

GLASS CEILING EFFECT ON WOMEN CAREER PROGRESSION IN URBAN PAKISTAN

Rozina Imtiaz, Sadia Shaikh, and Syeda Qurat ul Ain

ABSTRACT

Regardless of the notable increase in the women workforce worldwide, their advancement toward the senior managerial designations has remained limited. The obstruction for women to achieve senior-level positions due to gender discrimination is referred to the Glass Ceiling (GC) effect. Gender discrimination persists as a constant setback globally, but it has become an acute problem in developing countries. The key objective of this study is to investigate the glass ceiling effect on women career growth in urban Pakistan. Deductive approach is used to determine the variables which support the GC effect. A total of 150 questionnaires were distributed using random sampling technique among the female employees of Karachi, out of which 100 responded. Data is analyzed using descriptive statistics with the help of SPSS. The study concluded that urban working women are drained with family responsibilities, workload and gender discrimination at work, which eventually results in inefficiency and a high degree of stress. Study findings reveal that the strongest predictor that hinder Women Career Progression (WCP) is Gender Stereotype (GS), followed by Organizational Practices (OP), and the Work-life Conflict (WLC). Based on the study findings it is recommended that the organizations in Pakistan should inculcate equality, encourage diversity in the senior management, offer the women workforce flexible-job arrangements and maternity leaves, and provide day care facilities to the children, to balance the women work-life conflicts.

Keywords: *Stereotype, Work-Life Conflict, Glass Ceiling, Gender Discrimination, Developing Economies.*

INTRODUCTION

The term glass ceiling is referred to the invisible barriers which obstruct women to reach the senior management positions in an organization (Pai & Vaidya, 2009). The ‘ceiling’ is an impediment that

obscures upward career progression while the 'glass' indicates the invisibility of the obstacle (Lathabhavan & Balasubramanian, 2017). It has been observed that, globally, women are earning only ten percent of the world wages instead of making about seventy-five percent of the world's total workforce (OXFAM, 2016). Conventionally, women are considered to bear and up-bring the children and run the household chores only (Barnett & Hyde, 2001). This attitude has created unnecessary obstacles and hurdles in women's career progression (Hejase, 2015). Interestingly this trend is witnessed not only in the developing economies but all over the world (Barnett & Hyde, 2001), for which the Glass Ceiling Commission was set up by the US corporate to examine the reason of relatively fewer women at the senior level positions as compared to their proportion at lower and middle management levels (US Glass Ceiling Commission, 1995). The US Corporate Leadership report proclaimed that the women as leaders in the business division are moving with slow advancement in the USA (Clevenger & Singh, 2013). In Lebanon, which has the highest literacy rate in the world, women entrance in decision making & public positions are relatively low due to the factors like gender career choice; low technical skills; and early exit due to marriages (Hamdan, Hamdan, Batlouni, & Mansour, 2007). The United Nations Statistical Division (2010), reports similar circumstances persistent in India, where due to occupational separation and lack of job opportunities for the women, men get more benefits.

In the past, due to the cultural and societal factors, women of Pakistan were hesitant to work in the job market (Faizan, Nair, & Haque, 2018), but now they have started participating in the economic activities. According to the World Economic Forum (2016), Pakistan ranked 143 out of 144 in the economic participation & opportunity gender wise; in labor force participation it ranked 139 out of 144 countries, whereas the male/female ratio was reported as 25:85. Furthermore, the country ranked 138 in the estimated earning income claiming the male/female ratio of 1,745:7714; ranked 119 in the professional and technical worker category with a work ratio of 22:78; and ranked at 122 in the senior officials, legislators and manager category declaring the male/female ratio as 3:97. According to CPDI (2017), and the Pakistan Employment Trends (2013), there persists a large wage/earnings gap between the two genders in Pakistan. The data reports that the wages of females stayed at 61.45% as compared to that of male's income.

Yukongdi and Benson (2005), ascertain that the women workforce participation in Asia involved in economic activity is quite high, which is nearly 64%. However, a small number of women in senior positions is the real research concern and it suggests that the women may face glass ceiling (Blank, 1996). Interestingly contribution of Pakistani women in the corporate boards is only 4.6% in the national firms, which is not only more than India (4.1%), but Indonesia (4.2%) too (Pakistan Bureau of Statistics, 2012).

The share of women in the top management positions has remained negligible due to the existence of biased obstacles which prevent women to get into senior management positions (Bazazo et al., 2017). It is the managerial level ahead of which women don't get promoted although attain the same qualification as their male colleagues (Pollard, 2007). Although Asian women workforce is quite high, nearly 64% (Yukongdi & Benson, 2005), still a smaller number of women on the senior positions is an alarming situation for the researchers (Blank, 1996). A safe and non-discriminative environment is not only in favor of women but in general for societies too (Yousaf & Schmiede, 2016). In such circumstances, the researchers intention of this study is to find the existence of the glass ceiling on women professional progress in Pakistan. The study is guided by the following research questions:

- What is the association between glass ceiling and low women career progression in Pakistan?
- What is the effect of organizational practices on women career progression in Pakistan?
- What is the effect of work life conflict on women career progression in Pakistan?
- What is the effect of gender stereotype on women career progression in Pakistan?
- How to overcome glass ceiling on women career progression in Pakistan?

LITERATURE REVIEW

The term 'glass ceiling' was first mentioned in the Wall Street Journal in 1986 (Al-Manasra, 2013). All the way through the history of human psychology, researchers have persistently interested to study not only the prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination (Dovidio, 2001; Brewer, 1999; Fiske, 1998), but also the trend of 'intergroup biases' (Hewstone, Rubin, &

Willis, 2002). These topics have remained an area of interest for the discipline of anthropology and sociology. Moreover, the social psychologists, Allport, Clark, and Pettigrew (1954), in their book, 'The Nature of Prejudice', built a concrete foundation on discrimination, in which they conducted critical and systematic analysis (Dovidio, Hewstone, Glick, & Esses, 2010), which later became part of many disciplines including, sociology and political science, and also emerging disciplines such as neuroscience (Dovidio et al., 2010). Their research was further recognized and later implemented in law, business, medicine, media and education curriculum (Brief et al., 2000; Baldus, Woodworth, & Pulaski, 1990).

The women and gender issues have become key concerns in the organizational studies today. Different level of discussion groups and workshops are extensively held to spread awareness related to these issues (Varma, 2002). Although the intensity of women inequality issues today has lessened to some extent, but it still persists at senior level positions (Kilgour, 2013). Globally, women get less likely promoted on the higher corporate hierarchy, get comparatively low wages, and mostly hold part-time jobs whether it is Europe, Africa or Asia (Wilson, Gadbois, & Nichol, 2008). In countries like USA & UK where the forty percent of the workforce is comprised of women, and where the gender equity target has already proclaimed to be accomplished, only two percent of the women workforce succeed in getting a top position (Cole, 1997).

Theories on Gender Discrimination

Several theories have enlightened the hierarchy of gender discrimination in society. Some of them are discussed in this paper to support the issue of gender discrimination which women face in all the spheres of life.

Structural Functionalism Theory

It is one the most important sociological research of the twentieth century. The structural functionalist theory rationalizes present division of labor among the genders as necessary for the progress of a competent society (Virginia, 1990). Functionalists theory states that the gender roles were created way before the pre-industrial times. It was when men thought about more tasks outside of the home, like hunting or farming to feed the family, and women took the household tasks. After the industrial revolution the changes occurred in the society which changed the family structures too. Women started going out as breadwinner along with their domestic roles which eventually disproportioned imbalanced the societal balance (Hawke, 2007).

Conflict Theory

In the conflict theory, Farrington (1993), stated that there is a competition persistent between the social groups (men and women) for the dominance of society's inadequate resources. The problem arises when the dominant group takes advantage of the subordinate group. It is quite difficult for the women to formulate a system for the success in this race.

Statistical Discrimination Theory of Sexism and Racism

Phelps (1972), presented this theory and mentioned the supposition of doubt in appointment decisions. While appointing employees, although companies inspect the aptitude and qualification of their candidates, they cannot be ascertained about a candidate's better performance. Therefore, to overcome this doubt most employers prefer male applicants over the females they consider the male applicants to be more productive than females. The consequences of this discrimination are damaging. In case a woman is paid less with fewer or no training, then chances are high that she will give up her job; consequently, this strengthens the view of the specific discriminatory employers' group. On the contrary, if women are paid well like their counterparts and get all firm-specific trainings, the chances of quitting her job are very low (ibid).

Organization Policies & Practices

Organizational policies emphasize and make clear standard operating procedures in any organization. Good policies facilitate the company to deal with the workforce more effectively by clearly stating what behaviors are acceptable and what are not (Hammer et al. 2005). As it is a well-known fact that these jobs are getting more demanding, thus it is essential for the firms to understand how they can support and enable the employees to balance work and family life (Kossek, Lewis, & Hammer, 2010).

Globalization has opened a venue of opportunities to the women for their career development (Rai & Srivastava, 2010). It is observed that women with the same skills and qualities as their counterparts, has to struggle more than her male colleagues (NJIRU, 2013). It is concluded in a study by Mainiero and Sullivan (2005), that although women workforce is increasing, still most achieved designations are not higher than the head of the middle management. (Lemière & Silvera, 2008; Gavray, 2004), claimed that these jobs are not considered as important as it provides little chances of promotion with fewer career opportunities for women. In the US, a native male has edge over native female not only in respect of pay but also in

authority and better job status (Dunn & Skaggs, 2006). Al-Manasra (2013), mentioned that the glass ceiling is the main reason for a female middle manager not getting promoted like her counterparts or having fewer career opportunities.

Gender inequality against women makes the organization's unfriendly for them (Abrams, 1991). Some of these gender inequalities comprise of gender wage gap (Petersen & Morgan, 2013); lack of women in leading positions (Eagly & Carli, 2007); and low career growth compared to their counterparts (Blau & Devaro, 2007). The reason of occurrence of such discrimination is none other than the HR policies and related decision-making, which ultimately not only affect physical and mental health of the female employees (Borrell et al., 2010; Schmader, Johns, & Forbes, 2008), but also affect their commitment towards the organization (Hicks-Clarke & Iles, 2000), and performance (Spector & Cohen-Charash, 2001).

Moreover, organizational prejudice also takes place during the process of performance evaluation such as rewards (compensation), opportunities (promotion, role assignments), and punishments (termination) (Stamarski & Hing, 2015). Another key factor that creates obstacle in female career growth is harassment. Harassment is an unwanted or unwelcomed behavior from one of the participants. In a research conducted in India Kakker and Bhandhari (2015), observed sexual harassment as the key factor, that hold back women from moving towards top management (Sandhu, Singh, & Batra, 2014). In Nepal, nearly 53.88% women experienced harassment in their workplaces in 2004 (Elder, & Schmidt 2004), while Japan Ministry of Labor, found nearly 40% of participants experienced sexual harassment in the workplaces (Caran, Secco, Barbosa, & Robazzi, 2010). In a report by Human Rights Watchdog it is revealed that 68% Pakistani women were harassed sexually (Arab Naz et al., 2013), most of these complaints don't get reported as victims fear to get disgraced and/or fear to lose their jobs (D'Cruz & Rayner, 2013).

Ambivalent Sexism

Ambivalent sexism is a theoretical framework which theorizes that sexism has two sub-components: hostile sexism and benevolent sexism. Hostile sexism is based on aggressive negative stereotype towards women, where women are viewed as incompetent, overly emotional, and sexually manipulative figures, whereas, men are believed as more authoritative and commanding (Cikara, Lee, Fiske, & Glick, 2009).

Although Benevolent Sexism is based on a comparatively better view about the women, as far as they are acting their traditionally feminine roles. Benevolently sexists believe females as a fragile figure who need their protection, support, and adoration (Glick et al., 2000).

Thus, managers with hostile beliefs discriminate against women in human resource policies and decision (Glick, Diebold, Bailey-Werner, & Zhu, 1997). It is noted that the organizational decision makers with the hostile sexism beliefs discriminate women in the form of gender harassment which includes hostile terms of address, negative comments regarding women in management, sexist jokes, and sexist behavior (Fitzgerald, Gelfand, & Drasgow, 1995). While the organization's authoritative person with benevolent beliefs gives high authority roles to men and low authority roles to the female employees (Rudman & Kilianski, 2000). Barreto, Ryan, and Schmitt (2009), affirmed that the careerist women who strive to get on top hierarchy face discrimination along with sexual harassment, which comes at a cost to them which they carry along all their life as a victim of chauvinism, harassment & stereotype.

In Pakistan, one of the successful working women, Salma Jafri, CEO of WordPL.net, mentioned that she got rejected in an interview of a multinational firm as her family have a tradition of female's early marriages, as the organization did not support that notion. Another Pakistani woman, Maria Umar, who is the owner of 'The Women Digital League', quitted her job when management refused to grant her maternity leave (Muhammed, 2013). There are pieces of evidence of women getting bullied, faced hostility, given underrated tasks and expected to make tea at the job (Dale, Jackson, & Hill, 2005). Moreover, women recruitment decisions are made on several inquiries about their personal life plans, it reflects employers concern that having a family will affect women's professional efficiency (Dale et al., 2005). Traditionally, all human resource policies and structures are arranged as per a man's life which conflicts with women's life (Newman & Mathews, 1999).

Work-life Conflict

A balanced work life builds a supportive and healthy workplace environment, which enables an employee to maintain a balance between work and family responsibilities, which in return enhances their productivity (Garg, 2018). Women employees as a member of society have diverse roles like wife, mother, employee, and a friend, thus, there is high possibility of

conflict to take place among these roles (Rantanen et al. 2011). The male model of work, where the men work full time, having no obligation other than office work, who was considered as more committed to the organization (Lewis, 1997), is outdated now (Bailyn & Harrington, 2004).

Men and women both encounter work-family conflict, which arises when one of both family and work starts affecting the other, like the long-jobs hours which are not suitable for parenting (Kumari, 2014). Work-life conflict arises in three forms namely: time, strain, and behavioral constraint (Dizaho, Dizaho, Salleh, & Abdullah, 2016). Among them, time is the main factor, as for women it is quite challenging to manage time with her career, kids, home tasks and herself (Pirzada et al., 2013). Time conflict plays an important role in career development of employees, especially working mothers, who face this conflict while balancing their roles as an employee and a mother. Thus, they are left with little time to deal with higher responsibilities (Bartolomé & Evans, 1979). Employees who could not dedicate most of their time to the firms are assumed as less productive employees (Lewis, 1997), as compared to the employees who are available for long hours. These employees thus successfully avail the career development opportunities (Burke, 2002).

For a working mother, it is quite difficult to be enthusiastically involved while balancing her work and family roles (Tausig & Fenwick, 2001). Firms rewarding long hour sittings at the workplace thus make it far more difficult for women, especially mothers, to fulfil the organizational commitment and balance work and family time (Lockwood, 2003). Women, no matter working or housewives, are more answerable than men when we talk about home tasks and kids. These uneven duties reflect that the women are leading dual-gendered life (Cook, 1993). A survey conducted by the Conference Board of Canada (2000), revealed that 52% of female employees of Canada found difficult to deal with both spheres of life simultaneously. As parents, they go through stress when failed to spend enough time with their children, and it is witnessed more among full-time working women of aged 25-44 years (NJIRU, 2013).

Extended work hours and days are common in today's organizations, which forces women to act as superwomen or discover further ways to achieve success in both fortes thus may result in stress (Kumari, 2014). Studies in India postulate that the traditional authoritarian culture tilts towards men, and the Indian women face troubles due to her dual role. These

troubles result in work-life conflicts which lead to stress, ill-health, poor work performance or even quitting the job (ibid). It is also discovered in a study that work-life conflict and the occurrence of illness such as hypertension, hypercholesterolemia, gastrointestinal disorders, allergies, and migraines are strongly correlated (Thomas & Ganster, 1995). Moreover, Duxbury & Higgins (2012), recognized that most of the time the cause of missing work was related to emotional, mental or physical fatigue. Work life conflict is considered as a source of cognitive problems like staying awake, lack of concentration, and low alertness (MacEwen & Barling, 1994). Due to all these pressures and conflicts, working women contribute less effort for their career development (Duxbury & Higgins, 2012).

Gender Stereotypes

The term “Gender Stereotype” is used for judging men and women over culturally recommended roles then restricting their perspective (Agars, 2004). Schein (2001), describe gender stereotyping as a belief that a set of qualities and capabilities is more probable to be existent among one gender than the other. A gender stereotype basically means role fixation linked up with diverse genders. (Shabir, Shakeel, & Zubair, 2017). Fiske, Haslam, & Fiske (1991), explain gender stereotypes, as expectations of how a man and a woman should be like. Organizations and the decision makers have different expectations for a male and female professional capability and performance. These expectations can cause gender discrimination” (Roberson, Galvin, & Cherise Charles, 2007). Gorman (2005), asserts that in a male chauvinistic world, a male boss represents the role of conventional and typecast male in the firm. Moreover, it’s a traditional mindset that female cannot be a productive manager and they are not capable for executive posts (Tajfel, 1969). Furthermore, it is considered that women should work in the traditional female occupations, comparatively on low remuneration, no matter full-time or part-time, somewhat like administrative occupation & services while men are portrayed as businessmen, craftsmen, workmen and managers (Čeněk, 2013).

Conventionally females are believed to be not physically strong and that is why males are more connected in particular tough job fields such as carpenters (Helgeson, 2016). Gender stereotype moreover comprises some vivid attributes of specifying duties and limitations as per the gender (Burgess & Borgida, 1999). Previous research also confirms the reality of gender stereotyping which considers women as less competent, but keen

on achieving goals as compared to the males (Broverman et al., 1972). However, women's role is assumed to be miss-fit and contradictory when she approaches for the role meant for the men, as a consequence, her performance decreases (Heilman, 1983). It can cause women to reconsider her career even force her to change the career path she decided for herself (Pinel & Paulin, 2005). Similar stance has also been witnessed among business managers (Gibson & Tulgan, 2002). It is further stated by Flanagan and Green (2013), that minority and female members under the influence of stereotype threat, demonstrated low performance. Stereotype threat lessens enthusiasm and interest, eventually, individuals entirely distance themselves from any connection with the job domain (ibid).

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK



Figure 1. Glass Ceiling Effect

RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

H₁: Organizational policies, work-life conflict and gender stereotype are positively related to career progression of urban Pakistani women.

H₂: Organizational policies and practices are positively related to career progression of urban Pakistani women.

H₃: Work Life conflict is positively related to career progression of urban Pakistani women.

H₄: Stereotype is positively related to career progression of urban Pakistani women.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study adopted descriptive as well as inferential research design. The research is quantitative in nature. Moreover, positivism research philosophy is adopted for the study. This research has collected cross-sectional data, as the data has been collected only once (Bell, Bryman, & Harley, 2018). Deductive approach is adopted as the theory and hypothesis are developed, and research strategy is designed to test the hypothesis (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2009). For the estimation of population of the sample size, we gathered information from the Pakistan Bureau of Statistics. According to the survey report of Pakistan Statistical Year Book (2012), there is a total of 87.64734 female labor force in Pakistan, out of which 14,20763 lies in urban Pakistan. Through the Rao soft sample calculator (2004), the sample size calculated is 384 with 95% significance & 5% margin of error. Due to time constraint, only 150 questionnaires were distributed out of which 100 responded completely. We have used probability convenience sampling technique to gather data from different corporate sectors of Karachi. The summary of the constructs adopted in this study is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Constructs Adopted

Construct	No of Items	Author
Career Progression	3	(Al-Manasra, 2013)
Organizational Policies	14	(Al-Manasra,2013), (Kumari, 2014), (Tran, 2014)
Work Life Conflict	4	(Al-Manasra, 2013),
Stereotype	4	(Mihail, 2006)

Pilot testing was carried out on 20 respondents to measure the reliability of the construct. The summarized results of the reliability analysis are mentioned below in Table 2.

Table 2. Reliability of the Pretest

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.911	.926	26

The overall reliability of the constructs is ($\alpha=.911$). Thus, based on the reliability analysis it can be safely assumed that the questionnaire was valid for conducting the research survey.

Multivariate Model

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \varepsilon$$

RESULTS

The result discussion on the descriptive analysis, reliability analysis, correlation and regression analysis are presented in this section. Table 3 illustrates the univariate normality which is measured by Kurtosis and Skewness analysis.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics

Construct	Mean	Std. Dev.	Skewness	Kurtosis
Organizational Practices	2.2900	.47420	0.4025	1.575
Work-Life Conflict	1.9950	.47405	0.4979	0.4246
Career Progression	2.2933	.65010	0.4730	0.3054
Stereotype	2.3340	.52498	1.6680	1.928

Table 3 shows that stereotype with a mean of 2.33, and SD .525 has the highest skewness (SK=1.67) and organizational practices with a of mean 2.29 and SD of .474 has the lowest skewness (0.402). Moreover, stereotype with a mean of 2.33 and SD of .525 has the highest kurtosis (KT=1.928). Whereas, career progression with a mean of 2.29 and SD of .650 has the lowest kurtosis (KT=0.305). It is mentioned in Table 3, that all the constructs fall within the range of ± 1.96 which proves the normality. Furthermore, Cronbach's Alpha is used for testing internal consistency of the research constructs. The results are illustrated in Table 4.

Table 4. Reliability Analysis

Construct	Cronbach's Alpha	Standardized Cronbach's Alphas	Mean	Standard Deviation
Organization practices	.799	.818	2.290	0.4230
Work Life conflict	.762	.763	1.995	0.0316
Career Progression	.788	.788	2.293	0.0447
Stereotype	.771	.776	2.334	0.089

Results from table 4 show that the alpha values deviate between ($\alpha=0.762$ to $\alpha=0.799$). Besides, the work-life conflict with ($\alpha=.762$, Mean=1.99, SD=0.0316) has the lowest reliability, the organizational practices with ($\alpha=.799$, Mean=2.290, SD=0.4230) has the highest reliability. Since all the above alpha values are greater than 0.7, it indicates the acceptable reliability (Leech et al., 2005).

To ensure the uniqueness of the constructs and to assure there is no

issue of multicollinearity, correlation analysis is carried out. The results of the correlational analysis are illustrated in Table 5.

Table 5. Correlation

Construct	Mean	STD_DV	ORG_P	WRK_LF	CARER_P	STEREO
Organizational Practices	2.2900	0.47520	1	.519	.757	.635
Work Life Conflict	1.9950	0.47405	.519	1	.464	.380
Career Progression	2.2933	0.65010	.757	.464	1	.839
Gender Stereotype	2.3340	0.52498	.635	.380	.839	1

The highest correlation ($r=.83$) is between the pairs of career progression (Mean=2.29, SD=0.650) and gender stereotype (Mean= 2.33, SD=0.524). Whereas, the lowest correlation ($r=.380$) is between the pair of work-life conflict (Mean=1.99, SD=0.474) and gender stereotype (Mean= 2.33, SD=0.524). Correlation results of all the constructs fall within the ranges of .30 and .90 which indicates that there is no multicollinearity and all the constructs adopted are unique.

Hypothesis 1: Organizational Policies, Work-life Conflict and Gender Stereotypes

To measure the combined effect of all predictors (work-life conflict, organizational practices, gender stereotype) on career progression, multiple regression analysis is used. Result summary of the results is illustrated in Table 6.

Table 6. Regression Analysis

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	
1 Career Progression	-.667	.169		-4.010	0.00
Work Life Conflict	.076	.075	.055	1.009	.316
Organizational Practices	.480	.090	.351	5.352	0.00
Gender Stereotype	0.737	.075	.595	9.810	0.00

Dependent Variable: Career Progression, $R^2= .889$, Adjusted $R^2=.79$, $F=120.676$, $p=0 < 0.05$.

The results show that the predictors (work-life conflict, organizational practices, gender stereotype) aggregately explain 88. of the variance $F=120.676$, $p=0 < 0.05$. It is mentioned in table above that the career progression is getting significantly influenced by gender stereotype ($\beta=.737$, $p<.05$), followed by organizational practices ($\beta = .480$, $p<.05$); and work-life conflict ($\beta = .076$, $p<.05$). Moreover, we

concluded that the developed model explains the glass ceiling effect on career progression, which is apparent from the regression equation mentioned below:

$$\text{Career progression} = .667 + .076 * \text{Work Life conflict} + 0.48 * \text{Organizational practices} + 0.737 * \text{Gender Stereotype} + .169$$

Hypothesis 2: Organizational Practices and Career Progression

The results of claimed hypothesis, organizational policies and practices which have direct impact on career progression of urban Pakistani women is summarized below in Table 7.

Table 7. Summarized Results (Simple Regression)

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta	T	
1 Career progression	-.079	.211		-.375	.709
Organizational practices	1.036	.090	.757	11.479	.000

Dependent Variable: Career progression, $R^2 = .757$, Adjusted $R^2 = .569$, $F = 131.757$, $p = 0 < 0.05$.

Regression summarized results illustrate that the organizational practices defines 75.7% of the variance ($R^2 = .757$, $F = 131.757$, $p < .05$). It is found that organizational practices ($\beta = 1.036$, $p < .05$) significantly influence career progression. For career progression the regression equation is:

$$\text{Career progression} = .079 + 1.036 * \text{organizational practices} + .211$$

Hypothesis 3: Work-Life Conflict and Career Progression

Table 8. Summarized Results (Simple Regression)

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta	T	
1 Career progression	1.025	.252		4.073	.000
Work life conflict	.636	.123	.464	5.181	.000

Dependent Variable: Career progression, $R^2 = .464$, Adjusted $R^2 = .207$, $F = 26.841$, $p = 0 < 0.05$.

The regression summarized results illustrate that the work-life conflict defines 46% of the variance ($R^2 = .464$, $F = 26.841$, $p < .05$). It is found that work-life conflict ($\beta = .636$, $p < .05$) significantly influence career progression. For this relation the regression equation is devised as:

$$\text{Career progression} = 1.025 + .636 * \text{work life conflict} + .252$$

Hypothesis 4: Gender Stereotype and Career Progression

The results of claimed hypothesis, gender stereotype, has direct impact on career progression of urban Pakistani women is illustrated below in Table 9.

Table 9. Summarized Results (Simple Regression)

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta	T	
1 Career progression	-.131	.163		-.802	.425
Gender Stereotype	1.039	.068	.839	15.243	.000

Dependent Variable: Career progression, $R^2 = .839$, Adjusted $R^2 = .700$, $F = 232.355$, $p < 0.05$.

Regression summarized results illustrate that the gender stereotype defines 83% of the variance ($R^2 = .839$, $F = 232.355$, $p < .05$). It is thus found that the gender stereotype ($\beta = 1.039$, $p < .05$) significantly influences career progression. The regression equation is given below:

$$\text{Career progression} = .131 + 1.039 * \text{gender stereotype} + .163$$

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

Almost all the claimed hypotheses seem to be consistent with the earlier studies, and all of them have answered the research questions. The hypothesis stating that predictors (Organizational Practices, Work-Life Conflict, Gender Stereotype) are positively related to Career Progression of urban Pakistani women is established (refer to Table 6). This conclusion supports the earlier studies, which also found that that glass ceiling positively affects women career progression (Wilson, Gadbois, & Nichol, 2008). Another hypothesis claiming that the predictor Organizational Practices is positively related to Career progression of urban Pakistani women is also established (refer to Table 7). It is also well supported by the result of frequencies distribution as More than 70% of respondents agreed that Organizational Policies and Practices on selection and promotions are hampering their career. Likewise, more than 70% of respondents agreed that they receive inadequate support from organizations to balance job and home life. In this connection, 80% agreed that they have to put more effort than their male counterparts to carry their career and 70% of respondents affirmed that their dual roles, lessen their working ability. Similarly, more than 65% agreed that they faced

discriminations while promotions and trainings and received less pay as compared to their male counterparts. Correlation results show strong positive relationship between Organizational Practices and WCP in urban Pakistan (Table 5). All these findings are consistent with previous studies, such as a research conducted in Malaysia concluded that women middle managers experienced glass ceiling at their workplace (Al-Manasra, 2013). The hypothesis stating that the predictor Gender Stereotype positively affects the WCP of urban Pakistani women is also established (refer to Table 9). Interestingly results of frequency distribution show that most women (65%) think that their organization gives important tasks to their male counterparts (Table 5). These findings are consistent with previous research of Flanagan and Green (2013), who assert that the stereotype threat lessens enthusiasm and interest amongst the individuals, eventually, they distance themselves from any connection with the job domain. The hypothesis stating the predictor Work-Life Conflict is positively related to Women Career Progression of urban Pakistani women is also accepted. Although it doesn't show high R^2 value (Table 8) and show moderate relationship with WCP (Table 5).

Regarding the dual role, more than 80% of the respondents agree that WCP is strongly hindered by dual role (Table 5). These findings are consistent with the survey conducted by the Conference Board of Canada (2000). The overall model successfully explains the GC effect on WCP of urban Pakistani women. It was also found that the strongest predictor that hindered WCP is Gender stereotype ($R^2 = .84$) followed by Organizational Practices and Policies ($R^2 = .75$) that also strongly effect the WCP, and Work-Life Conflict ($R^2 = .46$). All the established hypotheses not only answered all the research questions but also validated previous findings.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is empirically proved from this study that Pakistani urban women are facing challenges in their career development. Women are facing diverse discrimination; gender stereotype and organizational policies are the two most hindering factors in the path of women career progression. The study recommends initiating gender equality and fairness in promoting women career progression policies. Thus, organizations in Pakistan should practice encouraging the appointment, retention, and progression of women by adopting work/life policies. These policies should help women to balance the job and family roles in today's fast competitive environment. Moreover, facilities like maternity leaves, flexible-job arrangements and daycare for children should be provided to the working women to promote WCP and disdain the persistent glass ceiling in the organizations.

REFERENCES

- Abrams, K. (1991). Social Construction, Roving Biologism, and Reasonable Women: A Response to Professor Epstein. *DePaul Law Review*, 41, 1021.
- Agars, M. D. (2004). Reconsidering the impact of gender stereotypes on the advancement of women in organizations. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 28(2), 103-111.
- Allport, G. W., Clark, K., & Pettigrew, T. (1954). *The Nature of Prejudice*. Sydney: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Al-Manasra, E. A. (2013). What are the "Glass Ceiling" barriers effects on women career progress in Jordan? *International Journal of Business and Management*, 8(6), 40. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v8n6p40>
- Arab Naz, M. H., Daraz, U., Khan, W., Khan, T., & Muhammad Salman, M. (2013). A Paradigm Shift in Women's Movement and Gender Reforms in Pakistan (A Historical Overview). *Global Journal of Human-Social Science Research*.
- Bailyn, L., & Harrington, M. (2004). Redesigning work for work-family integration. *Community, Work & Family*, 7(2), 197-208. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1366880042000245470>
- Baldus, D. C., Woodworth, G., & Pulaski, C. A. (1990). *Equal justice and the death penalty: A legal and empirical analysis*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Barnett, R. C., & Hyde, J. S. (2001). Women, men, work, and family: An expansionist theory. *American Psychologist*, 56(10), 781.
- Barreto, M. E., Ryan, M. K., & Schmitt, M. T. (2009). *The glass ceiling in the 21st century: Understanding barriers to gender equality*. American Psychological Association. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/11863-000>.
- Bartolomé, F., & Evans, P. A. L. (1979). Professional lives versus private lives-shifting patterns of managerial commitment. *Organizational Dynamics*, 7(4), 3-29.
- Bazazo, I., Nasseef, M. A., Mukattesh, B., Kastero, D., & Al-Hallaq, M. (2017). Assessing the Glass Ceiling Effect for Women in Tourism and Hospitality. *Journal of Management and Strategy*, 8(3), 51.

- Bell, E., Bryman, A., & Harley, B. (2018). *Business research methods*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Blank, R. M. (1996). Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession. *American Economic Review*, 86(2), 502-506.
- Blau, F. D., & Kahn, L. M. (2017). The gender wage gap: Extent, trends, and explanations. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 55(3), 789-865.
- Blau, F. D., & Devaro, J. (2007). New Evidence on Gender Differences in Promotion Rates: An Empirical Analysis of a Sample of New Hires. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, 46(3), 511-550.
- Bombuwela, P. M., & De Alwis, A. C. (2013). Effects of Glass Ceiling on Women Career Development in Private Sector Organizations–Case of Sri Lanka. *Journal of Competitiveness*, 5(2), 3-19.
- Borrell, C., Artazcoz, L., Gil-González, D., Pérez, G., Rohlfis, I., & Pérez, K. (2010). Perceived sexism as a health determinant in Spain. *Journal of Women's Health (2002)*, 19(4), 741–750. <https://doi.org/10.1089/jwh.2009.1594>
- Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love or outgroup hate? *Journal of Social Issues*, 55(3), 429-444. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00126>
- Brief, A. P., Dietz, J., Cohen, R. R., Pugh, S. D., & Vaslow, J. B. (2000). Just doing business: Modern racism and obedience to authority as explanations for employment discrimination. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 81(1), 72-97.
- Broverman, I. K., Vogel, S. R., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., & Rosenkrantz, P. S. (1972). Sex-role stereotypes: A current appraisal. *Journal of Social Issues*, 28(2), 59-78.
- Burgess, D., & Borgida, E. (1999). Who women are, who women should be: Descriptive and prescriptive gender stereotyping in sex discrimination. *Psychology, public policy, and law*, 5(3), 665.
- Burke, R. J. (2002). Organizational values, job experiences and satisfactions among managerial and professional women and men: advantage men?. *Women in Management Review*, 17(5), 228-236. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09649420210433184>

- Caran, V. C. S., Secco, I. A. D. O., Barbosa, D. A., & Robazzi, M. L. D. C. C. (2010). Moral harassment among professors in a public university in Brazil. *Acta Paulista de Enfermagem*, 23(6), 737-744.
- Čeněk, J. (2013). Gender stereotypes in organizations. *Journal of Education Culture and Society*, (1). <https://doi:10.15503/jecs20131-30-37>
- Cikara, M., Lee, T. L., Fiske, S. T., & Glick, P. (2009). Ambivalent sexism at home and at work: How attitudes toward women in relationships foster exclusion in the public sphere. *Social and psychological bases of ideology and system justification*, 444-462.
- Clevenger, L., & Singh, N. (2013). Exploring barriers that lead to the glass ceiling effect for women in the US hospitality industry. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 12(4), 376-399.
- Cole, P. M. (1997). Women in family business. *Family Business Review*, 10(4), 353-371. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-6248.1997.00353.x>
- Cook, E. P. (1993). The gendered context of life: Implications for women's and men's career-life plans. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 41(3), 227-237. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-0045.1993.tb00373.x>
- Conference Board of Canada. (2000). *Creating high-performance organizations: Leveraging women's leadership*. Ottawa: Conference Board of Canada.
- CPDI. (2017, March). Women and Living wages in Pakistan. *Centre of Peace and Development Initiatives*. Retrieved from www.cpd-i-pakistan.org
- Dale, A., Jackson, N., & Hill, N. (2005). *Women in non-traditional training and employment*. Manchester: Equal Opportunities Commission.
- D'Cruz, P., & Rayner, C. (2013). Bullying in the Indian workplace: A study of the ITES-BPO sector. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 34(4), 597-619. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0143831X12452672>
- Dizaho, E., Dizaho, R., Salleh, A., & Abdullah, A. (2016). The Impact of Work-Family Conflict on Working Mothers' Career Development: A Review of Literature, 1991–8178, 328-334.
- Dovidio, J. F., Hewstone, M., Glick, P., & Esses, V. M. (2010). Prejudice, stereotyping and discrimination: theoretical and empirical overview. *The SAGE handbook of prejudice, stereotyping and discrimination*, 3-29.

- Dovidio, J. F. (2001). On the nature of contemporary prejudice: The third wave. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(4), 829-849.
- Dunn, D., & Skaggs, S. (2006). Gender and paid work in industrial nations. In *Handbook of the Sociology of Gender* (pp. 321-342). Springer, Boston, MA.
- Duxbury, L. E., & Higgins, C. (2012). 2012 National Study on Balancing Work and Caregiving in Canada. *Ottawa, Canada, Carleton University*.
- Eagly, A. H. (2013). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Psychology Press.
- Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2007). *Through the labyrinth: The truth about how women become leaders*. Boston, MA, US: Harvard Business School Press.
- Elder, S., & Schmidt, D. (2004). Global Employment Trends for Women, 2004 (Geneva: International Labour Organisation).
- Faizan, R., Nair, S. L. S., & Haque, A. U. (2018). The effectiveness of feminine and masculine leadership styles in relation to contrasting gender's performances. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 17.
- Farrington, K., & Chertok, E. (1993). Social conflict theories of the family. In P. G. Boss, WJ Doherty, R. LaRossa, WR Schumm, & SK Steinmetz (Eds.), *Sourcebook of family theories and methods* (pp. 357-381). Springer, Boston, MA.
- Fiske, S. T. (1998). Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination. *The handbook of social psychology*, 2, 357-411.
- Fiske, A., Haslam, N., & Fiske, S. (1991). Confusing one person with another: what errors reveal about the elementary forms of social relations. - PubMed - NCBI. *J Pers Soc Psycho*, 60(5), 656-674.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Gelfand, M. J., & Dragow, F. (1995). Measuring Sexual Harassment: Theoretical and Psychometric Advances. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 17(4), 425-445.
- Flanagan, J., & Green, R. (2013). The Impact of Stereotype Threat in Manual Labor Settings on Hispanic and African American Female Participants. *Journal of Business and Economics*, 5.

- Garg, P. (2018). Impact of Work-Life Balance Practices on Employees Retention and Organizational Performance – A Study on IT Industry. *Indian Journal of Applied Research*, 6(8), 105-108.
- Gavray, C. (2004). Chapter 7: Family and professional commitments: look at the projects of young men and women at the end of their schooling. In *private and professional spheres* (pp. 199-219). From Boeck Superior.
- Gibson, D., & Tulgan, B. (2002). *Managing anger in the workplace*. Human Resource Development.
- Glick, P., Fiske, S., Mladinic, A., Saiz, J., Abrams, D., Masser, B., and López-López, W. (2000). Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: Hostile and benevolent sexism across cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79, 763–775.
- Glick, P., Diebold, J., Bailey-Werner, B., & Zhu, L. (1997). The two faces of Adam: Ambivalent sexism and polarized attitudes toward women. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23(12), 1323–1334.
- Goldenhar, L. M., Swanson, N. G., Hurrell, J. J., Jr., Ruder, A., & Deddens, J. (1998). Stressors and adverse outcomes for female construction workers. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 3(1), 19–32. <https://doi.org/10.1037//1076-8998.3.1.19>
- Gorman, E. H. (2005). Gender stereotypes, same-gender preferences, and organizational variation in the hiring of women: Evidence from law firms. *American Sociological Review*, 70(4), 702-728.
- Hamdan, K., Hamdan, R., Batlouni, L., & Mansour, N. (2007). Women Entrepreneurs in the MENA Region: Obstacles, Potentials & Future Prospects: The case of Lebanon. https://doi.org/10.1142/9781783267347_0008
- Hammer, L. B., Neal, M. B., Newsom, J. T., Brockwood, K. J., & Colton, C. L. (2005). A longitudinal study of the effects of dual-earner couples' utilization of family-friendly workplace supports on work and family outcomes. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(4), 799-810. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.4.799>
- Hawke, L. A. (2007). Gender roles within American marriage: Are they really changing? *Essai*, 5(1), 23.

- Heilman, M. (1983). Sex bias in work settings: The lack of fit model. *Research in Organizational Behavior*. Retrieved from <https://nyuscholars.nyu.edu/en/publications/sex-bias-in-work-settings-the-lack-of-fit-model>
- Hejase, H. J. (2015). Sexual harassment in the workplace: An exploratory study from Lebanon. *Journal of Management Research*, 7(1), 107-121.
- Helgeson, V. (2016). *Psychology of gender*. Routledge.
- Hewstone, M., Rubin, M., & Willis, H. (2002). Intergroup bias. *Annual review of psychology*, 53(1), 575-604.
- Hicks-Clarke, D., & Iles, P. (2000). Climate for diversity and its effects on career and organisational attitudes and perceptions. *Personnel Review - PERS REV*, 29, 324-345. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00483480010324689>
- Kakker, D. J., & Bhandhari, A. (2015). Perception of Women on Higher Education: A Study of Glass Ceiling in Delhi. *Pezzottaite Journal*, 4, 1430-1434.
- Kilgour, M. A. (2013). The global compact and gender inequality: a work in progress. *Business & Society*, 52(1), 105-134. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650312459918>
- Kossek, E. E., Lewis, S., & Hammer, L. B. (2010). Work-life initiatives and organizational change: Overcoming mixed messages to move from the margin to the mainstream. *Human Relations; Studies towards the Integration of the Social Sciences*, 63(1), 3-19.
- Kumari, V. (2014). *Problems and challenges faced by urban working women in India* (Doctoral dissertation).
- Lathabhavan, R., & Balasubramanian, S. A. (2017). Glass Ceiling and women employees in Asian organizations: a tri-decadal review. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Administration*, 9(3), 232-246.
- Leech, N. L., Barrett, K. C., Morgan, G. A., Clay, J. N., & Quick, D. (2005). Multiple regression. *SPSS for Intermediate Statistics: use and interpretation*, 122-141.
- Lemière, S., & Silvera, R. (2008). The different facets of pay inequalities

between men and women *HRM and gender, the challenges of gender equality* edited by Annie Cornet, Jacqueline Laufer, and Sophia Belghiti-Mahut, 139-57.

- Lewis, S. (1997). 'Family Friendly' Employment Policies: A Route to Changing Organizational Culture or Playing About at the Margins? *Gender, Work & Organization*, 4(1), 13-23. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0432.00020>
- Lockwood, N. R. (2003). Work/life balance. *Challenges and Solutions, SHRM Research, USA*.
- MacEwen, K. E., & Barling, J. (1994). Daily consequences of work interference with family and family interference with work. *Work & Stress*, 8(3), 244-254. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678379408259996>
- Mainiero, L. A., & Sullivan, S. E. (2005). Kaleidoscope careers: An alternate explanation for the "opt-out" revolution. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 19(1), 106-123.
- Mihail, D. (2006). Gender-based stereotypes in the workplace: the case of Greece. *Equal Opportunities International*, 25(5), 373-388.
- Muhammed, F. (2013, October 20). 12 exceptional Pakistani Women in Business and Technology. *TECHJUICE*. Retrieved from <https://www.techjuice.pk/12-exceptional-pakistani-women-in-business-and-technology/>
- Newman, M., & Mathews, K. (1999). Federal family-friendly workplace policies: Barriers to effective implementation. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 19(3), 34-48.
- Njiru, F. E. L. I. S. T. A. (2013). Factors Affecting Career Progression of Women in the Corporate Sector: A Case Study of Standard Chartered Bank in Nairobi. *dissertation*.
- OXFAM. (2016). Gender Equality. Retrieved on October 30, 2018, from <https://www.oxfam.org.nz/what-we-do/issues/gender-equality>
- Pai, K., & Vaidya, S. (2009). Glass ceiling: role of women in the corporate world. *Competitiveness review: An International Business Journal*, 19(2), 106-113.

- Pakistan Bureau of Statistics. (2012). *Labour Force Survey 2012-13 (Annual Report)* (No. 31). Retrieved from <http://www.pbs.gov.pk/content/labour-force-survey-2012-13-annual-report>
- Pakistan Employment Trends. (2013). Annual report of Pakistan Bureau of Statistics. *Government of Pakistan Statistics Division, Pakistan Bureau of Statistics*. Retrieved from www.pbs.gov.pk
- Pakistan Statistical Year Book. (2012). Annual report of Pakistan Bureau of Statistics. Retrieved from <http://www.pbs.gov.pk/content/pakistan-statistical-year-book-2012>
- Petersen, T., & Morgan, L. A. (2013). Separate and Unequal: Occupation-Establishment Sex Segregation and the Gender Wage Gap. *The American Journal of Sociology*, *101*(2), 329-335.
- Phelps, E. S. (1972). The statistical theory of racism and sexism. *The American Economic Review*, *62*, 659-661.
- Pinel, E. C., & Paulin, N. (2005). Stigma consciousness at work. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *27*(4), 345-352. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15324834basp2704_7
- Pirzada, D. S., Hayat, F., Ikram, A. A., Ayub, M., & Waheed, K. (2013). Impact of human resources management practices on turnover, productivity and corporate financial performance. *European Journal of Business and Management*, *5*(10), 163-176.
- Pollard, P. L. (2007, December). A critical analysis of gender-based workplace challenges facing women: gender and compensation. In *Forum on Public Policy: A Journal of the Oxford Round Table*. Forum on Public Policy.
- Rai, U. K., & Srivastava, M. (2010). Women executives and the glass ceiling: Myths and mysteries from Razia Sultana to Hillary Clinton, *BUH Management Review*, *1*(2), 79-83.
- Rantanen, J., Kinnunen, U., Mauno, S., & Tillemann, K. (2011). Introducing theoretical approaches to work-life balance and testing a new typology among professionals. In *Creating Balance?* (pp. 27-46). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-16199-5_2

- Roberson, L., M. Galvin, B., & Cherise Charles, A. (2007). When group identities matter: Bias in performance appraisal. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 1, 617-650. <https://doi.org/10.5465/078559818>
- Rudman, L. A., & Kilianski, S. E. (2000). Implicit and Explicit Attitudes Toward Female Authority. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26(11), 1315-1328. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167200263001>
- Sandhu, N., Singh, D., & Batra, S. (2014). Corporate gender discrimination: Analysis and evaluation. *International Journal of Organizational Behaviour & Management Perspectives*, 3(4), 1250.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2009). *Research methods for business students*. Pearson education.
- Schein, V. E. (2001). A global look at psychological barriers to women's progress in management. *Journal of Social issues*, 57(4), 675-688.
- Schmader, T., Johns, M., & Forbes, C. (2008). An Integrated Process Model of Stereotype Threat Effects on Performance. *Psychological Review*, 115(2), 336-356. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.115.2.336>
- Shabir, H., Shakeel, M. A., & Zubair, R. A. (2017). Gender stereotype, glass ceiling and women's career advancement: an empirical study in service sector of Pakistan. *City University Research Journal*, 236-246.
- Spector, P., & Cohen-Charash, Y. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86(2), 278-321. <https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.2001.2958>
- Stamarski, C. S., & Hing, L. S. S. (2015). Gender inequalities in the workplace: the effects of organizational structures, processes, practices, and decision makers' sexism. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01400>
- Tajfel, H. (1969). Cognitive aspects of prejudice. *Journal of Biosocial Science*, 1(S1), 173-191.
- Tausig, M., & Fenwick, R. (2001). Unbinding time: Alternate work schedules and work-life balance. *Journal of family and economic issues*, 22(2), 101-119.

- Thomas, L. T., & Ganster, D. C. (1995). Impact of family-supportive work variables on work-family conflict and strain: A control perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80*(1), 6-15. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.80.1.6>
- United Nations Statistical Division. (2010). *The World's Women, 2000: Trends and Statistics* (Vol. 16). United Nations Publications.
- US Glass Ceiling Commission. (1995). A solid investment: Making full use of the nation's human capital, Final report of the Commission. *Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office*. Retrieved on September 10, 2007.
- Varma, A. (2002). Globalizing People Through International Assignments. *Human Resource Management, 41*(1), 144-144.
- Virginia, S. (1990). Women in American Society: An Introduction to Women's Studies. *California: Mayfield Publications*.
- Wilson, M., Gadbois, S., & Nichol, K. (2008). Is Gender Parity Imminent in the Professoriate? Lessons from One Canadian University. *Canadian Journal of Education, 31*(1), 211-228.
- World Economic Forum. (2016). *Global Gender Gap Report 2016*. Retrieved from <http://reports.weforum.org/global-gender-gap-report-2016/>
- Yousaf, R., & Schmiede, R. (2016). Underrepresentation of women at academic excellence and position of power: role of harassment and glass ceiling. *Open Journal of Social Sciences, 4*(2), 173-185.
- Yukongdi, V., & Benson, J. (2005). Women in Asian management: cracking the glass ceiling?. *Asia Pacific Business Review, 11*(2), 139-148. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360238042000291225>