The Apprentice is the latest craze to dominate reality TV viewing. From January to April 2004, over 20 million viewers[1] observed 16 people (8 men, 8 women) compete for a chance to serve as Donald Trump's Apprentice. The last person standing after everyone else was eliminated from this "13-week job interview" would become the President of one of Trump's companies, earning a starting salary of $250,000. Out of 16 contestants, the only two African Americans on the show captured the limelight during the first season: Omarosa and Kwame. Omarosa Manigault-Stallworth, a former political appointee in the Clinton White House, was one of the most compelling characters on the show due to the continually escalating conflict between her and her teammates. Omarosa was "fired" on the March 4th episode after nine weeks of competition. Kwame Jackson, an African American former investment manager for Goldman Sachs and a Harvard MBA, remained in the competition until the final round. Over 40 million people[2] watched the last episode to see if finalist Kwame would beat out Bill Rancic, a White entrepreneur from Chicago, for the chance to run one of Trump's business ventures for the next year. Ultimately, Kwame was not chosen to be Trump's Apprentice.

Even if you've never seen an episode of *The Apprentice*, you've probably heard about the show and seen the contestants. During its run and after its conclusion, *The Apprentice* was discussed and analyzed in every sector, as millions of Americans gave armchair accounts of who they thought was the most deserving candidate for Trump's apprenticeship. On television, pundits pondered the leadership capabilities of the candidates. The show raised questions about leadership that we all love to debate: Are leaders born or made? When should leaders take charge and when should they delegate? Where should leaders draw the line between integrity and appealing to consumer tastes? And, of course, who are better business leaders, men or women?

But in the post-mortem discussions of *The Apprentice*, we have yet to hear the more challenging conversation around the underlying issues of race, gender, and class that scripted the group dynamics and created the true drama in this show. Regardless of whether they were ultimately hired or fired by Trump, how did Kwame and Omarosa fare in the face of these social forces? As two business school professors, we want to add our thoughts to the din of commentary on *The Apprentice*. As Black women, we offer this commentary because we believe it is important to examine the intersectionality of race, gender, and class evoked by the show,[3] to highlight the lessons and insights about success that we can take away.

We recommend that the most effective means for managing visibility is to adopt a combination of both approaches: knowing how to stand out in critical moments and slip under the radar when needed.

In this article, we discuss two frequently employed visibility strategies and their implications for minorities who choose to use them. We also offer our advice on how minorities can strategically manage their visibility most effectively in work organizations. We begin by contrasting the visibility strategies that Omarosa and Kwame employed in their quest to become the Apprentice. We use these individuals as the focal point of our article because, as the only African American woman and man on the show, they each chose a strategy strikingly different from the other's to manage their visibility in this contest. Ironically, their quest to become the Apprentice is not so far removed from the pathway that many minorities traverse as they climb up the corporate ladder. Likewise, the strategies that Omarosa and Kwame used to try to win this game are very familiar; they are archetypes of commonly offered advice for navigating the corporate arena. One strategy is to know how to stand out from the crowd; the alternative is to blend in and slip under the radar. In describing the rationale for using these strategies, we will also point out the challenges that accompany each, particularly when adopted by minorities (i.e., the only member or one of a few members of a racial, ethnic, cultural, or gender group) in organizational settings. We will illustrate the

dynamics that come into play as minorities adopt these visibility strategies of standing out and blending in, with a particular focus on the double bind that minorities face in making themselves visible in their work organizations. (In layman's terms, a double bind represents a situation where you are "damned if you do and damned if you don't.") In conclusion, we will offer a strategic approach to managing visibility that enables minorities to maximize the benefits and minimize the consequences of being noticed in their organizations. We recommend that the most effective means for managing visibility is to adopt a combination of both approaches: knowing how to stand out in critical moments and slip under the radar when needed. In taking a more nuanced, or "tempered," approach to managing visibility, African Americans,[4] and anyone operating as "the only" in his or her organization, will have a powerful tool to demonstrate competence, establish credibility, build connections, counter negative stereotypes, and stay true to themselves while playing the tournament game of career advancement.

Strategy #1: Standing Out from the Crowd

In her quest to become the Apprentice, Omarosa adopted a visibility strategy that is frequently emphasized in business school: learn how to make yourself stand out from the crowd. In this strategy, being a leader is associated with being out in front. This leader differentiates herself from colleagues by displaying a number of traits associated with being a leader, including intelligence, autonomy, aggressiveness, and self-confidence.[5]

This strategy makes sense for aspiring professionals. If you want to be noticed, you can't wait for someone else to pat your back; you have to take the initiative to let the world know how great you are. How many times have you been told to believe in yourself, promote yourself, and sing your own praises? After all, the squeaky wheel gets the grease, right? For minorities, these self-promoting behaviors are particularly important because of the many stereotypes that people associate with their identities. Minorities must be vigilant about ensuring that stereotypes about their lack of competence, initiative, social skills, and integrity don't cloud others' perceptions of their strengths and capabilities.[6] By standing out from the crowd, others can truly see what you have to offer and appreciate and respect you for what you bring to the table.

Risk Factor: Hypervisibility

Despite its benefits, this strategy of standing out can be risky for minorities in the workplace. By virtue of their status as tokens[7] in organizations, minorities already experience more visibility than their majority group colleagues. Although colleagues may not always acknowledge others' professional contributions, they certainly pay attention to the ways in which minorities are culturally different from them. So on *The Apprentice*, when Omarosa (an African American woman) used this strategy of standing out, she became *hypervisible*, rather than becoming credible and respected for her contributions as she'd hoped. There are several reactions to the minority professional who seeks and/or receives this heightened visibility: her every action is scrutinized; her judgment is questioned; her performance is evaluated closely and criticized vigorously. Small errors are held up as proof of this leader's incompetence rather than seen as opportunities to learn from mistakes and hone important skills.[8]

This hypervisibility also highlights the incongruence between what people expect from leaders and what they expect from minorities. U.S. society often equates "leadership potential" with being White/Anglo, masculine, heterosexual, middle-class, and well-educated. Therefore, when African American women, for example, stand out and show their leadership potential, they challenge the cultural stereotypes that ascribe leadership to White males. Their White and male counterparts are often put off by their displays of traditional leadership traits, and as a result their behavior is interpreted through a different lens: confidence is seen as arrogance, sharing accomplishments is deemed bragging, and seeking opportunities for advancement risks drawing accusations of not knowing their place.[9] Behavior that is labeled as competitive and winning in Whites may be labeled as antisocial and cruel for the sister doing the same thing. How many times have African American women been told—across situation, generation, time, and place—that their personal style is problematic?[10]

Once minorities gain visibility, the spiral toward hypervisibility can quickly gather momentum.[11] Unfortunately, minorities' own responses to this spiral of spotlighting and scrutiny may be far more damaging than the criticism or isolation that they might experience from coworkers. Some internalize others' criticism and begin to doubt their own competence. Others swing to the opposite extreme, and externalize any feedback they receive about how they might improve, interpreting it as an indicator of others' limitations instead of their own developmental needs.[12] In either scenario, minorities can deliberately distance themselves from others in their workplace and become extremely defensive and distrustful of their colleagues (even those colleagues who might be potential allies). Ultimately, some minorities may find themselves seeking visibility at any cost, perhaps playing into the exact stereotypes that they were initially trying to dispel for the sake of maintaining their visibility.[13] Once this downward spiral is underway, minorities can lose total sight of their initial desire to be recognized and respected for the professional contributions they've made to their team. They

begin to stand out because of the racial and gender differences that they have dramatized, instead of standing out on the basis of their competence and character.

Omarosa definitely succeeded in gaining visibility. In fact, anyone who talks about the first season of *The Apprentice* will probably remember more about her than they do about the winner, Bill, who is a White man. From our vantage point, it seemed as though, once Omarosa realized that she was not going to win the show's popularity contest, she began to play her own game of becoming that much more memorable during and after the show. Now that the show's competition is over, one might argue that Omarosa has become a caricature, holding all of the negative stereotypes, anger, and fear that this culture has of Black women.[14] We have all encountered a sister like Omarosa in our organization. She becomes more isolated, more frustrated, more defensive, and eventually she self-destructs by compromising the public respect and regard she sought in the first place. This outcome can, to some degree, be laid at the feet of our self-destructive sisters. But we must ask: what role did hypervisibility, and the accompanying reactions of everyone involved, play in creating the image we now carry away from this TV depiction of an aspiring African American female professional?

Strategy #2: Slipping Under the Radar

Apprentice contestant Kwame Jackson, on the other hand, adopted a strategy very different from Omarosa's. By week twelve of the show, many Americans were wondering how Kwame had made it so far. Few thought he'd win the competition, yet no one was hoping for him to fail, either. He had mastered the art of slipping under the radar. Rather than standing out like Omarosa, Kwame's strategy was to stay in the game, without becoming the center of every conversation or interaction. He was recently quoted in a *Black Enterprise* feature story as saying, "I've learned to wear the mask; I've learned to interact. I've learned to be myself, but, at the same time, I've learned how to move among the crowd."[15] Kwame was low-key and easygoing in nature throughout the show, including his trips to the Board Room where he had to articulate why he should not be fired. Kwame never raised his voice and never got ruffled, even when he was accused of being unethical at one point in the game.

Kwame faced the challenge that many who are "the only" or "one of a few" face as they enter organizations: how to build trust across dimensions of difference. We've all heard the adage, "it's all about who you know." Relationships are important, and as people come together in the enterprise of work, their success or failure hinges upon their ability to build trust among their colleagues and clients. When people

of color enter organizations, they are often unfamiliar to their White colleagues, so it takes some effort to build the level of trust and comfort that accompanies particularly effective interpersonal relationships.[16] In U.S. society—indeed, in most of the world—people from different cultural backgrounds remain unfamiliar to one another. It's as though we live in separate worlds altogether; oftentimes our only point of true connection is at work. The even bigger challenge is that none of us starts with a blank slate in our intercultural relationships. For example, even though African Americans and Whites don't live or socialize together much outside of work, they each still have firmly set ideas about each other's abilities, aspirations, and character. In the workplace, many African Americans have to counter the stereotypes and misconceptions that have been inculcated in U.S. society.[17]

What role did hypervisibility, and the accompanying reactions of everyone involved, play in creating the image we now carry away from this TV depiction of an aspiring African American female professional?

African American men in particular have to disarm the stereotype that they are a threatening, criminal menace to society.[18] Kwame knew that there was only one way for him to win the game—he had to render himself non-threatening. By virtue of his race, class, gender, and age, Kwame triggered many fears regarding young Black men and their presumed desire to upset the dominant power structure in the U.S. by any means necessary.[19] He had to make sure that his White colleagues, including Donald Trump, were not threatened by his dark hue, his impressive physical build, his obvious intelligence, and his impeccable pedigree. Perhaps you've encountered someone like Kwame in your organization: he operates behind the scenes. He offers praise and shares triumphs with other members of his team. You might even see him socializing on the weekends with his White colleagues. While Omarosa was the contestant who raised everyone's hackles because of her confrontational style, Kwame was the exact opposite in his ability to build consensus and soothe concerns.

This strategy of slipping under the radar also dovetails nicely with recent models of leadership that call for more cooperative and collaborative practices.[20] These new leaders are more concerned with harmonious group interactions and making the work evolve smoothly. They are more egalitarian in their interaction style and do not believe that being in the

spotlight is essential for effective leadership. This style of leadership, which recognizes the importance of traits that have typically been described as female, has been suggested as being particularly effective in times when increased flexibility and collaboration are crucial to effective management and when dealing with rapidly changing conditions.[21]

Risk Factor: Invisibility

There is no way that we can deny Kwame's success—out of over 200,000 people who applied to compete for the title of the Apprentice, he was one of the final two contestants. As of July 2004, he was deciding between numerous lucrative job offers and endorsement opportunities. Kwame accomplished all of this without denigrating anyone for the sake of his own success. So why was he fired?

As with Omarosa, a look at Kwame's quest to be the Apprentice reveals important gender-race dynamics. There are two dynamics in particular that are key to understanding why Kwame did not get the job. First, while there is talk of this new leadership model being the mode du jour, some of this talk may be rhetoric.[22] In times of stress, we still fall back on our old definition of a leader as the person who takes a stance, stepping forcefully out front to rise to the occasion. If someone appears to be unwilling to take a stand on important issues or is unable to create a sense of urgency in critical times, his leadership potential is called into question.

While competing on *The Apprentice*, Kwame adopted a leadership style that some may consider too feminine and which is incongruent with our society's expectations of traditional leadership.[23] While people are uncomfortable with a woman who takes on a masculine style of leadership, they really squirm when a man takes on a style characterized as feminine. Winners in our society are still defined as those who step forward and employ "killer strategies for trouncing the competition," as a recent Harvard Business Review article attests.[24] In the cutthroat world of business leadership, "emotional intelligence" skills like delegation and coaching are dismissed as impediments to winning.

Yet the most dangerous consequence of Kwame's style was that he slipped too far under the radar. When it was his moment to shine, he delegated critical tasks and trusted his teammates to get the job done. He was patient with their mistakes, and did not publicly denigrate or chastise them. His comfort-inducing, threat-reducing tendencies led him to avoid conflict, and his team's performance faltered. And what happens in organizations when "the only" is perceived to be underperforming and does not stand out for his accomplishments? He rapidly gets "disappeared."[25] In essence, he becomes invisible. We've all seen someone rendered invisible, whose suggestions are ignored or dismissed until offered by someone else. The invisible person is not introduced to key decision makers and power brokers; after all, he may not represent the organization as well as others. He isn't offered leadership opportunities, yet he's criticized for not being a leader. Kwame's easygoing style, which enabled him to achieve the success of becoming a finalist on *The Apprentice*, was ultimately given as the reason why he was not chosen for Trump's dream job.

Viewers of the final episode also saw a sociohistorical drama playing out on their television screens: the charged interaction representing conflict and tension between upwardly mobile African American women and men.[26] In this episode, Trump asked Kwame why he didn't fire his "employee" Omarosa, who had lied to Kwame about following through on her assigned tasks. Most viewers were likely wondering the same thing: why didn't Kwame step forward, take charge, and "handle" Omarosa when she bungled her important assignments during his final test? The underlying question was, "How can Kwame be trusted to handle a multimillion-dollar business if he can't even handle his counterpart—the African American woman?" Perhaps Kwame understood the consequences for him and for other African American professionals if he had engaged in a heated, televised confrontation with Omarosa in front of "The Man" and "The Woman." Many African American professionals appreciated the fact that Kwame opted not to showcase Black-on-Black conflict for millions of viewers, as they try to keep negative representations of African Americans behind closed doors and away from the broader, majority-White U.S. society. Besides, who's to say that Kwame would have won even if he had confronted Omarosa? An angry confrontation with her, or with anyone else on his team, could have easily triggered the very fears about the "threatening Black man" that Kwame had worked so hard to avoid. If he had confronted her, he might then have crossed over into the land of hypervisibility, joining Omarosa as a racialized object of public scrutiny. In the final analysis, we see that there is always a delicate dance between hypervisibility and invisibility.

A Nuanced Approach: Tempering Your Visibility

What we can learn from Omarosa's and Kwame's choices of visibility strategies is that using either one exclusively is risky, as standing out can lead to hypervisibility and blending in can lead to invisibility. In the next section of this article, we offer a more nuanced approach to managing visibility, one that leaves space for the user to rely on her internal compass in determining what is right and what just doesn't make sense. We call this concept *tempered visibility*. We take "tempered" from our colleagues Debra Meyerson and Maureen Scully:

We chose the word tempered because of its multiple meanings…These people are tempered…in that they have become tougher by being alternately heated up and cooled down. They are also tempered in the sense that they have a temper: they are angered by the incongruities between their own values and beliefs about social justice and the values and beliefs they see enacted in their organizations. Temper can mean both "an outburst of rage" and "equanimity, composure," seemingly incongruous traits…[27]

We suggest that this strategy of tempered visibility represents the best aspects of the two options of "standing out" and "blending in" noted above. What does a leader who is using tempered visibility look like? Leaders who engage in tempered visibility know how to pick their battles and when to concede in order to win the war. They have a well-developed repertoire of strategies for ensuring that people pay attention to the right things—namely, their competence and their character—rather than racial stereotypes. They know how to speak eloquently on a position and how to translate what matters to multiple constituents so that all can hear their message. They know how to be visible enough such that their views are respected and heard, yet not so visible that they are discounted as "whining," "angry," or someone with a "chip on their shoulder." They are turned to as people who can note systemic inequities and injustices in organizations, and who can work constructively to address them. As such, leaders who employ tempered visibility are valuable and productive members of their organizations, acting as sources of change and transformation.

People who successfully temper their visibility pay attention to three dimensions: exposure, timing, and content. By tempering their visibility along these three dimensions, they are better able to safeguard against spinning into the cycle of hypervisibility or vanishing into the orbit of invisibility. Tempering exposure enables people to vary the length of time that they spend on center stage, in the wings, and backstage. In so doing, they moderate the amount of time that others are focused on them, so that they are not always the center of attention. Additionally, those who are successful in tempering their visibility are strategic about the moments they select to take up center stage, choosing to stand out only when they are able to display their strengths and contributions effectively. They learn constantly and ask colleagues for assistance when necessary, but they do not seek visibility for visibility's sake. It is not important that everyone pay attention to them all the time, but rather that the right people pay attention to them at the right time. Finally, people who successfully manage their visibility are keenly aware of the qualities—or the content—they want others to see in them, and they are careful to display these qualities when

given the right opportunity. They sidestep the mistake of feeling that they are overexposed and vulnerable to others' interpretations of their life stories. They also safeguard themselves against others' attributions that they might be antisocial or secretive, because they are comfortable with sharing certain facets of their work and/or life with others.

Leaders who employ tempered visibility are valuable and productive members of their organizations, acting as sources of change and transformation.

Risk Factor: Falling From the Tightrope

While the strategy of tempered visibility may be a good middle ground for minorities in the workplace, employing it can nonetheless lead to some costly consequences. Being tempered means staying inside of an organization where in some critical ways you don't necessarily fit. Patricia Hill Collins describes African American women as living in two worlds, constantly engaging in a series of negotiations to reconcile the contradictions between their self-images and their marginalized status in organizations.[28] In Hill Collins' words, they are "outsiders within," meaning that they have access to the processes and power of the inner group, but they will never totally belong. This "outsider within" status may mean that, as a minority, you have to initially hide some parts of yourself in order to make sure you don't threaten other people who are not ready to receive all of you. Over time, as you build trust, you can reveal as much of yourself as you are comfortable sharing with your colleagues, with less worries about potential threat. But along the way, you may begin to resent that you do not have the same freedom as your colleagues to openly publicize your accomplishments and claim sole responsibility for your organizational contributions. This can lead to feelings of alienation from your colleagues, and a sense that you cannot be authentic in your organization.

There are other challenges to tempering visibility. Meyerson and Scully suggest that those using a tempered approach are seen through many lenses because they are in communication with so many different constituencies.[29] When you temper your visibility, colleagues in your organization may perceive you to be duplicitous and manipulative. Such perceptions of inauthenticity can detract from the quality of your relationships and subsequent career advancement.[30] And of course, you will never be able to please everyone: some in the organization may perceive you as a hypocrite, some will

think you're not visible enough, and others will think you're too visible. When your co-workers are used to your invisibility, it might throw them out of kilter when you make yourself known. Even with this moderated visibility, there will still be some people who are not happy with how you take your stance.

And finally, there is a tremendous amount of emotional work associated with using the tempered visibility strategy. You may experience feelings of doubt and anger as you deal with the micro-inequities visited upon minorities in their everyday journeys in organizations.[31] Your status as an "outsider within" can wear away at your self-esteem and general well-being. Because those who temper their visibility are constantly negotiating three or more worlds (center stage, back stage, and in the wings), it can be challenging to find a comfortable space in any of them. As a result, if you choose to use the tempered visibility strategy, you may experience feelings of isolation. You may even find yourself torn between your desire for public recognition of your gifts and talents, and your worries that you will be burned by the heat of the spotlight when your every action is scrutinized. In these moments, it can be hard to decide whether you want to be visible or invisible in your organization. In many ways, you are walking a tightrope, trying to negotiate numerous personal and professional dilemmas and paradoxes. But there are tactics you can employ to keep from falling off the tightrope; we suggest some below.

Keeping Your Balance with Tempered Visibility

If you choose to temper your visibility, there are several tried and true tactics you can adopt to help address the challenges mentioned above.

1. Establish your network of allies. An important factor will be the relationships that you build—you need to have allies in all quarters of your organization. Through talking with African American women in organizations of all types, we have learned that one tactic that has aided them immeasurably is having people who support them when they are not in the room. Who has your back in your organization? Who is really concerned about your advancement and achievement, and will advocate and work on your behalf during important company decisions? Who will stand up and make sure that others pay attention to your strengths and contributions, so that the burden of promoting yourself doesn't always fall on your shoulders? The importance of mentors, sponsors, allies, and friends cannot be underestimated.[32] For minority professionals, this may mean that you have supporters inside of your organization as well as a cadre of support ready on the outside.[33]

2. Keep track of your internal compass. As you gain visibility and notoriety in your organization, it is critical that you always keep sight of your own "true north," especially at critical junctures.[34] Don't stand out just for the sake of standing out; instead, be clear about what you stand for and know what you absolutely refuse to condone. Those who act in accordance with their "true selves" are more likely to experience the psychological, relational, and professional benefits of authenticity in the work place.[35] As management professors, we counsel our students to strengthen their sense of self-awareness while they are cocooned in our classrooms, as they will be faced with challenges to their personal beliefs, values, and wisdom on a daily basis once they are back out in the "real world." In the face of this barrage, minorities are best served by being aware of the strengths they bring to the table as well as the personal boundaries that both hold in what is important and keep out what is not important to them.[36]

3. Take ownership of your identity. We should be clear— we believe that relying on any of these options to gain the approval of those in power may leave you in a perilous position. In fact, we have presented the formula for a double bind—standing out from the crowd can leave you in danger of becoming hypervisible, while trying to blend in may render you invisible. It is indeed difficult to walk the fine line of tempered visibility. Incongruence with the image of leader leaves minorities susceptible to others' tendencies to box them into racial and gender stereotypes instead of seeing their leadership potential.

In the face of these challenges, remember that you are the sole owner of your identity, and therefore you are in charge of your visibility. This means that you get to decide *when* you "show up" to the table, *how* you show up, and *what rules you will follow* as you play the game. It is crucial be strategic about when and how you present yourself. As you consider how to manage your visibility, there are three important questions that you must ask yourself:

1. How visible do I want to be? This question refers to the duration of your visibility. Be sure to avoid overexposure, so that the life of the organization does not always revolve around your thoughts and actions.

2. When do I want to be visible? This question refers to the timing of your visibility. Be sure to pick the right

moments to be in the spotlight, when you can truly shine because you are at your best.

3. What do I want to make visible? This question refers to the content of your visibility. It is your job to make sure that your audience is paying attention to the right things about you. You get to choose what you share with other people; you do not have to put every detail of your personal life on public record. Decide in advance which aspects of your story you are comfortable sharing with others.

Our final word is a reminder that your internal peace won't come from anyone's approval but your own. First and foremost, you must consider how you appear to yourself. You must monitor your own behavior, making sure that your strategies for success are just that, and not tools for sabotaging yourself or anyone else. And finally, you must be sure that you can look in the mirror every morning and every night, and be proud of the leadership contributions that you have made to your organization and to your community.

In the face of these challenges, remember that you are the sole owner of your identity, and therefore you are in charge of your visibility. This means that you get to decide when you "show up" to the table, how you show up, and what rules you will follow as you play the game.

Conclusion

In this article, we have drawn upon lessons learned from the first season of *The Apprentice* regarding the costs and benefits of two frequently employed strategies for managing visibility: 1) standing out and 2) blending in. The danger of the former strategy is that it can quickly lead to hypervisibility, where people are paying attention to the wrong things, while the latter can lead to invisibility, where people aren't paying attention to you at all. Many minorities fall into the trap of becoming chronically invisible or chronically hypervisible because they do not know how to pick the right moments to shine and how to make sure the right qualities and characteristics are exposed in a given situation. We do not mean to suggest that minorities who suffer from hypervisibility or invisibility should be blamed for experiencing this dilemma. On the contrary, we acknowledge that the intergroup dynamics that accompany race, gender, and class differences often create significant challenges for minorities who wish to

have their capabilities and contributions acknowledged in their organizations.

We have written this article to provide helpful guidance for minorities who wish to assume a proactive stance in managing their visibility, so that they can ensure that their favorable qualities and characteristics will have greater exposure in their workplaces. In order to release the double bind of visibility and avoid overexposure (hypervisibility) or underexposure (invisibility), we recommend that minority professionals temper their visibility: continually search your context for cues about when the time might be right to step into center stage and when it might be wiser to remain backstage or in the wings. In conclusion, we remind you to stay in touch with your internal compass; let it guide your decisions about how to manage your visibility, so that you don't shortchange your right to be recognized as a substantive contributor to your organization's success.

Endnotes

[1] According to http://www.nbc.com/The_Apprentice/about/index.html (8/30/04).

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] Holvino, E. 2001. *Complicating gender: The simultaneity of race, gender, and class in organization change(ing)*. CGO Working Paper #14. Boston, MA: Center for Gender in Organizations, Simmons School of Management; Blake-Beard, S. 2001. *CGO Insights #10, Mentoring relationships through the lens of race and gender.* Boston, MA: Center for Gender in Organizations, Simmons School of Management.

[4] At several points in this article, we specifically reference the African American experience because we have chosen Omarosa and Kwame as focal characters in this piece to illustrate the dynamics of visibility. However, we certainly believe that other racial and ethnic minorities, and women in some cases, face similar dilemmas with respect to managing visibility.

[5] Kirkpatrick, S.A. & Locke, E.A. 1991. "Leadership: Do traits matter?" *Academy of Management Executive.* 5(2), 48-60; Rosenfeld, P., Giacalone, R.A., & Riordan, C.A. 1995. *Impression Management in Organizations: Theory, Measurement and Practice.* New York: Routledge.

[6] Livers, A.B. & Caver, K.A. 2003. *Leading in Black and White: Working Across the Racial Divide in Corporate America.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass and the Center for Creative Leadership; Cose, E. 1993. *The Rage of a Privileged Class.* New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers; Heilman, M.E. 2001. "Description and prescription: How gender stereotypes prevent women's ascent up the organizational ladder." *Journal of Social Issues.* 57(4), 657-674; Heilman, M.E., Block, C.J., Martell, R.F., & Simon, M.C. 1989. "Has anything changed? Current characterizations of men, women, and managers." *Journal of Applied Psychology.* 74(6), 935-942.

[7] Rosabeth Moss Kanter describes tokens as "solos, the only one of their kind present." Several effects of token status include being the object of increased attention and increased visibility, as well as isolation. Kanter, R.M. 1977. *Men and Women of the Corporation.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

[8] Kram, K.E. & Hampton, M.M. 1998. "When women lead: The visibility-vulnerability spiral." In E.B. Klein, F. Gabelnick, & P. Herr (Eds.), *The Psychodynamics of Leadership.* Madison, CT: Psychosocial Press.

[9] Livers, A.B. & Caver, K.A. 2003. *op. cit.*

[10] In their ground-breaking book *Our Separate Ways*, authors Ella Bell and Stella Nkomo recount several examples where African American professional women have been challenged to modify their personal styles. From these stories, we learn that for Omarosa, and for many other Black women, standing out can mean standing alone. Bell, E.L.J.E. & Nkomo, S. 2001. *Our Separate Ways: Black and White Women and the Struggle for Professional Identity*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

[11] Kram, K.E. & Hampton, M.M. 1998. *op. cit.*

[12] Roberson, L., Deitch, E.A., Brief, A.P., & Block, C.J. 2003. "Stereotype threat and feedback seeking in the workplace." *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 62(1), 176-188.

[13] Livers, A.B. & Caver, K.A. 2003. *op. cit.*; Ely, R. 1995. "The power in demography: Women's social constructions of gender identity at work." *Academy of Management Journal*. 38(3), 589-634.

[14] A recent article in *Essence* magazine illustrates how Omarosa has become a receptacle for many of the negative stereotypes attributed to Black women. Edwards, A. 2004. "The Big O." *Essence*. 35(3), 124. See also Mary Mitchell's column "Show finds black woman who feeds all the stereotypes." *Chicago Sun Times*, April 13, 2004.

[15] Edmond, Jr., A.A. 2004. "Make-or-break leadership lessons from *The Apprentice*." *Black Enterprise*. 34(10), 108-114.

[16] Blake-Beard, S.D. 2001. "Taking a hard look at formal mentoring programs: A consideration of potential challenges facing women." *Journal of Management Development*. 20(4), 331-345; Thomas, D.A. 2001. "The truth about mentoring minorities: Race matters." *Harvard Business Review*. 79(4), 98-107.

[17] Parker, P.S. & ogilvie, dt. 1996. "Gender, culture, and leadership: Toward a culturally distinct model of African-American women executives' leadership strategies." *Leadership Quarterly*. 7(2), 189-214.

[18] Grier, W.H. & Cobbs, P.M. 1992 [1968]. *Black Rage*. New York, NY: Basic Books; Livers, A.B. & Caver, K.A. 2003. *op. cit.*; Cose, E. 2002. *The Envy of the World: On Being a Black Man in America*. New York, NY: Washington Square Press; Fernandez, J.P. 1998. *Race, Gender and Rhetoric: The True State of Race and Gender in Corporate America*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

[19] Grier, W.H. & Cobbs, P.M. 1992. *op. cit.*; Livers, A.B. & Caver, K.A. 2003. *op. cit.*; Cose, E. 2002. *op. cit.*

[20] Helgesen, S. 1990. *The Female Advantage: Women's Ways of Leadership*. New York, NY: Doubleday Currency; Goleman, D. 1998. "What makes a leader?" *Harvard Business Review*. 76(6), 93-102.

[21] Fletcher, J.K. 2003. *The paradox of post-heroic leadership: Gender matters*. CGO Working Paper #17. Boston, MA: Center for Gender in Organizations, Simmons School of Management.

[22] Fletcher (2002) describes how society naturally associates the use of relational skills with femininity and powerlessness. White men may be able to use such skills successfully, given that they are categorized as the prototypical leader and power-holder. Yet an African American male who uses such strategies might reinforce subtle associations regarding powerlessness. Fletcher, J.K. 2002. *CGO Insights #13, The greatly exaggerated demise of heroic leadership: Gender, power, and the myth of the female advantage*. Boston, MA: Center for Gender in Organizations, Simmons School of Management; Khurana, R. 2002. "The curse of the superstar CEO." *Harvard Business Review*. 80(9), 60-66.

[23] Williams talks about how the social pressures on men produce gendered behavior; men are being evaluated on their ability to present the classic management style. Williams, J. 2000. *Unbending Gender: Why Family and Work Conflict and What to Do About It*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

[24] Stalk, Jr., G. & Lachenauer, R. 2004. "Hardball: Five killer strategies for trouncing the competition." *Harvard Business Review*. 82(4), 62-71.

[25] Ralph Ellison eloquently describes this process of becoming invisible in his haunting story *Invisible Man*. 1952. New York, NY: Random House; Fletcher, J.K. 1999. *Disappearing Acts: Gender, Power and Relational Practice at Work*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

[26] Cole, J.B. & Guy-Sheftall, B. 2003. *Gender Talk: The Struggle for Women's Equality in African American Communities*. New York, NY: Ballantine Books.

[27] Meyerson, D. & Scully, M. 1995. "Tempered radicalism and the politics of ambivalence and change." *Organization Science*. 6(5), 585-600.

[28] Collins, P.H. 1990. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. New York, NY: Routledge. See also Bell, E.L. 1990. "The bicultural life experience of career-oriented black women." *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 11(6), 459-477.

[29] Meyerson, D. & Scully, M. 1995. *op. cit.*

[30] Rosenfeld, P., Giacalone, R. & Riordan, C. 2001. *op. cit.*

[31] Cose, E. 1993. *op. cit.*

[32] Blake-Beard, S.D. 2003. *CGO Insights #15, Critical trends and shifts in the mentoring experiences of professional women*. Boston, MA: Center for Gender in Organizations, Simmons School of Management.

[33] David Thomas and Jack Gabarro, in their seminal book *Breaking Through*, found that the minority professionals who attain top-level executive positions are those who have differentiated networks—people both within and outside of their workplaces, from diverse racial and gender backgrounds—to support them. Thomas, D., & Gabarro, J.J. 1999. *Breaking Through: The Making of Minority Executives in Corporate America*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

[34] In David Thomas's work on minority professionals, he finds that those who manage to overcome a rocky start and ascend to the highest levels of success are characterized by an ability to look inward and get their message about themselves internally. Thomas, D. 2001. *op. cit.*

[35] Roberts, L.M. Forthcoming. "Changing faces: Professional image construction in diverse organizations." *Academy of Management Review*; Kahn, W.A. 1992. "To be fully there: Psychological presence at work." *Human Relations*. 45(4), 321-349; Ibarra, H. 1999. "Provisional selves: Experimenting with image and identity in professional adaptation." *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 44(4), 764-791.

[36] Bell, E.L.J.E. & Nkomo, S.M. 1998. "Armoring: Learning to withstand racial oppression." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*. 29(2), 285-295.