

WOMEN AND LEADERSHIP: THE ROLE OF MENTORING AND NETWORKING⁺

by

Cindy A. Schipani*
Terry M. Dworkin**
Angel Kwolek-Folland***
Virginia G. Maurer****

The *Wall Street Journal*, in interviews with top women executives, discussed their path to the top and the importance of mentoring in getting there. The response of Michelle Coleman Mayes was typical. She stressed the importance of having many mentors at different points in one's career, and to mentor others. The question, and positive responses of the executives, indicates the acceptance of the idea that mentoring is important, if not crucial, in helping women and minorities, to reach the top ranks in organizations.¹

For at least two decades social research has confirmed what many have learned through experience. This article reviews the extant literature that addresses the ways in which mentoring and networking, both formal and informal, may help women executives achieve the highest levels of organizational leadership in business organizations, both national and international. In particular, the paper aims to identify those gaps of knowledge that, if bridged, would help companies better understand how to use mentoring and networking to develop women as leaders in multinational and multicultural business environments. The paper further seeks to identify the legal issues suggested by the mentoring and networking literature.

This article reviews and assesses the literature on mentoring and networking from different academic fields, including law, social psychology, sociology, and economics. Our objective is to identify features of successful programs with an eye toward focusing on the issues presented in a cross-cultural context. We begin in Part I with the relevance of globalization to gender in top leadership. Part II describes the barriers women face on the road to top leadership, and suggests the value of better understanding mentoring and networking as a possible pathway around these barriers. Part III identifies the extant theories of how and toward what end mentoring and networking function, examines the evidence supporting and refuting these theories, and provides examples of various business practices that reflect them. In conclusion, we find that the available literature suggests that although mentoring and networking experiences are not gender neutral, they are important pathways for women to obtain positions of organizational leadership. Further research about mentoring and networking in the context of cross-cultural issues and multinational corporations is still very much needed.

I. THE IMPACT OF GLOBALIZATION ON GENDER IN TOP LEADERSHIP

The contextual reality of a globalized knowledge economy requires special mention. Globalization almost certainly affects gender equality in the workplace. A substantial body of work relates political and economic globalization and gender participation in the workforce; the relationships between economic development and gender equity in the workforce; and relationships between gender equity and firm performance.

For example, it is reasonable to expect the globalization of international commerce, trade, and communication, all other things being equal, to reduce barriers to women to achieving top managerial positions. The mechanism connecting globalization to equality may be that the opportunity cost of deselecting for women in a globalized economy is greater than in more balkanized economic regimes, where firms are protected from competitors that achieve efficiency through the full utilization of the market for human capital.² Indeed, there is good reason to conclude that full inclusion of women in top management improves profitability. In a United States study of 353 Fortune 500 companies in eleven industrial sectors over a four year period, Catalyst, Inc. found a robust correlation between gender diversity and profitability.

[C]ompanies with the highest representation of women on their top management teams experienced better financial performance than the group of companies with the lowest women's representation. This finding holds for both financial measures analyzed: Return on Equity (ROI), which is 35.1 percent higher, and Total Return to Shareholders (TRS), which is 34.0 percent higher. . . . In four out of the five industries analyzed, the group of companies with the highest women's representation on their top management teams experienced a higher TRS than the group of companies with the lowest women's representation.³

In addition, the competitive behavior of multinational firms that utilize women in managerial positions may help break down local barriers based on traditional notions of women's roles by hiring local women and also by serving as a role model that stimulates change in the role of women.⁴

At the same time, globalization may affect women in top management positions differently than it affects men or than it affects women in lower management or non managerial positions. For example, because of traditional gender roles, the demands of doing business somewhere in the world at all times, along with the need to be available for both short term

and long term deployment abroad, can affect women's allocation of personal and career interests differently. Long term deployment far from home often poses difficulties for two-career couples that must find suitable opportunities for trailing members of the pair, who are more commonly women.

The relationships between gender, economic development, and the reduction of global poverty also require special mention as contextual realities. Economists and demographers observe a positive correlation between a nation's economic development and women's participation in the paid work force. It follows that with economic development will come the need for better understanding of how women participate in the workforce, not only generally, but also in positions of top leadership. In her economic history of women and work in the United States, Claudia Goldin concluded that "economic progress over the long run has generated a move to economic equality."⁵ She argues that, over the course of American history, one finds a relationship between women in the paid work force and economic development. The pattern is U shaped, with highest and lowest levels of development associated with high levels of participation. In this model, Goldin identifies the United States at present in the rising portion of the U. Furthermore, she attributes the rising slope of the U to the entry of large numbers of married women into the workplace.⁶

Extensive work at the World Bank on the relationship between economic development and gender equality⁷ found greater gender equality critical to a nation's economic growth and to the reduction of poverty⁸ because inequality lowers the productive allocation of labor and contributes to a lower quality of life for both men and women.⁹ Other links between gender inequality and poverty include several critical ideas. First, that females are likely to be more productive – or, at least, as productive – as males if they have access to the inputs of human capital formation that are necessary to form productive workers. Second, that females are more likely than males to devote resources to educating their children and improving human capital rather than to divert them to other uses. Third, that females engaged in paid work tend to produce fewer offspring than females not so engaged, and this lowered fertility rate positively affects the success and environmental sustainability of a nation's and region's economy, at least up to a point.¹⁰ Other scholars find that, despite laws, customs, and social norms that impede or prevent the operation of free labor markets, economic development brings an increase in women's educational opportunities in most societies. The linking mechanism is that the opportunity cost to educated women of bearing and rearing children increases as women move into the workforce, and therefore fertility rates decline and economic well-being increases.¹¹

Although little research links the effect of globalization on access to top levels of organizational leadership, a pattern emerges in the research that does exist. Although women achieve top levels of organizational leadership in many parts of the world, the phenomenon of a career path for women – one in which significant numbers of women systematically acquire the social and cultural capital and experience to lead a substantial economic organization – is most likely a feature of the developed world. Undoubtedly, this generalization holds for males as well, even given that men's opportunities tend to be greater than women's across all cultures and economies. Globalization probably benefits both women and men in developing countries who seek upward mobility as managers. Yet, if Goldin's U-shaped curve holds, the benefit of globalization for women in developing countries is more likely to be captured by those who have the social capital, perhaps by virtue of birth in an educated or elite family. This social capital may provide these women with skills and qualities that make them attractive to global organizations as managers, and thereby enable them to participate in the world economy in ways in which women in their countries were previously excluded.

II. FINDING A PATH: MENTORING WOMEN AROUND THE BARRIERS

A. What We Know about Women Who Make it to the Top

Sociological research on gender and organizational leadership has delved into the mechanisms by which women achieve power and leadership at elite levels at both the national and international level.¹² Researchers have examined the relationship between career success and decisions about family responsibilities and work/life balance in the United States¹³ and internationally;¹⁴ the role of networks, social capital, and mentors;¹⁵ the role of cultural capital, class, and socioeconomic status;¹⁶ the role of cultural and social context in promoting or disrupting gender inequality and discrimination;¹⁷ the course of career paths;¹⁸ the role of values in achieving leadership;¹⁹ and public and corporate policies affecting the rise of women in business and economic leadership.²⁰ In addition, major research undertakings and compilations of research by Vianello and Moore used sociological theories of elite groups, leadership, and gender to analyze how women and men acquire and exercise economic and political power in twenty-seven industrialized countries.²¹

In previous discussion of the above empirical works,²² the authors identified four tentative conclusions generally supported by that research:

Women elites in both politics and business are more likely to come from a more privileged class background, have more highly educated relatives, and have mothers with higher social and economic status than men in comparable positions;

The gender disadvantages that women elites face – the cultural, social, familial, and organizational obstacles – manifest themselves primarily in the process of gaining access to an elite position, the path to top leadership, rather than in performing in the leadership position;

Elite men and elite women differ in the life decisions they have made to manage both personal and career work; and Although women executives tend to have leadership styles that are more democratic, more inclined toward sharing power and communicating in non-competitive ways, those in higher levels of organizational authority exhibit the more “competitive, directive and risk leadership” associated with males.

Thus it appears that, both globally and nationally, women face distinct differences from men in their path²³ to, and their exercise of, power²⁴ and leadership²⁵ to get to the top.

B. Obstacles and Challenges for Rising Women

The barriers women face in corporate environments are legion, in both the United States and in the global economy.²⁶ They emanate both from the organization and from social roles outside the corporation, and especially those related to family. Scholarly literature from several disciplines has identified specific barriers, or hurdles, for women desiring access to the highest level of leadership in organizations, and has suggested other possible factors in their achieving such leadership, both nationally and internationally.²⁷

1. Endogenous barriers

Some barriers for women to top management appear endogenous to the business workplace. The term “glass ceiling,” used to describe the host of invisible but very real barriers that limit women’s rise to the top executive ranks of business organizations, is attributed to two *Wall Street Journal* reporters in 1986.²⁸ It began to appear more commonly in the academic literature shortly preceding²⁹ and following³⁰ the work of the United States Federal Glass Ceiling Commission in the early 1990s.³¹ The concept has had staying power as a metaphorical construct around which organizational behavior scholars have created a robust literature.³²

While explicit rules excluding women from executive roles in corporate America and western Europe have fallen through the influence of law and social pressure, the ceiling in much of the developing world, as well as in parts of the developed world, is better described as either “a glass darkly” or blatantly opaque. In the United States and much of the developed world, the glass ceiling is attributable less to structural barriers and more to organizational and social barriers.³³ Explicit sexual discrimination continues to play a role in reducing women’s access to high levels of management, and especially for women of color.³⁴ The more usual forms of discrimination, however, are the subtle but clear cultural biases and gender stereotypes³⁵ in corporate decision-making, behavior, and job assignment.³⁶ Men and women tend to use different styles of leadership and power and these differences reinforce the existing stereotypes.³⁷ For example, the nature of managerial competition in large organizations, often described as a “tournament” system, favors more traditionally male styles of leadership, and perceives and rewards women who engage in that style differently than it perceives and rewards men.³⁸

2. Exogenous barriers

A substantial body of literature indicates that many of the barriers women face on the way to top leadership stem from factors beyond the structures and constraints of their organizations.³⁹ Rather, they stem from social, political, and cultural factors that mediate the gender role. These factors are not easily affected by the firm, but the firm may accommodate or adjust to these issues in order to have an efficient and productive workforce. In particular, women may have diminished access to the experiences that build social capital,⁴⁰ which in many places includes access to appropriate education.⁴¹ Many jobs and career paths are segmented into those which are feminine and those which are masculine.⁴² Women may also face cultural issues in foreign assignments that make it more difficult to manage effectively.⁴³ And most particularly, they face the challenge of resolving the inevitable conflicts between traditional female and family roles and the role of managerial leadership.⁴⁴

One aspect of these role conflicts is the problem of balancing time between the traditional familial and the managerial role, the “work-life balance.”⁴⁵ Both male and female senior managers are subject to this conflict, but because women traditionally bear the heaviest load of “family work” in most cultures, men face fewer – and different -- role incongruities and conflicts than do women. Women must resolve these conflicts in several contexts: Preserving the degrees of career and geographic mobility that the path to top leadership may require;⁴⁶ sorting priorities at different points in time between the careers in a dual career family unit;⁴⁷ dealing with the consequences of career interruptions that are more common among female managers than among male managers;⁴⁸ and managing childbirth and child-rearing, neither of which is a traditional male role.⁴⁹

C. The Possible Roles of Mentoring and Networking

1. Mentoring

Having an effective mentor is one pathway around barriers women face along the path to top leadership, and the lack of mentoring may contribute to the disproportionate under-representation of women in top leadership of business. A substantial body of research supports the notion that mentoring contributes greatly to career outcomes.⁵⁰ Kram's groundbreaking work in the field more than twenty years ago explicated the benefits of mentoring to organizations, to mentors, and to mentees.⁵¹ Subsequent studies confirm this positive relationship.⁵² The benefit of a good mentor for a mentee is well-known, including higher income, greater job satisfaction, and promotions.⁵³

Furthermore, a mentor can buffer an individual from overt and covert forms of discrimination, lend legitimacy to a person or position, provide guidance and training in the political operation of the organization, and provide inside information on job-related functions.⁵⁴ A mentor may compensate for exclusion from organizational networks where such information is usually found. Mentors can also provide reflected power by signaling that an individual has a powerful sponsor. Mentors can perhaps even increase self-confidence and facilitate career goals.⁵⁵

Researchers have worked with several definitions of mentoring.⁵⁶ The definitions may emphasize the conduct, content, and function of the relationship or they may emphasize the outcome of the relationship.⁵⁷ Usually they include the idea that two individuals are in a relationship at different levels of power, one more senior than the other in terms of power, influence, position, experience, or maturity.⁵⁸ The senior member of the relationship undertakes to advise the junior member about the environment, issues, and relationships he or she encounters or expects to encounter, in the job or in the career.⁵⁹ In short, mentoring is a developmental relationship that may have a career-oriented function and it may also have a psychosocial function.⁶⁰ The former function may be characterized as helping the mentee "learn the ropes"⁶¹ toward the outcome of enhancing the mentee's effective functioning in the organization. The latter may be characterized as providing "counseling, friendship, acceptance and confirmation"⁶² and other forms of psychosocial support enhancing the mentee's "sense of competence, identity and work role effectiveness."⁶³ Thus, although some studies have found the link between mentoring and outcomes somewhat less robust for women than for men,⁶⁴ mentoring nonetheless is a promising source of guidance as women seek pathways around the barriers to their advancement and achievement.⁶⁵

2. Networking

Networking is another way of obtaining guidance around barriers to top leadership. In fact, networking is widely regarded as essential to positive career outcomes.⁶⁶ Its definition is somewhat more fluid, but networking is conceptually distinct from mentoring. It may be thought of as a constellation of developmental relationships⁶⁷ that function in various ways but contribute to positive career outcomes. It constitutes a part of the informal organizational system that is crucial for both men and women to advance through the organizational hierarchy.⁶⁸

I. J. Hetty van Emmerik found that, after one controls for having a mentor, the size and diversity of one's developmental network is positively related to career success.⁶⁹ Moreover, the size and diversity of the network appears to be more strongly correlated with the career satisfaction of women than of men.⁷⁰ This is evocative of earlier studies suggesting that women managers, independently of mentoring, benefit more than do men from general encouragement from superiors,⁷¹ probably because such encouragement leads to training that leads to advancement.⁷² It is also consistent with Adler and Izraeli's findings that, worldwide, social networks contribute to the social capital necessary for advancement to top management⁷³ and, moreover, that women's lack of social networks prevents them from rising to the top to a much greater extent than it does men.⁷⁴

III. MENTORING AND NETWORKING: THEORIES AND EVIDENCE

There is a consensus that mentoring and networking matter in the quest for top leadership. In order to make optimal use of mentoring and networking, however, companies and individuals need to know why and how they matter. This Part explicates the theoretical underpinnings of the mentoring and networking literature; explains how we understand the efficacy, methodologies, and processes of mentoring and networking; identifies how networking and mentoring schemes differently assist men and women; and explores why differences occur where they occur. As one would hope and expect, the literature presents a healthy debate about alternative theories and counter-theories in each of these areas. This Part concludes with examples of mentoring and networking practices in business.

A. The Efficacy of Mentoring and Networking: Theories

The literature advances several theories to explain and predict the efficacy of mentoring and networking. They include: (1) social and cultural capital theory; (2) socioeconomic class theory; (3) personality theory; (4) sociological theories of power; and (5) economic theory of human capital.

1. *Social and cultural capital theory*

Much of the mentoring and networking literature refers to the sociological theories of enhanced social and cultural capital as the basis for the power mentoring and networking confer.⁷⁵ *Social capital* “refers to the sum of the actual and potential resources embedded within, available through, and derived from the network of social relationships.”⁷⁶ Social capital enhances the access to mentors and networks that connect individuals through trust, understanding, and mutual values and that provide conduits for information that makes it easier to attain career goals and personal goals.⁷⁷ Social capital is also gained through networking,⁷⁸ by occupying one or more positions in a social network that provide access to developmental relationships, and that may include mentors.

Social network research has produced significant insights.⁷⁹ Both the diversity of the network relationships⁸⁰ and the strength of the network relationships affect one's efficacy in creating social capital. Relationship strength refers to “the level of emotional affect, reciprocity, and frequency of communication.”⁸¹ Strong ties involve high emotional investment. Conversely, weak ties tend to lack emotional investment. Both mentors and networks can have varying degrees of emotional investment, and those that are relatively strong – that involve long-term stable trusting relationships – provide psychosocial support that bolsters confidence and provides dependable sources of support when it is needed.⁸²

Through these mechanisms, mentoring and networking help build the social capital associated with top managerial leadership.⁸³ In addition, the study of gender differences in networks holds promise for understanding what kinds of networks are most beneficial for women and minorities.⁸⁴

Cultural capital, as a sociological paradigm,⁸⁵ is related to, but conceptually different from, social capital. It includes such elements as natural aptitude and the learned habits of an individual; the use of cultural goods such as art, books, reference tools, the internet, and the like; and institutional certification of knowledge that can be converted into economic capital through labor markets.⁸⁶ An understanding of the significance of cultural capital to accessing positions of power is attributed to the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu. Building on his work, others have explored the extent to which cultural capital is itself “gendered” in the sense that in a given culture access to acquiring salient cultural capital is commonly and systematically denied to women or other groups.⁸⁷ For example, women may be excluded from certain forms of education and public service that form the basis of shared cultural capital in organizations. If so, to what extent do mentoring and social networking represent a path around such a cultural barrier?

2. *Socioeconomic class theory*

Certain aspects of cultural capital are related to *socioeconomic class* status.⁸⁸ Work by Kanter,⁸⁹ Pfeffer,⁹⁰ and Stinchcombe⁹¹ in the 1960s and 1970s extended the theoretical underpinnings of socioeconomic class theory to the study of management. In their 1992 study of career-oriented mentoring of young managers, Whitely, Dougherty, and Ash confirmed that, although the effects were not strong, young managers from higher socioeconomic family origins tended to receive more career-oriented mentoring.⁹² The causative link, presumably, is that higher level managers who themselves tend to come from higher socioeconomic status perceive more similarities with mentees who also come from higher socioeconomic levels, and that this similarity factor influences the selection of mentees and the nature and depth of the mentoring relationship.⁹³ Higher level managers also tend to engage more frequently in networking behaviors.⁹⁴

3. *Personality theory*

Industrial and organizational psychologists have focused on the role of personality in the efficacy of mentoring and networking as career tools.⁹⁵ Though they are variously stated by different strands of personality research, certain relatively stable qualities of personality have the greater predictive value in relating personality to organizational phenomena and experiences, including advancement to top leadership.⁹⁶ Turban and Dougherty⁹⁷ looked at three of these qualities: (1) locus of control, or the extent to which an individual perceives that outcomes are controlled by their own actions or by external forces over which they have no control; (2) self-monitoring, or the extent to which the individual senses social cues and adapts behavior to the situation at hand or does not sense social cues and adjust behavior accordingly; and (3) emotional stability, or the extent to which the individual evaluates herself favorably across situations, reflecting self-esteem on the high end and negativity on the low end. Their work found that “individuals with internal loci of control and high self-monitoring and emotional stability”⁹⁸ were more likely to seek and find mentoring relationships. This mentoring was “related to both career attainment and perceived career success, and career attainment also influenced perceived career success.”⁹⁹ Furthermore, a propensity to engage in networking behavior can be correlated with high self-esteem and extraversion.¹⁰⁰

Other researchers have profitably applied personality theory to the study of mentors¹⁰¹ and effective mentoring, producing a basis for predicting which mentors can effectively provide career-oriented and psychosocial mentoring.¹⁰²

4. Sociological theories of power

Sociologists define power variously. At one level of analysis, power is the ability, or the perceived ability, to influence another or to change another's behavior. This is sometimes described as a "dyadic and reciprocal process" between the one in possession of power and the other. At an organizational level of analysis, power may be viewed as a function, or property, of the structure of the organization and the control over persons in the organization. And at the level of analysis between groups, power may be either symmetrical (or equal) or asymmetrical, in which event one group in the relevant society (which may be the organization) dominates another group and has more resources with which to exercise power. Most saliently, Ragins uses the latter two sociological perspectives with which to study mentoring in organizations and, in particular, to link mentoring research with the study of intra-group power relations in the context of mentoring.¹⁰³ Fagenson¹⁰⁴ posits that power is primarily a function of organizational position and that there are only two types of positions: advantageous ones and disadvantageous ones. The power-dominant group invariably occupies the advantageous ones. This line of work holds promise of yielding useful insights about the use of mentoring by minorities (a term defined in sociology with respect to inter-group power relations and not with respect to numerical majority), such as women and racial minorities, to attain advantageous positions, power, and top leadership in the organization.¹⁰⁵

5. Economic theory of human capital

From the viewpoint of economic theory, women's labor must be used productively in order to fully utilize human capital for the betterment of human welfare. This is an accepted truth to the Western mind, but it is also a reality throughout the world, where women are in fact employed productively – whether in the domestic economy or the measured economy. The full realization of the human potential requires, however, not only that human capital be deployed productively, but also that it be deployed optimally. In the multinational context, it follows that the talent to manage sophisticated organizations in a global knowledge economy is an expensive resource, and it is critical that such talent not be excluded or hindered at the expense of the organization or the society. Indeed, the economic and legal underpinnings of the modern corporation depend upon the organization effectively utilizing human resources, including managerial and directorial talent, for the benefit of shareholders and others.¹⁰⁶

Scholars interested in the cross-cultural prevalence and historical tenacity of gender inequity have explored the complex relationship between women's economic position inside and outside the family.¹⁰⁷ They argue that although women may choose to maximize their individual economic opportunities outside the family by working for wages, as professionals or managers, or as entrepreneurs, that they always do so within the context of what one scholar has called the "family claim."¹⁰⁸ That is, women's role as family members shapes social, cultural, and legal assumptions about their appropriate functions in the labor force. This phenomenon seems to hold across cultures and historically.¹⁰⁹ Within the family, women's economic contributions historically have been to provide unpaid household labor or to act as flexible wage workers able to step into the workplace when family necessity dictates.¹¹⁰ Further, as sociologist Joan Acker has argued, all forms of social organization to some extent share common gender structures and assumptions.¹¹¹ This is the case because social forms tend to coherence, but the end result creates differences in structure and experience for women and men both in families and in other social, economic, and cultural forms, such as business organizations.¹¹² In either case, women's economic relationship to the family favors the economic well-being of the family rather than that of women as individuals.

This relationship between women and the family can provide an argument for advancing women's status both outside and inside the family itself. In path-breaking work, economist Gary Becker has applied a human capital model of human capital investments to demonstrate the extent to which the family or household unit is a value-maximizing economic unit.¹¹³ The value of deploying talent optimally accrues not only to the larger society, he posits, but also to the basic unit of society, the family. It follows that the family/household unit will deploy human resources more efficiently in labor markets unfettered by gender barriers. That is, the economic society must embrace gender equality in the workplace if families are to allocate time and resources to obtain the greatest value for the family. It is disappointing that Becker's theoretical work has not been applied specifically to women at the highest-earning ranks of organizations, much less to mentoring and networking behaviors. It may be that such questions are too finely granulated for economic analysis, but Becker's hypothesis provides a starting point for understanding the vortex of forces that influence women's ability to achieve top leadership. One would hope to see it explored and understood in the expanded global context, and a rich body of knowledge awaits that application.

B. Functions of Mentoring

The mentoring research literature tends to focus either on the *functions of the mentor* or on the *outcomes of mentoring*.¹¹⁴ It is further segmented into the literature that focuses on the *role of the mentor* or the *role of the mentee*. This

section discusses what is known about the function of mentoring from the standpoint of both parties and how this knowledge is applied in practice.

1. Roles of mentors

Beginning with Kram's work in 1985,¹¹⁵ scholars have observed that mentoring's efficacy is the result of interactions between the mentor and the mentee around (1) career enhancement/development; (2) psychosocial support; and (3) role-modeling. The career enhancement/development mode of mentoring involves the mentor providing training and information about the organization or industry and navigating a career through it. Kram identified five career-oriented roles of mentors: sponsorship, coaching, protection, exposure to higher power in the organization, and challenging work assignments. Although the classical mentoring relationship involves both career development and psychosocial support,¹¹⁶ with attendant emotional involvement and intensity of interpersonal relationship, the career development function can occur successfully in the absence of such bonds. This has important consequences for formal mentoring programs that most likely will involve this mode of mentoring because different mentors and mentoring programs involve different styles of mentoring.

The psychosocial support mode of mentoring involves the mentor in counseling, befriending, encouraging, and building the self-confidence of the mentee. Because good self-esteem and confidence are more likely than poor self-esteem and lack of confidence to result in successful career outcomes, the link between psychosocial mentoring and positive outcomes is established.

The role-modeling mode has been separated out most recently as a distinct mode of mentoring,¹¹⁷ although it is clearly related to the first two modes and may be a part of both information-imparting and psychosocial support. Because the mentor relationship is dyadic in nature, these functions can be observed and studied from the point of view of either the mentor¹¹⁸ or the mentee, or both.

Christopher Orpen conducted a longitudinal study on the effect of a mentor on newcomers to the workplace.¹¹⁹ He found that vocational mentoring, but not personal mentoring, during the first months of employment was associated with greater career success (promotions and salary) in the same organization over the next four years.

Mentoring is specifically beneficial for women and minorities because it chips away at the glass ceiling and provides protégés with career functions.¹²⁰ It also helps women overcome an informational barrier that hinders their advancement in the business world. Results in one study conducted in Scotland showed 57% of women said their fear of moving into – or up in – the business world is related to lack of knowledge.¹²¹ Mentoring can help overcome that fear by providing business and confidence skills training as well as coaching.¹²²

2. Ideal mentors

Scholars have also investigated the characteristics of an ideal mentor along with how protégés can make the most of the relationship.¹²³ Listening and communication skills, patience, knowledge of one's company and industry, and the ability to understand others are said to be ideal characteristics of a mentor.¹²⁴ Also important were honesty, possessing a genuine interest in mentoring, being people-oriented, and having a structured vision.¹²⁵ Establishing an open communication system was most often stated to be one way of making the relationship most effective.¹²⁶ Also mentioned were setting standards and goals, establishing trust, caring for each other, allowing mistakes, taking part in training programs, participating willingly, and being flexible.¹²⁷

3. Formal versus informal mentoring

Georgia T. Chao, Pat M. Walz, and Philip D. Gardner conducted a study comparing organizational socialization, job satisfaction, and salary among informally mentored individuals, formally mentored individuals, and non-mentored individuals.¹²⁸ Their results showed that protégés in informal relationships reported slightly more career-related support from their mentors than protégés in formal relationships, but no differences in psychosocial support.¹²⁹ Moreover, psychosocial support can be provided by many people in an organization.¹³⁰ Both informal and formal protégés showed higher levels of job outcomes than non-mentored individuals, and there was a positive relationship between mentorship functions, especially the career function, and job outcomes for mentored protégés.¹³¹

Stacy D. Blake-Beard has also studied formal mentoring programs and the implications for women participating in them.¹³² She found formal mentoring relationships are generally much shorter than informal ones and are set up by the organization.¹³³ Formal mentors may be more motivated to perform the task assigned to them by the organization than to be a developmental supporter of their protégé. Formal mentors are also more visible and are thus less able to engage in career development behavior that may be seen as favoritism.¹³⁴

Belle Rose Ragins, John L. Cotton, and Janice S. Miller¹³⁵ examined the relationship between job and career attitudes and the presence of a mentor, the mentor's type (formal vs. informal), the quality of the relationship, and the design of a formal program.¹³⁶ The study found a positive relation between satisfaction with a mentoring relationship and career and job attitudes.¹³⁷ Non-mentored individuals reported less job-satisfaction than protégés in highly satisfying informal

mentoring relationships, but protégés in less satisfying informal relationships did not report more job satisfaction than non-mentored individuals. Formally mentored individuals in highly satisfying relationships reported somewhat more positive attitudes than non-mentored individuals.¹³⁸ This shows that the view that informal mentoring relationships will always be more beneficial than formal mentoring relationships is too simplistic; the level of satisfaction with the relationship is key. In some cases non-mentored individuals even expressed more positive attitudes than protégés in dissatisfying relationships.¹³⁹ Formal protégés in effective mentoring programs reported more positive career and job attitudes than those in less effective programs, but only frequency of guidelines and a focus on career support made a program viewed as being more effective.¹⁴⁰

The results also showed that men and women reported equivalent benefits in job and career attitudes from having an informal mentor, but that men with formal mentors reported more career commitment than women with formal mentors. Women with a formal mentor even reported less career commitment than non-mentored men and women.¹⁴¹

Moreover, by outcomes measures of compensation and promotions, it does not appear to matter whether the mentoring relationship is part of a formal program of mentoring or something that occurs informally. It does seem to matter, however, in terms of overall benefits from the relationship, with informal mentoring providing greater overall benefit.¹⁴²

4. Costs and benefits of being a mentor

Studies have explored the relationship between anticipated costs and benefits of being a mentor, mentoring experience, and intentions to mentor.¹⁴³ The primary benefit of being a mentor is a sense of satisfaction received from developing a junior employee.¹⁴⁴ Mentors may also receive self-rejuvenation and a loyal base of support from their protégés.¹⁴⁵ The costs are that the relationship can turn into exploitation, time demands, and the risk of being displaced or backstabbed by protégés.¹⁴⁶ In addition, mentors may be viewed as giving an unfair advantage to their protégés which may hurt their reputation.¹⁴⁷

One study also found that expected costs and benefits were related to intentions to mentor, and that individuals with mentoring experience expressed a greater willingness to mentor than those without.¹⁴⁸ The results of this study suggest that protégés may be more likely to become mentors than non-protégés.

Yet, another study, somewhat to the contrary, found that those now serving as mentors were more favorable to the prospect of mentoring, while those who were now a protégé were less favorably inclined toward mentoring. This may be because protégés assumed they imposed a great burden on their mentors.¹⁴⁹

5. Selecting a protégé

Studies have also considered the characteristics of a protégé which are most important to mentors.¹⁵⁰ Based on social exchange theory, which views interactions between people as an exchange based on cost-benefit analysis,¹⁵¹ one might expect mentors to prefer protégés whom they anticipate will become successful (ability/potential factor). There is also some research suggesting that mentors select protégés based on their need for help.¹⁵²

Allen and her colleagues found that mentors are more likely to select protégés based on the protégé's perceived ability and potential rather than on their need for help, and this was to a greater extent true for female than male mentors.¹⁵³ This may be because females try to limit the risk associated with mentoring by selecting high potential protégés.¹⁵⁴

Similarly, Judy D. Olian, Stephen J. Carroll, and Cristina M. Giannantonio found that a protégé's past performance had significant effects on mentors' intentions to engage in mentoring behaviors on behalf of the protégé, and expected rewards from the relationship.¹⁵⁵ Lower performing protégés were thus less likely to attract a mentor.

Yet, perceived barriers to mentoring were negatively related to selecting a protégé based on ability and potential.¹⁵⁶ It could be that mentors who see great barriers do not want to overcome them for someone they already believe has high potential. It could also be that high ability/potential protégés are seen as more assertive, demanding more of a mentor's time and resources. A positive relationship between mentor advancement aspirations and selecting protégés in need was also found.¹⁵⁷ High aspiration mentors may be visible in the organization attracting the attention of protégés in need, or they may view mentoring someone in need as increasing their own stature.¹⁵⁸

6. Negative aspects of the mentoring relationship

Although mentoring relationships may be generally beneficial, there are some downsides to the relationship. Lillian T. Eby and her colleagues studied the negative aspects of the mentoring relationship, how often they occur, as well as when they are most likely to occur, by obtaining qualitative accounts from protégés.¹⁵⁹ The 156 protégés in the study all reported one or more positive mentoring relationships and 84, or 54%, reported at least one negative relationship. In total, 168 distinct negative experiences were reported, 85% occurring in same-sex relationships.¹⁶⁰

The study yielded five broad categories of negative experiences. In order of frequency they are: (1) mismatch with the dyad, followed by (2) distancing behavior; (3) manipulative behavior; (4) lack of mentor expertise; and (5) general dysfunctionality.¹⁶¹ Within those themes the most frequently reported negative experiences involved mentor neglect, mentor lacking interpersonal skills, mentor abuse of power, and the mentor having dissimilar values and work habits.¹⁶²

No support was found for the hypothesis that mentors would be more likely to have a background that differed from their protégé's when a negative experience was reported; 53% of the protégés with negative experiences had a similar background as their mentor, compared to 61% for the positive experiences.¹⁶³ It was, however, found that those with dissimilar attitudes and values were significantly more likely to report negative experiences.¹⁶⁴ The hypothesis that having a direct supervisor as a mentor would increase the number of negative experiences was also not supported.¹⁶⁵

Victoria A. Parker and Kathy Kram have also identified factors that affect the ability of women to connect with one another in effective mentoring relationships.¹⁶⁶ Senior women reported feeling discounted or overburdened as mentors, or afraid that mentoring is risky to their careers or will take too much time. Junior women found senior women competitive with or unreceptive.¹⁶⁷ One factor that may contribute to this is that women's family role as mother may influence the mentor-protégé relationship.¹⁶⁸ Junior women may be afraid that they may be overpowered by a senior woman, or disappointed when their dependency needs are not met. Senior women may be afraid that junior women will be too dependent on them, and that they will expect them to be perfect.

Another factor concerns balancing family and career.¹⁶⁹ Senior and junior women often do not discuss this central issue because they are afraid they will be judged for the choices they are making or have made.¹⁷⁰ Moreover, junior women may expect empathy and patience from senior women, while the senior women approach mentoring relationships with a masculine model in mind, because that is what they were exposed to themselves and feel is what is needed to advance.¹⁷¹ Furthermore, senior women may look for support outside their organization for lack of other senior women higher in the hierarchy at their firm. This may make junior women believe they are cold and detached from the firm. Finally, men may unconsciously act to keep women apart because it serves to maintain their own power base.¹⁷²

D. Functions of Networking

Networking, while an important skill for every businessperson, can be especially beneficial to women looking to advance their careers. Networking allows an individual to increase visibility and is a good way to "get yourself on the radar screen for future searches."¹⁷³ In addition, participation in professional networks enhances industry knowledge and improves one's ability to offer innovative recommendations in their own workplace,¹⁷⁴ which has the added benefit of increasing visibility. In male-dominated industries, some women find that networking with men is not only beneficial to the advancement of their careers, but also essential. Female rappers, for example, "will not get a foot in the door unless a male artist walks in with them."¹⁷⁵

Forret and Dougherty explored the relationship between networking behaviors and career outcomes, i.e., the number of promotions, compensation and perceived career success, and whether networking behavior is as beneficial for women as it is for men.¹⁷⁶ The results of the study showed increasing internal visibility through networking was significantly related to promotions and compensation for men, but not for women.¹⁷⁷ It may be that assignments and committees women were involved with were less prestigious than those of men. Interestingly, increasing internal visibility was significantly related to perceived career success for women, but not for men. It may also be that women strive more consciously to enhance their visibility, and as a result their efforts contribute to their perceptions of career success. Yet, engaging in professional activities was significantly related to perceived career success for men, but not for women.¹⁷⁸ It could be that organizations value men's professional activities more than women's, or that men negotiate additional compensation for their professional activities.

1. Network size

I.J. Hetty van Emmerik examined the relationship between mentoring constellations (the combination of mentoring relationships and developmental networking relationships) and intrinsic career success.¹⁷⁹ Developmental network size was positively associated with intrinsic career success after controlling for having a mentor. However, the range of developmental network was not related to intrinsic career success.¹⁸⁰ It could be that a greater range network makes someone realize their job is comparatively worse than others.

Stability of the relationships was, however, found to be positively related to career satisfaction, and frequency of contacts was found to be positively related to job satisfaction, providing support for the hypothesis that after controlling for having a mentor, developmental relationship strength is positively associated with career success.¹⁸¹ However, emotional intensity was negatively associated with career satisfaction. Perhaps emotionally intense relationships become increasingly necessary the less satisfied one is with one's job. The study also showed that the size of the network of men is not related to career satisfaction, but the size of the network of women is positively related to career satisfaction.¹⁸²

2. Boundaryless careers

Forret and Dougherty studied 418 professionals to examine the relationship of personal and job characteristics to involvement in networking.¹⁸³ They found networking to be an important career management strategy, particularly in the era of boundaryless careers. They define a boundaryless career as one in which an individual takes responsibility for his or her

career and moves among various firms.¹⁸⁴ The structure of an individual's networks is important in understanding networking behaviors. The more structural holes one has in one's network, i.e. the fewer redundant contacts one has, the more access to information one has and the greater one's social capital.¹⁸⁵

Monica C. Higgins and Kathy E. Kram introduce a typology of developmental networks of which the main dimensions are the diversity of individuals' developmental networks, and the strength of the relationships that make up the networks.¹⁸⁶ They similarly find developmental networks important in the boundaryless work environment.¹⁸⁷ These networks become increasingly important because firms no longer provide the primary anchor to a person's identity.¹⁸⁸ Also, in keeping up with technological developments individuals may need to draw on sources other than senior-level employees. Moreover, the workplace has become increasingly diverse which affects the needs and resources available for development.¹⁸⁹

3. *Personal characteristics*

Forret and Dougherty studied the personal characteristics of those utilizing networks.¹⁹⁰ Contrary to their hypothesis, Forret and Dougherty found that gender was not related to involvement in networking.¹⁹¹ This may be because feminine values, such as cooperation and building relationships, are important in the boundaryless career, benefiting women.¹⁹² However, they found socioeconomic background to be positively related to networking, as were self-esteem and attitudes toward workplace politics.¹⁹³ They also found that organizational level was positively related to networking, but holding a sales or marketing position bore only a limited relationship to involvement in networking.¹⁹⁴

4. *Dimensions of developmental networks*

Higgins and Kram identify four central concepts to the developmental network perspective.¹⁹⁵ The first is the network which is defined as "the set of people a protégé names as taking an active interest in and action to advance the protégé's career by providing developmental assistance [i.e. career and psychosocial support]."¹⁹⁶ The other concepts are the developmental relationships that make up the network, the diversity of the network defined as the number of different social systems the ties originate from, and relationship strength (strong vs. weak), i.e. the level of emotional affection, reciprocity, and frequency of communication.¹⁹⁷

They further find four categories of developmental networks.¹⁹⁸ The first is the *entrepreneurial network*, characterized by high developmental network diversity and high developmental relationship strength.¹⁹⁹ This network is made up of developers who are highly motivated to act on behalf of the protégé and who provide access to a wide array of information. The second is the *opportunistic network*, characterized by high developmental network diversity and low developmental relationship strength.²⁰⁰ In this network individuals are open to receiving developmental assistance from multiple sources, but generally passive toward initiating and cultivating such relationships.²⁰¹ Third is the *traditional network*, characterized by low developmental network diversity and high developmental relationship strength.²⁰² The ideal type is composed of one strong tie to one social system, and one additional tie from that system. The information received is likely to be highly similar. Fourth is the *receptive network*, characterized by low developmental network diversity and low developmental relationship strength. This network is made up of weak ties that come from the same social system.²⁰³

The authors expect that when the protégé and his or her developers care about career as well as psychosocial support, relationship ties will be stronger, yielding an entrepreneurial or traditional network.²⁰⁴ They also expect that individuals with entrepreneurial networks will be more likely to experience career change because they receive assistance from a variety of strong-tie sources. Furthermore, they expect that individuals with strong-tie relationships should experience more personal learning than those with weak ties, because of the amount of psychosocial support involved.²⁰⁵ Another proposition they put forward is that individuals with traditional networks will experience the highest levels of organizational commitment. This is because strong-tie guidance will be provided only from within the organization.²⁰⁶ Finally, they expect protégés with receptive or opportunistic networks to experience lower levels of work satisfaction than individuals with the other kinds of networks, because with only weak-ties an individual is unlikely to experience the acceptance and confirmation of one's work that comes with strong ties.²⁰⁷

5. *Network dependency*

Michael and Gary Yukl examined managers' internal and external networking behavior and network dependency.²⁰⁸ Dependency is defined as the extent to which cooperation and support are needed to carry out a manager's job responsibilities effectively and achieve a desired rate of career advancement.²⁰⁹

The results showed that middle- and upper-level managers had more external dependency than lower-level managers and did more external networking. Middle- and upper-level managers also had more internal dependency than lower-level managers, and upper-level managers did more internal networking than middle- or lower-level managers. It could be that because upper-level managers have greater status and power in the organization, making it easier for them to network. It

could also be that networking not only depends on the level of dependency but also on the source of dependency; upper-level managers are more dependent on subordinates of subordinates, whereas midlevel managers are more dependent on superiors.

Managerial function also affected both external dependency and external networking behavior; marketing and production managers had more external dependency than finance managers, and marketing managers also did more external networking. The reasons most often given for dependency of network members were the need for information and the need for cooperation and coordination.²¹⁰

E. How Networking and Mentoring Differently Assist Men and Women and Why That May Happen

A considerable body of mentoring research has focused on the possible differences in the way men and women use, respond to, and benefit from mentoring and networking. We should state at the outset that there is debate in the sociology-oriented literature about whether it is useful to study these possible differences as gender-based, as though differences were the product of intrinsic gender-based qualities and conditions, or whether it is more useful to study these possible differences from the standpoint of how people in power-minority groups navigate intergroup power relations to accomplish what they seek.²¹¹ If female leadership aspirants and their companies understand that the barrier mentoring is designed to bypass is the state of “being female,” then they would frame mentoring and networking programs differently than they would if they understood the barrier to lie in the distribution of organizational power along lines that produced sub-optimal allocation and deployment of human resources. The latter conceptual framework would suggest a different set of choices for women who aspire to top leadership.²¹² These perspectives are not mutually exclusive, but they represent significantly different approaches to scientific inquiry and are likely to lead to significantly different recommendations for women and for companies. We observe that the preponderance of the literature takes the gender-based approach, but neither approach should be discarded at this point in the understanding of the mentoring and networking phenomena.

1. Gender differences in mentoring

Historically, American women have been less likely to receive mentoring than American men,²¹³ even though mentoring matters greatly for advancing to top leadership. Women who receive mentoring fare significantly better than their un-mentored counterparts, and this appears to be the case not only in management but in other professions as well.²¹⁴ In addition, there is support for the idea that women mentees receive more,²¹⁵ and report greater benefit from, the psychosocial aspects of mentoring than do men. And men report greater benefit from career-oriented aspects of the mentor relationship.²¹⁶ There is support, however, for the proposition that women *actually* benefit more from the career development aspects of mentoring than from the psychosocial.²¹⁷ This finding could reflect the greater utility of career-oriented mentoring, or it could simply reflect the greater efficacy of receiving mentoring from the dominant gender. In fact, an independent line of work suggests the preeminent value of mentoring by a member of the dominant group.²¹⁸ As women advance in rank, their need for psychosocial support and role modeling becomes less important than their need for career development and legitimacy within the organization.²¹⁹ Taken together, it would follow that women (that is, women in the culture of the United States, who represent the study samples) who are to reach top leadership positions need to include a white male among their mentors.

Further research supports the proposition that the gender-homogenous or gender-diverse nature of the mentoring dyad affects the nature of the mentoring function.²²⁰ Male mentors routinely provide less psychosocial and role-modeling mentoring and more career development than do female mentors, and this finding holds whether the mentee is of the same or different gender.²²¹ The career development function of a male mentor, however, is more robust and less psychosocial when the mentee is a female than when the mentee is a male.²²² There is also evidence suggesting that the duration of a mentoring relationship moderates the effects of not sharing gender similarity with the mentor, in terms of emotional intensity of the relationship.²²³

Men report seeking out mentors, initiating the relationship with them, and utilizing a larger number of mentors through the course of their careers, while women report having fewer mentors and a willingness to continue to be mentored at a higher age than men. This effect may not hold, however, for women who have reached elite levels of corporate leadership,²²⁴ who may be more likely to have had a mentor and to report having had more mentors, and mentors more highly placed in the organization than similarly situated men.

Research also shows that female non-protégés have lower expectations with regard to advancement opportunities within the organization and for alternative employment elsewhere, than female protégés and male protégés and male non-protégés.²²⁵ Yet, female non-protégés reported neither diminished organizational commitment and job satisfaction nor enhanced role ambiguity compared to the other three groups. It may be that women believe a mentor is essential for career advancement, and have lower mobility expectations in the absence of a mentoring relationship. Men on the other hand, do not see the absence of a mentor as reducing their chances of finding employment outside of their current organization.²²⁶ Contrary to what is the case for female non-protégés, not having a mentor devalues the current work environment for male non-protégés.²²⁷ This may be because men are more likely to expect obtaining a mentor, and when that does not happen, they reduce their psychological commitment to their current organization.

Ellen A. Fagenson studied 246 individuals in the health-care industry to examine whether male and high-level mentees have a more favorable job/career experience than female and low-level mentees.²²⁸ Fagenson found that individuals with mentors rated themselves as having significantly more career mobility, recognition, satisfaction, and promotions than did non-mentored individuals. She also found that high-level mentored individuals reported more career mobility and a higher degree of satisfaction than did low-level mentored individuals.²²⁹ Overall, however, mentoring was found to be egalitarian in its positive effect on individual's career outcomes.²³⁰

Furthermore, there is adequate evidence that women executives recognize the need for mentoring but approach it differently.²³¹ Women with mentors are more likely to report that they "fell into" a mentoring relationship than that they were selected for one or sought one actively.²³² Several reasons for women's reluctance to seek out mentors are offered in the literature, including the sex-role expectations and limited access to suitable mentors.²³³ Traditional gender roles fix women in a passive role in the initiation of a relationship, and this may complicate the matter, although there is some evidence that that risk does not much deter women from initiating mentoring relationships with men.²³⁴

2. Cross-gender relationships

There are both positive and negative aspects to cross-gender mentoring. Researchers have found that females tend to provide more role modeling and less career development than male mentors and that homogeneous male relationships offer less psychological support than female mentors in relationships with male protégés.²³⁵ Yet scholars have also found that contrary to expectations, male mentors did not provide more career support than did female mentors, but female mentors did provide more psychosocial support.²³⁶ Complicating matters further, psychosocial support may reduce women's advancement more than men's.²³⁷ Psychosocial support may not help advance women because it focuses on inward emotions and well-being rather than helping women deal directly with obstacles in the external environment, as career mentoring does.²³⁸ Thus, career support from a female mentor may help advance women most, but this must be balanced against the possible negative influence of the psychosocial mentoring.²³⁹

Cross-gender mentoring, however, is thought to eliminate an often-overlooked flaw in same-gender pairing, which is the deprivation of "men in power of the opportunity to learn from the experiences and perceptions of promising women."²⁴⁰ Providing men in power with female perspectives will not only help the men to become better managers, but it is also likely to improve the overall work environment for all employees, especially the females.

Raymond Noe studied the influence of protégés' job and career attitudes, the gender composition of the mentoring dyad, the amount of time spent with the mentor, and the quality of the relationship on psychological and career benefits protégés gain from mentoring.²⁴¹ The results showed that mentors with protégés of the opposite sex reported that these protégés utilized the relationship more effectively than protégés with the same gender as the mentor.²⁴² It could be that protégés in cross-gender relationships work harder to make the relationship work because they are aware of the possible negative outcomes. Mentors also reported that females use the relationship more effectively than males. Perhaps women are more motivated to use the relationship because of a lack of mentors for women.²⁴³ Protégé job and career attitudes had no effect on the time spent with the mentor or on the quality of the relationship. Protégés who had high levels of job involvement or engaged in career planning, reported receiving more psychosocial benefits than did protégés with low levels of job involvement or underdeveloped career plans.²⁴⁴

Yet, research has not disclosed many cross-gendering mentoring models. Suggested reasons for this discrepancy include: (a) women's lack of access to informal networks, (b) stereotypical beliefs that women are not as suited as men for leadership, and (c) sexual connotations.²⁴⁵ A gender neutral approach may be better because it recognizes neither the existence of different gender-role orientations nor the differences in leadership functions between the sexes.²⁴⁶

Research suggests that cross-gender mentoring relationships provide fewer role modeling functions than same-gender relationships, possibly because role modeling is harder when the mentor and protégés have different social identities based on their gender.²⁴⁷ Although mentees report more frequent contact and greater liking for mentors whom they perceive to be similar to them with respect to gender,²⁴⁸ research has also found no difference in mentoring functions received between homogeneous and diversified relationships.²⁴⁹ This may be because protégés respond more to a mentor's power than gender, or because mentoring is more related to gender roles than biological sex.²⁵⁰

Commentators have expressed a number of theories to explain the paucity of cross-gender mentoring relationships.²⁵¹ In some contexts women may be perceived as more likely to fail to thrive in the organization, reflecting poorly on the mentor.²⁵² There may be negative signals in the workplace about the suitability of women as mentees for male mentors.²⁵³ Either mentor or mentee may be leery of the possibility of sexual involvement in cross-gender mentoring.²⁵⁴ Sexual involvement, or even the appearance or speculation in the office about sexual involvement, may itself pose a barrier to women's advancement in the organization and cause a woman to be reluctant to initiate a mentoring relationship with a man.²⁵⁵

Selecting a female mentor poses few of these particular risks, but female mentors may be scarce. Even though women express a willingness to serve as mentors no less often than do men,²⁵⁶ the relative imbalance of males and females at senior and junior levels makes cross-gender mentoring inevitable if mentoring of women is to occur.²⁵⁷ Female mentors are often lacking because of a lack of women in high positions.²⁵⁸

Although cross-gender programs may not be specifically intended to benefit women, the sociological theories of power suggest that they may help women's advancement more than men's.²⁵⁹ This is because men are generally in the power-dominant group, while women are in the less advantageous group.²⁶⁰ In cross-gender pairs women mentees will be able to take advantages of mentors in the power-dominant group.²⁶¹

3. Gender differences in networking

Although the propensity of men and women to engage in networking behavior is about the same,²⁶² the networking methods of men and women differ.²⁶³ Research has disclosed a difference in both the reality and expectations for networking between men and women.²⁶⁴ Women executives are more likely than male executives to report feeling excluded from access to informal networks, and to the extent they were able to gain access, it was through their mentors.²⁶⁵ In a qualitative study of top executives in the insurance industry, Schor observed that women reported that they "initiated more work-based relationships, went to more work-related functions, and invited more co-workers to lunch than did men."²⁶⁶ Men, on the other hand, were more likely to engage in networks outside the work setting and in socializing with co-workers and their families. To the extent that women perceive themselves to be excluded from outside socializing, it would follow that their networking efforts would be work-based.

4. Role of family

The role of family as a part of one's network is lightly explored in the literature. Schor reports that executive women are far more likely to regard their spouses – all of whom worked in business -- as a source of career advice than were men.²⁶⁷ In addition, there is some evidence that women are more likely to receive valuable network access and advice from their parents, especially their fathers, and their extended families,²⁶⁸ a finding that is consistent with earlier observations about the higher social class origin of executive women.

Some of these differences could reflect psychological theory of gender. Taken together, these findings suggest that men and women may have different modes of career advancement, with males drawing on their characteristic preference for autonomy and individuation and females drawing on their attention to growth through informal relational networks and psychosocial mentoring and their support from family.²⁶⁹

F. Mentoring Models and Business Practices

The above theories explain why some individuals are more successful at mentoring and networking than others. They make clear that people who are lacking in social or cultural capital, and are not from a high socioeconomic class, may miss out on the benefits of mentoring and networking. This is unfortunate, because these may be the people who stand to benefit most from mentoring and networking. A number of companies in the United States and Europe have taken initiatives to remedy this by implementing formal mentoring programs accessible to employees regardless of their status. In addition, mentoring can increase the communication within an organization and help in merging different cultures.²⁷⁰

1. Formal programs

According to Ronald J. Burke and Carol A. McKeen, when establishing a formal mentoring program it is important to set goals and obtain support from the highest management levels.²⁷¹ There also must be a way to attain the set goals, by educating the employees on the importance of mentoring, or by making structural changes within an organization (e.g. rewards for participating in mentoring programs).²⁷² Moreover, they find that being a mentor should be voluntary and protégés should have a say in the matching process. It is suggested that a good structure may be to have a mentor outside the protégé's department, about two levels up in the organizational hierarchy.²⁷³

Blake-Beard identifies five issues women should pay attention to in entering into a formal mentoring relationship. First, it is important to avoid unrealistic expectations—a formal mentoring relationship may not be able to provide the same benefits as an informal relationship. Second, mentoring relationships may fail due to lack of attraction or similarities between the mentor and protégé because they did not seek each other out. Third, mentees should try to maintain the relationship after its formal duration. Fourth, the relationship should be based on reciprocity so that it will be rewarding for both parties involved, and finally, the better relationships try to find the appropriate level of intimacy (the developmental dilemma).²⁷⁴

2. Group mentoring

Gender-neutral programs include both group mentoring programs and community service programs. One type of program has been denoted as a Strategic Collaboration Model.²⁷⁵ This model focuses on succession planning. In other words, a company that elects to use the Strategic Collaboration Model will position individuals to assume increasing levels of

responsibility and then will “groom” them into upper-management material. For our purposes, the most interesting element of the Strategic Collaboration Model is that it uses a group mentoring approach.

Pursuant to this model, a team helps junior members obtain promotions more quickly. Anyone can become a part of the team -- there is no selection requirement by executives or protégés. Group mentoring is viewed to be especially valuable to women helping to eliminate the “gossip factor” because there are always groups of people meeting.²⁷⁶ By utilizing a group mentoring program rather than an individualized approach, companies can avoid the dreaded accusation of favoritism, which is often cited by ex-employees as their main reason for leaving their last place of employment.²⁷⁷

Furthermore, group mentoring provides a social benefit to mentees as well because it “provides opportunities for member to become integrated into the group’s culture.”²⁷⁸ In other words, by participating in group-mentoring, newcomers can obtain a feel for the work environment and will have an easier time adjusting to the group expectations and norms. Along these lines, group mentoring promotes feelings of inclusion and belonging.²⁷⁹ Participation in group mentoring is also linked to higher salaries because it allows participants to “observe and model the behaviors exhibited by other, higher status, members.”²⁸⁰ The relationship between mentorship participation and salary could also be related to the increased sense of professionalism reported by individuals who were mentees in comparison to those who were not.²⁸¹

There are a few other noteworthy benefits of group mentoring taken from the context of e-mentoring programs. Protégés can deal with change and acquire new knowledge more effectively. There is less pressure placed on mentors. And finally, protégés can take responsibility for initiating contact.²⁸²

3. Lateral versus hierarchical mentoring

Lillian T. Eby discusses a typology of mentoring based on the form of the relationship (lateral or hierarchical) and the type of skill development obtained through the mentoring relationship (job-related or career related).²⁸³ The traditional mentoring relationship is hierarchical between a senior and junior member of the same organization focused on the junior’s advancement within that organization. Yet, today’s organizations are characterized by less job security and increased peer relationships among employees, so that lateral mentoring and experiences that diversify a person’s skills may become increasingly important.

The first type of mentoring is the “lateral mentor-protégé relationship, job-related skill development.”²⁸⁴ This refers to relationships among individuals who are at comparable organizational levels in the same organization and the focus is on skills that will help the protégé advance within that organization. One form is peer mentoring, but other forms such as interteam mentoring are also possible. The second type of mentoring is the “lateral mentor-protégé relationship, career related skill development.” The skills developed in this type of relationship are career-enhancing and easily transportable to other organizations (e.g. diversifying career interests and obtaining information on other organizations). The relationship, moreover, includes contacts outside of one’s own department or organization. The third type of mentoring is the “hierarchical mentor-protégé relationship, job-related skill development.”²⁸⁵ This most closely resembles the traditional mentoring relationship in that it exists between a senior and junior member of the same organization and is focused on developing job-related skills which may not be so readily transportable to another organization. The last type is the “hierarchical mentor-protégé relationship, career related skill development.”²⁸⁶ This relationship is also between a senior and junior member, but focuses on skills that the protégé can use in other organizations. One form of this type of mentoring is group professional association mentoring, where the professional organization as a whole serves as the mentor.²⁸⁷

4. Mosaic mentoring

Mosaic mentoring refers to having mentors for different purposes at the same time or at different points in a career. For example, a new female faculty member might have a mentor to help set up a lab and give feedback on early articles, another could introduce her to important people in the national organizations and help her get on the right committees, and later, another might help her get to a leadership position within the school or university.²⁸⁸ It increases the scope of and opportunities for learning. Further, it distributes the mentoring workload. It can also help benefit an expatriate working abroad, her organization, and the organization where she is currently working.²⁸⁹ In the boundaryless economy, it is a way to transfer knowledge across locations and borders.²⁹⁰

5. Community service

Another type of program utilized by some firms involves community service. Corporate volunteering takes place when companies do community service together.²⁹¹ Corporate volunteering benefits the business because it facilitates staff development, enhances the reputation of the business, and is an investment in a healthier community. In addition, employees benefit from corporate volunteering because it provides them with opportunities that may not have otherwise have along with an additional opportunity to be involved with peers. It seems that these programs would provide opportunities for networking.

6. *Programs just for women*

Although theory suggests women in U.S. culture benefit most from having a male mentor, there are a number of existing programs that link businesswomen with other businesswomen to help promote the success of women and to provide women with the opportunity to exchange ideas. In the Buffalo Niagara Partnership's Woman to Woman mentoring program for example, seventy mid-level business women "mentees" were paired with thirty-five top-level local executive women "mentors."²⁹² The mentors provide executive coaching and consulting. The program also holds workshops on mentoring and has helped to develop a mentoring program for female executives at UPS.

Women indicate they like women-to-women programs because of the psychological support they provide. Additionally, women feel less left out and disappointed than when they are mentoring and networking with men. But, although women do indeed benefit from psychological support, they may need to find ways to overcome the feelings of disappointment and exclusion and engage in mentoring and networking relationships with men. Not only are men in the power-dominant group, they also provide more career-mentoring than their female counterparts, which helps women advance more than psychological support. Sumru Erkrut notes that "the upper levels of management have been occupied mostly by men they are the ones holding the power."²⁹³ Moreover, other commentators have found that although women may have more extensive networks than men, "men's networks include more high-status, influential individuals."²⁹⁴

Furthermore, exposure to the leadership styles of the opposite sex is likely to provide benefits. According to Kathy Hannan, men have a different perspective on organization and its culture. To see a business issue through a man's lens might provide a businesswoman with a broader perspective than a mentoring session with another woman.²⁹⁵ Female entrepreneurs can benefit from more mainstream networks in this regard. One of the reasons for entrepreneurs to network is to swap skills.²⁹⁶ Rather than networking only with other women, it is recommended that cross-gender programs are used to complement those networks.

Other concerns are that by participating in women-only networks, a woman may inadvertently be communicating that she has a negative relationship with a male colleague or some other personal problem. On the other hand, some women find women-only networks essential for circumventing men's organizational power.²⁹⁷ Amanda Boyle, a strong role model and mentor for business women in Scotland commenting on her experience with women-only programs, stated that she believed that these programs "gave people the confidence to make a difference."²⁹⁸

Women who participate in Forward Ladies, a women-only network, have identified the following benefits from networking with other women: (a) women are more interested in what you are doing and they do not walk off uninterested, (b) it is less intimidating to network with women because women are more easy-going, and (c) like-minded businesswomen build relationships and do business with each other.²⁹⁹ Unlike men, "women network to build relationships and an ongoing support base."³⁰⁰ On the other hand, "men network to get something done so it's very linear, strategic, intentional."³⁰¹ Additionally, by focusing on women only, it may be easier to hone in on gender-specific challenges, which can lead to more effective solutions. For example, the Women's Networking Support Project (WNSP) identified an inequity in the number of women and men online. This inequity negatively impacted women's abilities to "communicate, access information, and build strategic global alliances." With that specific challenge in mind, WNSP provided free on-site computer training workshops for women that covered topics ranging from introductory e-mail to organizational efficiency and impact training.³⁰²

In addition to the benefits of same-gender associations that stem from similarities in behaviors, emotional expectations and interests, research suggests that same-gender role-models may prove to be more effective than cross-gender role-models. In the academic setting, for example, it has been theorized that segregated teaching of certain subjects will increase female participation in the subject.³⁰³ This theory may be applicable to the business world.

Like the trend of racial minority group members to benefit from witnessing the successes of other members of the minority group with which they identify, females may derive a special benefit from the success of another female, or in other words, an in-group member.³⁰⁴ As an illustration, within their fields, women are inspired by outstanding women, but not by outstanding men. Females indicated "stronger beliefs that they were currently like the models and might become like the model in the future when they were exposed to a successful woman rather than a successful man in their field."³⁰⁵ It is interesting that females indicate a stronger belief that they are like female role-models, or will become like them, when considered along with the observation that women tend to choose female role models who "overturned rather than confirmed traditional gender role stereotypes."³⁰⁶ Traditional stereotypes predict that women will apply collaborative leadership styles, and men will apply authoritarian leadership styles.³⁰⁷ As Peter Gregg, president of The President's Team of Calgary explains, "The typical male CEO is still locked in command-and-control while women want more feedback and involvement."³⁰⁸ With respect to skill-based stereotypes, women are stereotyped as possessing more person-oriented skills than task-oriented skills in comparison to men.³⁰⁹

Women look to the women who illustrate the possibility of overcoming the barriers that businesswomen face as role models.³¹⁰ The women who "illustrate the possibility of overcoming the barriers" also happen to be the same women who do not conform to traditional gender role stereotypes. Thus, one could infer that women who confirm traditional gender-role stereotypes do not serve as effective role models because they do not serve as sufficient illustrations of the possibility of breaking through the glass ceiling. Perhaps women would benefit from a movement in corporate culture away from masculinity, rather than movement in the pool of businesswomen away from femininity. In fact, many women who attempt

to adopt male behaviors have found that it has not contributed to their career success, “nor did their experience help create a more hospitable setting for future generations of women.”³¹¹

7. Cross-company mentoring and networking programs

Women need career and psychological support from mentors and in addition they need role-models. Because there may not be enough suitable mentors available at one company, there are several benefits to implementing a mentorship program that pairs protégés with mentors from outside their office. This method not only helps to avoid internal competition and conflicts of interest, but it also allows protégés the opportunity to freely express uncertainties and to bond with mentors across sectors and long distances.³¹² Additionally, cross-company mentoring may provide executives with independent views on their careers as well as an insight into their roles.³¹³ Identified goals of cross-company mentoring include: increasing female representation in board rooms, helping chairmen to identify candidates with the right experience, and “widening the pools in which everyone is fishing.”³¹⁴

a. European companies

In Europe, where few senior women can be found at most companies, sharing top executives from a number of member companies has been an effective use of the cross-company networking and mentoring scheme. Deutsche Bank, for example, has a formal mentoring program that provides women executives with access to senior managers from other companies. Similarly, Norsk Hydro uses detailed psychological evaluations to match businesswomen with senior mentors from both public and private sectors. This program has been well-received by the participants. One protégé from Norsk Hydro, Hilde Myrberg, for example, believes that meeting with a cross-sectoral chief executive gave her confidence by helping her to become familiar with the types of decisions for which she would be responsible.³¹⁵

In addition to aiding women in developing necessary professional skills, cross-company programs also increase women’s visibility and expand their networks. According to Alison Maitland in the United Kingdom, about thirty relationships have been formed between chairmen or chief executives and aspiring women just below the board level in non-competing companies. These relationships are beneficial because leadership and awareness help overcome gender-based biases, and men and women need to become more “fluent in each other’s languages.”³¹⁶

Although not a mentoring or networking program per se, a unique initiative undertaken to improve the status of women in corporate leadership is the quota system recently adopted in Norway. Norway’s quota system requires that women occupy 40% of board seats.³¹⁷ Needless to say, Norwegian companies have been progressing quickly in the direction of getting more women on executive boards. If a company does not meet the quota, they may face government sanctions.

In the Netherlands, there is no quota system, but there is an emphasis placed on raising the visibility of female boardroom candidates. Other Dutch initiatives also include networking with male board directors and training women in boardroom skills.

The FTSE Female Index ranks the top 100 companies according to the proportion of women on their boards. This “praising-and-shaming exercise” is a unique form of pressure on companies to promote more women.

b. Examples of organizations facilitating Networking: Women into the Network (WIN) and Business Link

The Women into the Network (WIN) is an organization that matches protégés with mentors from other companies, and sometimes from distant locations. WIN, called UK’s best practice initiative for promoting female entrepreneurship, utilizes activities such as: online services, newsletter publication, role-model publications, and research into provision of business support. Through various programs, WIN provides encouragement, education, and mutual support to businesswomen.³¹⁸ One of WIN’s programs, Mentoring Women into Business, links entrepreneurs to male and female mentors from various regions of the world through the internet. The use of the internet allows for twenty-four hour support. The program also brings women of a region together so that they can share their enthusiasm and experiences with each other.³¹⁹

In Durham County, Newcastle, Business Link joins with other agencies and organizations to give women easy access to appropriate support. In order to identify which barriers exist and to determine which areas of support are needed, Business Link uses workshops and focus groups.³²⁰ For female entrepreneurs in Canada, common hurdles that have been identified include: difficulty obtaining funding, entry into high-risk industries, and avoidance of traditional business associations that men use to develop business contacts.³²¹

c. American executives mentoring women from Jerusalem

Top American executives have participated in special mentoring sessions to help new immigrants enter the business world. These sessions provide special training programs which allowed the new immigrants to brainstorm with experienced

businesspeople. According to Gail Lichtman the program was useful in helping the prospective businesspeople to develop a “skills database.” The program also provides money to start new businesses or to expand existing ones.³²²

8. *Pairing methods*

There are a number of different ways protégés can be matched with mentors. Regardless of the method selected, ideally the mentor will be at least two levels above the protégé, and the mentor should not be in a direct reporting relationship with the protégé’s supervisor.³²³

Some companies use random matching. Others allow mentors and protégés to select each other from a book of profile sheets. The majority of companies use “vocational sector” or “similarity of interests” as the primary matching criteria.³²⁴

CONCLUSION

Networking and mentoring programs are important for career advancement but they are not gender neutral, no matter how they are labeled. Not only do men and women have different expectations about networking and mentoring programs, but they also face different consequences from participating in them.³²⁵

Women-only networks are thriving, and there is probably a good reason for it. Although networking with women in mid-level positions is not likely to lead to a promotion or salary increase, these networks provide valuable emotional support. As they are structured now, however, the majority of mentoring and networking programs appear to broaden the gap between the sexes rather than leveling the playing field. For a woman who truly has career advancement in mind, participation in a more mainstream network is highly advised. Perhaps the best solution for women is to participate in various networks for various purposes – such as emotional support, and career growth. Moreover, cross-company and cross-gender programs have characteristics that are likely to combat the advantages of men over women. A cross-company, cross-gender approach seems to be ideal for women who are looking to move up in their companies.

Furthermore, it seems critical, for a research agenda on women in top leadership to attend to international and multinational aspects of the phenomenon. In this article we have reviewed and analyzed the literature on an important aspect of pathways to leadership – mentoring and networking. A further research agenda is needed to identify: 1) What, if any, of the knowledge gained through research on mentoring and networking in the North American experience may be useful in a multicultural multinational context; 2) What are the special circumstances of mentoring across national boundaries that may inform companies that seek to draw fully on human resources in top management; 3) Whether mentoring, and perhaps cross-cultural mentoring, is useful in bridging the cultural and national chasms encountered in doing business globally; and 4) To what extent cross-cultural mentoring affects the variables and outcomes observed in the literature documenting the North American experience with mentoring and networking.

Finally, American firms and their legal counsel must consider that mentoring and networking programs have become such an accepted and necessary part of career success that when women or minorities are significantly underrepresented in an organization’s top ranks, it may be necessary, as either a legal or legal advisory matter, to implement a mentoring program in order to avoid charges of discrimination under Title VII,³²⁶ in fulfilling an affirmative action duty, or as a voluntarily program designed to break the glass ceiling and achieve desired diversity and full utilization of the firm’s human capital resources. Much is yet to be learned from studying the barriers that might impede these pathways, and developing mentoring and networking programs to help overcome these barriers. In particular, a firm that sought to better level the playing field for women – for any of these reasons – should attend to the empirical evidence that would guide construction of such a program.

FOOTNOTES

⁺ Copyright 2008. Cindy A. Schipani, Terry M. Dworkin, Angel Kwolek-Folland, Virginia G. Maurer. All rights reserved. The authors would like to gratefully acknowledge the advice and support of Marina Whitman, Professor of Business Administration and Public Policy, University of Michigan and Mary Hinesly, Senior Associate Director, Women in Business Initiative, Ross School of Business, University of Michigan have generously provided throughout this project. The authors would also like to thank the Stephen M. Ross School of Business, at the University of Michigan; the European Union Center for Excellence at the University of Michigan; the Center for International Business Education at the University of Michigan; the Women’s Initiative at the Ross School of Business at the University of Michigan; the Center for International Business Education and Research at the University of Florida; and the Center for Business Education and Research at Indiana University for support of this project.

^{*} Merwin H. Waterman Collegiate Professor of Business Administration, Professor of Business Law, and Chair, Law, History & Communication, Ross School of Business, University of Michigan.

** Dean, Office of Women's Affairs, Jack R. Wentworth Professor of Business Law, Indiana University and Visiting Professor, Seattle University School of Law.

*** Associate Dean for Centers, Institutes and International Affairs, Professor of History and Women's Studies, University of Florida.

**** Huber Hurst Professor of Business Law & Legal Studies, Director of Poe Center for Business Ethics, Warrington College of Business, University of Florida. The authors would like to thank Sara Masterson and Roseanne Kross, J.D. candidates at the University of Michigan Law School, Nicole Cheskey, B.A. candidate at the University of Michigan, and John Wirthlin, M.A. candidate in International Business at the Warrington College of Business at the University of Florida, for valuable research assistance.

¹ Carol Hymowitz, *Women Get Better at Forming Networks To Help Their Climb*, WALL ST. J., Nov. 19, 2007, at B1.

² Nancy J. Adler, *Competitive Frontiers: Women Managing Across Borders*, in COMPETITIVE FRONTIERS: WOMEN MANAGERS IN A GLOBAL ECONOMY 22, 23 (Nancy J. Adler & Dafna N. Izraeli eds., 1994).

³ CATALYST, INC., THE BOTTOM LINE: CONNECTING CORPORATE PERFORMANCE AND GENDER DIVERSITY (EXECUTIVE SUMMARY) 2 (2004).

⁴ Adler, *supra* note 2, at 29-36. Microlending can also stimulate changes in and empower women to move out of traditional roles for women in developing countries. Women gain autonomy and authority with the income earned from the businesses they start with the small loans. See Abdul Bayes et al., *Beneath the Surface: Microcredit and Women's Empowerment*, 32 J. DEVELOPING AREAS 221 (1998). They also gain social support as part of a network of women receiving the loans. Multinational corporations and microlending organizations can also help empower women, by hiring their service to create a business that will help the people working for them be more productive. For example, they could hire a woman to organize others to provide childcare or lunch for the factory. Terry M. Dworkin & Cindy A. Schipani, *Linking Gender Equity to Peaceful Societies*, 44 AM. BUS. L.J. 391, 413-14 (2007) [hereinafter *Linking Gender Equity*].

⁵ CLAUDIA GOLDIN, UNDERSTANDING THE GENDER GAP: AN ECONOMIC HISTORY OF AMERICAN WOMEN 213 (1990); Claudia Goldin, *The U-Shaped Female Labor Force Function in Economic Development and Economic History*, in INVESTMENT IN WOMEN'S HUM. CAPITAL 61, 63-68 (T. Paul Schultz ed., 1995); accord Kristin Mammen & Christina Paxson, *Women's Work and Economic Development*, 14 J. ECON. PERSP. 141, 143-44 (2000).

⁶ GOLDIN, *supra* note 5, at 55-57.

⁷ See e.g., WORLD BANK, ENGENDERING DEVELOPMENT: THROUGH GENDER EQUALITY IN RIGHTS, RESOURCES, AND VOICE (2001), available at http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2001/03/01/000094946_01020805393496/Rendered/PDF/multi_page.pdf; WORLD BANK, GENDER, GROWTH, AND POVERTY REDUCTION (1999) (describing the specific ways in which gender inequality hampers economic development in Africa); GENDER & DEV. GROUP, WORLD BANK, IMPROVING WOMEN'S LIVES: WORLD BANK ACTIONS SINCE BEIJING (2005), available at <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTGENDER/Resources/Beijing10Report.pdf> [hereinafter IMPROVING WOMEN'S LIVES] (“[U]nless inequalities in the capacities, opportunities, and the voice of women and men are reduced, the Bank’s poverty reduction agenda will not be achieved.”); WORLD BANK, GENDER EQUALITY & THE MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS (2003), available at http://www.mdgender.net/upload/monographs/WB_Gender_Equality_MDGs.pdf [hereinafter WORLD BANK, GENDER EQUALITY].

⁸ WORLD BANK, GENDER EQUALITY, *supra* note 7, at 6.

⁹ *Id.* at 1 (“While women and girls bear the largest and most direct costs of these inequalities, the costs cut broadly across society, ultimately hindering development and poverty reduction.”).

¹⁰ WORLD BANK, GENDER EQUALITY, *supra* note 7, at 7, 11-12. See also Terry Morehead Dworkin & Cindy A. Schipani, *Gender, Voice, and Correlations with Peace*, 36 VAND. J. TRANSNAT'L L. 527, 557-661 (2003) [hereinafter *Gender Voice*]; Dworkin & Schipani *Linking Gender Equity*, *supra* note 4, at 392-99 (2007).

¹¹ Mammen & Paxson, *supra* note 5, at 150. See also Dworkin & Schipani, *Gender Voice*, *supra* note 10; Dworkin & Schipani, *Linking Gender Equity*, *supra* note 4.

¹² A rich body of literature exists on this subject. See, e.g., COMPETITIVE FRONTIERS: WOMEN MANAGERS IN A GLOBAL ECONOMY (Nancy J. Adler & Dafna N. Izraeli eds., 1994); GENDERING ELITES: ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL LEADERSHIP IN 27 INDUSTRIALIZED SOCIETIES (Mino Vianello & Gwen Moore eds., 2000) [hereinafter GENDERING ELITES]; MARGARET LINEHAN, SENIOR FEMALE INTERNATIONAL MANAGERS: WHY SO FEW? (2000); MINO VIANELLO ET AL., WOMEN AND MEN IN POLITICAL AND BUSINESS ELITES (Mino Vianello & Gwen Moore eds., 2004).

¹³ See, e.g., Mary Blair-Loy & Amy S. Wharton, *Mothers in Finance: Surviving and Thriving*, 596 ANNALS AM. ACAD. POL. & SOC. SCI. 151 (2004); George F. Dreher, *Breaking the Glass Ceiling: The Effects of Sex Ratios and Work-Life Programs on Female Leadership at the Top*, 56 HUM. REL. 541 (2003).

¹⁴ See e.g., Alison Woodward & Dawn Lyon, *Gendered Time and Women's Access to Power*, in GENDERING ELITES, *supra* note 12, at 91; Gwen Moore, *Mommies and Daddies on the Fast Track in Other Wealthy Nations*, 596 ANNALS AM. POL. & SOC. SCI. 208 (2004).

¹⁵ See *infra* notes 75-84.

-
- ¹⁶ See, e.g., Joanna Liddle & Elizabeth Michielsens, *Gender, Class, and Public Power*, in GENDERING ELITES, *supra* note 12, at 21; Gwen Moore, *Women in Elite Positions: Insiders or Outsiders?*, 3 SOC. F. 566 (1988).
- ¹⁷ See e.g., COMPETITIVE FRONTIERS, *supra* note 12; Bogdan Kavcic & Marjana Merkac, *Organisational Structure and Gender*, in GENDERING ELITES, *supra* note 12, at 131, 139 (national culture influences organizational culture and structure more than gender); Virginia E. Schein, *A Global Look at Psychological Barriers to Women's Progress in Management*, 57 J. SOC. ISSUES 675 (2001).
- ¹⁸ See, e.g., Paula M. Caligiuri & Wayne F. Cascio, *Can We Send Her There? Maximizing the Success of Western Women on Global Assignments*, 33 J. WORLD BUS. 394 (1998); Brigitte Liebig & Silva Sansonetti, *Career Paths*, in WOMEN AND MEN IN POLITICAL AND BUSINESS ELITES, *supra* note 12, at 49.
- ¹⁹ See, e.g., Renata Siemienska, *Values*, in WOMEN AND MEN IN POLITICAL AND BUSINESS ELITES, *supra* note 12, at 102.
- ²⁰ See FAMILIES AND WORK INST., CATALYST, INC. & THE CTR. FOR WORK & FAMILY, *LEADERS IN A GLOBAL ECONOMY: A STUDY OF EXECUTIVE WOMEN AND MEN 4-5* (2003), available at <http://www.catalystwomen.org/files/exe/GlobalLeadersExecSumm.pdf> [hereinafter CATALYST LEADERS].
- ²¹ GENDERING ELITES, *supra* note 12; WOMEN AND MEN IN POLITICAL AND BUSINESS ELITES, *supra* note 12.
- ²² Cindy A. Schipani et al., *Women and the New Corporate Governance: Pathways for Obtaining Positions of Corporate Leadership*, 65 MD. L. REV. 504 (2006).
- ²³ Joy A. Schnerer & Frieda Reitman, *The Impact of Gender as Managerial Careers Unfold*, 47 J. VOCATIONAL BEHAV. 290 (1995); Linda K. Stroh, Jeanne M. Brett, & Anne H. Reilly, *All the Right Stuff: A Comparison of Female and Male Managers' Career Progression* 77 J. APPLIED PSYCHOL. 251 (1992).
- ²⁴ Belle Rose Ragins & Eric Sundstrom, *Gender and Power in Organizations: A Longitudinal Perspective*, 105 PSYCHOL. BULL. 51, 73 (1989) (“[S]uccessful female executives appeared to rely on different bases of power at different points in their careers. Early in their careers, they tended to rely on expert power, whereas later, they reported paying more attention to interpersonal skills and influence.”).
- ²⁵ Gregory H. Dobbins & Stephanie J. Platz, *Sex Differences in Leadership: How Real Are They?*, 11 ACAD. MGMT. REV. 118 (1986).
- ²⁶ See Ragins & Sundstrom, *supra* note 24, at 53 (“The path to power for women may more accurately be described as an obstacle course.”).
- ²⁷ See, e.g., Karen S. Lyness & Donna E. Thompson, *Climbing the Corporate Ladder: Do Female and Male Executives Follow the Same Route?*, 85 J. APPLIED PSYCHOL. 86 (2000).
- ²⁸ Bickley Townsend, *Breaking Through: The Glass Ceiling Revisited*, 16 EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES INT’L 4 (1997).
- ²⁹ See A.M. MORRISON, R.P. WHITE, E. VAN ELSOR & THE CENTER FOR CREATIVE LEADERSHIP, *BREAKING THE GLASS CEILING: CAN WOMEN REACH THE TOP OF AMERICA’S LARGEST CORPORATIONS?* (1987); Gary N. Powell & D. Anthony Butterfield, *Investigating the ‘Glass Ceiling’ Phenomenon: An Empirical Study of Actual Promotions to Top Management*, 37 ACAD. MGMT. J. 68 (1994); Ann M. Morrison & Mary Ann Von Glinow, *Women and Minorities in Management*, 45 AM. PSYCHOLOGIST 200 (1990).
- ³⁰ Belle Rose Ragins, Bickley Townsend, & Mary Mattis, *Gender Gap in the Executive Suite: CEOs and Female Executives Reporting on Breaking the Glass Ceiling*, 12 ACAD. MGMT. EXECUTIVE 28 (1998); Lyness & Thompson, *supra* note 27; Townsend, *supra* note 28.
- ³¹ U.S. FED. GLASS CEILING COMM’N, *GOOD FOR BUSINESS: MAKING FULL USE OF THE NATION’S HUMAN CAPITAL* 6 (1995).
- ³² Jodi S. Goodman, Dail L. Fields, & Terry C. Blum, *Cracks in the Glass Ceiling: In What Kinds of Organizations Do Women Make It to the Top?* 28 GROUP & ORG. MGMT. 475 (2003); Powell & Butterfield, *supra* note 29; Townsend, *supra* note 28.
- ³³ Ragins & Sundstrom, *supra* note 30, at 74-6.
- ³⁴ See generally Lisa M. Fairfax, *Some Reflections on the Diversity of Corporate Boards: Women, People of Color, and the Unique Issues Associated with Women of Color*, 79 ST. JOHN’S L REV. 1105 (2005); Jeffrey H. Greenhaus & Saroj Parasuraman, *Job Performance Attributions and Career Advancement Prospects: An Examination of Gender and Race Effects*, 55 ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAV. AND HUM. DECISION PROCESSES 273, 291 (1993); Jacqueline Landau, *The Relationship of Race and Gender to Managers’ Ratings of Promotion Material*, 16 J. ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAV. 391, 391 (1995).
- ³⁵ Lyness & Thompson, *supra* note 27, at 88; Karen S. Lyness & Donna E. Thompson, *Above the Glass Ceiling? A Comparison of Matched Samples of Female and Male Executives*, 82 J. APPLIED PSYCHOL. 359, 372 (1997) (“All of the gender differences we found are consistent with the sex stereotype and occupational segregation literature suggesting that women are more likely to be found in jobs that are not comparable to men’s jobs at the same organizational level in status, power, or advancement potential.”).
- ³⁶ O.C. Brenner, Joseph Tomkiewicz, & Virginia Ellen Schein, *The Relationship Between Sex Role Stereotypes and Requisite Management Characteristics Revisited*, 323 ACAD. MGMT. J. 662, 668 (1989); Ragins & Sundstrom, *supra* note 30, at 63.
- ³⁷ J.L.A. Rowney & A.R. Cahoon, *Individual and Organizational Characteristics of Women in Managerial Leadership*, 9 J. BUS. ETHICS 293, 297 (1990); Scott E. Seibert, J. Michael Crant, & Maria L. Kraimer, *Proactive Personality and Career Success*, 84 J. APPLIED PSYCHOL. 416 (1999); Robert F. Martell & Aaron L. DeSmet, *A Diagnostic-Ratio Approach to*

-
- Measuring Beliefs About the Leadership Abilities of Male and Female Managers*, 86 J. APPLIED PSYCHOL. 1223, 1125-28 (2001). *But see* Dobbins & Platz, *supra* note 25, at 124-25.
- ³⁸ Uri Gneezy, Muriel Niederle, & Also Rustichini, *Performance in Competitive Environments: Gender Differences*, Q. J. ECON. 1040, 1050 (2003); Donald Langevoort, *Overcoming Resistance to Diversity in the Executive Suite: Grease, Grit and the Corporate Promotion Tournament*, 61 WASH. & LEE L. REV. 1615, 1623 (2004).
- ³⁹ Lyness & Thompson, *supra* note 27; Tuvia Melamed, *Career Success: The Moderating Effect of Gender*, 47 J. VOCATIONAL BEHAV. 35 (1995); Karen S. Lyness & Michael K. Judiesch, *Are Women More Likely to Be Hired or Promoted into Management Positions?*, 54 J. VOCATIONAL BEHAV. 158 (1999); Alison M. Konrad & Kathy Cannings, *The Effects of Gender Role Congruence and Statistical Discrimination on Managerial Advancement*, 50 HUM. REL. 1305 (1997).
- ⁴⁰ Susan Vinnicombe & Val Singh, *Locks and Keys to the Boardroom*, 18 WOMEN MGMT. REV. 325 (2003).
- ⁴¹ *Id.* at 325-36.
- ⁴² Thomas A. DiPrete & Whitman T. Soule, *Gender and Promotion in Segmented Job Ladder Systems*, 53 AM. SOC. REV. 26 (1988); Patricia J. Ohlott, Marian N. Ruderman, & Cynthia D. McCauley, *Gender Differences in Managers' Developmental Job Experiences*, 37 ACAD. MGMT. J. 46 (1994).
- ⁴³ Nancy J. Adler, *Expecting International Success: Female Managers Overseas*, 19 COLUM. J. WORLD BUS. 79 (1984); Nancy J. Adler & Dafna N. Izreali, *Where in the World Are the Women Executives?*, 59 BUS. Q. 89 (1994); Marta B. Calas & Linda Smircich, *Dangerous Liaisons: The 'Feminine-in-Management' Meets 'Globalization'*, 36 BUS. HORIZONS 71 (1993); Paula Caligiuri & Wayne F. Cascio, *Can We Send Her There? Maximizing the Success of Western Women on Global Assignments* 33 J. WORLD BUS. 394 (1998).
- ⁴⁴ Lillian T. Eby, *The Boundaryless Career Experiences of Mobile Spouses in Dual-Earner Marriages*, 26 GROUP & ORG. MGMT. 343 (2001).
- ⁴⁵ Ellen Ernst Kossek & Cynthia Ozeki, *Work-Family Conflict, Policies, and the Job-Life Satisfaction Relationship: A Review and Directions for Organizational Behavior*, 83 J. APPLIED PSYCHOL. 139 (1998); Mary M. Cutler & Anita L. Jackson, *A 'Glass Ceiling' or Work/Family Conflicts?*, 8 J. BUS. & ECON. STUD. 73 (2002); Stroh, Brett, & Reilly, *supra* note 23.
- ⁴⁶ Audrey J. Murrell, Irene Hanson Frieze, & Josephine E. Olson, *Mobility Strategies and Career Outcomes: A Longitudinal Study of MBAs*, 49 J. VOCATIONAL BEHAV. 324, 325 (1996).
- ⁴⁷ Cutler & Jackson, *supra* note 45, at 79.
- ⁴⁸ Joy A. Schmeer & Frieda Reitman, *The Interrupted Managerial Career Path: A Longitudinal Study of MBAs*, 51 J. OF VOCATIONAL BEHAV. 411, 428-30 (1997).
- ⁴⁹ *Id.* at 414
- ⁵⁰ David Marshall Hunt & Carol Michael, *Mentorship: A Career Training and Development Tool*, 8 ACAD. MGMT. REV. 475 (1983); George F. Dreher & Ronald A. Ash, *A Comparative Study of Mentoring Among Men and Women in Managerial, Professional, and Technical Positions*, 75 J. APPLIED PSYCHOL. 539 (1990). *See also* George F. Dreher & Thomas W. Daugherty, *Substitutes for Career Mentoring: Promoting Equal Opportunity through Career Management and Assessment Systems*, 51 J. VOCATIONAL BEHAV. 110 (1997) (noting a key factor in being afforded opportunity is having a mentoring relationship and offering substitutes to enhance opportunity for women and non-white men because they are less likely to form mentoring relationships with senior managers); Kathy E. Kram & Lynn A. Isabella, *Mentoring Alternatives: The Role of Peer Relationships in Career Development*, 28 ACAD. MGMT. J. 110 (1985) (examines how relationships with peers can offer opportunities for personal and professional growth).
- ⁵¹ K.E. KRAM, MENTORING AT WORK (1985).
- ⁵² William Whitely, Thomas W. Dougherty, & George F. Dreher, *Relationship of Career Mentoring and Socioeconomic Origin to Managers' and Professionals' Early Career Progress*, 34 ACAD. MGMT. J. 331 (1991).
- ⁵³ Y. Baugh & T.A. Scandura, *The Effects of Multiple Mentors on Protege Attitudes Toward the Work Setting*, 14 J. SOC. BEHAV. & PERSONALITY 503 (1999); Dreher & Ash, *supra* note 50; B.R. Ragins, J.L. Cotton, & J.S. Miller, *Marginal Mentoring: The Effects of Type of Mentor, Quality of Relationship, and Program Design on Work and Career Attitudes*, 43 ACAD. MGMT. J. 1177 (2000); W.T. Whitely & P. Coetsier, *The Relationship of Career Mentoring to Early Career Outcomes*, 14 ORG. STUD. 419 (1993).
- ⁵⁴ *See, e.g.*, Ellen A. Fagenson, *The Mentor Advantage: Perceived Career/Job Experiences of Proteges Versus Non-Proteges*, 10 J. ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAV. 309, 309 (1989).
- ⁵⁵ Ragins & Sundstrom, *supra* note 30, at 64.
- ⁵⁶ *See, e.g.*, Kathy E. Kram, *Phases of the Mentor Relationship*, 26 ACAD. MGMT. J. 608 (1983); Kram, MENTORING AT WORK, *supra* note 51; Donald D. Bowen, *The Role of Identification in Mentoring Female Proteges*, 11 GROUP & ORG. STUD. 61 (1986).
- ⁵⁷ *See, e.g.*, Kram, *supra* note 56; Kram, MENTORING AT WORK, *supra* note 51; Bowen, *supra* note 56.
- ⁵⁸ KRAM, MENTORING AT WORK, *supra* note 51.
- ⁵⁹ *Id.*
- ⁶⁰ *See generally* Whitely et al., *supra* note 52, at 333-34, 341-346 (finding that the career enhancing effects of mentoring were more robust for mentees from higher socioeconomic classes than from lower socioeconomic classes).

-
- ⁶¹ Samuel Aryee, Thomas Wyatt, & Raymond Stone, *Early Career Outcomes of Graduate Employees: The Effect of Mentoring and Ingratiation*, 33 J. MGMT. STUD. 95 (1996).
- ⁶² *Id.*
- ⁶³ *Id.* at 97.
- ⁶⁴ Ronald J. Burke & Carol A. McKeen, *Benefits of Mentoring Relationships Among Managerial and Professional Women: A Cautionary Tale*, 51 J. VOCATIONAL BEHAV. 43 (1997) (finding that among 280 female business graduates of the same university, 70% of whom describe a mentor relationship, with two third of the mentors male, the existence of a mentor only modestly related to work outcomes and less so to measures of personal wellbeing and satisfaction).
- ⁶⁵ See, e.g., Tammy D. Allen et al., *Career Benefits Associated With Mentoring for Proteges: A Meta-Analysis*, 89 J. APPLIED PSYCHOL. 127, 130-132 (2004). Tammy Allen and her colleagues found that mentored individuals were more satisfied with their careers, more committed to their careers, and more convinced they would advance in their careers. This was true for both career and psychosocial mentoring when taken individually. There was only mixed support for the hypotheses that objective career outcomes would have a stronger relationship with career mentoring and that subjective career outcomes would have a stronger relationship with psychosocial mentoring. It may be that having a mentor matters more for career success than the degree of mentoring provided. On the whole, the study found that mentoring is more strongly related to subjective indicators of career success than to objective indicators. Furthermore, it has been found that mentored individuals reported higher levels of career motivation than non-mentored individuals. However, mentored individuals did not report a higher level of self-efficacy. But self-efficacy was positively related to salary, career success, and performance effectiveness. It has also been found that career motivation mediated the relationship between career mentoring and mentee performance. *Id.* See also Kathryn Tyler, *Mentoring Programs Link Employees and Experienced Execs*, 43 HR Magazine 98, 98-100 (1998) (according to Tyler, mentoring enhances management skills, encourages diversity, increases productivity, is good for team building and makes information available to lower level employees).
- ⁶⁶ Lisa Mainiero, *Getting Anointed for Advancement: The Case of Executive Women*, 8 ACAD. MGMT. EXECUTIVE 53 (1994); Adler & Izraeli, *supra* note 43; H. Ibarra & L. Smith-Lovin, *New Directions in Social Network Research on Gender and Organizational Careers*, in CREATING TOMORROW'S ORGANIZATIONS 359 (C.L. Cooper & S.E. Jackson eds., 1997).
- ⁶⁷ See I. J. Hetty van Emmerik, *The More You Can Get the Better: Mentoring Constellations and Intrinsic Career Success*, 9 CAREER DEV. INT'L 578 (2004).
- ⁶⁸ Asya Pazy, *Sex Differences in Responsiveness to Organizational Career Management*, 26 HUM. RESOURCE MGMT. 243, 251 (1987).
- ⁶⁹ Hetty van Emmerik, *supra* note 67, at 588.
- ⁷⁰ *Id.*
- ⁷¹ See Phyllis Tharenou, Shane Latimer & Denise Conroy, *How Do You Make It to the Top? An Examination of Influences on Women's and Men's Managerial Advancement*, 37 ACAD. MGMT. J. 899, 923 (1994).
- ⁷² *Id.* at 924.
- ⁷³ NANCY J. ADLER & DANA N. IZRAELI, COMPETITIVE FRONTIERS (1994). See also Sally Ann Metzley Davies, *Women Above the Glass Ceiling: Perceptions on Corporate Mobility and Strategies for Success*, 12 GENDER & SOC'Y 339 (1998) (in a qualitative study of men and women in elite business positions, women spontaneously mentioned networking and mentoring as strategies for success); Sharon L. Allen, *From Boise to the Boardroom: What Matters Most on the Journey to the Top*, 20 EXECUTIVE SPEECHES 26 (2005).
- ⁷⁴ ADLER & IZRAELI, *supra* note 73.
- ⁷⁵ Daniel J. Brass, *Men's and Women's Networks: A Study of Interaction Patterns and Influence in an Organization*, 28 ACAD. MGMT. J. 327 (1985).
- ⁷⁶ Hetty van Emmerik, *supra* note 67, at 580.
- ⁷⁷ Michal Palgi & Gwen Moore, *Social Capital: Mentors and Contacts*, in WOMEN AND MEN IN POLITICAL AND BUSINESS ELITES 129 (Mino Vianello & Gwen Moore eds., 2004).
- ⁷⁸ Monica L. Forret & Thomas W. Dougherty, *Correlates of Networking Behavior for Managerial and Professional Employees*, 26 GROUP & ORG. MGMT. 283 (2001).
- ⁷⁹ See, e.g., Charles J. Fombrun, *Strategies for Network Research in Organizations*, 7 ACAD. MGMT. J. 280 (1982).
- ⁸⁰ M.C. Higgins, *The More the Merrier? Multiple Developmental Relationships and Work Satisfaction*, 19 J. MGMT. DEV. 277 (2000).
- ⁸¹ Hetty van Emmerik, *supra* note 67, at 581.
- ⁸² *Id.* at 582.
- ⁸³ Gwen Moore & Mino Vianello, *General Conclusions*, in GENDERING ELITES, *supra* note 12, at 269 ([W]omen who attain top positions have available additional structural and cultural resources on which they can draw as a replacement for the structural and cultural deficits implicit in their gender. These resources are forms of material, social, and cultural capital, which help to explain how and why these women gained access to top leadership positions.).
- ⁸⁴ Herminia Ibarra, *Paving an Alternative Route: Gender Differences in Managerial Networks*, 60 SOC. PSYCHOL. Q. 91 (1997); Herminia Ibarra, *Personal Networks of Women in Management: A Conceptual Framework*, 18 ACAD. MGMT. REV. 18 (1993).

-
- 56 (1993); Monica C. Higgins & Kathy E. Kram, *Reconceptualizing Mentoring at Work: A Developmental Network Perspective*, 26 ACAD. MGMT. REV. 264 (2001); Isabel Metz & Phyllis Tharenou, *Women's Career Advancement: The Relative Contribution of Human and Social Capital*, 26 GROUP & ORG. MGMT. 312 (2001).
- ⁸⁵ See Pierre Bourdieu, *The Forms of Capital*, in HANDBOOK OF THEORY AND RESEARCH FOR THE SOCIOLOGY OF EDUCATION 241, 243-48 (John G. Richardson ed., 1986).
- ⁸⁶ Maria Antonia Garcia de Leon et al., *The Elites Cultural Capital*, in GENDERING ELITES, *supra* note 12, at 35, 37.
- ⁸⁷ Metzley Davies, *supra* note 73 (qualitative study of men and women in elite positions in business in Southern California).
- ⁸⁸ R. M. KANTER, MEN AND WOMEN OF THE CORPORATION (1977).
- ⁸⁹ *Id.*
- ⁹⁰ Jeff Pfeffer, *Toward an Examination of Stratification in Organizations*, 22 ADMIN. SCI. Q. 553 (1977).
- ⁹¹ A.L. Stinchcombe, *Social Structure and Organizations*, in 142 HANDBOOK OF ORGANIZATIONS (James March ed., 1965). See also P. M. BLAU & O.D. DUNCAN, THE AMERICAN OCCUPATIONAL STRUCTURE (1967).
- ⁹² William Whitely, Thomas W. Dougherty, & George Dreher, *Correlates of Career-Oriented Mentoring for Early Career Managers and Professionals*, 13 J. ORG. BEHAV. 141 (1992).
- ⁹³ *Id.* at 143.
- ⁹⁴ Forret & Dougherty, *supra* note 78, at 300.
- ⁹⁵ Nikos Bozionelos, *Mentoring Provided: Relation to Mentor's Career Success, Personality, and Mentoring Received*, 64 J. VOCATIONAL BEHAV. 24 (2004); Daniel B. Turban & Thomas W. Dougherty, *Role of Protégé Personality in Receipt of Mentoring and Career Success*, 37 ACAD. MGMT. J. 688 (1994).
- ⁹⁶ Phyllis Tharenou, *Going Up? Traits and Informal Social Processes Predict Advancing in Management*, 44 ACAD. MGMT. J. 1005 (2001).
- ⁹⁷ Turban & Dougherty, *supra* note 78.
- ⁹⁸ *Id.* at 698.
- ⁹⁹ *Id.*
- ¹⁰⁰ Forret & Dougherty, *supra* note 78, at 300.
- ¹⁰¹ I.J. Hetty van Emmerik, S. Gayle Baugh, & Martin C. Euwema, *Who Wants to be a Mentor? An Examination of Attitudinal, Instrumental, and Social Motivational Components*, 10 CAREER DEV. INT'L 340 (2005).
- ¹⁰² See, e.g., Ellen J. Mullen, *Vocational and Psychosocial Mentoring Functions: Identifying Mentors Who Serve Both*, 9 HUM. RES. DEV. Q. 319 (1998).
- ¹⁰³ Belle Rose Ragins, *Diversified Mentoring Relationships in Organizations: A Power Perspective*, 22 ACAD. MGMT. REV. 482 (1997); Ragins & Sundstrom, *supra* note 24.
- ¹⁰⁴ Ellen A. Fagenson, *At the Heart of Women in Management Research: Theoretical and Methodological Approaches and Their Biases*, 9 J. BUS. ETHICS 267 (1990) (advocating attention to organizational factors and structures rather than inherent gender differences in studying women in organizations).
- ¹⁰⁵ For a succinct explication of the forms of power in an organization, see generally Ragins & Sundstrom, *supra* note 24.
- ¹⁰⁶ DOUGLAS M. BRANSON, NO SEAT AT THE TABLE: HOW CORPORATE GOVERNANCE AND LAW KEEP WOMEN OUT OF THE BOARDROOM (2007); David A. Carter et al., *Corporate Board Diversity and Firm Value*, 38 FIN. REV. 33, 51 (2003) (“[W]e find statistically significant positive relationships between the presence of women and minorities on the board and firm value”); Steven A. Ramirez, *Games CEOs Play and Interest Convergence Theory: Why Diversity Lags in America's Boardrooms and What to Do About It*, 61 WASH. & LEE L. REV. 1583, 1588 & n. 22 (2004) (same proposition as Carter).
- ¹⁰⁷ CARL N. DEGLER, AT ODDS: WOMEN AND THE FAMILY IN AMERICA FROM THE REVOLUTION TO THE PRESENT (1980).
- ¹⁰⁸ ROSALIND ROSENBERG, DIVIDED LIVES: AMERICAN WOMEN IN THE 20TH CENTURY (1992). See also ANGEL KWOLEK-FOLLAND, INCORPORATING WOMEN: A HISTORY OF WOMEN AND BUSINESS IN THE UNITED STATES (2002).
- ¹⁰⁹ Alice Kessler-Harris, *Reframing the History of Women's Wage Labor: Challenges of a Global Perspective*, 15 J. OF WOMEN'S HISTORY 186 (2004).
- ¹¹⁰ ROSENBERG, *supra* note 108, at Ch.1.
- ¹¹¹ Joan Acker, *Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations*, 129 GENDER & SOC'Y 146 (1990).
- ¹¹² *Id.*
- ¹¹³ GARY S. BECKER, A TREATISE ON THE FAMILY (enlarged ed. 1991).
- ¹¹⁴ Aryee et al., *supra* note 61, at 97.
- ¹¹⁵ KRAM, *supra* note 51; Kram & Isabella, *Mentoring Alternatives*, *supra* note 50.
- ¹¹⁶ Kathy E. Kram, *supra* note 56; Mullen, *supra* note 102.
- ¹¹⁷ T.A. Scandura, *Mentorship and Career Mobility: An Empirical Investigation*, 13 J. ORG. BEHAV. 169 (1992).
- ¹¹⁸ See, e.g., Tammy D. Allen & Mark L. Poteet, *Developing Effective Mentoring Relationships: Strategies from the Mentor's Viewpoint*, 48 CAREER DEV. Q. 59 (1999).
- ¹¹⁹ Christopher Orpen, *The Effects of Mentoring on Employees' Career Success*, 135 J. SOC. PSYCHOL. 667, 667 (1995).
- ¹²⁰ Valerie Darroch, *Being the Only Woman in a Boardroom Can Get You Down if You Let It. I Don't*, SUNDAY HERALD (Glasgow), Feb. 19, 2006, at 6.

-
- ¹²¹ Johnathan Rennie, *Are Women Too Scared To Be Their Own Boss? Survey Finds Females Have the Brains but Not the Bottle*, EVENING TIMES (Glasgow), May 5, 2006, at 20.
- ¹²² *Id.*
- ¹²³ Allen & Poteet, *supra* note 118.
- ¹²⁴ *Id.* at 64-66.
- ¹²⁵ *Id.* at 66.
- ¹²⁶ *Id.*
- ¹²⁷ *Id.*
- ¹²⁸ Georgia T. Chao, Pat M. Walz, & Philip D. Gardner, *Formal and Informal Mentorships: A Comparison on Mentoring Functions and Contrast with Nonmentored Counterparts*, 45 PERSONNEL PSYCHOL. 619 (1992).
- ¹²⁹ *Id.* at 630-31.
- ¹³⁰ *Id.* at 631.
- ¹³¹ *Id.* at 632.
- ¹³² Stacy D. Blake-Beard, *Taking a Hard Look at Formal Mentoring Programs*, 20 J. MGMT. DEV. 331 (2001).
- ¹³³ *Id.* at 332-33.
- ¹³⁴ *Id.* at 333.
- ¹³⁵ Ragins, Cotton, & Miller, *supra* note 53.
- ¹³⁶ *Id.* at 1177.
- ¹³⁷ *Id.* at 1183.
- ¹³⁸ *Id.* at 1183-84.
- ¹³⁹ *Id.* at 1190.
- ¹⁴⁰ *Id.* at 1187-89.
- ¹⁴¹ *Id.* at 1191.
- ¹⁴² *Id.* at 1190-91.
- ¹⁴³ Belle Rose Ragins, *Burden or Blessing? Expected Costs and Benefits of Being a Mentor*, 20 J. ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAV. 493 (1999).
- ¹⁴⁴ *Id.* at 494.
- ¹⁴⁵ *Id.*
- ¹⁴⁶ *Id.*
- ¹⁴⁷ *Id.*
- ¹⁴⁸ *Id.* at 504-05.
- ¹⁴⁹ Judy D. Olian, Stephen J. Carroll, & Cristina M. Giannantonio, *Mentor Reactions to Proteges: An Experiment with Managers*, 43 J. VOCATIONAL BEHAV. 266, 266 (1993).
- ¹⁵⁰ See e.g., Tammy Allen, Mark L. Poteet, & Joyce E.A. Russell, *Protégé Selection by Mentors: What Makes the Difference?*, 21 J. ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAV. 271 (2000).
- ¹⁵¹ *Id.* at 272.
- ¹⁵² *Id.*
- ¹⁵³ *Id.* at 278.
- ¹⁵⁴ *Id.*
- ¹⁵⁵ Judy D. Olian, Stephen J. Carroll, & Cristina M. Giannantonio, *supra* note 149.
- ¹⁵⁶ *Id.* at 279.
- ¹⁵⁷ *Id.*
- ¹⁵⁸ *Id.*
- ¹⁵⁹ Lillian T. Eby, Stacy E. McManus, Shana A. Simon & Joyce E. A. Russell, *The Protege's Perspective Regarding Negative Mentoring Experiences: The Development of a Taxonomy*, 57 J. VOCATIONAL BEHAV. 1 (2000).
- ¹⁶⁰ *Id.* at 10.
- ¹⁶¹ *Id.*
- ¹⁶² *Id.* at 11.
- ¹⁶³ *Id.*
- ¹⁶⁴ *Id.*
- ¹⁶⁵ *Id.*
- ¹⁶⁶ Victoria A. Parker & Kathy E. Kram, *Women Mentoring Women: Creating Conditions for Connection*, 36 BUS. HORIZONS 42 (1993).
- ¹⁶⁷ *Id.* at 43.
- ¹⁶⁸ *Id.* at 44.
- ¹⁶⁹ *Id.*
- ¹⁷⁰ *Id.*
- ¹⁷¹ *Id.* at 45.

¹⁷² *Id.* at 47.

¹⁷³ Justin Martin, *Job Surfing: Move on to Move Up*, FORTUNE (New York), Jan. 13, 1997, at 50.

¹⁷⁴ Max Messmer, *Making the Move to the Executive Ranks: Now is the Time to Prepare*, 87 STRATEGIC FIN. 11, May 2006, at 12.

¹⁷⁵ Ted Lucas, *Still a Man's World for Female Rappers*, 118 BILLBOARD 13, Apr. 1, 2006, at 6.

¹⁷⁶ Monica L. Forret & Thomas W. Dougherty, *Networking Behaviors and Career Outcomes: Differences for Men and Women?*, 25 J. ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAV. 419 (2004).

¹⁷⁷ *Id.* at 432.

¹⁷⁸ *Id.*

¹⁷⁹ Hetty van Emmerik, *supra* note 67. Similar to other studies, these results showed that having a mentor is positively associated with career satisfaction.

¹⁸⁰ *Id.* at 588.

¹⁸¹ *Id.*

¹⁸² *Id.* at 587.

¹⁸³ Monica L. Forret & Thomas W. Dougherty, *Correlations of Networking Behavior for Managerial and Professional Employees*, 26 GROUP & ORG. MGMT., 283, 283 (2001). Forret and Dougherty define networking behavior as an individual's attempt to develop and maintain relationships with others who may potentially assist them in their careers.

¹⁸⁴ *Id.*

¹⁸⁵ *Id.* at 285.

¹⁸⁶ Higgins & Kram, *supra* note 84.

¹⁸⁷ *Id.* at 266-67.

¹⁸⁸ *Id.* at 267.

¹⁸⁹ *Id.*

¹⁹⁰ Forret & Dougherty, *supra* note 183.

¹⁹¹ *Id.* at 296.

¹⁹² *Id.* at 300.

¹⁹³ *Id.* at 296.

¹⁹⁴ *Id.* at 301.

¹⁹⁵ Higgins & Kram, *supra* note 84.

¹⁹⁶ *Id.* at 268

¹⁹⁷ *Id.* at 269-70.

¹⁹⁸ *Id.* at 270.

¹⁹⁹ *Id.* at 271.

²⁰⁰ *Id.* at 272.

²⁰¹ *Id.*

²⁰² *Id.*

²⁰³ *Id.* 272-73.

²⁰⁴ *Id.* at 276.

²⁰⁵ *Id.* at 277-79.

²⁰⁶ *Id.* at 280.

²⁰⁷ *Id.* at 280-81.

²⁰⁸ James Michael & Gary Yukl, *Managerial Level and Subunit Function as Determinants of Networking Behavior in Organization*, 28 GROUP & ORG. MGMT. 328 (1993). They define a manager's network as "a loosely organized social system consisting of a set of informal cooperative relationships." *Id.* Networking behaviors are the activities engaged in by managers to develop and maintain their networks. Internal networking is networking with people who are members of the organization, excluding direct subordinates and immediate bosses, and external networking is done with people outside the organization.

²⁰⁹ *Id.*

²¹⁰ *Id.*

²¹¹ R. KANTER, MEN AND WOMEN OF THE CORPORATION (1977); S. Riger and P. Galligan, *Women in Management: An Exploration of Competing Paradigms*, 35 AM. PSYCHOLOGIST 902 (1980); Ellen A. Fagenson, *supra* note 104.

²¹² Ibarra, *Personal Networks of Women and Minorities in Management*, *supra* note 84.

²¹³ Belle Rose Ragins, *Barriers to Mentoring: The Female Manager's Dilemma*, 42 HUM. REL. 1 (1989) [hereinafter *Barriers to Mentoring*]; R.J. Burke, *Mentors in Organizations*, 9 GROUP AND ORG. STUD. 353 (1984).

²¹⁴ Ragins, *Barriers to Mentoring*, *supra* note 213, at 3.

²¹⁵ John J. Sosik & Veronica M. Godshalk, *The Role of Gender in Mentoring: Implications for Diversified and Homogenous Mentoring Relationship*, 57 J. VOCATIONAL BEHAV. 102 (2000).

²¹⁶ Ragins, *Barriers to Mentoring* *supra* note 213, at 5.

-
- ²¹⁷ Phyllis Tharenou, *Does Mentor Support Increase Women's Career Advancement More Than Men's? The Differential Effects of Career and Psychosocial Support*, 30 AUSTRALIAN J. MGMT. 77 (2005) [hereinafter *Does Mentor Support Increase Women's Career Advancement More Than Men's?*].
- ²¹⁸ George F. Dreher & Taylor H. Cox, Jr., *Race, Gender, and Opportunity: A Study of Compensation Attainment and the Establishment of Mentoring Relationships*, 81 J. APPLIED PSYCHOL. 297 (1996).
- ²¹⁹ *Id.* But see Tharenou, *Does Mentor Support Increase Women's Career Advancement More Than Men's?*, *supra* note 217.
- ²²⁰ Sosik & Godshalk, *supra* note 215, at 115-16.
- ²²¹ *Id.* at 115-16.
- ²²² *Id.* Male mentors may harbor a bias toward mentoring other males because they may identify more clearly with them. Bowen, *supra* note 56.
- ²²³ Daniel B. Turban, Thomas W. Dougherty, & Felissa K. Lee, *Gender, Race, and Perceived Similarity Effects in Developmental Relationships: The Moderating Role of Relationship Duration*, 61 J. VOCATIONAL BEHAV. 240 (2002).
- ²²⁴ Susan M. Schor, *Separate and Unequal: The Nature of Women's and Men's Career-building Relationships*, 41 BUS. HORIZONS 51 (1997) (reporting qualitative interviews with male and female presidents and vice presidents in the insurance industry).
- ²²⁵ S. Gayle Baugh, Melanie J. Lankau, & Terri A. Scandura, *An Investigation of the Effects of Protégé Gender on Responses to Mentoring*, 49 J. VOCATIONAL BEHAV. 309 (1996).
- ²²⁶ *Id.*
- ²²⁷ *Id.*
- ²²⁸ Fagenson, *supra* note 104, at 309, 312.
- ²²⁹ *Id.* at 315.
- ²³⁰ *Id.* at 316.
- ²³¹ *Id.*
- ²³² *Id.*
- ²³³ *Id.*
- ²³⁴ Belle Rose Ragins & John L. Cotton, *Easier Said Than Done: Gender Differences in Perceived Barriers to Gaining a Mentor*, 34 ACAD. MGMT. J. 939 (1991). Female mentors may be better role models for female protégés, and sexual issues are less likely to arise in same-gender mentorships. However, female mentors tend to be less powerful than male mentors and may thus be less able to promote the career of their protégé. From an organizational perspective, cross-gender mentoring relationships provide a visible model of men and women working closely together and as such have educational value. And, as cross-gender mentorships become more common, the problems with them may decrease. Ragins, *Barriers to Mentoring: supra* note 213.
- ²³⁵ Jenny Headlam-Wells, Julian Gosland & Jane Craig, "There's Magic in the Web:" *E-mentoring for Women's Career Development*, 10 CAREER DEV. INT'L 6, Apr. 2005, at 444.
- ²³⁶ *Id.* at 90-91.
- ²³⁷ *Id.*
- ²³⁸ *Id.*
- ²³⁹ *Id.* at 101. The reason that a male mentor does not help advance women more than a female mentor may be because men do not provide more career support than female mentors. *Id.* at 102.
- ²⁴⁰ Segal, *infra* note 309, at 125.
- ²⁴¹ Raymond A. Noe, *An Investigation of the Determinants of Successful Assigned Mentoring Relationships*, 41 PERSONNEL PSYCHOL. 457 (1988).
- ²⁴² *Id.*
- ²⁴³ *Id.*
- ²⁴⁴ *Id.*
- ²⁴⁵ Cristina Trinidad & Anthony H. Normore, *Leadership and Gender: A Dangerous Liaison*, 26 LEADERSHIP & ORG. DEV. J. 7 574 (2005).
- ²⁴⁶ Hannan, *infra* note 295, at 22.
- ²⁴⁷ Sosik & Godshalk, *supra* note 215.
- ²⁴⁸ Ellen A. Ensher & Susan E. Murphy, *Effects of Race, Gender, Perceived Similarity, and Contact on Mentor Relationships*, 50 J. VOCATIONAL BEHAV. 460 (1997).
- ²⁴⁹ *Id.*
- ²⁵⁰ *Id.*
- ²⁵¹ Raymond Noe identifies a number of barriers for establishing cross-mentoring relationships. Raymond A. Noe, *Women and Mentoring: A Review and Research Agenda*, 13 ACAD. MGMT. REV. 65 (1988). First, women are perceived as not possessing desirable qualities such as leadership, assertiveness and competitiveness, and are therefore not included in information networks and groups that could provide access to potential mentors. Another barrier is that women are highly visible in male-dominated work-environments (tokenism). Their high visibility dissuades potential mentors from developing

relationships with them because there is a greater likelihood of negative consequences should the relationship be unsuccessful. Other employees may also become resentful if they think women are given preferential treatment within the organization. Women may also be excluded from mentorships based on stereotypes; potential mentors may believe women are not interested in career advancement, or lack necessary intrinsic characteristics such as skill and effort. In other words, there is a perceived incompatibility between women and the managerial role. Furthermore, female socialization encourages the development of traits contrary to those needed to be a successful manager. Women may also lack the necessary power bases to be able to attract a mentor. They seem to rely on helplessness and incompetence to gain influence; characteristics that will not help them to be sought out for a mentorship. Finally, both men and women prefer interacting with members of the same sex in the work environment. Women may not be able to find a mentor because men simply prefer working with men. In addition, an opposite-sex mentorship is often interpreted by peers as sexual in nature, which leads to jealousy and resentment.

Regina M. O'Neill and Stacy D. Blake-Beard explore six psychosocial and social gender barriers to the female mentor – male protégé mentoring relationship. Regina M. O'Neill and Stacy D. Blake-Beard, *Gender Barriers to the Female Mentor-Male Protégé Relationship*, 37 J. BUS. ETHICS 51 (2002). The first drawback concerns organizational demographics; because of the glass ceiling there are relatively few women at the top, so female mentors are scarce. Relational demography is another barrier; individuals prefer to interact with members of the same sex because they have similar attitudes and experiences. The third barrier is the possibility of real or perceived sexual involvement which may disincline women and men to form a mentoring relationship. Next is gender stereotyping; masculine behaviors are associated with being a successful manager, and so men may be reluctant to have a woman as their mentor. Women may also not want a male protégé because they believe that men do need as much help in advancing their careers. Fifth are gender behaviors; men may not want a masculine female mentor because it is incongruent with their expectations based on stereotypes. And finally power dynamics form a barrier; power is typically associated with men, and so men may not perceive women as being powerful enough to be their mentors.

James G. Clawson and Kathy E. Kram describe the drawbacks of cross-gender mentoring relationships. James G. Clawson and Kathy E. Kram, *Managing Cross-Gender Mentoring*, 27 BUS. HORIZONS 22 (1984). A developmental relationship is “one in which the conscious goal of both parties is to develop the ability and promotability of the subordinate.” The quality of such a relationship depends on mutual respect and trust between the individuals in it. There are two aspects of developmental relationships. The first is the internal relationship; the relationship between the two individuals. The second is the external relationship; the relationship between the two individuals and the rest of the organization and public. One major risk for a developmental relationship is unproductive closeness. Although closeness generally benefits the relationship, becoming too close can lead to romantic involvement which can jeopardize personal lives and professional effectiveness. However, an unnecessarily distant working relationship can reduce the learning of subordinates. Regarding the external relationship it is not the actual level of intimacy in the internal relationship that matters, but the perceived level of intimacy. When colleagues in an organization believe the mentor is having an affair with the protégé, they lose respect for the mentor and historical biases against women in the workforce may be reinforced. On the other hand, if others outside the relationship see the mentor as distant, they might be less willing to learn from him or her.

²⁵² Belle Rose Ragins & John L. Cotton, *Easier Said Than Done: Gender Differences in Perceived Barriers to Gaining a Mentor*, 34 ACAD. MGMT. J. 939 (1991) [hereinafter *Easier Said Than Done*].

²⁵³ *Id.*

²⁵⁴ *Id.*

²⁵⁵ Ragins & Cotton, *Easier Said Than Done*, *supra* note 252.

²⁵⁶ Belle Rose Ragins & John L. Cotton, *Gender and Willingness to Mentor in Organizations*, 19 J. MGMT. 97, 106 (1993).

²⁵⁷ *Id.*

²⁵⁸ *See* Noe, *supra* at 251.

²⁵⁹ *Id.*

²⁶⁰ *Id.*

²⁶¹ *Id.*

²⁶² Forret & Dougherty, *supra* note 78, at 300.

²⁶³ Herminia Ibarra, *Paving An Alternative Route: Gender Differences in Managerial Networks*, 60 SOC. PSYCH Q. 91 (1997).

²⁶⁴ Forret & Dougherty, *supra* note 78.

²⁶⁵ *Id.* at 54-55.

²⁶⁶ Schor, *supra* note 224, at 54.

²⁶⁷ *Id.* at 55.

²⁶⁸ R.J. Burke and C.A. McKeen, *Mentoring in Organizations: Implications for Women*, 9 J. BUS. ETHICS 317 (1990).

²⁶⁹ Catherine Kirchmeyer studied 292 mid-career managers by comparing the career success of male and female managers. Catherine Kirchmeyer, *Determinants of A Managerial Career Success: Evidence and Explanation of Male/Female Differences*, 24 J. MGMT., 673, 673-74 (1988). She found experience and tenure had stronger effects on progression and perceived success for men than for women. However, the effect of having a professional degree on level was stronger for

women than for men. Femininity had a stronger negative effect on women's progression than on men's progression, and masculinity had a stronger effect on women's perceived success. Having a mentor had stronger effects on men's progression than on women's and the effects of having a mentor were the same on the perceived success for both sexes. The family hypothesis was not supported. Yet, although women in the study earned less income than men but achieved the same hierarchical levels, they perceived their careers to be as successful as men's. This can be explained by the relative deprivation theory. It was found that having a spouse worked against women's income, and that women had more career interruptions than men, mostly due to family demands, that stood in the way of their success. *Id.* at 687.

²⁷⁰ Monica L. Forret, *Issues Facing Organizations When Implementing Formal Mentoring Programs*, 17 LEADERSHIP & ORG. DEV. J. 27-30 (1996).

²⁷¹ Ronald J. Burke & Carol A. McKeen, *Developing Formal Mentoring Programs in Organizations*, 53 BUS. Q. 76 (1989).

²⁷² *Id.*

²⁷³ *Id.*

²⁷⁴ *Id.*

²⁷⁵ Mara H. Washburn & Alexander W. Crispo, *Strategic Collaboration: Developing a More Effective Mentoring Model*, 27 REV.BUS. 18 (2006).

²⁷⁶ *Id.* at 24.

²⁷⁷ Herbert W. Lovelace, *Mentoring Has Own Rewards – And Risks*, INFO. WK., Mar. 21, 2005, at 80.

²⁷⁸ Kathryn H. Dansky, *The Effect of Group Mentoring on Career Outcomes*, 21 GROUP & ORGANIZATIONAL STUD. 5, 9 (1996).

²⁷⁹ *Id.* at 13.

²⁸⁰ *Id.* at 16.

²⁸¹ Lovelace, *supra* note 277, at 73.

²⁸² Headlam-Wells, Gosland & Craig, *supra* note 235, at 455.

²⁸³ Lillian T. Eby, *Alternative Forms of Mentoring in Changing Organizational Environments: A Conceptual Extension of the Mentoring Literature*, 51 J. VOCATIONAL BEHAV. 125 (1997).

²⁸⁴ *Id.*

²⁸⁵ *Id.*

²⁸⁶ *Id.*

²⁸⁷ *Id.*

²⁸⁸ David A. Thomas, *Constellations and Careers: Toward Understanding the Effects of Multiple Developmental Relationships*, 22 J. ORG. BEHAV. 223 (2001).

²⁸⁹ Michael Harvey et al., *Mentoring Dual-career Expatriates: A Sense-Making and Sense-Giving Social Support Process*, 19 INT'L J. HUM. RES. MGMT. 808 (1999).

²⁹⁰ Madaline M. Crocitto et al., *Global Mentoring as a Means of Career Development and Knowledge Creation*, 10 CAREER DEV. INT'L 530, 536 (2005).

²⁹¹ Darren Quirk, *Corporate Volunteering The Potential and The Way Forward* (May 1998),

<http://www.ozvpm.com/resourcebank/documents/CO48-CorporateVolunteering-thepotentialandthewayforwardDarrenQuirk.doc>.

²⁹² Tracey Drury, *Area Women's Mentoring Programs Are Growing*, BUS. FIRST (Buffalo), Aug. 20, 2004, at 1.

²⁹³ *Id.* at 1 (comment of Sumru Erkut, associate director and senior research scientist at the Wellesley Centers for Women).

²⁹⁴ Hetty van Emmerik, Baugh & Euwema, *supra* note 101, at 310.

²⁹⁵ Kathy Hannan, *Women Are Taking Initiative in Moving Their Careers Forward*, CRAIN'S CHI. BUS., Mar. 27, 2006, at 22.

²⁹⁶ Dan Webber, *Networking Sisters Are Doing It For Themselves*, (Mar. 20, 2006), available at

<http://www.thetelegraphandargus.co.uk/>.

²⁹⁷ Barbara Pini, Kerry Brown & Chris Ryan, *Women-only Networks as a Strategy for Change? A Case Study from Local Government*, 19 WOMEN MGMT. REV. 286 (2004).

²⁹⁸ Darroch, *supra* note 120.

²⁹⁹ Webber, *supra* note 297.

³⁰⁰ El-Khoury, *supra* at 1.

³⁰¹ *Id.*

³⁰² Susan Mooney, *The APC Women's Networking Support Project*, 17 FEMINIST COLLECTIONS 24, 27 (1996).

³⁰³ Bola Olabisi, Fiona Cruickshank, Nina Kristensen & Anna McGrail, *Breaking Barriers and Making Connections*, FIN, TIMES (London), Sep. 17, 2004, at 2.

³⁰⁴ Penelope Lockwood, *Someone Like Me Can Be Successful: Do College Students Need Same-gender Role Models?*, 30 PSYCHOL. OF WOMEN Q. 36, 37 (2006).

³⁰⁵ *Id.* at 40.

³⁰⁶ *Id.* at 42.

³⁰⁷ Johnathan A. Segal, *Shatter the Glass Ceiling, Dodge the Shards*, 50 HR MAGAZINE, 121, 123 (2005).

-
- ³⁰⁸ Rhea Seymour, *Ms Versus Mr: Women and Men Have Distinct Styles When It Comes to Managing Their Businesses and Their Employees. Who's the Better Boss?*, 19 Profit (Toronto) Iss.6, Oct. 1, 2000 at 50.
- ³⁰⁹ Sabine Sczesny, *A Closer Look Beneath the Surface: Various Facets of the Think-Manager-Think-Male Stereotype*, 49 SEX ROLES 353, 353 (2003).
- ³¹⁰ Lockwood, *supra* note 304, at 42-3.
- ³¹¹ Kathryn E. Jandeska & Maria L. Kraimer, *Women's Perceptions of Organizational Culture, Work Attitudes, and Role-modeling Behaviors*, 17 J. MANAGERIAL ISSUES 461, 461, 465 (2005).
- ³¹² Andrea Chipman, *Mentoring Helps Women Navigate Career Changes*, WALL ST. J. ONLINE, (Mar. 27, 2002), available at <http://www.hightech-women.com/mentoring.html>.
- ³¹³ Sally Flood, *The New Sisterhood*, HUM. RES. (London), Jun. 2005, at 46.
- ³¹⁴ *Id.* at 46.
- ³¹⁵ Chipman, *supra* note 312.
- ³¹⁶ Alison Maitland, *Business Life*, FIN. TIMES (London), Oct. 14, 2005, at 36.
- ³¹⁷ Maitland, *supra* note 316, at 36.
- ³¹⁸ Rebekah Ashby, *Women Ready to Show Their Prowess*, JOURNAL (Newcastle, United Kingdom), June 4, 2003, at 26.
- ³¹⁹ *Id.* at 28.
- ³²⁰ *Id.*
- ³²¹ Laura Ramsay, *A League of Their Own*, THE GLOBE & MAIL (Toronto), Nov. 29, 2002, at B11.
- ³²² Gail Lichtman, *Spreading the Wealth*, JERUSALEM POST, Apr. 29, 2005, at 12.
- ³²³ Darroch, *supra* note 120.
- ³²⁴ Jenn Ellen A. Ensher & Susan E. Murphy, *Effects of Race, Gender, Perceived Similarity, and Contact on Mentor Relationships*, 50 J. VOCATIONAL BEHAV. 460 (1997); Ellen A. Ensher, Craig Thomas, & Susan E. Murphy, *Comparison of Traditional, Step-Ahead, and Peer Mentoring on Proteges' Support, Satisfaction, and Perceptions of Career Success: A Social Exchange Perspective*, 15 J. BUS. AND PSYCHOL. 419 (2001); Daniel C. Feldman, William R. Folks & William H. Turnley, *Mentor-Protégé Diversity and Its Impact on International Internship*, 20 J. ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAV. 597 (1999); Headlam-Wells, Gosland & Craig, *supra* note 235, at 447.
- ³²⁵ George F. Dreher & Aarti Ramaswami, *The Interactive Effects of Gender and Mentoring on Career Attainment: Do Female Lawyers Need Good Counsel?* (manuscript available from the authors).
- ³²⁶ Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title VII, 42 U.S.C. 2000e, § 706 (g).