
Women and the Glass Ceiling in the American Workplace:

Describing the Phenomenon and Its Internal and External Causes

Eva Har-Even

"If we are to achieve a richer culture, rich in contrasting values, we must recognize the whole gamut of human potentialities, and so weave a less arbitrary social fabric, one in which each diverse human gift will find a fitting place."

—Margaret Mead

This statement was made in 1935, and its profound and lasting importance is underscored by appearing in two out of the four reports of the Federal Glass Ceiling Commission of the U.S. Department of Labor, chaired by the Secretary of Labor. The commission was created as part of the Civil Rights Act of 1991, and sunset on November 21, 1995, after a four-year mission to conduct a study and prepare recommendations regarding the elimination of artificial barriers to the advancement of women and minorities, and to provide them with opportunities and development experiences in management.

The commission's reports define the glass ceiling as artificial barriers that are based on bias in attitudes of individuals and organizations, and that prevent the advancement of individuals into management positions that they qualify for. The glass ceiling disregards merit and achievement, by reinforcing barriers that are discriminatory in nature. The commission's reports make a strong point in asserting that not only is it morally and legally wrong, but that companies can't afford glass ceilings. Due to a competitive global marketplace, companies need to promote the most qualified people, regardless of gender, color, race, or national origin. In the last report, Robert B. Reich, the chair of the commission, says,

"The glass ceiling denies millions of Americans opportunities for economic and personal advancement (1995)." He also claims that during the past 15 years, most of the economic growth of the nation went to the wealthiest fifth of households, while incomes have fallen for the poor and reached a plateau for the middle class. Reich assigns the blame for two major "fault lines" between winners and losers, namely, access to education and discrimination (the glass ceiling in particular)

Even though women are not the only group who encounters discrimination, the focus here will be on how the internal and external causes for the glass ceiling affect women in the workplace, be it in business, government, the media, or the professions.

The "glass ceiling" is a concept that became popular in its usage in the 1980s, and it describes invisible obstacles so subtle that they are as transparent as glass, yet so strong that they are impenetrable for women to move up to higher levels of management.

The "glass ceiling" is a concept that became popular in its usage in the 1980s, and it describes invisible obstacles so subtle that they are as transparent as glass, yet so strong that they are impenetrable for women to move up to higher levels of management.

Eva A. Har-Even is Senior Vice President and Regional Quality Director for Manchester's Tri-State Region. She is a senior career planning, management, and development professional with an extensive background working in a leadership and consulting capacity with human capital consulting, corporate, academic, and non-profit organizations. Eva has a master's degree from New York University in counseling, with a career counseling concentration.

As a result, women have a full view of the top of the organization, but if they try to move up there, they hit the invisible shield. The glass ceiling exists at different levels in different industries or organizations, even though originally it meant a barrier to entry into top-level management positions only. Judith Lorber (1993) in her essay about the inequality women physicians face in their profession, squarely assigns the blame for the phenomenon to sexism. She claims that sexism permeates men's attitudes and hinders women's career mobility. Tannen (1994) agrees with this view, but correctly adds that sexism tells us where we are, but not how we got there, or how to get out. I cover all three issues here.

Many executives (mostly men) believe that there is no glass ceiling, but rather a pipeline problem. Women, according to them, have not been in management positions long enough to reach positions at the top (Tannen, 1994). This opinion is corroborated by a Catalyst survey of CEOs who claim that it is only a matter of time that women will have an equal share of management positions on all levels, because their advancement is at the same rate as men's, but they are latecomers into the work force and their current status reflects it. Contrary to this view, the evidence I have found in my readings repeatedly confirms the existence of the glass ceiling phenomenon in women's professional lives.

Representation of Women in the Work Force

The readings provided a wealth of statistical data on women's unequal representation and advancement into higher positions in every field. According to the 1991 Glass Ceiling Commission report, from 1979 to 1989 women's representation in the top executive positions of the 1000 largest American corporations rose from 3% to 5%.

The readings provided a wealth of statistical data on women's unequal representation and advancement into higher positions in every field. According to the 1991 Glass Ceiling Commission report, from 1979 to 1989 women's representation in the top executive positions of the 1000 largest American corporations rose from 3% to 5%.

A 1991 survey of 94 Fortune 1000 companies found women comprised 37% of employees, 17% of managers, but only 6.5% of executive-level managers (Tannen, 1994). A recent *Business Week* survey indicated that in the top 1000 corporations, all (but one) CEOs are men (Powell and Butterfield,

1994). Women comprise 2.6% of 6,500 corporate officers in Fortune 500 companies, 18% of state administrative heads, 5% of city managers, 16% of all state legislators (Bullard and Wright, 1993). In the Federal Government, in 1990, of 150 senior executive service (SES) positions, women filled 29 (or 19%). At the same time, there was a total of 10% women in SES positions (Powell and Butterfield, 1994). In public education, 3.7% of superintendents in 1988 were women (Hill and Ragland, 1995). Morrison and Van Glinow (1990) in their article about women and minorities in management, say that based on a study from 1986 of colleges and universities, only 1.1% of the top positions of deans and above, were occupied by women. Women, according to them, occupy a third of all management positions, but this ratio is misleading, because most of them are stuck in jobs with little authority and low pay relative to men at the same level. Snyder, et al, (1991) quote the results of a study done in 1984, of 400 California firms demonstrating that 59% of firms were completely sex segregated. They also claim, as many others do, and as seen by the data presented here, that women are overrepresented in lower organizational levels and underrepresented in higher levels. The last report of the Glass Ceiling Commission, from November 1995, provides the latest statistics and accompanying commentary by Robert Reich. He says, "The executive suite is still overwhelmingly a white man's world." He presents the fact that half of all master's degrees are presently earned by women, yet in Fortune 1000 industrial companies and Fortune 500 service companies, 95% of senior-level managers are men, and 97% of these men are white. This is at a time when 57% of workers are women, minorities, or both.

Not only is the glass ceiling manifested in the positions that women occupy, but also by the lower pay that they receive for the same work that men perform. Additionally, their title is changed and diminishes in its value, they report to a lower executive than a man in the same position thus undermining their executive power, and once they penetrate a male-dominated profession, the entire profession loses prestige as well as income level, and becomes "feminized" (Lorber, 1993).

In the 1991 report of the Glass Ceiling Commission, one of the findings was that even when women advanced in their positions, the titles they received were inconsistent with those of men's throughout all businesses and industries, and the levels of their salaries were inconsistent with their titles. The report also quotes a study of women in corporate management, conducted by Catalyst in 1990, that showed that in some fields, such as financial services, women attained higher percentages in all levels of management than in either durable goods or non-durable manufacturing. In the Commission's third report (1995), the industries that

employed almost the same number of women and men in management positions were business services, finance/insurance/real estate, and retail.

... the industries that employed almost the same number of women and men in management positions were business services, finance/insurance/real estate, and retail.

The majority of workers in all these fields were women, except in retail where the numbers were about the same both for workers and managers. The industries where the percentages of male managers were overwhelmingly higher than female managers, were manufacturing, transportation, public utilities, communication, and wholesale trade. Public administration had a somewhat lower differential, but it is still a male-dominated industry in both general and management positions. The report provides the findings of a Catalyst survey of women in the private sector being concentrated in staff positions that are traditionally female, such as human resources, corporate communications, community and government relations, and the staff side of marketing and finance. Certain professions are predominantly staffed by women, including management positions. Some of the female fields are public education, social work, nursing, etc. Even in these fields, the top positions are still mostly occupied by men (Levinson, 1996).

Recognition and Compensation

Hill and Ragland in their 1995 book about women as leaders in the field of education, elaborate on the role of a job label in the level of compensation. Women receive different titles for similar duties, hindering their future advancement and pay scale. In public education, for example, women will often be called "supervisors;" men in similar roles are "directors" or "associate superintendents." Women receive less pay for the same type of work.

In public education, women will often be called "supervisors;" men in similar roles are "directors" or "associate superintendents." Women receive less pay for the same type of work.

Another glass ceiling phenomenon is expressed in the commission's initial report (1991). Female executives are very

similar to their male peers in terms of job satisfaction, commitment to the organization, and stress related to job performance, but not in terms of their future promotability. Female executives have much lower expectations of being promoted. The report attributes this to women managers' awareness of the existence of a glass ceiling.

In his book, *The Seasons of a Woman's Life*, Levinson (1996) says that there are multiple glass ceilings that a woman must get through. In this sense, the original term is a misnomer, because it implies that once a woman passes through a glass ceiling to the top she will be home free. The reality is that at each level the woman encounters artificial barriers and the problems are greater than in the previous level. Men encounter obstacles in their ascent too, but women's problems are more acute because of sexism. Women are placed in staff rather than in line positions, and these have a limited range of advancement. It is like being placed on the wrong track to the top. Also, sexist obstacles increase in the senior levels. Destructive female stereotypes, such as a tyrant, dragon lady, caring but powerless mother, woman who uses sex to advance to the top, are applied more frequently to higher-level female managers.

External and Internal Barriers

On their rise to higher levels of management, women encounter barriers of two kinds: external and internal. These barriers are the cause for the glass ceiling. Walsh and Osipow (1993) in their career counseling book for women, claim that while men managers suffer mainly from internal pressures, women's pressures are mainly external. I share this view, since throughout my readings for this paper, there seemed to be an enormous amount of evidence on external barriers that women managers encounter and have to overcome, in addition to the external and internal pressures that their male peers have to deal with and that women cannot escape either. The internal pressures seemed to be fewer and easier to deal with, as evidenced by women's increasing shift of orientation from what Levinson (1996) calls the Internal Traditional Homemaker figure to the Internal Anti-Traditional Figure.

The internal barriers that may prevent some women's rise to the top are hard to observe and to verify; they are subjective in nature and may be based on the observers' biases or on the women internalizing and adopting others' stereotypical views of them.

In their article about women in management, Morrison and Von Glinow (1990) argue against some researchers' opinions that emphasize person-centered traits to explain women's generally low job status. They claim that women's traits and

behaviors, socialization and attitudes, do not make them deficient or inadequate for management positions. They say that field studies refuted the assumption that women suffer from a fear of success and of taking risks, and thus are internally prevented from becoming managers in larger numbers. AT&T's Assessment Center reports showed, according to the authors, that women and men managers were more alike than different in personality, motivation, and abilities.

I believe that many women do internalize or suffer from undue pressures that are placed on them by their social environment. Because of the patriarchal environment that many women grew up in, they may lack a sense of inner authority.

Because of the patriarchal environment that many women grew up in, they may lack a sense of inner authority.

Levinson (1996) suggests that with the traditional division of labor, there was also a division of authority, which set up the man and not the woman as the figure of authority, the "head of the household." The woman internalized this lack of a feeling of power. This may explain why many women may feel a lack of self-confidence, a deficiency in having management skills, and intimidated by men (Walsh and Osipow, 1993). Women's Internal Homemaker Figure, as Levinson (1996) describes, may experience an emotional pressure, one that is instilled and reinforced by the environment, to select traditional careers, to put their children's and husbands' needs and careers before their own, and to sacrifice their careers within the role conflicts that they experience.

Some studies (Walsh and Osipow, 1993) indicate that females are less confident in occupational attainment, and have lower academic self-esteem, even when they have equal ability. Women's lower self-efficacy, or belief in performing a given task successfully, is especially weak when it relates to male-dominated educational majors (particularly mathematics) and careers. This self-perceived weakness is, in my opinion, a clear internalization of a stereotypical view and behavior towards women. Hill and Ragland (1995), in describing barriers to women's leadership in educational settings, maintain that the ongoing message to women from an early age is that they are less worthy and deserving than men, and that this treatment permanently sabotages their self-esteem. They often lack self-confidence, and suffer from a fear to challenge the stereotypical roles they were assigned. The authors mention their objection to some women's occasional use of a fragile image in their seeking of acceptance. In my opinion, when it comes to internal barriers, the biggest way women contribute to their own failure to advance results from internalizing the negative stereotypes and evaluations of their management abilities, to a

degree that they turn down opportunities because of a fear of failing. In other words, other people's negative expectations of women managers, cause these women to turn down assignments, due to their fear of failure (Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990).

As I've stated before, I believe that women managers' hardest obstacles to overcome in their rise to higher management positions are external, rather than internal ones. I am not minimizing the importance of internal barriers but it is obvious to me that many of the internal barriers are environmental rather than a part of the female "nature," and thus if the environment and the "nurture" will change, the internal barriers that are unique to women will no longer exist. Some of the many external barriers that comprise artificial obstacles to women's advancement are discrimination based on gender and sex-role stereotypes; early age education and career channeling; lack of role models; difficulties in finding a mentor; more scrutiny by supervisors and peers; stereotypical evaluation process; social isolation due to tokenism; not being part of the good ol' boy powerful network systems; top executives' ways of grooming their successors; unequal compensation; limited access to training and developmental opportunities; image and communications style; leadership and management style; and assumptions regarding mobility and corporate recruitment practices (Walsh and Osipow, 1993; Lorber, 1993; Levinson, 1996; Hill and Ragland, 1995; Sekaran and Leong, 1992; Glass Ceiling Commission Reports, 1991, 1992, and 1995).

...many of the internal barriers are environmental rather than a part of the female "nature"...

Stereotyping

I believe that gender and sex role stereotyping and the resulting sexism is at the heart of the glass ceiling phenomenon. Levinson (1996) investigates the social and historical aspects of gender splitting. In American society, a rigid differentiation between the masculine and the feminine is manifested in the "Traditional Marriage Enterprise" where the male is the husband, father, and provider, and the female is the wife, mother, and homemaker. As the provider, the male has the ultimate power and authority within the unit, as well as the opportunity to advance and gain executive and leadership roles in the public worlds of work and society. The male controls the public sphere. The female is mostly confined to the domestic sphere, where she is subordinated to her husband, "the head of the household." If the woman participates in the public sphere, her role is marginal and subordinated. If she chooses to work, it is in traditional "female" professions.

such as nursing, teaching, social work, and office support. These occupations are an echo of her nurturing role within the family, an extension of her providing service to others, without threatening the patriarchal power structure. There were many dissenting voices all along against the patriarchal society. One of the loudest was Virginia Woolf, whose internal figure of the Angel was like Levinson's (1996) Traditional Homemaker Figure, and her internal figure of the Writer was like the Anti-Traditional Figure. These two figures were locked in a mortal combat, and Virginia Woolf hoped that the next generation of women would be fully free of the Angel to participate in all domains of human life as equals, without the burdens and limitations of stereotypical gender roles.

As women became increasingly involved in the work force, the traditional female occupations created little social conflict and gender tension. These "Genderized" occupations kept women segregated in professions that payed less and offered fewer opportunities for advancement in authority and remuneration. Even in the genderized fields, men held positions of policy making and high authority. The most problematic area and the one that created social conflicts and stress, was the entry of women into higher-status organizations and professions that were always dominated by men, and were considered "men's work." It was a violation of the traditional division of labor and of male authority, and it changed the segregated and genderized world of work (Levinson, 1996). Unfortunately, gender discrimination, segregation, and stereotypes are still in existence in all areas of American society. The most recurring theme in all the readings I have done for this paper is the belief that achievement is not feminine, that women's place is in the home and they cannot combine domestic and professional lives successfully, and that women are not as motivated or committed to their work as men because they are not the "primary breadwinners" (Walsh and Osipow, 1993; Snyder, et al, 1991).

In their research of women's self-perceived competence and organizational commitment, Snyder, et al, (1991) prove that even though the common assumptions about women's deficiencies in these areas are false, they cause them to suffer from uneven treatment by managers when it comes to promotions. The authors' research points to a correlation between rank in the hierarchy and self-confidence and commitment to the organization, regardless of gender. The higher the position, according to Snyder, et al, the more self-confidence and commitment is experienced by a person. However, women have not been promoted to higher positions because of a stereotypical bias that they lack self-perceived competence and organizational commitment.

Other gender-biased barriers that keep women from advancing are male managers' beliefs that women lack the

interpersonal and technical skills to be effective managers, thus they deny women the same autonomy as men receive in similar positions and give them routine assignments that do not lead to promotions. The resulting apprehension and anxiety experienced by the women managers may lead to making errors and to mismanagement, creating a self-fulfilling prophecy of ineffectiveness (Walsh and Osipow, 1993). Judith Lorber (1993) describes in her essay about women physician's careers, a subtle boycott against them to maintain the glass ceiling. She calls the process the "Salieri Phenomenon." It entails the combination of faint praise and subtle denigration of female physicians' abilities to be leaders in their profession by their male colleagues. Lorber ascribes the reasons for this manipulation to male physicians' fear of the profession becoming too feminized and, as a result, losing prestige, income, and authority.

There are several plausible theories that posit the existence of discrimination against women in organizations because of their gender (Powell & Butterfield, 1994; Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990). Patriarch theories suggest that men wish to keep women in a dependent status, so they limit women's advancement and opportunities. The theory of sex discrimination says that the subjective decision to promote a candidate to top management involves the evaluation of whether she will fit in with the incumbent top managers. A female is at a disadvantage in a male-dominated organization because of her dissimilarity to the rest of the management group. In the rational bias theory, even when men managers consider women equally qualified for the position, they choose a male candidate out of self-interest and a lack of regard for eliminating gender discrimination. In some instances gender discrimination is unintentional, and can involve having unconscious stereotypical biases as to who is an ideal candidate, having a fear of selecting an unacceptable candidate, and the tendency of people to select a candidate similar to themselves. Since the majority of incumbents in top positions are men, the "similar-to-me" effect is a strong dynamic in the continuation of the glass ceiling phenomenon (Powell & Butterfield, 1994).

Walsh and Osipow (1993) quote several sources that suggest that gender is not a simple internal trait based on biological factors, but rather depends on social context. Gender is a complex social and environmental construct, and differences in gender can be largely explained by the degree of access to power and influence. I believe this to be true, especially in explaining the differences in male and female interpretation of management and leadership roles and style.

Leadership Style

A distinct profile of women's leadership style emerged from the various sources in the reading materials that I have cov-

cred. This seems to be an additional barrier in the advancement of women to top positions, because it is different than that of men and interpreted by them as weak and inadequate. Women's leadership style does not perceive power as a limited resource that is exercised by exclusion, but as a personal attribute, an inclusive feeling of empowerment, to be shared by others. Thus, the emphasis of women's leadership is on relationships and social responsibility (Konek and Kitch, 1994). The third Glass Ceiling Commission report (1995) discusses women's leadership style in similar terms. It mentions Sally Helgesen's study of female managers, that concluded that women lead by creating a "web of inclusion." This is done by listening, communicating, and empowering others to act rather than using the male style of "command-and-control." Women's style of leadership creates "centrarchies" rather than "hierarchies," according to Ann Jardim, Dean of the Simmons Graduate School of Management, whose work is also mentioned in the report. Centrarchies are circle-like organizations that involve participation and positive interactions. Women are comfortable with this style, and men have used it successfully in organizations such as Levi-Strauss. In the first report of the Glass Ceiling Committee (1991), manager-style and leader-style qualities are differentiated, and the report says that women did not rise to the top because of the perception that they possess the inclusive manager-style qualities rather than the leader-style qualities that are required to give an organization a direction. The report refutes these perceptions, saying that women were shown to have leadership orientation just as much as men but were still mostly assigned to staff rather than to line positions.

As stated before, women have their own unique leadership style, as distinguished from that of men, and it is an effective one, though often not recognized by men in management, or embraced by women in high positions who emulate men's style in order to be respected and accepted by men executives. The image of a manager or leader has been traditionally associated with being a man and having men's characteristics. Being aggressive, competitive, decisive, rational, tough, independent, venturesome, and firm, are some of the characteristics ascribed to leaders and men alike. The more feminine traits, such as emotional, intuitive, sentimental, dependent, soft, and subjective were regarded as obstacles to leadership. Women leaders possessed men's characteristics, and were considered to be an aberration. Management was a man's occupation (Walsh and Osipow, 1993; Sekaran and Leong, 1992). Recent studies of men and women manager stereotypes show that the differences in gender attributions are still in existence. Walsh and Osipow (1993) report that male managers were perceived as authoritative, committed to the organization's needs, knowledgeable about political and structural aspects of their workplace, outspoken, taking a

stand to express their convictions, and temperamentally steady. Women, on the other hand, were seen as pushy, too emotional, manipulative in their efforts to advance, and having difficulty with not being nurturing.

Women's positive side was seen in their ability to balance productivity and sensitivity. Other damaging views of women managers were cited by a 1991 Catalyst survey where half of the human resource managers surveyed thought that women were not as willing to take risks as men, and had less initiative. They were thought to be less committed, and not willing to relocate. Women's management style of inclusion and inspiring others by involving them in decision making was seen as indecisive and unassertive, as opposed to the preferred male style of being hierarchical, giving orders, and expecting obedience. In actuality, studies found no gender differences in motivation, risk-taking, task orientation, intelligence, analyzing problems, motivating others, independence, and verbal skills, but the negative perceptions, and the resulting discrimination persist. Furthermore, negative attitudes towards women in management are often shared by men and women, and may be a barrier to women managers being promoted because of concern over employee morale (Walsh & Osipow, 1993).

Another interesting way of looking at women's difficulty in being accepted as managers and leaders, is what Tannen (1994) describes as "the glass ceiling as a wall of words," meaning that women's communications style, stands in the way of being seen as leaders and promoted to the top of organizations. Since qualities such as decisiveness, competence and ability to lead are associated with a certain style of speech, women who lead by consensus, and not by commanding others to carry out orders, may be seen as weak and incompetent. Another point made by Tannen, is that women come up with excellent ideas, but many times are not given the credit for them, because they do it quietly, and not through impressive presentations. Unlike men, women use the word "we" rather than "I" when they describe projects or accomplishments, to avoid sounding arrogant. All these ways of communicating may minimize the credit women managers receive for their accomplishments.

Women managers' difficulty with creating an acceptable leadership image is deeply embedded in traditional stereotypes. Some managers are regarded as too feminine because they are sensitive, emotional, and family-oriented, and some managers are regarded as too masculine because they are seen as being too competitive, deceitful, and aggressive. Women managers are criticized for being both or neither (Sekaran and Leong, 1992). One of the reasons, in my opinion, is the lack of acceptable role models that women can emulate. This is the result of the rapidly changing roles and identity of women

the past few decades. Women have broken many barriers already, but there are still many others to overcome, such as the ongoing creation of a new identity, including leadership identity, and finding new role models to help the process.

Women managers need women role models in higher positions to help them cope with their experiences in the workplace, such as, tokenism, sexism, family-work conflict, and social isolation. There are few such role models, and even fewer who are able or willing to help the women below them, because of problems they face themselves or to avoid charges of favoritism (Walsh and Osipow, 1993).

Tokenism

Tokenism is a term that I encountered in many of the sources that I've used for this paper (Morrison and Van Glinow, 1990; Walsh and Osipow, 1993; Sekaran and Leong, 1992; Levinson, 1996). It is described as a situation that most women in high levels of management experience and suffer from. Tokens are the minority members of a skewed group. They comprise up to 15% of the entire group. In reality, in most companies, there is considerably less than 15% women in top management, and they are viewed and treated (consciously and unconsciously) as outsiders by the dominant group. The few women managers who stand out in the group have a hard time fitting in with their male colleagues, and experience additional stress and performance pressures due to their visibility. Another source of pressure for women managers who are tokens, is the dominant group's tendency to evaluate them based on sex role stereotypes. Women's characteristics may become distorted by the dominant group, and they may feel isolated and unaccepted. Levinson (1996), in his study of 15 women in the academic world, concludes that the higher the position a woman attains, the more sexist obstacles and pressures she experiences, because the more likely it is that she becomes a token. The senior women in his study had a harder time than their male colleagues getting grants, resources from their departments and universities, space, and students.

Mentorship

An additional external barrier that women managers face is the difficulty of finding a mentor. The importance of mentorship is illustrated in the Glass Ceiling Commissions' first report (1991), where in one of the companies that the commission was interviewing, upper-level managers chose individuals with high potential to sponsor. They explained that sponsorship meant to "make it happen." Many companies officially recognize mentorship as a needed career development component (Sekaran and Leong, 1992). Mentors have a double function. As career guides they coach their protégés,

provide them with feedback, help them learn the ropes, give them challenging assignments, expose them to higher management, and sponsor them for promotions. The second function is offering psychological support and confirmation, personal counseling, enhancing their sense of competence, and being a role model in their professional identity and development. Walsh and Osipow (1993) claim that as a result of mentoring, protégés are better educated, better paid, and more satisfied with their jobs. Also, they see women as needing mentors even more than men because of the additional barriers that they have to overcome, such as less access to inside information and less developmental experiences. I agree with this view and see the lack of mentoring for women as one of the central issues of the glass ceiling problem. Regrettably, it is harder for women managers to get a mentor than for men managers, because men may prefer someone similar to themselves (meaning a younger male version of themselves), or because the relationship of a woman protégé with a male mentor might be misconstrued as sexually intimate, or the male mentors might treat the woman protégé in a stereotypically protective way. Women mentors, as we have seen with women role models, are few in numbers. Also, when women perceive themselves as tokens, which most women in top positions are, they are reluctant to share their knowledge with others, for fear of losing their positions. They will keep their emotions and ideas private because they feel alienated and unaccepted, as if they were "the only one" (Hill and Ragland, 1995).

Many companies officially recognize mentorship as a needed career development component.

Networking

Networking is yet another example of women manager's disadvantage in career advancement. Based on the study of 15 women executives, Levinson (1996) concludes that the women thought initially that it was hard work that counts in a person's success in their careers. As they rose through the management ranks, they all discovered that job performance was only one ingredient, supplemented by personal relationships and social networks. Unfortunately, these women executives were excluded from what is known as the "old boy" or "good ol' boy" networks and the activities and advantages that they offer. The experience of the women in this group is common in America's segregated management levels. Most women miss the advantages of networking, such as the exchange of inside information that helps in maneuvering in organizational politics, planning career strategies, professional

and personal support, visibility, and upward mobility (Sekaran and Leong, 1992; Walsh and Osipow, 1993). Women's exclusion from informal networks is yet another barrier to their rise to the top, as well as an isolating psychological stressor. Some of the "new girl" networks for managerial and professional women, such as Catalyst, and the National Association for Female Executives, provide them with emotional support, but do not replace the need for women to become accepted and involved in informal networks in their own organizations, and this means being accepted by male colleagues as people rather than viewed as stereotypes.

Mobility

One of the requirements for advancement in many corporations is the mobility of the executives. Women, according to the first Glass Ceiling Commission's report (1991), are assumed by their superiors not to be willing to relocate, thus hindering their career advancement. This phenomenon was verified by a study, quoted in the report, done by the Kellogg Graduate School of Management and Loyola University, of the career progressions of male and female managers with similar education, positions, ability to relocate, and career orientation. The study showed that the females had been transferred less often than their male colleagues, resulting in slower advancement and income. The study calls this practice discriminatory. It is true that many women managers would choose not to relocate, if asked to, because of their children's education and social support systems. Another reason for the lack of mobility of some women is the consideration of their husbands' careers and income, which might be higher than theirs (Hill and Ragland, 1995). The discriminatory aspect comes into play when the women's supervisors assume that they would not relocate. Some women, just as some men, have greater mobility than others do, and each case should be treated individually, without generalizing along gender lines.

Professional Development

The last major external barrier that is a part of the glass ceiling for women executives is development, meaning education before and during employment, and career channeling by influential people in their lives, such as parents, teachers, counselors, and later on, supervisors at the workplace. Lapan and Jingeleski (1992) write about how important it is for students' persistence in science and mathematics to have teachers' and counselors' support, and how this support was withheld from female students starting in middle school. Women's emerging gender identity at that age may limit their professional interests, and it is the task of the counselors and the teachers to help them with keeping all options open. Walsh and Osipow (1993) speak about the "Null

Environment" in higher education for women, which means that they are ignored by their professors in the universities and colleges, not being encouraged or discouraged. The authors stress the damage that this attitude causes the women, particularly in fields that are dominated by men, where they need extra encouragement. The segregation of professions starts with the educational process, and is prevalent among career counselors as well, who often channel or subtly sway women away from certain careers and lifestyles. These counselors, according to the authors, are part of the problem, instead of being part of the solution.

The second Glass Ceiling Commission report (1992) says that there are many industries that don't have a diverse work force, and that there are many highly competent female college students in math and science who are much less likely to pursue these fields than their male classmates. The report cites an 11.1% drop in the number of women earning engineering degrees in the past five years. To make things worse even when women and men do have similar educational levels, studies suggest that the investment in education yields higher returns for men than women, in income and career advancement (Morrison and Von Glinow, 1990). Women's career development through education keeps being a barrier in management positions as well. *Business Week* surveyed in October 1991, participation in Stanford's prestigious advanced-management program, paid for by corporations to round out a manager's background at an advanced stage of their career. Most participants were in their 40s. Only 3% of the participants were women. This is a clear demonstration of the lack of availability of equal opportunities in development practices as well as credential-building experiences, much needed for advancement to high levels in American organizations. The developmental barriers extend to being excluded from participation in important committees, task forces, and special projects as well (Glass Ceiling Commission, 1991).

The findings indicate that women in general, but especially white women, are advancing, but their progress is slow. The Glass Ceiling Commission has investigated the barriers to women's advancement in American organizations and concluded (1995) that the major barriers to women's rise to senior management positions are the ongoing segregation of women into dead-end female positions, placing women in staff rather than in line positions that lead to the top, lack of mentoring and job rotation that provide visibility, exclusion from the "go to" network, the continuing existence of bias, insensitivity and sexual harassment, and lower compensation levels that affect executive search firms' consideration for senior positions. The four reports and the other sources that I've covered in this paper, offer many remedies to the barriers; some of them are already being used in companies and other workplace settings.

Visible Trends

There is an awareness that the shattering of glass ceilings is a lengthy process, involving men and women alike.

There is an awareness that the shattering of glass ceilings is a lengthy process, involving men and women alike.

Many companies, government bodies, educational institutions, professional organizations, and individuals are increasingly aware and concerned about issues of equality in the workplace, and about the social and economic value of every member of American society contributing to the economic growth and gaining personal and financial rewards, as described in Robert Reich's summary of the last report (1995) of the Glass Ceiling Commission. On a more individual level, I agree with Levinson's concluding comments in his book *The Seasons of a Woman's Life*, that our long-term evolution is leading toward an increase in gender equality that involves more participation by women in every area of society and the workplace. In the future, the differences between men and women will lessen, and we will all have some feminine and some masculine traits. The differences between men and women will be more individual than stereotypical, based on biology rather than cultural prescriptions and limitations. Men and women will increasingly participate in both the domestic and the public worlds.

Bibliography

Bullard, A.M. & Wright, D.S. (1993). "Circumventing the Glass Ceiling: Women Executives in American State Governments." *Public Administration Review*, 53 (3), 189-202.

Glass Ceiling Commission reports (1991 - 1995):

1. U.S. Department of Labor (1991). "A Report on the Glass Ceiling Initiative." 1-25.
2. U.S. Department of Labor (1992). "Pipelines of Progress: A Status Report on the Glass Ceiling." 1-41.
3. U.S. Department of Labor (1995). "Good for Business: Making Full Use of the Nation's Human Capital." 1-235.
4. U.S. Department of Labor (1995). "A Solid Investment: Making Full Use of the Nation's Human Capital, Recommendations of the Federal Glass Ceiling Commission."

Hill, M.S. & Ragland, J.C. (1995). *Women as Educational Leaders: Opening Windows, Pushing Ceilings*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press, Inc.

Konek, C.W. & Kitch, S.L. (Eds.) (1994). *Women and Careers: Issues and Challenges*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

Lapan, R.T. & Jingeleski, J. (1992). "Circumscribing Vocational Aspirations in Junior High School." *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 39(1), 81-90.

Levinson, DJ (1996). *The Seasons of a Woman's Life*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.

Lorber, J. (1993). "Why Women Physicians Will Never Be True Equals in the American Medical Profession." In E. Riska & K. Wegar (Eds.), *Gender, Work and Medicine: Women and the Medical Division of Labor*, 62-76. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Morrison, M.M. & Von Glinow, M.A. (1990). "Women and Minorities in Management." *American Psychologist*, 45(5), 200-208.

Powell, G.N. & Butterfield, D.A. (1994). "Investigating the 'Glass Ceiling' Phenomenon: An Empirical Study of Actual Promotions to Top Management." *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(1), 68-86.

Sekaran, U. & Leong, F.T.L. (Eds.) (1992). *Womanpower: Managing in Times of Demographic Turbulence*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications, Inc.

Snyder R.A.; Verderber, K.S.; Langmeyer, L.; & Myers, M. (1991). "A Reconsideration of Self-and-Organization-Different Attitudes as 'Causes' of the Glass Ceiling Effect." *Group and Organization Management*, 17(3), 260-278.

Tannen, D. (1994). *Talking from 9 to 5: How Women's and Men's Conversational Styles Affect Who Gets Heard, Who Gets Credit, and What Gets Done at Work*. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc.

Walsh, W.B. & Osipow, S.H. (Eds.) (1993). *Career Counseling for Women*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.