Breaking the Glass Ceiling in Politics and Business

Report on Salzburg Global Seminar Session 447

November 3 – 8, 2007
Salzburg, Austria

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ᘓ

SALZBURG GLOBAL SEMINAR

"CHALLENGING PRESENT AND FUTURE LEADERS TO SOLVE ISSUES OF GLOBAL CONCERN"
The Salzburg Global Seminar is a unique international institution focused on global change – a place dedicated to candid dialogue, fresh thinking and the search for innovative but practical solutions. Founded in 1947, it challenges current and future leaders to develop creative ideas for solving global problems, and has brought more than 25,000 participants from 150 countries and regions to take part in its programmes. The Salzburg Global Seminar convenes imaginative thinkers from different cultures and institutions, organizes problem-focused initiatives, supports leadership development, and engages opinion-makers through active communication networks, all in partnership with leading institutions from around the world and across different sectors of society.

AUTHOR

Shauna L. Shames is a Ph.D. Candidate in American Government at Harvard University. Her primary areas of academic interest are women, gender, feminism, and politics, and she has published articles, book chapters, and reports on women as candidates, women and leadership, feminism in the US, public opinion on same sex marriage, reproductive rights, and gender consciousness. She has served as Assistant to the President of NOW, Research Director for The White House Project, and Coordinator of the Haven Coalition, a group dedicated to ensuring reproductive health and safety for low-income women. She graduated with high honors from Harvard College, where her senior thesis on female political candidates won the prestigious Hoopes Prize in Social Science, and she has lectured widely on women, gender, politics, and policy. Ms. Shames is an alumna of the Salzburg Global Seminar, and attended both of the programs that led to the creation of this work.

I NTRODUCTION

Women's Leadership in a Changing World

Between November 3 and 8 of 2007, the Salzburg Global Seminar convened an extraordinary gathering of over 35 delegates from 19 countries, entitled "Breaking the Glass Ceiling in Politics and Business." Participants came to this seminar from a vast array of cultural contexts, but with a shared set of concerns and convictions. All worried about the situation of women in their countries, and believed that an increased proportion of female leaders would help make things better not just for women, but also for girls, boys, men, families, communities, governments, and businesses. The conference consisted of presentations, discussions, small-group workshops, and working groups, where delegates shared experiences and sought to develop new ideas, connections, and solutions. This report is based on the lectures, debates, and analysis from this session.

Fellows from countries across the world recounted their fears about gender-related trends they are witnessing: rising fundamentalism, polygamy, the spread of HIV/AIDS, girls forced into early marriages, high rates of domestic violence and rape, girls receiving less and lower-quality education than boys, the persistence of a gender gap in pay despite women's rising education levels, women continuing to drop out of the labor force after having children, low rates of women leaders in politics and business, gender stereotypes that limit individual women's and girls' opportunities, and intersectional discrimination that doubly disadvantages women of color, indigenous women, women of non-dominant religions, and poor women. Although the inequalities clearly ran deeper in some countries than others, no delegate felt that, in her country, women had achieved equality with men.[1] Through many discussions, participants came to agree that change is happening, but not fast enough, and not always in the direction of greater equality.

The title of the session naturally begs a question: is there still a glass ceiling? Does it cross cultures and continents? Despite vast diversity among the conference delegates in race, ethnicity, religion, country, profession, age, and income, we compared experiences and found agreement on these basic questions: there is, and it does. Metaphors for the problems abound; delegates spoke of labyrinths of leadership, glass ceilings, glass doors, sticky floors, clogged pipelines, maternal walls, and more. Something, all agreed, is holding women back.

The numbers illustrate this point. In developing targets, the United Nations has set 30-35 percent women as the "critical mass" necessary to ensure that women did not function as a minority.[2] The averages in almost every country are well below this figure. Across all countries, women constitute only 17% of parliamentarians.[3] Such a figure, however, masks large regional and national differences. Nordic countries lead the rest of the world, with an average of over 40% women in their national legislatures. This is more than double the proportion of women in the next-highest region, countries in the Americas, which have on average 20% women. Europe and Sub-Saharan African nations follow more closely, with 18% and 17%, respectively (excluding the Nordic states from the European nations' calculation). Asian and Pacific nations follow, with 16% and 15%, respectively.

---

[1] Indeed, as of 2007, the World Economic Forum confirms that no country has achieved gender quality, according to its gender equality index: for full details and country rankings, see http://www.weforum.org/en/initiatives/gcp/Gender%20Gap/index.htm.
[2] See, *Women in Politics and Decision-making in the Late 20th Century: A U.N. Study*, Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1992, p. 107.
[3] Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU), www.ipu.org.

Arab states have the lowest proportion of women of all nations, with an average of only 9% across countries. The numbers are even lower for women in business leadership: across Europe, women make up on average only 9% of all corporate board positions. In the U.S., women constitute 15% of board members of Fortune 500 companies. Norway currently leads the rest of the world in promoting women to business leadership, due largely to a recent quota law requiring 40% of corporate board seats to be filled by women.

Clearly, the glass ceiling has not been sufficiently shattered in either field. In most countries, women leaders are still by and large exceptions to the rule of male leadership. Laura Liswood, Secretary General of the Council of Women World Leaders and Faculty Chair of the Salzburg gathering, spoke of the work of the seminar as "hurrying history." Without great dedication and work, she explained, it may take another century or more to reach a world of equality. Liswood urged immediate and collective action: "Remember," she said, "women are like snowflakes. One alone may melt, but together we can stop traffic!"

<div align="center">ᘓ</div>

Women's Leadership: For What?

Why focus on women's leadership? Why now? Many seminar participants reported encountering opposition or ridicule when they tried to bring gender into their national political and business conversations. In many countries there is a sentiment that feminism is no longer needed, despite the fact that in no country are women fully equal to men. In other nations, those pushing for more women's leadership have been told that what their country most needs is economic development and stable democracy – as if women and their leadership were not integral to both concerns. And women in all countries sometimes hesitate to speak out about women's issues and leadership, fearing that it will be perceived as either selfish or "whining."

Yet the participants of the session were adamant that studying, theorizing, strategizing, and working for women's leadership are all essential tasks. The changes sought are not only for the benefit of women, but also for men, children, families, and communities. Session lectures and debates revealed the benefits of women's leadership. In politics, the presence of a critical mass of women is a catalyst for a dynamic shift in the types of issues that are addressed by a legislature. Having one or two "token" women is not enough; Linda Tarr-Whelan, former U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., spoke of her vision for "shared leadership," which she said would mean "at least 30% women sitting around those tables with the men." When you have a critical mass of women, she said, "the agenda chances in politics and business." The data are clear on this point: the presence of a critical mass of women in elected bodies fundamentally changes "politics as usual." Studies shows that women's participation positively impacts both policy, in that elected women tend to prioritize different issues, often those relating to children, families, and ending violence against women.[4] Additionally, research sponsored by the World Bank has found lower levels of corruption for countries with high percentages of women in parliament.[5]

---

[4] See, e.g., Center for American Women in Politics studies, available at:
http://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/Research/publist.html#impact; Sue Thomas, How Women Legislate (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994); and Joni Lovenduski, Feminizing Politics: Themes for the 21st Century (Polity Press, 2005).
[5] Dollar, David; Fisman, Raymond; and Gatti, Roberta: 1999. "Are Women Really the 'Fairer' Sex?; Corruption and Women in Government," World Bank, Policy Research Report on Gender & Development, Working Paper Series, No. 4, available at:
http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTGENDER/Resources/wp4.pdf.

Hanna Tetteh, formerly an MP in Ghana, spoke of a personal experience when she took up a different issue to represent women's particular concerns; women who sold goods in the markets approached her and told her they were often robbed at the end of market days, and they needed better security in and around the markets. Tetteh thought perhaps these women would not have even approached a male MP with this problem. Tetteh explained: "When I was in Parliament, I would have meetings in different areas, and the men would take their stools and gather around me. Farther off, I would see the women, with their children, and even if I asked them to bring me questions, they couldn't. It would only be later, getting into my car, that they would start to gather around and say when we go to sell our food at the market, they take our money, there is no security, can't you do something about that?" And so she did.

Experiences like Tetteh's are at the basis of scholarly research showing important differences between women and men serving in legislative bodies. As political scientist Karen O'Connor has written, "Three decades of rigorous scholarly inquiry leave no doubt that women in politics in general and women in elective office, in particular, make a difference in the lives of all women. They help enact better policy for women, as well as affect the legislative bodies in which they serve."[6] Melanne Verveer, Co-Founder and Chair of the Board of Vital Voices Global Partnership, explained, "It's not just the right thing to do, it's the smart thing to do. Growing evidence shows that investing in women is fundamental for sustainable development, alleviating poverty and a country's general prosperity. Women's voices are vital to the world we want to see."[7]

In terms of the impact of such differences on the financial success of businesses, Catalyst's study *The Bottom Line: Connecting Corporate Performance and Gender Diversity* demonstrated that U.S. Fortune 500 companies with high percentages of women officers experienced, on average, 35.1% higher return on equity and 34% higher total return to shareholders than did those with low percentages of women corporate officers.[8] While this study did not prove causation, it showed a strong correlation between companies that have diversified their senior management and strong financial benefits. Donna Klein, president and founder of Corporate Voices for Working Families (a U.S.-based NGO), spoke in the Seminar of research by her organization showing the many benefits for companies of utilizing workplace flexibility as a business tool. "Individual negotiations between employers and employees about when and where work gets done can vastly improve productivity," she explained.[9]

The change women bring is not limited to outcomes; women's differences from men also affect the ways in which work gets done, in both business and politics. Chris Grumm, President and CEO of the international Women's Funding Network, characterized the difference by invoking an image of a round rather than a square table. She noted, "It will take some sawing to be a round table, some redesigning – and a rebirthing of the long narrow table can be painful for the people already at the

---

[6] Karen O'Connor, "Do Women in Local, State, and National Legislative Bodies Matter? A Definitive 'Yes' Proves Three Decades of Research By Political Scientists," Why Women Matter: Briefing Book, 2003 Conference. Available from the White House Project, at http://www.thewhitehouseproject.org/culture/researchandpolls/documents/Briefing_book.pdf.

[7] Melanne Verveer, quoted in Salzburg Seminar, "Women, Political Power and Next Generation Leadership," Report on Salzburg Seminar Session 433 (Salzburg, Austria: Salzburg Seminar, forthcoming). For more information, contact the Salzburg Global Seminar, http://www.salzburgseminar.org/.

[8] Catalyst, The Bottom Line: Connecting Corporate Performance and Gender Diversity (New York: Catalyst, 2004), available online at: http://www.catalyst.org/files/full/financialperformancereport.pdf (accessed September 4, 2007).

[9] Corporate Voices for Working Families: 2005. "Business Impacts of Flexibility; An Imperative for Expansion," available at: http://www.cvworkingfamilies.org/downloads/Business%20Impacts%20of%20Flexibility.pdf.

table." But, she says, it's an essential change: "Roundtabling means no preferred seating, it means being with, a part of, together." Without a critical mass, it is difficult for any one woman to change the shape of the table on her own – instead, as Grumm noted of the business world, women who are able tend to leave the workforce or start their own business. In both politics and business, women who try to change the shape of the table are often punished or marginalized if they do not have a critical mass of other women to help them. Yet if enough women can make it up the corporate or political ladder together, they can "change the game rather than just play it," in Grumm's words. The research bears out Grumm's hope; in both business and politics, women's leadership styles overall have been shown to be more transparent, more inclusive, and less hierarchical than men's styles.

In business, a recent study on corporate boards found that having "a critical mass of three or more women can cause a fundamental change in the boardroom and enhance corporate governance." The authors elaborated:

> "Women bring a collaborative leadership style that benefits boardroom dynamics by increasing the amount of listening, social support, and win-win problem-solving. Although women are often collaborative leaders, they do not shy away from controversial issues. Many of our informants believe that women are more likely than men to ask tough questions and demand direct and detailed answers. Women also bring new issues and perspectives to the table, broadening the content of boardroom discussions to include the perspectives of multiple stakeholders. Women of color add perspectives that broaden boardroom discussions even further."[10]

The reasons for fighting for women's full inclusion as leaders, for Tarr-Whelan's vision of women's and men's "shared leadership," was summarized by one of the small break-out groups at the seminar. In their presentation at the end of the Session, the group's presenters made a two-part case for why having more women as leaders: "Why not? We have a right to fulfill our potential and have the same opportunities and choices as men. And women bring difference experiences and priorities, they help organizations (business or government) become more successful, and will represent more people." This neatly collapses two sets of arguments for women's inclusion, one based in justice (women deserve equality) and one based in women's different perspectives and life experiences and ways of working.

As if all this weren't enough, there is an important final reason: young women and girls need to see women leaders as role models before they can themselves aspire to leadership. One Session participant from the U.K. expressed consternation that a recent poll there showed that most girls took television celebrities as their role models. But perhaps this is in part a response to a lack of substantive women leaders to emulate. Lubna Olayan, CEO of the Olayan Financial Company, as a woman in a rare position of business leadership in Saudi Arabia, told the Seminar that she has become a magnet for attracting ambitious young women in need of mentorship. She said that after she addressed the Jeddeh Economic Forum in 2004, "I had a lot of exposure, I had a lot of young girls coming over to me, you become a mentor for so many young girls. It gives you great satisfaction, but it's a great responsibility as well." Other women at the Session spoke about girls in their lives. Another U.K. delegate said, "I come from a line of very strong women who have had to make sacrifices in their careers to raise families. I want to know how we can change things so my two young daughters don't have to make those sacrifices."

---

[10] Vicki W. Kramer, Alison M. Konrad, and Sumru Erkut, "Critical Mass on Corporate Boards: Why Three or More Women Enhance Governance," Wellesley Centers for Women, Report No. WCW 11 (Wellesley, MA: Wellesley Centers for Women, 2006), p. iv.

Linking Business and Politics

One of the most challenging tasks put before the Seminar participants was finding and exploring the links between women as leaders in politics and business. At first glance, the connections are not immediately apparent. Indeed, as one business executive participating in the Seminar pointed out, the women in these two fields are engaged in very different pursuits, and for different reasons: "Many women have not entered business to create social change, but are in it for themselves." Perhaps different kinds of women are drawn to these separate kinds of work; alternatively, perhaps the women who go into each are subsequently shaped by the different working environments, trainings, languages, and institutional cultures of the political versus business worlds.

Yet after careful thought and analysis, session delegates found several important connections between women's leadership in business and politics. Women seeking leadership in both fields face similar stereotypes, in the sense of gender-based expectations of how women should and should not behave, and therefore confront similar barriers to success. Women as leaders in any male-dominated field are outsiders, immediately failing to conform to the norms of the job simply by virtue of their sex. Their difference from those in charge tends to make both insiders and the public suspicious of their abilities, and they are often held to higher standards than men around them.

Negotiating the balancing of work and family responsibilities is doubly difficult in the public spotlight, and many women leaders find that anything they do – or don't do – is criticized. When Laura Liswood interviewed women world leaders, one spoke about encountering a double standard for women in terms of marital status:

> "If you are a single woman in a high-level position, people think you can't get a husband. If you are married, they think you are neglecting your husband. If you are divorced, they think you drove your husband away, and if you are widowed, they think you killed your husband!"

The double standards apply to the work women do as well as their personal lives. A recent *New York Times* article described a trend whereby women in business are subjected to a series of double standards.[11] If they act caring and compassionate, they are viewed as less competent; but if they display ambition and work too hard, their co-workers and bosses think they are too "masculine." Similarly, in India, an academic study entitled "Unappreciated Services" examined how villagers evaluated the performance of male and female village council leaders. The study found that "Overall, villages reserved for women leaders have more public goods, and the measured quality of these goods is at least as high as in non-reserved villages. Moreover, villagers are less likely to pay bribes in villages reserved for women. Yet, residents of villages headed by women are less satisfied with the public goods."[12]

In both politics and business, women (particularly those who are tokens, rather than surrounded by a critical mass of others like themselves) have to learn the tricks of the trade to succeed. Liswood spoke of how former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher took voice lessons, training herself to speak in a more "masculine" way (including lowering rather than raising her voice at the end of

---

[11] Belkin, Lisa: 2007. "The Feminine Critique," *The New York Times*: Thursday, November 1.

[12] Duflo, Esther and Topalova, Petia: 2004. "Unappreciated Services," The Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab (J-PAL) at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (http://www.povertyactionlab.com). Available online from: http://www.povertyactionlab.com/papers/Duflo%20Topalova%20Unappreciated%20Services.pdf (accessed December 2007).

questions and speaking in a deeper tone). Although women often unconsciously raise their voices as a relational technique, Liswood noted that "When men hear women raise their voice at the end of sentences, they hear lack of confidence." Thatcher's vocal transformation, Liswood explained, was just one way in which she "took on the colors of the species she was trying to invade."

These are thus some of the many similarities about the glass ceiling in politics and business. In both fields, women need similar skills and training to succeed – not only in terms of unconscious characteristics such as their voices, but also in other learned behaviors like being uncomfortable asking for help or for money. Networking and fundraising are essential skills for both business and political women, but these are skills that are not usually compatible with a lifetime of training in being "feminine." If women are going to be entrepreneurs, business owners, and candidates for public office, they must overcome these barriers and learn to put themselves forward for promotions and investments.

A further connection is that in both politics and business, women need male allies in order to succeed, both individually and as a group. One of the male participants in the Seminar spoke about men who are afraid of women gaining power, saying, "We all have to realize that we have to work together. We've learned from our mothers that women are just the same as men, we've learned the same from our grandmothers." He added that helping women along would not be "a big step" for his fellow men: "All the men I know would have been here had they heard the things I have here." Several female delegates recounted stories of how their first big breaks had come from men, and how male allies had been more supportive of them and more willing to push them forward than had other women. Indeed, for both business and politics, a lack of female solidarity was a key complaint; Fellows agreed that young women needed more support from senior women in both fields. The kind of mentoring, networking help, and third-party endorsements that senior women and men can provide is essential to younger women's success.

Overall, despite the differences between business and politics, similar challenges hold women back and similar strategies are required to break the glass ceilings. Women in politics can help women in business to succeed – and vice versa. Women in business can help funnel money and support to elect more women in politics. Women in legislatures, courts, ministries and executive offices can make, interpret, and implement laws to protect women in the workplace and give them equal opportunities to compete. Government policies can be instrumental in helping women balance work and family-caretaking responsibilities, due to the gendered nature of care work around the world. Women's leadership in politics and business is therefore not just similar in both fields, but is deeply connected and mutually reinforcing.

ଔ

HEADWINDS & TAILWINDS

Chair Laura Liswood challenged delegates to think about the blockages to the full flourishing and acceptance of women's leadership globally. She noted that, for the record, she did not believe there is a glass ceiling – instead, she explained, "I think it's just a thick layer of men." (To which someone responded from the audience, "But you can see right through them!")

Debate about the hurdles still to overcome touched on issues including cultural myths, stereotypes, and schemas; the lack of role models and mentoring for girls and young women; fundraising and networking; balancing work and family; violence and economic marginalization of women; education and teaching styles; and more. The questions of women's leadership force consideration of fundamental questions about our societies, our cultures, our politics, and our businesses. As Liswood suggested in her opening lecture, there are both **headwinds** pushing back against women leaders and women's entry into leadership, and **tailwinds** pushing us forward toward greater equality in leadership.

<div align="center">∾</div>

Headwinds Pushing Women's Leadership Back

The challenges facing women in reaching and retaining positions of leadership are not always the same in all cultures, political systems, and economies. Nevertheless, seminar participants generally agreed that the barriers to women's leadership across countries and in both business and politics include:

> **(1) Gender-based myths/stereotypes/schemas that hold women back;**
> **(2) Work-family conflict;**
> **(3) Economic inequities and violence against women;**
> **(4) A lack of female role models, mentors, and supporters;** and
> **(5) Disempowering education for girls and women.**

These trends mean that time alone will not advance equality. To reach "shared leadership" between women and men, we must understand the barriers that hold women back.

1. The first major category of barriers can be described as **<u>gender myths, stereotypes, and schemas</u>**. These vary from country to country, but overall have the effect of relegating women to the private rather than the public sphere. In this category are the common associations of women with care-work, especially for children and elders, and the assumption that most of this work will be done (unpaid) by women – an assumption incompatible with gender equality. Other gender myths pertain to "femininity" and its associations. Wrapped up in these associations are assumptions that women are not "tough" or "strong" enough to be leaders, as well as the expectation that women are more passive and hesitant. Laura Liswood noted that she studies myths and fairy tales across cultures, and explained how those she studies are gendered:

   > "Basically, there are two kinds of myths. The first is the hero's journey, the young man who has to overcome great odds, defeat the empire, find the Holy Grail. He may fail, but he comes back, he succeeds eventually, comes back and wins the hand of the fair maiden. Star Wars, Harry Potter, these are hero's journeys. They are great myths for leadership, they are about overcoming huge odds, testing yourself. The other category is the rescue myth – Cinderella waiting around, talking to mice, waiting to be rescued. Sleeping Beauty is ultimate rescue myth, the woman is unconscious until the prince kisses her. Needless to say, rescue me myths are not good myths for leadership!"

   These myths and gender expectations go to the very heart of gender roles, and were unfortunately not completely different across the cultures of those present at the Seminar. Delegates agreed that in all represented cultures, women are considered the "weaker" or more timid sex, and that many cultures penalize women who step outside their proscribed roles. These social expectations make it difficult for women to try to achieve the role of "leader" (a

role usually associated with men and masculinity) without breaking social taboos about women are and are not supposed to do or be.

May Rhiani, senior vice president and director of the Center for Gender Equity at the Academy for Educational Development in Washington, D.C., talked about the gender awareness training she does for teachers in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East. She said all she has to do is buy all the trainees that day's paper wherever she is, and have them look at how men are described versus women. She explains how she did this recently for a training in Malawi, saying,

> "Positions of men described were varied, from president of the country to head of a union of farmers, everybody was there. Women had three positions, men had over twenty. Women could be teachers, housewives, and women farmers, that's it. Why do you want the girls to be president of the country, head of a company, a minister, the judge, if she never sees herself there? What the media does when it is aligned with a very traditional non-transformative educational system is it continues reinforcing the status quo in the choices of girls and boys."

2. A second type of barrier that was a problem for women across cultures was **_work-family conflict_**. This type of "headwind" is of course related to the gender schemas/expectations described above. In line with those gender roles, most cultures assume that it is "women's work" to care for the children, the sick, and the elderly in families and communities, and to keep house for their husbands and fathers, and to do all this work for no pay but out of love and duty. Recent studies by feminist economists estimate that women's unpaid house- and care-work annually adds the equivalent of billions to the global economy, meaning that all current economies are heavily dependent on women's unpaid labor.[13] Legal scholar Joan Williams has explained, ""The widespread sense that employers are entitled to workers with limited caregiving responsibilities reflects the sharp split between work and family that is characteristic of domesticity. The classic expression of this split was the 'arrangement' of the husband as breadwinner and the wife as homemaker."[14]

In the "domesticity" gender system that Williams describes, a male breadwinner brings home his earnings to a female house-manager/mother, who uses the money to take care of him, herself, and the children. This kind of model of each (male) employee as an "ideal worker" who has a full-time support person (female) caring for him in the home is not only untrue of most countries, but is damaging to women when they too enter the paid labor force. As Williams notes, the "business model" for many jobs today is designed around a man ("ideal worker") who has a wife to do the care- and house-work for him in the home. Women trying to fill these jobs thus face a double burden: they do not have unpaid wives to do the childcare and housework, and they are also expected to do all of it in their spare time in addition to their paid jobs (what sociologist Arlie Hochschild has called "the second shift"[15]). This is the basic problem; different cultures respond to it differently. In India, a delegate from that country explained, the result of this conflict (combined with job discrimination and a lack education for women) is that 90% of

---

[13] See, for example, Riane Eisler: 2007. *The Real Wealth of Nations: Creating a Caring Economics*. San Francisco: Berrett-Kohler Publications; Barker, Druscilla and Edith Kuiper, editors: 2003. *Toward a Feminist Theory of Economics,"* London: Routledge; UNIFEM's 2000 report "Progress of the World's Women," available from UNIFEM at: http://www.unifem.org/resources/item_detail.php?ProductID=9; and the conference proceedings from the Levy Institute's "Global Conference on Unpaid Work and the Economy," available from the Levy Institute at: http://www.levy.org/undp-levy-conference/files/Conf_Proceedings.pdf.

[14] Williams, Joan: 2000. *Unbending Gender: Why Family & Work Conflict and What To Do About It.* New York: Oxford University Press, p. 20.

[15] Hochschild, Arlie and Anne Machung: 2003. *The Second Shift.* New York: Penguin.

the women work in the informal sector, seeking out jobs they can do at home (such as sewing) or where they can take their children. Working in the informal sector can be dangerous; workers are unprotected, non-unionized, and often exploited, but in this case the women do not have much choice.

Other women and countries deal with the problem in other ways, which are often deeply linked to the women's class/socioeconomic status. In many countries, if the family can afford it, women hire maids, governesses, and other household help to care for the house and children – a situation that works well for the women who have the money to do so, but is clearly not a universal solution for women as a whole. In some industrialized countries, such as the Scandinavian nations, governments have implemented policies to help women balance work and family responsibilities, such as universal child care and paid maternity leave programs. In countries where the government has not stepped in so clearly, as in the U.S., individual companies are beginning to recognize the benefits of helpful policies like flexible working time and telecommuting. Donna Klein explained that the private sector can play a leading role in creating major systemic chances, as it is theoretically more sophisticated than either government or the NGO sector in terms of structure and processes. She warned, however, that such proposed changes must be framed in terms of the benefits they bring to business, not as an accommodation for women. "There is a remarkable and compelling business case to use flexibility as a key management tool," she said, "not as an accommodation for child care or for women. Flexibility in where, when and how work gets done gives managers a new tool, a new cookbook. The way that flexibility works lifts men and businesses more generally as well as women."[16]

3. The discussion of class and economics above leads to a third important category of headwinds holding women back: ***economics and violence against women***. Although these are two separate issues, they are deeply related, with both functioning together to keep many women in a position of deprivation and dependence on men. Worldwide, violence against women affects women in every country and culture, and inhibits their confidence, their physical integrity and mental well-being, and their entry into leadership. The threats (both implicit and explicit) of assault, beating, rape, and assassination serve as a strong deterrent keeping women from seeking positions of power. As one delegate explained, "For me, the glass ceiling is a life and death issue for women, as it was for me when I was beaten by my husband and had to watch him abuse my children. I fled and survived because I was able to get public assistance and go to college." The violence does more than inflict physical, mental, and emotional pain on women – it also impoverishes them. The vast majority of women who are homeless are fleeing domestic violence situations, and most women who end up working in prostitution have a history of sexual violence.[17] And the cycle works the other way as well: many women stay with abusive husbands or fathers in part because of the economic power these men have, and the women's relative economic powerlessness.

Women's economic disadvantage springs both from the work/family conflict described above and from discrimination against women in the workforce and in education. Worldwide, women receive less education and less access to labor force jobs, and often are paid less than men for

---

[16] For more information on making the business case for workplace flexibility, see the report by Corporate Voices for Working Families at http://www.cvworkingfamilies.org/downloads/Business%20Impacts%20of%20Flexibility.pdf.
[17] See MacKinnon, Catharine: 2007. *Sex Equality Casebook,* 2nd ed. New York: Foundation Press.

equivalent work. In countries where resources are scarce, parents often invest in education for boys rather than girls, as marriage and children are supposed to be the main work for women. In developed countries, women are starting to receive more education than men, but are still paid less and often do not achieve the same career success due to taking time out or a reduced work schedule to bear and rear children. Women as a group also suffer economically from the hereditary structure of wealth, which for millennia has flowed from father to son; women for most of this time were treated as chattel, traded for a bride-price or given with a dowry, over which transactions they had little control. Still in many countries the disputes over dowries rage; in India, for example, the national government stepped in to try to end a stream of dowry deaths, where wives are killed for their dowry money. The combination of women's economic inequalities and the worldwide epidemic of violence against women leaves most women in a place of vulnerability, making it difficult to achieve equality, let alone leadership.

4. The fourth category of headwinds is **_a lack of female role models, mentors, and supporters._** In the seminar, we discussed several different components of this problem. First and most important, the lack of women in positions of leadership means that there are not enough role models and mentors to help other women come up through the pipeline. Research by the White House Project (WHP), a U.S. NGO, has found that mentoring and role modeling are two of most critical components leading young women to seek positions of leadership.[18] WHP's President Marie Wilson explains, "You can't be what you don't see." Another problem arising from a lack of top-level women is that many times the women who do make it through the glass ceiling are not sufficiently supportive of women trying to follow in their footsteps. This trend is sometimes called the "Queen Bee" syndrome, where women leaders do not identify with women of a lower rank than themselves or do not try to help other women attain leadership positions. As one U.K. businesswoman put it,

> "There is plenty of evidence about women who have 'made it' who see their struggle to do that as a rite of passage and expect other women to have to go through it. I think we have to change that and recognize that there are successful women out there that feel the rite of passage is crucial to success. I think we do have a responsibility to educate the women at the entry level, and that this is not just a rite of passage and your career is not only measured as the struggle you have made."

5. The final category of headwinds is **_disempowering education for girls and women._** As mentioned above, girls and women worldwide receive less and often lower-quality education than that available for boys and men. May Rhiani said that her decades of work on gender and education has led her to believe that "Education is a major element in how boys and girls decide what they want to become and, once they become what they want to become, how they carry on their lives." Education, she explained, shapes the aspirations of girls, and therefore their upward mobility and their ability to "reach the glass ceiling and scratch it or break it."

There are several factors within education that hold girls and women back, including: curricular content; authoritarian versus empowering styles of teaching behavior; discrimination against girls in schooling opportunities, in school funding, and in classrooms; and schools' reactions to teen pregnancy. In terms of curricula, Rhiani said "The content of curricula is a key influential factor of what girls become." She said that curricular materials she has studied from countries in Africa and the Middle East describe women as submissive, passive, not proactive, and describe

---

[18] White House Project: 2000. "Pipeline to the Future," National Survey and Focus Groups conducted by The White House Project and Lake, Snell, Perry and Associates. Available online at: http://www.thewhitehouseproject.org/culture/researchandpolls/Pipeline.php.

their work as taking care of children and the house. Images in textbooks show women cooking, sweeping floors, carrying wood and water on their backs and heads, and carrying children. Boys are described in leadership positives and in positive terms, and as active rather than passive. Rhiani asked, "Why do you think the girl is going to think that she is going to be a leader if this is what we tell her from the age of 6 to the age of 18, to be passive, submissive, and obedient?"

She said that the behavior of teachers, however, may be even more important than curricula. Most teachers in the countries Rhiani discussed use an authoritarian teaching methodology in the classroom, which ignores different needs for individual students, does not encourage creativity, expects uniformity, rejects non-conformity, teaches by rote, and makes the teacher the center of authority. This style of teaching produces leaders who do not value diversity or new ways of thinking. Teachers (both male and female) also tend to empower boys in the classroom and disempower girls, especially through calling on boys more than girls, interacting more with the boys, and giving more authority and responsibility to the boys. Rhiani said, "Boys are in charge of locking things in the cupboards, they have the key for the day, and then give it back to the teacher, so power passes from the teacher to the boys and then back. Meanwhile, the girls are told to sweep the floor." Teen pregnancy often unfortunately precludes further education for those girls, even if the pregnancy is unwanted or the result of rape. Rhiani says that school administrators need to work harder to ensure that pregnant teenagers and young mothers have the opportunity to continue their schooling.

<div align="center">◌</div>

Tailwinds Pushing Women Forward as Leaders

Clearly, the challenges facing women as leaders are many and varied, and time alone will not be sufficient to even out existing inequalities. However, despite the many headwinds against women's progress, there are also tailwinds – trends that have the effect of helping women advance in both business and politics. These include:

   (1) International instruments/human rights agreements
   (2) Positive public perceptions of women
   (3) Gender quotas, in both business and politics
   (4) Women's skills in networking/building connections
   (5) Men supporting women
   (6) Fundraising possibilities/women accessing wealth
   (7) New work/life balancing tools

1. The first type of positive tailwind is the existence of a growing number of ***international instruments and human rights agreements*** that safeguard women's rights and can help advance their leadership. These instruments include the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW, ratified by all but a handful of holdout countries), the Beijing Conference Platform for Action (PFA), the Millennium Development Goals (MDG), and the U.N. Security Council's Resolution 1325, among others.[19]

---

[19] For full information on CEDAW, please see: http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/cedaw/. For information on the Beijing Platform for Action, see: http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing/platform/. For information on the Millennium Development Goals, see: http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/. And for further information on Security Council Resolution

The U.N. Division of Advancement for Women calls CEDAW an "International Bill of Rights for Women." It is both an international statement of aspiration and a functional treaty that can act as the basis for a legal complaint within ratifying countries.[20] Similarly the Beijing PFA, adopted in 1995 at the U.N. Fourth World Conference on Women (held in Beijing, China) is called "an agenda for women's empowerment," with the goal of "removing all the obstacles to women's active participation in all spheres of public and private life through a full and equal share in economic, social, cultural and political decision-making."[21] Meanwhile, the eight MDGs "form a blueprint agreed to by all the world's countries and all the world's leading development institutions," according to the U.N. Millennium Development Goals website. The third MDG calls for the "promotion of gender equality and the empowerment of women." This goal recognizes the fact that women's full equality is both an end in itself and a means to alleviating poverty worldwide.[22] Finally, Security Council Resolution 1325 (passed unanimously in 2000) builds on the Beijing PFA to urge U.N. Member States to "ensure increased representation of women at all decision-making levels in national, regional and international institutions and mechanisms for the prevention, management, and resolution of conflict" (from the text of the Resolution).[23]

As Peruvian MP Ana Elena Townsend pointed out, "Because of the MDGs and other agreements, now all countries have to get into the good gender equality game. The World Bank and IMF now consider gender equality as vital to advancing the other millennium goals such as halving poverty and lowering the child mortality rate. Like the glass ceiling, the glass doors of these institutions have been broken."

2. A second "tailwind" that can help women along is the fact that **_public opinion across countries views women as more honest, less corrupt and less corruptible, and as better on human resources, interpersonal relations, and on social policy issues such as education, children's issues, and health care_**. Precisely because women have for so long been excluded from the political and business spheres, women now coming into these areas look like outsiders. When used carefully, this "outsider style" can be positive and can help women get promoted, elected, or appointed.[24] The research is uncertain whether such an outsider style

1325, see: http://www.womenwarpeace.org/toolbox/toolbox.htm (UNIFEM) and http://www.unfpa.org/women/1325.htm (UNFPA).

[20] For information on how to file a complaint within your country under CEDAW, see the U.N.'s Division for the Advancement of Women's website with a "Model Communication Form" at: http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/cedaw/opmodelform.html.
[21] The PFA identifies 12 critical areas of concern for improving women's status. Of particular interest to readers of this report is the section on "Women in Power and Decision-Making," which contains two strategic objectives (G1 and G2), calling for governments to "take measures to ensure women's equal access to and full participation in power structures and decision-making" and to "increase women's capacity to participate in decision-making and leadership" (PFA). The Platform calls for women to be at least 30% of political representatives. These sections are described in detail at: http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing/platform/decision.htm. For more information visit: http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing/platform/plat1.htm or see the full report of the conference at: http://www.un.org/esa/gopher-data/conf/fwcw/off/a--20.en
[22] For more information visit: http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/
[23] For more information visit: http://www.womenwarpeace.org/toolbox/toolbox.htm (UNIFEM), http://www.peacewomen.org/un/sc/1325.html (WILPF), and http://www.unfpa.org/women/1325.htm (UNFPA).
[24] See, for example: Duke, Lois Lovelace: 1996. _Women in Politics: Insiders or Outsiders?; A Collection of Readings._ Englewood Cliffs, N.J. : Prentice Hall.; Kahn, Kim: 1996. _The Political Consequences of Being a Woman._ New York: Columbia University Press; Shames, Shauna: 2003. "The Un-Candidates: Gender and Outsider Signals in Women's Political Advertising,

derives from biology or socialization, but clearly finds that whether by birth, training, or simply having different life experiences, women as a group differ in significant ways from men, and these differences make it important for women to share leadership alongside men. Public acknowledgement of these differences is nearly universal (and can sometimes be harmful for women if these differences are taken as weaknesses). But women in many countries have found careful explication and publicizing of certain differences, such as in leadership style and in increased productivity, useful as tools for their own and other women's advancement.

3. Countries and companies are increasingly using **_affirmative action mechanisms, such as gender quotas or "targets"_,** to overcome the effects of discrimination against women. Currently, nearly 100 countries use some form of gender quotas in politics, either as reserved seats in the legislatures for women or party-based gender quotas for women as candidates.[25] The majority of these countries use voluntary or mandatory party quotas as the mechanism for ensuring that women have a more meaningful voice in the political process. As scholar Drude Dahlerup writes, "The quota system places the burden of recruitment not on the individual woman, but on those who control the recruitment process."[26] Although all forms of quotas have proved useful, academic research has argued that party quotas are the most effective way of bringing a critical mass of women into legislatures.[27] The rapid spread of political gender quota systems internationally has prompted observers to call this a "new global women's movement."

This is not to suggest that quotas always work, or that they have no drawbacks. Quota laws are not always enforced, can be misapplied or manipulated to benefit certain women at the expense of others, and may engender resistance against the women they benefit. Yet they remain possibly the best strategy for increasing women's political representation at the national level. Some countries, such as India and Bangladesh, have also successfully used quotas to greatly magnify women's representation at the local/village level. Their experiences suggest that not only does it make a difference to have women in positions of decision-making at the local level but it also helps build the pipeline of women with political experience to feed up to higher levels.

Quotas, also called business "targets" or "goals," can also make an important different for women in the corporate world, as in Norway. Before the 2003 law there, women constituted 7% of all directors of publicly-traded companies. As of 2007, that number has jumped to 36%, a proportion far higher than that in Great Britain (11% for the FTSE 100) or in the U.S. (15% in the Fortune 500), for example. *The Economist* reported earlier this year that recent events have suggested that these women, because of their outsider status and their differences from men, often make for strong directors:

> "When a whistleblower at Statoil, the country's biggest firm, alerted managers in 2003 to possible illegal payments to a consultant to secure contracts in Iran, it was Grace Reksten Skaugen and two other women directors who called an extraordinary board meeting that resulted in the resignations of the chairman and chief executive. 'Women feel more compelled than men to do their homework,' says

---

1968-1998," *Women & Politics Journal* 25(1/2), Haworth Press; and Wilson, Marie: 2007. *Closing the Leadership Gap: Why Women Can and Must Help Rule the World*. New York: Penguin Press.

[25] For information on the different country's gender quotas, see www.quotaproject.org, a joint project of International IDEA and Stockholm University.

[26] See www.quotaproject.org.

[27] For literature on quotas, see the Quota Project papers and publications databases at http://www.quotaproject.org/case_studies.cfm; http://www.quotaproject.org/papers_SU.htm; and http://www.quotaproject.org/papers_other.htm.

Ms. Reksten Skaugen, who was voted Norway's chairman of the year for 2007, 'and we can afford to ask the hard questions, because women are not always expected to know the answers.'"[28]

4. Women's traditional strength in building and nurturing relationships means that **_networking and building connections_** can be another positive tool to help advance women as leaders. Networks are useful for multiple reasons, including the sharing of information and experiences, the leveraging of collective effort, and the maximizing of individual potential. As Laura Liswood noted, "If you are the only O in a room full of X's, and things start happening to you, you being to think there's something wrong with you. You don't think it has to do with what happens to O's, but it's about you. This is why these networks are so important, so you can share these experiences." (Also see the following section for more on "Strategic Networking.")

Liswood noted further evidence for the importance of networks: individual confidence-building and empowerment, particularly necessary for women. She explained, "Sociologists say that men have this trait, "positive illusion," which is a very helpful trait! It makes you think you are better than you are. The flip side is that women have "negative illusion," and think they are worse than they are. So men feel fully prepared for something when they have 25% of the knowledge, but women don't feel fully prepared until they have 75% of the knowledge! And this is not necessarily unwise for women, because the tolerance for mistakes is less for historically underrepresented groups." The different (and often tougher) standards that women face and their greater need for self-confidence and empowerment are two more good reason for building strong networks, both with other women and with male allies.

5. Networking expert Anita Brown-Graham strongly recommended that all women make sure to have powerful men in their networks, too; "Sometimes the person that will open the door to the first woman is going to be a man." Indeed, a fifth positive tailwind is the large number of **_men supporting women's leadership._** After all, men as well as women stand to benefit from the inclusion of women in leadership in both politics and business, and policies that help mothers balance work and family responsibilities also help fathers do the same. A delegate from Norway, who started a new company to help bring more women into corporate board governance, explained, "My network would never have worked had I not been able to find someone to champion my cause. I used my own personal networks and I found one or two chairmen of companies to put their name down on my advisory board. And then every time I wanted to open a door, I could push one of those guys ahead of me! It is always useful to have someone with a bigger name. I couldn't have done this on my own since I was nobody, but I had somebody to help me open the doors."

Others suggested looking for specific types of men, such as those who, like many women, are discontented with the current system and seek positive change. Although in many cases men's attitudes seem to hold women back, men are also diverse and varied, and some are more open to change than others. In particular, delegates recommended looking to men with daughters as a potential group of men more sympathetic to women's issues. One male participant focused specifically on the potential market for gender issues among new fathers; he stated, "No one is more scared than a man about to have a child, this man is absolutely terrified. We can talk to him, this terrified man will listen." And it is quite often the case that the first woman to break

[28] "Girl Power," *The Economist*, Jan. 3, 2008, print edition. Available online at
http://www.economist.com/business/displaystory.cfm?story_id=10431105 (accessed March 2, 2008).

through a glass ceiling, especially in politics, achieved her position through her connection to her father or husband.[29] This is not to deride women who come to power through this path; until we have achieved full equality, and while we still live in a discriminatory world, male allies and women's familial connections are essential tools for helping some women break through the glass ceilings so that other women may follow.

6. ***Women's fundraising possibilities*** constitute a sixth tailwind that can help women advance and achieve equality, if this potential is properly exploited. Yet there are many barriers to the full achievement of such possibilities, since women (as noted above) tend to have less access to wealth than men and are also not socialized to make charitable donations in the same way as men do. Yet Chris Grumm offered both cause for hope and several concrete suggestions for women's fundraising: "Women have never had more access to wealth than today," she said, "And women have yet to take full advantage of this access. I want to unleash women's wealth to fuel the creation of a solid foundation for social change." Grumm pointed to three important facts about women's economic power, including (a) "Women are arguably now the most powerful engine of global growth. Women are entering the workforce in huge numbers, we are more that engine of global growth than the big economies of China and India and new technology all put together;" (b) "Women's wealth has been steadily growing for decades. In the U.S. for instance women make up 1.6 million of the top wealth holders, with a combined net worth of $2.2 trillion. The same kind of wealth is happening with women in China, in the Middle East, and in Europe. Women have a huge amount of wealth, and there is a whole generation that we have yet to look at and think of in terms of usage;" and (c) "We have consumer power, controlling over 80% of consumer buying. Imagine the difference we could make – we could control multinational corporations on a daily basis and we haven't done it yet!"

Grumm suggested several concrete tips for women as both fundraisers and donors. "As women we have enormous economic power, but we have yet to take full advantage of that and infuse it into the community so the community reflects our values. Men have been doing that for years. Andrew Carnegie in the U.S. decided that he wanted to fund health care, and decided on a Western European model, and donated money strategically to make the whole country's health care model assume the form he wanted to see. We could do that too. How do we unleash women's wealth? Women are ready to give if you give them a place to do it. And you can't just say I want your money, feel sorry for women, women are victims. You need to give women an opportunity to *invest*, you need to offer a big, bold vision that actually allows people to say, if I pool my money I can make a difference in the world, and then the world will be a better place. That's what they want to do." She reminded us all to "Make sure that when you talk about giving money for women you remind everyone around you that giving to women is not a selfish act, not an act of self-absorption like a lot of women believe. If a woman is economically secure, a family is economically secure. If families are economically secure, the country is secure, and if the country is economically secure, the world is economically secure. You can say the same thing about education, anti-violence, and the environment." In other words, giving to and raising money for women has tremendous positive ripple effects in all areas.

Grumm offered several practical suggestions about fundraising, particularly on the importance of follow-up and thanking donors. "The number one rule of fundraising is follow through, follow through, follow through – we lose more money through a lack of good follow through,

---

[29] Howley, Kerry: 2008. "It Takes a Family (to Break a Glass Ceiling)," *New York Times*, January 5.

whether because we forgot to get the check or failed to turn in the evaluation form or didn't want to bother someone. Most money is lost not in the ask but in the follow-through – and be sure to make sure you ask your donors how they want to be thanked, and do exactly as they say. But also remember that the best thank you for a donor is that you produce results with their money!" She ended her talk by returning to the themes of investment and broad social change: "Remember, the reason you are asking other women to invest is we believe women are the best possible investment you can do if you want to change the world. If we truly want to break the class ceiling for women in politics and business, we have to be willing to fuel and fund the social change movement." She acknowledged that not all countries have the same fundraising opportunities for women, but noted that "on every continent there are big dollars," and strongly recommended being bold and asking for big donations whenever possible. She also suggested that women trying to raise money for women in developing countries also look to women (and men) in the Diaspora.

7. Finally, we can draw hope from the successful implementation in a growing number of workplaces of ***work/life balancing tools***. As Donna Klein of the U.S. put it, "I don't know of any solution better than changing the way we work to level the playing field for women." The most important thing, Klein explained, is avoiding the language of "special accommodations" for women. In her work at Corporate Voices for Working Families, a U.S.-based NGO, Klein promotes the use of "workplace flexibility" as a key business management tool, not as an accommodation for child care or for women generally. "As long as childbearing is a mainstream "women's" issue, Klein explained, we're never going to achieve equality. Instead, she suggests that everyone make the "business case for increasing flexibility as a business tool. Flexibility lifts men as well as women, and the data show that men like and use flexibility as much as women." She defines "flexibility" as "the mutually determining between employers and employees where, when, and how work gets done," and calls it a new "cookbook" for workplace managers, one which can greatly increase both productivity and employee satisfaction. Companies that she has worked with report higher rates of productivity and lower rates of employee burnout and turnover due to increased use of flexibility.

   Klein believes that the private sector can play a leading role in promoting major structural changes and can be a champion on how to make the systems of work change, as theoretically businesses are more sophisticated than governmental and nonprofit organizations in terms of structure and process, and should be able to recognize the vast advantage in greater workplace flexibility. She stated that the very first step in moving women into key leadership positions is to level out the floor, and make sure there are no structural disadvantages holding women back systematically: "I don't know of any solution better than changing the way we work to level the playing field for women."

<div align="center">ଓଷ</div>

<div align="center">

POINTS OF CONVERGENCE & SUCCESSFUL EXAMPLES

</div>

Solutions for changing deeply entrenched systems do not simply happen on their own; they take work and planning. Delegates at the Salzburg Seminar gathering did not always agree on the best strategy for moving forward, and debate was spirited. After many days of conversations, however, several points of convergence emerged, along with helpful case studies and advice relating

to creating change. These "success stories" offered by the Session's participants are both inspirational and instructional for those of us continuing the work of the meeting. Overall, they relate to four tactics for enhancing women's leadership: **enabling education/better role models for girls and women, grassroots mobilizing, recruiting talent, allies, and donors in unlikely places,** and **strategic networking.**

<center> C3</center>

Strategic Networking

Anita Brown-Graham of the U.S. offered a three-dimensional framework for thinking about and increasing the value of their networks. "What will determine your relative success will be the support and sponsors you have in your respective networks," she stated, noting that she referred not only to network expansion. "If you are serious about your network, you need to assess what you have and maximize what's there. 70-90% of jobs, contacts, and economic opportunities come through our informal networks, so the value that resides in them is profoundly economic and political as well."

The three dimensions of a network, Brown-Graham explained, are (a) *diversity*, (b) *density*, and (c) *depth*. She elaborated on each dimension: (a) "The value of a network is having **diverse** sources of information, so some of us may really have to struggle to find and have people in our networks that are not just like us or our friends. Insular networks lead to insular thinking;" (b) "Lots of people assume that the more contacts you have, the **denser** your network is, but I want to suggest that is not true. If you just have superficial connections with lots of people, that is not a dense network. What is the purpose of your network and how do you use it? The question you should ask yourself is what you want from each connection, and what is the way you are going to go about making that connection what you really need;" and (c) "It is particularly important for women to have connections in their networks that have **depth**. These are the people who are the first respondents when we have a crisis, who can help take care of the children when we go back to work, who can support us in an emotional moment. Sometimes it can be hard and lonely when you are blazing trails for social change and the only way you make it through is by having a support network of people who know who are always there beside you or behind you. The advantages are not just personal, they can also be professional, but these are the relationships that probably require the greatest commitment of time and nurturing in order to keep."

<center>C3</center>

Recruiting Talent, Allies, & Donors in Unlikely Places

Talent, allies, and funds should be recruited in both the likely and the unlikely places. Speaking of recruiting talented individuals for leadership, one U.S. participant who works with women receiving public assistance described the additional burdens for women who are poor. "Working with women to develop a program of higher education for women to become self-sufficient," she said, "I have found that there are some jewels in women who have not had the opportunity to develop and express themselves – they are true, natural leaders."

In talking about creating new donors for women's movements, several delegates recommended the pooling of resources. One from South Korea explained that her country is witnessing a wave of

<center>19</center>

"ajuma" networks. The Korean politicians' rhetoric calls the "ajuma" (mother/housewife) the upholder of the nation and the key to prosperity. This delegate said that now ajumas are joining together into groups that pool their money and donate strategically, often to charity causes. Similarly, in several countries women have begun a collective fund to help other women run for political office, based on the model from "EMILY's List" in the U.S. (which stands for "Early Money is Like Yeast – it helps the dough rise!). These kinds of pooled-resources networks can make a key difference for women, who are most likely to need start-up funds to begin any public or private venture.

<div align="center">ଔ</div>

Enabling Education/Better Role Models for Girls & Women

Despite the cultural diversity represented in the seminar, all delegates complained of media stereotypes portraying women as weak, overly emotional, incompetent, sexual objects, or more interested in home and family than the public sphere. Improving the status of women's image in the media was critical for education specialist May Rhiani: "I think we need to form movements against how the media is portraying what our young girls and young boys need to become. We need to work against the media the way we work against drunk drivers, there should be something against drunk media, the way it's portraying our young girls and young women and boys and men and what they should become!"

Delegates agreed that we need more positive cultural images of women as leaders, both in the media and in the fields of politics and business. Often the first woman to break the glass ceiling in a country or company ends up becoming an "honorary man," [30] as was the case for Margaret Thatcher in Britain and other famous examples. This tends to be especially true for trailblazers who lack a critical mass of other women around them who could all push together to create change or defy the double standards. In this situation, the women who make it to the very top tend to be the ones who are "more man than the men," as Thatcher used to say with pride. Sociological research suggests that when women are tokens in any organization, they are marginalized and do their best to fit their behavior to the prevailing (male) model.[31] To provide young women with both inspiration and role models, we need both critical mass and diversity among the women in leadership positions.

In terms of educating girls to be leaders, Rhiani explained that there are positive educational strategies that can help move us away from an "authoritarian education" model and more toward "empowering education." She believes that education is a major element in how both boys and girls decide what they want to become and what is possible for them: "Education shapes the aspirations of girls and boys," she says, both through the style of the teaching and through the content of the curriculum. Teachers who use an enabling education strategy take pains to interact similarly and equally with girls and boys, and ensure that there are equal role models for both offered in the textbooks and examples given in class (so that girls and women are not just seen as caretakers of men and children).

---

[30] Tolleson-Rinehart, Sue: 1994. *Claytie and the Lady: Ann Richards, Gender, and Politics in Texas.* Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.
[31] Kanter, Rosabeth Moss: 1993. *Men and Women of the Corporation.* New York: Basic Books.

Enabling education strategies include: eliminating gender stereotyped images and messages from school curricula; eliminate gender-stereotyped methods by teachers; paying male and female teachers equally, and promoting women into school leadership positions; and increasing the presence of role models and mentors for girls and young women. "If there are positive media messages about women, open and enabling educational systems, and community supports for girls and young women, then women can become leaders," Rhiani stated. She recommended that parents band together (both mothers and fathers) to demand these kind of changes in school systems, and suggested using the statistics about teen pregnancy to appeal to recalcitrant dads. "If you allow the girls to go to and complete secondary school, teen pregnancies drop, is what was found in a longitudinal study over 100 countries. In Chad and Niger, the percent of girls in school is 4%, and the percent of teen pregnancy is extremely high, nearly 25%. But for girls in Belgium, who almost all go to high school, the teen pregnancy rate is less than 1%, so tell them that. No father wants his teenage daughter to be pregnant outside of marriage, especially the Muslim fathers, they don't want that."

Finally, Rhiani expressed both ambivalence and a potential fear about the new trend toward single-sex education: "The jury is still out on single-sex schools, this system seems to have as many cons as it has pros. Some of the pros are less competition between girls and boys which allows more girls to have leadership positions. However, this does not necessarily translate to girls running for future leadership positions once they get back to a co-ed environment. And the biggest con is that many governments give fewer resources to girls' schools than to boys' schools – many! The trend is that governments end up giving fewer resources, train women's school teachers less, send fewer books, don't build them latrines. They become second class schools."

<div align="center">Ↄ</div>

Grassroots Mobilizing

One delegate from Cameroon stated, "Grassroots women are really powerful, they are patient, but invisible and voiceless. Politics is numbers. If grassroots women are the majority, then we have to be elected to in all organs where decisions are being taken." She noted that she had been surprised at the title of the session, explaining, "Grassroots women don't have a ceiling, so first we have to let grassroots women have a ceiling and then we can break it!"

Anita Brown-Graham of the U.S. highlighted the power of the masses through a story about the power of mass mobilization of farmers in her state, North Carolina. "North Carolina is a tobacco state, and was once the highest producer of tobacco in the world. About 6 years ago our general assembly was debating some issues about tobacco, and some very powerful business interests were trying to skew the legislation a certain way, but a grassroots organization led by women mobilized a group of farmers to protest. On the day the committee was going to vote, there were 7200 tractors blocking every road in town as these farmers drove in! It completely turned around the course of the bill. The legislators had to recognize that these business interests who had a bunch of money were single votes, but the farmers on all their tractors would mean that they would lose the election." She concluded, "If you mobilize the masses you can be a countervailing force if you get enough people behind you, as long as you're paying enough attention and there is enough transparency so you know what the time to mobilize is and know what the time to organize is."

A final terrific example of a mass mobilization came from Hanna Tetteh of Ghana, who told the gathering that there is a famous mantra in Ghana, "Organization decides everything." She illustrated the truth of the motto with the following recent example: "Before the 2004 election, the women's groups decided to join together. We had a series of retreats and wrote "The Women's Manifesto," which came from women in media, in business, in politics, from all over. It dealt with customary marriage, domestic violence, workplace issues – we would ask women to support political parties who subscribed to the women's manifesto. If they do not even nominally accept the work we have done, we will ask women not to vote for that party. Not all the issues on the "Women's Manifesto" were accepted because some were radical, but every party at least paid lip-service to our issues. Subsequent to the election we had our domestic violence bill passed, which had been sitting on the table for 4 years before that! Now we have more women in positions of power than have we ever had, including a presidential advisor on government affairs, the Chief Justice of Supreme Court, and four women in cabinet ministerial positions. It just tells you the difference you can make when you begin to work together!"

ꙅ

CONCLUSION

The world is changing rapidly, and women are gaining power and influence in ways that that may have seemed inconceivable a generation or two ago. The question now is how to tap the full potential of women's leadership, and how to ensure that traditional role models and conventional work structures do not hold all of us back from the change that needs to happen. The push for progress will need to come simultaneously from several sources, including from within both the private and public sectors, from both elite insiders and the grassroots, and from both women and men. To secure the full advantages of women's leadership in both politics and business, it seems that certain policy frameworks are necessary and desirable, such as a reframing of family responsibilities as shared between men and women, strong non-discrimination policies, and perhaps temporary quotas or "targets" to normalize women's inclusion.

One clear outcome from the Session and other research is that we need to dispel the myth that the pipeline will simply solve the problem on its own. Progress is never certain, and the gains women have made thus far toward equality are still fragile; without constant vigilance, we could just as easily fall backward as move forward. The challenges are many, but the potential for positive change is far greater, particularly if we could get women (and their male allies) in both business and politics working together toward this shared goal.

Laura Liswood urged the assembled delegates of Session 447 to be leaders working for women's equality when they returned to their own countries. Liswood stated, "Change is what I think leadership is for, and it takes a few people out in front to make it happen. Tacitus once said that the worst crimes were dared by a few, willed by more, and accepted by all – change is exactly the same way. I think of it like a standing ovation: started by a few, and then more join in, and eventually everyone follows." Liswood posed a challenge for all those participating in the Session, and for all those reading this report: ***"The question is, when will you stand up?"***

ꙅ