

UDK: 616-058:005

POSLOVNA EKONOMIJA
BUSINESS ECONOMICS

Godina X

Broj II

Str 86–105

doi 10.5937/poseko10-13048

Originalni naučni rad

PhD Daniela B. Hristić¹

University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Technical Sciences,
Department of Industrial Management, Novi Sad

PhD Slađana R. Čabrilo²

I-Shou University, International College, Department of International Business
Administration, Kaohsiung, Taiwan (R.O.C.),
University Educons, Sremska Kamenica – Novi Sad, Faculty of business
economics

MSc Tatjana S. Savić Šikoparija³

University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Technical Sciences,
Department of Industrial Management, Novi Sad

EXPLORING THE IMPACT OF SOCIOCULTURAL FACTORS ON POSITIONING WOMEN IN MANAGEMENT

ABSTRACT: Job division according to gender is, in its roots, of social and cultural character. Gender characteristics, cultural heritage and system of values in their living and working environment, have influenced women rather than men, in their professional development and progress within leadership hierarchy in organizations. This study is focused on a problem of women's professional promotion. The basic assumption is that positioning a woman in managerial structure of an organization, is influenced by a group of sociocultural factors such as social background, residential location, level of education and close environment which defines individual's action, recognition, understanding and evaluation of information, motives and achievements. These bundle

¹ hrida@sbb.rs

² sladjanacabrilo@gmail.com

³ tanja.sikoparija@gmail.com

of sociocultural factors have been referred to as an individual cultural capital. The main aim is to identify and analyze supportive and non-supportive factors, within the set of explored sociocultural factors, a woman faces on her way up the managerial hierarchy as well as to find possibilities to manage relevant factors in order to enable the woman to fully realize her professional potential and reach the highest possible level at managerial hierarchy. The findings prove relevance of explored factors and their influence on woman's professional promotion.

Key words: gender, cultural capital, sociocultural factors, management, promotion, hierarchy

INTRODUCTION

Emancipation and gender equality have brought new challenges and opportunities to women. At the same time, if a woman decides to follow a new path, she needs to add a role of a businesswoman to the existing role of a mother, which was determined by birth. Gender characteristics, together with system of values of the working and living environment, have influenced the differences in characteristics found in male managers and female managers, as well as evident discrepancy in a number of women and men at managerial positions.

The results of numerous studies have proved that the term leader is compatible with women (Konrad et al, 2000; Hofstede, 2001; Gibson, 2003; Bigoness, 1988; *Autor*, 2003), and that female managers are inclined to democratic style of management. Statistic data show that there have never been more working women than today (Naisbitt and Aburdene, 1990; Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia, 2010), while our historical and cultural heritage presented us with the predisposition of a complete self realization, which corresponds with modern managerial theory. A question arises: Which preconditions would make it possible for more women to access management structures and to have more opportunities and chances to succeed?

Taking into account all the statistical data on working women, one can not neglect the fact that they still hold low rank positions. An extremely small number of women can be found at the top managerial positions in big companies, where men take 90% and women take 10% of best paid executive positions (Daily et al., 1999; Winn, 2004; Anonymous, 2005).

In order to identify the supportive and obstacle factors every woman faces on her way up the managerial hierarchy, a woman sociocultural context containing various sociocultural factors (social background, residential

location, level of education and close environment characteristics which define individual actions, recognition, understanding and evaluation of information, motives and achievements) has been chosen as an indicator, whose relevance and determining influence are measured and analyzed during the study presented in this paper.

The problems of the study

Job division according to gender, points to social image of a woman and her education, justifying it, by using well- rooted cultural conditions. The identities of a man as a head of family and a provider, and a woman as a wife, a mother and economically weak and marginal worker, have been created throughout the history. Those are social perceptions of gender identities that have a correlation with work, and which are not homogenous or fixed. At the same time, they are constantly being redefined.

There is also a price that a woman pays, when she succeeds in getting rid of subordination to a certain degree (Winn, 2004). When a woman takes a competitive 'male' position at work, her professional affirmation stands out and very often creates social disapproval.

Living in separate worlds, men and women have developed different abilities and different dominant logics, as they have followed different objectives and kept different values. In almost all cultures (even though it is less obvious today than it used to be in the past), women stay at home, they do housework and take care of children, the sick and elderly, while men work outside of home. In addition, activities done by women, are regarded as less prestigious in the society than the ones done by men. As a result, we face over-masculinization of the public life as opposed to feminization of the private life.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

In theoretical discussions, there are three basic approaches to analyze insufficient women participation in managerial positions in companies. Gender, position within a company or both of these factors can determine achievements and behavior of an individual in a company. Depending on which of these three are the focus of the study, theories can be divided into: gender-oriented perspective, organization-oriented perspective and gender-organizational perspective.

Gender- oriented perspective

Gender research concentrates on difference between men and women (McGregor and Tweed, 2001). According to gender-oriented perspective, limited representation of women at higher positions in organizations is a result of factors found within woman herself - her unsuitable characteristics, attitudes and behavior. According to this approach, women are conditioned to possess the characteristics incompatible with the ones needed for managerial roles, and completely unethical for their promotion to higher positions in organizations (Fagenson, 1986; Harragan, 1977; O'Leary, 1974; Riger and Galligan, 1980; Terborg, 1977).

Since Schein's article "Think manager - think male" (Schein, 1976) there has been a great discussion on gender difference in managerial style in the academic literature. This discussion whether men and women are different still has power, because management is saturated with idealizations of masculinity (Marshall, 1995) The gender oriented approach is presented in the works of Matina Horner (1972), Margaret Hennig and Ann Jardim (1976). These authors consider that female biological and sociological patterns have caused the expression of characteristics and behavior unsuitable for becoming successful and prospective managers.

The environment sees prospective managers as aggressive, energetic, rational and competitive individuals who are determined, strong, self-confident and independent (Putman and Heinen, 1976). On the other hand, women are usually seen as relatively submissive, passive and irrational when it comes to business communication – they tend to show female characteristics such as being warm, kind and selfless (Feather, 1984; Putnam and Heinen, 1976; Spence and Helmreich, 1978). In other words, theorists of this approach, believe that women are constrained by their own characteristics and behavior, and that they possess personal characteristics, which are opposite the ones successful leaders should have (O'Leary, 1974; McClelland, 1965).

Organization-oriented perspective

From organization-oriented perspective, organizational structure is seen as another obstacle for limited female promotion in organizations. The most important proponent of this approach, Rosabeth Moss Kanter (1993), thinks that individuals' positions at hierarchy of power are shaped by their characteristics, behavior and further professional and hierarchical path. Somebody's position, not gender, defines actions and characteristics within an organization. Women are traditionally placed at lower positions, and develop their behavior and characteristics as the answer to their hierarchical position. If women were at higher managerial positions, they would show the behavior and attributes that

men have. Besides this, Rosabeth Moss Kanter also points out that symbolic participation of women in management, have contributed to the creation of stereotypes. There would be less stereotypes if the percentage of female managerial positions increased (Heilman, 1980).

Gender- organizational perspective

The third perspective, i.e. gender-organizational approach or gender context, has conceptually combined several directions, including previously mentioned approaches, into one perspective. Gender context suggests that women's behavior and their limited promotion in organizations, might be due to their gender, organizational context, as well as broader social and institutional system. The approach has encompassed both of the previous theories. However, instead of presumption that woman's behavior in organization is "either – or situation", this approach states that organizational structure and gender can form and define woman's behavior at work (Fagenson and Horovitz, 1985). It also introduces the third factor- the system of values in the environment and suggests that it influences woman's behavior and accessibility of higher managerial levels. Business organizations function in broader contexts such as societies that have special cultural values, historic heritage, social and institutional practice, ideology, expectations, and stereotypes related to male and female roles and behavior. All these factors influence the structures and processes in organizations (Martin et al., 1983).

In order to explore the issue of professional promotion of women, we starts from the assumption that professional orientation of a woman towards positioning in managerial structures is influenced by her 'cultural capital'. An individual cultural capital is the notion derived from heritage, existing conditions and opportunities, obstacles that should be overcome, education and consequent cognitive orientation of an individual. Individual cultural capital is closely related to personal development, circumstances and decisions that greatly influence a career growth. Career development, from the initial position to the top executive position, is influenced by cultural capital of a person which determines recognition, understanding, formation and evaluation of information, motives and achievements.

This research is aimed to analyze the influence of different sociocultural factors on positioning of women in managerial structure and identify supportive and obstacle factors a woman faces on her way up the managerial hierarchy. The main purpose is to disclose factors and situations that positively or negatively influences the positioning of women in organization and eventually to manage these factors in order to enable women to reach higher positions in managerial hierarchy.

INDIVIDUAL CULTURAL CAPITAL – A BUNDLE OF SOCIOCULTURAL FACTORS

In this study, an individual cultural capital is analyzed as a bundle of sociocultural factors (social background and residential location, level of education, characteristics of close environment) that influence individual behavior, professional and business aspirations and ambitions.

Numerous studies on hereditary and acquired differences in the level of abilities, lead us to conclusion that probability of talents and abilities is approximately the same in all groups, regardless of gender, race, nation or any other feature. Stimulus and block have roots in favorable and unfavorable socio-economic factors and their influence on further development of the given genetic potentials (Hrnjica, 2003).

Most primary socialization is facilitated by the family. Family strongly affects personal attitudes to future work, as well as their interpretations of family and professional roles. The research realized by the Institute for Educational Research in Belgrade (Polovina, 2009), on the sample of 2,447 eight-grade students from 36 primary schools in Serbia, observed the connection between the students' attitude to school and educational aspirations and the aspects of their families. The main findings have been the following:

I - compared to their male peers, female eight-grade students had considerably higher educational aspirations, more positive attitude to school, and extra curriculum activities that support school subjects.

II- there was a strong correlation between students' educational aspirations and the level of education their parents of the same sex have.

A similar study in Croatia analyzed students from Zagreb (the capital of Croatia), having in focus their social origins. The results showed that three quarters of the respondents came from urban areas, and almost three fifths came from the families where either both parents or at least one of the parents, had a university degree. These findings have indicated the process of higher class social reproduction (Ilisin, 2008).

Material and cultural factors consequently make differences in the dynamics of family relationships. In families of lower socio-economic status, stimuli that encourage child's curiosity are also lower. If the level of parents' aspiration is low, the gifted children have no chance to show their potential, while the most educated social class is likely to continue the trend of reproducing itself.

There is the assumption that a good start and a supportive figure in the development of genetic potential have higher significance for women that they have for men.

Businesswomen and management

There are a few factors that influence the rising employment of women today:

- education accessibility,
- constant need to increase family budget,
- changes in attitude to female roles,
- new needs that women have.

Recent data have shown that greater percentage of women having no children have been employed (79%) in comparison with men having no children (74%). The studies also show that women start new businesses twice faster than men. In Canada, one-third of small businesses is owned by women, while in France that is one-fifth. In Great Britain, since 1980, the number of self-employed women has been rising three times faster than a number of self-employed men (Naisbitt and Aburdene, 1990). The rise in female entrepreneurship was especially present in 1990s. According to the Center for Women's Business Research (2001) the number of women-owned firms in the US increased by 14 percent nationwide - twice the rate of all firms at the beginning of the 21st century. Most of the newly-founded companies in the Netherlands, Denmark and Germany are owned by women. In Germany, these companies have created a million job positions and made annual turnover of 15 billion dollars. In Japan, women run 23% of small businesses. In France and UK every fourth company is run by a woman.

Reasons can be partly found in the fact that today 44% of working women (25-65 years) have higher level of education, in comparison to 20% in 1965. The trend of rising women's participation in business is present in developing countries as well. In China, for example, 25% of small businesses since the 1970s were started by women. In Africa, Asia and Latin America women are dominant in food production, distribution and sales. In these regions, the presence of women at executive positions in family companies is evident (Naisbitt and Aburdene, 1990).

The marker of the above mentioned statistics is the circulation of a business magazine for women called "Working Women", which sold 450,000 copies in 1981, in comparison to 900 000 copies sold today. It also exceeds the sales of Fortune, Forbes and even Business Week. The only business paper that has larger circulation in US is Wall Street Journal. Businesswoman as a phenomenon, is one of the topics found in the section "Decade of Women in Management", of American bestseller Megatrends 2000 by Naisbitt and Aburdene. In the book, they mark 10 new directions for the coming century and one of them belongs to female managers. Being a leader in business is not an advantage reserved for men only.

Glass ceiling syndrome

The previous thesis on female leadership access is limited to a certain extent. Although women have gained visibility at upper management positions, corporate ladder is still populated by middle-aged men (Winn, 2004). The biggest obstacles to women's advancement in business and politics are deeply rooted social prejudice. Women's commitment to their professional growth and career is still viewed with suspicion (Cordano et al., 2002; Lancaster, 1999). A social phenomenon called "glass ceiling syndrome", that was defined by Wall Street Journal in 1985, implied invisible obstacles that prevent women from reaching hierarchical top in companies. An American theorist, Laurie Morgan (1998) defined *glass ceiling* as the case when women start their career from the same starting position as men, but over time, their progress to the top is either more slowly than men's or at the same rate, until at certain point, they hit the ceiling and their progress stops. Attaining top management positions usually includes ambition, long working hours and a lot of social events, informal gatherings and networking. Without familiar responsibilities, both men and women can compete equally. However, when marital situations change, this competition becomes more difficult for women (Winn, 2004).

According to a world magazine "Economist", there are three major reasons why we have glass ceiling syndrome. The first reason is exclusion of women from informal networks within a company, which are extremely important for promotion opportunities. The second reason is a prevailing prejudice that women are incapable of leadership. For the same reason, men who make the majority in company boards do not appoint women to higher and more responsible positions. The third reason is the lack of role models. The fact is that there are few women at high positions that can serve as role models.

According to UN data, women are discriminated most in top management of major companies. Joan Winn (2004) use the phrase 'a snail's pace to the top' for women's progress to top management. Finally, when they manage to reach executive positions, they earn less than men. In the world of big corporations, they are invisible because they attend less informal gatherings than men. The presence of women at executive positions is evident only in the Netherlands, Canada, Finland and Australia.

Getting a job is only a first step in female professional affirmation, while promotion in company represents more important challenge. By definition of Federal Glass Ceiling Commission, the term is defined as a border line that separates those who have the opportunity to accomplish their goals in accordance with their professional abilities, from those who stay behind. It is an artificial barrier that prevents women from advancing, regardless of their qualifications and effort. Therefore, we can talk about *glass ceiling*, in cases

where women do not get promoted to higher or top managerial positions, despite their demonstrated abilities and devotion.

Glass ceiling is the outcome of economic and social gender inequality.

The existing gap between men and women at managerial positions will not disappear by itself, so the companies, as well as governments, should make certain changes that would make it possible for the women to move up the corporate ladder with the same ease and speed as men. Breaking glass ceiling is a long term goal that should involve the whole society. The fact that we face glass ceiling phenomenon everywhere in the world, tells us that today we can only speak about making a hole in it, rather than completely breaking it.

This process should definitely involve state institutions, and not only in the sense of introducing and applying the laws on equality. The liberation of gender stereotypes in education and the changes in the attitudes of families, teachers and the environment (which cannot be possible without a comprehensive social program) are desirable basic measures for the reducing glass ceiling effects.

The role of education in professional emancipation of women

The role of education in female participation and professional emancipation has emerged as attractive research topic (Euwals et al., 2011). Until the end of The Second World War, family was the primary environment for women, while the content of the subjects taught in single-sex schools was conditioned by gender roles. The short history shows that women have gone long and hard journey in achieving their rights to education. An extremely important support on this journey came from women's closest family, especially fathers and husbands. Today, women's education is their legal right, but they still need this support in professional emancipation.

We have already mentioned that the lack of education is one of the factors that affect women's unemployment and inactivity. Education brings higher awareness and give access to wider work opportunities (Sidani, 2013). However, relationship between education and female labor participation is not coherent across different countries (Psacharopoulos and Tzannatos, 1989).

The environment and the value system

The system of values is a key factor in differences amongst modern developed and undeveloped countries. The difference between developed and undeveloped countries does not lie in years of country's history or its tradition – Egypt is a poor country, even though it has a tradition 2000 years long, while Canada and Australia are rich countries with a two –century history. The difference is not in natural resources either – Japan is among the most

developed economies in the world, yet, it practically has no resources. The difference is not in the academic level of a country's leadership or management – many African and Latin American countries have super/well educated elites and are still poor. The difference is not in ethnic background, race, culture or religion – in the developed countries, there are very successful ethnic groups which have a reputation of being inferior and the cause of their country's failure. The key difference is the system of values which is learned and shared through education, culture and social relations. It is manifested by our attitude to work, responsibility, punctuality, abiding of laws and rules, moral integrity, and the respect of ethical principles and rights of the others (Vujovic, 2004).

The effect of cultural value systems on gender differences and stereotypes has been in focus of many studies (Hofstede, 2001; Costa et al., 2001; Sidani, 2013). Culture modifies individual's intellectual development through encouragement of the values important for a certain culture. In addition, individual's behaviour and activities are influenced by the value system found in their society, favoured by that society and prejudice that the society suffers from. Social roles of gender relate to social expectations of male and female behavior in their environment, thus their socialization and their values are different.

RESEARCH PROBLEM AND HYPOTHESES

The process of business orientation is closely linked to education and it ends with professional maturity and integrity, which correspond to the wishes and needs of an individual in their professional and social system. There is always a question whether a woman's choice of professional future is her own decision, or it is predetermined by the conditions she has adopted while creating her self-image. Furthermore, the question is what determines the quality of her decisions? Professional orientation is a process which favors acceptance of responsibility in professional choices, on the basis of motivation and personal motives, bearing in mind persons' relations to social and economic context they come from, that they are in or the context they aspire to.

To adapt the process of female orientation to higher managerial positions, means to accept the concept of female subjectivity as an integral part of their identity and gender. In the center of this process of professional affirmation, there is an individual whose personality bears the burden of cultural conditions, uniqueness of personal identification, different beliefs and values closely connected to gender identity.

The following hypotheses were defined in accordance to the problem and objectives of the study:

H1 -cultural capital is a relevant indicator of positioning women in managerial hierarchy.

H2 -there are differences in sub-samples (M-F manager) in comparison to their cultural capital.

RESEARCH METHOD

The key objective is to analyze the relevance of cultural capital as a set of sociocultural factors on female positioning in management. According to the goals, these were particular tasks to be realized:

- presentation of basic parameters of the subject,
- establishing the difference between the groups of the respondents,
- defining each group's characteristics,
- establishing each group's homogeneity,
- establishing features' contribution to each group's characteristics.

For the needs of the empirical study, the hypotheses were tested as described below:

- if $p > 0.100$ – there is no reason to accept the single hypothesis.

In order for hypothesis to be accepted, two thresholds of significance will be used:

- if $0.10 > p > 0.05$ single hypothesis is accepted with an increased risk of deduction
- when $p < 0.05$ single hypothesis is accepted and it is regarded that there are significant differences between respondents' groups, in comparison to the subject of the study.

Questionnaire

A specifically designed questionnaire containing 25 closed –ended questions, where respondents' answers are limited to a fixed set of responses, was made. Questions were divided in separate sections. Basically, questionnaire was designed as respondents' profile containing details about who they were, where they came from, what their social background was, their residential location; education, environment, professional ambitions and aspirations as well as the information on their companies. The questionnaire was adopted and modified by an expert-method technique.

The sample

To ensure the representativeness of the sample respondents were high and top level managers from diverse companies with regard to ownership

structure, industry and geographic location. The sample was adapted, and contained 130 respondents, split into two sub-samples. The first sub-sample included 64 male managers (M), while the other sub-sample included 64 female managers (F).

Data analysis

The applied statistical methods and the order of their application were of extreme importance, not only for deduction of the facts, but also for elimination and inclusion of certain features adding more quality to the study. The analysis was done in two steps – the testing of the hypothesis on similarities or differences and determining the extent of the differences alongside defining the characteristics of the sub-samples.

The features of the wholes had non- parametric characteristics, so they were analyzed in non- parametric way according to the frequency of modality. In order to avoid losing the data, we scaled the data on contingency tables, which enabled usage of Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) and discriminative analysis. From the univariate procedures, we applied Roy Test, Pearson's Contingency Coefficient and multiple correlation coefficient. Calculating the coefficient of discrimination gives us the specific features of the sub-samples and the characteristics, based on which the reduction of the observed study field is done. The evaluation of homogeneity of the sub-samples and the distance between them is also shown.

THE RESULTS

The analysis of the differences between sub-samples in relation to cultural capital

In this section we will prove or disprove hypothesis H2 that there is a significant difference between the sub-samples: male (M) and female (F) managers, according to cultural capital.

Table 1 – The Significance of the Difference of the Sub-samples (M-F manager) in Relation to Cultural Capital

Analysis	n	F	p
MANOVA	17	9.916	.000
discriminative	17	98907.300	.000

Based on the values $p=.000$ (MANOVA analysis) and $p=.000$ (discriminative analysis), a hypothesis H2 was accepted, which means that there was a clearly defined line between the sub-samples (Table 1).

Table 2 – The Significance in the Difference (M-F manager) in Relation to Cultural Capital

	χ	R	F	p	c.dsc
What type of local community did you grow up in?	.259	.268	9.420	.003	.000
Residential status:	.169	.172	3.707	.056	.021
Residential situation of your family :	.108	.108	1.450	.231	.044
Your mother's level of education	.243	.251	8.202	.005	.009
Circle the mother's job position:	.295	.308	12.812	.000	.054
Your father's level of education:	.241	.248	8.003	.005	.134
Circle the father's job position:	.340	.362	18.346	.000	.305
Your spouse/partner's level of education:	.235	.242	7.563	.007	.001
Circle the partner's job position	.407	.446	30.273	.000	.079
Your level of education	.395	.430	27.709	.000	.258
During your education you achieved:	.121	.122	1.838	.178	.135
When did you have the highest ambitious?	.221	.227	6.621	.011	.192
After employment, you continued with personal and professional education	.418	.460	32.813	.000	.188
What motivates you to continue education?	.486	.556	54.718	.000	.186
What demotivates you from your further education while working?	.373	.402	23.513	.000	.064
Is your current professional status reflection of the past ambitions?	.156	.158	3.121	.080	.048
Please state the reasons if you haven't achieved expected success	.122	.123	1.862	.175	.026

Legend: c.dsc is a coefficient of discrimination

With markers with the result $p<.1$, a single hypothesis H2 was accepted, which means that there are significant differences between the sub-samples. The coefficient of discrimination led to the conclusion that the biggest discrimination according to cultural capital was in these markers: Father's job position (.305), Your level of education (.258), When did you have the highest professional ambitions? (.192), After employment, you continued with personal and professional education (.186), During your education you achieved (.135), Your father's level of education: (.134), Your spouse/partner's level of education: (.079), What demotivates you from further education while working? (.064), Your mother's job position (.054), Is your current professional status reflection of the past ambitions? (.048), Residential situation of your family (.044), Please state the reason if you haven't achieved expected success (.009), Your spouse/partner's level of education (.001), What type of local community did you grow up in? (.000) (Table 2).

Characteristics and homogeneity of the sub-samples in relation to cultural capital

Based on the observations, and in accordance to the applied methodology, a logical order of the study is - first defining specific

characteristics and homogeneity of the each sub-sample (M-F manager) and then defining the distance between them.

The fact that $p=.000$ is of discriminative analysis, leads to the conclusion that there is a clear border line between the sub-samples (M-F manager), i.e. that it is possible to define the characteristics of each group (M-F manager) in relation to cultural capital.

Table 3 – Characteristics and Homogeneity of the Sub-samples (M-F manager) in Relation to Cultural Capital

	<i>men-managers</i>	<i>women -managers</i>	dpr %
Father's job position:	Farmer. *, State company.*	Executive position*	17.489
Your level of education:	High school degree*	MA/ PhD*	14.794
When did you have the highest ambitious?	-	Before starting family*	11.009
Did you continue your education after your employment?	No*	Yes, higher education*, Yes, specialization*	10.780
Your motives for further education	Promotion within company*	Academic career*	10.665
During your education you achieved	-	-	7.741
Your father's level education:	-	MA/PhD*	7.683
Your spouse/ partner's job position:	Civil administration, civil service*, unemployed*	Executive position*, private business*	4.530
What demotivates you from your further education while working?	I want to spend more time with my friends, not with a book*	The society doesn't value education*, family commitments*	3.670
Your mother's job position:	House wife*	Civil service.*	3.096
Is your current professional status reflection of past ambitions	-	-	2.752
Residential situation of your family	-	-	2.523
Please state the reason if you haven't achieved expected success	-	-	1.491
Residential status:	-	City centre*	1.204
Your mother's level of education:	Primary education*	University degree*	.516
Your spouse/partner's level of education	High school degree*	University degree *	.057
What type of local community did you grow up in?	Medium sized town*	City centre*	.000
n/m	53/64	61/66	
%	82.81	92.42	

dpr % - relative weight of each feature

Homogeneity: men managers 82,81% (high); women managers 92,42 % (extremely high).

Based on the specific single characteristics of the respondents' cultural capital, the men sub-sample shows the specific features presented in Table 4.

Table 4 – The Specific Single Characteristics of the Respondents' Cultural Capital, the Men Sub-sample

	<i>men-managers</i>
Father's job position:	Farmer.*, State company.*
Level of education:	High school degree*
Continued professional education:	No*
Motive for further education	Promotion within company*
During your education you achieved	-
Your spouse/ partner's job position:	Civil administration, civil service*, unemployed*
What demotivates you from your further education while working?	I want to spend more time with my friends, not with a book*
Your mother's job position:	House wife*
Your mother's level of education:	Primary education*
Your spouse/partner's level of education	High school degree*
What type of local community did you grow up in?	Medium sized town*

The specific features related to the single characteristics of the respondents' cultural capital of the women sub-sample are presented in Table 5.

Table 5 – The Specific Single Characteristics of the Respondents' Cultural Capital, the Women Sub-sample

	<i>women -managers</i>
Father's job position:	Executive position*
Level of education:	MA/ PhD*
Continued professional education:	Before starting family*
Motive for further education	Academic career*
Your spouse/ partner's job position:	Executive position*, private business*
What demotivates you from your further education while working?	The society doesn't value education*, family commitments*
When did you have the highest professional ambitions?	<i>Before starting family*</i>
Your mother's job position:	Civil service.*
Your mother's level of education:	<i>University degree*</i>
Your spouse/partner's level of education	<i>University degree*</i>
What type of local community did you grow up in?	<i>City centre*</i>

By calculating of Mahalanobis generalized distance between sub-samples (M-F manager) we got another marker of similarities or differences, because we could compare the distance of different areas. The Table 4 shows that the distance between the sub-samples is (M-F manager) is considerable.

Table 6 – Distance (Mahalanobis) between Sub-samples in Relation to Cultural Capital

	men-managers	women-managers
Men	.00	2.43
Women - managers	2.43	.00

CONCLUSION

The biggest differences in partial measurements between male and female managers were related to their social background: educational and professional status of the respondents' families (especially their fathers and spouses). This proves our hypothesis that support that a woman receives from her closest family, used to be and still is, the most important supportive factor on her journey to professional affirmation. Today, women's education is their legal right, but they still need this support from their environment in their professional emancipation. Therefore, a significant discrimination, stated in educational level of the respondents (male and female managers) who take the same positions in the companies, might be considered as the consequence of the above mentioned differences.

Furthermore, the differences in further education and career development are proportional to the differences in educational level of the respondents' social background. A woman's social background, her household and her family, greatly influence her professional development. This is in line with the previously mentioned studies (Polovina, 2007; Ilisin, 2008), whose results stated that students' educational aspirations highly correlated with their parents' educational level.

The differences were also found in further education. Based on the survey, there is a conclusion that female managers are more likely to continue their education (in the pursuit of academic career) in comparison with male managers with family commitments as obstacles. Family commitments are "*the stumbling block*" to further education for female managers, while male managers would like to spend their time with friends rather than with a book.

It is important to emphasize the marker which is significant as a factor of discrimination of the sub-samples, even though its nature is not the cultural capital's focus of interest. It is the question related to the time when their professional ambitions were at the highest level. For female managers, that was the time before starting their families. Therefore, unless women experience drastic changes in their lives, their family and children are their priority and preference. The society still assess men's success by their profession, while the image of a successful woman is usually subjected to prejudice. Female managers are seen as women who lack femininity and whose ambitions do harm to their

husbands and children. Working outside household is sanctioned, if it is the result of a woman's need for self-realization and autonomy, and it is accepted if it is the result of economic needs of her family.

The results of the study prove the hypothesis that cultural capital of the respondents shows a great discrimination between the groups. Thus, even though the statistics on educational and professional status of the respondents' families are in favor of female managers, as they come from urban areas with the families of higher educational level and whose members are professionally realized, these factors do not give them an advantage when it comes to managerial hierarchy. The criteria that are considered significant within an organization lose the importance in case of men. Men need less support from their educational, social or residential background than women.

REZIME

ISTRAŽIVANJE UTICAJA SOCIO-KULTURNIH FAKTORA NA POZICIONIRANJE ŽENA U MENADŽMENTU

Podela poslova po polovima ima u osnovi društveni i kulturološki karakter. Rodne karakteristike, kulturno nasleđe i sistem vrednosti okruženja u kome žive i rade, uticali su da nivo kulturnog kapitala ima različit determinišući uticaj na žene, u odnosu na muškarace, na prostoru njihovog profesionalnog ostvarivanja i dostizanja rukovodećih pozicija u okviru organizacije. Ovaj rad razmatra probleme profesionalne promocije žena. Osnovna pretpostavka u radu je da se pozicioniranje žene u upravljačkim strukturama organizacija, realizuje pod uticajem grupe socio-kulturnih faktora, kao što su socijalno i rezidencijalno poreklo, obrazovni status žena i njihovog neposrednog okruženja koji određuje delovanja pojedinca, prepoznavanje, razumevanje i vrednovanje informacija, motiva i postignuća. Grupa navedenih socio-kulturnih faktora u ovom radu oznacena je kao *individualni kulturni kapital*. Osnovni cilj istraživanja je identifikovanje i analiza faktora koji podržavaju ili stvaraju prepreke ženama u profesionalnom napredovanju, i formiranje klase relevantnih faktora, radi mogućnosti da se na neke od njih utiče u cilju kvalitetnijeg profesionalnog ostvarivanja i boljeg pozicioniranja žena u menadžment hijerarhiji. Rezultati istraživanja dokazuju relevantnost individualnog kulturnog kapitala i njegov determinišući uticaj na profesionalnu promociju žene.

Ključne reči: rodnost, kulturni kapital, socio-kulturni faktori, menadžment, promocija, hijerarhija.

REFERENCES

1. Anonymous (2005). Latest count of top women in Canadian business shows little progress since last catalyst census, *Women in Management Review* 20.7/8: 538-539.
2. Bigoness, W.J. (1988). Sex differences in job attribute preferences, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 9, 139-147.
3. *Center for Women's Business Research* (2001), available at: www.nfwbo.org (accessed 7 October 2002).
4. Cordano, M., Scherer, R.F. and Owen, C.L. (2002), "Attitudes toward women as managers: sex versus culture", *Women in Management Review*, Vol. 17 No. 2, pp. 51 -60.
5. Costa, P.T. Jr, Terracciano, A. and McCrae, R.R. (2001), "Gender differences in personality traits across cultures: robust and surprising findings", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 81 No. 2, pp. 322-331.
6. Daily, C.M., Certo, S.T. and Dalton, D.R. (1999). A decade of corporate women: some progress in the boardroom, none in the executive suite, *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 93-9.
7. Euwals, R., Knoef, M. and van Vuuren, D. (2011). The trend in female labour force participation: what can be expected for the future?, *Empirical Economics*, Vol. 40 No. 3, pp. 729-753.
8. Fagenson, E. (1986). Women's Work Orientations: Something Old, Something New, *Group and Organization Studies* II, pp. 75-100.
9. Feather, N. (1984). Masculinity, Femininity, Psychological Androgyny and the Structure of Values, *Journal of Personal and Social Psychology* 47, pp. 604-2 I.
10. Gibson, C.B. (2003). An Investigation of Gender Differences in Leadership cross Four Countries, *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 26 No. 2, pp. 255 – 279.
11. Gregory, A. (1990). Are Women Different and Why are Women Thought to Be Different Theoretical and Methodological Perspectives, *Journal of Business Ethics* 9: 257-266, Kluwer Academic Publishers.
12. Harragan, B. (1977). *Games Mother Never Taught You*, Warner, New York.
13. Hennig, M. and Jardim, A. (1976). *The Managerial Woman, Anchoress/Doubleday*, Garden City, NY.
14. Homer, M. (1972). Toward an Understanding of Achievement Related Conflicts in Women, *Journal of Social Issues* 28, pp. 157-76.
15. Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations*, Second Edition, Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publications

16. Hristić, D. (2003). *The characteristics of female managers and a new managerial style*, Faculty of Technical Sciences, Novi Sad.
17. Hrnjica, S. (2005). *Psychology and personality psychology*, NAUČNA KMD, ISBN: 86-83645-12-6.
18. Ilišin, V. (2008). A Sketch for the Sociological Portrait of Students in Zagreb, *Sociology and space journal*, num 3-4, pp. 221-40.
19. Kanter, R. M. (1993). *Men and Women of the Corporation*, N.Y. Basic Books.
20. Konrad, A. M., Ritchie, J. E., Jr., Lieb, P., & Corrigan, E. (2000). Sex differences and similarities in job attribute preferences: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126, 593-641.
21. Lancaster, H. (1999). To get shipped abroad, women must overcome prejudice at home, *The Wall Street Journal*, Vol. B1 June 29, p. 4.
22. Martin, P., Harrison, D. and Dinitto, D. (1983) Advancement for Women in Hierarchical Organizations: A, Multilevel Analysis of Problems and Prospects, *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 19, pp. 19-33.
23. Marshall, J. (1995), Gender and Management: A Critical Review of Research, *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 6, Special Issue, pp.53-62.
24. McClelland, D. (1965). Toward a Theory of Motive Acquisition, *American Psychologist* 20, pp. 321-33.
25. McGregor, J. and Tweed, D. (2001) Gender and managerial competence: support for theories of androgyny?. *Women in Management*, Vo I 16 (nos 5/6), pp. 279-286. - See more at: <http://www.aut.ac.nz/profiles/judy-mcgregor#sthash.ws1MHwTR.dpuf>
26. Naisbitt J. and Aburdene P. (1990). *Megatrends 2000 - Ten New Directions For the 1990*, Avon Books, NY.
27. O'Leary, V. (1974). Some Attitudinal Barriers to Occupational Aspirations in Women, *Psychological Bulletin* 81, pp. 809-26.
28. Polovina, N. (2009). *General beliefs of teachers and students about working and living environment: Implications for mutual cooperation*, Education Research Institute, num.1, pp. 76-99.
29. Psacharopoulos, G. and Tzannatos, Z. (1989), Female labor force participation: an international perspective, *The World Bank Research Observer*, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp. 187-201.
30. Putnam, L. and Heinen, S. (1976). Women in Management: The Fallacy of the Trait Approach, *MSU Business Topics*, pp. 47-53.
31. Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia, (2010). *The Bulletin on Basic Sets of the population of Serbia*, Announcemnt, number 368, LX, 29.12.2010., ISSN 0353-9555
32. Riger, S. and Galligan, P. (1980). Women in Management: An Exploration of Competing Paradigms", *American Psychologist* 35, pp. 902-10.

33. Schein, V.E. (1976), Think manager-think male, *The Atlanta Economic Review*, March-April, pp. 21-4.
34. Sidani, Y. M. (2013). *Gaps in female labor participation and pay equity: the impact of cultural variables*, *Gender in Management* 28.7: 424-440.
35. Spence, J. and Helmreich, R. (1978). *Masculinity and Femininity: Their Psychological Dimensions, Correlates and Antecedents*, University of Texas Press, Austin.
36. Terborg, J. (1977). Women in Management, A Research, *Journal of Applied Psychology* 62, pp. 647—64.
37. Winn, J. (2004). Entrepreneurship: not an easy path to top management for women, *Women in Management, Review* 19.3: 143-153.

Ovaj rad je primljen **29.01.2017.**, a na sastanku redakcije časopisa prihvaćen za štampu **03.03.2017.** godine.