

Service work continues to pull women associate professors away from research. What can be done?

TOMORROW'S PROFESSOR(sm) eMAIL NEWSLETTER
<http://cgi.stanford.edu/~dept-ctl/cgi-bin/tomprof/postings.php>

Archives of all past postings can be found at:
<http://cgi.stanford.edu/~dept-ctl/cgi-bin/tomprof/postings.php>

Sponsored by
Stanford Center for Teaching and Learning
<http://ctl.stanford.edu>

Folks:

The posting below looks at factors, particularly increased level of service work, that may be responsible for the difference in promotion rates between men and women from associate to full professor. It is by Joya Misra, Jennifer Hickey Lundquist, Elissa Holmes, and Stephanie Agiomavritis* and is from the January/February 2011 issue of *Academe*, Vol. 97, No. 1. *Academe* is a publication of the American Association of Higher Education (AAUP) [<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe>]. ©2011, the American Association of Higher Education. All rights reserved. Reprinted with permission.

Regards,

Rick
reis@stanford.edu
UP NEXT: No Room for Books

Reis

Tomorrow's Academic Careers

----- 2,671 words -----

The Ivory Ceiling of Service Work

How does a successful associate professor with a distinguished publication record, a visible leadership role among women scientists on campus, and prestigious grant funding for interdisciplinary initiatives in graduate and undergraduate training as well as research feel about seeking promotion to full professor? In the course of our research, we commonly heard, "It feels like the first time in my life that I'm hitting up against the

glass ceiling.” Compared with earlier cohorts, women are earning more doctorates, taking more academic jobs, and earning tenure more frequently. But when it comes to promotions to full professorship, our research confirms growing scholarship that women may hit a glass ceiling near the top of the ivory tower.

Men still hold more than three-quarters of full professorships in the United States, and women’s share of full professorships has increased only marginally over the last several decades. Women are less likely ever to be promoted to full professor than men, and their promotions take longer. A 2006 report of the Modern Language Association’s Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession, *Standing Still: The Associate Professor Survey*, showed that women professors in the association were less likely to be promoted than their male counterparts, and it took women from one to three and a half years longer than men to advance to full professorships, with women at doctoral universities lagging farthest behind.

National data across all disciplines confirm these findings. Indeed, University of Pennsylvania education researcher Laura Perna’s analysis of National Study of Postsecondary Faculty data reveals that, nationwide, women at four-year colleges and universities are 10 percent less likely than men to attain promotion to full professor, even after controlling for productivity (career-refereed publications), educational background, institution type, race, ethnicity, and nationality. Perna’s findings suggest that gender differences cannot simply be attributed to men being more productive researchers or having more experience than women. Instead, they point to entrenched institutional practices that may disadvantage women.

What explains the stubborn ivory ceiling of academia? A study of tenured and tenure-track women faculty members in science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) fields by Georgia Institute of Technology sociologist Mary Frank Fox and cultural studies and literature professor Carol Colatrella identified ambiguity in institutions’ criteria for promotion to full professor. While most faculty members interviewed could identify the expectations for tenure, fewer could identify the expectations for promotion to full professor. This lack of clarity opens the door for promotion based on vague criteria rather than straightforward expectations.

A related explanation may be found in the way men and women professors divide their time at work—and how colleagues value the division of labor. A variety of studies show that men focus more on research than do women. While men are not necessarily more productive than women, they are more protective of their research time. Tenured women, on the other hand, devote more time to teaching, mentoring, and service, and particularly to activities that may be seen as building bridges around the university. Yet, these pursuits hold less value in promotion cases in many institutions, especially at research-intensive universities.

Faculty Work-Life Study

Our own research—surveys and focus groups with 350 faculty members at the University of Massachusetts Amherst in 2008–09—explores evidence of a glass ceiling among faculty at a research-intensive university. What we found mirrors other studies: by cohort, women are less likely to be promoted than men, and when they are promoted, the process takes longer. Why might this be? Could women’s service to the university, an issue often raised in our focus groups, limit chances for promotion? Our survey asked whether associate professors had served in major administrative positions in their departments—for example, directing undergraduate or graduate programs or working as associate chair or chair. We also examined compensation in the form of course releases and extra pay for assuming administrative roles. We saw few differences in how men and women were compensated. We did, however, find substantial differences by gender in when professors and associate professors took on major service roles. Three-quarters of women associate professors, compared with half of their male counterparts, had played such roles. And a third of the women had served as undergraduate directors, compared with 17 percent of the men. Because undergraduate directors spent more time teaching and working with undergraduates—tasks that research universities tend to undervalue—gendered norms may contribute to women associate professors spending more time in devalued roles.

Such norms, however, do not hold for service as chair. Chairing a department is generally viewed as more prestigious, reflecting a high level of respect. Yet, not one of the male associate professors who responded to the survey had served as chair, compared with 15 percent of the women. The reverse is true among full professors—35 percent of men have chaired, while only 14 percent of women have done so. Thus, women may be asked, and may agree, to chair their departments earlier in their careers than men. Does serving in these administrative positions slow progress to full professorship? There were no differences in time to promotion for men and women who served as chairs, associate chairs, or graduate directors. But women who served as undergraduate directors were promoted significantly more slowly; women associate professors who served as undergraduate directors took twelve years (rather than the usual seven) after receiving tenure to be promoted to full professor. By contrast, male undergraduate directors saw no slowing in time to promotion. While, of course, other factors may contribute to being selected as undergraduate director and being slow to promotion, there is a clear association. As one female associate professor noted, associate professorship is “the midcareer service gully that we find ourselves taking an extended stay in.”

The Gendered Gully of Service

Our survey asked faculty members at all ranks to summarize their time spent on research, teaching, mentoring or advising, and service. We saw some small gendered differences between lecturers, assistant professors, and full professors—for the most part, men and women in these ranks spent their time similarly, although women spent a little more time on mentoring and service.

However, when we focused on associate professors, we saw remarkable differences. Although associate professors of both sexes worked similar amounts of time overall—about sixty-four hours a week—the distribution of work time varied considerably. Men spent seven and a half hours more a week on their research than did women. Even if these differences in research time occurred only during semesters, not during summer or holiday breaks, this would mean that men spent in excess of two hundred more hours on their research each year than women. On the other hand, women associate professors taught an hour more each week than men, mentored an additional two hours a week, and spent nearly five hours more a week on service. This translates to women spending roughly 220 more hours on teaching, mentoring, and service over two semesters than men at that rank.

Another way to consider this would be to look at the percentage of time spent on research, teaching, mentoring, and service. On average, male associate professors spent 37 percent of their time on research, while women associate professors spent 25 percent of their time on research. While women associate professors spent 27 percent of their time on service, men spent 20 percent of their time on service. This dramatic difference suggests that men focus more on their research, which earns greater prestige and potential for promotion. One associate professor survey respondent reported difficulty balancing research, teaching, and service, commenting, “In reality, only research matters when it comes to tenure and promotion, but service and teaching require lots of time.” Our survey also asked faculty members to differentiate between service to the university and service to the profession. Men and women associate professors spent about the same amount of time on service to the profession (5.4 hours a week), but women spent much more time on service to the university (11.6 hours versus 7 hours). While service to the profession often means more prestigious external visibility, service to the university includes a range of activities necessary to keep the university going but less likely to increase one’s faculty stature.

We found similar patterns when zeroing in on STEM fields, despite the fact that faculty members in these fields, overall, have lower teaching loads and therefore more time to spend on research. On average, STEM men and women associate professors spent less time teaching than associate professors in other disciplines. But STEM men spent significantly more time on research (42 percent) than STEM women (27 percent), while STEM women put in more time mentoring (21 percent compared with 15 percent for STEM men) and performing service (25 percent for women compared with 20 percent for men). Thus, gendered patterns of work distribution are more pronounced when we focus on STEM faculty.

Not Just for the Love of Service

Perhaps women associate professors enjoy service more, while men prefer research? None of our data fits this interpretation. Overwhelmingly, both men and women faculty members express a preference for research. Most associate professors viewed service as impinging on their time, while they expressed frustration at how service is distributed. As one associate professor noted, “Having good judgment, being thorough, means more work. . . . The reward for good work is more work.” Another argued, “There are faculty

[who] earn twice as much as I do, but they are making more work for everyone, since they don't share in the work that needs to be done." Sylvia Hurtado and Linda DeAngelo, both research directors with the Higher Education Research Institute at the University of California, Los Angeles, conducted a study further suggesting that a gendered time allocation leads to lower levels of job satisfaction and higher turnover risk among senior women as compared with senior men.

Why do associate professors, both men and women, spend so much time on service activities? In one focus group exchange for our study, an associate professor noted, "Because departments try to shield junior faculty from service, and full professors are usually in a better position to say 'no' when asked, associate professors often carry disproportionately heavy service loads compared to their junior and senior colleagues." Another said, "Some departments have lost a lot of faculty. So their full professor ranks are thin. Even if these departments are hiring assistant professors, the associates are doing most of the service to protect the junior faculty."

Men and women faculty members consistently noted that when faced with multiple demands, they sacrificed research first. As one associate professor said in response to an open-ended survey question, many faculty members believe they "have to fit research into 'spare time' that isn't consumed by committee meetings, teaching undergrads, and mentoring grad students." Another associate professor said in a focus group, to wide agreement among the participants, "You do your vocational work on the weekend because the administrative work takes up the week." In one focus group, a participant said that emphasizing service is "actually very counterproductive for the university. Tenured faculty are seasoned researchers. If they are putting all their time into admin[istration] rather than research it is really terrible for the university." Another added, "Academia is a whole series of bait and switch. You go to grad school because you are good in college classes and then have to switch and write a dissertation. . . . When you get good, you are asked to do service—something else I have never been trained to do."

Nevertheless, the work trends differed by gender, suggesting that women felt particularly pressured by the demands of service, mentoring, and teaching. Focus-group participants directly related the pressure on associate professors to do service and the imbalance of service to difficulties in attaining promotion. At the same time, they voiced concern about how service might limit their ability to be promoted. In one focus group, we heard the following exchange among three participants. "There's a contradiction between the pressure for service at the associate level and the devaluing of service for promotion to full," one said. "People who do a lot service for their departments and schools have difficulty going up for full because they just don't get enough time to do their research," said another. A third responded: "The criteri[on] for promotion is research. Associate professors have time for everything but research." As a participant noted in another focus group, "Something has to give at some point. [I wish] there was a recognition of these different aspects, different balance for different people . . . and valuing them for that."

All in all, associate professors, especially the women, seemed to view service primarily

as an imposition taking time away from the valued work—research, which earns promotion. One associate professor argued, “As associate faculty . . . we become penalized for doing this service monster.” Another said, “There is a price to pay . . . for the administrative load.” A third chimed in, “Yes, \$13,000,” which was the university’s salary bump related to promotion, and laughter broke out around the room.

If faculty members recognize that service is undervalued and likely to lead away from promotion, why do they do it? Many devote time to service because they see it as vital to the running of the university and believe students will suffer if it is not done. At the same time, faculty members voice bitterness at colleagues who do not share the burden. “I have colleagues who have not seen service in ten years,” one said. A sense of being part of a larger enterprise also led some to do more service than they would have liked. One associate professor noted, “If I set limits, I know it means [other faculty and graduate students] will do that extra work. I feel guilty if I say no.”

Changing the Service Culture

What policies might help alleviate the stress associate professors, and particularly women associate professors, experience? We recommend two policy changes that would require university investment and three that would require shifting the culture of work.

First, at many universities, economic hard times have led to fewer full-time faculty appointments and greater reliance on non-tenure-track instructors, who may also be less involved in faculty governance and leadership. For universities to thrive, they must replace lost tenure-line faculty members, increase tenure-line faculties along with student enrollment, and ensure that all faculty members are involved in and compensated for governance activities. Secondly, we urge that greater resources be focused on mentoring to support promotions to full professorships, particularly for women faculty. We believe that workshops that emphasize the “pathways” to full professorship may be particularly instructive.

Cultural changes also matter. Deans and department chairs or heads need to examine teaching, advising, mentoring, and service responsibilities to ensure that all faculty members pull their weight and are rewarded accordingly. Department chairs should review service, teaching, and mentoring expectations with their department members and ensure that women do not disproportionately carry their departments’ service burdens.

We also believe that cultural changes are needed to stress the value of the work of the professoriate more broadly. Too many faculty members and administrators devalue the importance of “institutional housekeeping,” even though it is crucial for the institution’s ongoing health. Universities need to recognize, reward, and publicize their faculty’s service, mentoring, and teaching accomplishments, in addition to their research accomplishments, and ensure that promotions recognize the wide range of contributions faculty make.

To return to the successful woman colleague with whom we started, what explains the glass ceiling she seems to be hitting? For her, and for countless other women, the ceiling

exists not simply because of her gender, but because she is engaged in a broader range of activities, focusing not only on her own research but also on interdisciplinary training and mentoring grants and on building a community of scholars. Clearly, a promotion system that recognizes these contributions—in addition to the value of her research—will support truly healthy, sustainable universities.

*Joya Misra is professor in the Department of Sociology and the Center for Public Policy and Administration at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. She studies labor market inequalities and work-family policies. Her e-mail address is misra@soc.umass.edu. Jennifer Hickey Lundquist is associate professor of sociology at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. She is a social demographer who studies racial, ethnic, and gender inequality. Her e-mail address is lundquist@soc.umass.edu. Elissa Holmes is a master's student in the public policy and administration program at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, and Stephanie Agiomavritis graduated from the university in 2010 with a bachelor's degree in sociology.

Comment on this article by writing to academe@aaup.org.

Why Men Still Get More Promotions Than Women

by **Herminia Ibarra**, **Nancy M. Carter**, and **Christine Silva**

Listen to an interview with the author of this article.




Nathalie (all names in this article are disguised), a senior marketing manager at a multinational consumer goods company and a contender for chairman in her country, was advised by her boss to raise her profile locally. An excellent intracompany network wouldn't be enough to land her the new role, he told her; she must also become active in events and associations in her region. Recently matched with a high-level mentor through a companywide program, she had barely completed the lengthy prework assigned for that when she received an invitation to an exclusive executive-training program for high potentials—for which she was asked to fill out more self-assessments and career-planning documents. "I'd been here for 12 years, and nothing happened," observes Nathalie. "Now I am being mentored to death."

Amy, a midlevel sales manager for the same firm, struggles with a similar problem: "My mentor's idea of a development plan is how many external and internal meetings I can get exposure to, what presentations I can go to and deliver, and what meetings I can travel to," she says. "I just hate these things that add work. I hate to say it, but I am so busy. I have three kids. On top of that, what my current boss really wants me to do is to focus on 'breakthrough thinking,' and I agree. I am going to be in a wheelchair by the time I get to be vice president, because they are going to drill me into the ground with all these extra-credit projects."

With turnover sky-high in the company's fast-growing Chinese market, Julie, a much-valued finance manager with growth potential, has likewise undergone intensive mentoring—and she worries that she may be getting caught betwixt and between. When she was nominated for a high-potential program, her boss complained that the corporate team was interfering with the mentoring operation he was already running in the region. Julie also took part in a less formal scheme pairing junior and senior finance leaders. "I'd prefer to be involved in the corporate program because it is more high-profile," says Julie, "but it all adds up to a lot of mentoring."


 Are women as likely as men to get mentoring? Yes. (Located at the end of this article)

Nathalie, Amy, and Julie are not atypical. As companies continue to see their pipelines leak at mid-to-senior levels even though they've invested considerable time and resources in mentors and developmental opportunities, they are actively searching for ways to retain their best female talent. In a 2010 World Economic Forum report on corporate practices for gender diversity in 20 countries, 59% of the companies surveyed say they offer internally led mentoring and networking programs, and 28% say they have women-specific programs. But does all this effort translate into actual promotions and appointments for both sexes?

 Does mentoring provide the same career benefits to men and women? No. (Located at the end of this article)

The numbers suggest not. A 2008 Catalyst survey of more than 4,000 full-time-employed men and women—high potentials who graduated from top MBA programs worldwide from 1996 to 2007—shows that the women are paid \$4,600 less in their first post-MBA jobs, occupy lower-level management positions, and have significantly less career satisfaction than their male counterparts with the same education. That's also the case when we take into account factors such as their industry, prior work experience, aspirations, and whether they have children. (For more findings, see Nancy M. Carter and Christine Silva, "**Women in Management: Delusions of Progress**," **HBR March 2010**.) Yet among that same group, more women than men report having mentors. If the women are being mentored so thoroughly, why aren't they moving into higher management positions?

To better understand what is going on, we conducted in-depth interviews with 40 high-potential men and women (including Nathalie, Amy, and Julie) who were selected by their large multinational company to participate in its high-level mentoring program. We asked about the hurdles they've faced as they've moved into more-senior roles, as well as what kinds of help and support they've received for their transitions. We also analyzed the 2008 survey to uncover any differences in how men and women are mentored and in the effects of their mentoring on advancement. Last, we compared those data with the results of a 2010 survey of the same population, in which we asked participants to report on promotions and lateral moves since 2008.

 Do men and women have the same kinds of mentors? No. (Located at the end of this article)

All mentoring is not created equal, we discovered. There is a special kind of relationship—called sponsorship—in which the mentor goes beyond giving feedback and advice and uses his or her influence with senior executives to advocate for the mentee. Our interviews and surveys alike suggest that high-potential women are overmentored and undersponsored relative to their male peers—and that they are not advancing in their organizations. Furthermore, without sponsorship, women not only are less likely than men to be appointed to top roles but may also be more reluctant to go for them.

Why Mentoring Fails Women

Although more women than men in the 2008 Catalyst survey report having mentors, the women's mentors have less organizational clout. We find this to be true even after controlling for the fact that women start in lower-level positions post-MBA. That's a real disadvantage, the study shows, because the more senior the mentor, the faster the mentee's career advancement. Despite all the effort that has gone into developing the women since 2008, the follow-up survey in 2010 reveals that the men have received 15% more promotions. The two groups have had similar numbers of lateral moves (same-level job assignments in different functions, designed to give high potentials exposure to various parts of the business). But men were receiving promotions after the lateral moves; for the women, the moves were offered in lieu of advancement.

Do men and women get their mentors in the same way? Yes. (Located at the end of this article)

Of course, the ultimate test of the power of mentoring would be to show that its presence during the 2008 survey is a statistically significant predictor of promotion by the time of the 2010 survey. That's true for the men but not for the women. Though women may be getting support and guidance, mentoring relationships aren't leading to nearly as many promotions for them as for men.

Does having formal versus informal mentoring make any difference in terms of promotions? Yes. (Located at the end of this article)

The survey findings are echoed in our interviews: Men and women alike say they get valuable career advice from their mentors, but it's mostly men who describe being sponsored. Many women explain how mentoring relationships have helped them understand themselves, their preferred styles of operating, and ways they might need to change as they move up the leadership pipeline. By contrast, men tell stories about how their bosses and informal mentors have helped them plan their moves and take charge in new roles, in addition to endorsing their authority publicly. As one male mentee recounts, in a typical comment:

"My boss said, 'You are ready for a general management job. You can do it. Now we need to find you a job: What are the tricks we need to figure out? You have to talk to this person and to that one and that one.' They are all executive committee members. My boss was a network type of a person.... Before he left, he put me in touch with the head of supply chain, which is how I managed to get this job."

Not only do the women report few examples of this kind of endorsement; they also share numerous stories about how they've had to fight with their mentors to be viewed as ready for the next role.

Paradoxically, just when women are most likely to need sponsorship—as they shoot for the highest-level jobs—they may be least likely to get it. Women are still perceived as "risky" appointments for such roles by often male-dominated committees. In a study of top-performing CEOs, for instance, the women were nearly twice as likely as the men to have been hired from outside the company (see Morten T. Hansen, Herminia Ibarra, and Urs Peyer, "**The Best-Performing CEOs in the World**," **HBR January–February 2010**). That finding suggests that women are less likely to emerge as winners in their firms' own CEO tournaments.

Sponsorship That Works

Impatient with the speed at which women are reaching the top levels, many leading-edge companies we work with are converging on a new set of strategies to ensure that high-potential women are sponsored for the most-senior posts. Those principles can make all the difference between a sponsorship program that gets results and one that simply looks great on paper.

Clarify and communicate the intent of the program.

It's hard to do a good job of both mentoring and sponsoring within the same program. Often the best mentors—those who provide caring and altruistic advice and counseling—are not the highfliers who have the influence to pull people up through the system. Employees expecting one form of support can be very disappointed when they get the other. And companies hoping to do A can find themselves with a program that instead does B. To prevent such problems, they need to clearly define what they're trying to accomplish.

☰ Mentors and Sponsors: How They Differ (Located at the end of this article)

At Deutsche Bank, for example, internal research revealed that female managing directors who left the firm to work for competitors were not doing so to improve their work/life balance. Rather, they'd been offered bigger jobs externally, ones they weren't considered for internally. Deutsche Bank responded by creating a sponsorship program aimed at assigning more women to critical posts. It paired mentees with executive committee members to increase the female talent pool's exposure to the committee and ensure that the women had influential advocates for promotion. Now, one-third of the participants are in larger roles than they were in a year ago, and another third are deemed ready by senior management and HR to take on broader responsibilities.

Select and match sponsors and high-potential women in light of program goals.

When the objective of a program is career advancement for high potentials, mentors and sponsors are typically selected on the basis of position power. When the goal is personal development, matches are made to increase the likelihood of frequent contact and good chemistry.

Unilever has established a program with the explicit objective of promoting more high-potential women to the firm's most-senior levels. The two key criteria for selecting the sponsors, all members of Unilever's senior ranks, are experience in areas where the high potentials have developmental gaps, and presence at the table when the appointment decisions get made. Given the company's international scope and matrix organization, this means that many of the women do not live and work in the same location as their sponsors. So some don't spend much face-to-face time with sponsors, but they do have advocates at promotion time.

Coordinate efforts and involve direct supervisors.

Centrally run mentoring programs that sidestep direct bosses can inadvertently communicate that diversity is an HR problem that requires no effort from the front lines.

Coordination of corporate and local efforts is especially important when it comes to senior-level participants in whom companies invest significantly. Effective sponsorship does not stand alone but is one facet of a comprehensive program that includes performance evaluation, training and development, and succession planning—all of which add up to more than the sum of the parts. The Deutsche Bank sponsorship program for female managing directors, for instance, is one piece of a highly tailored initiative that also involves leadership evaluations, external coaches, and leadership workshops.

Train sponsors on the complexities of gender and leadership.

Good sponsorship requires a set of skills and sensibilities that most companies' star executives do not necessarily possess. When you layer on top some of the complexities of sponsor relationships between senior men and junior women, you easily have a recipe for misunderstanding. The strategies and tactics that helped the men progress in their careers may not be appealing or even feasible for the women.

A classic case is the challenge of developing a credible leadership style in a context where most of the successful role models are male. One of the women in our research describes the problem like this: "My mentor advised me that I should pay more attention to my strategic influencing skills...but often he suggests I do things that totally contradict my personality." The behavioral styles that are most valued in traditionally masculine cultures—and most used as indicators of "potential"—are often unappealing or unnatural for high-potential women, whose sense of authenticity can feel violated by the tacit leadership requirements.

A further complexity is the famed "double bind" examined in Alice H. Eagly and Linda L. Carli's book **Through the Labyrinth** (Harvard Business Review Press, 2007) and in the 2007 Catalyst research report "**The Double-Bind Dilemma for Women in Leadership.**" Here's the problem, in short: The assertive, authoritative, dominant behaviors that people associate with leadership are frequently deemed less attractive in women. Male mentors who have never faced this dilemma themselves may be hard-pressed to provide useful advice. As one of our interview participants describes, even well-intended mentors have trouble helping women navigate the fine line between being "not aggressive enough" or "lacking in presence" and being "too aggressive" or "too controlling." She explains the challenge of dealing with conflicting expectations from two different bosses:

"My old boss told me, 'If you want to move up, you have to change your style. You are too brutal, too demanding, too tough, too clear, and not participative enough.' My new boss is different: He drives performance, values speed. Now I am told, 'You have to be more demanding.' I was really working on being more indirect, but now I will try to combine the best of both."

Male sponsors can be taught to recognize such gender-related dilemmas. Women in Sodexo's reciprocal-mentoring program, for

example, have been promoted at higher rates than other high potential women at the company, in part because the senior male mentors serve as career sponsors and (thanks to the upward mentoring) learn to manage their unconscious biases.

Hold sponsors accountable.

To fully reap the benefits of sponsorship, companies must hold sponsors accountable. At IBM Europe, a sponsorship program designed for senior women below the executive level aims to promote selected participants within one year. Sponsors, all vice presidents or general managers, are charged with making sure that participants are indeed ready within a year. So they work hard to raise the women's profiles, talk up the candidates to decision makers, and find the high potentials internal projects that will fill in their skills gaps and make them promotable. Failure to obtain a promotion is viewed as a failure of the sponsor, not of the candidate.

Although our data show that formal programs can be quite effective in getting women promoted, a potential pitfall is their fixed duration. Sponsors typically declare victory and move on after their high potentials advance—just when they need help to successfully take charge in their new roles. We know of no programs designed to shore up participants past promotion and through the “first 100 days” in the new position. With that extra bit of attention, sponsors could help deliver not just promotions but strong transitions.

Although the women we interviewed all come from the same company, the trends there mirror those at many other firms we've worked with and observed. And the survey responses, gathered from men and women at hundreds of firms, also provide strong evidence for gender difference in mentoring outcomes.

More sponsoring may lead to more and faster promotions for women, but it is not a magic bullet: There is still much to do to close the gap between men's and women's advancement. Some improvements—such as supportive bosses and inclusive cultures—are a lot harder to mandate than formal mentoring programs but essential if those programs are to have their intended effects. Clearly, however, the critical first step is to stop overmentoring and start accountable sponsoring for both sexes.

Are women as likely as men to get mentoring? Yes.

They're actually more so: In the 2008 Catalyst survey, **83%** of women and 76% of men say they've had at least one mentor at some point in their careers. Indeed, **21%** of women say they've had four or more mentors, compared with 15% of men.

Does mentoring provide the same career benefits to men and women? No.

Among survey participants who had active mentoring relationships in 2008, fully **72%** of the men had received one or more promotions by 2010, compared with 65% of the women.

Do men and women have the same kinds of mentors? No.

In 2008, **78%** of men were actively mentored by a CEO or another senior executive, compared with 69% of women.

More women than men had junior-level mentors: **7%** of women were mentored by a nonmanager or a first-level manager, compared with 4% of men.

Though both groups had more male than female mentors on balance, **36%** of women had female mentors, whereas only 11% of men did.

Do men and women get their mentors in the same way? Yes.

Most men and women—**67%** of the groups combined—found their mentors on their own, relying on personal networks. Just **18%** of women and 16% of men formed their mentoring relationships with the help of formal programs.

Does having formal versus informal mentoring make any difference in terms

of promotions? Yes.

Women who had found mentors through formal programs had received more promotions by 2010 than women who had found mentors on their own (by a ratio of almost three to two).

Among all participants who had found mentors on their own, the men received more promotions than the women (again, by a ratio of almost three to two).

For more on how companies are providing sponsorship, go to www.catalyst.org/publication/413/mentoring-sponsorship.

Mentors and Sponsors: How They Differ

Companies need to make a sharper distinction between mentoring and sponsorship. Mentors offer “psychosocial” support for personal and professional development, plus career help that includes advice and coaching, as Boston University’s Kathy Kram explains in her pioneering research. Only sponsors actively advocate for advancement.

“Classical mentoring” (ideal but rare) combines psychosocial and career support. Usually, though, workers get one or the other—or if they get both, it’s from different sources.

Analysis of hundreds of studies shows that people derive more satisfaction from mentoring but need sponsorship. Without sponsorship, a person is likely to be overlooked for promotion, regardless of his or her competence and performance—particularly at mid-career and beyond, when competition for promotions increases.

Mentors

- Can sit at any level in the hierarchy
- Provide emotional support, feedback on how to improve, and other advice
- Serve as role models
- Help mentees learn to navigate corporate politics
- Strive to increase mentees’ sense of competence and self-worth
- Focus on mentees’ personal and professional development

Sponsors

- Must be senior managers with influence
- Give protégés exposure to other executives who may help their careers
- Make sure their people are considered for promising opportunities and challenging assignments
- Protect their protégés from negative publicity or damaging contact with senior executives
- Fight to get their people promoted

Herminia Ibarra (herminia.ibarra@insead.edu) is a professor of organizational behavior and the Cora Chaired Professor of Leadership and Learning at Insead in Fontainebleau, France, and the author of **Working Identity: Unconventional Strategies for Reinventing Your Career** (Harvard Business Review Press, 2003).

Nancy M. Carter (ncarter@catalyst.org) is the vice president of research at Catalyst, a New York–based nonprofit that works with businesses to expand opportunities for women; she is also a visiting scholar at Insead.

Christine Silva (csilva@catalyst.org) is a director of research at Catalyst.