



Aalborg Universitet

AALBORG UNIVERSITY
DENMARK

Historicizing the "Glass Ceiling"

The engendering of difference in German and danish media presentations of leadershipdebates 1960-1989

Rittenhofer, Iris

DOI (link to publication from Publisher):
[10.5278/freia.4983311](https://doi.org/10.5278/freia.4983311)

Publication date:
2000

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication from Aalborg University](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Rittenhofer, I. (2000). *Historicizing the "Glass Ceiling": The engendering of difference in German and danish media presentations of leadershipdebates 1960-1989*. Institut for Historie, Internationale Studier og Samfundsforhold, Aalborg Universitet. FREIA's tekstserie No. 46 <https://doi.org/10.5278/freia.4983311>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal -

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at vbn@aub.aau.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Iris Reittenhofer

**Historicizing the “Glass Ceiling”
The engendering of difference in
German and Danish
media presentations of
leadership debates 1960-1989**

FREIA

**Paper
March 2000**

46

*Feminist Research Center in Aalborg
Department of History, International and Social Studies
Aalborg University
Fibigerstraede 2
DK-9220 Aalborg East
Tel: + 45 9635 8310, Fax: + 45 9815 3298
www.ihis.aau.dk/freia/index.php*

Iris Rittenhofer
Historicizing the “Glass Ceiling”
The engendering of difference in German and Danish
media presentations of leadership-debates 1960 - 1989

Paper from
FREIA - Feminist Research Centre in Aalborg
Department of Development and Planning
Aalborg University
Fibigerstraede 2
DK-9220 Aalborg East
Phone: +45 96 35 83 10

Print: Uni-Print, Aalborg University, 2000

Layout: Line Jacobsen

ISSN: 0907-2179

FREIA's paper series contains working papers, papers for conferences and seminars, project descriptions, lecture manuscripts, chapters from books etc. The papers are made by researchers affiliated to FREIA or by researchers who have visited the centre. The paper series aims at spreading the knowledge of FREIA's activities, internally as well as externally. Editors of the series are Ann-Dorte Christensen and Ruth Emerek. The papers can be ordered at Aalborg University, Department of Development and Planning, phone: +45 96 36 83 10, or by e-mail: line@i4.auc.dk.

Iris Rittenhofer

**Historicizing the “Glass Ceiling”
The engendering of difference
in German and Danish
media presentations of
leadership debates 1960 – 1989**

Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. The purpose of the analysis	4
3. Method and key-concepts	6
3.1. Presentation	6
3.2. Category.....	7
3.3. Construction.....	8
3.4. Analogies/ Correspondences	10
3.5. Discourse	11
4. Selected conclusions	14
4.1. The presentation of equality and inequality in Denmark and Germany	14
4.2. Change and permanency in Danish and German top leadership	15
4.2.1. Denmark	15
4.2.2. Germany	17
4.3. Difference enunciating hierarchy - the correspondence between leadership and gender	19
4.4. The permanency of hierarchy	21
5. Concluding remarks	25
6. Literature	27

This working paper consists of five parts. After a short introduction to the subject and a description of the purpose of analysis, the theoretical and methodological key-concepts of my analysis will be briefly introduced. I developed these key concepts by combining elements of Foucauldian discourse analysis and Derridian deconstruction. I will then present selected results and key conclusions from my dissertation. The paper ends with a number of concluding remarks on the character of the "glass ceiling", seen from the perspective of an historical analysis inspired by poststructuralist thought.

1. Introduction

The starting point for my dissertation was dissatisfaction with the focus and the explanations offered in the literature on women and management. The focus here is in most cases on the lack of "women" in top management positions. By referring to the sociologist Wetterer, my critique is that this literature not only takes outset in a gender difference, but reproduces this difference as well.

I therefore looked for a way to analyse the relation between gender and leadership without reproducing gender difference myself.

In the following, I first want to present my theoretical and methodological framework. Secondly, I want to present a selection of empirical results. Thirdly, I will turn to one of my main conclusions. In doing so, I want to use the opportunity to specify my argumentation.

I will start with a brief explanation of the terms "the glass ceiling" and the expression of "the engendering of difference".

The term "the glass ceiling" emerged in the literature in 1986 ("*the glass ceiling effect*", Hymounts 1986). It takes outset in the existence of two genders, and tries to identify what can be described as the persistence of a barrier into top management despite the acquisition of required qualifications. This barrier is analysed and described not as a barrier for women, but as a barrier for qualified women. The possibility of an existence of barriers for qualified men is not thought into the concept.

The "engendering of difference" is related to the findings of my dissertation, which clearly indicate that gender is one way of enunciating hierarchy as difference.

Based on the findings in my analysis, my argumentation goes a step further, namely that this conception applies to leadership as well. Gender is not the only way of enunciating hierarchy. Leader, too is an enunciation of hierarchy as difference. Thus, the presentations of both leader and gender are of equal importance to the analysis.

The enunciation of hierarchies as both gender and leader is found in the intertextual analysis of presentations and constructions of categories both within time (synchron) and over time (diachron). In the context of my analysis, to historicize means to conduct an intertextual diachronical analysis of the presentation and construction of chosen categories, which reveals analogous transformations in contents and meanings. I will return to this below.

The enunciations of hierarchies as presentations and constructions of both gender and leader not only produce the relational content of categories. In the establishing of a relationship between gender and leader, meaning is produced. The focus of my analysis is on the production of meaning, not on the production of content. In attempting to historicize these meanings, the puzzle cannot be solved in analysing the historical differentiation of the meanings of gender in the context of leadership alone. Even when including the analysis of the historical differentiation of leader in the context of gender, this outset would still stay within and reproduce the difference and hierarchy of both gender and leader.

Instead, I questioned the obviousness of the relevance of discussing gender when talking leader and of discussing leader when talking gender. I took outset in the position that this obviousness as well as the obviousness of the existence of leader and gender itself is cultural and historical produced perceptions of society. Thus, the interplay of both the production of gender and the production of leader, the framework for making this interplay possible and the meaning established in this interplay between two cultural phenomena has to be analysed.

The focus of my paper is hence the relation between gender and leader, and the cultural meanings established in the interplay between these categories in the period of 1960 - 1989 in Denmark and Germany.

Cultural meaning is established in history. This meaning, though, is not coincidental. In the introductory chapters of the dissertation, I present some theoretical considerations about the cultural frameworks, which are crucial for both the ways meaning is established in the sources, and the content of this meaning itself. In the dissertation, I labelled these frameworks "discursive knowledge".

At this point, I briefly want to turn to my understanding of gender. As many other historians, I was very much inspired by Joan Scott's (1988) definition of gender as an analytical category of history.

Here, I especially focused on the aspect that gender is social relationships based on the perceived differences of the sexes. To me, the question, then, was what precedes this perception shared within a culture? Why do we perceive differences? Why do we perceive them as gender? Is gender the only perception of differences? Scott also defined gender as a primary way of signifying relationships of power. In the context of my analysis, I was inspired to ask the question, whether gender is the primary way of enunciating hierarchy? Has it always been the only way of doing so?

Taking an outset in what is usually referred to as poststructuralist thinking, I also questioned the suggestion that gender should be the primary way of enunciating hierarchy regardless of context and time. My findings suggest that the enunciations of hierarchies have to be contextualized. The historicizing of categories in the context of leadership debates suggest that gender is not the only way of enunciating hierarchies. Talking the level of presentation, it neither has always been the primary way. I think that the same observation can be made with regard to leader. On the level of social relationships, this might lead to the question of what is shared within a culture that is preceding the perception of there being leaders? And talking at the level of intertextual analysis, the question is what is preceding the

enunciation of hierarchies as gender and leader? In the dissertation, I labelled this commonly shared "knowledge" which I found to be preceding enunciations as the discursive knowledge of "Zweigeschlechtlichkeit"¹, and the discursive knowledge of leadership.

Finally some general reservations. The purpose of my analysis is neither to analyse the origin of perceptions of gender and leader, nor the reasons and causes for meaning being established in this way. I want to analyse what this meaning is and consists of. Neither do I intend to analyse the relation between the meaning created in the sources and a world outside the sources. The epistemological question of the relationship between perceiving matter and matter itself is thus excluded. Neither is it the purpose of my analysis to show that an apriorical or given framework for these perceptions exists in the sources. Instead, the identification of the mentioned frameworks of discursive knowledge is one of the results of my analysis.

2. The Purpose of the Analysis

The purpose of my dissertation is to analyse the production of categories and discourses and their meaning creating relationship to each other in a within the sources and in the relation of the sources to each other. The sources were chosen with outset in the visible existence of categories of leader and gender in the sources. Thus, in the dissertation, I attempt to contribute to the development of a method for gender history as discourse history, which does not reproduce gender difference. In my understanding, discourse history means a history of gender and leader as relational categories. The first step in the development of such a method is to analyse the constitution

¹ The term "Zweigeschlechtlichkeit" itself I borrowed from Carol Hagemann-White 1984, 1989 and Angelika Wetterer 1992. I use the term to visualise the dualism in the concept of gender. This is of special importance considering the fact that the dissertation was wrote in German language. In German, the term "Geschlecht" is the only available term, including its various connotations. However, I want to point out that I only borrow the term "Zweigeschlechtlichkeit" itself and use it in my own understanding.

of meaning in the language that presents and constructs differences and hierarchies as both gender and leader.

What I want to suggest is that the crucial point for analysis is how meaning is created in the production of interplay of or a link between gender and leader. The purpose of my analysis is thus to understand the cultural meaning established in the language of sources.

The questions I want to discuss here are: (1) How can the enunciation of hierarchy as difference in the sources be conceptualised and analysed? (2) How is this interplay between gender and leadership established? (3) What does it consist of? (4) What is the meaning produced in this interplay of gender and leadership? (5) Are there differences between Denmark and Germany, and are there changes over time?

The production of gender and leader, the enunciation of hierarchies as gender and leader, and the production of interplay between gender and leader can be analysed at the "third level" of history. The term "third level" of historical analysis, die ""dritte Ebene" der Geschichte", I borrowed from the historian Peter Schöttler (1989:118). I found the term useful to illustrate the level of the analysis I conducted in the dissertation. For Schöttler, the term "third level" covers the level of the constitution of meaning in the language of the sources. The "third level" - in Schöttler's understanding - is neither simply reflecting the levels of economy and society, nor does there exist a linear or hierarchic relation between discourse, society and economy. Here, it means that I am not analysing social relationships, but rather their production in the presentations and constructions of binary categories in the sources.

The question, then, is: How are we to analyse the production of gender, leader and the meaning established in the relationship between the two at the third level of history? This brings me to the third point, methods and key concepts.

3. Method and Key Concepts

In the language of the sources, the diversity of social relationships is presented and constructed as dichotomies. Dichotomy means the presentation and construction of categories as hierarchical binaries. In the analysis of my dissertation, both gender and leader turned out to be binary categories or dichotomies, that means: they are ways of expressing, thinking and enunciating hierarchies as relational difference.

3.1. Presentation

The meaning of enunciating hierarchy in these ways can be analysed in the way leader and gender is produced in relation to each other in the sources. To produce, to establish or to create in the following means both to present and to construct. This leads me to the introduction of my first key concept, namely the concept of presentation.

As I stated above, it is my outset that there is no linear relation between the levels of historical analysis. Neither is there a linear relation between the reality produced in the sources and a reality outside the sources. The sources are no reflection of a matter. Therefore, the starting point is to separate the analytical levels of representation - for example, of social relationships - and presentation. Sources in my understanding do not re-present a historical reality outside the texts, but produce a textual reality. The sources for analysis were articles in newspapers and magazines, read as textual presentations, which produce meanings. But there is no possibility of an endless and accidental variety of presentations of the relation between leader and gender, since the variety of possibilities in the way reality is produced is restricted by a cultural framework. The articles were analysed as "*a subgroup within the larger category of cultural constructions of meaning*" (Toews 1987:879). In the explicit use of language, sources present and construct categories and their relationships and thus produce a historical reality, including gender, leader and the meaning produced in the interplay of both categories.

3.2. Category

The second concept I want to introduce is the key concept category. I do not use gender as an analytical category, but use the concept of category as an analytical tool in analysing the relation between gender and leader. The focus on the categories of leader and gender was my choice of interest. The concept of category refers to the condition that neither gender nor leaders as categories do have a content or a meaning in themselves. They are produced in the presentations and in the constructions of the sources and in relation to each other. Their content is established in their contextual attachment to difference and hierarchy, and their meaning is created in the presentation and construction of their interplay. I am taking an epistemological outset in poststructuralist thought. Here, thinking in hierarchical binary opposites is considered to be a basic characteristic of Western thought. Hierarchy and binarity cannot be considered or expressed as a fixed characteristic of neither gender nor leader. Both gender and leader have to be historicized as contextual enunciations of hierarchy as difference.

Both gender and leader are main binary categories, enunciating difference and hierarchy both between categories and within categories. Gender enunciates hierarchy as a difference of man and woman, leader enunciates hierarchy as a difference of leader and non-leader. To give an example of the production of difference and hierarchies between categories: gender is for instance non-class, man is non-woman. Examples for subcategories of gender are woman and man, educated and uneducated woman, successful and unsuccessful man. Subcategories of leader are for instance entrepreneur and manager, top manager and middle manager.

At this point, it should be emphasised in general that when I talk about top leader, leader, man and woman, I always refer to categories without a fixed, apriorically given content or contextual meaning.

The concepts left to be introduced are the key concepts of construction, analogy and discourse.

3.3. Construction

The distinction between presentation and construction can be explained by looking at the main categories of my analysis. While the category of gender is in itself a presentation of binarity, the category of leader constructs the binarity, since leader cannot be thought of without thinking its opposite, though the opposite is not visible in the explicit expression of the category.

Categories of gender and leader are not only visibly present in the text. Categories are also constructed in the statements of the texts, statement used in the Foucauldian understanding of the term. Construction means implying the invisible and thus marginalised or repressed part of a dichotomy in the explicit presentation. For example, the presentation of woman implies man in the meaning non-woman, though this is not explicitly presented in the text. The presentation of top leader implicitly says something about non-top leaders, and so on. In the intertextual analysis over time, a shift from construction to presentation and from presentation to construction of categories could be showed. This shift contributes to the creation of a notion of change and progress, at the same time both making the repressed visible and marginalising the visible.

The second meaning in my use of the term construction is the creation of an analogy between gender and leader. Subcategories of leader as well as categories of non-leader, expressing hierarchy as differences within leadership and between leader and non-leader, are at the same time enunciated as gender difference. Gender and leader are found to be parallel categories. One example is the headings of the sources. At the level of presentation, a hierarchy between the sources is produced in the way gender and leader is presented. Looking at the headings, there are sources only presenting leader. And there are sources, presenting woman in connection with a subcategory of leader. In the case of Germany, in the 1960s this was the hereditated business owner. In Denmark in the 1960s, this was the pre-industrial leader of a production based on agrarian products. There are no headings presenting both the category of man and leader, but a link between man and leader is constructed in the texts.

These presentations exemplify a pattern of difference between the enunciations as leader and woman leader. Since difference is a way of enunciating hierarchy, a hierarchy between the two groups of sources is constructed. Moreover, a hierarchy between the categories of leader and the categories of leader parallel to woman is constructed. In the intertextual analysis over time, this pattern revealed that the presentation of woman parallel to leader in the context of the leadership debates is an enunciation of subordinate categories of leader.

The third use of the term construction is the meaning constructed in the presentation and construction of an interplay between gender and leader or non-leader. Not presenting man and leader in the headings means that gender is repressed in the enunciation of superiority, that means the categories of top leader. In the pattern of both explicit presentation of woman and subordinate categories of leader and the construction of man and the superior categories of top leader meaning is constructed. In the analysis, the focus on the presentation of women and subordinate positions turned out to be the enunciation of non-leader or non-top-leader qualities. Superiority on the other side turned out to be enunciated as education and qualification. I will return to that in the discussion of the key concept of analogy and later in the discussion of selected results.

However, the example of the headings ought not to give the impression that sources simply produce dual genderedness. This opinion would be an interpretation of the sources as reflection of material structures, and it would take outset in an apriorical assumption of the existence of gender difference. In looking at the relation of the key concepts, it can firstly be shown that superior and subordinate positions within the category of leader can present and construct both woman and man. Secondly, it can be shown as well that the enunciation as a gender presents and constructs both a superior and a subordinate category of leader. Thirdly, there is a time dimension in this relation, which I also will return to in the key conclusions.

3.4. Analogies/ correspondences

The relationship between gender and leader can be analysed in an intertextual comparison of sources, which reveals analogies. In the intertextual analysis over time, categories are differentiated without abolishing differences and hierarchies. New categories are produced, but without the original ones being eliminated. They become invisible in the presentations, but can be made visible with the help of historicizing and deconstruction. One example would be the category of born leader, which is not presented after the 1960's, but is constructed in the presentations of highly qualified candidates having a successful or a success lacking management career. The discursive knowledge on the existence of leader personalities continues to be a legitimisation of top leaders or superiority. Because of this continuity and change of categories, I use the term transformation instead of change, since the term change indicates a break and thus produces both a notion of a linear progress and of something new. On the analytical level of presentation, transformation is visible, on the level of construction continuity is revealed. This continuity over time of transformed categories is labelled analogies or correspondences.

The intertextual analysis of these transformations over time reveals differentiations within the hierarchical difference of superiority and subordination. Analogies exist between the old and the transformed dichotomies. Analogies are intertextual correspondences of categories over time. Correspondences are built within hierarchy and difference. In other words, it is not hierarchy and difference that change, but the ways of their enunciations as subcategories of leader. The interplay between the categories of gender and leader, for example, consists of a continuing correspondence of superior categories of leader enunciated as man but never as woman, and subordinate categories of leader or non-leader always enunciated as woman and sometimes as man.

The relationship between and within categories is organised as analogous superiority and subordination within difference. In the example of a correspondence mentioned above between man and top leader, the transformation over time is a variety of presented subcategories of top leader enunciated as man only. On the other

hand, correspondences exist between categories subordinate within the respective dichotomies. The transformed variety of presented respective subordinate leader categories is always enunciated as woman. Here, the importance of the analytical differentiation between representation and presentation can be illustrated. Reading the sources as representation, woman appears never to have been top leader. In relation to the category of leadership, subordination appears to characterise woman. At the same time, woman appears as unchangeable condition for limited access to leader or top leader positions. Reading the sources as presentation, however, opens up for the opportunity of going beyond apriorical assumptions and thus for the analysis of both, meaning and the limitations for our conception of the world.

3.5. Discourse

I shall now turn to the last concept to be introduced, the concept of discourse. As I mentioned above, the subject for analysis of the third level of history is the constitution of meaning in the language of statements. That is what discourse is about. In the analysis of the pattern of analogies between the presentation and construction of categories, in the intertextual analysis of the pattern of transformation of categories, discourses can be traced. I understand them as a framework for thought, a framework of discursive knowledge.

I want to give one example from Germany in 1966 to illustrate how discursive meaning is produced in the sources, how meaning is attached to difference, and how hierarchy is produced and legitimated in language. This piece of text concerns the presentation of a relationship between employed top leaders and self employed business owners, between University education as required qualification for top leadership, but not as only legitimisation of top positions, and heredity. In short, this text contains the basic dichotomies characteristic for presentations of the leadership debates in the second half of the 1960s in Germany, at which point the self employed business owner already has lost its superior position to the employed top leader.

"Personen, die ein Studium absolviert haben, sind offenbar in höherem Masse als die Nicht-Akademiker mit grösserer Verantwortung qualifiziert. Warum dies so ist, muss offen bleiben. Ob es auf dem Studium beruht, auf den dadurch erworbenen Kenntnissen und Fähigkeiten, oder ob es einfach daran liegt, dass sich junge Männer mit Führungsqualitäten eben in besonders grosser Zahl zunächst einem Studium zuwenden, kann niemand sagen. Auch die Tatsache, dass die Akademiker-Quote bei den Selbständigen... wesentlich niedriger ist als bei den "Managern", hilft nicht viel weiter. Unter den Selbständigen gibt es viele, die sich ihre Führungsposition nicht erst "erkämpfen" müssen, sondern denen sie im Zuge der Erbfolge weitgehend "von selbst" zufällt..." (Kruk 17-10-1966)

The presentation of the question whether male academic top leaders acquire knowledge and skills at universities, or whether men with leadership traits take university degrees, allows us to identify the frameworks, which make this presentation possible. University education and leadership traits together construct employed leadership as top leadership. Heredity presents self-employed business owners. The hierarchy within the category of leader is expressed as difference in responsibility and successful competition and enunciated as man.

The text constructs the exceptional personalities of top leaders. The conflict in the second half of the 1960s is a conflict between two kinds of exceptionality: between exceptional scientific and rational knowledge alone or alternatively exceptional personality traits in combination with scientific knowledge legitimating the top leader. The construction of the employed top leader as exceptional person is made possible by a discursive framework that I labelled the great man discourse. That means, the few chosen leader personalities being superior to the masses.

Superiority is enunciated as both, traits and knowledge, or knowledge alone. The first one legitimises top positions, the second one legitimises access to a management career. The presentation of the existence of the educated leader or leader personality is made possible

by the framework I labelled a traits- discourse. Namely, the existence of exceptional leader personalities characterised by either, traits acquired by birth, by early socialisation, or acquired as adults through education. In the case of our example, trained exceptional skills are a transformation of born or socialised traits. The changeable social skills do become hegemonic in the period after mid 1960s, but without the unchangeable socially or biologically hereditated traits being abolished. Within heredity, the heredity of traits continues to legitimise superiority, while the heredity of social position presents subordinate leader categories of doubtful legitimacy. At the same time as business owners loose their superior positions, traits become disconnected with business owners and connected to educated and employed top leaders. But traits continue to legitimatise the top leader, while the category of top leader as enunciation of superiority is changing.

The enunciation of hierarchy as leader in itself not only means a legitimation of superiority, but also a naturalisation of superiority and thus constructs its legitimate permanency. And this makes a paradox to the growing presentations of social equality through the opportunity of education, the characteristic of a classless modern society. The presentation of the classless society is an enunciation of the growing unimportance of heredity in terms of social descent, while traits and thus the importance of heredity in terms of descent in different enunciations continue to exist throughout the period. The results of my dissertation suggest that the categories of class and of gender both are enunciations of descent. The comparison between Denmark and Germany showed that this is true in both countries, while the difference between the countries is the ways of presenting and enunciating hierarchies. But common for both countries is the enunciation of superiority as man, as can be seen in the example, too. And the enunciation of subordination as woman; in the case of Germany in the 1960s, woman leaders are almost exclusively presented as business owners, and mostly as business owners by heredity.

4. Selected conclusions

Now, having introduced the key elements of my method, I will proceed to present some relevant aspects of the empirical results of my dissertation. I have chosen three focuses. First, I focus on the development over time. Second, I focus on top leadership, since top leadership is the relevant category concerning the glass ceiling problematic. Third, I focus on the tension in the sources, which I have touched upon briefly already: on the one hand, successfully progressing social change is presented in the sources. Social change means that education, especially higher education, presents the means to successful social upwards mobility into the top of industrial enterprises and society, leaving behind heredity of social positions as the remedients of a class society having outlived itself. On the other hand, I found a permanency of both categories of gender and categories of class enunciating hierarchy, corresponding to the category of leader.

4.1. The presentation of equality and inequality in Denmark and Germany

Before I take a closer look at this tension, I would like to point out a significant difference between Denmark and Germany. This difference occurs in the presentations of top leadership in the sources. The top leader is in the time period concerned identical with the professional leader or manager.

In Denmark, different categories of leader are mainly presented in terms of categories of equality (Gleichheitskategorien). Hierarchy between top leaders and leaders is established on the level of construction, i.e. on the implicit level. So are polarisations between leaders and non-leaders. Presentations of non-leaders in the context of the leadership debate do not occur before the early 1970's.

In Germany, categories of leader are mainly presented as hierarchical polarisations between categories. Equality is constructed within the respective subcategories of leader. The polarised presentation between

leaders and non-leaders as well as between different subcategories of leader does exist throughout the period concerned.

I will get back to the consequences of this difference in the following presentation of my findings.

4.2. Change and permanency in Danish and German top leadership

I will now turn to the changes in both the presentation and the construction of the category of top leader over time. I will give an overview over the main developments, starting with the major differences between Denmark and Germany in the early 1960s.

In Denmark at this point, the inheritance of the position is included in the presentation of the professional leader. Property is excluded from the Danish presentations of educated professional top leaders.

In Germany, both inheritances of position and property are included in the presentation of top leadership, but is transformed into subordinate categories of leader. Top leadership covers the accomplishment of a successful career by personal achievement alone.

4.2.1. Denmark

In Denmark, merit (Verdienst) presents legitimate leaders. Leaders present both inheritance and career by accomplishment. Within merit, however, a hierarchical difference is constructed.

On the one hand, inheritance means the merit of descent from both a patrilineary family line and a tradition of work for the well being (welfare) of society, and the prosperity of the economy. On the other hand, merit covers the personal accomplishment of higher education in combination with the proof of efficiency.

While merit presents a common characteristic of the leaders, the top leaders of descent are merited twice - by tradition and by accomplishment. The successful self-made man, however, only has the single merit of personal accomplishment. Thus, a hierarchy of difference within the equality of merited leadership is constructed, and

the top leader of descent is placed in a superior position to the successful self-made-man.

The establishment of this hierarchy within merit corresponds to the presentation of a difference within the highly educated leaders. Leader personality traits enunciate difference and construct a correspondence of superior position within the binary hierarchies of top leaders and leaders, professional leaders and educated leaders, leaders and specialised experts, international and national leaders. The first of these pairs is placed in a superior position to the other, and leader personality traits are what place them there.

The presentation of the equality of all in leadership is transforming into the presentation of equality of wage earners in the late 1970's. Leaders and co-workers both present wage earners. Here, a difference between the wage-earning director (der "direktorale Lohnempfänger", p. 328) on the one hand, and the wage-earning co-workers constructs hierarchical binary difference within the presented category of equality, which is the category of the wage earner. Within the category of top leader, a corresponding difference is established between the task oriented technocrat and the people oriented, cooperative leader, the former being placed in the superior hierarchical position.

Success is another category of equality presented, divided between the success in accomplishing a career and the success as a human being, both constructing a binary hierarchy. In the 1980's, two competing dichotomies can be found. On the one hand, the top leader technocrat who is superior to the cooperative leader. On the other hand, the unification of both aspects in the category of either the holistic top leader or alternatively the category of team of top leaders. At the end of the 1980s the competition between both has not ended yet. Articles from the 1990's presenting holistic and communicative leadership as feminine leadership, however, indicate that the technocrat and holistic leader succeeded in being the enunciation of superiority and the presentation of the new category of top leader.

Read over time, the presentations of changing categories of top leader in the sources read over time clearly create a notion of change. The different presentations of the category of top leader read chronologically construct a progressing development and thus a changing top leadership. However, at the same time, the intertextual analysis reveals correspondences between the respective categories enunciating superiority and subordination. These correspondences hence produce permanency. They produce the impression of a blurred connection between social position and descent, descent being understood as both family descent and personal abilities. Hence, even if subcategories of leader are transformed over time, the correspondences reveal that descent (family descent or personal abilities) produces the superior subcategory of leader. In the presentations of top leader, both categories are enunciations of superiority.

Throughout the period, descent maintains a connotation of both the unchangeable personal (descent) and the changeable, the social at the time (social position). And here I find a correspondence between the category of leader and the meaning established in the presentation of gender enunciating hierarchy as difference in both Denmark and Germany.

Before I return to that, I shall present the main transformations and continuities in Germany, concerning the category and subcategories of leader.

4.2.2. Germany

In Germany, achievement (*Leistung*) is the central category presented. A polarised division between achievement and inheritance is presented, with achievement in the superior position. A hierarchical polarisation is presented between a leader position as result of success due to the personal achievement of higher education, and on the other hand as result of the inheritance of property and position. The inheritance of traits is constructed. Thus, on the level of presentation, personal achievement enunciates superiority, inheritance enunciates subordination. Correspondingly, the achievement of leader is divided

between the personal achievement of education, and the achievement of wealth for the people, both enunciating respectively the superiority of the top manager and the subordination of the self-employed business owner. Hierarchy between the two is constructed, and after 1973 this hierarchy is explicitly presented, its change into visibility indicating its increasing importance for the establishing of the end of what was labelled a first post-war period. Employees and the people present categories of non-leaders and construct childlike or womanly dependants, those being provided for.

However, the time dimension in the relation between construction and presentation is important here. Personality constructs an additional trait of the educated and legitimate top leader in the 1960s. After 1973, personality in terms of top leader traits legitimates the division within the highly educated into those with a top career within organisations, and those with a career which does not lead to the very top.

In the 1980's a change in the presentation of scientific training as higher education takes place. Higher education no longer presents the guarantee of success in terms of successfully reaching top leader positions. Now, scientific training presents the mere access to a top career, success no longer being guaranteed. At the same time, self-employed business ownership undergoes a revaluation. No longer inheritance, but the founding and leading of a successfully expanding enterprise now presents the chance for an alternative top career of the scientifically educated. This corresponds to a division within the characteristics of the category of top leader. The scientifically trained founder and owner of an expanding enterprise even presents a superior to the expert in employed middle management, the one presented as self-employed, independent, risk taking and successfully competing self-provider, the other as a not successfully competing dependant, being provided for (in terms of salary, limited working hours, unemployment benefits, social security etc.). The first subcategory is an enunciation of the superior position in a binary, the other similarly of the subordinate position. Interestingly enough, the 1980s presentations of the expert middle manager not only construct lack of success. The presentation of his characteristics also corresponds

to the presentations of dependants or those being provided for - enunciated as the categories of non-leaders throughout the 1960s, in the whole period enunciated as the category of woman, too.

The presentations of the scientifically trained founder of a successful enterprise construct a differentiation within the category of top leader. On the one hand, the ownership of enterprises once again enunciates subordination. This binary dichotomy can be established, since for example major shareholders, board members and top leaders are not presented as owners, not even partial owners. On the other hand, the employed top leader gets out of the focus of presentations, thus constructing a new development of independent and self-reliant successful careers as top leader careers of self owned enterprises, superior to careers into lower and middle management within organisations. In other words, the employed top manager getting out of the focus of the presentations, a hierarchy within the category of leader is enunciated as a difference between successful self employed founder and not successful employed lower or middle manager, as top leader and leader.

As is the case in Denmark, the presentations of difference within top leader, between top leader and leader, and between leader and non-leader enunciate hierarchy. Continuity in the enunciation of superiority can be found as well. The differentiation within the presentations of top leadership over time establishes the notion of change.

4.3. Difference enunciating hierarchy - the correspondence between leader and gender

A comparison of both countries points to continuity over time in the correspondence between achievement, descent or inheritance respectively, and accordingly between the categories of the social position of top leadership and top leader personality. In both countries, personality traits and correspondingly top-leadership are disconnected from inheritance of property ownership. In both countries the hierarchy between top leaders and leaders, leaders and non-leaders remains untouched, being presented in terms of categories

of equality in Denmark and in terms of polarised inequality in Germany.

Significantly, the correspondence of merit and inheritance to personality is established in both countries over time. And in both countries, this position is being established as the superior pole of binaries and as such constantly and without changes enunciated as man.

I will now turn to the correspondence between gender and leader as enunciations of the same hierarchies, focusing on the category of gender. These correspondences are to be found in the intertextual analysis over time. The following points are important in this aspect:

(1) The changing categories of both non-top leader and non-leader, enunciating subordination, are correspondingly enunciated as woman as well. Importantly, these are the only enunciations as woman, woman only being presented corresponding to subordinate categories of leader. This means that categories presenting top leader and enunciating superiority are enunciated as man at the analytical level of presentations.

(2) Throughout the period, there is a correspondence between non-leaders, pre-industrial leaders and leaders, being enunciations of subordination. This correspondence is found, too in the presentation of categories presenting woman.

(3) The differentiation of the category of leader over time does lead to a transformation of the respective former top leader into a subordinate leader. What is transforming is the enunciation of superiority.

Moreover, the category of top leader never presents woman. Man is the only enunciation of this very superior category, but man enunciates not only the very superior category. The various subordinate categories of leadership present woman's and man's successful career and top positions. However, the enunciation as woman is only an enunciation of the very subordinate categories. In Germany, this means both self-employed inherited business owners and self-employed founders of not expanding businesses. In Denmark, this means the single merited leader, in the 1980s the cooperative and holistic leader.

(4) There are but few presentations of superior categories presenting a correspondence between top leader and man. This correspondence mostly is implicitly presented as pronouns, or it is constructed. Thus, the category of woman not only enunciates subordinate categories of leader and non-leader, but also constructs a correspondence between superiority and man, that means categories of top leader.

In both countries, positions which are presented as open to socially upwards mobility regardless of social origin, by acquiring the right traits/skills through either education, practical experience or a combination of both, present and construct subordinate categories of leadership and gender.

And there is another intertextual continuity over time, as the top leader in the national debates always constructs a superior category of man and vice versa. The transformed categories of top leader corresponding to the transformed superior man create a notion of societal progress, despite the continuity of categories of top leader and man enunciating superiority. In both countries, this superiority is legitimated as traits. This means, that despite the transformations, a very top enunciated as leadership not opens for change in terms of mobility from descent is established. In other words, from this perspective continuity of hierarchy appears to be presented or talked about in terms of progress, change and equality.

4.4. The permanency of hierarchy

The notion of a permanent top not open for social change is created in a third way. Namely in the correspondence of categories enunciating superiority respectively subordination over time. A correspondence across categories of gender and leadership can be found between both traits acquired by early socialisation or by birth, and thus between social and thus obtainable skills as enunciations of the promise for change. I want to exemplify this in the case of Denmark.

One example is thus that descent in the 1960s is both descent in terms of kinship and in terms of social position. Leaders present the equality

of education and construct a division of merit into a superior top and a subordinate middle position.

In the 1980s, the descent of leaders presents the equality of unequal social descent and a division between man as the only enunciation of top leader, woman and man as enunciations of leaders. In this way, a hierarchy within success enunciated as man and woman is constructed. In the intertextual analysis over time, a corresponding analogy to the older presentation of leaders divided by double merit and single merit can be found. Double merit refers to social descent and superior man, single merit corresponding to social descent, woman and man. The enunciation of superiority seen over time is an enunciation as the corresponding categories of kinship, social descent and man.

Another example is a correspondence between necessary skills for a top leader, the technocrat, and skills desirable for a future top leader, the holistic leader. Necessary top leader skills in the 1980s present man alone, desirable skills present woman and man. That means, while desirable skills also can be acquired by man, necessary skills can neither be acquired by woman nor by all men. In the intertextual analysis over time, I found a correspondence between the double merit of both education and descent of the top leader to both necessary and desirable skills. In other words, education corresponds to desirable skills, and I found a correspondence between single merit of education to desirable skills, which do not have a connotation of necessity.

The desirable skills enunciated as woman are characteristics like intuition, sensibility, communicative skills and cooperation. Human oriented skills or traits and cooperative leadership in the 1960s present those of mother and wife leading the family household. The correspondences revealed in the intertextual analysis over time show that the mother leading the family household is an enunciation of the pre-industrial agrarian based production and of non-merited descent. In 1977 - 1989, the characteristics of the new industrial so-called "female leader" correspond to those of the motherly leader of the home and thus appears to be a transformed enunciation of subordinate traits, skills, position.

Comparing the enunciations of subordinate and superior categories of leader as respectively woman and man also reveals correspondences. In constructing subordination within leadership, the family household corresponds to non-merited descent, thus being two different enunciations of the same. Equally, cooperative people oriented leadership presents the expert and traits of subordinate importance to the top leader. This corresponds to education being of main importance to the leader, but of less importance to the top leader back in time. And equally, there is a correspondence to education as something to be acquired, but to descent as something that is not acquirable. Considering the focus on education in the presentation of the debates on leadership in both Denmark and Germany, education can be said to be the enunciation of social change, the unchanged or continuity being made invisible, marginalised and thus eliminated from the visibly presented picture of society.

Interestingly, at the level of presentation, education transforms from a presentation of education as possibility for mobility for unprivileged social descent and man to an enunciation of woman alone. In other words, there is a transformation in the enunciation of hierarchy from categories of class, i.e. social decent, to categories of gender, i.e. descent. This transformation is especially obvious in the Danish sources, where the enunciation of subordination as woman in the context of the leadership debates does not occur before 1977. This indicates that gender not at all times and not in all cultures has been the primary way of signifying relationships of power. This means a change in the way hierarchy and possibilities for change is perceived and written. This shift in presentation indicates as well that non-privileged descent and man no longer are perceived as barriers for reaching (top) leadership.

Generally, the enunciation of hierarchy as both gender and leader has personality characteristics in common, in terms of both socially and bodily descent. At the same time, the shift from categories of class to categories of gender is a shift from the presentation of education as the only precondition for mobility to the presentation of education as only one precondition for mobility. The increasing enunciation of

subordination as woman from 1977 and on thus constructs the legitimisation of both limited success and lack of success in terms of leader career and social mobility.

In both leader and gender a shism is found, between on the one hand the social and changeable - difference - and on the other hand the early socialised or acquired by birth and unchangeable- hierarchy. Thus, top leader never presents woman but man alone. At the same time, the intertextual analysis reveals that top leader constructs superior man as well. Leader presents woman and man and constructs subordinate man. This indicates that the description of a person as effeminated man has to be understood not as a characterisation of personality, but as an enunciation of contextual subordination. Together, the relation between construction and presentation has a confirming effect. This relation continuously creates the corresponding notion of the possibility of a future change and at the same time its denial. This relation simultaneously legitimises the continuity of hierarchy, the possibility for future change being a fixed characteristic mostly enunciated as woman. In the Danish context, the expression of women "being on their way" might be well known to everyone until today. But the fixity of various expressions of future change enunciated as woman indicates that the arrival or being at the top is not thought of or enunciated as woman. Simply, because success in this context is enunciated and thought of as man.

The correspondence between the changing presentations of top leader on the one hand and the continuity of the presentation of man and the construction of superior man on the other hand, does both produce the notion of progress, but also a notion of the legitimacy of a unchanged hierarchy. To put it in slightly different words, the element of continuity in the enunciation of superiority as both the category of top leader, and the category of (superior) man not only produces the impression of the unchangeability of a hierarchical top, but also of its legitimacy. The legitimisation of the continuity of hierarchy is the meaning created by enunciating hierarchy as difference in the categories of both gender and leader, and by constructing correspondences over time. The similarities across the categories of gender and leader indicate,

that these interplaying enunciations of hierarchy as difference construct a double naturalisation, which means legitimate continuity and lack of change with regard to the category of top leader.

5. Concluding remarks

The intertextual analysis over time reveals correspondences between the categories of social descent, traits, education, gender and leader. These correspondences produce a double naturalisation of hierarchy, legitimating its continuity despite the emerging impression of successfully obtained social change. This perception is produced in the transforming enunciations of superior and subordinate positions within binaries.

Returning to the question of the "glass ceiling", I therefore want to suggest that the enunciation of hierarchy as "glass ceiling" for women is a contemporary way of reproducing this naturalisation. The expression at the same time questions the legitimacy of primarily employing men as top leaders and legitimates it at the same time, enunciating a barrier as woman. Moreover, the term at the same time assumes qualifications as only existing means of access and gender being the additional one. Education in terms of qualification is the category of equality, hierarchy within the category is enunciated as gender and analogous as leader.

Thus, as I see it, the term "glass ceiling" constitutes a legitimising contemporary cultural enunciation of a focus on a hierarchy between top leaders and leaders within the equality of especially higher education, which seems to be an important narrative in the passed 20 years. Thus, talking the third level of presentation, the major change occurs to be the transformation of the enunciation of a barrier between superior and subordinate positions as first a concrete ceiling between none leaders and leaders and then a glass ceiling within the category of leader. This transformation is identical with an enunciation of superiority first as privileged social descent and then as man, and an enunciation of subordination as first unprivileged social descent and then woman. The difference between top leader and leader is

correspondingly conceptualised as gender difference. Woman and leader are contemporary enunciations of subordination in this context, while man and top leader correspondingly are contemporary enunciations of superiority. They replaced the older enunciations of difference as privileged versus unprivileged social descent and leader and non-leader, as the example from Germany in 1966 illustrates. With regard to the quality of education, education means the access to a career position for the corresponding enunciations of non privileged descent and woman, while education is the legitimisation of a top leader position for the corresponding enunciations of privileged descent and man.

In other words, these results indicate that our perception of society and the meaning produced in this perception has transformed, the transformation not necessarily being identical with change in society. What seems to have been changing is the enunciation of non-leader positions into co-workers and leader or middle respectively lower manager positions. What has not been changing is the enunciation of subordination as mainly presenting unprivileged descent and woman.

In Denmark, the change of presentation from industrial leaders being man to leaders being both man and woman is new. In Germany, top leadership shifted from being presentations of self employed business owners to employed top managers, thus allowing the enunciation of not only self employed business owners, but also middle and lower managers as woman, this last development being the new development within the period analysed. While the enunciation of leader as woman in Denmark is relatively new, in Germany it did exist throughout the period analysed. It was extended from inherited business ownership to lower and middle management. From the perspective of the analysis of the third level, equality means an enunciation of both superiority and subordination as leader, instead of as leader and non-leader, and correspondingly as both genders instead of as man and woman.

6. Literature

- Engelmann, Peter (ed.), *Postmoderne und Dekonstruktion. Texte französischer Philosophen der Gegenwart*. Stuttgart 1990.
- Foucault, Michel, *Archäologie des Wissens*. Frankfurt a.M. (1973) 1995.
- Hagemann-White, Carol, Thesen zur kulturellen Konstruktion der Zweigeschlechtlichkeit, in: Scheffer-Hegel, Barbara/ Wartmann, Brigitte (eds.), *Mythos Frau. Projektionen und Inszenierungen im Patriarchat*. Berlin 1984(2).
- Hagemann-White, Carol, Wir werden nicht zweigeschlechtlich geboren... in: Hagemann-White, Carol/ Rerrich, Maria S. (eds.), *FrauenMännerBilder*. (Forum Frauenforschung Bd. 2) Freiburg 1989, 224-235.
- Hymounts, C., The corporate woman - the glass ceiling, in: *The Wall Street Journal*, 24 March 1986.
- Kruk, Max, Die deutschen Unternehmer (IV): Fast jedes Vorstandsmitglied hat studiert. *Blick durch die Wirtschaft*, 17-10-1966.
- Rittenhofer, Iris, Køn som diskurs, i: Christensen, Ann-Dorte; Ravn, Anna-Birte (eds.); Rittenhofer, Iris, *Det kønnede samfund*. Aalborg Universitetsforlag 1997, 17 - 51.
- Schöttler, Peter, Mentalitäten, Ideologien, Diskurse. Zur sozial-geschicht-lichen Thematisierung der "dritten Ebene", in: Lüdtke, Alf (ed.), *Alltagsgeschichte. Zur Rekonstruktion von historischen Erfahrungen und Lebensweisen*. Frankfurt/ New York 1989, 85-135.
- Scott, Joan, *Gender and the Politics of History*. Columbia University Press, New York 1988.
- Toews, John E., Intellectual History after the Linguistic Turn: The Autonomy of Meaning and the Irreducibility of Experience. *American Historical Review* 92(1987), 879-907.
- Wetterer, Angelika, *Profession und Geschlecht. Über die Marginalität von Frauen in hochqualifizierten Berufen*. New York/ Frankfurt a.M. 1992.
- Wetterer, Angelika, Hierarchie und Differenz im Geschlechterverhältnis, in: ds., *Profession und Geschlecht*. Frankfurt a.M./ New York 1992, 13-41.

Publications in FREIA's paper series:

1. Karin Widerberg: Udfordringer til kvinneforskningen i 1990'erne - foredrag på Center for Kvinneforskning i Aalborg 10.5.90, 1992
2. Feminist Research. Aalborg University. Report 1976-1991, 1992
3. Ann-Dorte Christensen: Kvinder i den nye fredsbevægelse i Danmark - mellem køkkenruller, resolutioner og teltpæle, 1992
4. Ulla Koch: Uformel økonomi og social arbejdsdeling - en fortælling om tværfaglighed og det umuliges kunst, 1992
5. Marianne Rostgaard: Kvindearbejde og kønsarbejdsdeling i tekstilindustrien i Danmark ca. 1830 - 1915, 1992
6. Inger Agger: Køn og krænkelse - om politisk vold mod kvinder, 1992
7. Margrethe Holm Andersen: Heks, hore eller heltinde? - et case-studie om tanzanianske kvinders politiske deltagelse og kønsideologier i forandring, 1993
8. Ulla Koch: A Feminist Political Economics of Integration in the European Community - an outline, 1993
9. Susanne Thorbek: Urbanization, Slum Culture, Gender Struggle and Women's Identity, 1993
10. Susanne Thorbek: Køn og Urbanisering, 1994
11. Poul Knopp Damkjær: Kvinder & rektorstillinger - et indlæg i ligestillingsdebatten, 1994
12. Birte Siim: Det kønnede demokrati - kvinders medborgerskab i de skandinaviske velfærdsstater, 1994
13. Anna-Birte Ravn: Kønsarbejdsdeling - diskurs og magt, 1994.
14. Bente Rosenbeck: Med kønnet tilbage til den politiske historie, 1994
15. Jytte Bang og Susanne Stubgaard: Piger og fysik i gymnasiet, 1994
16. Harriet Bjerrum Nielsen og Monica Rudberg: Jenter og gutter i forandring, 1994
17. Jane Lewis: Gender, Family and the Study of Welfare 'Regimes', 1995
18. Iris Rittenhofer: A Roll in the Hay with the Director: The Manager in a Genderhistorical Perspective, 1995

19. Ruth Emerek: On the Subject of Measuring Women's (and Men's) Participation in the Labour Market, 1995
20. Maren Bak: Family Research and Theory in Denmark: A Literature Review, 1995
21. Ann-Dorte Christensen & Birte Siim: Gender, Citizenship and Political Mobilization, 1995
22. Hanne Marlene Dahl: Contemporary Theories of Patriarchy - Like a Bird without Wings? Power, Signification and Gender in the Reproduction of Patriarchy, 1995
23. Lene Klitrose: Moving far beyond the Separated Fields of Patriarchal Scholarship: the Qualitative Leap of Philosophical Daring, 1995
24. Ulla Koch: Omsorgsbegrebet i lyset af international økonomisk integration - begrebs- og metodediskussion, 1995
25. Karen Sjørup: Patriarkatet og det kvindelige subjekt, 1995.
26. Susanne Thorbek: Women's Participation in Slum Organizations - Does it Make a Difference? 1995
27. Mette Groes: Kvinder laver daghøjskoler for kvinder, 1995
28. Signe Arnfred: Conceptualizing Gender, 1995
29. Durre Ahmed: Essence and Diversity in Gender Research, 1995
30. Ann Schlyter: Women's Responses to Political Changes in Southern Africa - Common Grounds and differences, 1995
31. Diana Mulinari: Thinking about Feminism, 1995
32. Susanne Thorbek: Global Context - Local Concepts, 1995
33. Sylvia Walby: Key Concepts in Feminist Theory, 1996
34. Yvonne Hirdman: Key Concepts in Feminist Theory – Analysing Gender and Welfare, 1996
35. Anna Alten: The Incompatibility of Entrepreneurship and Femininity: A Dilemma for Women, 1996
36. Jane Lewis: Equality, Difference and Gender in Twentieth Century Welfare States, 1996
37. Eileen Drew: Key Concepts Employed to Understand Gender in Relation to the Labour Market, 1996

38. Ilona Ostner: Individualization, Breadwinner Norms, and Family Obligations. Gender Sensitive Concepts in Comparative Welfare, 1996
39. Feminist Research. Aalborg University. Report 1996-1999, 1997
40. Ruth Lister: Engendering Citizenship, Work and Care, 1997
41. Ruth Lister: Citizen or Stakeholder. Policies to combat social exclusion and promote social justice in the UK, 1997
42. Anne Showstack Sassoon: Beyond Pessimism of the Intelligence: Agendas for Social Justice and Change, 1997
43. Lilja Mósesdóttir: Breaking the Boundaries: Women's Encounter with the State in Sweden, Germany and the United States, 1997 Labour Market, 1996
44. Ruth Emerek, Jeanette E. Dahl og Vibeke Jakobsen: Migrant Women on the Danish Labour Market, 2000
45. Birte Siim: Dilemmas of Citizenship in Denmark – Lone Mothers between Work and Care, 1999
46. Iris Rittenhofer: Historicizing the “Glass Ceiling”. The engendering of difference in German and Danish media presentations of leadershipdebates 1960 – 1989, 2000

FREIA - the Feminist Research Centre in Aalborg is an interdisciplinary organization of feminist researchers at Aalborg University. Focus of the centre lies within the social sciences, especially the fields of anthropology, history, sociology/social science and political science. The present research programme “Gender relations – power, identity and social change” forms the framework of a number of individual and collective projects. FREIA is part of the Department of Development and Planning at Aalborg University.