WOMEN AND THE GLASS CEILING*


The author contends that the glass ceiling women executives encounter is the result of discrimination. She focuses on six categories in which sex bias occurs: informal culture; recruitment and selection; gender segregation of roles and responsibilities; performance appraisal; promotion; and salary allocation. In general, the more subjective and informal procedures are in these areas, the more likely sex bias will enter into the decision-making process. Auster suggests: careful monitoring to ensure that women's initial placements in the company are in positions that are as advantageous as men's; increasing women's visibility in their work assignments; making information about promotion opportunities easily accessible; and standardizing methods for combining data and information about candidates under consideration for promotion.


The author maintains that the attitudes and interpersonal skills women develop during their primary socialization in the family are inappropriate for high level managers. Girls are less likely than boys to learn to use power in interpersonal relationships, and it is the motivation to acquire and exercise power that sets apart successful from unsuccessful management candidates. Both boys and girls learn that women should occupy a position in the family ("ascribed status") subordinate to men, and this attitude is applied to women in corporations. Organizations concerned with affirmative action must facilitate the resocialization of women aspiring to be managers.


Data from 1982 to 1987 about 2,000 women executives and their current placement and distribution with respect to position, industry, age, education, and geographical area are used to predict when and where the first female chief executives will appear. The authors expect that no more than 2% of the top positions at major corporations will be held by women in the near future.

Gallo, Liz R. Women like us: what is happening to the women of the Harvard Business School, Class of '75—the women who had the first chance to

* Prepared by Linda Oppenheim, Assistant Librarian, Industrial Relations Library.
** Items on this list should be ordered directly from the publisher. Addresses are given in connection with each reference.

Gulleson interviewed eighty-two women from the Class of '75 (the first to be fully ten percent women) and writes at length about six who represent different patterns of executive women's lives. Their stories illustrate the difficulty women encounter in balancing personal needs with corporate work demands and the sacrifices they must make to achieve their primary career goals. Only one interviewee stated clearly that she wanted to become chief executive officer of a major American corporation, and the author describes her as being most likely to reach the top of the corporate ladder. Despite her desire and skill, however, this executive encountered a ceiling on her progress, because as a woman she is not perceived by her male superiors as a good "fit" for top level manager.


Using interviews with a wide spectrum of women of all ages, working at various levels in companies, two vice presidents present a model "life cycle" of women managers and examine how the myths and expectations women bring to the workplace change at different stages in their careers. Chapter 7, "Success and corporate betrayal" (pp. 209-238), focuses on the glass ceiling. Among the reasons the authors give for its existence are: 1) With the narrowing of opportunity towards the top of the corporate pyramid, men who have previously been supportive are now threatened by their female peers and subordinates who are competitors for a small number of positions; 2) There is a double standard of performance for men and women; behavior considered acceptable or admirable in men is seen as unacceptable in women; 3) One woman's failure is often institutionalized as gender failure, preventing other women from being promoted.


This three-year study comparing women's and men's advancement in management concludes that: 1) Women and men resemble each other in their need for achievement, affiliation, power, dominance, self-esteem, their motivation to manage and in the barriers and dilemmas they experience as they are promoted, such as vague career plans, limited access to mentors, and career roadblocks; 2) Sex bias does not decrease as the number of women in management increases; 3) The same managerial characteristics and experiences for men and women are perceived and interpreted differently, often to the detriment of the women managers.


The author of Men and women of the corporation (Harper Collins Publishers, Order Dept., Keystone Industrial Park, Scranton, PA 18512, $14.95, paper) finds that the major hypotheses of this classic work are still valid ten years after its publication. Productivity, motivation, and career success are determined largely by the organizational structure and social context of the workplace, not by inherent differences between the motivations or abilities of individuals. While men and women behave similarly when given similar opportunities, women are seldom given the same opportunities as men. Kanter believes that the progress that has been made will continue because of the increasing number of corporations actively involving employees in the decision-making process, the employment of women in all occupations, the growth of two-career families, the demise of the "women's auxiliary" of unpaid corporate wives, the changing role of the secretary, the growing
representation of women in entry- and mid-level managerial positions, the
formation of networks of professional and managerial women, and the re-
vision of subjective and unfair personnel practices. Kanter admits that the
glass ceiling still keeps women from the highest level positions. Downsizing
the work force has eliminated managerial positions and opportunities in
traditional industries. In the newer, high-tech industries, women are often
shut out of the communication and power networks of male-dominated tech-
nical peer groups.

Mackay, Malcolm and Debra Noumair. *Men, women, and leadership in
the American corporation.* New York, NY 10166. Russell Reynolds As-
sociates (200 Park Ave.) 1990. 60 pp. $25.00, paper.

In this study of 164 male and female high-level executives in large corpo-
rations, 47% of the female executives displayed leadership characteristics
compared with 39% of the male executives; these women were more likely
to work for companies that include women on their boards. Other findings
included: 67% of the leadership-style women had faced hostility from their
superiors, while only 2% of the men believed that such gender-based ten-
sion existed; one-third of the women said that their companies actively en-
couraged their career development compared to three-quarters of the men.
Among the study's recommendations was that corporations look at talented
women in both line and staff positions for candidates for CEO or president.

Morrison, Ann M., Randall P. White, and Ellen Van Velsor. *Breaking
the glass ceiling: can women reach the top of America's largest corporations?*
Reading, MA 01867. Addison-Wesley (Order Dept., 1 Jacob Way).

The Center for Creative Leadership conducted a three-year study of top
women executives in Fortune 100-sized companies. The authors inter-
viewed 76 women general managers and higher-level executives (male and
female) to determine why female managers succeed or fail. They found that,
in addition to intelligence and hard work, women who succeed need credi-
bility through prestigious accomplishment, the advocacy of an influential
superior, and luck. The three main barriers keeping women from senior
management were the difficulty in getting line positions, conflicting expec-
tations about the masculinity and femininity of their behavior, and lack of
support. The authors conclude that barriers to women's advancement in
large corporations will continue to impede progress for several more dec-
ades. In a more recent article, "Women and minorities in management"
(American Psychologist, February, 1990, pp. 200-208), Morrison and
Mary Ann Von Glinow cite research suggesting that discrimination, both
by majority individuals and by the policies and practices of organizations,
accounts for the lack of female and minority advancement.

(Box 2440, Costa Mesa, CA 92628), April, 1990. pp. 96-105. $3.00,
reprint.

The first half of this article reviews the causes for the stalled careers of many
women and minority managers. The last part presents the examples of
Corning and Honeywell as two corporations that have actively sought so-
lutions to the glass ceiling problem. Corning has established numerical
goals for increasing the number of women and black executives; given man-
gers the responsibility for assigning black and women executive recruits
positions that are key for their career advancement; incorporated discussion
of career development and both employee's and supervisor's diversity-sup-
port performance into the annual performance review; developed an array
of family support benefits; and instituted mandatory diversity awareness
programs. Honeywell's executive talent committee reviews the progress of
high potential women and minorities and ensures that they gain experience
in departments across the company.

Do women face barriers to advancement at the highest levels of management? This article presents opposing viewpoints. For those who believe that there are no barriers, the explanation for the lack of women senior executives is that women have not been in the managerial pipeline long enough to have gained appropriate experience to be promoted to senior management; women's greatest barrier is their own impatience. Other self-imposed barriers include low aspirations and poor career management. The other viewpoint is that both conscious and unconscious discrimination against women executives still pervade male-dominated corporations. Opinions also vary about the role companies should play in promoting the advancement of women to high level positions. Some people support women-only training programs or special policies and procedures, while others feel gender-based practices label women as inferior and needing special accommodation.


Focusing on law firms, Spurr provides some of the hard data that have been lacking to compare the promotions of women and men. Based on a sample of women who entered the legal profession between 1969 and 1973 and in 1980, this empirical study shows that women were half as likely as men to be promoted from associate to partner; the probability of partnership for women was 17.9%, for men 38.6%. Spurr could find no significant difference in quality between male and female lawyers, based on the quality of the law school attended or the achievement of academic distinction while at law school. Also, production standards for women were found to be much higher than for men. While the results strongly suggest discrimination as an explanation for the promotional differential, other hypotheses to be explored are: women exert less effort to attain partnership, given that the likelihood of promotion is low; or that the higher standards of production are used by firms to "weed out" women who would likely leave after promotion because of the demands of family life.


A survey of Service 500 and Fortune 500 CEOs and human resource officers presents evidence that erroneous preconceptions about female employees act as barriers to the promotion of women managers. The report also points to the retention of women employees as a problem companies need to address. Human resource officers have not yet connected cost containment with the need to retain women managers in whom the companies have made a considerable investment. The most successful programs combine work and family benefits with flexibility in scheduling and location of workplace.


Woody polled fifty senior women managers in Fortune 500 companies and found that informal processes—power struggles and political alliances—dominate the selection of top corporate executives. Most companies have an uncoordinated collection of programs for developing their managers rather than a systematic human resources policy that takes into account the special status of women. In this context, the most effective advancement strategies for women were numerical goals set by top management and the opening of line positions to women.