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Abstract

In this paper we critically assess the extant conceptual and empirical literature on women’s careers. Building on a historical overview of the research and writing on women’s careers spanning the 40 year period from the 1950s to the 1990s, we review the conceptual and empirical literature from 1990 to the present. Based on our review of large-sample, quantitative studies as well as small-sample, inductive investigations, we identify four major patterns that cumulatively contribute to the current state of the literature on women’s careers: diffuse and fragmented theory, continued usage of male constructions of work and career, the lack of clarity about key career constructs, and over-reliance on samples of elite women. We provide direction for a research agenda for future empirical work on women’s careers that addresses the development of integrative career theories that are relevant for women’s contemporary lives.
Research on Women’s Careers: A Review and Agenda

Transformation in the nature of work and organizing, the flood of women into the workforce in contemporary times, and recent changes in the ways careers and career development are conceptualized, suggest the need for new theory to take into account the expanded occupational opportunities and resultant choices now faced by women, and to explicitly address the lives, experiences, and issues of women in the workforce. However, despite repeated calls for gender distinct treatments of careers (e.g., Diamond, 1987; Larwood & Gutek, 1987), career theory has generally evolved without “a specific explanatory focus on women” (Osipow & Fitzgerald, 1996: 261). As we show in this review, more than a decade after these calls, the literature on women’s career development continues to be characterized by diffuse and fragmented research and theory, a subtle perpetuation of male-defined constructions of work and careers, lack of clarity about the conceptualization of the key variables of career, career success, and career development, and an almost exclusive reliance on samples of elite, corporate women.

In the present review, we critically assess the extant literature on women’s careers in two distinct phases – first, a brief historical overview of the research and writing on women’s careers spanning the 40 year period between 1950 and 1990, drawing on Betz’s (1993) and Fitzgerald, Fassinger, and Betz’s (1995) reviews of the literature to that point, and second, a more detailed review of the conceptual and empirical literature appearing since 1990. Based on this review, we identify the major patterns that cumulatively contribute to the current state of the literature on women’s careers. In the final section of the paper, we provide directions for future empirical
work on women’s careers, addressing the conceptual and methodological needs of career theories that specifically attend to women’s contemporary lives.

**Review of the Literature on Women’s Careers**

**Brief Historical Overview (1950s-1990)**

Homemaking vs. career orientation was the central question being explored in the then new field of women’s career theory in the late 1950’s and 60’s. Super (1957) was one of the first theorists to address women’s career development as potentially different from men’s experience and worthy of separate study. He noted the salience of homemaking and childcare in women’s lives and studied how these impacted women’s occupational behavior. Super’s main contribution was in defining the centrality of the role of family life and its impact on women’s careers.

A decade later, the importance of marriage and motherhood to the career choices of women was again highlighted. The sociologist Psathas (1968) focused on marriage as a method of status attainment for women. He proposed that occupations that provided proximity to potentially desirable mates would prove most attractive to women. In his view, this explained the abundance of women as secretaries, nurses and flight attendants. This view suggests that women freely chose those occupations to have access to men, which ignores the larger gender role segregation that may have been operating. Psathas’ main contribution was to propose that understanding women’s career development would mean paying attention to variables not previously examined in the study of men.

In a similar vein as Super and Psathas, Zytowski (1969) noted that homemaker was the modal role for women. He believed this role was largely incompatible with serious career
development and characterized women’s career patterns in terms of their age at entry into the workforce, and span and degree of participation. Zykowski’s study marked the beginning of the “either or” perspective on women’s careers and foreshadowed studies on women’s commitment to work vs. commitment to home and family.

Betz (1984) study of women college graduates of the class of 1968 documented the dramatic changes then occurring in women’s labor force participation. She found that most of the participants in her study worked continuously following graduation and 28% had entered pioneer occupations. The use of the word pioneer suggests that the standard by which a woman’s career was measured was a male one.
In the 1970’s, recognition that women were combining homemaking and career, not choosing between them, changed the focus of women’s career research. Studies began looking at the nature and degree of career orientation instead of the increasingly diminishing dichotomy of work or homemaking. According to Betz and Fitzgerald (1987), the first of these career orientation studies done by Rossi in 1965 differentiated between women in “traditional” female careers such as teaching or nursing vs. women in “non-traditional” or male dominated careers. It was assumed that women in male dominated fields, interchangeably called “pioneers,” “innovators” and “non-traditionals,” (Almquist, 1974) had stronger commitments to their careers than those employed in “traditional” careers. At this point in women’s career theory, studies were focused on the differentiating characteristics between these two groups. The perspective from which to view commitment, evidenced by the words “stronger” and “traditional” again implies a masculinist framing. Chillingly, in 2001, the U.S. Department of Labor, Women’s Bureau web site still lists non-traditional careers as a category.

The focus of women’s career research then turned to numerous studies that examined the degree of importance women assigned to work in comparison to the other salient roles in their lives (Angrist & Almquist, 1975). This treatment of work and family balance became a zero sum game with time spent on one translating to less time spent with the other. In traditional ways of working, organizations were structured and managed under the assumption that jobs were men’s priorities and family lives the priorities of women. This fiction of separate worlds (Kanter, 1977), contributed to barriers for women as they began to enter the workforce.

According to Betz (1993), career studies then began to focus on the compounding influence of individual and environmental factors on career development as well as individual differences models of career choice. Astin (1984) developed a socio-psychological model based
on four constructs: motivation, expectations, gender role socialization, and the structure of opportunity. By including the concept of the structure of opportunity, Astin focused attention on the fact that women live their lives within contexts that shape their opportunities and perceptions, and result in consequent choices and behavior. Gottfredson (1981) developed a model of career development that focused on processes of circumscription and compromise between employment preferences and employment realities. She looked at the dimensions of occupational gender type, prestige and field of work. She concluded that occupational gender stereotyping seriously restricted women’s career ideals. These were the first studies to highlight the impact of societal attitudes toward women on women’s career choices.

Farmer (1985) and Betz and Fitzgerald (1987) looked at individual differences that focused attention on issues and concerns unique to women. Farmer created a multi-dimensional model that looked at the influence of background, personal factors and environmental conditions on women’s aspirations, mastery and career commitment. She stated that a clear finding of her research was the “powerful role of the changing environment on career and achievement motivation” (Farmer, 1985: 388). Empirical studies done by Betz and Fitzgerald (1987), and later tested and modified by Fassinger (1990) found that high-ability levels plus gender role attitudes and individual agency influenced career orientation and career choices of college women.

In overview, our reading of this historical body of work reveals that the writings focused mainly on the following major dimensions: (1) the choice facing women to work or not, and their degree of commitment to work, (2) a clear delineation between women’s personal and professional lives, (3) the use of male standards for defining women’s working lives (e.g., career
success as defined by movement up the corporate ladder), and (4) limits on women’s careers imposed by societal structures (e.g., the sex segregation of jobs and careers).

**Literature Since 1990**

**Conceptual Work**

In the past decade or so, a number of reviews of the existing literature have appeared, primarily calling for the development of new theories of women’s careers. Gallos’ (1989) comprehensive review of the field was one of the first to question extant male standards for judging success in women’s careers. Her suggestion that research on women’s development may provide fertile ground for understanding the complexities of women’s careers has been often revisited in ongoing discussions of women and career theory. Powell & Mainiero (1992, 1993) pointed to the need for theory that addresses the complex choices and constraints in women’s career and life development, and that addresses issues of balance, connectedness, and interdependence in addition to issues of achievement and individuation. Their conceptualization of “cross currents in a river of time” proposed a framework for looking at women’s careers that takes into account non-work issues, subjective measures of success, and the impact of personal, organizational & societal factors on women’s choices.

Betz’s (1993) review of selective work primarily done between 1975 and 1990 called for studies that account for greater contextual validity of women’s careers, expand samples beyond white, middle class, heterosexual women, use idiographic, interview-based approaches, simultaneously investigate multiple dependent and independent variables, and study developmental & historical changes in women’s career development. Similarly pointing out that contextual factors are critical in understanding the career development of women, Fitzgerald,
Fassinger, & Betz, (1995) called on the literature to pay more attention to heterogeneity among women, and to remain up to date with social realities in developing theories of women’s vocational behavior. Commenting on the “promise and problems” inherent in research on women’s career development, Hackett (1997) called for methods (e.g., qualitative studies, more sophisticated modeling and testing, programmatic research, and diverse samples) and theories that extend and expand our current knowledge base. She argued for exploring the generation of “gendered” models of career development, and advocated more focused attempts to define the specific aspects impacting women’s career development that can lead to a greater understanding of the overall vocational behavior of women.

Examining the concept of a career-ambitious person, O’Leary (1997) showed how career “success or failure” varies according to the traditional male “corpocratic” career model (based on linear, hierarchical progression likened to tournaments or competitions with winners and losers) or the newer female “lifestream” career model (based on a more holistic framework that looks at the interplay between work, relationships, organizational factors, and various lifestages, and where success is measured in both personal and professional arenas through measures like perceived degree of challenge, satisfaction, sense of growth and development).

Brett and Stroh (1999) reviewed the advances made by women in management and concluded that while much progress has been made, much still needs to be done, particularly in the areas of income equality, opportunities for relocation, benefits to women of changing organizations, and work-family balance. Tharenou (1999) reviewed recent empirical work investigating gender differences in career advancement to executive levels. She sorted the existing research into three perspectives, human capital, social capital and stage/transitional approaches. She concluded that the evidence suggests that women’s lack of social capital, due to
gender-role stereotyping and men’s preferences to work with other men, results in less women advancing to executive status than men. She calls for rigorous research designs that track gender differences longitudinally and test contrasting explanations via objective, multi-source data.

Stroh and Reilly (1999) provided an overview of female and male differences on issues such as career choice, advancement and attitudes toward work, reflecting theoretical constructs from economics, sociology, psychology, and management and organizational behavior. They call for research to examine the “very meaning of career,” based on the changing nature of organizations and family life (Stroh & Reilly, 1999: 323). Mavin’s (2000, 2001) reviews ended the decade just as it began for women’s career theory - with the call for a paradigm shift away from traditional (male) models of careers toward new conceptions of career based on women’s experiences and realities, as distinct from those of men.

Empirical Work

The empirical literature on women’s career development that emerged in the 1990s has primarily followed two distinct streams. The first stream comprises of studies testing existing theory, generally using large samples and quantitative analysis methods (see Table 1 for a comprehensive review of these studies). While the research in this stream has used a wide range of theoretical frameworks, hypotheses, variables, and operationalizations, generally, these studies have attempted to categorize and apply women’s careers into the stages and patterns developed by earlier theorists (e.g., Super, 1957; Lepine, 1992; Levinson, Darrow, Levinson & McKee 1978). Some of the studies in this stream have explored the application of theories developed by researching men’s careers (e.g., Super,1957; Gould & Penley, 1984; Rosenbaum 1989; and Levinson et al, 1978) to discrete segments of women’s career experiences (e.g., Hurley &
Sonnenfeld, 1997; Smart, 1998). Others have tested the applicability of categories developed from prior women-specific theories (Astin, 1984; Lepine, 1992) to updated populations (e.g., Poole, Langan-Fox, Ciavarella & Omodei, 1991; Richardson, 1996). Still others have drawn on a wide range of constructs, ranging from trait theory to human capital theory to social roles and socialization theories, to explain the differential factors affecting women’s careers. Many of these studies compare the managerial and executive advancement and success of women compared to men (e.g., Stroh, Brett & Reilly, 1992; Tharenou, Latimer & Conroy, 1994; Schneer & Reitman, 1995). Predominantly, the studies in Table 1 address various career development issues specific to women in the corporate sector, and to notions of conventional advancement within the corporate hierarchy. A few studies, however, take into account the influence of non-work factors on women’s career development, and the contextual interplay of women’s personal and professional lives (e.g., White, 1995; Poole & Langan-Fox, 1997).

-----------------------
Table 1 around here
-----------------------

The second stream of empirical work consists of inductive, predominantly small sample empirical research, which seeks to build theory around women’s career phenomena (see Table 2). In response to the earlier calls for a more holistic treatment of women’s career development, starting in the 1990s a few empirical studies began to appear in this stream. We were able to locate ten such studies. Topics addressed included women’s developmental tasks and the interplay of their personal and professional lives (e.g., Gersick & Kram, 2002); the paths, challenges and barriers to career advancement and success of older (50+) women (Still & Timms, 1998); midlife (35+) women’s career and life balance decisions (Gordon & Whelan, 1998); and the effects of race, gender, and class on professional development (e.g., Richie,
Fassinger, Linn, Johnson, Prosser & Robinson, 1997; Bell & Nkomo, 2001). Overall, this stream has attempted to address earlier calls by paying close attention to (a) the contextual nature of women’s careers, (b) the intertwining of career and relational development, and (c) the multiple and complex methods of professional and personal advancement and fulfillment. Despite these advances, the samples used in these studies have tended to focus almost exclusively on higher level managerial, executive, or professional women who are highly successful in their chosen careers on objective, traditionally male, standards of career success such as advanced organizational level and high income (e.g., Mainiero, Williamson & Robinson, 1994; Richie et al, 1997; Gersick & Kram, 2002).

Table 2 around here

Conclusions from the Literature

Several patterns emerge from the above review of the empirical literature, as follows.

(1) Diffuse and Fragmented Theory

Academic research relevant to women’s careers is scattered across a variety of fields and publication outlets, including business/management, psychology, counseling and vocational behavior, organizational psychology, industrial relations, sociology, gender studies, and public administration. This diffuse and somewhat fragmented literature dilutes and disperses cumulative knowledge, giving rise to a plethora of interrelated constructs, and inhibiting their coherent integration within an overarching theoretical framework. During our search for work on women’s career development, we came across many studies investigating related elements such as mentoring, networking, power, sexual harassment, the glass ceiling and sex-based discrimination, career advancement, corporate mobility, opportunity structures, personal
development, relational development, work-life balance, career interruptions, women’s leadership, organizational turnover, and human resources policies. While these constructs inform us about how women’s careers develop, the boundaries between these related fields impacting women’s lives and careers remain somewhat blurred, contributing further to a somewhat disjointed and less than coherent field of knowledge.

Our review indicates that the studies appearing in Table 1 add significantly to existing discrete knowledge about specific aspects of women’s careers, while the studies appearing in Table 2 move the field in the direction of explicating the complex contextual variables impacting women’s careers. Cumulatively, however, these studies appear as disparate and fragmented treatments of a variety of specific career phenomena. The existing work generally focuses on several distinct aspects of women’s career development, but not on a holistic treatment of career development across a life course. What seem to be lacking are comprehensive, integrative, theoretical treatments of women’s career development that take into account the multiple, distinctive and intersecting aspects of women’s lives. We do not mean to suggest here that women’s career development is monolithic. Rather, we recognize that something fundamentally integrative is missing in the extant research on women’s working lives and relationships, sufficient to explain the complex fabric of women’s contemporary patterns and choices.

(2) Continued Reliance on Male-Defined Career Constructions

Theory building and testing of women’s career development continues to draw heavily on frameworks and conceptions derived from male constructions of work and careers. Leona Tyler’s (1977: 40) words, “much of what we know about the stages through which an individual passes as [he] prepares to find [his] place in the world of work might appropriately be labeled
‘The Vocational Development of Middle Class Males’” may be as relevant today as they were twenty-five years ago. For example, research on the stages of adult development for women suggests that women find a renewed sense of purpose, energy, and increased vitality for work pursuits in their 40s and 50’s, after childbearing and rearing (Borysenko, 1996). In stark contrast to this, traditional male models of career development suggest stages of maintenance and decline after 40 (Miller & Form, 1951; Schein, 1978; Super, 1980). Applications of male understandings such as these to women’s careers and lives thus inhibit the advancement of knowledge about the factors influencing contemporary women’s career development.

Despite appearing on the surface to have corrected the previous over-reliance on theories and models primarily derived from men’s careers, most large-sample, hypotheses testing investigations of women’s career stages and patterns (in Table 1) continue to subtly perpetuate a male-defined framing of work and careers. For example, over-reliance on measures such as income to determine women’s career success offer an incomplete picture; women’s own definitions of success may have less to do with externally defined, traditionally male, corporate criteria and may be more likely to rely on internal criteria such as a sense of personal achievement, integrity, balance, etc. (cf. Sturges, 1999). Kirchmeyer’s (1998, 2002) investigations, for instance, found that although women earned lower incomes than men, they perceived their careers to be as successful. Although some recent studies have begun to employ respondents’ own personal definitions of success (e.g., Sturges, 1999; Poole & Langan-Fox, 1997; Kirchmeyer, 1998, 2002), the bulk of empirical studies continue to rely predominantly on traditional (male) career outcomes and externalized definitions of success, such as income, wealth accumulation, and position within the corporate hierarchy. This pattern is of some concern given the recent widespread flight of women from corporate America (Marshall, 1995;
Moore and Buttner, 1997; Moore, 2000), including many women who meet traditional standards of corporate success.

Recent studies (e.g. Stroh, Brett and Reilly, 1992; Tharenou, Latimer and Conroy, 1994; Lyness and Thompson, 1997; Kirchmeyer, 1998, Smart, 1998) have attempted to utilize more gender-free frameworks, and constructs applicable to all managers (e.g., geographic transfers for career advancement, access to organizational opportunities, career encouragement, career interruptions, career involvement, the link between individual traits and success, etc.). However, while these constructs certainly pertain to both genders, women frequently may be disproportionately impacted. For example, in Judiesch and Lyness’ (1999) study on the impact of leaves of absence on managers’ career success, the authors found that organizational penalties did not differ by gender; however out of their sample of 523 leave takers, 476 were women and 47 were men. Similarly, while Kirchmeyer (1998) found that career interruptions for both male and female mid-career managers negatively impacted success, women experienced significantly more career interruptions than men, mainly due to family responsibilities. Thus, there would appear to be a disproportionately larger negative impact of career interruptions on women. In another study, while women and men’s base salary and bonus were not found to be different, women executives received fewer stock options and had less authority than their matched male counterparts, leading the authors to conclude that women executives may be less valued than men executives in the organization studied (Lyness & Thompson, 1997). While the lack of differences in the compensation (salary and bonus) variables studied suggests gender parity in the organizational reward structure, a deeper understanding of the organizational treatment of women and men arises from unpacking other organizational variables. In summary, although the reliance on constructs such as income, career interruptions, and career advancement may provide
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insight about overall patterns and trends in male and female corporate careers, their differential application to and impact on men and women suggest caution in their use and interpretation.

(3) Conceptual Confusion about “Career” and “Career Development”

Our review indicates that there continues to be conceptual confusion about what a career entails and what constitutes career development, especially for women. Many studies use organizational advancement as if it were a synonym for career development, which may not accurately reflect the way women currently conceptualize or construct their careers. For instance, successful women who opt out of corporate careers to establish their own businesses, do individual consulting, pursue new credentials, or change their career field, do not fit extant criteria for career progression. The current plethora of studies that tie career development to hierarchical advancement thus exclude a whole segment of non-linear career development experiences and criteria relevant to an overarching framework of women’s contemporary careers.

In fact, the traditional notion of a successful career as a progression up a corporate ladder is becoming increasingly obsolete for both women and men. As Hall (1996:1) notes, “the career as a series of upward moves with steadily increasing power, income, status and security has died”. Indeed, the more global, networked, and diverse nature of emerging organizational forms requires a new conceptualization of the careers of the women and men who work in these new organizations. It is untenable to continue to frame career development as a vertical progression when the emergent organizational reality is increasingly horizontally and laterally directed. As Stroh and Reilly (1999) note, the very meaning of career is now ripe for new conceptualization and definition.
(4) Exclusive Focus on Samples of Elite Corporate Women

Our review indicates that the samples studied consist mostly of highly successful women managers, executives, and professionals, drawn predominantly from white, middle class, and highly educated backgrounds. Samples draw heavily on either corporate executives and managers or MBA alumni and students. This treatment of women’s careers, limited to a select sample of elite or successful women, is of concern because this sampling represents only a small proportion of the population of working women, and generalizations from this group may not be relevant for the majority of women’s careers. The literature largely does not account for the career development of blue-collar or pink-collar working women, the careers of women in public sector or non-profit organizations, or non-white women. Additionally, and most insidiously, the sample selection criteria for inclusion of women in research studies are themselves based on career success definitions emanating from male models and male standards, whose applications may be severely limiting to overall insights about women’s career development.

An Agenda for Future Research

We encourage future research in three major areas relevant to women’s careers. First, future research should continue to employ holistic approaches to women’s career-in-life development. As Fagenson (1990) suggests for the study of women in management, what is required is an integrated gender-organization-system approach that takes into account the interactional dynamics of individual, organizational and societal factors. Powell and Mainiero (1992) call for the examination of personal, organizational and societal factors that influence women’s development. More integrative theoretical development needs to occur in the examination of contextual variables, addressing questions such as: What are the societal,
organizational and individual factors that impact women’s career development? How do these factors interact to influence women’s decisions over the life course? How are women’s working lives embedded in the larger context of their multiple life arenas?

Second, research should focus on expanding extant definitions of career and working life. The changing nature of work and careers in contemporary times provides the imperative for advancing new understandings of career development for women. Especially for women, the notion of career is embedded in the multiple roles they play in the varying contexts of their lives. Future research needs to explore broadened conceptualizations of contemporary work and careers for women, utilizing women-specific framings of these constructs that include not just what one does for work but who one is while doing it. In this regard, theories of women’s developmental psychology, particularly theories of development-in-relation (Miller, 1976; Gilligan, 1982; Jordan, Kaplan, Miller, Stiver, & Surrey, 1991; Fletcher, 1999) may serve to inform extant understanding of women’s career choices and development. Additionally, the dynamics of the integrated relationship between women’s personal and professional lives (e.g., Ruderman, Ohlott, Panzer & King, 2002) needs to be further explored in ways that deepen our understanding of the complex synergies created by the flows of knowledge, skills, and experience among a woman’s multiple life roles.

Third, following Powell & Mainiero’s (1992) call, future research should expand existing definitions of career success for women. Career theorists must question the validity and generalizability of extant male-defined constructions of success, investigate why women in droves are abandoning the pursuit of “success” in corporate careers, re-examine the very meaning of career success in light of women’s contemporary lives and choices, and utilize expanded definitions of career success in their future research. As a few recent studies have
begun to do, women’s own subjective measures of success for their careers-in-lives should be explored, extending to the multiple arenas of their lives that interact with and influence their career development. Most importantly, sample selection considerations for future research investigations should take these expanded, women-specific definitions of success into account; objective, traditional measures of corporate career success need not be the only criteria for inclusion in studies of women’s career development.

Future research in the area of women’s career development should continue the recent trend of in-depth examination and inductive theory building of the complex factors influencing women’s careers. More research should focus on giving voice to women’s own career-in-life experiences with the intent of building integrated theory about these experiences. At the same time, large sample empirical research continues to be needed to apply, test, and generalize about theory that is generated on women’s careers. However, more varied samples need to be employed in these studies, expanding beyond the relatively homogenous managerial, executive, and professional women that currently comprise the majority of samples studied. Finally, to most fully explore women’s holistic career-in-life experiences over their life course, theorists should focus their efforts on undertaking longitudinal research, both of a qualitative and quantitative nature.

**Conclusion**

Our proposed research agenda comes at a critical time in the lives of working women for three distinct yet related reasons. First, the economic and technological climate of the last decade has increased the need for more workers with more advanced skills. Almost half of these workers are women, who with the increased demand for their services, have more occupational
options open to them than at any time in the past. Although women will have opportunities to move into new work arenas and take on new roles, other facets of their lives are likely to remain of central concern in determining and pursuing their career choices. Understanding how women develop successful careers as they navigate the multiple and often conflicting roles in their lives can inform both research and practice for creating supportive societal and organizational conditions for women.

Second, rapid changes in the management and organization of work will continue to offer expanded possibilities for transforming workforce participation. Because of a broadening menu of occupational choices and opportunities such as entrepreneurial ventures, job-sharing, and flex-time, the traditional notion of what constitutes a “successful career” is open to interpretation. New conceptualizations of careers as protean (Hall, 1996) and boundaryless (Arthur, 1994) are calling into question our long-held assumptions about organizational careers. Current conditions provide additional opportunities to rethink our notions of women’s careers based on the current realities of their lives, not on outdated conceptions of successful careers as those that exist solely in hierarchical organizational contexts.

Third, with the increasing advent of women in the work force and the rapid pace of social change, it is important to continue to explore societal attitudes and norms toward women and work as well as women’s own perceptions of their opportunities. Continued focus on the facilitators and barriers to successful careers for women will help add to our understanding of women’s career-in-life experiences. As suggested by Osipow in 1983, the study of women and careers will be a challenging and on-going effort due to the rapidity and magnitude of social change that makes the pronouncement of definitive conclusions and generalizations difficult. This sentiment may be even more relevant in the 21st century.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Central Question</th>
<th>Methodology/Sample</th>
<th>Theoretical Framework</th>
<th>Variables / Relationships</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ornstein & Isabella (1990) (US) | Explore differences in women across age and stage categories relative to their career development. | -Questionnaire  
  -Women only sample, N of 204 managers, average age 39  
  -1 organization (telecom) | Levinson’s et al (1978) model of adult development and Super’s (1957) model of career development | Dependent variables:  
  -commitment  
  -satisfaction  
  -intention to turnover  
  -willingness to relocate  
  -desire for promotion  
  -desired timing of promotions  
  Independent variables:  
  -Levinson’s age stages  
  -Super’s career stages | Regarding age: organizational commitment, intent to leave and desire for promotion differed.  
 Regarding career stage: there were no significant differences. |
| Cox & Harquail (1991) (US) | Examine whether differences in career success may be due to gender differences in career paths. | -Questionnaire  
  -502 MBA alumni from 1 University, 125 women, 377 men, 22% non-white, with average of 5 years since MBA | Human capital  
  Work-family issues  
  Discrimination | -Combination of gender, career success and career paths | Women were found to experience somewhat lower career success than men and had fewer management promotions. |
| Northcutt, (1991) (US)   | Determine common personal characteristics of successful career women across various occupations, and differences in achievement/motivation and self esteem between occupations. Provide demographic profiles of successful career women. | -Questionnaire (N 249) and interviews (N 23)  
  -Women only sample  
  -Population from businesses, civic clubs & organizations of career women recognized as successful by peer nominations in large city in Southwest US | Adler’s Individual Psychology (Manaster & Corsini, 1982).  
 Achievement theory. | -Definitions of success  
  -Birth order  
  -Achievement/ motivation  
  -Self esteem | Presents a profile of the characteristics of successful career women. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Central Question</th>
<th>Methodology/Sample</th>
<th>Theoretical Framework</th>
<th>Variables / Relationships</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cannings &amp; Montmarquette (1991) (Canada)</td>
<td>Analyze female and male differences in “managerial momentum” (sustained career progress).</td>
<td>-Questionnaire</td>
<td>Managerial momentum defined as an employee’s superior performance, greater ambition, capability and motivation.</td>
<td>Dependent variables: -promotions offered per year -promotions demanded per year -evaluation scores Independent variables: -human capital -behavioral -environmental</td>
<td>Men are more successful than women in gaining promotions and do so by relying more on informal networks. Women have less access to those networks and therefore rely more on formal processes such as bidding for promotions and performance evaluations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole, Langan-Fox, Ciavarella, &amp; Omodei, (1991) (Australia)</td>
<td>Study importance in adolescence of motivational, contextual and demographic variables in predicting professional attainment in early stages of career.</td>
<td>-Longitudinal. 3,000 students (49% female, 51% male) aged 17 to 27, over 10 years</td>
<td>Synthesis of 2 theories, Levinson’s et al (1978) Life Cycle &amp; Astin’s (1984) Career Choice</td>
<td>Predictor variables selected from data in line with contextualist framework, e.g., SES, sex role socialization, work motivation, external constraints, career planning. Dependent variable was subjects’ professional attainment in 1982.</td>
<td>External and individual factors are powerful determinants of professional attainment. Propose a contextualist explanatory framework in which career attainment is seen as an interactive process between an individual and the contexts in which she/he lives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKeen &amp; Burke (1992) (Canada)</td>
<td>Examine the desirability of various career development opportunities in developing productive, satisfying careers.</td>
<td>-Questionnaire</td>
<td>Career development opportunities</td>
<td>-Organizational opportunities -Work structure</td>
<td>Found a variety of desired developmental opportunities across the sample, e.g., -women with families wanted flexible working hours -women who wanted flexible hours were less satisfied with their work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lepine (1992) (Canada)</td>
<td>Examine the career paths of women business undergraduates in Canada.</td>
<td>-Sample of 49 women who graduated with undergraduate degrees between 1974-1981 from 1 University</td>
<td>Career development Work-family issues</td>
<td>-Career paths -Relationship between professional goals, personal choices, organizational factors and career itineraries.</td>
<td>Determined 4 career patterns: 1) fast linear progression 2) slow linear progression 3) downward progression 4) static or transitory</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>Stroh, Brett &amp; Reilly (1992) (US)</td>
<td>Examine the career progression (defined as salary, number of promotions and number of geographic moves), of female and male managers who had geographically transferred for career advancement.</td>
<td>-Questionnaire -Sample of 1,028 (223 women, 795 men) in 20 Fortune 500 companies in 8 industry groups who had been transferred by their organizations in the prior 2 years for career advancement</td>
<td>Human capital theory Family power theory Self-selection Industry differences Discrimination</td>
<td>Dependent Variables: -salary progression -promotion -geographic mobility Independent Variables: -human capital (education, gaps in employment, number of organization changes) -family power theory (% of family income from employee) -self-selection for job transfers -industry differences</td>
<td>Female managers had “done all the right stuff” – geographically relocated for career advancement, were as well educated, had as much family power, were employed in high paying industries just as men were. However, they moved less frequently and their salaries had progressed less rapidly than mens’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burke, &amp; McKeen (1993) (Canada)</td>
<td>Investigate correlates and consequences for women on a career – family continuum.</td>
<td>-Questionnaire -Sample of 792 managerial and professional women in Canada -Part of a larger study involving women in different countries.</td>
<td>“Mommy-track” Managing work-life roles -Women’s advancement</td>
<td>career-primary and career-family concepts</td>
<td>Determined differences between career-family and career-primary women in terms of job satisfaction and salary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhaus &amp; Parasuraman (1993) (US)</td>
<td>Examine the impact of gender and race on supervisors’ job performance attributions of managers.</td>
<td>-Questionnaire to black and white managers (matched by personal and organizational demographics) and their supervisors in 3 organizations (communications, banking, electronics) -Sample of 748, 322 black (211 women, 124 men) 426 white (212 women, 193 men)</td>
<td>Performance attribution process Gender Race</td>
<td>-Antecedents: gender, race, work experience -Consequences of supervisors attributions on their managers’ career advancement prospects</td>
<td>Among the most successful performers, the job performance of men was more likely to be linked to ability than that of women’s. Black managers’ job performance was less likely to be linked to ability than white managers’ and black managers’ supervisors believed them to have somewhat less favorable career prospects than white managers’.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>Konek, &amp; Kitch, (1994) (US)</td>
<td>Project started from a desire to study women and alcoholism and grew into Wichita State Research Group on Women &amp; Work</td>
<td>-29 page questionnaire dealing with each researcher’s topic, mailed 1st in 1986 &amp; followed up in 1991 -Quantitative &amp; qualitative methods, formative &amp; summative strategies -Researchers looked for connections and correlations among the areas they were studying. -770 women recruited from meetings of professional groups. -In 1986, 494 of 770, in 1991, 238 of same women -Sample represents over 200 job titles</td>
<td>Chapters in this edited volume draw on a variety of theoretical frames relevant to women’s careers.</td>
<td>Career women and: -attitudes toward feminism -technology -supervision -discrimination -dual-career marriages -motherhood -leisure -alcoholism -power</td>
<td>-Factors that affected career success: personal motivation to succeed, hard work, actions/attitudes of one’s family, mentors &amp; role models, personal relationships. -Factors that will make the future better for women: They have worked hard to advance, their workforce participation will have proved their value as workers, more women will know how to succeed in the workplace, more women will have the power to ensure that things are better for other women, and laws will make employers less likely to discriminate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tharenou, Latimer &amp; Conroy (1994) (Australia)</td>
<td>Examine the determinants of managerial advancement for men and women.</td>
<td>-Questionnaire -Test models of situational and individual influences on managerial advancement -513 female, 501 male managers across 6 managerial levels, in public and private organizations -Tharenou’s, (1990) model of a “sequence of relationships” including societal and organizational factors, home roles and early socialization. -Fagenson’s (1990) theory of the interactive effects of socialized traits, structural limitations and institutional beliefs on women’s managerial advancement.</td>
<td>-Gender, age, education -Male hierarchy in organizations -Career encouragement -Training &amp; development -Home status -Work experience -Educational encouragement -Self-confidence</td>
<td>An overall model of managerial advancement, relevant to both men and women, can be described as a combination of development opportunities provided by organizations and individuals’ skills. Gender is relevant in terms of access to the development opportunities provided by organizations.</td>
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<tr>
<td>Melamed (1995) (UK)</td>
<td>Examine the moderating effects of gender on predictors of career success (defined as salary and managerial level).</td>
<td>-Questionnaire&lt;br&gt;-Convenience sample of 457 (233 women, 224 men) employees in various industries ranging in age from 18-64.</td>
<td>Five theoretical constructs:&lt;br&gt;1) career success&lt;br&gt;2) gender&lt;br&gt;3) human capital&lt;br&gt;4) career options&lt;br&gt;5) structural features</td>
<td>-Criterion: career success &lt;br&gt;-Predictors: human capital (job relevant &amp; job irrelevant attributes, personality) career options (career choices, career moves) structural features (macro-societal, intermediate organizational &amp; micro job features) -Moderator: gender</td>
<td>No definitive evidence suggested that career success is gender-specific. Predictors of career success for females were more complicated than those for men. Results showed that women needed some degree of job-relevant human capital and might need to delay family life and/or work in a less competitive organization to succeed. Women faced male-dominant environments, multiple responsibilities of home and work, and the necessity of choosing between them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenbrunsel, Brett, Maoz, Stroh &amp; Reilly (1995) (US)</td>
<td>Investigate work-family linkages of dual-employed couples.</td>
<td>-Questionnaire&lt;br&gt;-281 dual employed couples with males having dominant careers, from 20 Fortune 500 organizations who had been relocated in the late 80’s.</td>
<td>-Work-family&lt;br&gt;-Economic theory&lt;br&gt;-Socialization theory&lt;br&gt;-Ease of control (over family domain)</td>
<td>Theoretical model:&lt;br&gt;-work involvement&lt;br&gt;-family involvement&lt;br&gt;-marital satisfaction&lt;br&gt;-role conflict tension&lt;br&gt;-intrinsic satisfaction&lt;br&gt;-organizational loyalty&lt;br&gt;-intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>Men’s relationships between work and family were reciprocal reflecting a dynamic system while women’s relationships were unidirectional, reflective of a static system of fixed resources with the family taking precedence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosin &amp; Korabik (1995) (Canada)</td>
<td>Examine gender differences in managers’ experiences and their departure from organizations.</td>
<td>-Questionnaire&lt;br&gt;-303 female (average age 32) &amp; 238 (average age 40) male MBA graduates&lt;br&gt;-Men sampled from 1 University and women either from same University or an association of women MBAs</td>
<td>-Organizational turnover&lt;br&gt;-Intentions to leave</td>
<td>-Position characteristics&lt;br&gt;-Job demands&lt;br&gt;-Met expectations&lt;br&gt;-Job involvement&lt;br&gt;-Organizational commitment&lt;br&gt;-Job satisfaction&lt;br&gt;-Reasons for leaving&lt;br&gt;-Intention to leave&lt;br&gt;-Demographics</td>
<td>No gender differences were found in managers’ intentions to leave their organizations. Situation-centered factors such as organizational commitment and job satisfaction were strong predictors of intentions to leave. While turnover rates do not differ by gender, reasons for leaving might.</td>
</tr>
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</tbody>
</table>
| Schneer & Reitman (1995) (US)| Examine the development of female and male managerial career paths over time.    | -Questionnaire  
- Random sample of 676 MBA graduates from 1975-1980 (51% female, 49% male) from 2 Universities, currently in mid-career  
- Longitudinal study – data collected in 1987 and 1993. | Three theoretical frameworks for gender differences in income at mid-career:  
1) early socialization  
2) economic theory, particularly human capital  
3) discrimination | Independent Variable:  
gender  
Intervening Variables:  
-field  
-experience  
-company size  
gaps  
-work significance  
-family structure  
-importance of family  
Outcome Variables:  
-income  
-work hours  
-management level  
career satisfaction | Results showed that women and men in mid-career are not on similar paths. There is an income gap with women making 19% less income than men, a full time employment gap with 1/5 of women not employed in mid-career, and a gap in reaching higher management levels with 9% of women at the executive level vs. 25% of men. Women’s career satisfaction in early career was higher than men’s but equal by mid career suggesting a downward trend. |
| Granakos (1995) (US)         | Investigate the effects of sex-role identity on career decision-making self-efficacy. | -Questionnaire  
- 178 undergraduate psychology students (134 women, 44 men) from 1 University  
-Sex-role identity  
-Career decision-making  
-Self-efficacy | Independent variable:  
sex-role classification  
Dependent variables:  
Career decision-making (goal selection, information gathering, problem solving, planning, accurate self appraisal), Career exploration behaviors, Job outcome factors |                                                                                      | Sex-role identity was found to be an important element in individuals’ perceptions of their career decision-making self-efficacy as it related to problem solving, planning, self appraisal and career exploration. |
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-48 successful women managers or entrepreneurs in business and senior lawyers and accountants.  
-Sample established via women’s business networks in different regions of UK  
-Success was peer defined                                                                 | Stage theories: Levinson’s et al (1978)  
4 life eras:  
1) childhood  
2) early adulthood  
3) middle adulthood  
4) late adulthood.  
Super’s (1957) 4 stages of career development:  
1) exploration  
2) establishment  
3) maintenance  
4) decline                                                                 | Career issues across the lifespan:  
childhood personality work history non work – family issues                                                                 | -Analysis of career decision making combined with issues of integration of work and family life to produce an age-linked stage model of women’s career development.  
-Model bears strong resemblance to Levinson’s (1978) such as period of stability followed by period of questioning & change.  
Main difference is in timing of relationship/family events.  
-Majority of women displayed high career centrality by working full time & fitting in family responsibilities around career or forgoing children. |
| Richardson (1996) (UK) | Consider the career patterns of women & men professional accountants and their resultant salary levels. | -Questionnaire gathered data on career histories, then used to assess career patterns.  
-Random sample of 2% of female (156) & male (104) accountants from membership of 6 main UK accounting bodies.                                                                 | Looked at 4 career patterns from Lepine’s (1992) study of women managers:  
1) fast linear progression  
2) slow linear progression  
3) downward progression  
4) static or transitory                                                                 | -Career history, e.g. frequency and type of career moves or promotions, increments in salary and reasons for each move or promotion.  
-Number of years of post-qualifying experience.                                                                 | fast linear pattern:  
-highest salaries for both men and women  
-men had higher average salary than women  
slow linear pattern:  
-women more successful than men  
downward pattern:  
-only women had this pattern, many had work gaps followed by part time or lower level work  
static pattern:  
-for women, career gaps were advantageous                                                                 |
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stroh, Brett &amp; Reilly (1996) (US)</td>
<td>Examine differential turnover rates between female and male managers.</td>
<td>-Questionnaire&lt;br&gt; -Longitudinal (Time 1 – 1989, Time 2 - 1991)&lt;br&gt; -Sample of 615 female and male managers from 20 Fortune 500 companies</td>
<td>Employee turnover&lt;br&gt; Family structure/work-life balance&lt;br&gt; Glass ceiling effects</td>
<td>Dependent Variables:&lt;br&gt; -turnover&lt;br&gt; -intention to leave&lt;br&gt; Independent Variables:&lt;br&gt; -family structure&lt;br&gt; -glass ceiling&lt;br&gt; -traditional turnover predictors (extrinsic &amp; intrinsic satisfaction, organizational &amp; career loyalty, job involvement)</td>
<td>26% of female managers left their organizations in the 2 year period studied compared to 14% of male managers. Perceptions of lack of career opportunities was a major factor in women leaving, not family responsibilities, providing support for glass ceiling effects impacting women’s turnover rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burke &amp; McKeen (1996) (Canada)</td>
<td>Investigate work experience and satisfaction of women related to the gender proportions of their organizations.</td>
<td>-Questionnaire&lt;br&gt; -792 managerial and professional women graduates from a Canadian university</td>
<td>Proportional representation and tokenism (Kanter, 1977; Ely, 1991)</td>
<td>-Gender proportions of the participants’ organizations&lt;br&gt; -Demographic characteristics&lt;br&gt; -Organizational and personal characteristics</td>
<td>-Demographic characteristics impacted work outcomes of job satisfaction, involvement and future prospects.&lt;br&gt; -Situational and organizational characteristics significantly impacted work outcomes.&lt;br&gt; -Gender proportion impacted work outcomes of intentions to quit and job satisfactions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas (1997) (US)</td>
<td>Examine the relationship between career development and psychological separation from parents to ego identity development among young women and men.</td>
<td>-Various instrumentation&lt;br&gt; -247 undergraduates (48% female, 52% male) from 1 University, 53% non-white</td>
<td>-Self-efficacy&lt;br&gt; -Ego development&lt;br&gt; -Career development&lt;br&gt; -Individuation</td>
<td>-Ego identity status (Achieved/Moratorium)&lt;br&gt; -Career development (career decidedness, comfort level of decidedness, clarity of self, self-exploration, career self-efficacy)&lt;br&gt; -Psychological separation (functional, emotional &amp; attitudinal independence)</td>
<td>Women scored lower than men on functional and emotional independence, but not on attitudinal, and higher than men on Achieved identity status. Women’s commitments to their own perspectives were a function of career development progression and having similar values and beliefs to their parents.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>Schaefer, Epperson, Nauta (1997) (US)</td>
<td>Examine the factors related to persistence in engineering for women drawing on theories relevant to women’s career development.</td>
<td>-Questionnaire -278 engineering students, 135 women - 93 persisters (in engineering program), 42 non-persisters, 143 men - 105 persisters, 38 non-persisters</td>
<td>Ability -Self-efficacy -Expectancy-valence -Interest congruence -Barriers and support</td>
<td>-Ability -Math and science self-efficacy -Expectancy-valence -Support-barriers -Interest congruence</td>
<td>Gender was not a significant predictor of persistence in engineering, but ability, self-efficacy, support-barriers and interest congruence were.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCracken &amp; Weitzman (1997) (US)</td>
<td>Investigate the influence of personal variables on women’s attitudes toward multiple role planning.</td>
<td>-Questionnaire and various instrumentation -131 college women at 1 University, 61% white, 28% African-Americans, average age of 23</td>
<td>Multiple role realism -Career maturity</td>
<td>-Personal agency -Problem-solving appraisal -Traditionality of career choice -Planning for multiple roles</td>
<td>For women, lack of knowledge, uncertainty about multiple role planning and the absence of needing to plan immediately is prevalent. Problem-solving appraisal factors are positively related to realism regarding multiple role planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainey &amp; Borders (1997) (US)</td>
<td>Expand O’Brien &amp; Fassinger’s (1993) model of career orientation and choice of adolescent women</td>
<td>-Questionnaire and various instrumentation -276 seventh and eighth grade students from a rural school system and their mothers -Female only sample</td>
<td>Career orientation -Career aspiration</td>
<td>-Relationship to mothers -Maternal characteristics -Gender role attitudes -School performance -Career orientation and aspiration</td>
<td>Found evidence to support the contention that the mother-daughter relationship influences the career development of adolescent girls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurley &amp; Sonnenfeld (1997) (US)</td>
<td>First study to test the relevance of the Tournament Model (Rosenbaum, 1989) to women.</td>
<td>Looked at signals of who wins the career tournament. Hypothesized that career attainment would be related positively to early promotion &amp; that entering position would affect attainment; career attainment would be related positively to the dominant race in the organization, years of education &amp; tenure. Sample: 3,805 women managers, 20% racial minorities in 1 large international service firm.</td>
<td>Tournament model (Rosenbaum, 1989) of careers which integrates elements of structural and individual models. Wins and losses signaled by age and career velocity; winners receive most of a firm’s human resources and contend for the highest positions. Historical, path – dependent model</td>
<td>Dependent variable: career attainment level Independent variables: early promotions career velocity entering position entered part time race education tenure in firm</td>
<td>-Tenure, entering age, velocity and education were related positively to career attainment; Entering part time and being a minority were related negatively. -Use of variables related to career experiences for men does not explain a major proportion of the variance for women. -Women entering organizations might be slotted into certain career paths based on other factors regardless of tournament rounds they win.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>Lyness &amp; Thompson (1997)</td>
<td>Compare the career and work experiences of female and male executives.</td>
<td>-Archival data on 51 women, 56 men, questionnaire responses from 38 women and 34 men, and interviews with 5 women and 5 men. -Participants identified via a succession planning review in 1 multinational financial services organization.</td>
<td>Gender differences in organizational outcomes predicted by sex stereotypes, organizational barriers and family relationships</td>
<td>Outcomes: -organizational stature -compensation -developmental opportunities Career Histories: -interruptions -mobility Work Experiences &amp; Attitudes: -obstacles -lack of culture fit -work attitudes -work-family conflict</td>
<td>Gender similarities: - salary and bonuses were equal, but men received more stock options -no significant differences in work conflict due to family obligations Gender differences: -women’s positions had less authority -women’s career histories reflected more interruptions and less mobility than men’s -women reported significantly less satisfaction with future career opportunities Authors suggest the presence of a second, higher glass ceiling affecting these female executives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole &amp; Langan-Fox (1997)</td>
<td>Understand the impact of social and contextual influences on women’s orientations, successes and achievements.</td>
<td>-Quantitative and qualitative. -Large-scale, longitudinal study that looked at the careers of Australian men and women in 1973, 1976 and 1982. -Qualitative interviews with small percentage of the sample. -Sample of 1,489 women between the ages of 17 and 27.</td>
<td>In order to understand women’s career perspectives and successes, they looked at individual lives over time (‘the life course’) and the individual social contexts in which those lives were lived (‘time lines’).</td>
<td>-Concepts not previously identified in existing theories: disconnection, transitions, constraint, conflict and compromise. -Importance of building the notion of context into career theory at the micro and macro levels.</td>
<td>Proposed two frameworks to explain career development: 1. a contextualist framework 2. the notion of “lifecareer” in which there are multiple options and various pathways deemed legitimate over the life course.</td>
</tr>
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</table>
| Smart (1998)       | Test Super’s (1957) career stage theory and examine relationship between career stage and attitudes toward work. | - Questionnaire  
-414 out of 1000 women from a professional organization for dieticians.  
-Age 21-63, mean 33.  
-N for stage 4 only 3 so didn’t test that stage. | Super’s (1957) career stage theory used focus of concern with age to categorize 4 career stages:  
1) exploration  
2) establishment  
3) maintenance  
4) disengagement | Dependent variables:  
- work satisfaction  
- pay satisfaction  
- promotion satisfaction  
- supervisor satisfaction  
- coworker satisfaction  
- job involvement  
- career involvement  
- professional commitment  
- organizational commitment  
- intention to leave  
- willingness to relocate  
Independent variables:  
- concern with career  
- age  
- demographics | - Suggests Super’s career stage model is a useful framework for understanding women’s careers.  
- Exploration stage: uncertainty and instability with fit between self and work as main concern. Pay satisfaction / involvement with job lowest, intentions to leave highest.  
- Establishment stage: develop a stable work and personal life. Pay satisfaction and willingness to relocate for promotion different from stage 1.  
- Maintenance stage: hold onto accomplishments, maintain self concept. Career involvement, professional commitment high. |
| Kirchmeyer (1998) (US) | Examine the determinants of career success for female and male mid-level managers. | - Questionnaires to random sample of MBA graduates from one University in the 1980s.  
-139 women, 153 men with a mean age of 38 and work experience of 15 years. | Determinants of career success expected to show differential effects by gender based on prior studies.  
1) human capital  
2) masculinity vs. femininity  
3) interpersonal relationships  
4) family status | - Gender differences: Women had more career interruptions, higher femininity scores, fewer children, were less likely to be married, to have a non-employed spouse, earned less money.  
Gender similarities: Women and men had the same experience, tenure, education, masculinity scores, level, experienced supportive relationships and perceived same career success. |                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
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<tr>
<td>Burke, Divinagracia, &amp; Mamo (1998) (Philippines)</td>
<td>Examine the use of Gould &amp; Penley’s (1984) 7 career strategies of self management. Extended Canadian study by Burke &amp; McKeen (1993) to another culture.</td>
<td>-Questionnaire measuring frequency of engaging career strategies and participation in developmental activities during the prior year. -Women obtained from firms in cosmetics/fashion industry &amp; financial institutions. -Sample of 200 women in Manila - 100 cosmetics, 100 financial services, 77% under 40, 70% married, 74% with children, 70% college educated.</td>
<td>7 career strategies &amp; relationship between career progression and use of these strategies Gould &amp; Penley (1984)</td>
<td>-Career strategies: creating opportunities, extending work involvement, self-nomination &amp; self-presentation, seeking career guidance, networking, opinion conformity, ingratiation with supervisors. -Developmental activities: e.g., career development program, training, coaching, etc.</td>
<td>-Women using greater number of strategies worked more extra hours per week, participated in greater number of developmental activities and rated the usefulness of those activities higher. -Use of strategies was significantly correlated with greater satisfaction with careers to date and more optimistic future prospects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ragins, Townsend, &amp; Mattis, (1998) (US)</td>
<td>Examine the overt and subtle barriers to women’s advancement and strategies used to overcome barriers. Intended to seek out both women’s and CEOs’ perspectives.</td>
<td>Large scale national survey. -presented women with 13 strategies and asked to rank; presented women and CEOs with 10 barriers and asked to select top 3 that prevent women from advancing -in depth follow up phone interviews with 20 women and 20 CEOs -thematic and componential analyses -population was Fortune 1000 CEOs and highest ranking women (1251) in their companies -461 (37%) women and 325 (33%) CEOs responded</td>
<td>Women’s advancement theories</td>
<td>Career advancement strategies: -performance -professional style -stretch assignments -mentoring -corporate culture</td>
<td>-Women &amp; CEOs had vastly different perceptions of barriers facing women. 4 strategies were key to women’s success: 1) consistently exceed performance expectations 2) develop style with which male managers are comfortable 3) seek out difficult/challenging assignments 4) have influential mentors -CEOs thought women didn’t advance due to lack of general management/line experience and short tenure in the pipeline. -Women thought they didn’t advance because of male stereotyping, exclusion from formal networks and inhospitable corporate cultures.</td>
</tr>
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</table>
| Lyness & Judiesch (1999) (US) | Investigate gender differences in hiring vs. promoting managers | -Analysis of archival information relative to human capital and organizational promotions  
-30,996 financial services managers from 1 firm, 13,503 women, 17,493 men | -Structural theory  
-Lack of fit  
-Sex stereotype theory | -Human capital variables: age, tenure in company, education  
-Internal promotions  
-New additions - levels  
-Hierarchical levels  
-Job families  
-Gender | Overall, women received more promotions than men, but gender did not appear to account for the difference. Women in higher levels received fewer promotions than men. Relative to men, women were more likely to be promoted than hired. |
-Sample of 11,762 managers (523 leave takers of which 476 were female, 47 male) | Human capital  
Gendered culture | -Gender  
-Leaves of absence  
-Hierarchical level  
-Promotions  
-Percent salary increase  
-Performance rating | Managers taking multiple leaves of absence received less rewards than managers taking only 1 leave, and managers taking no leaves received greater rewards than those who took 1 or more. No gender differences in penalties were found but 89% of leave takers were women. |
| Pulkkinen, Ohranen & Tolvanen (1999) (Finland) | From a developmental point of view, address the question of how career orientation is related to prospectively measured personality characteristics. | Longitudinal - data collected at ages 8, 14, 27, and 36  
- at 8 & 14: teacher ratings of variables for social behavior  
-at 27: personality questionnaire  
-at 36: 217-item Life Situation questionnaire and interview to determine career orientation  
Sample: 151 women, 160 men randomly selected from 12 school classes in a Finnish town. | -Model of emotional and behavioral regulation | Personality characteristics and career orientation (occupational status, education, present work situation, career stability).  
-Personality characteristics of high self control explain high career orientation and low self control explain low career orientation for both women and men.  
-Social activity was related to women’s, not men’s career orientations, and passivity was a risk factor for women’s, not for men’s career orientations.  
-Both stable & unstable careers more strongly related to personality characteristics in women than men. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Central Question</th>
<th>Methodology/Sample</th>
<th>Theoretical Framework</th>
<th>Variables / Relationships</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Beauvais &amp; Lyness (1999) (US)</td>
<td>Develop a measure of work-family culture and investigate its link to organizational attachment, work-family conflict and use of organizational work-family benefits.</td>
<td>-Questionnaire</td>
<td>Work-family culture, conflict, organizational policies</td>
<td>-Work-family culture usage</td>
<td>Employees in a supportive work-family culture tended toward more use of work-family benefits, more commitment to an organization and less work-family conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyness &amp; Thompson (2000) (US)</td>
<td>Compare the careers of female and male executives by examining barriers and facilitators to career advancement, and executives’ developmental experiences and career histories.</td>
<td>-Questionnaire asked participants to rank barriers and facilitators, and report their developmental experiences. -Career histories were computed from organizational records. -Matched sample of 69 women and 69 men in 1 multinational financial services firm.</td>
<td>Tokenism theory (Kanter, 1977) to derive barriers to career success</td>
<td>-Perceived barriers</td>
<td>Women faced greater barriers and employed different career advancement strategies than men. Gender differences were consistent with tokenism, e.g., women reported lack of culture fit, exclusion from networks and difficulty getting developmental assignments. Women executives reported that developing relationships and having a good track record were facilitators of their advancement to a greater degree than male executives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyness &amp; Judiesch (2001) (US)</td>
<td>Examine the relationship of gender, promotions and leaves of absence (LOAs) to voluntary turnover.</td>
<td>-Event history analysis from archival databases -26,359 managers (11,076 women, 15,283 men) in 1 financial services organization</td>
<td>-Statistical discrimination theory -Voluntary turnover</td>
<td>-Voluntary turnover -Age, education, salary, level -Marital status, % of women in job families</td>
<td>No evidence of a gender gap in turnover rates was found. Women’s voluntary turnover rates were slightly lower than men’s, women who had been recently promoted were less likely to resign than recently promoted men, although most of the managers who took LOAs were women, most of them did not resign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Central Question</td>
<td>Methodology/Sample</td>
<td>Theoretical Framework</td>
<td>Variables / Relationships</td>
<td>Conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tharenou (2001)</td>
<td>Investigate whether traits and interpersonal support predict advancement through</td>
<td>-Questionnaire</td>
<td>Two advancement-related traits: (the extent to which an employee wants to advance</td>
<td>-Managerial level</td>
<td>Traits such as aspirations and masculinity and interpersonal support in interaction with gender predict advancement in a managerial hierarchy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>managerial hierarchies and whether the relationship between interpersonal support</td>
<td>-Longitudinal – 3 time periods, time 1 n = 5,627 (2,614 women, 3,013 men), time 2</td>
<td>and advancement differs by gender.</td>
<td>-Traits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and advancement differs by gender.</td>
<td>n = 3,434 (1,593 women, 1,841 men), time 3 n = 2,830 (1,399 women, 1,421 men).</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Mentor career support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Lower and mid-level employees in public and private sector</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Career encouragement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Male hierarchy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Human capital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Promotion opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Gender, private/public, organization size, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schneer &amp; Reitman (2002)</td>
<td>Examine the impact of family structures on managerial career success.</td>
<td>-Questionnaire to 2 data sets:</td>
<td>-Family structure and career success</td>
<td></td>
<td>Married with children and an employed spouse was the dominant family structure. Men who were married, with children and a non-working spouse had the most career success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1) Longitudinal, 3 waves:</td>
<td>-Human capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1987 - 925 participants, 1993 - 676 participants, 2000 - 514 participants, MBA</td>
<td>-Societal stereotypes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>alumni from 2 Universities, in early, mid &amp; late career, average age 51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) 494 MBA alumni from 1990s in early career, average age 38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent variable:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-family structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dependent variables:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-4 measures of career success (income, level, satisfaction, salary progression)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Control variables:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Age &amp; gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirchmeyer (2002)</td>
<td>Compare the career progression of female and male managers during the 1990s to see</td>
<td>-Longitudinal study of male and female mid-career managers during the 1990s.</td>
<td>Determinants of career success expected to show differential effects by gender based on</td>
<td>Outcomes: income change, promotion rate, perceived success at Time 1 and Time 2 and</td>
<td>Found favorable and unfavorable aspects of women’s career progression. Women do currently and will continue to earn less than men, but as a result of greater progress made by men prior to 1995 as well as differential effects of organizational tenure, mentoring and individual traits. Found no evidence to support continuing subtle forms of workplace discrimination by the late 1990s. Family determinants continue to pose obstacles for women’s progression in the workplace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>if discriminatory employment practices were still keeping women from realizing</td>
<td>-Questionnaires mailed in 1995 and 1999 to 1980s MBA graduates from 1 University.</td>
<td>show differential effects by gender based on prior studies.</td>
<td>future progression at Time 2. Variables: Human capital – tenure, career interruptions,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>career gains.</td>
<td>-139 women, 153 men in 1995, 96 women, 111 men in 1999.</td>
<td></td>
<td>professional degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual: masculinity, ambition, motivation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal Relational demography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Central Question</th>
<th>Methodology/Sample</th>
<th>Theoretical Framework</th>
<th>Variables / Relationships</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giscombe &amp; Mattis (2002) (US)</td>
<td>Examine the career experiences of African-American, Hispanic &amp; Asian-American women in management.</td>
<td>Multi-method study: -national census data -focus groups (57) &amp; in depth interviews (42) -questionnaire (1,735) -diversity policy analysis of 15 Fortune 500 companies</td>
<td>-Diversity -Stereotyping -Managerial advancement</td>
<td>-Factors for career advancement -Barriers -Perceptions of work environment -Organizational policies</td>
<td>Women of color faced a double bind of working in organizations that held negative stereotypes regarding their ethnicity/gender. Also, there was great disparity between espoused diversity policies and their impact, and training efforts fell short in helping to manage diversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hewlett (2002a) (see also 2002b) (US)</td>
<td>Examine the professional and personal lives of highly educated executive women.</td>
<td>National survey of top 10% of women in terms of earning power with small sample of men for comparison -1,168 high achieving career women, 479 high achieving non-career women, 472 high achieving men -two age groups, 28-40 &amp; 41-55</td>
<td>-Work-life balance -Family responsibilities -Economic theory</td>
<td>Marital status Parental status Work hours Income level</td>
<td>These women postponed choices to have families in order to pursue their careers resulting in women past childbearing age regretting those choices and younger women believing (wrongly) they can continue to postpone family choices until their careers are well established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruderman, Ohlott, Panzer &amp; King (2002) (US)</td>
<td>Examine the relationships between multiple life roles, psychological well-being and managerial skills in women managers and executives.</td>
<td>-2 studies -Study 1 – qualitative, grounded theory, phone interviews, questionnaires &amp; assessment ratings -61 women in a leadership development program, average age 40, 92% White -Study 2 – quantitative, questionnaires, bios, additional assessment ratings -276 women in same program, average age 40, 85% White</td>
<td>-Role accumulation theory -Psychological well-being</td>
<td>Study 1: -roles -challenges -transfer of skills from personal life to worklife Study 2: -Independent variable: Multiple life role commitment -Dependent variables: Psychological well-being &amp; Managerial skills -Control variables: Age, Education, Commitment to work roles</td>
<td>Study 1: women believed skills learned in non-work roles made them more effective managers. Six areas in which professional skills benefit from a transfer from personal roles: 1) interpersonal skills 2) psychological benefits 3) emotional support/advice 4) multi-tasking 5) interests/ background 6) leadership Study 2: peers, managers and subordinates saw women who managed multiple life roles as highly effective inter-personally and managerially.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Empirical Research (1990-2002) Stream 2 – Inductive Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Central Question</th>
<th>Methodology/Sample</th>
<th>Theoretical Framework</th>
<th>Variables / Relationships</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainiero, Williamson &amp; Robinson (1994) (US)</td>
<td>Investigate critical events in executive women’s early career stages that lead to them being on the career “fast-track.”</td>
<td>Interviews with 55 high profile executive women</td>
<td>Career advancement</td>
<td>Career processes and Career paths</td>
<td>5 hurdles encountered and overcome early in careers contributed to success: 1) assignment to highly visible project 2) demonstrating critical skills 3) top level support 4) entrepreneurial behavior 5) identifying company values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richie, Fassinger, Linn, Johnson, Prosser &amp; Robinson (1997) (US)</td>
<td>Explore critical influences on the career development of high-achieving African-American and White professional women.</td>
<td>-Semi-structured, in depth interviews of 18 prominent, highly successful women (9 African-American, 9 white), average age of 51, from a variety of industries -Use of grounded theory to generate theory based on participants’ experiences</td>
<td>-The combined effects of racism and sexism on career development. -The experiences of women of color.</td>
<td>-Background influences -Stress, coping, resiliency -Self-efficacy -Community &amp; social support -External challenges and obstacles -Individual personality and temperament</td>
<td>Created an emergent theoretical model for understanding the career development of these women. The model consists of a core story (self-beliefs) embedded in 3 concentric layers - the current context, personal background, and sociocultural conditions that impact the core.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still &amp; Timms (1998) (Australia)</td>
<td>Investigate career and life decisions of women in their 50’s.</td>
<td>-First sent questionnaire which asked about background and work experience as way to ensure women met criteria of age, work longevity and relatively uninterrupted career patterns. -33 managerial or professional women from Western Australia with 75% from public sector. -Aged 50-59 -Either individually interviewed or participated in a focus group</td>
<td>2 theoretical perspectives: 1) the meaning of work in older women’s lives &amp; 2) career development theory</td>
<td>Career Family Life patterns Health Goals Aging Retirement plans</td>
<td>-Work was central to these women. -None had adhered to concrete career plans because they were continually negotiating links between the personal &amp; the professional. -5 areas of barriers still impact their careers: 1) male culture &amp; gender discrimination, 2) nature of past &amp; present working lives, 3) ageism, 4) continuing care-taker role, 5) balancing personal and professional relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Central Question</td>
<td>Methodology/Sample</td>
<td>Theoretical Framework</td>
<td>Variables / Relationships</td>
<td>Conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon &amp; Whelan (1998) (US)</td>
<td>Understand the distinct needs of midlife women as opposed to early career women and midlife men in order to create organizational and societal support for effective midlife for women. Offer suggestions for organizations to improve environments for midlife professional women.</td>
<td>Qualitative study in which women were asked to describe their experiences at midlife in their own way, with little intervention from interviewers. -36 “highly successful” women aged 35-50. -criteria: always worked, were married, and had children. -convenience, snowball sample. -different industries, public &amp; private sectors.</td>
<td>Careers of professional midlife women</td>
<td>-Midlife experiences -Relationships -Challenges -Disappointments -Dilemmas -Career/family barriers</td>
<td>Needs of midlife women: -renewed work-family balance -more personal time -continued achievement, accomplishment, value to organizations -prepare for challenges of next decade Coping strategies of midlife women: -setting limits -accept that it is OK to take time for self -develop individual definitions of success -focus on core activities -make tradeoffs -purchase services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies-Netzley (1998) (US)</td>
<td>Explore the perceptions of corporate mobility and strategies for success of female and male CEOs and Presidents.</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews with 16 “corporate elites” from 1 region of the US. - 9 women, 7 men, all white - median age 51 -snowball sample</td>
<td>Glass ceiling Corporate mobility and success</td>
<td>-Social origins -Education -Career Path -Business/Social affiliations -Social networks -Facilitating factors to success</td>
<td>Women believed social networks and peer similarities were essential to get to the top and individual qualities were but one criterion for success. Women’s strategies for success were further education, developing similarities with men, establishing networks with women and reconciling home &amp; work demands. Men believed success was primarily due to hard work and competition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Central Question</td>
<td>Methodology/Sample</td>
<td>Theoretical Framework</td>
<td>Variables / Relationships</td>
<td>Conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sturges (1999) (UK)       | Examine female and male managers’ definitions of career success.                 | -Exploratory study, intended to generate theory.                                  | -Theoretical gap in the literature which defines career success by mostly external,    | Sought participants’ perceptions of career success | Identified 4 orientational categories: 1) Climbers (7 men, 0 women) 2) Experts (7 women, 2 men) 3) Influencers (6 men, 5 women) 4) Self-Realizers (6 women, 1 man)  
Women more likely than men to define career success from an internal perspective. Results suggested that as managers age, material criteria for success was replaced with more of an emphasis on influence and autonomy, especially for men. |
| Blair-Loy (1999) (US)     | Examine the intact careers of female finance executives in the context of legal and social changes introduced to the work place in the early 1970s. | -Life history questionnaire from early 20s to present detailing work, family and education.  
-In depth interviews  
-56 women aged 36-60, in high-ranking finance-related jobs from a variety of industries  
-Data analyzed via optimal matching and qualitative analysis | -Sociological research on careers  
-Structuralist approach  
-Historical context and historical analysis | -Career  
-Family  
-Triumphs  
-Regrets | Found 4 career patterns: 1) Corporate climbers 2) Big fish in small & medium sized organizations 3) Movers & shakers 4) Entrepreneurs  
These 4 were shaped by internal labor markets, geographic mobility, prior work histories and turbulence.  
1970s changes in women’s employment rights increased these women’s advancement. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Central Question</th>
<th>Methodology/Sample</th>
<th>Theoretical Framework</th>
<th>Variables / Relationships</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vinnicombe, Singh &amp; Sturgess (2000) (UK)</td>
<td>Examine in depth corporate directors in order to understand explanations for achievements and to see if there were gender differences.</td>
<td>-Individual semi-structured interviews with 6 women and 6 men (because only 6 women at director level) -1 company (telecom) -Participants aged 40-50</td>
<td>Referenced 4 studies of women’s careers: Astin (1984) Larwood &amp; Gutek (1987) Mainiero (1994) Ragins, Townsend, Mattis (1998)</td>
<td>Sought participants’ views of the key facilitators of their success.</td>
<td>3 key factors influenced career development: 1) finding a mentor 2) taking on challenge 3) becoming visible All inter-linked, cyclical &amp; equally important to women and men, but operated differently for each. Overall similarity in men’s and women’s experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell &amp; Nkomo (2001) (US)</td>
<td>Explore how women’s identities informed their life course, and their ability to pursue non-traditional career paths.</td>
<td>-Sample of 120 black (80) and white (40) female managers and executives, majority aged 45-55, in private sector corporations. -In-depth life history interviews focused on early childhood through college and career and personal lives since college. -Supplemented by in-depth survey of additional 825 black and white women managers.</td>
<td>A conceptual framework of core elements of identity: gender, race and class, embedded in the larger context of culture and history.</td>
<td>-Early life stories -Effects of race, gender and class on: development over the life course, work experiences, upward mobility, career satisfaction -Role conflicts -Work, family, community roles and interrelationships</td>
<td>-Reports detailed life stories of specific women whose lives are representative of other women in the sample. -Determined 6 “flashpoints” in these women’s careers: 1) breaking into management 2) adjusting to corporate life 3) encountering barriers 4) overcoming barriers 5) making changes at work 6) facing personal choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gersick &amp; Kram (2002) (US)</td>
<td>Clarify central developmental tasks women face as they move into leadership roles and understand the interplay of women’s personal and professional lives over time.</td>
<td>Qualitative, in depth interviews then 4 question survey on 30 women invited to a follow up conference to react to preliminary data -10 “high achieving” women -1 company (banking) in NYC -stratified, aged 45-55, women of color, with &amp; without children from top 200 women executives in the organization</td>
<td>Uses Levinson’s et al (1978) adult development model as a framework, particularly life structure development, e.g., what a person’s life is like</td>
<td>-Life stories reflecting on decisions, events and relationships that shaped women’s life course. -Addressed past, present and hopes and concerns for future.</td>
<td>3 key developmental tasks: 1) finding life role (20s) 2) managing career-family trade offs (30s) 3) coming into one’s own (50s+) “findings broadly support Levinson’s model of development”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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