certification process has four phases.

**Phase 1**

Phase 1 is a preliminary to the six-day train-the-trainer workshop, which forms the core of the certification process for diversity trainers.

At this stage, diversity awareness trainees complete a questionnaire and are interviewed in depth by the diversity awareness planning coordinator. Trainees discuss their personal and professional interest in the subject of diversity, their current skill levels, their knowledge of diversified
issues, and the personal challenges that they foresee.

The coordinator asks each trainee about his or her business unit/region's goals regarding diversity awareness training and about his or her views of the organization's overall strategies for managing diversity.

The coordinator informs trainees that they're likely to become targets of stereotyping once they begin championing diversity and that their biggest challenge will be to overcome other people's skepticism and negative comments about diversity awareness training. While diversity awareness trainers are attempting to meet that challenge, they will be trying to educate people on the benefits of understanding and working in an organization that is diverse.

At this stage, if the trainees' commitment is questionable or if it appears that there will be a major challenge to the training program, the coordinator discusses these issues with the trainees and with the appropriate managers.

**Phase 2**

Phase 2 involves an intensive training-workshop. Beginning on a Sunday afternoon and ending on a Friday afternoon, the workshop packs 60 hours of diversity awareness into six days.

The training staff informs trainees to expect intense interaction with them and with other participants. The staff tells them about the emotion and introspection that sometimes occur during this phase.

The staff recommends to trainees that they get a lot of sleep and participate in relaxing activities before the first day of the workshop. They warn trainees that they'll be exhausted by Friday, but most don't believe it.

Trainees prepare by reading various articles on diversity and two books, Managing Workforce 2000: Gaining the Diversity Advantage by David Jamieson and Julie O'Mara, and Beyond Race and Gender by Roosevelt Thomas.

Phase 2 focuses on each trainee's personal perspective, practical application of the content, and facilitation skills. Trainees each receive a 500-page manual that contains transparencies and handout masters, background information, guidelines, and descriptions of 48 activities—such as "A Time I Felt Different," "Diversity Defines," "Perspectives on Your Past," and "Post-its."

During the workshop, the training staff observes trainees and periodically meets with them one-on-one for individual coaching. The trainees' behaviors and progress—as participants and as practice trainers—influence whether they become certified diversity awareness trainers.

Sunday through Tuesday, trainees focus on the content of diversity and deal with their own stereotypes, biases, and assumptions. They examine different cultures, reflect on that information, and integrate it with what they expect to encounter when they return to the workplace. During this time, the training staff provides more than 24 hours of diversity education and demonstrates many of the 48 activities.
It's important that trainees get in touch with and identify "hot buttons" that might get pushed in training sessions and hamper facilitation. The activity "Assumptions," for example, shows how people may formulate opinions about others because of their gender, ethnicity, physical appearance, and occupation.

In this activity, trainees learn that when people look alike, their assumptions about each other tend to be more accurate. When people look different, their assumptions tend to be less accurate.

For example, an established diversity awareness training team at PG&E begins diversity awareness training by asking trainees to make assumptions about the team. One of the trainees, who is a person of color, found that trainees tend to assume she lives in Oakland, which is predominantly black community. They also tend to assume that she has two or three children and is Baptist. In fact, they're wrong on all counts.

On Tuesday evening, trainees switch to being active trainers, by participating in one of the 48 activities that hasn't been demonstrated. The training staff pre-selects six activities. Each trainee chooses one to demonstrate. The staff and other trainees critique each trainee as he or she facilitates the selected activity.

On Wednesday evening, several certified diversity awareness trainers who have field experience discuss their challenges and successes. Typically, trainees enthusiastically ask questions about whether training is accepted by employees, what hot buttons are being pushed, and what the worst situations are.

On Thursday morning, trainees start preparing to make presentations to their eventual audiences—their business unit/regions. Each trainee focuses on needs assessment, design, and facilitation skills—with an emphasis on conflict management. The first two are particularly important because trainees must customize the program to the needs of their respective business unit/regions.

In the afternoon, trainees design and rehearse the sessions that they plan to conduct on the next day. For these practice sessions, employees from outside the workshop are invited to participate as audience. They may or may not be from the trainees' business unit/region. In the practice sessions, trainees can hone their new skills in an environment that reflects an actual work situation.

Beforehand, trainees receive descriptions of the practice groups and choose which ones they want to work with. The prospective trainers work in teams of about six each to design and deliver a four-hour module, which they base on the needs of the 8 to 14 participants in their individual practice groups.

For instance, will a group be composed of white male managers who work in line positions? Or will a group be composed of bargaining unit employees of different sexes and ethnic backgrounds?

Trainees prepare the introduction, flipcharts, overheads, and handouts in advance, which may mean working until 11 p.m. the night before.

Friday is the grand finale. The tension and excitement runs high, whether trainees are beginners or experts. It's interesting to watch the dynamics of the group as trainees become trainers and take on leadership roles to decide which activities should be presented.

**Phase 3**

In Phase 3, trainees conduct sessions with their actual business unit/regions.

Each trainee must facilitate a four- or eight-hour training session that includes the following:

- factors that influence change—such as demographics in the United States, California, and the trainee's own business unit/region
- business reasons for managing diversity
- similarities and differences between EEO, affirmative action, and managing diversity—and how each supports the others
- an experiential exercise that helps participants get in touch with their beliefs and behaviors regarding differences, assumptions, and stereotypes
- an issue or strategy exercise that reveals the changes—either individual or in the business unit/region needed to achieve PG&E's goals

The training staff observes the trainee to judge how well he or she is doing. About 25 percent of
trainees exhibit the four key competencies and don't require a second observation. But most need an additional observation and feedback before a final observation.

**Phase 4**

In the fourth and final phase, qualified trainees earn certification as diversity awareness trainers.

The training staff talks with trainees about its observations of the trainees' use of the four competencies. Then the staff writes a report on each trainee's skill and ability to facilitate diversity awareness training. Trainees who earn a rating of "fully satisfactory" receive a letter of certification and a certificate signed by Russ Cunningham, the company's vice-president of human resources.

A certified diversity awareness trainer for PG&E sums up the experience this way: "By 4 p.m. Friday I felt totally drained and exhausted due to the energy put into the presentation and the emotions associated with the content. It was hard to say goodbye to the other trainees because I felt a bond with each person. It changed my perspective; now see things in a different light. It was a great learning experience; I'll never forget."

Another certified diversity awareness trainer says, "I really valued the training. There was a great sense of unity and dedication to its purpose and outcome. The cutting-edge nature of the work assured a potential positive impact on PG&E."

**Aftermath**

Diversity awareness trainers have an important role beyond training; they're expected to champion diversity in their day-to-day interaction with others. They're expected to walk the talk and thereby reinforce the messages they teach.

To that end, diversity awareness trainers at PG&E are encouraged to regularly talk with management and human resource managers to create an environment that values and appreciates diversity.

Certified diversity awareness trainers who have already graduated from the program report that employees in their training sessions began to open up during training, once they felt that they were supported and accepted.

One trainer says, "I let all employees who are participating in the training know up front that the material and discussion may make them uncomfortable but that I'm not there to judge or change values and beliefs. I'm there to provide an opportunity to explore the thought processes that affect their behavior in the workplace."

As a result of that straightforward approach, attitudes tend to shift during diversity awareness training, and many people who have been through it. Often, people who thought of themselves as unprejudiced discover and admit during the training that they do stereotype, generalize, etc.

Since 1976, Situation Management Systems has helped over 250,000 managers and professionals develop the skills required to influence people and events while maintaining positive working relationships.

SMS' programs focus on applying influence skills to the critical tasks of negotiation, problem solving, selling, and innovation. They have been translated into 11 languages in 22 countries and are currently being delivered in dozens of Fortune 500 companies.

For information on either our public workshops or our in-house programs, call us at (617) 826-4433.

And join the influential people in the world.

**SMS**, Situation Management Systems, Inc.

The Influence Company
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categorize people according to external factors.

"It's not easy to eliminate stereotypes," says a trainee. "But because I've become aware of my biases, I can act more appropriately."

Trainers also learn about their own tendencies to stereotype. "During training, I had to deal with my own biases," says a certified diversity awareness trainer. "I realized that I'd somehow rationalized my stereotyping as my opinion, rather than what it was. Now I'm much more cognizant of how I view others."

Another certified trainer says, "Being a diversity awareness trainer means being an ally in every situation, proactively and reactively. It means looking for and creating opportunities within my sphere of influence that allow me and others to be ourselves and be most effective. It means risking rejection and sometimes not fitting into an environment that isn't ready to address the issue of diversity."

Once employees are certified as diversity awareness trainers, they work with appropriate management to determine how much and what kind of training to deliver to their business unit/regions.

They consider a variety of factors—such as the level of interest in diversity awareness training, the most important diversity issues for their business unit/regions, decisions about who will be trained first, the time and the budget needed for training, marketing of the training, communication techniques, demographics, and elements that may hinder or facilitate training.

Benefits

Some of the benefits of having internal employees provide diversity awareness training are as follows:

- Internal trainers already know the employees in their business unit/regions. That familiarity increases their personal accountability for what they say and do.
- Internal trainers have a vested interest in training's outcome because they will interact with participants again.
- Internal trainers directly benefit from their new knowledge and skills as facilitators.

Because they're aware of background information, internal trainers can personalize information, easily respond to employees’ questions, and sensitively bring real issues to the surface.

Internal trainers are familiar with the jobs and daily challenges associated with their business unit/regions. They can use this information to focus training on relevant, critical issues.

Internal trainers are available before and after training to answer employees’ questions.

Internal trainers can easily follow up with the training group or provide additional sessions and extra organizational work.

It's too early to report hard results. But diversity awareness trainers at PG&E are taking on the challenge. They're spreading the diversity message and gaining respect.

If PG&E had used external consultants, it would have taken several million dollars and many more years to deliver diversity awareness training to its many locations. And the company would have lost the benefits of having follow-up built in.

When PG&E conducts its next employee survey, it can easily track how it's doing on the issue of understanding and managing diversity.

The future

PG&E's train-the-trainer program is only a part of its long-term commitment to managing diversity. The company says it's working on managing diversity not only because it's the right thing to do, but because it makes good business sense.

PG&E believes that managing diversity improves its competitive advantage in recruiting and retaining employees and that it increases productivity, quality, creativity, and morale. The company believes that managing diversity creates better customer service, improves its public image, and boosts consumer confidence and credibility.

PG&E received early recognition for its leadership in this area. In 1989, it won the U.S. Department of Labor's Opportunity 2000 Award, which honors employers who "adopt strategies to anticipate and take control of changing demographic and human resource issues."

PG&E has helped women, workers with disabilities, and ethnic minorities—through early-intervention programs, scholarships, counseling, work study, and pre-employment training programs—to become significant contributors at all levels of its workforce.

Senior Vice-President and General Manager Virgil Rose says, "In order to serve our 5 million gas-and-electric customers in northern and central California, we had to establish far-reaching programs for customer service and community involvement that both managers and nonmanagers could use. We set up a task force for a multicultural California, and away we went."

PG&E defines diversity as any difference in race, gender, age, language, physical characteristics, disability, sexual orientation, economic status, parental status, education, geographic origin, profession, lifestyle,
religion, or position in the hierarchy of the organization.

According to the company’s view, managing diversity “requires the creation of an open, supportive, and responsive organization in which differences are understood, encouraged, appreciated, and managed.”

For example, PG&E’s customer service programs help eliminate language barriers and help customize the delivery of customer service to people of different ethnic groups. The company is working to provide a multilingual telephone service and more service information material in different languages. It wants to help employees understand diverse customers’ needs and effective ways to interact with people who exhibit diverse cultural characteristics.

Organizations can build long term alliances with their communities’ emerging ethnic constituencies by responding to their needs and by supporting initiatives that improve their economic and political participation.

PG&E’s efforts include supporting minority educational and community programs, facilitating economic development in ethnic communities, enhancing the Equal Opportunity Purchasing Program, and communicating to everyone the company’s commitment to ethnic diversity.

In addition to diversity awareness, employee training at PG&E will include diversity skills building to help managers and supervisors adapt pre-existing skills for use in dealing with a diverse workforce—skills such as managing conflict, improving communication, building teams, conducting performance appraisals, interviewing, coaching, and counseling.

The use of diversity safe-zone groups, adapted from Barbara Walker’s work at Digital Equipment, will help PG&E’s employees examine stereotypes, assumptions, and perceptions about age, race, gender, lifestyle, disability, and other issues. These group workshops will encourage open communication about emotional issues that are associated with diversity. The groups’ goals are to establish authentic work relationships, build teams, and encourage employee involvement.

PG&E plans to provide advance seminars for diverse groups of employees to help them become more educated about diversity issues. These employee programs will be supported by conferences, bimonthly training meetings for diversity awareness trainers, by employee association round tables, and diversity-related promotional items.

Clearly, internal training is only one option for establishing diversity awareness, but at PG&E, it seems to be an effective one.

Ronita Johnson is corporate human resources diversity planning coordinator at Pacific Gas & Electric Company, 201 Mission Street, Room 1524, San Francisco, CA 94105. Julie O’Mara is coauthor of Managing Workforce 2000: Gaining the Diversity Advantage. She owns and manages O’Mara and Associates, 5979 Greenridge Road, Castro Valley, CA 94552.
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Developing Diversity in Organizations

Organizations can get more women and people of color into leadership ranks. Here's how

How can an organization attract the best of the new workforce and help them reach their full leadership potential?

At one company, executives were pleased that they were making headway in recruiting people of color and monitoring their progress in more detail than was required by government instructions. They were stunned when a contingent of black managers called a press conference to declare the company racist. At another company, expensive work-family resources had been provided to employees, but executives were dismayed that the handful of high-potential women being groomed for senior management all left within a few months.

Leadership diversity is an increasingly important business issue for executives. The shrinking, demographically-shifting labor pool available to compete in a brutally competitive global market has prompted many organizations to confront this issue. One company president remarked, "to have a management body that doesn't reflect a spectrum of diversity is, from a business point of view, irresponsible."

Research Led to Discovery of Best Practices

Few guidelines exist, however, to help executives use their limited resources to get the best results from a diversity effort. To learn more about this problem, we investigated 16 of the most progressive organizations in the U.S., organizations that are models in their industries for taking positive action to develop diversity in management. Our goal was to identify the best diversity practices being used in these model organizations so that other organizations could consider adopting them for their own use in advancing more women and people of color into higher levels of management.

Of the 16 organizations we studied, 13 use recruitment methods that target people of color or women for entry level, non-managerial positions. They go to historically black colleges, conferences for female or Hispanic engineers, community groups and other sources to recruit nontraditional employees for professional and lower-level positions. A number of managers we interviewed, however, believe that recruitment is not the principal problem in fostering diversity, compared with development or advancement, for example. Other managers concluded that these activities do not warrant priority because they have little effect on leadership diversity over the short term.

Ten of the 16 organizations have organized employee advocacy groups, which sometimes negotiate directly with top management about administrative policies and business procedures that may impact members of their groups – black managers, Hispanic employees and so on. Many managers applaud the achievements made by these groups working in partnership with senior management to guide and drive progress on diversity. Some managers, however, find these groups to be divisive and combative, and they wish the groups had never been formed.

Ten organizations have adopted training programs to increase managers' and other employees' awareness of the value of diversity and the negative impact of prejudice. These programs, which generally run one to five days, typically include experiential exercises to alert participants to the stereotypes they bring to work. While some managers praise these educational programs as an essential first step in changing workplace behavior, a number of managers have become cynical about them. "How can you expect to change attitudes that have been reinforced for managers' entire lives in two or three days?", they question. Some managers we interviewed find training programs to be too confrontational and threatening, even causing some participants to leave with stronger biases. Other managers blast training as a superficial "quick fix" to problems that instead require systemic change.

For virtually all of the 52 types of diversity practices revealed in our study, there is both heartfelt praise and crushing criticism from managers of

Ms. Morrison's articles have appeared in *The New York Times*, *The Los Angeles Times*, *Psychology Today* and *Small Business Reports*. She was awarded an M.A. by Bucknell University and an M.B.A. by Wake Forest University. She is also a graduate of Leadership Greensboro, Outward Bound's program in the Florida Everglades, and the Grand Prix racing course at the Bob Bondurant School of High Performance Driving.

various ethnic backgrounds in numerous levels and functions. The 196 managers we interviewed agree on only one thing: it takes the personal intervention of top management to make a diversity effort work. There is even some difference of opinion about how top managers need to carry out their commitment to diversity goals. In more specific diversity practices, the differences escalate to the point where there is controversy over any diversity activity proposed.

These controversies occur in organizations widely recognized for their leadership in developing diversity. They include major corporations such as American Express, Colgate-Palmolive, Dupont, US WEST, and Xerox. They also include two educational institutions and two government agencies that stand out as models in the public sector. Some of these organizations have been struggling for two or three decades to promote diversity, yet most of them have not achieved agreement among their own managers about which practices are more effective than others.

**Best Diversity Practices Not Applicable to All Organizations**

The practices most prevalent and most central to the diversity efforts of these and other model organizations are the most promising, worthy of consideration by other organizations wanting to integrate their management ranks with more white women and people of color. In this sense, some practices do seem to be better than others. But that is not enough to give organizations the help they need to take action.

Best practices do not exist on a stand-alone basis. While we can identify some of the strengths and potential pitfalls of a given practice, it cannot be adequately assessed in isolation. We need to consider other practices needed to complement that one. We also need to factor in the process used to arrive at one mix of practices versus another. The importance of the mix and the method used to create it explains why a list of best practices remains so elusive. It explains why one practice, such as incorporating diversity goals into managers' performance appraisal criteria or assigning mentors to high-potential nontraditional managers, works in one organization but not in another, or why it works for a while in an organization and then either dies on the vine or becomes troublesome.

Managers wanting to create a diversity plan for their organizations should take a look at the practices used in other, leading organizations. This information is helpful in making later decisions. More importantly, however, managers should focus on the process to be used in their own organizations to arrive at a set of practices that will work for them.

**A Five-Step Process to Get Diversity**

The recommendation from our study is to use a five-step process to prepare and carry out a diversity effort. This process is based on the successes and mistakes of model organizations, as well as the strengths and weaknesses of the practices they adopted and managers' suggestions for improving existing diversity activities.

This step-by-step process incorporates basic principles of organizational change. But because of the history and sensitivity of diversity issues, these principles are often ignored in diversity efforts. Managers' pain and awkwardness in dealing with diversity tempt many to take shortcuts that leave major problems unsolved. The five steps are:

**HOW TO GET DIVERSITY**

1. **Discover and analyze the problems in your organization**
   - Identify what needs to be done
   - Identify who will be involved
   - Set the agenda

2. **Strengthen top-management commitment**
   - Select the leader to oversee diversity effort
   - Select leaders to focus on diversity
   - Set goals

3. **Implement the plan**
   - Develop a diversity goal
   - Assign responsibilities
   - Establish performance appraisals

4. **Remove obstacles and review goals**
   - Conduct focus groups
   - Review progress
   - Modify goals

5. **Use building blocks to maintain momentum**
“Leadership diversity is an increasingly important business issue for executives.”

1. Discover and rediscover the problems in your organization.

Discovering the problems that currently exist in your own organization, involves collecting information. Executives sometimes conclude that a high turnover rate among professional women, for example, is due to family demands. A recent study done by Victoria Tashjian, however, indicates that women at this level leave their companies for the same reason men do – they perceive a lack of career advancement opportunities. Assumptions about what women need can cause organizations to rely too much on work-family policies while other significant barriers go unrecognized. Only later, if turnover statistics are monitored, will it become evident that the solutions put into place are the wrong ones.

Statistics on turnover, promotions, salaries and bonuses, grievances and participation in outside training programs can be compiled from company records to determine whether certain groups of employees are being treated differently from others. In addition, surveys, focus groups or individual interviews that capture opinions and experiences of employees can reveal subtle differences in getting access to developmental opportunities and in being objectively evaluated by supervisors. The combination of statistics and perceptions helps target problems to address.

The initial investigation and subsequent follow-ups, should be directed by a diverse team representing both sexes and different ethnicities as well as various levels and functions in an organization. The team may hire a consultant to assist, but it is the team that will shape and interpret the information collected and set the priorities recommended to top management. Including white men on this team as well as nontraditional employees will help keep backlash under control.

2. Strengthen top management commitment.

Some commitment from the top must exist before an investigation is conducted, because asking questions is likely to raise employees’ expectations that problems will be addressed. The findings from an investigation, however, often increase senior executives’ commitment, because they now have concrete evidence of the types and extent of problems in their own organizations. For many executives, this is the first time they become convinced that such problems are actually occurring.

Commitment is expressed in different ways, and not all are equally effective. Personal intervention appears to be critical. Senior executives have modified the management succession process, for example, to include lists of nontraditional candidates as well as a general list. They have returned for revision their managers’ bonus recommendations because they did not adequately reward nontraditional managers. They have made their managers accountable for developing diversity among their own groups by nagging and cajoling in private.

Going beyond informal intervention, however, also seems to be essential. Senior executives who take the next steps to change the succession planning process or to incorporate diversity goals into the appraisal and compensation systems may be giving their organizations the best chance for long-term success. Managers we interviewed were sometimes concerned when accountability had not been built into their organizations’ administrative and business practices. They wondered what would happen when the current top management left.

3. Select practices to fit a balanced strategy.

Step 3 involves the nitty-gritty work of choosing a mix of diversity practices that is strategically and operationally effective. So many tools and techniques are available – we identified 52 types of diversity practices in our study – it is difficult to choose some over others.

At the strategic level, our findings indicate that balancing three elements may be most effective.
One element is education – making traditional employees aware of the value of diversity and also helping nontraditional employees accumulate the experiences and credentials considered in promotion decisions. Development techniques are largely aimed at education. Training programs, rotational assignments, mentors and networks, performance feedback tools and other activities are especially suited to this purpose.

A second element of diversity strategy is enforcement, which emphasizes the need to reward and reinforce the education that is taking place. Greater awareness may not result in different behavior unless incentives are used to shape how employees treat one another. Accountability tools address behavior. Modifications made to performance appraisal and merit pay criteria, succession planning, and selection procedures, and other systems help ensure that employees will devote energy to diversity goals. At the least, these changes discourage behavior that excludes nontraditionals, deliberately or not.

The third strategic element involves exposing managers and other employees to talented nontraditionals, so that their stereotypes of blacks, women, Latinos or members of other ethnic groups are proved to be wrong. White men and others are uncomfortable with people who are different partly because they have not had much contact with them, especially in peer working relationships. Recruitment practices can provide personal exposure to nontraditionals at entry levels, where many efforts are aimed, and also at executive levels in cases where a key management position is filled with a person of color or a woman. The powerful personal impact of getting to know and like a nontraditional colleague makes some senior managers advocates of diversity and complements the other two elements of education and enforcement.

Many operational issues must also be considered during Step 3. How to prepare employees to carry out any new or revised practices, and how to limit participation in some new programs are two issues that are typically debated. The practices chosen as priorities should address the problems identified in Step 1, but that is easier said than done. A 1990 survey by Catalyst, for example, shows that the techniques most commonly used in corporations to help women advance are not strongly related to the barriers reported. One conclusion reached from our research is that the mix of practices selected in a diversity effort should give nontraditional managers an appropriate level of challenge that will provoke continuous learning, but also adequate recognition and support to sustain their motivation and well-being over the long term. Imbalances among these three ingredients appears to be a key problem in many organizations, and it may explain why many high-potential nontraditional managers seem to opt out or burn out before they have reached their full leadership potential.

4. Demand results and revisit goals.

Step 4 highlights the importance of specific goals and measures of progress in accordance with the business maxim, "What gets measured gets done." Numerical goals are essential for a meaningful diversity effort, but goals and measures are increasingly being tailored to the priorities of each organization. Instead of simply monitoring the personnel profile level-by-level, as the U.S. federal government requires in affirmative action guidelines, an organization might also look for increased nontraditional representation in key functional areas that are used as feeder pools to senior management positions. Or, an organization might keep close track of a small group of managers identified as high-potential, to be sure that they are getting rotational assignments and outside training, for example.

The model organizations in our study use personnel statistics and other measures of success that may be less quantifiable. Information about employees' satisfaction with their work and career
"Managers’ pain and awkwardness in dealing with diversity tempt many to take shortcuts that leave many problems unsolved."

prospects, their assessment of the quality of supervision they receive, the information they get about career planning and developmental opportunities, and other aspects of the workplace is also being collected by organizations to get beyond a purely statistical description of multicultural organizations. These measures help prevent an “up or out” mentality that focuses solely on advancement to gauge how well diversity is being developed in an organization.

Demanding results and periodically reviewing the goals set for the diversity effort are essential characteristics. There is no substitute for concrete, numerical measures of progress, even though any measure chosen is likely to be controversial. Thoughtful, reasonable outcomes can be specified and monitored as an integral part of any diversity effort.

5. Use building blocks to maintain momentum.

Building blocks can be used to maintain momentum in developing diversity. These building blocks actually weave through the other steps as well, since they involve capitalizing on characteristics of an organization that encourage continued progress on diversity. For example, an organization with a strong tradition of using job rotation to broaden managers’ capabilities might incorporate job rotation into its diversity effort. Organizations with a reputation for being innovative or humanitarian may use that image as a drawing card in its diversity effort to attract talented nontraditional employees away from competing employers.

Another way to use building blocks is to publicize the successes that are achieved in a diversity effort so that they motivate employees to continue investing in diversity. Some managers we interviewed are adamant about getting feedback to employees on a regular basis. One executive, for example, spends his own time preparing a report that goes out every two or three months to everyone in his area. This report reminds employees of the diversity goals set last quarter and details the progress that has been made on these goals. He wants his people to be continually reminded of the importance of diversity goals and to feel good about the steps they take to achieve them.

Building on diversity also means that the progress made in business in integrating women and people of color into the management ranks may represent a head start in dealing with employees, customers, vendors and partners on a global basis. That is, gaining expertise in domestic diversity (based on sex and ethnicity or on other factors) may translate into greater competence in a worldwide market. As organizations struggle to gain a competitive edge, their successes in developing diversity become increasingly important business assets.

An Organization can be Changed

These five steps frame a process that, over the long term, is likely to change an organization so that more nontraditionalists join and contribute more fully at the management level. This process is also likely to benefit traditional managers who are interested in the overall success of their organization. This step-by-step plan of action will not eliminate mistakes or make decision making painless, but our research suggests that it will help organizations confront and resolve the most critical issues in developing leadership diversity. The process itself is in fact the “best practice” that an organization can use.
Module V: The Purpose of Leadership

This module includes the moral and ethical dimensions of leadership. It focuses upon moral development and the moral and ethical responsibilities of leaders and followers.

The integrative literature focusing on diversity and leadership discusses why it is the moral and ethical responsibility of a leader to know how to lead in a diverse setting when they are placed in the role. The literature also shows how, without this diversity training, society will be harmed because leaders are emerging that are not prepared for leading in an increasingly diverse world. Numerous case studies are integrated into the literature.
We can’t train tomorrow’s leaders with yesterday’s leadership training practices. The decade ahead demands a new set of competencies and a revamping of training methods.

The Brave New World of Leadership Training

JAY A. CONGER

These are unparalleled times in the world of business. A hint of the magnitude of the changes taking place is captured in the new vocabulary used to describe leading-edge organizations—the “boundary-less company,” the “post-hierarchical organization,” the “transnational corporation.” What these new words signal is a fundamental shift in how organizations compete and in how they are managed. It is a time of remarkable transition—some might say the most significant transition in the history of business itself. One certainty is that, by the end of the decade, the corporation as we know it will be a vastly different animal.

In times of great transition, leadership becomes critically important. Leaders, in essence, offer us a pathway of confidence and direction as we move through the seeming chaos. And the magnitude of today’s changes will demand not only more leadership but newer forms of leadership.

To put it bluntly, our older models of leadership will no longer be appropriate. Just as important, our approaches to developing leaders will have to change. For this very reason, we must take a hard, critical look at the way we train and develop future leaders—and we must do so now. The training investments we make today in a young manager will not begin yielding paybacks until some two decades hence, when he or she reaches a senior leadership post. Teaching young managers yesterday’s leadership skills will put them at even greater disadvantage.

But we face several serious problems in trying to address this issue. The first is that most companies have allowed leadership development to become a haphazard process. For example, interviewers pay limited attention to leadership qualities when screening new recruits. Later in their careers, managers might attend a seminar or two on the subject, or the company might offer a career path program with occasional leadership experiences. But the idea of a more serious and systematic approach has largely been neglected—until very recently.

In the last few years, we have seen a growing recognition of the need for more leaders and the realization that we might actually be able to train leadership. As a result, companies are experimenting like never before, making this the most exciting time for leadership training since the decade following World War II. As a matter of fact, if your corporation does not have a “leadership training” program, some people might blink their eyes and wonder how you could have
tically. We have to begin with the business environment of the future, recognizing that two primary forces are determining what the next generation of leaders must be capable of addressing. These forces are dramatically heightened competitive pressures and significant changes in the backgrounds and needs of employees.

Since the 1970s, competitive pressures have been building like a cyclone. This is powerfully evident in the wide range of products from which you and I can select. To quantify the magnitude of this change, consider a single statistic from the automobile industry. In 1958, U.S. consumers could choose only 21 different models of cars from ten different manufacturers. By 1989, they could shop from 167 models by twenty-five different manufacturers! This is due largely to two interrelated factors: the rise of new world economic powers (e.g., Germany, Japan) and the increasing wealth world-wide for consumers. Behind this enormous selection is, of course, a global business war from which there will be no near-term letup.

Global competitive battles account for many of the changes that today’s leaders are attempting to manage. Fierce competition has forced everyone to seek innovative strategies, upgrade product quality, and scramble faster for markets. Competitive pressures generated the “three year, idea-to-product life cycle” for automobiles, as well as new cost management techniques such as just-in-time inventory. They have driven companies to search for markets outside their homelands. Finally, competition (and the advent of computer technology) has pushed us to flatten our hierarchies and to decentralize decision making so that people can respond quickly to rivals’ actions. All these marketplace forces will have significant implications for future leaders.

Specifically, to manage successfully in this sea of competition, future leaders at all levels will have to become:

- Strategic opportunists,
- Globally aware, and
- Capable of managing highly decentralized organizations.

We will explore each of these competencies in a moment. For now, suffice it to say that today’s approaches to leadership development in these areas are inadequate. Typical training programs spend only a day on strategy or visioning, little or no time on international issues, and address the complexities of decentralized organizations mostly with simple participative decision-making exercises. This is the *nouvelle cuisine* answer to future leadership needs—a little taste of everything, and everyone leaves hungry. It is no small wonder that training is not accorded the status it potentially deserves.

Beyond these horrendous marketplace pressures, there is another, equally powerful, set of forces coming from within organizations. These forces, now shaking up the old competencies of leadership, are the by-product of a fundamental shift occurring in the Western world’s workforce. Diversity is the name of this game. It is said that, by the year 2000, fewer than 10 percent of North Americans entering the workforce (for their first job) will be white, Anglo-Saxon males. Women and minority groups will make up the vast majority of future employees. They will bring with them a set of needs and concerns different from those of today’s white males, who currently populate the tops of our corporate hierarchies. In addition, a significant percentage of these new employees will be immigrants with limited education. These individuals will be operating the high-tech factories of the future. One potential outcome might be the creation of an emerging caste structure in which the well-educated elite direct employees who have problems with English and simple math.

The more diverse workforce will likely include individuals who are less tolerant of the interpersonal weaknesses of their superiors. With the increasing emphasis on organizational behavior in management schools, the appearance of employee rights acts, and greater public awareness of “effective” interpersonal behavior (thanks to the popularity of psychotherapy and self-help books), subordinates will expect their leaders to be interpersonally competent. Those who are not
problems facing their own companies) comes into play. Action learning can duplicate "real-time" experiences in structured learning environments by using a company's strategic issues as the learning context. In addition, action learning provides an educational structure within which a manager can reflect, critique, and learn from an undertaking—free from the pressures of a normal business day. Learning by doing, in controlled experiences such as these, will increasingly become the educational wave of the future. The only barriers to its widespread use will be the cost and the complex logistics involved.

As action learning becomes more widespread, we will have to confront one inherent pitfall. Since companies are heavily involved in the processes being studied, they may unconsciously put invisible blinders on their participants. Because company managers select the issues and critique the participants' work, the "right answers" might turn out to be those that reinforce existing assumptions. Essentially, then, the education becomes a process of socialization. The antidote is to involve more outsiders or company mavericks—people who can effectively challenge company perspectives—as educational leaders.

Another hurdle that must be faced is the tendency to reserve strategy training for senior executives. In the 1990s, strategy making, like decision making, will have to be pushed further down the hierarchy. Junior managers must be exposed early on to strategic decision-making experiences. The poverty of conceptual and strategic skills among today's young managers is remarkable. This is due largely to their confinement within narrow functional tracks for much of their careers. As a result, they reach the executive suite with low levels of strategic competence.

Expect to see new learning techniques play a role in strategy training. Experimental approaches will push participants into looking beyond established company world views. How do we challenge our own assumptions about the world? How do we challenge the assumptions that led us to success in the past, but are today outdated? Finding innovative systems and techniques to uncover and challenge organizational world views will become one of the primary training challenges in the 1990s.

One experiment attempting to meet this challenge can be found at the Center for Creative Leadership in North Carolina. The center's new program, called LeaderLab, uses art and visualization to expand participants' abilities to capture the dilemmas they are facing. The objective is to force participants beyond their words and rational minds—the underlying assumption being that we have rehearsed, all too well, how we explain and solve our current situations. This rationality limits our ability to see options and to understand our deeper emotions about a situation.

Some experiments such as this may prove to be the next "snake oil" of training. At this stage, however, we must encourage the exploration of new learning processes such as these. Among the various snake oils we may find an elixir of surprising effectiveness.

Finally, strategic training will have to facilitate long-range thinking. Today's leaders already face simultaneous pressures to think long term and short term—to come up with innovations now, and to build for the future. This split will become more acute than it currently is. While Japan and Germany are investing significantly for the long term, the United States and Canada continue to dwell on quarterly numbers and slash long-term R&D expenditures. As a result, we can expect to see the Japanese gain new ground through new product introductions. To face this competitive challenge, future leaders will have to think far more strategically for the long term, carefully targeting limited resources and resist the short-term mindset.

This will not be easy. Our current crop of future leaders is still "growing up" in functionally specialized fields—which offer few opportunities for breadth of perspective. Moreover, the society remains concerned about the next quarter's earnings. These forces and others will mitigate against the long-range, strategic focus. "Think-tank" training provides opportunities to reflect on long-term strategy and debate future demographic trends, thus allowing the possibility for correcting this myopia. In addition, job ro-
vestment will come from sending future leaders to those markets with the highest project- ed potential. When logistics are too complex or costs too high for "on location" training, organizations may wish to use actors trained in the nuances of other cultures to simulate the problems a manager is likely to face in managing or negotiating in a particular country.

Classroom education, when it is used, must bring together participants from many cultures. The classroom leader can then design simulations and exercises to help each participate play out his or her cultural assumptions and biases, thus creating a laboratory in which participants become teachers for one another. In addition, the learning experience should include structured time for shared reflections on how cultural differences manifest themselves in these interactions and discussions.

Managing the Flattened Pyramid: The Leader as Tightwire Walker

The organizations of the future—far more decentralized than today's pyramids—will be built around cross-functional project or process teams, each team positioned to answer a specific need, such as faster market responsiveness. Team members will report to their leaders as well as their functional superiors. This challenges the manager's tradition role as "the boss." The leader will increasingly become a teacher, coach, and consultant.

In addition, a leader's span of control will expand dramatically. Two decades ago, our management textbooks preached that four to five direct reports was ideal; today a span of control involving ten to twelve direct reports is not uncommon. The computer now sitting on a manager's desk allows him or her to monitor a growing number of individuals with unparalleled efficiency. But the computer cannot replace two critical management roles—coordinating and coaching. These two responsibilities will grow dramatically with the expanded spans of control. Further, a greater reliance on outside suppliers, "outside workers" (working at home), and on a growing number of strategic alliances with other companies will demand that leaders possess exceptional networking and coordinating skills.

These forces will encourage leaders to be more supportive and less directive. This, however, will pose a serious dilemma when a situation requires strong directive action. Future leaders may find themselves reluctant to provide a decisive overarching direction, anxious that such activity might undermine their consultative relationship. This will be reinforced by the growing aversion toward formal authority felt by younger generations. Thus, future leaders will be presented with a paradox: While many employees will want their leaders to be less directive on a day-to-day basis, they will continue to look to these individuals as never before for overall direction and reassurance as something solid in a sea of never-ending changes. As a result, the leader's overall role as a source of stability and control will remain. As Rosabeth Moss Kanter comments in When Giants Learn to Dance (Simon & Schuster, 1989), managers and executives will need to "become passionately dedicated to 'visions' and fanatically committed to carrying them out—but be flexible, responsive, and able to change direction quickly.... The outcome will be that leaders must "speak-up, be a leader, set the direction—but be participative, listen well, and cooperate." Future leaders will be tightwire artists.

How well are today's training programs preparing leaders for these challenges? On the one hand, most programs instill an awareness of these challenges and dilemmas. But they stumble in their attempts to go beyond awareness. For example, many programs point to the necessity of an overarching vision and teamwork, and most attempt to teach aspects of both. Usually, training in the art of vision and teamwork commands no more than two or three days of instruction! We know from research that to do both well involves time and a significant number of hands-on experiences. Current programs fall frightfully short in addressing the problems of managing a growing number of outside relationships.

If the future belongs to the cross-functional or process team, then the future of leadership belongs to those with multiple functional competencies and a broad conceptualization of
joke, will no longer be acceptable and may raise serious questions about a manager's credibility. It is in the little actions of day-to-day work that employees will be testing to see if their leaders are respectful of the concerns and traditions of a particular gender or ethnic group. Training, then, has to begin with an education on the issues and concerns of specific nationalities, races, and genders. Information on demographic trends, on the common issues that a particular group faces in the workplace, and on management approaches that engender negative reactions must all be part of a comprehensive education program.

Ideally, the trainer should design classroom simulations and exercises to trigger common diversity issues so that participants can see firsthand the behaviors with which they need to be more sensitive. Field projects that assign managers to work with unfamiliar ethnic groups offer potentially rich areas for learning. Finally, one of the most powerful ways to "train" these skills in the classroom is through the mix of participants and trainers themselves—in essence, learning using course members. Participants for programs should be selected on the basis of their diversity— their culture, race, gender, faith, and so forth. In this way, the issues of diversity can be learned firsthand. For example, in one classroom I witnessed a dramatic example of managers learning about the problems of diversity. The program itself was divided into two one-week segments, each separated by several months. Just before the second phase of the course, all the men in the group had contacted each other about a golf game on the Saturday before the course began. The women had not been invited (everyone knows that women usually do not play golf—or so the men assumed). Needless to say, this omission caused significant resentment, which surfaced in one session. The debate that followed was a very powerful learning experience.

Interpersonally More Skillful: The Leader as Role Model

More and more, we will expect our leaders to be role models. This is particularly evident in the political arena, where a candidate's background and behavior are scrutinized for the slightest flaws. Some of this same attention will be directed toward our organizational leaders, especially in terms of interpersonal skills. As noted earlier, the popularity of self-help books and psychotherapy has heightened our expectations that our bosses and leaders will be "interpersonally correct."

We can train such skills, at a superficial level, with traditional programs such as active listening or participative decision making. Or, in some cases, we can go much deeper to uncover the root issues related to why a certain manager cannot listen or delegate. In other words, depending on the manager and his or her psychological make-up, interpersonal skill training can be either a straightforward case of step-by-step training, or it can be a more complex, difficult, and profound learning process.

In the step-by-step approach, the traditional problems have been limited classroom time for acquiring the skills as well as the absence of follow-up coaching. On the other hand, training at the more profound levels has run into a deeper barrier, the issue of tampering with the human psyche. While this is a reasonable concern, more supportive and constructive environments can be created using highly skilled staff to assist in deeper learning experiences.

In either case, coaching is of paramount importance. Its absence is a principal reason that interpersonal skills training, in general, is not as effective as it could be. Whether the training required is straightforward or profound, interpersonal skill development demands active and persistent coaching for new behaviors to take hold. To learn interpersonal skills thoroughly, one needs a coach. Any significant change in behavior must be constantly reinforced before becoming ingrained. Typically, trainers have played this coaching role—and so the coaching ends the moment participants leave the classroom.

One possible antidote is the process advisor system. In the ideal case, the process advisor is a psychologist who is versed in organizational issues. This role, as described by the Center for Creative Leadership's Leader-
rather than the participant's organization (where much would be left to chance).

Enriching the Last Community:
The Leader as Community Builder

Finally, we come to the last of the leadership competencies required for the future—community building. This, combined with strategic opportunism, will prove to be the most important of the competencies—but also the most difficult to teach.

Community building is a special talent, one that reflects an individual's deep sense of purpose. It also combines two leadership competencies that are widely talked about today—empowerment and vision. In this case, both are intertwined, since vision itself must be empowering. The nature of the vision's purpose is not only to achieve a meaningful strategic or company goal but also to build a dedicated community.

The important question is whether training can develop such skills. I have seen managers return from programs and more actively reward their employees—which is one element of empowerment. This side of the equation can be taught. Yet an individual's psychological make-up is the key to success on this dimension. Managers must feel secure in themselves to be truly empowering and to learn how to be empowering. A controlling manager cannot become an empowering manager without significant assistance. A program might cause an occasional breakthrough with a "disempowering" manager. Generally speaking, however, it is highly unrealistic to expect that training will transform everyone into empowering leaders.

The second part of the community-building equation—vision—is far more difficult to train, especially in a one-shot program. Vision is the by-product of experience and an openness to ideas and trends. Training can help managers become aware of the need to seek the right mix of work experiences in their careers and encourage them to think beyond their status quo. It can also provide participants with information on future demographic and other trends that might stimulate visionary thinking. Personal growth programs may assist somewhat—if they attempt to help participants find their passions. However, this can backfire if the passions discovered are unrelated to work, or if an individual simply has none.

Most importantly, community builders are usually individuals who are driven by a deep esprit de corps. They are the ones who, in college or on the job, seem to pull everyone together for a special project. Their gift is that of the organizer. Most of us do not have this drive. Can you teach it? Not likely. Or at least, by the time we reach adulthood, our chances of learning it are greatly diminished. Thus, finding community builders is an exercise in selecting and encouraging those who already are.

DESIGNING COURSES
WHERE THE LEARNING STICKS

As training departments face tightening resources, someone is likely to raise the question that everyone dreads: "How come we spent all that money on leadership training last year, and I don't see more leaders around here?" In this decade, training departments will be forced to show "results" like never before. From the perspective of program design itself, design elements such as the process adviser system can play critical roles in producing results. Just as important, the recent trend from single-session programs to multiple sessions will also prove very helpful.

A single, one-time course is insufficient to create and support lasting behavioral change. Instead, courses should be designed as a week-long session followed by a break of three to six months, and then a several day follow-up course. In the first session, participants will most likely develop leadership improvement programs for themselves as well as learn key leadership competencies. Improvement programs are then implemented during the three- to six-month interval, and the follow-up course becomes an opportunity to review the progress of plans, modify them for the future, and learn from successes and failures. Some in-company programs (such as at Ford Motor Company) incorporate this design.


Racist Speech: A Problem Of Power

by Alan Wald

THE NATIONAL PRESS is slowly acknowledging what the radical press has warned for some time: The end of the twentieth century is characterized by a dramatic increase in reported racist assaults on people of color in the United States, a fact confirmed by police surveys and documented by research foundations.1

For the left, this has meant a general recrudescence and reorientation of anti-racist movements during the past several years—a further movement away from the early demands for “civil rights” for African-Americans, and more toward a campaign “against racism” that affects all people of color. The change is quite noticeable on university campuses where vile racist attacks appear to many people to be incongruous with the ethos of “liberal education,” and where the tradition of political activism remains stronger than elsewhere in society.

In the initial phase of the campus anti-racist actions—from Massachusetts to Michigan to Wisconsin to Berkeley—the demands of the student movement focused on two issues. One was the demand that administrators take dramatic action in the form of curriculum renovation (such as implementing less-Eurocentric courses and hiring faculty qualified to teach them). The other was the formulation of punitive policies against explicitly racist—as well as sometimes sexist, anti-Semitic, and homophobic—behavior.

During the past two years there has been a backlash. Conservatives have denounced curriculum reform as “political indoctrination.” Some liberals have joined conservatives in charging that punitive policies to curb racist hate-epithets are a violation of First Amendment rights.3 What strategies might be promoted by socialists who wish to participate in these struggles, responding with decisive immediate action yet also pushing long-term emancipatory possibilities to the limit?4

While I think that most activists would hold that, in the long run, the broader struggles to fundamentally change the culture of the university are more significant than punitive action, the mainstream as well as liberal news media (such as the New York Times, ABC’s “Nightline,” and the Nation) have focused debate on the legalistic aspect of the issue of “Free Speech.” This may be because debates over “Free Speech” lend themselves to more simplified and sensationalist reporting. But I also suspect that some news media see the “Free Speech” angle as attractive because it is a divisive sore point.

The question of whether and how to ban epithets that demoralize and may lead to violence aimed at students of color has tended to split anti-racist activists from civil libertarian and faculty allies in such a way as to make “good copy” suggesting that even the components of the left are so disunited that they can’t find agreement with one another. And the right wing has falsely painted efforts of the left to democratize the university atmosphere as if they were repressive attacks on “Free Speech” and “Academic Freedom.”

The Dynamic of the Struggle

Among the most publicized of such “Free Speech” cases has been that at the University of Michigan. There, in May 1988, in response to explicit racist incidents that had occurred on campus in 1987, an anti-harrassment and anti-discrimination policy was put in place by administrators, only to be struck down by a U.S. District Court in September 1989.

The American Civil Liberties Union was the group that took on the University, on behalf a student who is now feted by right-wing academic networks; the judge ruled that such a university policy violated the guarantee of “Free Speech” provided by the First Amendment. Since that time the University of Michigan has revamped its regulations on harassing and discriminatory speech, vastly limiting the areas of applicability.

University of Michigan radical students, who tended in the past to be sympathetic to the banning of violence-producing epithets while they adamantly opposed all “codes” to monitor any other aspect of speech and behavior, are now confused about the matter. A number of other universities considering such policies have also come under scrutiny and criticism.5

The issues complicating the debate over “Free Speech” and the anti-racist movement are many. First, the general dynamic of these struggles provides an important context for assessing certain aspects of the various proposals. The issue usually arises when stu-
dent activists, often students of color, respond angrily to a racist attack of some sort on campus, mobilizing a constituency to demand action through demonstrations, press conferences, the seizing of a building, etc. Then the administration, embarrassed by local and national publicity that might hurt its reputation and thereby endanger admissions and financial stability, looks for the quickest and the least painful fix.

Of all the options raised by the students—which usually include a call for a dramatic increase in enrollment, support and financial aid for students of color, and the hiring of faculty of color and specialists in the complex issues of racism and ethnocentrism—the administrators are most agreeable to institutionalizing some sort of authoritarian “code” of behavior against students. Their impulse is to make it broader than many of the protesters intended, and to ignore demands that anti-racist activists and students who are the targets of racist assault participate in formulating and applying the policy. (Here we should also point out that neither the University of Michigan anti-discriminatory policy, nor any of the others I have seen, make faculty or administrators accountable.)

At this point in the struggle, some civil libertarians, both in the legal profession itself and among the university population, have entered the picture. They accurately warn that policies that prohibit certain kinds of speech, even vilifying epithets, will establish a dangerous precedent. After all, once the university administration has power to limit speech in one area, it can move more easily into other areas.

Since it is very difficult to determine in advance how a prohibitive policy will be interpreted, there is every reason to fear that punishment will be exacted primarily against the students of color themselves and the left—for example, against Nation of Islam students who may want to hold a meeting for Louis Farrakhan (who has made anti-Semitic statements); against critics of Zionism (who are frequently slandered as anti-Semitic); and against radical anti-CIA protestors (who have been accused of “harassing” and of “discriminating” against the rights of U.S. government representatives).

Beyond that, critics of anti-discrimination policies concerning speech charge that a focus on restricting individual behavior diverts energy to a symptom without addressing the real, underlying, social causes of racism.

From my experience, the events at the University of Michigan indicate that the fears raised by the civil libertarians must be taken seriously. The University authorities have a much stronger record of moving against protesters on the Left—such as participants in anti-CIA demonstrations and editors of the Michigan Daily who criticize Israeli state policy—than they have against right-wing racist activists.

With the signal exception of a campus radio station employee who was tape recorded (by African-American students) when he aired racist jokes, racists have never been seriously impeded in their activities. These include violent acts such as destroying the symbolic shanties built on campus by the United Coalition Against Racism, the Free South Africa Coordinating Committee, and the Palestine Solidarity Committee, as well as the distribution of racist flyers that physically threaten people of color with execution.

The central problem here, then, is a familiar one: Those who have been the targets of oppression and hence the quickest to decry racism and militantly mobilize against it, want immediate relief. Of course, their first response, which socialists fully support, is to mobilize the largest possible demonstrations on the campus and in the community to try to educate people and change the climate of the university. But one cannot expect people to mobilize day-in-and-day-out. Nor can one place the burden on people of color, or their allies, to find time to prepare a mobilization in response to every episode of racism.

In this context of institutionalizing sentiments expressed from the bottom up, many activists feel that a response, even in the form of administrative sanctions against racist verbal behavior, will be a victory, provide legitimacy, and encourage further fight-back.

"Free Speech" and "Academic Freedom"

Of course, the civil liberties argument cannot be dismissed merely because of its frequent origin as part of the sideline commentary on the struggle. More problematic is that this approach, while presenting truths that have a general validity, simply does not respond to the issue of demanding immediate relief from outrageous language, threats and other verbal behavior that interfere with a student of color’s Fourteenth Amendment right to a hypothetically equal education.

In particular, the ACLU spokespersons in the University of Michigan case, when calling on students to focus instead on the “real” problems of racism, offered little but platitudes. When a local ACLU Board member commented on the complex cultural issue of racism, he revealed only a superficial grasp of the debate.

Moreover, even socialists who adhere to a general civil libertarian orientation but who have been part of the anti-racist struggle, among whom I count myself, have not really come up with satisfactory short-term responses to the demand for immediate relief. Following the important first step of building mass mobilizations against the racism that prevents freedom of expression on the part of its targets. Among the more substantial problems currently faced by the campus anti-racist movement are the following:

- There is still a simplistic reliance by some activists on very abstractly-defined categories of “Free Speech” and “Academic Freedom”; this is a dubious concession to the perpetuation of concepts lending themselves to a variety of contradictory interpretations depending upon relations of power.

The problem is that both liberals and conservatives tend to throw these terms about as if they described conditions already extant and now in danger of being overthrown if radicals succeed in making people accountable for racist and sexist behavior. But in fact the speech and academic work of students, faculty and staff, as well as the general culture of the university, are shaped, determined, limited, and unconsciously censored by a host
of legal restrictions (for example, against slander, obscenity, death threats), customs, material resources, and the "norms" of academic disciplines.

At most universities, there are real, material reasons why students do not have the "Freedom" to study Chicano History as seriously as that of European elites; to concentrate on the Native American Indian novel without first going through required indoctrination courses in Shakespeare, Milton, et al; to major in Socialist Revolution; etc.

In bourgeois society, "Free Speech" and "Academic Freedom," provide important openings for the Left but also function as the means by which the dominant ideology is naturalized. Of course, the task of socialists is not at all to abandon the call for "Free Speech" and "Academic Freedom," which also have historical connotations and emotional weight in our culture that are favorable to the Left, but one must not passively accept their conventional usage, either.

Instead, socialists should struggle to redefine the content of "free speech" and "academic freedom" so that they change from unchallenged weights of domination, basically ratifying the status quo (and readily curtailed in time of war), to active instruments that give voice to exploited people in society who are shut out by the present relations of power.

The use of racist hate-words should not be equated with the expression of "Free Speech," but, rather, understood as creating a situation in which "free" expression is impossible for those who have the most impediments to gaining expression in the institutions of our society.

Moreover, in the history of U.S. universities, socialists have fought to interpret "Academic Freedom" as the right of dissident scholars to maintain their teaching positions in spite of the fact that their political views are at odds with the rulers of the society and sometimes of the university (regents, trustees, wealthy backers, etc.). So far as I know, the issue of "Academic Freedom" for faculty first became a national concern when professors opposed to U.S. policy in World War I were fired from schools like the Wharton School of Business (Scott Nearing) and Columbia University (from which Charles Beard resigned in protest).

The issue was raised a few times in the 1930s when pro-Communist or merely pro-labor faculty came under attack, and then with greater force in the period of the McCarthyite witch-hunt when U.S. government committees collaborated with university administrators across the country to cast out academics who would not "name names" and serve as stool pigeons.\^\footnote{In the 1960s and 1970s there were also a series of "Academic Freedom" cases, such as the one at the University of Maryland where Bertell Ollman was denied an appointment as head of the Political Science Department due to his Marxist views, and the one at Boston University where the prominent radical pedagogue Henry Giroux was denied tenure. In addition, there continue to be "Academic Freedom" cases where women and people of color have received unfair treatment due to institutional racism and sexism by administrators. True, in some cases, right-wing faculty have claimed to be persecuted in ways that violate their "Academic Freedom" to propagandize for imperialism and carry out research for various death machines, just as several decades ago there were Cold War liberals who claimed their freedoms were being limited by student protests. Moreover, in the 1960s some portions of the Left either fell for a popularized version of Herbert Marcuse's idea of "Repressive Tolerance" (against "anti-social" forces) while others cited Stalin, Mao and even Trotsky to justify the banning of reactionary speakers and films through mobilizations to "stop fascism.

For the most part, however due to relationships of power, I feel that historically and in the future, "Academic Freedom" is a cause that ought to be associated with the left and the anti-racist movement (although it will have to be reconceptualized to some extent to deal more precisely with racism, sexism and homophobia). This is because these groups stand for the empowerment of the economically and otherwise disenfranchised in opposition to the ruling elite.

Therefore, rather than defend and celebrate such abstract ideas as conditions that already exist and must thus be defended, we ought to assiduously strive to impart to them contents consistent with anti-racism and empowerment of the population.

The "Fighting Words" Argument

- Another problem with some approaches to the issue of racist hate-words is the separation that some believe can be clearly drawn between fascist/racist "actions," which may be suppressed by law, and fascist/racist "speech," which must be tolerated as a necessary evil to prevent suppression of our own controversial speech.

Unfortunately, racist ideology is so deep, ugly and intertwined with the dominant culture of the United States, that in some contexts certain epithets and types of speech are triggers to action. In other words, due to the concrete features of U.S. history, there does not exist a formal "equality" of epithets.

In the case of most groups of people of color in the United States, there is an historical past that somewhat resembles a "colonization" process in which the epithet/violence connection played a central role. An intensive indoctrination of the white population with the view of people of color as objects and barbaric was necessary to rationalize kidnapping, invasion, conquest, enslavement, massive land theft, and the outlawing of indigenous language, religion and culture. Vile epithets were institutionalized along with the punitive techniques of branding, castration, and mutilation.

Four centuries ago as well as today, real or threatened violence ineluctably appears when invoked by cultural symbols and verbal expressions. Whereas the original verbal levers of such violent oppression involved imputing of sub-human qualities to people of color, today the associations are more along the lines of connecting people of color to a permanently degenerate "underclass" of gangs, prostitutes and drug addicts.

A residue of this remains even when we move into the realm of academic discourse. When a Yale Univer-
A university English Professor was cited by critics for characterizing accused African-American rapists as “uneducated monkeys who aren’t ready for civilization,” and a University of Michigan Professor of Sociology allegedly characterized Malcolm X in his classroom as a “red-haired pimp.” This is hard not to feel that the choices of words were especially upsetting to students of color because the signals they touched off are associated with horrendous patterns of oppression and exclusion.

On the other hand, racist expressions against whites, such as that of the CUNY chair of Black Studies who characterized whites as “ice people,” materialistic and intent on domination, in contrast to Black “sun people,” who are humanistic, seem in the context of U.S. history to be tragic and disorienting, but not the ideological counterpart of systematic discrimination against and violent physical assaults on Euro-Americans.

Even the more dangerous Nation of Islam expressions of anti-Semitism are deluded frustrations of a beleaguered group, not the excesses of centuries of entrenched patterns of horrendous domination of Jews by African-Americans within the United States. Whatever abstractions may be offered about the need to be “color blind” and to judge all ethnocentric talk “equally,” racist epithets in the U.S. concerning people of color have a specificity that requires somewhat separate categories of analysis, evaluation and response from other forms of ugly prejudice.

Moreover, it is hard to take into account these specificities with the abstract civil liberties language of “rights,” which often relies to a large degree on notions of formal equivalence, reciprocity, and universality. At the least, the use of certain epithets on the part of white students that has been documented in the university incidents that have received national attention—“Coon. Nigger. Porchmonkey.”—is so intimately linked to violent suppression in our society that a student of color who is exposed to these epithets may understandably feel fear, demoralization, or anger that is a major block to his or her realizing an education.

The designation by some legal experts of certain words in certain contexts as “Fighting Words” (words that inflict injury or incite immediate breach of peace) or “Words That Wound” (language interfering with the ability to function), and the banning of these epithets from the university community, has a measure of validity as a strategy that is not so easily countervailed by the argument that this action undermines “Free Speech” in the same way as the banning of other, merely disgusting and repulsive, offensive speech.

The Campus and the State

- Another confusing argument is that some activists blur significant distinctions between a university and the capitalist state—a state that socialists, of course, never trust. While any notion that the university is an ivory tower, apart from the mainstream of society, is ridiculous—and disproved at once by the presence of virulent racism at universities, in spite of all the official propaganda against it—important differences between the campus and the state are worth considering.

Since the university is a workplace of a very specific type, it has considerable potential for becoming the site of “liberated space.” In particular, students are relatively freed up from nine-to-five work hours and direct parental supervision, so that they can devote more time to the work of organizing, mobilizing, and demonstrating. Faculty are sometimes veterans of the student activist movement themselves and may have special areas of expertise and material resources that can aid student anti-racist struggles. Campus facilities exist for student-controlled meetings, news reportage, cultural publications, political speakers, and educational events.

Moreover, while one cannot forget the murders at Jackson State and Kent State in 1970, the conventions of university life may still act as a buffer against the use of armed force and other direct repressive measures as readily on the campus as elsewhere in society. The reason for this is partly because the university still functions in loco parentis with undergraduate students regarded more as children (whose parents are paying the university to “care” for them) than employees (to be fired and replaced at the university’s convenience), and also because of the popular idea that debate and controversy are more acceptable at universities.

Thus it is reasonable to consider that mobilized students, faculty and staff may be able to devise procedures for insuring that the banning of “Fighting Words” occurs more democratically and with fewer dangers to other rights than is currently possible when dealing directly with the state and its own legal system.

Some Strategic Options

The experience of the last few years suggests to me a number of tactical and strategic points that socialists ought to take into account and perhaps promote as participants in current anti-racist struggles on university and college campuses:

- Socialist anti-racist activists should not become the allies, against the activist movement, of the particu-
lar kinds of professional civil libertarians, armchair academics, and sideline critics who only seem to step into the struggle in order to raise objections at the moment when immediate action is demanded by students of color for relief from racist abuse.

However, simultaneously, social activist should base their support for immediate relief on an awareness of the double-edged nature of any repressive legislation—whether aimed against merely action or against racist hate-speech itself—when the power of interpreting that legislation is mainly in the hands of administrators who identify their self-interest with the corporate world and not with the general population. Some University of Michigan radicals have suggested that, as a result of administration claims that it wishes to provide better “protection” through an anti-discriminatory policy and the deputization of a university police force, the environment has become far less free for the left.

- If the demand of the activists of color is for immediate relief from harassing and intimidating language, the concept of “Fighting Words,” if it can be defined so as to be restricted to racist epithets against people of color in a context threatening violence, demoralization, or exclusion, provides a legitimate starting point for a policy.

Despite its dangers, such a policy may be necessary because of (1) the special nature of racist oppression of people of color in the U.S.; (2) the fact that violent racist speech, perpetuates an environment in which “free speech” is anything but a reality and inhibits rather than promotes alternative perspectives; and (3) the need to support the right of anti-racist activists of color to set their own agenda. (In other words, the Euro-American component of the anti-racist movement should not try to make the banning of racist hate-speech a demand for the anti-racist activists of color; but should accept it as a demand when it arises naturally, from the anti-racist activists of color themselves. Of course, it does not follow that socialists automatically support any and every demand raised by victims of racism; principles of class solidarity, internationalism, opposition to sexism and homophobia, etc., must also be taken into account.)

Moreover, the precise application and limitations of even the “Fighting Words” argument remain in question, which is why I am unenthusiastic about raising it unless under duress. For example, the Constitutional Law expert at Stanford University Law School, Thomas Gray, insisted to Nation correspondent Jon Weiner that the use of “Nigger” constitutes “Fighting Words,” but that “Black son of a bitch won’t do”.

In another variant of an attempt to restrict punishment to personally-harassing language, the most recent version of the University of Michigan anti-discrimination guidelines gives four examples of racist discourse, the first three of which are now deemed to be acceptable at the University: A student announces in class that cranium size is an indicator of intelligence; a student praises in class the holocaust on the grounds that it destroyed “an inferior religion”; a student tells a racist joke during a class discussion; and a white student uses a racial epithet to tell an African-American student just before an exam that she should “go home and stop using a white person’s space.”

According to the new University of Michigan policy, only the fourth example can be considered for disciplinary action because the goal of the epithet was not exchanging an opinion but “affecting a particular student’s performance on an exam . . .” But it seems to me that a much wider range of behavior than that exemplified by the fourth example might affect a student’s performance on an exam, and also that it would be a highly unusual occurrence for a student to decide to spew out racist filth with such a precise focus in mind. However, I do hold the opinion that, if a student believes such outrageous ideas about cranium size or the holocaust, it is far better to allow him or her to express the views openly where they can be thoroughly refuted, rather than intimidate them into private conversations among friends who may reinforce them.

- The ambivalences of even the “Fighting Words” approach to prohibiting violent verbal abuse under-
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scores the frailty of the whole strategy of calling on institutional regulation. "Immediate relief" from racist verbal harassment can't be the primary axis of the anti-racist struggle, but only an emergency stop-gap that serves largely as a symbol of a willingness to see the seriousness of the whole matter of racist culture—a life and death matter for people of color in this society. Regulation is one way of registering the anti-racist opinion expressed through anti-racist mobilization, given the impossibility of most people to mobilize day-in-and-day-out, whenever a damaging episode occurs.

The problem here is not an abstract moral one—that one must protect the right even of bigots if one is to protect everyone else's rights—but that the methods of the short-term immediate response approach are foreign to the socialist project as a whole. That is, relying on university administrators to "catch" somebody in an explicit act of a certain kind is simply not an expression of the dynamic of "socialism from below." The latter is more accurately defined as empowering in a liberatory fashion the targets of racism and their allies by garnering numbers and material resources. These are the means to giving power and legitimacy to anti-racist (or, from another angle, internationalist) views on the campus. Here we must affirm as a general policy that the route to liberation will come through "using, not curtailing free speech."13

Toward this end we have to look more seriously, albeit critically, at the experiences of anti-racist centers or counter-institutions, such as the Ella Baker/Nelson Mandela Anti-Racist Center at the University of Michigan, and the Third College at the University of California at San Diego. Certain features of these counter-institutions may point toward the eventual creation of alternative centers of real power on the campus. But this will only happen if such centers can develop so that, in contrast to the universities themselves, their functioning is under the democratic control of students, faculty and staff, with strong representation from people of color and a clear commitment to a liberatory culture that is opposed to authoritarianism.

- We must also take into account that, while explicit racism periodically erupts on many campuses, several recent studies suggest that the real axis of campus racism may rotate around far more subtle issues. We know that the preponderance of racist physical attacks occur not at the university at all but when a person of color accidentally enters neighborhood turf controlled by gangs of young white males (as in the now famous cases in Queens and Bensonhurst).

In contrast to that urban pattern, a recent study conducted by the University of Michigan School of Public Health claims that the most pressing preoccupation of many students of color is the classroom situation in which an issue of race and racism is clearly implied by the material under discussion, but where no one is willing to raise and confront the issue except students of color. A second preoccupation of respondents was that, when an issue of race did come up, the students of color were then looked upon to provide expert testimony on "the Black experience," etc., which in the eyes of the Euro-Americans seemed to be exclusively equated with poverty and deprivation.14

This suggests that, for all the theoretical advances made by scholars of color and others in various aspects of sociological, anthropological, cultural and literary research, the bottom line is still a profound ignorance on the part of most Euro-American students and faculty. For all the administrators' glib talk about "tolerance" and "diversity," for all the insistence that the majority of the university is anti-racist and the bigots are a tiny minority with "bad ideas," the fact remains that misconceptions remain widespread that prevent the university community from appropriating the vocabulary and analytical perspectives necessary to discuss racism in an atmosphere conducive to productive exchange.

In my view, this is largely because the explanation for modern racism—as an ideology elaborated to rationalize super-exploitation of people in those parts of the world conquered by European elites—requires a basically radical critique. If the analysis is carried out consistently, it threatens the view of U.S. capitalist society and the role of Europe in world history that is the basis of the academic ideology of the university.

Hence, any expectation that top-down administrative solutions to racism are going to be crucial to eradicating racist practices is misguided. The prime focus for socialists must be on developing a sort of cultural revolution from below, in the sense that material forces must be gathered, organized and set in motion to progressively alter the culture of the university at its roots. This alteration should include every aspect—the decor, names of buildings and physical locations, relation to the community, composition of faculty and staff, nature of the curriculum at the foundation (organization of disciplines, models of "academic excellence"), how knowledge is validated (including the abstract/formal approach to "Free Speech").

Moreover, the strategy and tactics for such a momentous undertaking, which cannot proceed to fulfillment without major changes outside the university as well as in the center/periiphery relations of the capitalist world, can best be characterized as "liberatory," not "repressive." This is in spite of the fact that the goal, from Day One, is to disempower racist behavior.

For example, while there is a sound case to be made for demanding that the entire university community participate in required courses that take up the complexities of racism, socialist activists should fight against the insinuation that the sole object of such courses is to force students to face up to the horrors of racist oppression and deprivation.

On the contrary, such courses should be presented as an opportunity to expand the participants' grasp of the forces that shape their own lives and possibilities of experience. The "required" aspect of such courses is only a necessary concession, and hopefully a temporary one, to the fact that the university is permeated by a system in which (1) making a course a "requirement" is a necessary qualification to gain serious attention and appropriate resources, and (2) existing "requirements," fundamentally based on Eurocentric notions (often most pernicious where least acknowledged because the subject matters are allegedly "value-free," as in the teaching
of composition skills or the hard sciences), are already firmly in place and will therefore take precedence over non-required courses in a student's schedule.

In summary, the strategy of mass militant mobilization and formulating demands to prioritize a human culture on the campuses are the foundations of any movement that hopes to defend learning, understanding, and freedom in the concrete. In my view, racism against people of color constitutes a special and horrendous category of assault. Therefore if activists of color themselves raise the demand to provide immediate relief by banning certain violence-provoking epithets—the unique verbal instigators, facilitators, and allies of material oppression—socialists should be supportive and suggest ways in which the university population as a whole, especially the targets of racism, can play the major role in monitoring and interpreting such restrictions against wounding epithets.

However, the main concern of socialists must be to mobilize forces to strike at the unequal resources that empower the racist conceptual foundations of the culture of the university. To that end, we should also work toward the creation of counter-cultural centers under control of those who have been targets of racist assault and ideological domination, animated by the kind of thinking that for some has been roughly symbolized by books such as Samir Amin's *Eurocentrism* and Martin Bernal’s *Black Athena*.

### Racism Versus Academic Freedom

**by Elizabeth Anderson**

RECENT UNIVERSITY-BASED anti-racist activities have prompted a media backlash: Attacks on campus racism are derided as assaults on freedom of speech, as leftist attempts to enforce “politically correct” views on everyone else. Mainstream publications offer little, if any, space to anti-racist activists to rebut these charges.

This is not the first time oppositional groups have been denied the opportunity to present their own case in the mass media. Although such bias is incompatible with the news media’s purported commitment to objective inquiry, it is defended by claiming that media access is, after all, a commodity, and so available only to those rich enough to pay for it or powerful enough to influence it.

This reply makes a mockery of the notion that “the free market of ideas” can be expected to promote objective inquiry, as opposed to beliefs favorable to the interests of the rich and powerful. But it also highlights a contrast between the professed aims of academic inquiry and of “free speech” in the marketplace, and hence also between the institutional embodiments of “freedom of speech” within and without academia. For the academy *does* ostensibly commit itself to an ideal of objective inquiry, in which people acquire beliefs because they are supported by argument and evidence, not because they are backed up by money and power.

The academy, unlike privately owned media, has no market excuse for systematically depriving subordinate groups—such as the poor, people of color, and women—of an effective voice. This contrast between the underlying points of freedom of speech in the academy and in the market, however blurred in practice, provides a key for understanding the directions a campus-based anti-racist movement should take.

### What Kind of Freedom?

The campus anti-racist agenda is and ought to be deeply informed by an ideal of academic freedom which is distinct from the generic notion of “freedom of speech.” That the purposes of speech and hence the freedoms it properly enjoys are different within and without the academy is uncontroversial. Lying and
Faking research results are constitutionally protected activities outside the academy, as long as they are not used for commercial fraud, libel, or slander, yet they are punishable within the academy.

This difference reflects the fact that the market seeks profitable speech, whereas the academy is supposed to seek true and reasoned speech. Campus-based activists can strengthen their anti-racist agenda by linking their attacks on racist speech to the specific aims of academic freedom.

Outside the academy, legal support for punishing racist epithets must be found in such positions as the "fighting words" doctrine, as Alan Wald argues. The possibility of prosecuting such speech then depends upon showing that the epithets are not merely "offensive" but virtual incitements to violence. (Alternatively, an analogy can be drawn between racist harassment and sexual harassment in the form of obscene phone calls, which are also constitutionally unprotected.)

Inside the academy, racist epithets appear not only in these guises, but as symptoms of the much larger problem of systematically distorted communication between whites and people of color. Systematically distorted communication occurs whenever class, race, gender, or other relations of domination influence a community's acceptance of claims, its assignment of burdens of proof, and the quality of attention it pays to different speakers and to different human interests, problems, and experiences. Wherever this occurs, subordinated groups occupy a status of second-class academic citizens and enjoy a lesser degree of educational opportunity than dominant groups. In depriving subordinated groups of equal freedom and opportunity to influence the course of inquiry, the academy also undermines the very goal for which academic freedom is supposedly instituted—the pursuit of an understanding of the world supported by reasoned argument and evidence rather than power, prejudice, and superstition.

The public meaning and effect of assaulting a person of color with a racist epithet in a campus context is to attack the recipient's legitimacy and power to engage in inquiry on equal terms with others in the university—to command the respect that is a prerequisite for her contribution to be taken seriously, and to command the self-confidence needed to get on with the project.

Racist Speech Attacks Freedom

Recent events at the University of Michigan illustrate various ways in which racist speech on campus constitutes an attack on people's academic freedom.

The attack may take the form of a direct threat to the presence of people of color on campus, as in a poster once plastered over the campus that declared that "niggers ought to be hanging from trees." Or it could effectively deter inquiry through humiliating retort, as when, in a political science class, a white student derided a Black student's question by calling Blacks ignorant. Or it could constitute an attack on the importance of studying phenomena of racism and oppression, as when students in a European history class loudly complained about having to study the Holocaust, since what did they care if the Jews had been gassed?

Such remarks do not constitute "inquiry," but assaults on the conditions for freedom of inquiry itself. As such, they are no less deserving of punishment by the university than other betrayals of academic freedom such as plagiarism, fraudulent research, and tampering with other people's experiments or computer files.

Of course, care must be exercised in determining when a remark undermines the background conditions for free and open discussion, and when it constitutes an offensive but sincere attempt by someone with racist beliefs to understand the reasoning behind rival views. Open discussion of racist beliefs is a painful but necessary part of anti-racist education, and must not be stifled by fears that any potentially offensive remark relating to race might be punished. An academic policy that punishes racist epithets would have to clearly distinguish harassment, abuse, and other acts of domination from sincere but offensive inquiry.
This is not a very difficult task: contextual clues such as posture, tone of voice, responsiveness to challenges, surrounding cautionary remarks, and the presence of a specific target of attack can aid the interpretation of remarks, and be used by sincere inquirers to signal their intention to engage in reasoned discussion rather than abuse of others.

**Systematically Distorted Communication**

Racist speech is especially objectionable in the university. As a form and cause of systematically distorted communication, it denies an equal education to people of color and undermines objective inquiry. But sporadic and intentional outbursts of racist speech constitute only a small part, although perhaps the most overt, hateful, and immediately painful part, of such practices.

A unified and coherent anti-racist agenda should frame its response to racist speech in the context of the far more pervasive, systematic, institutionalized, and unconscious (and hence more damaging and resistant) educational practices that silence, exclude, ignore, distort, or drown out the voices of people of color and other oppressed groups in society.

The aim of the campus struggle should be to eliminate the influence of race-, gender- and class-based power relations on whose voices, interests, questions, problems, experiences, and presuppositions are taken seriously in teaching and research. A brief survey of a few practices that systematically distort academic communication—in admissions policies, pedagogy, research methodology, the academic hierarchy of disciplines and fields, hiring practices, and the specific presuppositions and concepts of research programs in different fields—suggests how daunting a challenge this is:

—Teachers expect and thus demand more from white male students, and least attention to Black female students. They thereby give higher priority to the educational interests and problems of white men, and inculcate unequal expectations in students as to what demands they may make on teachers' attentions.

—Teachers habitually pay most personal attention to white male students, and least attention to Black female students. They thereby give higher priority to the educational interests and problems of white men, and inculcate unequal expectations in students as to what demands they may make on teachers' attentions.

—Teachers expect and thus demand more from white students than from students of color, and more from male than female students in fields such as mathematics. Since teacher expectations are an important factor in student performance, and the history of performance is an important factor determining a student's access to more and higher quality education, racist and sexist expectations constitute a self-fulfilling prophecy.

—Lower-class students and students of color are more often placed in lower educational "tracks" in high school or earlier. Universities thus inherit a pool of students whose "qualifications" are already shaped by institutional racism and classism. While universities have taken some steps to remedy these problems in the admissions process, they remain ill-equipped to deal with the educational problems and perspectives of students from subordinate groups, since their educational programs have been designed for privileged students.

—Having been taught that their opinions are important and that they are entitled to express them, white, economically privileged men feel entitled to "take over" classroom discussions, expect others to defer to their opinions, and aggressively interrupt people of color and women more than they are interrupted.

—The "attributional fallacy" inclines people to give more respect and credence to opinions ascribed to white men, or uttered by lighter-skinned, taller, lower-voiced persons of whatever race or gender. Thus, even when persons of color and women get a word in edgewise, their opinions are discounted by race and gender, or by factors highly correlated with race and gender.

—The common conservative methodological principle that new theories "fit" with what is already "known" imposes a bias in favor of investigations that cohere with past racist and sexist theories, and with racist and sexist background assumptions of dominant groups in society, whose opinions are more salient and appealing to most researchers than those of oppressed groups. Similarly, the common emphasis on expanding the predictive range of established theories and on finding a unitary research program, rather than on criticizing the background assumptions of theories and developing rival research programs, impart a bias in favor of theories that have been developed for a long time, regardless of the ideological interests that made them salient and appealing in the first place, and discourages investigation into these interests.

—The academy continues to resist opening up its professorial ranks to members of groups with background assumptions and interests contrary to those of dominant groups in society.

Yet the history of each discipline touching on human interests shows that to expose and criticize the influence of race-, class-, and gender-based assumptions in inquiry, research itself must be conducted by people who do not share these assumptions and who have an
people of color on campus, anti-racist activists seek not only to provide equal educational opportunities to all, but to realize the conditions under which, for the first time, academic inquiry can proceed undistorted by racist ideology and racist power relations.

Of course, it doesn’t appear this way to the mainstream academy and media. They are convinced that perfect academic freedom already exists for everyone on campus, and that the anti-racist movement threatens to inject politicized motivations into the process of inquiry, thereby distorting its basic neutrality and objectivity. There is one element of truth in this portrayal of the campus anti-racist movement: It is politically motivated—that is, it is motivated by civic concerns. Its aim is to realize two basic civic conditions required for all to enjoy academic freedom: that research and educational opportunities be equally provided to all, and that members of the academy engage in inquiry undistorted by relations of racist domination and subordination.

Notes
4. Wald discusses this concern on page 19.

Defeat Racism, Don’t Censor It

by John R. Salter, Jr.

I’M COMPLETELY AGAINST any efforts to ban racist or sexist speech, or any other speech, on college or university campuses—or anywhere else. I speak as both activist and academic and as one who has been involved in social justice pursuits and teaching since the 1950s.

American Indians, traditionally, recognized the right of everyone to be heard—no matter how unpopular or even noxious the verbiage. (And critics of some things said have certainly never felt inhibited about disputing things!) Whatever its limitations, my native state of Arizona has never deteriorated—despite the presence of copper bosses and the farming magnates, among others—into the sort of closed society once exemplified by Mississippi. In part, at least, this has been because of the libertarian traditions of a far-ranging frontier where “things open out instead of in” and where free speech has generally, however grudgingly, been respected or at least tolerated.

I’ve never known any effort anywhere to ban speech that really “worked.” I’ve known few such efforts that, sooner of later, weren’t turned against the advocates of constructive social change. Hell, look at human history. Frankly, some of the most sanctimonious proponents of racist and sexist speech in university settings have been, in my observation, administrators whose real commitment to, say, affirmative action, has been zero—and who frequently have worked against anything of a tangible nature that would increase the numbers (and morale) of women and minorities in meaningful positions. Other, more well-meant official folk, worry about “negative speech,” expressing their concerns in the context and style of a prattling timidity that brings out the worst in everyone.

Here at the University of North Dakota, in a state and region where Native Americans are the most substantial minority, our Department of American Indian Studies offers several sections of a course called Introduction to Indian Studies—which fulfills a state teacher certification necessity and also meets certain humanities and social science requirements. About 350 students per year pass through these courses (I teach 200 or so personally); the majority are Anglo, with a good number of American Indians and other minorities represented. In this classroom setting, academic dimensions are heavily laced with confronting all kinds of people’s hang-ups—and we deal with these directly in a non-guilty trip, “say what you please” hang-loose sort of atmosphere.

This works—and often these students go on to take other courses of ours, such as Contemporary Indian Issues or Federal Indian Law and Policy or Plains Indians. Common interests, common concerns and common allies surface. And in many other sectors, in and out of the university setting, we’ve challenged all kinds of anti-people words and deeds and patterns. We’ve done it openly and candidly—and without tearing people down. Our efforts are interracial and intercultural.

We’ve seen things improve enlightenment-wise with the students, considerably so, and with many townspeople. But we still have a long, long way to go in getting minorities and women hired in solid and influential university positions. Academics—including academic liberals—are certainly often harder to deal with than an essentially nice Anglo kid who has some hang-ups.

The kid usually honest enough to face-up and change, given a firm push or two or three—done in a friendly fashion. Too many academics combine slipperiness and functional intractability in the most creative and self-serving ways.

We just have to keep fighting, all of us together, step by step. But let’s not waste time on dangerous gimmicks like gag laws and regulations. The real prize lies “over the mountain yonder” and we can catch it—if we don’t allow ourselves to be de-railed and diverted into the canyons.
interest in challenging them. (This does not mean that every member of a subordinate group is automatically immune to distorting influences on inquiry, nor that every member of a dominant group is automatically interested in perpetuating these influences. It does mean that a community of inquiry cannot seriously aspire to undistorted communication if it does not include widespread participation by all groups.)

—Research programs that aim to expose and criticize the ideological influences of mainstream theories are marginalized into sub-fields, such as African-American Studies and Women’s Studies, that rank low on the academic hierarchy and that often lack the institutional power (and hence access to resources) of full academic departments. Faculty who work in these fields are similarly marginalized. The academic hierarchy insulates dominant forms of inquiry from the critical scrutiny of others, for it consists of norms that tell researchers in dominant programs that they may ignore findings on the “margins” or beneath them in the hierarchy.

—Faculty in dominant research programs use their own ignorance of marginalized programs to disqualify job candidates in these fields, for they are not in a position to judge the quality of their work, and are unwilling to defer to the judgments of experts in these fields. Thus the marginalization of critical research programs in a discipline effectively reverses the standard of qualification for hiring faculty: while mainstream candidates may be disqualified because of their own ignorance, marginalized candidates are disqualified because of the ignorance of those who could hire them.

—The central critical categories, concepts, and canons of many disciplines are themselves informed by racist and sexist assumptions. In English literature, the critical category of “sentimentality” is a code-word for attacks on women’s writing. In sociology, modernization theory reflects the assumption that whereas “we” in the West have a “history,” “they” have only a static “culture.” In philosophy, while canonical writers have disagreed over the meaning of “reason,” they have almost uniformly agreed that whatever it is, women, workers, and people of color have it to a lesser degree than white or upper class men. The uses of such concepts show that their application and perhaps their content as well is informed by interests in domination.

This list offers only a small selection of the ways in which power relations influence the acceptance of theories and the selection of persons and perspectives that are taken seriously in the academy. In light of these systematic, institutional forms and causes of distorted communication, the problem of racist epithets on campus appears as only a small part of a deeply entrenched problem that must be addressed on a wide front.

An Anti-Racist Agenda

How then, should university-based anti-racist activists respond to the problem of racist speech on campus? If the larger goal of the campus anti-racist movement is to remove all forms and causes of distorted communication, then it would be a mistake to focus on punishing overtly racist speech. Such a focus would distract attention from more damaging and pervasive forms of institutional racism, and suggest to many that racism is a matter of a few hostile people with bad attitudes, rather than a matter of institutions and practices that systematically silence, exclude, and ignore the interests and voices of people of color.

But a movement to punish racist epithets could be a useful part of an anti-racist program to establish genuine academic freedom and equal educational opportunity for all groups on campus. Activists can design a powerful anti-racist agenda tailored to universities by unifying their activities around an expanded ideal of academic freedom. Such an agenda would include:

1) Activists need to articulate a conception of academic freedom which, instead of providing cover for abusing other people, provides support for anti-racist activity. Such a conception must link academic freedom to its underlying aim of objective inquiry.

Propositions are supposed to lay a valid claim on belief formation only as they are supported by argument and evidence, and survive criticism from rival points of view, not as they are supported by money, power, or the status of the people who promulgate them, or as they are insulated from criticism by those who lack these resources. To support its claims to provide an environment for genuinely free and objective inquiry, the academy must strive to remove the influence a view has on belief formation just because it is well-funded, or supports the interests of dominant groups, or is expressed by people who are socially or economically dominant.

2) To root out these influences, activists must call for the recruitment of people to the academy who are in a position to detect them, have an interest in resisting them, and equally enjoy the right to a respectful hearing from other members of the academy. This requires massive efforts to recruit people of color, women, and persons of lower class backgrounds to faculty positions.

3) To remove structures of systematically distorted communication, marginalized and critical perspectives need not only to be represented on campus, but empowered. Activists should call for better funding and publicity of oppositional research programs, attack the academic hierarchy which legitimizes ignorance of their findings, and challenge mainstream researchers to respond to and incorporate the findings of these programs in their own teaching and research. They should also call for curricular reforms that address the problems of distorted communication entrenched in classes today.

4) Activists must engage in a systematic critique and reform of pedagogy, research methodology, and theoretical categories that reflect or reinforce the influence of race-class- and gender-based power relations on teaching and research.

5) Finally, as part of such a comprehensive movement against systematically distorted communication, activists may call for treating racist epithets on campus on a par with other speech that violates academic standards, such as plagiarism and fraudulent research. Of course, caution must be exercised here, as universities may easily abuse their sanctioning powers.

In calling for the recruitment and empowerment of
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Implications of Member Role Differentiation

ANALYSIS OF A KEY CONCEPT IN THE LMX MODEL OF LEADERSHIP

WILLIAM E. McCLANE
Loyola College in Maryland

Recent research exploring the leader-member exchange (LMX) model of leadership has suggested that members within the same work unit are differentiated in terms of their level of negotiating latitude. In this study, the possible impact of this role differentiation on member affective reactions was explored. As hypothesized, groups whose members experienced higher levels of negotiating latitude tended to have higher overall satisfaction with the leader, task, and co-workers. Contrary to expectations, however, the differentiation of follower roles was negatively related both to the level of negotiating latitude in the group and to member satisfaction with the task.

Research exploring the leader-member exchange (LMX) model of leadership suggests that leaders may develop very different relationships with different members of the same work unit (Dansereau, Green, & Haga, 1975; Green & Cashman, 1975). Surprisingly, however, the degree of differentiation in leader-member relationships has not been examined for its possible group-level effects. In this study, the affective reactions of members in groups including different leader-member relationships are contrasted with the affective reactions of members in groups consisting of more homogeneous relationships.

According to LMX theory, the nature of these differences in leader-member relationships is the "negotiating latitude" that the leader allows the
member (Graen & Scandura, 1987). Negotiating latitude is based on (a) the leader's willingness to allow changes in the member's job and (b) regardless of the leader's formal authority, his or her inclination to use position power to help the member solve work-related problems (Dansereau et al., 1975). Negotiating latitude thus reflects the degree to which the member is allowed by the leader to develop his or her work role. High-negotiating-latitude members report many opportunities to exchange ideas with their superiors in developing their work role, whereas low-negotiating-latitude members report having relatively few such opportunities.

The LMX model posits that member roles are initially relatively undifferentiated with all followers accorded only limited negotiating latitude (Dansereau et al., 1975). Members apparently accrue negotiating latitude via an initial role-taking process, in which the leader formulates an impression of the member's capabilities, and a subsequent role-making process, consisting of a reciprocal interaction between the leader and member (Graen & Scandura, 1987). Over time, differences arise in member roles as a subset of members acquires an additional increment of negotiating latitude (Dansereau et al., 1975).

The responses of members to the negotiating latitude they are allowed have been reasonably well documented. Several studies have suggested that the negotiating latitude of the member is positively related to the member's satisfaction with the leader (Dansereau et al., 1975; Graen, Dansereau, Minami, & Cashman, 1973; Scandura & Graen, 1984; Seers & Graen, 1984; Vecchio & Gobbel, 1984), although there was one failure to replicate (Graen & Ginsburgh, 1977). In a similar fashion, reasonable support exists for the positive relationship between the member's negotiating latitude and his or her satisfaction with the task (Dansereau et al., 1975; Graen et al., 1973; Rosse & Kraut, 1983), although there was also one failure to replicate this relationship (Seers & Graen, 1984). Finally, several studies have concluded that the negotiating latitude of the member is positively related to that member's satisfaction with his or her co-workers (Graen et al., 1973; Graen, Novak, & Sommerkamp, 1982; Seers & Graen, 1984). Collectively, these results suggest that members enjoying high negotiating latitude are more satisfied with their leader, task, and co-workers than their low-negotiating-latitude counterparts.

LMX theory views the different leader-member relationships as part of providing the social structure necessary for task accomplishment (Dansereau et al., 1975; Graen & Scandura, 1987). Because the leader has neither time nor energy to perform all important tasks, he or she must be able to delegate certain tasks to competent, trusted personnel. These members become the
"cadre" of the leader and are accorded considerable latitude to negotiate their work role with the leader. By contrast, other members are allowed only limited negotiating latitude. These members do not demonstrate the involvement of their high-negotiating-latitude counterparts, instead acting as "hired hands" concerned with the less critical tasks of the work unit.

Differences in the negotiating latitude accorded members in the same work group thus reflect the level of role differentiation within the group. For example, members of a group with minimal role differentiation would have similar levels of negotiating latitude and demonstrate similar levels of commitment and involvement. By contrast, a group with greater role differentiation would be characterized by wide ranges of negotiating latitude among its members and clear differences among members in their commitment.

Several studies have explored group-level effects within the LMX model. However, these studies have sought to explore the residual effects of leader-member relationships after group-level effects are removed (Kanterberg & Hom, 1981; Nachman, Dansecreau, & Naughton, 1983). By contrast, this study is concerned with the impact of the role differentiation reflected in these different leader-member relationships on member responses to the group. Thus the critical dimension of interest is the difference in negotiating latitude across members within the group and the effects of these differences on member responses to the group.

The previous discussion would suggest that role differentiation occurs as some members accrue additional negotiating latitude via the role-making process. Thus groups in which greater role differentiation has occurred should have higher negotiating latitude than their less differentiated counterparts. Because a positive relationship apparently exists between member negotiating latitude and affective responses to the leader, task, and co-worker, differences in negotiating latitude between groups may have positive implications for the affective responses of members. Accordingly, the following hypotheses are advanced:

Hypothesis 1: Groups in which members are allowed high negotiating latitude will evidence, on the average, greater satisfaction with the leader, task, and co-workers than groups in which less negotiating latitude is accorded members.

Hypothesis 2: Groups in which more role differentiation occurs will have higher average negotiating latitude than groups in which less role differentiation is evident.

Hypothesis 3: Groups in which more role differentiation occurs will have higher average satisfaction with leader, group, and co-workers than groups in which less role differentiation is present.
METHOD

SUBJECTS AND PROCEDURE

Seven-person task groups, each composed of six members and one leader, were formed for the study. The six members were undergraduate management or psychology students who received performance feedback in return for their participation. Members were balanced with respect to gender. Leaders were MBA students who were invited by the researcher to participate on the basis of their having significant work experience. In return for participating in the study, leaders received performance feedback and a $20.00 stipend. Leaders and members both received feedback in terms of typical assessment-center dimensions (e.g., verbal clarity) by trained observers at the conclusion of the session.

Leaders and members met each other for the first time at the group meeting and received identical task materials. The task was based on an actual organizational problem and consisted of a series of memos between organization members concerning a production expansion. On the basis of this series of memos, participants were to identify possible problem areas in the upcoming expansion. Pilot testing confirmed that the task was quite challenging and involving.

Participants were allowed 10 min to review the task materials and an additional 40 min to identify possible problem areas. No instructions were provided to suggest how they were to behave or accomplish the task. Following the task, members completed measures of their negotiating latitude and affective reactions to the leader, task, and co-workers.

MEASURES

Negotiating latitude was assessed by four Likert-type items (5-point scale) adapted from Liden and Garne (1980). Higher scores indicate that the member perceives that the leader allowed him or her more opportunities to develop a work role.

Member affective reactions were assessed using the leader, task, and co-workers subscales of the Job Descriptive Index (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969). For task satisfaction, items clearly irrelevant to the current setting (e.g., "on your feet") were omitted. Higher scores correspond to increasing satisfaction with the leader, task, or co-workers.
RESULTS

SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

A total of 29 groups participated in the study. The six members in each group were balanced with respect to gender, whereas 11 of the 29 leaders were female. Leaders were older than members, with mean ages of 28.7 (SD = 5.0) and 22.4 (SD = 3.3), respectively. Leaders also had more work experience than members (8.3 years vs. 5.6 years; SD = 4.4 vs. SD = 3.8, respectively) and were more likely to be currently employed (88.0% vs. 56.7%) than were members.

ANALYSIS

Two group-level measures of leader-member relationships were prepared for this study: average negotiating latitude and the sum of differences in negotiating latitude. The average negotiating latitude was simply the mean level of negotiating latitude of the six members in the group. A measure of the degree of role differentiation within the group was prepared by summing the absolute value of the difference between each member’s negotiating latitude and the mean negotiating latitude of his or her group. For the current setting, this measure potentially ranges from 0 (no difference in negotiating latitude among group members) to 48 (three group members receiving the maximum score of 20 on the negotiating latitude scale, three the minimum of 4).

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Zero-order correlations of the dependent and independent variables are presented in Table 1. On the whole, groups showed a moderate level of role differentiation, with a mean sum of differences of 11.60, about 20% of the theoretical scale maximum. The average level of negotiating latitude accorded members was relatively high at 15.58, about 78% of the scale maximum.

Member affective reactions to the leader, task, and co-workers were all strongly and positively related. Thus members who were satisfied with one aspect of the group apparently tended to be satisfied with other aspects as well.
MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND INTERCORRELATIONS OF MEASURES OF MEMBER NEGOTIATING LATITUDE AND SATISFACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negotiating latitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Sum of differences</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Average</td>
<td>15.58</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>-.66**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Leader</td>
<td>27.94</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Task</td>
<td>32.25</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Co-workers</td>
<td>36.15</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 29.
*p < .05; **p < .01.

NEGOTIATING LATITUDE AND SATISFACTION

Hypothesis 1 stated that the average level of negotiating latitude would be positively related to the average level of member affective reactions. To test this hypothesis, the average member satisfaction with the leader, task, and co-worker were regressed separately onto the average negotiating latitude for each group. These results are shown in Table 2.

In line with predictions, group member negotiating latitude was positively related to satisfaction with the leader (beta = 1.16, F = 14.38, p < .01) with the task (beta = 1.60, F = 6.66, p < .05) and with their co-workers (beta = 1.38, F = 4.47, p < .05). Thus groups whose members were allowed more negotiating latitude were characterized by members who were, on the average, more satisfied with their leader, task, and co-workers than groups whose members were allowed less negotiating latitude.

ROLE DIFFERENTIATION AND NEGOTIATING LATITUDE

Hypothesis 2 stated that groups in which greater role differentiation is present would have higher average negotiating latitude than groups in which this role differentiation is not evident. To test this hypothesis, the zero-order correlation between the sum of differences in member negotiating latitude and average negotiating latitude was computed and tested for significance. These results are presented in Table 1.
In contrast with expectations, the sum of differences in the member negotiating latitude was strongly and negatively related to the average level of negotiating latitude allowed members (r = -.66). Thus leaders who tended to minimize differences in the negotiating latitude allowed their members also allowed members of their groups relatively high levels of negotiating latitude. By contrast, leaders who made greater differentiation among member roles tended to allow members of their groups relatively little negotiating latitude.

**ROLE DIFFERENTIATION AND SATISFACTION**

Hypothesis 3 stated that groups with greater role differentiation would have higher average satisfaction with leader, group, and co-workers than groups without such role differentiation. To test this hypothesis, the group average of the member's satisfaction with the leader, task, and co-workers was regressed separately onto the sum of the differences in negotiating latitude within each group. These results are shown in Table 2.

In contrast with expectations, the sum of the differences in member negotiating latitude within the group was significantly and negatively related to member satisfaction with the task (beta = -0.34, F = 4.39, p < .05). The relationships between the sum of the differences in member negotiating latitude and the group member's satisfaction with the leader (beta = -0.14, F = 0.13, ns) and satisfaction with their co-workers (beta = -0.20, F = 0.25, ns) were in a negative direction, although these relationships did not reach conventional levels of significance. Thus groups in which greater differences

|)**TABLE 2**
| Relationship of Average and Sum of Differences in Negotiating Latitude With Member Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Satisfaction</th>
<th>Negotiating Latitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average F beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>14.38** 1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>6.66* 1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker</td>
<td>4.47* 1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum of Differences F beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>0.13 -0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>4.39* -0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker</td>
<td>0.25 -0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 29.

*p < .05; **p < .01.
in member negotiating latitude were present were characterized by members who were, on the average, less satisfied with their task.

DISCUSSION

The LMX model of leadership seeks to explore differences among the leader-member relationships in the same group, as reflected in the negotiating latitude possessed by the member (Graen & Scandura, 1987). Member roles become differentiated as some members within the group accrue negotiating latitude, becoming more involved in the critical tasks of the unit while others are involved in less important activities. In the present study, possible group-level effects resulting from this role differentiation are explored.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Before discussing the findings and implications thereof, the possible limitations of this study need to be addressed. First, although the leaders and members of the study possessed significant work experience (approximately 5 and 8 years, respectively), the sample was younger and less experienced than that which might be found in an organizational setting. However, the LMX model has been documented for entry-level subordinates in organizations (Wakaybashli & Graen, 1984), college students (Kim & Organ, 1982), and high school students (Duchon, Green, & Tabor, 1986). These observations would suggest that the current subjects would provide a suitable sample with which to study the LMX model.

Other possible limitations to the generalizability of the study to organizational settings concern the duration and setting of the group exercise. In contrast to field studies involving participants who interact over prolonged periods of time (cf. Dansereau et al., 1975), the current study involved only a single 50-min session during which role differentiation could develop. However, the LMX model has been studied in a setting of similar duration (Vecchio, 1982), suggesting that the duration and setting of the current study may not be a serious limitation of a study designed to observe group-level implications of the LMX model.

THE EFFECTS OF ROLE DIFFERENTIATION

Surprisingly, the results of the current study suggest that the overall level of negotiating latitude allowed by the leader is strongly and inversely related
to member role differentiation. This result suggests that leaders may be of two minds in how to handle the negotiating latitude they accord members. Those leaders who allowed their members a great deal of negotiating latitude were not very selective in how much they allowed individual members, tending to establish relatively homogeneous leader-member relationships. By contrast, other leaders made strong distinctions among their members in terms of the negotiating latitude they were accorded. These leaders tended to treat this latitude as a scarce resource, according less of it to their members than did leaders who failed to make such differentiation.

Previous research exploring the LMX model has offered reasonable support for the positive relationship between negotiating latitude and member satisfaction with the leader, task, and co-workers. Recent training programs have sought to increase member negotiating latitude under the assumption that more negotiating latitude for group members is beneficial to the group (Graen, Novak, & Sommerkamp, 1982; Scandura & Graen, 1984). The results of the present study offer some support for this position, as groups whose members experienced higher levels of negotiating latitude tended to have higher overall satisfaction with the leader, the task, and their co-workers.

The LMX theory of leadership also suggests that differences in member negotiating latitude define a social structure by which the work unit accomplishes its tasks (Dansereau et al., 1975; Graen & Scandura, 1987). That is, some members (the cadre) are accorded considerable negotiating latitude and act as the trusted assistants of the leader. By contrast, other members (the hired hands) are allowed only limited latitude to negotiate their work roles and tend to carry out the more mundane activities of the group. One possible implication of this understanding of work-unit roles is to recommend to managers that they strive to recognize these differences among their subordinates. Thus, instead of attempting to develop homogeneous relationships with all members of their work unit, managers might be prompted to differentiate member roles as a way of recognizing differences among members in their potential contribution to the work unit.

The results of the present study would argue that such differentiation of member roles may have a downside, in that the level of role differentiation was observed to be negatively related to member satisfaction with that task. Similarly, although the relationship between role differentiation and member satisfaction with the leader and co-workers failed to reach conventional levels of significance, the direction of these relationships with satisfaction with the leader and satisfaction with co-workers was negative as well.
Although the correlational nature of the data prohibits causal interpretations, the results do caution us that member role differentiation may have undesirable effects on the group as a whole.

FUTURE RESEARCH

In attempting to further explore possible group-level effects resulting from member role differentiation, three distinct lines of inquiry are apparent. First, although the present results suggest that role differentiation has negative effects on the group as a whole, the results do not explain why role differentiation would have such an adverse effect. One possibility may be in the perceived source of the distinctions made in member roles. Although LMX theory posits that member roles reflect the capacity of members to contribute to the work unit (Dansereau et al., 1975), it is plausible that the leader was perceived as simply playing favorites, thereby creating inequities within the group. Thus the observed decline in satisfaction may not be related to role differentiation as much as the perceived basis on which those roles were differentiated. Further research is necessary to explore the perceptions of members regarding the nature of role differentiation within the group.

Second, there is a need to replicate and extend the current study by examining possible group-level effects of role differentiation on other variables important for organizational functioning, such as turnover, organizational commitment, and job involvement. Further, it appears reasonable that the relative degree of role differentiation may have an impact on group performance or task efficiency as well. Future work may seek to extend the criteria by which the group-level effects of providing role differentiation are evaluated.

The third line of inquiry concerns the conscious use of negotiating latitude by leaders as a means of structuring their work groups. Previous work has suggested that leaders may be trained to increase the negotiating latitude of followers (Graen, Novak, & Sommerkamp, 1982; Scandura & Graen, 1984). However, it is not known whether leaders can be trained to make distinctions among followers consciously on the basis of their negotiating latitude as well. Such training would be consistent with treating negotiating latitude as a managerial resource used to elicit additional commitment and involvement from key group members (Dansereau et al., 1975; Graen & Scandura, 1987). Further, such a direct manipulation of the level of role differentiation would provide a much stronger test of the effects of such differentiation than the correlational design employed in this study.
CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the LMX model offers a unique picture of leadership as a dyadic phenomenon rather than a group-level (or average) phenomenon. This should not obscure the fact that leaders work with dyads in groups and that group-level effects are equally crucial for organizational functioning. Future research examining the LMX model needs to continue to examine the implications of role differentiation on members of these groups.

NOTE

1. I am indebted to an anonymous reviewer for this observation.
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Research Projects
Projects A, B, C, and D

III. The research included the following projects:

I. Research Project A: This first research project will include interviewing pairs of individuals (leader-follower relationship) who have worked together in an effective, cooperative, and trusting multicultural relationship. The student must make sure that a variety of contexts are included in the research (for example, leader-follower relationships in a university setting, in a corporate setting, in a political setting, etc.). Questions that should be asked include the following: (1) Under what circumstances did you begin to work together? (2) Describe your initial thoughts and feelings about working with this person versus your current thoughts and feelings. (3) Was there tension because of your differences? What accounted for the change? (4) What are the key elements that made the collaboration successful? (5) What do you think are the most effective means to developing cooperation, trust, and collaboration between colleagues from different racial or ethnic backgrounds? (6) What activities can students practice in the classroom to learn to establish effective relationships between people from different racial or ethnic backgrounds?

II. Research Project B: Interview groups that have worked together in an effective, cooperative, and trusting relationships. The student must make sure that a variety
of contexts are covered. The same questions that were asked in project A should be asked.

III. Research Project C: Interview pairs of individuals who have failed to work together in effective, cooperative, and trusting relationships (One of the two pairs individuals may be interviewed). The student must make sure that a variety of contexts are covered. The following questions should be asked: (1) Under what circumstances did you begin to work together? (2) Describe your initial thoughts and feelings about working with this person. Was their tension before the project began or did it develop over time? (3) What types of activities and projects did you engage in with this individual? (4) What are the key elements that made this collaboration unsuccessful? Was it ethnically-related or was it personality-related? (5) What could you have done to make the situation more favorable? What could the other person have done to make the situation more favorable? (6) What do you think are the most effective means to developing cooperation and trust between colleagues from different racial or ethnic backgrounds? (7) What activities can students practice in the classroom to learn how to establish effective relationships between people from different racial ethnic or racial backgrounds and deal with negative relationships of the same type.

IV. Research Project D: Interview groups that have failed to work together in effective, cooperative, and trusting relationships. Make sure that a variety of contexts are covered. The same questions that were asked in project C should be asked.