

---

# KEY EVENTS AND LESSONS FOR MANAGERS IN A DIVERSE WORKFORCE

A REPORT ON RESEARCH AND FINDINGS

---

Christina A. Douglas

---

A Center for Creative Leadership Report

KEY EVENTS  
AND LESSONS FOR  
MANAGERS IN A  
DIVERSE WORKFORCE  
A REPORT ON RESEARCH AND FINDINGS



KEY EVENTS  
AND LESSONS FOR  
MANAGERS IN A  
DIVERSE WORKFORCE  
A REPORT ON RESEARCH AND FINDINGS

Christina A. Douglas

Center for Creative Leadership  
Greensboro, North Carolina

The Center for Creative Leadership is an international, nonprofit educational institution founded in 1970 to advance the understanding, practice, and development of leadership for the benefit of society worldwide. As a part of this mission, it publishes books and reports that aim to contribute to a general process of inquiry and understanding in which ideas related to leadership are raised, exchanged, and evaluated. The ideas presented in its publications are those of the author or authors.

The Center thanks you for supporting its work through the purchase of this volume. If you have comments, suggestions, or questions about any CCL Press publication, please contact the Director of Publications at the address given below.

Center for Creative Leadership  
Post Office Box 26300  
Greensboro, North Carolina 27438-6300  
Telephone 336 288 7210 • www.ccl.org



**Center for  
Creative Leadership**

leadership. learning. life.

©2003 Center for Creative Leadership

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher. Printed in the United States of America.

CCL No. 186

Director of Publications: Martin Wilcox; Manager, Publication Development: Peter Scisco; Copy Editor: Deborah G. Shoffner; Design and Layout: Joanne Ferguson; Editorial Assistant: Marianne Moorhead

### **Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

Douglas, Christina A.

Key events and lessons for managers in a diverse workforce : a report on research and findings /  
Christina A. Douglas.

p. cm.

ISBN 1-882197-79-8

1. Executives—Training of—United States. 2. Minority executives—United States. 3. African American executives. 4. Women executives—United States. 5. Executive ability—United States. 6. Diversity in the workplace—United States. 7. Industrial management—Research—United States. I. Center for Creative Leadership. II. Title.

HD30.42.U5D68 2003

658.4'07124'08996073—dc21

2003055058

---

## Table of Contents

<b>List of Tables</b> .....	vii
<b>Preface</b> .....	ix
<b>Introduction</b> .....	1
<b>Methods</b> .....	1
Data Collection .....	3
Coding .....	4
Reliability Analysis .....	5
<b>Results</b> .....	5
Analysis of Lessons .....	8
<b>Discussion</b> .....	8
Key Events .....	9
Lessons .....	10
Limitations and Implications .....	11
<b>Suggested Readings</b> .....	12
<b>Appendix A: Key Events Categories</b> .....	13
<b>Appendix B: Lesson Categories</b> .....	19
<b>Appendix C: Analysis of Events Tables</b> .....	23
<b>Appendix D: Analysis of Lessons Tables</b> .....	33



---

## List of Tables

Table 1	Sample demographics in terms of race and gender .....	2
Table 2	Means and standard deviations for years of education and age .....	2
Table 3	Means and standard deviations for age by race and gender .....	2
Table 4	Means and standard deviations for years of education by race and gender .....	2
Table 5	Organizational level by race .....	3
Table 6	Organizational level by gender .....	3
Table 7	Reliabilities for key events .....	6
Table 8	Reliabilities for lessons .....	7
Table 9	Frequencies for all events, and a breakdown by race .....	23
Table 10	Frequencies for all events, and a breakdown by gender .....	24
Table 11	Frequencies for all events, and a breakdown by gender within race .....	25
Table 12	Chi-square analyses (events by race) .....	26
Table 13	Chi-square analyses (events by gender) .....	27
Table 14	Chi-square analyses (white female managers versus white male managers) .....	28
Table 15	Chi-square analyses (African American female managers versus African American male managers) .....	29
Table 16	Chi-square analyses (African American male managers versus white male managers) ....	30
Table 17	Chi-square analyses (African American female managers versus white female managers) .....	31
Table 18	Frequencies for lessons by race .....	33
Table 19	Frequencies for lessons by gender .....	34
Table 20	Chi-square analyses (lessons by race) .....	35
Table 21	Chi-square analyses (lessons by gender) .....	36
Table 22	Frequencies of lessons within <i>start from scratch</i> event .....	37
Table 23	Frequencies of lessons within <i>fix-it/turnaround</i> event .....	38
Table 24	Frequencies of lessons within <i>project/task force</i> event .....	39
Table 25	Frequencies of lessons within <i>change in scope</i> event .....	40
Table 26	Frequencies of lessons within <i>line-to-staff switch</i> event .....	41
Table 27	Frequencies of lessons within <i>breaking a rut</i> event .....	42
Table 28	Frequencies of lessons within <i>business mistake</i> event .....	43
Table 29	Frequencies of lessons within <i>lousy job/missed promotion</i> event .....	44
Table 30	Frequencies of lessons within <i>problems with subordinates</i> event .....	45
Table 31	Frequencies of lessons within <i>personal trauma</i> event .....	46
Table 32	Frequencies of lessons within <i>race mattered</i> event .....	47
Table 33	Frequencies of lessons within <i>downsizing</i> event .....	48
Table 34	Frequencies of lessons within <i>role models</i> event .....	49
Table 35	Frequencies of lessons within <i>values played out</i> event .....	50



Table 36	Frequencies of lessons within <i>mentors</i> event .....	51
Table 37	Frequencies of lessons within <i>peers</i> event .....	52
Table 38	Frequencies of lessons within <i>coursework</i> event .....	53
Table 39	Frequencies of lessons within <i>early work experience</i> event .....	54
Table 40	Frequencies of lessons within <i>first supervision</i> event .....	55
Table 41	Frequencies of lessons within <i>purely personal</i> event .....	56
Table 42	Frequencies of lessons within <i>feedback</i> event .....	57
Table 43	Frequencies of lessons within <i>business success</i> event .....	58

## Preface

A landmark study completed in the early 1980s at the Center for Creative Leadership (CCL®) did much to highlight the importance of on-the-job experiences in developing effective leaders. In the Key Events in Executives' Lives study, 191 successful executives (executives considered by their respective organizations to possess high potential or to have lived up to their potential) described the important events that had led to a lasting change in themselves as managers. In addition, they also described what they had learned from each of these key events. The results of the study (Lindsey, Homes, & McCall, 1987) indicated that managers reported learning from various types of events including developmental assignments, hardships, other people, and other types of events (coursework, for example, or early work experience).

Based on the findings of the study, the authors concluded that certain types of on-the-job experiences such as training, mentoring, career planning programs, and job rotations have a far greater impact on developing managerial talent than other strategies typically used by organizations (McCall, Lombardo, & Morrison, 1988). That conclusion had a major impact on research and applications at CCL and further influenced the field of management development in terms of practice, theory, and research.

As important as this study was and continues to be, it does not account for the dramatic shift in demographics reflected in executive ranks in the United States. The participants in the original Key Events study were, almost exclusively, white men (a reflection of early 1980s' demographics, when white men comprised the majority of the executive workforce). Responding to that homogeneous sample, and with the goal of understanding the key experiences of women, Morrison, White, and Van Velsor (1987) replicated the Key Events study with a small sample of 26 female executives. That study indicated similarities between the key experiences reported by these women and by the sample from the original Key Events study. It also pointed out that women faced additional barriers (prejudice and differential treatment, for example).

Another response was to examine the key events in the lives of African American executives, male and female, and to set those experiences alongside the experiences reported in the original Key Events research. The results of that effort are documented in this report.

I am grateful to several people who helped me with this report. First, I would like to thank Martha Hughes-James who initiated this project in 1996 and who has provided assistance and information in the writing of this report. I am also indebted to Marian Ruderman for her ongoing assistance, support, and feedback. Thanks also go to the reviewers of this manuscript: Ancella Livers, Ellen Van Velsor, and Donna Chrobot-Mason. Finally, I want to thank Pete Scisco for his editorial direction in creating a suitable presentation for these findings.



## Introduction

The survival of an organization often depends on its developing effective leaders. Certainly, formal types of management development efforts (training programs, for example) play an important role in leadership development. But job experiences and assignments are also crucial to managerial development and career success (McCauley & Brutus, 1998). Because the workplace environment continues to change (more global competition, downsizing, decentralization, and technological innovations, for example), it's plausible that the experiences that managers see as key to their own leadership development are also changing. This seems especially likely given the fact that about 45 percent of all net additions to the labor force in the 1990s were nonwhite employees and almost two-thirds were female (Cox, 1994). Although there aren't exact figures on the size of the pool of potential executives, it's safe to assume that this pool has grown much more diverse.

The research project documented in this report builds on and extends CCL's earlier work in this area (McCall et al., 1988) and has its own goals. It is designed to answer the following questions:

1. What are the significant events from which African American managers learn and develop?
2. Are the key events and lessons learned different for African American managers than for white managers?
3. Are there new experiences or lessons reported since the original 1980s work?

In replicating the earlier research using a sample derived from a more diverse workforce, this project aims to assist scholars and organizational leaders responsible for managerial development to better understand the experiences and lessons that managers in underrepresented groups see as key to their own leadership development. It also aims to help determine if there are new or additional key events and lessons that were not reported in the earlier research. Additionally, it explores the effect that a manager's race or ethnicity has on career experience and how a manager might develop as a result of those experiences.

## Methods

This study included 288 managers. They were selected from three types of groups: managers who were participating in a CCL public program (Leadership Development Program (LDP)<sup>®</sup> or The African-American Leadership Program), managers who were participating in a CCL custom training program, and managers from a single organization who did not participate in a CCL training program. The final sample, illustrated in Table 1, included 160 whites (121 males, 39 females) and 128 African Americans (81 males, 47 females).

Table 1  
**Sample demographics in terms of race and gender (N = 288)**

	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>
African American	47 (16.3% of sample)	81 (28.1% of sample)
White	39 (13.5% of sample)	121 (42% of sample)

The age of the participants ranged from 28 to 59. The years of education reported by the participants ranged from 6 to 25 years. Table 2 shows the means and standard deviations for years of education and age. Table 3 shows the means and standard deviations for age by race and gender. Table 4 shows the means and standard deviations for years of education by race and gender.

Table 2  
**Means and standard deviations for years of education and age**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
Number of years of education	17.32	1.89
Age	43.79	6.75

Table 3  
**Means and standard deviations for age by race and gender**

	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>
African American	42.47 (6.19) <i>n</i> = 39	43.29 (6.56) <i>n</i> = 76
White	39.51 (6.16) <i>n</i> = 37	45.86 (6.49) <i>n</i> = 118

Table 4  
**Means and standard deviations for years of education by race and gender**

	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>
African American	16.97 (1.69) <i>n</i> = 39	17.38 (1.88) <i>n</i> = 76
White	17.57 (1.64) <i>n</i> = 37	18.02 (7.79) <i>n</i> = 118

Participants were asked to report their current organizational level. Table 5 shows the frequency breakdowns for organizational level by race (excluded were hourly employees, first-level managers, and top-level managers). Table 6 shows the frequency breakdowns for organizational level by gender. It is important to note that most of the participants were mid- to upper-level managers (the original Key Events study focused mostly on upper-level managers).

Table 5  
**Organizational level by race**

	<b>African American</b>	<b>White</b>
Middle management	49	51
Upper-middle management	20	32
Executive level	20	32

Table 6  
**Organizational level by gender**

	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>
Middle management	32	68
Upper-middle management	26	90
Executive level	18	34

### **Data Collection**

Participants were asked to complete a survey that was included in their preprogram packet and identify three career-related key events that made a difference in how they manage. As a way of providing structure for reporting these events, the participants were asked two questions: (1) What happened? and (2) What did you learn from it? Participants reported 813 key events.

The study methodology replicated the earlier work of McCall et al. (1988), which described key developmental opportunities in a sample of 191 white male managers. In addition to the survey, participants were also asked to provide demographic information (race, gender, age, years of education, degrees awarded, organizational level, function, type of organization, number of employees, and compensation).

## **Coding**

A multiracial, cross-gender team coded the key events and lessons. The demographic makeup of the team was designed to mirror the sample population. (Although the team's composition changed during the coding process, it always included at least one African American female, one African American male, one white female, and one white male.) The coding was completed in two stages: first, all surveys were typed and key events were excerpted for content coding; second, all of the lessons were excerpted for content coding.

**Key events coding.** A content coding scheme established and validated in two previous studies (Lindsey et al., 1987; Van Velsor & Hughes, 1990) was used to analyze the reported events. In the coding scheme, there were four superordinate categories of events, including challenging assignments, hardships, events dealing with other people, and miscellaneous events. Within each superordinate category, between four and six subcategories were identified, resulting in 16 distinct categories. In addition to the 16 original categories, 6 new categories emerged during coding. The result was a 22-category coding scheme.

Each event was independently coded by at least two team members (of different genders and race) using the described coding scheme. After coding each event independently, the coders compared ratings and came to a consensus on a single rating for each event. (A listing of the event categories and their definitions is included in Appendix A.)

The team coded 813 events. Sixty-one events were dropped from further analyses because they were unclear, lacked key information, or did not appear to be an event. Finally, 752 events were divided among the 22 key event categories.

**Lessons coding.** The coding of the lessons took place in two separate phases and used two different coding schemes. First, a smaller sample of the data using the 34-category coding scheme from the original Key Events study (Lindsey et al., 1987) was coded. In an attempt to maximize the usefulness of the data and to ensure that the smaller sample included a broad range of lessons, a sampling strategy was developed and implemented. Based on this sampling strategy, 535 lessons were selected for inclusion in the smaller sample. The methodology and results of this content validation study can be found in a separate report (Douglas, 1999).

A second coding of the lessons data using a simplified 13-category coding scheme derived from the original was also completed. The original coding scheme from the Key Events study used 34 categories. The addition of 10 categories based on the data in this study proved too cumbersome to be practical. It was difficult for the coders to reach agreement, and their concern about the reliability of the large coding scheme led to a coding scheme with fewer categories. In this approach, three superordinate categories (lessons about managing oneself and one's career, lessons about managing relationships with others, and lessons about managing the work) were developed. Within each superordinate category, between three and six subcategories were identified, resulting in 13 distinct categories.

Each lesson was coded by at least four individuals, who discussed discrepancies to reach agreement regarding the appropriate code assignment. Agreement was determined by these rules: At least four team members were required to code each lesson, and agreement was reached when

at least 75 percent (three out of four, or five out of six) of the coders agreed to assign a single code to a particular lesson. A listing of the lesson categories and their definitions are included in Appendix B.

The team coded 1,412 lessons. The team dropped 130 lessons from further analyses because they were unclear, lacked key information, or did not appear to be a lesson. A total of 1,282 lessons were included in the analyses.

### **Reliability Analysis**

Separate reliability analyses were completed for the events coding and for the lessons coding. The team selected 193 events using a random sampling strategy. Two CCL staff members (a white female and an African American male) who were independent of the group involved in the initial coding of the data comprised the coding team for the reliability study. Both individuals independently coded events and then discussed discrepancies to reach agreement.

The final output for the events reliability analyses was a single set of codes. This set was compared with the original codes from the larger sample in this study in order to determine agreement across the two sets of codes. The overall agreement between the two sets of codes (the original coding group and the second group) was 0.886. Within categories, agreement ranged from 0.60 to 1.00. (See Table 7 on page 6.)

The team randomly selected 147 lessons (11.5% of the total) from the total sample using a random sampling strategy. The coding team for the lesson reliability study was comprised of a white female and an African American male who were independent of CCL. Both individuals independently coded the lessons and then met to discuss disagreements and reach a consensus.

The final output was a single set of codes. This set was compared with the original codes in order to determine agreement across the two sets of codes. The overall agreement between the two sets of codes was 0.789. Within categories, agreement ranged from 0.69 to 1.00. (See Table 8 on page 7.)

## **Results**

A total of 752 events were coded as belonging to one of the 22 event categories. Frequencies were computed to determine which categories were most prevalent in the data and to examine prevalence with respect to race. Table 9 in Appendix C displays the results of the frequency analyses for the overall sample and also breaks down the frequencies according to race. For the overall sample, hardships were the most frequently cited experiences, followed by challenging assignments and events focusing on other people. See Table 10 in Appendix C for frequency breakdowns by gender and Table 11 in Appendix C for frequency breakdowns by gender within race.

Pearson chi-square analyses were employed to compare the difference in frequency of reported key events for African American managers versus white managers. As presented in



Table 7  
**Reliabilities for key events**

---

Overall agreement = 171/193 = 0.886  
 Agreement within categories (at least five events in each category)

Category	Agreement
Start from scratch	5/5 = 1.00
Fix-it/turnaround	8/9 = 0.89
Project/task force	12/13 = 0.92
Change in scope	17/19 = 0.89
Line-to-staff switch	4/5 = 0.80
Breaking a rut	7/8 = 0.88
Business mistake	13/17 = 0.76
Lousy job/missed promotion	8/9 = 0.89
Problems with subordinates	13/13 = 1.00
Personal trauma	5/5 = 1.00
Race mattered	8/8 = 1.00
Downsizing	5/5 = 1.00
Role models	10/12 = 0.83
Values played out	7/10 = 0.70
Mentors	9/9 = 1.00
Peers	5/5 = 1.00
Coursework	8/8 = 1.00
Early work experience	4/5 = 0.80
First supervision	4/5 = 0.80
Purely personal	4/5 = 0.80
Feedback	12/13 = 0.92
Business success	3/5 = 0.60

---

Table 12 (Appendix C), white managers proportionally identified more challenging assignments than African American managers ( $\chi^2 = 4.2$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p < .05$ ). In addition, African American managers proportionally identified more hardships than white managers ( $\chi^2 = 5.6$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Pearson chi-square analyses were also employed to compare the reported key events of male managers and female managers, which are reported in Table 13 (Appendix C). It appeared that female managers proportionally identified fewer challenging assignments than did male managers ( $\chi^2 = 24.4$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p < .01$ ). In addition, female managers proportionally identified more events that relate to other people than did male managers ( $\chi^2 = 12.2$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p < .01$ ).

Pearson chi-square analyses were also employed to compare the reported key events of the subgroups (African American males, African American females, white males, and white females).

Table 8  
**Reliabilities for lessons**

---

Overall agreement = 116/193 = 0.789  
Agreement within categories (at least five events in each category)

Category	Agreement
Learning about oneself	13/14 = 0.93
Management values and guiding principles	11/16 = 0.69
Managing one's career	12/15 = 0.80
Managing direct reports	29/34 = 0.85
Managing upwards	4/5 = 0.80
Managing laterally	6/8 = 0.75
Effects of racial identity	6/6 = 1.00
Valuing diversity	4/5 = 0.80
Understanding organizational politics and organizational culture	5/5 = 1.00
Developing task and managerial skills	12/17 = 0.71
Managing divergent pressures	5/6 = 0.83
Managing change	5/7 = 0.71
Cynicism	9/9 = 1.00

---

For white managers (Table 14 in Appendix C), females proportionally identified fewer challenging assignments than did male managers ( $\chi^2 = 24.4$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and proportionally identified more events that relate to other people than did male managers ( $\chi^2 = 12.2$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p < .01$ ). A slightly different pattern emerged when the responses of African American male managers and African American female managers were compared (Table 15 in Appendix C). African American male managers proportionally identified more events that relate to challenging assignments than did African American female managers ( $\chi^2 = 5.8$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p < .05$ ). However, no significant differences were noted for events relating to other people.

The reported events of white males were compared to the events reported by African American males (Table 16 in Appendix C). White male managers proportionally identified more events that relate to challenging assignments than African American male managers ( $\chi^2 = 4.00$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p < .05$ ). The reported events of white females were compared to the events reported by African American females (Table 17 in Appendix C). It was found that white females proportionally identified fewer hardships than African American female managers ( $\chi^2 = 4.8$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p < .05$ ) and proportionally reported more events that relate to other people ( $\chi^2 = 8.8$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p < .01$ ).

### Analysis of Lessons

A total of 1,282 lessons were coded as belonging to one of the 13 lesson categories. For the overall sample, frequencies were computed to examine what categories were most prevalent in the data and to examine the prevalence as related to race (Table 18 in Appendix D). Lessons about managing relationships were most commonly reported, followed by lessons about managing oneself. Table 19 in Appendix D presents the frequency breakdowns by gender.

Pearson chi-square analyses were employed to compare the reported lessons of African American managers versus white managers. White managers proportionally identified more lessons related to managing the work than African American managers ( $\chi^2 = 15.4$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p < .01$ ). When looking at the individual lessons, it appeared that African American managers proportionally reported more lessons related to racial identity and fewer lessons related to managing reports, developing skills, divergent pressures, and cynicism (Table 20 in Appendix D). Chi-square analyses were also employed to compare the reported lessons of female managers and male managers (Table 21 in Appendix D). It appeared that male managers identified proportionally more lessons about managing the work than female managers ( $\chi^2 = 7.1$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p < .01$ ).

Frequencies were computed for the lessons within each of the 22 key event categories and presented separately (see Tables 22–43 in Appendix D).

### Discussion

The purpose of this study is to explore the self-reported managerial experiences of a diverse group of individuals in order to better understand (1) the experiences that managers see as key to their own leadership development and (2) the lessons they have learned from these experiences. This exploration can help determine if there have been changes in the types of experiences reported by managers since the original Key Events in Executives' Lives study was completed by CCL in the early 1980s. It appears that there is overlap between the events reported earlier and the events reported in this study, but there are also some differences.

Six new event categories have emerged since the original Key Events study: *race mattered*, *downsizing*, *mentors*, *peers*, *feedback*, and *business success*. Managers who described events relating to *downsizing* typically relayed the personal trauma and organizational trauma that resulted. Events in the *race mattered* category typically described hardships and obstacles managers encountered and attributed to race. *Mentors* events and *peers* events described the impact of important relationships in the careers of the managers. *Feedback* events (that is, managers reporting that they received or gave job-related feedback) were also seen for the first time in the current sample. Finally, a new category, *business success*, emerged from the current data and accounted for 4.3 percent of the total events. The events in this new category included job challenges and organizational issues that were overcome due to a manager's actions and were seen as successful outcomes. Together, the six new categories accounted for 23.7 percent of all of the events reported by the current sample.

The study also compares the experiences of subgroups in the sample based on race and gender. Further, this study explores the differences in reporting patterns for African American and white managers and the differences in reporting patterns for women and men. The reports of key events and lessons are different for various subgroups, providing evidence that there are important differences in the types of experiences reported by African American managers and white managers.

### **Key Events**

Surprisingly, business mistakes (a type of hardship) is the most frequently reported experience, followed by changes in scope (a type of challenging assignment). Together, these two categories make up almost one-fourth of the entire sample of reported key experiences. When comparing the four superordinate categories (challenging assignments, hardships, other people, and other events), hardships are the most frequently reported type of experience, followed by challenging assignments. These results provide strong evidence that hardships and obstacles, while painful, can provide key developmental experiences from which managers can learn and grow. Managers do not seek out, nor do they want to repeat, experiences like business mistakes, lousy jobs, problems with subordinates, personal trauma, downsizing, and those that give rise to race-related obstacles. However, these experiences apparently can lead to positive results in terms of a manager's professional growth. Managers learn from challenging assignments and from other people, but they also learn from career difficulties.

In comparing the key experiences of African American managers and white managers, the results provide evidence that there are meaningful differences in the types of experiences reported by these two subgroups. The results suggest that the key events cited by African American managers and white managers are significantly different and lend support to the idea that African American managers experience more hardships and fewer challenging tasks than white managers experience. For example, African American managers proportionally identified more hardships, including trauma and race-related obstacles, than did white managers. On the other hand, white managers proportionally reported more challenging assignments, including start-from-scratch assignments, fix-it assignments, and serving on or leading project teams and/or task forces.

These differences in reported results suggest two alternative interpretations. One, the results might indicate that African American managers actually experience fewer developmental job assignments. Two, it is possible that African American managers do not see developmental assignments as opportunities through which important career lessons are learned. Based on the content of the key experiences reports, it appears that discrimination related to job assignments is the more likely explanation. In the descriptions of the key experiences, African American managers repeatedly expressed frustration with the race-related obstacles that were put before them and the lack of opportunities that were offered to them. These descriptions indicate that while African American managers believe that challenging assignments are important developmental experiences, these same managers are offered fewer challenging assignments and endure more hardships than their white counterparts. Findings may indicate a kind of catch-22 for African Ameri-

can managers. In order to get promoted, research suggests that a manager needs to be exposed to developmental job assignments in order to prepare for the next level. To the extent that African Americans are exposed to fewer developmental assignments than white males, they may be less prepared for advancement. Organizations may perceive African Americans as less prepared for advancement because of organizational policies or practices that limit their developmental opportunities.

Another finding that became salient when comparing the reports of African American and white managers was related to mentoring experiences. Previous research suggests that African Americans develop fewer mentoring relationships than whites (Cox & Nkomo, 1991; Thomas, 1990). Contrary to those findings, African American managers in this study reported significantly more mentoring experiences than their white counterparts. In light of the hardships and obstacles that African American managers may face in the workplace, developing a relationship with a mentor provides needed support and sponsorship in a difficult environment. Therefore, mentoring relationships may be seen by them as critical to their success. In contrast, white managers see these same kinds of experiences as less critical for their success, which might explain why they were reported less frequently.

Comparing the experiences of female managers and male managers suggested that female managers experience fewer challenging assignments than male managers. Another significant difference in the reporting patterns for male and female managers is that female managers report significantly more experiences involving role models than do male managers, but that doesn't overlap or translate to other categories involving relationships (mentors and peers, for example).

## **Lessons**

Managers participating in this study report 13 different types of lessons learned from key events. For the most part, these lessons relate to managing themselves, managing relationships, and managing the work. Almost half of the lessons reported are about managing relationships (managing direct reports, managing upwards, managing laterally, managing the effects of racial identity, valuing diversity, and managing organizational politics). More than half of the lessons related to managing relationships focus specifically on managing direct reports. It appears that many of the managers recall having learned strategies that helped them develop effective working relationships with direct reports.

The results of this part of the study provide more evidence of differences between African American and white managers, specifically in the types of lessons reported by these two sub-groups. It comes as no surprise that African American managers reported learning from workplace racism. What is surprising in the descriptions of these lessons is the depth and magnitude of the racism and racial injustices that study participants reported. African American managers describe lessons from which they have experienced a deeper understanding of the personal impact of racism and/or lessons related to repeatedly proving themselves in order to get the same opportunities as their white counterparts. White managers describe lessons about managing the work (developing skills, managing divergent pressures, and managing change, for example)—

lessons typically derived from challenging assignments. The content of these reports lends further support to the likelihood that white managers and African American managers are afforded different developmental opportunities.

African American managers report significantly more lessons related to cynicism than white managers. This finding is not surprising given the depth and magnitude of racism that African American managers report. It is also likely that African American managers report more lessons related to cynicism because they saw a disconnect between potential and realized job opportunities and because a developmental support network was unavailable to them.

It is important to note that most of the African American managers participating in the study are successful, effective managers who have taken to heart important lessons derived from the hardships and obstacles they have faced in the workplace. It is encouraging that these managers find a way to develop their leadership skills and can compensate for the lack of opportunities and assignments given to them. These managers seem to empower themselves by developing positive learning strategies amid hardships and obstacles. There may be a lesson for organizations in this as well—that the leadership potential of an organization can be increased with policies and practices that provide the same kinds of developmental opportunities for all managerial ranks.

Interestingly, only a few differences exist between the types of lessons reported by men and women. The women in the study reported more lessons about themselves. In general, these lessons resulted in an increased self-awareness and/or a heightened awareness of the importance of learning about oneself through feedback. On the other hand, the men in the study reported more lessons revolving around the development of specific skills or knowledge that helped them effectively manage the work.

### **Limitations and Implications**

This study relies solely on self-reported data. The participants must remember and describe their key experiences. Typically, participants describe experiences that happened many years in the past. They have to rely on their memories of these experiences with no other sources of data to verify those experiences. Therefore, some of these descriptions may be distorted or inaccurate.

Further, many of the African American participants in the study were also participating in a leadership program specifically dealing with issues related to being an African American leader. It is possible that the survey responses of these participants may have been affected by their participation in the leadership program. In other words, participating in a leadership program that specifically deals with race issues would probably make the participant more aware of these issues. This awareness or focus on racial issues might bias the individual when being interviewed about key experiences in his or her career. The individual might be more likely to report race-related experiences than individuals who were not participating in an African American leadership program.

Finally, the study excludes reports from other ethnic groups (Asian Americans and Hispanics, for example) because these subgroups were too small for making informed comparisons. Future research into this area should explore and compare the experiences of other ethnic groups.

### Suggested Readings

- Cox, T. H. (1994). *Cultural diversity in organizations: Theory, research, and practice*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Cox, T. H., & Nkomo, S. M. (1991). A race and gender group analysis of the early career experience of MBAs. *Work and Occupations*, 18(4), 431–446.
- Cox, T. H., & Nkomo, S. M. (1994). Race and ethnicity. In R. Golembiewski (Ed.), *Handbook of organizational behavior* (pp. 205–229). New York: Marcel-Decker.
- Davies, J., & Easterby-Smith, M. (1984). Learning and developing from managerial work experiences. *Journal of Management Studies*, 21(2), 169–183.
- Douglas, C. A. (1999, April). A content validation approach to revising Benchmarks. In D. G. McDonald-Mann (Chair), *Revising a 360-degree feedback instrument: Integrating quantitative and qualitative data*. Symposium conducted at the 14th annual meeting of the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Atlanta, GA.
- Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., & Wormeley, W. M. (1990). Effects of race on organizational experiences, job performance evaluations, and career outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(1), 64–86.
- Hall, D. T. (1976). *Careers in organizations*. Pacific Palisades, CA: Goodyear.
- Lindsey, E. H., Homes, V., & McCall, M. W., Jr. (1987). *Key events in executives' lives*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Lombardo, M. M. (1985). Five challenging assignments. *Issues & Observations*, 5(2), 1–8.
- McCall, M. W., Jr., Lombardo, M. M., & Morrison, A. M. (1988). *The lessons of experience: How successful executives develop on the job*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- McCauley, C. D., & Brutus, S. (1998). *Management development through job experiences: An annotated bibliography*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- McCauley, C. D., Ruderman, M. N., Ohlott, P. J., & Morrow, J. E. (1994). Assessing the developmental components of managerial jobs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(4), 544–560.
- Morrison, A. M., White, R. P., & Van Velsor, E. (1987). *Breaking the glass ceiling: Can women reach the top of America's largest corporations?* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Nkomo, S. M., & Cox, T. H. (1989). Gender differences in the upward mobility of black managers: Double whammy or double advantage. *Sex Roles*, 21(11–12), 825–839.
- Ohlott, P. J., Ruderman, M. N., & McCauley, C. D. (1994). Gender differences in managers' developmental job experiences. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(1), 46–67.
- Ruderman, M. N., & Hughes-James, M. (1998). Leadership development across race and gender. In C. D. McCauley, R. S. Moxley, & E. Van Velsor (Eds.), *The Center for Creative Leadership handbook of leadership development* (pp. 291–335). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Thomas, R. R., Jr. (1990). From affirmative action to affirming diversity. *Harvard Business Review*, March–April, pp. 107–117.
- Van Velsor, E., & Hughes, M. W. (1990). *Gender differences in the development of managers: How women managers learn from experience*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

---

## **Appendix A**

### **Key Events Categories**

The following descriptions illustrate the kinds of events reported in the study by providing explanations and examples. The events are grouped by superordinate categories. Events marked with an asterisk (\*) did not appear in the original Key Events study but are new to this research project.

#### **Challenging Assignments**

##### ***Start from scratch***

This event refers to building something from nothing or almost nothing. For example, it might indicate that organizational strategies for growth and expansion were met through such assignments as building a plant, creating a new department or subsidiary, opening a new market, or introducing a new product line.

##### ***Fix-it/turnaround***

Turning around and stabilizing a failing operation was the key to successful completion of a fix-it assignment.

##### ***Project/task force***

These events are discrete projects or temporary assignments, done alone or as part of a team or task force. Aimed at specific outcomes, these assignments brought deadlines and high visibility. They typically involved grasping new content areas or activities and grappling with new relationships.

##### ***Change in scope***

This event refers to an increase in responsibility that was both broader and different from what had gone before. It included switching to new businesses and massive increases in numbers of people, dollars, and functions to manage.

##### ***Line-to-staff switch***

These events involved managers who moved (not always by choice) from line operations to corporate staff roles. The purpose of these assignments was to teach managers the other side of the business and expose them to corporate strategies and culture; the jobs themselves varied greatly.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The original Key Events study's definition of this event included only line-to-staff switches, but this study also includes staff-to-line switches.



***Breaking a rut***

In these events, executives traded in successful (or at least known) careers for a chance at something new. These moves were preceded by discontent and accompanied by a willingness to take risks. Some managers insisted on being transferred to new areas while others left companies they had been with for over a decade. The tactics varied, but the goals were the same: to find new business challenges with continued career growth.

**Hardships*****Business mistake***

These are stories of managerial shortcomings that derailed goals. Errors were made in dealing with people critical to a project's success. Failure to give or obtain necessary information, support, or agreement on specific issues curtailed plans and collapsed business ventures.

***Lousy job/missed promotion***

These events indicate cases of a job-person mismatch, in which something about the manager's position was regarded as a career setback. These managers described how they had been demoted, had been exiled to unwanted jobs, or had lost a badly wanted promotion to someone else. The common theme is that the job did not suit perceived skills and aspirations.

***Problems with subordinates***

In these events, managers had to confront a subordinate with a problem that was performance related. The problems revolved around ineptness, alcoholism, and older managers who had let technology pass them by. A personality conflict was never reported as the origin of the problem.

***Personal trauma***

Crisis experiences with a powerful emotional impact were the focus of these experiences. Executives described events in which their families, their health, even their lives, were threatened by unanticipated tragedies. These traumas stemmed from both work and personal life and included personal injury or illness, the death of others, divorce, and combat duty.

***Race mattered\****

Managers reporting these events described the impact of race and race-related dynamics in the workplace. A *race mattered* event is not a job assignment, hardship, or other people event that mentions race as a matter of context; rather, it is a situation or interaction in which the manager (1) experiences or observes an injustice due to racial prejudice or discrimination or (2) is the first African American to be hired at the management or executive level.

***Downsizing\****

Downsizing includes three themes: managers who were responsible for implementing downsizing efforts, managers who were survivors in organizations that were undergoing a workforce reduction, and managers who lost their jobs during reorganizations and staff reductions. These hardship events not only relayed the personal trauma the managers experienced but also the trauma the organizations felt in going through reductions.

***Gender mattered***

Managers reporting these events described the impact of gender in the workplace. (This category was dropped from the analysis because only one event was characterized as a *gender mattered* event.)

**Other People*****Role models***

Role models are superiors that managers interacted with or observed during the course of their careers. Some of these models were characterized as possessing exceptional skills or attributes. Others were remembered for their weaknesses and the impact it had on people. Regardless of whether the role model was positive, negative, or a little of both, each case described a person who profoundly influenced the executive's approach to management.

***Values played out***

These short-lived events involved a person (or persons) doing something to another person (or persons) at work that had a visible impact. The manager, as an actor in the scene or as an observer of it, drew a value-laden conclusion from it. Events of this type almost always occurred in chain-of-command relationships and were discussed out of context; that is, the snapshot survived while the larger scenario in which it happened dimmed. The values conveyed related to correct and incorrect behavior when dealing with other people.

***Mentors\****

Managers reporting this event described the important role that mentoring plays in the career-development process. They described a superior who took special interest in their development; their devastation when their mentor left the organization; or the occasion when they successfully mentored another individual. A central theme in this category is the timing of the mentoring relationship in the individual's career. A majority of the managers who were mentored by a superior were in a job transition—either new in their position (for example, recently promoted, serving an internship, or in their first job after graduate school) or preparing for a promotion. Mentors helped shape careers by providing advice about job changes, providing new challenges

and opportunities, teaching about corporate life, introducing managers to senior managers, and portraying specific management skills.

### ***Peers\****

Managers reporting this event described relationships with their peers. The majority of the relationships and interactions were negative and often characterized by conflict. Core themes included (1) competition among and betrayal by peers where peers used unfair practices to make themselves look good, (2) resentment from peers who were jealous of the manager for reasons such as salary issues, work schedules, or relationships with superiors, and (3) differences that were worked through and resulted in finding common ground or even friendship. Except for the last theme, the relationships often involved confrontation and were rarely mended. Although most of the peer relationships were negative in nature, a few were described as positive. Managers talked of learning from co-workers who were friends—from advice they gave or by observing their career experiences.

## **Other Events**

### ***Coursework***

Coursework refers to the formal training and academic programs attended by managers. The specific purpose of these events is to provide managers the opportunity to obtain information and experiences not available in their day-to-day jobs.

### ***Early work experience***

These events represent important work experiences that took place early in the managers' careers. In most cases these were nonmanagement jobs that introduced the aspiring manager to new environments, cultures, and management philosophies. Through this exposure, the would-be executives were given some of their first opportunities to successfully meet the requirements and challenges of the business world.

### ***First supervision***

First supervision assignments welcomed these executives to the world of management and a new realm of problems: people. *First supervision* events portrayed young managers in tough new situations.

### ***Purely personal***

These events covered a range of experiences outside the workplace that contributed to managers' development.

***Feedback\****

This category is about job-related feedback. The majority of the managers reported receiving feedback; only a small number of the events related to giving feedback. There were four themes within the events when managers received feedback: (1) Managers described receiving feedback on a specific situation (for example, specific interpersonal interactions, a specific aspect of their job) or a characteristic or ability (for example, leadership style, communication skills, personal appearance); (2) managers mentioned receiving general feedback on their job performance, such as in a performance appraisal; (3) the event was about receiving 360-degree feedback (for example, the manager's first time receiving feedback from multiple raters, noting a difference in perceptions of raters); and (4) managers reported receiving friendly words of advice from others on managing employees.

***Business success\****

The *business success* category represents aspects of managers' jobs that turned out very well. The majority of the events in this category were job challenges and organizational issues that were doomed for failure but were overcome due to the actions of the manager. For instance, organizations experiencing poor manufacturing results and on the brink of shutting down were saved by the manager, the manager greatly improved inefficient systems, and unmarketable products were turned into successful ones. There are several core elements within this theme. In most cases, the successes came about due to the initiative of the manager. Often the manager described a process that was important in the successful outcome: success through teamwork and team ownership was critical. Innovation and experimentation on the part of the manager were frequently mentioned.



---

## **Appendix B**

### **Lesson Categories**

The following descriptions illustrate the kinds of lessons reported in the study by providing explanations and examples.

#### ***Learning about oneself***

Statements of self-discovery, self-trust, trusting one's gut, and/or increased self-confidence define this category. These lessons revolve around an increased self-awareness and/or a heightened awareness of the importance of learning about oneself through feedback. Individuals report learning about themselves, either in terms of strengths, personal limits, and/or weaknesses. This category also includes lessons about understanding the importance and value of receiving feedback. Most of the lessons revolve around personal insights regarding strengths (for example, *I am very good at managing others* or *I can handle a lot of stress*) or weaknesses (for example, *I realized that others think I am too aloof*). Some of the lessons seem to reflect a perspective that might be described as "I wish I had done it differently." Several of the lessons are related to gaining self-confidence (for example, *I learned that I am very capable*) or self-trust (for example, *I learned to trust my gut*).

#### ***Management values and guiding principles***

This category relates to learning to behave with integrity when dealing with oneself and with others. It includes statements about guiding principles or values that guide appropriate, ethical, and caring behavior as a manager. The lessons revolve around principles that managers discover and then use to guide their behavior, and which serve as consistent, stable values and behaviors that are not dependent on the situation. Examples of lessons in this category include increased sensitivity and compassion for others, honesty, standing up for one's beliefs, treating people with respect, behaving with integrity, communicating openly and honestly, understanding the importance of credibility, establishing principles, etc. Some of the lessons deal with learning to persevere under adverse conditions (for example, understanding the importance of persistence) and learning general strategies for coping with situations beyond one's control.

#### ***Managing one's career***

These lessons revolve around an increased awareness of the importance of taking responsibility for managing one's career development, becoming active in planning one's career path, and finding mentors and other types of support in order to manage one's career. Included in this category are statements about discovering one's career preferences, learning to take control of one's career, seizing opportunities, understanding the importance of mentors and networking to career advancement, making sure that new assignments and positions fit with career goals, learning about potential assignments and career moves, finding mentors and coaches, and learning how to balance career goals with personal goals. These lessons focus on managers' learning

how to make the most of the resources and individuals around them in order to advance their careers. Many of these lessons relate to taking charge of one's career as opposed to letting others control it. In addition, there are lessons about the importance of balance in one's life (for example, statements of understanding how important one's family is and of balancing different priorities).

### ***Managing direct reports***

*Managing direct reports* is a category that refers to learning how to effectively lead direct reports and/or teams. These lessons include all aspects of managing direct reports and discovering strategies for developing effective working relationships with them. Some examples include lessons about setting goals, challenging employees, building teams, delegating, managing, hiring talented staff, training, developing, motivating, supporting, coaching, hiring, protecting, mentoring, and dealing with employee performance problems. The focus of these lessons is on learning to become a better manager in order to get the work completed. Some lessons relate to a new understanding about the importance of getting work done through others (for example, one can't do it all by oneself; one must learn to delegate and work through others).

### ***Managing upwards***

Lessons belonging to this category include statements about learning how to develop good relationships with executives (including managers and above). These lessons relate to an increased understanding of executives and/or how to work with executives in various contexts. Examples may include discovering something about a particular executive, discovering effective strategies for working with higher management, understanding how higher management operates, and learning from the mistakes of higher management.

### ***Managing laterally***

Lessons belonging to this category include statements about learning how to develop effective working relationships with individuals outside of the direct reporting line (including clients, peers, colleagues, and outside individuals). These lessons relate to an increased understanding of these relationships and effective strategies for gaining lateral cooperation without authority. Examples include negotiating strategies, lessons about effective ways to build cross-functional teams, and lessons about gaining cooperation from individuals over whom you have no authority.

### ***Effects of racial identity***

This category is defined as a discovery that one's race does impact how others in an organization perceive and treat an individual. Most of these lessons relate to racism and racial injustices that exist in the workplace. Most of these lessons fall into two types: experiencing a deeper understanding of the personal impact of racism (for example, *racism does exist* or *I learned that I was not trusted because of my color*) or learning that there is constant scrutiny (for example, individuals have to repeatedly prove themselves, they have to work twice as hard, or higher standards are

set for them). A few of the lessons relate to a new understanding or opinion about a group of individuals based on race (for example, *don't trust white people* or *don't trust African Americans*).

### ***Valuing diversity***

This category includes statements related to learning that differences in race, gender, age, skills, attitudes, and style are of value in the workplace. This category looks at diversity with a broad lens (for example, differences in style, color, age, attitude, skills). The thread tying these lessons together is that they all relate to a better understanding or awareness of the importance of appreciating differences in teams, in organizations, and/or across departments.

### ***Understanding organizational politics and organizational culture***

Statements about understanding and dealing with organizational politics and organizational culture define this category. These lessons revolve around the realization that organizational politics play a large role in organizational life. Examples of lessons may include learning how to effectively work with the realities of organizational politics (for example, using knowledge about existing politics to effectively manage relationships) or cynical lessons that involve the discovery of organizational politics (for example, discovering the good-old-boy network is alive and well).

### ***Developing task and managerial skills***

This category includes statements about gaining knowledge or skills that help the individual effectively manage the work. Lessons revolve around developing knowledge about the organization or business, developing skills sets, taking courses, and developing specific task-related competencies. These lessons tend to be fairly specific, and most of the lessons relate to learning how to do something that will get the job done (for example, learning specific technical knowledge, learning how the business works, learning how a particular department works, learning a specific project-related skill such as finance or accounting procedures, learning how to build systems and processes for getting the work done).

### ***Managing divergent pressures***

These lessons include examples such as learning to be decisive, to think strategically, to anticipate problems, to set priorities, to communicate openly, to take risks, to understand the importance of vision, to deal with ambiguity and stress, and others.

### ***Managing change***

These lessons are about learning how to manage change efforts and the impact of decisions. They include the development of effective strategies for implementing one's agenda by sharing information to increase awareness, involving others at the start of an initiative, building a consensus, getting endorsements from others, and reducing resistance. These lessons focus on learning how to more effectively initiate and manage change efforts or change initiatives in an organization.



For most of these lessons, the individual is responsible for overseeing the implementation of change within the organization and has learned something about managing transitions.

### ***Cynicism***

This category is defined as a feeling of pessimism or distrust that was learned as a result of a particular event. Lessons falling within this category represent a unique type of lesson that did not readily fall into any of the other lesson categories. The lessons were negative in nature and revolved around an increased sense of distrust toward other people or toward the organization in general. In these lessons individuals describe feelings of anger, disappointment, and sadness. Examples of lessons falling within this category include a distrust of other people (for example, learning not to be too trusting, learning that people won't tell you what they are thinking, learning that friends will turn their backs on you) or an increased pessimism about the organization (for example, a loss of trust, a view that performance was not rewarded, a loss of respect for the organization and corporate life).

**Appendix C**  
**Analysis of Events Tables**

Table 9  
**Frequencies for all events, and a breakdown by race ( $N = 752$ )**

<b>Event category</b>	<b>Overall sample count (%) (<math>N = 752</math>)</b>	<b>African American count (%) (<math>n = 336</math>)</b>	<b>White count (%) (<math>n = 416</math>)</b>
<i>Challenging assignments</i>			
Start from scratch	12 (1.6)	3 (0.9)	9 (2.2)
Fix-it/turnaround	34 (4.5)	12 (3.6)	22 (5.3)
Project/task force	45 (6.0)	15 (4.5)	30 (7.2)
Change in scope	88 (11.7)	40 (11.9)	48 (11.5)
Line-to-staff switch	6 (0.8)	3 (0.9)	3 (0.7)
Breaking a rut	15 (2.0)	4 (1.2)	11 (2.6)
Total	200 (26.6)	77 (22.9)	123 (29.6)
<i>Hardships</i>			
Business mistake	89 (11.8)	40 (11.9)	49 (11.8)
Lousy job/missed promotion	41 (5.5)	20 (6.0)	21 (5.0)
Problems with subordinates	58 (7.7)	26 (7.7)	32 (7.7)
Personal trauma	12 (1.6)	1 (0.3)	11 (2.6)
* Race mattered	29 (3.9)	27 (8.0)	2 (0.5)
* Downsizing	30 (4.0)	17 (5.1)	13 (3.1)
Total	259 (34.4)	131 (39.0)	128 (30.8)
<i>Other people</i>			
Role models	61 (8.1)	15 (4.5)	46 (11.1)
Values played out	66 (8.8)	29 (8.6)	37 (8.9)
* Mentors	21 (2.8)	14 (4.2)	7 (1.7)
* Peers	17 (2.3)	9 (2.7)	8 (1.9)
Total	165 (21.9)	67 (19.9)	98 (23.6)
<i>Other events</i>			
Coursework	23 (3.1)	10 (3.0)	13 (3.1)
Early work experience	8 (1.1)	5 (1.5)	3 (0.7)
First supervision	12 (1.6)	3 (0.9)	9 (2.2)
Purely personal	5 (0.7)	2 (0.6)	3 (0.7)
* Feedback	48 (6.4)	25 (7.4)	23 (5.5)
* Business success	32 (4.3)	16 (4.8)	16 (3.8)
Total	128 (17.0)	61 (18.2)	67 (16.0)

\* New event category.

*Note:* Percentages for the subgroups (African American and white) are based on the total number of events for that subgroup.

Table 10  
**Frequencies for all events, and a breakdown by gender (N = 752)**

<b>Event category</b>	<b>Overall sample count (%) (N = 752)</b>	<b>Female count (%) (n = 223)</b>	<b>Male count (%) (n = 529)</b>
<i>Challenging assignments</i>			
Start from scratch	12 (1.6)	1 (0.4)	11 (0.4)
Fix-it/turnaround	34 (4.5)	5 (2.2)	29 (2.2)
Project/task force	45 (6.0)	8 (3.6)	37 (3.6)
Change in scope	88 (11.7)	15 (6.7)	73 (6.7)
Line-to-staff switch	6 (0.8)	0 (0.0)	6 (0.0)
Breaking a rut	15 (2.0)	3 (1.3)	12 (1.3)
Total	200 (26.6)	32 (14.3)	168 (31.8)
<i>Hardships</i>			
Business mistake	89 (11.8)	28 (11.5)	61 (11.5)
Lousy job/missed promotion	41 (5.5)	8 (6.2)	33 (6.2)
Problems with subordinates	58 (7.7)	25 (6.2)	33 (6.2)
Personal trauma	12 (1.6)	5 (1.3)	7 (1.3)
* Race mattered	29 (3.9)	9 (3.8)	20 (3.8)
* Downsizing	30 (4.0)	9 (4.0)	21 (4.0)
Total	259 (34.4)	84 (37.7)	175 (33.1)
<i>Other people</i>			
Role models	61 (8.1)	30 (13.5)	31 (5.9)
Values played out	66 (8.8)	23 (10.3)	43 (8.1)
* Mentors	21 (2.8)	7 (3.1)	14 (2.6)
* Peers	17 (2.3)	7 (3.1)	10 (1.9)
Total	165 (21.9)	67 (30.0)	98 (18.5)
<i>Other events</i>			
Coursework	23 (3.1)	7 (3.1)	16 (3.0)
Early work experience	8 (1.1)	0 (0.0)	8 (1.5)
First supervision	12 (1.6)	4 (1.8)	8 (1.5)
Purely personal	5 (0.7)	0 (0.0)	5 (0.9)
* Feedback	48 (6.4)	19 (8.5)	29 (5.5)
* Business success	32 (4.3)	10 (4.5)	22 (4.2)
Total	128 (17.1)	40 (17.9)	88 (16.6)

\* New event category.

*Note:* Percentages for the subgroups (female and male) are based on the total number of events for that subgroup.

Table 11  
**Frequencies for all events, and a breakdown by gender within race (N = 752)**

<b>Event category</b>	<b>Overall sample count (%) (N = 752)</b>	<b>African American count F/M (% for totals) (n = 117/219)</b>	<b>White count F/M (% for totals) (n = 106/310)</b>
<i>Challenging assignments</i>			
Start from scratch	12 (1.6)	1/2	0/9
Fix-it/turnaround	34 (4.5)	3/9	2/20
Project/task force	45 (6.0)	1/14	7/23
Change in scope	88 (11.7)	12/28	3/45
Line-to-staff switch	6 (0.8)	0/3	0/3
Breaking a rut	15 (2.0)	1/3	2/9
Total	200 (26.6)	18 (15.4)/59 (26.9)	14 (13.2)/109 (35.2)
<i>Hardships</i>			
Business mistake	89 (11.8)	18/22	10/39
Lousy job/missed promotion	41 (5.5)	4/16	4/17
Problems with subordinates	58 (7.7)	14/12	11/21
Personal trauma	12 (1.6)	1/0	4/7
* Race mattered	29 (3.9)	9/18	0/2
* Downsizing	30 (4.0)	6/11	3/10
Total	259 (34.4)	52 (44.4)/79 (36.1)	32 (30.2)/96 (31.0)
<i>Other people</i>			
Role models	61 (8.1)	7/8	23/23
Values played out	66 (8.8)	10/19	13/24
* Mentors	21 (2.8)	5/9	2/5
* Peers	17 (2.3)	3/6	4/4
Total	165 (21.9)	25 (21.4)/42 (19.2)	42 (39.6)/56 (18.1)
<i>Other events</i>			
Coursework	23 (3.1)	3/7	4/9
Early work experience	8 (1.1)	0/5	0/3
First supervision	12 (1.6)	1/2	3/6
Purely personal	5 (0.7)	0/2	0/3
* Feedback	48 (6.4)	13/12	6/17
* Business success	32 (4.3)	5/11	5/11
Total	128 (17.0)	22 (18.8)/39 (17.8)	18 (17.0)/49 (15.8)

\* New event category.

Note: Percentages for the subgroups (African American females, African American males, white females, and white males) are based on the total number of events for that subgroup.

Table 12  
**Chi-square analyses (events by race) (N = 752)**

<b>Event category</b>	<b>Expected frequency (African American/ white)</b>	<b>Observed frequency (African American/ white)</b>	<b>Pearson chi-square</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>p (2-sided)</b>
<i>Challenging assignments</i>					
Starting from scratch	5.4/6.6	3/9	1.91	1	.167
Fix-it	15.2/18.8	12/22	1.27	1	.260
Project/task force	20.1/24.9	15/30	2.49	1	.114
Change in scope	39.3/48.7	40/48	0.02	1	.877
Line-to-staff switch	2.7/3.3	3/3	0.07	1	.792
Breaking a rut	6.7/8.3	4/11	2.01	1	.156
Total	89.4/110.6	77/123	4.21	1	.040*
<i>Hardships</i>					
Business mistake	39.8/49.2	40/49	0.00	1	.958
Lousy job/missed promotion	18.3/22.7	20/21	0.30	1	.587
Problems with subordinates	25.9/32.1	26/32	0.00	1	.981
Personal trauma	5.4/6.6	1/11	6.52	1	.011*
* Race mattered	13.0/16.0	27/2	28.61	1	.000**
* Downsizing	13.4/16.6	17/13	1.82	1	.178
Total	115.8/143.2	131/128	5.56	1	.018*
<i>Other people</i>					
Role models	27.3/33.7	15/46	10.84	1	.001**
Values played out	29.5/36.5	29/37	0.02	1	.899
* Mentors	9.4/11.6	14/7	4.23	1	.040*
* Peers	7.6/9.4	9/8	0.48	1	.488
Total	73.8/91.2	67/98	1.42	1	.233
<i>Other events</i>					
Coursework	10.3/12.7	10/13	0.01	1	.906
Early work experience	3.6/4.4	5/3	1.04	1	.308
First supervision	5.4/6.6	3/9	1.91	1	.167
Purely personal	2.2/2.8	2/3	0.05	1	.833
* Feedback	21.4/26.6	25/23	1.14	1	.286
* Business success	14.3/17.7	16/16	0.38	1	.536
Total	57.2/70.8	61/67	0.55	1	.457

\* New event category.

Note: A single asterisk equals  $p < .05$  and a double asterisk refers to a  $p < .01$ .

Table 13  
**Chi-square analyses (events by gender) ( $N = 752$ )**

<b>Event category</b>	<b>Expected frequency (female/male)</b>	<b>Observed frequency (female/male)</b>	<b>Pearson chi-square</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>p (2-sided)</b>
<i>Challenging assignments</i>					
Starting from scratch	3.6/8.4	1/11	2.66	1	.103
Fix-it	10.1/23.9	5/29	3.81	1	.051
Project/task force	13.3/31.7	8/37	3.24	1	.072
Change in scope	26.1/61.9	15/73	7.60	1	.006**
Line-to-staff switch	1.8/4.2	0/6	2.55	1	.110
Breaking a rut	4.4/10.6	3/12	0.68	1	.408
Total	59.3/140.7	32/168	24.35	1	.000**
<i>Hardships</i>					
Business mistake	26.4/62.6	28/61	0.16	1	.691
Lousy job/missed promotion	12.2/28.8	8/33	2.14	1	.144
Problems with subordinates	17.2/40.8	25/33	5.45	1	.020*
Personal trauma	3.6/8.4	5/7	0.84	1	.358
* Race mattered	8.6/20.4	9/20	0.03	1	.868
* Downsizing	8.9/21.1	9/21	0.00	1	.966
Total	76.9/182.1	84/175	1.46	1	.227
<i>Other people</i>					
Role models	18.1/42.9	30/31	12.13	1	.000**
Values played out	19.6/46.4	23/43	0.94	1	.333
* Mentors	6.2/14.8	7/14	0.14	1	.708
* Peers	5.0/12.0	7/10	1.11	1	.293
Total	48.9/116.1	67/98	12.15	1	.000**
<i>Other events</i>					
Coursework	6.8/16.2	7/16	0.01	1	.934
Early work experience	2.4/5.6	0/8	3.41	1	.065
First supervision	3.6/8.4	4/8	0.08	1	.778
Purely personal	1.5/3.5	0/5	2.12	1	.145
* Feedback	14.2/33.8	19/29	2.42	1	.120
* Business success	9.5/22.5	10/22	0.04	1	.840
Total	38.0/90.0	40/88	0.19	1	.664

\* New event category.

Note: A single asterisk equals  $p < .05$  and a double asterisk refers to a  $p < .01$ .

Table 14  
**Chi-square analyses (white female managers versus white male managers) (n = 416)**

	Expected frequency (female/male)	Observed frequency (female/male)	Pearson chi-square	df	p (2-sided)
<b>Event category</b>					
<i>Challenging assignments</i>					
Starting from scratch	2.3/6.7	0/9	3.15	1	.076
Fix-it	5.6/16.4	2/20	3.29	1	.070
Project/task force	7.6/22.4	7/23	0.08	1	.779
Change in scope	12.2/35.8	3/45	10.57	1	.001**
Line-to-staff switch	0.8/2.2	0/3	1.03	1	.309
Breaking a rut	2.8/8.2	2/9	0.32	1	.573
Total	31.3/91.7	14/109	18.28	1	.000**
<i>Hardships</i>					
Business mistake	12.5/36.5	10/39	0.75	1	.386
Lousy job/missed promotion	5.4/15.6	4/17	0.48	1	.488
Problems with subordinates	8.2/23.8	11/21	1.44	1	.229
Personal trauma	2.8/8.2	4/7	0.71	1	.401
* Race mattered	0.5/1.5	0/2	0.69	1	.407
* Downsizing	3.3/9.7	3/10	0.04	1	.840
Total	32.6/95.4	32/96	0.02	1	.881
<i>Other people</i>					
Role models	11.7/34.3	23/23	16.38	1	.000**
Values played out	9.4/27.6	13/24	1.99	1	.158
* Mentors	1.8/5.2	2/5	0.04	1	.850
* Peers	2.0/6.0	4/4	2.58	1	.108
Total	25.0/73.0	42/56	20.39	1	.000**
<i>Other events</i>					
Coursework	3.3/9.7	4/9	0.20	1	.657
Early work experience	0.8/2.2	0/3	1.03	1	.309
First supervision	2.3/6.7	0/6	0.30	1	.585
Purely personal	0.8/2.2	0/3	1.03	1	.309
* Feedback	5.9/17.1	6/17	0.01	1	.945
* Business success	4.1/11.9	5/11	0.29	1	.589
Total	17.1/49.9	18/49	0.08	1	.776

\* New event category.

Note: A single asterisk equals  $p < .05$  and a double asterisk refers to a  $p < .01$ .

Table 15  
**Chi-square analyses (African American female managers versus  
 African American male managers) ( $n = 336$ )**

	Expected frequency (female/male)	Observed frequency (female/male)	Pearson chi-square	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i> (2-sided)
<b>Event category</b>					
<i>Challenging assignments</i>					
Starting from scratch	1.0/2.0	1/2	0.00	1	.957
Fix-it	4.2/7.8	3/9	0.53	1	.467
Project/task force	5.2/9.8	1/14	5.49	1	.019*
Change in scope	13.9/26.1	12/28	0.47	1	.495
Line-to-staff switch	1.0/2.0	0/3	1.62	1	.203
Breaking a rut	1.4/2.6	1/3	0.17	1	.678
Total	26.8/50.2	18/59	5.77	1	.016*
<i>Hardships</i>					
Business mistake	13.9/26.1	18/22	2.07	1	.150
Lousy job/missed promotion	7.0/13.0	4/16	2.06	1	.151
Problems with subordinates	9.1/16.9	14/12	4.49	1	.034*
Personal trauma	0.3/0.7	1/0	1.88	1	.171
* Race mattered	9.4/17.6	9/18	0.03	1	.866
* Downsizing	5.9/11.1	6/11	0.00	1	.967
Total	45.6/85.4	52/79	2.25	1	.134
<i>Other people</i>					
Role models	5.2/9.8	7/8	0.97	1	.325
Values played out	10.1/18.9	10/19	0.00	1	.968
* Mentors	4.9/9.1	5/9	0.01	1	.943
* Peers	3.1/5.9	3/6	0.01	1	.924
Total	23.3/43.7	25/42	0.23	1	.632
<i>Other events</i>					
Coursework	3.5/6.5	3/7	0.11	1	.745
Early work experience	1.7/3.3	0/5	2.71	1	.100
First supervision	1.0/2.0	0/2	0.00	1	.957
Purely personal	0.7/1.3	0/2	1.08	1	.300
* Feedback	8.7/16.3	13/12	3.51	1	.061
* Business success	5.6/10.4	5/11	0.09	1	.759
Total	21.2/39.8	22/39	0.05	1	.822

\* New event category.

Note: A single asterisk equals  $p < .05$  and a double asterisk refers to a  $p < .01$ .



Table 16  
**Chi-square analyses (African American male managers versus  
white male managers) ( $n = 529$ )**

	Expected frequency (African American/ white)	Observed frequency (African American/ white)	Pearson chi-square	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i> (2-sided)
<b>Event category</b>					
<i>Challenging assignments</i>					
Starting from scratch	4.6/6.4	2/9	2.50	1	.114
Fix-it	12.0/17.0	9/20	1.36	1	.244
Project/task force	15.3/21.7	14/23	0.21	1	.648
Change in scope	30.2/42.8	28/45	0.32	1	.570
Line-to-staff switch	2.5/3.5	3/3	0.19	1	.667
Breaking a rut	5.0/7.0	3/9	1.36	1	.243
Total	69.6/98.4	59/109	4.00	1	.045*
<i>Hardships</i>					
Business mistake	25.3/35.7	22/39	0.81	1	.369
Lousy job/missed promotion	13.7/19.3	16/17	0.73	1	.393
Problems with subordinates	13.7/19.3	12/21	0.37	1	.544
Personal trauma	2.9/4.1	0/7	5.01	1	.025*
* Race mattered	8.3/11.7	18/2	20.24	1	.000**
* Downsizing	8.7/12.3	11/10	1.09	1	.297
Total	72.4/102.6	79/96	1.51	1	.219
<i>Other people</i>					
Role models	12.8/18.2	8/23	3.30	1	.069
Values played out	17.8/25.2	19/24	0.15	1	.699
* Mentors	5.8/8.2	9/5	3.11	1	.078
* Peers	4.1/5.9	6/4	1.45	1	.228
Total	40.6/57.4	42/56	0.11	1	.745
<i>Other events</i>					
Coursework	6.6/9.4	7/9	0.04	1	.846
Early work experience	3.3/4.7	5/3	1.49	1	.222
First supervision	3.3/4.7	2/6	0.90	1	.343
Purely personal	2.1/2.9	2/3	0.00	1	.949
* Feedback					
* Business success	9.1/12.9	11/11	0.70	1	.403
Total	36.4/51.6	39/49	0.37	1	.543

\* New event category.

Note: A single asterisk equals  $p < .05$  and a double asterisk refers to a  $p < .01$ .

Table 17  
**Chi-square analyses (African American female managers versus  
white female managers) ( $n = 223$ )**

	Expected frequency (African American/ white)	Observed frequency (African American/ white)	Pearson chi-square	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i> (2-sided)
<b>Event category</b>					
<i>Challenging assignments</i>					
Starting from scratch	0.5/0.5	0/0	0.91	1	.340
Fix-it	2.6/2.4	3/2	0.12	1	.733
Project/task force	4.2/3.8	1/7	5.32	1	.021*
Change in scope	7.9/7.1	12/3	4.89	1	.027*
Line-to-staff switch	0/0	0/0	n/a		
Breaking a rut	1.6/1.4	1/2	0.45	1	.504
Total	16.8/15.2	18/14	0.21	1	.643
<i>Hardships</i>					
Business mistake	14.7/13.3	18/10	1.79	1	.180
Lousy job/missed promotion	4.2/3.8	4/4	0.02	1	.887
Problems with subordinates	13.1/11.9	14/11	0.14	1	.707
Personal trauma	2.6/2.4	1/4	2.16	1	.141
* Race mattered	4.7/4.3	9/0	8.50	1	.004**
* Downsizing	4.7/4.3	6/3	0.76	1	.384
Total	44.1/39.9	52/32	4.81	1	.028*
<i>Other people</i>					
Role models	15.7/14.3	7/23	11.80	1	.001**
Values played out	12.1/10.9	10/13	0.83	1	.362
* Mentors	3.7/3.3	5/2	1.04	1	.307
* Peers	3.7/3.3	3/4	0.27	1	.605
Total	35.2/31.8	25/42	8.82	1	.003**
<i>Other events</i>					
Coursework	3.7/3.3	3/4	0.27	1	.605
Early work experience	0/0	0/0	n/a		
First supervision	2.1/1.9	1/3	1.23	1	.267
Purely personal	0/0	0/0	n/a		
* Feedback					
* Business success	5.2/4.8	5/5	0.03	1	.873
Total	21.0/19.0	22/18	0.13	1	.723

\* New event category.

Note: A single asterisk equals  $p < .05$  and a double asterisk refers to a  $p < .01$ .



**Appendix D**  
**Analysis of Lessons Tables**

Table 18  
**Frequencies for lessons by race (N = 1,282)**

<b>Lesson category</b>	<b>Overall sample count (%) (N = 1,282)</b>	<b>African American count (%) (n = 539)</b>	<b>White count (%) (n = 743)</b>
<i>Managing self</i>			
Learning about oneself	160 (12.5)	68 (12.6)	92 (12.4)
Management values and guiding principles	144 (11.2)	66 (12.2)	78 (10.5)
Managing one's career	123 (9.6)	57 (10.6)	66 (8.9)
Total	427 (33.3)	191 (35.4)	236 (31.8)
<i>Managing relationships</i>			
Managing direct reports	350 (27.3)	131 (24.3)	219 (29.5)
Managing upwards	67 (5.2)	30 (5.6)	37 (5.0)
Managing laterally	58 (4.5)	23 (4.3)	35 (4.7)
Effects of racial identity	42 (3.3)	40 (7.4)	2 (0.3)
Valuing diversity	24 (1.9)	10 (1.9)	14 (1.9)
Understanding organizational politics	31 (2.4)	13 (2.4)	18 (2.4)
Total	572 (44.6)	247 (45.8)	325 (43.7)
<i>Managing the work</i>			
Developing task and managerial skills	107 (8.3)	31 (5.8)	76 (10.2)
Managing divergent pressures	70 (5.5)	18 (3.3)	52 (7.0)
Managing change	50 (3.9)	20 (3.7)	30 (4.0)
Total	227 (17.7)	69 (12.8)	158 (21.3)
<i>Other lessons</i>			
Cynicism	56 (4.4)	32 (5.9)	24 (3.2)

*Note:* Percentages for the subgroups (African American and white) are based on the total number of lessons for that subgroup.

Table 19  
**Frequencies for lessons by gender (N = 1,282)**

<b>Lesson category</b>	<b>Overall sample count (%) (N = 1,282)</b>	<b>Female count (%) (n = 382)</b>	<b>Male count (%) (n = 900)</b>
<i>Managing self</i>			
Learning about oneself	160 (12.5)	59 (15.4)	101 (11.2)
Management values and guiding principles	144 (11.2)	43 (11.3)	101 (11.2)
Managing one's career	123 (9.6)	38 (9.9)	85 (9.4)
Total	427 (33.3)	140 (36.6)	287 (31.9)
<i>Managing relationships</i>			
Managing direct reports	350 (27.3)	114 (29.8)	236 (26.2)
Managing upwards	67 (5.2)	22 (5.8)	45 (5.0)
Managing laterally	58 (4.5)	11 (2.9)	47 (5.2)
Effects of racial identity	42 (3.3)	14 (3.7)	28 (3.1)
Valuing diversity	24 (1.9)	4 (1.0)	20 (2.2)
Understanding organizational politics	31 (2.4)	8 (2.1)	23 (2.6)
Total	572 (44.6)	173 (45.3)	399 (44.3)
<i>Managing the work</i>			
Developing task and managerial skills	107 (8.3)	23 (6.0)	84 (9.3)
Managing divergent pressures	70 (5.5)	15 (3.9)	55 (6.1)
Managing change	50 (3.9)	13 (3.4)	37 (4.1)
Total	227 (17.7)	51 (13.4)	176 (19.6)
<i>Other lessons</i>			
Cynicism	56 (4.4)	18 (4.7)	38 (4.2)

Note: Percentages for the subgroups (female and male) are based on the total number of lessons for that subgroup.

Table 20  
Chi-square analyses (lessons by race) ( $N = 1,282$ )

Lesson category	Expected frequency (African American/ white)	Observed frequency (African American/ white)	Pearson chi-square	df	$p$ (2-sided)
<i>Managing self</i>					
Learning about oneself	67.3/92.7	68/92	0.02	1	.901
Management values and guiding principles	60.5/93.5	66/78	0.96	1	.328
Managing one's career	51.7/71.3	57/66	1.03	1	.310
Total	179.5/247.5	191/236	1.90	1	.168
<i>Managing relationships</i>					
Managing direct reports	147.2/202.8	131/219	4.21	1	.040*
Managing upwards	28.2/38.8	30/37	0.22	1	.642
Managing laterally	24.4/33.6	23/35	0.14	1	.706
Effects of racial identity	17.7/24.3	40/2	50.43	1	.000**
Valuing diversity	10.1/13.9	10/14	0.00	1	.970
Understanding organizational politics	13.0/18.0	13/18	0.00	1	.990
Total	240.5/331.5	247/325	0.55	1	.459
<i>Managing the work</i>					
Developing task and managerial skills	45.0/62.0	31/76	8.19	1	.004**
Managing divergent pressures	29.4/40.6	18/52	8.10	1	.004**
Managing change	21.0/29.0	20/30	0.09	1	.765
Total	95.4/131.6	69/158	15.36	1	.000**
<i>Other lessons</i>					
Cynicism	23.5/32.5	32/24	5.48	1	.019*

Note: A single asterisk equals  $p < .05$  and a double asterisk refers to a  $p < .01$ .

Table 21  
**Chi-square analyses (lessons by gender) (N = 1,282)**

<b>Lesson category</b>	<b>Expected frequency (female/male)</b>	<b>Observed frequency (female/male)</b>	<b>Pearson chi-square</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>p (2-sided)</b>
<i>Managing self</i>					
Learning about oneself	47.7/112.3	59/101	4.38	1	.036*
Management values and guiding principles	42.9/101.1	43/101	0.00	1	.986
Managing one's career	36.7/86.5	38/85	0.08	1	.780
Total	127.2/299.8	140/287	2.74	1	.098
<i>Managing relationships</i>					
Managing direct reports	104.3/245.7	114/236	1.77	1	.183
Managing upwards	20.0/47.0	22/45	0.31	1	.576
Managing laterally	17.3/40.7	11/47	3.41	1	.065
Effects of racial identity	12.5/29.5	14/28	0.26	1	.610
Valuing diversity	7.2/16.8	4/20	2.02	1	.156
Understanding organizational politics	9.2/21.8	8/23	0.24	1	.623
Total	170.4/401.6	173/399	0.10	1	.753
<i>Managing the work</i>					
Developing task and managerial skills	31.9/75.1	23/84	3.85	1	.050*
Managing divergent pressures	20.9/49.1	15/55	2.48	1	.115
Managing change	14.9/35.1	13/37	0.36	1	.549
Total	67.6/159.4	51/176	7.09	1	.008**
<i>Other lessons</i>					
Cynicism	16.7/39.3	18/38	0.15	1	.695

Note: A single asterisk equals  $p < .05$  and a double asterisk refers to a  $p < .01$ .

Table 22  
**Frequencies of lessons within *start from scratch* event (n = 29)**

---

<b>Lesson category</b>	<b>Frequency (%)</b>
<i>Managing self</i>	
Learning about oneself	2 (6.9)
Management values and guiding principles	2 (6.9)
Managing one's career	0 (0.0)
Total	4 (13.8)
<i>Managing relationships</i>	
Managing direct reports	8 (27.6)
Managing upwards	2 (6.9)
Managing laterally	4 (13.8)
Effects of racial identity	0 (0.0)
Valuing diversity	0 (0.0)
Understanding organizational politics	0 (0.0)
Total	14 (48.3)
<i>Managing the work</i>	
Developing task and managerial skills	5 (17.2)
Managing divergent pressures	4 (13.8)
Managing change	1 (3.4)
Total	10 (34.5)
<i>Other lessons</i>	
Cynicism	1 (3.4)

---



Table 23  
**Frequencies of lessons within *fix-it/turnaround* event ( $n = 63$ )**

---

<b>Lesson category</b>	<b>Frequency (%)</b>
<i>Managing self</i>	
Learning about oneself	3 (4.8)
Management values and guiding principles	6 (9.5)
Managing one's career	1 (1.6)
Total	10 (15.9)
<i>Managing relationships</i>	
Managing direct reports	24 (38.1)
Managing upwards	3 (4.8)
Managing laterally	6 (9.5)
Effects of racial identity	0 (0.0)
Valuing diversity	0 (0.0)
Understanding organizational politics	1 (1.6)
Total	34 (54.0)
<i>Managing the work</i>	
Developing task and managerial skills	3 (4.8)
Managing divergent pressures	7 (11.1)
Managing change	9 (14.3)
Total	19 (30.2)
<i>Other lessons</i>	
Cynicism	0 (0.0)

---

Table 24  
**Frequencies of lessons within project/task force event (n = 87)**

---

<b>Lesson category</b>	<b>Frequency (%)</b>
<i>Managing self</i>	
Learning about oneself	13 (14.9)
Management values and guiding principles	4 (4.6)
Managing one's career	2 (2.3)
Total	19 (21.8)
<i>Managing relationships</i>	
Managing direct reports	16 (18.4)
Managing upwards	5 (5.7)
Managing laterally	7 (8.0)
Effects of racial identity	4 (4.6)
Valuing diversity	2 (2.3)
Understanding organizational politics	0 (0.0)
Total	34 (39.1)
<i>Managing the work</i>	
Developing task and managerial skills	19 (21.8)
Managing divergent pressures	6 (6.9)
Managing change	7 (8.0)
Total	32 (36.8)
<i>Other lessons</i>	
Cynicism	2 (2.3)

---

Table 25  
**Frequencies of lessons within *change in scope* event ( $n = 176$ )**

---

<b>Lesson category</b>	<b>Frequency (%)</b>
<i>Managing self</i>	
Learning about oneself	26 (14.8)
Management values and guiding principles	8 (4.5)
Managing one's career	13 (7.4)
Total	47 (26.7)
<i>Managing relationships</i>	
Managing direct reports	50 (28.4)
Managing upwards	5 (2.8)
Managing laterally	13 (7.4)
Effects of racial identity	1 (0.6)
Valuing diversity	8 (4.5)
Understanding organizational politics	4 (2.3)
Total	81 (46.0)
<i>Managing the work</i>	
Developing task and managerial skills	28 (15.9)
Managing divergent pressures	14 (8.0)
Managing change	4 (2.3)
Total	46 (26.1)
<i>Other lessons</i>	
Cynicism	2 (1.1)

---

Table 26  
**Frequencies of lessons within *line-to-staff switch* event (n = 13)**

---

<b>Lesson category</b>	<b>Frequency (%)</b>
<i>Managing self</i>	
Learning about oneself	3 (23.1)
Management values and guiding principles	0 (0.0)
Managing one's career	0 (0.0)
Total	3 (23.1)
<i>Managing relationships</i>	
Managing direct reports	1 (7.7)
Managing upwards	1 (7.7)
Managing laterally	1 (7.7)
Effects of racial identity	0 (0.0)
Valuing diversity	0 (0.0)
Understanding organizational politics	0 (0.0)
Total	3 (23.1)
<i>Managing the work</i>	
Developing task and managerial skills	3 (23.1)
Managing divergent pressures	2 (15.4)
Managing change	1 (7.7)
Total	6 (46.2)
<i>Other lessons</i>	
Cynicism	1 (7.7)

---

Table 27  
**Frequencies of lessons within *breaking a rut* event (n = 26)**

---

<b>Lesson category</b>	<b>Frequency (%)</b>
<i>Managing self</i>	
Learning about oneself	3 (11.5)
Management values and guiding principles	2 (7.7)
Managing one's career	12 (46.2)
Total	17 (65.4)
<i>Managing relationships</i>	
Managing direct reports	0 (0.0)
Managing upwards	3 (11.5)
Managing laterally	0 (0.0)
Effects of racial identity	1 (3.8)
Valuing diversity	0 (0.0)
Understanding organizational politics	1 (3.8)
Total	5 (19.2)
<i>Managing the work</i>	
Developing task and managerial skills	3 (11.5)
Managing divergent pressures	0 (0.0)
Managing change	0 (0.0)
Total	3 (11.5)
<i>Other lessons</i>	
Cynicism	1 (3.8)

---

Table 28  
**Frequencies of lessons within *business mistake* event ( $n = 123$ )**

---

<b>Lesson category</b>	<b>Frequency (%)</b>
<i>Managing self</i>	
Learning about oneself	13 (10.6)
Management values and guiding principles	17 (13.8)
Managing one's career	3 (2.4)
Total	33 (26.8)
<i>Managing relationships</i>	
Managing direct reports	45 (36.6)
Managing upwards	12 (9.8)
Managing laterally	4 (3.3)
Effects of racial identity	1 (0.8)
Valuing diversity	2 (1.6)
Understanding organizational politics	2 (1.6)
Total	66 (53.7)
<i>Managing the work</i>	
Developing task and managerial skills	8 (6.5)
Managing divergent pressures	5 (4.1)
Managing change	8 (6.5)
Total	21 (17.1)
<i>Other lessons</i>	
Cynicism	3 (2.4)

---

Table 29  
**Frequencies of lessons within lousy job/missed promotion event (n = 66)**

<b>Lesson category</b>	<b>Frequency (%)</b>
<i>Managing self</i>	
Learning about oneself	7 (10.6)
Management values and guiding principles	7 (10.6)
Managing one's career	23 (34.8)
Total	37 (56.1)
<i>Managing relationships</i>	
Managing direct reports	7 (10.6)
Managing upwards	2 (3.0)
Managing laterally	1 (1.5)
Effects of racial identity	3 (4.5)
Valuing diversity	0 (0.0)
Understanding organizational politics	3 (4.5)
Total	16 (24.2)
<i>Managing the work</i>	
Developing task and managerial skills	2 (3.0)
Managing divergent pressures	2 (3.0)
Managing change	0 (0.0)
Total	4 (6.1)
<i>Other lessons</i>	
Cynicism	9 (13.6)

Table 30  
**Frequencies of lessons within *problems with subordinates* event (n = 103)**

---

<b>Lesson category</b>	<b>Frequency (%)</b>
<i>Managing self</i>	
Learning about oneself	8 (7.8)
Management values and guiding principles	9 (8.7)
Managing one's career	0 (0.0)
Total	17 (16.5)
<i>Managing relationships</i>	
Managing direct reports	66 (64.1)
Managing upwards	3 (2.9)
Managing laterally	1 (1.0)
Effects of racial identity	3 (2.9)
Valuing diversity	1 (1.0)
Understanding organizational politics	0 (0.0)
Total	74 (71.8)
<i>Managing the work</i>	
Developing task and managerial skills	2 (1.9)
Managing divergent pressures	1 (1.0)
Managing change	3 (2.9)
Total	6 (5.8)
<i>Other lessons</i>	
Cynicism	6 (5.8)

---



Table 31  
**Frequencies of lessons within *personal trauma* event ( $n = 23$ )**

---

<b>Lesson category</b>	<b>Frequency (%)</b>
<i>Managing self</i>	
Learning about oneself	5 (21.7)
Management values and guiding principles	4 (17.4)
Managing one's career	7 (30.4)
Total	16 (69.6)
<i>Managing relationships</i>	
Managing direct reports	1 (4.3)
Managing upwards	1 (4.3)
Managing laterally	0 (0.0)
Effects of racial identity	1 (4.3)
Valuing diversity	0 (0.0)
Understanding organizational politics	0 (0.0)
Total	3 (13.0)
<i>Managing the work</i>	
Developing task and managerial skills	3 (13.0)
Managing divergent pressures	0 (0.0)
Managing change	0 (0.0)
Total	3 (13.0)
<i>Other lessons</i>	
Cynicism	1 (4.3)

---

Table 32  
**Frequencies of lessons within race mattered event (n = 50)**

---

<b>Lesson category</b>	<b>Frequency (%)</b>
<i>Managing self</i>	
Learning about oneself	5 (10.0)
Management values and guiding principles	6 (12.0)
Managing one's career	4 (8.0)
Total	15 (30.0)
<i>Managing relationships</i>	
Managing direct reports	4 (8.0)
Managing upwards	3 (6.0)
Managing laterally	1 (2.0)
Effects of racial identity	19 (38.0)
Valuing diversity	4 (8.0)
Understanding organizational politics	0 (0.0)
Total	31 (62.0)
<i>Managing the work</i>	
Developing task and managerial skills	1 (2.0)
Managing divergent pressures	0 (0.0)
Managing change	0 (0.0)
Total	1 (2.0)
<i>Other lessons</i>	
Cynicism	3 (6.0)

---

Table 33  
**Frequencies of lessons within *downsizing* event ( $n = 39$ )**

---

<b>Lesson category</b>	<b>Frequency (%)</b>
<i>Managing self</i>	
Learning about oneself	4 (10.3)
Management values and guiding principles	7 (17.9)
Managing one's career	8 (20.5)
Total	19 (48.7)
<i>Managing relationships</i>	
Managing direct reports	7 (17.9)
Managing upwards	0 (0.0)
Managing laterally	1 (2.6)
Effects of racial identity	0 (0.0)
Valuing diversity	0 (0.0)
Understanding organizational politics	0 (0.0)
Total	8 (20.5)
<i>Managing the work</i>	
Developing task and managerial skills	1 (2.6)
Managing divergent pressures	2 (5.1)
Managing change	6 (15.4)
Total	9 (23.1)
<i>Other lessons</i>	
Cynicism	3 (7.7)

---

Table 34  
**Frequencies of lessons within *role models* event ( $n = 96$ )**

<b>Lesson category</b>	<b>Frequency (%)</b>
<i>Managing self</i>	
Learning about oneself	7 (7.3)
Management values and guiding principles	20 (20.8)
Managing one's career	6 (6.3)
Total	33 (34.4)
<i>Managing relationships</i>	
Managing direct reports	33 (34.4)
Managing upwards	11 (11.5)
Managing laterally	1 (1.0)
Effects of racial identity	1 (1.0)
Valuing diversity	0 (0.0)
Understanding organizational politics	3 (3.1)
Total	49 (51.0)
<i>Managing the work</i>	
Developing task and managerial skills	4 (4.2)
Managing divergent pressures	2 (2.1)
Managing change	2 (2.1)
Total	8 (8.3)
<i>Other lessons</i>	
Cynicism	6 (6.3)

Table 35  
**Frequencies of lessons within values played out event (n = 115)**

---

<b>Lesson category</b>	<b>Frequency (%)</b>
<i>Managing self</i>	
Learning about oneself	5 (4.3)
Management values and guiding principles	26 (22.6)
Managing one's career	7 (6.1)
Total	38 (33.0)
<i>Managing relationships</i>	
Managing direct reports	30 (26.1)
Managing upwards	11 (9.6)
Managing laterally	3 (2.6)
Effects of racial identity	2 (1.7)
Valuing diversity	5 (4.3)
Understanding organizational politics	2 (1.7)
Total	53 (46.1)
<i>Managing the work</i>	
Developing task and managerial skills	4 (3.5)
Managing divergent pressures	11 (9.6)
Managing change	1 (0.9)
Total	16 (13.9)
<i>Other lessons</i>	
Cynicism	8 (7.0)

---

Table 36  
**Frequencies of lessons within *mentors* event ( $n = 30$ )**

<b>Lesson category</b>	<b>Frequency (%)</b>
<i>Managing self</i>	
Learning about oneself	2 (6.7)
Management values and guiding principles	0 (0.0)
Managing one's career	10 (33.3)
Total	12 (40.0)
<i>Managing relationships</i>	
Managing direct reports	5 (16.7)
Managing upwards	2 (6.7)
Managing laterally	1 (3.3)
Effects of racial identity	0 (0.0)
Valuing diversity	0 (0.0)
Understanding organizational politics	4 (13.3)
Total	12 (40.0)
<i>Managing the work</i>	
Developing task and managerial skills	4 (13.3)
Managing divergent pressures	2 (6.7)
Managing change	0 (0.0)
Total	6 (20.0)
<i>Other lessons</i>	
Cynicism	0 (0.0)

Table 37  
**Frequencies of lessons within peers event (n = 23)**

---

<b>Lesson category</b>	<b>Frequency (%)</b>
<i>Managing self</i>	
Learning about oneself	1 (4.3)
Management values and guiding principles	3 (13.0)
Managing one's career	2 (8.7)
Total	6 (26.1)
<i>Managing relationships</i>	
Managing direct reports	1 (4.3)
Managing upwards	1 (4.3)
Managing laterally	5 (21.7)
Effects of racial identity	0 (0.0)
Valuing diversity	0 (0.0)
Understanding organizational politics	3 (13.0)
Total	10 (43.4)
<i>Managing the work</i>	
Developing task and managerial skills	0 (0.0)
Managing divergent pressures	2 (8.7)
Managing change	0 (0.0)
Total	2 (8.7)
<i>Other lessons</i>	
Cynicism	5 (21.7)

---

Table 38  
**Frequencies of lessons within coursework event (n = 46)**

<b>Lesson category</b>	<b>Frequency (%)</b>
<i>Managing self</i>	
Learning about oneself	14 (30.4)
Management values and guiding principles	7 (15.2)
Managing one's career	4 (8.7)
Total	25 (54.3)
<i>Managing relationships</i>	
Managing direct reports	10 (21.7)
Managing upwards	0 (0.0)
Managing laterally	0 (0.0)
Effects of racial identity	0 (0.0)
Valuing diversity	1 (2.2)
Understanding organizational politics	1 (2.2)
Total	12 (26.1)
<i>Managing the work</i>	
Developing task and managerial skills	8 (17.4)
Managing divergent pressures	0 (0.0)
Managing change	1 (2.2)
Total	9 (34.6)
<i>Other lessons</i>	
Cynicism	0 (0.0)



Table 39  
**Frequencies of lessons within *early work experience* event ( $n = 16$ )**

---

<b>Lesson category</b>	<b>Frequency (%)</b>
<i>Managing self</i>	
Learning about oneself	1 (6.3)
Management values and guiding principles	2 (12.5)
Managing one's career	3 (18.8)
Total	6 (37.5)
<i>Managing relationships</i>	
Managing direct reports	4 (25.0)
Managing upwards	0 (0.0)
Managing laterally	1 (6.3)
Effects of racial identity	1 (6.3)
Valuing diversity	0 (0.0)
Understanding organizational politics	0 (0.0)
Total	6 (37.5)
<i>Managing the work</i>	
Developing task and managerial skills	1 (6.3)
Managing divergent pressures	0 (0.0)
Managing change	1 (6.3)
Total	2 (12.5)
<i>Other lessons</i>	
Cynicism	2 (12.5)

---

Table 40  
**Frequencies of lessons within *first supervision event* ( $n = 32$ )**

---

<b>Lesson category</b>	<b>Frequency (%)</b>
<i>Managing self</i>	
Learning about oneself	3 (9.4)
Management values and guiding principles	0 (0.0)
Managing one's career	5 (15.6)
Total	8 (25.0)
<i>Managing relationships</i>	
Managing direct reports	14 (43.8)
Managing upwards	0 (0.0)
Managing laterally	0 (0.0)
Effects of racial identity	0 (0.0)
Valuing diversity	1 (3.1)
Understanding organizational politics	0 (0.0)
Total	15 (46.9)
<i>Managing the work</i>	
Developing task and managerial skills	7 (21.9)
Managing divergent pressures	2 (6.3)
Managing change	0 (0.0)
Total	9 (28.1)
<i>Other lessons</i>	
Cynicism	0 (0.0)

---

Table 41  
**Frequencies of lessons within *purely personal* event (n = 13)**

---

<b>Lesson category</b>	<b>Frequency (%)</b>
<i>Managing self</i>	
Learning about oneself	3 (23.1)
Management values and guiding principles	4 (30.8)
Managing one's career	2 (15.4)
Total	9 (69.2)
<i>Managing relationships</i>	
Managing direct reports	3 (23.1)
Managing upwards	0 (0.0)
Managing laterally	1 (7.7)
Effects of racial identity	0 (0.0)
Valuing diversity	0 (0.0)
Understanding organizational politics	0 (0.0)
Total	4 (30.8)
<i>Managing the work</i>	
Developing task and managerial skills	0 (0.0)
Managing divergent pressures	0 (0.0)
Managing change	0 (0.0)
Total	0 (0.0)
<i>Other lessons</i>	
Cynicism	0 (0.0)

---

Table 42  
**Frequencies of lessons within *feedback* event ( $n = 71$ )**

---

<b>Lesson category</b>	<b>Frequency (%)</b>
<i>Managing self</i>	
Learning about oneself	24 (33.8)
Management values and guiding principles	5 (7.0)
Managing one's career	7 (9.9)
Total	36 (50.7)
<i>Managing relationships</i>	
Managing direct reports	12 (16.9)
Managing upwards	0 (0.0)
Managing laterally	3 (4.2)
Effects of racial identity	5 (7.0)
Valuing diversity	0 (0.0)
Understanding organizational politics	7 (9.9)
Total	27 (38.0)
<i>Managing the work</i>	
Developing task and managerial skills	0 (0.0)
Managing divergent pressures	2 (2.8)
Managing change	3 (4.2)
Total	5 (7.0)
<i>Other lessons</i>	
Cynicism	3 (4.2)

---

Table 43  
**Frequencies of lessons within *business success* event ( $n = 42$ )**

<b>Lesson category</b>	<b>Frequency (%)</b>
<i>Managing self</i>	
Learning about oneself	8 (19.0)
Management values and guiding principles	5 (11.9)
Managing one's career	4 (9.5)
Total	17 (40.5)
<i>Managing relationships</i>	
Managing direct reports	9 (21.4)
Managing upwards	2 (4.8)
Managing laterally	4 (9.5)
Effects of racial identity	0 (0.0)
Valuing diversity	0 (0.0)
Understanding organizational politics	0 (0.0)
Total	15 (35.7)
<i>Managing the work</i>	
Developing task and managerial skills	1 (2.4)
Managing divergent pressures	6 (14.3)
Managing change	3 (7.1)
Total	10 (23.8)
<i>Other lessons</i>	
Cynicism	0 (0.0)

## Ordering Information

For more information, to order additional CCL Press publications, or to find out about bulk-order discounts, please contact us by phone at **336-545-2810** or visit our online bookstore at **[www.ccl.org/publications](http://www.ccl.org/publications)**.

# KEY EVENTS AND LESSONS FOR MANAGERS IN A DIVERSE WORKFORCE

The survival of an organization often depends on its developing effective leaders. Along with formal executive training efforts, job experiences and assignments are also crucial to managerial development and career success. Just as the workplace continues to change, the experiences that managers see as key to their own leadership development are also changing. One of those changes is the growing diversity of potential executives. The research documented in this report was designed to (1) uncover the significant events from which African American managers learn and develop; (2) determine if the key events and lessons African American managers learned are different from those of white managers; and (3) determine if there were new experiences or lessons reported since CCL originally researched the lessons of experience in the 1980s. Answers to those questions help scholars explore the effect that a manager's race or ethnicity has on career experience, and how a manager might develop as a result of those experiences.

## The Author

Christina A. Douglas is a former research associate at the Center for Creative Leadership. During her tenure at CCL, she conducted research in the areas of management development, diversity, and developmental relationships. She holds a Ph.D. in organizational behavior and human resources from Purdue University.

