

PATHWAYS FOR WOMEN TO OBTAIN POSITIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP: THE SIGNIFICANCE OF MENTORING AND NETWORKING

CINDY A. SCHIPANI*

TERRY M. DWORKIN**

ANGEL KWOLEK-FOLLAND***

VIRGINIA G. MAURER****

I. INTRODUCTION

In interviews with top women executives, the *Wall Street Journal* discussed their paths 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 mentoring others. The question, and positive responses of the executives, indicates the

Copyright © 2008 by 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 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 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; the Poe Center for Business Ethics 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.

**** 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 also 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.

acceptance of the idea that mentoring is important, if not crucial in helping women and minorities reach the top ranks in organizations.¹

For at least two decades, social research has confirmed what many have learned through experience: mentoring and networking may help executive women reach the highest positions of leadership within their organizations.² This article reviews the extant literature addressing the ways in which mentoring and networking, both formal and informal, may help female executives achieve the highest levels of organizational leadership in business organizations, both national and international. In particular, the article 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 several different academic fields, including law, social psychology, sociology, and economics. The objective of this article is to identify features of successful programs with an eye toward focusing on the issues presented in a cross-cultural context. Part I begins 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 that a better understanding of mentoring and networking holds value 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, 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.

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

2. See 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, 539 (1990) (study finding that intensive mentoring increased income, promotions, and job satisfaction); David Marshall Hunt & Carol Michael, *Mentorship: A Career Training and Development Tool*, 8 ACAD. MGMT. REV. 475, 484 (1983) (noting that mentor relationships greatly benefited both the organizations and the individuals involved in the process). See also George F. Dreher & Thomas W. Dougherty, *Substitutes for Career Mentoring: Promoting Equal Opportunity Through Career Management and Assessment Systems*, 51 J. VOCATIONAL BEHAV. 110, 122 (1997) (noting the 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, 129 (1985) (examining how relationships with peers can offer opportunities for personal and professional growth); Lisa Mainiero, *Getting Anointed for Advancement: The Case of Executive Women*, 8 ACAD. MGMT. EXECUTIVE 53, 61 (1994); H. Ibarra & L. Smith-Lovin, *New Directions in Social Network Research on Gender and Organizational Careers*, in CREATING TOMORROW'S ORGANIZATIONS 358, 360-61 (C.L. Cooper & S.E. Jackson eds., 1997).

II. 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;³ the relationships between economic development and gender equity in the workforce;⁴ and relationships between gender equity and firm performance.⁵

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 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.⁶ 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.⁷

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.⁸

3. 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).

4. CLAUDIA GOLDIN, UNDERSTANDING THE GENDER GAP: AN ECONOMIC HISTORY OF AMERICAN WOMEN 1, 213 (1990) [hereinafter UNDERSTANDING THE GENDER GAP]; 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) [hereinafter Goldin, *The U-Shaped Female Labor Force Function*]. Accord Kristin Mammen & Christina Paxson, *Women's Work and Economic Development*, 14 J. ECON. PERSP. 141, 143–44 (2000).

5. Adler, *Competitive Frontiers*, *supra* note 3, at 23.

6. *Id.*

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

8. Adler, *supra* note 3, 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

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. 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.⁹

The relationships among 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 comes 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."¹⁰ She argues that over the course of American history, one finds a relationship between women in the paid work force and economic development.¹¹ 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 presently in the rising portion of the U.¹² Furthermore, she attributes the rising slope of the U to the entry of large numbers of married women into the workplace.¹³

Extensive work at the World Bank on the relationship between economic development and gender equality¹⁴ found greater gender equality critical to a

(1998); Abdul Bayes, *Beneath the Surface, Microcredit and Women's Empowerment*, available at <http://www.gdrc.org/icm/wind/beneath-surface.html>. Women 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 Dworkin & Schipani, *Linking Gender Equity*].

9. Lillian T. Eby, *The Boundaryless Career Experiences of Mobile Spouses in Dual-Earner Marriages*, 26 GROUP & ORG. MGMT. 343, 360-61 (2001).

10. *Supra* note 4.

11. UNDERSTANDING THE GENDER GAP, *supra* note 10, at 213.

12. Goldin, *The U-Shaped Female Labor Force Function*, *supra* note 10, at 55-57.

13. *Id.*

14. 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/WDSCContentServer/WDSP/IB/2001/03/01/000094946_01020805393496/Rendered/PDF/multi_page.pdf [hereinafter WORLD BANK, *ENGENDERING DEVELOPMENT*]; C. MARK BLACKDEN & CHITRA BANU, *WORLD BANK, GENDER, GROWTH, AND POVERTY REDUCTION: SPECIAL PROGRAM FOR ASSISTANCE FOR AFRICA, 1998 STATUS REPORT ON POVERTY IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA* (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 17* (2005), available at <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTGENDER/Resources/Beijing10Report.pdf> [hereinafter WORLD BANK, *IMPROVING WOMEN'S LIVES*] ("[U]nless inequalities in the capacities, opportunities,

nation's economic growth and to the reduction of poverty¹⁵ because inequality lowers the productive allocation of labor and contributes to a lower quality of life for both men and women.¹⁶ Other links between gender inequality and poverty include several critical ideas. First, females are likely to be more productive than—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.¹⁷ Second, 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.¹⁸ Third, 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.¹⁹ 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.²⁰ The linking mechanism is that the opportunity cost to educated women of bearing and rearing children increases as women move into the workforce,²¹ and therefore fertility rates decline and economic well-being increases.

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. Women achieve top levels of organizational leadership in many parts of the world, but 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 into 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

and the voice of women and men are reduced, the Bank's poverty reduction agenda will not be achieved."); GENDER & DEV. GROUP, 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].

15. WORLD BANK, GENDER EQUALITY, *supra* note 14, at 6–9.

16. *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.").

17. *Id.* at 7.

18. *Id.* at 6–7.

19. *Id.* at 12.

20. Mammen & Paxson, *supra* note 10, at 144.

21. *Id.* at 150. See also Terry Morehead Dworkin & Cindy A. Schipani, *Gender, Voice, and Correlations with Peace*, 36 VAND. J. TRANSNAT'L L. 527, 562 (2003) [hereinafter Dworkin & Schipani, *Gender Voice*]; Dworkin & Schipani, *Linking Gender Equity*, *supra* note 8, at 413–14.

participate in the world economy in ways in which women in their countries were previously excluded.

III. 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, both nationally and internationally.²² Researchers have examined the relationship between career success and decisions about family responsibilities and work/life balance in the United States²³ and internationally;²⁴ the role of networks, social capital, and mentors;²⁵ the role of cultural capital, class, and socioeconomic status;²⁶ the role of cultural and social context in promoting or

22. 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) (discussing the role that intense competition plays in affording more opportunities for women managers working across borders in transnational firms and the cultural myths that stand as barriers to these women) [hereinafter *COMPETITIVE FRONTIERS*]; *GENDERING ELITES: ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL LEADERSHIP IN 27 INDUSTRIALISED SOCIETIES* (Mino Vianello & Gwen Moore eds., 2000) (discussing ways in which women can reach high positions in public life, analyzing the different leadership styles of men and women, and looking at gender inequality among the elite) [hereinafter *GENDERING ELITES*]; MARGARET LINEHAN, *SENIOR FEMALE INTERNATIONAL MANAGERS: WHY SO FEW?* (2000) (studying 50 European female managers with cross border careers and finding that the problems facing domestic managers (e.g. lack of skill) are also faced by international managers); MINO VIANELLO ET AL., *WOMEN AND MEN IN POLITICAL AND BUSINESS ELITES* (Mino Vianello & Gwen Moore eds., 2004) (discussing various barriers women face in attaining powerful positions in politics and business, the different pathways women take in achieving success, the role family plays in the lives of powerful women, and the impact of the 'politics' of time on women in the workforce) [hereinafter *WOMEN AND MEN IN POLITICAL AND BUSINESS ELITES*].

23. See, e.g., Mary Blair-Loy & Amy S. Wharton, *Mothers in Finance: Surviving and Thriving*, 596 *ANNALS AM. ACAD. POL. & SOC. SCI.* 151 (2004) (discussing the difficulties women managers face in striking a work-family balance and how family life often acts as a barrier to advancement for women); 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) (showing that companies can increase the likelihood of women breaking into top management positions by implementing policies that provide flexibility for non-work related matters and policies designed to address the recruitment and retention of low-level and mid-level women managers).

24. See e.g., Alison Woodward & Dawn Lyon, *Gendered Time and Women's Access to Power*, in *GENDERING ELITES*, *supra* note 22, at 91; Gwen Moore, *Mommies and Daddies on the Fast Track in Other Wealthy Nations*, 596 *ANNALS AM. POL. & SOC. SCI.* 208 (2004) (stating that in countries outside the United States, responsibility for family life falls more on women managers than men in the workforce and that family life impedes on the careers of women more than on the careers of comparable men).

25. See *infra* notes 86–95.

26. See, e.g., Joanna Liddle & Elizabeth Michielsens, *Gender, Class and Public Power*, in *GENDERING ELITES*, *supra* note 22, at 21 (discussing the role of class background when comparing male and female managers and finding that women managers are much more likely to come from a higher class background than their male counterparts); Gwen Moore, *Women in Elite Positions: Insiders or Outsiders?*, 3 *SOC. F.* 566 (1988) (stating that fewer women become high-ranking managers, those women that are managers are more likely to have a higher background class than male managers, and that male managers have more highly developed and powerful social networks than female managers).

disrupting gender inequality and discrimination;²⁷ the course of career paths;²⁸ the role of values in achieving leadership;²⁹ and public and corporate policies affecting the rise of women in business and economic leadership.³⁰ 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.³¹

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

1. 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;
2. 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, that is, the path to top leadership, rather than in performing the leadership position;
3. elite men and elite women differ in the life decisions they have made to manage both personal and career work; and
4. although women executives tend to have leadership styles that are more democratic, more inclined toward sharing power and communicating in non-

27. See e.g., COMPETITIVE FRONTIERS, *supra* note 22, at 36–37; Bogdan Kavčič & Marjana Merkač, *Organisational Structure and Gender*, in GENDERING ELITES, *supra* note 22, 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) (gender stereotypes act as a significant barrier to women achieving management positions).

28. 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 22, at 49 (requisite factors for success in elite positions of power are similar across the globe and as applied to gender, but the subjective analysis of success varies and has changed from generation to generation).

29. See, e.g., Renata Siemienska, *Values*, in WOMEN AND MEN IN POLITICAL AND BUSINESS ELITES, *supra* note 22, at 102 (representation of women in elite positions in society can be increased through systems set up in countries with a highly involved democracy and the societal belief in equal opportunity for men and women).

30. 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].

31. See generally GENDERING ELITES, *supra* note 22 (finding that stereotyping and bias operate as structural barriers in women achieving positions of elite status, while men and women in elite status exhibit similar leadership styles); WOMEN AND MEN IN POLITICAL AND BUSINESS ELITES, *supra* note 22 (discussing various barriers women face in attaining powerful positions in politics and business, the different pathways women take in achieving success, the role family plays in the lives of powerful women, and the impact of the 'politics' of time on women in the workforce).

competitive ways, those in higher levels of organizational authority exhibit the more "competitive, directive and risk leadership" associated with males.³²

Thus it appears that both globally and nationally, women face clear differences from men in their path³³ to and in their exercise of, power³⁴ and leadership³⁵ to get to the top.

B. Obstacles and Challenges for Rising Women

The barriers women face in both the United States and the global corporate economy are legion.³⁶ They emanate both from within the organization and from social roles outside the organization, and 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 in the national and international arenas.³⁷

1. *Endogenous Barriers*

Some barriers for women to top management appear to be 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 1986.³⁸ It began to appear more commonly in the academic literature shortly preceding³⁹ and following⁴⁰ the work of the United States Federal Glass Ceiling

32. Cindy A. Schipani et al., *Women and the New Corporate Governance: Pathways for Obtaining Positions of Corporate Leadership*, 65 MD. L. REV. 504, 522–24 (2006).

33. See, e.g., Joy A. Schmeer & Frieda Reitman, *The Impact of Gender as Managerial Careers Unfold*, 47 J. VOCATIONAL BEHAV. 290, 308 (1995) (examining the career paths of male and female MBAs from longitudinal data); 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, 251 (1992) (finding lower geographical mobility and pay progression rates for women managers when compared with similarly situated male managers).

34. See 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.").

35. See Gregory H. Dobbins & Stephanie J. Platz, *Sex Differences in Leadership: How Real Are They?*, 11 ACAD. MGMT. REV. 118, 125 (1986).

36. See Ragins & Sundstrom, *supra* note 34, at 53 ("The path to power for women may more accurately be described as an obstacle course.").

37. 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) (barriers to success for women include not fitting in culturally, less effective mentor relationships, informal social network exclusion, low geographic mobility, fewer opportunities in roles of authority, and an increased pressure to maintain successful job-performance and inter-personal relationships) [hereinafter *Climbing the Corporate Ladder*].

38. Bickley Townsend, *Breaking Through: The Glass Ceiling Revisited*, 16 EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES INT'L 4, 4 (1997).

39. See A.M. MORRISON, R.P. WHITE, E. VAN VELSOR & THE CENTER FOR CREATIVE LEADERSHIP, *BREAKING THE GLASS CEILING: CAN WOMEN REACH THE TOP OF AMERICA'S LARGEST CORPORATIONS?*

Commission in the early 1990s.⁴¹ The concept has had staying power as a metaphorical construct around which organizational behavior scholars have created a robust body of literature.⁴²

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 a glass darkly or "blatantly opaque."⁴³ 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.⁴⁴ Explicit sexual discrimination continues to play a role in reducing women's access to high levels of management, especially for women of color.⁴⁵ The more usual forms of discrimination, however, are the subtle but clear cultural biases and gender stereotypes⁴⁶ in corporate decision-making, behavior,

(1987) (discussing what is needed to be successful in the corporate world and focusing on the specific obstacles faced by women on their way to the top); Ann M. Morrison & Mary Ann Von Glinow, *Women and Minorities in Management*, 45 AM. PSYCHOLOGIST 200, 200 (1990) (discussing sociological and psychological explanations of the glass ceiling and exploring the effects of different methods of eliminating the glass ceiling); 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, 84 (1994) (finding that the number of women in top management positions can be increased by changing certain aspects of the hiring process: increasing accountability of decision-makers, increasing uniformity, and increasing the transparency of the process to workers).

40. See 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); *Climbing the Corporate Ladder*, *supra* note 37, at 86 (study that compares female and male executives and the findings of potential barriers to achieving high level management positions for women); Townsend, *supra* note 38, at 4 (discussing recent gains in the number of women in top management positions and company policies that are effective in increasing these numbers).

41. U.S. FED. GLASS CEILING COMM'N, GOOD FOR BUSINESS: MAKING FULL USE OF THE NATION'S HUMAN CAPITAL 3-6 (1995).

42. See generally 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, 477 (2003) (study comparing company policies based on the effectiveness of increasing the number of women in managerial positions); Powell & Butterfield, *supra* note 39, at 84 (finding that the number of women in top management positions can be increased by changing certain aspects of the hiring process); Townsend, *supra* note 38, at 4 (discussing recent gains in the number of women in top management positions and company policies that are effective in increasing these numbers).

43. U.S. FED. GLASS CEILING COMM'N, *supra* note 41, at 122.

44. Ragins & Sundstrom, *supra* note 34, at 74-76.

45. 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) (women of color face even more barriers to board representation than white women or male minorities); Jacqueline Landau, *The Relationship of Race and Gender to Managers' Ratings of Promotion Potential*, 16 J. ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAV. 391, 391 (1995) (discussing the interaction of race and gender on employment potential).

46. *Climbing the Corporate Ladder*, *supra* note 37, 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.").

and job assignment.⁴⁷ Men and women tend to use different styles of leadership and power, and these differences reinforce the existing stereotypes.⁴⁸ 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.⁴⁹

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.⁵⁰ 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,⁵¹ which in many organizations includes access to appropriate education.⁵² Many jobs and career paths are segmented into those which are feminine and those which are masculine.⁵³ Women may also face cultural issues in foreign assignments that

47. See O.C. Brenner, Joseph Tomkiewicz, & Virginia Ellen Schein, *The Relationship Between Sex Role Stereotypes and Requisite Management Characteristics Revisited*, 32 ACAD. MGMT. J. 662, 668 (1989) (attitudes of male managers about women contribute to the disproportionate level of women in managerial positions); Ragins & Sundstrom, *supra* note 34, at 63 (discussing the role of gender stereotypes as a barrier to women's success in the workplace).

48. J.L.A. Roney & 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, 416 (1999) (examining the role of specific personality traits in identified measures of career success); Richard 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, 1225-28 (2001) (finding that stereotypical beliefs on gender play a role in the perceptions of female managers). *But see* Dobbins & Platz, *supra* note 35, at 124-25 (differences in perceived effectiveness of male and female leaders reported more frequently in laboratory studies than in field studies).

49. Uri Gneezy, Muriel Niederle, & Also Rustichini, *Performance in Competitive Environments: Gender Differences*, Q. J. ECON. 1049, 1050 (2003); Donald C. Langevoort, *Overcoming Resistance to Diversity in the Executive Suite: Grease, Grit, and the Corporate Promotion Tournament*, 61 WASH. & LEE L. REV. 1615, 1623 (2004).

50. See generally *Climbing the Corporate Ladder*, *supra* note 37; Alison M. Konrad & Kathy Cannings, *The Effects of Gender Role Congruence and Statistical Discrimination on Managerial Advancement*, 50 HUM. REL. 1305 (1997); Karen S. Lyness & Michael K. Judiesch, *Are Women More Likely to Be Hired or Promoted into Management Positions?*, 54 J. VOCATIONAL BEHAV. 158 (1999); Tuvia Melamed, *Career Success: The Moderating Effect of Gender*, 47 J. VOCATIONAL BEHAV. 35 (1995).

51. Susan Vinnicombe & Val Singh, *Locks and Keys to the Boardroom*, 18 WOMEN MGMT. REV. 325, 328 (2003).

52. *Id.* at 332.

53. See Thomas A. DiPrete & Whitman T. Soule, *Gender and Promotion in Segmented Job Ladder Systems*, 53 AM. SOC. REV. 26, 39 (1988) (sex segregation is a factor that leads to lower present advancement, which in turn can lead to lower overall career success); Patricia J. Ohlott, Marian N. Ruderman, & Cynthia D. McCauley, *Gender Differences in Managers' Developmental Job Experiences*, 37 ACAD. MGMT. J. 46, 62 (1994) (limited access to higher levels of responsibility restricts the ability of women to attain promotions).

make it more difficult to manage the projects effectively.⁵⁴ Most particularly, women face the challenge of resolving the inevitable conflicts between traditional female and family roles and the role of managerial leadership.⁵⁵

One aspect of these role conflicts is the problem of balancing time between the traditional familial role and the managerial role: the work-life balance.⁵⁶ 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 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;⁵⁷ sorting priorities at different points in time between the careers in a dual-career family unit;⁵⁸ dealing with the consequences of career interruptions that are more common among female managers early in their careers than among male managers;⁵⁹ and managing childbirth and child-rearing, neither of which is a traditional male role.⁶⁰

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 positions in

54. See Nancy J. Adler, *Expecting International Success: Female Managers Overseas*, 19 COLUM. J. WORLD BUS. 79, 83 (1984) (companies are less willing to send female managers to foreign countries because of gender stereotypes); Nancy J. Adler & Dafna N. Izreali, *Where in the World Are the Women Executives?*, 59 BUS. Q. 79, 82 (1994) (surveying personnel managers about sending females abroad and finding that foreigner's prejudices, dual-career marriage, and prejudice within the own firm are seen as major barriers to women's participation in international management); Marta B. Calás & Linda Smircich, *Dangerous Liaisons: The 'Feminine-in-Management' Meets 'Globalization,'* 36 BUS. HORIZONS 71, 78 (1993) (discussing the long-term effects of denying women managerial positions in foreign countries on equality in the workplace); Paula Caligiuri & Wayne F. Cascio, *Can We Send Her There? Maximizing the Success of Western Women on Global Assignments* 33 J. WORLD BUS. 394, 397-98 (1998) (women tend to interact with others in a more cooperative style, thus allowing female managers in foreign countries to develop strong working relationships with the hosting nationals).

55. Lillian T. Eby, *The Boundaryless Career Experiences of Mobile Spouses in Dual-Earner Marriages*, 26 GROUP & ORG. MGMT. 343, 360-61 (2001).

56. See Ellen Ernst Kossek & Cynthia Ozeki, *Work-Family Conflict, Policies, and the Job-Life Satisfaction Relationship: A Review and Directions for Organizational Behavior-Human Relations Research*, 83 J. APPLIED PSYCHOL. 139, 145 (1998) (study showing that work-life conflicts negatively impact job satisfaction); Mary M. Cutler & Anita L. Jackson, *A 'Glass Ceiling' or Work/Family Conflicts?*, 8 J. BUS. & ECON. STUD. 73, 80 (2002) (study finding greater impact of work-life conflicts on women, since women are more likely to have a partner with a career and are more likely to be affected by their partner's career); Stroh, Brett, & Reilly, *supra* note 33, at 257 (suggesting that work-life conflicts explain the differences in career progression between men and women).

57. Audrey J. Murrell, Irene Hanson Frieze, & Josephine E. Olson, *Mobility Strategies and Career Outcomes: A Longitudinal Study of MBAs*, 49 J. VOCATIONAL BEHAV. 324, 324-25 (1996).

58. Cutler & Jackson, *supra* note 56, at 79.

59. Joy A. Schnerer & Frieda Reitman, *The Interrupted Managerial Career Path: A Longitudinal Study of MBAs*, 51 J. OF VOCATIONAL BEHAV. 411, 428-30 (1997).

60. *Id.* at 414.

business. A substantial body of research supports the notion that mentoring contributes greatly to career outcomes.⁶¹ Kram's ground-breaking work in the field more than twenty years ago explicated the benefits of mentoring to organizations, to mentors, and to mentees.⁶² Subsequent studies confirm this positive relationship.⁶³ The benefits of a good mentor to a mentee are well-known, including higher income, greater job satisfaction, and promotions.⁶⁴

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.⁶⁵ A mentor may compensate for exclusion from organizational networks where such job-related 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 achievement of career goals.⁶⁶

61. See 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, 539 (1990) (study finding that intensive mentoring increased income, promotions, and job satisfaction); David Marshall Hunt & Carol Michael, *Mentorship: A Career Training and Development Tool*, 8 ACAD. MGMT. REV. 475, 484 (1983) (noting that mentor relationships greatly benefited both the organizations and the individuals involved in the process). See also George F. Dreher & Thomas W. Dougherty, *Substitutes for Career Mentoring: Promoting Equal Opportunity Through Career Management and Assessment Systems*, 51 J. VOCATIONAL BEHAV. 110, 122 (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, 129 (1985) (examining how relationships with peers can offer opportunities for personal and professional growth).

62. KATHY E. KRAM, *MENTORING AT WORK: DEVELOPMENTAL RELATIONSHIPS IN ORGANIZATIONAL LIFE* (1985).

63. See, e.g., William Whitley, 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, 346 (1991) (finding that mentorship training led to higher levels of income and higher promotion rates, affecting those from high socioeconomic backgrounds the most).

64. See S. Gayle Baugh & T.A. Scandura, *The Effects of Multiple Mentors on Protégé Attitudes Toward the Work Setting*, 14 J. SOC. BEHAV. & PERSONALITY 503, 503 (1999) (indicating that mentees involved in one or more mentoring relationships experience increased job satisfaction and organizational commitment, while the probability of role conflict increases when involved in more than one mentoring relationship); Dreher & Ash, *supra* note 61, at 539 (study finding that intensive mentoring increased income, promotions, and job satisfaction); 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, 1190 (2000) (finding that having a satisfying mentor relationship increased career opportunity and job satisfaction as compared with individuals without a mentor relationship); William T. Whitley & Pol Coetsier, *The Relationship of Career Mentoring to Early Career Outcomes*, 14 ORG. STUD. 419, 433 (1993) (noting a relationship between career mentoring and promotion rate and job satisfaction).

65. See, e.g., Ellen A. Fagenson, *The Mentor Advantage: Perceived Career/Job Experiences of Protégés Versus Non-Protégés*, 10 J. ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAV. 309, 309 (1989) (finding increased responsibility, protection, sponsorship, and visibility for employees with mentors).

66. Ragins & Sundstrom, *supra* note 34, at 64.

Researchers have worked with several definitions of mentoring.⁶⁷ The definitions may emphasize the conduct, content, and function of the relationship or they may emphasize its outcome.⁶⁸ Usually, they include the idea that two individuals are in a relationship at different levels of power, one more senior than the other in power, influence, position, experience, or maturity.⁶⁹ The senior member of the relationship attempts 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.⁷⁰ In short, mentoring is a developmental relationship that may have a career-oriented function and a psychosocial function.⁷¹ The former function may be characterized as helping the mentee "learn the ropes"⁷² in order to enhance the mentee's effective functioning in the organization. The latter may be characterized as providing "counseling, friendship, acceptance and confirmation"⁷³ and other forms of psychosocial support, which enhances the mentee's "sense of competence, identity and work role effectiveness."⁷⁴ Thus, although some studies have found the link between mentoring and outcomes somewhat less robust for women than for men,⁷⁵ mentoring nonetheless is a promising source of guidance as women seek pathways around the barriers to their advancement and achievement.⁷⁶

67. See, e.g., Donald D. Bowen, *The Role of Identification in Mentoring Female Protégées*, 11 GROUP & ORG. STUD. 61, 62–63 (1986) (noting that since many different definitions of mentors exist there is confusion about the functional role of the mentor); Kathy E. Kram, *Phases of the Mentor Relationship*, 26 ACAD. MGMT. J. 608, 621 (1983) (discussing how the phases of a mentoring relationship change over time, often in order to meet the needs of the individual).

68. See, e.g., Kram, *Phases of the Mentor Relationship*, *supra* note 67, at 622 (examining the conduct and function of a mentoring relationship); Bowen, *supra* note 67, at 72 (focusing on the conduct and content of a mentoring relationship).

69. KRAM, MENTORING AT WORK, *supra* note 62, at 15–19.

70. *Id.*

71. See generally Whitely et al., *supra* note 63, at 333–34, 341–46 (finding that the career enhancing effects of mentoring were more robust for mentees from higher socioeconomic classes than from lower socioeconomic classes).

72. Samuel Arye, Thomas Wyatt, & Raymond Stone, *Early Career Outcomes of Graduate Employees: The Effect of Mentoring and Ingratiation*, 33 J. MGMT. STUD. 95, 97 (1996).

73. *Id.*

74. *Id.* at 98.

75. See Ronald J. Burke & Carol A. McKeen, *Benefits of Mentoring Relationships Among Managerial and Professional Women: A Cautionary Tale*, 51 J. VOCATIONAL BEHAV. 43, 43 (1997) (finding that among 280 female business graduates of the same university, 70% of whom describe a mentor relationship, with two-thirds of the mentors male, the existence of a mentor was only modestly related to work outcomes and less so to measures of personal wellbeing and satisfaction).

76. See, e.g., Tammy D. Allen et al., *Career Benefits Associated With Mentoring for Protégés: A Meta-Analysis*, 89 J. APPLIED PSYCHOL. 127, 130–32 (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 was 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

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.⁷⁷ Its definition is somewhat more fluid, but networking is conceptually distinct from mentoring. Networking may be thought of as a constellation of developmental relationships⁷⁸ that functions in various ways and contributes 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.⁷⁹

IJ. 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.⁸⁰ Moreover, the size and diversity of the network appears to be more strongly correlated with the career satisfaction of women than of men.⁸¹ This is evocative of earlier studies suggesting that women managers, independent of mentoring, benefit more than do men from general encouragement from superiors,⁸² probably because such encouragement leads to training that leads to advancement.⁸³ It is also consistent with Adler and Izraeli's findings that worldwide, social networks contribute to the social capital necessary for advancement to top management⁸⁴ and moreover, that women's

success, and performance effectiveness. It was also 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 MAG. 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).

77. Lisa Mainiero, *Getting Anointed for Advancement: The Case of Executive Women*, 8 ACAD. MGMT. EXECUTIVE 53, 61 (1994); Adler & Izraeli, *supra* note 54, at 8; H. Ibarra & L. Smith-Lovin, *New Directions in Social Network Research on Gender and Organizational Careers*, in CREATING TOMORROW'S ORGANIZATIONS 359, 360-61 (C.L. Cooper & S.E. Jackson eds., 1997).

78. See IJ. Hetty van Emmerik, *The More You Can Get the Better: Mentoring Constellations and Intrinsic Career Success*, 9 CAREER DEV. INT'L 578, 589 (2004) (finding that the size of a developmental network of diverse relationships was associated with successful careers).

79. Asya Pazy, *Sex Differences in Responsiveness to Organizational Career Management*, 26 HUM. RESOURCE MGMT. 243, 251 (1987).

80. Van Emmerik, *supra* note 78, at 588.

81. *Id.*

82. 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) (noting the significance of the finding that women receive less career encouragement, since career encouragement is shown to increase development and training, which in turn, leads to managerial advancement).

83. *Id.* at 924.

84. Dafna N. Izraeli & Nancy J. Adler, *Competitive Frontiers: Women Managers in a Global Economy*, in NANCY J. ADLER & DANA N. IZRAELI, *COMPETITIVE FRONTIERS: WOMEN MANAGERS IN A GLOBAL ECONOMY* 8 [hereinafter ADLER & IZRAELI, *COMPETITIVE FRONTIERS*] (1994). See also Sharon L. Allen, *From Boise to the Boardroom: What Matters Most on the Journey to the Top*, 20 EXECUTIVE SPEECHES 26, 28-29 (2005) (discussing the challenges companies face in retaining and promoting women in male-dominated fields); Sally Ann Davies-Netzley, *Women Above the Glass Ceiling: Perceptions on Corporate Mobility and Strategies for Success*, 12 GENDER & SOC'Y 339, 348 (1998) (in a qualitative study of men and women in elite business positions, women spontaneously mentioned networking and mentoring as strategies for success).

lack of social networks prevents them from rising to the top to a much greater extent than it does men.⁸⁵

IV. 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 section explicates the theoretical underpinnings of the mentoring and networking literature; explains the efficacy, methodologies, and processes of mentoring and networking; identifies how networking and mentoring schemes differentially 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. These theories 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 power basis for mentoring and networking.⁸⁶ *Social capital* "refers to the sum of the actual and potential resources embedded within, available through, and derived from the network of social relationships."⁸⁷ Social capital enhances access to mentors and networks, which connects individuals through trust, understanding, and mutual values, provides conduits for information, and makes it easier to attain both career and personal goals.⁸⁸ Social capital is also gained through networking,⁸⁹ by occupying one or more positions in a social network that provide access to developmental relationships, which may include mentors.

85. Ellen A. Fagenson & Janice J. Jackson, *The Status of Women Managers in the United States*, in ADLER & IZRAELI, *COMPETITIVE FRONTIERS*, *supra* note 84, at 395–96.

86. See Daniel J. Brass, *Men's and Women's Networks: A Study of Interaction Patterns and Influence in an Organization*, 28 *ACAD. MGMT. J.* 327, 339–340 (1985) (finding that although women are more adept at social networking with other women, they are at a disadvantage in forming social networks in male-dominated fields).

87. Van Emmerik, *supra* note 78, at 580.

88. 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).

89. Monica L. Forret & Thomas W. Dougherty, *Correlates of Networking Behavior for Managerial and Professional Employees*, 26 *GROUP & ORG. MGMT.* 283, 285 (2001).

Social network research has produced significant insights.⁹⁰ Both the diversity⁹¹ 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."⁹² 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. Those that are relatively strong—that involve long-term, stable, and trusting relationships—provide psychosocial support that bolsters confidence and provide dependable sources of support when it is needed.⁹³

Through these mechanisms, mentoring and networking help build the social capital associated with top managerial leadership.⁹⁴ In addition, the study of gender differences in networks holds promise for understanding what kinds of networks are most beneficial for women and minorities.⁹⁵

Cultural capital, as a sociological paradigm,⁹⁶ 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, and the Internet; and institutional certification of knowledge that can be converted into economic capital through labor markets.⁹⁷ An understanding of the significance of cultural capital in accessing positions of power is attributed to the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu. Building on his

90. See, e.g., Charles J. Fombrun, *Strategies for Network Research in Organizations*, 7 ACAD. MGMT. REV. 280, 285 (1982) (discussing the strengths and weaknesses of nodal, dyadic, and triadic network research strategies).

91. Monica C. Higgins, *The More, the Merrier? Multiple Developmental Relationships and Work Satisfaction*, 19 J. MGMT. DEV. 277, 291 (2000).

92. Van Emmerik, *supra* note 78, at 581.

93. *Id.* at 582.

94. Gwen Moore & Mino Vianello, *General Conclusions*, in GENDERING ELITES, *supra* note 22, 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").

95. See Monica C. Higgins & Kathy E. Kram, *Reconceptualizing Mentoring at Work: A Developmental Network Perspective*, 26 ACAD. MGMT. REV. 264, 282 (2001) (discussing the factors that shape developmental network structures); Herminia Ibarra, *Paving an Alternative Route: Gender Differences in Managerial Networks*, 60 SOC. PSYCHOL. Q. 91, 98 (1997) (finding that different approaches in the diversity, closeness, and quantity of social networks create alternative paths to similar career goals for both men and women); Herminia Ibarra, *Personal Networks of Women in Management: A Conceptual Framework*, 18 ACAD. MGMT. REV. 56, 56–58 (1993) (finding that the personal networks of women and minorities differ from the networks of white males because of the organizational context of the networks, which in turn affect career opportunities); Isabel Metz & Phyllis Tharenou, *Women's Career Advancement: The Relative Contribution of Human and Social Capital*, 26 GROUP & ORG. MGMT. 312, 336 (2001) (noting the differential impact of human capital and social capital on women's advancement into high-level banking jobs in Australia, specifically that social capital had a negligible effect on advancement whereas differing levels of human capital resulted in differing levels of advancement).

96. See generally Mitchell L. Stevens, *Cultural Sociology and Its Diversity* in 619 ANNALS OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF POLITICAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCE 97 (2006) (Amy Binder, et al. eds., 2006) (reviewing the intellectual history of the construct of cultural capital).

97. Maria Antonia Garcia de Leon et al., *The Elites Cultural Capital*, in GENDERING ELITES, *supra* note 22, at 35, 37.

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.⁹⁸ 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 cultural barriers?

2. Socioeconomic Class Theory

Certain aspects of cultural capital are related to *socioeconomic class* status.⁹⁹ Work by Kanter,¹⁰⁰ Pfeffer,¹⁰¹ and Stinchcombe¹⁰² 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.¹⁰³ 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. This similarity factor influences the selection of mentees and the nature and depth of the mentoring relationship.¹⁰⁴ Higher level managers also tend to engage more frequently in networking behaviors.¹⁰⁵

3. Personality Theory

Industrial and organizational psychologists have focused on the role of personality in the efficacy of mentoring and networking.¹⁰⁶ Though they are

98. Davies-Netzley, *supra* note 84, at 339–41 (discussing a qualitative study of men and women in elite positions in business in Southern California).

99. ROSABETH MOSS KANTER, *MEN AND WOMEN OF THE CORPORATION*, 8 (1977) (examining how the careers of corporate employees, especially women, are determined by the distribution of power within the organization).

100. *Id.*

101. See Jeffrey Pfeffer, *Toward an Examination of Stratification in Organizations*, 22 ADMIN. SCI. Q. 553 (1977) (noting the relationship between a person's status in an organization and the person's status in society).

102. See Arthur L. Stinchcombe, *Social Structure and Organizations*, in HANDBOOK OF ORGANIZATIONS 142 (James G. March ed., 1965) (discussing the historical and sociological development of organizations in society and the effect of society on organizations). See also PETER M. BLAU & OTIS D. DUNCAN, *THE AMERICAN OCCUPATIONAL STRUCTURE*, 1 (1967) (analyzing the dynamics of stratification systems in the United States through its occupational structure).

103. William Whitely, Thomas W. Dougherty, & George F. Dreher, *Correlates of Career-Oriented Mentoring for Early Career Managers and Professionals*, 13 J. ORG. BEHAV. 141, 141 (1992).

104. *Id.* at 143.

105. Forret & Dougherty, *supra* note 89, at 300.

106. See Nikos Bozionelos, *Mentoring Provided: Relation to Mentor's Career Success, Personality, and Mentoring Received*, 64 J. VOCATIONAL BEHAV. 24 (2004) (discussing the link between the amount of mentoring an employee received and their objective and subjective career success, and that the personality trait of openness was positively related to mentoring provided); Daniel B. Turban & Thomas W. Dougherty, *Role of Protégé Personality in Receipt of Mentoring and Career Success*, 37 ACAD.

variously stated by different strands of personality research, certain relatively stable qualities of personality have a greater predictive value in relating personality to organizational phenomena and experiences, including advancement to top leadership.¹⁰⁷ Turban and Dougherty looked at three of these qualities: (1) locus of control, or the extent to which an individual perceives that outcomes are controlled by her own actions or by external forces over which she has no control; (2) self-monitoring, or the extent to which an individual either senses social cues and adapts behavior to the situation at hand or does not sense social cues and adjusts behavior accordingly; and (3) emotional stability, or the extent to which an individual evaluates herself favorably across situations, reflecting self-esteem on the high end and negativity on the low end.¹⁰⁸ Their work found that "individuals with internal loci of control and high self-monitoring and emotional stability"¹⁰⁹ 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."¹¹⁰ Furthermore, a propensity to engage in networking behavior can be correlated with high self-esteem and extraversion.¹¹¹ Other researchers have successfully applied personality theory to the study of mentors¹¹² and effective mentoring, producing a basis for predicting which mentors can effectively provide career-oriented and psychosocial mentoring.¹¹³

4. *Sociological Theories of Power*

Sociologists define power in various ways. 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"¹¹⁴ 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 organization's structure and its control over persons in the organization.¹¹⁵ At the level of analysis between groups, power may be either symmetrical (or

MGMT. J. 688 (1994) (finding that a mentee, through positive personality traits, can affect the amount of mentoring received, which in turn is related to career success).

107. Phyllis Tharenou, *Going Up? Do Traits and Informal Social Processes Predict Advancing in Management?*, 44 ACAD. MGMT. J. 1005, 1013-15 (2001).

108. Turban & Dougherty, *supra* note 106, at 689-90.

109. *Id.* at 698.

110. *Id.*

111. Forret & Dougherty, *supra* note 89, at 300.

112. See IJ. 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 310 (2005) (discussing factors that increase the tendency to become a mentor as well as factors that increase the desire to become a mentor).

113. See, e.g., Ellen J. Mullen, *Vocational and Psychosocial Mentoring Functions: Identifying Mentors Who Serve Both*, 9 HUM. RES. DEV. Q. 319, 319 (1998) (finding that the presence of certain factors of a mentor relationship increase the effectiveness of the relationship and the satisfaction of both of the individuals involved).

114. Belle Rose Ragins, *Diversified Mentoring Relationships in Organizations: A Power Perspective*, 22 ACAD. MGMT. REV. 482, 485 (1997).

115. *Id.*

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.¹¹⁶ Most saliently, Ragins uses the latter two sociological perspectives 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.¹¹⁷ Fagenson, citing Kanter, posits that power is primarily a function of organizational position and that there are only two types of positions: advantageous and disadvantageous.¹¹⁸ The power-dominant group invariably occupies the advantageous position. This line of work holds the promise of yielding useful insights about the use of mentoring by minorities¹¹⁹ such as women and racial minorities, to attain advantageous positions, power, and top leadership in the organization.¹²⁰

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.¹²¹ This is an accepted truth to the Western mentality, 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 the cost of excluding or hindering such talent through, for example, prejudice, may be expensive to the organization and to the society.¹²² Indeed, the economic and legal underpinnings of the modern corporation depend upon the organization's effective use of human resources, including managerial and directorial talent, for the benefit of shareholders and others.¹²³

116. *Id.*

117. *Id.* at 482–83; Ragins & Sundstrom, *supra* note 34, at 51–53.

118. See Ellen A. Fagenson, *At the Heart of Women in Management Research: Theoretical and Methodological Approaches and Their Biases*, 9 J. BUS. ETHICS 267, 269–70 (1990) (advocating attention to organizational factors and structures rather than to inherent gender differences in studying women in organizations).

119. In sociology, minorities are classified with respect to inter-group power relations and not with respect to numerical majority.

120. For a succinct explication of the forms of power in an organization, see Ragins & Sundstrom, *supra* note 34, at 52.

121. See Zafiris Tzannatos, *Women and Labor Market Changes in the Global Economy: Growth Helps, Inequalities Hurt and Public Policy Matters*, 27 WORLD DEV. 551, 559–60 (1999).

122. Adler, *supra* note 3, at 23 (observing the economic costs of prejudice under competitive conditions); WORLD BANK, GENDER EQUALITY & THE MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS 6 (2003) (“[O]ne of the key conclusions of recent research is that, other things being equal, general inequality retards both economic growth and poverty reduction.”).

123. DOUGLAS M. BRANSON, NO SEAT AT THE TABLE: HOW CORPORATE GOVERNANCE AND LAW KEEP WOMEN OUT OF THE BOARDROOM 177–79 (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”). Accord Steven A. Ramirez, *Games CEOs Play and Interest Convergence Theory: Why Diversity Lags in America’s Boardrooms*

Scholars interested in the cross-cultural prevalence and historical tenacity of gender inequity have explored the complex relationship between women's economic positions inside and outside the family.¹²⁴ 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, they always do so within the context of what one scholar has called the "family claim."¹²⁵ 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.¹²⁶ 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.¹²⁷ Further, as sociologist Joan Acker has argued, all forms of social organization to some extent share common gender structures and assumptions.¹²⁸ This is the case because social forms tend toward 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.¹²⁹ 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 provides 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.¹³⁰ 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.¹³¹ 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

and What to Do About It, 61 WASH. & LEE L. REV. 1583, 1588, 1613 n.22 (2004) (noting that diverse board members bring rich cultural perspectives, including diverse experiences and insights, to the boardroom, resulting in the improvement of corporate governance).

124. See CARL N. DEGLER, *AT ODDS: WOMEN AND THE FAMILY IN AMERICA FROM THE REVOLUTION TO THE PRESENT* 144, 144–77 (1980) (posits that the modern family has been shaped by women's demands for greater autonomy and puts the conflicting needs of the family and equality and opportunity for women in historical perspective).

125. ROSALIND ROSENBERG, *DIVIDED LIVES: AMERICAN WOMEN IN THE 20TH CENTURY* 3–35 (Hill & Wang 2008). See also ANGEL KWOLEK-FOLLAND, *INCORPORATING WOMEN: A HISTORY OF WOMEN AND BUSINESS IN THE UNITED STATES* 3–12 (2002) (discussing the relationship between women's economic and familial roles).

126. Alice Kessler-Harris, *Reframing the History of Women's Wage Labor: Challenges of a Global Perspective*, 15 J. WOMEN'S HIST. 186, 190–92 (2004).

127. ROSENBERG, *supra* note 125, at Ch.1.

128. Joan Acker, *Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations*, 4 GENDER & SOC'Y 139, 146 (1990).

129. *Id.*

130. GARY S. BECKER, *A TREATISE ON THE FAMILY* 1–3 (1991).

131. *Id.*

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. 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*.¹³² 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 1985,¹³³ scholars have observed that the efficacy of mentoring 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's 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.¹³⁴ Although the classical mentoring relationship involves both career development and psychosocial support,¹³⁵ with attendant emotional involvement and intensity of interpersonal relationship, the career development function can occur successfully in the absence of such bonds.¹³⁶ 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.¹³⁷ Tharenou and her colleagues posit that encouragement, self-esteem, and confidence increase a mentee's acceptance of training and development opportunities, and that training and development are, in turn, positively linked

132. Aryee et al., *supra* note 72, at 97.

133. KRAM, *supra* note 62; Kram & Isabella, *Mentoring Alternatives*, *supra* note 61.

134. Kram & Isabella, *Mentoring Alternatives*, *supra* note 61, at 111.

135. Kathy E. Kram, *Phases of the Mentor Relationship*, *supra* note 67, at 621–22; Mullen, *supra* note 113, at 319.

136. See Mullen, *supra* note 113, at 320.

137. Bowen, *supra* note 67, at 63–64.

to women's advancement as managers in organizations, thereby establishing the link between psychosocial mentoring and career advancement.¹³⁸

The role-modeling mode has been separated out most recently as a distinct mode of mentoring,¹³⁹ although it is clearly related to the first two modes and may be a part of both information-impacting 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 mentor¹⁴⁰ or the mentee, or both.

Christopher Orpen conducted a longitudinal study on the effect of a mentor on newcomers to the workplace.¹⁴¹ 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.¹⁴²

Mentoring is specifically beneficial for women and minorities because it chips away at the glass ceiling and provides protégés with career functions.¹⁴³ 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.¹⁴⁴ Mentoring can help overcome that fear by providing business and confidence skills training as well as coaching.¹⁴⁵

2. *Ideal Mentors*

Scholars have also investigated the characteristics of an ideal mentor along with how protégés can make the most of the relationship.¹⁴⁶ 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.¹⁴⁷ Also important are honesty, possessing a genuine interest in mentoring, being people-oriented, and having a structured vision.¹⁴⁸ Establishing an open communication system was most often stated to be one way of making the

138. Phyliss Tharenou, Shane Latimer, & Denise Conroy, *How Do You Make It To The Top? An Examination of Influence on Women's and Men's Managerial Advancement*, 37 ACAD. MGMT. J. 899, 922 (1994)

139. Terri A. Scandura, *Mentorship and Career Mobility: An Empirical Investigation*, 13 J. ORG. BEHAV. 169, 170–72 (1992).

140. See, e.g., Tammy D. Allen & Mark L. Poteet, *Developing Effective Mentoring Relationships: Strategies from the Mentor's Viewpoint*, 48 CAREER DEV. Q. 59, 62–66 (1999) (discussing factors characteristic of an ideal mentor and practical suggestions that either the mentor or mentee can implement to develop a more effective mentoring relationship).

141. Christopher Orpen, *The Effects of Mentoring on Employees' Career Success*, 135 J. SOC. PSYCHOL. 667, 667 (1995).

142. *Id.* at 668.

143. Valerie Darroch, *Being the Only Woman in a Boardroom Can Get You Down if You Let It. I Don't*, SUNDAY HERALD, Feb. 19, 2006, at 6.

144. Jonathan 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.

145. *Id.*

146. Allen & Poteet, *supra* note 140, at 60.

147. *Id.* at 64–66.

148. *Id.* at 66.

relationship most effective.¹⁴⁹ 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.¹⁵⁰

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.¹⁵¹ 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.¹⁵² Moreover, psychosocial support can be provided by many people in an organization.¹⁵³ Both informal and formal protégés showed higher levels of job outcomes than non-mentored individuals.¹⁵⁴ Additionally, there was a positive relationship between mentorship functions, especially the career function, and job outcomes for mentored protégés.¹⁵⁵

Stacy D. Blake-Beard has also studied formal mentoring programs and the implications for women participating in them.¹⁵⁶ She found formal mentoring relationships are generally much shorter than informal relationships and are arranged by the organization.¹⁵⁷ 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.¹⁵⁸

Belle Rose Ragins, John L. Cotton, and Janice S. Miller 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.¹⁵⁹ The study found a positive relation between satisfaction with a mentoring relationship and career and job attitudes.¹⁶⁰ 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

149. *Id.*

150. *Id.*

151. 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).

152. *Id.* at 630–31.

153. *Id.* at 631.

154. *Id.* at 632.

155. *Id.*

156. Stacy D. Blake-Beard, *Taking a Hard Look at Formal Mentoring Programs: A Consideration of Potential Challenges Facing Women*, 20 *J. MGMT. DEV.* 331 (2001).

157. *Id.* at 332–33.

158. *Id.* at 333.

159. Ragins, Cotton, & Miller, *supra* note 64, at 1177.

160. *Id.* at 1183.

individuals. Formally mentored individuals in highly satisfying relationships reported somewhat more positive attitudes than non-mentored individuals.¹⁶¹ 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.¹⁶² 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.¹⁶³

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.¹⁶⁴

Moreover, by outcome 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. The level of formality does seem to matter, however, in terms of overall benefits from the relationship, with informal mentoring providing greater overall benefits.¹⁶⁵

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.¹⁶⁶ The primary benefit of being a mentor is the sense of satisfaction received from developing a junior employee.¹⁶⁷ Mentors may also experience self-rejuvenation and receive a loyal base of support from their protégés.¹⁶⁸ The costs of mentoring are that the relationship can turn into exploitation, the time demands are substantial, and there is a risk of being displaced or backstabbed by protégés.¹⁶⁹ In addition, mentors may be viewed as giving an unfair advantage to their protégés, which may hurt the mentors' reputation.¹⁷⁰

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 experience.¹⁷¹ The results of

161. *Id.* at 1183–84.

162. *Id.* at 1190.

163. *Id.* at 1187–89.

164. *Id.* at 1191.

165. *Id.* at 1190–91.

166. See Belle Rose Ragins & Terri A. Scandura, *Burden or Blessing? Expected Costs and Benefits of Being a Mentor*, 20 J. ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAV. 493 (1999) (finding a greater willingness to become a mentor with individuals who had previous experiences in a mentoring relationship and who expected fewer costs and more benefits from the experience).

167. *Id.* at 494.

168. *Id.*

169. *Id.*

170. *Id.*

171. *Id.* at 504–05.

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 protégés were less favorably inclined toward mentoring. This may be because protégés assumed they imposed a great burden on their mentors.¹⁷²

5. *Selecting a Protégé*

Studies have also considered the characteristics of a protégé that are most important to mentors.¹⁷³ Based on social exchange theory, which views interactions between people as an exchange based on cost-benefit analysis, one might expect mentors to prefer protégés whom they anticipate will become successful—the ability/potential factor.¹⁷⁴ There is also some research suggesting that mentors select protégés based on the protégé's need for help.¹⁷⁵

However, Allen and her colleagues found that mentors are more likely to select protégés based on the protégé's perceived ability and potential than on their need for help, and this was more true for female than male mentors.¹⁷⁶ Possibly, females try to limit the risk associated with mentoring by selecting high potential protégés.¹⁷⁷

Similarly, Judy D. Olian, Stephen J. Carroll, and Cristina M. Giannantonio found that a protégé's past performance had significant effects on both a mentor's intentions to engage in mentoring behaviors on behalf of the protégé and expected rewards from the relationship.¹⁷⁸ 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.¹⁷⁹ 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.¹⁸⁰ 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 a means to increase their own stature.¹⁸¹

172. Judy D. Olian, Stephen J. Carroll, & Cristina M. Giannantonio, *Mentor Reactions to Protégés: An Experiment with Managers*, 43 J. VOCATIONAL BEHAV. 266, 266 (1993).

173. 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) (finding that mentors chose protégés more based on their perception of the protégés' ability rather than on their need for help).

174. *Id.* at 272.

175. *Id.*

176. *Id.* at 278.

177. *Id.*

178. Judy D. Olian, Stephen J. Carroll, & Cristina M. Giannantonio, *supra* note 172, at 266.

179. *Id.* at 279.

180. *Id.*

181. *Id.*

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.¹⁸² The 156 protégés in the study all reported one or more positive mentoring relationships and eighty-four, or 54%, reported at least one negative relationship.¹⁸³ In total, 168 distinct negative experiences were reported, 85% occurring in same-sex relationships.¹⁸⁴

The study yielded five broad categories of negative experiences, in order of frequency: (1) mismatch with the dyad; (2) distancing behavior; (3) manipulative behavior; (4) lack of mentor expertise; and (5) general dysfunction.¹⁸⁵ Within those themes, the most frequently reported negative experiences involved mentor neglect, mentors' lack of interpersonal skills, mentor abuse of power, and the mentor having dissimilar values and work habits.¹⁸⁶

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.¹⁸⁷ It was, however, found that those with dissimilar attitudes and values were significantly more likely to report negative experiences.¹⁸⁸ The hypothesis that having a direct supervisor as a mentor would increase the number of negative experiences was also not supported.¹⁸⁹

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.¹⁹⁰ Senior women reported feeling discounted or overburdened as mentors, feeling afraid that mentoring will be risky to their careers, or that mentoring will take too much time.¹⁹¹ Junior women found senior women competitive with them or unreceptive.¹⁹² One possible contributing factor is that women's family role as mothers may influence the mentor-protégé relationship.¹⁹³ Junior women may be afraid they may be overpowered by a senior woman, or may be disappointed when their dependency needs are not

182. 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).

183. *Id.* at 10.

184. *Id.*

185. *Id.*

186. *Id.* at 11.

187. *Id.*

188. *Id.*

189. *Id.*

190. Victoria A. Parker & Kathy E. Kram, *Women Mentoring Women: Creating Conditions for Connection*, 36 BUS. HORIZONS 42 (1993).

191. *Id.* at 43.

192. *Id.*

193. *Id.* at 44.

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.¹⁹⁴ Senior and junior women often do not discuss this central issue because they are afraid they will be judged by each other for the choices they are making or have made.¹⁹⁵ 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 needed to advance.¹⁹⁶ Furthermore, senior women may look for support outside their organization because of lack of other senior women higher in the hierarchy at their firm.¹⁹⁷ This may make junior women believe they are cold and detached from the firm.¹⁹⁸ Finally, men may unconsciously act to keep women apart because it serves to maintain their own power base.¹⁹⁹

C. Functions of Networking

Networking, while an important skill for every businessperson, is especially beneficial to women looking to advance their careers. Networking allows an individual to increase visibility and is a good way to "get [one]self on the radar screen for future searches."²⁰⁰ In addition, participation in professional networks enhances industry knowledge and improves one's ability to offer innovative recommendations in the workplace,²⁰¹ 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."²⁰²

Forret and Dougherty explored the relationship between networking behaviors and career outcomes—the number of promotions, compensation, and perceived career success—and whether networking behavior is as beneficial for women as it is for men.²⁰³ The results of the study showed that increased internal visibility through networking was significantly related to promotions and compensation for men, but not for women.²⁰⁴ It may be that the assignments and committees in which women were involved were less prestigious than those dominated by men. Interestingly, increased internal visibility was significantly related to perceived career success for women, but

194. *Id.*

195. *Id.*

196. *Id.* at 45.

197. *Id.* at 46.

198. *Id.*

199. *Id.* at 47.

200. Justin Martin, *Job Surfing: Move on to Move Up*, FORTUNE, Jan. 13, 1997, at 50.

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

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

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

204. *Id.* at 432.

not for men.²⁰⁵ 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.²⁰⁶ 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*

IJ. Hetty van Emmerik examined the relationship between mentoring constellations—the combination of mentoring relationships and developmental networking relationships—and intrinsic career success.²⁰⁷ 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.²⁰⁸ It could be that a greater range network makes persons realize their job is comparatively worse than others.

However, stability of the relationships was found to be positively related to career satisfaction, and frequency of contacts was found to be positively related to job satisfaction, which provides support for the hypothesis that after controlling for having a mentor, developmental relationship strength is positively associated with career success.²⁰⁹ However, emotional intensity was negatively associated with career satisfaction.²¹⁰ Perhaps emotionally intense relationships become increasingly necessary the less satisfied one is with one's job. The study also showed that the size of men's networks is not related to career satisfaction, but the size women's networks is positively related to career satisfaction.²¹¹

2. *Boundaryless Careers*

Forret and Dougherty studied 418 professionals to examine the relationship between personal and job characteristics and involvement in networking.²¹² 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.²¹³ Further, the structure of an individual's networks is important in understanding networking behaviors. The more

205. *Id.*

206. *Id.*

207. Van Emmerik, *supra* note 78, at 578. Similar to other studies, these results showed that having a mentor is positively associated with career satisfaction.

208. *Id.* at 588.

209. *Id.*

210. *Id.* at 589.

211. *Id.* at 587.

212. Monica L. Forret & Thomas W. Dougherty, *Correlates 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. *Id.*

213. *Id.*

structural holes one has in one's network—i.e. the fewer redundant contacts one has—the more access to information and the greater one's social capital.²¹⁴

Monica C. Higgins and Kathy E. Kram introduced a typology of developmental networks in which the main dimensions are the diversity of individuals' developmental networks and the strength of the relationships that make up the networks.²¹⁵ They similarly found developmental networks important in the boundaryless work environment.²¹⁶ These networks become increasingly important because firms no longer provide the primary anchor to a person's identity.²¹⁷ 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."²¹⁸

3. *Personal Characteristics*

Forret and Dougherty studied the personal characteristics of those utilizing networks.²¹⁹ Contrary to their hypothesis, they found that gender was not related to involvement in networking.²²⁰ This may be because feminine values, such as cooperation and building relationships are important in the boundaryless career, which benefits women.²²¹ However, they found socioeconomic background to be positively related to networking, as were self-esteem and attitudes toward workplace politics.²²² 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.²²³

4. *Dimensions of Developmental Networks*

Higgins and Kram identify four central concepts to the developmental network perspective.²²⁴ The first—the network—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."²²⁵ The other concepts include: (1) the developmental relationships that make up the network; (2) the diversity of the network defined as the number of different social systems from which the ties originate; and (3)

214. *Id.* at 285.

215. Higgins & Kram, *supra* note 95, at 264.

216. *Id.* at 266–67.

217. *Id.* at 267.

218. *Id.*

219. Forret & Dougherty, *Correlates of Networking Behavior for Managerial and Professional Employees*, *supra* note 212, at 287–90.

220. *Id.* at 296.

221. *Id.* at 300.

222. *Id.* at 296.

223. *Id.* at 301.

224. Higgins & Kram, *supra* note 95, at 266–67.

225. *Id.* at 268.

the relationship strength—i.e. the level of emotional affection, reciprocity, and frequency of communication.²²⁶

Higgins and Kram further found four categories of developmental networks.²²⁷ The first is the *entrepreneurial network*, characterized by high developmental network diversity and high developmental relationship strength.²²⁸ 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.²²⁹ The second is the *opportunistic network*, characterized by high developmental network diversity and low developmental relationship strength.²³⁰ In this network, individuals are open to receiving developmental assistance from multiple sources, but are generally passive toward initiating and cultivating such relationships.²³¹ Third is the *traditional network*, characterized by low developmental network diversity and high developmental relationship strength.²³² The ideal type is composed of one strong tie to one social system and one additional tie from that system.²³³ 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.²³⁴ This network is made up of weak ties that come from the same social system.²³⁵

The authors expect that when the protégé and her developers care about career as well as psychosocial support, relationship ties will be stronger and yield either an entrepreneurial or traditional network.²³⁶ 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.²³⁷ Furthermore, they expect that individuals with strong-tie relationships will experience more personal learning than those with weak ties because of the amount of psychosocial support involved.²³⁸ Another proposition the authors put forward is that individuals with traditional networks will experience the highest levels of organizational commitment.²³⁹ This is because strong-tie guidance will be provided only from within the organization.²⁴⁰ Finally, they expect protégés with receptive or opportunistic networks to experience lower levels of work satisfaction than individuals with the other kinds of networks; with only weak ties an individual is unlikely to

226. *Id.* at 269–70.

227. *Id.* at 270.

228. *Id.* at 271.

229. *Id.*

230. *Id.* at 272.

231. *Id.*

232. *Id.*

233. *Id.*

234. *Id.*

235. *Id.* 272–73.

236. *Id.* at 276.

237. *Id.* at 277.

238. *Id.* at 277–79.

239. *Id.* at 280.

240. *Id.*

experience the acceptance and confirmation of her work that comes with strong ties.²⁴¹

5. *Network Dependency*

James Michael and Gary Yukl examined managers' internal and external networking behavior and network dependency.²⁴² Dependency is defined as the extent to which cooperation and support are needed to carry out a manager's job responsibilities effectively and to achieve a desired rate of career advancement.²⁴³

The results showed that middle-and upper-level managers had more external dependency than lower-level managers and did more external networking.²⁴⁴ 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.²⁴⁵ It could be that because upper-level managers have greater status and power in the organization, it is easier for them to network.²⁴⁶ 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.²⁴⁷ 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.²⁴⁸ The reasons most often given for dependency of network members were the need for information and the need for cooperation and coordination.²⁴⁹

D. Networking and Mentoring Assist Men and Women Differently

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. There is debate in the sociology literature about whether it is useful to study these possible differences as gender-based—i.e. the product of intrinsic gender-based qualities and conditions—or from the

241. *Id.* at 280–81.

242. James Michael & Gary Yukl, *Managerial Level and Subunit Function as Determinants of Networking Behavior in Organization*, 28 *GROUP & ORG. MGMT.* 328, 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. *Id.* 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. *Id.* at 330.

243. *Id.* at 330.

244. *Id.* at 332.

245. *Id.*

246. *Id.* at 346.

247. *Id.*

248. *Id.* at 333.

249. *Id.* at 347.

standpoint of how people in power-minority groups navigate intergroup power relations to accomplish what they seek.²⁵⁰ If female leadership aspirants and their companies understood that the barrier mentoring is designed to bypass is the state of "being female," then they would frame mentoring and networking programs differently than 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.²⁵¹ 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 companies. It seems that the preponderance of the literature takes the gender-based approach, but neither approach should be discarded at this point in the understanding of mentoring and networking phenomena.

1. *Gender Differences in Mentoring*

Historically, American women have been less likely to receive mentoring than American men,²⁵² even though mentoring matters greatly for advancing to top leadership. Female managers who receive mentoring fare significantly better than their un-mentored counterparts, and there is a positive correlation between mentoring relations and self-reports of career success among women in a variety of professions.²⁵³ In addition, there is support for the idea that women mentees receive more,²⁵⁴ and report greater benefit from, the psychosocial aspects of mentoring than do men.²⁵⁵ Men report greater benefit from career-oriented aspects of the mentor relationship.²⁵⁶ However, there is support for the proposition that women *actually* benefit more from the career development aspects of mentoring than from the psychosocial aspects.²⁵⁷ This finding could

250. See KANTER, MEN AND WOMEN OF THE CORPORATION, *supra* note 99, at 202–05 (finding that what appear to be gender differences between women and men in the corporate setting may actually be power differences); Fagenson, *supra* note 65, at 267–71; (discussing the theoretical frameworks that influence women in management research, including the gender-centered perspective and the organization structure perspective); Stephanie Riger & Pat Galligan, *Women in Management: An Exploration of Competing Paradigms*, 35 AM. PSYCHOLOGIST 902 (1980) (exploring the person centered and situation centered perspectives in psychological research, concluding that both variables need to be explored in psychological studies on women in management).

251. See Ibarra, *Personal Networks of Women and Minorities in Management*, *supra* note 95, at 80–81 (positing that networks of women and minorities differ from those of white males in composition and characteristics of the relationships with people in the network).

252. Belle Rose Ragins, *Barriers to Mentoring: The Female Manager's Dilemma*, 42 HUM. REL. 1, 2 (1989) [hereinafter *Barriers to Mentoring*]; Ronald J. Burke, *Mentors in Organizations*, 9 GROUP & ORG. STUD. 353, 368 (1984).

253. Ragins, *Barriers to Mentoring*, *supra* note 252, at 3 (measuring self reported success rates among women in medical, legal, and academic professions).

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

255. Ragins, *Barriers to Mentoring*, *supra* note 252, at 5.

256. *Id.*

257. See 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, 101

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.²⁵⁸ The advancement of women within an organization is positively related to the mentor functions of career development and giving legitimacy and credibility, but negatively correlated with psychosocial support.²⁵⁹ Taken together, it would follow that women in the United States who aspire to reach top leadership positions need to include a white male among their mentors.²⁶⁰

Further research supports the proposition that the gender-homogenous or gender-diverse nature of the mentoring dyad affects the nature of the mentoring function.²⁶¹ Male mentors routinely provide less psychosocial and role-modeling mentoring and more career development than do female mentors, despite whether the mentee is of the same or different gender.²⁶² 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.²⁶³ 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.²⁶⁴

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.²⁶⁵ This effect may not hold, however, for women who have reached elite levels of corporate leadership.²⁶⁶ These women may be more likely to have had a mentor and to report having had more mentors and mentors who were more highly placed in the organization than similarly situated men.

(2005) [hereinafter *Does Mentor Support Increase Women's Career Advancement More Than Men's?*] (finding that women benefited more than men from career development aspects of mentoring and that psychosocial support in fact hindered women's advancement).

258. 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, 298 (1996) (arguing that mentees who develop relationships with those who hold power and influence in companies benefit most).

259. See Tharenou, *Does Mentor Support Increase Women's Career Advancement More Than Men's?*, *supra* note 257, at 80, 102.

260. Dreher & Cox, *supra* note 258, at 305–06.

261. Sosik & Godshalk, *supra* note 254, at 115–16.

262. *Id.*

263. *Id.*

264. 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, 240 (2002).

265. See Ragins, *Barriers to Mentoring: The Female Manager's Dilemma*, *supra* note 252, at 5. But see Susan M. Schor, *Separate and Unequal: The Nature of Women's and Men's Career-Building Relationships*, 40 BUS. HORIZONS 51, 52 (1997) ("More executive women than executive men had mentors. On the average, they also had more mentors than did the men . . .").

266. See Schor, *supra* note 265, at 52 (reporting qualitative interviews with male and female presidents and vice presidents in the insurance industry).

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, male protégés, and male non-protégés.²⁶⁷ Yet, female non-protégés reported neither diminished organizational commitment and job satisfaction nor enhanced role ambiguity compared to the other three groups.²⁶⁸ 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.²⁶⁹ In contrast to female non-protégés, not having a mentor devalues the current work environment for male non-protégés.²⁷⁰ This may be because men are more likely to expect to obtain 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.²⁷¹ Fagenson found that individuals with mentors rated themselves as having significantly more career mobility, recognition, satisfaction, and promotions than did non-mentored individuals.²⁷² She also found that high-level mentored individuals reported more career mobility and a higher degree of satisfaction than did low-level mentored individuals.²⁷³ Overall, however, mentoring was found to be gender egalitarian in its positive effect on an individual's career outcomes.²⁷⁴

Furthermore, there is adequate evidence that women executives recognize the need for mentoring but approach it differently.²⁷⁵ Women with mentors are more likely to report that they fell into a mentoring relationship rather than being selected for one or actively seeking one.²⁷⁶ 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.²⁷⁷ Traditional gender roles fix women in a passive position in the initiation of a relationship, although there is some evidence that they are not deterred from initiating mentoring relationships with men.²⁷⁸

267. 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, 319 (1996).

268. *Id.*

269. *Id.*

270. *Id.*

271. Fagenson, *supra* note 65, at 309, 312.

272. *Id.* at 309.

273. *Id.* at 315.

274. *Id.* at 316.

275. *Id.*

276. *Id.*

277. *Id.*

278. Belle Rose Ragins & John L. Cotton, *Easier Said Than Done: Gender Differences in Perceived Barriers to Gaining a Mentor*, 34 ACAD. MGMT. J. 939, 940 (1991). Female mentors may be better role models for female protégés, and sexual issues are less likely to arise in same-gender mentorships. Ragins, *Barriers to Mentoring*, *supra* note 252, at 11. However, female mentors tend to be less powerful

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.²⁷⁹ 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.²⁸⁰ Complicating matters further, psychosocial support may reduce women's advancement more than men's.²⁸¹ Psychosocial support may not help women advance because it focuses on inward emotions and well-being rather than on helping women deal directly with obstacles in the external environment, as career mentoring does.²⁸² Thus, career support from a female mentor may help advance women most effectively, but this must be balanced against the possible negative influence of the psychosocial mentoring.²⁸³

However, cross-gender mentoring is thought to eliminate an often overlooked flaw in same-gender pairing: depriving "men in power of the opportunity to learn from the experiences and perceptions of promising women."²⁸⁴ 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.²⁸⁵ The results showed that mentors with protégés of the opposite gender reported that these protégés utilized the relationship more effectively than protégés with the same gender as the mentor.²⁸⁶ 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.²⁸⁷ Mentors also reported that females use the relationship more

than male mentors and may thus be less able to promote the career of their protégé. *Id.* 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. *Id.* And, as cross-gender mentorships become more common, the problems with them may decrease. *Id.*

279. 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 444, 447 (2005).

280. Tharenou, *Does Mentor Support Increase Women's Career Advancement More Than Men's?*, *supra* note 257, at 101.

281. *Id.*

282. *Id.*

283. *Id.* The reason that a male mentor does not help advance women more than a female mentor may be that men do not provide more career support than female mentors. *Id.* at 102.

284. Jonathan A. Segal, *Shatter the Glass Ceiling, Dodge the Shards*, HR MAGAZINE, April 2005, at 125.

285. Raymond A. Noe, *An Investigation of the Determinants of Successful Assigned Mentoring Relationships*, 41 PERSONNEL PSYCHOL. 457, 457 (1988).

286. *Id.* at 470.

287. *Id.* at 475.

effectively than males.²⁸⁸ Perhaps women are more motivated to use the relationship because of a limited number of available mentors.²⁸⁹ Protégé job and career attitudes were unaffected by the time spent with the mentor or by the quality of the relationship.²⁹⁰ 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.²⁹¹

Yet, research has not disclosed many cross-gendering mentoring models. Suggested reasons for this discrepancy include: (1) women's lack of access to informal networks; (2) stereotypical beliefs that women are not as suited as men for leadership; and (3) sexual connotations.²⁹² A gender-neutral approach may be better because both genders offer different perspectives of an organization and its culture, and both perspectives can be educational.²⁹³

Research suggests that cross-gender mentoring relationships provide fewer role modeling functions than same-gender relationships, possibly because role modeling is more difficult when the mentors and protégés have different social identities based on their gender.²⁹⁴ Although protégés report more frequent contact with and greater liking for mentors of the same gender,²⁹⁵ research has also found no difference in mentoring functions received between homogeneous and diversified relationships.²⁹⁶ 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.²⁹⁷

Commentators have expressed a number of theories to explain the paucity of cross-gender mentoring relationships.²⁹⁸ In some contexts, women may be perceived as more likely to fail to thrive in the organization, which reflects poorly on the mentor.²⁹⁹ There may be negative signals in the workplace about the suitability of women as mentees for male mentors.³⁰⁰ Either the mentor or

288. *Id.*

289. *Id.*

290. *Id.* at 470.

291. *Id.*

292. Cristina Trinidad & Anthony H. Normore, *Leadership and Gender: A Dangerous Liaison?*, 26 LEADERSHIP & ORG. DEV. J. 574, 582 (2005).

293. Sosik & Godshalk, *supra* note 254, at 116–17.

294. Ellen A. Ensher & Susan E. Murphy, *Effects of Race, Gender, Perceived Similarity, and Contact on Mentor Relationships*, 50 J. VOCATIONAL BEHAV. 460, 474 (1997).

295. *Id.* at 460.

296. *Id.* at 474.

297. Sosik & Godshalk, *supra* note 254, at 117.

298. Raymond A. Noe, *Women and Mentoring: A Review and Research Agenda*, 13 ACAD. MGMT. REV. 65 (1988) (identifying barriers for establishing cross-mentoring relationships); Regina M. O'Neill and Stacy D. Blake-Beard, *Gender Barriers to the Female Mentor-Male Protégé Relationship*, 37 J. BUS. ETHICS 51 (2002) (exploring six psychosocial and social gender barriers to the female mentor–male protégé mentoring relationship); James G. Clawson and Kathy E. Kram, *Managing Cross-Gender Mentoring*, 27 BUS. HORIZONS 22 (1984) (describing the drawbacks of cross-gender mentoring relationships).

299. Belle Rose Ragins & John L. Cotton, *Easier Said Than Done: Gender Differences in Perceived Barriers to Gaining a Mentor*, 34 ACAD. MGMT. J. 939, 943 (1991) [hereinafter *Easier Said Than Done*].

300. *Id.*

mentee may be leery of the possibility of sexual involvement in cross-gender mentoring.³⁰¹ Sexual involvement, or even the appearance or speculation of 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.³⁰² 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 equally as often as do men,³⁰³ the relative imbalance of males and females at senior and junior levels makes cross-gender mentoring inevitable if mentoring of women is to occur.³⁰⁴ Female mentors are often lacking because of a lack of women in high positions.³⁰⁵

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.³⁰⁶ This is because men are generally in the power-dominant group, while women are in the less advantageous group.³⁰⁷ In cross-gender pairs, women mentees will be able to take advantage of mentors in this power-dominant group.³⁰⁸

3. *Gender Differences in Networking*

Although the propensity of men and women to engage in networking behavior is about the same,³⁰⁹ the actual networking methods of men and women are different.³¹⁰ Research has disclosed a difference in both the reality and the expectations for networking between men and women.³¹¹ Female executives were 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.³¹² 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."³¹³ Men, on the other hand, were more likely to engage in networks outside the work setting and to socialize

301. *Id.*

302. *Id.*

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

304. *Id.*

305. See Noe, *supra* note 298, at 70 (finding that because male managers may prefer to interact with male mentees and because the majority of available mentors are male managers, women often lack mentors).

306. *Id.* at 71.

307. *Id.*

308. *Id.*

309. Forret & Dougherty, *supra* note 89, at 300.

310. See Herminia Ibarra, *Paving an Alternative Route: Gender Differences in Managerial Networks*, 60 SOC. PSYCH Q. 91, 99-100 (1997) (finding that, in a study of male and female middle managers, women's networks differed in terms of range, tie strength, and homophily).

311. Forret & Dougherty, *supra* note 89, at 300-03.

312. Schor, *supra* note 265, at 54-55.

313. *Id.* at 54.

with co-workers and their families.³¹⁴ To the extent that women perceived themselves to be excluded from outside socializing, it would follow that their networking efforts would be work-based.

E. Mentoring Models and Business Practices

The above theories explain why some individuals are more successful at mentoring and networking than others. 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 disparity by implementing formal mentoring programs that are accessible to all employees regardless of their status.³¹⁵ In addition, mentoring can increase the communication within an organization and help in merging different cultures.³¹⁶

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.³¹⁷ There also must be a way to attain the goals, either 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.³¹⁸ Moreover, they find that being a mentor should be voluntary, and protégés should have a say in the matching process.³¹⁹ 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.³²⁰

Blake-Beard identifies five issues women should pay attention to in entering into a formal mentoring relationship.³²¹ 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.³²² 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.³²³ Third, mentees should try to maintain the relationship after its formal duration.³²⁴ Fourth, the relationship should be based on reciprocity so that it will be rewarding for both

314. *Id.*

315. See Dworkin & Schipani, *Linking Gender Equity*, *supra* note 8, at 405–10.

316. Monica L. Forret, Daniel B. Turban, & Thomas W. Dougherty, *Issues Facing Organizations When Implementing Formal Mentoring Programmes*, 17 LEADERSHIP & ORG. DEV. J. 27, 27 (1996).

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

318. *Id.* at 76–77.

319. *Id.* at 78.

320. *Id.* at 77.

321. Blake-Beard, *supra* note 156, at 335.

322. *Id.*

323. *Id.* at 335, 337.

324. *Id.* at 338.

parties involved.³²⁵ Finally, the better relationships should try to find the appropriate level of intimacy (the developmental dilemma).³²⁶

2. *Group Mentoring*

Gender-neutral programs include both group mentoring programs and community service programs. One type of program has been described as a Strategic Collaboration Model.³²⁷ This model focuses on succession planning.³²⁸ 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. 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 especially valuable in helping to eliminate the gossip factor because there are always groups of people meeting.³²⁹ By utilizing a group mentoring program rather than an individualized approach, companies can avoid the dreaded accusation of favoritism,³³⁰ which is often cited by ex-employees as their main reason for leaving their last place of employment.³³¹

Furthermore, group mentoring provides a social benefit to mentees as well because it "provides opportunities for members to become integrated into the group's culture."³³² 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.³³³ 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."³³⁴ 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.³³⁵

There are a few other noteworthy benefits of group mentoring taken from the context of e-mentoring programs. E-mentoring programs use computer-mediated communications, such as e-mail and chat rooms, in the mentoring

325. *Id.*

326. *Id.* at 337.

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

328. *Id.* at 21.

329. *Id.* at 24.

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

331. *Id.*

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

333. *Id.* at 13.

334. *Id.* at 16.

335. Lovelace, *supra* note 330, at 73.

process. 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.³³⁶

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).³³⁷ The traditional mentoring relationship is hierarchical between a senior and junior member of the same organization and is focused on the junior's advancement within that organization.³³⁸ 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.³³⁹

The first type of lateral mentoring is the "lateral mentor-protégé relationship, job-related skill development."³⁴⁰ 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.³⁴¹ One form is peer mentoring, but other forms such as intrateam mentoring are also possible.³⁴² The second type of mentoring is the "lateral mentor-protégé relationship, career-related skill development."³⁴³ 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. Moreover, the relationship 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."³⁴⁴ 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.³⁴⁵ The last type is the "hierarchical mentor-protégé relationship, career-related skill development."³⁴⁶ This relationship is also between a senior and junior member, but focuses on skills that the protégé can use in other organizations.³⁴⁷ One form of this type of

336. Headlam-Wells, Gosland, & Craig, *supra* note 279, at 455.

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

338. *Id.* at 126–27.

339. *Id.* at 126.

340. *Id.* at 127.

341. *Id.*

342. *Id.* at 127–29.

343. *Id.* at 133.

344. *Id.* at 134.

345. *Id.*

346. *Id.* at 137.

347. *Id.*

mentoring is group professional association mentoring, where the professional organization as a whole serves as the mentor.³⁴⁸

4. *Mosaic Mentoring*

Mosaic mentoring refers to having multiple 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 laboratory 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.³⁴⁹ This form of mentoring increases the scope of and opportunities for learning. Further, it distributes the mentoring workload. It can also help benefit an expatriate working abroad, her home organization, and the organization where she is currently working.³⁵⁰ In the boundaryless economy, it is a way to transfer knowledge across locations and borders.³⁵¹

5. *Community Service*

Another type of program utilized by some firms involves community service. Corporate volunteering refers to company-wide community service activities.³⁵² In the corporate world, volunteerism can serve as a "win-win-win," in that the business, the employees, and the relevant community can all benefit.³⁵³ Volunteer activities benefit the business by facilitating staff development, enhancing the reputation of the business, and serving as an investment in the community in which the business operates. In addition, employees benefit from corporate volunteering because it provides them with additional opportunities for peer interaction, including interaction across departments.³⁵⁴ It seems that these programs would provide opportunities for networking.

348. *Id.* at 138.

349. See Monica C. Higgins & David A. Thomas, *Constellations and Careers: Toward Understanding the Effects of Multiple Developmental Relationships*, 22 J. ORG. BEHAV. 223 (2001) (comparing the long-term effects of "primary" developmental relationships to "sets" or "constellations" of developmental relationships on lawyers' careers, and finding that while the primary developmental relationship has a greater influence on short-term outcomes such as "work satisfaction and intentions to remain with one's firm," long-term outcomes such as "organizational retention and promotion" are more heavily influenced by the "entire constellation" of relationships).

350. See 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, 808 (1999) (exploring the need for a multi-stage mentoring program for expatriates to facilitate adjustment while overseas and repatriation upon return).

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

352. DARREN QUIRK, CORPORATE VOLUNTEERING THE POTENTIAL AND THE WAY FORWARD (1998), <http://www.ozvpm.com/resourcebank/documents/CO48-CorporateVolunteering-thepotentialandthewayforwardDarrenQuirk.doc>.

353. *Id.*

354. *Id.* at 4.

6. *Programs Just for Women*

Although theory suggests women in United States 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 them with the opportunity to exchange ideas. In the Buffalo Niagara Partnership's Woman to Woman mentoring program, seventy mid-level business women "mentees" were paired with thirty-five top-level local executive women "mentors."³⁵⁵ 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.³⁵⁶

Women indicate they like women-to-women programs because of the psychological support they provide.³⁵⁷ 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.³⁵⁸ Sumru Erkrut notes that "the upper levels of management have been occupied mostly by men [so] they are the ones holding the power, and women don't have the opportunity to network with them."³⁵⁹ Moreover, other commentators have found that although women may have more extensive networks than men, "men's networks include more high-status, influential individuals."³⁶⁰

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.³⁶¹ 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.³⁶² Female entrepreneurs can benefit from more mainstream networks in this regard. One of the reasons for entrepreneurs to network is to swap skills.³⁶³

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

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

356. *Id.*

357. Tamara El-Khoury, *Networking Their Way*, ST. PETERSBURG TIMES, April 14, 2005, available at http://www.sptimes.com/2005/04/14/Business/Networking_their_way.shtml.

358. *Id.*

359. *Id.* (noting the comment of Sumru Erkrut, associate director and senior research scientist at the Wellesley Centers for Women).

360. Van Emmerik, Baugh, & Euwema, *supra* note 112, at 310.

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

362. *Id.*

363. Dan Webber, *Networking Sisters Are Doing It For Themselves*, TELEGRAPH & ARGUS, Mar. 20, 2006, available at <http://archive.thetelegraphandargus.co.uk/2006/3/20/186116.html>.

other hand, some women find women-only networks essential for circumventing men's organizational power.³⁶⁴ Amanda Boyle, a strong role model and mentor for businesswomen 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."³⁶⁵

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.³⁶⁶ Unlike men, "women network to build relationships and an ongoing support base."³⁶⁷ On the other hand, "men network to get something done so it's very linear, strategic, intentional."³⁶⁸ 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.³⁶⁹ This inequity negatively impacted women's abilities to "communicate, access information, and build strategic global alliances."³⁷⁰ 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.³⁷¹

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.³⁷² This theory may be applicable to the business world.

Like the trend of racial minority group members who 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, in-group member.³⁷³ Within their fields, women are inspired by other 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

364. 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, 286 (2004).

365. Darroch, *supra* note 143, at 6.

366. Webber, *supra* note 363.

367. El-Khoury, *supra* note 357.

368. *Id.*

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

370. *Id.*

371. *Id.*

372. Anna Harding, *Breaking Barriers and Making Connections*, FIN. TIMES (London), Sep. 17, 2004, at 2.

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

a successful man in their field."³⁷⁴ It is interesting that females indicate a stronger belief that they are like female role-models, or will become like them, considering that women tend to choose female role models who "overturned rather than confirmed traditional gender role stereotypes."³⁷⁵ Traditional stereotypes predict that women will apply collaborative leadership styles, and men will apply authoritarian leadership styles.³⁷⁶ 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."³⁷⁷ With respect to skill-based stereotypes, women are stereotyped as possessing more person-oriented skills than task-oriented skills in comparison to men.³⁷⁸

Women look to other women who illustrate the possibility of overcoming the barriers that businesswomen face as role models.³⁷⁹ The women who "illustrate the possibility of overcoming such barriers"³⁸⁰ 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."³⁸¹

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.³⁸² Additionally, cross-company mentoring may provide executives with

374. *Id.* at 40.

375. *Id.* at 42.

376. Segal, *supra* note 284, at 121, 123.

377. 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?*, PROFIT, Oct. 1, 2000, at 50.

378. Sabine Sczesny, *A Closer Look Beneath the Surface: Various Facets of the Think-Manager-Think-Male Stereotype*, 49 SEX ROLES 353, 353 (2003).

379. Lockwood, *supra* note 373, at 42-43.

380. *Id.*

381. 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).

382. Andrea Chipman, *Mentoring Helps Women Navigate Career Changes*, WALL ST. J. ONLINE, Mar. 27, 2002, available at <http://www.hightech-women.com/mentoring.html>.

independent views on their careers as well as an insight into their roles.³⁸³ 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."³⁸⁴

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 female executives with access to senior managers from other companies.³⁸⁵ Similarly, Norsk Hydro uses detailed psychological evaluations to match businesswomen with senior mentors from both public and private sectors.³⁸⁶ This program has been well-received by the participants.³⁸⁷ 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.³⁸⁸

In addition to aiding women in developing the 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.³⁸⁹ 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."³⁹⁰

Although not a mentoring or networking program per se, a unique initiative undertaken to improve the status of women in corporate leadership is a quota system recently adopted in Norway. Norway's quota system requires that women occupy 40% of board seats in corporations.³⁹¹ Needless to say, Norwegian companies have been progressing quickly in the direction of getting more women on executive boards.³⁹² If a company does not meet the quota, they may face government sanctions.³⁹³

In the Netherlands, there is no quota system, but there is an emphasis placed on raising the visibility of female boardroom candidates.³⁹⁴ Other Dutch

383. Sally Flood, *The New Sisterhood*, HUM. RES. (London), Jun. 2005, at 46.

384. *Id.*

385. Chipman, *supra* note 382.

386. *Id.*

387. *Id.*

388. *Id.*

389. Alison Maitland, *Spanish Banker Scales the Heights; Women In Business Europe's Top 25*, FIN. TIMES (London), Oct. 14, 2005, at 12.

390. *Id.*

391. *Id.*

392. *Id.*

393. *Id.*

394. *Id.*

initiatives also include networking with male board directors and training women in boardroom skills.³⁹⁵

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.³⁹⁶

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.³⁹⁷ 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 certain regions together so that they can share their enthusiasm and experiences with each other.³⁹⁸

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.³⁹⁹ 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.⁴⁰⁰

c. American Executives Mentoring Women from Jerusalem

Top American executives have participated in special mentoring sessions to help new immigrants from Jerusalem enter the business world. These sessions provide special training programs which allow 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."⁴⁰¹ The program also provides money to start new businesses or to expand existing ones.⁴⁰²

395. *Id.*

396. *Id.*

397. Rebekah Ashby, *Women Ready to Show Their Prowess*, JOURNAL (Newcastle), June 4, 2003, at 26.

398. *Id.* at 28.

399. *Id.*

400. Laura Ramsay, *A League of Their Own*, THE GLOBE & MAIL (Can.), Nov. 29, 2002, at B11.

401. Gail Lichtman, *Spreading the Wealth*, JERUSALEM POST, Apr. 29, 2005, at 12.

402. *Id.*

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 should not be in a direct reporting relationship with the protégé's supervisor.⁴⁰³

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.⁴⁰⁴

V. CONCLUSION

Networking and mentoring programs are important for career advancement; however, 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.⁴⁰⁵

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. But as they are structured now, the majority of mentoring and networking programs appear to broaden the gap between the sexes rather than level 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 is critical for a research agenda concerning women in top leadership to consider both international and multinational aspects of the phenomenon. This article has 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

403. Darroch, *supra* note 143, at 6.

404. See, e.g., Jenn Ellen A. Ensher & Susan E. Murphy, *Effects of Race, Gender, Perceived Similarity, and Contact on Mentor Relationships*, 50 J. VOCATIONAL BEHAV. 460, 460 (1997) (finding both actual and perceived similarities to be important to a mentoring relationship); Headlam-Wells, Gosland & Craig, *supra* note 279, at 447 (finding that most companies use either "vocational sector" or "similarity of interests" as the method for matching mentoring pairs).

405. Aarti Ramaswami, George F. Dreher, Robert Bretz, & Carolyn Weithoff, *The Interactive Effects of Gender and Mentoring on Career Attainment: Do Female Lawyers Need Good Counsel?* (Apr. 16, 2008) (unpublished manuscript, on file with the authors).

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 advisory matter, to implement a mentoring program in order to avoid charges of discrimination under Title VII.⁴⁰⁶ This could be in the form of an affirmative action program or a voluntary program designed to break the glass ceiling and achieve the 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 from developing mentoring and networking programs to help overcome these barriers. In particular, a firm that seeks to better level the playing field for women—for any of these reasons—should attend to the empirical evidence that guides the construction of such a program.

406. Civil Rights Act of 1964, § 706(g), 42 U.S.C. § 2000e (2007).