

C

E



**Center for
Effective
Organizations**

**Women are Minorities in
Management**

**CEO Publication
G 88-17 (130)**

Ann M. Morrison
Center for Creative Leadership

Mary Ann Von Glinow
University of Southern California

May 1994

**Women are Minorities in
Management**

**CEO Publication
G 88-17 (130)**

Ann M. Morrison
Center for Creative Leadership

Mary Ann Von Glinow
University of Southern California

May 1994

Women and Minorities in Management

by

Ann M. Morrison, Center for Creative Leadership
Mary Ann Von Glinow, University of Southern California

Abstract

Women and minorities face a “glass ceiling” that limits their advancement toward top management in organizations throughout U.S. society. This article reviews the extant literature and discusses why this is so, using theoretical constructs from psychology and other social sciences that cover both individual and systemic factors. Recent research evidence is cited, remedies used to halt differential treatment are outlined, and further research is suggested.

Management and executive positions, along with professional and technical jobs, are among the fastest-growing occupations between 1984 and 1995 (U.S. Department of Labor, 1987). However, these occupations include jobs not traditionally held by women and minorities, who comprise the new workforce. Therefore, one challenge for American organizations is to assimilate a more diverse labor force into high-status, high-skill management roles.

This article examines the current status of women and minorities in management, including some recent changes. We present theoretical models from psychology and other social sciences to explain the progress and the barriers experienced by women and minorities, supported by recent data. Finally, we explore potential remedies for the problems that endure, including programs and practices currently being applied in U.S. organizations as well as research directions that may increase our understanding of relevant issues.

We discuss white women and a wide range of minority groups, including blacks, Hispanics, and Asians, but relevant research varies considerably in its coverage of various groups. The literature on white women is substantial, evidenced in part by the number of literature reviews done (nine reviews within the last ten years were cited by Dipboye in 1987). In contrast, the research base on other minorities in management is quite small and is dominated by studies of black men. Even employment statistics are difficult to uncover for minority groups in management (Cox & Nkomo, 1987; Larwood, Szwajkowski, & Rose, 1988; Leinster, 1988; Thomas & Alderfer, in press). Reviews of research on white women are cited instead of individual studies whenever possible, and our focus is on U.S. studies published since 1980.

Current data on the status of women and minorities in management

According to an Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Report (cited by Bradsher, 1988), the number of women, blacks and Hispanics in management has quadrupled since 1970, and the number of Asians has increased eightfold. However, the rate of upward movement of women and minority managers provides "clear evidence of nothing less than the abiding racism and sexism of the corporation" (Bradsher, 1988, p. 1).

Authors' Note: The authors are especially grateful for Alice Sargent's resources in the early stages of this work. We thank those who critiqued the draft and provided additional information, particularly Richard Morales, Dana Friedman, Janet Spence, Carole Leland, Helen Astin, and David DeVries. We also thank the two anonymous reviewers chosen by the editors for their excellent suggestions. We thank Price Cobbs and Lynda Moore for suggesting useful references, and we thank Karen Hardie and Carol Keck for their research support. Finally, we thank Carol S. Y. Green for preparing the manuscript.

There is considerable evidence that white women and people of color encounter a "glass ceiling" in management. The "glass ceiling" is a concept popularized in the 1980s to describe a barrier so subtle that it is transparent, yet so strong that it prevents women and minorities from moving up the management hierarchy. "Today, women fill nearly a third of all management positions (up from 19% in 1972), but most are stuck in jobs with little authority and relatively low pay" (Hymowitz & Schellhardt, 1986, p. 1D). A Korn/Ferry International survey (1982) reported that only 2% of 1,362 senior executives were women. A study of the Fortune 500, Fortune Service 500, and the 190 largest health care organizations in the U.S. similarly found that only 3.6% of board directorships, and 1.7% of corporate officerships in the Fortune 500 were held by women (Von Glinow & Krzyckowska-Mercer, 1988). The Fortune Service 500 and the health industry indicated that 4.4% of board members were women, and 3.8% and 8.5%, respectively, of corporate officers were women.

Women do not fare any better in management in government or educational institutions. The U.S. government reported only 9% of women in Senior Executive Service levels at G.S. 16 and above (Office of Personnel Management, 1989), with most female employees clustered in low-paying, non-prestigious G.S. 5-10 levels (U.S. Department of Labor, 1986). In education, Sandler's 1986 report shows that "on the average, colleges and universities nationwide employ 1.1 senior women (dean and above) per institution" (p. 14).

With regard to the racial composition of management ranks, the statistics show less progress than for women. Only one black heads a Fortune 1000 company (Leinster, 1988). In the senior ranks, studies by Korn/Ferry International (reported by Jones, 1986) show little change. Of 1,708 senior executives surveyed in 1979, three were black, two Asian, and two Hispanic; only eight were women, all white. In 1985, the list showed four blacks, six Asians, three Hispanics, and 29 women. In Jones' words, "I think it's fair to say that this is almost no progress at all" (1986, p. 84).

Some evidence also exists of a glass ceiling for Asians (Lan, 1987). In 1988, only 2.2% of California's Career Executive Assignment positions were held by Asians despite larger representation at the journey and mid-management levels "that could be considered as qualifying developmental experience for these assignments" (p. 11).

With regard to management, one of the few surveys on minorities in business shows that in 1986 in 400 of the Fortune 1000 companies, less than 9% of all managers were minorities, including blacks, Hispanics, and Asians. A 1986 Equal Employment Opportunity Commission survey (cited by Leavitt, 1988) shows that from 1974 to 1984, the percentage of black women officials and managers grew at .7% of the total, to 1.7%. Malveaux and Wallace (1987), Nkomo (in press), and others claim that minority women are doubly

disadvantaged in terms of upward mobility. They also note that research on certain minority women, particularly Asians and American Indians, has essentially slipped through the cracks.

Those women and minorities who have advanced into management often find reward differentials. There is evidence that at higher occupational levels, women are less satisfied with their pay than are men (Varca, Shaffer, & McCauley, 1983). One study of 2,600 employees found substantial wage differences in managerial levels (Drazin & Auster, 1987); another reported that "women at the vice presidential levels and above earn 42% less than their male peers" (Nelton & Berney, 1987, p. 17). Earnings of black men in management come closer to those of white men (Ploski & Williams, 1983).

The exodus of women and blacks from corporate America is a disturbing trend sometimes attributed to differential treatment in management (Ellis, 1988; James, 1988; Leinster, 1988; Taylor, 1986). Women started their own businesses at six times the rate that men did between 1974 and 1984 (Leavitt, 1988). Of the 100 leading corporate women identified by a *Business Week* survey in 1976, nearly a third had left their corporate jobs for other pursuits ten years later (DeGeorge, 1987).

A study by Morrison, White, Van Velsor and the Center for Creative Leadership (1987) concluded that obstacles related to the glass ceiling will impede women's progress toward top management for the next several decades. Others concur, citing little hope for women or minorities in the near future. Dipboye (1987) claims that even though female managers are progressing faster than their counterparts of decades ago, they still fail in terms of their rate of progress when compared with white males. *Business Week* recently concluded that "except for the true stars, the first generation of black managers is destined to top out in middle levels" ("Progress Report," 1984, p. 105).

Theoretical Perspectives

A number of theories have been offered as to why sexual and racial differences exist within management. These theories tend to fall into three general groups. First, there are theories that assume differences that handicap women and minorities, postulating that deficiencies in under-represented groups are largely responsible for their differential treatment in management. Second, there are theories that cite discrimination by the majority population as the major cause of inequities. Here, bias and stereotypes by white men in power account for the slow progress of women and minorities. Third, there are theories that pinpoint structural, systemic discrimination as the root cause of differential treatment rather than actions or characteristics of individuals. These theories claim that widespread policies and practices in the social system perpetuate discriminatory treatment of women and people of color.

Theories postulating differences

Riger and Galligan (1980) note that psychological researchers have emphasized person-centered variables to explain women's low job status. Women's traits, behaviors, attitudes, and socialization are said to make them inappropriate or deficient as managers, due to such factors as their alleged fear of success, or unwillingness to take risks. They note that investigations of sex differences have yielded mixed results overall, but that current field studies have generally refuted this explanation.

Data disputing both sex and race deficiencies comes from the AT&T assessment center reports (Howard & Bray, 1988), showing that female and male managers were more similar than different on personality and motivation factors as well as abilities. Race differences were greater than sex differences, but among the high-potential managers assessed, the relative weaknesses among blacks in intellectual ability were compensated for by superior performance in interpersonal skills and stability of performance. There is considerable other evidence that women and men in management roles have similar aspirations, values, and other personality traits as well as job-related skills and behaviors (Dipboye, 1987; Dobbins & Platz, 1986; Harlan & Weiss, 1981; Liden, 1985; Morrison et al., 1987; Noe, 1988b; Powell, 1988; Riger & Galligan, 1980; Ritchie & Moses, 1983; White, Crino, & DeSanctis, 1981). Donnell and Hall's (1980) unusually large field study of nearly 2,000 matched pairs of female and male managers led them to conclude that "the disproportionately low numbers of women in management can no longer be explained

away by the contention that women practice a different brand of management from that practiced by men" (p. 76).

The human capital theory attempts to explain continued sex- and race-related differences in management by suggesting that individuals are rewarded in their current jobs for their past investment in education and job training (Blau & Ferber, 1987). Workers may choose to accept a wage, or to invest in acquiring new skills and experiences to qualify for higher-paying jobs. Blau and Ferber (1987) contend that, if this explanation is correct, then women choose the occupational setting they prefer and invest accordingly in their own human capital. Any policy changes that may be called for to correct differential treatment should be directed to the educational process rather than the employment setting, since no differences other than human capital are seen to operate.

The human capital explanation assumes that investment pays off equally for all groups, but recent studies suggest that investment yields higher returns for white males than for women and minorities. Education level has not fully accounted for discrepancies in level or pay in recent studies of sex and race differences in management (Cabezas, Shinagawa, & Kawaguchi, in press; Larwood et al., 1988; Madden, 1985). Results of a survey of Asian Americans in professional and managerial positions indicate that education and work experience yield low returns to promotion or advancement (Cabezas, Tam, Lowe, Wong, & Turner, in press). Thus, person-centered theory cannot adequately explain differential treatment in management; other factors must also be considered.

Discrimination explanations

The second group of theories targets bias by the dominant group as the cause of differential treatment. The labor market discrimination explanation is an economic theory that assumes that relevant stakeholders—employers, customers, employees, etc.—have discriminatory tastes even when women or minorities are perfect economic substitutes for white men in the workplace (Becker, 1957). Blau and Ferber (1987) pointed out that employers with discriminatory tastes hire women only at a wage discount large enough to compensate for the loss of utility or level of discomfort associated with employing them.

The rational bias explanation is a psychological theory that suggests discrimination is influenced by the contextual circumstances in which sexual or racial bias results in career rewards or punishments (Larwood, Gutek, & Gattiker, 1984; Larwood et al., 1988; Larwood, Szwajkowski, & Rose, in press). In this case, a manager's decision to discriminate is based on whether

such discrimination will be viewed positively or negatively by relevant stakeholders and the possibility of receiving rewards for discriminating. Rational bias illustrates why discrimination can continue to occur despite substantial regulation against it (Larwood et al., 1988; Larwood et al., in press).

Discrimination by the dominant group is also addressed by Wells and Jennings (1983), who argue that black individuals are not rewarded based on performance. Organizations that espouse and even mandate racial equality are also characterized by a psychological mindset of entitlement on the part of the dominant whites. Blacks' access to resources is limited, Wells and Jennings claim, and blacks are systematically excluded from advancement except for a few who are allowed in "threshold" or acceptable positions.

Discrimination occurs in part because of the belief by white men that women and people of color are less suited for management than white men. Comparing actual performance in managerial jobs is very difficult, but there is growing concern that differential treatment of women and blacks is not related to performance alone. Some studies suggest deficiencies are presumed even when no differences exist, because stereotypes based on historical roles persist (Davis & Watson, 1982; Dubno, 1985; Larwood et al., 1984; Leinster, 1988; Powell, 1988; Stevens, 1984; Thomas & Alderfer, in press). The "good manager" is still described as masculine, rather than androgynous, despite the growing number of female managers (Powell & Butterfield, in press). Ambiguity or lack of specific information about an individual contributes to bias against women and minorities, because judgments are based on negative stereotypes of the group as a whole (Heilman & Martell, 1986; Nieva & Gutek, 1981; Noe, 1988b; Powell, 1988). For example, pay differentials for women may be related more to the salary allocation process than to performance evaluation because salary decisions are made by people less familiar with female managers than their immediate supervisors (who conduct their performance appraisals), and so bias is more likely (Freedman & Phillips, 1988; Drazin & Auster, 1987). The stereotypes are so strong that contrary data are sometimes ignored in managerial selection and other managerial decisions (Freedman & Phillips, 1988; Heilman & Martell, 1986; Ilgen & Youtz, 1986). This research suggests that individuals, consciously or not, contribute to differential treatment of women and minorities.

Systemic barriers

The third set of theories highlights structural discrimination. Intergroup theory (Alderfer, 1986; Thomas & Alderfer, in press) suggests that two types of groups exist in organizations—identity groups (based on race, ethnicity, family, gender, or age) and organization groups (based on common work

tasks, work experiences, and position in the hierarchy). Tension results because organization group membership changes while identity group membership does not. When the pattern of group relations within an organization mirrors the pattern in society as a whole, such as when whites predominate in high-status positions while blacks are concentrated in low-status jobs, then evaluations of blacks (or members of other low-status groups) are likely to be distorted by prejudice or anxiety as racist assumptions go unquestioned in the organization (Thomas & Alderfer, in press).

Intergroup theory has elements in common with the dual labor market concept in economics. Dual labor market theory was proposed as an alternative explanation to the human capital theory of the 1960s when education and training of inner-city minority workers did not reduce their unemployment rate as much as was anticipated by policy makers at the time (Thurow, 1969). The dual labor market consists of a set of better jobs and a set of worse, or secondary jobs, with little mobility between the two. Groups most frequently associated with the secondary labor market (including women and minorities) are largely confined there, and discrimination is often justified as economic efficiency (Larwood & Gattiker, 1987; Osajima, 1988). Within management, the secondary jobs may not be only those at lower levels, but also those in staff (versus line) functions where women and minorities are found in disproportionate numbers. Staff positions typically are out of the mainstream of the business and do not lead to top management posts (Jones, 1986; Larwood & Gattiker, 1987; Powell, 1988).

Structural barriers are included in the psychological field as part of the situation-centered perspective (Riger & Galligan, 1980) and the organization structure perspective (Fagenson, 1988a; Kanter, 1977), which emphasize that women's lack of opportunity and power in organizations and the sex-ratio of groups within organizations explain their lack of managerial success. For example, Kanter's classic (1977) research pointed out that if a management cadre is comprised of at least 85% men, then the women in the group are "tokens" who very visibly represent women as a category whether they want to or not. These tokens' performances are hindered because of the pressure to which their visibility subjects them, and because members of the dominant group exaggerate differences according to stereotypes they believe about women. Because people of color also become tokens in management ranks, the same dynamics may affect them (Ilgen & Youtz, 1986). Women, however, additionally face sexual harassment, which may be a result of skewed sex ratios favoring men (Gutek, 1985).

The dominance of white men in management poses another structural problem for under-represented groups. Minorities struggle with fitting into two distinct cultural worlds, a concept called biculturalism, documented in studies of black Americans (Thomas & Alderfer, in press). Bell's (1988) research on bicultural conflict among black women shows that those from

cultures other than that of the dominant work group must choose how to manage the stress of moving physically, cognitively, and emotionally between the two cultural systems. For women of all races, responsibility for home, family, and social activities still accompanies a demanding management job, adding other major sources of pressure (Dipboye, 1987; Morrison et al., 1987; Powell, 1988).

The impact of structural factors is shown by researchers such as Irons and Moore (1985) in their study of the banking industry, who identified the three most significant problems faced by blacks: (1) not knowing what is going on in the organization/not being in the network (rated as the most serious problem by 75% of survey respondents), (2) racism, and (3) inability to get a mentor. They point out that these results concur with Fernandez (1981) showing a strong perception that minorities are excluded from informal work groups. In a study of Asian Americans in professional and management jobs, similar barriers to upward mobility were most often cited: a corporate culture alien to some Asian Americans, management insensitivity, and a lack of networks, mentors, and role models (Cabezas, Tam, et al., in press). Other research has shown that many female and black managers feel excluded from informal relationships with their white male colleagues (Rogan, 1984; Rosen, Templeton, & Kochline, 1981; Thomas & Alderfer, in press).

Mentors and sponsors represent key relationships attributed to career success and, while research results are inconclusive as to whether women and minorities find fewer mentors than do white men, there is some indication that mentor relationships are harder to manage and provide a narrower range of benefits for women and minorities (Dickens & Dickens, 1982; Fagenson, 1988b; Fitt & Newton, 1981; Ford & Wells, 1983; Gooden, 1980; Herbert, 1986; Hunt & Michael, 1983; Kram, 1985; Noe, 1988b; Thomas & Alderfer, in press). For example, cross-race relationships take longer to initiate, are more likely to end in an unfriendly fashion and provide less psychosocial support than those of the same race (Bearden, 1984; Thomas, 1986). Cross-sex mentor relationships are subjected to sexual innuendo, and black women face taboos across both sex and race (Feinstein, 1987; Kram, 1985; Thomas, 1986). Women and minorities may need more mentors or sponsors than their white male counterparts—those white male superiors in their own area and same-sex or same-race mentors in other areas of the organization who increase their comfort (Thomas & Alderfer, in press).

Major career development theories do not consider race as a factor, yet evidence from recent studies of black managers suggest that black identity development may slow or alter the career development process and affect blacks' willingness to accept white mentors (Thomas & Alderfer, in press). Larwood and Gattiker (1987) studied the career development of 215 employees in 17 firms and postulated a dual development model because career patterns differ between women and men, resulting from widespread discrimi-

nation as well as competing demands outside work and from other structural barriers. Greenhaus, Parasuraman and Wormley (1988) studied the career success of 828 managers in three companies. They found differences by sex and race, with black women having more negative experiences than any other group. To the extent that organizational structures and practices follow models based solely on how white men develop, women and minorities are disadvantaged.

It is possible that elements of all three theoretical approaches described are significantly related to the lack of upward mobility in management for women and minorities. According to some, the interaction of situational factors (in the organization and in society at large) with person-centered characteristics (related to sex and race) accounts for differential treatment (Fagenson, 1988a; Fagenson & Horowitz, 1985; Ilgen & Youtz, 1986; Riger & Galligan, 1980). For example, without opportunities to take challenging assignments, minority managers may fall behind their white cohorts in terms of knowledge and skill development, or they may internalize negative evaluations and stereotypes to the point where they limit themselves and turn down future opportunities fearing they will not succeed (Ilgen & Youtz, 1986). Tests of the interaction between gender and job factors lends some support to this combined approach (Fagenson & Horowitz, 1985; Mainiero, 1986; Yammarino & Dubinsky, 1988), suggesting that remedies and continued research should be directed at all three sets of theories presented here.

Remedial Actions

In 1977 Kanter recommended that adjustments be made in the workplace to better accommodate women. She rejected the notion that women bear sole responsibility for equal opportunity in business. It is no longer uncommon to hear similar sentiment regarding both women and minorities (Larwood et al., 1984, 1988), although actual implementation of adjustments remains an unmet goal for many organizations.

Some organizations may be able to make adjustments more effectively than others, depending on their current status of diversity. A team at Procter & Gamble recommended that firms go beyond two generations of affirmative action, into true "multicultural management" (Merenivitch & Reigle, 1979). Most firms tend to be in what they describe as the first generation of affirmative action, characterized by a focus on numbers that stimulates superficial and crisis-oriented actions, racial or sexual hostility, lack of trust, and a widespread presumption that women and minorities are less capable. Compliance with government regulations is the main goal.

Some organizations have evolved to a second generation where they meet most numerical goals and attempt to provide the necessary critical mass for support and role models. Their concern over retaining high-performing women and minorities means implementing accountability for effectively managing these groups.

Merenivitch and Reigle (1979) propose that in multicultural organizations, the culture recognizes and appreciates diversity, resources and influence are distributed without regard to race or sex, and policies and practices are responsive to all employees' needs. In effect, the multicultural organization deliberately capitalizes on its diversity. As organizations evolve, different techniques for halting discrimination may be advocated, depending upon which phase the organization is in.

A variety of techniques are being used to reduce differential treatment and to bring diversity into organizations' cultures. Some techniques appear to be targeted toward the human capital issue, some toward discriminatory treatment, and some toward the structural and contextual barriers. Some techniques cover aspects of more than one theory. Education and training, for example, can be important steps for an organization. Some organizations, such as DuPont and GTE, provide additional classroom training opportunities to women once they are hired, but the trend is to avoid segregating women or minorities so that they are not seen as needing special help to become equally qualified. Many companies, such as IBM and Hewlett-Packard, provide no training at the corporate level for women per se, expecting that the training programs already being offered apply to all equally (Lee, 1986).

A recent development in training is the variety of programs geared to help managers work together within a diverse workforce and reduce discrimination. The value of programs on managing diversity is that issues are brought out into the open, allowing people to discuss their beliefs. One problem this addresses is that women and minorities who have felt pressure to remain silent on issues of sexism and racism now can confront the system rather than raising doubts about one's loyalty, and being seen as "too ambitious" ("Blacks in Management," 1983; Jones, 1986; Lee, 1986; Morrison et al., 1987; Rosener, 1986). Eastman Kodak offers such a program to top division managers, while other firms run them for mixed groups, ensuring that at least a third to one-half of the under-represented groups participate in each program. DuPont began running its "Men and Women Working Together" program specifically for managers of saleswomen, but has since opened it to various employee groups. A spin-off is a program for women only (Lee, 1986).

Despite these attempts to avoid treating women as different, demand for women-only programs is still strong. Because companies have made varying degrees of progress in attacking discrimination, and because some women and minorities rebel against attending segregated programs, the flexibility of organizations in providing different types of training is commendable. Limited research suggests that training may be most useful, not in skill-building, but in areas such as career and self-awareness, mentoring, and leadership development (Dipboye, 1987; Lee, 1986; Staley, 1984; White et al., 1981).

Since women and minorities face special situations as tokens, they may need to perfect certain competencies such as conflict resolution. Researchers who have studied black managers conclude that special skills and, therefore, specialized training may be needed by blacks. If blacks do not resolve conflicts that involve themselves or their area, they are likely to be blamed for the conflict (Dickens & Dickens, 1982). Blacks need to be skilled at managing racism and managing their own rage over the racism they encounter (Cox & Nkomo, 1986; Dickens & Dickens, 1982; Simpson, 1981; Thomas & Alderfer, in press). Thus, some skill-building programs, as well as awareness and assessment programs, may be appropriate to help women and minorities compete and cope in management.

Some research suggests that bias is most effectively decreased not only by education, but also by exposure to and experience with members of the opposite sex and other races (Noe, 1988b; Powell, 1988). Working alongside a woman or a minority group member may be the key to quelling discriminatory tastes of white men.

Incentives may also be needed to help overcome rational bias and other discrimination that legislation has failed to address, and to reduce the effects of tokenism. Some organizations such as Corning Glass Works and Gannett are giving equal employment opportunity accountability to line managers,

using bonuses as an incentive. Minority recruitment at Gannett, for example, is monitored by a committee of its publishers and factored into managers' bonus pay-outs (Roberts, 1988; Schmidt, 1988).

Other organizations use task forces to mandate and even implement changes. The Equitable Financial Company has been using the Women's Business Resource Group to identify and solve women's issues that emerge from the corporation's annual employee survey. According to Nelton and Berney (1987), this task force has been responsible for redesigning the job posting system as well as implementing flex-time for working parents and toughening the company stand on sexual harassment. Task forces used in this way—to actually define the problem as well as create the cure—are more unusual than those aimed at problems already targeted, such as those on combining family and career. The task forces most highly praised seem to share several characteristics: direct access to the office of the president, influential members, and the resources required to try out new solutions (Lee, 1986; Nelton & Berney, 1987).

Career management is another key technique for eliminating the glass ceiling for women and people of color. Some research (McCall, Lombardo, & Morrison, 1988; Morrison et al., 1987) suggests that challenging, successfully completed assignments are important to executives' development. Yet some assignments cited most frequently by the male executives studied were rarely cited by female executives. The indicators are that these assignments are less available to women, including start-ups, troubleshooting, and international experience (Morrison, 1988). The same kind of restrictions on minority managers may also block their advancement. One unusual task force has taken this challenge of increasing the mobility between "secondary" jobs and primary jobs. Mobil's Committee of Executives targets high-potential women and minorities and places them in key line jobs (Nelton & Berney, 1987).

Senior managers can help move women and minorities out of secondary or threshold management posts by giving them opportunities to take such challenging assignments in the mainstream of the organization, and to reinforce their authority in those assignments. A recent study revealed that "only one woman in five found the professional impact of gender to be primarily negative abroad" (Jelinek & Adler, 1988, p. 16). However, confronting superiors' resistance to get the assignment abroad was a major hurdle. Once a woman began the job, her senior male colleagues, particularly from the head office, became important in redirecting early client conversations away from her male colleagues and toward the woman herself to establish smooth, ongoing work relationships (Jelinek & Adler, 1988).

Career development functions such as these are often attributed to mentors; yet, as we noted, women and minorities face special problems with mentoring relationships. Some companies such as Ortho Pharmaceutical Corp. (Zintz, 1988) have tried formally assigning mentors to promising

women and minorities, sometimes also including white male protégés in the program as well. However, there is little evidence that assigning mentors is effective (Feinstein, 1987; Noe, 1988a; Zey, 1985). One suggested alternative (or complement) to a formal mentor program is to provide training on how to be a mentor and how to be mentored (Dickens & Dickens, 1982; Feinstein, 1987; Willbur, 1987). This approach may not only help build awareness of the barriers involved, but it may also allow the element of choice to continue in relationships initiated both by women and minorities seeking a mentor and by more senior managers who want to help.

Support groups may also help. Security Pacific National Bank created a program called Black Officers Support System (BOSS) to help recruit blacks and reduce their turnover (Irons & Moore, 1985). The Executive Leadership Council in Washington, D.C. consists of about 50 black line managers from major industries who recruit and hire minorities (Leinster, 1988). These groups, along with the many internal women's networks and community groups for women and minorities, may help by providing career guidance and psychological support in managing biculturalism and other tensions.

Despite the existence of these various remedies, the glass ceiling continues to frustrate ambitious women and minorities. While employers' attitudes appear to be changing, the lack of results can be partly attributed to the lack of employers committed to equal opportunity. A 1983 survey of nearly 800 business opinion leaders (reported by Jones, 1986) showed that, of 25 possible human resource priorities, the issue of affirmative action for minorities and women ranked twenty-third. Some efforts to attack discrimination in organizations have no doubt been piecemeal, and some may even have been harmful. When women believed they were hired only to meet EEO guidelines, there was a negative effect on their self-image and development (Heilman, Simon, & Repper, 1987).

Poor results may also be attributed to confusion over which remedies affect which symptoms or causes of differential treatment. As Dipboye (1987) points out, few attempts have been made to evaluate training programs, as evidenced by the sparsity of evaluation studies in the literature.

Research Needed

Evaluating potential remedies to sex- and race-based differential treatment in management is no small task. One difficulty is that the organizational context is so complicated that factors external to specific remedies may affect the outcome more than the remedies themselves. Interventions that can and should be made in critical organizational practices such as recruitment and selection, evaluation, career development, and promotion may be greatly influenced by what Merlin Pope called "contextual prejudices," or exclusionary mechanisms that subtly keep women and minorities on the outside (Jaffe, 1985; Lee, 1986; Morrison et al., 1987; Nelton, 1988; Noe, 1988b; Powell, 1988; Sandler, 1986). A major challenge for researchers is to assess specific techniques, taking into account the effects of organizational culture and other contextual factors. Research across organizations to assess techniques would provide useful data which would allow executives to select those techniques that are shown to be more effective under circumstances that match those in their own organizations. Better links between specific techniques and theoretical constructs such as those reviewed here are also needed.

Many more fundamental research issues are apparent by the questions that remain. These include unraveling the effects of race, sex and age in studies by separating female subjects by age and race, separating blacks by sex and age, and so on. Another needed step is separating one minority group from another rather than grouping them as "minorities"; data on Hispanics and Asians are particularly needed. Assumptions are made about how white women experience the same or different treatment as men or women of color, but little research addresses this issue. Studies that separate the various groups would provide useful comparison data, particularly with regard to the impact of various remedial actions within organizations. Further theoretical refinement is also needed, so that theories based on one group (such as white men) are not erroneously generalized to all others. Career development is one such area in which models developed on white males' career experiences may be inappropriately applied to women or minorities (Thomas & Alderfer, in press).

The number of promising research areas is indicated by the number of questions this review has raised. We especially encourage research in organizations using actual managers and multiple methods so that the results reflect realistic situations. However, it is important that research be done on a variety of theoretical and applied issues. Research is needed to answer questions about whether actual or perceived differences are keeping women and minorities below a glass ceiling in management, and the extent to which the structures and systems of organizations contribute to limited upward

mobility. With the demographic changes already taking place in the U.S. labor force, restricting the pool of potential organizational leaders to only white men is foolhardy. Achieving diversity in management requires action. Continued research will help ensure that effective action is taken.

References

- Alderfer, C.P. (1986). An intergroup perspective on group dynamics. In J. Lorsch (Ed.), *Handbook of organizational behavior* (pp. 190-222). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Baum, L. (1987, June 22). Corporate women. *Business Week*, pp. 72-78.
- Bearden, K.W. (1984). *Women protégés' perception of the mentoring process*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Louisville.
- Becker, G. (1957). *The economics of discrimination*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bell, E.L. (1988). *The bicultural life experience of career oriented black women*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Blacks in management: No progress. (1983, January). *Management World*, p. 24.
- Blau, F.D., & Ferber, M.A. (1987). Occupations and earnings of women workers. In K.S. Koziara, M.H. Moskow, & L.D. Tanner (Eds.), *Working women: Past, present, future* (pp. 37-68). Washington, DC: BNA Books.
- Bradsher, K. (1988, March 17). Women gain numbers, respect in board rooms. *The Los Angeles Times*, pp. 1, 6.
- Cabezas, A., Shinagawa, L.H., & Kawaguchi, G. (in press). Income differentials among Asian Americans, blacks, and whites in California, 1980. In S. Chan (Ed.), *Persistent inequality in the United States*. Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press.
- Cabezas, A., Tam, T.M., Lowe, B.M., Wong, A., & Turner, K. (in press). Empirical study of barriers to upward mobility of Asian Americans in the San Francisco Bay area. In G. Nomura, R. Endo, R. Leong, & S. Sumida (Eds.), *Frontiers of Asian American studies*. Pullman, WA: Washington State University Press.
- Cox, T., Jr., & Nkomo, S. (1987). *Race as a variable in OB/HRM research: A review and analysis of the literature*. Paper presented at the Symposium on Black Career Research, Drexel University, Philadelphia, PA.
- Cox, T., Jr., & Nkomo, S. (1986). Differential performance appraisal criteria: A field study of black and white managers. *Group and Organization Studies*, 11, 101-119.
- Davis, G., & Watson, G. (1982). *Black life in corporate America*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday.
- DeGeorge, G. (1987, June 22). Where are they now? Business Week's leading corporate women of 1976. *Business Week*, pp. 76-77.

- Dickens, F., Jr., & Dickens, J.B. (1982). *The black manager: Making it in the corporate world*. New York: Amacom.
- Dipboye, R.L. (1987). Problems and progress of women in management. In K.S. Koziara, M.H. Moskow, & L.D. Tanner (Eds.), *Working women: Past, present, future* (pp. 118-153). Washington, DC: BNA Books.
- Dobbins, G.H., & Platz, S.J. (1986). Sex differences in leadership: How real are they? *Academy of Management Review*, 11, 118-127.
- Donnell, S.M., & Hall, J. (1980, Spring). Men and women as managers: A significant case of no significant difference. *Organizational Dynamics*, 8, 60-76.
- Drazin, R., & Auster, E.R. (1987, Summer). Wage differences between men and women: Performance appraisal ratings vs. salary allocation as the locus of bias. *Human Resource Management*, 26, 157-168.
- Dubno, P. (1985). Attitudes toward women executives: A longitudinal approach. *Academy of Management Journal*, 28, 235-279.
- Ellis, J. (1988, March 14). The black middle class. *Business Week*, pp. 62-70.
- Fagenson, E.A. (1988a). *At the heart of women in management research: Theoretical and methodological approaches and their biases*. Paper presented at the WIM Conference, Halifax, Nova Scotia.
- Fagenson, E.A. (1988b). The power of a mentor. *Group and Organization Studies*, 13, 182-194.
- Fagenson, E.A., & Horowitz, S.V. (1985). On moving up: A rest of the person-centered, organization-centered and interactionist perspectives. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 345-348.
- Feinstein, S. (1987, November 10). Women and minority workers in business find a mentor can be a rare commodity. *The Wall Street Journal*, p. 39.
- Fernandez, J.P. (1981). *Racism and sexism in corporate life*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Fitt, L.W., & Newton, D.A. (1981, March-April). When the mentor is a man and the protégé a woman. *Harvard Business Review*, pp. 56-60.
- Ford, D., & Wells, L., Jr. (1983). *Upward mobility factors among black public administrators*. Paper presented at the National Forum for Black Public Administrators.
- Freedman, S.M., & Phillips, J.S. (1988). The changing nature of research on women at work. *Journal of Management*, 14, 231-251.

- Gooden, W. (1980). *The adult development of black men*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yale University.
- Greenhaus, J.H., Parasuraman, S., & Wormley, W.M. (1988, August). *Organizational experiences and career success of black and white managers*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Anaheim, CA.
- Gutek, B.A. (1985). *Sex and the workplace*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Harlan, A., & Weiss, C. (1981, September). *Moving up: Women in managerial careers* (Working Paper No. 86). Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College, Center for Research on Women.
- Heilman, M.E., & Martell, R.F. (1986). Exposure to successful women: Antidote to sex discrimination in applicant screening decisions? *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 37, 376-390.
- Heilman, M.E., Simon, M.C., & Repper, D.P. (1987). Intentionally favored, unintentionally harmed? Impact of sex-based preferential selection on self-perceptions and self-evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, 62-68.
- Herbert, J.I. (1986). *The adult development of black male entrepreneurs*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yale University.
- Howard, A., & Bray, D.W. (1988). *Managerial lives in transition*. New York: Guilford.
- Hunt, D.M., & Michael, C. (1983, July). Mentorship: A career training and development tool. *Academy of Management Review*, 8, 475-486.
- Hymowitz, C., & Schellhardt, T.D. (1986, March 24). The glass ceiling. *The Wall Street Journal*, pp. 1D, 4D-5D.
- Ilgen, D.R., & Youtz, M.A. (1986). Factors affecting the evaluation and development of minorities in organizations. *Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 4, 307-337.
- Irons, E.D., & Moore, G.W. (1985). *Black managers: The case of the banking industry*. New York: Praeger.
- Jaffe, B. (1985, September). A forced fit. *Training and Development Journal*, 39(9), 82-83.
- James, F.E. (1988, June 7). More blacks quitting white-run firms: Many cite bias, desire to help minority firms. *The Wall Street Journal*, p. 37.
- Jelinek, M., & Adler, N.J. (1988, February). Women: World-class managers for global competition. *Executive*, II, 11-19.

- Jones, E.W., Jr. (1986, May-June). Black managers: The dream deferred. *Harvard Business Review*, pp. 84-93.
- Kanter, R. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Korn/Ferry International's profile of women senior executives. (1982). New York: Korn/Ferry International.
- Kram, K.E. (1985). *Mentoring at work*. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.
- Lan, D. (1988, September 7). *Information hearing on Asian, Filipino, Pacific Islander (AFPI) demographics and employment*. Memo presented to the California State Personnel Board.
- Larwood, L., & Gattiker, U.E. (1987). A comparison of the career paths used by successful women and men. In B.A. Gutek & L. Larwood (Eds.), *Women's career development* (pp. 129-156). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Larwood, L., Gutek, B., & Gattiker, U.E. (1984). Perspective on institutional discrimination and resistance to change. *Group and Organization Studies*, 9, 333-352.
- Larwood, L., Szwajkowski, E., & Rose, S. (in press). When discrimination makes "sense" - The rational bias theory of discrimination. In B.A. Gutek, A.H. Stromberg, & L. Larwood (Eds.), *Women and work*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Larwood, L., Szwajkowski, E., & Rose, S. (1988). Sex and race discrimination resulting from manager-client relationships: Applying the rational bias theory of managerial discrimination. *Sex Roles*, 18, 9-29.
- Leavitt, J.A. (1988). *Women in administration and management: An information sourcebook*. New York: Oryx Press.
- Lee, C. (1986, December). Training for women: Where do we go from here? *Training*, pp. 26-40.
- Leinster, C. (1988, January 18). Black executives: How they're doing. *Fortune*, pp. 109-120.
- Liden, R.C. (1985). Female perceptions of female and male managerial behavior. *Sex Roles*, 12, 421-433.
- Madden, J.F. (1985). The persistence of pay differentials: The economics of sex discrimination. In L. Larwood, A.H. Stromberg, & B.A. Gutek (Eds.), *Women and work: An annual review, Vol. 1* (pp. 76-114). Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Mainiero, L.A. (1986). Coping with powerlessness: The relationship of gender and job dependency to empowerment-strategy usage. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31, 633-653.

- Malveaux, J., & Wallace, P. (1987). Minority women in the workplace. In K.S. Koziara, M.H. Moskow, & L.D. Tanner (Eds.), *Working women: Past, present, future* (pp. 265-298). Washington, DC: BNA Books.
- McCall, M.W., Jr., Lombardo, M.M., & Morrison, A.M. (1988). *The lessons of experience*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Merenivitch, J., & Reigle, D. (1979, January). *Toward a multicultural organization*. (Available from The Procter & Gamble Company, Personnel Development Department, Cincinnati, OH.)
- Morrison, A.M. (1988, May). *Comparing the career paths of men and women*. Paper presented at The Conference Board's conference on *Women in the corporation: The value added*, New York, NY.
- Morrison, A.M., White, R.P., Van Velsor, E., & Center for Creative Leadership. (1987). *Breaking the glass ceiling: Can women reach the top of America's largest corporations?* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Nelton, S. (1988, July). Meet your new work force. *Nation's Business*, pp. 14-21.
- Nelton, S., & Berney, K. (1987, May). Women: The second wave. *Nation's Business*, pp. 18-27.
- Nieva, V.F., & Gutek, B.A. (1981). *Women and work: A psychological perspective*. New York: Praeger.
- Nkomo, S.M. (in press). Race and sex: The forgotten case of the black female manager. In S. Rose & L. Larwood (Eds.), *Women's careers: Pathways and pitfalls*. New York: Praeger.
- Noe, R.A. (1988a). An investigation of the determinants of successful assigned mentoring relationships. *Personnel Psychology*, 41, 457-479.
- Noe, R.A. (1988b). Women and mentoring: A review and research agenda. *Academy of Management Review*, 13, 65-78.
- Office of Personnel Management. (1989). Full citation forthcoming.
- Osajima, K. (1988). Asian Americans as the model minority: An analysis of the popular press image in the 1960s and 1980s. In G.Y. Okihiro, S. Hune, A.A. Hansen, & J.M. Liu (Eds.), *Reflections on shattered windows: Promises and prospects for Asian American studies*. Pullman, WA: Washington State University Press.
- Ploski, H.A., & Williams, J. (1983). *The Negro almanac: A reference work on the Afro-American*. New York: Wiley.
- Powell, G.N. (1988). *Women and men in management*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Powell, G.N., & Butterfield, D.A. (in press). The "good manager": Does androgyny fare better in the 1980s? *Group and Organization Studies*.
- Riger, S., & Galligan, P. (1980). An exploration of competing paradigms. *American Psychologist*, 35, 902-910.
- Ritchie, R.J., & Moses, J.L. (1983, May). Assessment center correlates of women's advancement into middle management: A 7-year longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 227-231.
- Roberts, J.L. (1988, May 11). Gannett surpasses other newspaper firms in the hiring and promotion of minorities. *The Wall Street Journal*, p. 25.
- Rogan, H. (1984, October 26). Young executive women advance farther, faster than predecessors. *The Wall Street Journal*, p. 31.
- Rosen, B., Templeton, N.C., & Kichline, K. (1981, December). First few years on the job: Women in management. *Business Horizons*, 24, 26-29.
- Rosener, J.B. (1986, December 7). Coping with sexual static. *The New York Times Magazine*, pp. 89, 120-121.
- Sandler, B.R. (1986, October). *The campus climate revisited: Chilly for women faculty, administrators, and graduate students*. Washington, DC: The Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges.
- Schmidt, P. (1988, October 16). Women and minorities: Is industry ready? *The New York Times*, pp. 25, 27.
- Simpson, J.C. (1981, January). The woman boss. *Black Enterprise*, pp. 20-25.
- Staley, C.C. (1984, September). Managerial women in mixed groups: Implications of recent research. *Group and Organization Studies*, 9, 316-332.
- Stevens, G.E. (1984, June). Attitudes toward blacks in management are changing. *Personnel Administrator*, pp. 163-171.
- Taylor, A., III. (1986). Why women managers are bailing out. *Fortune*, pp. 16-23.
- Thomas, D.A. (1986). *An intra-organizational analysis of black and white patterns of sponsorship and the dynamics of cross-racial mentoring*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yale University.
- Thomas, D.A., & Alderfer, C.P. (in press). The influence of race on career dynamics: Theory and research on minority career experiences. In M. Arthur, D. Hall, & B. Lawrence (Eds.), *Handbook of career theory*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Thurow, L. (1969). *Poverty and discrimination*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institute.

- Trost, C. (1987, November 30). Best employers for women and parents. *The Wall Street Journal*, p. 21.
- U.S. Department of Labor. (1987, May). *Work force 2000*. Washington, DC: Employment and Training Administration.
- U.S. Department of Labor. (1986). *Meeting the challenges of the 1980s*. Washington, DC: Women's Bureau.
- Varca, P., Shaffer, G.S., & McCauley, C.D. (1983, June). Sex differences in job satisfaction revisited. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 348-353.
- Von Glinow, M.A., & Krzyckowska-Mercer, A. (1988, Summer). Women in corporate America: A caste of thousands. *New Management*, 6, pp. 36-42.
- Wells, L., & Jennings, C.L. (1983). Black career advances and white reactions: Remnants of Herrenvolk democracy and the scandalous paradox. In D. Vails-Webber, & W.N. Potts (Eds.), *Sunrise seminars* (pp. 41-47). Arlington, VA: National Institute.
- White, M.C., Crino, M.D., & DeSanctis, G.L. (1981). A critical review of female performance, performance training and organizational initiatives designed to aid women in the work-role environment. *Personnel Psychology*, 34, 227-248.
- Willbur, J. (1987, November). Does mentoring breed success? *Training and Development Journal*, 38-41.
- Yammarino, F.J., & Dubinsky, A.J. (1988). Employee responses: Gender- or job-related differences? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 32, 366-383.
- Zintz, A.C. (1988, May). *Succession planning, career tracks and mentoring*. Paper presented at The Conference Board's conference on *Women in the corporation: The value added*, New York, NY.
- Zey, M. (1985, February). Mentor programs: Making the right moves. *Personnel Journal*, 53-57.