Why Do Few Women Advance to Leadership Positions?

Sunita Chugh

Punam Sahgal

Women comprise a large segment of the available managerial talent across the globe, yet their representation at top level managerial positions in business and public administration, is rather obscure. The leadership prospect for women managers is a critical issue in gender equality and remains a researchable proposition. This article examines the literature of the last two decades on career advancement and leadership to unearth the impediments for women in management. Sex role orientation and the stereotyping of a manager's role as a masculine construct, along with the glass ceiling effect in organizations, are predominant themes that explain why so few women progress to positions of leadership and authority. The literature also points out that lack of career planning amongst women managers and their collaborative, power sharing management style, that are in sharp contrast to male managers, significantly influence women's advancement to the top echelons of management.

Introduction

In their revolutionary book, *Mega Trends for Women* (1992), Aburdene and Naisbitt called the 1990s 'The Decade of Women in Leadership'. It seemed that women were finally making it to the top spaces in corporate hierarchy. But, in the same year, 'Women Challenges of Year 2000' wrote that 'women constitute half the world's population, perform two-thirds of the world's work, but receive only one tenth of its income and own less than one-hundredth of its property' (United Nations Publications 1991). 'In the largest and most powerful organizations, the proportion of top positions occupied by women is generally 2 to 3 per cent (United Nations Publications 1996). A survey of

Sunita Chugh is Fellow Scholar at Management Development Institute, Gurgaon, 122001. E-mail: fpm04_schugh@mdi.ac.in, sunita.chugh@gmail.com
Punam Sahgal is Professor of OB at Indian Institute of Management, Lucknow, NOIDA Campus. E-mail: punam.sahgal@gmail.com; psahgal@iiml.ac.in

70,000 German companies in 1995 reported that only 1 or 2 per cent of board members and top executives were women. In the US women in 1996 held just over 2 per cent of the higher-ranking corporate positions of the Fortune 500 companies. These and many more evidence abound in management literature to show that few women advance to leadership positions in organizations.

'Women in Management' remains an issue of concern, given that an increasing number of women are in the workforce, but only a small percentage holds top level managerial positions in business and public administration (Alvesson and Billing 1997; Crampton and Mishra 1999; Wah 1998; Wentling 2003). Evidence suggests that the absence of women at the top level of large companies is a global phenomenon, indicating that biological sex[1] (often referred to as gender in management literature) is a common barrier in a variety of international contexts to women's career advancement (Singh and Vinnicombe 2003). Career advancement for women managers has been of considerable research interest (Corrothers 1992; Fernandez 1981; Hirshman 1995; Kay and Hagan 1995; Kelly 1995; Lewis and Cooper 1988; Morrison, White and Van Velsor 1987; Northcutt 1991; Offermann and Beil 1992; Reskin and Ross 1992; Stover 1994; Stroh, Brett and Reilly 1992; Treiman and Hartman 1981). Therefore, the absence of women in the highest and most visible positions in corporate hierarchy cannot be ignored (Burke and Nelson 2002; Ely 1995; Solomon 1998; Wentling 2003).

The question here is: why don't women make it to leadership positions? 'Women have made no progress in ascending to executive positions and are unlikely to do so for many years' (Owen, Scherer, Sincoff and Cordano 2003). The first few women who were appointed to corporate boards were token[2] appointments, recruited in many cases for symbolic value. There has been a marked increase in the number of women now serving on boards, but their absolute number is still small. It appears that the need to actually strive and reach the top for the sake of being at the top, prestige, respect, awe, power it gives may be more important for men than for women. 'Men will continue to have access to the organization elevators while most women are forced to take the stairs' (Rosener 1995). According to a report released in 1995 by Glass Ceiling Commission, 'Women in US have moved from clerical basement to the managerial mezzanine but the door to the executive suite still remains largely closed'. Glass Ceiling is becoming more like a steel cage (Rosener 1995).

This article examines realities/ issues surrounding the 'gender factor' in organizations to determine why there is lower number of women in leadership positions. It analyses career advancement phenomenon from literature on 'women in management' of last two decades (1985–2006). Two domains of literature are reviewed to present this argument. These include Social Science books/ articles on the subject 'Women in Management' and 'Leadership' in areas of Organization Behaviour and Organization Studies.

Findings

Historically, management carries overtones of being a male dominated domain. So, what

are women doing in 'management'? Extant literature reveals five key recurring themes in career advancement literature:

- Sex-role orientation
- Gender stereotyping
- Glass ceiling
- Leadership in women managers
- Other shades of career advancement: Women in management

Sex-role Orientation

The term 'sex role stereotype' refers to location of a particular set of traits and abilities as more likely in one sex than the other (Pleck 1985). The process of sex-role orientation is the process by which individuals acquire sex–appropriate preferences, behaviours and personality characteristics. There are theories that explain sex–role orientation. The Phallocentric perspective follows Freud's early formulations regarding sexual behaviour (penis-envy[3]) and assumes the basic superiority of males and holds that girls accept feminity only when they realize that they cannot be males (Freud 1969). Gender roles and gender identity are taught and learnt within a complex set of relationships in the family and are reinforced through the socialization process in every society, with socially ascribed roles and duties as per norms of the particular society (Chakravarti 1995). Most cultures attribute dominant and aggressive qualities to males and passive and dependent qualities to females, which in turn affects gender identity as well as behaviour. Attributes valued highly in men reflect a 'competency cluster', including traits such as decision making, business skill and so

on; whilst female traits include 'warmth–expressiveness cluster' which contain traits such as being emotional, concerned with relationships and communal orientation (Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson and Rosenkrantz 1972).

Gender Stereotyping

The breakdown of traditional barriers, those between work and home, public and private, men and women, and employer and employee, which define organizational life, have considerable impact on women's careers. The traditional view of one partner as breadwinner, the other as caregiver has blurred (Van Der Boon 2003) and at the workplace, attributes that are more typical of women, are becoming the new leadership behaviour models (Management Today 2000). American research is advocating the more authentic style of leadership that is characteristic of women. Ironically, the 'male — manager' syndrome works against women who aspire for senior management positions. 'Deeply entrenched in our definition of what it means to be a manager is the belief that the manager will be male' (Shrank and Kanter 1994). There are innumerable studies (Fels 2004; Manning 2002; Rosener 1997) debating whether women lack the abilities and personality traits required of managers. This stereotyping of management poses a major obstacle to women who are qualified to excel in positions of leadership. With organizations and jobs being gendered (Webb 1991), stereotypes around women managers get perpetuated. The constitution legislation by the UN on Glass Ceiling itself is an outcome of stereotyping of women managers.

Glass Ceiling

'I have both a brain and a uterus, and they both work (Ely 2003)'. This volatile statement and many more such exchanges have been made by women managers as a response to their inability to reach higher levels of management. Glass ceiling is one key barrier that impedes women's career advancement. It serves as an invisible barrier to the advancement of women within organizations across countries. Investigation of glass ceiling suggests that beliefs and attitudes held by organizational members (i.e., women are not viewed as leaders), as well as contextual aspects of the organization (i.e., social structures) contribute to the glass ceiling effect, which is experienced by many women in management. Scarcity of women in executive positions across a variety of countries—a mere 3 per cent—has been attributed to the glass ceiling (Adler and Izraeli 1994). It is argued by researchers that women may not create the glass ceiling but help maintain it (Rosener 1995). Almost all scientific literature on women in management carries a section on glass ceiling. It has manifested in organizations differently and conceptualized in literature as 'Glass Cliffs', 'Glass Walls', 'Glass Floors' and 'Glass Elevators'. These stereotypical cages, from which women managers are struggling to emerge as leaders, needs a closer scrutiny (Table 1).

Table 1

Glass Ceiling Manifestations in Organizations

Various shades of Glass ceiling –barriers to the top-:

Career in Management:

- Female managers overall were less likely than males to see progression to senior management position as a career goal (Hede and Ralston 1993; Oakley 2000).
- There are stereotypes and preconceptions about women's abilities and suitability for business careers (Catalyst 1990; Mattis 1995).
- Lack of access to line positions is a common ailment that women managers experience (Catalyst 1990; Mattis 1995; Oakley 2000; U.S. Census Bureau Report 1996).
- Women managers lack careful career planning and planned job assignments (Catalyst 1990; Mattis 1995).
- Short term adjustments in working schedules (flexi-time) results in long term reduction in earnings and advancements (Rosener 1995).
- Senior management assumes that married women do not want international careers (Van Der Boon 2003).
- Assumptions about inadequate commitment of working mothers adversely influence advancement (Rosener 1995).

Position and Power in Workplace:

- Visibility-vulnerability spiral which renders women as violating both role of a leader and role of a women (Rosener 1995).
- Fear of success[6] defined as specific motive to avoid success because of its perceived negative consequence (Buddhapriya 1999).
- Excluded from overseas experience, women are excluded from promotions and power in multinational organizations (Van Der Boon 2003).

(Table 1 contd)

(*Table 1 contd*)

- A CEO quotes 'There's not a woman in this country I would want on my board' (Wall Street Journal Europe 2001; Van Der Boon 2003).
- 'I had to give up a lot. You (should) too' attitude from women at the top (Rosener 1995).

Cultural and Organizational Barriers:

- Exclusion of women from informal channels of communication and networks and counterproductive behaviour of male coworkers (Catalyst 1990; Mattis 1995).
- Lack of influential mentors for women in management (Catalyst 2001).
- According to CEOs: Women have not been in pipeline long enough (Mattis 1995).
- Cultural bias coupled with their not being viewed as primary income-earners are major obstacles for women's advancement (International Labour Organization 1997; Van Der Boon 2003).
- Higher performance standards are often expected of women (International Labour Organization 1997; Van Der Boon 2003).
- Barriers for promotion to top levels cited by men reported issues like family etc. whilst women perceived barriers such as exclusion from informal networks, personal style differences and lack of political awareness (Singh and Vinnicombe 2003; Catalyst/Opportunity Now 2000; Fortune Marketing Research Report for Deloitte and Touche LLP 1996).
- It would take several generations for women to achieve proportional representation at the top of American businesses. The period may be much longer for other nations (Fortune Marketing Research Report for Deloitte and Touch LLP 1996).
- When a corporation has many more men than women (or vice versa) in influential positions, the culture tends to adopt attributes that favour the dominant gender. In relation to barriers that impede women's career development, culture is further delineated into stereotyping and organizational climate (Jackson 2001).

Leadership in Women Managers

Underlying the belief that women are less qualified than men for managerial positions is the assumption that the successful manager possesses most of the traits valued in men, such as assertiveness, emotional stability and ambition. This assumption is oversimplified in view of the various psychological researches done on leadership. Characteristics of a leader usually depend on the situation, follower and organization culture, where dynamism and adaptability are the key characteristics. It has also been found that women tend to be collaborative, share power and information and often lead in an interactive manner. Most importantly, women tend to be comfortable with ambiguity. All this and especially, the collaborative and information sharing leadership style is found more commonly among women (Helgesen 1990; Rosener 1995).

Adopting masculinity becomes a way out for women managers in their search for upward movement. One of the ways women try to minimize being stereotyped, is by 'making themselves disappear'. They become invisible by wearing clothes that disguise their bodies (Davidson and Cooper 1992; Ehrich 1994; Sampson 1990) and try to blend in, by talking tough (Rosener 1990; Tannen 1990). The result, however, is that by not emphasizing their real differences, women are reducing their chances of being viewed as potential leaders (Goffee and Jones 2001). Typically, the masculine style of management

proves to be exceedingly costly to men who abide by it, as well as women who feel pressurized towards adopting it (Sargent 1983). Therefore, for both men and women it may be considered important to adopt an androgynous[4] sex-role identity (Bem 1981; Buddhapriya 1999). In both 'Leadership' and 'Women in Management' studies the shift from biological sex to sex-role orientation (gender) as a better predictor variable for scientific inquiry has begun. But, further research is necessary to settle the dispute over the relative utility of an androgynous approach in leadership (Williams and Deal 2003).

Do women have different leadership styles from those of men (Stanford, Oates and Flores 1995)? This remains an unanswered question in management research. Some studies emphasize the findings of female leaders using self-descriptive terms, such as 'team based', 'involved', 'participation' or 'participative', and 'encourage' that highlight 'employee involvement' as a unique leadership trait amongst women. Another finding which is congruent with theories on female power bases is that women do not refer to their own position in the organization as a platform for influence nor indicate that they use coercive power. Thus it can be surmised that referent or expert power bases are operative among the women leaders (Rindfleish and Sheridan 2003). Other findings underscore the quality of interpersonal relationships between managers and employees especially when the manager is a woman. Women leaders consistently express that relationships with their employees are built on mutual trust and respect. Much contemporary thinking conceptualizes a feminine style of leadership that is singularly different from its male counterpart (Aburdene and Naisbitt 1992; Cantor and Bernay 1992; Fierman 1990; Loden 1985; Rosener 1990, 1995; Rudolph 1990; White 1992).

Since there is an overwhelming emphasis on 'relational aspect of leadership' amongst women, it needs an even more thorough analysis. Relational actions have been explained in the literature reviewed as: 1) Associated with feminity 2) Unconsciously coded as inappropriate for work sphere 3) Associated with domestic sphere, more as natural inclination of a personality, therefore not a leadership competence. Relational skills refer to mutuality, openness to influence, willingness to acknowledge collaborative nature of achievement. 'Needing others' is tainted in any system that is characterized by unequal power. It refers to those with less power to be ultra sensitive and attuned to perceptions, desires and requests of the more powerful. Relational skills, therefore, have an association with the lack of power (Ely 2003). Although this quality is emphasized in women leaders, it is negated as a leadership competency.

There are other leadership studies which help demystify the subject of 'female advantage in leadership'. For example, after the demise of Heroic Leadership (Fletcher 2002), many issues around gender, power and myth of female advantage got addressed through Post Heroic Leadership. Post Heroic Leadership envisions the 'who' of leadership by challenging the primacy of individual achievement, 'what' of leadership by focusing on collective learning and mutual influence and 'how' of leadership by noting the more egalitarian relational skills and emotional intelligence needed to practice it (Ely 2003).

To rise to senior positions, one must be and seen as a leader. In preparation, one must have and be perceived to have the potential for leadership. Several South Asian nations have woman leaders, and the studies in this region throw up different findings. South Asian women hold key corporate ranks and are significantly represented in the workforce. Patience, persistence and compromise are characteristics that have helped influential South Asian women. Women have reached top positions in South Asia without affirmative action programmes and while gender may not have as much impact, class is important; women of higher classes in South Asia are well-educated and face better prospects for careers as senior managers and organization owners. Women in countries where childcare and household help are inexpensive and easy to arrange do not view balancing work and family as an obstacle (Van Der Boon 2003).

'Women in leadership' is found to be the main theme in management research combining two domains of research; 'leadership' with 'gender' (Calas and Smircich 1992; Eagly and Johnson 1990). Fundamentals of leadership including Emotional Intelligence (Goleman 1998) and Adaptive Learning (Fletcher 2002) are exaggerated to be female advantages and several researchers are currently working on these aspects of women leadership. Although the 'Post Heroic Principles' of leadership have been touted a lot, it is the individual leaders who are highlighted and their personal characteristics such as integrity, charisma and vision that more often get described. Therefore, one may assume that adaptive leadership paradigms may be created by simply hiring 'better hierarchical leaders' who have 'emotional intelligence' or who 'value relationships'. Also, many women experience the so called female advantage as a form of exploitation, where their behaviour benefits the bottom-line but does not mark them as leadership potential. This phenomenon has been well explained by the visibility—vulnerability spiral,[5] which becomes operative in the case of women leaders.

Proponents of the 'Women do lead differently' theory postulate that women inherently possess or develop certain traits that diverge sharply from male leadership characteristics. Some researchers developed a theory that women are perceived stereotypically as operating from personal helplessness and indirect power bases, while men are viewed as using 'strong aggressive types of power' (George 1993; Johnson 1976; Stanford, Oates and Flores 1995). 'In a flat organization, when you must get things done through people over whom you have no formal authority, you need a different kind of management style, and women have it' (Van Der Boon 2003; Patterson 1998).

Other Shades of Career Advancement: Women in Management

Other than the four aspects of career advancement, extant literature includes other issues that mitigate career advancement for women in management (Table 2).

Conclusion

It would no longer be true of most progressive economies to impose entry level barriers

Table 2
Other Shades of Career Advancement: Women in Management

1) Aspiration and Motivation:

- Career aspiration is a function of: 1) Achievement motivation 2) Mastery 3) Commitment which influences a person's achievement and persistence in a career (Farmer 1985, 1997).
- Women's occupational aspirations have become more similar to those of men (Powell and Butterfield 2003).
- One predictor of aspiration is the individual's 'gender identity': Individuals who described themselves as possessing a greater amount of masculine characteristics and a lesser amount of feminine characteristics—a gender identity consistently reflected in stereotypes of males and managers—were more likely to aspire to top management (Bem 1981; Deaux and Kite 1993; Deaux and LaFrance 1998; Powell and Butterfield 1979; Powell, Butterfield and Parent 2002).
- Women often subscribe to 'If you are happy doing what you are doing don't be pushed into the next step because it's the traditional thing to do' (Mattis 1995).
- Those on high mobility track develop attitudes and values to impel them along that track. For example, high work commitment, high aspirations and upward orientation (Kanter 1977).
- Rather than encountering a 'glass ceiling' as they try to reach the top, women encounter the glass wall in the form of intangible barriers, largely based on the organization's culture and traditions, and lessen the abilities and true desires of the person aspiring to an executive position (Catalyst 1994).
- Women are increasingly leaving organizations to move laterally at senior positions, to start up companies around their own unique styles rather than adapt to environments which do not welcome them (British Institute of Management Survey 1994; Burke 1996; Marshall in Tatum (eds) 1994).

2) Career Objective:

- If the objective is career advancement through the management ranks of today's corporation, who is most likely to win: The man who sees the world as of winning and losing, of teams, of stars, of average and mediocre players, in essence his world or the woman struggling to find a world as it should be, as it ought to be, in search of the best possible method (Rosener 1995).
- Women in corporate subscribe to 'If business is about adding value, then what better place to find it than within ourselves' (Burke 1996).
- Women expressing greater interest in alternative career options had less satisfaction with their jobs, had greater intention to quit, more frequent work-family conflict, and rated the firm more negatively compared with other places where they might work (Catalyst 1994).

3) Exposure to Line Function in Career:

- Senior line managers and human resources professionals have uniformly reported that possessing varied experience in core business areas was paramount to career advancement (Mattis 1995).
- Women business owners in last 20 years have grown from 5 per cent to 30 per cent and are still rising. By end 1992 more people will work for companies owned by women than for Fortune 500 companies. This option has become available to increased number of women in corporate (Rosener 1995).

4) Proportion of Women in Management:

- The supply of women qualified for management jobs has continued to increase, as more women accumulate work experience and complete management and professional education programs. Although women have made great progress in attaining management jobs, their access to senior level management positions remains very limited (Catalyst 1994).

(Table 1 contd)

(*Table 1 contd*)

- Although, women form 40 per cent of all new hires in one US law firm, it had only one woman partner (Rosener 1995).
- About half the new professionals recruited/hired from universities are women (Schwartz 1992).

5) Success in Career:

- In the US, considerably less time is required to advance to levels of senior management or partnership in professional service firms than in other large private sector organizations (Schwartz 1992).
- US Law Organizations have identified barriers that women face and attempted to remove them (Burke and McKeen 1993; Schwartz 1989, 1992), creating 'Mommy Tracks'.
- Factors that pertain to success of women managers in organizations: educational credentials, hard work, mentors, interpersonal/people skills, demonstrating competence on the job, and willingness to take risks (Wentling 2003).
- Characteristics commonly shared by successful career women: 1) consistently exceeding performance expectations 2) developing a style with which male managers are comfortable 3) seeking out difficult or high-visibility assignments (Catalyst 1994).
- Successful career women have these characteristics in common: 1) having future career goals 2) hard work 3) determination 4) perseverance 5) commitment to careers 6) achieving position and status despite many barriers (Hennig and Jardim 1977).
- 'Being a woman' as a barrier to advancement has been documented by many researchers (DeLaat 1999; Deloitte and Touche 1996; Rosener 1995).
- Key reasons for lack of progress in career: Being a woman; lack of support from boss; lack of opportunity; family obligations; company reorganization/downsizing and age (Wentling 2003).
- Women's apparent failure in hierarchical advancement may be more due to the characteristics and organizational location of their jobs rather than their own shortcomings. The data was collected over a three-year time span with a group of 103 women who participated in Arizona Leadership 2000 and beyond, a professional leadership program (Stover 1994).

6) Development for Career Advancement:

- Training areas identified by women as needing additional training in: Communication Skills (written, oral, listening), Leadership skills, Negotiation skills, Strategic Management, and Financial Planning (Wentling 2003).
- Factors frequently hindering their career development: bosses who did not guide or encourage their career progression, sex discrimination, not politically savvy, lack of career strategy, lack of opportunity, and family obligations (Wentling 2003).
- Managerial women who participate in a greater number of education and training activities are more organizationally committed, job-satisfied and involved and have higher career prospects (Burke and McKeen 1994).

for women in organizations. Women in the management function are here to stay and this seems obvious for the last three decades (Helgesen 1990; Hennig and Jardim 1977; Kanter 1977; Rosener 1995). Their existence and survival are not an emerging issue but their movement and progress to the top and highest levels in the organisation hierarchy which remains a subject of concern (Burke 1996; Burke and Mckeen 1993; Burke and Nelson 2002; Cappelli and Hamori 2004; Singh and Vinnicombe 2003). Some theorists claim that women leaders lead differently, and many studies claim that their styles are more suited for the organizations of the future with flatter, team based approach,

openness and flexibility. Yet, an answer to why such few women reach leadership positions remains elusive.

The foregoing literature on 'women in management' suggests that jobs and organizations are gendered which has an impact on individuals. It is also evident that individuals reflect their socialization in sex–role orientation and therefore, what they bring to the organization is gendered. Gender issues get treated by organizations as a problem and organizations begin to try to fix it, or else try to celebrate the difference between males/females. Either ways this problem remains. The shift is from equality management (equal representation) to diversity management (Singh and Vinnicombe 2003). In fact, there is evidence to believe that this issue in organizations is similar to the issue of racism. It remains a diversity issue which needs 'readiness' and 'attention' from the more powerful.

'Male is equal to manager' seems entrenched in the minds of employees across organizations. It is the male dominance in organizations and gendering of jobs which does not allow women leaders to emerge. Also, it is 'being a woman' that slackens the pace of progress in the corporate hierarchies as various studies reveal. This stereotyping of women managers is a critical issue that needs to be addressed if women have to make it to the higher echelons of management.

A trend gaining prominence of late is women leaving organizations to move laterally at senior positions, to start up companies around their own unique styles. Their need for flexibility at workplace and their inability to handle power and politics is a major contributor to this 'lateral movement'.

Globally, there seems to be a tough standard for women to meet the demand of CEOs for 'international, diverse, and line experienced' women, resulting in reduced horizontal movement of women to boardrooms. In addition, the 'old boy's network' allows most male leaders to be available/accessible to the boardroom selection process, thereby tending to exclude women from top jobs (International Labour Organization 1997; Oakley 2000; Van Der Boon 2003). The 'girls' network' is clearly missing. These two reasons coupled with the need to move laterally specially in senior positions, often results in few women in the highest place of power. Consequently, the pool of senior experienced women to choose for leadership positions remains deficient. Once women have become 'part of the inner circle' at the top, that is the top management team, their achievement orientation to progress further upward gets reduced sharply (Burgess and Fallon 2003). They just might remain in the lower positions and not in the highest leadership positions.

Although no studies on women leadership show that women do not have career needs and aspirations in place, it may be concluded that women and men have different motivations for working. Women at workplace would like to do 'different' and 'satisfying' jobs, not necessarily jobs which give them more 'power'. It is important to mention that literature in women studies in organizational settings show a lack of career planning in the case of women. Women's careers are not designed taking constraints into account. They seem to happen more by default perhaps reinforcing the belief that where 'happiness' prevails, 'power' does not enter. Perhaps the

need to strive and reach the top, prestige, respect awe and power it gives may be more important for men than for women, which add to the explanation of why there are few women in powerful positions at the top.

Career advancement is a function of both individual (self) factors as well as organization factors. The foregoing review suggests that glass ceiling and stereotyping are the key organizational factors that contribute to this phenomenon under question. Career advancement literature rests on the assumptions that women managers need to: 1) Define their career objectives, aspirations and motivation for themselves; 2) Determine the success and development of their careers as women managers.

Organizations seem to respond in broadly two ways: they either seek to 'fix the problem' or they 'celebrate the difference'. However, there can be other options of creating cultures where competencies/capabilities for excellence 'really' thrive. It is high time that successful organizations, searching for excellence, ask themselves: What is the proportion of women across management levels? Do

their careers progress at the same pace as their male counterparts? Does gender come in the way of assigning challenging and diverse assignments? And to what extent is there a determined effort to allow women to hold key positions which involve planning, policy formulation and decision making? What and who are missing from leadership positions?

Moving away from equality management, the reviewer is not discussing equal representation of women in management, but in fact, this literature review is aimed at diversity management. Are organizations missing this point? All this has implications for much future research: For example, why are women not able to make it through in this race with men? Do women actually use the stairs rather than the escalator which men seem to use? What does it take for a woman of the 21st century to make it to the boardroom in the corporate setting? What are the qualities of successful women in corporate boardrooms today? These and many more questions remain unanswered.

NOTES

1. Biological sex is often referred in management literature as gender. Though, gender is based on social and psychological influences on a person, in this paper the word 'gender' is used instead of the word sex.
2. Rosabeth Kanter used the word 'tokens' to refer to the relatively few women given prominent positions in a particular occupational setting.
3. Penis-envy: An aspect of Sigmund Freud's developmental theory. As per him, it was woman's nature to be ruled by man and her sickness to envy him.

At about the age of four, Freud believed that girls first discovered they lacked a penis. The girl will blame her mother for the lack of a penis and the consequent hurt to her own self-esteem.
4. Androgynous individual is regarded as one, who does not rely on the gender as a cognitive organising principle and who combines both masculine and feminine elements in a unified personality.
5. Visibility–vulnerability spiral: This spiral is about the Projective processes (almost invisible) which get stirred when women are placed in formal

organization. In leadership roles women will be experienced as violating traditional role expectation either of leaders or of women or both.

6. Fear of Success: A specific motive to avoid success because of its negative consequence. This fear of success seems to be a major problem of women manager, particularly those occupying top positions.

REFERENCES

Aburdene, P. and J. Naisbitt. 1992. *Mega Trends for Women*. New York: Villard Books.

Adler, N. and D.N. Izraeli. 1994. 'Where in the World are the Women Executives?', *Business Quarterly*, Autumn: 89–94.

Alvesson, M. and Y. Billing. 1997. *Understanding Gender and Organizations*. CA: Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.

Bem, S.L. 1981. 'Gender Scheme Theory: A Cognitive Account of Sex–typing', *Psychological Review*, 88: 354–64.

Broverman, I.K., S.R. Vogel, D.M. Broverman, F.E. Clarkson and P. Rosenkrantz. 1972. 'Sex-role Stereotypes: A Current Appraisal', *Journal of Social Issues*, 28: 59–78.

Buddhapriya S. 1999. *Women in Management*. New Delhi, India: A.P.H. Publishing Corp.

Burke R.J. 1996. 'Women's and Men's Interest in Alternative Career Options: A Slow Advancement Way to the Top?', *Career Development International*, 1(7): 52–57.

Burke, R.J. and C.A. McKeen. 1993. 'Career Priority Patterns among Managerial and Professional Women', *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 42: 341–52.

———. 1994. 'Effects of Employment Gaps on Satisfactions and Career Prospects of Managerial and Professional Women', *International Journal of Career Management*, 6: 22–28.

Burke, R.J. and D.L. Nelson. 2002. *Advancing Women's Careers*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Burgess, Z. and B. Fallon. 2003. 'A Longitudinal Study of Women Directors in Australia', *Women in Management Review*, 18(7): 359–68.

Calas, M. and L. Smircich. 1992. 'Rewriting Gender into Organizational Theorizing: Directions from Feministic Perspectives?' in M. Reed and M. Hughes, (eds), *Rethinking Organization*, London: Sage Publications.

Cantor, D.W. and T. Bernay. 1992. *Women in Power— The Secrets of Leadership*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Cappelli, P. and M. Hamori. 2004. 'The Path to the Top: Changes in the Attributes and Careers of Corporate Executives–1980-2001'. Working Paper 10507 http://www.nber.org/papers/w10507.National Bureau of Economic Research. Cambridge, MA.

Catalyst. 1990. 'A Survey of Chief Executive Officers and Human Resources Professionals in Fortune 500/Service 500 companies', *Catalyst*, New York.

———. 1994. 'On the Line: Women's Career Advancement', *Catalyst*, New York.

Catalyst/Opportunity Now. 2000. 'Breaking the Barriers: Women in Senior Management in the UK', *Catalyst*, New York and *Opportunity Now*, London.

———. 2001. 'Cracking the Glass Ceiling: Catalyst's Research on Women in Corporate Management 1995–2000', *Catalyst*, New York.

Corrothers, H. 1992. 'The Working Woman: A Guide to Managing Success in Today's Corrections Career', *Corrections Today*, 54: 168–77.

Chakravarti, M.1995. 'Towards Gender Equality', *Yojana*, April, 39(6): 54–59.

Crampton, S.M. and J.M. Mishra. 1999. 'Women in Management'. *Public Personnel Management*, 28(1): 87–106.

Davidson, M.J. and C.L. Cooper. 1992. *Shattering the Glass Ceiling: The Woman Manager*. London: Paul Chapman.

Deaux, K. and M. Kite. 1993. 'Gender Stereotypes', in F.L. Denmark and M.A. Paludi (eds), *Psychology of Women: A Handbook of Issues and Theories*, pp. 107–39. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Deaux, K. and M. LaFrance. 1998. 'Gender', in D.T. Gilbert, S.T. Fiske, and G. Lindzey (eds), *The Handbook of Social Psychology Vol. 1, 4th ed.*, pp. 788–827. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Deloitte and Touche LLP. 1996. 'Women at Work–A Special Report on the Status and Satisfaction of Working Women and Initiative for Their Advancement', *Fortune*, 3, V, O. conducted in partnership with Yankelovich Partners and Fortune ® Marketing Research.

Eagly, A.H. and B.T. Johnson. 1990. 'Gender and Leadership Style: A Meta-Analysis', *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(2): 233–56.

Ehrich, L. 1994. 'The Problematic Nature of Dress for Women Managers', *Women in Management Review*, 9(2): 29–32.

Ely, Robin J. 1995. 'The Power in Demography: Women's Social Constructions of Gender Identity at Work', *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(3): 589–634.

———. (ed.). 2003. *Reader in Gender, Work and Organization*. By the Centre for Gender in Organizations Simmons School of Management, U.S.A: Blackwell.

Farmer, H.S. 1985. 'Model of Career and Achievement Orientation for Women and Men', *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 32(3): 363–90.

———. 1997. 'Women's Motivation Related to Mastery, Career Salience, and Career Aspiration: A Multivariate Model Focusing on the Effects of Sex Role Socialization', *Journal of Career Assessment*, 5: 355–81.

Fels, A. 2004. 'Do women Lack Ambition?', *Harvard Business Review*, 82(4): 50–93.

Fernandez, J.P. 1981. *Racism and Sexism in Corporate Life*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Fierman, J. 1990. 'Do Women Manage Differently?', *Fortune*, 17 December.

Fishman, P. 1978. 'Interaction: The Work Women Do', *Social Problems*, 25(4): 397–406.

Fletcher, J. 2002. 'The Greatly Exaggerated Demise of Heroic Leadership: Gender, Power and Myth of Female Advantage', *CGO Insights*, Boston, MA: Simmons School of Management.

Freud, S. 1969. *An Outline of Psychology*. New York: Norton.

Goleman, D. 1998. *Working with Emotional Intelligence*. NY: Bantam Books.

Goffee, R. and G. Jones. 2001. 'Why Should Anyone Be Led by You?' *Harvard Business Review*, 78(5): 63–70.

Hede, A. and D. Ralston. 1993. 'Managerial Career Progression and Aspiration: Evidence of the "Glass Ceiling"', *International Journal of Employment Studies*, 1(2): 253–82.

Helgesen, S. 1990. *The Female Advantage: Women's Ways of Leadership*, New York: Doubleday.

Hennig, M. and A. Jardim. 1977. *The Managerial Woman*, New York, Garden City: Anchor Press.

Hirshman, L. 1995. 'Material Girls: A Game Theoretic Revision of the Social Contract Enterprise with Women Present', Doctoral dissertation, [AAT 9532395], University of Chicago, IL.

International Labour Organization. 1997. *Conclusions on Breaking through the Glass Ceiling: Women in Management*, December. Available at: www.ilo.org

Jackson J.C. 2001. 'Women Middle Managers' Perception of the Glass Ceiling', *Women in Management Review*, 16(1): 30–41.

Johnson, P. 1976. 'Women and Power: Toward a Theory of Effectiveness', *Journal of Social Issues*, 32(3): 99–110.

Kanter R.M. 1977. *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.

Kay, F. and J. Hagan. 1995. 'The Persistent Glass Ceiling: Gendered Inequalities in the Earnings of Lawyers', *British Journal of Sociology*, 46: 279–311.

Kelly, R.M. 1995. 'Offensive Men, Defensive Women: Sexual Harassment, Leadership, and Management', in G. Duerst-Lahti and R.M. Kelly (eds), *Gender Power, Leadership, and Governance*, pp. 195–210. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Lewis, S.N.C. and C.I. Cooper. 1988. 'Stress in Dual Earner Families', in B. Gutek, A.H. Stromberg, and L. Larwood (eds), *Women and Work*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Loden, M. 1985. *Feminine Leadership or How to Succeed in Business without Being One of the Boys*. New York: Times Books.

Management Today. 2000. 'The Future is Feminine: Survey Tells Men to be More like Women at Work', *Management Today*, 27 September.

Manning, T. T. 2002. 'Gender, Managerial Level, Transformational Leadership', *Women in Management Review*, 17(5): 207–16.

Mattis, M.C. 1995. 'Corporate Initiatives for Advancing Women', *Women in Management Review*, 10(7): 5–15.

Mackay, H. 1997. *Generations*. Sydney: Macmillan.

Morrison, A., R. White, and E. Van Velsor. 1987. *Breaking the Glass Ceiling*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Northcutt, C.A. 1991. *Successful Career Women*. New York: Greenwood Press.

Oakley, J.G. 2000. 'Gender-based Barriers to Senior Management Positions: Understanding the Scarcity of Female CEO's', *Journal of Business Ethics*, 27(4): 321–34.

Offermann, L.R. and C. Beil. 1992. 'Achievement Styles of Women Leaders and their Peers', *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 16: 37–56.

Owen C.L., R.F. Scherer, M.Z. Sincoff and M. Cordano. 2003. 'Perceptions of Women as Managers in Chile and the United States', *Mid-American Journal of Business*. Muncie, 18(2): 43–50.

Patterson, V. 1998. 'Breaking the Glass Ceiling: What's Holding Women Back?', *Career Journal*, 1(13):, Wall Street Journal Online. Available at: www.wsj.com.

Pleck, J.H. 1985. *Working Wives/Working Husbands*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publishers.

———.1979. 'The "Good Manager": Masculine or Androgynous?', *Academy of Management Journal*, 22: 395–403.

Powell G.N. and D.A. Butterfield. 2003. 'Gender, Gender Identity, and Aspirations to Top Management', *Women in Management Review*, 18(3/4):88–96.

Powell, G.N., D.A. Butterfield and J.D. Parent. 2002. 'Gender and Managerial Stereotypes: Have The Times Changed?', *Journal of Management*, 28: 177–93.

Reskin, B.F. and C.E. Ross. 1992. 'Jobs, Authority, and Earnings Among Managers', *Work and Occupations*, 19(4): 342–65.

Rindfleish, J. and A. Sheridan . 2003. 'No Change From Within: Senior Women Managers' Response to Gendered Organizational Structures', *Women in Management Review*, 18(6): 299–310.

Rosener, J. B. 1990. 'Ways Women Lead', *Harvard Business Review*, 68(6): 119–25.

———. 1995. *America's Competitive Secret: Women Managers*. New York: Oxford University Press.

———. 1997. 'Sexual Static' in K. Grint (ed.), *Leadership. Classical, Contemporary and Critical Approaches*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rudolph, B. 1990. 'Why Can't A Woman Manager Be More Like...a Woman?', *Time*-Fall: 53.

Sampson, E. 1990. 'Dressing for Success', *Women in Management Review*, 5 (4): 20–1.

Sargent, A.G. 1983. *The Androgynous Manager*. American Management Association, AMACOM.

———. 1989. 'Management, Women and The New Facts of Life', *Harvard Business Review*, 89: 65–76.

Schwartz, F.N. 1992. *Breaking with Tradition*. New York: Warner Books.

Shrank, N. and R.M. Kanter. 1994. *Reach for the Top: Women and the Changing Facts of Work Life*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Singh Val. and Susan Vinnicombe. 2003. 'The 2002 Female FTSE Index and Women Directors', *Women in Management Review*, 18(7): 349–58.

Solomon, C.M. 1998. 'Women Are Still Undervalued: Bridge the Parity Gap', *Workforce*, 77(5): 46–53.

Stanford, J.H., B.R. Oates and D. Flores. 1995. 'Women's Leadership Styles: A Heuristic Analysis', *Women in Management Review*, 10(2): 9–16.

Stover, D.L. 1994. 'The Horizontal Distribution of Female Managers Within Organizations, *Work and Occupations*, 21(4): 385–402.

Stroh, L., J. Brett and A. Reilly. 1992. 'All the Right Stuff: A Comparison of Female and Male Managers' Career Progression', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77: 251–60.

Tannen, D. 1990. *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation*. New York: William Morrow.

Treiman, D. and H. Hartman (eds). 1981. *Women, Work and Wages*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

United Nations Publications. 1991. *The Worlds' Women 1970–1990: Trends and Statistics*. New York.

———. 1996. *Special Report on Women*. Department of Public Information, Development and Human Rights Section, Room S-1040, New York: United Nations, DPI/1862/REV.1, December.

U.S. Census Bureau Report. 1996. *Facts on Women's Owned Businesses*.

Van Der Boon, M. 2003. 'Women in International Management', *Women in Management Review*, 18 (3): 132–46.

Wall Street Journal Europe. 2001. 'Summary of Findings, Attitudes and Beliefs of Today's European Women Executives', *Wall Street Journal Europe*, 1 March.

Wah, L. 1998. 'Why There Are So Few Women CEOs?', *Management Review*, 87(7): 8–15.

Webb, J. 1991. 'The Gender Relations of Assessment', in J.F. Cozens and M.A. West (eds), *Women and Work*, Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Wentling R.M. 2003. 'The Career Development of Women in Management', *Women in Management Review*, 18(6): 311–24.

White, J. 1992. *A Few Good Women—Breaking the Barriers to Top Management*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Williams, R.G. and T.E. Deal. 2003. *When Opposites Dance: Balancing the Manager and Leader Within*. Palo Alto: Davies-Black.