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THE DILEMMAS OF BRINGING YOUR CULTURE WITH YOU: THE CAREER ADVANCEMENT CHALLENGES OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN WOMEN FOUNDATION EXECUTIVES

Grounded in leadership, cultural, communication, and gender studies, this dissertation investigates the challenges African-American women executives in the philanthropic foundation sector faced as they strive to have their culture legitimated within the culture of the workplace. Through the use of case study methodology, I examined the experiences of participants by conducting oral history interviews that traced their critical path to leadership. I also incorporated my own experiences in the field to further explore the connections between race, gender, and leadership styles in philanthropic organizations. The interviews and my own auto-ethnographic research explored the possible consequences of black executive women in the foundation world not being able to share aspects of their cultural lives in workplace networks and the impact of the critical exclusion of who they really are as whole human beings on the quality of their careers.

An analysis of data collected from the interviews revealed key factors critical to the success of study participants. First was the presence of familial or close adults actively engaged in philanthropic activity during the participants’ formative years. Second was a strong influence of a faith tradition. Additionally, the date revealed that participants’ involvement in outside leadership roles, often tied to their racial and gender identities, were not capitalized on by employers.
This study achieved several key outcomes. First, it afforded participants an opportunity to develop the personal satisfaction of expanding the body of knowledge related to leadership development within the philanthropic foundation sector. Additionally, by sharing their stories, these individuals were able to develop or strengthen mentorship relationships. Lastly, this study has the potential of being of significant benefit to the greater philanthropic foundation sector, since it worked towards the expansion of the body of knowledge specific to the issues of gender and cultural differences within the foundation sector.

John H. Stanfield II, PhD, Chair
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Chapter One: Introduction

Background

Throughout my professional career, prior to entering my doctoral program, I often observed the behavior, leadership styles, and interactions with staff of my supervisors, who were often women of European descent. As I watched them lead their teams, I was often struck by a sense that, were I to be the person in the leadership position, I would “do things differently.” This belief was not driven simply by youthful enthusiasm or naïveté. Rather, this “do it differently” mentality was rooted in the leadership roles I had held in my private sphere. Whether managing the registration system of my church’s Vacation Bible School Program at 16, excelling in high school and college speech teams, or serving as president and treasurer of the undergraduate chapter of my sorority, certain leadership and management skills were ingrained and nurtured in my civic experiences. I knew, if given the chance, the lessons I learned about listening, effectively communicating, creating a nurturing environment, and building up those around me to reach their maximum potential would help me succeed in leadership roles in the world of work.

This notion about using private sphere knowledge to influence public sphere action was rarely encouraged in my world of work. Nevertheless, I found this topic interesting, and I spent my time as a doctoral student researching whether this notion of mine was just that—a notion—or something that could be researched, dissected, and analyzed. Shortly after entering the program, I came across the November 2005 issue of the Harvard Business Review. In it, Sylvia Hewlett, Carolyn Luce, and Cornel West provided findings from a 2005 survey conducted by the Center for Work-Life Policy. In it, they described how for-profit executives of color, particularly African-American
women, often intentionally kept information about their leadership roles outside of the workplace (i.e., church, civic, social organizations) hidden from their employers for fear that their employers would use their work in these organizations “against them punitively” in the professional settings. Respondents reported often shying away from discussions regarding these outside roles for fear that this type of information could potentially be used to reinforce negative stereotypes held about African-Americans. By consciously keeping activities that were reflections of their racial and gender identities hidden from their employers, respondents reported feeling as though they could not fully share their lives, skills, and core values in their day-to-day work.

This study, coupled with my experiences prior to entering the doctoral program, provided the background for my proposed area of research: does the non-profit sector, specifically foundations, foster an environment for its executives to retain and incorporate their cultural identity into their work life or, similar to the corporate sector, do these employees work toward keeping their personal affiliations, which often reflect racial and/or gender cultural identifiers, hidden in order to be successful professionally? Specifically, is there an inability for African-American women foundation executive to incorporate areas of their broader personal life as cultural attributes into work setting networks, and if so, does this impact their ability to navigate work setting cultures, become understood in workplace cultures, their mobility, and their impact on the communities they represent? Therefore, my research question was to focus on the possible impact of African-American executive women in the foundation world not being able to share aspects of their cultural lives in workplace networks and the impact of such
critical exclusion of who they really are as whole human beings on the quality of their careers.

Before I dug further into the development of the research for this study, I sought to determine how many potential participants there could be. The D5 Coalition, a five-year effort to increase philanthropy's diversity, equity, and inclusiveness, found, in its study on foundation leadership, that “17% of foundation programs officers identified as black, while 65% identified as white” (D5 Coalition, 2011, 4). Similarly, only 3-4% of foundation CEO’s/Presidents/Full-time Executive staff members identified themselves as black, while 87-91% identified as white (D5 Coalition, 2011, 5). Gender demographics told a similar tale: 56-63% of foundation CEO’s/Presidents/Full-time Executive staff members identified as women compared to 44-37% of men. This data does not explicitly break down leadership roles by both racialized identity and gender; but, when compared to general U.S. Census data, a reasonable estimation can be determined.¹

Three years after I began my research, I became a program officer for a small, private foundation in the southern United States. While the conclusions I had begun to develop from my research were in the back of my mind, I very purposefully sought to keep what I had found in my research separate from my own work experience. As I continued in my role in a philanthropic organization, however, it became abundantly clear that there was soon developing a blurring and blending of my research world and my world of work. Unbeknownst to me, I was becoming the living embodiment of my research, seeing clear parallels between the lives of the participants in my study and my

¹ Rosabeth Kanter, in her seminal work, *Men and Women of the Corporation*, noted that women who have reached upper echelons of the workforce exist within a “rarefied air” environment. While Kanter’s work focused on white women in the 1970’s corporate culture, the participants in this study, by nature of the limited number of them in the field, also exist within this rarefied air.
own. While I diligently sought to avoid researcher bias that might influence my analysis of the data, it became evident over the course of the analysis that my story was not unique to those of other African-American women who work in the philanthropic sector. Thus, my experiences merited inclusion into this study.

The goal of this research was to study whether cultural, ethnic, and gender identities are maintained and exhibited by African-American women executives in the philanthropic sector as they develop their professional identities. Through the use of case study methodology, I explored the experiences of participants by conducting oral history interviews, in order to better understand tracing their critical paths to leadership, and any racialism they might have experienced on their paths. I also incorporated my experiences in the field to further expand upon the research, to determine if participant experiences were generalizable to my own experiences and vice versa. The information gathered in this study is significant because it explores the connections between race, gender, and leadership styles in philanthropic organizations.

Statement of Purpose

Grounded in leadership, cultural, communication, and gender studies, this study investigated whether racial and gender identities were maintained and exhibited by African-American women executives in the philanthropic sector as they developed their professional identities.\(^2\) I was concerned with the research considerations of the possible consequences of African-American executive women in the foundation world not being able to share aspects of their cultural lives in workplace networks and the impact of such

\(^2\) For the purposes of this study, “philanthropic sector,” “philanthropic organization,” and “philanthropic foundation” are interchangeable terms used to describe foundations, as defined under the IRS Code 501(c)(3) and/or 509 (a)(1).
critical exclusion of who they really are as whole human beings on the quality of their careers. When I first formulated this question nearly ten years ago, it was, for the most part, a matter of academic curiosity. Then in 2008, when I became an executive at a small southeastern foundation, it became a critical experience in my personal and professional life. As such, throughout this research study, I report on not only impartial data gleaned from a reliable and valid research design embedded in the administration and analysis of interviews with a small sample of African-American woman foundation executives, but also my own autoethnographic observations and experiences.

Sample participants were asked to participate in in-depth telephone or face-to-face interviews from Spring 2006 through Fall 2007. The interview protocol used was an adaptation of the instrument utilized by Edmondson and Nkomo (2001). The Edmondson and Nkomo protocol was originally designed to understand professional identity formation and maintenance by African-American and Caucasian women executives in the corporate sector. For this study, the Edmondson and Nkomo protocol was modified in order to conduct oral history interviews of ten women who self-identified racially, culturally, and ethnically as African-American in order to trace their critical path to leadership in their role and work in grant-making and philanthropic organizations. Qualitative software was used to assist in the analysis of this data, and the information collected was analyzed and coded using accepted qualitative research practices, looking for patterns indicative of the impact of racial and gender identity on professional identity.

Juxtaposing research on the influence of racial and gender identity on philanthropic leadership development and manifestation, through the collection, analysis, and dissemination of the key findings from this study, I sought to achieve several key
outcomes. First, this research afforded participants an opportunity to develop the personal satisfaction of expanding the body of knowledge related to leadership development within the philanthropic sector. Moreover, through the sharing of best practices in leadership development within the philanthropic sector, models for success and professional advancement would be made available to subsequent generations of philanthropic leaders for years to come. Next, by sharing their stories, these individuals would be able to develop or strengthen mentorship relationships. Lastly, this study has the potential to benefit the greater philanthropic sector, and society in general.

Definitions

Although this study is rooted in philanthropic social origins theory, leadership theory, and gender studies, certain definitions from the field of sociology were helpful to ground the research. It should be noted at the onset that I recognize the limitations of using race and racial identity as categorical methods to separate and differentiate between and among groups of individuals. Race, as noted by Stanfield (2011, 228), is “a dangerous myth... simply because you cannot look at someone physically and predict their social, cultural, behavioral characteristics, particularly those characteristics which tend to be random in most populations, communities, and societies and/or are characteristics shaped for the most part by societal environments.” Additionally, “race is a human experience that at times occurs simultaneously with other experiences such as gender or class and in other ways independent...[or]...counter to such experiences” (Stanfield, 2011, 229). Moreover, Grosfoguel (2004, 319) notes that terms used in the United States as alternatives to ethnicity actually “obscure the complex, heterogeneous,
and contradictory relationships between and within such groupings. That said, for purposes of this study, the following definitions are used:

- “Racial identity” is defined as the “significant and qualitative meaning that individuals attribute to their membership within the Black racial group within their self-concept” (Sellers, et al, 1998, 23).
- “Ethnicity” is defined as “the synthesis or biological and fictive ancestry and cultural elements of people” (Stanfield, 2011a, 220).
- The term “Black” is used interchangeably with “African-American,” although participants specifically used this term as a personal affirmation of Black cultural identity.
  - Both terms also refer to a large category of people in the United States who are of African descent, but define themselves according to their country of origin (e.g., Jamaican-American) (Parker, 2005, xxiii).
- “Culture” is defined as “the affective perceptions, normative standards, modes of sustenance, modes of communication, technology, religious beliefs, and political ideas which materialize the interactional forms which constitute life worlds of a population and its members” (Stanfield, 2011a, 18).
- “Executive” is defined as a person who holds the position title of “vice president,” “executive director,” “president,” and/or another similar title to denote a high level position within his or her organization, including, but not limited to “director of programs,” “senior program officer,” and, “program officer,” where applicable.
- “Foundation” is defined as an organization that:
  - Meets the requirements of Internal Revenue Code section 501(c)(3), or section 509(a)(1);
  - Has as its primary activity the making of grants to other charitable organizations and to individuals, rather than the direct operation of charitable programs.

Methodology

Due to the subject matter and context of this study, I employed a qualitative research approach to data collection and analysis. Rather than merely seeking knowledge, I undertook the Weberian approach of verstehen, looking towards making meaning through an understanding of the experiences of participants, rather than a reliance upon quantitative data analysis. This approach made for a richer, contextual framework within which to understand the challenges faced by participants as they sought to make meaning.
The research took place through a series of oral history interviews with participants who fit the outlined parameters for inclusion in this study. As a result, a qualitative methodology was appropriate, given the use of a purposeful sampling and a collection of open-ended data (Creswell, 2003).

Furthermore, due to the goals, limitations, and focus of this study, I implemented a case study approach. This qualitative framework was appropriate because it can be used in a variety of settings. The study participants in this research had experience working for foundations for a minimum of five years, thus giving them a significant amount of experience and opportunities for leadership development and practice. In-depth interviews with ten leaders were conducted in an attempt to further understand the experiences of these leaders and the degree to which, and how, their leadership was impacted by the racial and gender identities they brought to their organizations, and their perceptions of said impact. Additionally, as mentioned previously, I interspersed my own experiences as a program officer, as a way of comparing the experiences of study participants to my own.

The study design and implementation took place as a part of my work as a research assistant under the Third Millennium Leadership Initiative, a project of the Center of Philanthropy at Indiana University, which has subsequently become the Lilly Family School of Philanthropy at Indiana University. Under the leadership of Larry Smith, the initial study was designed to trace the critical path to leadership of women and/or members of various cultural and ethnic groups in foundation leadership. This data was collected prior to the formation of my research committee, and as a result, yielded an atypically small sample size. Additionally, because the interviews that serve as the basis
for this study were conducted from Spring 2006 through Fall 2007, there is a likelihood that this data has aged significantly. This aging can serve as the basis for future areas of research and is addressed in the “Future Areas of Research” chapter.

Participants were asked to participate in in-depth interviews. The interview protocol used was an adaptation of the instrument utilized by Edmondson and Nkomo (2001), which was used primarily to understand professional identity formation and maintenance by African-American and Caucasian women executives in the corporate sector. Oral history interviews were conducted of ten African-American women executives. Participants who were selected self-identified as being of the African-American ethnic group, and were of family ancestries that had lived in the United States for at least one generation. For instance, if a participant was the daughter of parents who had emigrated from an Afro-Caribbean nation, but she was born and raised in the U.S., she was considered for inclusion, and this parental heritage was noted in the interviews. This distinction is further addressed in the “Future Areas of Research” chapter, as this ethnic heritage may influence how leaders are viewed and how they view themselves. The information collected was analyzed and coded using accepted qualitative research practices, looking for patterns indicative of the impact of racial and gender identity on professional identity.

Participants selected for the interviews were from various focus areas and types of foundations, including health-legacy/conversion, education, health, operating, family, private, and community foundations. Additionally, they were identified based upon one or more of the following criteria:

- Membership in the National Center on Black Philanthropy;
- Membership in the Association of Black Fund Raising Executives;
- Membership in the Alliance for Nonprofit Management People of Color Affinity Group; and/or
- Recommendation of a member of the aforementioned organizations.

The areas that the interview protocol covered include: Early Life Experiences, School Experiences, College and Graduate School, Early Adult Experiences, Public World, General Sector Questions, Relationships with Others, and Private World. Interviews were conducted by me, either in person or on the telephone, and were audio recorded. Audiotapes were labeled prior to their use and, after being used, were stored in a safe deposit box until time for analysis.

The data for these oral history interviews was analyzed through both open and axial coding. At the conclusion of the interviews, the audio recordings were submitted for transcription. The transcript was then entered into the qualitative software program, N’VIVO. The software package was utilized to code the data in order to find similar responses from participants to questionnaire items.

Summary

The goal of this research was to study whether racial and gender identities are maintained and exhibited by African-American women executives in the philanthropic sector as they develop their professional identities. Through the use of a case study approach, I examined the experiences of ten women who self-identified racially, ethnically, and culturally as African-American by conducting oral histories, tracing their critical path to leadership. The information acquired was significant because it explored
the connections between race, gender, and leadership styles in philanthropic organizations.

In addition to going more in-depth about my own experiences, the remainder of this thesis includes the following: a review of the literature in Chapter Two, a discussion of the methodology in Chapter Three, research findings in Chapter Four, and conclusions and suggestions for future research, in Chapter Five.
Chapter Two: Literature Review

In order to delve deeply into my research question, which focuses upon the possible consequences of African-American executive women in the foundation world not being able to share aspects of their cultural lives in workplace networks and the impact of such critical exclusion of who they really are as whole human beings on the quality of their careers, I felt it necessary to incorporate literature from several different disciplines. Through an examination of key literature from the areas of the social origins theory of philanthropy, race philanthropy, the influence of gender on leadership theory, and the influence of racial identity on leadership theory, I sought to see where these theories intersected in order to provide the basis for my research.

I selected social origins theory of philanthropy because at the core of this study is an analysis of the impact of philanthropy on its leaders and, in some ways, the impact of these leaders on how they express and operate within philanthropy. Social origins theory looks at the cultural, religious, and economic realities of society and how those realities influenced the development of philanthropic organizations specifically, and the nonprofit sector as a whole.

Additionally, I focused on race philanthropy theory, as it examines the influence of racial identity and expression on philanthropy, and philanthropy’s concurrent influences on racial identity and expression. As a body of research, race philanthropy tries to answer the question, “how have racial and ethnic groups and expressions been influenced and impacted by, and conversely influenced and impacted, philanthropic expression?”
In turn, I focused on the influence of gender on leadership theory because I was eager to investigate how the research on gender and its impact on leadership could be interwoven into this study. I looked at the influence of gender on linguistics in order to see how women leaders interacted with peers, superiors, and subordinates.

Lastly, I placed an emphasis on the influence of racial identity on leadership and linguistic theories, in order to understand how this contextual lens could impact the development of leaders who seek to interweave their expressions of cultural and ethnic identity into their world of work, and how the integration of this identity is expressed and accepted in the wider community and context. Essentially, I imagined my literature review as the foundations upon which to build my research, each theoretical framework building one upon the other, until, there was a solid foundation upon which to base my study. Over the balance of this chapter, I discuss the key pieces of literature that framed my research, as long with discussing how each area of study built upon the previous work studied.

Review of Literature: Social Origins Theory of Philanthropy

A key theoretical framework to the development of philanthropy, which may be used to help frame the discussion around foundation diversity, is social origins theory. This theoretical perspective emphasizes the embeddedness of the nonprofit sector in the cultural, religious, political, and economic realities of different countries (Salamon & Anheier, 2006, 106). With embeddedness at its core, this theory argues that decisions about whether to rely on the market, the nonprofit sector, or the state for the provision of key services are not simply open to choices of individual consumers in an open market; rather, these choices are heavily constrained by prior patterns of historical development.
and by the relative power of various social groupings that have significant stakes in the outcomes of these decisions (Ibid). In this way, the size and character of the nonprofit sector in any society is “path-dependent,” reflecting not only current pressures and developments, but also historical patterns of social and economic evolution that make certain outcomes far more likely than others (Ibid). To understand the current nature of the foundations, and the role that social origins theory has had on foundation development and the work of foundations towards institutionalizing diversity within their ranks, it therefore becomes necessary to delve into the broader cultural, religious, political, and economic realities of a society’s “social origins” in order to uncover the pattern of relations among these various actors that have influenced the role that this sector plays (Ibid). Thus, I investigated key literature related to these realities of social origins theory.

According to the ideological aspects of social origins theory in the development of philanthropy in the U.S., there is rooted within U.S. citizens a moral obligation to “do well” through the use of philanthropy as a creative, innovative process. These individuals have sought “to give content and reality to the American national character and through work in education, research, welfare and social policy at home and abroad, have helped realize national values” (Curti, 1958, 431). This “expression of alienation of the separation of individuals from one another into competing firms, religious sects, clubs, and institutions” and the place “where the mores and morals of a society are grounded, where the interests and views of individuals take shape and gain experience, and where, anticipating de Tocqueville, individuals are socialized as citizens,” the nonprofit sector has evolved from merely an outward expression of an inward moral belief to the very
embodiment of national identity and character (Foley & Edwards, 1998, 12). Through uniting in voluntary associations, this affiliation can provide connection around a common cause or idea, leading to the development of shared norms and behaviors (Curti, 1958, 421).

In terms of the religious realities of the social origins theory and the role religious realities played in the development of philanthropy in the U.S., early settlers heavily relied on not only the rule of law, but also the rules of their Creator to guide their actions, and sought to provide aid, comfort, and support to one another. John Winthrop, Governor of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, wrote from the deck of the Arrabella in 1630 that the basis for the philanthropic work of the early settlers was rooted in the principles of Christian charity. Winthrop (1630, 1968) felt that, because God, in “His most holy and wise providence, had so disposed some high and eminent in power, and others mean and in subjection,” it was the duty of those in power to provide comfort and aid to those who had not been so fortunate (Winthrop, 1630, 282). Trattner (1999) asserted that Winthrop argued that “disparities in wealth and condition existed, not to separate and alienate people from one another, but to make them have more need of each other” (Trattner, 1999, 17). Winthrop (1630) further asserted that it was the duty of mercy to be “kind, giving, lending, and forgiving,” and that the colonists were commanded of their Maker to “do good to all, but especially those who were of the household of faith” (Winthrop, 1630, 282).

Rooted in Christian charity, these early settlers sought to move from the notion of strictly acting in such a way as to “be engaged individuals in concrete, direct acts of compassion and connection to others,” to more of a social justice model, in order to usher
in a world where “charity was uncommon and perhaps unnecessary” (Friedman, 2003, 31). Through the creation of schools, churches, and other benevolent aid societies, they provided, according to Thomas Jefferson, the “charitable motivation that, when acted upon, provided the well-intended with ‘approbation of their neighbors, and the distinction which that gives them.’” (Friedman, 2003, 7) The moral and spiritual foundations laid by Winthrop on the Arrabella and propagated by early colonists, citizens, and later generations of reformers alike, also served as the same framework within which noted philanthropist and businessman Andrew Carnegie operated. In “The Best Field for Philanthropy,” Carnegie (1889, 698) extolled his contemporaries to become followers of “The Gospel of Wealth,” for by doing so, they would “approach [their] end no longer the ignoble hoarders of useless millions,” and while they may be “poor, very poor in money,” they would be “rich in the affection, gratitude, and admiration of [their] fellow men,” for through their lives, the world would have been “bettered just a little.” This same framework can be seen in the lives of ordinary Americans today who collect soda can tabs to fund cancer treatments for children, as well as the work of captains of industry in business and entertainment who use their time, talents, and treasure in support of various causes.

In terms of the political realities of the social origins theory in its relationship to the development of philanthropy in America, Curti (1958, 425) argued that American philanthropy has, from the onset, operated within a framework of The Statute of Charitable Uses of 1601 and The Elizabethan Poor Laws of 1601. The Elizabethan Poor Laws were brought to the U.S. by early colonists, with Victorian modifications of these laws influencing early American charitable practices, and English law guiding the use of
the will, the bequest, the perpetuity, and the foundation in the early days of this nation (Ibid). When observed in the context of a democratic, representative government that developed in the U.S., these laws and this form of government influenced how the nonprofit sector was molded and shaped in the early days of this nation. This early development then influenced, and was influenced by, the various political and social pressures applied to the young nation, resulting in and influencing the Dartmouth College Case. Additionally, the Freedoms of Speech, Religion, Assembly, and Equal Protection Under the Law in the U.S. Constitution have been used as the basis for interpretation by the U.S. Supreme Court to ensure that the nonprofit sector is a viable option for its citizens.

In terms of the economic realities related to the social origins theory as applied to U.S. philanthropy and the free market economy that also exists here, these two realities helped to shape how the nonprofit sector emerged. In 2000, the nonprofit sector produced 4.2 percent of the U.S. GDP. While this is small relative to the contributions of the business sector and government (84.9 and 10.8, respectively), this is still a significant amount of goods and services being produced (Boris & Steuerle, 2006, 79). Additionally, the passage of the Tariff Act of 1894, the Revenue Act of 1913, and the 1954 Internal Revenue Code have all shaped the present manifestation of this sector, in that each act or subsequent code provided a tangible monetary benefit to those who either engaged in or supported nonprofit and philanthropic endeavors.

Based upon a critical analysis of social origins theory, several common themes emerged. I selected the social origins theoretical framework as the cornerstone for this study because of its emphasis on the role that cultural, religious, political, and economic
realities have on the growth and influence of the nonprofit sector. Because the nonprofit sector is embedded in these realities of American society, it has served as a vehicle for social justice and provision of goods and services to African-Americans in the U.S. Racial and ethnic groups in the U.S. have used the nonprofit sector, along with both formal and informal channels of philanthropy, to combat discrimination and fight legalized oppression. Particularly in African-American history, philanthropy has been a driving force for progress, from the abolitionist and social benefit organizations of the pre-U.S. Civil War era, through Jim Crow and the struggle for civil rights, to today.

Through an analysis of the social origins theory, it became clear that this framework has been a key factor in understanding why African-American women might select this field as a career path. First, by emphasizing the cultural value of “doing good,” this field provides an opportunity for these women to express an inner yearning to be of service to all mankind. Additionally, this sector addresses often deeply held religious and spiritual values about service, honoring faith traditions, and celebrating the humanity of others through service, all of which are key, particularly within the African-American community. Lastly, through participation in this sector on a professional level, African-Americans can have economic opportunities to provide stable asset streams for their families. Therefore, this theoretical perspective’s emphasis on the aforementioned realities offer a glimpse into how and why African-American have found this sector vital to their personal and professional success.

Review of Literature: Influence of Race Philanthropy

Following a review of key literature on social origins theory, I then researched key articles from the area of race philanthropy theory. I focused on race philanthropy
theory because of its examination of the influence of racial identity and expression on philanthropy, and philanthropy’s concurrent influences on racial identity and expression. As a body of research, race philanthropy tries to answer the question, “how have racial and ethnic groups and expressions been influenced and impacted by, and conversely influenced and impacted, philanthropic expression?” As such, Stanfield (1993, 2011a, 2011b, 2011c) noted that race philanthropy has an intrinsic flaw; in that it focuses on racialized political ideologies and stereotypes without a critical analysis of the impact these stereotypes have on the theoretical development. It is impossible, therefore, to examine race philanthropy in a vacuum, as its impact is inextricably linked to racial, political, and stereotyped mindsets from both majority and racialized minority groups.

An analysis of race philanthropy theory led to an immediate understanding between “racism” and “racialism.” Stanfield (Stanfield, 2011a, 234) defines racism the “vertical power relations which stratify racialized lived experiences in terms of unequal access to power, privilege, and prestige resources, such as quality land, environment, political elections and appointments, investment capital, natural resources, and major decision-making occupations and circles.” This is often more widely understood than the concept of racialism. Racialism (Stanfield, 2011a, 231) is “the process through which cognitive mental images of race and ethnicity are triggered, often connected to the one to one presumptions about phenotype and behavior or social or cultural characteristics.” Racialism (Stanfield, 2011a, 231) looks at the “routine, the everyday, the taken for granted ways in which we are taught to use race in making normal and extraordinary decisions such as where to live, where not to live, who to befriend, who to fear, the geography of fear, who to trust, who not to trust, who to hire and promote, who is smart,
who is dumb, who would make a good spouse, who would not, who can dance, who cannot, etc.” Racialism, therefore, would be the attitudes associated with images of individuals of racialized ethnic groups, while racism is the actions undertaken based upon said images. This distinction is vital to how both members of racialized ethnic groups see themselves, and how they are perceived by others, especially when taken in concert with the development and influence of race philanthropy.

According to Anderson (1988, 241), three types of race philanthropy emerged in the latter half of the Nineteenth Century: missionary and industrial philanthropy, both led by northern white philanthropists, and African-American religious philanthropy, which, as the name implies, was led by churches whose membership was predominantly African-American. All three were the driving forces for the development of colleges, training and normal schools, and other institutions of higher learning for newly freed slaves. Missionary philanthropy was based upon the notion that its proponents were led by a “civilizing mission” to “prepare college-bred black leadership to uplift the black masses from the legacy of slavery and the restraints of the postbellum caste system” (Ibid). Without education, blacks would rapidly degenerate and become a national menace to American civilization (Ibid). To the missionary philanthropists, slavery, not race, kept blacks from acquiring the important moral and social values of thrift, industry, frugality, and sobriety, all necessary to live a Christian life, and it was these missing morals and values that prevented the development of a stable family life (Ibid).

Conversely, industrial philanthropic endeavors, led by white corporate philanthropic foundations and wealthy individuals, were based upon the theory that the key to the uplift of former slaves was through industrial training. These philanthropists
believed that higher education “ought to direct black boys and girls to places in life that were congruent with the South’s racial caste system, as opposed to providing them with the knowledge and experiences that created a wide, if not unlimited range, of social and economic possibilities” (Anderson 1988, 248). Shunning classical education, these philanthropic endeavors were concentrated on creating a ready labor force for the industries that created the funds to perpetuate this system. In fact, industrial philanthropists viewed the work of missionary philanthropists as “the futile and even dangerous work of romantics” (Anderson, 1988, 247).

Sandwiched between these two approaches sat the efforts of African-American religious philanthropy, which was most concerned with the uplift of the lives of former slaves by any means necessary. Guided by faith and a deep concern for their brothers and sisters, these organizations, not unlike the missionary philanthropists, struggled to find funding that could compete with the prowess of the industrial philanthropists.

Based upon a critical analysis of these texts, several common themes regarding race philanthropy emerged. First, the impact of giving by white northern industrialists to develop schools and training institutions for newly freed black slaves in the South could just as easily be viewed as an attempt to uplift an oppressed population, or to train the next generation of workers for the northern industrial complex. Depending upon the lens through which these acts are viewed, the development of said training institutions could be viewed as a racist response, a racialized one, a hybrid of the two, or something more benign. Additionally, in response to the impacts of racism and racialism, there was a noted impact of philanthropic giving by racialized ethnic groups on their own communities and the wider society.
Review of Literature: Influence of Gender on Leadership Theory

With analysis of social origins theory and race philanthropy serving as the base of the framework for this study, an analysis of leadership theory, particularly as it is influenced by gender, added context to this study. The first key aspect of the literature investigated was to find a comprehensive definition of what leadership is, and by extension, who is a leader. Key operational and disciplinary frameworks were found through an investigation of the disciplines of public administration and social psychology. According to Van Wart (2005, 27), public administration defines leadership as a complex process involving numerous fundamentally different types of acts which involve assessing one’s environment and constraints. Through the development of certain key traits and skills and continual self-evaluation, leaders are able to achieve predetermined goals, often through the refinement and situational modification of their styles (Ibid). Hackman and Johnson (2000, 12) further define leadership as the “human symbolic communication which modifies the attitudes and behaviors of others in order to meet shared group goals and needs”. These texts begin to provide a clear definition of leadership for purposes of this study.

Van Wart (2005, 123) outlined key leadership traits, which can build upon the developing definition of leadership. These traits include self-confidence (“the general positive sense that one has about one’s ability to accomplish what needs to be accomplished”), decisiveness (“the ability to act relatively quickly depending on circumstances without excessively damaging decision quality”), resilience (“the ability to spring back into shape, position, or direction after being pressed or stretched”), energy (“the physical and psychological ability to perform”), flexibility (“the ability to ‘bend
without breaking' and to adjust to change or be capable of modification"), and emotional maturity ("a conglomerate of characteristics indicating that a person is well balanced in a number of psychological and behavioral dimensions"). Additionally, leaders are motivated by a willingness to assume responsibility ("the taking of positions requiring broader decision-making duties and greater responsibility") and a need for achievement ("a strong desire to accomplish things and generally to be recognized for it") (Van Wart, 2005, 123). Lastly, leaders possess both personal integrity ("the state of being whole and/or connected with oneself, one's profession, and the society of which one is a member, as well as being incorruptible) and a service mentality ("an ethic of considering other's interests, perspectives, and concerns") (Van Wart 2005,124).

Unlike management, which according to Bennis (2003, 42) is the ability to "do things right, and in such a way that administers, maintains, and focuses on process, with an eye on the bottom line," leadership has a broader focus. Leadership is instead concerned about "doing the right things in a way that is innovative, develops and focuses on people, offering inspiration, creating trust, with an eye for the horizon." Similarly, the Dominican University of California Institute for Leadership Studies proposes that (ethical) leadership is a "process where individuals influence a group to identify and achieve a common set of goals through competence, inspiration and motivation, not with coercion" (Dominican University of California Institute for Leadership Studies, 2007). Additionally, they suggest that "effective leaders focus their team on determining the organization's vision, its strategic direction, authentically engage partners in a process of achieving a shared set of goals, shape the culture of the organization, and their behaviors and values have an exponential impact on the organization's culture and health."
can either ignore the organization's viruses, further contaminating them, or they can facilitate it towards health and to thrive (Ibid).

Just as having a key understanding of social origins theory is vital to grounding research into the philanthropic sector, having a core definitional framework regarding the key attributes of a leader is vital to a study on leadership development. Based upon a critical analysis of these texts, several common themes emerge. First, leaders possess key qualities and attributes that inspire others to follow them. These include, but are not limited to self-confidence, decisiveness, resilience, energy, flexibility, and emotional maturity. Additionally, leaders have personal integrity, have influence, are competent, and are motivational without having to coerce others to follow. These key traits were key determinants in the selection of participation for this study. Leaders who exhibited these traits, as observed by colleagues, peers, and subordinates, were included for participation in the interviews. This is not to say that all leaders possessed all of these traits on a “leadership scorecard.” Rather, they possessed a common core of these characteristics, and exhibited them in such a way as to be observed by others, or recognized as an inherent component of their personality.

Once I developed a solid foundational perspective on leadership in general, I next focused on literature that differentiates leadership knowledge, skills, and abilities along gender lines. By focusing on literature that investigated the types of leadership styles more often exhibited by women leaders, I was able to provide a framework for gleaning how potential study participants viewed themselves in their leadership roles, and what influence, if any, their gender had on their leadership, and perceptions of them as leaders within their organizations. It is one thing to be viewed as a leader; it is quite another to
perceive oneself as a leader, and act in a manner which exudes that one has embraced the mantle of leadership.

While women leaders have the potential to exhibit any style of leadership (i.e., laissez-faire, directive, delegative, achievement-oriented, external, or a combination of these styles), all of which can often be exhibited by men in leadership roles, the research tended to indicate that women tend to express leadership styles rooted in the relational and transformational models of leadership. The relational leadership model defines leadership as “a relational process of people together attempting to accomplish change or make a difference to benefit the common good.” This relational leadership model includes elements of inclusiveness, empowerment, ethics, purposefulness, and process orientation (Komives, Owen, Longerbeam, Mainella, & Osteen, 2005, 594).

Not unlike the relational model, the transformational leadership model reflects a style of leadership whereby the leader moves the follower beyond immediate self-interest. In an unpublished paper, Del Castillo (undated) argued transformational leaders would be better prepared to value and adapt to diversity among their followers. This was reasoned because these leaders were expected to envisage a culturally competent organization and to inspire confidence in its achievement. Through their use of intellectual stimulation to encourage new ways of dealing with the increasing diversity of their followers, these leaders also tend to be empathetic with their followers’ different needs as individually considerate leaders (Bass, 1999, 17).

Expanding further upon the definition, Bass (1999, 11) found that, through idealized influence, inspiration, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration, these leaders elevate their followers’ level of maturity and ideals, and their concerns for
achievement, self-actualization, and the well-being of others, the organization, and society. Transformational leadership enhances commitment, involvement, loyalty, and performance of followers. While transactional leadership may induce more stress, transformational leadership helps both the leader and the follower deal with stress. Lastly, contingencies in the environment, organization, task, goals, and relationships affect the utility of transactional and transformational leadership (Bass, 1999, 12).

Several studies have shown that women tend to be somewhat more transformational than their male counterparts, and to some degree this was often accompanied by greater satisfaction and rated effectiveness according to both male and female subordinates. Paradoxically, one might propose anti-feminine bias and disadvantage as a plausible explanation for finding that women are somewhat more transformational and, therefore, more likely to make effective leaders (Bass, Avolio, & Atwater, 1996). Women often have to be that much better leaders than their male counterparts in order to attain the same positions of responsibility and levels of success. In order to combat these stereotypes, some may argue that affirmative action has pushed women faster and higher than justified by their competencies.

Next, I conducted a review of articles related to how women leaders differ in the workplace from their male counterparts. Building upon the research related to leader characteristic and leadership styles, it was next critical to see how this research manifested in the office. Differentiating between how men and women lead proved invaluable, as it then allowed for an analysis of leadership by racial and ethnic groups, which would lead to the ability to overlay these two schools of thought at the intersection of racial/ethnic background and gender.
The work of Billing and Alvesson (1994) provided an extensive literature review and theoretical discussion about the role and influence of gender on leadership, and includes in-depth discussions on the differences in leadership style and the use of power by women and men, along with looking at macro- and micro-sociological theories on gender, before applying these theories to case studies of three Scandinavian organizations in order to determine if the theoretical played out in the actual. This was built upon by the work of Becker, Ayman and Korabik (2002), who surveyed 49 male and 49 female leaders to determine whether the leader’s gender, self-monitoring ability (i.e., a leader’s ability to adjust behavior based upon situational appropriateness), and the perception of them given the organizational context (i.e., female leaders in more traditionally male-dominated organizations with masculine norms of behavior) were similar to those observed by members of their work teams. Their findings supported their hypothesis that female leaders tended to be more accurate in their perceptions of themselves if they were in more “feminine” industries, such as education, than in business or accounting.

After analyzing survey data from 1,031 Certified Public Accountants, Burke and Collins (2001) sought to determine whether or not there was a personally perceived difference in leadership styles between women and men. Their findings suggested that female accountants tend to self-report more as transformational leaders who serve as positive role models for subordinates, as well as inspire and encourage their followers to be creative problem solvers, while their male counterparts tended to self-report as leading-by-exception (often monitoring effort by identifying and penalizing mistakes). An area of future research that emerged from this study was whether female leaders, using a more “feminine style,” were perceived as weaker leaders by their peers.
Basing their research on the premise that female middle managers and executives would be rated by subordinates as having more favorable interpersonal behaviors than their male counterparts, and that executives of either gender would be rated by their subordinates on all other measures of leadership, Bartol and Kromkowsk (2003) selected 658 middle and executive leaders to attend a weeklong development program and garner feedback from at least three subordinates to support these hypotheses. The researchers also sought to determine whether there were any appreciable differences among leaders from various ethnic backgrounds, but their findings were less significant than those related to gender, which were that gender and organizational norms play a factor in the leadership development of women managers and executives.

Collins’s (2004) provided a brief synopsis of a study conducted by Catalyst, which found that top-performing Fortune 500 companies tend to be those that have a greater representation of women on their leadership teams than those that do not. Additionally, after interviewing 48 British women managers or entrepreneurs and/or senior leaders in law and accounting, Cox and Cooper (1997) presented certain traits and experiences common among these women that were indicative of their success as leaders. These included their birth order (first or only child or having older brothers), having a stable, stress-free relationship with their parents, attending single-sex schools, having a strong sense of control over their careers and a high self-efficacy, overcoming an early professional setback or challenge, and having an informal professional mentor.

Decker and Rotondo (2001) investigated the relationship between a leader’s gender and the style of humor he/she used in order to measure how effective their leadership was perceived by followers. After studying 359 surveys from alumni of a Mid-
Atlantic university business school, they found that female leaders who used more positive humor tended to be perceived more favorably than men who used a similar style, although they cautioned women to refrain from overly relying on this aspect of their personality, for fear they be labeled silly or flighty. In addition to humor, Ehrich (1994) argued that how a female manager dressed in the workplace impacted her perceived leadership abilities, and, despite the argument that dress was not a clear-cut determinant of attitude, skill, or competence, it could, nevertheless, play a role in the interpretation of these attributes of a leader.

Eicher-Catt (2005) began by defining and expanding upon the essential dimensions of servant leadership, followed by an investigation into why this style of leadership has gained popularity because of its gender-neutral, or rather, gender-blind approach to management. The author contended that, based upon her feminist perspective, servant leadership actually does more to perpetuate male-dominated leadership in organizations through promoting the “myth” of a servant leader.

The work of James (1998) supports this, as it chronicles the experiences of 50 women executives in the National Health Service in the United Kingdom to learn more from these women as to what has helped shape their “path to leadership.” The findings indicated that these female leaders had been able to use both male and female leadership frameworks to guide their career paths, and that organizations that encouraged personal responsibility, accountability, and employee contributions tended to have a better framework for the type of participatory democratic leadership needed in organizations.

Kark (2004) explored how various approaches in feminist thought intersect with the study of gender and transformational leadership. She encouraged the development of
the study of "gendered organizations," as well as areas of feminist thought that have yet to be included in the study of gender and leadership. Korac-Kakabadse, Korac-Kakabadse, (1998) expanded upon this, by first providing a literature review of resources related to gender differences, followed by an examination of gender through a demographic perspective and the impact of gender on job and organizational tenure, and conclude with providing the results of studies conducted to investigate whether gender influenced leadership performance among senior officials in Australia and the United Kingdom. Their work showed that job and organizational tenure had a greater influence on the philosophy, attitudes, and behaviors of leaders than gender, and suggested that further research be conducted to determine if "getting there" (i.e., the passage of men and women in the progress up and across organizations) played a greater role and influence than "got there" (focuses on the performance that influences progress in an organization).

Langford, Welch, & Welch (1998) sought to determine whether men and women differed in their use of power and decision-making in traditional hierarchical situations and circumstances. Their findings indicated that a more autocratic style of leadership still tended to be exhibited by women in spite of being placed in situations that naturally called for a less autocratic approach. This was somewhat contradicted by the findings of Manning (2002), who indicated that transformational leadership is a more gender-neutral, feminine-role-compatible leadership style than other styles of leadership, is preferred by subordinates, and is not exclusively used by female managers. Oakley (2000) investigated why there were still significantly fewer women in senior management and leadership roles in organizations, stating that factors such as tokenism, differences in
linguistic styles between genders, and the “old boy’s network” all played a role in leading high-achieving women away from the corporate world toward entrepreneurial careers.

Odendahl and O’Neill (1994) shared the history and rise of women as leaders in the nonprofit sector, offering discussions about pay inequities, gender and its impact on nonprofit boards, the role and impact of women as fundraisers and volunteers, and how the prevalence of women in the nonprofit sector has impacted definitions of power and the demographic landscape of the sector.

Rigg and Sparrow (1994) sought to determine whether, given the autonomy to create their own positions, leaders would differ in how they led their staffs. They began their investigation by first determining whether gender played a factor in leadership, followed by whether there was a perceived difference based on a leader’s gender. Among the most significant findings was that, while there is a difference in leadership style, the “masculine” form was often perceived as being the preferred style. This related to the work of Park (1996), who sought to investigate the intersection between gender and a leader’s decision-making styles. Through analyzing 90 participants in three different questionnaires, it was found that women tended to use a more conceptual/behavioral decision-making style in conjunction with their relationship orientation, while men, who generally are more task-oriented, tend to use a more directive and analytical decision-making style.

Stelter’s literature review (2002) looked at articles that dealt with gender difference and leadership, and found that the articles reviewed tended to focus on the trends associated with women as leaders and the potential causes for the comparatively lower numbers than for male leaders; current trends in research on the subject; the
theoretical models that were used to discuss the differences in women's ways of leading (organizational, social, or individual frameworks); and the impact of stereotypes and perceptions about women on their ability to lead (and vice versa).

Alimo-Metcalfe (1995) found that women leaders who tended to be more transformational in their leadership style were more likely to ascribe their power to interpersonal skills, and the relationship between managers and subordinates was what most distinguished the leadership styles of male and female leaders. After doing an extensive literature review on transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles, Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, and Engen (2003) found that women leaders tend to be transformational, although if they did exhibit a transactional style, they had a greater tendency to use rewards than their male counterparts, and that men tended to use the lesser effective leadership styles across the board.

The works of Park (1996), James (1998), and Gregory (1990) delved further into the impact of gender on a leader's relationships with subordinates and peers. Park (1996) found that women tended to use a more conceptual/behavioral decision-making style in conjunction with their relationship orientation, while men, who are generally more task-oriented, tend to use a more directive and analytical decision-making style. James (1998) found that female leaders tend to use both male and female leadership frameworks to guide their career paths. Likewise, Gregory (1990) discussed three theoretical perspectives related to gender differences and stereotyping. These include person-centered, which posits that women's limited professional progression is a function of characteristics inherent to women; organization-centered, which purports that a person's
position within an organization shapes their traits and behaviors; and gender context, which argues that the social status ascribed to women influences their behavior.

Eagly (2005) explained that leaders may assume a level of authentic leadership with followers only after they have first been given the authority by followers to promote a particular set of values that the community holds dear. This level of authentic leadership is often more difficult to achieve for women and/or people who may be viewed as “outsiders” by the group (i.e., regional, educational, or social differences) than for men, but these individuals should strive to achieve it.

Based upon a critical analysis of these texts, several themes emerge. An analysis of this literature was key because, by understanding how women leaders differ in the workplace than their male counterparts, there can be a foundational framework when overlaying racial and ethnic differences to leadership styles. Building upon the research related to leader characteristics and leadership styles, it was next critical to see how this research manifested in the office. Differentiating between how men and women lead proved invaluable, as it then allowed for an analysis of leadership by racial and ethnic groups, which would lead to the ability to overlay these two schools of thought at the intersection of racial/ethnic background and gender. One common theme is that women tend to lead with more of an interpersonal/relational style than that of their male counterparts. Additionally, women tend to work towards consensus during the decision-making process. One shortcoming of this literature is that it tends to be based upon research primarily focused on white women of Euro-American descent. However, since this is the most prevalent body of literature in the field related to gender and leadership, I felt it provided an additional valuable framework upon which to base my research.
Review of Literature: Influence of Linguistics on the Expression of Leadership by Women

Having reviewed literature related to social origins theory, race philanthropy, leadership in general, and the influence of gender on leadership, I next looked at the literature related to the expression of linguistics on gender and leadership. I decided to focus on this research primarily to determine if how women who lead interact through oral and written communication. Additionally, I wanted to determine if how leaders expressed themselves impacted the perception of them as leaders.

The ancient Greek philosopher Aristotle argued that spoken words “are the symbols of mental experience, and written words are the symbols of spoken words. Just as all men have not the same writing, so all men have not the same speech sounds, but the mental experiences which they directly symbolize are the same for all, as also are those things of which our experiences are the images.” (Gibbon, 1999, 35) Just as all symbols of language are not the same, leadership often takes on different expressions, based upon the leader’s racial, gender, and socioeconomic background. Too often, though, in the case of leadership preparation, Poplin, Gosetti and Rusch (1995) noted that “the texts, conversation, writings and professional activities that construct our knowing and understanding of leadership come from an embedded privileged perspective which largely ignores issues of status, gender, and race and insidiously perpetuates a view of leadership that discourages diversity and equity” (Rusch, 2004, 18).

Halliday and Hasan argued that to study language is to concentrate upon exploring how language systematically patterned towards important social ends (Gibbon, 1999, 21). According to this school of linguistics, language does not exist in a cultural vacuum, but rather focuses on the systematic relationship between the social environment
on the one hand, and the functional organization on the other, (Ibid) Henley argued that language is one of the factors influencing perception and the general organization of experience, and while this influence is not necessarily primary, unique, or compelling, it is also not negligible (Gibbon, 1999, 35). Therefore, a greater understanding of the influences of race and gender must be developed in order to fully appreciate language and its role in society.

Cameron (1997a, 60) asserted that people’s use of language reflects group norms and recognizes that human behavior needs to be explained not in terms of invariant causes and effects but in terms of the existence in social meanings. Additionally, she observed that a woman’s race, class, or ethnicity would affect her gender relations as well as the symbolic representations of femininity to which she has access (Cameron, 1997b). Through Cameron’s work, we can see how all aspects of a person’s identity, but especially race and gender, can shape the way they view the world, as well as how they express these views. This mirrored the work of Tannen (1990), who argued that women’s language is one of intimacy, connection, and rapport, while men’s is one of autonomy, status, and report. Additionally, she found that while rapport talk is associated with the private domain and focuses on building and maintaining intimacy, connection and relationship, report talk tends to be task-oriented, involving giving of information, proposing solutions to problems, and attempting to establish status (Gibbon, 1999, 40).

According to Talbot (1998), feminist linguistics is interested in identifying, demystifying, and resisting the ways in which language is used, together with other social practices, to reflect, create, and sustain gender divisions and inequalities in society. It aims to theorize gender-related linguistic phenomena and language use, and to explicitly
link those to gender inequality or discrimination, on the assumption that linguistic change holds an important part of overall social change. It asserts that people produce their identities in social interaction, in ways that sometimes follow and other times challenge dominant beliefs and ideologies of gender. As social resources become available, language users enact and produce new identities, themselves temporary and historical, that assigns new meanings to gender (Litosseliti, 2006, 23).

Litosseliti further argued certain key theories associated with gender and linguistics have emerged in recent years; namely:

- Discourses reflect and constitute (i.e., create, maintain, resist, and modify) social ‘realities,’ practices, relationships, and identities;
- There is a dialectic relationship between any text (spoken or written), its associated discursive practices, and the broader institutional context in which it exists;
- The discursive (i.e., social and linguistic) construction of gender identities is accomplished through an ongoing process of selection, negotiation, appropriation, and restatement;
- Identity work involves making choices from the discourses about femininity and masculinity that are available and appropriate in our social contexts; These choices are not free choices, but shaped by the highly contextualized enabling and constraining potential of ‘doing’ gender appropriately;
- Rather than a set of attributes or simply a social category, gender is conceptualized as a process: something we do, produce, accomplish, and perform;
- Gender identity is then a communicative achievement, an effect of discursive practices, rather than a priori factor that determines linguistic behavior; and
- Gender identities are multi-layered, variable, diverse, fluid, shifting, fragmented, and often contradictory or dilemmatic (Litosseliti, 2006, 63).

Similarly Holmes (2002) found that “sociolinguistic universal tendencies” will help in the refinement of the understanding of these topics. Specifically:

- Women and men develop different patterns of language use;
• Women tend to focus on the affective functions of an interaction more often than men do;
• Women tend to use linguistic devices that stress solidarity more often than men do;
• Women tend to interact in ways which will maintain and increase solidarity, while (especially in formal contexts) men tend to interact in ways which will maintain and increase their power and status; and
• Women are stylistically more flexible than men (Wardhaugh, 2002, 320).

Lakov (2002) countered this approach by arguing that, because men are often dominant and many times women lack power, “women may have to behave more like men if this unequal relationship is to be changed” (Wardhaugh, 2002, 324). Similarly, Fischer (2002) argued that “gender differences in language become established early [in life] and are then used to support the kinds of social behavior males and females exhibit” (Wardhaugh, 2002, 325). Holmes (2002) went further, arguing “the differences between women and men in ways of interacting may be the result of different socialization and acculturation patterns. If we learn the ways of talking mainly in single-sex peer groups, then the patterns we learn are likely to be sex-specific. And the kind of miscommunication which undoubtedly occurs between women and men will be attributable to the different expectations each sex has of the function of the interaction, and the ways it is appropriately conducted” (Ibid).

Eckert and McConnell-Ginet asserted that language and gender research needs to be grounded in detailed investigations of the social and linguistic practice of specific communities of practice. They further argued that these are “an aggregate of people who come together around mutual engagement in some common endeavor. Ways of doing things, ways of talking, beliefs, values, power relations--in short, practices--emerge in the course of their joint activity around that endeavor. A community of practice is different
as a social construct from the traditional notion of community, primarily because it is defined simultaneously by its membership and by the practice in which that membership engages. Indeed, it is the practices of the community and members' differentiated participation in them that structures the community socially" (Wardhaugh, 2002, 326).

Individuals participate in a variety of communities of practice at any given time, and over time: the family, friendships, the workplace, etc. Whether these communities are integrated along gender lines or not, the nature of an individual's participation in communities of practice and one's experience of gender emerges in participation as a gendered community member with others in a variety of communities of practice. Communities of practice enable speakers to establish who they are and who they are not and how they stand in relation to significant others (Coates, 2004, 218).

Based upon a critical analysis of these texts, several themes emerge. An analysis of this literature was key because, by understanding how women leaders communicate in the workplace, particularly when compare to how their male counterparts communicate, this analysis could serve as an additional perspective when overlaying racial and ethnic differences to communication styles. Building upon the research related to the impact of a leader's gender on his/her leadership characteristics and leadership styles, it was next critical to see how this research manifested in the office. Similar to leadership styles, women leaders tend to communicate in a more collaborative, collegial manner, often centering their conversive tones around building cohesion and solidarity. Differentiating between how men and women communicate also proved invaluable, as it then allowed for an analysis of the language of leadership by racial and ethnic groups, which would lead to the ability to overlay these schools of thought at the intersection of racial/ethnic
background and gender. Again, not unlike leadership style, women tend to speak with more of an interpersonal/relational style than their male counterparts. Additionally, women tend to speak in a manner that builds consensus during the decision-making process. One shortcoming of this literature, similar to the literature around leadership styles, was that, it, too, tends to be based upon research primarily focused on white women of North American descent. However, since this is the most prevalent body of literature in the field related to gender and leadership, I felt it provided an additional valuable framework upon which to base my research.


Having reviewed literature related to social origins theory, race philanthropy, leadership in general, the influence of gender on leadership, and the literature related to the expression of linguistics on gender and leadership. When taken in concert, these theories tend to present a case for an appreciable difference between how men and women communicate. I decided to focus on this research primarily to determine how racialized identity impacts oral and written communication. Not unlike the analysis of gender's influence on language, a study of the influence of ethnicity on language is also vital. According to Fishman (1997, 330), this analysis may produce an understanding of the sense and expression of collective, intergenerational cultural identity (the sensing and expressing of links to one's own people). This analysis can also provide clues as the extent to which ethnicity pervades and dictates all social sensings, doings, and knowings, the need to monitor whether language is an aspect of presumed ethnic authenticity becomes vital.
According to Morgan (2002, 37), “as cultural practices, language ideologies are mirrors and tools that probe, reflect, refract, subvert, and exalt social and cultural production, reproduction, and representation.” Influences of racial influence on language resonate throughout various racial and ethnic groups. While no monolith of thought exists that can provide sweeping generalizations regarding racial minorities and their linguistics practices in-group and with the greater society, nevertheless Morgan argued that, for the African-American speech community, “language ideology incorporates the knowledge that the construction and assessment of social face and character are simultaneously performed and grounded within the notion of multiple audiences” (Ibid). Again, this cannot provide a broad characterization for other racial and ethnic minorities, but it does provide a solid foundation for analysis.

Through an analysis of various African-American writing genres, Hudson (2001) asserted that African-Americans generally, and African-American women in particular, tended to use highly expressive language in conversational situations. Of particular note was their usage of exclamations, including religious references, general interjections, softened expletives, mock and direct commands, and repetition of these phrases for emphasis. Kochman (1981, 77) contended that in African-American culture, “traits like independence, and aggressiveness... are seen to be common to (and respected by) both males and females.” Goodwin’s (1990, 117) research, involving interactions of African-American children, noted similar patterns. Of particular note was the work related to use of directives, where it was shown that boys tend to format their directives in subordinate relationships and requests when dealing with superiors, while girls tended to phrase their requests as proposals for future activity, regardless of their level of authority in the
relationship. In terms of linguistic analysis, she also asserted that, not only does language reflect some aspect of social order, as is commonly purported in linguistic and anthropologic literature, but it also "provides for social organization, shaping alignment, and social identities of participants to the present action" (Goodwin, 1990, 286). Her work in face-to-face interactions, not unlike the way in which this project considered, "provides an opportunity to study language, culture, and social organization from an integrated perspective" (Goodwin, 1990, 2).

Thorne and Henley (Thorne, Kramarae, & Henley, 1983, 10) concurred with these findings, noting that "social class, region, ethnicity, age, occupation, and sex all affect speech behavior." They also noted that, "speakers may shift speech styles depending upon situation, topic, and role" (Ibid). This supported the research of Bucholtz (1996), who found that there was a difference in speech patterns among African-American and other participants on an integrated radio panel. Logan (2005) found that the behaviors exhibited in Bucholtz's study were more prevalent in a non-integrated setting, where both participants and audience members were African-Americans.

Smitherman (1994, 25) asserted that within this distinctive language known as "Black Talk," there was a "commonality that went across the boundaries of job or social position." Their participation in the community "creates in-group crossover lingo that is understood and shared by various social groups within the race" (Ibid). Troutman (2001, 213) took this research further, noting that, there was a "rich linguistic capability" within the African-American female community that was manifested in the form of African-American women's language (AAWL). One chief characteristic of AAWL include reported speech, where these women gave deference to men's words as a result of being
socialized to “talk like a lady” (Troutman, 2001, 214). This could become problematic in a professional mixed race/gender environment that study participants often found themselves within. It also includes cooperative or collaborative speech, where participants in a dialogue tend to exhibit “an idealized categorization of conversational turn-taking, where speakers take ‘rightful’ turns at speaking” (Troutman, 2001, 215). A specific usage of the word “little” was also noted, where the word meant “very important” or “enormous”, as opposed to the standard meaning of “small” or “diminutive.” Typically, this definition of little was used to “downplay very important roles or functions they [African-American women] held or as an understatement for important events in their lives” (Troutman, 2001, 216). Troutman also contended that the AAWL characteristic of culturally-toned diminutives, such as the words girl, sistah, honey, baby, and muh’dear, “express solidarity within all spheres of [African-American female] existence, public and private, and in all age groups” (Troutman, 2001, 217).

Logan (2006) found the frequent usage of such culturally-toned diminutives served as a clear indication of the level of intimacy between and among women in a beauty salon. Houston (2003) emphasized the additional theme of an emphasis on the wisdom in these women’s language, particularly in their personal and professional lives, including conversations about Black men (Jones and Shorter-Gooden, 2003, 101). Additionally, it was noted that speakers of AAWL can simultaneously be perceived as both “tough, direct, and candid” and “warm, sensitive, and caring,” particularly “in the sound, meaning, embrace, and passion in Black women’s speech” (Ibid). These conflicting perceptions often lead to a lack of respect for this language, forcing its speakers, in a quest for professional prestige and recognition, to shift between this language and
standard English (code-switching, as it were). Fearful that they might ‘slip’ and use the more relaxed voice (and language) they reserve for African-Americans in the presence of Whites, these women, more often than their male counterparts, tend to code switch more frequently, shifting between the dialects, languages, and styles of communication found in their own community and those typically found in the majority community. Jones and Shorter-Gooden (2003, 108) suggested that these women shifted “White” in the office, in the classroom, or when addressing the community board during a public forum, and shifted “black” at church, during book club meetings, and among family and friends.

Stanback (1985, 178) supported these findings, noting that, while the common perception was that AAWL is only by spoken the least educated, least affluent African-Americans, the reality was that “most black adults, regardless of their current educational or economic status, learned to speak in black communities where [it] was spoken... and where they developed some level of proficiency in speaking the dialect themselves.” Hewstone and Giles (1997, 274), in their discussion of the role of stereotyping in cross-cultural communication, offered important issues in the study of stereotypes; namely, that “there were cognitive biases that result in or from stereotypical perceptions of social groups, and that there are behavioral consequences of stereotyping.” They argued that, because Blacks and Whites employ different approaches to information-seeking, stereotype-disconfirming contact with individual outgroup members will reduce or erase stereotypes (Hewstone and Giles, 1997, 280).

Additionally, it was noted that, “while there was a clear symmetry between men’s and women’s relationships to the language in white middle-class American speech communities,” because there is a “tension between male-female communicative parity
and male-female communicative asymmetry in Black American culture," there is not such a clear-cut and straightforward difference in the genders" (Hewstone and Giles, 1997, 179). Consequently, there was a complexity in “black community norms for appropriate women’s speech and language behavior” much more so than “those of socioeconomically similar white speech communities (Hewstone and Giles, 1997, 180). This complexity is made evident through two distinct factors. First, African-American women have, contrary to their white counterparts, historically had to hold positions in “both spheres” of life, the “domestic” that all women share, and because of their long history of work outside the home, the “public” sphere. As a result of working this “second shift,” these women have influenced the norms and definitions within their community by defining what it means to be a woman, which has had an impact on both their language and the perception of it within said community. Specifically, because there has been “a reciprocal relationship between her tradition of work and her perception of herself as an ‘autonomous individual,” this has had an impact on her style of speaking, making the black woman more outspoken, confident, and self-assertive” (Hewstone and Giles, 1997, 182). Secondly, because they often have to contend in the “public” sphere, their interactions with black men are often on a more equal footing than white male-female communication. There is, however, a chilling effect of this sense of equality for these women when their interactions are investigated. When investigated by researchers, these women are often perceived as “contentious, dominant, or even ‘verbally castrating’ to those who are accustomed to encountering more submissive female speakers” (Ibid).

Based upon a critical analysis of these texts, several common themes emerge. An analysis of this literature was key because, inclusion of the ways in which African-
American women communicate provided a comparative backdrop against the research previously analyzed, which generally focused on non-white women. This proved valuable in developing my framework for this study because it highlighted the differences in how these women interact in both inter- and intra-racial groups. These communicative differences, especially interracially, may prove to limit how much of their “whole selves” participants bring to their world of work.

Review of Literature: Influence of Black Feminist Theory

Juxtaposing the research on social origins theory and racial and gender influences on nonprofit and philanthropic leadership development with research on racial identity, there can be found additional influences of racial and gender identity on leadership development and manifestation. Through a review of the literature of sociological resources on racial identity, it becomes clear that certain key factors are significant. Beal (2008) describes the “double jeopardy” African-American women face, dealing with both racial bias and gender bias, both inter- and intra-racial. This “double jeopardy” often leads to economic exploitation, reflected in lower wages, psychological manipulation, and reproductive exploitation. Bell (1990) argued that this “double jeopardy” leads to African-American women perceiving that they live compartmentalized lives: one white, the other African-American. This compartmentalization, or bicultural life structure, can lead to role stress and role overload, where these women feel as though they must constantly maintain their professional lifestyles while overcoming the prevailing stereotypes associated with African-American women (controlling, authoritarian, militant, and hostile), whether these stereotypes were real or perceived. This often leads these women to responding to these stereotypes, rather than working to develop their own
identities. Denton (1990) asserted that, in order to overcome double jeopardy and a bicultural life structure, many African-American women develop supportive relationships with significant African-American women friends for social companionship, task help, and supportiveness. These relationships provided emotional support, encouragement, and validation to address bicultural stress.

Clark Hine (1989, 915), when looking at how African-American women historically chose to make meaning for themselves and their children, often by leaving the known horrors of the South, with its rapes, child abductions, beatings, and psychological torture, for the unknown of the Northwest Territory, found that,

Because of the interplay of racial animosity, class tensions, role and economic Black gender differentiation, regional variations, women, as a rule, developed and adhered to a cult of secrecy, a culture of dissemblance, to protect the sanctity of inner aspects of their lives. The dynamics of dissemblance involved creating the appearance of disclosure, or openness about themselves and their feelings, while actually remaining an enigma. Only with secrecy, achieving self-imposed invisibility, could ordinary women accrue the psychic space and harness the resources needed to hold their own in the often one-sided and mismatched resistance struggle.

Based upon a critical analysis of these texts, several themes emerge. An analysis of this literature was key because it serves as the cornerstone for my research. As African-American women continue to rise to higher positions of power within the philanthropic sector, can there be a tendency for their “double jeopardy” existence to be in continuous, hyper conflict? Can their “two worlds” positively exist, or must there be an inherent conflict, leading to a collision, and undue stress and pressure to keep the two at bay? This is the central question related to the development of this study.

Through a review of the literature of black feminist thought, it becomes readily apparent that there is no clear-cut definition of the term “black feminism” or “black
feminist thought.” Indeed, many of the key scholars and researchers in this area of study differ greatly in not only how they define the phrase, but even who can claim to support this line of thought. These differing perspectives that are used to define black feminism are generally further complicated by the fact that they do not offer a clear definition of who a black feminist is, or what (s)he believes in. While the term black feminist should not be strictly constructed to allow only Black women the title, it simultaneously cannot ignore the unique perspective that these women bring to the table (Collins, 1991). Thompson (2002) constructed a multiracial feminist movement timeline, and juxtaposed it with the normative (white) feminist timeline, in order to celebrate the contributions that black feminist scholars, authors, and activists brought to the field.

In her “Selected Bibliography on Black Feminism,” Patricia Bell Scott contends that all African-American women, regardless of the content of their ideas are, by definition, black feminists (Collins, 1990). This definition, many critics assert, is rather limiting, in that it presupposes that only African-American women can be black feminists and that all African-American women have feminist thought patterns (Ibid). Beverly Guy-Sheftall, another black feminist author and scholar, contends, however, “that Black women’s experiences with both racial and gender oppression result in needs and problems distinct from white women and black men, and that black women must struggle for equality both as a woman and an African-American” (Cole & Guy-Sheftall, B., 2003, 20). This definition, unlike the one proposed by Scott, allows room for male black feminists such as Frederick Douglass and W.E.B. DuBois (Cole & Guy-Sheftall, B., 2003, 120).
Others who have defined the term have presupposed that only through the biological possession of a certain race and gender can one be a black feminist (Collins, 1990). In contrast to these views, as well as those of Scott and Guy-Sheftall, are those of Deborah McDowell, who in her essay, “New Directions for Black Feminist Criticism,” asserts that the term black feminist “can apply to any criticism written by a Black woman regardless of her subject or perspective--a book written by a male from a feminist or political perspective, a book written by a Black woman or about Black women authors in general, or any writings by women” (Ibid).

Hooks (1981, 163) found that “historians who label themselves feminist continually minimize the contribution of black women’s rights advocates by implying their focus was solely on racial reform measures,” yet leading white women advocates often “initiated social reforms that would affect primarily white women, as if their efforts were completely divorced from the issues of women’s rights.” Additionally, she argued that Anna Julia Cooper and other nineteenth-century black activists “believed that were they [black women] given the right to vote, they could change the educational system so that women would have the right to pursue fully their educational goals” (hooks, 1981, 168). She further contested that contemporary black feminists (i.e., the 1960’s and 1970’s), while eager to join their white counterparts in a “struggle to end sexist oppression,” became “disappointed and disillusioned when [they] discovered that white women in the movement had little knowledge of or concern for the problems of the lower class and poor women or the particular problems of non-white women from all classes” (hooks, 1981, 188). It was this disillusionment that led to the formation of “black feminist” groups, often similar in make-up and design as the white groups they had
recently left, only possessing a greater concern for the struggles of those whom they felt had been neglected by their white counterparts (hooks, 1981, 189). Her argument ultimately rests upon the notion that, in order to be “feminist in any authentic sense of the term is to want for all people, female and male, liberation from sexist role patterns, domination, and oppression” (hooks, 1981, 195). She further asserted that “feminism is not simply a struggle to end male chauvinism or a movement to ensure that women will have equal rights with men; it is a commitment to eradicating the ideology of domination that permeates Western culture on various levels—sex, race, and class, to name a few—and a commitment to reorganizing U.S. society so that self-development of people can take precedence over imperialism, economic expansion, and material desires” (hooks, 1981, 194).

Simien (2004, 324), in a study to determine the differences in attitudes toward black feminism within the African-American community, first offered four key themes that are often viewed as cornerstones of this thought. As “recognition that African-American women are status deprived because they face discrimination on the basis of race and gender,” this thought has been purported by scholars to “bring the academic force of study of black males and female attitudes toward actualizing the goals of feminism.” Among the themes, she argues, are the concept of intersectionality, which “suggests that interlocking oppressions circumscribe the lives of black women through day-to-day encounters with race and gender oppression” (Ibid). Additionally, she argues that black feminist scholars have addressed the issues of gender (in)equality within the black community, citing the unequal coverage of the contributions of black women during the Civil Rights Era and the Million Man March as classic examples of intraracial
inequality (Simien, 2004, 325). She further asserts that “black feminists have maintained that feminism benefits the black community by challenging patriarchy as an institutionalized, oppressive structure and advocating the building of coalitions” (Ibid). Lastly, she argues that these scholars “have suggested that a sense of belonging or conscious loyalty to (black women) stems from lived experiences, specifically, day-to-day encounters with race, class, and gender oppression,” and that this shared experience drives “black women to political activism” (Simien, 2004, 326).

Collins (1990) believed that an understanding of five key dimensions was necessary when working within the context of black feminist thought. The first of these dimensions is the legacy of struggle common among African-American women. These women have had to deal with not only a history of slavery, being considered as 3/5 of a person by the framers of the U.S. Constitution, Jim Crow segregation, the struggle for civil rights, and life in a post “affirmative action world” (where their talents and abilities are often questioned and demeaned), they have had the additional burden of living in the often misogynistic culture of America, where women’s thoughts, opinions, and perspectives are diminished, devalued, and denied. In 1831, Maria W. Stewart asked, “How long shall the fair daughters of Africa be compelled to bury their minds and talents beneath a load of pots and kettles?” (Collins, 1990, 1) Another key dimension of a solid definition of black feminist thought is the interlocking nature of race, gender, and class oppression. This dimension integrates the aforementioned oppressions these women must deal with, along with the additional impact that economic disparities play in the lives of these women.
A third key dimension of this definition is the replacement of denigrated images of Black womanhood with self-defined ones. In order to maintain a level of personal and mental sanity, these women have had to function in such a way as to replace the negative themes and images promoted in the media and popular culture about these women with ones they have created for themselves that are positive and celebrate their unique value and perspectives.

An additional component to the dimensions of this definition is the way in which black women’s activism is manifested in their roles of mother, teacher, and community leader. As a by-product of the historic ravages of slavery, coupled with the modern injustices of a rampant drug culture and other criminal activities, significant numbers of black women have had to assume leadership roles in the household. Their roles as both mother and father have strengthened their resolve, empowering them to seek greater avenues of expression for their frustration at the systems that forced them to assume these leadership positions in the first place. In addition, these women have long been viewed, both within their own communities and in the dominant culture in which they reside, as teachers and nurturers. Whether serving as the mammy on the plantation, or at the forefront (though often behind the scenes) in the struggle for equality, these women have become both revered and feared for their power, tenacity, and will to share their knowledge and experiences with others.

Lastly, within this dimension there is a sensitivity to the sexual politics that often follows these women. Aside from the historic view of mother and teacher, an equally dominant theme propagated in the culture is that of the black women as a sexual (often oversexed) being. Within this context, these women have often had to combat against
negative imagery in the media, whether in early books and songs, or on television and in the movies. And yet, these women have been able to redefine their own sexuality, often by reclaiming it, in such a way as to use it as a tool to overcome oppression. Their sexuality has been used to force both men within their own culture and those in the dominant culture, who might have been initially drawn to them by a perceived sense of sexuality, to stop and listen to their agendas, and has garnered them respect both at home and in the marketplace.

According to Collins (1990, 23), responses to these dimensions are often colored by class, sexual orientation, ethnicity, regionalism, urbanization, and age. Regardless of their responses though, these women experience the world differently than those who are not black and female (Collins, 1990, 24). As members of an oppressed group, their experiences put them in a position to see things differently, but their lack of control over the ideological apparatuses of society makes expressing a self-defined standpoint more difficult (Collins, 1990, 26). Put another away, “I have grown to womanhood in a world where the saner you are, the madder you are made to appear” (Ibid). By embracing an Afrocentric worldview that is counter to white domination while promoting an individual and group valuation of an independent, longstanding Afrocentric consciousness, coupled with a feminist sensibility, these women share experiences that all women share, regardless of ethnic or racial backgrounds, as well as a shared consciousness about these experiences (Ibid).

Collins (2000, 22) asserted that “black feminism remains important because U.S. Black women constitute an oppressed group.” She further argued that “as a collectivity, they participate in a dialectical relationship linking African-American women’s
oppression and activism” (Ibid). She contends that, “as long as Black women’s subordination within intersecting oppressions of race, class, gender, sexuality, and nation persists, Black feminism as an activist response to that oppression will remain needed” (Ibid).

Given that there is no monolith of black thought, there is no “one right response” to these core, uniting themes. The experiences of African-American women provide them with a unique standpoint on Black womanhood unavailable to other groups (Collins, 1990, 33). Black women intellectuals provide unique leadership for Black women’s empowerment and resistance (Collins, 1990, 34). These intellectuals are central in the production of Black feminist thought because they alone can create the group autonomy that must precede effective coalitions with other groups (Collins, 1990, 35). It cannot, however, flourish isolated from the experiences and ideas of others, and must be advocated for, refined, and disseminated by other groups in order to develop further (Ibid).

A more humanist view of the struggle to overcome racial and sexual oppression is why Alice Walker prefers the term “black womanist” to black feminist, for she believes that it “addresses the notion of solidarity of humanity” (Collins, 1991, 38). In her view, “one is a womanist when one is committed to the survival and wholeness of entire people, male and female” (Ibid). She further explains that “a womanist is not a separatist, except periodically for health,” and is traditionally universalist (Ibid). Through embracing womanist over feminist, Walker argues that, while “raising the issue of gender, it simultaneously offers a distance from the ‘enemy,’ in this case, Whites generally and White Women in particular” (Collins, 1998, 63).
Dr. Anna Julia Cooper wrote that:

We take our stand on the solidarity of humanity, the oneness of life, and the unnaturalness and injustice of all special favoritisms, whether of sex, race, country, or condition…. The colored woman feels that woman’s cause is one and universal; and that… not till race, color, sex, and condition are seen as accidents, and not the substance of life; not till the universal title of humanity to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is conceded to be inalienable to all; not till then is woman’s lesson taught and woman’s cause won—not the white woman’s nor the black woman’s, not the red woman’s but the cause of every man and of every woman who has writhed silently under a mighty wrong (hooks, 1981, 193).

Based upon an analysis of all of the many definitions and the pros and cons of each, the most widely accepted definition comes from Patricia Hill Collins, who defines it as a “process of self-conscious struggle that empowers women and men to actualize a humanist vision of community” (Collins, 1990, 39).

Bell (1992, 9) found that Black professional women must fight about their experiences in order to combat the abundance of myths that exist about them. These myths are perpetuated because there are so few stories about their experiences. Black career-oriented women have only fictionalized accounts of their life experiences; there are no mirror reflections that provide authentic accounts of their lives. This argument serves as the core basis for the selection of this research and the participants: too often, the story of Black women, especially those who are professionals, is told by others. In order for their authentic stories and voices to be heard, I sought to let the participants share their stories, in their own voice, thereby validating their own experiences, and not what others said or thought their experiences should be.

Based upon a critical analysis of these texts, several themes emerge. An analysis of this literature was key because, inclusion of black feminist/womanist theory was
valuable in developing my framework for this study. This theoretical framework highlighted the often subconscious approach to the way of work many of these women bring to the conversation. Sexual politics, sexism within black culture, and a struggle to define gender roles against the backdrop of the remnants of the American slavery complex and Jim Crow legislation can lead to a conflict with the black community about where, when, and how black women lead. Couple this with the aforementioned “double jeopardy” construct these women can face, and it would lead to an additional layer of complexity when trying to determine how the private world and the public face of these women collide.

Methodological Perspectives

Key considerations that must be accounted for using a qualitative research approach include designing the interview protocol to elicit responses that would provide insight into the respondent’s perceived identity and the impact that race and gender had on that identity’s development and expression of said identity in the workplace.

Briggs (1986) offers many premises that were used to ground the interview process. These include investigating the metacommunicative repertoire of the group in question, examining the cultural and communicative roots of the group, and using this analysis to shape the research design. Becker (1970, 52) observed that “the very large number of observations and kinds of data an observer can collect...means that his final conclusions can be tested more often and in more ways than is common in other forms of research.”

The data for these oral history interviews was analyzed through both open and axial coding. According to Strauss and Corbin (1998), an open coding analysis of the data
must take place prior to the axial coding in order to have a baseline of analysis. By first building theory through conceptualizing the data into “discrete incidents, ideas, events, and acts” that are named for what they represent, the researcher can move from open coding of the data into axially coding it (Strauss and Corbin, 1998, 105). Within axial coding, Strauss and Corbin assert that four basic tasks should be accomplished. First, the dimensions and properties established in open coding must be laid out (Strauss and Corbin, 1998, 126). Next, an identification of the variety of conditions, actions/interactions, and consequences associated with the phenomenon should be conducted (Ibid). This should be followed by relating categories to their subcategories through statements denoting how they are related to each other (Ibid). Lastly, the researcher should look at the cues in the data to denote how the categories might relate to each other (Ibid).

The efforts to analyze the data collected are similar in many ways to Carson’s (2004, 180) approach. The approach used for the collection and analysis of the oral narratives was to first elicit stories of key events in the history of the center from clients, staff, board members, volunteers, constituents and funders. This methodology allowed the researcher to learn how each group viewed and interpreted the philosophy, mission, and services of the center, as well as how this helped shape the identity-building process, which was the original intent of this ethnographic study. Carson also interviewed members of various African nations who were clients, in an effort to understand the center’s role in their lives, as well as their personal stories of immigration and identity and community development.
This is similar to the approach suggested by both Rosier and Briggs, along with Rubin and Rubin (2005, 223). There, it is suggested that the researcher first look at transcribing the interviews to look for finding themes and concepts that emerge, followed by coding these themes, and determining whether there is a relationship between the codes in this scheme.

The process of recognizing, refining, defining, and elaborating on the themes that emerged from the analysis allowed me to look at the evidence provided in the interviews and develop my theory about identity building from it. I am not attempting to generalize due to the small size of my sample and also because I am using a case study method to understand rather than to predict a human experience. This is what Max Weber meant by verstehen. Weber argued for “an approach to sociological inquiry that generated its theory from rich, systematic, empirical, historical research” (Weber, 1947, 87). He further contended that understanding, or verstehen, was the proper way of studying social phenomena (Ibid). Derived from the interpretive practice known as hermeneutics, the method of verstehen strives to understand the meanings that human beings attribute to their experiences, interactions, and actions (Ibid).

Integration of Social Origins Theory, Race Philanthropy and the Influences of Gender and Racial Identity on Leadership in Philanthropy with Methodological Perspectives

Having reviewed literature related to cultural, communication, gender and leadership studies, it becomes clear that certain patterns and themes emerge. As previously stated, the purpose of this data collection and analysis was to determine the extent to which the data collected not only follows the various literatures reviewed, but also called literatures into question and expand professional canons of research in nonprofit studies to consider research questions and findings regarding non-European
descent canon presumptions in nonprofit studies--which most of the literatures reviewed represent.

Given that my proposed area of research was to determine whether or not the nonprofit sector, specifically foundations, fosters an environment for its executives to retain and incorporate their cultural identity into their work life or, similar to the corporate sector, do these employees work toward keeping their personal affiliations, which often reflect racial and/or gender cultural identifiers, hidden in order to be successful professionally; and having reviewed key literature from the areas of the social origins theory of philanthropy, race philanthropy, the influence of gender on leadership theory, and the influence of racial identity on leadership theory, I then sought to design my research study to address these questions, incorporating what I had gleaned from the research. As has already been established, I selected social origins theory of philanthropy because, at the core of this study is an analysis of the impact of philanthropy on its leaders, and in some ways, the impact of these leaders on how they express and operate within philanthropy. Social origins theory looks at the cultural, religious and economic realities of society, and how those realities influenced the development of philanthropic organizations specifically, and the nonprofit sector as a whole. From this theoretical framework, I determined that this framework was key to an understanding of why African-American women might select this field as a career path. First, by emphasizing the cultural value of “doing good,” this field provides an opportunity for these women to express an inner yearning to be of service to all mankind. Additionally, this sector addresses often deeply held religious and spiritual values about service, honoring faith traditions, and celebrating the humanity of others through service. Lastly, through
participation in this sector on a professional level, members of society can have economic opportunities to provide stable asset streams for their families. Therefore, this theoretical perspective’s emphasis on the aforementioned realities offers a glimpse into how and why African-Americans have found this sector vital to their personal and professional success.

Additionally, I focused on race philanthropy theory, as it examines the influence of racial identity and expression on philanthropy, and philanthropy’s concurrent influences on racial identity and expression. As a body of research, race philanthropy tries to answer the question, “how have racial and ethnic groups and expressions been influenced and impact by, and conversely influenced and impacted philanthropic expression?” From this theoretical framework, I determined that if there is a critical analysis on the impact of racialized perspectives on the implementation of public benefit through the distribution of philanthropic dollars, we can see that, in spite of its inadequate definitional frameworks, race philanthropy provides a key perspective on the African-American traditions of civic responsibility.

In turn, I focused on the influence of gender on leadership theory because I was eager to investigate how the research on gender and its impact of leadership could be interwoven into this study. By understanding that the research indicates that women leaders differ in the workplace in comparison to their male counterparts, there can be a foundational framework when overlaying racial and ethnic differences to leadership styles. Building upon the research related to leader characteristic and leadership styles, it was next critical to see how this research manifested in the office. Differentiating between how men and women lead proved invaluable, as it then allowed for an analysis
of leadership by racial and ethnic groups, which would lead to the ability to overlay these
two schools of thought at the intersection of racial/ethnic background and gender. One
common theme is that women tend to lead with more of an interpersonal/relational style
than their male counterparts. Additionally, women tend to work towards consensus
during the decision-making process. When looking at the body of research selected for
this study as it relates to leadership, certain key themes emerged, which were critical to
framing my research questions. First, leaders possess key qualities and attributes that
inspire others to follow them. Leaders who exhibited these traits, as observed by
colleagues, peers, and subordinates, were included for participation in the interviews.
Second, women leaders in large part have certain styles of interacting with their peers,
colleagues, and subordinates.

Lastly, I placed an emphasis on the influence of racial identity on leadership
theory because I was eager to see how it, too, would impact the development of leaders
who seek to interweave their expressions of cultural and ethnic identity into their world
of work, and how the integration of this identity is expressed and accepted in the wider
community and context. Inclusion of black feminist/womanist theory was valuable in
developing my framework for this study because it highlights the often subconscious
approach to the way of work many of these women bring to the conversation. Sexual
politics, sexism within black culture, and a struggle to define gender roles against the
backdrop of the remnants of the American slavery complex and Jim Crow legislation can
lead to a conflict with the black community about where, when, and how black women
lead. Couple this with the aforementioned “double jeopardy” construct these women can
face, and it can lead to an additional layer of complexity when trying to determine how the private world and the public face of these women collide.

Based upon the theoretical frameworks studied that served as the basis of my research, I employed a qualitative research approach to data collection and analysis. While I could have selected to take a quantitative approach to the data collection and analysis, several factors led me to pursue a qualitative approach. First, while much of the literature that was reviewed to guide this research project provided valuable insight into the intersection of racialized ethnic identity, gender, and leadership, most of the literature came from a European descent perspective. Subjects included in those research studies were, by and large, also of European descent, and many of the researchers also were of European descent, and thus, perspectives may have been skewed towards this perspective. By bringing the perspective of a researcher who shares both the racialized ethnic identity and gender with my participants, I believed that this would provide an insight into both the literature and the interviews that other similar studies may lack. More directly, as a researcher who is of North American ancestry and identifies with the African-American ethnic and racial identity, my perspective and lens around issues of race, gender, and identity would be guided, not unlike those researchers of European racial and ethnic identity, by this historical and social context and construct, and give me a unique insight into the lives of the participants in my study (i.e., African-American woman researcher interviewing African-American women participants would tend to lead to research analyzed from a African-American woman’s perspective). This argument serves as the core basis for the selection of this research and the participants: too often, the story of African-American women, especially those who are professionals, is told by
others. In order for their authentic stories and voices to be heard, I sought to let the participants share their stories, in their own voice, thereby validating their own experiences, and not what others said or thought their experiences should be.

The downside to this approach is, naturally, that my views and perspective would inherently be skewed and influenced by my contextual experiences. This is where taking a quantitative approach might have been more appropriate. It is far more difficult for a researcher to skew what data reflects quantitatively-research questions in a quantitative study can certainly be skewed to elicit a researcher’s bias, but the responses cannot. The downside of doing a strictly quantitative approach to this type of study, though, was that part of the richness of the experiences of these women would have been lost simply through survey collection and analysis. Hearing their stories, through my own shared experiences, I believe provided a richer framework for their voices to be heard which could have not been as easily nuanced by a survey.
Chapter Three: Research Methodology

As previously stated, the purpose of this data collection and analysis was to determine the extent to which the data collected not only follows the various literatures reviewed, but may also call literatures into question and expand professional canons of research in nonprofit studies to consider research questions and findings regarding non-European descent canon presumptions in nonprofit studies—which most of the literatures reviewed represent.

Therefore, based upon the pros and cons of taking a qualitative or quantitative approach, I determined that the most effective method of data collection was through the development of a qualitative research design. Through the use of case study methodology, I examined the experiences of participants by conducting oral history interviews, tracing their critical path to leadership. I also incorporated my experiences in the field to further expand upon the research, to determine if participant experiences were generalizable to my own experiences and vice versa. The information gathered in this study was significant because it explored the connections between race, gender, and leadership styles in philanthropic organizations. In this design, I looked at the importance of research design, the development of the research plan, the recruitment procedures and criteria, how I would gain entry into the lives of the participants, the actual interview itself, the interview protocol, ethical considerations, reliability, validity, and generalizability of the data, and the method of interview analysis.

In order to address these research questions, I first developed the research design. From there, I began to determine what would be the best interviews questions that could elicit the answers I sought through my research questions. This work was followed by
establishing how I would select the participants to be included in the study. I then approached how and when I would conduct the interviews. Finally, I determined what I would do with the data once it was collected and how it would be analyzed.

Research Design

When determining the best course for this study in order to address the research questions, I first designed the interview protocol. The interview protocol used was an adaptation of the instrument utilized by Edmondson and Nkomo (2001), which was used primarily to understand professional identity formation and maintenance by African-American and Caucasian women executives in the corporate sector. This protocol was selected because the questions used were designed to elicit responses that would provide insight into the respondent’s perceived identity and the impact that race and gender had on that identity’s development and expression of said identity in the workplace.

Next, I determined what type of foundations for whom participants worked would be selected. According to the National Center for Charitable Statistics, in 2010, there are 120,810 private foundations in the United States. Additionally, according to the Foundation Center, in 2007 there were 2,600 grantmaking corporate foundations, along with 650 community foundations. Given the sheer number and types of foundations in existence in the U.S., contextually the differences in sizes, locations, and mission, environmental quality can have an influence on perceived interactions. For instance, one could argue, based upon location, mission, and size, it would stand to reason that corporate foundations in the northeastern U.S. would have a different culture than a hospital conversion foundation in the Southeast. Similarly, a family foundation in the Midwest would likely have a different office culture than a private foundation in the
Pacific Northwest. Thus, in the development of the research design, it was critical to select participants from various types, sizes, and geographic foundations, in order to determine if there were similarities across the various types, regardless of difference.

Research Plan, Recruitment Procedures, and Criteria

As I stated in Chapter One, this research was designed while I conducted research in the Third Millennium Leadership Initiative in order to expand the body of knowledge regarding gender, culture, and leadership. Therefore, participants for this study were selected as a part of that research. Executives selected for the interviews were identified based upon one or more of the following criteria:

- Membership in the National Center on Black Philanthropy;
- Membership in the Association of Black Fund Raising Executives;
- Membership in the Alliance for Nonprofit Management People of Color Affinity Group; and/or
- Recommendation of a member of the aforementioned organizations.

Participants selected for the interviews are from various focus areas and types of foundations, including health-legacy/conversion, education, health, operating, family, private, and community foundations. Participants ranged in age from 25-70, included both married and single women [never married and divorced], parents and non-parents, all were heterosexual, and included three daughters of immigrant parents.

I then selected and recruited the study participants based upon the aforementioned criteria. To begin the selection process, I first reviewed the attendee lists from previous National Center for Black Philanthropy conferences. I then contacted peers who were members of the National Center on Black Philanthropy, the Association of Black Fund
Raising Executives, or the Alliance for Nonprofit Management People of Color Affinity Group, in order to get recommendations of colleagues of the aforementioned organizations.

From there, the list was narrowed down on the basis of gender. Additionally, I surveyed the websites of the employer foundations, as these sites often have photographs of staff members. Additionally, a second tier of participants was selected, in the event the initial group was unable, unwilling, or not interested in participating. Once the final list of participants and alternates were selected, they were contacted first by email and then with a follow-up telephone call after seven days.

Initial recruitment of participants included a description of the study and outline of the potential risks. Participants received an informed consent form, which outlined the potential risks, and signed forms were collected prior to the interviews being conducted. Participants were notified of the consent process during recruitment for participation, and were given a copy of the form to review at that time. Consent was obtained in the same location where the interviews were conducted prior to the start of the interviews.

Oral history interviews were conducted with ten African-American women executives during Spring 2006. The information collected will be analyzed and coded using accepted qualitative research practices, looking for patterns indicative of the impact of racial and gender identity on professional identity.

Entry

In order to gain entry into the lives of the women I hoped to interview, I sought informants in the organizations from whence I intended to select participants. By seeking the assistance of staff members at the National Center on Black Philanthropy, the
Association of Black Fund Raising Executives, and the Alliance for Nonprofit
Management People of Color Affinity Group, I worked towards getting their buy-in and
recommendation of potential participants. After connecting with the informants, seeking
their input and direction in the development of the protocol and participant selection, this
lent a level of credibility toward my own efforts to connect with the participants.
Additionally, including a cover letter of support from the informants at one of the
aforementioned organizations with my own letter of inquiry linked me to individuals the
participants respected. Once this initial connection was made, follow-up telephone
conversations were held to determine potential participants’ interest and willingness to
participate. If consent was granted, the informed consent and statement of ethics were
sent via email, along with the confirmation of the agreed-upon date of the interview.
Within this document was also a preview of the types of questions that would be asked,
so that there were few surprises for the participants, and encouraged more open dialogue
during the interviews.

From May 2006 to September 2007, oral history interviews took place with ten
participants. In addition to those analyzed in this study, an additional eight interviews
also took place. Participants in those interviews included white women and African-
American men, and therefore, the data from those interviews was not included. It should
be noted that those interviews were also transcribed, and the data collected can be used
for future research.

Interviews

In order to make the interviews as comfortable for participants as possible, I
undertook several measures to diminish potential discomfort. These included connecting
with the informants, having initial dialogues with participants prior to the actual
interviews, and spending time at their organizations connecting with them and observing
how they interact with colleagues and staff. If schedules permitted, I conducted the
interviews in settings that were familiar and minimally stressful. That meant, for half of
the interviews, I traveled to the participants to conduct the interview, whether this
interview took place in the office or a relaxed setting (i.e., coffeehouses, bookstores, etc.).
For the remaining interviews, they were conducted via telephone.

Interview Protocol

The areas that the interview protocol covered include: Early Life Experiences,
School Experiences, College and Graduate School, Early Adult Experiences, Public
World, General Sector Questions, Relationships with Others, and Private World. As
previously stated, the questions were adapted from the Edmonson and Nkomo (2001)
protocol. This protocol was selected and adapted because it provided a rich,
comprehensive entry into the lives of participants, offering the opportunity to have
participants share key experiences and life markers throughout their lives, from their
earliest childhood memories, to their current professional and personal lives, and
everything in between. While my initial goal was to both videotape and audio-record all
the interviews, due to scheduling constraints, I was only able to audio record them. Audio
files were labeled prior to their use and, after being used were stored in a safe deposit box
until time for analysis.

Questions related to Early Life Experiences sought to first learn more about the
participants’ home life, along with learning about their external community. Additionally,
these questions also sought to learn about their early recollections about conversations on
race and gender, crucial to understanding the formative roots of their racial identity. School Experience questions centered primarily on the role and impact that elementary and secondary education played in the racial identity formation in the lives of these women.

Questions related to College and Graduate School focused primarily on undergraduate and graduate school choice, in order to determine what role, if any, these decisions played in furthering racial identity formation and development. Early Adult Experiences allowed participants to reflect on the early days of the professional life, and what impact those early days had on their racial and professional identity development.

Public World questions dealt primarily with their current professional role, their rise to leadership, and the role their employer has played in their professional track. Lastly, this series of questions had the participants reflect on their current and future trajectory of their careers. General Sector Questions looked first at participants’ perceptions of their rise to leadership in light of their race and gender, followed by their thoughts on if there are differences in which subsectors within the nonprofit sector are more receptive to leaders of color, which positions within those sectors have been, or would have been, beneficial in their ascent, and their views on if they perceived there are differences in their leadership style as influenced by their racial and gender identity.

Lastly, this series of questions asked their perceptions about how their racial identity has or has not impacted their organization, along with their beliefs about how racial and gender identity would or would not impact the future of the nonprofit sector.

Questions related to their Relationships with Others allowed the participants to reflect on their interactions with co-workers and subordinates, in an effort to determine
what impact, if any, their gender and racial identity has had on these relationships. This line of inquiry also asked participants to reflect upon what influences peers, mentors, and colleagues have had on their ascension to leadership. The last series of questions, Private World, varied according to participants’ marital and parental status, and focused in on how relationships outside the workplace influence, and were influenced by, the workplace. This series of questions also inquired about the community where the participants live. The full interview protocol is included in Appendix A.

Ethics

Ethical considerations for this study were addressed first by sending a preliminary letter outlining the goals of the study and my collection and dissemination plans for the interviews. Additionally, an informed consent document was drawn up and sent to the participants for their review and approval. A copy was given to them upon the start of the interview. Research materials were kept in a research binder and external memory device to ensure limited access to the information by non-study participants or researchers. These steps greatly assisted in my ability to meet my own ethical standards, as well as made participants more likely to be open to my presence and the study.

Verstehen

The process of recognizing, refining, defining, and elaborating on the themes that emerged from the analysis allowed me to look at the evidence provided in the interviews and develop my theory about identity building from it. I am not attempting to generalize due to the small size of my sample and also because I am using a case study method to understand rather than to predict a human experience. This is what Max Weber meant by verstehen. Weber argued for "an approach to sociological inquiry that generated its
theory from rich, systematic, empirical, historical research” (Weber, 1947, 87). He further contended that understanding, or verstehen, was the proper way of studying social phenomena (Ibid). Derived from the interpretive practice known as hermeneutics, the method of verstehen strives to understand the meanings that human beings attribute to their experiences, interactions, and actions (Ibid).

Interview Analysis

My process of analysis was similar to that conducted by Carson. By first identifying theoretical models to interpret the data that had been collected, and then juxtaposing these models with the data collected, I determined whether or not there was a consistency in the patterns that she believed were emerging. The process of recognizing, refining, defining, and elaborating on the themes that emerged in the analysis allowed me to look at the evidence provided in the interviews and develop my theory about identity building from it.

At the conclusion of the interview, the audio recorder was submitted to a transcriber from Digital Media Services for transcription. Upon receipt of the transcript from the transcriber, the transcript was entered into the qualitative software program, N’VIVO. The software package was utilized to code the data in order to find similar responses from participants to questionnaire items.

Interweaving An Autoethnographic Perspective

In order to expand upon the interview data I had collected, I also wove in an autoethnographic perspective to my study. Autoethnography is an “approach to research and writing that seeks to describe and systematically analyze (graphy) personal experience (auto) in order to understand cultural experience (ethno)” (Ellis, 2011). By
using key aspects of autobiography and ethnography, autoethnography allows for both “doing” and “writing” (Ibid). While there are several different autoethnographic approaches, I selected an *reflexive ethnographic* approach, as it allowed me to capture how I changed over the course of my experience.

When I became a program officer for a small, private foundation in the southern United States, certain observations began to crystalize in my mind that I purposefully sought to keep separate and apart from my research process. As I continued in my role in a philanthropic organization however, it became abundantly clear that there was soon developing a blurring and blending of my research world and my world of work. Unbeknownst to me, I was becoming the living embodiment of my research, seeing clear parallels between the lives of the participants in my study and my own. While I diligently sought to avoid researcher bias that might influence my analysis of the data, it became evident over the course of the analysis that my story was not distinct from those of other African-American women who work in the philanthropic sector. Thus, my experiences merited inclusion into this study.
Chapter Four: Findings
As previously stated the goal of this research was to study how cultural, ethnic, and gender identities are maintained and exhibited by African-American women executives in the philanthropic sector as they develop their professional identities. Upon reviewing the data, certain key influences in the lives of participants emerged as items critical along their path to leadership. The three key themes that emerged centered around the influences of family or other significant adults to be engaged actively in philanthropic activities, the influence of faith on developmental stages of giving, the role of supportive individuals in the lives of those participants who were mothers, and the challenges of integrating civic and personal philanthropic activities into workplace leadership development. The first was the role of familial philanthropic expressions during the formative years of study participants. Overall, the majority of participants indicated that they watched their parents or other significant adults in their lives participate in both forms of philanthropy. Witnessing their parents give support to other relatives and friends, along with more traditional forms of philanthropy, such as giving to church, participating in civic organizations, or volunteering in their communities, instilled in these participants the value of philanthropic endeavors, and often encouraged them to mimic similar patterns in both their formative and adult lives.

For example, when asked whether she witnessed parents or other significant other adult engaged in philanthropic activities, one participant responded:

“Some of my first “work” experiences were actually volunteer experiences at a retirement home. That was sort of the service that one just sort of naturally gave. Between that and the lessons around tithing and giving to the church, I think I sort of grew up understanding that it’s just what you did. I think it was just kind of reinforced with relatives. People were sort of, as much as they could be, giving with each other.”
Another participant responded:

“We didn’t have an Urban League; our town was small. I’m not even sure if we had an NAACP but my father was a part of a group called the ‘Community Advancement Men’s.’ He and some of his friends got together, black men, and they were, I guess, the local NAACP. They were very philanthropic to the kids and the community. They started a scholarship fund. They held a big dinner every year and give scholarships to graduating seniors. They used to host picnics for the kids and I just remember drinking a lot of strawberry pop. It’s outlawed in my house now. They would try to do those kinds of things and when families were in need, I remember them taking food and stuff if somebody died or whatever. My mother—her profession was she was a social worker. She lived that 24 hrs/day. There were always kids in our house. She was always very generous and she was very involved in church. She and my grandmother took turns cleaning the church, making communion—just everything. Even my grandmother, after she had her leg amputated because of diabetes, when she was healed, she continued to do that.”

Further evidence was provided by a participant who stated “We paid tithes. We believed in paying tithes. My father was not involved in a church. My mother was very. So we definitely gave to the church.”

Additionally, another participant, who was the daughter of Jamaican immigrants shared:

“Yes. Certainly the church. My parents were always involved in church. You gave to support the church. Because certainly church was a place that in terms of the why you were involved with church and the whole religion that was supportive. That meant also giving money and time, talent and your dollars. Also though my father went to Carmel College in Jamaica. He formed the Carmel College Old Boy’s Association, which is like an alumni association in New York. He and another uncle, who was really a friend, formed this alumni group in New York because there were a number of them beginning to come together in New York. The purpose of that was one to fellowship but also to raise money to support other students who were not able to afford it. So they did a lot of fundraising, had dances, whatever events. Also, my mother was involved with a nurse’s association of Caribbean West Indian nurses group. Again, a lot of that was around raising money, scholarships and also clothes collection. My mother was constantly, whatever clothes that we didn’t use, was always sending them back and shipping them. Whenever anybody went they went with 14 other suitcases of clothes because it was so expensive in
Jamaica. We were always told that we were very blessed because things were so expensive. Education was so expensive in the Caribbean unless you were very bright and could get scholarships. I think that was really core to our growing up.”

She further shared that her family also engaged in nontraditional forms of philanthropy: “(Because) we were the American cousins, there was value in family and keeping connections. There was always family coming through our house because we lived near Kennedy Airport. We were the stop off.”

Another participant, whose parents were also immigrants, shared that:

“I would say through the church and tithing, 10% to God and that we would get our allowance and you were expected to tithe. But we also did a lot of mission work. My earliest recollection of a trip, I was probably about 10 or 11. My parents took my brothers and I. We were (near the side of) Panama closest to Costa Rica, extremely poor. That’s where the indigenous Indians, the Guayanas, still inhabit. I should add my grandfather is also a Methodist minister. That’s where most of his ministry was. I can remember my parents saying, “This Christmas we’re going to have a different Christmas. We are going to serve. You were put on this earth to serve and to help. Your fixation on the toys and all the things that we thought were important for Christmas needs to shift.” They didn’t quite say it that way. I remember asking, “So what are we going to do with all of the presents under the tree?” My parents said, “You can take two with you but we’d like you to think about giving the rest away to a child who won’t have any presents this Christmas.” I can tell you I was a little stinker. I was not nice for a little bit of time there. But we went and we flew in on this small two-seater plane. My family pretty much took up the whole plane. We landed and there were very few cars. To get anywhere you got there by boat or walking. We spent the Christmas there. Ever since my family has not bought into the Christmas you need to buy things. Instead we do things for each other or give gifts of meaning. So I think that’s how that kind of got cultivated in us that you need to give back and you need to do. We volunteer our time to mentor. We’re involved in different social cultural groups and volunteer our time. Of course we volunteer our time in church. I cannot leave that one out. We teach Sunday School, play instruments, sing. So we do quite a bit with church. For me the extension of this was I became a Peace Corps volunteer after my graduate degree. So I volunteered for two years. It was just ironic that I was actually assigned to Jamaica. So I went back to Jamaica to work for two years. For two years truly if you’re thinking
about income and all of that, there really isn’t an income. So I think that is how it has impacted me.”

Additionally, a participant whose family was heavily involved in the U.S. Civil Rights Movement shared that:

“It was all about what, I mean the debates in my household continued and certainly accelerated when my father took the national position, but even as a youngster, I didn’t know who everybody. They would have spaghetti dinners, and friends would come over, and they would play cards or whatever. They were a young couple when we were in Atlanta on the weekends. People who would come over there would be these conversations that I only sort of understood but about the boycotts going on in the city. There would be planning meeting. My parents were involved in all of that and engaging and mobilizing people at that time whether it was art, or music, or literature, or whatever. It was all about the advancement of us as a community and as a people. I never knew differently.”

When asked whether she was involved in her parents’ activism, she shared that:

“When I was little, I wasn’t. It was sort of peripheral. When we left Atlanta, I was six or seven, but I was expected to have a sort of general understanding, some understanding. I remember being frustrated when we left when the boycott started in Atlanta, and we wouldn’t go downtown at all anymore. They were explaining to me why that was going on. When I got older, when we were in New York, by the time I got to that stage in my life and certainly into middle school and high school, I was encouraged to become politically active within my school or civically active within the community. I worked at YMCA camp. I volunteered. I assumed positions both in school and within the community that were all a part of giving back. My mother tutored. I tutored in the summers for a Headstart program. It was just kind of what we all did.”

Lastly, another shared that the primary vehicle of philanthropic activity in the home was through the church. “They were very involved in the church on a regular basis. I don’t remember other philanthropic activities. Everything they did, for example one of the groups at the church that my mother belonged to they used to sell cancer pads. As a little girl, I didn’t know what those were for. They would get together, and they would
make these cancer pads, and they would take them to the hospital. Latter on as I grew up, I asked my mother about that. She said that back then they had patients who had cancer, who spent long hours in the bed. They would have sores, and these pads were used to help with that.”

When I juxtaposed my personal experiences as a program officer with the lives of the participant interviewees, I found several striking similarities. First, in terms of the role of familial philanthropic expressions during the formative years of study participants, I experienced several forms of familial emphasized informal “non-traditional” philanthropy. Whether it was donating old clothes and furniture to younger relatives, or volunteering at my church’s daycare, my mother believed that “service was the rent I paid to live in her house.” Similar to the research participants in this study, witnessing my parents give support to other relatives and friends, along with more traditional forms of philanthropy, such as giving to church, participating in civic organizations, or volunteering in their communities, instilled in me the value of philanthropic endeavors, and often encouraged me to mimic similar patterns in both my formative and adult lives.

Because so many of the participants responded to having seen their families’ primary vehicle of philanthropy tied to their house of worship, a second key finding emerged regarding the influence of religion and/or impact of religious or faith communities during both formative years and adult life. As mentioned previously, many of the interview participants witnessed their own parents or other significant adults giving both monetarily and of their time to their faith communities. Witnessing these commitments, combined with the teachings that they received at their places of worship or at home, played a crucial role in the formation of a “culture of caring,” which often
was manifested later in their professional choices. More specifically, individuals whose parents tended to be more actively engaged in their faith traditions tended to see a clear link between this upbringing and their choice of profession than those where whose upbringing did not have a strong emphasis on faith.

For example, when asked what role, if any, did your faith tradition play in your family, one participant responded:

“(It played a very) prominent role with my grandmother in particular. I have to say we consistently attended church all the time. It was sort of a very regular routine thing, as I think about it. It just became reinforced as an adult.”

Another participant responded:

“It was interesting because my mother belonged to the Church of Christ, which is a non-denominational church and my father was AME. My mother was at church every time the doors opened and basically Christmas and Easter. It was a big part of our lives. My mother and my grandmother always went to Bible study and as children, we always went to Sunday school and vacation Bible school. It was really a big part of our lives. Big. Very big.”

Additionally, another participant noted:

“Yes, actually the whole sort of lessons around philanthropy rooted in what you see in church. So the plate was passed all the time in my grandmother’s church. I grew up Catholic and part of the ongoing education that one receives in parochial school is centered in service.

Further evidence was provided by a participant who stated, “it was hugely formative for me, not as for my brother, interestingly. But my mom, my brother and I went to church every Sunday, a lot of strong Christian values.”

Another participant, who was the daughter of Jamaican immigrants, shared that “we also in the family have a number of bishops, whatever, different Catholics, Episcopalian, Anglican Church of God, Anglican Church. So that was always a thread
throughout. One uncle became a minister in New York. So we always in terms of the church calendar and there were always gatherings and also prayer.”

Additionally, one shared that “It was very prominent, and it still is to this day. We very active in our church, and had established a scholarship at our church. We sang in the choir. We were ushers. We were in service clubs. The church was the central part of all of our activity. The kids that we socialized with were a part of the church. It was an influential part of everything you did.”

Additionally, another participant whose family was also heavily involved in the U.S Civil Rights Movement shared that:

“It is surprising especially since this began in Atlanta. My parents were member of the Unitarian Church. Coming out of Atlanta as a Black woman that is not what you would expect. The beauty of the Unitarian Church, I am very appreciative of that as that as a background because what I learned, and I think that is why my father was drawn to it one intellectually, but two because it has a very strong social justice background. Much of the social justice was originated within the context of Unitarian Church and a very core teaching or tolerance and understanding of all faiths. I grew up with a quote from my dad, “I believe in the inherent decency of human kind.” That is what I grew up with was with a sense of probably not a traditional religious but a more intellectualized because it was Unitarian, but a sense of belief in a larger power and of goodness and justice being inherent within the world. That is was incumbent upon us as individuals and communities to act upon that faith by promoting justice, and promoting tolerance, and promoting goodness and kindness. I guess it was a more ethically based faith in some ways, but at the same time a strong sense of understanding of God and something bigger that united humanity and supported. Prayer and all of that was a part of it. I can pray in multiple faiths.”

Even when life circumstances changed the dynamics within the household, the influence of faith remained. As one participant stated,

“It changed after my mom died. We were regular church goers; she had me baptized and everything. Her great-grandfather was a minister and she pretty much grew up in the church. My dad was the same way with my
grandmother being an organist and everything but he took a different approach to it. He didn’t have to be in church every Sunday. I remember when my mom was sick, she had the church associate ministers come to our house to do Sunday communion for her. She couldn’t leave the house. I distinctly remember that because that was very important for her to not miss communion that Sunday but after she died, we didn’t really go to church that much. My dad wasn’t into it, so I didn’t start going regularly until I was in high school. I decided that I was going to start—it was their faith that certainly played a role but it wasn’t what most people are used to—being in church every Sunday and being active and all of that stuff. We were definitely a faithful household for sure.”

In terms of the influence of religion and/or impact of religious or faith communities during both formative years and adult life, I, too, witnessed my parents give monetary and time donations to our faith community. Combining seeing my parents’ philanthropy with the religious teachings that I received at church, my Catholic school, and at home, played a crucial role in the formation of a “culture of caring,” which often was manifested later in my professional choices.

Lastly, the importance of an outside support network (i.e., family, friends, and/or paid individuals) to success of women leaders has played a significant role in the ascension of these leaders professionally. Within the interviews, participants who were involved in committed relationships and had children were asked what impact raising their families in an environment where both they and their partner worked outside the home had on their professional roles. They often indicated that their spouses tended to have professional positions of similar stature and levels of responsibility, which often was played out in these women needing to either take on fewer projects or responsibilities at work, or enlisting the support of family, friends, and in some cases, paid professionals (whether live-in staff or out-of-home daycare facilities) to assist in the day-to-day balance between home and work tensions. One participant indicated that her husband worked an
alternate shift than her, thus allowing for seemingly more flexibility in his parenting; yet she often received little-to-no unsolicited assistance from him. In certain cases, his lack of unsolicited assistance meant she had to schedule business meetings around his schedule, in order to make certain that their children were not neglected. Anecdotally, onc participant continuously monitored her time during the interview because she had to “pick up the cupcakes for a birthday party.” Even participants whose husbands were “at-home,” either through retirement or choosing to consult on a limited basis, were still often responsible for taking an active role in the day-to-day household maintenance, and often required to coordinate and rearrange their own schedules to prevent their children from being “left at school” or “having both parents out of town.”

In terms of family support, one participant shared that,

“When my children were young, my sisters provided a lot of support. My sisters were here when both of my boys were born. When I would have to travel, I would buy them a plane ticket, they would meet me in New Orleans or wherever, and they would enjoy that time hanging out with my children.”

Another joked that she and her husband would be able to manage a dual-career life if “we had a concierge.” When pushed further, she elaborated:

“I’m not sure I’ve figured that out yet. If it’s two careers without children, that’s one thing. If it’s with children and also aging parents, that’s also another thing. So, it takes a lot of things, just having gotten a combination. It takes patience. So, we had a conference call this week. “Okay, where are you this week, what’s the schedule?” I see him every day but I can’t—just the time to sit down and say, “What’s going on? Who’s on first, who’s on second, what’s happening this week?” We started this Monday morning. When he would get to the office I’d say, “Let’s look at the calendar.” So, that would be kind of quiet people time that we could even say, “Okay, what’s going on?” So, really, the willingness to compromise and bend, and flexibility…. [F]lexibility in one’s schedule is the key. That’s perhaps in terms of what roles we have taken on because there was a point in time when I was on still on the deal
side before I was with the Foundation where a deal would drop at maybe 4:30 in the afternoon and, okay, you were going to be there till midnight or 1:00 in the morning trying to work up this deal. He had moved on to work for a private firm and we were both doing deals. It was crazy. Something had to give. So, right now, he doesn’t travel very much at all which is good, and I’m doing more traveling. I remember one week a couple of years ago when we were both going to be out of town. Okay, what do we do with these children? So, I think it’s really a balancing act in the compromise and patience. Don’t sweat the small stuff. A lot of stuff just doesn’t get done at home. You can’t do everything. You also have to have a network of friends or relatives, or whatever, who are able to support you and help out.”

Lastly, a participant whose children were married adults, reflected on their upbringing by sharing that:

“First of all, it’s lot of responsibility but you’re quite intentional about it so you do it without complaining every step of the way, but it’s a lot of work. You forget and you’re not aware of it at the time but it’s actually going by so fast. Both of our children were engaged in school activities or extracurricular activities so that’s a lot of tracking and carpooling. Then, they went off to college—that’s another stage—so you’re quite engaged. When you live apart from most of your family and other communities, you’re keeping in touch, too, with family—grandparents and sisters and brothers and that, because you want to stay connected to that family network. But we stuck to the basics—church, work, school, education, nurturing. We stuck to the basics pretty much.”

When looking at the rich philanthropic backgrounds these participants have, both in terms of their upbringing, and the various roles they maintain within the private sphere, surprisingly, they often commented about the struggle they faced merging their private and public worlds. Participants noted that they faced challenges as they tried to integrate their cultural and gender identities into their professional sphere. One participant shared, when asked if she felt limited integrating her cultural identity into her work, that,

“In a perfect world I would say (there is) no impact. But I think in the field of development in particular there are very few people of color. So on some subtle level I’m certain that there are always questions around ‘can this person raise money?’ ‘Can they lead a team that’s supposed to
be focused on development? ‘Can they interact, can I interact with people of different means and from different culture from which I might not be that acquainted?’ I think those are the subtle questions that (are) rarely overtly asked but play a role in how I have to work even harder to develop relationships in the professional advisory community and in the estate planning community where there are very few people of color, very few lawyers of color in estate planning locally. It probably plays a role in expectations of me, both how I respond to those perceived expectations and then expectations that others have for me. I’m sure that I probably overcompensate by working all those extra hours.”

Another participant noted,

“I think for women and for African-Americans in general in philanthropy there are a lot of barriers because the path to leadership is often based on relationships and whom we know. If you are not the person that has an opportunity to make your case and demonstrate that you have capacity to lead in this work because you are not a part of a particular group: that is a barrier.”

When asked to share if she had witnessed these barriers in her environment, she shared the experience of her male, African-American mentor:

“When he wanted to talk about men coming out of correctional facilities and he wanted to really focus on the violence in the community, some people on our board said, ‘Well, he’s only focusing on the black issues.’ Of course, they never said that about the white people who are running the foundation and who are putting all this money into things that aren’t saving anybody’s lives. I think you have to have a strong sense of yourself because that will be challenged”

When pressed on whether she, too, had had a similar experience, she shared that,

“I think from an ethical standpoint, we are more scrutinized and it’s not right. I don’t defend that it’s right but it is true. We have to have the highest of the ethics and how we do things. People are watching us in whole different ways.”

One participant decided to take a proactive approach to helping her staff overcome the challenges they had faced in previous professional settings:

“I think that I look to hire more women of color. My staff was for many years all women of color, Asian, Latina, African-Americans. I thought what wonderful representative of New York City. I think I have really valued the gifts and I try to value the gifts that women bring to the context.
I think I might more value a pastoral value than just a woman’s value or what I bring as a woman. I have really tried to nurture people’s gifts so that the job provides them with an opportunity to really fine tune, sharpen, flourish and grow. Sometimes women don’t know how fabulous they are. They just need somebody else to be like, ‘Girl, you are fabulous.’ They just need a chance. Even if they didn’t go to college for that, they just need a chance and some encouragement to show their stuff. So I think that I have really tried to bring the sensibility that women often don’t know all that they have to offer. They haven’t been affirmed. There has not been an open opportunity for them to use all of their gifts or to just be magnificent in what they’re doing and to be affirmed of that. I hope that I’ve tried to bring that.”

Additionally, in terms of the role of leadership positions in private sphere organizations influencing public sphere leadership opportunities, I looked to my own experiences. During my 5+ year tenure as a program officer, I maintained an active membership role in three civic organizations. Two of the organizations have historically had an exclusive African-American female membership, with a limited, but growing membership from women of other racialized ethnic groups. The third has historically had very limited representation of African-American and other racialized ethnic women. The three organizations combined have 200+ years of service, leadership, and philanthropic impact globally. While at the foundation, I was elected both vice president and president of the local chapter of one of the historically African-American civic organization, served on regional and national committees, including planning a banquet for attendees for one annual regional conference. I was also elected treasurer of the second historically African-American civic organization. Additionally, I was elected treasurer for the largest annual fundraiser for the historically white organization. With all these credentials, coupled with my academic and professional acumen, I was nevertheless told by my supervisor that, in order to be more effective in my role at the foundation, I should
“deepen my community connections.” When I shared the active memberships and leadership roles just outlined, I was met with nonchalance and a cool reception, as though these organizational affiliations mattered little in her mind as being able to provide key leadership opportunities or exposure to community partners. Upon further explanation that such organizations have historically been vehicles for women of all races to hone their leadership skills, thus incorporating what I had gleaned from the participant interviews and research for this study, I was again rebuffed. Therefore, rather than continuing to push the issue, I retreated from the conversation, yet continued to use the resources, both human and educational, afforded to me through active membership, including networking, international leadership conferences, and deepened facilitation skills, to expand my professional skill set.

Through the analysis of their shared stories, and juxtaposing those stories with my own, I was able to clearly see how both my subjects and I were having difficulty in our experiences bringing our culture with us. These problems become highly relevant to this issue when taken in context with how we understand both the relevance and important of this vital issue of sharing private sphere knowledge sharing in informal work place networks. This sharing, or rather, lack thereof, can often determine career advancement, due to the factor of racialized ethnicity as well as gender many if not most of my sample did not have the privilege of sharing since their culture was viewed to be irrelevant or marginal to the mission of the professional workplace.
Chapter Five: Conclusions and Recommendations

Using my background and the 2005 study by Hewlett et al. as backdrops, this study addressed whether the nonprofit sector, specifically foundations, foster an environment for its executives to retain and incorporate their cultural identity into their work life or, similar to the corporate sector, do these employees work toward keeping their personal affiliations, which often reflect racial and/or gender cultural identifiers hidden, in order to be successful professionally. More specifically, I determined there is an inability of foundation executive African-American women to incorporate areas of their broader personal life as cultural attributes into work setting networks, which impacts their ability to navigate work setting cultures and become understood in workplace cultures, their mobility, and their impact on the communities they represent. My research question, therefore, was to determine what were the possible consequences of African-American executive women in the foundation world not being able to share aspects of their cultural lives in workplace networks and the impact of such critical exclusion of who they really are as whole human beings on the quality of their careers.

Based upon interviews with ten African-American women who held leadership positions at private and community foundations in various locations across the continental United States, as well as the incorporation of my own experiences as a program officer at a private foundation in the southeastern United States, these women indicated that their activity in religious, civic, and social activities, particular their roles as leaders, was rarely utilized in their public space. In fact, participants often noted that they downplayed their activities in their private worlds, in order to avoid having to feel as though they should justify or explain how activity in these organizations would positively impact their work in their public sphere. By diminishing their success in their private
realm, which often served as the foundation for the development of their leadership and management skills, these women felt as though their knowledge, skills, and abilities were not being used fully, ironically doing a disservice to their public sphere work. Leading separate lives often led these women to feel disconnected from the true selves, creating an unnecessary separation. This separation damaged both aspects of their lives, as their public spaces, which often struggled to make connections in communities of color, failed to capitalize on the opportunity that was placed before them. Similarly, the organizations where these women served, which often wanted access to the financial and intellectual capital funding organizations could offer, were unable to fully use their connection.

In addition to this finding, several other key items of interest related critical success factors emerged. First, there was a strong indication of the impact of familial philanthropy during formative years. Participants expressed clear memories of members of their nuclear and extended families, along with other influential adults, as having been engaged in both traditional and nontraditional forms of giving and service to the community. These early examples ignited a lifelong commitment to giving and service in these women, which ultimately manifested in their chosen career paths, which culminated in positions at philanthropic organizations.

Second, there was a strong indication of the impact of religious or faith communities during both formative years and adult life. Participants indicated that the primary vehicle to express their philanthropic tendencies during their formative years was through the donations of time and money to institutions of faith. Additionally, the emphasis on generosity and assisting “the least of these” in traditional faith traditions
played a strong role to reinforce parental/influential adult memes around giving of time, talent, and treasure.

Lastly, for those participants who were parents and/or the primary caretakers of minor children, there was a strong indication of the importance of an outside support network (i.e., family, friends, and/or paid individuals) to success of women leaders.

When looking at the research collected in the context of the literature analyzed, this data helped to expand upon the body of literature associated with African-American women in leadership. The stories and experiences of participants as they struggle to integrate their whole selves into the work space offer an absent glimpse into the world of work of African-American women, who are increasingly assuming leadership roles in foundations. Providing evidence that their work suffers through the separation of public and private spheres will guide future leadership training programs, mentoring programs, and how the philanthropic sector can effectively recruit, retain, and promote highly skilled women of various racialized ethnic backgrounds.

Because of the limited sample size, along with the narrow focus on the size and type of foundations represented by the participants, there is likely to be limited opportunities to generalize the findings.

Further investigation and analysis is required in order to accurately determine the level of impact of these aforementioned influences. While this study did uncover several key indicators for success as a philanthropic leader, it did provide areas for further research. First, this sample size is too small to make the findings generalizable for the field, especially when compared with the total population of philanthropic leaders who are women and/or people of color. A larger sample size would be required before making
any of these findings generalizable. This increased recruitment could be handled either through the promotion of this study by participants to a greater extent or by utilizing the various networks within affinity groups that are comprised of members of the intended participants in order to expand the reach and scope of this study. As mentioned previously, part of the limitations around sample size is inherent in the “rarefied air” within which these women exist.

Additionally, individuals come from various aspects of the philanthropic sector (i.e., community foundations, corporate foundations, private foundations, and family foundations). In order to determine if these findings could be generalized, a larger sample size from each of these types of foundations should be gathered and analyzed. Inclusion of participants who serve as corporate social responsibility officers and/or heads of corporate foundations would also be beneficial, as it would determine what impact working at a blended-model organization could have on leadership expression.

All participants in this research were either “native born” African-Americans or second generation immigrant African-Americans. Growing up in the United States likely colored the perspective of participants as it relates to racial, gender, and ethnic identities, as well as their interactions with and perspectives about members of the “majority” community (however it would be defined in comparison to participants). Subsequent studies should, therefore, be more sensitive to the differences in ethnicity and national origin of African-American women participants in order to determine how those factors would influence leadership behavior and values manifestation. Thus, in order for the study to be more generalizable, subsequent participants who are first generation immigrants from countries of the African diaspora should be recruited. Additionally,
conducting interviews with men, white women, and women of other racialized ethnic groups, including immigrant women from various nations of the African Diaspora (i.e., Afro-Caribbean, Afro-European, and African) would provide wider samples to determine if the data collected could be generalizable.

Moreover, when this survey instrument was developed and the data collected, it was prior to the election of Barack H. Obama as the 44th President of the United States. This watershed election of the first person of African descent to a once non-integrated position has had a significant impact on perceptions of racial and ethnic identity globally. While there have been a noted rise in activity by supremacist groups, there has also been an opposite effect of increased comfort with, and a near fascination about African-Americans in general. Popular culture, scholarly research, and various forms of print, television, and social media have all devoted time, intellectual capacity, and interest in how African-Americans “live, move, and have their being.” More importantly, as First Lady of the United States, Michelle Obama has impacted the conversations related to how African-American women are perceived as leaders and the expectations of them as leaders. While the characterization of Mrs. Obama in the run up to the 2008 Presidential Election was filled with stereotypical depictions of her as the “Angry Black Woman,” by embracing both her role as “First Mom,” and Champion for military families, this perceived angry persona is often coupled with an admiration for her role as a not-so-silent, but powerful broker in the West Wing, and has begun to make headway in diminishing the perception that African-American women in leadership can use skills learned outside of the boardroom to succeed within the boardroom. Media representations about Mrs. Obama vary from an emphasis on her fashion choices to her impassioned
commitment to increasing exercise and healthy meal options for children. Yet, she is often criticized for the most mundane aspects of her life, including her choices to select non-designer clothing, her dedication to her physical fitness, even her facial expressions at official gatherings have garnered criticism from fans and critics alike. Her very presence, in what is being deemed a “post-racial” society has raised the consciousness of mainstream media, who use the image of Mrs. Obama to make sweeping generalizations about other African-American women. In recent years, there have been increased print and televised coverage about African-American women and marriage (or the lack thereof), leadership, parenting, career, fashion, hair, and fitness. This coverage often feels more like the perpetuation of African-American as “other,” rather than true lines of scholarly inquiry. Therefore, it would be beneficial to re-interview participants to determine if their perceived roles have been impacted by the election of President Obama in this purported “post-racial” world.

The journey that was this research, from concept through execution to analysis, has been an opportunity to discover what are key indicators and factors that impact success for African-American women who work and lead philanthropic organizations in the U.S. While it started out as an academic interest, through my own experiences and moments of self-discovery and awareness, it became the living embodiment of what it means for African-American women to survive and thrive, in spite of their “double jeopardy” status, carrying the mantle of non-dominant racialized identity and gender in an often European-descendant male-dominated environment. The key takeaway from this research, as reflected in the title of this study, The Dilemmas of Bringing Your Culture With You: The Career Advancement Challenges of African-American Women
Foundation Executives was that in order to feel as though there is both personal and public success in all aspects of their lives, African-American women must find opportunities to face and circumvent the challenges they face bringing their whole selves to the table. In other words, to paraphrase text from a hymn I learned as a child, these women, present company included, must “let their little lights shine,” and not hide key knowledge, skills, and abilities acquired in their private spaces from their public spheres. By not bringing in their own cultures, these women do a disservice to their employers, the organizations where they serve, the field of philanthropy, and most importantly, themselves.
Appendix A: Interview Protocol

Part I: Early Life Experiences
1. Where did you live primarily as a child? How often did you and your family move?
2. How many children were in your family? Where were you in the birth order? How would you characterize your parents’ expectations of you and your siblings?
3. What was your socio-economic status as a child?
4. Who were the significant people in your life as a child? (This can include immediate and extended family, friends, individuals in the community, and anyone else you particularly remember.)
5. What was your neighborhood like? What was its racial, ethnic, and class mix?
6. As a child, how did you first become aware that you were a member of an ethnic group? [As a child, how did you first become aware that you were female?]
7. Were you taught special values about being a member of a particular ethnic group? What were the values? How were you taught them? [Were you taught special values about being female? What were the values? How were you taught them?]
8. Did your parents talk about race? If so, how? About issues of being a person of color? Did they ever talk about your role as a person of color as you grew older? [How did your parents talk about gender? About issues of being a woman? Did they ever talk about your role as a woman as you grew older?]
9. Did you ever witness your parents or other significant adults engage in “philanthropic activities?” (i.e., giving to the church, supporting the NAACP/Urban League, providing food/shelter/clothing/transportation to extended family members, collecting of food/toys/money for others)
10. Were you encouraged to participate in “philanthropic activities?” (i.e., giving to the church, supporting the NAACP/Urban League, providing food/shelter/clothing/transportation to extended family members, collecting of food/toys/money for others)
11. What role, if any, did your faith tradition play in your household?
12. What was your parents’ educational level?
School Experiences
1. What type of elementary school did you attend? What was the racial composition of the school? How were you treated in school?
2. Were you treated in any special ways because of your race [ethnicity] while in elementary school?
3. Were you treated in any special ways because of your gender while in elementary school?
4. In high school, what was the racial composition?
5. What activities did you participate in while in high school?
6. What supports were there for you in high school? What obstacles? Were any of the obstacles due to your race [ethnicity; gender]? How did they affect you? Were any of the supports due to your race [ethnicity; gender]? How did they affect you?
7. While you were in high school did you think about going to college? Did you think a lot about your future? Do you remember having any career plans? Describe them.
8. Did your teachers and counselors encourage you to plan for a career?
9. What was your ideal vision of being an adult? What were you taught to aspire to? Who taught you? How were you taught?
10. While you were growing up, what historical events stand out in your mind?

College and Graduate School
1. What factors were important in your choosing a college? What major did you choose? Why?
2. If you attended college, where did you go? Who were the important people and influences in your decision to attend college?
3. Was it a predominantly black or white setting? How did this impact your experiences in college?
4. Who were your friends in college?
5. What co-curricular activities did you participate in?
6. Did you go to graduate school? What led you to choose graduate school?

Part II: Early Adult Experiences
1. How did your career and life plans evolve from your early life influences, such as your family and school experiences?
2. At what point in your life did you decide on your career goals? How have your career goals changed? Why?
3. What expectations did you have for your life when you were twenty years old—personally, socially, and for your career?
4. What other factors contributed to your career selection?

Public World
1. Can you tell me about your current job? What's the nature of your work?
2. What is a typical work week like for you? How many hours do you work on average? How often do you work on weekends? How often do you travel out of town for your job?
3. What was your first "quantum leap"—movement to a job with significantly more responsibility, challenge, and pressure than prior jobs?
4. What do you see as critical turning points in your career? Why?
5. What's the biggest job challenge you have ever faced?
6. What kinds of personal sacrifices have you had to make to get where you are today?
7. How has your organization helped in your achieving success? What other support would you have liked?
8. We sometimes invest in developmental activities that we hope will pay off. Have you done so? Which of these activities have proven to be particularly valuable? (Probe: Education? Courses? Workshops?) Which of these was a waste of time?
9. How have you changed significantly as a person over the course of your career? What changes do you like? Which changes don’t you like?
10. How would you assess your career at this point? Are you behind, ahead, or about where you expected to be in your career?
11. Where do you see your career moving? What’s next for you?

General Sector Questions
1. Do you think the road to the top is different across racial and gender lines (i.e., black men, white men, black women, white women, other people of color)?
2. Do you believe certain sub-sectors are more likely to produce top executives of color? Which ones and why?
3. Are there certain jobs or skills you see as critically important in seasoning top managers of color [women managers] on the way up?

4. Do you see any differences between styles by people of color, especially the women? What are they? (Can you give me an example of that?) When are you most likely to be aware of those differences? Can you tell me a story that illustrates those differences?

5. Some organizations have recently developed programs and policies to help their employees with their family lives. What one change would improve both the quality of your home life and your productivity at work? In what specific ways would this change improve your personal life? Your productivity at work?

6. What impact has your race/gender had on your work at your organization?

7. What impact do you think increased numbers of women/people of color will have on the sector?

8. What are the knowledge/skills/abilities necessary for succeeding generations of philanthropic leaders, especially women and people of color? Are these different from or the same as for whites/men?

**Relationships with Others**

1. As a person of color, how have you experienced discrimination in your organization? Tell me a bit about those experiences. How did you respond when you became aware of the discrimination? What about sex discrimination? (As a woman, have you experienced sex discrimination in your organization? Tell me a bit about those experiences. How did you respond when you became aware of the discrimination? What about sexual harassment?)

2. How important to you is it that you develop close relationships with other people of color [women] at your organization?

3. Are there whites [men] at your organization that you turn to for support—either emotional or task-related? In what situations would you turn to a white person [man] in your organization for support? Can you tell me about one of those times?

4. Do you have a professional coach or mentor? What is your mentor's gender and race? Is there more than one? Do you go to difference ones for different reasons?
How long have you had these relationships? How did the relationship begin? Tell me a little more about these relationships (i.e., How often are you in contact? How have these relationships changed over time?)

5. Would you say that you are particularly close to any of the white [male] colleagues at your organization? Tell me about this relationship. In what ways are you close? How did this relationship develop? Do you ever discuss your cultural [gender] differences? Has race [gender] ever been an issue in the relationship? How has the relationship changed over time?

6. Are there white [male] colleagues that you find you have conflicts with? Can you tell me about a time when you were particularly troubled by a conflict with a white [male] colleague? (Probe: How did you handle the situation? Do you think race was an issue?)

Private World
(Note: Questions used vary according to participants’ marital and parental status.) Now, I’d like you to respond to some questions concerning your private world: those life dimensions that reflect significant relationships, family, leisure activities, and support groups.)

1. Let’s talk about how you spend your time away from your job. What life dimensions other than work are important to you? Are there specific things you do away from your job that really make you happy?

2. What are the demands, constraints, and choices for you in your personal life? Of the ones you’ve identified, which ones have a direct impact on your career? Are there things that make you crazy?

3. Are you currently involved in an intimate (committed or marriage) relationship?

4. How many years have you and your partner been together? How did you meet? What attracted you to your partner? How has the relationship evolved?

5. What kind of work does your significant other do? Do the two of you spend time talking about your jobs? What kind of things do you talk about? Have you ever shared your career dreams with each other?

6. How do you and your significant other spend your leisure time together?
7. What does it take to manage a two-career family? How do you organize your schedule to balance your personal life with your personal life?

8. In what ways do family responsibilities affect your work life, such as your ability to accept promotions, spend informal time with your colleagues, or simply being able to concentrate on your job?

9. If it seems that there is tension between your career and your home life, how do you handle it? Can you tell me a story about a situation in which you chose your career over your family? Could you tell me a story about a situation in which you chose family over career?

10. Tell me about the community where you live: What are its distinctive characteristics? Is the community racially integrated? How long have you lived in the community?

11. If you have children, what are their ages, starting with the oldest child?

12. What arrangements do you have with your husband/wife/partner concerning household chores, household decisions, and child care? Do you feel your partner is supportive? Are there special concerns related to child care? Please give me some examples.

13. What does it mean to be a professional raising a child/children? How does your race influence the way you raise your children?

14. I am particularly interested in learning how your family and friends provide you support. In what kinds of situations do they support you? How do they communicate their support? What kinds of support do they provide?

15. Are you associated with other nonprofit or philanthropic organizations? If so, which ones? How long have you been a member of these organizations? Do you have any leadership roles with these groups?

16. Are you associated with a faith community? How often do you attend? Are you involved in any auxiliaries within in that community?

17. Do you have a fantasy of how your personal life will be five years from now? Create a verbal photograph of this fantasy in terms of significant relationships, things you believe in, dimensions that will be important in your life.
Closing
How have you been feeling about the many things we talked about today? What’s been the easiest to talk about? What’s been the hardest? Has anything you said felt like a real surprise to you? Anything you feel you’d like to restate or rediscuss? Any final thoughts before we wrap up? Any final questions before we say good-bye?

Thank you for the opportunity you’ve given me to learn from your life experience. I appreciate your honesty and will respect your privacy about your experiences accordingly.
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