



WWJMRD 2018; 4(6): 54-63
www.wwjmr.com
International Journal
Peer Reviewed Journal
Refereed Journal
Indexed Journal
UGC Approved Journal
Impact Factor MJIF: 4.25
E-ISSN: 2454-6615

Dr. Saraju Prasad
Associate Professor in
Marketing, Biju Pattnaik
Institute of IT and Management
Studies, Patia, Bhubaneswar,
Odisha, India

Measuring Women Beliefs on Glass Ceiling In Career Development

Dr. Saraju Prasad

Abstract

Glass ceiling is a type of metaphor represent an invisible barrier mostly in organizations that keeps a hindrance for women to reach beyond a certain level in a hierarchy. The study was mostly focused on the effect of Glass Ceiling on women career development in most of the organizations. The study was structure based on the conceptual framework built up using the information from pilot survey. The study was conducted with the aim of obtaining the objectives of glass ceiling faced by female executive level employees who are working in private sector organizations. This study has been completed with an empirical survey which was thoroughly conducted using a self-administered questionnaire and the sample consisted of 300 women executives. For presenting and analyzing the data both descriptive and inferential statistics were used. Both regression and factor analysis conducted to validate the data and find the factors responsible for glass ceiling on women executives in private organizations. The findings reveal that the glass ceiling and women career development have a moderate negative relationship and individual, cultural and organizational factors have a significant effect on women career development. The study result concluded that there are significant effects of the glass ceiling on women career development of executive level female employees working in private sector organizations in Odisha.

Keywords: Factor, Eigen, glass, ceiling, regression etc.

1. Introduction

The Federal Glass Ceiling Commission defines the glass ceiling as "the unseen, yet unbreachable barrier that keeps minorities and women from rising to the upper rungs of the corporate ladder, regardless of their qualifications or achievements." The glass ceiling metaphor has often been used to describe invisible barriers ("glass") through which women can see elite positions but cannot reach them ("ceiling"). These barriers prevent large numbers of women and ethnic minorities from obtaining and securing the most powerful, prestigious, and highest-grossing jobs in the workforce. Moreover, this effect prevents women from filling high-ranking positions and puts them at a disadvantage as potential candidates for advancement. The "Glass Ceiling" is a term that symbolizes a number of barriers that prevent qualified individuals from advancing higher in their organizations. Although many women hold management positions, few have made the breakthrough to top-level positions. The estimate was suggested that only one to five percent of the top executive officials are women. Hymowitz & Schelhardt (1986) used the term of "the glass ceiling" first used in the Wall Street Journal special report on corporate women. They asserted that access to the top for women was blocked by corporate traditions & prejudice. Since then this term denotes an artificial and transparent barrier that kept women from rising above a certain level in corporations. Simon (1995) opined that the term "Glass Ceiling" generally implies that women are confronted by a single layer of glass/barrier to their career progression. In reality there are many layers and those too at different stages of career progression. It is propounded in the relevant literature that under-representation of women in various organizations is attributed to different constraints. These include, among others, the type of employing sector, vertical segregation, gender and corporate strategy (Wilson, 2002; Davidson and Cooper, 1992; Morgan and Knight, 1991; O'Leary and Ickovics, 1992). In terms of Gender Development Index, still India's 113th rank out of 157 countries demands immediate and

Correspondence:
Dr. Saraju Prasad
Associate Professor in
Marketing, Biju Pattnaik
Institute of IT and Management
Studies, Patia, Bhubaneswar,
Odisha, India

necessary action for gender equality. The present study is an attempt to measure the presence of Glass ceiling in Indian education system particularly in the Colleges of Education in the state of Haryana.

1.2 Barriers

Barriers may be tangible or intangible, actual or as imagined by the recipient (Maskell-Pretz and Hopkins, 1997). Prejudices, glass ceiling effect or gender diversity are such barriers which are unseen and yet cast spells a lot on working woman so that organizations having intention to retain them ultimately are in vain. Glass ceiling effect is instigated by the issues of gender differentiation and gender stereotyping which affect women continuously. There are some barriers e.g. psychological barriers, societal-related barriers, organizational barriers against which women are still fighting to strengthen their presence in the higher level of management of organizations.

1.2.1 Psychological barriers

From the very childhood days, women are bound to abide by some so called social rules which are deeply enrooted in their mind and they cannot even ignore the influence of those rules in their matured age. In some cases, they accept these rules as the rules of thumb and flow their lives as it goes. This kind of mindset gradually demotivate them and they loss their confidence and enthusiasm. And also there is class of women who try to overcome these rules and reshape their mind as career oriented. This class of women is actually psychologically potential to cope up with any situation either in war fronts or in organizations. But to ignore these rules and prejudices is not as easy as it works against the society or rather societal rules. It has been found in psychological studies that certain personality traits like emotional, social, soft heartedness, warmth found in women who are not suitable for managerial roles. They are also risk averse whereas, in this era of globalization and increased competition, organizations demand aggressiveness, competitiveness and risk taking ability to develop and sustain. And the society driven psychology which is playing the whole game of gender discrimination have a great impact on organization.

1.2.2 Societal-related barriers

Indian society has not been able to break the shackles of old tradition of “woman at home” concept. Women are always in dilemma to make progress in their career. This problem creates a heavy impact basically on married women. Marriage is social institution and once a woman is married, it is their prime responsibility to take care of her husbands, in laws and child. It has been seen that male members are the main bread earners of their families and women, either married or not, do their domestic or household works including elder care and if married, neonatal and child care. As women have long been considered as household or domestic workers so ‘education for women’ got the least or no priority in the society. Now, the mentality of the society has been changed with the change of time and economy of the country. In this era of globalization, no country can progress having the ‘half human resources’.

1.2.2 Societal-related barriers

Indian society has not been able to break the shackles of old tradition of “woman at home” concept. Women are always in dilemma to make progress in their career. This

problem creates a heavy impact basically on married women. Marriage is social institution and once a woman is married, it is their prime responsibility to take care of her husbands, in laws and child. It has been seen that male members are the main bread earners of their families and women, either married or not, do their domestic or household works including elder care and if married, neonatal and child care. As women have long been considered as household or domestic workers so ‘education for women’ got the least or no priority in the society. Now, the mentality of the society has been changed with the change of time and economy of the country. In this era of globalization, no country can progress having the ‘half human resources’.

In spite of changing situation, women employees still have to face problems as they have to play dual roles like an employee of an organization and household worker. Due to the improvement of thought and need for financial security, husband also wants a working wife. Nowadays many organizations have started Flexible Working Arrangements (FWA) for women by the means of job sharing, flexi-time, telecommunicating etc. to give them relaxation. But according to Anker (1977), women cannot concentrate at their workplace as they bring their domestic responsibilities and children with them at their workplace and prefer flexible work time for convenience. So women are compelled to take a career break or flexible working hours to look after their young children (Schwartz, 1989) and these are the barriers in acquiring managerial positions in their organizations. Whereas, male employees can focus solely on their assigned work as they have stay-at-home wives who are taking dual responsibilities as of office and home and children. Our society expects a woman to be a “good mother”. But there is a dilemma with dual roles: “If they do access FWAs, they are seen as good mothers, but not good workers. If they do not use FWAs then their face is being viewed as good workers, but lousy mothers” (Beard et.al, 2010). Besides, women have to relocate with the relocation of their husbands due to job switch and thus women have to sacrifice their prospecting jobs to honor this kind of social norm

1.2.3 Organizational barriers

Having the stereotyped and preconceived notion, male employees cannot accept women for their upward mobility in the organization and try to create barriers in any form. Women are excluded from informal organizational network and get no help from their colleagues in decision making process. Thus by restraining women from strategic decision making process male counterparts try to heckle intentionally and creates a barrier for promotion. So women are less popular in strategic decision maker role. Due to male imposed pressure women are also stressed throughout the day and indirectly it affects their performances and then it would be easy to find excuse to restrain them from promotion. This kind of thing sometimes causes losing of enthusiasm and it also affects their personal lives. It has been seen that a woman, in her prime time in organization or at the peak of her career, suddenly bounds to drop her career to meet social obligations and responsibilities and never think of returning back due to the unwelcoming situation of the organization

1.2.4 Systemic Barriers

Men tend to hold more powerful positions with higher levels of responsibility and authority than women.

Confinement to lower level, staff, or dead-end jobs may promote management style and behavior that are viewed as ineffective, further reducing possibilities for advancement. Compounding the historical trend is the apparent reluctance of white male managers to give women and minorities highly visible, challenging assignments, thus denying them the types of experiences that promote the development of managerial and executive talent.

There is some evidence that women and minorities are excluded from informal networks that provide the information, feedback, and contacts necessary for career advancement. Research also suggests that minorities and women have more difficulty finding a mentor than do white males. Moreover, mixed-gender mentorships pose potential problems in establishing a relationship that is supportive of a female manager's development. Attitudinal research indicates that distinct differences in perceptions exist among gender and racial/ethnic groups regarding the extent to which systemic barriers exist. Women and minorities identify attitudinal and cultural barriers to promotion, whereas white men are more likely to feel that structure changes have eliminated those barriers. White males seem to see fewer obstacles to opportunity sharing than do women and minorities. They are more likely to think that a system in which employee treatment was based on merit has been replaced with one in which women and minorities are favored because of affirmative action.

2. Objectives

Glass ceiling in corporate sector became prime hindrance for the women professional growth. Keeping in view of the above discussion the present study has made an attempt to study the profile of young women working interested for career growth, to study the variations in growth among men and women perceived by women and to study the factors considered by the young working women for glass ceiling.

3. Methodology

The research design is mostly based on the women employees' decisions in various organisations related to glass ceiling. Sampling procedure used for this research is mostly convenient one (colleges mostly in the twin city Bhubaneswar and Cuttack of Odisha). Primary data are collected from the respondents (college students) through questionnaire method from the sample size 370 during the period of 2017 and 300 are validated. Statistical tools like tabulation, weighted average mean and factor analysis are being used for the data analysis. The attitude of women employees towards different organisations are studied through the questionnaire and Likert scale is used on each twenty six statements. The data validated empirically through statistical techniques especially through regression analysis and finally factor analysis (FA) applied to study the variables responsible for glass ceiling.

4. Literature Review

Stereotypes and associated bias underlie the belief that minorities and women are not suited for managerial positions. Such beliefs, thought to be one of the major causes of employment inequities (Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990), are the subject of this section. Most of the research discussed here addresses women's issues, given the unfortunate lack of focus on the minority populations in the literature. Still, according to the data presented by Leinsten

(1988) and others, black individuals fair even more poorly than females in traditional organizations. This is particularly the case when one considers the plight of "doubly disadvantaged" minority females. Malveaux and Wallace (1987) comment on the additional deficit in research on women of other minorities, noting that when non-black minorities are studied they are typically placed into an all-encompassing minority group. This lack of research is reflected in the discussion of the literature that follows.

Stereotypes are the products of a normal psychological process of categorization, whereby intra-category similarities and inter-category differences are accentuated (Tajfel, 1982). Tajfel (1982) proposed that stereotype formation serves two functions: a cognitive function and a value function. The cognitive function simplifies the complex network of social relationships confronting individuals in their environment. That is, stereotyping is the process of "chunking" information to facilitate social decision making. The value function leads to a growing emphasis on in-group similarity and out-group differences, which "serves to protect, maintain, or enhance the value systems applying to distinctions between social groups". Such maximization of differences and associated favoring of in-group members preserves that part of the individual's self-concept determined by his or her social identity. A corollary of in-group favoritism is discrimination against outgroup members. Thus, discrimination is a correlate of the natural process of stereotype formation. Sex is an obvious basis for social categorization and sex stereotypes are the result. Terborg (1977) identified two components of sex stereotypes. The first involves attributes or behaviors deemed to be characteristic of each sex. For example, men are seen to be assertive and strong, while females are perceived to be caring and emotional (Colwill, 1987). The second component defines appropriate behavior for men and women. The former, descriptive component is a belief about what men and women are like; the second, prescriptive component, dictates what men or women should be like. Just as a man should not be passive or sensitive, it is deemed inappropriate for a female to be competitive or independent.

A large body of literature indicates that descriptive stereotypes influence attitudes about the proper place and commonly held attitudes may block career development for women. Dubno's (1985) concluded that such polarized attitudes on the parts of MBA students who represent a large proportion of aspiring managers in the business world will ensure the continued prevalence of discrimination against female managers, blocking their career development. Successful promotion to the upper echelons of the organization requires an independent, aggressive, and competitive individual. If women are not thought to possess such attributes, they would not be considered for such a position.

Freedman and Phillips (1988) note that a great many studies have found that male applicants are rated higher for traditionally male jobs while female applicants are rated higher for traditionally female jobs. It has been shown that female applied for a traditionally male job will actually be discouraged from further pursuit of this path (Dipboye, 1987). Leventhal and Herbert (1990) note that females who wish to move up the corporate ladder have been advised to adopt more masculine characteristics in order to be

accepted by both their superiors and their subordinates. It is widely believed that women would do better in their work roles if they were to hold attitudes and behave more like men (Freedman & Phillips, 1988). However, "behaving more like men" is incompatible with the prescriptive stereotype that dictates how women should behave, and leads to gender-incongruent behavior.

In an employment setting, individuals fill an organizational role defined by what is expected and appropriate behavior required performing the job. In addition, people develop expectations about others' behavior based on what is considered to be appropriate for their gender. When gender-based expectations are carried over into the workplace, the carry-over is termed "sex-role spillover" (Gutek & Cohen, 1987). They point out that the work roles which have been dominated by white males in the past have taken on the characteristics deemed typical of this majority. Terborg (1977), in fact, holds that a "male managerial model" exists that all but ensures that women cannot be successful in management as it perpetuates the stereotype that women should not be successful in management. Thus, sex-role spillover in management jobs is greater for female than male incumbents because the disparity between expectations of the gender role and job role is less for males. Both women and men state that women are held to a higher standard of performance and must work harder than men to succeed (Merit Systems Protection Board, 1992; Valerio, 1990). Not only do a large number of females think that they are presumed to be incompetent until they prove otherwise, but they also believe that the errors they make receive far more attention than do those made by males. Leinsten (1988) notes that there is also a pervasive belief that blacks cannot perform as well as whites and that when they do meet a higher level of performance, it is surprising. Blacks also feel that they must work harder than whites to prove themselves, and that they are not allowed the same luxuries as whites in making mistakes. Rather, black individuals feel as if they are responsible for holding up the reputation of their race (Alderfer et al., 1980). The general conviction is that if one black individual does not meet performance standards; the stereotype of poor black performers is reinforced against all black individuals. This situation is magnified as the ratio of females/minorities to males shrinks.

Performance Evaluations and Stereotyping

Thomas and Alderfer (1989) state that the modern organization is one that is founded on distributive justice principles or what they term to be "meritocracy," where individuals are rewarded based upon their performance. In contrast, Dipboye (1985) hypothesized that raters process information about individuals differently given the stereotypes they hold for similar individuals as a whole--regardless of performance. One way that stereotypes might operate to block the advancement of women and minorities is through the differential evaluation of performance. Kraiger and Ford (1985) investigated the effects of race on performance ratings through the use of meta-analysis. Results indicated that whites rated white ratees higher than black ratees. Black raters, on the other hand, gave significantly higher ratings to black ratees than they gave to white ratees. The only substantial moderating effects found in the study involved the setting of the ratings and the saliency of blacks in the workgroup. The magnitude of the

rating differences was greater in field studies than in laboratory studies, while race effects were found to decline as the percentage of blacks in the workgroup increased. Pulakos, White, Oppler, and Borman (1989) looked at both race and sex effects on performance ratings collected from a large sample of enlisted Army personnel. Because multiple raters had evaluated each ratee, Pulakos and her colleagues could separate the effects of actual ratee performance differences from the effects of rating bias in the evaluations. Ratings were collected from peers and supervisors on three composite behavioral dimensions: technical skill and job effort, personal discipline, and military bearing. Although significant results were found, the proportion of variance accounted for in the ratings by the independent variables of race and sex was determined to be extremely small. Pulakos et al. (1989) went on to conduct a meta-analysis regarding the nature and magnitude of race and sex effects on performance ratings. Once again, although some significant race and sex effects were found, very little of the variance in the ratings was correlated with race and sex. Pulakos et al. noted the possibility that the effects of race and sex on associated ratings may have been smaller here than in other research given the focus on the military population. As there is a greater percentage of minorities in the military than in the civilian workforce, military raters may be more accustomed to rating minority performers.

5. Results and Interpretation

This study is conducted in Bhubaneswar city which gives us an approximate judgment about the women status in different organisations in Bhubaneswar. This study will throw a light on the lifestyle of women in different organisations and the culture of different organisations to provide healthy environment for women. The study also emphasizes on the various aspects responsible for the glass ceiling in career development.

5.1 Respondent Profile

In the present study the respondents of various income groups is being considered on the total sample. The total sample size for the research is 300. Out of the total respondents 16.6% are executives having experience less than 1 year, 15.3% are executives having experience 1 to 5 years and 30% are executives having experience 5 to 10 years and 15.3% are executives having experience 10 to 15 years and 18% are executives having experience more than 15 years. Around 84% of the total respondents are coming under the income level of higher than Rs.20, 000. Around 75% of the women are coming above the age of 30. About 90% of the respondents are coming under the age of 50. Out of this 9% are coming under age 20, 17.6% are coming under age 21-30 and 28.3% are coming under 31-40 and 31% are coming under 41-50 and 13.6% are coming above the age of 50. The people who are very much aware of glass ceiling are taking into consideration because the questions can be solved by the highly aware respondents only. The above information is available in the exhibit-1.

5.2 Factor Analysis

The study has been made to know the attitude of Indian Customers towards e-tailing especially the different shopping internet websites with reference to Bhubaneswar. 26 statements are generated for measuring respondents'

opinion on a 5-point Likert scale card. This exhibit-2 in appendix provides the R and R² values. The R value represents the simple correlation and is 0.898 (the "R" Column), which indicates a high degree of correlation. The R² value is 0.807 (the "R Square" column) indicates how much of the total variation in the dependent variable glass ceiling 80.7% explained by the independent variable (statements for factor analysis of all twenty six statements). The exhibit-3 shows the validity of variables which has taken for factor analysis through Cronbach's Alpha is 0.929. Again exhibit-4 Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy for the factor analysis came 0.703 which is more than 0.5 and quite acceptable for the research which shows the sample adequacy. Again Bartlett's Test of Sphericity should be significant at the level 0.01 but here it is more significant as the value is lesser than 0.01. The total variance accounted for by all the seven factors is 80.76% which is quite high and it establishes the validity of the study.

These factors having different eigen values, percentage of variance and cumulative variance are represented in this exhibit-5. Factor matrix and their corresponding factor loading after the varimax rotation are presented. Here the eigen values above 1 are considered for the study and by these seven factors can be generated. The statements of factor loadings less than 0.5 are grouped and are shown. Factor F1 has an Eigen value of 4.312 and explains 20.569% of the total variance. The Eigen value of Factor F2 is 3.531 and explains 17.606% of the total variance. Factor F3 has an eigen value of 2.325 and explains 12.329% of the total variance. Factor F4 has an Eigen value of 2.516 and explains 10.487% of total variance. Factor F5 has an Eigen value of 2.089 and explains 8.298% of total variance. Factor F6 has an Eigen value of 2.251 and explains 6.552% of total variance. Factor F7 has an Eigen value of 1.913 and explains 5.015% of total variance. The total variance accounted for by all the seven factors is 80.76% which is quite high and it establishes the validity of the study. The factors are named after grouping the key variables and looking at the communality of the variables in explaining at typical attribute of glass ceiling. The exhibit-6 represents the grouping of factors. The grouping of factors takes into consideration of the high factor loadings of statements under each factor. The exhibit-7 depicts the variables under each of the four desired factors. The first factor F1 is termed as "Stereotype" factor. The second factor F2 is termed as "Deceptive" factor. The third factor is termed as "Emotion" factor. The fourth factor F4 is termed as "Equality" factor. The fifth factor F5 is termed as "Balanced" factor. The sixth factor F6 is termed as "Supportive" factor. The seventh factor F7 is termed as "Open-mindedness" factor. According to the ranking the most prioritized factors can be known from the customer's response. In the exhibit-8 customers have given highest priority to the factor like "Stereotype" followed by Deceptive, Equality, Emotion, Supportive, Balanced and Open-mindedness respectively

6. Concluding Observation

The data in this project do not allow for a definitive test of the glass ceiling hypothesis for several reasons. First, the strategy of assessing relative promotional probabilities from cross sectional distributions is problematic unless unrealistic demographic assumptions are met. We argued that since the biases of this method are likely to inflate the appearance of glass ceiling effects, if it turns out that no glass ceiling effects appear in the cross-sectional data, they would still be relevant for provisionally assessing the glass ceiling hypothesis. Nevertheless, since there are many possible distortions introduced by using cross-sectional data, and not all of them may work in the same direction, a fine-grained test of the glass ceiling hypothesis should rely on data that directly measure promotional trajectories for men and women. What is needed is a comprehensive set of career histories of a large sample of men and women with detailed descriptions of the organizations within which they have worked and their hierarchical location within those organizations.

Second, if glass ceiling effects are highly concentrated at the very apex of organizations, then relying on sample survey data of the sort used in this article will simply miss the phenomenon. At most, survey research would be able to identify glass ceiling effects in the middle to upper tiers of organizations. Third, even given the limitations of the kind of data used in this article, the relatively small sample size has made it difficult to conduct rigorous statistical tests of the differences in odds ratios across levels of the hierarchy. We have had to rely mainly on descriptions of the patterns of coefficients. For all of these reasons, the results of the analysis in this article are at best suggestive.

7. Limitations and Directions for Future Research

The sample which has taken is mostly young of age group 20-25 years may not be the replica of the population of India. It is a convenience sample of young minds both students and executives of Bhubaneswar state capital of Odisha (Eastern State of India) and prediction is on the basis of this limited territory. The dimensions considered here for the factor analysis are limited to the pilot survey conducted in Bhubaneswar only. The research mostly highlighted the quantitative part of the survey not the qualitative one. A study with a bigger sample from different parts of India can be recommended for further research. There are several limitations of the present research. However, each of these limitations provides a direction for future research. First, and of most concern, both our studies included only moderate numbers of respondents from top level management. Second, most of the participants were based in Odisha and there is a need to carry out international comparisons across different countries. There is also a strong need for longitudinal studies to assess the stability of glass ceiling beliefs over time, as well as when women change jobs and careers.

Appendix

Exhibit-1

(Demographic profile of respondents)

| Demographic Profile | | | |
|---------------------|-------------|-----------|------------|
| Type | Particulars | Frequency | Percentage |
| Marital Status | | | |

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|-----|-------|
| | Unmarried | 82 | 27.33 |
| | Married | 218 | 72.67 |
| Age | | | |
| | Less than 20 | 28 | 9.33 |
| | 21-30 | 53 | 17.67 |
| | 31-40 | 85 | 28.33 |
| | 41-50 | 93 | 31.00 |
| | More than 50 | 41 | 13.67 |
| Educational Qualification | | | |
| | Graduation | 105 | 35.00 |
| | Post-Graduation | 90 | 30.00 |
| | PG above | 55 | 18.33 |
| Occupation | | | |
| Executives | Less than 1 Years | 50 | 16.67 |
| | 1-5 years | 46 | 15.33 |
| | 5-10 years | 90 | 30.00 |
| | 10-15 years | 46 | 15.33 |
| | 15+ years | 54 | 18.00 |
| Family Income per month | Less than 20K | 50 | 16.67 |
| | 20K-40K | 60 | 20.00 |
| | 40K-60K | 80 | 26.67 |
| | 60K-80K | 55 | 18.33 |
| | Above 80K | 55 | 18.33 |

Exhibit-2

(Regression analysis for correlation among variables)

| Model Summary | | | | |
|---------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1 | .898 ^a | .807 | .791 | .630 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Statements for Factor Analysis S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, S6, S7, S8, S9, S10, S11, S12, S13, S14, S15, S16

Exhibit-3

(Reliability test of variables)

| Reliability Statistics | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
| .929 | 26 |

Exhibit-4

| KMO and Bartlett's Test | | |
|--|--------------------|---------|
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. | | 703 |
| | Approx. Chi Square | 831.732 |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | DF | 231 |
| | Sig | .000 |

Exhibit-5

Loadings of selected variables on key factors (Factor Loading Criteria >0.5)

| Rotated Component Matrix | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|-----------|----|------|----|------|----|----|
| s.no | Statement | Component | | | | | | |
| | | F1 | F2 | F3 | F4 | F5 | F6 | F7 |
| S1 | Women face no barriers to promotions in most Organizations. | | | .849 | | | | |
| S2 | Women prefer a balance life more than gaining Highly paid careers. | | | | | .723 | | |
| S3 | Networking is a smart way for women to increase The chances of career success. | .909 | | | | | | |
| S4 | Talented women are able to overcome sexist Discrimination. | | | .800 | | | | |
| S5 | Smart women avoid careers that involve intense Competition with colleagues. | | | | | .855 | | |
| S6 | Women are capable of making critical leadership decisions. | .816 | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|------|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|------|
| S7 | Women who have a strong commitment to their Careers can go right to the top. | | | | | | | .854 | |
| S8 | Jealousy from co-workers prevents women from | | .693 | | | | | | |
| S9 | Women and men have to overcome the same Problems at the workplace. | .474 | | | | | | | |
| S10 | Even women with many skills and qualifications Fail to be recognized for promotions. | | | | .771 | | | | |
| S11 | Women leaders are seldom given full credit for Their successes. | | | | | .511 | | | |
| S12 | Women have the same desire for power as men do | | | | .858 | | | | |
| S13 | Women have reached the top in all areas of Business and politics. | | | | .887 | | | | |
| S14 | Women commonly reject career advancement as they are Keener to maintain a role raising children. | .514 | | | | | | | |
| S15 | Women in senior positions face frequent putdowns of Being too soft or too hard. | | | | | | | | .853 |
| S16 | The support of a mentor greatly increases the success of A woman in any organization. | | | | | | .595 | | |
| S17 | If women achieve promotions they might be accused of Offering sexual favours. | | .854 | | | | | | |
| S-18 | Women are just as ambitious in their careers as men | | .889 | | | | | | |
| S-19 | Women are more likely to be hurt than men when they take big risks necessary for corporate success. | .754 | | | | | | | |
| S-20 | A supportive spouse/partner or close friend makes it easier for a woman to achieve success in her career. | .845 | | | | | | | |
| S-21 | Women are less concerned about promotions than men are. | | | | | | .802 | | |
| S-22 | Motherhood is more important to most women than career development. | | | .676 | | | | | |
| S-23 | Daughters of successful mothers are inspired to overcome sexist hurdles. | | .521 | | | | | | |
| S-24 | Women's nurturing skills help them to be successful leaders. | | | | | | | | .521 |
| S-25 | Women leaders suffer more emotional pain than men when there is a crisis within their teams. | | .574 | | | | | | |
| S-26 | Women face no barriers to promotions in most organizations. | | | | | | | | .539 |
| | Eigen Values | 4.312 | 3.531 | 2.325 | 2.516 | 2.089 | 2.251 | 1.913 | |
| | %age of Variance | 20.569 | 17.606 | 12.239 | 10.487 | 8.298 | 6.552 | 5.015 | |
| | Cumulative Variance | 20.569 | 38.175 | 50.413 | 60.901 | 69.198 | 75.75 | 80.766 | |

Exhibit-6**(Highly correlated statements under factors)**

| St.no | Statement | Component | | | | | | |
|-------|---|-----------|-------|-------|-------|----|----|----|
| | | F1 | F2 | F3 | F4 | F5 | F6 | F7 |
| S-3 | Networking is a smart way for women to increase The chances of career success. | 0.909 | | | | | | |
| S-20 | A supportive spouse/partner or close friend makes it easier for a woman to achieve success in | 0.845 | | | | | | |
| S-6 | Women are capable of making critical leadership Decisions. | 0.816 | | | | | | |
| S-19 | Women are more likely to be hurt than men when they take big risks necessary for corporate | 0.754 | | | | | | |
| S-14 | Women commonly reject career advancement as they are keener to maintain a role raising | 0.514 | | | | | | |
| S-9 | Women and men have to overcome the same problems at the workplace. | 0.474 | | | | | | |
| S-18 | Women are just as ambitious in their careers as men | | 0.889 | | | | | |
| S-17 | If women achieve promotions they might be accused of offering sexual favours. | | 0.854 | | | | | |
| S-8 | Jealousy from co-workers prevents women from seeking promotions. | | 0.693 | | | | | |
| S-25 | Women leaders suffer more emotional pain than men when there is a crisis within their teams | | 0.574 | | | | | |
| S-23 | Daughters of successful mothers are inspired to Overcome sexist hurdles. | | 0.521 | | | | | |
| S-1 | Women face no barriers to promotions in most organizations. | | | 0.849 | | | | |
| S-4 | Talented women are able to overcome sexist discrimination. | | | 0.8 | | | | |
| S-22 | Motherhood is more important to most women than career development. | | | 0.676 | | | | |
| S-13 | Women have reached the top in all areas of Business and politics. | | | | 0.887 | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|------|---|--|--|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| S-12 | Women have the same desire for power as men | | | | 0.858 | | | |
| S-10 | Even women with many skills and qualifications fail to be recognized for promotions. | | | | 0.771 | | | |
| S-5 | Smart women avoid careers that involve intense competition with colleagues. | | | | | 0.855 | | |
| S-2 | Women prefer a balance life more than gaining Highly paid careers. | | | | | 0.723 | | |
| S-11 | Women leaders are seldom given full credit for Their successes. | | | | | 0.511 | | |
| S7 | Women who have a strong commitment to their careers can go right to the top | | | | | | 0.854 | |
| S-21 | Women are less concerned about promotions than men are | | | | | | 0.802 | |
| S-16 | The support of a mentor greatly increases the success of a woman in any organization. | | | | | | 0.595 | |
| S-15 | Women in senior positions face frequent Putdowns of being too soft or too hard. | | | | | | | 0.853 |
| S-24 | Women's nurturing skills help them to be successful leaders. | | | | | | | 0.521 |
| S-26 | Women face no barriers to promotions in most | | | | | | | 0.539 |

Exhibit-7

(Factors of Glass ceiling in every organisations)

| Factors | Statements |
|-----------------------------|---|
| F1 (Stereotype) | Networking is a smart way for women to increase the chances of career success. |
| | A supportive spouse/partner or close friend makes it easier for a woman to achieve success in her career. |
| | Women are capable of making critical leadership decisions. |
| | Women are more likely to be hurt than men when they take big risks necessary for corporate success. |
| | Women commonly reject career advancement as they are keener to maintain a role raising children |
| | Women and men have to overcome the same problems at the workplace. |
| F2(Deceptive) | Women are just as ambitious in their careers as men. |
| | If women achieve promotions they might be accused of offering sexual favours. |
| | Jealousy from co-workers prevents women from seeking promotions. |
| | Women leaders suffer more emotional pain than men when there is a crisis within their teams. |
| | Daughters of successful mothers are inspired to overcome sexist hurdles. |
| F3(Emotion) | Women face no barriers to promotions in most organizations. |
| | Talented women are able to overcome sexist discrimination. |
| | Motherhood is more important to most women than career development. |
| F4(Equality) | Women have reached the top in all areas of business and politics. |
| | Women have the same desire for power as men do. |
| | Even women with many skills and qualifications fail to be recognized for promotions |
| F5(Balanced) | Smart women avoid careers that involve intense competition with colleagues |
| | Women prefer a balance life more than gaining highly paid careers. |
| | Women leaders are seldom given full credit for their successes. |
| F6(Supportive) | Women who have a strong commitment to their careers can go right to the top |
| | Women are less concerned about promotions than men are. |
| | The support of a mentor greatly increases the success of a woman in any organization. |
| F7(Open- mindedness) | Women in senior positions face frequent putdowns of being too soft or too hard. |
| | Women's nurturing skills help them to be successful leaders. |
| | Women face no barriers to promotions in most organizations. |

Exhibit-8

Ranking of Factors on Satisfaction Level

| Factors | Factor Loadings | Rank |
|---------------------|-----------------|------|
| F1(Stereotype) | 4.312 | 1 |
| F2(Deceptive) | 3.531 | 2 |
| F3(Emotion) | 2.325 | 4 |
| F4(Equality) | 2.516 | 3 |
| F5(Balanced) | 2.089 | 6 |
| F6(Supportive) | 2.251 | 5 |
| F7(Open-mindedness) | 1.374 | 7 |

References

1. Barnet-Verzat, C. and Wolff, F-C. (2008), "Gender wage gap and the glass ceiling effect: a firm level investigation", International Journal of Manpower, Vol. 29, No. 6, pp. 486-502.
2. Barreto, M., Ryan, M.K. and Schmitt, M.T. (Eds), (2009), the glass ceiling in the 21st century: understanding barriers to gender equality, American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.

3. Bergman, B. (2003), "The validation of the Women Workplace Culture Questionnaire: gender related stress and health for Swedish working women", *Sex Roles*, Vol. 49, No. 5/6, pp. 287-297.
4. Booyesen, L.A.E. and Nkomo, S.M. (2010), "Gender role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics: The case of South Africa", *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, Vol.25, No. 4, pp. 285-300
5. Brownne, K.R. (2006), "Evolved sex differences and occupational segregation", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 27, pp. 143-162.
6. Burke, R. and Vinnicombe, S. (2005), "Advancing women's careers", *Career Development International*, Vol. 10, No. 3, pp. 165-167.
7. Buss, D.M. (1995), "Evolutionary psychology: A new paradigm for psychological science", *Psychological Inquiry*, Vol. 6, pp. 1-49.
8. Cordano, M., Scherer, R.F. and Owen, C.L. (2003), "Dimensionality of the Women As Managers Scale: factor congruency among three samples", *The Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 143, No. 1, pp. 141-143.
9. Crosby, F.J., Williams, J.C. and Biernat, M. (2004), "The maternal wall", *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 60, No. 4, pp. 675-682.
10. Crino, M.D., White, M.C. and DeSanctis, G.L. (1981), "A comment on the dimensionality and reliability of the Women as Managers Scale", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 24, pp. 866-876.
11. Davidson, M. (2009), "The glass ceiling – Australian and British women in management 2009: myth or reality?", paper presented at the 44th Australian Psychological Society Annual Conference, 30 September-October 4, Darwin, Australia.
12. Dubno, P. (1985), "Attitudes toward women executives: a longitudinal study", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 235-239.
13. Dubno, P., Costas, J., Cannon, H., Wankel, C. and Emin, H. (1979), "An empirically keyed scale for measuring managerial attitudes toward female executives", *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, Vol. 3, No. 4, pp. 357-364.
14. Duehr, E.E. and Bono, J.E. (2006), "Men, women, and managers: are stereotypes finally changing?" *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 59, No. 4, pp. 815-846.
15. Eagly, A.H. and Carli, L.L. (2007), *Through the labyrinth: The truth about how women become leader*, Harvard Business School, Boston, MA.
16. Eagly, A.H. and Karau, S.J. (2002), "Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*", Vol. 109, No. 3, pp. 573-598
17. Elacqua, T.C., Beehr, T.A., Hansen, C.P. and Webster, J. (2009), "Managers' beliefs about the glass ceiling: interpersonal and organizational factors", *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, Vol. 33, No. pp.285-294.
18. Everett, L., Thorne, D. and Danehower, C. (1996), "Cognitive moral development and attitudes toward women executives", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 15, pp. 1227-1235.
19. Fassinger, R.E. (2008), "Workplace diversity and public policy: challenges and opportunities for psychology", *American Psychologist*, Vol. 63, No. 4, pp. 252-268.
20. Goward, P. (2001), *a business of your own: how women succeed in business*, Allen & Unwin, Sydney.
- Hakim, C. (2006), "Women, careers, and work-life preferences", *British Journal of Guidance & Counseling*, Vol. 34, No. 3, pp. 279-294
21. Heilman, M.E. and Okimoto, T.G. (2007), "Why are women penalized for success at male tasks? The implied communality deficit", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 92, No. 1, pp. 81-92.
22. International Labour Office (2004), *breaking through the glass ceiling: women in management*, ILO, Geneva.
23. Jackson, J.C. (2001), "Women middle managers' perception of the glass ceiling", *Women in Management Review*, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp. 30-41.
24. Kumra, S., and Vinnicombe, S. (2008), "A study of the promotion to partner process in a professional services firm: how women are disadvantaged", *British Journal of Management*, Vol.19, pp. S65- S574.
25. Maginn, P.J. (2010), *breaking through the glass ceiling of local government? The gender profile of Australian mayors in metropolitan Australia 1985-2010*, Fact Base Bulletin 11, The University of Western Australia and Committee for Perth, Perth
26. Mathur-Helm, B. (2006), "Women and the glass ceiling in South African banks: an illusion or reality?", *Women in Management Review*, Vol. 21, No. 4, pp. 31-326.
27. McLeod, F. (2008), "Glass ceiling still firmly in place", available at <http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0,25197,23926883-30537,00.html> (accessed July 2009).
28. Morrison, A.M., White, R.P. and Van Velsor, E. (1992), *breaking the glass ceiling: can women reach the top of America's largest corporations?* Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.
- O'Connor, V.J. (2001), "Women and men in senior management: A "different needs" hypothesis", *Women in Management Review*, Vol. 16, No. 8, pp. 400-404.
29. Olsson, S. (2002), "Gendered heroes: male and female self-representations of executive identity", *Women in Management Review*, Vol. 17, No. 3/4, 142-150.
30. Phelan, J.E., Moss-Racusin, C.A. and Rudman, L.A. (2008), "Competent yet out in the cold: shifting criteria for hiring reflect backlash toward agentic women", *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, Vol. 32, pp. 406-413.
31. Pinker, S. (2002), *the blank slate: the modern denial of human nature*, Viking, New York, NY.
- Still, L.V. (2006), "Where are the women in leadership in Australia?", *Women in Management Review*, Vol. 21, No. 3, pp. 180-194
32. Stone, P. (2007), *Opting out? Why women really quit careers and head home*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
33. Tan, J. (2008), "Breaking the "bamboo curtain" and the "glass ceiling": the experience of women entrepreneurs in high-tech industries in an emerging market", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 80, pp. 547-564.
34. Terborg, J.T., Peters, L.H., Ilgen, D.R. and Smith, F. (1977), "Organizational and personal correlates of attitudes toward women as managers", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 89-100.

35. Thomson, P., Graham, J., and Lloyd, T. (2008), a woman's place is in the boardroom: the roadmap, Palgrave Macmillan, Hound mills, Basingstoke, Hampshire.US Department of Labor (1991), a report on the glass ceiling initiative, US Government Printing Office, Washington, DC.
36. Weyer, B. (2007), "Twenty years later: explaining the persistence of the glass ceiling for women leaders", *Women in Management Review*, Vol. 22, No. 6, pp. 482-496.
37. Wood, G.J. and Lindorff, M. (2001), "Sex differences in explanations for career progress", *Women in Management Review*, Vol. 16, No. 4, pp. 152-162
38. Wrigley, B.J. (2002), "Glass ceiling? What glass ceiling? A qualitative study of how women view the glass ceiling in public relations and communication management", *Journal of Public Relations Research*, Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 27-55.