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Abstract

There have been relatively few studies examining the leadership of Black men, and even fewer studies examining the leadership of Black men from the phenomenology of Black men, themselves. The purpose of this Q Methodology study was to examine Black male perspectives of the role race plays with Black male leader/leadership development in the world of work. The study was designed as an exploratory attempt to surface and understand how 40 emerging African American male leaders in a large, urban city in the SE United States viewed their own leadership development. Elements of socio-analytic theory and leader-member exchange theories were the basis for the conceptual framework.

The 40 participants sorted 41 statements reflecting distinct perspectives on the role race plays with Black male leader/leadership development within the world of work. Participants sorted these 41 statements within a forced distribution response grid based on what best reflected their perspectives. These 40 sorts were then correlated and the correlations were factor analyzed and rotated, leading to the extraction of five factors, each representing five distinct, shared perspectives. Following examination and analysis of these five factors, or shared perspectives, the researcher named them: 1) Faithful, Familial, and Resilient, 2) Creative, Faithful, and Independent, 3) Attentive, Connected, and Woke, and 4) Knowledgeable, Congruent, and Unapologetically Black, and 5) Responsible, Faithful, and Supportive. The results of this study suggest there is rich diversity among Black male perspectives regarding their leadership development, and demonstrates important functions outside the workplace. These diverse perspectives and those elements characterizing them should be considered as educators prepare to work with Black males and those preparing to support their development, leadership and
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otherwise. Finally, the researcher suggests that future research into the experiences and perceptions of Black men continue to seek methodologies that honor and magnify their voices.
Chapter 1: Introduction

The topic of leader emergence among African American males has attracted considerable attention within academic literature, with many scholars examining inhibitors of and predictors to career success. African American men experience leadership development that is shaped by institutionalized socio-cultural determinants (H. E. Briggs et al., 2014) and a warring reality between Black and White (Bruce, 1992). Anecdotally, the present study is inspired by a life-long attempt to better understand social, cultural, and political dynamics that have played a role in my personal/professional development; an effort to excavate possibilities of why occupational success has been such an arduous endeavor for me. As a Black man, struggling with his unapologetic pride, competitive spirit, and perceived competent/capable threat, I feel as though my talents have been ignored and passed over for reasons I am not privy to. Over my professional career, I have always outperformed most of my peers, but generally failed to advance through organizational structures in the traditional manner. I oftentimes find myself working for and reporting to someone that is less competent and capable than I am, but exhibits the prototypical appearance, behavior, and obedience of an organization’s culture. A recurring motif that has echoed throughout my professional career is that, advancing in the world of work “ain’t gotta be right, but it has got to be White.”

The present study employs socio-analytic theory and leader-member exchange as theoretical frameworks to capture salient perspectives of leadership development among African American males. Theoretical synthesis and Q methodology data are examined through the lenses of four conceptual constructs: (1) developmental relationships (mentoring, sponsorship, and
BLACK MALE PERSPECTIVES

developmental networks), (2) career mobility (contest mobility and sponsored mobility), (3) self-monitoring (social perceptiveness and behavioral flexibility), and (4) nigrescence (personal and professional identity). By analyzing the aforementioned theoretical frameworks and conceptual constructs, as it relates to leadership development among African American males, several contributions are made to extant literature: (1) leadership development perspectives of African American males are brought to the forefront of academic research. Too often empirical research regarding African American males is conceptualized, constructed, investigated, analyzed, and interpreted by those other than African American males. (2) Career mobility, developmental relationships, self-monitoring, and nigrescence (previously disconnected constructs that have never been examined together) are united to critically examine appreciative attributes African American males feel contribute to their development as leaders. (3) A self-referent, as oppose to an external frame-of-reference, approach is applied to a marginalized populace that too often suffers from deficit narratives. (4) First voice as methodology is demonstrated to amplify Black male lived experiences as legitimate knowledge.

If African American male leadership is to be understood as ontologically, epistemologically, and axiologically different from the White male middle class standard, research has to examine Black male leaders in more developmental, non-exploitative, and inclusive ways (Aveling, 2013). Leadership has a different impression on and for African Americans (Domingue, 2014), particularly African American men. Black men, within the working populace, are the most underemployed, are disproportionately laid off, and earn slightly less than three fourths of what their White male counterparts make (Johnson & Eby, 2011).
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Black men also contend with an unreasonable amount of negative stereotypes that include: violence, emotional incompetence, sexual power, and immaturity which frequently obstruct career advancement opportunities (Hall, 2001). The inequality, exclusion, and brute categorizations can add debilitating stressors to African American men’s existence, performance, social relevance, and positionality in the world of work. The lack of African American males in leadership positions inspires a deeper examination of developmental influences that impact African American male leader emergence. The present study endeavors to inform African American males’ leader/leadership development, leader emergence, and locus of control by better understanding the importance of socioanalytic theory and LMX through the lenses of career mobility, developmental relationships, self-monitoring, and nigrescence. If this research can catalyze Black men (and those leading them) to think more deeply about sociocultural structures, political exercises, and economic realities that influence their development as leaders; to have Black men (and those leading them) critically question the internal as well as external factors that contribute to their development as leaders, this research had done its job.

Problem Statement

African American men experience leadership development that is shaped by institutionalized socio-cultural determinants (H. E. Briggs et al., 2014) and a warring reality between Black and White (Bruce, 1992). Anecdotally, the present study is inspired by a life-long attempt to better understand social, cultural, and political dynamics that have played a role in my personal/professional development; an effort to excavate possibilities of why occupational success has been such an arduous endeavor for me and so many other Black men.
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Purpose Statement

The purpose of the present study is to examine Black male perspectives of the role race plays with Black male leader/leadership development in the world of work and is designed as an exploratory attempt to interrogate the development of capable, qualified, and ambitious emerging African American male leaders. Here, emerging African American leaders are defined as Black males between the ages of 30 and 50, employed by organizations across various industries with at least 4 hierarchical strata (e.g., sales representative, sales manager, sales director, chief executive officer or HVAC technician, district manager, regional director, president), recognized by their colleagues and organization leaders as positively influential, and have a desire to advance their leadership capacity and careers. The present study is a concerted effort to capture feelings, beliefs, and thoughts of emerging Black male leaders as it relates to their personal and professional development. In the present study, the terms African American and Black are used synonymously, and infer no difference in significance or utility. Leader development and leadership development are also used interchangeably throughout the present study and oscillate between intra- and inter-personal developmental dispositions. Inspired by personal and shared lived experiences of emerging Black male leaders, the present study seeks to inform heightened human and social capital, a healthier behavioral congruence, and a stronger sense of personal/professional identity that ultimately yields more of an internal locus of control for African American men in the world of work.
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Research Questions

The present study asks emerging African American leaders the question: “What are Black male perspectives of the role race plays with Black male leader/leadership development in the world of work?” This research question is designed to explore human subjectivity; to examine perceptions held by Black men regarding their development as leaders in the workplace. Q methodology is applied to best capture genuine perspectives of emerging Black male leaders regarding their leadership development. This research question also suggests that leadership development for Black men is unique and warrants different developmental strategies than those generally applied based on a Eurocentric male norm. Leadership development is more difficult for minorities and women due to the social, cultural, and political forces associated with traditional models of leadership development (Cornileus, 2010). Stereotypes, scarcity of developmental relationships, insufficient experience, and exposure/visibility are all common hindrances that impede career advancement for minorities and women (McCarty Kilian, Hukai, & Elizabeth McCarty, 2005). African American men experience a wide range of unspoken sociocultural nuances that conflict with their realities, beliefs, and values. This sociocultural discord causes psycho-emotional dissonance, personal distress, anxiety, guilt, and resentment when there is a violation of identity orientation (Molinsky, 2007).

Overview of Theoretical Framework

Following slavery, Black codes, and Jim Crow, legislative achievements like the Thirteenth Amendment, the Civil Rights Act of 1866, the Fourteenth Amendment, and the Fifteenth Amendment were significant advancements for African Americans during the
reconstruction period (Alexander, 2012). However, an extreme underrepresentation of minorities and women in leadership across various professions has continued to be an area of concern over time (Barabas, 2015; Eagly & Chin, 2010; Gündemir, Homan, de Dreu, & van Vugt, 2014; Kay & Gorman, 2012; McGinn & Milkman, 2013; Vinson, 2014), particularly for Black men. Concurrent to this underrepresentation there is a self-perpetuating assertion of White male hegemony. The present study makes two theoretical assumptions: everyone wants to get-along and get-ahead (socioanalytic theory) and all leaders manage distinctly different relationships with each of their subordinates (leader-member exchange theory). Operating under the auspices of these theoretical assumptions the present study examines emerging Black male leaders’ perceptions of leadership development through the lenses of four conceptual constructs: 1) developmental relationships (mentoring, sponsorship, developmental networks), 2) career mobility (contest mobility and sponsored mobility), 3) self-monitoring (social perceptiveness and behavioral flexibility) and 4) nigrescence (personal/professional identity). The constructs of developmental relationships, career mobility, self-monitoring, and nigrescence are neither right or wrong, however, they do present a critical lens through which leadership development among African American men can be interrogated.

Developmental relationships provide career-related, psychosocial, and role-modeling support that enhances career outcomes (Marcinkus Murphy & Kram, 2010). Career mobility is the occupational advancement to a higher-level position (Nachum & Oded, 1990). Self-monitoring is self-observation and self-control regulated by environmental/situational cues that yields social appropriateness (Snyder, 1974). Identity in the current study specifically addresses
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the degree to which race is desired to be discussed by Black men within the world of work, particularly within developmental relationships. Nigrescence – the ideology of ‘becoming black’ within a white dominated environment – explains Black men’s personal/professional identity and reference group orientation, as well as their implications in the world of work (Vandiver, Cross Jr., Worrell, & Fhagen-Smith, 2002).

Overview of Methodology

Q methodology was selected as the preferred research technique as it has been identified as “a systematic and rigorously quantitative means for examining human subjectivity” (Mckeown & Thomas, 1988). Other research methods could and absolutely have been employed to explore participant subjectivity (e.g., ethnographic interviews, phenomenological questionnaires, surveys), however, Q methodology affords pronounced fidelity to subjectivity and significantly elicits culturally relative and responsive data while honoring Black males’ lived experiences. Q Methodology combines psychometric properties with correlation and factor analysis techniques to quantitatively examine human subjectivity (Mckeown & Thomas, 1988). Q methodology maintains close proximity and juxtaposition to emerging Black male leaders’ perspectives while engaging empirical qualities that amplify and preserve academic rigor. Every common experience in life has countless self-referent alternatives which dispute objectivity of attitude, perspective, and perception (Stephenson, 1980). Q methodology phenomenologically illustrate frames of reference through participants’ viewpoints that are captured under relatively unrestricted conditions and organized in deductive structural categories (S. R. Brown, 2002).
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Because leadership development within the Black community, specifically with Black men, requires empathic social, cultural, and political support that attends to distinct ontological, epistemological, and axiological needs, Q methodology is employed to elevate the voice of emerging African American male leaders. African Americans generally struggle with broader, more complex mobility barriers that involve a moral imperative (Hoffman, 2009) and due to a self-deprecating phenomenon Black leaders are seldom extended the necessary support to realize change (Harper, 2007). When Black leaders do acquire the social, cultural, and political authority to challenge the establishment, their influence is usually co-opted into systemic institutional processes (Smith, 2008). Q methodology is important in this case because of how much subjectivity drives thought, decisions, and ultimately behavior; perspective is critical to the socially, culturally, and politically nuanced development of Black men.

Significance of the Research

The concern for minorities and women in leadership being grossly underrepresented in most United States professions has been prevalent over a period of time (Barabas, 2015; Eagly & Chin, 2010; Gündemir et al., 2014; Kay & Gorman, 2012; McGinn & Milkman, 2013; Vinson, 2014). Whites, specifically White men, have controlled the leadership landscape by stratifying power and influence within the labor market; by limiting access to the human and social capital necessary for career advancement to that of White men, structural and institutional apparatuses suppress ascension of minorities and women into influential leadership positions (McDonald, Lin, & Ao, 2009). As a matter of fact, White men make up an overwhelming percentage of senior executive officer positions in high-level United States’ businesses, politics, and education
Emancipating the arrested development of African American males as leaders is extremely important to the progress of the United States’ democracy. Black men bring a unique set of experiences and perspectives that truly represents diversity, expands opportunities for innovation and creativity, and catalyzes an untapped wealth of knowledge and influence. A better understanding of how emerging Black male leaders feel about their development creates space to acknowledge, analyze, and address the undeniable and uncomfortable barriers that constitutes such inequity. The present study prefaces its exploration with two theoretical assumptions: 1) socioanalytic theory – everyone wants to get along and get ahead (Blickle, Schneider, Liu, & Ferris, 2011) – and 2) leader-member exchange – all leaders develop unique relationships with each of their subordinates (Martin, Guillaume, Thomas, Lee, & Epitropaki, 2015). And, looks at emerging Black males’ perspectives through the lenses of developmental relationships, career mobility, self-monitoring, and nigrescence. By empirically examining the subjective voice of African American males, which is rare in the world of academia, a door to educative and communicative connections opens that magnifies a more harmonious human kind while combatting an existing unfair hegemony.

**Chapter Summary**

The present study seeks to gain a better understanding of how emerging African American male leaders feel about their personal/professional development and specifically asks the question: “What are Black male perspectives of the role race plays with Black male leader/leadership development in the world of work?” This explorative undertaking will
BLACK MALE PERSPECTIVES

extensively examine the salient, but un/under recognized, voice of emerging African American male leaders that can potentially advance an urgently needed understanding of Black males throughout society. Chapter 1 provides an introduction to the concepts and contexts while framing the conversations between extant literature, the present study, and future research. Chapter 2 unpacks socioanalytic theory and leader-member exchange which are used as theoretical assumptions while assessing the perspectives of emerging Black male leaders are through the lenses of developmental relationships, career mobility, self-monitoring, and nigrescence. Chapter 3 explains how and why Q methodology is used as “a systematic and rigorously quantitative means for examining human subjectivity” (McKeown & Thomas, 1988) among emerging Black male leaders. Chapter 4 will present, analyze, and interpret data and relevant findings of the present study. Chapter 5, finally, discusses implications of the present study, how it advances extant research, and recommendations for future research.
Chapter 2: Review of Literature

An underrepresentation of minorities and women in leadership across various professions has continued to be an area of concern over time (Barabas, 2015; Eagly & Chin, 2010; Gündemir et al., 2014; Kay & Gorman, 2012; McGinn & Milkman, 2013; Vinson, 2014). There is a common demographic leader thread running through United States’ business, politics, and education elites that scarcely recognizes, accepts, or develops African Americans as leaders. Whites occupy more than 87% of all chief executive offices, 84% of Fortune 100 Board of Director seats, 97% of Fortune 500 chief executive offices (Rosette et al., 2008). A 2016 Fortune Magazine article declared that in the history of the Fortune 500 there have been only 15 African American chief executive officers (CEOs) of which five are currently serving in those roles. Only 4.7% of Fortune 100 companies have African American CEOs while smaller companies report 6.7% African Americans in CEO positions. The large technology companies – Facebook, Google, Twitter and LinkedIn – report African Americans representing only 1% of all their employment (McGirt, 2016). In the political milieu, Whites make up 96% state governor, 94% U.S. Senator, and 83% U.S. House of Representative seats (Rosette et al., 2008). As it relates to education, a depressed representation of African Americans serving as college/university president of predominantly white higher education institutions (PWIs) is prevalent as well, and as of 2004 an African American had never held the position of PWI president in former confederate states of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina and South Carolina (Fikes Jr., 2004).

Concurrent to an underrepresentation of minorities and women in leadership positions, is
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a self-perpetuating assertion of white hegemony. Whites in leadership, as a natural interpersonal phenomenon, practice homophily – the likelihood and preference to associate with people socially similar to self (Bottero, 2007; Yuan & Gay, 2006) also known as homosocial reproduction (Dressel, Hartfield, & Gooley, 1994) – and develop other whites to succeed them (Mollica, Gray, & Trevino, 2003). Homophily is not limited to race/ethnicity and can also manifest in social attractions like gender, age, belief systems, education, and behavioral patterns (Bottero, 2007; Sliskovic & Tipuric, 2015, April; Yuan & Gay, 2006). That is, sourcing and selection into leadership positions traditionally looks at familiar, conservative attributes while overlooking situational factors (e.g., uncertainty, cultural heterogeneity, and member motivation; (Fiedler, 2001). Access to information, resources, and developmental practices (e.g., 360 feedback, coaching, mentoring, developmental networks, stretch assignments, and action learning) are extended to assure ascension of those selected into leadership. Organizational milieu influences (i.e., perceptions of role requirements, culture, structure, context, expectations, and locus-of-control) leader-membership exchange, particularly when it comes to developing subordinates (Shivers-Blackwell, 2006). Existing models of leadership development preserve a social, cultural, and political homogeneity that minimizes opportunities for those outside the ‘in-group’ (Breland, Treadway, Duke, & Adams, 2007).

Leader and leadership development are used interchangeably throughout the present study, however, they warrant differentiation because of important social distinctions. Leadership development encompasses a myriad of definitions and dispositions that complicate the idea of a comprehensive leadership development model. An abundance of extant research draws a distinct
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line between leader development and leadership development. The present study defines leader development as an investment in intra-personal competence that enhances self-awareness, self-regulation, as well as self-motivation (Day, 2001). Leadership development is defined as the integration of interpersonal perceptiveness, coordinating efforts, building commitments, and extending social networks (Day, 2001). Leader development is more of a private, individual endeavor where leadership development uses social systems to engage members in a public community of practice. Leader and leadership development operationalize two motives in the world of work: (1) getting along – to be involved, encouraged, and supported, and (2) getting ahead – acquisition of status, influence, and authority over resources (Ewen et al., 2014; Wolfé, Lennox, & Cutler, 1986). The present study considers leadership a developmental disposition inspired by unconditional positive regard — everyone has the desire to be accepted, learn, contribute and be recognized – in the sense that leadership transcends the traditional hierarchical structure and embraces emancipatory and empowerment intentionality (Rogers, 1959, 2012). Leadership disposition should reflect a posture of opportunity and for all. Everyone has the capacity and the right to be better tomorrow than they were yesterday, and effective leadership should cultivate an environment to do so. Human beings are learning organisms, continuously seeking knowledge to make meaning of the world (Senge, 2006). These definitions and dispositions of leader and leadership development challenge conventional models and propose a reduced power differential that exhibits a more equitable learning experience.

Leadership development is even more difficult for minorities and women due to the social, cultural, and political forces associated with traditional models of leadership development
(Cornileus, 2010). Stereotypes, scarcity of developmental relationships, insufficient experience, and exposure/visibility are all common barriers that impede career advancement for minorities and women (McCarty Kilian et al., 2005). More specifically, African American men can experience varying sociocultural norms that conflict with their inherent and socialized behaviors. This sociocultural discord causes psycho-emotional dissonance, personal distress, anxiety, guilt, and resentment when there is a violation of identity orientation (Molinsky, 2007). Within this definition and disposition of leadership development, through the constructs of developmental relationships, career mobility (contest mobility and sponsored mobility), self-monitoring and nigrescence (See Figure 1), the present study begins with the question: “As a Black man, what has most impacted your development as a leader?” The constructs of developmental relationships, career mobility, self-monitoring, and nigrescence are neither right or wrong, good or bad. However, the constructs do provide a critical lens through which leadership development among African American men can be examined.
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(Chandler, Kram, & Yip, 2011). Developmental relationships provide career-related, psychosocial, and role-modeling support that enhances career outcomes (Marcinkus Murphy & Kram, 2010). Career mobility (also known as upward and social mobility), which deconstructs into contest and sponsored mobility, represents routes to perceived success (Turner, 1960). Contest mobility is an individual’s merit; how good is one at what they do and how does that contribute to their career success? Sponsorship mobility is the strength, depth, and level of developmental relationships associated with one’s career success (Turner, 1960). Self-monitoring is formally defined as self-observation and self-control governed by environmental/situational cues to exhibit social appropriateness (Snyder, 1974). In addition to its formal definition, self-monitoring is similar to rule following and derives from ecological development; high self-monitors find rules easier to follow than low self-monitors. For example, high self-monitors are more likely to work with organizations where uniforms are mandatory, while low self-monitors look for room to express themselves. Environmental orientations influence self-monitoring preferences in that a balance between internal needs/desires and social opportunity determines how one behaves (R. Hogan & Cheek, 1983). In terms of leadership, high self-monitors exhibit a more hierarchical, fixed organizational structure, while low self-monitors seek a more collective, egalitarian organizational milieu (Snyder, 1974). Identity in the current study specifically addresses the degree to which race is desired to be discussed by Black men within the world of work, particularly within developmental relationships. Nigrescence – the ideology of ‘becoming black’ within a white dominated environment – is a theoretical construct that explains personal identity, professional identity, black identity, and reference
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group orientation and their implications in the world of work (Vandiver et al., 2002). The current study will first expound on the two theoretical frameworks, secondly present each conceptual construct while illustrating how each construct is connected the frameworks as well as each other.

Socioanalytic Theory

The first theoretical framework, socioanalytic theory, posits that people live in socially stratified groups with two major motivations in terms of social/career mobility; everyone wants to be accepted and get along with others and everyone wants to acquire status and power (Blickle et al., 2011; Ewen et al., 2014; R. Hogan & Roberts, 2004). Socioanalytic theory also suggests that identity, which fundamentally influences social behavior, and reputation indexed by others’ perceptions, should both define personality (J. Hogan & Holland, 2003). Socioanalytic theory is believed to have evolved out of William McDugall’s 1908 interpersonal theory which is rooted in ideology that social acceptance is more important than self-acceptance (R. Hogan & Benson, 2009). Similar to McClelland’s Theory of needs – need for affiliation, achievement, and power – socioanalytic theory asserts a need of individuals to attain favorable relationships and social status (Royle, 2013). Socioanalytic theory has important implications for leadership and social/career mobility; aspiring leaders exhibit behaviors that initiate structure while promoting group cohesion (Ewen et al., 2014) and exercise a political skill in which social perceptiveness and behavioral flexibility enhance interpersonal interactions (Blickle et al., 2011; Blickle et al., 2008). The underlying motivations of the socioanalytic theory within industrial organizational psychology primarily rely on the big five personality dimensions: openness to experiences,
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agreeableness, conscientiousness, ambition/extroversion, and emotional stability/neuroticism (J. Hogan & Holland, 2003).

Getting along and getting ahead looks very different for African American men than it does for their white counterparts. Black men, as part of a larger marginalized group, experience a cultural assault that forces them to endure a concurrent disregard for native culture and an assumptive assimilation into a mainstreamed white, middle-class set of behavioral norms (Taylor & Kachanoff, 2015). Whether it is double-consciousness (Bruce, 1992), biculturalism (Ashong-Lamptey, 2014), or multiculturalism (Berry, 2005), Black men must cross real physical, emotional, social, cultural, political, and spiritual borders every day to get along and get ahead. For a myriad of reasons, African American men struggle to gain acceptance into the in-group. Can Black men maintain their cultural heritage and ascend into mainstream leadership? Can Black men in leadership positions support the development of other Black men without the risk of losing in-group membership? Does leadership development for Black men look the same as it does for their White counterparts? What happens to those Black men that do not exhibit prototypical behaviors recognized by leaders capable of mentoring and sponsoring emerging leaders? Do the big five personality dimensions manifest similarly across cultures, specifically with Black men? These are a few question the current study would like to address in terms of African American males getting along and getting ahead.

Leader-Member Exchange

The second theoretical framework, Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) theory, is a relationship-based approach to leadership and explains the quality of and differentiation in
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exchanges leaders have with each of their subordinates (Graen & Uhl-Bein, 1995; Martin et al., 2015). LMX evolved from contemporary models of leadership that assumed superiors essentially had similar prescribed relationships with subordinates and subordinates demonstrated homogenous perceptions, interpretations, and behaviors toward superiors (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975). In an effort to improve the unit of analysis for examining leadership, a vertical dyadic linkage approach emerged that advanced from the aforementioned assumptions and accounted for radically distinct dyadic relationships (Dansereau et al., 1975). LMX progressed to operationalize leadership as an interdependent function of leader, member, and the distinct relationship between the two (Graen & Uhl-Bein, 1995).

Four stages represented the dynamic LMX processes: discovery of dyads, organizational implications, partnership building, and aggregation of differentiated dyads (Graen & Uhl-Bein, 1995). Identification of leader-member dyads permits investigations of isolated relationships between superior and a single subordinate. Organizational implications consider LMX factors like performance, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship, and career progress. Partnership building ranges from trusted, respectful, and loyal (high-quality LMX or in-group) relationships to transactional and contractual (low-quality LMX or out-group) relationships. Partnership also shifts leadership from a hierarchical, hegemonic exchange to a more collegial, egalitarian alliance. And, the aggregation of dyads refers to leaders comprehensively managing network assemblies – system of differentiated leader-member relationships – that also may cross organizational boundaries.
LMX, as a negotiation of information, resources, and relationships is oftentimes governed by leaders’ self-interest and affords in-group members more developmental support and autonomy (Omilion-Hodges & Baker, 2013). As LMX has advanced, leaders continue to practice homophily within dominant in-groups where not everyone is welcome (Bartol & Zhang, 2007). Homophily, particularly as it relates to race/ethnicity, limits social worlds of African Americans and restricts access to information, resources, and relationships that propel social/career mobility (McPherson, Smith-Lovin, & Cook, 2001). Homophilic practices in the workplace set limitations on access to funds of knowledge, resources, and developmental relationships for those in the out-group. High-quality LMX is characterized by access to network advantages that enhance social/career mobility while low-quality LMX is characterized by systemic barriers that constrain acquisition of human capital necessary to progress (Ibarra, 1992). Leaders, whether consciously or unconsciously, establish in-groups (through high-quality LMX) and out-groups (through low-quality LMX) within their spheres of influence (Bhatnagar, 2004; Malik, 2015). LMX, because of its affect on social/career mobility, serves as an important theoretical backdrop to the professional development and emergence of African American males as leaders.

Academe is fueled by theory predominantly powered by White values and norms (Brigham, 2007) that consequently do not account for the ontology, epistemology, or axiology of African Americans, particularly Black men. That is to say that what Black men see as reality, consider to be truth, and place value on, is insufficiently examined and therefore underrepresented in much academic theory. The present study has selected socioanalytic theory
and leader-member exchange theory as theoretical frameworks to express Black men’s motivations to develop as leaders and their access to the information, resources, and relationships needed to do so, respectively.

Socioanalytic theory posits that everyone wants to get along and get ahead (Wolfe et al., 1986), which is not a zero-sum game. Getting along and getting ahead, in the present study, does not suggest hegemonic contempt, but instead espouses that everyone wants to be accepted, learn, contribute, and be recognized. Ideology that everyone has the capacity to be better tomorrow than they were yesterday in no way implies that someone has to be worse off for this to occur. Leader-member exchange, in the present study, speaks to the possibility that, under opportune conditions, Black men can undoubtedly be developed as leaders. Leader-member exchange asserts that leaders have unique relationships with each of their subordinates (Wayne, Liden, Krainmer, & Graf, 1999). Accordingly, leaders tend to have stronger relationships with those that look like themselves (Ibarra, 1992); and because most leaders are prototypically White males (Cook & Glass, 2014), Black men scarcely experience high-quality developmental exchanges due to the preferential homophily practiced by White leaders. A better understanding of leader-member exchange and amplification of quality leader-member interactions can help Black men better navigate and negotiate professional and social landscapes. Therefore, socioanalytic theory and leader-member exchange theory applicably support the postulated theoretical assumptions that everyone wants to get along and get ahead as well as everyone, under opportune conditions, can benefit from high-quality leader-member relationships.
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Developmental Relationships

The first conceptual construct is developmental relationships and will be examined in terms of mentor/protégé relationships and developmental networks. No universal definition for mentoring exists (Washington, 2010), thus permitting varying interpretations and transmitting a degree of doubt to the efficacy of existing mentoring models. In an effort to eliminate uncertainty, the mentoring definition used for this present study is an interpersonal exchange between a more experienced individual (the mentor) and a less experienced individual (the protégé) characterized by guidance, feedback, and support from mentor to protégé for career-related and psychosocial development (B. P. Brown, Zablah, & Bellenger, 2008; Ensher & Murphy, 1997; Higgins & Kram, 2001; Mullen & Tuten, 2010; Ramaswami & Dreher, 2010). Career-related, often termed instrumental, functions are looked at in terms of visibility/exposure, coaching, career advancement, protection, promotion, pay, and sponsorship. Psychosocial functions include motivation, counseling, acceptance, confirmation, role modeling, and personal friendship (Baranik, Roling, & Eby, 2010; B. P. Brown et al., 2008; Mezias & Scandura, 2005; Pan, Sun, & Chow, 2011; Ramaswami & Dreher, 2010). Role modeling, sometimes looked at as a third function, is usually categorized as a component of the psychosocial function.

Mentorship has demonstrated alleviation of anxiety and apprehension in the world of work (Zafar, Roberts, & Behar-Horenstein, 2012) while improving job performance, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment (Behar-Horenstein, West-Olatunji, Moore, Houchen, & Roberts, 2012; Ensher & Murphy, 1997; Ramaswami & Dreher, 2010). Mentoring is not only advantageous to protégés; it benefits mentors and organizations as well (Chandler et
Conversely, the absence of mentorship practically assures that development, if any, will occur within silos (Behar-Horenstein et al., 2012; Benishek, Bieschke, Park, & Slattery, 2004).

Expanded models of mentoring that occur when multiple developmental relationships are established and operate concurrently are called developmental networks (Higgins & Kram, 2001), mentor networks (Mezias & Scandura, 2005), or relationship constellations (Higgins & Kram, 2001). Developmental networks are protégés’ egocentric networks made up of senior, peer and subordinate developers that span organizational proximity. Developers are selected by the protégé and actively contribute to the advancement of the protégé’s career through developmental support (Dobrow, Chandler, Murphy, & Kram, 2012; Higgins & Kram, 2001; Higgins & Thomas, 2001; Kim & Kim, 2007; Marcinkus Murphy & Kram, 2010). Many theorists have applied a general model to mentoring and neglect to acknowledge idiosyncratic characteristics of the individuals and the contexts in which their interaction occurs (Benishek et al., 2004). Despite the amount of attention research has given to mentoring, we can advance our collective understanding of what it can be and how it can contribute to individual and organizational goals. Too often, mentoring strategies apply a hegemonic and mono-cultural approach where mentors are the authority and protégés are subordinates, with little or no regard for the salient characteristics of the individuals comprising that mentoring relationship. This oftentimes results in misguided, oppressive protégé-mentor arrangements (Meyer & Warren-Gordon, 2013).

Conventional research suggests that the power and influence possessed by White men in
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America, who are most cited as mentor/sponsor in developmental relationships, give them the most value in roles of mentor and sponsor (Ensher & Murphy, 1997). Because of this advantage held by whites, and the lack thereof by black men, black men are studied as protégés mentored according to white norms and rarely researched as mentors. Although effective mentorship is more dependent upon philosophical alignment than racial similarity (B. P. Brown et al., 2008), there are distinct social, cultural and political nuances that black men must understand, at a visceral level, if mobility is to be realized. The necessity of mentorship is an intuitively obvious concept, however, a scarcity of research specifically examining sociocultural nuances distinct to African American men inspires a deeper look at why and how African American men can better participate in the mentoring process (as protégés as well as mentors). A greater appreciation for the ontological – how one’s reality is constructed – and epistemological – how one’s knowledge is constructed – factors that influence African American men’s access to information, resources, and relationships lends itself to better developmental practices that embrace a more culturally sensitive (Tillman, 2002), culturally relevant/responsive (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Landson-Billings, 2014), and culturally sustaining (Paris, 2012) leadership development model. For some people, developmental relationships may be tacit and accepted as procedural developmental practices; others may need more attention and explicit direction to incorporate developmental relationships into their professional maturation. This inconsistency of understanding is usually due to interests, backgrounds (demographic, economic, and cultural), access, and geographical proximity (Ensher & Murphy, 1997).

The underrepresentation of other perspectives complicates any effort to accurately study
mentoring of women and minorities, especially Black men. Extant academic articles touch on a variety of demographic variables including race/ethnicity, gender, age, and socioeconomic status. Although everyone desiring personal, professional, and career development would benefit from a mentor (Mertz, 2004), developing and sustaining quality mentorship is an arduous process (Borden, 2014; Herber & Bradbury-Jones, 2011; Wills & Kaiser, 2002), specifically for African American males. Developmental relationships, for African American males, are influenced by biological and socio-cultural antecedents (e.g. identity-group membership and self-extension orientation; (Thomas, 1993), which add to the difficulty of securing these relationships. Also, the lack of acceptance African American males experience with inner circles in the world of work threatens traditional techniques used to construct developmental relationships; African Americans may need to employ creative, non-assimilationist strategies to overcome homophylic advantages reserved for their white counterparts (Ibarra, 1995). The re-imagination of protégé-mentor interaction as a developmental praxis should ontologically and epistemologically consider the social, cultural, political, historical and economic influences surrounding these relationships to sharpen leadership and identify implications worth analyzing for more culturally comprehensive leadership models.

Developmental relationships are typically assessed according to tie strength – the depth and fortitude of a relationship, role-relation – the power differential between mentor and protégé, and frequency of contact. In addition to the aforementioned, criteria used to assess developmental networks include size – how many developers are in one’s relationship constellation, diversity – [range – the variations of hierarchical social systems developers belong
to and *density* – the connectivity among developers], and *centrality* – the between-ness or principal orientation of the protégé to his/her developers; all of which are impacted by *gender*, *race/ethnicity* and *socioeconomic status* (Higgins & Thomas, 2001; Kim & Kim, 2007; Shen & Kram, 2011; Singh, Ragins, & Tharenou, 2009; Van Emmerik, 2004).

**Developmental relationships and socioanalytic theory.** Because human beings live in stratified groups where everyone wants to get along and get ahead, developmental relationships are critical to development as a leader. Although gaining attention and status are generally unconscious behaviors, a biogrammar – programmed biological predisposition to act a certain way – ritualizes human behavior within given circumstances; specific sets of rules govern how one is to behave (R. Hogan, Jones, & Cheek, 1985). This ritualized social interaction becomes a part of the developmental process in the world of work which makes developmental relationships that much more important to obtaining the connectivity and social position that drives leader/leadership development. In a more palpable sense, the world of work can be seen as an existing system where mental models are the deeply ingrained rituals that influence individual behavior and ultimately organizational culture (Senge, 2006). The socioanalytic theory explicitly asserts that everyone, at different intensities, has a desire to get along and get ahead, and therefore aspiring leaders need developmental relationships to grow as effective leaders… socially, culturally, and politically.

**Developmental relationships and leader-member exchange (LMX).** *Leader-Member Exchange (LMX)* and developmental relationships (i.e., mentor/protégé and developmental networks that are enveloped within social networks) are both part of a larger resource/exchange-
based philosophy (McManus & Russell, 1997; Raabe & Beehr, 2003; Sparrowe & Liden, 1997, 2005). Developmental relationships strengthen leaders’ LMX and allow them to extend more valued information, resources, and relationships to their subordinates for developmental purposes (Venkatataramani, Green, & Schleicher, 2010). Developmental relationships are also known to situate subordinates within a superior’s in-group or out-group, based on context and quality of LMX (McManus & Russell, 1997). Because LMX differentiates subordinates according to trust and partiality, high-quality LMX in-group members are able to broker the more valuable information, resources and relationships among out-group members (Wang, Hu, & Dong, 2015).

A question in developmental relationship literature, in terms of LMX, is does high-quality LMX improve performance, productivity, and job satisfaction or is it the highly performing, productive, and satisfied superiors/subordinates that experience high-quality LMX within developmental relationships (Scandura, 1998)? The answer to this question is debatable and impels further investigation into the subjectivity of leadership development, particularly for African American men.

**Career Mobility**

Career mobility is the second conceptual construct and is composed of sponsored mobility which entitles leaders to select individuals they think have potential to lead (Myung, Loeb, & Horng, 2011) while contest mobility magnifies performance, productivity, and longevity as linchpin attributes of emerging leaders (Russ-Eft, Levine, & Fernandez, 2014). Leader emergence is commonly associated with promotion and some leader-promotion literature suggests that promotions markedly impact *core self evaluations* (i.e., self-esteem, self-efficacy,
neuroticism, and locus of control), assessed human capital, career satisfaction, and consequently future promotions (Stumpf & Tymon, 2012). Promotions are typically results of performance (contest mobility) and/or relationship (sponsored mobility), where sponsored mobility prospectively selects, inducts, and grooms those whom elite deem deserving and contest mobility retrospectively incentivizes those with proficient past performance (Collier, 2012). Promotion is an integral factor of individual career success as well as organizational success and can accurately be predicted with sponsored and contest mobility measures (Collier, 2012; Ng, Eby, Sorensen, & Feldman, 2005). Promotion and leader emergence can therefore be considered mutually inclusive and favor those with high degrees of integrated sponsored and contest mobility.

Leader emergence as a result of integrated sponsored and contest mobility is more likely to benefit those in close proximity with existing leadership demographics (e.g., race/ethnicity and gender/sex) and organizational fit (Myung et al., 2011). Leaders tend to promote prospects they perceive have proactive personalities and strong core self-evaluation, which consequently contributes to further promotion (Fuller & Marler, 2009; Stumpf & Tymon, 2012). When there is remote proximity to leadership, in terms of demographics and organizational fit, aspirants experience limited opportunity for sponsored mobility regardless of exhibited contest mobility. In a study conducted among several large corporations in the United States that looked at objective and subjective antecedents to career success, sponsored mobility was significantly more supported than contest mobility among the supervisor-subordinate dyads researched (Wayne et al., 1999). This suggests that contest mobility may be of little value in terms of career
success for those unable or unwilling to engage in sponsored mobility systems. If contest mobility is devalued, an implication of social, cultural, political, and economic control manifests as a barrier for all not selected by the elite. With employees who are unable or unwilling to advantage sponsored mobility opportunities, another implication of organizational discontent emerges as an additional barrier to career advancement. One common occurrence of organizational disconnect occurs when employees experience a breach of psychological contract – violation of perceived promises concerning organizational opportunity (i.e., promotion, compensation, and professional development). Further, it is more likely those employees will exhibit adverse emotional and behavioral orientations (Restubog, Bordia, & Bordia, 2011).

Another study that examined career satisfaction among a sample of Chinese employees found procedural justice and perceived organizational support to echo Wayne et al’s (1999) argument with respect to sponsored and contest mobility’s cumulative influence on one’s career development (Loi & Ngo, 2010). Among other demographics, African American males experience less social support and consequently lower core self-evaluations (Ng & Feldman, 2014). In the absence of social support along with deficient core self-evaluations, which are pivotal roles in career development and leader emergence, African American males’ contest mobility is devalued in the face of their desired career success.

**Career mobility and socioanalytic theory.** Career mobility in and of itself suggests a desire to get along and get ahead (socioanalytic theory). There is an ecological affiliation within career development/mobility (i.e., a perpetual interdependency between the person and his/her environment) that coerces the continuity of an individual’s motivations and talents cooperatively
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nestled in a socially stratified environment (Young, 1984). Career mobility, sponsored mobility more so than contest mobility, requires an advanced degree of social, cultural, and political acumen, especially for African American men (Blickle et al., 2011). The negotiation and navigation of Black men in the world of work involves shifts in what it means to have social, cultural, and political capital. Social, cultural, and political capital, in this sense, is the ability to exercise social competence, emotional competence, self-monitoring, political competence, ego resiliency, behavioral flexibility, self-efficacy, and interpersonal acumen to enhance interpersonal relations and ultimately career mobility (Ferris, Perrewé, & Douglas, 2002). Due to homophily or homosocial reproduction, African American men tend to have less access to information, resources, and relationships that yield the human and social capital necessary for upward mobility (Worsley & Stone, 2011). African Americans, particularly Black men, experience handicapped career mobility due to inferior occupational origin and more limited occupational destinations than their White counterparts (Yamaguchi, 2009).

**Career mobility and leader-member exchange.** Leader-Member Exchange (LMX), as it relates to career mobility, is directly associated with sponsored mobility and positively influences salary increase and promotability (Wayne et al., 1999). LMX enhances job performance, productivity, attitudes, work behaviors, job/career satisfaction, and organizational commitment which ultimately benefit the subordinate, superior, and organization while fostering career advancement (Erdogan & Enders, 2007; B. Walker & Walker, 2013). High-quality LMX is pivotal to career mobility, specifically sponsored mobility, in that the instrumental and psychosocial support garnered encourages help-seeking behavior that builds human and social
BLACK MALE PERSPECTIVES

capital (Fuller & Marler, 2009). Protégés within the sponsored mobility system experience high-quality LMX and benefit from air-cover/protection, bureaucracy avoidance, and having someone at the decision making table fighting for them (Roots, 2006). The more knowledge, resources, and relationships proactive personalities with access to decision makers gain, the more disproportionate access they get to gain more knowledge, resources, and relationships (Merton, 1968). Although high quality LMX occurs between superiors that nurture high performing subordinates, organizations that do not effectively foster high quality LMX often experience elevated turnover rates due to emerging leaders going elsewhere for those developmental relationships (K. J. Harris, Kacmar, & Witt, 2005).

Career mobility and developmental relationships. Learning (Scoggins, 2008) and leading (Van de Valk, 2008) are social endeavors and can be extremely influential in constructing relationships for career advancement. Mentoring and developmental networks assist in the negotiation and navigation process of career development. Among many, zone of proximal development, guided participation, and scaffolding are developmental concepts that support leading and learning (Dzickowski, 2013). Zone of proximal development is the difference between what can be done alone and what can be done with the help of others; guided participation is the transfer of skill and problem-solving proficiency through interests, support, and independence; and scaffolding is tailored instruction and support through modeling, advising, and coaching (Dzickowski, 2013). These developmental concepts suggest that career mobility is more probable with the career-related and psychosocial support from mentors, sponsors, and developers than attempting to advance in silo. Savvy relational developers broadly
solicit others’ advice, carefully manage relationships, enjoy learning from others, and have extraordinary social competence (Chandler, Hall, & Kram, 2010). In a study that examined career/job attributes (i.e., career mobility/opportunity, recognition, job security, job satisfaction, and promotions) affected by mentorships and job success, protégés had more opportunities and career mobility than non-mentored participants (Fagenson, 1989). Mentorship and developmental networks expand access to information, resources, and relationships in a way that builds social capital while augmenting human capital and promoting career mobility as well.

**Self-Monitoring**

The third conceptual construct is self-monitoring and is the extent to which one is able and willing to monitor their behavior is largely dependent upon self-awareness, position, and intention within a set of circumstances. An individual’s self-awareness and self-expression governed by situational cues is called *self-monitoring* (Bryant, Mitcham, & Araiza, 2011; Ickes, Reidhead, & Patterson, 1986; Jamieson, Lyndon, & Zanna, 1987; Snyder, 1974; Snyder & Gangestad, 1986; Tate, 2008; Zaccaro, Foti, & Kenny, 1991). Self-monitoring is used to effectively convey authentic emotions (*congruence*) or to conceal inappropriate emotions while communicating messages that are situationally appropriate (*incongruence*; Snyder, 1974). Congruence, as it relates to self-monitoring, involves an understanding of one’s own convictions and behavioral patterns to better align with varying social systems. As situations present themselves, self-monitoring serves to approximate behavior with that of a specific social environment (Jawahar, 2001).
High self-monitors (HSMs) use salient situational factors to exhibit cross-situational variability, complementary to environmental settings. HSMs look at a situation and ask what does this situation need from me, what is situationally appropriate? HSMs also exercise status enhancement motive – impression management or opportunism by altering public and private behavior based on a desired outcome. Status enhancement motive manifests itself as interpersonal potency or a win-at-all-cost disposition, depending on the circumstances (Oh, Charlier, Mount, & Berry, 2014). Although HSMs are perceived as competent and more likely to advance in their career, they may also be seen to have little organizational commitment because of their status enhancement and opportunistic motives (Oh et al., 2014; Tate, 2008).

Low self-monitors’ (LSMs’) behavior is more congruent with their innate beliefs and emotions; they choose not to alter their self-presentation according to situational cues. LSMs look at a situation and ask how can I be myself in this situation? LSMs also exercise self-validation – acceptance of one’s own emotions, beliefs, and experiences – that manifests itself as more socially consistent behavior, regardless of situational cues (Oh et al., 2014). Whether through willingness and/or ability, LSMs exhibit consistent behavior across social systems regardless of their position.

Self-monitoring has many implications as it relates to leadership (e.g., expressive control, social and situational perceptiveness, congruence of private emotions and public behavior, and developmental and socialization processes (Gangestad & Snyder, 2000). Expressive control is the ability to modify behavior based on the message one wants to convey. All of these implications, depending on dispositional usage, contribute to the status enhancement motive of
HSMs or self-validation of LSMs. While some theorists will argue that self-monitoring prowess is not reflective of work performance (Bedeian & Day, 2004), most research supports a strong correlation between self-monitoring agility, job performance, and leader emergence (Garland & Beard, 1979; Mehra, Kilduff, & Brass, 2001; Van Der Heide & Wittenbaum, 2007). HSMs’ typically have better job performance and advance in their careers faster than LSMs. Individuals in leadership positions are more likely to demonstrate HSM behaviors (i.e., social perceptiveness, social appropriateness, attention to situational cues, and command of behavioral responsiveness; (Zaccaro et al., 1991). Perceived work attributes that impel leader emergence are commonly in alignment with existing leadership customs, behaviors, and beliefs.

In a study that examined how social approval, self-monitoring, and need for social power influenced leadership style and vision statement, self-monitoring was more positively associated with leaders who were HSMs than LSMs (Sosik & Dinger, 2007). While studying the theoretical understanding of self-monitoring personality in work settings Day, Shleicher, Unckless, and Hiller (2002) found self-monitoring to be instrumental in understanding job performance and leader emergence (p. 397). Another study that looked specifically at social perceptiveness and behavioral flexibility found self-monitoring to be prevalent in leader emergence (Snyder, 1974). HSMs achieve leadership status more often than LSMs because of more conventional behavioral patterns (e.g., extroversion, emotional competence and situational flexibility/appropriateness), social expectations, alignment with organizational norms, and affinity with those in leadership (Shivers-Blackwell, 2006).
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Self-monitoring oftentimes requires crossing cultural borders (i.e., barriers created by differences in language, customs, and race/ethnicity). All languages carry a distinct ideology — set of beliefs, principles, and customs — that define culture (C. Zhang & Ma, 2012), and mindful intercultural communication considers the understanding, support, and respect of language (Flammia & Sadri, 2011). Understanding how to cross language barriers strengthens the ability to self-monitor. One’s native cultural norms must commonly be overridden in order to appropriately engage with foreign cultures that exist in the world of work (Molinsky, 2007). The greater the difference between one’s native behavior and one’s work environment, the less congruence there is between how they act at home and self-monitored behavior at work.

Developing relationships across races/ethnicities is critical to career development. A degree of social, cultural, and political acumen is necessary when moving between native behavioral norms and foreign settings where behavior has to be modified to achieve acceptance. Border crossing can be extremely arduous, particularly for African American males. There are expectations, within the world of work, that are very different than those generally found in African American communities. Appropriate behavior within the world of work depends on situational norms specific to a given environment, as well as the role one plays within the situation (e.g., a certain behavior is expected in an interview, however, there are different demands for the interviewer than the interviewee). When African Americans code switch – culturally adaptive behavior where internalized norms encoded in scripts or event-based schemas must be consciously overridden to engage in behavior appropriate to an unfamiliar culture (Molinsky, 2007) – they appropriate their native behavior to accommodate foreign environments
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while maximizing rewards and minimizing risk. All interpersonal interaction has referential and intentional meaning that is important to index the power differential among inter-acting participants. Therefore, marked behavior – strategically acting in accordance with social consequences – becomes beneficial when there are behavioral expectations in place related to career advancement and leader emergence.

**Self-monitoring and socioanalytic theory.** Effective self-monitoring generally constitutes wide ranges of network associations and higher work performance which eases the exercise of getting along and getting ahead (Flynn, Reagans, Amanatullah, & Armes, 2006; Shaker, 2015). Self-awareness, social perceptiveness, and behavioral flexibility all enhance interpersonal interaction, thereby improving access to promotional opportunities and leader emergence (Bryant et al., 2011; Flynn et al., 2006). The challenge for African American men to get along and get ahead becomes an extremely arduous one. Black men must master the delicate dance of oscillating between their native community and the mainstream world of work (Johnson & Eby, 2011; Taylor & Kachanoff, 2015). High self-monitors are able to tactically negotiate and navigate varied landscapes while simultaneously getting along and getting ahead (Wolfe et al., 1986). Leader/leadership development for Black men in a White world of work requires a biculturality where what accounts for acceptance and status in one environment does not in the other (Bell, 1990). The consequence of not assimilating may lead to embarrassment, performance anxiety, psychological distress, and even guilt (Molinsky, 2007). If career success is to be realized, African American men must expand their behavioral repertoire to accommodate varying environments. The better understanding and appreciation Black men have for the micro-
processes involved in self-monitoring, the more confidence they have to get along and get ahead. The greatest self-efficacy and productivity is achieved when one’s psychological orientation is congruent with the existing social system (Bandura, 2001).

**Self-monitoring and leader-member exchange (LMX).** Self-monitoring is a political skill that kindles high-quality LMX while mitigating the complexities and competition of social mobility (Zinco, 2010). High self-monitoring protégés exercise behavioral acuity that subscribes to superiors’ expectations and, due to a high level of social perceptiveness, exhibit help seeking behavior toward other developers as well (Ghosh, 2014). This suggests that high self-monitoring protégés more frequently (than low-self monitoring protégés) develop high-quality LMX with multiple leaders, concurrently. High self monitors, consequently, have higher levels of success (i.e., more promotions, better performance evaluations, and stronger support), more influential social exchange, and emerge as leaders faster and more frequently (Flynn et al., 2006).

In a study that examined corporate managers from multiple industries, charismatic and visionary leaders were more positively associated with being high self-monitors while contingent reward leaders were more positively associated with being low self-monitors (Sosik & Dinger, 2007). Implications here are that high self-monitoring leaders are more likely to have a greater appreciation for high-quality LMX with more subordinates, more so than low self-monitoring leaders. As African American men emerge as leaders, it is important for them to acknowledge and understand the significance that self-awareness and self-expression have on developing high-quality LMX to drive career success (Johnson & Eby, 2011). This is not to say that Black men
must be something other than who they are, however, it is to suggest that informed insight engenders a coherent and courageous decision-making pattern that yields a more internal locus of control.

**Self-monitoring and developmental relationships.** Self-monitoring orientation directly impacts the social structure of protégé-mentor and developmental network relationships (Kim & Kim, 2007). Due to the complexity of signaling, initiating, developing, managing, and sustaining developmental relationships, it is important for emerging leaders to be aware of self-monitoring orientations and practices. Developmental relationships that serve status enhancement purposes are generally formed by high self-monitors, while those developmental relationships that serve as affirmation apparatuses are formed by low self-monitor (Oh et al., 2014). High self-monitors develop structural holes – brokerage positions that bridge disassociated developers – and network diversity to strengthen the utility of their social capital (Wang et al., 2015). Structural holes and network diversity enhance work outcomes by eliminating redundant support and increasing opportunities to improve job performance; high self-monitors’ social/self-monitoring prowess fuels network heterogeneity and consequently accesses higher levels of information, resources and developmental relationships (Wang et al., 2015). High self-monitors usually have developmental relationships that run an inch deep and a mile wide and tend to have different developers that serve different purposes. Low self-monitors’ developmental relationships run an inch wide and a mile deep, and low self-monitors have fewer connected developers whose roles overlap. High self-monitors use activity and
function as decision-making criteria for selecting developmental relationships, while low self-monitors employ likability as their social selection barometer (Fang et al., 2015).

**Self-monitoring and career mobility.** Self-monitoring fuels social perceptiveness and behavioral flexibility, thereby promoting leader emergence (Zaccaro et al., 1991). Self-monitoring is a socio-political skill that attracts interpersonal and organizational favorability. High self-monitors recognize social/organizational demands and through impression management more appropriately present themselves to effectively manage perceptions (Gangestad & Snyder, 2000). High self-monitors, consequently, experience higher performance evaluations and more promotions than low self-monitors (Day, Shleicher, Unckless, & Hiller, 2002; Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2009) which inevitably equate to greater career mobility. Much of the reasoning behind career success for high self-monitors, in contrast to low self-monitors, is due to the willingness and ability to align their communication and behavior with organizational objectives (Van Der Heide & Wittenbaum, 2007). Although contest mobility can be enhanced through better relationships with superiors, self-monitoring is more affiliated with sponsored mobility, in that high-quality LMX with organizational elites affords a competitive advantage that amplifies career sponsorship and career success (Blickle et al., 2011). Self-monitoring is, by an large, directly associated with job performance and career success, and can play a pivotal role in negotiating and navigating organizational structures within the world of work.

**Nigrescence**

The fourth conceptual construct is nigrescence which is the self-actualization process of becoming and being Black in the face of White supremacy (Alexander-Lee, 2014). Within the
nigrescence model, Blacks progress from a state of racial unawareness through an Afrocentric orientation to an empathic multicultural understanding where there is an appreciation for all oppressed cultures (MacDonald-Dennis, 2006). Although Black is a biological certainty, it is also a psychological experience realized through a racial socialization process (Charles, 2014). The perpetual, psychological process of nigrescence was once believed to only contribute racial preference to one’s *personal identity* – unique, individual attributes (e.g., I am reserved, sentimental, and cautious) – and mental health; accepting being black suggests psychological health and high self-esteem while assimilation to white values reflects self-hatred and low self-esteem (Vandiver et al., 2002). However, nigrescence has since been revised to delineate personal identity and *reference group orientation* – social group membership preference based on characteristics such as race, gender, sexuality, spiritual denomination, and disability – and personal identity and the relationship between reference group orientation and self-esteem (Vandiver et al., 2002). Self-concept – one’s public and private view of oneself – is the overarching psychological dimension that envelops personal identity and racial group orientation and contributes to how all human beings, but more specifically African American males, make sense of their social being (Vandiver, 2001). Nigrescence posits that personal identity plays less of a role in black identity than reference group orientation because of the social salience of self-identification (Vandiver et al., 2002). This notion is also supported by interpersonal theory which posits that self-acceptance plays less of a role in getting along and getting ahead than social acceptance (R. Hogan & Benson, 2009).
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The latest postulation of the nigrescence theory is operationalized in the *Cross Racial Identity Scale*, which categorizes racial identity attitudes into *Pre-Encounter, Encounter* or *Immersion-Emersion*, and *Internalization* stages. Pre-Encounter consists of Assimilation, Miseducation, and Self-Hatred identities; Immersion-Emersion consists of Anti-White and Intense Black Involvement identities; and Internalization consists of Black Nationalist or Afrocentricity, Biculturalism, Multiculturalism Racial, and Multiculturalism Inclusive identities (Gardner-Kitt & Worrell, 2007; Vandiver et al., 2002; Worrell, Cross Jr., & Vandiver, 2001; Worrell, Mendoza-Denton, Telesford, Simmons, & Martin, 2011).

Nigrescence, as represented in the aforementioned stages and identities, is a dynamic, developmental process within the context of social reality that begins at adolescence and lasts a lifetime, as opposed to a static designation (Gardner-Kitt & Worrell, 2007; Parham, 2001). Different factors (e.g., cognitive, emotional, behavioral, and spiritual) influence one’s racial identity orientation or nigrescence and may vary over time and environmental condition. Nigrescence as a developmental process is important to the current study because of its implications for socioanalytic and Leader Member Exchange theories as well as career mobility, developmental relationship, and self-monitoring constructs. How will African American men better negotiate and navigate professional America without having a clear and coherent ownership of who they are and how their identity plays out within systems of the world?

**Nigrescence and socioanalytic theory.** The idea that everyone wants to get along and get ahead (Socioanalytic Theory), in terms of nigrescence, is operationalized within three functions of cultural identity: (1) *bonding*- culturally congruent connectedness within one’s
racial group orientation, (2) buffering – contextualized management of perceived racism, and (3) bridging – the negotiation and navigation between native and dominant cultures. The more secure people are with their own racial/ethnic identity, the better they bridge with individuals and institutions of the dominant culture (Byars-Winston, 2010). Fundamental psychological forces drive all human beings to elevated egocentric status and sociocentric popularity (Bedeian & Day, 2004). Moreover, African Americans are coerced into a delicate dance between two distinctly different worlds to get along and get ahead (Taylor & Kachanoff, 2015). Bonding, buffering, and bridging become imperative artistries that African American men must master to participate in a social mobility system (i.e., contest mobility and sponsored mobility). Self and social awareness around the four constructs of career mobility, developmental relationships, self-monitoring, and nigrescence afford more informed consciousness with the bonding, buffering, and bridging processes. Socioanalytic theory posits that leadership personality should be characterized by actor and observer, however, getting along and getting ahead greatly depend on others’ evaluations which are subject to observers’ assessment of an actor’s appraisal factors (J. Hogan & Holland, 2003). Scarce extant research that combines the aforementioned constructs, particularly nigrescence, imply that Black males are held to standards without consideration of social, cultural and political differences. Similar to sociopolitical forces that limit marginalized populations’ access to educational opportunities and heighten the propensity for poverty and crime (Haslanger, 2011), African American men’s unfamiliarity with nigrescence and its criticality to social mobility hinders their chances to get along and get ahead.
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**Nigrescence and leader-member exchange.** LMX, as it relates to nigrescence and emerging African American male leaders, addresses complexities with gaining access to the information, resources, and relationships that propel one into leadership. Leaders develop unique, dyadic relationships with their subordinates that range from *in-group* relationships rooted in trust, respect, and loyalty that are psychologically and tangibly beneficial – *high-quality LMX* relationships, to *out-group* transactional, contractual relationships that favor compliance and standardized behavior – *low-quality LMX* relationships (B. P. Brown et al., 2008; Hogg et al., 2005). Access to important information, resources, and relationships is significantly more advantaged through high-quality LMX and notably absent within low-quality LMX (Bauer, Erdogan, Liden, & Wayne, 2006; Brouer & Harris, 2007; Sparrowe & Liden, 2005). Black men experience extreme difficulty gaining admittance into the in-group and therefore have limited access to information, resources, and relationships that yield leader emergence. In-group LMX, which is preceded by liking, perceived similarity, and expectations (Engle & Lord, 1997; Head, 2014; Sparrowe & Liden, 1997), increases the probability of subordinates’ strong work performance, high job satisfaction, and commitment to organization (O'Donnell, Yukl, & Taber, 2012; Z. Zhang, Wang, & Shi, 2012). LMX theory suggests that in-group relationships strengthen subordinates’ influence among other work groups and personal well-being while enhancing the bonding, buffering, and bridging process.

When African American men advance in organizations, especially as firsts, they struggle with the prototypicality – the ideal African American professional as perceived by those in power – of being a professional African American and the gravity of being Black (Slay, 2003).
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Prototypicality is subject to perceptions and presumptions of those in power and seldomly benefits Black men seeking career success while being true to themselves. A multiplicity of institutional barriers impact African Americans’ access to high LMX relationships (i.e., tokenism, stereotyping, discrimination, racism) and complicate ascension into leadership position (Flores & Matkin, 2014). Tokenism typically presents itself when someone is put in position (usually without legitimate authority) to appease diversity requirements and demonstrate an equal opportunity environment (Cain, 2015; Mays, 2013). Stereotyping, discrimination, and racism are salient contributors to diversity, inclusion, and acceptance issues that many organizations face (Dawson, Johnson, & Ferdman, 2013), particularly regarding African American men. At the end of the day, high-quality LMX is essential to developmental relationships (Bauer et al., 2006; Sparrowe & Liden, 2005) that empower Black men to better navigate and negotiate the temperamental terrain of middle class professionalism. Tokenism, stereotyping, discrimination, and racism continue to be inhibitory for African American males, however, an informed orientation around nigrescence can possibly reimagine and reframe the limited prototypicality of Black male leaders.

**Nigrescence and developmental relationships.** Due to an underrepresentation of African American men in leadership positions (with the capacity to serve as mentors, sponsors, and developers), the probability of cross-racial developmental relationships is higher. Although both Blacks and Whites experience more psychosocial support within same-race developmental relationships, sponsorship with White males is an organizational imperative where career related objectives are supersede identity and racial group orientation (Thomas, 1990). Within cross-
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racial developmental relationships, it is critical to have a clearly understood personal identity and reference group orientation of self and others (Barker, 2010). Cross-racial mentor-protégé relationships give rise to enormous challenges for African American men crossing borders within a White world of work (where social capital is so salient); legal, social, and economic stratification assign position and power to the dominant groups (Alfred, 2001; Ashong-Lamptey, 2014; Bell, 1990). Legality in the world of work is generally expressed in organizational rules, regulations, and standard operating procedures. Because of disparities between African American customs and the world of work, behavioral compliance in the form of social conformity is usually the price African Americans pay towards opportunities for advancement (Liu, 2013).

Historically W.E.B. Dubois referred to this struggle for African Americans to succeed in two competing raciocultural worlds as double consciousness and more recently biculturalism has been coined to describe this dichotomous dilemma (Ashong-Lamptey, 2014; Bell, 1990; Brannon, Markus, & Taylor, 2015; Bruce, 1992). Within double consciousness is a warring uncertainty between the ‘African’ and ‘American’ realities of African Americans (Ashong-Lamptey, 2014; Barker, 2010; Bell, 1990; Bruce, 1992; Liu, 2013). Double consciousness also reflects a cross-racial identity, communication, and behavioral strategies that must be employed by Black men and Black men in the world of work. Racial/ethic consciousness speaks to a necessity for African American men to exercise a cultural duality where one culture uncooperatively dominates the other.
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Biculturalism, a broader racial/ethnic representation of double consciousness, is the frame-switching – the shifting of one’s attributions and values due to relevant cultural stimuli (Cheng, Lee, & Benet-Martinez, 2006; Ramirez-Esparza, Gosling, Benet-Martinez, & Potter, 2006) and code-switching – the purposeful, assimilative application of culturally appropriate behavior in foreign settings (Molinsky, 2007) between native and dominant cultural environments of African American men (Brannon et al., 2015). Double consciousness and biculturalism, when not performed by African Americans to the satisfaction of a dominant culture, obstructs informal mentorship/sponsorship relationships that white, male, middle-class counterparts benefit from (Ashong-Lamptey, 2014). An underlying assumption of double consciousness and biculturalism is that White and Black’s assimilative experiences should be similar. However, because extant research positions White culture as a mainstreamed, implicit benchmark, very little is known about Black double conscious and bicultural experiences, especially regarding developmental relationships (Blake-Beard, Murrell, & Thomas, 2006).

**Nigrescence and career mobility.** Nigrescence has many career mobility implications. The present study integrates nigrescence because of its influence on career exploration, development, and advancement. As suggested by the Theory of Circumscription, Compromise, and Self-Creation, African Americans stereotype occupational opportunities (consciously and/or unconsciously) before vocational pursuit begins (Gottfredson, 2002). Gottfredson explained self-creation as occupational aspirations that incorporate accessibility, compatibility, social space (zone of acceptable alternatives) into a set of self-imposed parameters that restrict occupational
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possibilities. Self-creation is a cognitive map of occupational alternatives that is constructed through circumscripive and compromised processes.

Circumscription, shaped by several factors that contrive one’s social space, occurs in four stages: (1) Orientation to size and power, attitudinal classification of power differentials; (2) Orientation to sex roles, appropriation of occupational possibilities according to sex distinctions; (3) Orientation to social valuation, explicit recognition of social class/occupational pecking orders, social and economic artifacts (e.g. clothing, possessions, and experiences), and intellectual and educational levels that influence occupational achievement; and (4) Orientation to the internal, unique self, acceptance of one’s place in society that is negotiated with identity ambiguity, uncertainty in ability, and realistic expectations of self. Compromise begins in the orientation to the unique self and drives people to question who they want to be and whether they will acquiesce to who the world tells them they are. Compromise is the shift from dreams of attaining internal aspirations to submission to external expectations, and these compromises are oftentimes revisited later in life to chase one’s true calling. Although Gottfredson’s Theory of Circumscription, Compromise, and Self-Creation posits the stages occur throughout childhood over specific age ranges, inertia perpetuates one’s reality if there is no investment in changing the mindsets of African American men.

Dickens and Dickens Career Development Model also offers insight into the intersection of career development and nigrescence (Cornileus, 2010). Expressing some tenets of the socioanalytic theory – everyone wants to get along and get ahead – the Dickens and Dickens Career Development Model magnifies social, cultural, and political nuances experienced by
African American men navigating and negotiating their careers. The model segments the career development process into four phases: (1) Entry, personal gratification for simply acquiring position (I’m just happy to be here); (2) Adjusting, the realization that ‘just being here’ is not enough, oftentimes interpreted as insubordination; (3) Planned Growth, gained emotional competence, calculated decision making, and professional socialization; and (4) Success, achievement and acceptance as perceived by White middle class professionalism (Cornileus, 2010; Knight, 2009).

Nigrescence adds a layer of complexity to career development in terms of sponsored and contest mobility systems. Mobility barriers for African Americans become more complex as African Americans scale organizational structures in ways that broaden their scope of power and responsibility (Knight, 2009). Gottfredson’s Theory of Circumscription, Compromise, and Self-Creation examined with Dickens and Dickens’ Career Development Model can be used to illustrate many complexities associated with African American men exploring, identifying, selecting, initiating, penetrating, navigating, negotiating, and developing a career. In the past African Americans experienced a entitativity (i.e., an abstraction from acceptance, inclusion, and recognition) through residential proximity, similar conditions, comprehensive fate of success or failure, and racial permanence (Slay, 2003). However, educational and occupational opportunity eventually afforded advancement into a White middle class while eroding a cohesiveness that once powered an emancipatory civil rights movement. As intoxicating as opportunity has been for African Americans, it comes with a cost, a price of circumscription, compromise, and self-creation as well as other uncertain mobility barriers.
**Nigrescence and self-monitoring.** Self-monitoring is not only a psychological state shaped by situational expectations of Black men; it is also a personality characteristic associated with schemata and the ability/willingness to self-monitor (K. P. Walker, 2011). Because professional America has framed a picture of how successful African Americans should think and behave (e.g., placating corporate officers, co-opting centers of influence, and undermining competition), a homophilic culture (that does not comprehensively reflect emerging leaders’ willingness to psychologically and behaviorally conform) influences who existing Black leaders mentor and sponsor (Carbado & Gulati, 2004). An African American male whose mental model – acutely established assumptions and generalization that drive how one makes meaning of and interacts in the world (Senge, 2006) – conflicts with a dominant culture is less likely to be tapped by another African American male in leadership. Hierarchically successful African American minorities are often not committed to, nor do they feel responsible for, exercising ameliorative succession strategies that develop emerging minority leaders (H. E. Briggs et al., 2014).

African American men must therefore recognize that, as it relates to social/career mobility, their professional experiences are shaped by individual, relational, and organizational social determinants. Oftentimes it is an inability and/or unwillingness to abandon racial group orientation for rewards and emotional wholeness afforded by Blacks’ acculturation into White mainstream. Trade-offs for emotional wholeness take Black men through an inner-outer bipolarity similar to that of the internal versus external locus of control, high self-awareness versus low self-awareness, and inner-directedness versus other-directedness (S. R. Briggs & Cheek, 1988). The ultimate objective of African American social mobility is empowerment and
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psychological well-being within an integrated cultural duality; however, ascension frequently demands assimilative identity and cultural immersion (Bell, 1990). Though African American ascension is contextual and can be within a majority (mainstreamed culture or minority culture) racial group orientations are implicitly or explicitly declared. Group membership then drives social identity, social attraction, and prototypicality, and engenders several different identity orientations: emerging African American leaders in White cultures generally de-emphasize their Black social identity and experience to experience more social attraction within the dominant culture; emerging African American leaders in minority cultures generally emphasize their Black social identity to experience more social attraction within their native culture (Slay, 2003). Social identity, social attraction, and prototypicality are motivated by status enhancement or self-verification and interact with performance to drive leadership influence.

Self-monitoring and nigrescence play pivotal roles in the professional development of Black male emerging leaders. Social perceptiveness, behavioral flexibility, and personal/professional identity are all factors in an elaborate social mobility equation that can make or break a Black man’s ascension into leadership. Subtle decision-making episodes can be critical to how African Americans are perceived by the dominant culture and can oftentimes be as confusing as they are conflicting. Insidious racial micro-aggressions marginalize and threaten the very existence of African American men, and pressure them to ‘choose a side’ (Watkins, 2012). Do I demand respect and defend my dignity as a black man, or do I passively absorb the slight and not cause anyone discomfort? African American men struggle with an incongruence of different worlds and self-monitor out of a necessity to get along and get ahead. High self-
monitors suppress their nigrescence and exhibit impression management due to a status enhancement motive, while low self-monitors embrace their nigrescence due to a self-verification motive (Oh et al., 2014). This socio-racial tension adds stress to social/career mobility of African Americans by pushing them to perpetually assess situations, evaluate their position, and adjust their behavior according to the tacit cultural standards set forth, usually by White middle class leaders (Watkins, 2012).

In a struggle between maintaining a native cultural identity and being accepted in mainstream society, African Americans usually find themselves in one of four acculturation strategies: (1) assimilation, disengagement from one’s native heritage and immersion in the dominant culture; (2) separation, allegiance to one’s native culture and detachment from the dominate culture; (3) integration, honoring one’s native culture while showing respect and appreciation for the dominant culture as well; and (4) marginalization, little interest in native heritage and an apathetic desire to integrate within the dominant culture (Berry, 2005). How willing and able are African American men to tolerate and/or actively engage in such a delicate and dubious dance? A better understanding of self-monitoring, as it relates to nigrescence, gives African American men more of an internal locus of control, and consequently empower informed and intentional decision-making processes.

**Educational Leadership**

Black males lead the nation in homicides, as victims and perpetrators, they exhibit the fastest growing percentage of suicides, and have been acquiring AIDS and HIV at more frequent rates than any other populace (Noguera, 2003). Black boys are also underrepresented in gifted
classes, overrepresented in at-risk programs, suspended more often, and less likely to advance grades (Decuir-Gunby, 2009). Because education is the pipeline through which the only form of compulsory schooling takes place, it is detrimentally important for Black boys to see Black men in educational leadership positions. For example, a study that examined student-level longitudinal administrative data on public schools in North Carolina found that Black boys, especially those from lower socioeconomic environments, who were taught by Black male teachers during elementary school experienced 39% lower high school dropout rates and exhibited increased aspirations to attend college (Gershenson, Hart, Lindsey, & Papageorge, 2017).

Black teachers have not only been more valuable to Black students, but have been widely recognized as beneficial to White students as well (M. L. Taylor, 2013; Van den Hoogenhof, 2012; Villegas, Storm, & Lucas, 2012). In an academic study using secondary analyses of the Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) longitudinal database that investigated over 5,000 diverse students’ perceptions of their teachers’ pedagogical practices, found that students had more favorable ratings for Black and Latino teachers than White teachers (Cherng & Halpin, 2016). White teachers also benefit from African Americans in educational leadership positions. Black educational leaders help White teachers negotiate cultural capital while mediating nuanced moral decisions that impact academic and psychosocial wellbeing of minority students (Milligan, 2013), especially Black male students. The scarcity of Black males as educational leaders deserves a deeper examination and should be the kernel of school reform and public policy (Jordan & Cooper, 2003). There has been little research done on the implications of
socioanalytic theory and leader-member exchange on Black male leadership development in education and no research through which developmental relationships, career mobility, self-monitoring, and nigrescence are applied as lenses to examine Black male perspectives of the role race plays with their development as leaders.

**Educational leadership and socioanalytic theory.** Very little academic research looks at educational leadership in terms of socioanalytic theory – getting along and getting ahead – and that which does speaks directly to career advancement and heavily refers to the Big Five personality domains – openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism. Socioanalytic theory, in and of itself, posits that everyone wants to get along and get ahead; Black men want to advance through organizational structures just as much as anyone else, and have the capacity to do so. Getting along is usually associated with conscientiousness, extraversion, and agreeableness, while getting ahead is typically connected to openness, conscientiousness, and extraversion (H. & Foster, 2015). The role of play and communion was also associated with socioanalytic theory and education in the developmental sense of harmony and respecting the interest of others (Dmytro, Kubiliene, & Cameron, 2014).

**Educational leadership and leader-member exchange.** Leader emergence most likely favors those in close proximity to existing leadership and organizational fit (Myung et al., 2011). Leaders generally associate with, develop, and promote prospects they perceive have proactive personalities and strong core self-evaluation, which consequently contributes to further promotion (Fuller & Marler, 2009; Stumpf & Tymon, 2012). Black men tend to be in remote proximity to leadership, in terms of demographics and organizational fit, and as aspirants for
advancement experience limited opportunity for high quality LMX regardless of proactive personality and strong core self-evaluation. Academic literature that connects educational leadership to LMX is generally consistent with literature that addresses the broader world of work. Working relationships in education that have higher quality LMX consisting of mutual trust and respect increases job satisfaction, commitment, performance and consequently promotions and higher compensation. For example, in a quantitative study that used structural equation modeling to examine the role of leadership in the development of academic talent in higher education from a social exchange and organizational support perspective found that participants perceived developmental support received from department chairs was significantly impacted by the quality of LMX relationships (Horne, du Plessis, & Nkomo, 2016). Another mixed-methods study that looked at factors within leader-subordinate relationships that may impact teacher attrition found that the more satisfied a teacher is with the relationship between them and their principal, the higher their job satisfaction and the less likely they are to leave (Rudolph, 2014).

**Educational leadership and developmental relationships.** The present study looks at developmental relationships as mentor-protégé relationships, sponsor-protégé relationships, and developmental networks. Although everyone desiring personal, professional, and career development would benefit from developmental relationships (Mertz, 2004), developing and sustaining these relationships is an arduous process (Borden, 2014; Herber & Bradbury-Jones, 2011; Wills & Kaiser, 2002), specifically for Black men. Developmental relationships, for African American males, are influenced by biological and socio-cultural antecedents (e.g.
identity-group membership and self-extension orientation; (Thomas, 1993), which add to the difficulty of securing these relationships. Developmental relationships in education, consistent with the broader world of work, provide the career-related and psychosocial support necessary for success. For example, in a qualitative-narrative study that looked at how multiple mentoring relationships championed success in an Ed.D. program found that developmental relationships afforded Ed.D. students access to the support mechanisms (i.e., coaching, counseling, mentorship, sponsorship, learning, acceptance, autonomy) necessary to successful complete their doctoral programs and contribute to their fields of study (Terry & Ghosh, 2015). A second quantitative correlation research study that examined the influence of administrator (i.e., principal-administrator) mentoring relationships on retaining secondary school administrators found that there was a significant correlation between the formality of administrator mentoring relationships and the retention of secondary school administrators; Black male and White female principals with informal developmental relationships showed higher retention rates than White male and Black female principals (Flowers, 2013).

**Educational leadership and career mobility.** Career mobility (i.e., contest mobility and sponsored mobility) plays a significant role in educational leadership, particularly with Black males’ ascension into leadership positions. Among other demographics, African American males experience less social support and consequently lower core self-evaluations (Ng & Feldman, 2014). In the absence of social support along with fragile confidence levels, which play pivotal roles in career development and leader emergence, African American males’ contest mobility is devalued in the face of their desired career success. This is critical because
leadership careers in education advance in sponsored mobility systems (Marshall, Mitchell, & Gross, 1990; Valverde, 1980). As an example, a quantitative correlational research designed study investigated personal, educational, career, political, and school board composition factors that affected ascendancy of African Americans into superintendency and found that career ascendancy into superintendency for African Americans were perceived to be the same as for their White counterparts, but in actuality, were narrower and less achievable due to intangible determinants that influenced the selection process (Shepherd, 1996). Another convergent parallel mixed-method study looked at the adaptive capacity of Division 1 Black male athletes from school into the world of work found awareness, purposefulness, resourcefulness, and networking to be statistically significant and correlated to subjective career success (Jackson, 2015).

**Educational leadership and self-monitoring.** High self-monitors prefer more enterprising occupations (e.g., sales, business executive, buyer) and generally exhibit strong persuasive prowess with an assertive need to achieve, while low self-monitors favor social vocations (e.g., teacher, counselor, minister) that welcome their idealistic, moral, and congruent disposition (M. T. Brown, White, & Gerstein, 1989). Although there is very little literature that speaks directly to self-monitoring and educational leadership, self-monitoring is directly associated with leader emergence; high-self monitors, because of their adaptability to situational demands, typically advance through organization more readily than low self-monitors (Jenkins, 1993). This suggests that, along with other social, cultural, and political determinants, Black should be high self-monitors to attain leadership position in education. The present study uses
self-monitoring as a lens to examine Black male perspectives of self-monitoring’s influence on their development as leaders. If self-monitoring is a prerequisite to leadership, what implications does this have on Black male leader emergence in education? How does the education milieu nurture and develop Black men in the face of structural and institutional norms?

**Educational leadership and nigrescence.** Nigrescence which is the self-actualization process of becoming and being Black in the face of White supremacy (Alexander-Lee, 2014). The latest postulation of the nigrescence theory is operationalized in the *Cross Racial Identity Scale*, which categorizes racial identity attitudes into *Pre-Encounter, Encounter* or *Immersion-Emersion*, and *Internalization* stages (Gardner-Kitt & Worrell, 2007; Vandiver et al., 2002; Worrell et al., 2001; Worrell et al., 2011). Being Black and talking about race around Whites is a double-edged sword; when Black men mention race, they are questioned and/or accused of playing the ‘race card’ in a divisive manner or insidiously ignored (Gooden, 2014). However, not talking about race, although a more comfortable and receptive social standard, does not move the needle of inequity, inequality, and justice (Gooden, 2014). This is particularly significant to Black male leader emergence in education because the reality is that Black men are less likely to be seen in the classroom (Vaughn, 2008), in administration (Wilson, 2006), as principals (Humphrey, 2007), or as superintendents (Gregory, 2006). It is extremely important that teacher/principal preparation programs demonstrate a greater racial awareness; an intimate understanding of the racial, power, privilege, oppressive structures that influence leadership practices (Gooden & O'Doherty, 2015). Once Black men attain more educational leadership
positions, they will be better situated to address broader social, cultural, and political issues of race, especially those that affect the quality of education provided to Black students.

Chapter Summary

Colloquially, everyone wants to get along and get ahead, and leaders engage in unique relationships with each of their subordinates which consequently establish in-groups and out-groups. These two assumptions express socioanalytic theory and leader-member exchange theory, respectively. These two assumptions also suggest that all employees want to be accepted, to learn, to contribute, and to be recognized within their organizations and accordingly become a part of the group, in-group or out-group, embraces and supports them. In addition to the ontological and epistemological influences individuals bring to the table, the compelling frameworks shape behavioral patterns in terms of career advancement. For Black men there are a myriad of institutionalized sociocultural determinants that influence career success (H. E. Briggs et al., 2014), four of which serve as motivators, in conjunction with the theoretical frameworks, in the present study are developmental relationships, career mobility, self-monitoring, and nigrescence.

Developmental relationships, mentor-protégé dyads and developmental networks, are social technologies that act as career-related and psychosocial strategies for career advancement. Career mobility, sponsored mobility and contest mobility, are routes taken to reach desired career outcomes. Self-monitoring is the social perceptiveness and behavioral flexibility employed to enhance status or validate self within the world of work. And, nigrescence is the self-actualization of being Black in the face of white supremacy; the social, cultural, political
spaces where Black men navigate and negotiate the professional landscape through bonding, buffering, and bridging processes. The present study seeks to gain a better understanding of how the two theoretical frameworks and four conceptual constructs interact with each other as a complex and collaborative system to influence the quality and level of career development Black men experience.
Chapter 3: Methodology

The present study employs Q methodology to empirically examine emerging African American leaders’ perceptions of their leadership development. Specifically, the present study seeks to unpack answers to the question: “As a Black man, what has most contributed to your development as a leader?”

This inquiry is fundamentally an exploration into human subjectivity. The present study examines perceptions held by Black men regarding their development as leaders in the workplace. As such, Q methodology was selected as the research approach as it has been identified as “a systematic and rigorously quantitative means for examining human subjectivity” (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). Q methodology was originally developed by William Stephenson and incorporates both quantitative and qualitative elements in order to systematically understand perceptions, attitudes, or beliefs (Watts & Stenner, 2005). Q methodology, in key ways, represents a methodological innovation that creates opportunities for participants to espouse saliency of feelings, beliefs, and thoughts around a topic and operationalizes that subjectivity in ways unencumbered by researcher-driven designs and instruments, as is the general convention of most other research approaches seeking to understand subjectivity (Stephenson, 1980).

Although other research methods could have been used to explore participant subjectivity (e.g., ethnographic interviews, phenomenological questionnaires, surveys), Q methodology was selected because of its fidelity to subjectivity and its capacity to elicit culturally relative and responsive data while honoring Black males’ lived experiences. A purposeful snowball sampling technique was used to identify participants and data was statistically analyzed using
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PQMethod 2.11 software – a web-based software application that objectively quantifies subjectivity within a targeted populace (Pruneddu, 2013). This chapter will explain and justify the details of selection criteria, snowball sampling, and Q methodology.

Q Methodology

Q Methodology combines psychometric (i.e., the psychological measurement of mental traits, abilities, and processes) properties with correlation (i.e., how strongly variables are related to one another) and factor analysis (i.e., statistical method used to describe correlation among observed variables) techniques to quantitatively examine human subjectivity (Mckeown & Thomas, 1988). Q methodology maintains proximity and juxtaposition to participant perspectives in the research process while enveloping empirical qualities that ensure academic rigor. Every common experience in life has countless self-referent alternatives which dispute objectivity of attitude, perspective, and perception (Stephenson, 1980). For example, “It’s raining” is a factual statement of nature, however, thousands of frames of reference could not exhaust potential subjective meanings (e.g., refreshing, exasperating, farmer’s gold, resurrection; Stephenson, 1980). Q methodology phenomenologically articulates these frames of reference through participants’ verbiage that are captured under relatively unrestricted conditions and organized in deductive structural categories (S. R. Brown, 2002).

Q methodology was selected because of its design specificity to recognize individual and collectively held attitudes, perspectives, and perceptions (S. R. Brown, 1993, 2006; Mckeown & Thomas, 1988), and also because its methodological approach remains close to the experiences of marginalized populations (S. R. Brown, 2006). Leader and leadership development within the
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Black community, particularly with Black men, generally requires empathic social, cultural, and political support that accepts and attends to distinct ontological, epistemological, and axiological needs. This differentiated leadership development strategy is necessary for several reasons: African Americans usually battle with a broader, more complex mobility barrier that involves a moral imperative (Hoffman, 2009), due to a self-deprecating phenomenon Black leaders are seldom extended the necessary support to realize change (Harper, 2007), and when Black leaders do gain the social, cultural, and political equity to challenge the establishment their influence and capacity is oftentimes co-opted into systemic institutions and processes (Smith, 2008). Q methodology is important in this case because of how much subjectivity drives thought, decisions, and ultimately behavior; perspective is critical to the socially, culturally, and politically nuanced development of Black men.

For example, in an ethnographic study conducted in a minority, impoverished, urban high school Black leaders signified respect for differentiated gender roles, an obligation to advocate with students and the community, and fear that white leaders were not committed to Black students, while White leaders demonstrated deference to and respect for a patriarchal hegemony, a conflicting feeling that institutional reward and student achievement were due to contest mobility and preferential social mobility, and an ideology that attitudes and values of Black students, and their families, prevented them from being successful in school and in life (Brooks & Jean-Marie, 2007). This suggests that leadership has definitively different meanings and responsibilities for Black and White leaders.
Q methodology lends itself to social constructionism and has been applied to a multitude of psychological disciplines (e.g., love, jealousy, child abuse, environmental concerns, health issues; (Watts & Stenner, 2005). Q methodology permits participants’ perspectives that are uniquely significant to them and does not impose meaning a priori (Watts & Stenner, 2005). Q methodology begins with the concourse of communication – a universe of items are derived from conversations with participants around a particular context (e.g., perceptions of leadership development among Black males) – from which Q sets (also known as Q samples) are generated and Q sorts are rank-ordered (Stephenson, 1986). Concourse items range from insight of the profound intellectuals to uninformed thoughts of the most casual dreamers; not restricted to verbiage, concourses oftentimes include other communicable mediums (e.g., physical artifacts, music, videos, and periodicals; (S. R. Brown, 1993). A Q set – a heterogeneous collection of statements or items generated by an initial group of participants that contextualize ideological constructs and represent individual perceptions within a particular personality, attitudinal, or behavioral domain – is then established from the concourse where participants characterize their feelings regarding a specific topic (Waters & Deane, 1985). The Q set consists of approximately 40 to 50 statements that are distilled from concourse items and broadly represent opinions around the topic at hand (Van Exel & De Graaf, 2005). The Q set is sorted by participants in what is commonly known as the Q sort – a rank-ordering activity where participants prioritize Q set items along a continuum that ranges from -4 (least representative of my feelings/beliefs) to +4 (most representative of my feelings/beliefs; (S. R. Brown, 1996, 2002; Waters & Deane, 1985). The Q sorting process is not a test, there is no prior knowledge necessary, and there are no
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right/wrong or good/bad answers, simply perspectives; subjective responses personifying unique viewpoints of a precise populace.

While sorting Q sets, participants are forced to assign each statement a rank within a fixed quasi-normal distribution as illustrated in Figure 2 (Watts & Stenner, 2005). Although an 9 or 11-point scale is usually employed, these rankings are dependent upon the nature of the study and can have varying anchors (e.g., from -4 to +4, from -6 to +6). Once the Q sorts Figure 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-4</th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>+1</th>
<th>+2</th>
<th>+3</th>
<th>+4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[5]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[6]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[5]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[7]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

are completed by participants, PQMethod 2.11 software correlates and factor analyzes the aggregated data and extracts distinct factors that each participant loads on; participants are grouped according to homologous perspectives regarding a specific topic (e.g., leadership development perspective among Black males; (S. R. Brown, 1996). Factors are sometimes referred to as P sets and represent a structured sample of participants whose viewpoints can be
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compared to other groups or factors (Van Exel & De Graaf, 2005). The factors, in which each participant is grouped, are then analyzed through lenses of frameworks and constructs guiding the study. As with most qualitative research, Q methodology is not intended to be generalized (Janson, Miller, & Rainey, 2007) or transferred (Schroder, 2012) across large populations, however, Q methodology explicates subjectivity by transforming talk to functional information that is unlikely captured by questionnaires completed by thousands of participants (S. R. Brown, 1980).

Q methodology is gaining popularity as an effective analytical tool to study social sciences (Clare, Krogman, & Caine, 2013; Kamal, Koc r, & Grodzi ska-Jurczak, 2014; Krivokapic-Skoko & O'neill, 2011). Within a universe of social discourse, Q methodology acknowledges dominant perspectives while giving life to the marginalized voice as well (Clare et al., 2013). Q methodology’s examination of subjectivity has proved relevant and applicable within multiple industries to advance diverse research agendas. One Q methodology study involved an evaluation of a community-based leadership development initiative that sought to create socially just communities. Program evaluators, through Q methodology, found that learning leadership is a perpetual observance of epistemology of place, organic and participative organizational learning, and axiology of inclusivity (Millitello & Benham, 2010). Another study, through Q methodology, found perceptions of resource development to be distinctive, highly nuanced, and culturally dependent within and between two Western Australian communities (Chapman, Tonts, & Plummer, 2015). A third study that used Q methodology to interrogate what intervention strategies (i.e., waiting, suggesting, indirect, direct) would be used to initiate
same-race and interracial dating found that, despite racial advancements within the United States’ social order, a preferred social distance is evident when interracial relationships have romantic connotations (T. M. Harris & Kalbfleisch, 2000). This study suggests that until we embrace our racial differences they will always make a difference, regardless of how much time transpires. A final study employed Q methodology to investigate perceptions of school counselors and principals viewed their professional relationships with each other and found four subjective dispositions: a) a working alliance, b) impediments to alliance, shared leadership, and purposeful collaboration. Educative and communicative elements emerge as common threads within this empirical examination of subjectivity among counselor and principal relations; empathic understanding through appreciative exchange precedes effective collaboration (Janson, Militello, & Kosine, 2008). Whether it is community-based leadership development, resource development, race-related intervention strategies, or interpersonal relationship perspectives, Q methodology proves to be a powerful analytical tool to quantitatively operationalize human subjectivity.

**Research Design**

The present study’s research design will be conducted in two phases following successful International Review Board (IRB) proposal and approval: 1) collect lived experiences from Black male emerging leaders regarding their perceptions of their development as leaders. This universe of perspectives will ultimately be used to construct the Q sample; statements will be distilled to a number that expresses the broadest representation of perspectives. 2) The Q sample will then be administered to a purposeful, snowball sample of participants known as the P set. A
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Purposeful snowball sampling technique will be employed to maintain the subjective and self-referent design of Q methodology. Purposeful sampling seeks information-rich subjects – those possessing the greatest insight regarding units of analysis (Suri, 2011) and snowball sampling is a non-probabilistic sampling strategy where intentionally identified members within a defined population refer other participants, within that populations, according to a set of descriptive parameters (Handcock, 2011). Thus, purposeful snowball sampling engages a wide range of participants, with varying viewpoints, in the research process while sustaining the intended subjectivity of Q methodology. Descriptive sample parameters will include: African American men between the ages of 30 and 45 employed by organizations with at least four hierarchical strata of leadership and meeting the defined criteria of an emerging leader. Phase 1 of the present study will exercise purposeful sampling to engage 10 emerging Black male leaders in the concourse development. These first 10 participants will be recruited by the researcher and will provide two references, from a colleague and a superior from work, to objectively confirm positive, influential leadership qualities. These 10 participants will be interviewed individually to begin development of the concourse. Phase 2 will exercise snowball sampling and have each of the initial 10 participants to endorse two potential participants that meet the aforementioned selection criteria. This process was repeated until approximately 40 to 50 participants – an optimal number of entrants to constitute an empirically rigorous Q methodology sample (Van Exel & De Graaf, 2005) – were selected.
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Q Concourse

Q methodology examines shared perspectives and begins with a concourse – an extensive universe of statements that express different things possibly said or thought about a subject – that comprehensively represents the subject at hand and addresses a research question. The subject in the present study is leadership development among African American males and the research question is ‘What are emerging Black male leaders’ perspectives of their leadership development in the world of work?’. Although the concourse can be collected from anywhere, even constructed by the researcher themselves, in the present study, statements will be generated by a preliminary group of 10 participants. With homogenous demographics, professional descriptions will be obtained to possibly use during data analysis. The initial prompt – As a Black man, what has most contributed to your development as a leader? – accompanied by a supplemental interview to clarify responses will be administered with the inceptive 10 participants to begin generating the concourse.

Concourse interviews were all done in person and possibly. These 11 participants were conveniently and purposefully selected based on the selection criteria and assigned a number that aligns with their concourse statements. Matching the participants with concourse statements enable the researcher to further investigate interpretations if questions arise. Additional scaffolding will be conducted to give participants a deeper understanding of the question and broaden the reservoir of responses. To methodically examine and clearly interpret concourse statement ancillary questions that pertain to the four constructs at hand will include, but are not limited to, the following:
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• How have the opportunities and challenges you have experienced during your career advancement (or lack thereof) played a role in your development as a leader? (career mobility)

• How have key strategic and supportive relationships in your work life played a role in your development as a leader? (developmental relationships)

• What role could frame/code switch play in your development as a leader? (self-monitoring)

• What role has race played in your development as a leader? (nigrescence)

• Please list and describe up to 5 ways that race has played a role in your development as leader.

The idea of asking follow-up questions to the initial prompt is to minimize conceptual/contextual ambiguity and strengthen communication accuracy of participants. Statements will be accumulated until a point-of-saturation was reached (i.e., no new information will be contributing to the initial universe of statements). An interview appointment will be scheduled and confirmed with each participant and each interview should not exceed one hour. A consent form that explains the intent of this study – to meet doctoral dissertation requirements approved by the University of North Florida Institutional Review Board – will be provided to, signed, and/or verbally approved by each participant.

Q Concourse Refinement

The total number of concourse statements generated in phase 1 of the present study with the initial 10 participants will be distilled by combining duplicates as well as adding additional
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items, from extant literature, that may not have been captured within the concourse. This distillation process will also include consideration of supplemental interviews to assure a precise and comprehensive representation of concourse statements in the Q sample. My dissertation committee will assist in this process to affirm proper distillation of concourse items into sample statements, intelligible language for participants, and an exhausted representation of possible perspectives.

Q Sample

The concourse that is distilled into a smaller, tailored assemblage of statements – the Q sample – enables every participant, no matter their past or present circumstances, to subjectively communicate their perspectives on leadership development among Black men. It is extremely important for the Q sample to envelop salient subjective items germane to the participant pool; “people can ‘tell a story’ only if they have the appropriate statements with which to tell it” (Cross, 2005). The present study will employ a structured or naturalistic Q sample – the accumulation of statements from participants’ oral and written communication – as oppose to an unstructured of ready-made Q sample – the accumulation of statements from sources other than the participants (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). An inductive design – selection of structured samples based on emergence of observed patterns within collected statements – will then be applied to the Q sample in terms of assignment and assemblage of statement; as oppose to a deductive design – selection of structured samples based on a priori theoretical factors (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). These statements will be rank ordered according to how each participant feels. Forty emerging African American male leaders were met with personally and
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walked through the sorting process to assure comprehension and consistency among all participants.

Q Sort

Immediately after instructions are conveyed, participants will rank ordered forty (or the distilled number of) statements (the Q sample) on a response grid (the Q sort) that ranged from least like me (most disagree/least important) to most like me (most agree/most important). Interviews will also be conducted with each participant after the Q sort to clarify and gain better understandings of rank ordered responses. The statements will then be compared to identify coteries with similar sorting patterns and perceptions on the subject. The Q sorts and interview feedback will be used as data to interpret and analyze a variety of shared perspectives on the subject. A pattern analysis for the Q sort data will then be computed through a data reduction exercise that reduces Q sort data to a simplified number of shared perspectives that capture and clarify most participant viewpoints in original Q sorts. All Q sort data will then be entered into PQMethod 2.11 software that compares and contrasts participants’ Q sorts while grouping those participants with similar thought patterns and perspectives together. Q methodology should ultimately present a better understanding of shared perspectives around leader/leadership development among emerging Black male leaders and why they feel the way they do.

Participants

The present study’s point-of-entry – emerging African American male leaders – is defined as Black males between the ages of 30 and 50, employed by organizations across various industries with at least 4 hierarchical strata (e.g., sales representative, sales manager, sales
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director, chief executive officer or HVAC technician, district manager, regional director, president), recognized by their peers, colleagues, and organization leaders as positively influential, and have a desire to advance their leadership capacity and careers. Selection criteria has been constructed by the researcher to envelop the most extensive representation of participant perspectives of emerging African American leaders. Organizations with at least 4 hierarchical strata were selected as parameters to assure opportunities for intra-organizational career advancement. Phase 1 of the research design will involve the original purposefully selected 10 participants that co-constructing the concourse while phase 2 will require that the initial 10 participants that refer other emerging Black male leaders through a snowball sampling process, approximately 3 each, who fit the selection criteria. In order to strengthen data analysis, participants will complete a demographic questionnaire to include employee/employer background. In addition to the demographic questionnaire, participants will complete a Q sort questionnaire that captures additional information regarding career mobility, developmental relationship(s), self-monitoring, and nigrescence. The Q sort questionnaire will support the individual Q sorts and hopefully strengthen data analysis, findings, and implications of the present study.

Q Sort Procedures

Each participant will rank order a set of, approximately forty, statements face-to-face with the researcher to assure clarity, coherence, and completeness throughout to Q sorting process. Participants will start by preliminarily categorizing each statement as least important, unsure, and most important, as it relates to how their professional development has contributed to
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their maturation as a leader. Participants will then arrange each item or statement on a Q sorting grid, as illustrated in Figure 2, that systematically coerces a fixed quasi-normal distribution along an 11-13-point continuum ranging from least important to most important. The fixed quasi-normal distribution functions to merely provide more structure and convenience than would ordinarily exist when juxtaposing statements (Mckeown & Thomas, 1988). Participants will complete a demographic questionnaire to capture pertinent information that may contribute to data analysis and salient nuances among emerging Black male leaders. Once participant complete the Q sort and demographic questionnaire they will answer a set of post-Q sort questions that are intended to support interpretation of the factors generated from analysis of the data. Post-Q sort question generally explicate participants’ interpretation and contextualization of statements, additional perspective that were not included in the Q sort and their implications, as well as uncertainty with any statement that were a part of the Q sort (Watts & Stenner, 2005).

Demographic information and Q sorts will time-date stamped, securely stored, and accessible by me, the researcher, only.

Data Analysis

Q methodology is all about relationships; multi-dimensionally panning perspectives for patterns and separating the signal from the noise. Q methodology affords us the opportunity to examine inter- and intra-individual relationships among each Q sort. Individual Q sorts or actual participants function as variables, not the traits or Q sample statements, and are inter-correlated to generate point-of-view factors indicative of the extent to which each participant loads on a factor. Loading on a factor is, in essence, a correlation coefficient; loading on a factor denotes
the similarities, as well as variance, of each Q sort to the composite factor array. The sociological elements of Q methodology extend a deeper understanding of shared and disputing perspectives. Each participant’s Q sort represents their signature; their unique perspective of the subject at hand. Q methodology’s factor analysis process dis-entangles correlating perspectives through proportionalization – the designation of a statement’s position, salience, and valence in reference to all other statements within the Q sample. There is a correlation between each Q sort on each factor. Factor analysis three-dimensionally rotates Q sorts and groups correlating perspectives/Q sorts while also separating contrasting perspectives/Q sorts accordingly.

Each participant co-authors the factor they load on. As it relates to leader/leadership development among emerging Black male leaders, Q methodology can close the gap between how African American men feel and how leaders would like for them to feel regarding their maturation as leaders. As each Q sort configuration is proportionalized with each ‘point-of-view’ factor, a correlation matrix is generated that ultimately determines the factor matrix. Once factors are analyzed through the sequential application of correlations, factor analysis, and computation of factor scores (M. Brown, 2004), factor solutions are created based on how much data is captured within each factor. Factor scores are calculated by scoring each Q sample statement and constructing a factor array – a composite Q sort for each factor – and used to further interpret consensual and contrasting subjectivity.

The factor matrix is generally determined due to two or more participants significantly loading on a given factor and/or factors having an eigenvalue – the sum of squares of the factor coefficients – of 1.0 or higher (Mckeown & Thomas, 1988; Van Exel & De Graaf, 2005; Watts...
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& Stenner, 2005). Factor extraction is typically the responsibility of the researcher and affords autonomy to apply the most appropriate and theoretically informative rotated solution to selected perspectives. The present study will select factors based on the aforementioned determinations: significant factor loadings and eigenvalues equal to or greater than 1.0. Factor rotation will follow the varimax method to maintain the theoretical and statistical integrity of Q methodology. The resulting operant factor structure will explicate unique perspectives being expressed by each extracted factor. Factor arrays are converted to a format that appreciably correlates with Q sorts creating an interpretable ‘best estimate’ statement configuration characterized by a particular factor. Some statements exhibit contours of contrasting factor orientations – distinguishing statements – while others are not distinguishable between factors – consensus statements – and function as core descriptions of the factors themselves. Proportionalization, factor arrays, factor loadings, factor scores, and distinguishing/consensus statements will be further detailed in chapter 4.

Research Question

The present study asks emerging African American leaders the question: “What are Black male perspectives of the role race plays with Black male leader/leadership development in the world of work?” This research question is designed to explore human subjectivity; to examine perceptions held by Black men regarding their development as leaders in the workplace.

Chapter Summary

Perceived professional development and its influence on one’s maturation as a leader, particularly for Black men, is extremely nuanced and carries varying ontological,
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epistemological, and axiological perspectives. To advance the conversation around leadership development for emerging African American leaders, the present study will attempt to explore the different points-of-view held by emerging Black male leaders and look for patterns that can possibly improve the manner in which leadership is demonstrated to and with them. Chapter 3 will have framed the merits and limitations of Q methodology as an exploratory tool that examines human subjectivity. (Robbins & Krueger, 2000) posits that “Q method’s approach renders empirical the question of who is similar, under what conditions difference is expressed, and why” (p. 644). The Q sample, Q sorts, and subsequent interviews will be analyzed and presented further in chapter 4.
Chapter 4: Results

The purpose of the present study is to examine Black male perspectives of the role race plays with Black male leader/leadership development in the world of work and is designed as an exploratory attempt to interrogate the development of capable, qualified, and ambitious emerging African American male leaders. Q methodology was selected as the preferred research technique because it has been identified as “a systematic and rigorously quantitative means for examining human subjectivity” (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). Although other research methods could, and absolutely, have been employed to investigate subjectivity (e.g., ethnographic interviews, phenomenological questionnaires, surveys), Q methodology offers a distinct fidelity to subjectivity while eliciting culturally relative and responsive data, and honoring Black males’ lived experiences. Q Methodology incorporates psychometric properties with correlation and factor analysis techniques to quantitatively examine human subjectivity (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). Q methodology maintains proximity and juxtaposition to emerging Black male leaders’ perspectives and engages empirical qualities that preserve academic rigor. The research question in the present study asks emerging African American leaders: “What are Black male perspectives of the role race plays with Black male leader/leadership development in the world of work?” This research question is designed to examine human subjectivity; to investigate perceptions held by Black men about their development as leaders in the workplace.

Forty participants, Black men between the ages of 30 and 50 working in organizations with at least a four-tiered hierarchical organizational structure, completed the 41-item Q sort of statements about Black men’s development as leaders in the workplace. Emerging Black male
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Leaders were selected as a point of entry to broaden inclusivity among Black males’ perceptions on leader/leadership development. Participants were also recognized by their peers and organization leaders as positively influential with a desire to advance their leadership capacity and careers. Participants’ educational levels and occupational areas varied. Sixteen participants were in education (e.g., teacher, assistant principal, principal, university instructor), 6 participants were in the finance industry (e.g., loss mitigation, financial advisor), 8 participants held management positions in different organizational areas (e.g. sales, accounts, projects), 5 participants worked in different trades (e.g., maritime, HVAC, logistics), 1 participant was an on-air personality, 1 participant was a postmaster for the local post office, 1 participant was an advance technical support engineer for a local utility, 1 participant was a medical professional, and 1 participant was a parks/recreation leader with the City of Jacksonville.

Chapter 4 furnishes results of the present study. It includes the concourse development, construction of the Q sample, an analysis of the data obtained from the 40 Q sorts completed by participants (which describes the correlation matrix, factor extraction, factor rotation, correlations between factor scores, and factor characteristics), and the factor interpretation narratives for each of the five factors established in this study.

Concourse Development

Within any area of concern the universe of communicable subjectivity is infinite. The total number of possible statements or items collected around a given subject makes up what is called the concourse in Q methodology. To measure the subjectivity of Black male emerging leaders’ perspectives of the role race plays with Black males’ leader/leadership development in
the world of work, this greater concourse is sampled in a way that permits the participants to work with a manageable representation called the Q set (Mckeown & Thomas, 1988). Concourse development generally begins with a sample of statements about Black male leadership development obtained from the literature (S. R. Brown, 1980; Mckeown & Thomas, 1988; Watts & Stenner, 2005). The remainder of the concourse in the present study was generated from statements given by the initial 11 participants made up of 6 educators, an HVAC technician, a pharmacy technician, a logistics contractor, a maritime manager, and a provisional lieutenant in the fire department. With homogenous demographics, professional descriptions were obtained to possibly use during data analysis. The initial prompt – “As a Black man, what has most contributed to your development as a leader?” – accompanied by supplemental interview questions to clarify responses was administered with the inceptive 11 participants to complete construction of the concourse.

Supplemental questions, to the overarching research question, were provided to the initial participants: The initial 11 participants were met with individually to complete demographic information and answer the concourse prompts. All 11 participants completed the demographic information, questionnaire, and interviews in their entirety. All concourse development questionnaires were collected concluding the interviews so that any questions or concerns could be addressed at that time.

**Q Sample**

The concourse that is distilled into a smaller, tailored assemblage of statements – the Q sample – enables every participant, no matter their past or present circumstances, to subjectively
BLACK MALE PERSPECTIVES

communicate their perspectives on leadership development among Black men. It is extremely important for the Q sample to envelop salient subjective items germane to the participant pool; “people can ‘tell a story’ only if they have the appropriate statements with which to tell it” (Cross, 2005). The present study employed a structured or naturalistic Q sample – the accumulation of statements from participants’ oral and written communication – as oppose to an unstructured or ready-made Q sample – the accumulation of statements from sources other than the participants (Mckeown & Thomas, 1988). An inductive design – selection of structured samples based on emergence of observed patterns within collected statements – was then applied to the Q sample in terms of assignment and assemblage of statements; as oppose to a deductive design – selection of structured samples based on a priori theoretical factors (Mckeown & Thomas, 1988). These statements were eventually rank ordered accorded to how each participant felt.

Statements from the questionnaires were then categorized according to the conceptual construct they associated with (i.e., developmental relationships, career mobility, self-monitoring, nigrescence). If there were statements that did not align exactly with the four conceptual constructs, they were categorized under the most appropriate heading. The researcher then examined each statement to determine if there were multiple thoughts within a single statement. If so, the statement was broken apart and reduced into multiple clear, coherent thoughts. Once a statement was deconstructed, the original statement was discarded and replaced with the subsequent, derived statements. These statements were then combined with those from the literature to comprise the first iteration of the Q concourse. Statements were
collected until a point of saturation was met; that is, no new thoughts regarding Black male perspectives of the role race plays with Black male leader/leadership development in the world of work were being observed. This process resulted in 209 entries with 60 associated with developmental relationships, 56 associated with career mobility, 48 associated with self-monitoring, and 45 associated with nigrescence.

The statements were then numbered from 1 to 209 and reviewed according to the category to which they were assigned. Each set of statements was narrowed down to approximately 10 statements for each conceptual construct. A Fisher’s (1960) balanced-block approach was used to ensure that statements were evenly represented across the four conceptual constructs through which the data was examined. To do this, duplicate responses were simplified into a single statement and statements that did not directly answer or were applicable to the conditions of instruction were eliminated. The researcher continuously reflected on the literature review, as well as participant interviews, to determine which statements were most appropriate to include in the Q sample. The ultimate objective here was to generate a meaningful Q sample where each individual statement distinctly contributed to the greater narrative around Black male perceptions of the role race plays with Black male leadership development in the world of work, while avoiding any overlap and/or gaps within the broader conversation in extant literature (Watts & Stenner, 2012).

Once statements were chosen for each construct (i.e., developmental relationships, career mobility, self-monitoring, nigrescence), each statement was reviewed and operationalized so participants could intelligibly answer the conditions of instruction: “Please list and briefly
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describe up to 5 key/supportive relationships that impacted your development as a leader in the world of work (These supportive relationships could include mentorship and sponsorship – Mentor- advising and guidance from a more experienced individual investing in your development. | Sponsor- a mentor with voice and decision-making power that invests in, advocates for, and protects you in your career endeavors);” “Please list and briefly describe up to 5 experiences in your past/present organization(s) that have impacted your development as a leader in the world of work;” “Please list and briefly describe up to 5 ways your identity (and how you express it) has impacted your development as a leader in the world of work;” and “Please list and briefly describe up to 5 ways race has impacted your developmental as a leader in the world of work.” This operationalization was used to avoid complicated, academic language, double-barreled items with two or more propositions, and the use of double negatives in order to avoid internal contradictions that may affect the participants’ responses (Watts & Stenner, 2012). The researcher was also attentive to the natural language of the statements as much as possible (McKeown & Thomas, 2013; Watts & Stenner, 2012). Finally, each of the 41 Q sample statements were randomly assigned a number from 1 to 41.

Q Sort

In the Q sort phase of this study, participants were given the 41 statements that made up the Q sample that was developed after the concourse development phase. Participants then sorted 41 statements within a forced distribution response grid (See Appendix C) based on the conditions of instruction: “As a Black man, what has impacted your development as a leader in the world of work?” The forced distribution response grid ranged from -4 representing least like
me (most disagree/least important) to +4 representing most like me (most agree/most important). Each participant recorded the placement of the statements on a similar virtual forced distribution response grid. Additionally, participants recorded demographics and their reasoning for sorting statements at the extreme ends and the middle of the forced distribution response grid, particularly if there were statements thought to be missing or ambiguous.

**Correlation matrix.** Forty participants completed the Q sort and after entering data from each participant’s forced distribution response grid into the PQMethod 2.11 software, the first step in the process of analyzing Q sort data was to obtain a correlation matrix (See Table 1). PQMethod 2.11 generated a 40 x 40 correlation matrix that illustrates the measures of relationships of each individual Q sort with every other Q sort. A correlation coefficient of +1 would indicate a 100% positive correlation between two Q sorts, a -1 would indicate a 100% negative correlation between two Q sorts, and a 0 would indicate a 0% correlation between two Q sorts. The most significant positive correlation was between Q sort 39 and Q sort 21 (0.78), the most significant negative correlation was between Q sort 36 and Q sort 2, and Q sort 7 and Q sort 3 (-0.19), and there were seven pairs of Q sorts with 0 correlation: Q sort 36 and Q sort 7, Q sort 29 and Q sort 7, and Q sort 26 and Q sort 7, Q sort 27 and Q sort 13, Q sort 33 and Q sort 24, Q sort 30 and Q sort 31, and Q sort 27 and Q sort 39. Comprehensively, the correlation matrix represents 100% of the meaning and variability found within the present study, which is known as the study variance (Watts & Stenner, 2012).

**Factor extraction.** The correlation matrix, used within the PQMethod 2.11 software, performed a principal component analysis (PCA) that is used to account for as much of the
study’s variance as possible to explain the relationships between the Q sorts in a similar constellation grouping called a factor (Watts & Stenner, 2012). Principal component analysis was used, as opposed to centroid factor analysis, because no one Q sort stood out as a unique and important viewpoint to center the present study’s interpretation on. Instead, principal component analysis was used to find a unique, mathematically best solution (Watts & Stenner, 2012). This resulted in an un-rotated factor matrix with eight factors listed in decreasing order of size with eigenvalues and explained variances listed for each factor (See Table 2).

In the present study’s un-rotated factor matrix, each column represents a factor and lists the un-rotated factor loadings in the form of a correlation coefficients for each Q sort. The factor loading represents the extent to which each Q sort corresponds to that factor. For example, Q sort 5 had a factor loading of 0.83 on Factor 1, which accounted for 69% (0.83 X 0.83) of its variance as explained by Factor 1. Whereas, Q sort 7 had a factor loading of 0.19 on Factor 1, which accounted for 4% (0.19 x 0.19) of its variance as explained by Factor 1.

At this point, a determination for how many factors to be extracted was needed. Brown (1980) suggested that seven factors was a generally suitable number of factors to extract. Alternatively, Watts and Stenner (2012), suggested extracting one factor for every 6 to 8 participants in the study, which in this case would be between 5 (40 ÷ 8 = 5.0) and 7 (40 ÷ 6 = 6.67) factors. Third, the Kaiser-Guttman criterion can be used in which the number of factors is determined by factors with eigenvalues of 1.00 or greater (Watts & Stenner, 2012). For the eight factors that PQMethod 2.11 provided by default in the unrotated factor matrix, the eigenvalues (EV) for Factor 1 was 14.60 (36% of explained variance), Factor 2 was 2.56 (4% of explained
variance), Factor 3 was 2.18 (5% of explained variance), Factor 4 was 1.96 (5% of explained variance), Factor 5 was 1.90 (5% of explained variance), Factor 6 was 1.71 (4% of explained variance), Factor 7 was 1.59 (4% of explained variance), and Factor 8 was 1.37 (3% of explained variance). Therefore, all eight of these factors could be considered for extraction since their eigenvalues were all greater than 1.00.

A fourth option was to extract the number of factors that have two or more significantly loading Q sorts after extraction (Watts & Stenner, 2012). In this process, the factor loadings of each of the Q sorts in the unrotated factor matrix provided by PQMethod 2.11 are compared to the value of a significant factor loading at the 0.01 level. Brown (1980) explained that for a factor loading to be significant at the 0.01 level, it must exceed \(2.58(SE)\) or \(2.58 \times \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\text{number of items in the Q set}}}\right)\) or \(2.58 \times \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{41}}\right) = \pm 0.40\). Factor 1 had 31 significant factor loadings, Factor 2 had 5, Factor 3 had 2, Factor 4 had 4, Factor 5 had 3, Factor 6 had 2, Factor 7 had 2, and Factor 8 had 2. Since all factors had at least 2 significant loadings, they all could therefore meet this criterion and it would be appropriate to extract eight factors.

Fifth, Humphrey’s rule “states that a factor is significant if the cross-product of its two highest loadings (ignoring the sign) exceeds twice the standard error” (Brown, 1980, p. 223; Watts & Stenner, 2012). The standard error \(\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\text{number of items in the Q set}}}\right)\) equals 0.16; therefore, 2SE = 0.32. The cross-products of the two highest loadings in the unrotated factor matrix for Factor 1 was 0.84, Factor 2 was 0.59, Factor 3 was 0.56, Factor 4 was 0.50, Factor 5 was 0.55, Factor 6 was 0.50, Factor 7 was 0.54, and Factor 8 was 0.52. Of the eight
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factors that PQMethod 2.11 provided by default in the unrotated factor matrix, all 8 satisfy Humphrey’s rule which could indicate that it might be appropriate to extract 8 factors.

As a sixth option for determining how many factors to extract, a scree test can be used by graphing the eigenvalues of each of the eight factors that PQMethod 2.11 provided by default in the unrotated factor matrix (Watts & Stenner, 2012). The point at which the slope changes would indicate how many factors to extract. Given that the eigenvalue of Factor 1 was 14.60 and the eigenvalues for Factors 2 through 8 gradually decreased from 2.56 to 1.37, the slope of the line representing the change in the values of the eigenvalues for all eight factors dramatically changes after Factor 1 in which the slope of this line becomes noticeably shallower. This scree test would indicate that it would be appropriate to extract two factors.

At this point, rationales can be provided to extract two factors according to the scree test, four factors according to Humphrey’s rule, between 5 and 7 factors based upon Watts and Stenner’s (2012) one factor per every six to eight participants, eight factors based upon the number of significant factor loadings in the unrotated factor matrix, eight based upon Brown’s (1980) “magic number 7” heuristic (p. 223), and at least eight factors based upon the Kaiser-Guttman criterion using eigenvalues. Given this range of variability among these six options for decision-making on how many factors to extract, five factors were chosen to be extracted as guided by Humphrey’s rule.

Given the statistical and conceptual considerations used to determine how many factors to extract within a Q methodology study, it is important for factor extraction to observe the maximum number of Q sort that significantly load on an extracted factor, the amount of overall
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study variance that is explained, and the optimal number of factors to extract; generally the fewest number of justifiable factors (Watts & Stenner, 2012). Given the statistical and conceptual considerations used to determine how many factors to extract within a Q methodology study, it is important for factor extraction to observe the maximum number of Q sort that significantly load on an extracted factor, the amount of overall study variance that is explained, and the optimal number of factors to extract; generally the fewest number of justifiable factors (Watts & Stenner, 2012). There is no universally accepted strategy for factor extraction and while statistical concerns weigh heavily on how many factors will ultimately be used, conceptual concerns that account for contextual, warranted rationale and call for a more abductive examination are slightly more critical to avoid research resulting in a purely a priori philosophical fallacy (S. R. Brown, 1980; Watts & Stenner, 2012). The present study chose five factors, over two, three, four, and six factor solutions, because of the statistical significance demonstrated as well as conceptual considerations that honored inclusivity of Black male perspectives of the role race plays with Black male leader/leadership development in the world of work.

**Factor rotation.** The purpose of factor rotation is to position each factor so that it approximates the viewpoint of a group of participants as closely as possible (Watts & Stenner, 2012). There are two methods for factor rotation: theoretical and statistical. On the theoretical side, by-hand factor rotation is the traditional approach that allows for the factors to be rotated manually by the researcher who chooses where it is positioned (Watts & Stenner, 2012). An advantage of using by-hand factor rotation is that it allows for the option to find a viewpoint that
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may be substantively important to focus upon. Alternatively, varimax factor rotation is the most
common statistical approach that automatically rotates the factors within the statistical program
based upon finding the best solution by accounting for the maximum amount of variance (Watts
& Stenner, 2012). Varimax rotation was chosen over by-hand rotation since no one Q sort stood
out as a unique and important viewpoint to focus upon.

Ideally, rotated factor loadings are maximized as much as possible with a set factor while
also minimizing factor loadings with the other factors (Watts & Stenner, 2012). These groupings
of Q sorts that fall around a factor allow an estimate that can be used to support a meaningful
interpretation of that factor (Watts & Stenner, 2012). Therefore, caution must be used to avoid
accepting statistically significant factors that are substantively less meaningful (McKeown &
Thomas, 2013; Watts & Stenner, 2012). Choosing five as the number of factors to extract, and
subsequently to perform the factor rotation, helped to avoid this issue of having too many factors
that may have been statistically significant but not as substantively meaningful in regards to what
has most impacted emerging Black male’s development as leaders.

However, as an added precaution to ensure that a five-factor solution was the best choice
for the number of factors to extract, varimax rotations were also conducted with two, three, four
and six factor solutions to compare with the five-factor solution.

**Correlation between factor scores.** Correlations between factors indicates the level of
relationship between one factor array with another and ranges from -1.0 to +1.0 (Watts &
Stenner, 2012). To determine the value of a significant correlation for this study, the following
equation was used: $2.58 \times \left(1 \div \sqrt{\text{number of items in the Q set}}\right)$, or $2.58 \left(1 \div \sqrt{41}\right) = \pm0.40$. 
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According to the PQMethod 2.11 software, given a five-factor solution, Factors 1 and 2, 1 and 4, and 1 and 5 moderately correlate and therefore could be alternative manifestations of the similar factors (See Table 4). In contrast, Factors 2 and 3, and 3 and 4 have very low correlation coefficients of 0.24 and 0.21 indicating little relationship between each other. Although there were some strong similarities between a few of the factors, there was enough distinct difference in shared perceptions that deserved separate, independent interpretations each of the five factors.

Table 4

Correlation Between Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.4472</td>
<td>0.2964</td>
<td>0.4880</td>
<td>0.5473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4472</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.2407</td>
<td>0.3762</td>
<td>0.4979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2964</td>
<td>0.2407</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.2094</td>
<td>0.2581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4880</td>
<td>0.3762</td>
<td>0.2094</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.4499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5473</td>
<td>0.4979</td>
<td>0.2581</td>
<td>0.4499</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Factor characteristics.** According to the PQMethod 2.11 software, the eigenvalue of Factor 1 was 14.60, Factor 2 was 2.56, Factor 3 was 2.18, Factor 4 was 1.96, and Factor 5 was 1.90. Factor 1 explained 21% of the variance, Factor 2 explained 11%, Factor 3 explained 6%, Factor 4 explained 9%, and Factor 5 explained 12%. Additionally, Factor 1 had 11 factor loadings, Factor 2 had 5 factor loadings, Factor 3 had 4 factor loadings, Factor 4 had 4 factor loadings, and Factor 5 had 4 factor loadings.

According to the Factor Characteristics table provided by the PQMethod 2.11 software (See Table 5), Factor 1 had 11 defining variables, Factor 2 had 5 defining variables, Factor 3 had 4 defining variables, and Factor 4 had 4 defining variables, and Factor 5 had 4 defining variables. These defining variables are determined based on whether the factor explains more than half of the common variance ($h^2$) and if the loading is significant at the $p < 0.05$ level (Schmolck, 2014).

The composite reliability was 0.98 for Factor 1, 0.95 for Factor 2, 0.94 for Factor 3, 0.94 for Factor 4, and .94 for Factor 5 (See Table 5). These values represent the combined test-retest reliability coefficients of all the Q sorts for all participants in each factor (S. R. Brown, 1980). Therefore, the factor arrays produced by the PQMethod 2.11 software distinguish with high consistency between how the five factors represent the viewpoints Black male emerging leaders between the ages of 30 and 50 working in organizations with at least a 4-tier hierarchical structure. Additionally, the standard error of factor scores is 0.15 for Factor 1, 0.22 for Factor 2, 0.24 for Factor 3, 0.24 for Factor 4, and 0.24 for Factor 5. As can be noticed (See Table 5), as the composite reliability increases for each factor, the standard error of the factor score
BLACK MALE PERSPECTIVES

decreases, and vice versa. The following interpretations of the present study’s factors were therefore based a five-factor solution.

Table 5

*Factor Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Defining Variables</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Rel. Coef.</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Reliability</td>
<td>0.978</td>
<td>0.952</td>
<td>0.941</td>
<td>0.941</td>
<td>0.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E. of Factor Scores</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor interpretation.** Approaching the interpretation of factors in an empathic and holistic manner is extremely important within the Q methodology process; comprehending the self-referent elements of subjectivity by understanding their relation to the whole factor (Delprato & Brown, 2002; Watts & Stenner, 2005). Participants’ perspectives of Black male leadership development in the world of work, as represented by their Q sorts, are made operant and observable in the present study. The communicable viewpoints of participants in the present study are initially illustrated in the factor arrays generated within the PQmethod 2.11 software. Factor arrays are created when factor estimates, consisting of weighted averages of all participants’ Q sorts, significantly load on a given factor (Watts & Stenner, 2012). The weighted averages are then converted to z scores to homologize the factor estimates with each other (Watts & Stenner, 2012). Z scores are then converted into a 9-point scale ranging from -4 to +4 comparable to the forced distribution response grid employed in the present study during the Q
sort. Factor arrays can now be observed as a collection of individual Q sorts, which represent a single factor that illustrates shared perspectives of participants that loaded on that factor (Watts & Stenner, 2012).

The present study uses the crib sheet approach explained by Watts & Stenner (2012), where a list is made for each factor based upon their perspective factor array and the statements that ranked as +4, that ranked higher in that factor array than any other factor array, that ranked lower in that factor array than any other factor array, that ranked as -4, and that ranked as 0. The researcher then read these statements and through the logic of abduction, noted glaring similarities and relationships between statements in a factor array. The researcher also examined data from post-sort interviews, of participants that significantly loaded on a given factor, to further support the researcher’s interpretation of the statements. Additionally, demographic information was also examined for possible patterns to support similarities among participants’ loading on a factor. The crib sheets developed for each factor illustrates the self-referent perspectives of participants loading on that factor, as well as the comprehensive communicable subjectivity from the factor arrays. Finally, each factor is given a name based on the narrative being told.

Each of the following factor interpretation that are named explain statistical data and include participant demographics. A narrative then describes participants who significantly associated with that factor.

**Factor 1: Faithful, Familial, and Resilient.** Factor 1 has an eigenvalue of 14.60 and explains 21% of the variance in the present study. Eleven of 40 participants that loaded on
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Factor 1. They are all Black male emerging leaders between the ages of 32 and 48 working in an organization with at least a four tier hierarchical strata. These 11 participants included eight educators, two in management, and one medical professional. There were no participants involved in any of the other occupations represented in the present study (i.e., trades, finance, parks/recreation). Participants’ educational levels varied from high school to a master’s degree (e.g., account manager at Doubletree, assistant principle, math teacher, non-profit administrator).

Participants that loaded on Factor 1 expressed the impact of faith (30: +4), family (29: +4), and resilience (4: -4; 5: -4; 8: -4; 2: -3; 9: -3; 16: -3) as salient influences to their development as leaders in the workplace. Participants in this factor feel as though their faith, family, and resilience impacted their development as leaders. Each of these elements were defined via statements that were generated during the concourse development. Faith was defined as belief in and relationship with GOD, family represented supportive networks outside of the workplace, and resilience was regarded as the fortitude to succeed despite the presence of race/racism. Additionally, education (31: +3), ambition (15: +2; 41: +2), courage (20: +1; 34: +2), knowledge/skills (21: +1; 22: +2), innovation/creativity (35: 0), and pride (28: +4; 15: +2) also showed up as notably impactful to these participants’ development as leaders.

The theme of faith (30) was prominent among participants in this Factor 1, and given its position under the “+4” column in the factor array, represented one of the most comprised influences of leadership development for the Black male emerging leaders who loaded on this factor. Of the participants that comprised Factor 1, some professed faith to be a central authority to their development as leaders. One 47-year-old unit manager with a security company
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expressed that “I am all that I am because of my faith and relationship with God.” Other participants spoke about how their relationship with Christ shaped them into the people they are today. For example, a 45-year-old assistant principle stated, “My relationship with Christ has prepared and developed me into the person that I am today.” There was one participant that supported the influence faith has had on his development as a leader by referencing a biblical scripture; “In short, Matthew 10:27 …and Jesus looking upon them saith, with me it is impossible, but not with God; for with God all things are possible.” There was an inference among participants of a celestial external locus of control. As one 35-year-old expressed, “Ultimately, I believe that God is in control and trust in His plan for my life.” It is evident, among this select group of Black emerging leaders, that faith plays a pivotal role in what they feel impacts their development as leaders in the world of work.

Family (29: +4) was another prevalent perspective that surfaced; parents, aunts, uncles, and wives were all described as influential to leadership development. There was expression of how some participants were motivated by encouragement from their family to develop as leaders. The 47-year-old unit manager with a security company shared, “Watching a very strong work ethic from my father and continual encouragement from both my parents have been pivotal to my current success in life and corporate America.” There was come communality among participants that echoed family’s influence on their epistemology and axiology. A 38-year-old math teacher shared, “My family has set the foundation of my core beliefs and values.” When Black men honored the familial lessons, there was a sense of pride given to and received from family members. As stated by a 48-year-old collegiate instructor, “Family members are often
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proud of my accomplishments.” Other participants felt as though they owed everything to family because that is where it all originates from. A 37-year-old education non-profit executive stated, “Without my family I would not be where I am today. I also look at family in a much more organic way.” While a 47-year-old medical professional shares similar sentiments and posits, “Family is everything, this is where it all starts.” These statements, from participants who loaded on factor 1, exemplify the value they place on family and how it relates to their leadership development in the world of work.

Resilience was an element of leadership development that emerged as fortitude to overcome the barrier of race. Participants that loaded on Factor 1 acknowledged that race and racism exists in the world of work and consciously chose to ignore, outperform, and/or rise above it. A 46-year-old high school math teacher and basketball coach shared, “I try to focus on my goals and aspirations (15: +2; 41: +2), and not racism (3: -2).” Race/racism was clearly acknowledged, however, there was a shared perspective in Factor 1 that I will overcome it. A 35-year-old assistant principal expresses, “Although I know racism in very present in the workforce, I believe that I am my own hindrance (16: -3).” And, a 38-year-old math teacher shared that, “Race is an existing force that is purposeful in holding African American men down, or keeping those same types who are not mentally strong enough to soar above the perception of others (5: -4).” There was an implied internal locus of control when it came to race, and a recurring theme of being able to eliminate it as an impeding factor. A 47-year-old security manager said, “I have never allowed race to be the deciding factor in how I think or dream (5: -4).” This idea of eliminating race was echoed by a 46-year-old math teacher explaining that,
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“While I realize racism and discrimination exists, I become engulfed with the task at hand instead of wondering about the thoughts and/or intentions of others (16: -3).” Race was looked at as a barrier or minor influence, but not something that could stop progress. As another 37-year-old math teacher comments, “Race has influenced, but has not and will not ever stop or paralyze my creativity or progress (5 -4),” a 32-year-old high school teacher makes states, “Even though it makes me feel like an outsider, my level of confidence still remains high throughout whatever situation may be presented (9: -3),” and a 35-year-old assistant principal makes clear, “The existence of racism does not stop my show (5: -4).” All of these attitudes towards race/racism on the influence of participants’ development as leaders demonstrate how prevalent it is for Black men to acknowledge the ideology of race and its implications in the world of work, but still ignore, outperform, and/or just rise above it.

In the Factor 1 perspective, Black male emerging leaders have also attributed their development as leaders to acquiring education (31: +3). Education appeared as a supplemental theme that directly supports the ideas of faith, family, and resilience. A 38-year-old hospitality account manager shares that, “It is difficult to not respond in as irrational manner in certain situations when you know that you are being looked at just like those who act irresponsibly even when you are responsible. But, having an understanding life, an education, and a relationship with God (30: +4) allows you to just smile and continue on.” Education also emerged in connection with social exposure. A 38-year-old math teacher shared, “My education has allowed me to be in places to meet new and influential people.” Courage and ambition were highly associated with in Factor 1 as well. There was the idea of pursuing accomplishing my goals
despite and sometimes because of race. A 46-year-old math teacher shares that, “I try to focus on my goals and aspirations (41: +2), and not racism (3: -2).” Other participants spoke of courage and ambition in terms of resilience, fortitude and endurance. The hospitality account manager said that, “…it takes conditioning, experience, and pure desire to rise above it all,” while the collegiate instructor voiced his dreams of continuing his education, “I still have a personal and professional goal to earn a Ph.D. Although the process has been slower than I anticipated, I have not relinquished that dream.” It was particularly interesting that of the 11 participants that loaded on factor 1, 8 were educators. This implies that Black male emerging leaders in education prefer a different type of leadership development that is traditionally instituted in academia. How to we structure leadership development conditions that honor the realities, beliefs, and values of Black men while maintaining an organizational culture that demands excellence? The perspectives of this small contingent of Black male emerging leaders speaks to the influence of faith, family and resilience has on the leadership development of those participants that loaded on Factor 1.
Factor 2: Creative, Knowledgeable, and Independent. Factor 2 has an eigenvalue of 2.56 and explains 11% of the variance in the present study. Five of 40 participants that loaded on Factor 2. They are all Black male emerging leaders between the ages of 38 and 50 working in an organization with at least a four tier hierarchical strata. These 5 participants included a contract truck driver, a Sr. advance technical support representative, a financial advisor, and 2 sales leaders. Participants’ educational levels varied from high school to a master’s degree.

Participants that loaded on Factor 2 expressed the impact of creativity (35: +4), faith (30: +4), independence (27: -4; 33: -4; 10: -3; 26: -2; 34: -2) as salient influences to their development as leaders in the workplace. Participants in this factor feel as though their creativity, seeing different ways to get ahead; faith, faith in and relationship with God; and independence, a commitment to personal and professional development despite not having help from others, significantly impacted their development as leaders in the world of work. Additionally, being more knowledgeable (21: +3; 31: +2), lived experiences (39: +4), reputation (15: +3), being Black (1: +2; 10: -3; 8: -2; 9: -2; 5: -1), and being a truth-teller (34: -2) also showed up as notably impactful to these participants’ development as leaders.

Creativity (35: -3) emerged among participants in this factor as one of their most influential aspects of leadership development for Black male emerging leaders. The theoretical assumption posited earlier in the present study of ‘everyone wants to get along and get ahead’, was directly alluded to regarding creativity in Factor 2. A 37-year-old sales leader for a telecommunications company expressed that, “To succeed we must think outside the box and see different ways to get ahead.”
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Faith (30: +4) emerged in Factor 2 as an important influence on leadership development for those participants that loaded on this factor. Sentiments like, being and exemplar and putting God first were used as examples of how faith contributes to leadership development. A 48-year-old contract truck driver said, “Faith leaders must lead by example,” while a 48-year-old advanced technical support engineer posits, “Well, being a Christian and putting God first is where I start my endeavor.”

Independence (27: -4; 33: -4; 27: -4; 10: -3; 26: -2) emerged as an idiosyncratic developmental endeavor; independence in this sense speaks to participants’ lack of help and/or help-seeking behavior as it relates to leadership development. The Black male emerging leaders that loaded on Factor 2 saw statements like “I have had a prestigious mentor and that opened doors (27)” and “In my life outside of work, I have had very helpful mentors (33)” to least associate with their development as leaders. A 50-year-old sales manager stated, “I have never had a mentor to take me under their wing. I wasn’t going to let that be an obstacle in my development. I took it upon myself to make myself as knowledgeable about my business.” The latter part of his statement exhibits independence, but also shows the desire to be more knowledgeable (21: +3). This same participant further speaks to his independence by saying, “I have never had the opportunity to be mentored by a successful leader. However, I do learn (21) and observe from others around me.” There was a recurring theme of having no mentors and having to develop oneself. The contract truck driver that loaded on Factor 2 mentions, “…slim to none mentors, driven by Dad and Mom; no outside mentors (26: -2). I have not really researched leaders and the process to success (25: -3).” There was also a feeling of neglect that
BLACK MALE PERSPECTIVES

showed up in Factor 2. A sense of not being taught/groom be the previous generation emerged and was articulated by a 37-year-old sales leader when he states, “Sometimes the leadership from previous generations have forgotten that the foundation has to be made, meaning, they do not try to make a connection with the generation behind them.”

In line with the idea of a generational transfer of knowledge, there was a racial/cultural reference to the crab theory; a metaphor that figuratively describes crabs in a bucket pulling one back down because they themselves cannot get out. The contract truck drive mentions, “not very much love from Blacks (10: -3), crab mentality. There were other responses that placed race in the center of the conversation while expressing this idiosyncratic developmental theme but referred to different statement within the individual Q sorts. For instance, there was a reference to a glass ceiling when the sales leader, who distributed item 2 in the -4 column, said, “A glass ceiling is put up sometimes, no matter how good you are (2: +1).” The same participant expounds to his placement of statement 20 in the +4 column by stating, “As a Black man, you must swallow your fear and venture into the opportunities.”

Some participants that loaded on Factor 2 spoke to the theme of family, in that, they mentioned the influence family members have had on their development as leaders. The technical support engineer that loaded on Factor 2 states “The most influential mentors in my life have been my parents.” A fifth participant mentions “…not very much love comes from Blacks (10); crab mentality.” Although participants that loaded on factor 2 expressed and absence of developmental relationships, as it relates to their development, they did speak to their commitment to developing others. The sales manager that loaded on Factor 2 mentioned, “I
BLACK MALE PERSPECTIVES
develop my agents and mentor them on being successful in the business, as well as teaching them he to grow their business. I teach them business development and personal growth/development.” There is also an inference a system of success; a formula that can be taught to other that enhance the probability of emerging Black leaders succeeding. The sales leader that loaded on Factor 2 states, “As a sales leader in my industry, I try to show black men and women the algorithm to succeed.” Along with this commitment to helping others there is a sense of resilience encouraged in the process. A 50-year-old financial advisor submits, “I spend an hour per week speaking with some of the newer employees in service or sales roles. I tell them my path, including failures. It is my goal to open their eyes to the opportunity that they have in front of them if they stay the course.” To this group of Black male emerging leaders that loaded on Factor 2, Creativity, Faithfulness, and Independence serve as significant influencers to their development as leader in the world of work.

**Factor 3: Attentive, Connected, and Woke.** Factor 3 has an eigenvalue of 2.18 and explains 6% of the variance in the present study. Four of the 40 participants loaded on Factor 3. They are all Black male emerging leaders between the ages of 39 and 48 working in an organization with at least a four tier hierarchical strata. These 4 participants included an eighth science teacher, a public-school administrator, and graduate student, a university instructor. Participants’ educational levels varied from two years of college to a master’s degree.

Participants that loaded on Factor 3 expressed the impact of attentiveness (36: +4; 6: +2), developing the skills to network (22: +4), and being woke (i.e., having an allegiance to their Black identity (7: +3; 9: +3; 16: +1; 18: -4;13: -4; 38: -2; 17: -2) as salient influences to their
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development as leaders in the workplace. Participants that loaded on Factor 3 feel as though their attentiveness (e.g., watching and learning from other leaders as well as reflective practice), networking (i.e., relationships in and out of the workplace), and their being woke (i.e., having an informed Black consciousness), impacted their development as leader in the world of work. Additionally, education (31: +2), low expectations of Blacks (12: -3), and thrusts into leadership without support (32: -3) also showed up as notably impactful to these participants’ development as leaders.

Attentiveness (36: +4; 39: +4; 6: +2) emerged as participants’ intentional awareness of what other leaders do (good and bad) as well as reflection on their own experiences. Attributes like being curious and open to learn from others was a recurring theme within Factor 3. A 35-year-old science teacher and basketball coach expressed, “I am very observant of the elders in my life. Learning from the mistakes they have made and applying those teachings to my life has assisted in my development as a community leader.” This response was an explanation to the statement regarding watching and learning from others (36: +4). This same participant also mentioned, as an extended response to statement (39: +4) which speaks to lived experiences, “Along with observing and learning from other leaders and influential people in my life, I also take the experiences from my own life as learning experience. Attempting to learn from the decision making in my life and creating knowledge and wisdom to make more equitable decisions.” The idea of attentiveness is supported here by not only paying close attention to others, but also being very reflective of one’s own actions. A 47-year-old public-school administrator shared similar sentiments related to attentiveness when he stated, “My background
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shapes my foreground. It is through my experiences that I learn how to react in situations.”

According this select group of Black emerging leaders that loaded on Factor 3, attentiveness plays a pivotal role in what they feel impacts their development as leaders in the world of work.

Connectivity (22: +4; 26: +1; 29: +3) also emerged as an important element of leadership development among participants that loaded on Factor 3, and speaks to developmental relationships that extend from the workplace into family. Some of these participants expressed having more than one mentor. The 35-year-old science teacher shared “I have been fortunate to have observed and conversed with several positive and strong Black men as a part of my growth cycle. These men have not only provided me with support but with knowledge and encouragement for me to become my own strong Black man.” This is the first time, of the 3 factors discussed this far, where having multiple mentors has emerged as a prevalent perspective. Mutuality is expressed as developing win-win relationships and speaks again to multiple mentoring relationships. The public-school administrator states “Give and take is real. Typically, professionals each have their own set of goals and working relationships present an opportunity for win-win. Teamwork and networking have served a major influence in my career.” These ‘give-and-take’ relationships that this participant speaks about also extended into the family. The 35-year-old graduate student, who currently has an M.Ed., said, “My family has been my greatest influence on the person I have become in my life and my successes.” The degree of connectivity demonstrates of intentionality participant that loaded on Factor 3 to create relationships that help them develop as leaders.
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Woke (7: +3; 8: -1; 9: +3; 12: -3; 13: -4; 16: +1; 17: -2; 18: -4; 32: -3; 34: -4; 38: -2) represents the consciousness that participants who loaded on Factor 3 have for their Black identity. There are sociocultural reference the surface as barriers to leadership development. The 35-year-old science teacher shares, as a response to statement 9 regarding strong Black identity, “In this country the dominant society reflects cultures and values non-representative of the Black male energy. As a result, a strong and confident intelligent Black man is seen as a threat to society. This threat causes strong Black men to be viewed as outsiders or ostracized by the elite society. I, for example, have been the victim of several accusations of seen as inadequate for the simple fact of being a strong and unapologetic Black male. Society tends to reward Black males who show signs of passiveness and feminization, and strong Black males are pushed to the outside of the cultural circle.” For some Black men, this underrepresentation functions as a recognizable barrier, for others it may not be acknowledged as such. For example, the public-school administrator states “I could care less about White leadership. In fact, I view characterized White leadership as a counter example.” This response suggests that there needs to be a different type of example or model, other than White leadership, for emerging Black leaders to follow.

In a similar vein, the idea of “having fun and joking with others at work (18: -4),” emerges as an element of leadership development to stay away from. The science teacher said, “I consider myself an introvert and refrain from spending a significant amount of time having fun and joking with others in the workplace. My ability to create opportunities and complete important tasks has had a more significant affect than my social or comical skills.” Those Black
male emerging leaders who loaded on Factor 3 considered having fun and joking is the workplace the farthest item associated with their development as leaders. Race appeared to play a major role in why the participants that loaded on Factor 3 did so. Some expressed an un-acknowledgement of race in the workplace and attempted to address it directly. The public-school administrator shared, “Race plays a huge factor in the workplace. The denial of race is truly unrealistic. Race has substantial implications associated with it in the country. In order to embrace the full truth of the working environment one must accept the totality of human capital to generate the greatest return in productivity.” This participant appears to focus on working environment which suggests, in this case, faculty and staff. The science teacher expresses similar sentiments, but from a teacher-student perspective, “Being a teacher my race plays a significant role in the workplace. Over 60% of teachers in the United States are White females, which disproportionately places African American males at a disadvantage. Through my experience, I have observed that students of different races and sexes respond and behave differently to different stimuli and persons. My appearance, along with my experiences has significantly more impact on young Black males in the classroom and the school. These young Black men respond more positively and efficiently when they have a social, academic or political leader that shares their phenotype as well as value system.” Although neither of the participants that loaded on Factor 3 expounded upon statement (34: -4), “Being a truth teller in the workplace has influenced my development as a leader,” it appeared as an item that least represented their perspective and as a distinguishing statement as well.
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Education was one of the additional items that emerged as impactful to Black males’ development as leaders in the world of work. Education appeared as a lens through which one can view their future. The public-school administrator mentions “My informal and formal education has provided a foundation for powerful reflection. These experiences essentially allow me to see the future. The notions of voluntary prediction generate confidence.” Black male emerging leaders that loaded on factor 3 may best be described as attentive, connected, and woke.

**Factor 4: Knowledgeable, Congruent, and Unapologetically Black.** Factor 4 has an eigenvalue of 1.96 and explains 9% of the variance in the present study. Four of 40 participants that loaded on Factor 4. They are all Black male emerging leaders between the ages of 42 and 50 working in an organization with at least a four tier hierarchical strata. These 4 participants included a maritime coordinator, a teacher, a sales development manager, and a post office post master. Participants’ educational levels varied from two years of college to a master’s degree in education.

Participants that loaded on Factor 4 expressed the impact of being more knowledgeable (21: +4; 37: +2; 34: +4), congruent (34: +4), and unapologetically Black (7: +3; 17: +3; 8: -4; 4: -4; 14: -3; 15: -2; 25: -3; 40: -3). Participants that loaded on Factor 4 feel as though their advanced knowledge (i.e., having more knowledge than others in their workplace), congruence (i.e., being a truth teller in the workplace), and their unapologetic Blackness (i.e., their intentional response to the race/racism that exists in the workplace), most impacted their development as leader in the world of work. Additionally, having fun (18: +3), dreams, drive,
and courage (41: +2; 11: +2; 20: +2; 1: +2), thrusts into leadership without support (32: -4), and being underestimated (40: -3) also showed up as notably impactful to these participants’ development as leaders.

Being more knowledgeable (21: +4; 36: +1; 37: +2; 39: +4) emerged as having more knowledge than your peers in the workplace and learning more from lived experiences. It was interesting to see that knowledge for those participants who loaded on Factor 4 was not limited to formal education, which was sorted in column 0 for this factor. Having more knowledge at work than others had the highest z-score for this factor and appeared to be a common characteristic that separated them from others in the work place. A 43-year-old maritime coordinator stated, “This is what has always kept me prepared and ready for all the challenges or remaining employed and being able to standout, there is not a better attribute to bring to the table than being as knowledgeable as possible about your job assignment.” Other participants felt as though learning from lived experience is the key indicator to being successful in the world of work. A 43-year-old sales development manager mentioned, “I have seen a lot in almost 20 years of leadership and that has definitely shaped me to be the leader I am today. And, from a personal standpoint, my life has changed for the better year after year by learning from my mistakes.” This statement also supports item number 6 “Reflection is important to leadership and I am more reflective than most because I have to be as a Black man,” which was sorted in column +1 for Factor 2. There was also a reference to family in association with learning from experience. A 46-year-old postmaster shared, “I grew up in a neighborhood where you had to have thick skin. That along with a strong Father molded me into a tough competing man. That competitiveness
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extends into the workplace as well. That has greatly benefitted me throughout the years in regard to my professional career.” This same participant shared thoughts about learning from other leaders (36: +1) as well, “This is the key. No one knows it all, there is always a grain of knowledge you can grasp from another.”

Congruent (34: +4) emerged as Factor 4 participants’ commitment to telling the truth in the workplace. Being a truth-teller resonated with participants that loaded on Factor 4 and surfaced as an attribute to their development as leaders. A 50-year-old special education teacher shared, “I find this most evident because when I am transparent it conveys to my administrative that I am trustworthy. I believe in being an open book because in today’s society people have access to others’ police record, social media posts, etc. In order to not be hypocritical, it is imperative to be honest.” Truth-telling also emerged as a character trait; as an ethical or moral responsibility. The sales development manager that loaded on this factor stated, “Telling the truth has always been a point of proper business etiquette and honesty is always the best policy. My integrity is extremely important.”

Being unapologetically Black (4: -4; 7: +3, 8: -4; 18: +3; 25: -3; 40: -3) emerged as a central thought among multiple perspectives. Confusion around appropriate behavior, being denied opportunities due to race and geography, awareness of intimidation due to being talented, educated, and Black, knowing what leaders do, not fueling others that doubt you, all contributed to titling Factor 4 unapologetically Black. The maritime coordinator shared these thoughts regarding intimidation, “Blacks have really infiltrated the maritime industry over the last 15-20 years as far as employment goes. Within that change, younger Blacks are more confident and
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educated that speak well and perform their duties just as sophisticated and better in some cases than other races… this industry has been dominated by Caucasians for so long, the adjustment of seeing Blacks confident and striving has the potential to cause issues.” Although education was sorted in the 0 column for Factor 4, it did emerge as an element of intimidation. The special education teacher shared, “It has been my experience that when others find out my education level, they critique or question my knowledge on topics. They act as if I had three heads when they realize how educated I am.” Unapologetic was selected to describe Factor 4 because participants that loaded on this factor appeared to be comfortable with making other uncomfortable. In response to being confused about how to behave, the sales development manager expounded on his sort by sharing, “…not an issue as I am as intelligent as any other leader in my department no matter what their race is.” In this same vein of knowing how to behave, the postmaster posited “I can’t even relate to this, not knowing how to behave. I’ve always been comfortable in my own skin. There have been occasions when I was the only Black in the board room. Earlier in my career that might have shook me but I have come to realize I can put my skills up against anyone.”

Statement (18: +3), “Being able to have fun and joke with others at work has developed me as a leader,” was strongly represented within Factor 4, however, it was not expounded upon by any of the participants. Dreams, drive, and courage (41: +2; 11: +2; 20: +2; 1: +2) also emerged relatively strong and failed to be expounded upon by participants. Being thrust into leadership without the proper support emerged as a -4 and manifests itself as “Not my experience” by the maritime coordinator and “I have always had the support of my leadership
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team” to the sales development manager. Because of how these participants sorted their statements on the forced distribution response grid, knowledgeable, congruent, and unapologetically Black may best describe Factor 4 and the Black male emerging leaders’ perspectives of their development.

**Factor 5: Responsible, Faithful, and Supportive.** Factor 5 has an eigenvalue of 1.90 and explains 12% of the variance in the present study. Four of 40 participants that loaded on Factor 5. They are all Black male emerging leaders between the ages of 31 and 49 working in an organization with at least a four tier hierarchical strata. These 4 participants included a currency specialist, a manager at Gate Petroleum, an assistant principal, and a service advocate with Florida Blue. Participants’ educational levels varied from high school to a master’s degree in education.

Participants that loaded on Factor 5 expressed being responsible (28: +4), faithful (30: +4), and supportive (23: +4) as having the most impact on their development as leaders. Participants in this factor feel as though their responsibility (i.e., the charge to make someone in their life proud), faithfulness (i.e., belief in and relationship with God), and support (i.e., mentoring and being a resource to others), most impacted their development as leader in the world of work. Additionally, the statements: “…pushing my leadership development further so that the focus is on the work not the race (1: +3),” “my strong Black identity makes me feel like an outsider (9: -4),” “I am able to get into character and play the game (13: -4),” and “taking charge has worked against me (19: -4),” also showed up as notably impactful to these participants’ development as leaders.
Being responsible (28: +4) emerged in Factor 5 as wanting to make someone in their life proud. Responsibility manifested itself as a leadership function, particularly regarding family. A 31-year-old service advocate said, “My family has created a monster that strives daily to be great.” Another familial association was given by an assistant principal who shared, “In my early years, I always wanted to make my mother proud of me because she raised my brother and me by herself. She has always worked hard to make sure we had everything we needed. I now find myself, in my older years, still striving to make my family proud.” Being responsible did not only apply to family members, but was extended to other individuals that these participants interacted with as well. Some participants mentioned an obligation to those that admire or look up to them. For instance, a 48-year-old manager with a petroleum company shared, “I have a young daughter and young people in my life that look up to me and I work hard on not disappointing them.”

Faithfulness (30: +4) emerged in this factor as belief and relationship with God and held the second highest z-score in relation to the other 40 items sorted. Although only one participant expounded on this particular statement, two rank ordered it in the +4 column (i.e., the currency specialist and the assistant principal) and two rank ordered it in the +2 column (i.e., the manager with the petroleum company and the service advocate). The assistant principal commented, “I love the Lord, and I always draw strength from my relationship with my Father.”

Support emerged in Factor 5 as “mentoring and being a resource to others (23: +4) and had the third highest z-score of the 41 statements sorted. Mentoring, in Factor 5, manifested itself as formal and informal training as well as formal and informal mentoring. The currency
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specialist shared, “I am called upon often to train new staff persons as well as tenured staff. I have always taken the approach of sharing whatever knowledge I have with others.” Mentoring also showed up as an intrapersonal leadership developmental strategy as well. The manager with the petroleum company posited, “As a manager in the workplace I sometimes would be mentor, big brother, and even daddy when needed. But it taught me a lot about myself and how to deal with different personalities.” Mentoring and being a resource to others in important to those participants who comprised Factor 5, and being mentored inside and outside the world of work surfaced as important as well (33: +2; 36: +3). The assistant principal that loaded on Factor 5 shared, “I have been mentored in the workplace and have been a mentor to others.” There was also a reference to having multiple mentors. The service advocate that loaded on Factor 5 said, “I have a number of mentors in each aspect of my life, from husbands, to co-workers, to coaches who have coached for years.”

Placing focus on work instead of race (1: +3) also emerged as a salient element of Black male leadership development. Factor 5 comprised of participants the felt ignoring race and concentrating more on being productive would yield better results. The currency specialist that loaded on Factor 5 said, “We hold on to the thought that if we work hard we shall be rewarded for our efforts, but this is not always true.” This response suggests there is something besides hard work that contributes to one’s development as a leader. There was also an acceptance or degree of certainty with race/racism that surfaced among these participants. The manager with the petroleum company shared, “The color that I am cannot be changed so that is something I do not think of when pushing forward.”
Black Male Perspectives

Strong Black identity (9: -4; 13: -4; 8: -3) also emerged as an influential aspect of leadership development among Black male emerging leaders. The statements: (9:-4) “my strong Black identity makes me feel like an outsider,” (13: -4) “being able to get into character and play the game,” and (8: -3) “being confused about behaving and leading as Whites do,” all expressed thoughts of embracing one’s Black identity, especially in the world of work. The currency specialist that loaded on Factor 5 points out, “As much as we would like to think race doesn’t matter, we know it does. Being an African American in today’s workforce is almost more difficult than it was decades ago.” There is an understanding that race/racism exists in the workplace, but does not hinder their development as leaders. It is as if, race/racism is out of their control so why be concerned with it. The manager with the petroleum company that loaded on Factor 5 shared, “Race plays a major role in the workplace, because some people still today write your story from your race.” There were also stronger feelings toward perceptions Whites have about race in the workplace. The service advocate that loaded on Factor 5 felt as though, “Middle age White men hate a young fiery Black man that walks, talks, and looks better than them.” “Being able to get into character and play the game (13: -4)” was another shared perspective that stood out in Factor 5. A level of complexity, in terms of behavioral norms, showed itself through this statement. The assistant principal that loaded on Factor 5 shared, “It’s tough for me to play the game. I am who I am, and I find it difficult to be someone else.” When it comes to getting into character and playing the game, the service advocate simply states, “I don’t know how to play the game at all.” Among this small cross-section of Black emerging
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leaders the descriptor, responsible, faithful, and supportive envelops their Factor 5 communality around what has impacted their development as leader.

**Consensus Statements.** The present study yielded only one consensus statement – those statements of the Q sample that do not distinguish between any pair of factors (See Table 6). For this statement, “My courage. I am fearless.”, there are a myriad of reasons that could have possibly contributed to it not differentiating itself between factors. The statement could have been too vague; not providing enough coherence around how it related to the subject. The statement could have just not resonated with the participants in ways that the other statements did. The statement could have also been misplaced; unrelated to the subject matter in a way that did not allow participants to connect it to their perspective. Factor 1 ranked this statement 1, factor 2 ranked it 1, factor 3 ranked it 1, factor 4 ranked it 2, and factor 5 ranked it 0. This is indicative that the statement does not inform interpretation enough to definitively express a perspective shared by any number of the participants.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consensus Statement</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Statements</td>
<td>Rank Score</td>
<td>Rank Score</td>
<td>Rank Score</td>
<td>Rank Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>My courage. I am fearless</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chapter Summary**

In the initial phase of the present study, development of the concourse, eleven Black male emerging leaders provided statements that answered the questions: (1) “Please list and briefly describe up to 5 key/supportive relationships that impacted your development as a leader in the world of work. *(These supportive relationships could include mentorship and sponsorship –
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Mentor- advising and guidance from a more experienced individual investing in your development (B. P. Brown et al., 2008; Ensher & Murphy, 1997; Higgins & Kram, 2001; Mullen & Tuten, 2010; Ramaswami & Dreher, 2010)

Sponsor- a mentor with voice and decision-making power that invests in, advocates for, and protects you in your career endeavors (Hewlett, 2013; Roots, 2006);

(2) Please list and briefly describe up to 5 experiences in your past/present organization(s) that have impacted your development as a leader in the world of work;

(3) Please list and briefly describe up to 5 ways your identity (and how you express it) has impacted your development as a leader in the world of work;

(4) Please list and briefly describe up to 5 ways race has impacted your developmental as a leader in the world of work. This generated 209 statements which was then distilled down to 41 statements.

In the following phase of the present study, Q sorting, these 41 statements were provided to 40 participants who sorted these statements within a forced distribution response grid according to the condition of instruction, “As a Black man, what has most contributed to your development as a leader?” The participants also expounded on perspectives of sorted statements and demographic information.

All data was then put into the PQMethod 2.11 software which created a correlation matrix that was then used to conduct a principal component analysis to identify five factors to extract. Finally, varimax factor rotation was used on these five factors to create factor arrays that were used in the factor interpretation phase. Out of the factor interpretation process, emerged following factor descriptions: (1) Faithful, Familial, and Resilient; (2) Creative, Faithful, and
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Independent; (3) Attentive, Connected, and Woke; (4) Knowledgeable, Congruent, and Unapologetically Black; and (5) Responsible, Faithful, and Supportive.
Chapter 5: Discussion and Recommendations

The purpose of the present study was to examine Black male perspectives of the role race plays with Black male leader/leadership development in the world of work and is designed as an exploratory attempt to interrogate the development of capable, qualified, and ambitious emerging African American male leaders. Emerging African American leaders were defined as Black males between the ages of 30 and 50, employed by organizations across various industries with at least 4 hierarchical strata (e.g., sales representative, sales manager, sales director, chief executive officer or HVAC technician, district manager, regional director, president), recognized by their peers, colleagues, and organization leaders as positively influential, and have a desire to advance their leadership capacity and careers. The present study sought to capture feelings, beliefs, and thoughts of emerging Black male leaders in Jacksonville, FL as it relates to their personal and professional development.

Q methodology was selected as the preferred research technique because of its utility as “a systematic and rigorously quantitative means for examining human subjectivity” (Mckeown & Thomas, 1988). There were fundamentally four phases in this study: concourse development, Q sampling, Q sorting, and data analysis. During concourse development, which results in a universe of statements that comprehensively represents communicable subjectivity within a specific area of interest, eleven emerging Black male leaders generated statements that responded to the question: “As a Black man, what has most impacted your development as a leader?” During the Q sampling phase, the concourse is distilled into a smaller, tailored assemblage of statements – the Q sample – to enable each participant to subjectively
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communicate their perspectives regarding leadership development among Black men. This distillation process permits the Q sample to envelop salient subjective items germane to the participant pool; “…people ‘can tell a story’ only if they have the appropriate statements with which to tell” (Cross, 2005). In the Q sort phase participants sorted 41 statements within a forced distribution response grid (See Appendix C) based on the conditions of instruction: “As a Black man, what has impacted your development as a leader in the world of work?”

After all 40 participants sorted each of the 41 statements on the forced distribution response grid data was analyzed within PQMethod 2.11 software where 5 factors; 1) Faithful, Familial, and Resilient, 2) Creative, Knowledgeable, and Independent, 3) Attentive, Connected, and Woke, 4) Knowledgeable, Congruent, and Unapologetically Black, and 5) Responsible, Faithful, and Supportive were extracted to be interpreted. Once all 5 factors were interpreted named, and described, each factor was examined considering two theoretical assumptions: : 1) socioanalytic theory and 2) leader-member exchange. The five factors were also examined through the lenses of four conceptual constructs: 1) developmental relationships, 2) career mobility, 3) self-monitoring, and 4) nigrescence.

**Factor 1 | Faithful, Familial, and Resilient**

Participants that loaded on Factor 1, Faithful, Familial, and Resilient, perceived their development as leaders to be heavily influenced by their faith in and relationship with GOD, the encouragement from their family and making someone in their life proud, and not permitting race to play an inhibitory role. Education, dreams/ambition, and creativity also emerged as significant stimuli to their development as leaders. And, although there were many other
elements that constitute Factor 1’s perspective, faith, family, and resilience capture the essence of their viewpoint towards Black male leadership development. It is also worth mentioning that of the 11 participants that loaded on factor 1, 8 were educators. This shared perspective, in terms of Black male educators is perhaps an indication for further research. Looking at Factor 1 through the lenses of developmental relationships, career mobility, self-monitoring, and nigrescence, there are interesting associations that can be made.

**Developmental relationships.** Developmental relationships did not prevail as an integral part of these participants’ development as leaders. Participants that loaded on Factor 5 did not feel as though traditional mentoring, sponsorship, and/or developmental network, relative to faith, family, and resilience, significantly impacted their development as leaders. The developmental relationships were expressed as faith in and relationship with GOD, and relationship with family. What does this say about how they believe leadership development occurs in the world of work? Do they feel as though they can develop themselves? Do they see development as an individual, private endeavor? How do these participants feel about communities of practice? According to Vygotsky’s ‘Zone of Proximal Development’, development invariably occurs within a particular social context (Eun, 2008). If this ideology is true, what mechanisms are in place to address the most impactful developmental influencers for the Black men that loaded on Factor 1? Developmental concepts like zone of proximal development, guided participation, and scaffolding (Dzickowski, 2013) suggest that career mobility is more probable with support from mentors, sponsors, and developers than attempting to advance in silo. The fact that developmental relationships did not emerge as stronger
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influence in their development as leaders, in relation to the other statements that did, suggests that these participants have been more influenced by their faith, family, and resilience, than mentorship, sponsorship, or developmental networks. In the conventional world of work, how frequently is faith, family, and resilience assessed, challenged, and supported?

Career mobility. Career mobility, which deconstructs into contest and sponsored mobility, manifests itself more as contest than sponsored with those participants who loaded on Factor 1. They saw themselves as capable; able to develop as leaders despite being Black. There was more of an independent and private implication of leadership development, to a greater degree than a social one. Statements like “My lived experience has influenced my development” and “My leadership experiences outside the world of work” were rank ordered as more associated with what has impacted their development as leaders. Career mobility generally presents itself as promotion and leaders tend to promote prospects they perceive have proactive personalities and strong core self-evaluation, which consequently contributes to further promotion (Fuller & Marler, 2009; Stumpf & Tymon, 2012). Because participants that loaded on Factor 1 saw faith, family, and resilience as elements that most associated with their development as leaders, there is an implication that these individuals receive less social support in the workplace thereby experiencing an atypical style of leadership development. This is supported in academic research which asserts that African American males experience less social support, lower core self-evaluations, and consequently not as much leader emergence (Ng & Feldman, 2014). How is faith, family, and resilience supported, in terms of career mobility, in
the world of work? And, how can the Black men that loaded on Factor 1 be relevantly
developed as leaders in the world of work?

Self-monitoring. Self-monitoring is an individual’s self-awareness and self-expression
governed by situational cues (Bryant et al., 2011; Ickes et al., 1986; Jamieson et al., 1987;
Snyder, 1974; Snyder & Gangestad, 1986; Tate, 2008; Zaccaro et al., 1991). High self-monitors
(HSMs) use salient situational factors to exhibit cross-situational variability, complementary to
environmental settings, while Low self-monitors’ (LSMs’) behavior is more congruent with their
innate beliefs and emotions; they choose not to alter their self-presentation according to
situational cues. Participants that loaded on Factor 1 express themselves more as truth-tellers
than behaviorally flexible or able to get into character/play the game. Faith, family, and
resilience meant that they were less willing to compromise who they were for leadership
development or career advancement. These participants appeared to be comfortable in their skin;
you felt as though their faith, family, and resilience were the most impactful to their
development as leaders in the world of work.

Nigrescence. Nigrescence is being black in the face of White supremacy and is
categorized by racial identity attitudes: pre-encounter (i.e., assimilation, miseducation, and self-
hatred identities), immersion-emersion (i.e., anti-White and intense Black involvement
identities), and internalization (i.e., Black nationalist or Afrocentricity, biculturalism,
multiculturalism racial, and multiculturalism inclusive identities) (Gardner-Kitt & Worrell, 2007;
Vandiver et al., 2002; Worrell et al., 2001; Worrell et al., 2011). Although Black is a biological
certainty, it is also a psychological experience realized through a racial socialization process
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(Charles, 2014). Participants who loaded on Factor 1 expressed an appreciation and acceptance of their Blackness. They rejected race as an inhibitor to opportunity or ambition, and refused to be an outsider because of race. Participants who loaded on Factor 1 most associated with faith, family, and resilience as drivers of their development as leaders.

**Factor 2 | Creative, Faithful, and Independent**

Participants that loaded on Factor 2, Creative, Faithful, and Independent, saw their development as leaders to be strongly associated with seeing different ways to get ahead, faith in and relationship with God, and a commitment to personal/professional development as more significant influences on their development as leaders. Participants that loaded on Factor 2 also believe being more knowledgeable, lived experiences, reputation, being Black, and being a truth-teller played important roles in their development as leaders. There is an interesting narrative that emerges as the creative, faithful, and independent participants that loaded on Factor 2 are examined through the lenses of developmental relationships, career mobility, self-monitoring, and mobility.

**Developmental relationships.** Participants that loaded on Factor 2 did not associate developmental relationships with themselves as strongly as they did creativity, faithfulness, and independence. These participants closely related their development to learning from lived experiences while being different, being faithful, and being self-sufficient. Collectively, these participants viewed mentorship, sponsorship, and developmental networks to be less influential to their development as leaders. Most of the statements they rank ordered as most like themselves operatively contained the pronouns I and my. When developmental relationships
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were considered constructive to their leadership development, it was more often associated with family than not. Once again, the questions can be asked: What does this say about how they believe leadership development occurs in the world of work? Do they feel as though they can develop themselves? Do they see development as an individual, private endeavor? How do these participants feel about communities of practice?

Career mobility. Participants that loaded on Factor 2 viewed career mobility as an individual endeavor; their perception of career mobility leaned more towards contest than sponsored mobility. This contest mobility was motivated by encouragement from family, making someone in their life proud, and big dreams. The idea of sponsored mobility moderately surfaced as an impact on their development as leaders. Career mobility, sponsored mobility more so than contest mobility, requires an advanced degree of social, cultural, and political acumen, especially for African American men (Blickle et al., 2011). Participants that loaded on Factor 2 demonstrated a preference to not engage in the social, cultural, and political capital campaign, but to instead rely on their independent contest mobility to speak for them. Is this preference due to inability, unawareness, or the sheer desire not to employ sponsored mobility as a leadership development strategy?

Self-monitoring. Participants that loaded on Factor 2 considered self-monitoring moderately influential to their development as leaders, relative to the other statements they rank ordered on the forced distribution response grid. These participants associated creativity, faithfulness, and independence as more impactful to their development as leaders than statements like: “getting into character and playing the game” or “having fun and joking with others.”
Although the negotiation and navigation Black men must master to advance in the world of work involves shifts in what it means to have social, cultural, and political capital. Social, cultural, and political capital, in this sense, is the ability to exercise social competence, emotional competence, self-monitoring, political competence, ego resiliency, behavioral flexibility, self-efficacy, and interpersonal acumen to enhance interpersonal relations and ultimately career mobility (Ferris et al., 2002). It is more important for participants in Factor 2 to be their authentic selves than to self-monitor, as it relates to their development as leaders.

**Nigrescence.** Participants that loaded on Factor 2 found moderate to little association with their development as leaders and nigrescence, in the world of work. These participants rank ordered statements related to nigrescence between columns -2 and +1. The position that these participants placed items on the forced distribution response grid indicates they did not necessarily find nigrescence applicable to their development as leaders or was not sure how to respond. Either way, nigrescence was not as strong of an influence on their leadership development as creativity, faithfulness, and independence. Although African Americans are coerced into a delicate dance between two distinctly different worlds to get along and get ahead (Taylor & Kachanoff, 2015), participants that loaded on Factor 2 did not find nigrescence as an extreme determinant of their leadership development. Creativity, faith, and independence emerged as most influential element to their development as leaders.

**Factor 3 | Attentive, Connected, and Woke**

Participants that loaded on Factor 3 viewed attentiveness (e.g., watching and learning from other leaders as well as reflective practice), networking (i.e., relationships in and out of the
workplace), and being woke (i.e., having an informed Black consciousness), impacted their
development as leaders in the world of work. Additionally, education, low expectations of
Blacks, and thrusts into leadership without support also showed up as notably impactful to these
participants’ development as leaders. Participants that loaded on Factor 3 also saw themselves as
natural learners; learning from lived experiences, by watching other leaders, higher education,
and reflection were all rank ordered between +2 and +4 on the forced distribution response grid,
and represent the attentive description. Watching and learning from others, having the skills to
network, encouragement from family, and having multiple mentors suggests valuing
relationships which represents the connected description. A strong Black identity, Black
intimidation, racism as hindrance were rank ordered between +1 and +4 while having fun and
joking, being a truth-teller, being able to get into character were all -4s indicates an informed
Black consciousness or being woke.

**Developmental relationships.** Participants that loaded on Factor 3 strongly associated
their development as leaders with developmental relationships. These participants saw
themselves as connected; several participants mad mention of not only having mentors but also
mentoring others. This group of participants shared a perspective of developmental relationships
that was rank ordered higher than any of the other four factors. These participants also represent
a more traditional perspective regarding developmental relationships. There is a possibility that
these participants subscribe to a notion that developmental relationships strengthen leaders’
leader-member exchange (LMX) and allow them to extend more valued information, resources,
and relationships to their subordinates for developmental purposes (Venkatataramani et al.,
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2010). They could also believe that developmental relationships are known to situate subordinates within a superior’s in-group or out-group, based on context and quality of LMX (McManus & Russell, 1997). However, there was still an acknowledgement of race/racism playing a role in their development as leaders that may need to be studied to gain a deeper understanding. They rank ordered truth-telling, having fun and joking, and playing the game as -4s, which suggests a high degree of commitment to authenticity.

**Career mobility.** Participants that loaded on Factor 3 associated their leadership development more closely with sponsored mobility than contest mobility. Protégés within the sponsored mobility system generally experience higher-quality LMX and benefit from air-cover/protection, bureaucracy avoidance, and having someone at the decision making table fighting for them (Roots, 2006). The more knowledge, resources, and relationships proactive personalities with access to decision makers gain, the more disproportionate access they get to gain more knowledge, resources, and relationships (Merton, 1968). This lean towards sponsored mobility could also be expressing that these participants see learning and leading as more social endeavors than an individual endeavor. How is being attentive, connected, and woke supported in the workplace? Do these characteristics hold a significant place in leadership development as it relates to career mobility? Race/racism appeared to have played a role in these participants’ career mobility. Being denied opportunity, a hindrance of dreams, Black intimidation, and strong Black identity were all rank ordered between +1 and +3. The participants that loaded on Factor 3 expressed elements that most influenced their development as leaders, specifically career mobility, as more closely associated with sponsored as oppose to contest mobility.
Self-monitoring. Participants that loaded on Factor 3 were less willing to qualify social cues or alter their behavior because of them. Having fun and joking, being a truth-teller, and getting into character/playing the game were all rank ordered -4 on their forced distribution response grid. This suggests that fun and jokes at work come with some socio-cultural contexts, telling their truth may not be well received, and an unwillingness to play others’ games. These participants would probably be classified as low self-monitors, in that high self-monitoring protégés exercise behavioral acuity that subscribes to superiors’ expectations and, due to a high level of social perceptiveness, exhibit help seeking behavior toward other developers as well (Ghosh, 2014). Due to the complexity of mentor-protégé relationships in the world of work, particularly for low self-monitors, participants that loaded on Factor 3 most likely have fewer developmental relationships with stronger tie strength.

Nigrescence. Participants that loaded on Factor 3 associate their development as leaders high as it relates to nigrescence. All of the statements rank ordered in the -4 column, as these shared perspective for these participants, speak to the influence of identity in the workplace. Although there is an affinity to relationships in the world of work, there is also a strong acknowledgement of the race/racial dynamics in play. Fun and jokes at work, telling their truth, and getting into character/play the game, may work for others but participants that loaded on Factor 4 strongly reject those tenants. Nigrescence adds a layer of complexity to career development in terms of sponsored and contest mobility systems. Mobility barriers for African Americans become more complex as African Americans scale organizational structures in ways that broaden their scope of power and responsibility (Knight, 2009). There appears to be a deep
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awareness of the race/racial nuances, as it relates to the world of work, that enable these participants to negotiate and navigate developmental relationships, career mobility, and self-monitoring in a manner that favors their developmental preferences.

**Factor 4 | Knowledgeable, Congruent, and Unapologetically Black**

Participants that loaded on Factor 4 expressed that their advanced knowledge (i.e., having more knowledge than others in their workplace), congruence (i.e., being a truth-teller in the workplace), and their unapologetic Blackness (i.e., their intentional response to the race/racism that exists in the workplace), most impacted their development as leader in the world of work. Additionally, having fun, having dreams, drive, and courage, being thrusts into leadership without support, and being underestimated also showed up as notably impactful to these participants’ development as leaders. Being more knowledgeable, being a truth-teller, and lived experiences were all rank ordered as +4s on the normalized forced distribution response grid for participants that loaded on Factor 4. Being more knowledgeable was specific to the workplace, being a truth-teller was related to career trajectory, and lived experiences included leadership experiences outside of work and all were strongly associated with these participants’ development as leaders. Feeling confused about how to behave as a White leader would, being thrusts in to leadership without proper support, and being denied opportunities because of race were all strongly disassociated with these participants’ development as leaders. Collectively, participants that loaded on Factor 4 believed themselves to be competent, hard-working, honest, and comfortable with other people being uncomfortable.
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**Developmental relationship.** Participants that loaded on Factor 4 moderately associated their development as leaders with developmental relationships. It is almost as if these participants feel as though they should be able to make it on merit alone; it is as if they can know enough and become good enough that developmental relationships should not matter. The socioanalytic theory posits that leadership personality should be characterized by actor and observer, however, getting along and getting ahead greatly depend on others’ evaluations which are subject to observers’ assessment of an actor’s appraisal factors (J. Hogan & Holland, 2003). While these participants carry an independent degree of knowledge and prowess, being more knowledgeable, telling the truth, and being loyal to one’s identity may not necessarily enough. Being able to have fun and joke with others in the workplace stood out as a relationship mechanism that is probably use to compensate for being unapologetically Black. Humor and knowing that other Blacks have succeeded appeared to stand on the periphery of and buffer their ability/knowledge, authenticity, and Blackness.

**Career mobility.** Participants that loaded on Factor 4 also favored contest mobility to sponsored mobility; Their knowledge, congruence, and unapologetic Blackness leaned more towards reliability than relationship. Although Factor 4 participants recognized the existence of race/racial dynamics in the workplace and were more willing to conform than not, they would only do so without compromising their Blackness. Career mobility, sponsored mobility more so than contest mobility, requires an advanced degree of social, cultural, and political acumen, especially for African American men (Blickle et al., 2011). Humor appears to afford these participants an avenue to build social, cultural, and political capital to strengthen their sponsored
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mobility while employing their knowledge and ability to build contest mobility. How are these knowledgeable, congruent, and unapologetically Black emerging leaders assessed, challenged, and supported in the workplace? What type of conditions, in the world of work, are conducive for this preferred leadership development modality?

**Self-monitoring.** Participants that loaded on Factor 4 expressed humor as a possible coping mechanism to self-monitor in the workplace. Although their merit may be able to speak for itself, these participants used lived experiences, their understanding that others may be intimidated by a strong Black identity, and being able to have fun/joke around as tools to get along and get ahead in the workplace. When African American men advance in organizations, especially as firsts, they struggle with the prototypicality – the ideal African American professional as perceived by those in power – of being a professional African American and the gravity of being Black (Slay, 2003). Participants that loaded on Factor 4 see this prototypicality as a challenge; they fearlessly push themselves and learn from other to be better and not concentrate on race. In this sense, these participants do not see themselves as compromising their identity, but constantly developing themselves to prove others wrong.

**Nigrescence.** Participants that loaded on Factor 4 expressed a strong affinity for nigrescence; they exhibited a heavy preference for reference group orientation and would probably sit at intense Black on the Cross-Race Identity Scale (CRIS). These participants displayed an unapologetic Blackness with a hint of humor that is present but not intrusive. Because Black men experience extreme difficulty gaining admittance into the in-group and therefore have limited access to information, resources, and relationships that yield leader
emergence, this group of participants employ humor, drive and courage to relate. In-group LMX, which is preceded by liking, perceived similarity, and expectations (Engle & Lord, 1997; Head, 2014; Sparrowe & Liden, 1997), increases the probability of subordinates’ strong work performance, high job satisfaction, and commitment to organization (O'Donnell et al., 2012; Z. Zhang et al., 2012). LMX theory suggests that in-group relationships strengthen subordinates’ influence among other work groups and personal well-being while enhancing the bonding, buffering, and bridging process.

**Factor 5 | Responsible, Faithful, and Supportive**

Participants that loaded on Factor 5 expressed that their responsibility (i.e., a desire to make someone in their lives proud), faith (faith in and relationship with God), and being supportive (being a mentor and resource to others) as most influential to their development as leaders. Additionally, “…pushing my leadership development further so that the focus is on the work not the race, feeling like an outsider because of their strong Black identity, and an inability to get into character and play the game also showed up as notably impactful to these participants’ development as leaders. Responsibility, to and for others, appeared to power these participants’ learning from lived experiences, watching and learning from others, and performing despite race as drivers to develop as leaders. Responsibility also represents their commitment to their identity; they are unable to get into character/play the game, they see their strong Black identity as intimidating to others, and they have not allowed race/racism to prevent them from chasing their dreams. Faith emerged, as with three of the other factors, as an impactful element of their development as leaders.
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**Developmental relationships.** Participants that loaded on responsible, faithful, and supportive honored developmental relationships where they give more than they receive. Although most of the other mentoring statements were not extremely disassociated with their development as leaders, they were not rank ordered as high as being a resource to others. These participants had significant developmental relationships in and out of the world of work. Family also appeared to have played an important role in their motivation to develop as leaders. Participants that loaded on this factor used this motivation to learn both independently and from others; there were direct mentions of learning from experiences and by watching others, while pushing themselves to develop and focus on performance, not race.

**Career mobility.** Career mobility emerged as both contest and sponsored mobility for participants that loaded on Factor 5. Their strong desire to develop others is a developmental strategy in and of itself; the old educational adage, if you want to learn something, teach it to someone holds true in this case. Practicing reflection and intentionally observing to learn directly contributes to contest mobility. While striving to make someone else proud and mentoring others attends to the sponsored part of career mobility. Although contest mobility can be enhanced through better relationships with superiors, self-monitoring is more affiliated with sponsored mobility, in that high-quality LMX with organizational elites affords a competitive advantage that amplifies career sponsorship and career success (Blickle et al., 20111). This suggests that participants who loaded on Factor 5 could possibly benefit from adding more mentors and sponsors to the protégés they already have in their developmental networks.
Self-monitoring. Participants that loaded on Factor 5 found self-monitoring to be something that has least influenced their development as leaders. As a matter of fact, the normalized rank order on the forced distribution response grid was -4, represented by the statement that addressed getting into character and playing the game. Other statements that suggest participants on Factor 5 are less willing to self-monitor are; “my strong Black identity makes me feel like an outsider” and “racism has hindered me from chasing my dreams.” Both statements are indicative of being comfortable in their skin; not having to observe social cues or adjust their behaviors to honor others. Most of the participants that loaded on Factor 5 would probably be characterized as low self-monitors. While it is high self-monitors who are tactically able to negotiate and navigate varied landscapes while simultaneously getting along and getting ahead (Wolfe et al., 1986). Black men have trouble with this process as high self-monitors and leader/leadership development for Black men in a White world of work requires a biculturality where what accounts for acceptance and status in one environment does not in the other (Bell, 1990). This may mean that, for these participants to increase the probability of career mobility, it may be best for them to be more informed self-monitors.

Additional Subheading if needed. Participants that loaded on Factor 5 appear to have predisposed affinity to nigrescence; they naturally honor and appreciate their Black identity and do not see a need for others to recognize it. These participants are so comfortable with their identity, if there is an issue it is someone else’s issue. Their willingness to not play the game, to consider themselves an insider in spite of race, and to refuse race as a dream killer, all speak to their acceptance and honor to be black. The fact that their motivation is to make someone in
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their lives proud, to exalt their faith in and relationship with God, and to mentor and be a resource to others speak volume of their responsibility, faithfulness, and support. Historically W.E.B. Dubois referred to this struggle for African Americans to succeed in two competing raciocultural worlds as *double consciousness* and more recently *bicuralism* has been coined to describe this dichotomous dilemma (Ashong-Lamptey, 2014; Bell, 1990; Brannon et al., 2015; Bruce, 1992). Within double consciousness is a warring uncertainty between the ‘African’ and ‘American’ realities of African Americans (Ashong-Lamptey, 2014; Barker, 2010; Bell, 1990; Bruce, 1992; Liu, 2013). Participants that loaded on Factor 5 have mastered ‘serving two masters’, all while being a model for others to do the same.

**Limitations**

The present study employed Q methodology as its research technique to as systematically and rigorously examine human subjectivity through quantitative means (Mckeown & Thomas, 1988), while eliciting culturally relative/responsive data and honoring Black males’ lived experiences. In doing so, Q methodology considers 40 participants a robust sample. Q methodology research is designed to identify the existence of shared, communal perspectives in a particular population rather than make statistical claims concerning the distribution of clusters (S. R. Brown, 1996). And, the findings of the present study can be used to challenge extant discourse regarding leadership development strategies for Black men. However, findings of the present study, by virtue of its very nature, are not generalizable.

The snowball sampling process use to construct the concourse was also a limitation in the present study and may have included sampling bias. The point of entry for sampling was
BLACK MALE PERSPECTIVES

emerging leaders, which was defined as Black males between the ages of 30 and 50, employed by organizations across various industries with at least 4 hierarchical strata (e.g., sales representative, sales manager, sales director, chief executive officer or HVAC technician, district manager, regional director, president), recognized by their peers, colleagues, and organization leaders as positively influential, and have a desire to advance their leadership capacity and careers. The snowball sampling may have been too homogeneous, in terms of attitudes towards leadership development, because of sheer geographical proximity.

Another limitation to the present study was that every participant did not expound on each one of their extreme rankings from the forced distribution response grid. This may have weakened the richness of data interpretation. Incorporating an inquiry process, for all participants post Q sort, could have possibly strengthened interpretations of participant perspectives and story.

Implications for Future Research

The present study focuses on Black male perspectives of the role race plays with Black males’ development as leaders and functions as a snapshot of that viewpoint. There were two theoretical assumptions (i.e., socioanalytic theory and leader-member exchange) and four conceptual constructs (i.e., developmental relationships, career mobility, self-monitoring, nigrescence) that functioned as lenses through which perspectives of Black male leadership development was examined. There are no existing studies that used these theoretical assumptions and conceptual constructs together to investigate leadership development with
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Black men. There are also no existing studies that used Q methodology, with these theoretical assumptions and conceptual constructs, to investigate leadership development with Black men. Additional research regarding leadership development with Black men is warranted, particularly as it relates to their realities and lived experiences. Future research could examine the perspectives of other marginalized populations (e.g., women, Latino/Hispanic, LGBTQ, disabled). Black men in elite leadership positions could also be examined to gain a better understanding of their perspective regarding leadership development. White professionals in leadership positions is another populace that warrants investigation. The present study did not limit sampling to a specific profession/occupation, however, doing so could narrow the scope of perspectives and add value to leadership development models. For example, of the 11 participants that loaded on factor 1, 8 were educators. This pattern of Black men identifying faith, family, and resilience as salient influencers to their development as leaders suggests a need for further inquiry. Each of the theoretical assumptions and conceptual constructs could also serve as independent lenses to examine perspectives of marginalized populations. Future research using Q methodology is also warranted to give voice to those marginalized populations that would not ordinarily have a voice.

Implications for Policy

The present study will be of interest to policy in terms of Black male representation in leadership, Black male development as leaders, as well as Black male sustainability and wellbeing in the world of work. Because education is the prescribed pipeline to career mobility, educational policy is particularly of interest; K-12 and post-secondary institutions serve as the
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impetus to personal, professional, and career development. The underrepresentation of Black men in leadership, especially in education, is perhaps the reason for an overrepresentation of Black male incarceration and could possibly be addressed through policies that provide more purposeful, relevant, and responsive development of Black men. Education reform and public policy must become more intentional and strategic toward recruiting and developing Black men as leaders. It is equally important for Black male leaders, due to their proximity to identify with Black boys, to have opportunities to proselytize the nuanced talents and motivations of Black boys into meaningful behaviors that help Black boys negotiate and navigate their way from their “point A to their point B.” Black men are best suited to help Black boys combat the deficit narratives that relegate Black boys to dangerous, uneducable, and unintelligible stereotypes (Jackson & Moore III, 2008). The perspective and counsel of Black men is needed at the table when decisions are being made about the education and careers of Black boys.

Implications for Practice

There are several implications for practice that can be derived from the present study. Institutions and organizations should be mindful of socio-cultural nuances germane to Black males in terms of leadership development. The present study demonstrates that spiritual, familial, and identity concerns that impact Black males’ perspectives of their development as leaders can be more appropriately addressed. Leadership has a different impression on and for African Americans (Domingue, 2014), particularly African American men. Black men, within the working populace, are the most underemployed, are disproportionately laid off, and earn slightly less than three fourths of what their White male counterparts make (Johnson & Eby,
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2011). Black men also contend with an unreasonable amount of negative stereotypes that include: violence, emotional incompetence, sexual power, and immaturity, and frequently obstruct career advancement opportunities (Hall, 2001). The inequality, exclusion, and brute categorizations can add debilitating stressors to African American men’s existence, performance, social relevance, and positionality in the world of work. The lack of African American males in leadership positions inspires more intentionality of developmental influences that impact African American male leader emergence. While Black boys are oftentimes stereotyped as violent, academically apathetic, and incapable of learning (Yaffe, 2012), improved development of Black men as leaders directly addresses the idea that Black boys need Black men in order to be successful (B. A. Brown, Mangram, Sun, & Raab; McShepard, Goler, & Baston, 2007).

The present study did not yield conventional developmental practices (i.e., 360-degree feedback, coaching, sponsor, stretch assignments, action learning) as significant influencers that impacted Black males’ development as leaders. This suggests that the organizations employing this study’s participants do not use these developmental practices to develop their leaders, chose not to use these developmental practices with emerging Black males, or these leadership practices did not resonate as impactful to Black men as it relates to their development as leaders. Why is it that Black male emerging leaders did not immediately point to their organization’s leadership development models as influential to their development as leaders? Why is it that Black male emerging leaders did not use conventional leadership development language to describe what has most contributed to their development as leaders in the world of work? Why is it that Black male emerging leaders did not mention immediate supervisors or specific
leadership development programs as salient influencers to their development as leaders? The fact that 3 of the 5 factors shared faith and family as +4 statements illustrates an unconventional approach is needed for Black male leader/leadership development. It is as if Black men have found an alternative way of not only surviving, but advancing within organizations that does not advantage traditional tools, practices, and relationships provided by the organization.

Education is the only compulsory conduit through which the development of Black men exists, and it is through education that Black men can most appropriately begin a more acknowledged and appreciative developmental experience as emerging leaders. Our educational institutions start failing our Black boys at an early age. Black boys are underrepresented in gifted classes, overrepresented in at-risk programs, suspended more often, and less likely to advance grades (Decuir-Gunby, 2009). Black boys, as a generalization, also experience a degree self-hate that is perpetuated by being told, all of their young lives, that they will amount to nothing and oftentimes realize this self-fulfilling prophecy (Alexander, 2012). The present study speaks to this self-hate through the lens of nigrescence; self-hate being one of the measures of nigrescence according to the Cross Racial Identity Scale (Worrell et al., 2001). Black boys seldom see Black men in leadership positions that are influential enough to change their educational/vocational trajectory. Black boys who are taught by Black male teachers in elementary school have a 39% lower rate of dropping out of high school (Gershenson et al., 2017). Black boys then grow up to be Black men who experience an underrepresentation of minorities and women in leadership within the world of work as well (Barabas, 2015; Eagly & Chin, 2010; Gündemir et al., 2014; Kay & Gorman, 2012; McGinn & Milkman, 2013; Vinson,
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2014), particularly in education.

Because of Brown v. Board of Education many Black educational leaders, historically the linchpin to African American’s epistemology to teaching/learning and the collective ethos of the Black community, were dismissed thereby creating conditions of lost traditions of excellence, disengaged communities, and ultimately unequal educational opportunities (Tillman, 2004). These accumulative disadvantages have contributed to the faithful, familial, resilient, independent, woke, congruent, and unapologetically Black shared perspectives that Black men feel most contribute to their development as leaders. Those in the world of work responsible for developing Black must do a better job, organizationally, programmatically, and psychosocially; we, as leaders, must become more culturally inclusive to the attributes and assets that Black men bring to the table, for the lives of our Black boys depends on it (cf. Tillman, 2002). We must reimagine socioanalytic theory and leader-member exchange, as well as developmental relationships, career-mobility, self-monitoring, and nigrescence so that they are sensitive to all identities.

The present study represents the ingenuity Black men exhibit to develop themselves as leaders in the world in the world of work. Faith, family, resilience, creativity, independence, consciousness, congruence, and identity all function as nuanced elements of influence to the development of emerging Black male leaders; as unconventional developmental practices that drive Black male development in the world of work. The present study looked at the development of emerging Black male leaders through the lenses of developmental relationships, career mobility, self-monitoring, and nigrescence. Three of the four constructs emerged very
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different than how they appear in the literature. Developmental relationship surfaced primarily as connections with God and family. Career mobility presented itself more so as contest mobility than social mobility; an independent disposition that did not exhibit help-seeking behaviors. And, self-monitoring was almost universally rejected while race was accepted as an asset not to be compromised. Our challenge as leaders developing emerging Black male leaders, particularly in education, is to be more culturally cognizant of the leadership development models we employ and the implications these models ultimately have on our organizations. We must examine why we continue to depend on leadership development programs that do not address to socio-cultural needs of Black men and ultimately Black boys.

Organizationally and programmatically, leaders can do better at developing Black men. As it relates to career mobility, contest and social mobility can be approached drastically different. In terms of contest mobility, rarely do Black men have the luxury of exploring their most favorable occupational fit. Black men’s career considerations may be best explored through the theologian Frederick Buechner’s idea of vocation – the intersection between their great gifts and the world’s greatest needs (Buechner, 1993) rather than Jim Collins’ hedgehog concept – the intersection between most passionate about, able to be the best in the world, and drives one’s economic engine (Collins, 2001). Due to the practice of homophily, sponsored mobility and social capital are difficult for Black men to acquire in the workplace. Access to the information, resources, and relationships that yield high quality leader-member exchange is a conventional career strategy, however, for Black men this access is distant, awkward, and impractical. The cultural nuances associated with gaining access requires Black men to self-
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monitor in a way that is incongruent with their reality, beliefs, and values. Based on extant literature, findings of the present study suggest that Black men are less likely to secure leadership positions, especially in education, because of their proclivity to low self-monitor. One participant in the present study told a story about whenever higher-ups would visit the office his White male counterpart always found ways to socialize with them about life outside of work (e.g., skiing, boating, vacations) which were extremely uncomfortable conversations for this participant to engage in. He mentioned that instead of joining the conversations, he would put his head down and work harder. He felt as though this was his way of getting ahead. In his mind, it was contest mobility that meant more than the social mobility being afforded to his counterpart. As leaders, it is our responsibility to recognize this inequitable social reproduction and exercise more intentionality to create complimentary conditions that invite and permit a more diverse group to advantage access to the information, resources, and relationships that fosters high quality leader-member exchange.

Race is oftentimes the elephant in the room and for Black men demands decisions around nigrescence. Being a Black man in the face of White supremacy, especially in the world of work, comes with profound pressures; the consequence of not being White enough or being too Black is detrimental to self and family. Navigating and negotiating a double consciousness that enables moral congruence and social acceptance is extremely difficult. This is what Black men are experiencing in the world of work and it plays a major role in their development as leaders. At the end of the day leader/leadership development, specifically related to career advancement, is about relationship. When Black men struggle with socialization in work environments
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limitations are placed on the quality of leader-member exchange requisite to career mobility. If the case for better development of Black male emerging leaders has been made, leaders, especially White leaders, must create conditions that are more socially, culturally, and politically responsive to the realities, beliefs, values of Black men. It is the responsibility of leaders to suspend their posture of power and privilege to properly prepare Black men for leadership.

Conclusion

The present study endeavors to inform African American males’ leader/leadership development, leader emergence, and locus of control by better understanding the importance of socioanalytic theory and LMX through the lenses of career mobility, developmental relationships, self-monitoring, and nigrescence. The present study advances extant literature in that: (1) leadership development perspectives of African American males are brought to the forefront of academic research. Too often empirical research regarding African American males is conceptualized, constructed, investigated, analyzed, and interpreted by those other than African American males. (2) Career mobility, developmental relationships, self-monitoring, and nigrescence (previously disconnected constructs that have never been examined together) are united to critically examine appreciative attributes African American males feel contribute to their development as leaders. (3) A self-referent, as oppose to an external frame-of-reference, approach is applied to a marginalized populace that too often suffers from deficit narratives. (4) First voice as methodology is demonstrated to amplify Black male lived experiences as legitimate knowledge.

The purpose of the present study is to examine Black male perspectives of the role race
BLACK MALE PERSPECTIVES

plays with Black male leader/leadership development in the world of work and is designed as an exploratory attempt to interrogate the development of capable, qualified, and ambitious emerging African American male leaders. The present study asks emerging African American leaders the question: “What are Black male perspectives of the role race plays with Black male leader/leadership development in the world of work?” Q methodology was selected as the preferred research technique as it has been identified as “a systematic and rigorously quantitative means for examining human subjectivity” (Mckeown & Thomas, 1988). Emancipating the arrested development of African American males as leaders is extremely important to the progress of the United States’ democracy. Black men bring a unique set of experiences and perspectives that truly represents diversity, expands opportunities for innovation and creativity, and catalyzes an untapped wealth of knowledge and influence. A better understanding of how emerging Black male leaders feel about their development creates space to acknowledge, analyze, and address the undeniable and uncomfortable barriers that constitutes such inequity. The present study prefaces its exploration with two theoretical assumptions: 1) socioanalytic theory – everyone wants to get along and get ahead (Blickle et al., 2011) – and 2) leader-member exchange – all leaders develop unique relationships with each of their subordinates (Martin et al., 2015). And, looks at emerging Black males’ perspectives through the lenses of developmental relationships, career mobility, self-monitoring, and nigrescence. By empirically examining the subjective voice of African American males, which is rare in the world of academia, a door to educative and communicative connections opens that magnifies a more harmonious human kind while combatting an existing unfair hegemony.
BLACK MALE PERSPECTIVES

The present study found that there were five distinct perspectives regarding how Black men viewed their development as leaders: Faithful, Familial and Resilient; Creative, Faithful, and Independent; Attentive, Connected, and Woke; Knowledgeable, Congruent, and Unapologetically Black; and Responsible, Faithful, and Supportive. Each of the five perspectives generated unique stories that can enhance the limited extant literature around how Black men perceive their development as leaders. These perspectives, as observed under the assumptions of socioanalytic theory and leader-member exchange, and seen through the lenses of developmental relationships, career mobility, self-monitoring, and nigrescence, express leadership development realities, beliefs, and values unique to emerging Black male leaders.
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As a Black man, what has impacted your development as a leader in the world of work?

I. Please list and briefly describe up to 5 key/supportive relationships that impacted your development as a leader in the world of work. *(These supportive relationships could include mentorship and sponsorship – Mentor- advising and guidance from a more experienced individual investing in your development (Brown, Zablah, & Bellenger, 2008; Ensher & Murphy, 1997; Higgins & Kram, 2001; Mullen & Tuten, 2010; Ramaswami & Dreher, 2010) | Sponsor- a mentor with voice and decision-making power that invests in, advocates for, and protects you in your career endeavors (Hewlett, 2013; Roots, 2006).)

II. Please list and briefly describe up to 5 experiences in your past/present organization(s) that have impacted your development as a leader in the world of work.

III. Please list and briefly describe up to 5 ways your identity (and how you express it) has impacted your development as a leader in the world of work.

IV. Please list and briefly describe up to 5 ways race has impacted your developmental as a leader in the world of work.
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Appendix B | Q Set

1) I have pushed my leadership development further so that the focus is on the work not my race
2) Certain opportunities have been denied to me, doors have been shut, because of my race
3) I often find myself asking the question “is this situation racially motivated or am I just conditioned to think and feel the it is? This constant question definitely impacts my development as a leader
4) Race has kept me from some leadership opportunities because of my unwillingness to go to the location where the position was offered
5) Race has paralyzed my creativity in order to appear mainstream. This absurdity is akin to expecting an eagle not to fly
6) Reflection is important to leadership and I am more reflective than most because I have to be as a Black man
7) Many people in authority are intimidated by educated and talented Blacks
8) I feel confused, not knowing how to approach and/or behave as a White leader would
9) My strong Black identity makes me feel like an outsider
10) The love Blacks show each other sometimes. This love has supported my development as a leader
11) I am driven to become a successful leader to let it be known that we can dominate this field
12) I benefit from low expectations of me as a Black man. When I surprise people with my ability then they look to me for leadership
13) I am able to get into character and play the game
14) I am flexible, willing to try new things
15) My hard earned reputation has helped position me as a leader
16) Racism has hindered me from chasing my dreams
17) Knowing other Black men have succeeded before me has influenced my drive to become a better leader
18) Being able to have fun and joke with others at work has developed me as a leader
19) Taking charge has worked against me, as it is a threat
20) My courage, I am fearless
21) Being more knowledgeable than others in the workplace
22) I have grown the skills to network and that’s helped me develop as a leader
23) Mentoring or being a resource to others
24) My ability to see multiple solutions to every problem
25) Not knowing what successful leaders do
26) I have multiple mentors who are cultivated for various situations and contexts
27) I have a prestigious mentor and that has open doors. When I tell people who my sponsor/mentor is they pay attention
28) I strive to make someone in my life proud and that has pushed me to develop as a leader
29) The encouragement from my family has helped me develop
30) My faith and relationship with my God has strengthened my growth as a leader
31) My education has afforded me opportunity, confidence, and positioning as a leader
32) I was thrust into a leadership position without proper support
33) In my life outside of work, I have had a very helpful mentor
34) Being a truth-teller in my workplace has influenced my trajectory as a leader
35) I am creative and that fuels my development as a leader
36) I watch and learn from other leaders (good and bad)
37) My leadership experiences outside the world of work
38) I have experienced raw, uncut racism in the workplace (e.g., slur, insult)
39) My lived experiences (professional/personal) have influenced my development
40) Being doubted on by haters
41) I dream big and strive to reach those dreams
NOTE: THIS IS AN APPROXIMATION AS THE FINAL CONFIGURATION WILL ONLY BE KNOWN AFTER THE CONCOURSE AND SUBSEQUENT Q SAMPLE ARE DEVELOPED

Black Male Perspectives Of The Role Race Plays With Black Male Leader/Leadership Development in the World of Work

A Q Methodology Exploration
Spring 2017

Sort Number:
Q Sort Activity Protocol

1. Lay out the number cards from left to right with the negative (-) numbers on your left (see picture below):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-4</th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>+1</th>
<th>+2</th>
<th>+3</th>
<th>+4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3 statements)</td>
<td>(3 statements)</td>
<td>(4 statements)</td>
<td>(5 statements)</td>
<td>(7 statements)</td>
<td>(5 statements)</td>
<td>(4 statements)</td>
<td>(3 statements)</td>
<td>(3 statements)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Read through all cards to become familiar with the statements.

3. As you read through the statements for a second time, organize them into three piles:
   - On the right, create a pile for the cards with statements that are like your perspectives toward Black Male Leader/Leadership Development in the World of Work.
   - On the left, create a pile for the cards with statements that are unlike your perspectives toward Black Male Leader/Leadership Development in the World of Work.
   - In the middle, create a pile for the cards with statements that fall somewhere in the middle or that you are unsure about.

4. Beginning with the pile on the right, place the three cards that are most like your perspective toward Black Male Leader/Leadership Development in the World of Work and place them under the +4 marker.

5. Now, turning to your left side, place the three cards that are most unlike your perspective toward Black Male Leader/Leadership Development in the World of Work and place them under the -4 marker.

6. Continue this process, working your way from the outside in, until all the cards are placed. You are free to change your mind during the sorting process and switch items around.

7. When completed, you should have the following number of cards under each row (see grid on next page):
   - You should have three cards under markers +4 (most like) and -4 (most unlike).
   - You should have three cards under markers +3 (more like) and -3 (most unlike).
   - You should have four cards under markers +2 (most like) and -2 (most unlike).
   - You should have five cards under markers +1 and -1.
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- You should have **seven** cards under marker 0 *(somewhere in the middle, unsure).*

**KEEP YOUR CARDS DISPLAYED**

8. Now, record the card numbers in the grid on the next page (p. 3).

9. After you fill in the grid, answer the remaining questions using your sort for reference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-4 (3 statements)</th>
<th>-3 (3 statements)</th>
<th>-2 (4 statements)</th>
<th>-1 (5 statements)</th>
<th>0 (7 statements)</th>
<th>+1 (5 statements)</th>
<th>+2 (4 statements)</th>
<th>+3 (3 statements)</th>
<th>+4 (3 statements)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Post-Sort Questions**

1) Please briefly describe why you feel so strongly about the statements you placed under the "+4."

**Statement #**  **Reason**
Likewise, please describe why you also felt strongly about the statements you placed in the "-4."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement #</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background Information

Occupation: ____________________

Primary work organization: ________________________________
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Age: ____________________

Education
Please list your education level: highest certificate, degree, etc.:___________

Military Service: ☐ Yes ☐ No

Have you ever been mentored in the world of work? If so, please explain below:

__________________________________________________________________________

How many mentors have you had (if any): ________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
From your perspective as a Black man, what has influenced your development as a leader?

**Researcher Notes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your Age____________________________________
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Your Occupation ________________________________
Your Education Level ________________________________
Your Military Service (if any) ___________________________
Your Previous Experiences with Mentoring ____________________

____________________________________________________
Welcome to this examination of attitudes Black men hold toward Black male leader/leadership development. My name is Rudy Jamison and I am doctoral candidate at the University of North Florida (UNF). I would appreciate your participation in this dissertation research.

Your participation will involve you responding to 1 interview prompt designed to elicit your perspectives toward Black males toward Black male leader/leadership development in the world of work. Your participation in this interview process responding to this one open-ended prompt with as many distinct influences on your development as a leader in the workplace is designed to take no longer than 30 minutes.

You must be between the ages of 30-50 to take part in this research study. Also, your participation is completely voluntary; you may withdraw at any time during the process. Following all data collection, your responses will be anonymous, all data will be kept securely by the researchers, and any data and findings resulting from this study that are eventually described in writing or presented publicly, will only be in the aggregate. In compliance with IRB requirements and to insure data security, your responses will be stored on a secure server and destroyed at the culmination of this research.

Again, please note that no personal identifiable information will be used to formulate or compose any data reports. There are no foreseeable risks, direct benefits, or compensation for participating in this study. However, your participation in this research may lead to a general advancement in how we understand the attitudes toward how leader/leadership development, specific to Black male emerging leaders, is perceived and addressed.

The University of North Florida Institutional Review Board has approved this research study. If you have any concerns, questions, or requests regarding your rights as a participant, please contact the University of North Florida’s Institutional Review Board directly at 904-620-2498 or via email at irb@unf.edu. Should you have any questions regarding the design or purpose of this study or the research approach I am using, please feel free to contact my faculty advisor, Dr. Chris Janson directly at [email protected] or [email protected] or me as the lead researcher, Rudy F. Jamison Jr., directly at [email protected]

Completion of this concourse interview implies that you have read the information describing the process and consent to take part in the research. Your signature below indicates that you agree to participate in the study. Finally, a copy of this form will be made available to you for your records if you would like. Thank you very much for your time and participation.

_________________________________________________
Name of Participant

_________________________________________________
Signature of Participant              Date

_________________________________________________
Signature of Researcher              Date

Sincerely,
Rudy F. Jamison Jr.
Welcome to this examination of attitudes Black men hold toward Black male leader/leadership development. My name is Rudy Jamison and I am doctoral candidate at the University of North Florida (UNF). I would appreciate your participation in this dissertation research.

Your participation will involve you responding to 1 written prompt designed to elicit your perspectives toward Black male leader/leadership development in the world of work. Your participation in this process responding to this open-ended questionnaire will take approximately 30 minutes to complete.

You must be between the ages of 30-50 to take part in this research study. Also, your participation is completely voluntary; you may withdraw at any time during the process. Following all data collection, your responses will be anonymous, all data will be kept securely by the researchers, and any data and findings resulting from this study that are eventually described in writing or presented publicly, will only be in the aggregate. In compliance with IRB requirements and to insure data security, your responses will be stored on a secure server and destroyed at the culmination of this research.

Again, please note that no personal identifiable information will be used to formulate or compose any data reports. There are no foreseeable risks, direct benefits, or compensation for participating in this study. However, your participation in this research may lead to a general advancement in how we understand the attitudes toward how leader/leadership development, specific to Black male emerging leaders, is perceived and addressed.

The University of North Florida Institutional Review Board has approved this research study. If you have any concerns, questions, or requests regarding your rights as a participant, please contact the University of North Florida’s Institutional Review Board directly at 904-620-2498 or via email at irb@unf.edu. Should you have any questions regarding the design or purpose of this study or the research approach I am using, please feel free to contact my faculty advisor, Dr. Chris Janson directly at [contact information] or me as the lead researcher, Rudy F. Jamison Jr., directly at [contact information].

Completion of this concourse questionnaire implies that you have read the information describing the process and consent to take part in the research. Your signature below indicates that you agree to participate in the study. Finally, a copy of this form will be made available to you for your records if you would like. Thank you very much for your time and participation.

________________________________________________________________________
Name of Participant

________________________________________________________________________
Signature of Participant
Date

________________________________________________________________________
Signature of Researcher
Date

Sincerely,
Rudy F. Jamison Jr.
Appendix G | Consent to Q Sort

University of North Florida

Consent to Participate in Scientific Investigations
Consent Agreement for Q Sorting

Welcome to this examination of attitudes Black men hold toward Black male leader/leadership development. My name is Rudy Jamison and I am doctoral candidate at the University of North Florida (UNF). I would appreciate your participation in this dissertation research.

Your participation will involve sorting 35-45 statements, each representing attitudes of Black males toward Black male leader/leadership development in the world of work. Your participation in this sorting process will take approximately 30 minutes to complete.

You must be between the ages of 30-50 (REVIEWER NOTE: THIS NUMBER WILL BE DETERMINED AFTER THE CONCOURSE INTERVIEWS ARE COMPLETED AND THE Q SAMPLE IS DEVELOPED FROM THE CONCOURSE) to take part in this research study. Also, your participation is completely voluntary; you may withdraw at any time during the process. Following all data collection, your responses will be anonymous, all data will be kept securely by the researchers, and any data and findings resulting from this study that are eventually described in writing or presented publicly, will only be in the aggregate. In compliance with IRB requirements and to insure data security, your responses will be stored on a secure server and destroyed at the culmination of this research.

Again, please note that no personal identifiable information will be used to formulate or compose any data reports. There are no foreseeable risks, direct benefits, or compensation for participating in this study. However, your participation in this research may lead to a general advancement in how we understand the attitudes toward how leader/leadership development, specific to Black male emerging leaders, is perceived and addressed.

The University of North Florida Institutional Review Board has approved this research study. If you have any concerns, questions, or requests regarding your rights as a participant, please contact the University of North Florida’s Institutional Review Board directly at 904-620-2498 or via email at irb@unf.edu. Should you have any questions regarding the design or purpose of this study or the research approach I am using, please feel free to contact my faculty advisor, Dr. Chris Janson directly at [contact information] or me as the lead researcher, Rudy F. Jamison Jr., directly at [contact information].

Completion of this Q sort implies that you have read the information describing the process and consent to take part in the research. Your signature below indicates that you agree to participate in the study. Finally, a copy of this form will be made available to you for your records if you would like. Thank you very much for your time and participation.

_________________________________________________
Name of Participant

_________________________________________________
Signature of Participant  Date

_________________________________________________
Signature of Researcher  Date

Sincerely,
Rudy F. Jamison Jr.
Appendix H | Q Concourse Recruitment email

From: Rudy F. Jamison
Date: 3.10.17
To: Potential Participant
Subject: Black male perceptions of their development as leaders

My name is Rudy F. Jamison Jr. and I am a doctoral student conducting dissertation research on Black male perceptions of their development as leaders. I am requesting your participation in this research study. The research instrument (Q sample) will take approximately 30 minutes to complete. Your participation will involve you responding to 1 written prompt designed to elicit your perspectives toward Black male leader/leadership development in the world of work. Your participation in this process responding to this open-ended questionnaire will take approximately 30 minutes to complete.

You must be between the ages of 30-50 to take part in this research study. Also, your participation is completely voluntary; you may withdraw at any time during the process. Following all data collection, your responses will be anonymous, all data will be kept securely by the researchers, and any data and findings resulting from this study that are eventually described in writing or presented publicly, will only be in the aggregate. In compliance with IRB requirements and to insure data security, your responses will be stored on a secure server and destroyed at the culmination of this research.

Again, please note that no personal identifiable information will be used to formulate or compose any data reports. There are no foreseeable risks, direct benefits, or compensation for participating in this study. However, your participation in this research may lead to a general advancement in how we understand the attitudes toward how leader/leadership development, specific to Black male emerging leaders, is perceived and addressed.

The University of North Florida Institutional Review Board has approved this research study. If you have any concerns, questions, or requests regarding your rights as a participant, please contact the University of North Florida’s Institutional Review Board directly at 904-620-2498 or via email at irb@unf.edu. Should you have any questions regarding the design or purpose of this study or the research approach I am using, please feel free to contact my faculty advisor, Dr. Chris Janson directly at [contact information] or me as the lead researcher, Rudy F. Jamison Jr., directly at [contact information].

Completion of this concourse questionnaire implies that you have read the information describing the process and consent to take part in the research. Your signature below indicates that you agree to participate in the study. Finally, a copy of this form will be made available to you for your records if you would like. Please click the link below to go to the survey web site or copy and paste the link into your internet browser to begin the survey. Upon opening the link below, you will be asked to read the consent letter for this study. Once completed, you will be asked to check a box indicating that you have read the consent letter and agree to participate in this research study. Upon checking the box, the actual survey instrument will be launched.

Survey link:

Thank you in advance for your time and participation.

Sincerely,
Rudy F. Jamison Jr.
Principal Researcher
Appendix I | Q Sort Recruitment email

From: Rudy F. Jamison Jr.
Date: 3.13.17
To: Potential Participant
Subject: Black male perceptions of their development as leaders

My name is Rudy Jamison and I am doctoral candidate at the University of North Florida (UNF). I would appreciate your participation in this dissertation research. Your participation will involve sorting 35-45 statements, each representing attitudes of Black males toward Black male leader/leadership development in the world of work. Your participation in this sorting process will take approximately 30 minutes to complete. You must be between the ages of 30-50 (REVIEWER NOTE: THIS NUMBER WILL BE DETERMINED AFTER THE CONCOURSE INTERVIEWS ARE COMPLETED AND THE Q SAMPLE IS DEVELOPED FROM THE CONCOURSE) to take part in this research study. Also, your participation is completely voluntary; you may withdraw at any time during the process. Following all data collection, your responses will be anonymous, all data will be kept securely by the researchers, and any data and findings resulting from this study that are eventually described in writing or presented publicly, will only be in the aggregate. In compliance with IRB requirements and to insure data security, your responses will be stored on a secure server and destroyed at the culmination of this research.

Again, please note that no personal identifiable information will be used to formulate or compose any data reports. There are no foreseeable risks, direct benefits, or compensation for participating in this study. However, your participation in this research may lead to a general advancement in how we understand the attitudes toward how leader/leadership development, specific to Black male emerging leaders, is perceived and addressed. The University of North Florida Institutional Review Board has approved this research study. If you have any concerns, questions, or requests regarding your rights as a participant, please contact the University of North Florida’s Institutional Review Board directly at 904-620-2498 or via email at irb@unf.edu. Should you have any questions regarding the design or purpose of this study or the research approach I am using, please feel free to contact my faculty advisor, Dr. Chris Janson directly at [Contact Information] or me as the lead researcher, Rudy F. Jamison Jr., directly at [Contact Information].

Completion of this Q sort implies that you have read the information describing the process and consent to take part in the research. Your signature below indicates that you agree to participate in the study. Finally, a copy of this form will be made available to you for your records if you would like. Thank you very much for your time and participation.

Survey link:

Thank you in advance for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,
Rudy F. Jamison Jr.
Principal Researcher
Table 1 | Correlation Matrix Between Sorts

Note. Numbers represent the correlation percentages for each Q sort, where \( n = 40 \)
Table 2 | Un-rotated Factor Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q sorts</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6804</td>
<td>0.1771</td>
<td>0.0119</td>
<td>-0.0614</td>
<td>0.0940</td>
<td>-0.2726</td>
<td>-0.2971</td>
<td>0.0909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1396</td>
<td>-0.1500</td>
<td>0.5613</td>
<td>0.1200</td>
<td>-0.4643</td>
<td>0.2709</td>
<td>-0.1984</td>
<td>0.2496</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7023</td>
<td>-0.3368</td>
<td>-0.2160</td>
<td>-0.1864</td>
<td>0.1603</td>
<td>-0.0603</td>
<td>-0.1117</td>
<td>0.1675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4031</td>
<td>0.0039</td>
<td>-0.2392</td>
<td>0.4228</td>
<td>-0.2929</td>
<td>0.4196</td>
<td>0.1394</td>
<td>0.0350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.8316</td>
<td>0.0418</td>
<td>0.1416</td>
<td>0.0966</td>
<td>0.0991</td>
<td>-0.1477</td>
<td>0.1087</td>
<td>0.0474</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.5431</td>
<td>-0.3805</td>
<td>0.2104</td>
<td>-0.1684</td>
<td>0.0295</td>
<td>0.2249</td>
<td>-0.0359</td>
<td>-0.3784</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.1904</td>
<td>0.5013</td>
<td>0.2611</td>
<td>0.4874</td>
<td>-0.1228</td>
<td>-0.0728</td>
<td>0.2190</td>
<td>-0.0044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.7482</td>
<td>0.0729</td>
<td>-0.0828</td>
<td>0.4058</td>
<td>-0.0169</td>
<td>-0.0382</td>
<td>0.0888</td>
<td>-0.1603</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.6322</td>
<td>0.1097</td>
<td>-0.0934</td>
<td>-0.1196</td>
<td>0.0639</td>
<td>-0.3681</td>
<td>0.0746</td>
<td>-0.0778</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.4613</td>
<td>-0.2863</td>
<td>0.2306</td>
<td>-0.1146</td>
<td>-0.0895</td>
<td>0.1629</td>
<td>-0.1953</td>
<td>-0.5155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.6456</td>
<td>-0.0517</td>
<td>0.2114</td>
<td>0.3118</td>
<td>0.2072</td>
<td>-0.0036</td>
<td>0.2262</td>
<td>-0.0268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.6281</td>
<td>-0.2032</td>
<td>-0.0056</td>
<td>0.2818</td>
<td>0.2316</td>
<td>0.0756</td>
<td>0.2680</td>
<td>0.1973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.4561</td>
<td>-0.0568</td>
<td>-0.2086</td>
<td>-0.0037</td>
<td>0.2003</td>
<td>0.2534</td>
<td>-0.1462</td>
<td>0.1088</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.6558</td>
<td>-0.3102</td>
<td>0.1475</td>
<td>0.2925</td>
<td>-0.0854</td>
<td>0.0916</td>
<td>0.0728</td>
<td>-0.2126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.6280</td>
<td>0.3492</td>
<td>-0.2438</td>
<td>0.0915</td>
<td>-0.1215</td>
<td>0.0810</td>
<td>-0.3210</td>
<td>0.0950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.6239</td>
<td>0.0605</td>
<td>0.3352</td>
<td>0.2489</td>
<td>0.3510</td>
<td>-0.0680</td>
<td>-0.1796</td>
<td>-0.0769</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.2160</td>
<td>-0.0999</td>
<td>-0.2715</td>
<td>-0.0214</td>
<td>0.4389</td>
<td>0.4072</td>
<td>-0.0718</td>
<td>0.3938</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.6155</td>
<td>0.4473</td>
<td>0.1201</td>
<td>-0.1944</td>
<td>0.1313</td>
<td>0.2015</td>
<td>0.1191</td>
<td>-0.1375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.7359</td>
<td>0.3231</td>
<td>-0.1864</td>
<td>0.0428</td>
<td>-0.1721</td>
<td>0.0368</td>
<td>0.1834</td>
<td>-0.0298</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.7340</td>
<td>0.3216</td>
<td>-0.0018</td>
<td>-0.1794</td>
<td>-0.0440</td>
<td>-0.3092</td>
<td>-0.0954</td>
<td>0.0047</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.8072</td>
<td>-0.2022</td>
<td>-0.1268</td>
<td>-0.1193</td>
<td>-0.2506</td>
<td>-0.0815</td>
<td>0.1249</td>
<td>-0.0819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.7953</td>
<td>-0.3530</td>
<td>0.0658</td>
<td>0.0104</td>
<td>0.0304</td>
<td>0.0509</td>
<td>0.0546</td>
<td>0.1261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.4285</td>
<td>0.4349</td>
<td>0.0615</td>
<td>0.0331</td>
<td>-0.2194</td>
<td>0.2072</td>
<td>-0.2518</td>
<td>-0.0388</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.3732</td>
<td>-0.2463</td>
<td>0.3063</td>
<td>-0.1170</td>
<td>-0.1397</td>
<td>-0.5041</td>
<td>0.3224</td>
<td>0.1352</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.5258</td>
<td>-0.1881</td>
<td>-0.3076</td>
<td>-0.0173</td>
<td>0.0559</td>
<td>0.0223</td>
<td>-0.1026</td>
<td>0.2650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.5646</td>
<td>0.0462</td>
<td>0.3094</td>
<td>-0.4980</td>
<td>-0.2970</td>
<td>0.1759</td>
<td>0.0549</td>
<td>-0.0498</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.0043</td>
<td>0.0016</td>
<td>0.4730</td>
<td>-0.2636</td>
<td>-0.2851</td>
<td>0.1716</td>
<td>-0.0734</td>
<td>0.4280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.7998</td>
<td>0.0558</td>
<td>-0.0584</td>
<td>-0.0802</td>
<td>-0.0225</td>
<td>-0.0934</td>
<td>-0.1894</td>
<td>0.0949</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.6327</td>
<td>-0.2585</td>
<td>0.3121</td>
<td>-0.1283</td>
<td>0.3441</td>
<td>-0.0467</td>
<td>-0.1632</td>
<td>0.1235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.5563</td>
<td>0.0663</td>
<td>0.1177</td>
<td>0.3312</td>
<td>-0.2242</td>
<td>-0.0804</td>
<td>-0.2342</td>
<td>0.3043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.2746</td>
<td>0.4049</td>
<td>-0.0019</td>
<td>-0.3074</td>
<td>0.0552</td>
<td>0.3757</td>
<td>0.5416</td>
<td>0.0263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.7281</td>
<td>0.0777</td>
<td>-0.2197</td>
<td>-0.0491</td>
<td>-0.1374</td>
<td>0.2155</td>
<td>0.0220</td>
<td>-0.0532</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.3942</td>
<td>0.5928</td>
<td>0.2164</td>
<td>-0.3170</td>
<td>0.2736</td>
<td>-0.0309</td>
<td>-0.2193</td>
<td>-0.0051</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.7854</td>
<td>0.1773</td>
<td>0.0897</td>
<td>0.1861</td>
<td>0.0128</td>
<td>-0.0647</td>
<td>-0.0288</td>
<td>-0.2888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.7002</td>
<td>-0.0026</td>
<td>-0.3382</td>
<td>-0.2957</td>
<td>-0.0192</td>
<td>0.1670</td>
<td>0.1049</td>
<td>-0.0977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.6873</td>
<td>-0.0093</td>
<td>-0.2855</td>
<td>-0.1354</td>
<td>-0.1835</td>
<td>-0.2991</td>
<td>0.2890</td>
<td>0.1320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.3930</td>
<td>0.0132</td>
<td>-0.2942</td>
<td>0.0783</td>
<td>0.5527</td>
<td>0.1879</td>
<td>0.0410</td>
<td>-0.0994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.8440</td>
<td>-0.1433</td>
<td>-0.0538</td>
<td>-0.0399</td>
<td>0.0037</td>
<td>-0.0959</td>
<td>0.0205</td>
<td>-0.0984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.5023</td>
<td>-0.1490</td>
<td>-0.3442</td>
<td>0.0953</td>
<td>-0.2363</td>
<td>-0.4301</td>
<td>-0.0442</td>
<td>-0.2397</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.7175</td>
<td>-0.2952</td>
<td>0.0637</td>
<td>-0.1450</td>
<td>-0.1889</td>
<td>0.0877</td>
<td>0.1644</td>
<td>0.1490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 | Factor Matrix with Factor Loadings

Table 3

*Factor Matrix with Factor Loadings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QSORT</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>182672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>265719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>671542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>871542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>841329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>165792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>896245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>543182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>390027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>166422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>909724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>165146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>152883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>902617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>101074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>178227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>898981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>271962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>309812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>176171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>287176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>119376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>298176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>612398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>008071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>454132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>812938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>567291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>981672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>891152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>362719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>787119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>610562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>215872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>511200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>519961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>210741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>481037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>313245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>121091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% expl. Var.</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Table 4 | Correlation Between Factors

Correlation Between Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations Between Factor Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Significant correlation between factors occur when the correlation is greater than +/-0.40; p > 0.01.
Table 5 | Factor Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Characteristics</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Defining Variables</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Rel. Coef.</td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Reliability</td>
<td>0.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E. of Factor Scores</td>
<td>0.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 | Consensus Statement

Table 6

Consensus Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rank Score</td>
<td>Rank Score</td>
<td>Rank Score</td>
<td>Rank Score</td>
<td>Rank Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>My courage. I am fearless</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>