



**The Prevalence And Effects of Glass-ceiling in Higher Education:
Evidence From Pakistan**

Arooj Waqar,¹ Muhammad Zeb Khan² and Zia Ullah³

Keywords:

*Glass ceiling, facilities,
corporate climate,
stereotypical behavior*

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to examine the invisible barriers in the way of faculty members getting to top positions. Data was collected from two private universities in two phases. In the first phase, the focus was on analyzing the official records (HR reports, prospectus, and website information) with a view to getting some clue from the policies that might have implications from the existence of glass ceiling. In the second phase, data relating to corporate culture, enforcement of laws, stereotypical behavior, mentoring, and provision of facilities were collected in order to see if they have any bearing on the existence of glass ceiling. Various statistical techniques such as regression analysis were used to test five hypotheses. Based on the results, it was found that the existence of discriminatory laws and lack of necessary facilities (transportation, child-care center, flexible timings, and social support) made it hard for female faculty to compete with their male counterparts and acquire positions of authority in the organizations they were working in.

INTRODUCTION

In the last three decades of the 20th century a tremendous change has been noted in the women representation in organizations. Despite the increase in female ratio, women continue to be underrepresented at the higher levels of organizational hierarchy and are mostly seen in abundance at the lower and middle management level only. This imbalanced ratio can be due to couple of factors such as the age of organizations, individual's problems, societal issues, and glass ceiling etc. Glass ceiling is related to the impediments that are encountered by women, minorities and people of color when they pursue for senior level posts (M.O'Callaghan J. F., 2009). The glass ceiling phenomenon can be defined as, when females are underrepresented in the organizations higher echelons (Haslam & Ryan, 2008). Although the victims of glass ceiling can be men and women both, however, in this paper glass ceiling is being studied for women only. Since the area of concern of this thesis is to highlight the causes of glass ceiling for women in universities, therefore the literature included in this paper has been narrowed to glass ceiling for women only. Glass ceiling can be considered to come under the umbrella of gender discrimination. This study focuses on the issues of glass ceiling as one of the causes of underrepresentation of females in universities. According to a report in 2003 by NCSW "Women are usually not considered on merit in Pakistan and are not often seen at the policy making levels. It seems like women are deliberately detracted from becoming managers or administrators."

The study in hand aimed at highlighting whether glass ceiling exists in universities or not. Once it was established, the causes of glass ceiling were explored. Based on literature, facilities, corporate climate, enforcement of related laws, stereotypical behaviors and mentoring were taken as independent variables to explain glass ceiling. Quantitative data was collected from two private sector universities and inferential

¹Lecturer, Institute of Business and Finance, Lahore Email aroorj.waqar@hotmail.com

²Associate Professor, Shaheed Zulfikar Ali Bhutto Institute of Science & IT, Islamabad Email dr.zeb@szabist-isb.edu.pk

³Professor, Lahore Leads University, Lahore Pakistan Email ziaullah@leads.edu.pk

statistics was applied to draw findings. Result confirmed the existence of glass ceiling in universities that the above mentioned variables account for 61% variation in glass ceiling.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The “glass ceiling” continues to exist although there are no explicit obstacles keeping women from securing advanced job positions—there are no advertisements that specifically say “no minorities hired at this establishment” (Lok A et al, 2017). When companies exercise this type of discrimination, they typically look for the most reasonable explanation to justify their decision. Most often this is done by citing qualities that are highly subjective or by emphasizing or de-emphasizing specific criteria that gives the chosen candidate the edge (Brinton et al. 2016)

Currently, women in higher education are still underrepresented in senior level administrative positions on college campuses (Ellemers, N. 2018). Despite newly developed mentoring programs, leadership training, and professional development, women in higher education are still not advancing at the same rate as their male counterparts (Marquis et al, 2017). Women may make it to lower levels of hierarchy but when it comes to obtaining leadership positions, especially in fields like academia and higher education which are male dominated career field's women undergo many obstructions. (Ghouralal, 2019) The term “glass ceiling” was coined in the early 1980s in reference to artificial barriers in the advancement of women and people of color which prevent them from rising to administrative positions in higher academia (Desender et al. 2016).

The statistics show that women representation in leadership in higher education is worse. (Nakitende, 2019). Researchers say that women are considered to be less competent than men and there is a perception that females do not deserve equal pay as males no matter if they have the same qualification (Linkova, 2017).

In an analysis of women in low-paying jobs, Harland and Berheide (1994) revealed that women have a slim to zero likelihood to advance high enough to encounter the glass ceiling; rather, they are trapped by what Harland and Berheide termed the “sticky floor”—low-wage low-mobility jobs. In 2012, women comprised over a third of the workforce in the United States, yet they held a mere 14.3% of executive officer positions at Fortune 500 companies and only 8.1% of executive officer top-earning positions (Catalyst, 2013). During the same time period, women held only 16.6% of the Fortune 500 board seats and fewer (6.6%) executive positions (Catalyst, 2012). In the state of Iowa, over 80% of women ages 16 to 64 are in the labor force, yet they work for approximately four fifths (79%) of men's income for similar positions (median income of \$34,534 for women vs. \$43,872 for men (Iowa's Women's Leadership Project, 2012). According to Kagan, women percentage in higher level positions in Fortune 500 companies is somewhat higher now however it was observed that females on those posts earned less than men (Kagan, 2018)

Despite the slow progress, national trend statistics indicate that women are gaining representation in senior level management and leadership positions in business at rates which exceed those in academia (Dobbin et al. 2015). The promising news is that the number of women in leadership roles is growing. The International Business Report (IBR) survey, which includes both listed and privately held businesses, has indicated a 3% increase in the number of women in senior management positions from 2011 to 2012, with nearly one fourth (24%) of businesses indicating women in senior management roles globally in 2012 as compared to slightly more than one fifth (21%) in 2011 (Grant Thornton, 2013). It was observed that when women work with a higher percentage of female supervisors; females report smaller gender pay gaps, better gender equality; family and organizational support. (Yang Yang, 2019)

The consensus is that change begins with education. Until approximately 1990, men had outpaced women in educational attainment, whereas women surpassed men in 1992 and, since that time, the gap has continued to widen (Jung, 2016). In the state of Iowa, the graduation rate in 2012 for women from a four-year institution was 71.4% (national rate for women being 58.5%) whereas the rate for Iowa men during the same period was 67.1% (national rate for men being 53%) (Almanac of higher education, 2012).

Underrepresentation of women in senior level administrative positions in higher education is problematic for several reasons. First, a lack of women in senior level positions may indicate to women in lower-level positions that aspiring to a senior level administrative position is unobtainable. Therefore, highly qualified and experienced women may not apply for senior level positions. As a result, organizations lose the opportunity to capitalize on the skills and talent of a portion of their workforce (Kato et al, 2017).

The second reason women's underrepresentation in senior level administrative positions (both in higher education as well as business and industry) is problematic is lack of mentorship—when there are fewer women in senior leadership positions, women who are lower in the organization hierarchy have few, if any, female mentors with experience in senior level administrative management.

With the lack of veteran female mentors to guide women through what might be understood as a politically-driven succession planning process, women may feel unprepared for senior level administrative positions and, thus, might not apply. For many students, their career training begins on campus; therefore, more women serving as role models in higher education will provide encouragement for female college students to seek leadership positions in the medical, legal, political, and corporate fields (Mun et al. 2016). In sum, a diversified group of administrators and faculty is valuable to higher education institutions because it provides a diversity of viewpoints, role models, and leadership styles. There is a need for more women in senior level administrative positions in higher education to help close the gender gap (Sharkey, 2015).

Women leaders are always underestimated and undervalued not only by men but also women in our societies; especially when compared with a male leader. This stereotypical approach is one of the most important reasons of lack of females in leadership designations. (Nakitende, 2019). If we overcome this stereotypical attitude as a society we will observe a significant change in the workforce provided we give opportunities to women as females make highly competent leaders, according to those who work closely with them (Folkman, 2019)

Further evidence of gender issues was studied by Dominici, Fried, and Zeger (2009), who revealed gender challenges were widespread across higher education, and that paths to leadership were slower and often blocked for women. They identified four themes perceived to prevent or slow the promotion of women to leadership: (a) women were recruited less often into administrative positions through the traditional ranks of faculty, chair, dean, and university leadership; (b) women less frequently occupied the important leadership position of department chair, the individual who normally appoints hiring committees; (c) women found many senior positions made less attractive by the heavy workload that requires carrying work home or being available to the campus leadership at any time; and (d) women often believed that the optimal model for leadership is male, transactional, and hierarchical, minimizing collegiality and selfless missions.

They found that women who achieved success in male dominated environments were at times likely to oppose the rise of other women. This occurred, they argued, largely because the patriarchal culture of work encouraged the few women who rose to the top to become obsessed with maintaining their authority (Blau & DeVaro, 2007).

Theoretical Framework

Adams equity theory provides the rationale for glass ceiling issues that is the dissatisfaction felt by women with regard to career advancement prospects and wage differentials compared with men (Myers, 2010). The glass ceiling issues address the second type of inequity in Adams equity theory, i.e. comparison of the ratio of his/her job input and outcome with the input and outcome of peers of equal cadre. The theory also focuses the perception of justice with the organization and glass ceiling is a kind of lack of procedural justice.

According to the work of Myers (2010) if one relates this concept to academia, it is commonly observed if a comparison is made in the salaries, promotion rates and positions of females to other females, equity would be noted. However, when comparing these same factors between males and females, inequity is found. It is evident that males are earning better salaries, and are promoted more often as a result they attain more upper level positions in educational organizations than do females. Whereas women are concentrated in lower administrative positions, lower ranks and earn lower salaries. Coffee & Delamont, (2000) concluded that men are seen in abundance in managerial posts even in the universities where female teacher numbers are high.

Women teachers claim that they have unequal access to positions to power and decision making (Mulenge, 2002), despite constituting the majority of the workforce. Researchers like Skelton (2002) and Griffiths (2006) second the point of view of Mulenge (2002) and claim that unequal gender stratifications are observed in the management hierarchy. Once organizations start implementing equity it will have a positive impact on society as well, the stereotypical role expectations will change and the organizational culture will be supportive for females (Myers, 2010).

Operationalization and Hypothesis

Glass Ceiling: *Glass ceiling* can be described as: when females are underrepresented in the organizations higher echelons (Haslam & Ryan, 2008); the transparent barriers that obstruct females progress in the higher management (Gelfand, 2005); when it is easier for males to have the vertical mobility as compared to females in the same domains (Hultin, 2003); women's progression is slow as compared to men (Weinberger, 2011); unequal treatment (Isabelle Agier, 2013) women are kept from advancing higher because of their gender (Morrison et al. 1987); inequality at the top of corporate hierarchies (Huffman, 2012); discrimination is present in the workplace (Heathfield, 2012); and that men are more likely to get promoted and their salary packages are higher than females of the same cadre (Weinbeger, 2011).

A precise definition that captures all the above mentioned characteristics of glass ceiling can be written as; the presence of a visible or an invisible obstruction that hinders the vertical mobility of women. Women can be promoted below these barriers but it is difficult for them to get promoted beyond these barriers.

Facilities: According to Moser (1993), "Strategic gender needs help women gain equality. Strategic gender needs are related to the division in terms of labor and power. It can be defined as the needs required by women as they hold a subordinate post to men in society.

It is a proven fact that lack of flexible working environment results into glass ceiling issues. Women require special needs, Moser (1993) named them as practical gender needs; these are the necessities of working women. According to Faisal (2010) practical gender needs can be summarized as: sufficient provision of transportation, toilet and baby care facilities; facilities to create balance between work and family; protecting females from harassment and resolving specific issues of females. SANEF (2006) proposed that if organizations practice policies that can create a balance in work and family life it will have a direct effect on the career paths of all employees. According to the Federal Glass Ceiling Commission (1995) this can help in minimizing the issues of glass ceiling.

H1: Provision of facilities has a negative impact on glass ceiling.

Corporate Climate: The psychosomatic surrounding of an organization that includes experiences, values, behaviors, unwritten and written rules that are created over a period of time and are considered valid is termed as corporate climate. Researchers like (Khmil et al., 2017) confirmed that, although management in organizations is considered to be gender neutral still they often perform stereotypical practices that value men.

Another barrier reported by the Federal Glass Ceiling Commission (1995) and Storozhuk (2017) is harassment. It is a fact that females are harassed by colleagues. Moreover, law monitoring and enforcement regarding harassment is not that strong. Morrison & Von Glinow, (1990) portrayed the fact that if a woman is competent and comes up with out-of-the box ideas still she might turn down an assignment due to a fear of failure and lower morale (Yu, S, 2018) this fear is developed in her by the stereotypical society and culture of organization.

The above mentioned issues come under the umbrella of corporate climate, if an organization has a supportive environment for women then females are least likely to experience harassment, stereotypical attitudes and comments.

H2: Supportive corporate climate has a negative impact on glass ceiling

Mentoring: Mentoring is a training system in which a senior employee is assigned to guide or advise a junior (Business Dictionary.com, 2015).

Another frequently cited barrier for women progression is lack of mentors and role models for females (Fassinger 2008) Evidence supports that mentors act as a key to assist females so that they can rise above glass ceiling. Anderson (2005) concluded that with the support of mentors, females can make an advancement into middle and upper levels of hierarchy however a male hierarchy prohibits advancement for females (Tharenou, 2001).

It has been commonly observed that lack of mentors and exclusion of females from social networks is a root cause of lesser females in the higher echelons (Thomas1990; Eiser&Morahan, 2006). There is a strong evidence that employee mentor relationship is beneficial for the employee, as mentors facilitate employees by providing them with valuable information regarding career opportunities, organizational norms, they also delegate responsibilities on important projects to the employee, they help the employee figure out his hidden talent and develop a realistic career path for the employee (Kalbfleisch& Davies 1991), moreover they act as a liaison between higher level management and employee.

It is suggested that organizations should have formal mentoring sessions for employees especially females, unfortunately lack of mentors has been very common in organizations. Turner (1965) emphasizes the fact that in organizations mentoring is provided to only those who are being considered for upward mobility. Therefore, it is proposed that mentoring can reduce the glass ceiling effect.

H3: Mentoring has a negative impact on glass ceiling

Laws. It can be defined as a principle to enforce justice that cannot be violated and if violated it results in penalty (Business Dictionary.com, 2015).

According to Faisal (2010) organizations often claim to have special quotas for females but the practical application of such claims is not seen much. Bible & Hill (2007) highlighted the fact that most organizations do not ensure non-discriminatory practices and policies, they have certain practices and processes that preclude women and as a result it affects the ability of women to be promoted. (Van Vianen& Fischer, 2002).

Department of Labor (1995) asserts that there is a huge flaw in data collection, monitoring and enforcement of laws to overcome the issues of glass ceiling. Unfortunately, organizations specially the senior managers do not take the responsibility to plan, develop or monitor policies regarding gender equality in terms of accessing opportunity. As Roosevelt Thomas (1994) reported that the issue of poor law enforcement and monitoring is not only at a micro level but at the Government level too, it has been observed that government fall short to ensure equal job opportunities for women. (Paul Smith,2012)

Kalev et al. (2006) concluded from his research regarding adoption of equality practices that by adopting action plans and developing equality committees an increase in the ratio of females was observed in private sectors.

H4: Proper law monitoring and enforcement has a negative impact on glass ceiling

Stereotypical Behavior: Another major factor contributing to the issues of glass ceiling are the stereotypical attitudes Wrigley (2002), which can be defined as an unfair belief that all people that belong to a particular group are the same.

Myers (2010) men and women live in families that model stereotypical gender roles, women are considered to perform house hold chores, this perception is transferred into the work environment too, where females come across males that have a strong belief that women are incompetent and cannot play a role of leader or manager. There is a common perception that women do not meet the demands of top level posts as they are submissive and inactive. (Fagenson 1990; Billing & Alvesson 2000; Van Vianen & Fischer 2002). In the early 1970s Schein (1973, 1975) verified a connection among gender role stereotyping and personality traits required for management success. Due to the male dominant culture of organizations, women are not much seen in the high level posts. This male dominating culture of organizations is due to the societies in which we live; we have specific cultural values, societal practices and stereotypes regarding what roles women and men can perform

better, this mind set has a great influence on the processes in organizations. Fagenson (1990) talks about the gender-centered perspective, according to this perspective males and females own different psychological and socialization traits and they have different career choices (Billing & Alvesson 2000). It has been observed that men are valued more in organizations due to the stereotypical practices (Tijdens, 2010).

The issue concerned here is that even if females have the competence to give their hundred percent at job still there is a stereotypical attitude that women are occupied in household chores and hence they cannot perform their job duties well as a result they are usually not offered higher level posts. Hence absence of family friendly policies can result into glass ceiling. If organizations practice policies that can create a balance in work and family life it will have a direct impact on the career paths of all employees. (Roosevelt Thomas, 1994)

According to the work of Faisal (2010) organizations often have a gender discrimination culture where females are trained less and the reward systems are biased as a result females are least likely to reach senior posts. Moreover, organizations often claim to have special quotas for females but it's hard to see the application of these claims.

Morrison & Von Glinow, (1990) portrayed the fact that if a woman is competent and comes up with out of the box ideas still she might turn down an assignment or fail to make it as a team leader due to a fear of failure and lower morale. According to Walsh & Osipow (1993) this fear is developed in her by the stereotypical society and culture of organization.

H5: Stereotypical behavior of employees has a positive impact on glass ceiling.

METHODOLOGY

Female faculty members of two private universities of Lahore were taken as the population for this study. These universities were chosen as they have comparatively large female faculty size. A total of 243 female faculty members, 158 from University of Management and Technology (UMT) and 85 from University of Central Punjab (UCP). A sample was not drawn; instead census was used because of limited population. Questionnaires were distributed among the entire female staff of both the universities. A total of 131 questionnaires were received out of which 123 (73 from UMT and 50 from UCP) were perfect from all respects and qualified for analysis. Data collection comprised of two phases; first to have a look at the imbalanced ratio of males and females in universities to ascertain whether glass ceiling exists or not, as researchers like Cummings (2000), Hema Krishnan (2007), and Tijdens (2010) have highlighted in their work that the imbalanced ratio of female and male staff members explains the existence of glass ceiling. Prospects, websites and reports of HR department of both the universities were used for this purpose.

Once the existence of glass ceiling was established, a close ended questionnaire (with .784 Cronbach Alpha) was administered to all the female faculty members. The scales used to measure glass ceiling were adapted from the work of Stokes, Joseph et al. (1995), Bergman, B, and L. Hallberg (2002), Moos (2008), Newaz (2008), Faisal (2010), Vlado (2010), and Smith (2012). After verifying the goodness of data inferential statistics were applied to test the hypotheses.

ANALYSIS

Data revealed as the post becomes more influential the number of females lessens. The number of females in the elementary phase of hierarchy i.e. Lecturer is still better than the rest of the posts. Although the number of male lecturers is far beyond female lecturers still the ratio of female lecturers is slightly better than other posts. As we move up the hierarchy the ratio of females starts descending, i.e. in the column of Assistant professors, Associate professors, Professors, Directors and Deans.

Ratio of Female and Male Faculty Members from 2013-2019 UMT

	Lecturer		Assistant Professor		Associate Professor		Professor		Dean	
	Fem ale	Tot al	Female	Total	Fema le	Total	Fem ale	Tot al	Fem ale	Tot al
2013	15	30	3	15	0	0	0	4	0	5
2014	22	35	4	21	0	0	0	6	0	8
2015	42	69	16	77	3	28	1	22	1	11
2016	56	103	25	130	4	28	1	20	1	9
2017	70	150	40	187	6	31	1	17	1	8
2018	86	190	54	205	6	32	1	16	1	6
2019	91	204	56	226	8	35	1	14	1	6
Females % in 2019	44.06 %		24.78%		22.87%		7.14%		16.66%	

Ratio of Female and Male Faculty Members from 2013-2019 UCP

	Lecturer		Assistant Professor		Associate Professor		Professor		Dean	
	Fem ale	Tota l	Femal e	Tot al	Fema le	Total	Fem ale	Total	Fema le	Tot al
2013	16	57	6	45	1	17	0	13	1	7
2014	35	103	9	52	1	19	0	9	1	7
2015	30	92	13	82	1	28	0	12	1	7
2016	34	97	15	97	1	22	0	14	1	7
2017	41	105	16	110	0	22	0	12	1	8
2018	50	120	28	121	0	24	0	11	1	8

In UMT the ratio of female lecturers has always been better as compared to the ratio of Assistant professors, Associate professors, professors and directors. A slight increase in the ratio of female lecturers has been observed in 2014 as compared to 2013 and 2015. In 2015 the percentage of female Assistant professors increased to 20.78% from 20% in 2012 and 19.04% in 2014. Associate Professors' percentage rose to 10.71% in 2014 from 0% in 2013 and 2014. Similarly, in 2015 the ratio of female Professors and Directors reached 4.54% and 9.09% from 0% in 2013 and 2014. This university shows a slightly better ratio of female lecturers throughout as compared to the other university. Almost 1:4 ratio of female assistant professors is being observed throughout from 2016 to 2019. There was not a single female associate professor in 2013 and 2014 but in the later years some improvement is visible in the ratio of females. Once again the graph goes down as only 1 female professor is in the university among 14 males. Talking about the deans 1 female has been able to make it to the highest echelon of hierarchy and is maintaining her position for the last 5 years. In UCP the ratio of female lecturers was the highest in 2014 but slightly dropped in 2015 with a percentage of 32.60. Similarly, the percentage of female Assistant professors was the highest in 2014, i.e. 17.30 % but dropped to 15.85% in 2014. A drop from 5.88% to 3.57% was observed in 2014 for female Associate professors. Percentage of female Professors and Associate Deans remained 0% throughout the period of 2013-2015 whereas the percentage of female Deans is stagnant at 14.28% since 2013. There is an increase in Female lecturers from 2016 to 2019 however the ratio remains almost the same if we compare data in this period. As far as Assistant professors are concerned majority are males. Talking about the ratio of male and female Associate Professors, for the past 3 years not even a single female is an assistant professor. Same trend can be observed when it comes to ratio of female Professors from 2016 to 2019. Only 1 dean is a female who has been associated with this university for years, although a new discipline was introduced in 2017 but its dean is also a male.

Correlation

Multi co-linearity was not found among any variables, since the Tolerance value of all the variables is above 0.1 and VIF of all variables is lesser than 10. Glass ceiling had a significant negative correlation with facilities (-0.551), corporate climate (-.626), laws (-0.440) and mentoring (-0.450). This means that with the provision of facilities, supportive corporate climate, mentors for females, one can decrease the issues of glass ceiling. On the other hand, glass ceiling had a positive significant correlation with stereotypical behavior (0.374) indicating that stereotypical behavior of coworkers, subordinates and seniors increases glass ceiling.

Regression Analysis

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	Sig. F Change
1	.782 ^a	.611	.573	.44987	.611	15.740	.000

The value of R square being 0.611 portrays the fact that 61.1 % of the variation in glass ceiling is explained by the model, where as 38.9% of the variation in glass ceiling remained unexplained in error term. A significant linear relationship among variables can be observed as the value of F is greater than 4 ,i.e F= 15.740 and p= 0.00 portrays that this model is a good fit for the data.

Table 5.10 explains significant and insignificant relationship of independent variables with glass ceiling: Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	5.833	.537		10.856	.000
Facilities	-.265	.089	-.277	-2.977	.004
Climate	-.206	.079	-.235	-2.627	.010
Laws	-.246	.101	-.213	-2.435	.017
Stereotypical	.160	.078	.152	2.047	.044
Mentoring	-.091	.043	-.162	-2.120	.037

a. Dependent Variable: GC

The above table shows that hypotheses related to Facilities (0.004), Corporate climate (0.010), Laws (0.017), Stereotypical attitude (0.044), and Mentoring (0.037) have been accepted. The sign of coefficient indicates that variables like Facilities, Corporate Climate, Laws, and Mentoring have a significant negative impact on Glass ceiling.

Stereotypical behavior has a significant value of 0.044 which indicates that it has a positive impact on Glass ceiling indicating that as Stereotypical behaviors increase Glass ceiling increases by 0.160 units keeping all other variables constant.

DISCUSSION

Once it was established that there was an imbalanced ratio of males and females the opinions of female faculty members of universities regarding the existence of glass ceiling in their work place was collected through a questionnaire. Literature shows, women face multiple hindrances on career progression, especially in male-dominated career fields such as academia and higher education. (Ghouralal, 2019) The findings illustrate that the culture/environment of universities hamper the promotion of females. In this study, culture has been measured by assessing the concepts regarding organizational support for women's advancement; opportunities for participation and leading teams; isolating women; frequency of harassment cases at work place and action taken by employers regarding harassment issues. The hypothesis is being supported that favorable corporate climate has an indirect effect on glass ceiling. This is consistent with the findings of Gallagher, (1994) that environment adapted by organizations affect the promotion of women. One of the major obstacles faced by women during career advancement is the stereotypical attitudes of society which is also seen in the workplace culture (Ghouralal, 2019).

According to the scales adapted from the work of Stokes (1995) and Moos (2008) unsupportive climate of organizations obstruct the performance of females and is one of the main reasons of glass ceiling. Therefore, there is a need to improve the organizational climate and make it supportive for the advancement of women by encouraging and promoting the participation of women in team work; besides the issues of harassment need to be minimized by punishing employees for such acts. Since the hypothesis is accepted that corporate climate has a negative effect on glass ceiling therefore it means that this issue prolongs in universities and the corporate climate should be made conducive for females so that it does not hamper their advancement.

The hypothesis regarding provision of facilities having a negative impact on glass ceiling has been accepted which is consistent with the literature. Literature supports the fact that universities lack provision of facilities; females have insufficient facilities such as toilet, transportation and child care facilities; a lack of support in terms of maintaining a balance between work and family from the organization, and encouragement to pursue higher studies. Women should be facilitated with flexible work hours as they have a harder time as they are considered to be responsible for taking care of children. The researchers write, one of the most prominent factors holding back women's earnings at the executive level is child care. (Hill C. , 2018) Provision of

transportation facilities for females is of great importance since it is hard for females to travel in public transports especially when it gets late. Literature supports that provision of facilities has a relationship with glass ceiling, as women hold a subordinate post to men in society (Moser, 1993) they require special needs, if a balance is created between work and family life it will have a direct impact on the career paths of all employees (SANEF, 2006 and Faisal, 2010) and ultimately reduce the issues of glass ceiling (Federal glass ceiling commission, 1995). The mean value of facilities is 3.20 indicating that respondents feel that facilities are being provided in universities but they can be made better to decrease glass ceiling.

Literature portrays that proper law monitoring and enforcement has a negative impact on glass ceiling. Females feel that the requirement to incorporate consistent laws regarding gender bias issues is the need of the hour. Ladies partially agree that laws are being practiced in universities but not to the extent that it breaks the glass ceiling. Hypothesis has been accepted in this context and claims that this is still one of the causes of glass ceiling. Through implementation and consistent monitoring of laws like having special quotas for females, nondiscriminatory practices and policies, equal job opportunities for women and maternity leave policies one can eliminate the issues of glass ceiling.

As expected, the effect of stereotypical attitudes on glass ceiling was positively significant. Stereotypical attitudes were measured by the following perceptions; men believe that women are incompetent, cannot do justice with higher level posts and as a result they cannot make it to the top. Males not only hold a negative attitude for female's competence but they also feel uncomfortable working under the supervision of a female. The consequences of such stereotypical behavior lowers the morale of females that is, if a woman is competent and comes up with out-of-the box ideas still she might turn down an assignment due to a fear of failure and lower morale (Walsh & Osipow 1993). As the society has defined gender roles it is reflected in the attitudes of employees and employers at workplace and as a result it creates obstacles for women when they are trying to advance in their careers. (Ghouralal, 2019).

This fear is developed in her by the stereotypical society and culture of organization. What needs to be done is to give a chance to competent females and let them prove their abilities, it will not only prove the suppositions of males wrong but it will also help females make their name in the academic world and utilize their degrees.

Another significant cause of glass ceiling highlighted by the results is lack of mentors for females, mentors act as a key to assist females so that they can rise above glass ceiling, therefore universities need to facilitate women with the provision of mentors. A study by Ying Zhuge (2011) found that males were significantly more likely to find a mentor of their same gender. This may be in part due to the fact that some women lack initiative in finding a mentor, whereas mentors believe that it is the mentee's responsibility to take the first step. In fact, women are less willing to ask for advice than men, especially when it comes to issues that concern only women. It has been commonly observed that lack of mentors and exclusion of females from social networks is a root cause of lesser females in the higher echelons. (Thomas 1990; Eiser & Morahan, 2006). There is a strong evidence that employee mentor relationship is beneficial for the employee, as mentors facilitate employees by providing them with valuable information regarding career opportunities, organizational norms, they also delegate responsibilities on important projects to the employee, they help the employee figure out his hidden talent and develop a realistic career path for the employee and they act as a liaison between higher level management and employee. Leaders need to carefully assess the hindrances that effect women promotion in their organizations. The mindset that women are not meant for senior level positions plays a huge role. The need of the hour is that organizations change their recruitment, selection and promotion decisions and ensure that eligible women are given serious consideration. (Folkman, 2019).

It is suggested that organizations need to have formal mentoring sessions for employees especially females, unfortunately lack of mentors has been very common in organizations. Turner (1965) emphasizes the fact that in organizations mentoring is provided to only those who are being considered for upward mobility. Therefore, it is proposed that mentoring can reduce the glass ceiling effect. Organizations must give more encouragement to women. Mentors should make females realize their abilities and encourage them to seek promotions earlier in their careers. (Folkman, 2019).

CONCLUSION

The universities were found not the exception and they exhibit the same picture as other organizations present in terms of glass ceiling. Despite holding seminars, workshops, training, conducting researches on equity, equality, enforcement of law, gender mainstreaming, women empowerment academia itself is suffering from the menace of glass ceiling. The gender based discrimination prevails in academia and invisible barriers are much effective to impede females to make their ways to the top positions. The existence of glass ceiling not only causing loss of talent that female faculty members possess but they also develop turnover intentions, least motivation, lack of commitment. Existence of glass ceiling widens the gap between male and female faculty members which damages harmony, mutual understanding and teamwork. Since the size of female students in universities is on increasing trend, when they observe gender based discrimination and existence of deliberately generated barriers for females in the path of their promotions they develop a negative attitude towards the system and start losing motivation in their studies. Thus glass ceiling not only creating problems for the existing female employees but it is casting profound negative impact on the female coming generation. All the claims of equity, equality, merit, gender mainstreaming, women empowerment etc. cannot be realized before addressing the issue of glass ceiling.

Future Research Direction

The variables used in this study could explain about 61% of variation in glass ceiling and the remaining causes remained unexplained for the given population. Literature says that human resource practices like effective recruitment, meritocratic selection, pertinent training, valid performance appraisal, and informal network among female employees may affect the barriers faced by female employees. However, this study could not include them as predicting variables. Focusing these variables may give more detailed and explained view of glass ceiling. Private universities were taken as population for the study while including public sector universities and a comparative study would produce more meaningful findings.

REFERENCES

- Brinton, M. C., and E. Mun 2016 "Between state and family: Managers' implementation and evaluation of parental leave policies in Japan." *Socio-Economic Review*, 14: 257–281
- Business Dictionary.com*. (2015). Retrieved January 7th, 2015, from <http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/recruitment-and-selection.html>
- Commission, T. F. (, (1995)). *Good for business: making full use of the nation's human capital*. Washington, D.C: A fact-finding report.
- Desender, K. A., R. V. Aguilera, M. Lo'pezpuertas-Lamy, & R. Crespi (2016). A clash of governance logics: Foreign ownership and board monitoring. *Strategic Management Journal*, 37, 349–369.
- Dobbin, F., D. Schrage, and A. Kalev (2015). Rage against the iron cage: The varied effects of bureaucratic personnel reforms on diversity. *American Sociological Review*, 80:1014–1044.
- Eiser, B. &. ((2006)). Fixing the system: Breaking the glass ceiling in health care. *Leadership in Action* , 8-13.
- Ellemers, N. (2018). Gender stereotypes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 69, 275-298.
- Fagenson, E. A. (1990). At the heart of women in management research: Theoretical and methodological approaches and their biases. *Journal of Business Ethics* , 267–274.
- Fassinger, R. (2008). Workplace diversity and public policy: challenges and opportunities for psychology. *American Psychologist*, 252-268.
- Folkman, J. Z. (2019). Women Score Higher Than Men in Most Leadership Skills. *Harvard Business Review* 256-278
- Gallagher, M. ((1995)). *An unfinished story: Gender patterns in media employment*. France: UNESCO.
- Gelfand, M. N. ((2005)). Discrimination in organization: An organizational level perspective. *Discrimination at work: The Psychological and Organizational Bases*, 89-118.
- Ghouralal, S.-L. (2019, August 14). Mere Cracks in the Academic Glass Ceiling: Why Are Women So Underrepresented in Higher Education Leadership? *Engaged Sociology*.211-229

- Haslam, S. A. (2008). The road to the glass cliff: differences in the glass cliff: differences in the perceived suitability of men and women for leadership positions in succeeding and failing organizations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 530-546.
- Heathfield, S. M. (2012). How to Promote Women in Leadership Roles. *American Sociological Review*, 80:1014–1044.
- Hema A. Krishnan, M. A. (2007). Acquisition Premiums, Subsequent Workforce Reductions and Post-Acquisition Performance. *Journal of Management Studies*, 709-732.
- Hill, F. (2004). Shattering the glass ceiling: Blacks in coaching. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 36–47.
- Hill, C. (2018, August 26). MarketWatch. Retrieved September 16, 2019, from 3 reasons -- beyond sexism -- that the glass ceiling and the pay gap persist: <https://www.marketwatch.com/story/3-reasons---beyond-sexism---that-the-glass-ceiling-and-the-pay-gap-persist-2019-08-26>
- Huffman, M. (2012). Introduction : Gender, Race, and Management. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 639 - 646.
- Hultin, M. (2003). Some take the glass escalator, some hit the glass ceiling? Career consequences of occupation sex segregation. *Work and occupations*, 30-61.
- Isabelle Agier, A. S. (2013). Microfinance and gender: Is there a glass ceiling on loan size? . *World Development*, 165-181 .
- Jung, J., and E. Mun 2016 "Bending but not breaking? Foreign investor pressure and dividend payouts by Japanese firms." *Sociological Forum*, 31: 663–684.
- Kalbfleisch, P. A. (1991). Minorities and mentoring: Managing the multicultural institution. *Communication Education*: , 266-271.
- Kalev, A. K. (2006). Best practices or best guesses? Assessing the efficacy of corporate affirmative action and diversity policies. *American Sociological Review*, 589-617.
- Kato, T., and N. Kodama (2017). The effect of corporate social responsibility on gender diversity in the workplace: Econometric evidence from Japan." *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, published online ahead of print. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/bjir.12238/full>.
- Khmil, V. V., & Korkh, O. M. (2017). Conditions of historicity of human existence and history humanity according to Jaspers. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, 12, 121-127
- Krishnan, H. a. (2007). A few good women- on top management teams. *Journal of Business Research*, 1712-1720.
- Linková, M. (2017). Academic Excellence and Gender Bias in the Practices and Perceptions of Scientists in Leadership and Decision-making Positions. *Gender A Výzkum / Gender and Research*, 18(1), 42-66. doi: 10.13060/25706578.2017.18.1.349
- Marquis, C., M. W. Toffel, and Y. Zhou (2016). Scrutiny, norms, and selective disclosure: A global study of green washing. *Organization Science*, 2, 483–504.
- M.O Callaghan, J. F. (2009). What Do We Know About Glass Ceiling Effects? *A Taxonomy and Critical Review to Inform Higher Education Research*. 50(5), 460-482.
- Moos, R. H. (2008). *Work environment scale*. Mind garden inc.
- Moser, C. N. (1993). *Gender planning and development*. London: Routledge.
- Myers, C. (2010). Perceptions of the glass ceiling effect in community colleges. *Paper 1273*. University of New Orleans theses and dissertations.
- Mun, E. (2016). Negative compliance as an organizational response to legal pressures: The case of Japanese equal employment opportunity law. *Social Forces*, 94: 1409–1437.
- Nakitende, M. (2019). Motivation and perseverance of women in education leadership in the United States of America. *Journal of Science & Sustainable Develo*, 6(2), 75-101. doi: 10.4314/jssd.v6i2.5
- NCSW (2003). *The national commission on the status of women: Inquiry into the status of women in public sector organizations*. Islamabad: Government of Pakistan.

- Newaz, S. R. (2008). Factors determining the presence of glass ceiling and influencing women career advancement in Bangladesh . *Brac University*.
- Roosevelt Thomas, J. P. (1994). The impact of recruitment, selection, promotion and compensation policies and practices. *federal publication*.
- SANEF. (2006). *The Glass ceiling and beyond: Realities, challenges and strategies for South African media*. . Retrieved from www.sanef.org.za
- Schein, V. E. (1975). The relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisite characteristics among female managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 340–344.
- Sharkey, A. J., and P. Bromley (2015). Can ratings have indirect effects? Evidence from the organizational response to peers' environmental ratings. *American Sociological Review*, 80: 63–91.
- Smith, P. C. (2012). Measuring women's beliefs about glass ceilings: development of the career pathways survey. *Gender in Management*, 68-80.
- Stokes, J. e. (1995). Measuring perceptions of the working environment for women in corporate settings. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 533-549.
- Storozhuk, S. V., & Hoyan, I. M. (2017). Gender equality as a modern phenomenon. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, 11, 71-83
- Tharenou, P. (2001). Going up? Do traits and informal social processes predict advancing in management? *Academy of Management Journal*, 1005-1017.
- Thomas, D. (1990). The impact of race on managers' experiences of developmental relationships (mentoring and sponsorship): An intra-organizational study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 479-492.
- Tijdens, T. M. (2010). Gender diversity policies in universities:a multi-perspective framework of policy measures. *High edu*, 719-735.
- Turner, R. (1965). Modes of Social ascent through education: Sponsored and contest mobility. *American Sociological Review*. 128-139
- Walsh, W. &. (1993). *Career counseling for women*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Inc.
- Weinberger, C. J. (2011). In search of the glass ceiling: Gender and earnings growth among US college graduates in the 1990s. *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 949- 980.
- Wrigley, B. (2002). Glass ceiling? What glass ceiling? A qualitative study of how women view the glass ceiling in public relations and communications management. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 27-55.
- Yang Yang, N. V. (2019). A network's gender composition and communication pattern predict women's leadership success. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. California.
- Ying Zhuge, M. J. (2011). Is there still a glass ceiling for women. . *Annals of surgery*. 146-167
- Yu, S. (2018). Uncovering the hidden impacts of inequality on mental health: A global study. *Translational Psychiatry*, 8(98), 1-10