

THE GLASS CEILING TASK FORCE REPORT

**Presented to
the Honorable Arne H. Carlson,
Governor of Minnesota**

B. Kristine Johnson, Chairperson

January 1995

Minnesota Planning is charged with developing a long-range plan for the state, stimulating public participation in Minnesota's future and coordinating public policy with state agencies, the Legislature and other units of government.

The Governor's Glass Ceiling Task Force was coordinated by Jan Gallagher, Office of the Governor, (612) 296-0015.



February 1995

Upon request, the *Governor's Glass Ceiling Task Force Report* will be made available in an alternate format, such as Braille, large print, or audio tape. For TDD, contact Minnesota Relay Service at (612) 297-5353 or (800) 627-3529 and ask for Minnesota Planning.

Printed on recycled paper with at least 10 percent post-consumer waste.

The Governor’s Task Force on the Glass Ceiling

Summary	1
How We Started	3
Findings	5
Discussion of Findings	6
Barriers	21
Discussion of Barriers	22
Recommendations	28
Discussion of Recommendations	29
Appendices	34
A. Press Release Announcing Appointments to the Task Force	
B. Defining Minnesota’s Labor Force	
C. 1990 Census - Representation and Earnings: Women	
D. 1990 Census - Representation and Earnings: People of Color	
E. 1990 Census - Representation and Earnings: Work Disability	
F. Survey Questionnaire	
G. Industry Survey Results	
H. Government Survey Results	
Bibliography	47



Members of the Governor's Glass Ceiling Task Force State of Minnesota

B. Kristine Johnson, Vice President and General Manager
Medtronic, Inc. Tachyarrhythmia Management Business

Reatha Clark King, President, Executive Director
General Mills Foundation

Melvin D. George, Vice President for Institutional Relations
University of Minnesota

Maria R. Gomez, Commissioner
Minnesota Department of Human Services

Gayle Holmes, President
Menttium Corporation

Kathleen Kelly, Administrator
Mayo Health Plan

Anita Pampusch, Ph.D., President
College of St. Catherine

Lawrence Perlman, Chairman, President and CEO
Ceridian Corporation

John G. Turner, FSA Chairman, CEO
The NWNL Companies, Inc.

Curtis White, Vice President
Honeywell Inc. Corporate Diversity

The U.S. Department of Labor defines the glass ceiling as “those artificial barriers based on attitudinal or organizational bias, intentional or unintentional, that prevent qualified individuals from advancing upward in their organizations into management level positions.”

Summary

Governor Arne H. Carlson established the Governor's Glass Ceiling Task Force in September 1994. The charge to the task force was to study:

- The manner in which organizations in Minnesota fill management decision-making positions;
- The practices used to foster the necessary qualifications for advancement; and
- The compensation and reward programs currently used in the workplace.

To meet these goals, the task force mailed a survey to 1, 980 Minnesota organizations and reviewed data and findings from several resources. We expanded our mission to study the effects of the educational and socialization processes on attitudes and stereotypes.

This report presents an in-depth discussion of our findings and of the barriers that prevent change.

Findings of the Task Force

- In all types of organizations, women and people of color are not proportionally represented in leadership positions. Minnesota is no more progressive than the rest of the country in creating organizations that reflect our population's diversity.
- Organizations are concerned about hiring, retaining and promoting women, people of color and people with disabilities — but few are making the organizational changes necessary to make a difference.
- In many cases, feeder-line positions that fill the “pipelines” for advancement fail to represent the diversity organizations seek.
- In areas where they are significantly represented in the pool from which leadership is drawn, women and people of color still do not move into leadership positions in equal proportions.
- In most organizations, women and people of color do not make the same salaries as their white male counterparts, even when their years of experience and years of education are taken into account.
- Because women typically shoulder a disproportionate share of the burden of balancing job and family, their careers may suffer.
- The presence of senior role models and mentors is a significant factor in the ability of organizations to retain top talented women and people of color.
- The progress of people of color, women and people with disabilities in organizations appears to be affected by more than qualifications and career choices.
- The socialization processes within our educational institutions are more powerful than we may acknowledge. They appear to shape attitudes and expectations in ways that may not serve people of color and females well.
- Our socialization processes appear to shape the expectations and attitudes of both males and females.

Six Major Factors that Perpetuate Glass Ceilings

- **Lack of bold leadership** — Bold leadership at the top and dogged persistence are needed to challenge the status quo and produce real change. This leadership is lacking in many organizations.
- **Workplace environments** — Attitudes and organizational cultures must change to value diverse leadership styles. Gender and racial stereotypes frequently limit women and people of color from fully participating in their organizations.
- **Work experience** — Women and people of color frequently lack the “right” type of job experience to move ahead. The experiences they have often do not match traditional promotion criteria.
- **Family obligations** — Working parents, especially mothers, are often forced to choose between their children and their jobs. Employers need to recognize that both mothers and fathers require flexibility at work.
- **Socialization** — Pervasive, socially accepted stereotypes adversely impact the expectations, self-esteem and ambitions of some of our children, especially girls and children of color.
- **Education** — Many women and people of color do not come out of our schools with the credentials and confidence needed to succeed. Participation of women and people of color in the scientific and technological disciplines remains low.

Recommendations

The following recommendations focus on the necessity of increasing the level of awareness about the need for change as well as specific actions that will lead to that change. The recommendations are directed to Minnesota state officials, business and other organizational leaders, and the media.

- During the next four years, Governor Carlson should lead a statewide initiative to increase the level of awareness among organizational and educational leaders, elected officials and the public regarding the impact on our work force of Minnesota’s changing demographics.
- Governor Carlson should proclaim October 1995 as the second annual Celebration of Diversity Month.
- The Minnesota media should provide greater visibility to both the changing demographics and the steps organizations are taking to prepare for those changes.
- Business and other organizational leaders should take responsibility for removing barriers and improving developmental and advancement opportunities for women and people of color.
- Organizational leaders should identify and remedy the ongoing systemic problems that limit opportunities within their organizations.
- Organizations should provide more flexibility for employees to balance family obligations and job responsibilities.
- Working with the Minnesota Chamber of Commerce, Governor Carlson should establish an annual recognition program that focuses on the advancement of women and people of color.

- The Governor should ensure prompt implementation of the recommendations submitted by Minnesota Planning in its report, *State of Diversity — A Plan of Action for Minnesota*, November 1993.
- The Minnesota Department of Education should develop appropriate curricula and teacher training to address the socialization issues in the classroom that limit the self-esteem, self-confidence and expectations of girls and children of color.
- The Minnesota departments of Education and Trade and Economic Development should work with the Governor to promote and expand work-school partnerships throughout the state.
- The Minnesota Department of Human Services should develop parenting education initiatives to help parents understand the importance of early childhood development in establishing expectations, self-esteem and learning skills.

How We Started

On August 3, 1994, Governor Arne H. Carlson and Minnesota Planning officials released a report showing that the days of rapid labor force growth are over in Minnesota. The growth rate will decrease to 2 percent between the years 2010 and 2020.

The study projects that by the year 2020, 48 percent of Minnesota's labor force will be women, compared to 46 percent today. The proportion of the labor force that is nonwhite will grow from 4 percent in 1990 to 12 percent in 2020.

Tomorrow's Labor Force: The Next 30 Years demonstrates that as the growth of the working population slows, higher participation by women will become the major component of labor force growth. The report states, "Higher female participation will account for almost all of the gain in the labor force between 2010 and 2020. *If women's labor force participation rates do not continue to rise, there will be little or no labor force growth after 2010*" (emphasis added).

The report explains that as the population becomes more diverse and women continue to enter the labor force, white males will become an even smaller fraction of the total state labor force.

In addition to releasing this report, Governor Carlson announced that a Symposium on the Glass Ceiling would be held on August 25, 1994. The half-day event, sponsored by government agencies and private, nonprofit and civic organizations would kick off an awareness effort to share information about the components, both organizational and attitudinal, that create the glass ceiling in the workplace.

In his morning speech to more than 250 symposium participants, Governor Carlson announced his appointment of B. Kristine Johnson as chair of the Task Force on the Glass Ceiling. Johnson is vice president and general manager of the Tachyarrhythmia Management Business at Medtronic, Inc. The Governor explained that nine additional members would be appointed within the next few weeks.

The charge to the task force, established by executive order, was to study the manner in which organizations in Minnesota fill management decision-making positions, the practices used to foster the necessary qualifications for advancement and the compensation and reward programs currently used in the workplace. The task force was to deliver a report to the Governor and the Legislature by January 1995.

With the cooperation of Minnesota Planning, the task force developed a survey that was mailed to 1,980 organizations: 1,500 private organizations, 105 nonprofit organizations, 81 educational institutions (public and private), and 294 governmental bodies (87 counties, 182 cities with populations of more than 2,500 and 25 state agencies). The surveys were color-coded for each sector but did not require responding organizations to identify themselves by name. A copy of this survey is included in the appendix.

With a 36 percent rate of return, we added the results of the survey to our other research and developed our statement of findings.

Waiting for the completed surveys to be returned, we gathered data and findings from other resources. We relied on work already done by the U.S. Department of Labor, Wisconsin, the Hennepin County Bar Association, and Minnesota Planning. We expanded our fact-finding to include information that would help us understand more fully the effects of our educational and socialization processes on attitudes and stereotypes.

For several years, researchers at the Center for Creative Leadership in Greensboro, North Carolina, and the New Leaders Institute in Del Mar, California, have studied the issues of the glass ceiling. We reviewed the published work of Ellen Van Velsor, Randall P. White and Ann Morrison. We are most grateful to Ann Morrison of the New Leaders Institute for her assistance in reviewing our findings and providing us with additional information.

Chris Brown Mahoney, assistant professor in the College of Management at Metropolitan State University, shared with us published studies she co-authored in the area of job titles and the financial compensation of women.

We consulted dozens of publications written by experts in the field (please refer to the bibliography which is located at the end of the report for a list of excellent publications that may be useful to you). Studies conducted by Catalyst, the Women's Bureau in the U.S. Department of Labor, the American Association of University Women, our local Urban Coalition, Northwestern National Life Insurance, the Minnesota Business Partnership and the Employers' Association served as excellent resources, as did the *Saint Paul Pioneer Press* and the *Star Tribune*.

Time did not allow us to hold public hearings or to review and evaluate working environments in specific organizations. However, we believe that our survey results are representative of what is occurring in Minnesota organizations and reflect what has already been documented nationally by professionals.

Findings

1. In all types of organizations, women and people of color are not proportionally represented in leadership positions. Minnesota is no more progressive than the rest of the country in creating organizations that reflect our population's diversity.
2. Organizations are concerned about hiring, retaining and promoting women, people of color and people with disabilities — but few are making the organizational changes necessary to make a difference.
3. In many cases, feeder-line positions that fill the “pipelines” for advancement fail to represent the diversity organizations seek.
4. In areas where they are significantly represented in the pool from which leadership is drawn, women and people of color still do not move into leadership positions in equal proportions.
5. In most organizations, women and people of color do not make the same salaries as their white male counterparts, even when their years of experience and years of education are taken into account.
6. Because women typically shoulder a disproportionate share of the burden of balancing job and family, their careers may suffer.
7. The presence of senior role models and mentors is a significant factor in the ability of organizations to retain top talented women and people of color.
8. The progress of people of color, women and people with disabilities in organizations appears to be affected by more than qualifications and career choices.
9. The socialization processes within our educational institutions are more powerful than we may acknowledge. They appear to shape attitudes and expectations in ways that may not serve people of color and females well.
10. Our socialization processes appear to shape the expectations and attitudes of both males and females.

Discussion of Findings

Discrimination may be less visible in today's workplace, but subtle forms of discrimination occur at every level. When they occur consistently, they create patterns of exclusion. These subtle behaviors reduce self-esteem and prevent women, people of color and people with disabilities from fully participating in their organizations. They affect the way people advance or hope for advancement.

Biased behaviors stem from the stereotypes we learn during childhood. Our attitudes toward people different from ourselves are shaped by these stereotypes. We then create myths that diffuse the true issues of equality and opportunity.

The glass ceiling is a direct result of these common myths. The rigidity of our culture builds an organizational resistance against the values that women, people of color and people with disabilities bring to the workplace. Such rigidity prevents many individuals from relating to values or styles that may differ from their own.

Some of the commonly accepted myths include:

- Women and people of color have not been in the work force long enough.
- Men are more serious about their careers than women.
- Male characteristics are better suited for leadership positions than female characteristics.
- Women and people of color do not have enough broad experience to take on leadership positions.
- Women are unable to handle tough and technical subjects, such as math and science.

Our survey illustrates that Minnesota is no more progressive than the rest of the country in creating organizations that reflect diversity and opportunity. Further, Minnesota has yet to understand fully the necessity for doing so.

According to our survey, most Minnesota organizations are not actively involved in dialogue and change. Yet, as mentioned in our findings, a few organizations have been evaluating and adapting their policies and procedures to attract and retain a talented and diverse work force. In each case, the commitment to diversify an organization and advance women, people of color and people with disabilities comes directly from top leadership.

After analyzing our data and findings, members of the task force agreed that the glass ceiling is not just a national problem, but a problem for Minnesota. We have been able to more clearly define the situation for women and people of color. However, there is so little information about people with disabilities in Minnesota that we could not reach a definition of the situation for them. Little data exists, at least in part because people do not disclose their disabilities to employers.

1. In all types of organizations, women and people of color are not proportionally represented in leadership positions. Minnesota is no more progressive than the rest of the country in creating organizations that reflect our population's diversity.

In a 1991 report, the U.S. Department of Labor revealed that the number of women and people of color progressively diminished as the jobs got higher. Of those who were assistant vice president or above, only 6.6 percent were women, and 2.6 percent were people of color.

People of color account for 22.3 percent of all jobs at large companies, yet they make up only 9.9 percent of officials and managers (“The Glass Ceiling: Are Women and Minorities Blocked from the Executive Suite?” 29 October 1993).

A recent study done by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission revealed that women make up 45.7 percent of the employees in large companies (100 or more employees), yet only 27.4 of managerial positions are held by women.

Nationally, women make up about 45 percent of the work force, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, but hold less than 5 percent of the top jobs in the nation’s 1,000 largest companies.

According to a 1993 study by the National Association of Female Executives, women hold about 40 percent of all executive management and administrative positions in the United States. These positions, however, are mostly confined to the lower and middle ranks.

A report by Heidrick and Struggles, an executive search firm, found that women of color make up 3.3 percent of women corporate officers, who in turn make up only 1 to 2 percent of all corporate officers.

The results of a survey conducted by the *St. Paul Pioneer Press* revealed that women in Minnesota hold only 6 percent of the nearly 900 board seats at the 100 largest Minnesota public companies. Just 43 women occupy board seats among those companies; that compares with 35 women board members five years ago at the same companies. Based on two recent national surveys, the *Pioneer Press* found that Minnesota is well behind the nation as a whole in coming to terms with the glass ceiling (“Women as Directors,” 31 January 1993).

Catalyst, a national not-for-profit research organization, released a report on November 14, 1994, indicating that the percentage of directorships among the country’s Fortune 500/Service 500 companies “remains insignificant.” The number of board seats held by women in 1994 is 721 out of 11,715 seats, or 6.2 percent, compared with 5.7 percent last year. Thirty-two Minnesota firms are among the companies studied. The 33 female directors at these Minnesota firms represent 4.6 percent of the total number of women directors. Nine of the 32 Minnesota firms had no women directors.

The results of the Minnesota Survey on the Glass Ceiling clearly demonstrate that regardless of sector, women, people of color and people with disabilities are not proportionally represented in leadership positions. White males dominate leadership positions in all sectors. The nonprofit sector has a better representation of women in leadership positions, but all sectors cluster women at middle management or supervisor positions or lower in the organization.

Overall, people of color are better represented at the director level (5.3 percent) than at any other level. This may signal an effort by some organizations to address the issues of opportunity in the workplace.

The banking and legal industries have the lowest total participation rates for people of color. In all industries, women are underrepresented.

State agencies have the strongest representation of women in director, executive and upper management positions. Clustering of women at mid-management and supervisor positions is not evident. The lack of data about the total number of people with disabilities in the work force makes it impossible for us to accurately define the situation for them.

Leadership Positions

	DIRECTORS					EXECUTIVE POSITIONS					UPPER MANAGEMENT				
	White		People of Color		Dis-abled	White		People of Color		Dis-abled	White		People of Color		Dis-abled
	Men	Women	Men	Women		Men	Women	Men	Women		Men	Women	Men	Women	
Overall	72.4%	21.0%	3.1%	2.2%	1.3%	80.7%	14.7%	2.7%	0.8%	1.1%	71.2%	24.7%	2.3%	0.7%	1.1%
Private	81.3	13.9	2.7	1.1	1.0	84.8	10.6	2.8	0.7	1.1	78.2	17.7	2.7	0.8	0.6
Non-profit	63.7	27.8	4.7	3.8	0	74.9	19.7	3.0	1.2	1.2	57.8	37.6	1.9	1.3	1.4
Educa-tional	67.3	25.2	4.0	3.0	0.5	83.5	12.0	1.5	1.5	1.5	60.6	35.8	1.9	.07	1.0
Govern-ment	80.9%	18.8%	0%	0%	0.3%	71.4%	24.8%	2.2%	0.6%	1.0%	69.4%	26.2%	2.1%	0.2%	2.1%

	MIDDLE MANAGEMENT					SUPERVISORS				
	White		People of Color		Dis-abled	White		People of Color		Dis-abled
	Men	Women	Men	Women		Men	Women	Men	Women	
Overall	63.4%	31.8%	2.3%	1.3%	1.2%	66.8%	27.8%	3.0%	1.4%	1.0%
Private	71.0	25.4	2.3	0.9	0.4	74.5	20.4	3.6	1.3	0.2
Non-profit	47.1	47.9	1.8	1.6	1.6	41.8	53.5	1.7	1.9	1.1
Educa-tional	51.1	41.1	3.3	2.9	1.6	42.8	49.9	2.8	3.1	1.4
Govern-ment	63.9%	29.4%	2.3%	1.2%	3.2%	57.5%	36.1%	1.8%	1.3%	3.3%

2. Organizations are concerned about hiring, retaining and promoting women, people of color and people with disabilities — but few are making the organizational changes necessary to make a difference.

Organizations are aware of glass ceiling issues and are concerned about them. In a letter that was returned to us with our survey, a male vice president wrote, “The results of this survey are going to confirm what everyone already knows, namely that women, people of color and people with disabilities make up a disproportionately small number of middle management, upper management and executive positions within the business community, but it won’t come close to answering why.”

His remarks are reinforced by information from the U.S. Department of Labor. Most organizations realize that creating a diverse workplace and providing opportunities for advancement is the right thing to do.

However, many organizations find it difficult to objectively evaluate their established organizational procedures to determine their impact on opportunities for women, people of color and people with disabilities. Other organizations may give lip service to diversity and opportunities for advancement without really trying to understand the issues or to change the process.

A commitment from the top is absolutely critical to ensure an organization’s success in recruiting, training and advancing women, people of color and people with disabilities. Jude M. Werra writes that “with respect to search consultants, they mirror their clients’ expectations so they can be a barrier where the hiring executives’ values are a barrier. They won’t look hard for people of color or women unless directed by the client. They should enlighten their client executives on diversity... that is an appropriate role for them” (Werra, May 1993).

“A major catalyst for change in organizations,” according to the Hennepin County Bar Association Glass Ceiling Task Force Report, *Walking Through Invisible Doors and Shattering Glass Ceilings*, “is the realization by management that without diversity the organization will lose its competitive edge.”

The U.S. Department of Labor, in its 1991 *A Report on the Glass Ceiling Initiative*, gives some indication that “American businesses are beginning to understand that their bottom line success may well depend on recruiting, training and retaining the best possible work force. And given today’s demographics — that means recruiting people of color, including the physically handicapped and women.”

Our survey reveals that most Minnesota organizations (government, private, nonprofit and educational) have yet to involve themselves in any meaningful dialogue, assessment or change that addresses the issues of the glass ceiling in their organizational environments. Only 49 out of the 713 total respondents (7percent) have formally addressed the issues of the glass ceiling in their workplace, and only 3 percent have initiated programs to create change.

Categorized by sector we find:

SECTOR	HAVE ADDRESSED THE ISSUES		HAVE INITIATED CHANGE	
Private 415 responses	25	6%	10	2.4%
Nonprofits 119 responses	12	10%	6	5.0%
Educational 34 responses	6	18%	3	9.0%
Government 145 responses	6	4.1%	2	1.4%
Total 713 responses	49	6.9%	21	2.9%

We would like to share with you some of the good practices that a few organizations have implemented. This is not a comprehensive list, and these organizations do not pretend to have all the answers, but they are committed to opening up opportunities for women, people of color and people with disabilities in their workplace.

Initiatives at U S WEST include the sponsoring of a Women of Color Initiative, which supported selected candidates through career development and mentorship. It currently sponsors the American Indian Leadership Initiative, a program for targeted development of American Indians. Mentorship programs provide support and development for interested women and people of color. All officers and executive directors are required to mentor at least one employee of diverse origin a year. U S WEST has also implemented a plan that focuses accountability for its diversity strategy on directors and above for all U S WEST entities and organizations. The objectives include measurements and timetables in the areas of monitoring, education, compliance with policies and work force profiles.

As our findings have indicated, the new changes in some organizations not only help employees, but also contribute to the bottom line of the organization. For example, the St. Paul Companies found that by providing on-site child care, it is better equipped to recruit and retain employees.

IDS has also been working to strengthen its organizational environment for women, people of color and people with disabilities. It should come as no surprise that one of the primary motivators was the bottom line. It's so important to create a work force that better reflects the changing demographics of our marketplace. "In fact, according to the Hudson Institute's 'Workplace 2000' study, white women, people of color and immigrants will soon account for 85 percent of the growth in the U.S. labor force. Any company that wants to maintain a competitive edge, and be able to attract the best and the brightest people, needs to know how to create and manage a diverse work force. We are committed to this challenge."

One of its main objectives is to align IDS demographics with the external market. It has set a goal to achieve work force parity by 1996 through aggressive recruitment, selection and retention of under-represented populations. IDS recognizes that to retain competent women, people of color and people with disabilities, it needs to build an environment of support and opportunities. It started with a year-long benchmarking project to determine where it was in its effort to build a diverse work force and to find out how other U.S. companies have built diversity into their corporate structures.

"Toward Full Participation" is the motto for Medtronic's Diversity Initiative, which began in 1990. Since then, several employee resource groups have been formed to help the company better understand what was getting in the way of full inclusion and involvement of all Medtronic employees in the company mission. As a result of the partnership between the resource groups and management, several systems have been updated. Medtronic asks supervisors and employees to work together to solve work and home life conflicts. Work at home, temporary part-time work, and providing day care at national meetings are some of the solutions that have resulted.

Other organizations throughout the country have worked on the issues of the glass ceiling. "Many American companies are making efforts to open up their work places. Honeywell Inc. has a women's council with a full-time, paid coordinator. Corning, Inc. is aggressively recruiting people of color and women with engineering degrees or M.B.A.'s. The Colgate-Palmolive Co. is known for its mentoring system. Tenneco Inc. is linking executives' bonuses to how well they develop female and minority talent" ("The Glass Ceiling," 29 October 1993).

An increasing number of organizations are providing options and programs for their workers to help them cope with both job and family. According to a survey conducted by Hewitt Associates, the percentage of large employers offering some type of child-care benefit grew from 78 percent to 84 percent. For example, Hewlett-Packard has recently been recognized for its efforts in redefining its culture to make the work-and-life balance of employees easier. The company is trying to institutionalize rarely used alternatives, such as telecommuting, job-sharing and compressed work weeks.

3. In many cases, feeder-line positions that fill the “pipelines” for advancement fail to represent the diversity organizations seek.

There are areas in the work force where, due to the relatively small number of people of color and women receiving college degrees in specific fields, such as math and science, the feeder lines may not provide an abundance of diverse resources. However, even when a vast pool of talent does exist, women and people of color are traditionally routed into staff and functional positions — not line positions.

The U.S. Department of Labor’s *Pipelines of Progress*, released in August 1992, stated that “no long-term progress will be made without continued efforts to improve placement of people of color and women into entry level professional positions.” The report also determined that “this is particularly true for those companies that hire a large proportion of professionals requiring technical and scientific degrees.”

Statistics reviewed by the department revealed that “people of color and women are less likely to obtain positions in line functions (such as sales and production) which most directly affect the corporation’s bottom line, and are considered the fast track to the executive suite.”

Business Week found that “some African American middle managers feel they are being shunted into human resources and public relations — jobs that often spell ‘dead end’ in the corporation.”

For women and people of color to advance in an organization by leaving their support staff positions and joining their peers on the ‘fast track’ can be risky. “The risk for a woman sometimes involves giving up a promotion in her staff function, where her presence is less threatening, to enter a new part of the business, perhaps at a lower level...where she may be as welcome as the plague and the possibility of promotion may be slim” (Morrison, White and Van Velsor, August 1987).

The results of a 1992 Fortune magazine poll of 201 chief executives of the nation’s largest companies revealed that only 16 percent thought it was “very likely” or “somewhat likely” that a woman would succeed them in the next decade. A full 50 percent of the respondents said women “are too concentrated in areas of the company that don’t lead to the CEO post, such as communications.”

Getting the right assignments to develop managerial experience is essential in reaching these top executive positions. The pipeline issue and the concentration of women, people of color and people with disabilities in positions that do not lead to advancement become more significant as we see how organizations in Minnesota fill management positions.

	Business	Nonprofit	Educational	State	Government County	City
Search outside organization frequently	32.8%	41.7%	70.5%	21.4%	65.7%	54.1%
Search inside organization frequently	53.7	50.4	44.0	85.7	45.7	37.6
Promote from the next level below the position	41.9	37.8	18.0	57.1	14.3	23.5
Train nonmanagement personnel	18.6%	23.5%	12.0%	28.6%	2.9%	22.4%

4. In areas where they are significantly represented in the pool from which leadership is drawn, women and people of color still do not move into leadership positions in equal proportions.

Sheila Wellington, president of the business research group Catalyst, reminds us that despite increased education, women are not advancing. “Twenty years ago 15 percent of middle-level management jobs were held by women, yet those same women are not in top leadership ranks today.”

The preliminary findings of a 1994 study conducted by the Department of Labor's Women's Bureau show that female executives were very similar to their male peers in terms of job satisfaction, commitment to the organization and job stress. But when it came to expectations of being promoted, the findings varied significantly between female and male executive peers — with women having lower perceptions of their own future promotability than their male counterparts.

Among the nation's 16.4 million union members, 38 percent in 1993 were women, 15 percent were African American and 7.5 percent were Hispanic. But only three women sat on the 33-member Executive Council of the AFL-CIO. Two of these women are people of color; two members are African American men, and the presidents of most major unions are white and male.

According to the Hennepin County Bar Association Glass Ceiling Task Force report, “Twenty-five years after significant numbers of white women first started graduating from law schools, there is no white woman managing partner in any large Twin Cities law firm, there are very few white women at the highest management levels in such firms, and there are many, many talented women who have gone elsewhere or left the profession entirely.”

The same report found that “even though the pool of lawyers of color is expanding, the largest Twin Cities law firms still have no lawyers of color in senior management. The number of partners of color in all firms combined can be counted on one hand. These firms have only a small number of associates of color and an even smaller number of associates with more than a few years of experience.”

“Of the more than 310,000 members of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 23 percent are women. But while women made up about half of all accounting graduates since the mid-1980s, there remains a dearth of women represented at senior levels” (Miller, April 1994).

We also discovered “the highest positions in hospitals traditionally were held by women in religious orders or nurses. Now, even though women make up more than 80 percent of the nation's health care work force and more than half the graduates of health administration programs, men are at the helm of the majority of the nation's hospitals. With the number of women in religious orders declining, most men and women agree that it could be decades before women again play a dominant role in health care” (Weiss, March 1993).

According to the May 1993 issue of *Personnel Journal*, “Fifty-five percent of the 3 million women who work in state and local government hold jobs in the lowest paying categories, and only one-fifth of white men hold those jobs.”

5. In most organizations, women and people of color do not make the same salaries as their white male counterparts, even when their years of experience and years of education are taken into account.

While some organizations have addressed the very important but complex issue of pay equity, most organizations continue to compensate white males at a higher rate of salary than women and people of

color. There is clear evidence that the lesser value placed on jobs done by women and people of color and their more limited career progression, directly impact their opportunity for equal salaries. Although we did not look in detail at the issue of comparable worth or review studies on pay equity by job classification, our findings demonstrate that the wage gap still exists in most organizations.

The Hennepin County Bar Association Glass Ceiling Task Force report states, "While women now occupy about a third of all management positions, they are still clustered in the lower levels of management in positions of less authority, status and pay than men."

Pipelines of Progress, an update on the Glass Ceiling Initiative by the U.S. Department of Labor, cited a study of more than 1,000 male and female managers in 20 Fortune 500 companies. The report concluded that "women with equal or better educations earn less on average than men and there are proportionately fewer women in top management positions" and "female managers and professionals with similar qualifications, educational attainment, career-orientation, comparable jobs, and ability to relocate, had actually been transferred or relocated less frequently than their male colleagues and their salaries had progressed far less rapidly over the past five years."

"Female executives in nonprofits earn only 71 percent of their male colleagues' salaries" ("Nonprofits Lag," 4 September 1994).

Based on 1990 Minnesota Census data, when women are strongly represented in a profession, they earn less than men on average. When people of color are strongly represented in a profession, they earn less than non-minorities on average. For comparisons, please refer to the appendix.

Schumann, Ahlburg, and Mahoney's study of pay differences between men and women, *The Effects of Human Capital and Job Characteristics on Pay*, found that a significant portion of the difference was explained by the lower value employers place on jobs held by women. The pay practices of over 200 employers in the upper Midwest reveal that women held jobs that were rated by the employer as being of lower value than those held by men. The authors of this study also found that women were paid less than men even when the women had a job of equal value to the employer. The lesser pay for women held true even when women had the same education, experience and time spent not working as men. The research revealed that women tend to be concentrated in jobs valued less by employers and are very poorly represented in jobs valued highly by employers.

In Minnesota, females age 25 to 30 with a bachelor's degree earn 68 percent of what males of the same age and education earn. Minorities age 25 to 30 with a bachelor's degree earn 84 percent of what nonminorities with the same education and age earn (Minnesota Planning, June 1993).

The salaries for 622 top executives were listed by 178 Minnesota public companies. Of the \$122.9 million in total salaries, only \$1.5 million went to 10 women. Women have made gains into upper management ranks, but men set the pace at all but nine of the 178 public companies reviewed by the *Star Tribune*.

The National Research Council found that American women physicists consistently earn less than their male counterparts and that the disparity increases as experience increases. In 1992, a woman in physics earned 85 percent of a man's starting salary, one of the largest gaps in the sciences.

There may be some good news. Women in 1986 received 31 percent of the medical degrees and MBAs and 39 percent of the law degrees. Some believe this trend in schooling is likely to reinforce the rise in work experience and contribute to continuing increases in the relative earnings of women workers.

An article in the October 7, 1994, *Wall Street Journal*, "The Shrinking Pay Gap," states that "when earnings comparisons are restricted to men and women with similar experience and life situations, the differences

are small. Among people 27 to 33 who have never had a child, the earnings of women are close to 98% of men's." This may tell us something about attitudes toward women who chose to have a child or it may be related to the fact that neither men nor women have advanced very far in their careers by age 30.

6. Because women typically shoulder a disproportionate share of the burden of balancing job and family, their careers may suffer.

According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 70 percent of families with children under the age of 18 have both parents working.

Mothers in the work force face a tremendous challenge in meeting the demands of work and family—especially if their partner does not share equally in the responsibilities. Many women have no partner.

The wage gap in salaries for women becomes more significant at a time when more and more women are becoming the sole heads of households. The U.S. Department of Labor reports that 12 million families were maintained by women in 1992, a figure that has more than doubled since 1970.

With all other factors being equal, organizations have different attitudes toward women who have children versus those who do not. The Hennepin County Bar Association Glass Ceiling Task Force report, reveals that “women lawyers, particularly in their child-rearing years, are often stereotyped as having a lack of commitment to the organization and to their career and as being suited more to a support role. A woman who leaves briefly for child bearing and then returns is still perceived as not actually being back, even when she has returned and is working as many hours as men.”

Working Women Count!, a national survey of working women conducted by the Women's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor, revealed that women executives or managers are much more likely to have family-friendly workplaces than women in blue-collar jobs. Sixty-three percent of women who work as executives or managers— compared to only 42 percent of women who work in low-wage blue collar jobs— rated their jobs as either excellent or good in terms of support for family responsibilities. According to this report, the main concern of working mothers is their struggle of balancing work and family.

In his published speech, “A Pregnant CEO in Whose Lifetime?” Lawrence Perlman, president and CEO of Ceridian Corporation, and task force member, states: “If we value family as much as we say we do, we should be encouraging men to participate more fully in the care of their children and the lives of their families. Instead, we continue policies and behavior that encourage women to drop out of work and men to drop out of family. It is time for companies to acknowledge the primacy of family in the value systems of both men and women and to recognize that too many women still have to choose between career and family.”

Wisconsin's *Report of the Governor's Task Force on the Glass Ceiling Initiative* found that female employees reported that “without flex-time, job sharing, work at home options, and child care resources, those who have family responsibilities lack employer support.” Flexible scheduling needs are often viewed as being in conflict with business needs.

The need for balance, family friendly workplaces and quality day care, especially for parents with preschool children, is a very real and valid concern. According to a report conducted by the Carnegie Corporation of New York in April 1994, “infants raised by caring adults in a safe and stimulating environment are better learners than those raised in less stimulating environments and the effects are long-lasting. The first three years are extremely critical to a child's development.”

Our survey found that some Minnesota organizations are paving the way in addressing the needs of working parents:

				GOVERNMENT		
	BUSINESS	NONPROFIT	EDUCATIONAL	STATE	COUNTY	CITY
Flex-time	45.5%	47.1%	68.0%	100%	57.1%	29.4%
Day care	4.1	10.9	44.0	21.4	0	2.4
Job share	16.6	23.5	26.0	85.7	40.0	18.8
No programs	43.1%	37.8%	18.0%	0	31.4%	45.9%

** Since several organizations offer more than one of these specific programs to their employees, the total will not add up to 100 percent.*

In October 1994, the results of two separate studies were released that revealed that men from traditional families, in which the wives stay home to care for children, earn more and get higher raises than men from two-career families. This may suggest that men may also find their career opportunities limited as they try to balance career and family.

One study conducted by Linda Stroh of Loyola University involved 348 male managers at 20 Fortune 500 companies. She found that over a five-year period, the traditional fathers received 20 percent higher raises than the men with working wives. Another study of 231 men who received MBA degrees in the 1970s, done by Frieda Reitman of Pace University, found that all else being equal, those whose wives were at home with children earned 25 percent more than those whose wives held jobs of their own.

There are many possible explanations for the pay gap. Both Stroh and Reitman determined that this data suggests a corporate prejudice in favor of traditional families.

7. The presence of senior role models and mentors is a significant factor in the ability of organizations to retain top talented women and people of color.

The Wisconsin *Report of the Governor’s Task Force on the Glass Ceiling Initiative* reported that “a sizable number of women determine a glass ceiling exists in their organization when there is an absence of women in upper levels of management. Regardless of the existence of mentoring and internal training programs and career planning sessions, women look for women role models and mentors as a means of inspiration.”

A 1991 U.S. Labor Department study determined that since there are so few women and people of color at high levels within organizations, they lack the mentors and role models that come naturally to white males and they are often excluded from the informal communication networks.

In 1991, Ellen Van Velsor, and Randall P. White of the Center for Creative Leadership published a paper titled “Federal ‘Glass Ceiling’ Initiative Is Justified.” One of the points discussed was the fact that men were more likely to report assignments and women were more likely to report relationships with other people as key to their development. “And while only a small percentage of male managers cited a relationship with a boss or role model as ‘key’ to their growth, more than half of the women we interviewed cited this type of relationship as important for them.”

The researchers concluded that “women may be more likely to see relationships as developmental opportunities regardless of the range of their other experiences. Women may simply be more oriented towards learning from people and more comfortable with the support and encouragement mentoring relationships can provide.”

With that in mind, it is interesting to note that “though the number of women enrolled in engineering school is rising somewhat, many female engineers are leaving their jobs after six years or so. A congressional task force on women and people of color in science and technology speculated in 1988 that the glass ceiling was to blame: when engineering students and new entrants to the labor force saw only white males being welcomed at upper corporate levels, they looked elsewhere for jobs.”

The need for role models is something Ann Morrison found in a nationwide study published in *The New Leaders: Guidelines on Leadership Diversity in America*. “According to managers in our study, having women and people of color in senior-level line management positions is one of the most important ingredients of an effective diversity effort. Not only are these nontraditional executives important role models, but their individual efforts also shape and vitalize diversity activities throughout the organization.”

This study also found “the portrayal of women and people of color in an organization’s communication with the public is likely to influence prospective employees at all levels. In at least one company, people of color and white women are recruited with special brochures describing opportunities for them. Publications such as annual reports now include more text about the organization’s commitment to diversity and more photographs of nontraditional employees. Perhaps these executives have realized that potential employees, particularly at managerial levels, are just as likely to form an impression from the organization’s general publications as from any special materials they receive.”

8. The progress of people of color, women and people with disabilities in organizations appears to be affected by more than qualifications and career choices.

A 1990 study by Catalyst found that 79 percent of responding CEOs in Fortune 500 companies conceded there are identifiable barriers to women’s advancement. And 91 percent agreed that it was the company’s responsibility to remove the barriers.

The Wisconsin *Report of the Governor’s Task Force on the Glass Ceiling Initiative* revealed that “women observed there were attitudes within their companies that women can’t handle the stress and the fast pace, or have difficulty balancing work and family” and “there were barriers because women’s opinions were not taken seriously and women were not considered to be as capable as men.”

In 1991, a report by the U.S. Department of Labor revealed that the “developmental practices and credential building experiences, including advanced education, as well as career enhancing assignments such as to corporate committees and task forces and special projects — which are traditional precursors to advancement — were often not as available to people of color and women.”

The department also found that while “evaluations of men were directed toward performance, female appraisals at times were stereotypical and that raters evaluate job performance of blacks less favorably than the job performance of whites, especially when the raters are themselves whites. Additionally, because their numbers are limited, women at high management levels are constantly tested and scrutinized.”

From our survey, we were unable to determine if women, people of color and people with disabilities have access to developmental programs in their organizations. However, the survey does show what is or is not available to employees within the four organizational sectors:

	Government					
	Business	Nonprofit	Educational	State	County	City
Career planning	17.8%	17.0%	29.0%	42.9%	8.6%	8.2%
Company paid education	86.5	73.0	85.0	78.6	48.6	72.9
Formal mentoring	16.6	17.0	9.0	14.3	8.6	16.5
Targeted recruitment of people of color from nonmanagement positions	8.9	15.0	12.0	35.7	11.4	2.4
Targeted recruitment of women from nonmanagement positions	9.2	15.0	15.0	42.9	11.4	7.1
No staff development programs	21.9%	18.0%	15.0%	14.3%	37.1%	32.9%

It is still common for women to be stereotyped about their commitment to their careers. The October 29, 1993, *CQ Researcher* notes that “the stereotypes that work against women have to be overcome. Among the most frequently cited: they’ll just leave to have babies; they won’t relocate for the sake of their careers; their style of leadership isn’t suited to the executive suite; they aren’t aggressive enough (or, paradoxically, they are too aggressive); their natural role is nurturing and supporting as teachers, nurses, secretaries and housewives.”

The material we referenced makes it clear that stereotyping keeps women and people of color in their place. “They must often meet the demanding performance standards set for executive men while being seen as outdoing men in areas where women are traditionally perceived as weak (e.g., commitment, toughness, career risks). To complicate matters, they must contend with a *vive la difference* attitude that requires women to retain ‘feminine’ characteristics, such as charm and adaptability, while discarding or suppressing those soft or eccentric traits perceived as unsuitable in the executive ranks. Violating these norms, even in the performance of outstanding service, can be as damaging as poor performance itself. These expectations are part of the environment in which women must work and live. This environment is qualitatively different from the environment executive men operate in, and this difference may be the crucial and only meaningful difference between male and female executives” (White, 1992).

The U.S. Census Bureau revealed “a substantial minority of people with disabilities who are employed or willing and able to work, confront discrimination, unfavorable attitudes, and physical barriers in the workplace. Three in 10 have encountered job discrimination; two in 10 have encountered physical barriers in the workplace.”

9. The socialization processes within our educational institutions are more powerful than we may acknowledge. They appear to shape attitudes and expectations in ways that may not serve people of color and females well.

In the April 22, 1992, issue of the *Atlantic Monthly*, “Race and the Schooling of Black Americans” by Claude M. Steele, reported that teachers often do not see giftedness in children of color or children with limited English-language skills. “Black students are also more than twice as likely as whites to receive corporal punishment, be suspended or labeled mentally disabled.” He concluded that “black students make two discouraging realizations early on in their education which undercut their success: first, that white society (as represented by their teachers) is predisposed to see the worst in them, making recognition of achievement difficult. And second, even if they are acknowledged in one classroom, approval will have to be won anew in the next.”

“Numerous studies now confirm what many educators have long suspected: gender bias still occurs frequently in America’s classrooms” (“Boys Get Called On,” 9 January 1994).

In a *Star Tribune* article September 22, 1994, Kay Miller reported that the girls she interviewed believed that in their schools, girls and boys are treated equally. Nothing discourages their advancement. “So it was all the more poignant when — over the course of a 2-1/2 hour discussion — sideways stories came out about the little battles they fight, just because they’re girls. You come to realize that the problem is not one of kind, but of degree.”

In the same report a teacher from Fridley noted that “in our classrooms we can teach gender-fair curricula and racist-free attitudes. But when we don’t have the media to support us — in the movies, TV, in advertisements — how do we fight that inconsistency? As teachers, we don’t want to admit that in 1994, things are still unequal. We’re trying. But schools can’t conquer what society is shoving down our throats.”

According to the 1994 Sexual Harassment in Schools Project done by the Center for Research on Women at Wellesley College, “Sexual harassment in school significantly impedes personal and academic achievement.” In 1989, Minnesota was the first state to enact legislation prohibiting sexual harassment in schools.

Numerous studies show that girls’ self-esteem lags behind boys’, including Minnesota Women’s Fund *Reflections of Risk*, which looked at 36,000 students across the state.

The American Association of University Women conducted a national survey of 3,000 girls and boys ages 9 and 15, and its study, “*Shortchanging Girls, Shortchanging America*,” reported that girls are far more likely than boys to suffer a crisis in self-confidence at puberty, preceding a long slide in girls’ math and science performance.

Similarly, the 1992 *Minnesota Milestones Public Review Draft* recommended continued evaluations to assess the percentage of children and youth with low self-esteem. The rationale for doing so: “For males, measures of self-esteem show little change across the three grades surveyed, so physical, emotional or social changes associated with adolescence appear to have little impact on how males evaluate themselves. With females, the same measures of self-esteem tell a different story. Middle adolescence is a time of extreme self-doubt, insecurity and harshly critical self-assessment for many females, according to their responses to survey questions. Although less self-disparagement is evident among high school senior fe-

males than middle adolescent females, the disparity in self-regard between females and males is troublesome.”

Teachers who assure children that opportunities are available to one and all may find little reinforcement in the instructional materials they use. Gender stereotypes and lack of culturally and racially diverse materials may send children a different message.

The Wellesley report found that “curriculum frequently ignores or stereotypes females and that many standardized tests contain elements of sex bias.”

Failing at Fairness: How America's Schools Cheat Girls, by American University professors Myra and David Sadker, explains that “because bias is not a noisy problem, most people are unaware of secret sexist lessons and the quiet losses they engender.” For example, the Sadkers found that boys in elementary and middle school spoke out in class eight times more often than girls. Teachers generally listened to the boys who spoke out but told girls who did so to raise their hands if they wanted to speak.

Susan Estrich reported in the *New York Times Magazine* that “all-girls' schools are turning out women who do great in math and science. Eighty percent of them take four years of science/math while the national average is two years. Also, graduates of women's colleges do better than women coed graduates in test scores, graduate school admissions, earned doctorates, salaries, and personal satisfaction.”

It is important to note that women make up 54.7 percent of the nation's college students, while minorities comprise 21.2 percent. Yet just over one-fourth of the nation's college professors are women. Only 3.2 percent are black, 2.3 percent are Hispanic, 4.2 percent Asian and 0.7 percent Native American (“The Glass Ceiling,” 29 October 1993).

10. Our socialization processes appear to shape the expectations and attitudes of both males and females.

According to a *CQ Researcher* report, “Women continue to be shunted into jobs typically considered ‘women's work.’ Fully 99 percent of the secretaries in America are women. So are 98 percent of the kindergarten teachers, 97 percent of the receptionists, 96 percent of the child care workers, 94 percent of the nurses, 92 percent of the bookkeepers, 91 percent of the bank tellers and 90 percent of the telephone operators.”

Why do so many women concentrate in certain fields of work? According to the studies conducted by Chris Brown Mahoney, of the College of Management at Metropolitan State University, one of two different choice processes appear to result in this concentration. The first is that women themselves choose to concentrate in certain fields of work, possibly due to life style choices, educational attainment, stereotypical influences, and ability. The second is that someone other than the working women involved decides that women will be concentrated in certain fields of work. Constraints may be placed on women's choices within the labor market if employers or others discriminate in hiring, training, mentoring or promotional opportunities. Alternatively, these constraints may be placed on women without their consent if they receive fewer educational opportunities before entering the labor force.

Several studies conducted during the past 15 years indicate that “children manifest a high degree of occupational sex typing, and acquire these stereotypes very early.” A 1992 study conducted by John C. Jessell and Lawrence Beymer noted that “although authors of interest inventories have endeavored to remove sex-biased language and to revise sex-referenced terms, a less obvious and perhaps a more common form of sex-biased language, occupational title, has gone largely ignored.”

“When asked about their interests in occupations on the basis of job titles alone,” the study found, “young people may tend to rely on their stereotyped notions of those occupations, which may include perceived appropriateness of occupations for males and females. As a consequence, young adolescents may rule out certain occupations, thus depriving themselves of the opportunity to explore careers in which they may truly be interested.”

In the past, women often assumed they would not be in the work force long enough to justify an investment in lengthy professional training.

According to a *Wall Street Journal* article, “the national longitudinal surveys found that even in the late 1960s, less than 30 percent of young women anticipated that they would be working at age 35, yet when this group actually reached 35, more than 70 percent of them were in the labor force. Their underestimation of future work activity surely influenced their early career preparation (or lack thereof). More recent survey data show a dramatic change in expectations. The vast majority of young women now report an intention to work at age 35.”

“Those changing work expectations are reflected in rising female enrollments in higher education. In 1968, women received 8 percent of the medical degrees, 3 percent of the MBA’s and 4 percent of the law degrees granted that year. In 1986, they received 31 percent of the medical degrees and MBA’s and 39 percent of the law degrees.”

Barriers

1. **Lack of bold leadership** — Bold leadership at the top and dogged persistence are needed to challenge the status quo and produce real change. This leadership is lacking in many organizations.
2. **Workplace environments** — Attitudes and organizational cultures must change to value diverse leadership styles. Gender and racial stereotypes frequently limit women and people of color from fully participating in their organizations.
3. **Work experience** — Women and people of color frequently lack the “right” type of job experience to move ahead. The experiences they have often do not match traditional promotion criteria.
4. **Family obligations** — Working parents, especially mothers, are often forced to choose between their children and their jobs. Employers need to recognize that both mothers and fathers require flexibility at work.
5. **Socialization** — Pervasive, socially accepted stereotypes adversely impact the expectations, self-esteem and ambitions of some of our children, especially girls and children of color.
6. **Education** — Many women and people of color do not come out of our schools with the credentials and confidence needed to succeed. Participation of women and people of color in the scientific and technological disciplines remains low.

Discussion of Barriers

The optimism that characterized the late 1970s and early '80s, when a large number of women and people of color were moving into middle management positions, has all but disappeared. Today, the problems faced by these two groups in the workplace are viewed as being more intractable, partly because little evidence exists of a real commitment to change.

Women and people of color are frustrated because after years of diversity planning and training, the percentage of them who have moved into upper management positions in organizations has changed very little. We have a serious problem, and good intentions alone will not solve it. Policies can be issued, but if there is no strong support to implement them, they will have little impact.

Minnesota has a reputation for having socially responsible organizations. The environments inside many of these organizations, however, do not match their external image. If the leaders of organizations do not get personally involved and encourage managers and supervisors to establish an internal environment that fosters the acceptance of diversity, little progress will be made.

The work force of the future will be more diverse, and organizations will have to rely more and more on women and people of color. We need to ensure through workplace readiness efforts that these workers are skilled and able. We also need to make sure the workplace is ready for them.

We need to increase the odds for employees to succeed. To do that, more attention must be paid to the fundamental management behaviors that result in significant problems.

Our findings indicate that the progress of people of color and women in organizations is affected by more than qualifications and career choices. Many complex factors come into play, including myths, assumptions and processes that lead to attitudinal and organizational barriers. The most common are listed below.

Attitudinal

- Women are not as serious as men about their careers. Family is their first priority.
- Diversity training and affirmative action programs are for people below the top tier in an organization.
- If one woman or person of color fails in a senior position, we have reason not to put another woman or person of color in a similar position.
- We do not want people of color or women to fail, so we will not take any risks in hiring or promotion.
- Graduates of southern schools do not meet northern business requirements.
- Flexible scheduling is in conflict with business needs.
- Female characteristics are less desirable than male characteristics in executives.

Organizational

- Women and people of color lack visibility within organizations.
- Lack of an accessible job posting system for senior positions restricts opportunities.
- Lack of informal mentoring narrows development opportunities.
- The organization's environment is hostile or unwelcoming to people who do not "fit the mold."
- Unwritten rules are not shared and lead to derailment.
- The organization has few or no women and people of color in line and decision-making positions.
- Flexible scheduling is available to only a few.

Our discussion focuses on the major factors that perpetuate glass ceilings in the workplace — socialization, education, work environment, work experience, family obligations and the lack of bold leadership at the top.

Our findings show there is an awareness of the problem, but insufficient effort to solve it. If we do not begin to recognize and strive to correct these causes, there will be another task force in 10 years trying to figure out how to eliminate organizational glass ceilings.

Lack of Bold Leadership at the Top

Our survey results demonstrate that most Minnesota organizations have yet to involve themselves in any meaningful discussion, assessment or change addressing the glass ceiling in organizational environments. The survey also clearly shows that opportunities are limited for women and people of color to advance within their organizations.

Deficiencies exist in all Minnesota sectors. We must begin to change leadership priorities in universities, colleges, nonprofit organizations and all levels of government, as well as businesses. Over the next few years, changes in the work force will require that organizational leaders recognize and address these problems. They can no longer afford to deny that glass ceilings exist in their organizations.

In most organizations, the personnel director or manager of human resources is responsible for ensuring compliance with affirmative action and equal opportunity laws. Involvement at this level alone will not develop an organizational culture that goes beyond the law by facilitating meaningful change. Doing this requires bold leadership from the top — leadership that is lacking in many Minnesota organizations.

Organizational leaders must acknowledge that there is a bottom line reason to open the pipeline to success to a diversity of talents. If not, they will perpetuate environments that remain closed to people with different styles and backgrounds, leaving their organizations unprepared for impending demographic shifts in the work force.

Change takes time, but the steps toward it must begin today. The first step is a fundamental change in the expectations of people who are leading organizations. They must intentionally raise their organization's consciousness and have a commitment that within the next three years, senior management will look different.

To meet this goal, leaders must look for the talents that are already in their organizations and create an organizational culture that will support developmental opportunities for them.

To challenge the status quo requires bold leadership and dogged persistence. One memo or one meeting will not create change. Instead, leaders must articulate their commitment by reinforcing their vision through a consistent definition of goals. Hiring, training, counseling and promotion activities must be monitored and evaluated to determine progress. Leadership goals must be assimilated into the definition of total quality management.

This is no time for fear of failure. Minnesota will be unprepared to meet the future if our organizational leaders do not become bold leaders.

Workplace Environments

Over the years, attitudes and organizational policies have created workplace environments that relied primarily on men to fill leadership positions. These attitudes and policies were based on a value system that tended to preserve the status quo and perpetuate an exclusive culture. It fit the times.

Today, organizations remain uncomfortable with the styles and approaches that people from somewhat different backgrounds bring to the operation. Organizations continue to value predominately male traits and expect women to adapt to succeed. Much of the discrimination that occurs is not intentional, but the culture allows little room for different approaches.

Gender and racial stereotypes and attitudes frequently limit women and people of color from fully participating. Such individuals may be allowed fewer mistakes, fewer opportunities to contribute and fewer challenging assignments — resulting in a slow career progression.

Placing women and people of color in line positions that lead to advancement is considered risky. If a woman or person of color fails in a senior position, many organizations will use this as an excuse to not place another such individual in a similar position, rather than evaluating what organizational problems may have contributed to the failure.

Unsupportive working environments that exclude high-potential women and people of color or have unrealistic expectations for them prevent these people from fully participating in the organization. These environments lower enthusiasm and ambitions. Even when organizations understand that women and people of color are a rich resource, they may have trouble retaining the talent because they have not adapted their environments to make these individuals comfortable.

The low representation of women and people of color in Minnesota leadership positions indicates serious problems in our organizational systems. Bad systems fail to develop people adequately and prevent meaningful change. It is impossible to create initiatives and expect them to be successful if the systemic problems are not addressed.

Opportunities for employee development should be the key factor in changing workplace environments. By discovering in-house talent, employers will benefit because more people will be better prepared to move to the next level for consideration.

Attitudes and organizational cultures must change to acknowledge both the concrete qualifications that women and people of color have and the value of diverse leadership styles. Empowering environments will offer women and people of color adequate training, participation opportunities, support and cooperation. We need to get away from the idea that we are doing somebody a favor by hiring them.

Work Experience

Growing numbers of women and people of color have obtained the training and education necessary to assume leadership positions in organizations. Yet they continue to confront obstacles to promotion and thus are not moving up.

These obstacles can often be attributed to the type of work experience they have in the organization. Many are excluded from key line-management positions, as well as opportunities for mentoring, networking, specialized training, new assignments and increased responsibilities. Women and people of color often do not receive adequate support in career development, needs assessment or succession planning.

Evaluations are frequently conducted based on traditional policies, expectations and qualities that fail to appreciate different management styles and experiences. While not intended to cause harm, this results in the individual stagnating and being unable to develop the experience and skills required for advancement.

Leadership work experience for most women and people of color is generally confined to areas within the organization that will not directly affect the bottom line. Most are positioned in midmanagement staff and supervisory positions or in human resource and public relations departments.

Efforts should be made to encourage broader involvement of women and people of color in line positions. At the same time, organizations should think more broadly about relevant work experience. While traditional criteria may be credible indicators of achievement, they may not be the only indicators of the skill levels or attributes required for success in top management positions.

To develop competent and diverse leadership within organizations, credential-building experiences, including advanced education, career enhancing assignments and special projects, should be accessible to all high-potential employees — white males, women and people of color. Sponsors that help them become more visible to organization leaders or mentors that help them navigate the system should also be available.

If organizations believe they are more effective because they make decisions in groups, then they need to understand that the insights, information and talents of women and people of color will only enrich this process. Organizations that do this will find that their decisions will better reflect the diversity in their customer base. This holds true for all sectors: educational, nonprofit, government and business.

Family Obligations

We are uncertain whether the disadvantages mothers confront in the workplace arise because they choose not to do some of the things that are required to move ahead or because they are perceived as being less committed to their careers.

Family responsibilities clearly influence how working mothers choose positions. Because women shoulder a larger share of the burden of managing households and caring for children than men do, many cannot consider positions that require several transfers or frequent travel.

Even if they do accept these positions, however, working mothers still face the perception that they are less committed to their careers.

We found that fathers with wives who stay home earn more money. This leads us to believe that the problem for working mothers is not as much an issue of gender alone, as it is the commonly held organizational expectation that people in leadership positions must be available for work at all times and must always put their jobs first.

If we as a society move toward a clearer vision of shared parenting, organizations will have to change to accommodate the needs of all employees. For this to happen, men must change their attitudes. More fathers need to accept, and organizations support, the premise that it is OK for fathers to take an active role in caring for their children.

Some men are choosing not to accept additional organizational responsibilities because of their family obligations. Very few, however, take advantage of family leave because the traditional definition of parenting implies that children are the primary responsibility of women. We need to develop different expectations about being partners and parents.

It is unfortunate that women are forced to choose between their children and their job. Organizations lose talent when women are not considered for promotion because of their family commitments. Working parents, especially mothers, are often forced to limit themselves because they are unwilling to choose between their children and their career.

If employers want to contribute to the strengthening of the family in this country, they will need to recognize that both mothers and fathers work and that both require some flexibility. Both women and men need a balance.

Socialization

Socialization is a collective responsibility that begins when a child is born. Children's self-esteem, expectations and attitudes begin to form through the influence of parents and educators, friends and the images in the world around them.

The experiences children have at home are often reinforced in the socialization processes that occur in the classroom. What happens in school fundamentally affects what females and people of color believe they can do and choose to do. Peer pressure, parental involvement and teacher guidance all influence the confidence and self-esteem a child will take into adulthood.

Limited expectations are a negative outcome of the socialization process. For example, the impressions that girls in particular have about their career options are shaped very early and often stereotypically. Boys are doctors, architects and engineers; girls are secretaries, teachers and nurses.

Organizational and educational environments generally do not create stereotypes; rather, they reflect and reinforce what society has already accepted. Stereotyping images are found everywhere. Movies, magazines, videos, television shows, advertisements and books too often fail to go beyond stereotypical characters.

Stereotypes are so pervasive that we seldom think about them. An example of their influence was pointed out by one of our task force members. A publication designed to attract new business to Minnesota gave 10 well-defined "reasons" to do business here, with a section dedicated to each "reason." Each section highlighted one successful white Minnesota businessman. The exclusion of people of color and women business leaders sent the message that only white males are successful in Minnesota. Many other stereotypes reinforce the same message.

Socially accepted stereotypes shape the expectations that we all have of people of color and women. These expectations shape the attitudes that become the barriers that create glass ceilings in organizations.

The expectations that women and people of color have about themselves affect their self-esteem, career ambitions and willingness to take risks. Their ability to become leaders and to challenge the stereotypes will depend, in part, on how they were socialized.

Role models are one of the best ways to remedy low expectations. A role model is someone with a similar background who has succeeded. People will respond when strong, positive examples are put before them. When individuals do not see anyone like themselves who has "made it," they set their sights on a lower level of attainment. Positive role models from culturally diverse backgrounds would go a long way to breaking the stereotypes and correcting the socialization process.

Positive experiences early in life will also reinforce a healthy self-concept and help elevate expectations. Children — particularly girls and children of color — need opportunities to engage in group activities where their talents and leadership abilities are nurtured.

Education

Education will continue to perpetuate glass ceilings if we continue with current patterns. Two characteristics of education today signal ongoing problems: few women and people of color are in the scientific, mathematical and technological disciplines, and women and people of color do not come out of our schools with high self-esteem and high levels of self-confidence.

Teaching methods and curricula continue to reflect gender-stereotyped expectations of career choices for boys and girls. As a result, the participation rates of women and people of color in mathematical, scientific and technological fields are low. A major educational emphasis must be placed on providing all students, regardless of race or gender, an opportunity to participate fully in these fields of study.

Today's educational environments do not help girls or children of color feel positive about careers in math, science or technology, and peer attitudes often reflect the myth that only "nerds" enter those fields. Teachers and classroom materials must provide positive images of women and people of color who are actively involved in and vital contributors to these professions. More carefully planned course work for college-bound students and more positive images will help girls and children of color enter these fields with the credentials and confidence they will need.

Teaching methods and curricula also need to be more responsive to different learning styles and student expectations. It is important to note that not only teaching styles and curricular materials make a difference but also the way teachers interact with students in the classroom. Many studies make it clear that boys are much more likely to be called on than girls and that this kind of behavioral anomaly negatively effects the educational and developmental growth of girls. High self-esteem and expectations, leadership skills, interpersonal abilities and confidence may not be easily quantified learning experiences, but they are extremely important contributors to breaking the glass ceiling.

Schools also need to do more to ensure worker readiness. Many students leave high school without fully understanding what career opportunities are available or the expectations of employers. Students need to understand that working is not just a matter of getting to work on time; rather, it involves proper conduct, the ability to work in teams and accepting people who are different from themselves. Exposing high school students to work environments will help them develop the qualities they will need to work successfully while increasing their expectations, leadership skills and self-esteem.

Boys and girls will more likely grow up with the confidence to be leaders if they are taught leadership skills and exposed to role models early and often. This confidence will prepare them to meet challenges and take risks all necessary components of successful careers.

Recommendations

1. During the next four years, Governor Carlson should lead a statewide initiative to increase the level of awareness among organizational and educational leaders, elected officials and the public regarding the impact on our work force of Minnesota's changing demographics.
2. Governor Carlson should proclaim October 1995 as the second annual Celebration of Diversity Month.
3. The Minnesota media should provide greater visibility to both the changing demographics and the steps organizations are taking to prepare for those changes.
4. Business and other organizational leaders should take responsibility for removing barriers and improving developmental and advancement opportunities for women and people of color.
5. Organizational leaders should identify and remedy the ongoing systemic problems that limit opportunities within their organizations.
6. Organizations should provide more flexibility for employees to balance family obligations and job responsibilities.
7. Working with the Minnesota Chamber of Commerce, Governor Carlson should establish an annual recognition program that focuses on the advancement of women and people of color.
8. The Governor should ensure prompt implementation of the recommendations submitted by Minnesota Planning in its report, *State of Diversity — A Plan of Action for Minnesota*, November 1993.
9. The Minnesota Department of Education should develop appropriate curricula and teacher training to address the socialization issues in the classroom that limit the self-esteem, self-confidence and expectations of girls and children of color.
10. The Minnesota departments of Education and Trade and Economic Development should work with the Governor to promote and expand work-school partnerships throughout the state.
11. The Minnesota Department of Human Services should develop parenting education initiatives to help parents understand the importance of early childhood development in establishing expectations, self-esteem and learning skills.

Discussion of Recommendations

Our findings show the existence of a glass ceiling for women and people of color is real and pervasive. But while the problem is clear, the solutions are not easily implemented because they involve fundamental individual and organizational change. Our recommendations focus heavily on the need for strong leadership in all sectors to create that change.

The task force's recommendations include actions that will give women and people of color who are in the work force better opportunities to move into leadership positions and improve future opportunities for others. These recommendations are based on our findings that show many well-qualified, capable individuals in middle management and professional positions are not being encouraged, and in some cases not permitted, to move into senior management positions simply because of their gender or race.

The policies and practices of many large public and private organizations still obstruct the progress of white women and people of color into the executive ranks. Individuals who come to our organizations with different styles, different experiences and different expectations from their white male counterparts still face real barriers. In too many cases, their capabilities are not fully recognized. Both the institution and the individual lose as a result.

While much can be done right now, the task force also recognizes that the limited advancement of women and people of color is rooted in long-standing practices that differentiate on the basis of gender and race. Very simply, the way we educate and socialize girls and ethnic minorities continues to limit their potential. Until we effectively deal with the problems of low expectations and low self-esteem among these groups, our strategies to achieve full work force diversity will fail.

1. During the next four years, Governor Carlson should lead a statewide initiative to increase the level of awareness among organizational and educational leaders, elected officials and the public regarding the impact on our work force of Minnesota's changing demographics.

Minnesota will be unprepared for the future unless there is a strong and continued commitment from the Governor to establish a sense of urgency among those who are in a position to create change in our organizations. He should communicate the fact that demographically, we have and will have an increasingly diverse work force.

Many managers and most of the citizens of Minnesota are unaware of what is occurring. The Governor's message should emphasize that our state's competitive edge will depend on increased participation and leadership opportunities for all segments of our population, regardless of race or gender.

Throughout the next four years, Governor Carlson should meet with organizational leaders in both the private and public sectors to encourage them to take ownership of the problem and commit to specific actions so they become advocates for change and lead by example.

The Governor's initiative should include a "kick-off" meeting to which he would invite members of the Glass Ceiling Task Force and the CEOs of Minnesota's 100 largest corporations. Follow-up meetings should be held periodically to assess progress and to highlight what is working.

2. Governor Carlson should proclaim October 1995 as the second annual Celebration of Diversity Month.

We applaud Governor Carlson for establishing the first statewide Week of Diversity in 1993 and for proclaiming the month of October 1994 as Diversity Month.

Events in October 1994 included a diversity videoconference conducted by the Minnesota Cultural Diversity Center and the Office of Diversity and Equal Opportunity in the Minnesota Department of Employee Relations and an Employment Conference co-sponsored by the Committee on Multicultural Diversity and Racial Fairness in the Courts and the Conference of Chief Judges.

We encourage Governor Carlson to continue his support of this annual celebration and to actively participate by emphasizing the richness of our diverse cultures and the value this diversity brings to our state.

The Governor should create a forum that focuses on the projected demographic changes in Minnesota and highlights the critical need to accept and work with our diverse neighbors. The forum should also showcase some of the “best practices” that Minnesota organizations have implemented to increase acceptance and opportunities for people of color and women in their workplace.

Diversity Month provides a wonderful opportunity to highlight role models and to challenge common stereotypes. Programs should feature outstanding women and people of color.

3. The Minnesota media should provide greater visibility to both the changing demographics and the steps organizations are taking to prepare for those changes.

The media should provide coverage that helps our citizens understand that the population in Minnesota is becoming more diverse and that we will increasingly rely on nontraditional sources in recruiting tomorrow’s work force.

Employers should be recognized for their efforts in creating positive working environments that increase leadership opportunities for women and people of color. Innovative classroom and organizational programs that are making a difference should be featured and held up as models for all.

Reporters and broadcasters should be trained in the subtle ways that images are conveyed and on how expectations are created from those images. Young people of color and girls need to see appropriate role models — women and people of color who have moved into leadership positions. The media should be conscientious about reinforcing positive images of our diverse population.

4. Business and other organizational leaders should take responsibility for removing barriers and improving developmental and advancement opportunities for women and people of color.

Change in organizations will not occur unless the leaders — top management — take a personal interest in making change happen. They must lead by example.

Organizational leaders should:

- review the representation of women and people of color in senior positions within their organizations.
- review their organizational, staff development and promotion policies and procedures (formal and informal).
- develop a workable action plan for their organization.
- track the results.

The evaluation should determine how open the work environment is to people with different styles and backgrounds. The action plan should create a climate where the abilities of women and people of color are recognized, where talents are strengthened and where career growth happens.

High-potential women and people of color should be given developmental assignments to strengthen their skills and expand their experience. The organization's expectations about the required skills and experiences for each level of advancement should be well defined and updated during the individual career planning sessions.

Organizational leaders should also be mindful that successful role models are a powerful motivator and an effective way of breaking stereotypes. Women and people of color who have broken through the barriers positively affect the expectations and attitudes of others.

5. Organizational leaders should identify and remedy the ongoing systemic problems that limit opportunities within their organizations.

For permanent progress, the impediments within an organizational system that limit advancement and leadership opportunities for women and people of color should be identified and wherever possible eliminated.

Traditionally, the list of expectations that qualify a person for advancement reflects a particular view of relevant experience (years with the organization, overseas experience, willingness to travel or transfer). While these experiences may lead to the qualities that truly affect job performance, other backgrounds also could provide relevant skills. Organizations should focus more on the required skill sets and examine possible alternatives to developing those skills.

Leadership should focus intentionally on women and people of color who are moving into their first supervisory job or middle management position. It is at that level where potential executive leadership can be identified. Identifying candidates and fostering their development must be recognized as a means of strengthening the organization.

Organizations must articulate their expectations and give accurate and honest feedback about job performance. Evaluators should concentrate on eliminating stereotypical images or style differences from their assessment. Concrete developmental plans must include sensitivity to the issues women and people of color face in their work environments. The attitudes and policies that could impede their success should be identified and addressed. Meaningful support mechanisms (mentors or sponsors, for example) should be provided to enhance their chances of succeeding.

Personnel staff, human resource and operation managers and all personnel responsible for hiring, should be held accountable and evaluated for their effectiveness in recruiting, training and retaining people of color and women.

6. Organizations should provide more flexibility for employees to balance family obligations and job responsibilities.

Organizations should create more family-friendly workplaces to help employees (both men and women) cope with the responsibilities of home and career. Workplace policies and attitudes should be reviewed and adjusted to reflect an organizational commitment to families. Organizations should be cognizant of the effects of mandatory travel and meetings outside of the normal workday for working parents. Flex-time policies, family leave options, sick care programs and support in obtaining quality day care are needed. These programs not only help employees, but also help the organizations by improving productivity and increasing the retention rate of trained and qualified people within the organization.

Organizational leaders should strive to provide a positive climate where men and women can discuss their family responsibilities and offer suggestions that would help them balance their home and work lives. With this input, leaders should look at what they can do to make organizational policies more supportive for men and women with families.

7. Working with the Minnesota Chamber of Commerce, Governor Carlson should establish an annual recognition program that focuses on the advancement of women and people of color.

The annual recognition program should publicly acknowledge organizations, both public and private, that have demonstrated a strong commitment to increase leadership opportunities for women and people of color. Their organizational climates and the methods used to implement change should be featured.

Recognition should also be given to organizations that have actively engaged in school-work partnership programs. Their relationship with the school and the types of experience made available to students should be featured.

The annual awards would be presented during the October Diversity Month celebration.

8. The Governor should ensure prompt implementation of the recommendations submitted by Minnesota Planning in its report, *State of Diversity — A Plan of Action for Minnesota*, November 1993.

Unless Minnesota's people embrace the growing diversity of our state as an asset, our organizations will be slow to accommodate a more diverse work force and even slower to provide leadership opportunities for them.

We encourage Governor Carlson to give high priority to both the implementation of Minnesota Planning's recommendations and ours. The recommendations reinforce and complement one another.

The *State of Diversity* report recommends:

1. Support and nurture minority investment and businesses.
2. Government and the private sector should do more to increase access to home ownership.
3. Prepare and motivate youth for careers and for business and community leadership.
4. Remove barriers and expand opportunities for employment in both government and the private sector.
5. Public and private organizations should institute zero-tolerance-for-bias policies and help train Minnesotans to live and work with diverse cultures.
6. State and local government leaders should adopt action plans to incorporate diversity throughout their activities and regularly measure progress toward goals.
7. Improve participation of Minnesotans of color in state and local government and school decision-making.
8. Give the human rights system the resources and tools it needs to reduce racial incidents through education and make enforcement timely and effective throughout the state.
9. Minnesota leaders and citizens statewide should make a commitment to improve the racial climate.

9. The Minnesota Department of Education should develop appropriate curricula and teacher training to address the socialization issues in the classroom that limit the self-esteem, self-confidence and expectations of girls and children of color.

The Department of Education should develop curricula for all grade levels that remove gender and racial bias from the classroom. To increase the number of girls and children of color in key disciplines, the

curricula should promote their full participation in math, science and technical skills. Instructional materials should reflect the diversity of our population by including women and people of color. The accomplishments and contributions of women and people of color should be incorporated in the materials and featured as positive role models.

The department should interact with the Board of Education, school boards and superintendents to promote the curricula and its implementation.

Primary and secondary education should establish classroom environments that affirm and support children. Teachers should be aware of and avoid the subtle stereotypical messages that tell children what they cannot do or do not have a right to do. Classrooms should give students an opportunity to practice behaviors that build confidence and leadership skills.

Teacher education programs should emphasize the value of diversity and the need to eliminate stereotyping in the classroom. Their instruction should focus on how to create a more positive and hospitable learning environment for all students. Sensitivity to how girls and children of color are educated and how that education affects their expectations, both in school and in the workplace, should be an essential component of their training.

10. The Minnesota departments of Education and Trade and Economic Development should work with the Governor to promote and expand work-school partnerships throughout the state.

To increase the expectations and perceptions of opportunity for girls and children of color, the departments of Education and Trade and Economic Development should expand their coordinated program that pairs Minnesota employers with Minnesota high schools. This statewide initiative should focus on increasing opportunities for students to participate in work-related internship and apprenticeship experiences.

The Department of Trade and Economic Development should serve as a clearinghouse where the work-school partnership data would be tracked and recorded. It would also serve as a resource for organizations that would like to become involved in the program but need information on how to start. Alternatively, another resource for the information could be the Youth Trust in Minneapolis.

The Governor should strongly encourage organizations and schools to work together in forming partnerships.

11. The Minnesota Department of Human Services should develop parenting education initiatives to help parents understand the importance of early childhood development in establishing expectations, self-esteem and learning skills.

The Department of Human Services should encourage parents to look for day care providers who will foster and nurture their children. Whether preschool care is provided by family members or a licensed day care home or center, parents need to understand that the quality of these environments will have an impact on their children's self-esteem and expectations.

The department should also develop information and public service messages that reinforce the need for parents to provide nurturing environments in their homes. They should be encouraged to pay attention to how their children are developing. Materials should be available to day care providers and parents that recommend activities that enhance child development practices.

Appendices



Defining Minnesota's Labor Force

On August 3, 1994, Governor Arne H. Carlson and Minnesota Planning officials released a report showing that the days of rapid labor force growth are over in Minnesota with the growth rate decreasing to two percent between the years 2010 and 2020. Minorities and women will also make up a larger share of the state's future labor force.

The report, *Tomorrows's Labor Force: The Next 30 Years*, shows the state's labor force growing about 10 percent between 1990 and the year 2000, 8 percent from 2000 to 2010 and 2 percent between 2010 and 2020. These figures compare to growth of 16 percent between 1980 and 1990 and 30 percent in the 1970's. Slower population growth and a small supply of young, entry-level workers are among the demographic shifts that will produce lower levels of labor force growth.

Projected Labor Force Trends for Minnesota

Racial Diversity in the Workplace

The study projects that by 2020, 48 percent of Minnesota's labor force will be women, compared to 46 percent now. The proportion of the labor force that is nonwhite will go from 4 percent in 1990 to 12 percent in 2020; the concentration of nonwhite workers will be highest at younger ages.

It is also expected the population in Minnesota will become more racially diverse during the next 30 years. Over the next three decades, the nonwhite labor force is projected to grow 243 percent, compared to only 11 percent for the white population. Rapid growth is projected for Asians (277 percent), African Americans (271 percent) and persons of Hispanic origin (243 percent).

The slow growth of the white labor force, as explained by state demographers, is attributable to slow population gains and the aging of many white workers. After 2015, the number of white workers is projected to decline as they begin to retire in large numbers.

The nonwhite labor force is projected to be 12 percent of the state total in 2020, up from 4 percent in 1990. By the year 2000, less than half of Minnesota's labor force will be white males. By the year 2020, white males are projected to be 46 percent of the total state labor force, down from 51 percent in 1990.

Women in the Workplace

According to the report, the entry of more women into the labor force has been one of the most striking social trends of the past several decades. The participation rate for women ages 35 to 44 rose from 67.8 percent in 1980 to 82.3 percent in 1990. Between 1990 and 2020, Minnesota's female labor force is projected to expand 26 percent compared to 17 percent for the male labor force.

Tomorrows's Labor Force: The Next 30 Years demonstrates that as the growth of the working age population slows, higher participation by women will become the major component of labor force growth. The report states, "Higher female participation will account for almost all of the gain in the labor force between 2010 and 2020. **If women's labor force participation rates do not continue to rise, there will be little or no labor force growth after 2010**" (emphasis added).

As the population becomes more diverse and women continue to enter the labor force, white males will become an ever smaller fraction of the total state labor force.

Representation and Earnings of Women in Selected Professional, Managerial and Supervisory Occupations

Occupation	Percent Female	Average Earnings of Females	Average Earnings of Males	Difference in Earnings	Number of Women in the Occupation	Unweighted Sample Size
Accountants	48.5	\$24,307	\$39,142	(\$14,835)	12,087	1,004
Other financial	46.1	23,950	51,617	(27,667)	4,800	471
Buyers	50.6	22,499	33,059	(10,560)	3,980	334
Human resources	51.4	28,363	36,978	(8,615)	3,994	300
Physicians	13.9	63,146	93,082	(29,936)	1,831	595
Nurses/therapists	82.5	29,042	41,616	(12,574)	20,185	1,172
Elementary teachers	61	26,568	33,413	(6,845)	16,382	1,338
Secondary teachers	32.7	26,037	33,488	(7,451)	1,807	295
College teachers	32	29,232	42,986	(13,754)	3,119	407
Social workers	62.6	22,772	28,900	(6,128)	6,379	472
Lawyers	21.8	49,987	72,544	(22,557)	2,088	379
Sales supervisor	28.2	21,879	40,391	(18,512)	14,648	2,485
Admin. support supervisor	61.2	25,048	34,639	(9,591)	7,963	575
Protective services supervisor	7.9	****	38,063	****	88	50
Food preparation supervisor	53.6	14,487	22,948	(8,461)	1,070	97
Janitorial supervisor	34.5	20,742	26,470	(5,728)	1,067	147
Mechanic supervisor	8.6	****	32,581	****	324	202
Construction supervisor	0.6	****	35,853	****	59	538
Precision production supervisor	18.2	23,639	34,757	(11,118)	3,759	1,074
Material mover supervisor	12	****	\$32,644	****	188	70

Note: Based on 1990 Census PUMS and subject to sampling error. Includes only full-time employees in the occupation. Women comprise 39.4 percent of the total Minnesota full-time work force.

****Fewer than 20 respondents in the sample.

**Representation and Earnings of People of Color
in Selected Professional, Managerial and Supervisory Occupations**

Occupation	Percent All Employee	Average Earnings	Average Earnings Nonminorities	Difference in Earnings	Number in the Occupation	Unweighted Sample Size
Accountants	3.9	\$29,381	\$32,046	(\$2,665)	981	1,004
Other financial	3.2	****	39,246	****	337	471
Buyers	3.1	****	27,756	****	247	334
Human resources	10.9	24,982	33,477	(8,495)	849	300
Physicians	4.7	97,075	88,514	8,561	621	595
Nurses/therapists	2.5	****	31,314	****	604	1,172
Elementary teachers	2.9	27,307	29,294	(1,987)	775	1,338
Secondary teachers	3.5	****	31,107	****	193	295
College teachers	8.3	35,934	38,821	(2,887)	807	407
Social workers	10	24,080	25,173	(1,093)	1,023	472
Lawyers	1.1	****	68,069	****	108	379
Sales supervisor	2	29,299	35,288	(5,989)	1,028	2,485
Admin. support supervisor	2	****	28,783	****	262	575
Protective services supervisor	0	****	37,580	****	0	50
Food preparation supervisor	3.2	****	18,469	****	63	97
Janitorial supervisor	6.1	****	24,549	****	188	147
Mechanic supervisor	1.8	****	32,540	****	69	202
Construction supervisor	0.5	****	35,923	****	51	538
Precision production supervisor	1.2	****	32,777	****	255	1,074
Material mover supervisor	2.4	****	31,797	****	37	70

Note: Based on 1990 Census PUMS and subject to sampling error. Includes only full-time employees in the occupation. Employees who are people of color comprise 4.5 percent of the total Minnesota full-time work force.

****Fewer than 20 respondents in the sample.

**Representation and Earnings of Employees with a Work Disability in
Selected Professional, Managerial and Supervisory Occupations**

Occupation	Percent of all Employees	Average Earnings	Average Earnings of Nondisabled	Difference in Earnings	Number in the Occupation	Unweighted Sample Size
Accountants	2.2	\$29,601	\$31,995	(\$2,394)	556	1,004
Other financial	1.4	****	38,723	****	151	471
Buyers	2.3	****	28,034	****	180	334
Human resources	1.4	****	32,714	****	111	300
Physicians	0.7	****	89,079	****	97	595
Nurses/therapists	3.6	29,599	31,303	(1,704)	875	1,172
Elementary teachers	2.6	25,758	29,329	(3,571)	690	1,338
Secondary teachers	3.6	****	31,338	****	198	295
College teachers	2.2	****	38,587	****	213	407
Social workers	3.9	19,849	25,273	(5,424)	394	472
Lawyers	2.5	****	67,486	****	237	379
Sales supervisor	4.8	29,712	35,445	(5,733)	2,494	2,485
Admin. support supervisor	2.8	****	28,870	****	360	575
Protective services supervisor	5.1	****	38,571	****	56	50
Food preparation supervisor	5.5	****	18,220	****	110	97
Janitorial supervisor	7.4	****	24,615	****	230	147
Mechanic supervisor	4.2	****	32,705	****	158	202
Construction supervisor	4.3	34,698	35,912	(1,214)	429	538
Precision production supervisor	3.7	27,592	32,936	(5,344)	768	1,074
Material mover supervisor	0.8	****	31,190	****	13	70

Note: Based on 1990 Census PUMS and subject to sampling error. Includes only full-time employees in the occupation. People with a disability that does not prevent them from working comprise 4.9 percent of the Minnesota work force.

****Fewer than 20 respondents in the sample.



The Glass Ceiling Task Force Survey Results by Industry

	DIRECTORS					EXECUTIVE POSITIONS					UPPER MANAGEMENT				
	White		People of Color		Dis-abled	White		People of Color		Dis-abled	White		People of Color		Dis-abled
	Men	Women	Men	Women		Men	Women	Men	Women		Men	Women	Men	Women	
Banking	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	66.7%	22.2%	0%	0%	11.1%	64.4%	35.6%	0%	0%	0%
Financial	40.6	25.0	9.4	21.9	3.1	67.9	23.8	3.5	4.8	0	67.6	20.0	1.0	8.5	2.9
Health Care	79.2	20.8	0	0	0	71.4	22.9	0	5.7	0	61.5	35.4	2.1	0	1.0
Insur-ance	96.0	4.0	0	0	0	62.1	24.1	13.8	0	0	54.2	45.8	0	0	0
Legal	80.0	20.0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	62.5	37.5	0	0	0
Mfg.	82.6	13.1	3.0	0.3	1.0	88.2	8.2	1.8	0	1.8	83.3	13.2	2.8	0.1	0.6
Retail	89.5	10.5	0	0	0	85.2	7.6	6.3	.9	0	70.8	24.5	2.8	1.9	0
Service Ind.	81.0	16.5	2.5	0	0	87.28	11.02	.85	0	.85	71.6	24.1	3.6	0	0.7
Other	78.3%	15.2%	2.8%	2.3%	1.4%	89.6%	8.6%	0.9%	0%	0.9%	77.4%	18%	3.6%	1.0%	0%

	MIDDLE MANAGEMENT					SUPERVISORS				
	White		People of Color		Dis-abled	White		People of Color		Dis-abled
	Men	Women	Men	Women		Men	Women	Men	Women	
Banking	25%	70.8%	0%	0%	4.2%	27.6%	72.4%	0%	0%	0%
Financial	53.0	38.4	3.3	4.6	0.7	43.4	38.2	7.4	11.0	0
Health Care	41.0	55.3	2.3	0.7	0.7	22.8	73.2	0.5	3.5	0
Insur-ance	48.6	37.1	2.9	0	11.4	39.5	57.9	2.6	0	0
Legal	75.0	25.0	0	0	0	33.3	66.7	0	0	0
Mfg.	78.9	17.5	2.4	0.9	0.3	78.7	16.4	3.7	1.1	0.1
Retail	59.0	39.3	0.3	1.4	0	53.5	43.7	0.9	1.9	0
Service Ind.	56.6	41.3	1.5	0.6	0	49.9	45.8	3.6	0.5	0.2
Other	71.2%	25.4%	2.8%	0.4%	0.2%	65.2%	28.9%	3.4%	1.8%	0.7%

The Glass Ceiling Task Force Government Sector Survey Results

	DIRECTORS					EXECUTIVE POSITIONS					UPPER MANAGEMENT				
	White		People of Color		Dis-abled	White		People of Color		Dis-abled	White		People of Color		Dis-abled
	Men	Women	Men	Women		Men	Women	Men	Women		Men	Women	Men	Women	
State Agencies	68.8%	31.3%	0%	0%	0%	61.0%	27.8%	2.8%	5.6%	2.8%	52.4%	35.7%	2.8%	0%	9.1%
Cities	79.7	19.7	0	0	0.6	79.1	17.4	2.3	0	1.2	79.9	19.1	0	0.5	0.5
Counties	84.6	15.4	0	0	0	60.7	38.1	1.2	0	0	69.7	26.9	3.4	0	0
Other	80.4%	19.6%	0%	0%	0%	68.2%	27.3%	4.5%	0%	0%	71.9%	25.0%	3.1%	0%	0%

	MIDDLE MANAGEMENT					SUPERVISORS				
	White		People of Color		Dis-abled	White		People of Color		Dis-abled
	Men	Women	Men	Women		Men	Women	Men	Women	
State Agencies	61.2%	24.6%	3.9%	1.6%	8.7%	66.8%	23.4%	1.9%	1.1%	6.8%
Cities	70.7	24.9	1.9	1.7	0.8	74.1	23	1.2	0.3	1.4
Counties	59.7	37.8	1.3	0.6	0.6	41	54.4	2.1	2	0.5
Other	75.9%	19.3%	2.4%	1.2%	1.2%	68.4%	31.6%	0%	0%	0%

Bibliography

“The Age of Social Transformation.” *Atlantic Monthly*. November 1994, p. 53-80.

Alexander, K. “Both Racism and Sexism Block the Path to Management for Minority Women.” *Wall Street Journal*. 25 July 1990, p. B1.

Allen, J. “When Women Set the Rules.” *Canadian Business*. April 1991, p. 40-43.

Andreoli, Theresa. “These Women Mean Business.” *Stores* (June 1993):24-26.

Andrew, C.; Coderre, C.; and Denis, A. “Stop or Go, Reflections of Women Managers on Factors Influencing Their Career Development.” *Journal of Business Ethics* 9 (1990):361-67.

Astin, H., and Leland, C. *Women of Influence, Women of Vision*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1991.

Baytos, L. “Launching Successful Diversity Initiatives.” *HR Magazine* 37 (1992):91-94.

“Black College-Educated Women Now Earn More Than Male Peers.” *St. Paul Pioneer Press*. 31 October 1994, p. 1A.

“Blacks Fired at Twice Rate of Whites.” *St. Paul Pioneer Press*. 23 October 1994, p. 1A.

“Board Sets and Women.” *New York Times*. 10 November 1993, p. D6.

“Boys Get Called On.” *New York Times*. 9 January 1994.

Bullard, Angela M., and Wright, Deil S. “Circumventing the Glass Ceiling: Women Executives in American State Governments.” *Public Administration Review* (May-June 1993):53.

Burke, R., and McKeen, C. “Mentoring in Organizations: Implications for Women.” *Journal of Business Ethics* (1990):317-32.

Capowski, Genevieve Soter. “Be Your Own Boss? Millions of Women Get Down to Business.” *Management Review* (February 1993):8.

Carnegie Corporation of New York. *Starting Points: Meeting the Needs of Our Youngest Children*, April 1994.

Carr-Ruffino, Norma. *The Promotable Woman*. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing, 1993.

Cohen, Allan R., and Bradford, David L. *Influence Without Authority*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1993.

- Collier, Abram T. "Business Leadership and Creative Society." *Harvard Business Review* (March-April 1992):159.
- Covey, Stephen B. *Leadership Jazz*. New York: Dell Publishing, 1992.
- Cox, T. "The Multicultural Organization." *Academy of Management Executive* 5 (1991):34-47.
- Crawford, Donna I. "The Glass Ceiling in Nursing Management." *Nursing Economics* 11 (November-December 1993):335-41.
- Dalton, Dan R., and Kesner, Idalene F. "Cracks in the Glass: The Silent Competence of Women." *Business Horizons*. March-April 1993, p. 6-11.
- Davidson, Marilyn J., and Cooper, Cary L. "Shattering the Glass Ceiling." *The Woman Manager*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing, 1992.
- Demark, Florence L. "Women, Leadership and Empowerment." *Psychology of Women*. (September 1993):343-56.
- Denton, T. "Bonding and Supportive Relationships Among Black Professional Women: Rituals of Restoration." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 11 (1990):447-57.
- DePree, Max. *Leadership Is an Art*. New York: Dell Publishing, 1989.
- Di Bella, Anthony J. "The Role of Assumptions in Implementing Management Practices Across Cultural Boundaries." *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* (September 1993): 311-27.
- Dickson, R. "The Business of Equal Opportunity." *Harvard Business Review* (January-February 1992):46-53.
- Diesenhouse, Susan. "Harvard Law '55." *New York Times*. 10 October 1993, p. F7.
- Dobrzynski, Judith B. "Who's in the Boardroom." *New York Times*. 12 March 1994, p. 21.
- Dominquez, Cari M. "The Challenge of Workforce 2000." *Bureaucrat* (Winter 1991-1992):15-18.
- Dominguez, Cari M. "Executive Forum — The Glass Ceiling: Paradox and Promises." *HR Resource Management* (Winter 1992):385-92.
- Driscoll, Dawn Marie. "Women, Jobs and the Press." *New York Times*. 9 January 1994, p. 13N.
- Driscoll, Dawn Marie, and Goldberg, Carol R. "Member of the Club." New York: *Free Press*. 1993.

Dunbar, D. "Desperately Seeking Mentors." *Black Enterprise*. March 1990, p. 53-56.

Education: Reaching Higher, Preparing for the Jobs of the Future. Minneapolis: Minnesota Business Partnership and the Employers Association, September 1994.

Edwards, A. "The Mindset of Black Success." *Executive Female* (January-February 1992):46-48.

Estrich, Susan. "For Girls' Schools and Women's Colleges Separate Is Better." *New York Times Magazine* 22 May 1994.

Ettorre, Barbara. "Breaking the Glass...or Just Window Dressing." *Management Review* (March 1992):16-22.

"Fathers From Dual-Income Families Earn Less." *Star Tribune*. 23 October 1994, p. 1J.

Feminist Majority Foundation. *Empowering Women in Business*. 1991.

"The Feminization of Management." *Training Magazine*. November 1994, p. 25-31.

Fierman, J. "Why Women Still Don't Hit the Top." *Fortune*. 30 July 1990, p. 40-62.

Fisher, A. *Wall Street Women*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1990.

Freeman, Sue J.M. *Managing Lives*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, 1990.

"From Marie Curie to Sally Ride..." *NEA Today*. March 1990, p. 4-5.

Galen, Michele. "White, Male and Worried." *Business Week*. 31 January 1994, p. 50-55.

Gage, Amy. "The Best Decade." *St. Paul Pioneer Press*. 11 December 1994, p. 1D.

Garland, Susan B. "Can the Fed's Bust Through the 'Glass Ceiling'?" *Business Week*. 29 April 1991, p. 33.

Garland, Susan B. "Commentary: How to Keep Women Managers on the Corporate Ladder." *Business Week*. 2 September 1991, p. 64.

Gentile, Mary C. "The Case of Unequal Opportunity." *Harvard Business Review* (July-August 1991):14-23.

"Girls and the Confidence Gap." *Star Tribune*. 22 September 1994, p. 1E.

"The Glass Ceiling: Are Women and Minorities Blocked from the Executive Suite?" *CQ Researcher* (29 October 1993): 939.

Glick, Peter. "Trait-Based and Sex-Based Discrimination in Occupational Prestige, Occupational Salary, and Hiring." *Sex Roles* 25. (1991):351-77.

Gurman, Ernest B., and Long, Keith. "Emergent Leadership and Female Sex Role Identity." *Journal of Psychology* (May 1992): 309-15.

Gutek, B., and Larwood, L. *Women's Career Development*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage, 1990.

Haslett, Beth J.; Geis, Florence L.; and Carter, Mae R. *The Organizational Woman: Power and Paradox*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing, 1992.

Health Insurance Task Force. *Insuring Health Care for People with Disabilities: Position Paper*. Cincinnati: Developmental Disabilities Planning Council, 1990.

Heery, William. "Diversity Management, Corporate Mentoring Can Break the Glass Ceiling." *HR Focus* (May 1994).

Helgesen, Sally. *The Female Advantage*. New York: Doubleday, 1990.

Hennepin County Bar Association. *Walking Through Invisible Doors and Shattering Glass Ceilings: Glass Ceiling Task Force Report*. Minneapolis, 1993.

"Higher-Pay Jobs Produce Increase in Hourly Pay." *St. Paul Pioneer Press*. 15 October 1994, p. 1A.

"How I Broke Through the Glass Ceiling." *Ebony*. January 1993, p. 102.

Huey, John. "The Leadership Industry." *Fortune*. 21 February 1994, p. 56.

Hunsacker, J., and Hunsaker, P. *Strategies and Skills for Managerial Women*. Cincinnati: South Western Publishing, 1990.

"The Invisible Barrier Is Crystal Clear to Many." *Wall Street Journal*. 20 April 1990.

Jenner, Lisa. "Diversity in Management: What Does It Mean?" *HR Focus*. January 1994, p.11.

Jessel, John C., and Beymer, Lawrence. "The Effects of Job Title vs. Job Description on Occupational Sex Typing." *Sex Roles* 28:1&2 (1993):73-83.

Johnsrud, Linda K. "Administrative Promotion: The Power of Gender." *Journal of Higher Education* (March-April 1991):119-48.

Kalish, Barbara B. "Dismantling the Glass Ceiling." *Management Review* (March 1992):64.

Karsten, Margaret Foegen. *Management and Gender: Issues and Attitudes*. Westport, Conn.: Quorum Books, 1994.

“The Kids Will Be All Right If We Help Raise Their Self-Esteem.” *Star Tribune*. 8 October 1994.

Kelly, Patrick. “Conducting a Glass Ceiling Self-Audit Now.” *HR Magazine*. October 1993, p. 76-80.

Kelly, Eileen P.; Young, Amy Oakes; and Clark, Lawrence S. “Sex Stereotyping in the Workplace: A Manager’s Guide.” *Business Horizons*.(March-April 1993):23.

Kizelos, P. “Take My Mentor, Please!” *Training* (April 1990):49:55.

Konrad, W. “Welcome to the Women-Friendly Company.” *Business Week*. 6 August 1990, p. 48-55.

Koretz, Gene. “Downward Mobility Is Stalking the Baby Boomers.” *Business Week*. 28 January 1991, p. 22.

Laabs, Jennifer J. “The Sticky Floor Beneath the Glass Ceiling.” *Personnel Journal* (May 1993).

Leonard, W. “Ways to Make Diversity Programs Work.” *HR Magazine* 36 (1991):37-39.

Livingston, A. “12 Companies That Do the Right Thing.” *Working Woman*. January 1991, p. 57, 59, 61.

Logsdon, Tom. *Breaking Through*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing, 1993.

Madsen, Mary K., and Blide, Leslie A. “Professional Advancement of Women in Health Care Management: A Conceptual Model.” *Topics in Health Information Management* (November 1992):1-12.

Mahoney, S. “Jobs Watch 2000: Paths of Glory.” *Executive Female* (July-August 1991):44-48.

Mandell, B., and Kohler-Gray, S. “Management Development That Values Diversity.” *Personnel* (March 1990):41-47.

“Many Working Women Feel Slighted, Survey Shows.” *Star Tribune*. 15 October 1994, p. 1A.

Martin, Lynn. “Glass Ceiling Initiatives.” *Public Manager* (Winter 1992-1993):28-30.

Maslin, Janet. “Sex and Terror: The Male View of the She-Boss.” *New York Times*. 14 January 1994, p. C1.

- Mason, Julie Cohen. "Knocking on the Glass Ceiling." *Management Review* (July 1993):5.
- Maynard, Herman Bryant, and Mehrtens, Susan E. *The Fourth Wave*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler, 1993.
- McGarvey, R. "No Vacancy." *Executive Female* (March-April 1991):29.
- Merrill, Ann. "Stepping Out of the Corporation Moved by Frustration, Fatigue or the Desire for a More Balanced Life, Some of the Highest-Ranking Women Executives Are Leaving Local Corporations." *St. Paul Pioneer Press*. 22 August 1993.
- Merrill, Ann. "The Veteran Reatha Clark King Not Uncomfortable Raising Touchy Issues With Board." *St. Paul Pioneer Press*. 31 January 1993.
- Miles, Ian. "Changing Sexual Division of Labor." *Annals of the American Academy* 522 (July 1992).
- Miller, Stephen H. "Crashing the Glass Ceiling." *Journal of Accountancy* (April 1994):18-19.
- "Millions Are Unable to Escape From Low-Wage Jobs." *Star Tribune*. 25 September 1994, p. 1J.
- Minerbrook, S. "Gender-Line Tensions." *Emerge* 1 (1990):32-36.
- Mink, Patsy T., and Schlafly, Phyllis. "Should Corporations and the Federal Government Take Stronger Action to Break the Glass Ceiling?" *CQ Researcher* (29 October 1993):953.
- Minnesota Department of Employee Relations. *Minnesota State Agency Affirmative Action Annual Report*. St. Paul, 1993.
- Minnesota Planning. *At The Crossroads: Higher Education in Minnesota*. St. Paul, 1992.
- Minnesota Planning. *Minnesota Milestones: A Report Card for the Future*. St. Paul, 1992.
- Minnesota Planning. *Minnesota Milestones Public Review Draft*. St. Paul, 1993.
- Minnesota Planning under the agreement with the Minnesota State Universities' Chancellor's Office. *Demographic Trends and Enrollments in the Minnesota State Universities*, St. Paul: Minnesota Planning, June 1993.
- Minnesota Planning. *State of Diversity: A Plan of Action for Minnesota*. St. Paul, November 1993.
- Minnesota Planning. *Tomorrow's Labor Force: The Next 30 Years*. St. Paul, 1994.

Minnesota Women's Consortium. *1994-95 Minnesota Women's Economic Action Plan*. St. Paul, October 1994.

"More Work for Less Pay Notion Not True in U.S." *Star Tribune*. 17 October 1994, p. 1A.

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

Morrison, Ann M. *The New Leaders: Guidelines on Leadership Diversity in America*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1992.

Morrison, Ann M.; White, Randall P.; and Van Velsor, Ellen. *Breaking the Glass Ceiling*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing, 1994.

Morrison, Ann M.; White, Randall P.; and Van Velsor, Ellen. "Executive Women on a Tightrope." Center for Creative Leadership, August 1987.

"The Myth of Schoolgirls' Low Self-Esteem." *Star Tribune*. 10 October 1994, p. 8A.

Nelson, Kristin. "Against All Odds, Women Climb Ladders." *Best's Review*. February 1994, p. 34-38.

Nelton, Sharon. "Putting Women into Business." *Nation's Business*. October 1992, p. 56.

Noble, Barbara Presley. "On Bosses, Barriers and Beliefs." *New York Times*. 6 March 1994, p. F25.

Noe, R. "Women and Mentoring: A Review and Research Agenda." *Academy of Management Review* 13 (1991):65-78.

"Nonprofits Lag in Minority Hiring." *Denver Post*. 4 September 1994, p. 1J.

Nussbaum, B. "A Career Survival Kit." *Business Week*. 7 October 1991, p. 98-104.

O'Donnell, Paul. "Look Who's No Longer Missing the Links." *Newsweek*. 14 March 1994, p. 68.

O'Rourke, J. Tracy. "The Essence of Leadership." *Industry Week*. 4 January 1993, p. 43.

Ohio Developmental Disabilities Planning Council, Health Insurance Task Force. *Insuring Health Care for People With Disabilities*, 2 October 1990.

"Once Seen as Perks, Flexible Benefits Recognized for Enhancing Productivity." *St. Paul Pioneer Press*. 25 September 1994, p. 5D.

Overman, S. "Managing the Diverse Workforce." *HR* 36 (1991):32-36.

Overman, Stephanie. "Success Comes from Accepting Challenges." *HR Magazine*. October 1993, p. 60-66.

Owen, Jean V. "Women in Manufacturing: Engendering Change." *Manufacturing Engineering* (March 1993):42-48.

"Panel Aims to Crack 'Glass Ceiling' for Women, Minorities." *St. Paul Pioneer Press*. 27 September 1994, p. 2A.

"The 'Parent Track' Becomes a Treadmill." *St. Paul Pioneer Press*. 20 October 1994.

Parker, Victoria A., and Kram, Kathy E. "Women Mentoring Women: Creating Conditions for Connection." *Business Horizons* (March-April 1991):42-51.

Posner, Barry Z., and Kouzee, James M. "Psychometric Properties of the Leadership Practices Inventory — Updated." *Educational and Psychological Measurement* (Spring 1993):191.

Powell, Gary N., and Mainiero, Lisa A. "Cross-Currents in the River of Time: Conceptualizing the Complexities of Women's Careers." *Journal of Management* (1992):215-237.

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

Powell, Gary. "One More Time, Do Women and Male Managers Differ?" *Academy of Management Executive* 4 (1990):68-75.

President's Committee on Employment of People with Disabilities, *Ability + Diversity = Economic Strength*. Washington, D.C., October 1994.

"Professionally Speaking." *HR Magazine*. April 1991, p. 40-43.

Quina, Kathryn, and Romenesko, Kim. *Assessing the Glass Ceiling in Higher Education*. Milwaukee: Center for Women's Studies, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 1993.

"Race-based Assumptions About Performance at Work Influence Firing." *St. Paul Pioneer Press*. 23 October 1994, p. 6A.

Ragins, B., and Cotton, J. "Easier Said Than Done: Gender Differences in Perceived Barriers to Gaining a Mentor." *Academy of Management Journal* 34 (1991):939-51.

"Readiness for the Workplace, An NWNL Survey Documenting the Gap Between School and Work." Minneapolis: Northwestern National Life Insurance Company, September 1994.

Report of the Governor's Task Force on the Glass Ceiling Initiative. Madison: United Wisconsin Services, 1993.

Rizzo, A., and Mendez, C. *The Integration of Women in Management.* New York: Quorum Books, 1990.

Ryscavage, Paul. "Gender Related Shifts in the Distribution of Wages." *Monthly Labor Review.* July 1994, p. 3-39.

Schumann, Paul L.; Ahlburg, Dennis A.; and Brown Mahoney, Christine. "The Effects of Human Capital and Job Characteristics on Pay." *Journal of Human Resources* 29 (Summer 1994):481-503.

Sheldon, James R., Jr. "Work Incentives for Persons with Disabilities under the Social Security and SSI Programs." *Clearinghouse Review* (July 1994):236-52.

Shellenbarger, Sue. "Working Hard to Take It Easy." *Star Tribune.* 15 December 1994, p. 1D.

"Should Companies Be Nannies?" *St. Paul Pioneer Press.* 26 September 1994, p. 1E.

"The Shrinking Pay Gap." *Wall Street Journal.* 7 October 1994, p. A10.

Signorielli, Nancy, and Lears, Margaret. "Children, Television, and Conceptions about Chores: Attitudes and Behaviors." *Sex Roles* 27:3-4 (1992):157-70.

Soloman, C. "Careers Under Glass." *Personnel Journal* (April 1990):97-105.

Sonnenberg, F. "The Professional (and Personal) Profits of Networking." *Training and Development Journal* 44 (1990):55-59.

"Stress, Pay Are Top Concerns of Working Women." *St. Paul Pioneer Press.* 15 October 1994, p. 1A.

"Subtle Sexism More Insidious Than Outright Discrimination, Study Shows." *Star Tribune.* 16 November 1994, p. 1E.

Thomas, D. "Mentoring and Irrationality: The Role of Racial Taboos." *Human Resource Management* 28 (1990):279-90.

Tillman, Randi S. "Women Dentists at Work: Views from the Glass Ceiling." *Journal of Dental Education* 56 (1992):569-70.

U.S. Census Bureau. *Americans with Disabilities 1991-1992: Data from the Survey of Income and Program Participation.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1993.

U.S. Department of Labor. *A Report on the Glass Ceiling Initiative*, 1991. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1991.

U.S. Department of Labor. *Pipelines of Progress — An Update on the Glass Ceiling Initiative*, 1992. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1992.

Urban Coalition. *Profiles of Change: Communities of Color in the Twin Cities Area*. Census Project, August 1993.

Van Velsor, Ellen and White, Randall P. “*Federal ‘Glass Ceiling’ Initiative Is Justified.*” Greensboro, N.C.: Center for Creative Leadership, 2 May 1991.

Weiss, Rhoda. “Shattering the Glass Ceiling.” *Health Progress* (March 1993):58-59.

Werra, Jude M. “What Barriers Exist for Women and Members of Minority Groups Who Aspire to Executive Positions...From the Standpoint of the Executive Search Professional?” Jude M. Werra & Associates, May 1993.

Wharton, Delores. “Through the Glass Ceiling, Minorities and Corporate America’s Human Resource Needs.” *National Voter* (June-July 1993):10.

White, Randall P. “*Beyond the Glass Ceiling.*” Greensboro, N.C.: Center for Creative Leadership.

“Why So Few Women Physicists?” *Wall Street Journal*. 9 January 1994, p. 25.

Wilson, J., and Elman, N. “Organizational Benefits of Mentoring.” *Academy of Management Executive* 4 (1990):88-93.

“Women as Directors.” *St. Paul Pioneer Press*. 31 January 1993.

“Women in Science Remain Invisible at the Top.” *New York Times*. 21 May 1991.

“Women Scientists’ Group Launches Effort to Probe the Plight of Female Researchers.” *Scientist*. 10 January 1994, p. 1.

“Women Still Behind in Executive Salaries in State, Data Show.” *Star Tribune*. 12 September 1994, p. 1A.