CHAPTER - I

INTRODUCTION
The term ‘Glass Ceiling’ is in vogue in the current era of organizational behaviour. If we break this term, it has two parts, Glass + Ceiling. “Glass” is a transparent and “Ceiling” is “top level”.

This situation is referred to as a “ceiling” as there is a limitation blocking upward advancement, and “glass” (transparent) because the limitation is not immediately apparent and is normally an unwritten and unofficial policy. This invisible barrier continues to exist, even though there are no explicit obstacles keeping minorities from acquiring advanced job positions – there are no advertisements that specifically say “no minorities hired at this establishment”, nor are there any formal orders that say “minorities are not qualified” – but they do lie beneath the surface. The “glass ceiling” is distinguished from formal barriers to advancement, such as education or experience requirements. Mainly this invisible barrier sees to exist in more the developing countries, in those businesses this effect is highly “visible”.

However, this glass ceiling tends to cripple working women the most. This barrier prevents large numbers of women, ethnic minorities, and sexual minorities from obtaining and securing the most powerful, prestigious, and highest-grossing jobs in the workforce. This barrier makes many women feel as they are not worthy enough to have these high-ranking positions, but also they feel as if their bosses do not take them seriously or actually see them as potential.

In the book “Through the Labyrinth: The Truth About How Women Become Leaders,” authors Alice Eagly and Linda Carli refer to the same concept as the “Glass Labyrinth.” They discuss why the “glass ceiling” is no longer useful as a metaphor for this problem. Specific questions proposed in this scientific research included: How far have women actually come as leaders? Do stereotypes limit women’s opportunities? And, Do people resist women’s leadership more than men’s? Within this book is the discussion of what women can do to conquer any restrictions in their organizations.
History

Sexual discrimination was outlawed in the United States through the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in the hopes of allowing women to rise in the working world once proper experience has been achieved.

The term “glass ceiling” has been thought to have first been used to refer to invisible barriers that impede the career advancement of women in the American workforce in an article by Carol Hymowitz and Timothy Schellhardt in the March 24, 1986 edition of the Wall Street Journal. However, the term was used prior to that; for instance, it was utilized in a March 1984 Adweek article by Gay Bryant. The term glass ceiling was used prior to the 1984 article by two women at Hewlett-Packard in 1979, Katherine Lawrence and Marianne Schreiber, to describe how while on the surface there seemed to be a clear path of promotion, but, in actuality, women seemed to hit a point where they seemed unable to progress beyond. Upon becoming CEO and chairwoman of the board of HP, Carly Fiorina proclaimed that there was no glass ceiling. After her term at HP, she called her earlier statement a “[d]umb thing to say.”

However, the term was used by the U.S. Department of Labor in 1991 in response from a study of nine Fortune 500 companies. The study confirmed that women and minorities encountered considerable glass ceiling barriers in their careers; these barriers were experienced earlier in their professions than previously thought. United States Senator Hillary Clinton used the term glass ceiling in her speech to endorse Senator Barack Obama for President: “And although we weren’t able to shatter that highest, hardest glass ceiling this time, thanks to you, it’s got about 18 million cracks in it.”

Types of Glass Ceiling Barriers

- Different pay for comparable work.
- Sexual, ethnic, racial, religious discrimination or harassment in the workplace
- Lack of family-friendly workplace policies
Society over the centuries has been unfair to the fair sex. Women have not been allowed to develop self-confidence and it is so because before marriage the fair sex under the thumb of patriarch, and after marriage her husband and father – in – law they think that they are the master’s of her life. Position of women has gone under a lot of change from pre-vedic to modern times.

There have been, in fact two phases in the life of women – period of subjection and the period of liberalization, while the former stretched for a long period, and the latter has just begun. With more and more women becoming educated and aware of their rights, the times are changing. Adam for field, Eve for hearth, no longer hold a relevance.

They are all trendsetters in their own right. Women have carved a niche for themselves, in what is believed to be predominately a male domain. We are talking of the corporate world, which was earlier a nascent industry and women in this field were very few, but today they are the first generation of team leaders, who have shattered the Glass Ceiling myth.

From their beginning, women were mainly concentrated in the ‘feminized’ professions, where at the same time they remained in lower job categories than men. But now they make small inroads in to non – traditional fields. There is a evidence that employees are beginning to promote women more systematically and to introduce family friendly policies in order to retain them. However, who choose non- traditional jobs can face special constraints in the workplace, not least of which are isolation, limited access to mentoring and female role models, and sexual harassment.

Men are in the majority among managers, top executives, higher levels of professional workers whilst women are still concentrated in the lower categories of managerial positions. Both visible and invisible rules have been concentrated around the “male” norm, which women sometimes find difficult to accommodate male and female colleagues and customers do not automatically see women as equal with men, women tend to have to work much harder than men to prove themselves and attitudes more than necessary. Furthermore, women tend to be excluded from the informal networks dominated by men at workplace, which are vital for career development. The problem is compounded by employees assumption that women, unlike men, are not able to devote
their full time energy to paid work because of their family responsibilities. Consequently, women are not given as many opportunities as men to do the more demanding responsible jobs which would advance their categories, advanced their careers. However, there is evidence to show that once women attain upper levels of management, attitudes towards them are not much different to those towards men.

There are still significant earning gaps between women and men, which plagues not only managers and workers with the same qualifications but also the labour market in general. Women earn on average only two-thirds of men's pay. Occupational segregation is the principal reason for these persistent pay gap. Women are also likely to have shorter careers than men of same age because they tend either to leave their jobs or work part-time in order to fulfill family responsibilities and return to full-time employment at a later stage. This leads to slower promotion and less pay. Differences in fringe benefits and bonuses offered to men and women managers are also factors contributing to earning gaps.

Women have carved a niche for themselves, in what is believed to be predominately a male domain. We are talking of the corporate world, which was earlier a nascent industry and women in this field were very few, but today they are the first generation of team leaders, who have shattered the Glass – Ceiling myth. To understand this concept, we must analyze what is Glass – Ceiling? The term ‘Glass – Ceiling’ is often credited as having been originally coined by Caral Hymowitz and Timothy Schellardt in March 24, 1986 edition of the Wall Street Journal. The term Glass Ceiling is confined to situations where the advancement of a person within the hierarchy of an organization is limited. This limitation is normally based upon some form of discrimination, most commonly being sexism.

Women are still less represented than men in managerial and executive positions at the government and the industrial circles. This is caused by many factors. For example, the existence of typical male and female professions, caused by the preferences and choices of women and men. But also in organizations which employ a relatively large amount of women, women are less represented in more senior positions. Presumably,
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there are less visible obstacles, which hinder women in their flow to the top. The phenomenon is therefore called the Glass Ceiling.

The term “glass ceiling” was coined by the Wall Street Journal in 1986 by Carol Hymowitz and Timothy Schellhardt to described the apparent barriers that prevent women from reaching the top of the corporate hierarchy; and it is ten years since the American government specially appointed Glass Ceiling Commission published its recommendations. In 1995 the commission said that the barrier was continuing “to deny untold number of qualified people the opportunity to compete for and hold executive level positions in the private sector”. It found that women had 45.7% of the America’s jobs and more than half of master’s degrees being awarded. Yet 95% of senior managers were men, and female manager’s earnings were on average a mere 68% of their male counterparts. Ten years on, Women account for 46.5 % of America’s workforce and for less than 8% of its top managers, although at big fortune 500 companies the figure is bit higher. Female managers earning now average 72% of their male colleagues. Booz Allen Hamilton, a consulting firm that monitors departing chief executives in America, found that 0.7% of them were women in 1998, and 0.7% of them were in 2004. In between the figure fluctuated. But the firm says that one thing is clear that the number is “very low and not getting higher”. Alice Sergeant in an interview about her book , “The Androgynous Manager” in 1987 wrote: “Women in Corporate America are bumping their heads on the glass-ceiling”. Private data on corporations tend to show very low percentages of minorities and women at high levels (Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990).

The term ‘glass elevator’ and ‘glass escalator’ are generally used as its synonyms. These terms are used to describe the rapid promotion of men over women, especially in to management, in female dominated fields like nursing. Recently the term ‘celluloid ceiling’ has been coined in the context of glass ceiling which refers to the small number of women in top position in Hollywood as documented by Lauzen (2002).

Clark (2006) gave a new study. In his study he added fuel to the fire. Accordingly to this study, about 70% of women and 57% of men believe an invisible barrier- a glass ceiling – prevents women from getting ahead in business, according to a study of 1,200 executives in eight countries, including the U.S., Australia, Austria and the Philippines.
Consulting firm Accenture released the study in conjunction with international Women’s Day. But if women are unhappy about making 77 cents for every dollar earned by a man, it’s not reflected in Accenture’s Statistics. Globally, the same percentage of men and women - 58% - felt they were fairly compensated. In US, 67% of men were happy with their salaries, compared with 60% of women.

GLASS CEILING EFFECT –

“The glass ceiling effect is an unseen, yet unreachable barrier that keeps minorities and women from rising to the upper ranks of the corporate ladder, regardless of their qualifications or achievements” (US Glass Ceiling Commission, 1995).

The above definition from the US Glass Ceiling Commission captures the essence of a glass ceiling effect. First, the description of the glass ceiling effect as a barrier, women face at work “regardless of their qualification or achievements” conveys the notion that the glass ceiling is a type of discrimination. In other words, the glass ceiling effect reflects a gender or racial disadvantage not fully explained by group differences in productivity factors such as education, skills, work experience and their input.

Second, the glass ceiling effect is not generic discrimination, but an obstacle minorities and women face in ascending the corporate ladder. Specifically, the glass ceiling discrimination refers to inequality of promotion and power distribution in private and public organizations. The notion that the glass ceiling effect primarily concerns relative status within organizational hierarchies, rather than status in the wider society, has implications for the choice of outcome measures for glass ceiling research.

Thirdly, the glass ceiling metaphor invokes the image of a subtle cap, imposed near the top, on how far women and minorities may rise in the ranks. For example, the expression is commonly used to describe the situation that some women may have obtained the position of vice president, but for some reason can not rise to top position of chief executive officer despite their qualifications. Thus, the glass ceiling effect is a specific type of discrimination that effect the higher echelons more than the lower echelons, to be distinguished from general discrimination operating at all levels and the specific pattern of discrimination concentrated at the bottom... known as the “sticky floor
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effect".... which operates to prevent women and minorities from entering managerial hierarchies.

Catalyst (1996) talked about the six major factors that perpetuate glass ceiling and these areas follows:

1. **Lack of bold leadership:**

   Bold leadership at the top and dogged are needed to challenge the status quo and produce real change. This leadership is lacking in many organizations.

2. **Workplace environment:**

   Attitudes and organizational cultures must change to value diverse leadership styles. Gender and racial stereotypes frequently limit women and people of color from fully participating in their organizations.

3. **Work experience:**

   Women and people of color frequently lack the "right" type of job experience to move ahead. The experiences they have often do not mach traditional promotion criteria.

4. **Family Obligations:**

   Working parents, especially mothers, are often forced to choose between their children and their jobs. Employers need to recognize that both mothers and fathers require flexibility at work.
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5. **Socialization:**

Pervasive, socially accepted stereotypes adversely impact the expectations, self esteem and ambitions of some of our children, especially girls and children of color.

6. **Education:**

Many women and people of color do not come out of our schools with the credentials and confidence needed to succeed. Participation of women and people of color in the scientific and technological disciplines remains low.

One of the major indicators that serves to demonstrate a perceived inequality between males and females is the controversy behind a supposed gender wage gap. This gap is the difference in both the wages and earnings between males and females who have equivalent job titles, training experience, education, and professions. In most circumstances, women are paid less than men when all of these factors are comparable. A comparison frequently cited is that women make 75.3 cents on the dollar to men, which is derived from statistics maintained by the United States Census Bureau from 2003, relating specifically to an across-the-board comparison of year-round full-time workers.

Furthermore, the gross national figures conceal the fact that men hold the highest paying, most prestigious, and most powerful jobs in the occupational structure; this accounts for much of the imbalance with men and women’s incomes. This is referred to as occupational segregation. Men tend to be highly concentrated in the top professions, such as supervisors, managers, executives, and production operators. On the other hand, women tend to be over-represented in the lowest-ranking and lowest paid professions in the workforce, such as secretaries, sales associates, teachers, nurses, and child care providers. As a result, occupations become “sex typed” as either being specifically male or female jobs. The stereotypically male-characterized occupations, in which at least 60-75% of the workers are males, are more highly paid than occupations in which 60-75% of the jobholders are women. This segregation of women into less-prestigious and lower-ranked jobs also decreases a woman’s chance of being promoted, as well as the chance of having any type of power over others. Moreover, occupational segregation reduces
women's access to insurance, benefits, and pensions. Occupational segregation is a vicious cycle that successfully continues to put women down.

Males not only have superior statuses than women between jobs, but also within the jobs themselves. Women are concentrated into the lower-ranked and lower-paid occupations within a given profession. If women are in management positions, they are more likely to be in personnel than in marketing professions; the averages salaries of each are $48,048 and $56,940 per year, respectively. Feminists usually assume that this is because of gender differences rather than ability differences. Another example occurs within the medical field. Female doctors are much more likely to be heavily constricted in the family practice or pediatric specialties, which average about $130,000 and $126,000 per year, respectively. However, men are more likely to become surgeons and highly specialized medical practitioners, who tend to average $240,000 or more per year.

This gender wage gap is present within all realms of the workforce – blue collar, managerial, and professional occupations. Only 16% of the top executive positions in America’s largest corporations and enterprises are held by women. Additionally, the median weekly income of full-time working women is only 70.5% of full-time working men. This statistic tends to hold true across all fields of work. This gender imbalance in occupations occurs to some degree because women are more likely than men to be newcomers in many fields; therefore, they lack the primacy and the increased pay that comes with seniority.

Gender Inequality is often embedded within the social hierarchy and this affects how women and men are perceived in leadership roles. Different traits are ascribed to females when compared to males that often color the selection process with unfounded bias. If a female does have other traits aside from the gendered traits that she is believed to possess, then she is viewed negatively. For example, in a study conducted by Thomas-Hunt and Phillips (2004) they found that when women possessed expertise they were actually viewed as less influential by others. However, expertise was positive for males. Also, female led groups were less productive than male led groups even though the women held expertise in the area just like males. Therefore, possessing expertise is not
viewed as positively as it is for males. This also suggests that lack of skills is not the only reason why women are not deemed worthy of leadership roles. As cited by Lyness and Thompson in 1997, one consequence of sex stereotypes is that women’s achievements tend to be devalued or attributed to luck or effort rather than ability or skill, and therefore this stereotype has the potential to reduce the organizational awards that they receive.

Lyness and Heilman (2006) found that in a study conducted with 448 upper-level employees that women were less likely to be promoted than males, and if they were promoted they had stronger performance ratings than males. However, performance ratings were more strongly connected to promotions for women than men. This suggests that woman had to be highly impressive to be considered eligible for leadership roles, whereas this was not the case for men. In a number of longitudinal studies done by Cox & Harquail, 1991; Olson, Frieze, & Good, 1987; Strober, 1982; Wallace, 1989; Wood, Corcoran, & Courant, 1993, that track comparably qualified men and women, such as graduates of the same MBA program or law school, they have shown that over time there is degradation of the women’s compensation that cannot fully be explained by differences in qualifications, work history, experience, or career interruptions, recorded by Lyness and Thompson.

Women are more likely to choose jobs based on factors other than pay, for instance: health care and scheduling that can be managed with the duties of primary care of children for which women are still overwhelmingly responsible, and thus they may be less likely to take jobs that require travel or relocation or jobs that are hazardous. On average, women take more time off and work fewer hours, often due to the unequal distribution of childcare labor, domestic labor, medical needs specific to women, and other family issues that tend to fall to a woman’s responsibility per the gender roles assigned by society. The ending result of women’s extensive obligation to attend to responsibilities of the home and children is that their wages plummet. Family demands have a downward pull on women’s earnings as they proceed throughout their life course. The earnings gap tends to widen considerably when men and women are in their early to mid-thirties; the gap reaches the widest point when men and women are in their fifties.
Another perspective on the gender wage gap comes from a 2008 research study by Judge and Livingston. They investigated the relationship(s) between gender, gender role orientation, and labor marker earnings. The study did not specifically look at the gender wage gap, but focused more on the impact that the interaction between gender role orientation (people's beliefs about what occupations are considered suitable and appropriate for males and females) and gender has on earnings. The researchers suggested that the gender wage gap cannot fully be explained through economic factors, offering that underlying psychological components and attitudes account for some of the difference. They found that while traditional gender roles were positively connected to earnings, that gender significantly predicted the amount and direction of this relationship. For instance, traditional gender role orientation was positively related with earnings for males, providing them with strong earnings. Meanwhile, traditional gender role orientation was slightly negatively associated with earnings for females, providing them weaker earnings. This suggests that men who have traditional male-female attitudes about working are rewarded in the workplace for seeking to maintain the social order, while women were neither rewarded nor punished. In general, the study indicated that even though gender role beliefs are beginning to become less traditional for men and women, traditional gender role orientation continues to intensify the gender wage gap.

The feminization of the work force has increased substantially although the aspiration level among women is high because of the opportunities offered by liberalization only few get any recognition. Society grants only certain freedom to women, but there is more women can do. There is always sense of suppression which haunts women, as women face many obstacles at work. And one such obstacle is the glass ceiling, which is not a barrier based on women's lack of ability to handle upper level management position. Instead the barrier keeps women from advancing higher in an organization because they are women. Glass Ceiling permits for women in public relations, management level and higher executive levels more than in other areas despite the increasing feminization in these fields. There are many instances where we come across extremely talented women, wiser than their years, but despite that their talents are not recognized. And this is the impact of Glass Ceiling that women leads to many
psychological as well as physiological problems which is adversely affecting their
organizational commitment, their adjustment, self-esteem and well-being.

The social disadvantage of this glass-ceiling is the inability of the most qualified
employees to move into the most important positions due to the irrelevant criteria such as
race or gender. The selection of a less qualified employee negatively impacts both the
employee and ultimately the economy as a whole. The successful elimination of glass-ceiling
requires not just an effective enforcement strategy but the involvement of
employees and others in identifying and reducing attitudinal and other forms of
organizational barriers encountered by minorities and women in advancing to higher
level management positions in different workplace settings.

Even in postindustrial societies, leadership at the highest levels has remained
overwhelmingly a male prerogative in corporate, political, military, and other sectors of
society. Although someone have gained considerably access to supervisory and middle
management positions, they remain scarce as elite leaders and top executives. Consider,
for example, that in the United States, women comprise only 4% of the five highest-
earning officers in Fortune 500 companies and 1% of the Chief Executive Officers
(Catalyst, 2000, 2002). In addition, women are a mere 13% of Senators, 14% of
Congressional Representatives, and 10% of state governors (Center for the American
Women and Politics, 2001). Other nations also have small proportions of women in most
high positions (Adler & Izraeli, 1994).

ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT:

Women are often perceived to lack the leadership skills of a manager. Despite the
gains women have made, negative attitudes and stereotypes of women as managers
(higher level) prevail. This barrier creates stressful situation which adversely effects on
her commitment towards job which is an organizational variable (Long & Khan, 1993).
The current rule of thumb in organization is, the higher up on organization’s hierarchy,
the fewer the women.

The term ‘Commitment’ enjoys an increasing vague in the concept of
organizational commitment (OC) has grown popularly in the literatures of industrial
Organizational psychology and micro-organizational behaviour. Mowday, Streers and porter (1979), proposed the two broad perspective approach to study the organizational commitment, namely behavioural, attitudinal and affective commitment.

(i) Behavioural Commitment: In the behavioural paradigm, commitment behaviour is distinguished from other behaviour by its extraordinary level, this is, behaviour that is beyond normative organizational expectations of the individual. Hence, the behavioural perspective focuses on the "overt manifestations of commitment (Mowday et al., 1979). Examples of commitment behaviour include extraordinary attendance, tenure and performance (Lowrel, 1988).

(ii) Attitudinal Commitment: Mowday et al (1979) defined commitment as a state in which an individual identifies with a particular organization and its goals and wishes to maintain membership in order to facilitate these goals. Both Buchman and Mowday et al. (1979) define commitment, its distinguish characteristic as the individual's internalization of the organization's goals and values.

(iii) Affective Commitment: This refers to employee's emotional attachment to identification with and involvement in, the organization. Porter and Smith (1970), characterizes a highly committed individuals as one who has: (1) a strong desire to retain a member of a particular organization; (2) a willingness to exert high levels of effort on behalf of the organization; and (3) a definite belief in and acceptance of the values and goals of the organization.

THEORIES OF COMMITMENT-

There are some theories of commitment.

(a) Sociological Theory - This theory revolve around the related concepts of social sanction and social control. Social sanction states that people act consistently because activity of some particular kind is regarded as right and proper in their society or social group and because deviations from this standard are punished. People act consistently, therefore, because it is morally/ethically wrong, practically inexpedient or both, to do otherwise.
Social control states that people obey social rules even when no sanctions would follow an infraction. This explanation is generally accepted by sociologists but is just as generally criticized because it offers no reasonable explanation of how people choose one from among the many audiences they can mentally survive on to observe any given act.

(b) **Psychological Theory** – Maslow (1954) proposed that employee’s needs emerge in a hierarchical fashion and it is important for the organization to satisfy their needs failing which the employees may exhibit non-commitment which may result in loss of productivity and effectiveness of organization.

Psychoanalysts predicate that individuals have stable needs and consistently act so as to maximize the possibility of satisfying them.

(c) **Side Bet Theory** – A person manifests a consistent course of action because of two states of mind:

1. **Made a Commitment** – This means a person is envisioned as having acted in such away.

2. **Being Committed** – Being in such a state that he will follow a consistent course.

The term ‘Side bet’ is used to refer to anything of value the individual has invested that would be lost or deemed worthless at some perceived cost to the individual if he/she have to leave the organization.

Organization Commitment found to be highly correlated to women than men. Grusky (1966) proposed that women would become more committed to an organization because they had to overcome more barriers than men to gain membership. But in the current era, this interpretation needs to be tempered. In general, there appears to be no consistent relationship between sex and levels of organizational commitment. Pre-employment attitudes and expectations were also found to be powerful determinants of organizational commitment (Buchnan, 1974; Salanick & Pfeffer, 1978; O’Reill & Caldwell, 1981; Rasin & Korabik, 1991). Salary is generally considered to represent a side bet and to thereby increase calculative commitment. Salary levels may also increase

**SELF-ESTEEM**

A women having improper adjustment in various domains of personal life will have low self-esteem. Self-esteem is an attitude the degree of correspondence between ideals and actual concept of himself- “a discrepancy between ideals and actual attainment” (Cohen, 1959). Self-esteem is simply described as one’s internal sense of worth or how one regards oneself. Self-esteem requires a delicate balance between accurately accessing strengths and limitations, while accepting and valuing one without conditions. Working women have been found to have low sense of self worth due to the perceived glass ceiling effect.

In our everyday lives we come across incidents of sexual discrimination at workplace, at home and social circles. Women since ages have been known as the weaker sex. One may ask now how does “glass ceiling effect” fit in all these? Well, situations of gender discrimination are popularly referred to as the glass ceiling effect. “Ceiling” stresses the limitation of upward progress a woman is subjected to and “glass” refers to the fact that though the limitation is apparently not written in any rule book, it is nevertheless a defeated fact understood by both the sexes.

The invisible barrier affect working women the most as it diminishes any chances of advancement for someone who is career conscious. Such discrimination leads women to have feelings of low self-esteem, decreased motivation and a slowing down of interest in their jobs. One of the many fangs of the glass ceiling effect is the evident difference in wages for the same job. Also, women are given inferior statuses within the same job and in most places are treated as subordinates to their male counter partners. Workplace discrimination is witnessed in all levels from blue collar jobs to professional careers.

Discrimination may be less visible in today’s workplace, but subtle forms of discrimination occur at every level. When they occur consistently, they create patterns of exclusion. These subtle behaviours reduce self esteem and prevent women, people of
color and people with disabilities from fully participating in their organizations. They affect the way people advance or hope for advancement.

Biased behaviours stem from the stereotypes we learn during childhood. Our attitudes toward people different from ourselves are shaped by these stereotypes. We then create myths that diffuse the true issues of equality and opportunity. The glass ceiling is a direct result of these common myths. The rigidity of our culture builds an organizational resistance against the values that women, people of color and people with disabilities bring to the workplace. Such rigidity prevents many individuals from relating to values or styles that may differ from their own.

However it has been found that the glass ceiling effect also has major derivations from traditional gender biases cultivated in the minds of people since ages. As defined by tradition, men were the earners and the women homemakers and that is still ingrained in the modern minds. Women tend to choose such careers that give them enough time to take care of domestic chores and they end up with jobs that are financially inferior to those chosen by men. Hence, though literacy and education have had far reaching effects with products like Indra Nooyi and Kiran Shah Mazumdar, we still have a long way to go if the glass ceiling effect has to be minimized to the least if not eradicated.

Self - Esteem is one of the most important variables affecting the lives of individuals at all stages of development (Bradburn, 1969). Battle et al, (1988) propose that self - esteem is a construct which refers to an individual’s perception of his/her personal worth. Thus, Self - esteem as a fundamental personality construct, can be defined as, ‘respect for or a favourable impression of oneself, good opinion of oneself” (Vijayamurthy & Partha Sarthy, 1990). Coopersmith (1967) defined self- esteem as, “the evaluation which the individual makes and customarily maintains with regard to himself; it expresses an attitude of approval or disapproval and indicates the extent to which an individual believes himself to be capable, significant, successful and worthy”. According to Losr and Winderlich (1986) self - esteem represents in part “a sense of power and competence that derives as feedback from the individual’s own actions”. It is a subjective experience which the individual conveys the others by verbal reports and other overt expressive behaviour.
For Rosenberg (1965), self-esteem is a composite of the sense of personal worth, appearance and social competence. Coopersmith (1967) has drawn attention to the need for feeling of competence, significance and power, while Abramson et al. (1978) have pointed out how attributional style may affect self-esteem. Beck (1967) and Beck et al. (1979) has demonstrated the importance of interpretation of events in arriving at a self-view. Robson (1988) defined it as “the sense of contentment and self acceptance that stems from a person’s appraisal of his own worth, significance, competence and ability to satisfy his aspirations”.

Several researchers observed the differentiation between the popular terms such as ‘self-concept and self-esteem’ (Calhoun & Morse, 1977; German, 1978). Calhoun & Morse (1977) defined self-concept as the way as individual perceives himself and his opinion of how others view him and self-esteem as the individual’s satisfaction with the self-concept (since self terms may be confusing to some).

Fitch (1970) discussed two ways in which self-esteem and attributions may be related: Self-Esteem may indicate the casual attributions that enhance self-esteem or they may display attributions consistent with current levels of self-esteem. Others researchers have also stressed the role of self-esteem enhancement or protection in casual attribution (Jones & Nisbett, 1971; Miller, 1976; Rosenberg, 1979). In general, self-esteem enhancement takes place when positive outcomes are attributed internally and negative outcomes are attributed to external causes (Cohen et al., 1985). People with different levels of self-esteem have been shown to attribute different causes to their success and failure (Fielstein et al., 1985). For example, those with high self-esteem, measured by Backman et al., (1978), scores were more likely to attribute success (Positive outcome) to ability (stable or internal attribution) and failure (negative outcome) to lack of effort or bad luck (unstable or external attributions), whereas people with low self-esteem make external, unstable attributions to success and stable, internal attributions to failure (Feather, 1985). These attributions may be the major determinants of the affective response to success and failure (McFarland & Rose, 1982).
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Feather (1983) has pointed out that the more depressed subjects tended to have lower self-esteem and that depression and self-esteem were linked to attributional behavior in generally opposite ways.

The test hypothesis derived from a learned helplessness model (Abramson et al., 1978) and Weiner, (1979) attributional model of motivation Zautra et al. (1985) have tried the association between attributional style, self-esteem, depressive symptoms and general distress with a purpose to explore the evidence for a single attributional style linked to depressions and self-esteem.

In the 1992 Minnesota Milestones Public Review Draft recommended continued evaluations to assess the percentage of children and youth with low self-esteem. The rational for doing so: “For males, measures of self-esteem show little change across the three grades surveyed, so physical, emotional or social changes associated with adolescence appear to have little impact on how males evaluate themselves. With female, the same measures of self-esteem tell a different story. Middle adolescence is a time of extreme self-doubt, insecurity and harshly critical self-assessment for many females, according to their responses to survey questions.”

Weiner (1979) model predicts that internal attributions for positive outcomes would be associated with greater self-esteem. Weiner & Litman – Adizes (1980) also linked casual attributions to self-esteem maintenance. According to the model, a person with high self-esteem expects to achieve a desired goal and with low self-esteem does not expect to achieve a desired goal and he or she attributes success to good luck and failure to lack of ability. Moreover, Abramson & Alloy (1981) contended that depressed individuals suffer from a breakdown in their motivation to maintain self-esteem.

In fact, evidence suggests that the attributional style seen among depressed subjects is also prevalent among subjects is also prevalent among subjects with low self-esteem. For example, Fitch (1970) reported that both high and low self-esteem subjects made more internal casual attributions for their failure. Ickes and Layden (1978) also found that high self-esteem subjects showed a strong preference for attributing positive
outcome to internal causes and this attributional style was dilated considerably in low self-esteem subjects. For negative outcomes, the pattern was reversed. They noted the similarity between the findings associating self-esteem and attributional style. The self-esteem level and attributional style clinically depressed patients appear to be essentially similar to those of the normal, but low self-esteem subjects. Tennen et al. (1986) found that, as predicted by the self-esteem maintenance model, subjects low in self-esteem who were not depressed tended to make more internal and stable attributions for failure. Tennen & Herzberger (1987) attempted to assess attributional even-handedness (i.e. the tendency to approach positive and negative outcomes with similar attributions) as well as individual casual dimensions. Following Raps et al (1982) even-handedness scores were obtained on subject's internality, stability and globosity ratings. The findings of the study appear to support the self-esteem maintenance hypothesis.

**PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING:**

This negative perception of ceiling not only influences the performance related variables, it has also a debilitating impact upon the personal variables of a women i.e. mode of adjustment and well-being.

In positive psychology well being is when people are healthy, both physically and mentally, they are usually adjusted to their circumstances and reporting being satisfied with life.

The perceived glass ceiling is not free from ill effect on health. Health, in laymen term, is a notion of well-being. It is a function of social, economical, biological, political and cultural factors. In 1948, WHO defined “as a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity.” The definition has been however criticized because of the difficulty of defining and measuring well-being. “Health is a physiological and psychological state but it is also fundamentally a social state”.(Jones, 1994).

Psychological well-being is easily influenced or changed concept which is concerned with an individual's feeling about his/her daily life experiences. These feeling extend from negative state such as stress, worry or unhappiness to more positive state
which are not simply state of absence of worry or unhappiness but a state which are related to sound mental health and include favorable self-esteem and success, Warr (1978) & Jahoda (1958) have also stated that such feeling may range from negative mental states or psychological strains such as anxiety, depression, frustration emotional exhaustion, unhappiness, dissatisfaction to a state which has been identified as positive mental health.

The concepts of psychological well-being and mental health, by and large, are used interchangeably by majority of the researchers. It is widely recognized that the concept of mental health focuses on an ideal state, emphasizing “Positive Well – Being” of the WHO chart rather than on disease, statistical or conformity criteria. Negative components of psychological well-being are relatively easily assessed through self-report of anxiety, depression, and frustration etc., but it is difficult to assess positive components of well-being.

Campbell converse and Rodgers (1976) wrote;

“It may be necessary to distinguish between which is associated with an experience of rising expectations and one which is associated with declining expectations. An individual who has achieved an aspiration of resignation. The two individuals might be equally satisfied in the sense of fulfilled needs but the affective content associated with success and resignation may well differ. The difference may be less significant in experiences of dissatisfaction where affective. Content of disappointment and frustration might be expected to accompany any failure to achieve one’s expectations.”

Campbell et al. (1976) has also stated explicitly the view that a given level of satisfaction can go along with different affective states. Psychological well-being depends upon how a person is valued by those around him the status of the elderly may depend upon the evaluative perception of those around i.e. primarily the members of family and secondary the significant others, outside the family circle (Jahoda, 1984).
Picture 1.5: Ill effect of Glass Ceiling.
The well-being in men and women has been found to increase with the number of roles undertaken (Pietromonaco & Froharelt, 1986). Women’s primarily responsibility for children has been suggested as a factor that may account for poor well-being of mothers compared to fathers (Rosenfield, 1989). Goldstein (1972) also found that having children did not generally improve the psychological well-being of parents. Ross and Misowsky (1995) contended that the effect of a women’s employment status on psychological well-being being depended on the presence of children, the type of child care and husband’s participation in child care.

Bandura (1986) in his social cognitive theory stated that the psychological well-being is determined by people’s belief in their efficacy or capability to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources and courses of action required to control over the events.

Social support in the family and work have been empirically studied in relation to well-being (Larocco & French, 1980). This construct has been operationalized by indicators of happiness, moral and life satisfaction (Okum, Medlichar Hell, 1980).

A person’s evaluations of his/her life may be in the form of cognitions (e.g. When a person gives conscious evaluative judgments about his or her satisfaction with life as a whole or evaluate judgments about specific aspects of his or her life such as recreation). Thus a person is said to have high SWB if she or he experiences life satisfaction and frequent job and only infrequently experiences life satisfaction and frequent job and only infrequently experiences unpleasant emotions such as sadness and anger. Contrariwise, a person is said to low SWB if he or she dissatisfied with life, experiences little job and affection and frequently feels negative emotions such as anger or anxiety. The cognitive and affective components of SWB are highly interrelated.

Quality of life is a composite measures of physiological mental and social well-being, happiness and satisfaction of an individual and as such is a multifaceted concept dealing with a range of factors such as health, marriage, family, work, financing, situation, education opportunities, self-esteem, creativity, sense of belongingness and trust very often terms like subjective well-being, happiness, life satisfaction and quality of life are used interchangeable, Cutter (1985) stated that quality of life is broadly
defined as an individual’s happiness or satisfaction with life including needs and desires, aspiration, life styles preference and other tangible and intangible factors that determine over all well being. Cambell (1976) & Diener (1984) has suggested that are several cardinal characteristics of the concept “well-being”. Firstly, it is subjective and secondly it is includes the positive measures. It is not just the absence of negative factors, as is true of most measures of mental health.

It is highly significant to note that for more than 25 years, the study of well-being is guided by two primary conception of positive functioning. One, the formulation, traceable to Bradburn’s (1965) seminal work, distinguishes between positive and affective affect and defined happiness as the balance between the two.

Second, the conception, which has gained prominence, emphasizes life satisfaction as the key indicator well-being. Diener (1984) defined life satisfaction as global evaluation by the person of his or her life viewed as a cognitive component and was seen to complement happiness – the more affective dimension of positive functioning. Well-being is a broad category of phenomena that includes people’s emotional responses, domain satisfaction and life satisfaction (Table No. 1.1). It is structured in such a way that these components from a global factors of interrelated variables. Each of the three major facets of well-being can in turn be broken in to subdivisions. Each of the subdivided even further. Well-being can be assessed at the most global level or at progressively narrower levels, depending on one’s purposes, eg., one might study life satisfaction, where as another might study marital satisfaction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pleasant</th>
<th>Affect</th>
<th>Unpleasant Affect</th>
<th>Life Satisfaction</th>
<th>Domain Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joy</td>
<td>Gift and Shame</td>
<td>Desire to change life</td>
<td></td>
<td>Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elation</td>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>Satisfaction with current life</td>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contentment</td>
<td>Anxiety and worry, anger</td>
<td>Satisfaction with past</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leisure Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>Satisfaction with future</td>
<td></td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affection</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>Significant other's views of one's life</td>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>Envy</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td>One's group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Diener, such. Lucas and Smith (1999)
So, well-being is clearly a multidimensional construct and the commonly proposed tri-partite structure of well-being, life satisfaction, positive affect and negative affect can be sustained. It is affected by work environment and is likely to do in complex ways.

It is undeniable that there exist physiological differences between men and women. This truth is used to justify the unequal treatment on all levels of human interactions. The uneven treatment is clearly reflected in the attitude of the American legal system toward the female gender. And the prevailing historical attitude of men towards women would have us believe that physiological differences limit women in their choice of career, their intellectual maturity, their credibility, as well as their ability to be effective contributors to the advancement of human society and that these differences Warrant that women to be treated differently from man. Thus, this attitude defines a view of women in which their role is that of keeper of hearth and home while that of the man is to provide for and protect this “weaker sex”- a view which continues to define different social roles for men and women. In that spirit protective legislation for women was born out of Muller V. Oregon in 1905. The case involved a Laundromat owner who was fined 10.00 $ for requiring a female employee to work more than ten hours. He appealed this fine to the Supreme Court which ruled against him on the grounds that a woman’s physical structure and proper discharge of her maternal functions justified legislation to protect her from greed as well as the passion of men”. Yet protection law seems to be more advantageous to male interests than female interests.

The wage gap between men and women is then an important aspect of the status of the U.S. Women- Social, legal and economic. Thus, the combination of these factors has resulted in the formulation of State and Federal Statues that contribute to devaluation of women and their achievements.

It should come as no surprise to any of us, then, that in an essentially male-dominated American society, the needs of, and issues of importance to women are not being adequately addressed by the American legal system which remains largely a position of male ideals. According to Judith A. Baer, gifted female law school graduated do not necessarily obtain positions at the higher hierarchy of the legal profession. The
proof of this statement is reflected in the fact that currently there is, and there has only been, one female Supreme Court justice, furthermore, as of 1991, forty women have served on the highest court of thirty states and the District of Columbia and only five have presided over their state’s court as Chief Justice (Baer, 270) and only 5.4 percent of all federal judges were women at the time of Sandra Day O’Connor’s appointment (Rhodrie 32). Because influential women within the hierarchy of the legal profession are such a minority it is harder for their point of view to come across in the shaping of state and federal statutes that affect their social and personal lives. Some, like Karen Marello, would argue that the same forces that worked to keep women out of the legal profession would work to keep them out of positions of power within the establishment.

Even equal educational attainment does not guarantee fair compensation. Regardless of credentials and preparedness, the return on investment or income, continues unequal. All women have considerably lower mean incomes as compared to their male counterparts, and most minority men earn less than non-Hispanic White men with the same educational level and at the same occupational level. It is this wage discrimination or pay inequity that is an indicator of the existence of glass - ceiling. Despite identical education attainment, ambition and commitment to career men still progress faster than women.

Women have been entering the US labour market in increasing numbers over the past 50 years. In 2005, women comprised 59% of the workforce (US Census Bureau, 2007), and it is no longer unusual to find women in every occupation, even those they have traditionally been dominated by men. Often, however, women tend to be clustered in lower level jobs (Cassirer & Reskin, 2000), with little authority and low pay (Morrison and Von Glinow, 1990) segregated into traditionally female occupations (Maume, 1999), or funneled into staff jobs that are less likely than time positions to lead to advancement (Kirchmeyer, 1998). Previously, it was taken for granted that once women comprised a large proportion of the workforce and gained sufficient experience, their representation in top management ranks would increase accordingly (Tharenou, 1999). However, this assumption has not been realized. Instead, research has shown that for every 10% increase in the number of females in an occupation, the rate of entry into management for women is reduced by 6% (Maume, 1990). In the US, women’s career
often stall at the middle management level, despite their ambitions to advance further (Tharenou, 1999). Women comprise approximately half of the first line supervisor of positions, but a very small percentage of top-level management jobs (Atwater, Brett, Waldman, Dimore & Mayden, 2004; Nelton, 1995). Fewer than 5% of senior executives are women (Agars, 2004; Lyness & Thompson, 1997; Tharenou, 1999). The glass-ceiling typically becomes a barrier for women at the point of entry into top management, thus partially their limited representation in the upper ranks of organizations (Maume, 2004; Powell & Butterfield, 1994).

Women's self-perceptions of success do not necessarily depend on external achievements. Though individuals both men and women may hold positions of importance and to be compensated highly for their work, they may not feel satisfied with their accomplishments (Judge et al. 1995; Korman, 1981; Seibert et al., 1999). Alternatively, they may derive strong personal satisfaction from their work, despite holding low-status positions, having little authority or receiving low salaries. Women in particular may find satisfaction through other sources such as their interpersonal relationships at work (Eddleston et al., 2004). Traditional, objective measures of success may not be as important to women as to men because women may have lower expectations due to their inferior positions within organizational power structure (Kantner, 1977). Women have also been found to attach less importance to promotions than men, be less likely to desire a promotion and express aspirations for advancing to top organizational positions (Cassirer & Reskin, 2000). Similarly, other research suggest women may focus on lateral moves and place greater emphasis on the socio-emotional sources of career success than on objective, visible accomplishments (Eddleston et al., 2004).

Women in particular may need to be more proactive about seeking out the developmental assignments that they need (Lyness & Thompson, 2000), as they may not always be automatically provided with the training and skill-building assignments necessary for advancement (Eddleston et al., 2004; Seibert et al., 1999). Employees can be reluctant to provide training for those they see as unlikely to say with the organization (Keaveny & Inderieden, 1999), and women, because of their often interrupted careers, frequently fall into this category. Therefore, women may not be able to take advantage of
available training and development activities unless they take the initiative to aggressively seek these out and demonstrate self-motivation for training.

Although, training is important to career success, people may not engage in it willingly, as they may see it as an irrelevant, unnecessary distraction from their existing job duties. Because some organizations mandate a certain number of hours of training per year, training is not necessarily voluntary and may be viewed by employees as a "have to" rather than a "want to" activity. It has also been found that women are more likely to have to pay for their training than men (Keaveny & Inderrienden, 1999; Miller & Mulvey, 1999), which can diminish their enthusiasm for it and contribute to their reluctance to seek it out.

Another individual variable that can potentially impact women’s advancement is confidence that they will be promoted. Personality traits associated with aspiration and ambition may influence one’s career (Tharenou, 1997) and having high promotional aspirations has been found to aid advancement (Tharenou, 2001). If individuals do not see opening above them or a pattern of woman receiving promotions, their own aspirations for advancement and belief in their promotability may suffer. Harlan (1989) found that the effects of opportunity variables on promotion attitude were significant. Employees who perceived a high level of advancement opportunity also had high expectations for promotion. Kantner (1977) found that employee location in the organizations opportunity structure affected the individual’s objective assessment of promotion, which in turn affected the importance of employee attached to being promoted (Cassirer & Reskin, 2000). Women may have lower aspirations for advancement because they do not see sufficient opportunities for promotion (Cassirer & Reskin, 2000). Cassirer & Reskin also found that only a slight majority of women (56%) felt that being promoted was important; a figure that was significantly less than the percentage of men who attached value to a promotion. Having faith in one’s abilities and readiness of promotion was also related to advancement (Regins & Sundstrom, 1989; Tharenou et al., 1994). Individuals who had the most confidence in their abilities and accurately recognized their worth in the market place were the most likely to advance in their organizations (Regins & Sundstrom, 1989), as marketability and confidence have been significantly related to promotions (Eddleston et al., 2004), advancement in
organizations (Eddleston et al., 2004; Regins & Sundstrom, 1989), and likelihood of success (Veiga, 1989). Consequently, individuals who see themselves as highly marketable are more likely to be selected for promotion because the organization recognizes their value and rewards them promotions in an effort to keep them committed the organization (Eddleston et al., 2004).

An individual's skills, knowledge and motivation by themselves cannot fully account for success in organization. Particularly the immediate environment within which an employee works, can affect the extent to which an individual is able to acquire skills, demonstrate them and receive accurate performance evaluations. The gender and immediate relationship characteristics of supervisor–subordinate dyads can influence career success through their impact on performance (Heilman, 2001), promotion opportunities (Powell & Butterfield, 1994), and career support (Tharenou et al., 1994). Because gender bias may influence evaluation of an individual's performance, establishing competence cannot assure women that they will be evaluated objectively or that they will advance to the same organizational level as equivalently performing men (Heilman, 2001). Also, the qualitative results from interviews with high-level women reveal that advancement was considered to be primarily dependant on one's manager rather than on formal organization systems (Liff & Ward, 2001). These research findings suggest that informal relationships are at least as important as formal policies in determining promotion for women.

A male or female boss gender related attitudes about woman as managers can have an effect on the mentoring and support for advancement they provide to women subordinates.

Having a female as a manager may be an advantage for women. Women supervisors assist female subordinates by serving as role models and examples of expected organizational behaviour (Daley, 1996). Because opposite gender supervisor/subordinate dyads eliminate the similarity – attraction factor, having a female manager allows women to enjoy the benefits of "Similar to me" relationships that generate support for advancement (Tharenou, 2001). Yet, female managers can also be determinant. Male supervisors are often more connected to key social networks within
the organization (Daley, 1996) and provide opportunities for women to benefit from heterogeneous networks (Daley, 1996; Ibarra, 1993, 1995) that are not accessible through female supervisors may hinder career progress for both men and women because they are frequently excluded from the informal social networks in organizations that influence promotions and advancement and thus unable to assist their subordinates (Daley, 1996). Successful female executives report that help from above was critical to getting ahead in an organization (Marrison, 1992; Tharenou, 2001) and men typically hold the highest positions of influence authority. Thus, women with female superiors may not receive sufficient top-level guidance.

Females in management positions may not be viewed favorably by males, who comprise the bulk of higher-level positions. Interviews with female executives revealed that male executives were not comfortable being supervised by or supervising women (Catalyst, 1992, 1996; Ragins et al., 1998; Tharenou, 1998). Despite research showing that men and women perform equivalently in leadership roles, male senior leaders often perceive that women are not effective as men are and are especially deficient in problem-solving skills (Catalyst, 2005).

Managers typically prefer to select individuals who closely resemble themselves to advance (Biebly, 1992; Cassirer & Reskin, 2000; Kantner, 1997; Kirchmeyer, 1998; Maume, 2004). In a male-dominated corporate hierarchy, this approach minimizes the perceived risks of introducing someone “different” into the organization’s authority chain who do not confirm to accepted practices and values (Bielby & Bielby, 1992; Cassirer & Reskin, 2000). Similarity, may also affect the level of management support and encouragement for the individual’s advancement (Tharenou, 2001). The presence of a male organizational hierarchy negatively affects women’s advancement into low and mid-management positions because of their greater interpersonal support for similar others (Tharenou, 2001). Multiple studies have found that the less “male” a managerial hierarchy is the more women advance in management (Konard & Pfeffer, 1991; Pfeffer, Danis – Blake & Julius, 1995; Tharenou, 2001; Tharenou & Conroy, 1994).

Studies of same and opposite sex Superior/Subordinate dyads have produced inconsistent results. Some have found no differences related to the sex of the rather
(Landy & Farr, 1980; Peters O’Cannon, Weekley, Pooyan, Frank & Erentrantz, 1984; Pulakos, White, Oppler & Borman, 1989) or the rate (Eagly et al, 1992; Powell & Butterfield, 1982; Terborg, 1977; Tsui & Gutek, 1984). Others have found that opposite gender dyads result in lower ratings for subordinates than same sex dyads (Tsui & O’Reilly, 1989) and the demographic differences (including gender) between superiors and subordinates may have significant effects on performance evaluations (Tsui & O’Reilly, 1989). Still other results suggest that same sex combinations do not produce higher evaluation for the individual being rated (Pulakos et al, 1989) and that supervisors do not higher ratings to employees of their own gender (Mabley, 1982). The results of some studies demonstrate that women are rated higher than men in terms of their performance (Mabley, 1982; Peters et al., 1984; Powell & Butterfield, 1994), while others reflect a tendency to rate male subordinates more positively (Butterfield & Grinnell, 1999; Eagly, Karau & Makhijani, 1995; Eagly, Makhijani & Kansy, 1992). These inconsistencies may arise from lab vs field studies (Bastol, 1999) and from situational variables that need to be taken into account (Tsui & Gutek, 1984).

The gender composition of a female manager subordinate group may also affect evaluations of her performance, perceptions of leadership, and consequently opportunities for advancement. For a woman in a leadership role, success in an organization is contingent on how effectively. She manages the people who work for her. Her performance as a manager of others is likely to be part of the criteria used as evidence of her suitability for promotion. If her team does not achieve the approximate business results, her opportunities for promotion will be limited. Research has identified some factors that may influence how well a female manager works with her team based on its gender compositions. A primary obstacle is the stereotypical perceptions some individuals hold regarding women in management roles. A female in a traditionally “male” position violates some assumptions about gender and status (Ridgeway, 2001) and produces incongruity between the behaviours expected from a woman and the behaviours expected from a manager(Melamed, 1995). Supervisory authority is still seen as a gendered concept by some people, for example, women are not perceived to be able to work for long hours required of managers (Maume, 2004). Consequently, it may be difficult for subordinates especially males to accept women as supervisors (Melamed,
Further, when women supervisors assert their authority, they may encounter resistance and negative reactions from their ideas are perceived to be less well liked, less trustworthy and to have less influence over man (Carti, 1990; Ridgeway, 2001), which limits their ability to manage other most effectively.

Other research points to the ratio of male and female subordinates as a factor in their ratings of their supervisors. Eagly and colleagues (1995) found that the higher the proportion of men among the rates, the more.

**ADJUSTMENT:-**

An adjustment is the process of trying to bring about a balance between needs, stimuli opportunities offered by the environment. It involves coping with problems with some willingness to accommodate to pressures. It also means that we make an effort to modify the environment to suit our needs.

Adjustment is the balancing of internal needs and external demands on the organism. Someone is well adjusted if they have developed the capacity to maintain the harmony of their inner and outer worlds.

The term adjustment usually implies a smooth relationship between the individual and the environment. In this sense, the adjusted individual interacts in a harmonious way with the world in which he or she lives.

Adjustment is a life long process that involves stimulus response behaviour. First of all, individual proceeds towards the dissection of goal and while proceedings towards the direction of goal, there is every possibility that obstacles may block him. He may face circumstances, which may lead him to thwarting. In this thwarting condition, the individual makes varied responses to attain the goal and he goes on until he discovers some appropriate response, reaches the goal and develops adjustment. If individual is able to accept himself and the ways of the live he has to follow without any hazard, he become well adjusted in life.

In the use of the term adjustment attention is often of focused on the mode of interaction. Alternatively, the emphasis may be on the conditions with in the individual.
Thus, the term may be defined in terms of the extent to which individual needs are satisfied usually with the implication that maximum or optional need satisfaction depending upon a satisfactory relationship with the environment. Since meeting needs usually entails interaction with our physical or social surrounding.

So, behavioral adjustment is the process of trying to bring about a balance between needs, stimuli and opportunities attempting to satisfy needs by overcoming both inner and outer obstacles and by fitting oneself to circumstances like the student who wants to get along with a group.

Well-adjusted individual maintains a stable sense of identity and possess the inner freedom to make their own decisions rather than yielding to pressures from the environment and from other people. Well-adjusted individual can function more or less satisfactory despite the inevitable problem of life. These persons are realistic and do not unduly grandiose expectations. They are not surprised overtly ashamed or angry when they themselves fail or others fail them. They can infect “Role with the Punch” and are rarely unhappy over the personal disappointments. They are flexible and confident of their ability to cope with, whatever situations may arise and can somehow manage to live with them. They find things to do which give pleasure. They have good deal of independence and do not shift like a whether value with every change of wind, either in society as a whole or among their associates, through they enjoy a certain mount of privacy.

Well-adjusted people are capable of feeling and showing affection and can establish close relationship with others. They accept with grace the realities of the physical world and of society and behave in harmony with them. They take failure realistically become satisfied with what they have attained and face the world squarely. Well-adjusted individuals acquire more or less effective techniques for dealing with most conflicting situations and resolve them adequately. Bizarre experience, apathy, depression, false beliefs, lost of identity and anxiety can make the person maladjusted. Here we had taken two types of adjustment i.e. occupational adjustment and emotional adjustment.
Occupational adjustment is a person's adaptation to their work. This can be to the physical requirements, for example becoming fitter as a building worker or developing repetitive strain injury through data input or psychological adjustment to the pace of work, and the social challenges of the workplace. It can also be conceptualized as a complex bio-psychosocial process of change. Think for example of the way shift work can affect many aspects of people's lives.

Emotional adjustment (also referred to as personal adjustment or psychological adjustment) is the maintenance of emotional equilibrium in the face of internal and external stressors. This is facilitated by cognitive processes of acceptance and adaptation. An example would be maintaining emotional control and coping behavior in the face of an identity crisis.

Feeling of insecurity, emotionally charge conditions, self-devaluation, inefficient contact with reality, unrealistic life goals, inability to learn from past experience and inability to bear criticism can lead to maladjustment.

A good adjustment in the sense involves more than a passive relationship with one's surroundings. It involves taking the initiatives, taking risks and learning to make the most of the situation instead of resigning oneself to it.

In adjustment, the crucial factors are the individual and the environment. In the study of the individual, the considerations are the heredity and biological factors. The psychological factors and the equality of socialization given to him or her whereas the environment includes all the social factors. Every individual from time to time he or she steps out of the family and goes to school makes to a long series of adjustment between unique personality and the environment. The ardent desire of each man and women to become an individual person having a healthy physique, a growing intellectual ability, a greater degree of emotional poise and increase participation in social groups, each characteristics enhance one's personality. Even parents, teachers and other significant number of the society to which person belongs with encourage this desire.

Several studies have been reported in area of social, education, health and emotional adjustment.
Objectives:

Keeping these variables in mind, the objectives of the present study are as follows:

1. To construe and operationalize the tool to measure glass ceiling phenomena.

2. To access the extent and intensity of glass ceiling effect by describing the sample characteristics among the female variables.

3. To compare the low glass ceiling perceivers and high glass ceiling perceivers on the dimensions of organizational commitment, mode of adjustment, self-esteem and well-being.

4. To study the impact of glass ceiling on the dimension of organizational commitment, mode of adjustment, self-esteem and well-being.