

MAKING WAY FOR PARADIGMS OF DIVERSITY LEADERSHIP

Jean Lau Chin
Adelphi University

Lyne Desormeaux
*Desormeaux Leadership
Consulting, New York, New York*

Katina Sawyer
Villanova University

To gain a better understanding of the new leadership challenges that diversity is bringing to organizations, the American Psychological Association provided an Interdivisional Grant to conduct a 1-day Leadership Diversity Summit (LDS). In January 2013, 15 leaders who were diverse across dimensions of race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation came together to discuss the following questions: (a) How do you view leadership? (b) How is your exercise of leadership influenced by the context in which you lead, the multiple dimensions of your identity, and your lived experiences associated with culture and minority status? (c) How do you project the kind of leadership needed for the future, given the rapid change, growing diversity, and increased globalization in society? Each question was covered in a roundtable session, and discussions were recorded, transcribed, and content-analyzed. As a result, the LDS identified 4 competencies (with 16 dimensions) that are likely to be crucial to leadership in the coming years as organizations become increasingly diverse: leveraging personal and social identities, utilizing a global and diverse mindset, leveraging community and organizational contexts, and promoting a diversity-supportive and inclusive climate. In this article we describe how the LDS was conducted; discuss the framework of competencies that was identified, drawing on the insights provided by participants and on our own experiences as consulting psychologists; and then consider the implications of this framework for current practice in executive coaching and organizational consulting and for future research on diversity leadership.

Keywords: competencies, diversity, intersectionality, leadership, social identities

Organizations and the societies they serve are becoming increasingly diverse (Lowman, 2013; Finkelman & Lopez, 2012). Yet, the importance of diversity in our lives, communities, and workplaces has simply not infused our understanding of leadership. Our theories and research on

Jean Lau Chin, Derner Institute for Advanced Psychological Studies, Adelphi University; Lyne Desormeaux, Desormeaux Leadership Consulting, New York, New York; Katina Sawyer, Department of Psychology, Graduate Programs in Human Resource Development, Villanova University.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Katina Sawyer, Department of Psychology, Graduate Programs in Human Resource Development, Villanova University, 800 Lancaster Avenue, St. Mary's Hall, Suite 119, Villanova, PA 19085. E-mail: katina.sawyer@villanova.edu

leadership have neglected the influence of diversity on access to leadership positions and the exercise of leadership. Our leadership-training models often presume that there is simply one prototypical leader. This is manifest in the disparities that persist in the representation of women and racial/ethnic minorities within the ranks of leadership in corporate, higher-education, and political sectors (Chin & Trimble, 2014, p. 11). The changing landscape of a diverse and global society brings with it a range of new leadership challenges for maintaining leader effectiveness and for the exercise of leadership overall. To gain a better understanding of these challenges, the first two authors convened a summit of diverse leaders. We hoped that by having these leaders share how their leadership behaviors were shaped by their identities associated with race, gender, ethnicity, and sexual orientation, as well as by their lived experiences associated with sociocultural contexts, we might help lay the groundwork for diversity-inclusive leadership practice and research. In short, we wanted to elucidate diversity leadership, which may well differ from more “traditional” leadership paradigms.

The Leadership Diversity Summit (LDS) deliberated on views of leadership and on understanding the identities, leadership styles, and lived experiences of diverse leaders. The discussions revealed a clear set of leadership competencies that the participating leaders saw as vitally important for an increasingly global and diverse world. In this article we report on the LDS, describing the process of how it was conducted. We then present the framework of competencies identified by the summit and discuss each of the competencies, drawing on the insights provided by participants and on our own experiences as consulting psychologists. Next we consider the implications of this framework for current practice in executive coaching and organizational consulting and for future research on diversity leadership. Finally, we offer some concluding remarks.

Key Definitions

Before describing the process for the LDS, we should provide some key definitions that guided the design of the summit, the creation of focal questions, and the selection of leader participants.

Leadership

First, there are many definitions of leadership. Northouse (2004) defined leadership as a process that involves influence occurring within a group context and which involves goal attainment. Similarly, Rost (1991, p. 102) defined it as “an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes.” We have been guided by both of these definitions within the current study. However, we postulate that the social identities and lived experiences of leaders and their followers significantly influence the nature of leadership.

Diversity

Second, there are also many views of diversity. Cooper and Leong (2008) pointed out that the terms *multiculturalism* and *diversity* have been used interchangeably to include aspects of identity. Using the definition of multiculturalism taken from the *Guidelines on Multicultural Education, Training, Research, Practice, and Organizational Change for Psychologists* (American Psychological Association, 2002), these authors define multiculturalism as “the broad scope of dimensions of race, ethnicity, language, sexual orientation, gender, age, disability, class status, education, religious/spiritual orientation, and other cultural dimensions.” Although this definition provides a basis for understanding multiculturalism as important for understanding diversity, we frame multiculturalism as a dimension of diversity, given the reflections of our participants and our analysis of their conversations. Chin and Trimble (2014) defined diversity from within the multicultural literature as based on principles of inclusiveness, cultural competence, difference, and multiculturalism. Attention to diversity is about valuing differences between groups and inclusion of all groups. It is not simply about representation of diverse leaders in the ranks of leadership but about the cultural competence of leaders and organizations to work effectively across groups and differences among

leaders and members. These authors differentiated between cross-cultural and diverse; the former compares differences between cultures or countries while the latter examines subgroup differences within a larger group, country, or organization. For our purposes, we view diversity in this way as well, in terms of difference with regard to a larger context (national, organizational, etc.) and by also giving consideration to cross-cultural influences, which may change how leaders influence diverse others across national borders.

Intersectionality

Finally, it is also important to note that we utilize an intersectional lens in order to examine diversity and leadership. Intersectionality is the theory of identity in which its dimensions are viewed as operating simultaneously and in interaction with one another (Crenshaw, 1989). For example, a Black lesbian woman may have differential experiences in the workplace compared with Blacks, lesbians, and women overall. Hence, the ways in which these multiple identities intersect to influence leadership competencies and experiences are central to our concern and was examined within the LDS.

Diversity Leadership

In a review of the leadership literature, Eagly and Chin (2010) noted the omission of diversity has “weakened the ability of research and theory to address some of the most provocative aspects of contemporary leadership, including (a) the limited access to leadership roles for people from outside the dominant group; (b) how leaders’ behaviors are shaped by their dual identities as leaders and members of gender, racial, ethnic, or other identity groups; and (c) the potential for people from outside the dominant group to provide excellent leadership because of their differences” (p. 216). There has been little research conducted to examine what diversity leadership is or to include the perspectives of diverse leaders. Existing leadership theories and most empirical leadership studies draw from a narrow sample of leaders—largely that of white, heterosexual men. Some of the major leadership theories including trait theories (Bass, 1990; Lord, De Vader, & Alliger, 1986), contingency theories (Fiedler, 1993), leader-member exchange theories (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995), and leadership styles (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Burns, 1978) have largely sought universal dimensions to characterize leader behaviors and attributes. Examination of contexts in these theories has largely been confined to the organizations in which leadership is exercised. These include such leadership styles as transformational leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1994) and task versus expressive leadership styles (Eagly & Johnson, 1990). However, it is unclear whether these styles reflect how leadership is exercised among diverse leaders.

Chin and Trimble (2014) recently discussed the need for leadership theories and practice to be global and diverse to create culturally competent leaders and organizations. They identified issues in current leadership models and suggested ways of reframing these theories to include dimensions of diversity (see Table 1). Studies in cross-cultural leadership have been conducted by House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, and Gupta (2004) where implicit cultural beliefs, values, and world-views underlie their framework. In their GLOBE studies they found cultural variation in six Culturally Endorsed Implicit Leadership Theory (CLT) leadership dimensions endorsed by leaders across 62 countries via a survey of 17,000 middle managers from 951 organizations in the food processing, finance, and telecommunications industries; these dimensions both facilitate and inhibit outstanding leadership. Although comprehensive in nature regarding cultural variation, the GLOBE studies specifically minimized diversity in the within country samples. Chin (2013) examined these within-country differences for leaders across five racial/ethnic groups in the U.S. (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, and Native American Indians) and found important variation across diversity dimensions of race, ethnicity, and gender in their perceptions of leadership. Chin (2013) attributed these differences to the common lived experience of minority status in the U.S. and of marginality and oppression among diverse leaders of color that set them apart from the White males in the study. Thus, we also explored these issues in the LDS.

Table 1
Reframing Current Theories of Leadership (Chin & Trimble, 2014, pp. 40–41)

Theory	Dilemma	Reframing for diversity leadership
Trait	Focuses on who leaders are. Has failed to identify a universal set of traits that distinguishes leaders. Ethnocentric; not inclusive; traits are based on those already in positions of leadership and may be biased against those groups who have had poor access to leadership roles.	Shift to leader identity intersecting with dimensions of social identities.
Situational	Focuses on where leaders act. Application of directive and supportive dimensions across different contexts/situations. Fiedler's leader-match contingency theory uses the Least Preferred Coworker Measure and is potentially harmful in not attending to unconscious biases associated with dimensions of diversity, e.g., race.	Emphasize adaptability of leaders across diverse contexts, as well as bicultural and cognitive flexibility as a function of acculturation.
Leadership style	Focuses on what leaders do. Transformational leadership has become favored in the 21st century; however, varying definitions that include charisma as a trait favors more Western and masculinized notions of leadership.	Expand these notions of what leaders do to include non-Western perspectives.
Leader–member exchange (LMX)	Focuses on the interaction between leaders and members. Leadership is cocreated in groups. Runs counter to principles of fairness and justice because it emphasizes building exchanges with in-group members as those who would most contribute to the organization's goal. Principles exclude and disadvantage minority and historically oppressed members as out-groups while privileging the in-group; viewed as unfair and discriminatory by out-groups.	Build a DLMOX framework, which includes diverse leaders and members interacting within the context of their organizations and lived experiences.

Method

To begin to understand the potential role of diversity in leadership, the first two authors planned and convened the LDS, held in January 2013, together with liaisons from six participating divisions of the American Psychological Association (APA): Consulting (Division 13); Industrial/Organizational (Division 14); Women (Division 35); Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (Division 44); Culture, Ethnicity, and Race (Division 45); and Men and Masculinity (Division 51). The LDS was funded by an APA Interdivisional grant. These divisions and their liaisons came together because of their common interest in diversity and its intersection with issues of leadership; they represent a cross section of practice, research, and individual, personal dimensions of diversity. The third author participated in the LDS as an observer and as a coordinator of the coding of the transcriptions of group discussions.

Diverse leaders were invited to participate in the LDS to identify their views of leadership, understand the intersection of their social identities with their leader identities, and identify how their leadership styles were informed by their social identities and lived experiences.

Leader Participants

Fifteen leaders were nominated by organizers of the LDS and invited to participate in the session. The final sample included leaders from four industry sectors (corporate, government/military, community nonprofit, and higher education). They were diverse across dimensions of race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation. Demographic characteristics of the leaders (detailed in Table 2)

Table 2
Leader Characteristics

Characteristic	Total population (<i>N</i> = 15)
Gender	
Male, <i>n</i> (%)	5 (33.33)
Female, <i>n</i> (%)	10 (66.67)
Transgender	
Transgender, <i>n</i> (%)	0 (0)
Cisgender, <i>n</i> (%)	15 (100)
Age group	
40–49, <i>n</i> (%)	4 (26.67)
50–59, <i>n</i> (%)	9 (60)
60+, <i>n</i> (%)	2 (13.33)
Race/ethnicity	
Native American, <i>n</i> (%)	1 (6.67)
Asian, <i>n</i> (%)	3 (20)
Black, <i>n</i> (%)	3 (20)
White, <i>n</i> (%)	6 (40)
Hispanic, <i>n</i> (%)	2 (13.33)
Middle Eastern, <i>n</i> (%)	0 (0)
Other, <i>n</i> (%)	0 (0)
Mixed race or ethnicity	
Mixed race or ethnicity	1 (6.67)
Non-mixed race ethnicity	14 (93.33)
Sexuality	
Heterosexual, <i>n</i> (%)	11 (73.33)
Lesbian, <i>n</i> (%)	3 (20)
Gay, <i>n</i> (%)	1 (6.67)
Bisexual, <i>n</i> (%)	0 (0)
Sector	
Mental health/psychology, <i>n</i> (%)	3 (20)
Higher education, <i>n</i> (%)	5 (33)
Corporation, <i>n</i> (%)	2 (13.33)
Government, <i>n</i> (%)	3 (20)
Military, <i>n</i> (%)	2 (13.33)
Community nonprofit agency, <i>n</i> (%)	7 (46.67)

were as follows: 67% of the leaders were women and 33% were men; 27% were between the ages of 40 and 49, 60% were between the ages of 50 and 59, and 13% were age 60 or above; 73% were heterosexual, 20% lesbian, and 7% gay. Race/ethnicity of minority groups was intentionally oversampled compared with the general population, whereas Whites were intentionally under-sampled. Middle Eastern groups were not represented.

The mean number of years in their current leadership positions was 6, with a range from 1 to 16 years. The mean number of years in all leadership positions was 18, with a range from 8 to 35. Leaders reported as many sectors as were relevant to their particular organizations, as shown in Table 2. Position titles of the leaders and the types of organizations they lead are identified in the Appendix with their permission.

Focus-Group Discussions

The leaders at the LDS met for one full day. During this period of time, the two senior authors facilitated a series of four focus-group discussions, each lasting an hour and 15 minutes, using a

roundtable format. Following welcome and introductions, leaders from each industry sector met as a group for 45 minutes to acclimate to the LDS process. Each of three focus-group discussions centered on our research questions (listed below) and the fourth discussion was a question-and-answer session that included observers of the LDS and enabled the leaders to reflect on the LDS process. The focus-group questions were as follows: (a) How do you view leadership? (b) How is your exercise of leadership influenced by the context in which you lead, the multiple dimensions of your identity, and your lived experiences associated with culture and minority status? and (c) How do you project the kind of leadership needed for the future, given the rapid change, growing diversity, and increased globalization in society?

The focus-group discussions were audio and video recorded by a graduate student of the first author. A graduate student of the third author transcribed the audio tapes for each discussion. Three independent coders (third author and two graduate students) then coded each of the audio tapes using a rigorous qualitative methodology from Auerbach and Silverstein (2003). First, the coders identified parts of text or quotations in the transcripts that were relevant to diversity and leadership. Then, these chunks of relevant text were grouped into themes or dimensions that were then further grouped into higher-order constructs. These higher-order constructs were deemed the competencies that are incorporated into our competency framework. To promote interrater reliability, the independent coders would regularly stop to reflect on their coding and come to consensus with one another after each step of the process (that is, after identifying relevant text, themes, and competencies). This process enabled coders to move back and forth between the data and their emerging constructs for a grounded approach. These consensus meetings were extensive and continued until all coders agreed on the finalized structure. The results of this qualitative analysis are presented below.

Results

Themes of Diverse Leaders

Although leaders came from four different industry sectors, the focus groups were not directed to elicit discussion of the different demands or characteristics of those different sectors. Although the participants' social identities were multiple and intersecting across dimensions of race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation, analysis did not attempt to distinguish separate profiles by these characteristics. Rather, the focus-group discussions were intended to elicit how diverse leaders viewed their leadership, how they felt their dimensions of identity and lived experiences influenced their exercise of leadership, and how diversity influenced their leadership styles. In fact, the process used in the LDS was illuminating as a way to identify and create new knowledge about leadership and to train diverse leaders. The leaders themselves commented about the safety and climate of the focus-group discussions, which promoted self-reflection and encouraged them to discuss dilemmas of how their leadership was influenced by social identities and lived experiences.

Four competencies with 16 dimensions emerged from the coding of the transcripts from the LDS (see Table 3): (a) leveraging personal and social identities, (b) utilizing a global and diverse mindset, (c) leveraging community and organizational contexts, and (d) promoting a diversity-supportive and inclusive climate. These competencies and dimensions were viewed by our diverse leaders as important for effective leadership.

A discussion of the competency framework follows, together with illustrative quotes.

Competency 1: Leveraging Personal and Social Identities

The importance of identity development as it relates to the practice of leadership was pervasive as an overarching theme. An observer posed the following question: "In developing leaders, is there some value in mentoring toward identity development?" The ensuing discussion touched upon social-identity development as being critical to leadership and "correlated with authenticity." Some spoke about drawing from their racial and ethnic heritage and lived experiences as leaders, and others detailed how embracing their complete identities as leaders was liberating. At the same time the intersection of identity and leadership was not experienced by all groups in the same way; for

Table 3
Competency Framework for Diversity Leadership

Competencies	Competency dimensions
<p>Leveraging personal and social identities</p> <p>“I think the question that I had the hardest time with . . . was about how sexual orientation had impacted my leadership. . . . As I thought about it, it’s because [it has impacted my leadership] but it’s changed over time. It’s changed over time because . . . America has changed over time.”</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recognizing intersectionality 2. Leading authentically 3. Balancing self-promotion with being humble 4. Projecting confidence in the face of identity backlash 5. Building trust and demonstrating integrity across diverse groups
<p>Utilizing a global and diverse mindset</p> <p>“I think that leaders are going to have even a different responsibility than only mentoring leaders coming up. . . . [We will need] to have an expanding definition of diversity. . . . I just don’t think that [existing ones are] adequate to capture the complexity of the world we live in.”</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Being culturally competent 2. Demonstrating cross-cultural flexibility 3. Promoting diverse and inclusive leadership styles
<p>Leveraging community and organizational contexts</p> <p>“I grew up in the segregated South, and my parents were community organizers. . . . It was always on their minds that you are colored. . . . Later I had my White world where I was a cheerleader and the president of the class . . . but then, when I went home and I’m in my Black world [with] the Black church and everything . . . those are things that helped to shape my identity.”</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Drawing from lived experiences 2. Developing affinity networks and engaging with diverse communities 3. Self-protection
<p>Promoting a diversity-supportive and inclusive climate</p> <p>“We select the faculty and . . . we came up with this strategy where we tried to anticipate these issues two and three and four years out, and we wrote every HBCU and every Hispanic-serving institution, and just said these are positions we expect to have in the next few years and we want you to please let your people . . . who are in graduate school know about these positions.”</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Communicating effectively across diverse groups 2. Advancing a shared vision for diversity 3. Mentoring diverse employees 4. Maintaining accountability for promoting diversity within the organization

example, LGBT identity was discussed as being invisible, allowing individuals to avoid stigma given the “invisibility of privilege.” The salience of social identities was viewed as important in the exercise of leadership among diverse leaders. Five major dimensions that the leaders emphasized in relationship to identity, described below, were recognizing intersectionality, leading authentically, balancing self-promotion with being humble, projecting confidence in the face of identity backlash, and building trust and demonstrating integrity across diverse groups.

Recognizing intersectionality. Consistent quotations within this dimension referenced leaders carrying multiple identities with them, even though this concept is scarcely discussed in the leadership literature. There are some exceptions to the lack of work on this topic, namely the work of [Livingston, Rosette, and Washington \(2012\)](#) on intersections of race and gender as they relate to leader perceptions, as well as the work of [Sawyer, Salter, and Thoroughgood \(2013\)](#). Missing from the research on intersectionality is how recognition of multiple group memberships of subordinates shapes how one leads. In addition to reflection on the impact of intersectional identities on their leadership, leaders need to value the intersectionality of multiple identities among their employees as well. As one LDS leader stated, in discussing a gay mentor who continued to receive only gay mentees,

You have to see people . . . as multidimensional. You can’t see them as just the gay guy. . . . While it may not have been so great that he kept getting gay mentees, the flip side would have been if [gay] people had been getting [mentors] who were not open to people being gay. So you have to . . . try to match up

people well. And I think that takes a real multidimensional perspective and it means you have to know enough about people. You see them on several dimensions and that's a hard thing to do sometimes.

The LDS leaders were clear that recognizing multiple-identity membership was crucial in managing and training leaders and individual employees. Another leader noted, "What we used to drive into leaders and managers, informal and formal ones, was . . . get this, it is through the act of seeing another human being in all of their dimensions that brings their contribution into existence." Similarly, another leader emphasized that leadership models need to reflect the reality of our multidimensionality and that we need to "contemporize our leadership models." This emphasis on intersectional identity was clear in leaders' style of understanding employees and in understanding themselves as leaders.

Leading authentically. The second dimension within social identities was authenticity—which is the extent to which a leader can be his or her true self when leading. The recent body of work on authentic leader behavior and its origins initiated by Avolio, Gardner, and Walumbwa (2005) paved the way for establishing a theory and practice. Being authentic becomes particularly difficult when a leader embodies multiple identities and needs to determine when to reveal or give preference to particular identities across different contexts. As an example of this tension, one Latina leader said,

Well, we stayed within our communities; so the next step, if you want to take that step, [is] if you leave your [Latino/Latina] community and you go to Harvard or you go to the government. . . . How do you translate a lot of those values and keep true to yourself, your authentic self?

Another leader said, "For many people in the LGBT community, there's this . . . social stigma that is still very prevalent against LGBT people, and many people bring that to the workplace with them." Thus, it was highlighted that leadership authenticity may depend on how progressive a specific organizational culture is and what is "permissible" to show in terms of one's identity. As one of the gay leaders said,

I think the question that I had the hardest time with . . . was about how sexual orientation had impacted my leadership. . . . As I thought about it, it's because [it has impacted my leadership] but it's changed over time. It's changed over time because . . . America has changed over time.

Some leaders believed that authenticity was fundamental to being a good leader but also highlighted that it took a lot of self-work and self-awareness to be deliberately authentic. In addition, these same leaders believed that colleagues will know and can observe if a leader is authentic or not. For example, one leader noted,

We really can own the fact that, wow, it's not based on what I'm saying to you about my leadership ability; it's about what you will sort of conclude based on your read on my authenticity, [and] your read on my integrity. And that's a whole different level of accountability that I can't then own, I can't control, which means I got to just be the best as I can be as a leader.

Further highlighting the self-reflection necessary for diverse leaders, another leader stated, "How can you have authenticity if you're not leading from who you are and where you are in the context in which you live?" These quotations reflect the recognition that one's behavior is a representation of one's leadership and that people are always watching, especially if you are a leader. Highlighting the importance of being vigilant about controlling one's personal behavior with regard to identity, one leader stressed,

Behavior is not about skills; I can have the skills and still not behave. I can behave right without having the skills. And so as we move forward in this incredibly diverse, rapidly changing pace, skills are no longer determinants of sustainable success, not as a leader, not as a business, not as an institution. They just aren't. . . . Instead it's going to be my behavior.

Overall, the link between authenticity and leading in a diverse context was one of the most important takeaways from the leaders. Clearly it may be easier to be an authentic leader in more

inclusive contexts. Thus, leaders who wish to be authentic may feel constrained if they have to monitor their multiple selves in response to a noninclusive context. Thus, authentic leadership is not a static event but a continual exploration and understanding of one's diversity (or diversities) in response to particular situations and contexts.

Balancing self-promotion with being humble. One of the major cultural conflicts that many LDS leaders identified was the concept of self-promotion versus remaining humble. Specifically, leaders discussed the ways in which the idea of self-promotion is linked to gender, race, and cultural upbringing; thus, it was necessary to consider how self-promotion would be experienced or received based on one's identity. One leader recalled his conflict: "But that's the struggle; how much can I self-promote and still feel kind of authentic to who I am, feel like I'm not bragging. And it depends on the situation; it's contextual." Some leaders also talked about how needing to adapt across different cultural contexts drove some of their decisions to self-promote or to maintain a humble exterior. A Native American leader, whose culture viewed self-promotion as detrimental, explained,

On this idea of multiple identities and how we navigate between those identities . . . what we value a lot is humility. . . . The idea of self-promotion . . . is a real cultural conflict for us, because as I've said, we don't promote ourselves. But I'll tell you what, if you're a junior faculty within higher education, you better promote yourself, because if you don't beat that drum, nobody's going to beat it for you. So . . . it's . . . those kinds of role conflicts that go on between the values that are . . . in my tribe and my ethnicity versus what's valued within the organization.

Another leader said,

This has been my struggle throughout. How can I be who I was taught to be in my home versus what I'm being asked to be as a leader? How much can I self-promote and still feel kind of authentic . . . ? When I was up for promotion, I got people to write great letters for me . . . so I could listen to them talk about me, rather than having to talk about myself.

These quotes highlight the unique push-and-pull that diverse leaders may experience in balancing promotion with maintaining a culturally acceptable presence within the organization.

Projecting confidence in the face of identity backlash. Confidence was also discussed as a valued dimension. Projecting confidence in the face of identity backlash is connected to the research on stereotype threat (Steele & Aronson, 1995) and stigma-induced identity threat (Major & O'Brien, 2005). Projecting confidence is especially important among minority leaders who often do not receive initial validation as leaders. Hence, being given a position of power or a title can often give diverse leaders the confidence needed to be effective. However, leaders in the LDS warned about mistaking positional leadership for effective leadership. As one leader stated,

When I think about myself as a woman, as a person of color . . . I think positional leadership may afford somebody a sense of confidence, but that doesn't mean that they've really become an effective leader. But I think . . . leaders who have the title, that sense of confidence of what you're able to do, what you can bring to the table or what you can be . . . , [have something] important.

Maintaining an affirmative stance was stressed by one leader who pointed out that "diverse leaders should have enough confidence not to question themselves continually because they may already have some internalized doubts about their personal effectiveness as a result of perceptions about their identity." Another leader highlighted the dilemma, saying,

But the criticisms of the position when you're in a positional leadership role aren't always personalized. And it becomes about the position and the decisions related to that and not necessarily about who you are. Because soon, I think if you allow that behavior to go on inside you, you then question everything and you become less effective.

Overall, these quotes speak to the phenomenon of how diverse leaders might internalize the negative expectations accorded by others and find showing confidence more taxing than nondiverse leaders do.

Building trust and demonstrating integrity across diverse groups. Trust and integrity were also central to the leaders' style. The body of research on leader behavior and its ethical implications is represented in the Big Five factors of personality and is especially important in how a leader can be perceived as trustful. Den Hartog and Kalshoven (2009, p. 116) found that a "leader's ethical behaviors such as clarifying roles, sharing power, and acting fairly signal that these leaders can be seen as ideal representatives of the group, and that in turn implies they can be trusted." Leaders highlighted that they had to be true to themselves and not be afraid of showing all of themselves, especially when they were different from their constituencies. One leader said, "I think [that trust] . . . is important. . . . The leader . . . [must] be comfortable enough in him- or herself to allow the kids to get dirty, to play, to make mistakes, to fall down, not to do for them, to let them do for themselves, and be able to kind of create that environment." Leaders also stressed the importance of a moral compassion in conjunction with utilizing personal values to make decisions—that is, having integrity. Building a network of trusting relationships was thought to facilitate acting with integrity, because individuals could be true to themselves without fearing repercussions. As a leader said,

That comes to the top two characteristics that this group valued, I think, which is authenticity and integrity. So you are who you are across whatever group you're talking about. You change your message and you may even change the way your message is delivered but the fundamental core of your message is that.

In sum, leveraging social identities played a crucial role in how these participants viewed their performance as leaders as well as how their performance was perceived by others. As they navigated their leadership, this competency was viewed as essential to becoming an effective diverse leader, particularly given the challenges and conflicts faced by leaders who were often perceived and judged by their social identities (and expected to behave in accordance with these) and not by their performance as leaders.

Competency 2: Utilizing a Global and Diverse Mindset

As expected, leaders believed that being able to speak across cultures and to be able to quickly recognize the nuances of cross-cultural situations were vastly important to leadership. Further, these leaders felt that fostering these skills in their employees was also necessary in creating effective leaders for the future. Thus, the following three dimensions were deemed important in utilizing a global and diverse mindset: being culturally competent, demonstrating cross-cultural flexibility, and promoting diverse and inclusive leadership styles.

Being culturally competent. Cultural competence was viewed by the LDS leaders as central to the dimensions needed for effective leadership. Cultural competence can be defined as the ability to work with and across diverse cultures and groups. It is a competency in which a leader promotes inclusiveness of all groups, and values and respects differences. An African American leader said,

It is important because when I think of culturally fluent leadership, it really involves constellations of things. Fundamentally, I view cultural competence as the ability to work with and for diverse cultures [along] a spectrum. At the high end of that spectrum is what we call *cultural fluency* or . . . *cultural proficiency*. So [cultural competence is your] ability to work with a diverse group of folks with diversity broadly defined and yet move towards a common direction. . . . There's an acronym [that defines cultural competence]: ASK (awareness, skills, and knowledge); it came out of a clinical context. . . . In a leadership context, it [becomes] BASK because [it adds behaviors to this model] and emphasizes the exchange of behaviors that takes place between leaders and members—together with awareness, both self-awareness and awareness of others; skills like cross-cultural communication and being able to listen effectively, not just speaking effectively; and knowledge, because you need to know about different groups that I belong to. If you're going to really work with me you have to know some African American history. You don't have to be African American, [but] you need to know some history.

A Latino American male leader reflected on his dilemma of developing cultural competence: “How do I be macho and still be . . . supportive of women, supportive of sexual-orientation issues, and supportive of all these diverse issues? How do I . . . sort these things out when all these different constituencies have different opinions [and] they are really strongly convicted?”

Another leader described how cultural fluency is a skill that leaders should work on developing to enable them to lead across different organizational contexts and cultures. Building on that point, an observer gave examples of generational issues and the development of cultural fluency. An observer added that she felt younger generations were struggling with their comfort level about who they were and noted,

It appears to me that you [experienced leaders] are settled with who you are and are conscious of how other people view you and what impacts your role as a leader. Knowing yourself has been important; to be a leader takes being aware of your surroundings, where you’re at, and what people think of you.

With regard to younger generations, many participants felt chagrin when people assert that they “cannot see race.” A leader spoke about how he reconciled this discomfort. He asked himself, “At what point do you take that leadership and say I am going to go there or not? That is the burden of awareness.” Taken together, these quotes demonstrate that leaders are struggling with cultural competence, both on a personal level and with regard to instilling it in employees, particularly as younger generations may have come to view diversity issues as having been “solved.”

Demonstrating cross-cultural flexibility. Flexibility or adaptability in managing and promoting change was also a central theme, as leaders emphasized the need to change the organizational culture if one is to succeed in creating an increasingly diverse environment. Caligiuri and Thoroughgood (2015) examined the unique characteristics and competencies of socially responsible global leaders; flexibility or agility was one of them. The LDS leaders underscored that diversity needed to be compelling to all within the organization; therefore, viewing diversity as a competitive advantage and as driving the bottom line were important concepts for motivating individuals to achieve cultural flexibility. One leader spoke about managing change, saying,

When you look at the changing world, you have younger generations coming in with very different expectations regarding communication. . . . Maybe we should start thinking about how different the world is going to look in five years as we start to frame, “How do we want to be as leaders?” and try to channel change as a society.

Another said,

I think that leaders are going to have even a different responsibility than only mentoring leaders coming up. . . . [We will need] to have an expanding definition of diversity. . . . I just don’t think that [existing ones are] adequate to capture the complexity of the world we live in.

A third leader said,

I envision . . . what senior leaders are going to look like, no matter what the organization is. They’re going to have to be multicompetent in multicultural issues. They will have to have many foreign languages, skills; they will have to have a corporate background so they can understand and have that business acumen to constantly [emphasize] results.

And, finally, one leader emphasized that “for us as individuals who are engaged in that transition [now], there’s a set of skills and competencies that we now need that we never needed before as leaders who manage those younger folks.”

These dilemmas and challenges posed by the rapid change in our world today—and the adaptability, flexibility, and cross-cultural knowledge needed—were best captured in the following statements:

Leadership is also going to change in terms of how we define it. Are we looking at a place where Americans have to then fit into a different definition of leadership? And it’s going to be different. I

think it's going to be hardest for those who are in the majority. Because for those in the minority, we're used to having to adjust, to be different, and to fit into whatever is the prevailing leadership style.

and

You look at those in the pipeline, and this country is getting a whole new workforce. . . . [The definition of leadership] will have to change. There will be a huge shift in culture because we're still [teaching and learning about] leadership with definitions that have no relevance to a world in which the teams we will be working with [are diverse]. So it's really important that we get this right [for those in the pipeline].

Further emphasizing flexibility and adaptability, a leader mentioned, "[Effective leadership not only means] being open to different ideas, different ways of doing things, seeing people for who they are but also being flexible and adaptable enough to understand that environments that you'll be in are not always going to be what you think it's going to be or what you're used to. [To know] that to create the change you want, you sometimes have to start from where the rest of the group is and bring them along. . . . To me, that's a really important characteristic of leadership."

Promoting diverse and inclusive leadership styles. Many leadership styles that exist in the literature are associated with effective and successful leadership: Transformational leadership, collaborative leadership, and relationship (as opposed to task) leadership are deemed important in the 21st century (Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996). Yet there is little consideration of how these leadership styles might be more inclusive or how diversity influences the ways in which they are enacted. A number of LDS leaders emphasized how cultural values urged them to choose consensus and collaboration over more competitive ways of engaging their members. Others spoke to the emphasis on family values and relationships as taking priority over getting down to business too quickly. Such differences can lead to miscommunication and ineffective leadership. Thus, part of utilizing a diverse and global mindset is instilling this into one's leadership style, as well as value system, in order to role-model this behavior for others.

Overall, leaders emphasized that utilizing a global and diverse mindset is increasingly necessary for leadership success and effectiveness; this includes demonstrating cultural competence and having the ability to adapt and remain flexible as a leader, especially when dealing in new cultural contexts or when interacting with members of nondominant groups.

Competency 3: Leveraging Community and Organizational Contexts

Our LDS leaders consistently mentioned the importance of utilizing their own lived experiences, as well as connecting with the lived experiences of those they led, as being important for leadership success. Leaders also warned, however, that opening up in this way to others within the organization might lead to increased vulnerability. Thus, leaders emphasized that drawing from lived experiences, developing affinity networks and engaging with diverse communities, and being aware of the potential need for self-protection were all important for diverse leadership.

Drawing from lived experiences. The LDS leaders emphasized their lived experiences and the influence of cultural background and history on their leadership practice. They stressed the importance of using power positively and appropriately. They felt that their shared experience of coming from less-privileged, oppressed, marginalized, or nondominant social groups created a new and different context for how leadership was exercised and that this involved both benefits and challenges to their leadership.

The benefits included their being more adept at reading the cultural contexts of their workplaces, being able to build relationships with a variety of constituents, and being able to take another's perspective. All believed that their lived experiences of oppression based on diverse identity membership helped to build their resiliency, adaptability, and flexibility and added to their ability to attend to contextual issues of power and relationships in the organizations which they led. They also felt that they were attuned to the voices that were frequently represented within their organizations, as well as those that were missing, and that it was important to promote diversity and

social-justice goals within the organizational cultures that they faced. Leaders also noted how often they drew on their cultural values and emphasized the importance of family upbringing, family life, and lived experiences in contributing to their exercise of leadership. In doing so, they underscored how dimensions of their diversity and social identities often made them a “symbol” for diversity in the organization, whether they wanted to take on this role or not.

Statements on race and ethnicity illustrate the richness and complexity of contexts and lived experiences in shaping leadership. An African American leader provided this perspective: “I always was told that I was Black, and then everything else comes secondary to that. So whatever you do, wherever you are, is always going to be this contest of your being Black.” Another African American leader said,

I think that my leadership style is characteristic . . . and is certainly influenced by my growing-up years and my experiences. I grew up in the segregated South, and my parents were community organizers. . . . It was always on their minds that you are colored. . . . Later I had my White world where I was a cheerleader and the president of the class . . . but then, when I went home and I’m in my Black world [with] the Black church and everything . . . those are things that helped to shape my identity.

An Asian American leader gave this perspective:

My experience of the world is filtered through race because of my experiences. I do think that those things impact how I see the world, how I am a leader, and how I can make a difference to the people that I serve. . . . When I hear other people, not only other Japanese Americans but other Asian Americans, say they were taught, especially the youth and the girls, to “Don’t say anything. . . . You just stay quiet; you listen to your elders” [I remember that] I was taught that as well about respect, . . . harmony: Get along, play nice, don’t rock the boat; [it’s made me] very conflict averse. But I had to learn to be comfortable [with conflict]. And I’m still working on it. . . . And so sometimes, I go into these places and I forget myself that I’m Asian because I’m so used to being in a place where I’m the minority. And yet it also influences me, how I interact with people, how I lead.

Given the quotes above, race, ethnicity, and sexual orientation were thought to have influenced leaders’ interactions with people and how they lead. Many of the leaders emphasized “using power to be influential in a positive way” was necessary, almost as a counterbalance against their experiences of being disempowered. A lesbian leader highlighted the powerlessness she felt:

I was there 20 years and left as the dean of an allied health college. I was the first woman dean there. . . . At the very same time I was coming out as a lesbian and realized I was unable to get ordained [because I was lesbian], which was really a very difficult experience for me.

These experiences demonstrate the intensified intersection of identity and leadership for the LDS participants and the impact of the interaction of their career and life journey on one another.

Developing affinity networks and engaging with diverse communities. To counter the experiences of isolation and alienation because of their social identities, many of the leaders emphasized the importance of building community networks and being a resource. As one of the leaders stated, “We want to remind the executives that they are a resource, whether it’s a women’s resource, a people-of-color resource, or an LGBT resource—that they can be a resource to talk about how to market to the LGBT community.” A female leader said, “A lot [of this happens] in the financial-services sector; you look at a pyramid of the employee population—70% of the lower-level employees are women; and then the further up you get in the organization, you’re lucky if 10% are at the very top.” Although promoting a more diverse organization was central for most of the leaders, they also emphasized the importance of buy-in. They felt a leader must understand what motivates people and how these motivations are often driven by cultural values. Consequently, developing measures of accountability directed toward diversity and balancing the power and influence of a leader with a servant-leadership perspective was also highlighted—that is, using power and influence wisely. They emphasized the need to be aware and proactive in working with different and diverse groups within an organization to reach a common direction. Lastly, they felt

diversity was not a goal in and of itself—they needed to be able to make the case for why inclusivity and diversity were powerful tools within the organization, which was made easier by having lived experiences as being “different” within an organizational context.

Self-protection. Although LDS leaders initially distanced themselves from this dimension, their discussion of lived experiences associated with minority status often led them to acknowledge that challenges to their competence or self-esteem because of stereotypic perceptions were not uncommon. Consequently, many did develop an armor to protect themselves from inaccurate or unwarranted assaults and attempted not to let this be an obstacle to leading effectively. On the other hand, some of the social psychology literature (Shih, 2004) suggest stigma may have beneficial effects in terms of promoting resilience and insight.

These findings demonstrate the centrality of a humane and social-justice orientation in the leadership styles of the LDS participants and how lived experiences of oppression promote this orientation toward equity and diversity. Self-protection heightened their awareness of power in their leadership roles, as well as the importance of using that power positively to promote diversity inside their organizations. The leaders stressed the importance of balancing power with an awareness of increased responsibility to the organization and the community. They also emphasized that being authentic is made more difficult because sharing so much of yourself and your personal story might increase vulnerability. Thus, leaders cautioned that working with diverse communities required a certain level of strategic identity management so that leaders were not “overexposed.” One leader stated, “[You need] that safety to open up.” Similarly, another leader noted,

That is one skill I think you can work on for yourself. It’s what you bring to the table. And it could be related to what you were talking about when you’re self-protective. It could be one way that we become more self-protective. So you can self-talk through, “Was this decision about me and about my personality?” or “Was it about my position?” and sort those two things out for your longevity in a leadership role.

Thus, leaders, while feeling responsibility to be authentic, also felt the need to care for themselves by strategically managing their identity at work.

Competency 4: Promoting a Diversity-Supportive and Inclusive Climate

The leaders of the LDS put great emphasis on the importance of creating a diversity-supportive culture. They also pointed out how important diversity is to their development and in driving their continued success. Specifically, the leaders highlighted communicating effectively across diverse groups, advancing a shared vision for diversity, mentoring diverse employees, and maintaining accountability for promoting diversity within the organization.

Communicating effectively across diverse groups. Listening and communication were noted as important skills and processes for leadership in general but especially when leading diverse groups, representing different viewpoints and perspectives. One leader summarized why this is important, addressing the double bind many female leaders face when acting assertively and being seen as unfeminine or when acting more timidly and being seen as weak: “It’s not just the ability to communicate but to listen, which is pretty important. . . . But it’s also specifically the ability to communicate on itchy topics. And in the past I think some of us have been conditioned that, oh, ‘confrontation is not good for ladies.’” Another way of capturing the importance of listening and communication for leadership was noted in the following statement:

I’ve often found that in certain government experience the most important leaders were not necessarily people who had that position leadership. They tended to be people who listened well, who really connected with their colleagues, who pulled from them their technical, substantive, whatever, expertise and also their life experience, and this became sort of the canary . . . something you need to consider.

Communication is central to all good leadership, but the leaders felt it was especially important to diverse leadership. Differences of social identities between leaders and employees were thought to potentially be met with concern, suspicion, and fearfulness, particularly when leaders were

unfamiliar with what others' perspectives were, which may have impeded who they were and how they were approached for opportunities.

Advancing a shared vision for diversity. Although a shared vision and shared strategy are important to all leadership, this can be more difficult when trying to create a shared vision that promotes and values diversity and is inclusive of all dimensions of diversity. It was thought to require a higher-level examination of the organization itself and to tap into unconscious biases and unintentional microaggressions. As one leader explained,

For example, so many of the [federal advisory] committees that we have . . . really have no representation of [racial/ethnic] minorities. . . . [If you are a minority], you're sitting there and you're going, okay, [what do I do?] Sometimes you'll say something and you can hear a pin drop because they're like . . . oh, so nice that she's here to represent those people.

Thus, this leader highlights the pressure that diverse leaders may feel to be the voice and representative for their particular group. It was agreed that, to create a shared vision, companies have to be proactive and have more than token representation from a variety of groups across all levels of the organization. As a lesbian leader recalled,

When we started realizing that a lot of senior executives would go back into the closet as they got further and further up the ladder of corporate America, we reconvened LGBT executives. What I learned when I talked to these executives was that they were often the only LGBT person in a room of executives. . . . They were the only executive, so there was no place for LGBT executives to talk to each other and so we convened this group of people and it has created a community of people that can call each other up and support one another and really make a change in workplaces around the country and around the globe.

Diverse representation on the executive board was also thought to help to advance this shared vision. One leader mentioned,

Well when you get the whole board to one level of understanding of what diversity and inclusion really is, then you start to look at policies, processes, and the practices of the organization. And you start to look at every aspect of the HR process, the selection process, and try to see how we can include what we're doing today so that we can pick the best qualified, despite what people look like. So that's the second thing of having to integrate diversity and inclusion into the organization.

Finally, being proactive about recruitment and retention processes was also thought to be important:

We select the faculty and . . . we came up with this strategy where we tried to anticipate these issues two and three and four years out, and we wrote every HBCU and every Hispanic-serving institution, and just said these are positions we expect to have in the next few years and we want you to please let your people . . . who are in graduate school know about these positions, because we're really interested in diversifying our workforce.

Mentoring diverse employees. Mentoring was repeatedly mentioned as not only important for diverse leaders to receive support and guidance within a safe climate but also as a leader's responsibility to provide access to others on the team. As one leader said, "I feel that it's imperative and my responsibility to be there for other people and mentor and provide access to persons coming up the chain who are really interested in our field, in our work, to be there for them and to help them along." Another said,

My focus is making sure that everyone is able to get to their level of potential and then also ensure that they contribute to the organization in the fullest capacity. . . . It's not just about race, ethnicity, and gender. It's also about the diversity of thought and the creation of innovation.

One leader spoke about the importance of a mentor who saw her potential early on in her career:

And she said, "I see you as a leader." And I never saw that and I just saw that it was just something that I do because . . . where I was raised, it was the right thing to do. And then she told me why she thought I had natural leadership abilities, and she wanted to help develop that with me and help move me forward.

The feelings were mixed about whether having a mentor who shared your social identity was essential. As a gay leader recounted,

They asked me to mentor . . . and so my first mentee turned out to be gay and I thought, "What a coincidence!" [As this kept happening], I went to HR and said, look, why am I being assigned this individual? Is it because he's gay? I'm noticing a trend. The HR person said, "Well absolutely! You're gay!"

However, the leader felt that his expertise did not match the needs of the mentee to whom he was assigned, and he preferred not to be talking about sexual-orientation issues when the mentee may have had a different frame of mind. Another leader agreed that "it's easy to get sort of pigeon-holed into this. I'm a Native American, so give me your Native American students; I'll advise them; I'll mentor them; that sort of thing." However, several offered other perspectives:

If you're in a place where you're the lonely only, you get pegged as, "You're the gay ambassador, so all the gay men are going to come to you," but it could be because there's nobody else to go to or . . . you're the only Native American leader so everybody's going to go to you . . . That's why people went to you, because there's sometimes not a whole lot . . . [of people who could understand where you're coming from].

Leaders also began to dissect what mentors can or should do. As one leader described it, "Creating a safe environment is a new one to add. There's sponsorship, talking for you when you're not in the room. [There's] skill development: How do I help you write a good brief or how do I help you do a good clinical assessment? And there's navigation: How do you really get things done? How do you really move up in this organization? Because it ain't anybody's rulebook and if somebody isn't mentoring you . . . you won't get all the information you need to get where you should go."

Maintaining accountability for promoting diversity within the organization. While all agreed about the importance of promoting diversity, many leaders grappled with how leaders and organizations could be made accountable. One leader suggested making diversity and inclusion a core competency, identifying diversity

as a core competency to leadership that takes the level of excellence to a higher level. And when we do identify this as a core competency, it institutionalizes diversity and inclusion in the organization. No matter if it's military, corporate, or nonprofit. So it has to be in our education and training processes.

Other leaders emphasized the economic or return-on-investment approach to promoting diversity in the workplace:

When we're spending several billion dollars a year in the company, [promoting diversity] will save you money every year. So is there any question to show your shareholders the reason this should exist? It's a line in your annual budget. You've got no one to argue with about the responsibility to make it happen.

The diffusion of responsibility for diversity was thought to be a problem because it may translate into a lack of diversity in leadership within organizations. As one leader highlighted, this could result in a lack of accountability and rationalizations about their failure to ensure diversity: "I heard this from the senior leader, heard this particular person say, 'I would love to hire a woman for that position but none applied.'" Another leader spoke to a leader's responsibility to be honest if there is a lack of diversity in leadership, stating,

I think one of the competencies you need as a leader—this isn't written down like this—is to tell people when the emperor has no clothes. We would hear people say, "There's no one in the pipeline." And then

it just stops right there. So it's pushing it further, if that is true that there's no one in the pipeline; then we don't . . . abdicate any responsibility to change that pipeline. And that's where the mentoring conversation that we had earlier comes into play, in a big way. . . . And then if it's still true that there's no one in the pipeline, then we have a responsibility to reach further, earlier in the educational pool of people, and bring people up.

As one leader pointed out,

I just want to say something about affirmative action. Because I feel that it changed our culture. It was the beginning. It seeded. Because maybe it's not working for people right now . . . but I can tell you this: If we didn't have policies in place in the late 60s, 70s, and 80s, we wouldn't be sitting here.

Overall, leaders felt that accountability in creating organizations with diverse representation had to be embedded in all organizational processes and remain the responsibility of all leaders in the workforce today.

Discussion

Practical Implications for Consultants and Coaches

Overall, these competencies have important practical implications for how consultants and coaches can inform or design their practices to be responsive to diverse leaders. In the report "Diversity Matters" (Hunt, Layton, & Prince, 2015), McKinsey's research shows how promoting diversity creates better financial performance for organizations. This has major implications for organizations that want to grow, succeed, and pay attention to the bottom line. Both consultants and their clients will do well to develop their self-awareness and to receive training on these skills in order to attend to the exchange that occurs between diverse leaders and diverse members of organizations. Participating in training that includes information on how to better influence organizational culture and that imparts knowledge about the impact of societal contexts on the exercise of leadership, as well as the impact of specific dimensions of identities (such as race, gender, and sexual orientation) on leadership styles and other's perceptions of a leader's competencies, may help to increase diversity leadership. Recommendations follow for how coaches and consultants can develop these competencies.

Leveraging personal and social identities. Coaches and consultants need to be explicit about what they are doing to help diverse leaders leverage their identities as leaders and gain self-insights about their identities. They need to get informed and educated, as well as be curious about diversities that are new to them. They also need to consciously set aside time to reflect on their own intersectionalities and diversities. James (2014) stated that "consultant self-exploration is critical to better understanding the biases which are being brought consciously or unconsciously to the table and how they impact the working relationship." In his white paper, Lawrence James (2014, p. 13) referred to Rogers' (1998) concept of race-sensitive communication versus race-blind communication, writing that the former "is more transparent and acknowledges what is obvious, but largely unspoken." Because social identities influence the exercise of leadership, coaches and consultants do a disservice to their clients in not actively addressing, approaching, or discussing how diversities of their clients might have implications on their leadership, especially when these identities are not aligned with those dominant in the organization. To do this properly, it is important that leaders are trained on the impact of diversity on leadership and that they have taken time to personally reflect on the impact of diversity on their leadership style.

Coaches and consultants also need to be explicit in building trust during engagements with clients to broach the topics of diversity, multiple identities, and intersectionality. Building trust with people of all races, ethnicities, genders, and sexual orientations is critical and demands more time because of inherent differences, which can be divisive. However, to build this trust, coaches and consultants need to be seen as diversity content experts. Spending time studying the history of various diverse groups across cultural contexts can help leaders to build these connections. For example, if a coach or consultant is working with a closeted LGBT senior leader in a company

where such leaders are not “coming out,” how should the former approach this situation? The client relationship should provide the safety for self-disclosure, as well as the knowledge to make sound recommendations about how to realistically encourage the client to be authentic at work. Good coaches and consultants build trust and, as a result, should enable LGBT clients to feel comfortable coming out within developmental conversations. This may not mean that the client will come out to the organization, but it may lead to more positive outcomes for the client because of the “safe space” that the coach or consultant has provided.

Further, coaches and consultants need to take the time to question their beliefs about diversity, especially if they are working with individuals different from themselves. They are as prone as their clients are to come with conscious and unconscious biases toward different social identities associated with dimensions of diversity. Some basic questions to ask are: “What race-based perceptions do I bring to the encounter?” and “How do these biases impact the formulation of the relationship as well as the interventions proposed?” (James, 2014).

For example, when consultants and coaches conduct assessments to develop the next generation of leaders or senior teams, do their biases about the social identities of the employees they are assessing help or hinder their assessment of leadership potential? Are they likely to choose those individuals for roles and promotion who have social identities more like themselves? Because these biases are often unconscious, self-reflection and consultation is often useful to create awareness for coaches and consultants, so that they can develop strategies for helping organizations deal with potential negative implications of these biases as they relate to organizational performance.

Utilizing a global and diverse mindset. Coaches and consultants need to know that correctly assessing the organizational context is a priority to understand the ethos, beliefs, and culture of the organization, especially if it is heterogeneous and multinational or if the leader’s social identities do not align with significant groups within it. Today, many companies have headquarters in one country and offices in other countries globally. Coaches and consultants cannot assume that what works in the U.S. works in all other contexts. Diversity within an organization and among customers is now more pronounced, and it is necessary to consider how these differences influence successful business and leadership practices for clients. Diversity operates differently across different contexts (Sawyer, 2015) and, as a result, it is important to understand the meaning of diversity in context. This may require coaches and consultants to become immersed in the culturally specific research and literature on diversity in various forms. Understanding which groups are stigmatized within particular cultural contexts will allow for a better connection with diverse clients and will also help to avoid any faux pas that clients may find offensive or ignorant.

For organizations to have a global and diverse mindset, coaches and consultants need to have their clients set this as an organizational priority and take active steps to promote it and provide opportunities for developing these skill sets. This means thinking about consumer markets as well as developing solutions and products to meet diverse needs. This also includes helping organizations to assess their cultural competencies and to develop skills for flexibility across different contexts.

For example, the second author had a client in a Fortune 500 company that provided opportunities for senior leaders to get to know foreign employees. The company sent its senior leaders to one of its international offices to enable them to get to know the country and learn about its beliefs, worldviews, and way of life. In addition, they brought employees from that country to the U.S. so that they too could learn more about U.S. work practices, beliefs, customs, and behaviors. This promoted trust and improved communication between the two sites. By promoting true understanding of cultural contexts within which diversity operates, coaches and consultants can enrich the perspectives on and understandings of diversity for their clients.

Leveraging community and organizational contexts. Coaches and consultants need to consciously spend time learning about the informal, internal, and external resources of the companies they are working with and how these can be leveraged. Many diverse leaders have developed strengths from their lived experiences by negotiating challenges of their social identities, while also being proud of them. Coaches and consultants can use these strengths to help their clients build confidence and apply these strengths to surmount challenges in the workplace. While cultural values

of being humble may not always be beneficial in the U.S. workplace, coaches and consultants can help women and ethnic minorities who maintain these values adapt to organizational contexts that favor more overt assertiveness and self-promotion.

For example, the second author was working with a 30-year-old Hispanic female in the financial industry, she encouraged the coachee to pursue her higher education as well as to join a nonprofit board where she could gain leadership experience. Not long after, her peers and supervisor observed favorable results in her leadership skills and encouraged her further. She felt more confidence in putting herself first, decided to go back to college, and started to voice more of her opinions at meetings with her supervisor and peers. Her supervisor began to see her as having high potential and gave her a stretch assignment to colead a project. Examples such as these highlight the ways in which coaches and consultants may help diverse clients to build confidence, which is particularly important for diverse employees who may be unsure of how colleagues will perceive their leadership.

Further, many organizations have affinity networks to support diverse employees. Leaders who are involved and connected to these groups contribute to organizational goals by staying close to the pulse of diverse groups and enabling them to connect with their respective markets. For example, a coaching client whose goal was to promote a diverse and inclusive organization did not have the benchmarks to measure its progress. The consultant, the second author, drew on affiliations to make an introduction to the CEO of another organization that had already achieved some measurable success in promoting diversity so that the two companies could share their strategies and benchmarks. Although this is only one example of many possible ways that consultants can help their clients to leverage their cultural and community knowledge to make a positive impact on their organizations, it clearly illustrates the untapped potential that may be unlocked within diverse clients if they begin to see their links to diverse communities as beneficial.

Promoting a diversity-supportive and inclusive climate. Organizations that promote a diversity-supportive and inclusive climate recognize that their employees hold diverse worldviews. Coaches and consultants can work with their clients to develop strategies for promoting a diversity-supportive and inclusive climate within their organizations. They can help their clients identify their role in making this happen, being careful not to make their client the “only one to carry the flag.” This may include helping clients to understand and assess the organization’s commitment to diversity and inclusivity. Coaches and consultants can also help their clients find mentors, as well as to become mentors, since this has been found to be important to building organizational support systems. Some organizations will have formal or informal mentoring programs, while other organizations may need help from the coach or consultant in building a mentoring program.

Additionally, mentoring programs often help to develop a pipeline to sustain and grow diversity efforts within an organization. For example, an African American executive who had been mentored by an African American CEO made time to himself mentor African American colleagues in his organization as well as other diverse individuals of his organization. During his coaching sessions with the second author he focused on figuring out how to balance his work responsibilities and career plans with his desire to mentor others. He credits his past mentorship for its significant impact on his current success, and he wanted to make sure to give others the same opportunity. In this particular case the coaching relationship helped the coachee create a safe place to discuss the diversity climate of the organization in a supportive and an open way. The coach helped the coachee build a stronger team within the organization and develop the next generation of leaders. The coachee built institutional knowledge that sustained a diversity-supportive and inclusive climate within the organization.

Finally, coaches and consultants often help their clients develop strategies central to an organization’s success. For example, they can help clients to discuss ways to be more inclusive by considering when and which groups within the organization are excluded from decision making and planning. They might also help clients examine how diversity is important to an organization’s strength and strategic position in the market. Instead of waiting for a crisis to occur, coaches and consultants can ask questions to help their clients proactively develop strategies that are inclusive and promote diversity strategically. These questions might include: Are you advancing a shared

vision for diversity in this organization? Does your strategy take into consideration building an inclusive climate? Does this organization have a mentoring program for diverse employees? How does this organization maintain accountability for diversity and how is it being measured? This is a limited list of questions, but it is likely that sparking this sort of discussion will help leaders and senior teams in their strategic process as they attempt to create a diverse climate.

Implications for Future Research

Given the findings of the LDS, we believe that our models of leadership need to change to meet the demands of increasing diversity and globalization in our communities and organizations. The LDS highlighted the idea that traditional leadership models and competencies may not be fully applicable to leaders with minority identities or to those leading within diverse or global workplace contexts. The current leadership literature identifies a number of leadership dimensions associated with successful leadership (Northouse, 2004), including such leadership styles as transformational leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1994) and task versus expressive leadership styles (Eagly & Johnson, 1990). Although gender differences have been identified (Eagly & Carli, 2007), little information is available about how leadership is exercised among diverse leaders because study samples have largely been Western and White males. For example, a meta-analysis of transformational leadership (Eagly, Johanessen-Schmidt, & Van Engen, 2003) did not report statistics for race, sexual orientation, or other minority statuses outside of gender and country of origin (even though 45% of the sample was non-U.S.).

Additionally, it was not our intent to compare existing leadership theories across various demographic groups. Rather, we intentionally aimed to depart from existing leadership literature by *beginning* with a diverse group of leaders as a starting point for theory building and in crafting a leadership framework that reflected the richness of their lived experiences. By starting with a group of individuals who were “on the margins,” we were able to derive new insights that have not been captured in the traditional theories of leadership listed above.

Furthermore, semantic differences in leadership dimensions may be discrepant across groups with minority social identities. Trait theories often include traits commonly associated with White, heterosexual male leaders (Bass, 1990; Lord, De Vader, & Alliger, 1986). Similarly, contingency theories often do not factor in diverse social contextual influences on the exercise of leadership (Fiedler, 1993). Although leader–member exchange theories (LMX) hold promise for a more diverse approach (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995), the emphasis on leaders aligning with favored in-groups are contrary to notions of equity and fairness associated with diversity (see Table 1 taken from Chin & Trimble, 2014). Thus, these theories of leadership may not resonate with or reliably characterize the leadership of those leaders with minority identities. Future research should empirically test the competencies we have identified with a larger and diverse sample of leadership in order to compare and contrast how they may operate across diverse groups, as well as privileged and marginalized social identities.

Our work highlights the need for new and more inclusive theories of leadership and for a reexamination of existing leadership frameworks for their applicability within more diverse and global populations. This research is necessary to identify effective leadership strategies across diverse leaders in order to address the pressing leadership issues of a diverse and global workforce.

Conclusion

Overall, the LDS produced a rich dataset that was analyzed using a rigorous phenomenological and qualitative methodology to identify some key competencies for diversity leadership. The process was useful not only in generating ideas about how leadership is exercised by a group of diverse leaders who differ by race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation but also in identifying a process for exploratory research and training. Because diversity has been largely omitted from the research on leadership, the use of a grounded-theory process enabled us to explore how diversity is important to the exercise of leadership.

Given the aforementioned shortcomings of the leadership literature in addressing the diverse nature of leaders and leadership, the LDS provided an exploratory examination of lived experiences of diverse leaders. It is our hope that future research will continue to question the universal applicability of existing theories of leadership and to create new theories of leadership. Starting from the “margins” may aid in creating a better and more complete picture of leadership in the 21st century.

Finally, the LDS provides suggestive evidence that coaching and consulting practices should be tailored for nonmajority leaders, based on their unique challenges and experiences. Although this work was exploratory and our findings are preliminary, we believe that it is extremely important that researchers and practitioners alike realize the potential inadequacy of both existing leadership theories and standard practices in driving success for *all* leaders within organizations today.

References

- American Psychological Association. (2002). *Guidelines on multicultural education, training, research, practice, and organizational change for psychologists*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Auerbach, C. F., & Silverstein, L. B. (2003). *An introduction to coding and analysis: Qualitative data*. New York, NY: New York University.
- Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., & Walumbwa, F. O. (Eds.). (2005). *Authentic leadership theory and practice: Origins, effects, and development*. San Diego, CA: Elsevier.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (Eds.). (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Caligiuri, P., & Thoroughgood, C. (2015). Developing responsible global leaders through corporate-sponsored international volunteerism programs. *Organizational Dynamics*, *44*, 138–145. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2015.02.008>
- Chin, J. L. (2013). Diversity leadership: Influence of ethnicity, gender, and minority status. *Open Journal of Leadership*, *2*, 1–10. Retrieved from www.scirp.org/journal/ojl
- Chin, J. L., & Trimble, J. E. (2014). *Diversity and leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cooper, S., & Leong, F. T. (2008). Introduction to the special issue on culture, race, and ethnicity in organizational consulting psychology. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, *60*, 133–138. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0736-9735.60.2.133>
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory, and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, *140*, 139–167.
- Den Hartog, N. D., & Kalkhoven, K. (2009). Ethical leader behavior and leader effectiveness: The role of prototypicality and trust. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, *5*, 102–120.
- Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. (2007). *Through the labyrinth: The truth about how women become leaders*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Eagly, A. H., & Chin, J. L. (2010). Diversity and leadership in a changing world. *American Psychologist*, *65*, 216–224. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0018957>
- Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin*, *129*, 569–591.
- Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *108*, 233–256. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.108.2.233>
- Fiedler, F. (1993). The leadership situation and the black box in contingency theories. In M. M. Chemers (Ed.), *Leadership, theory, and research: Perspectives and directions* (pp. 1–28). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Finkelstein, J., & Lopez, P. D. (2012). Global consulting in a cultural diverse world: Ethical and legal implications. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, *64*, 307–324. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0031675>
- Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level, multi-domain perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *6*, 219–247. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843\(95\)90036-5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(95)90036-5)

- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hunt, V., Layton, D., & Prince, S. (2015). *Diversity matters*. McKinsey.
- James, L., Jr. (2014). *Journey to the top: Developing African-American executives*. Chicago, IL: RHR International.
- Livingston, R. W., Rosette, A. S., & Washington, E. F. (2012). Can an agentic Black woman get ahead? The impact of race and interpersonal dominance on perceptions of female leaders. *Psychological Science, 23*, 354–358. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0956797611428079>
- Lord, R. G., De Vader, C. L., & Alliger, G. M. (1986). A meta-analysis of the relation between personality traits and leadership perceptions: An application of validity generalization procedures. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 402–410. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.402>
- Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *The Leadership Quarterly, 7*, 385–425. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(96\)90027-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(96)90027-2)
- Lowman, R. L. (Ed.). (2013). *Internationalizing multiculturalism: Expanding professional competencies in a globalized world*. (Kindle Location 1377). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association (Kindle ed.). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/14044-000>
- Major, B., & O'Brien, L. T. (2005). The social psychology of stigma. *Annual Review of Psychology, 56*, 393–421. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070137>
- Northouse, P. G. (2004). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rogers, M. R. (1998). The influence of race and consultant verbal behavior on perceptions of consultant competence and multicultural sensitivity. *School Psychology Quarterly, 13*, 265–280. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0088985>
- Rost, J. C. (1991). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. New York, NY: Praeger.
- Sawyer, K. (2015). International perspective. In E. King & A. Colella (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of workplace discrimination*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199363643.013.21>
- Sawyer, K., Salter, N., & Thoroughgood, C. (2013). Studying individual identities is good, but examining intersectionality is better. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice, 6*, 80–84. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/iops.12012>
- Shih, M. (2004). Positive stigma: Examining resilience and empowerment in overcoming stigma. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 591*, 175–185. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0002716203260099>
- Steele, C. M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 797–811. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.69.5.797>

Appendix

Leaders in Attendance at the Leadership Diversity Summit

Linda Akutagawa, President and CEO, Leaders Education for Asian Pacifics (Female, Asian American, community-based organization).

Selisse Berry, Founding Executive Director, Out and Equal (Female, White American, Lesbian, community-based organization).

Teresa Chapa, Senior Policy Advisor for Mental Health with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (Female, Latina American, government).

Michelle Crecca, Chief Marketing Officer, Webster Bank (Female, White American, corporate).

Ann Dobbmeyer, Primary Care Behavioral Health Proponent, Department of Defense (Female, White American, military).

Kurt Geisinger, Buros Testing Center (Male, White American, higher education).

Lori Gonzales, Provost, Appalachian State University (Female, White American, higher education).

Michael Guest, Senior Advisor, Council for Global Equality (Male, White American, Gay, community-based organization and former government employee).

Jennifer Kelly, Board of Directors, American Psychological Association (Female, African American, small business, volunteer professional organization).

Punam Mathur, Former Senior VP for Corporate Diversity & Community Affairs, MGM Mirage (Female, Asian American, corporate).

Fred Millan, President-elect, Association of State and Province Psychology Boards, Professor & Director of Graduate Mental Health Counseling Program, SUNY College at Old Westbury (Male, Latino American, higher education).

Ken Pepion, Associate VP of Academic Affairs, Fort Lewis College (Male, Native American, higher education).

Colonel Shirley Raguindin, Chief Diversity Officer, Air National Guard (Female, Asian American, military).

Beau Stubblefield-Tave, Principal and Co-Founder, Cultural Imperative (Male, Black American, corporate).

Received June 15, 2015

Latest revision received November 5, 2015

Accepted November 14, 2015 ■

E-Mail Notification of Your Latest Issue Online!

Would you like to know when the next issue of your favorite APA journal will be available online? This service is now available to you. Sign up at <http://notify.apa.org/> and you will be notified by e-mail when issues of interest to you become available!