**Glass Ceiling and Glass Cliff Effects on Women Career Advancement in Saudi Arabia**

**Abstract**

This study focused on gender discrimination on workplace and argued two main research questions, first whether organizational injustice and work/life balance issues considerably affect women advancement career in the form of glass ceiling effect and second, whether both organizational injustice and work/life balance issues leads to increase women turnover intention to job due to managerial pressure for the specific job tasks in the form of glass cliff. These questions addressed in this study by collecting responses from working women in different industries of Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. The results of step-wise regression for glass ceiling effect indicate that organizational justice and women job experience both are the significant contributor to women advancement career in an organization. The results of binary-logit regression effect for glass cliff effect confirmed that work/life balance issues, marital status, women job experience, and income are the chief contributing factor that affects women advancement career. The study concludes with food-for-thoughts for the feminist scholars and human right activists to play their role to reduce gender discrimination on workplace and formulate gendered based policies that should be based on equity and justice in an organization.
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**1. Introduction**

Glass ceiling and glass cliff both are the inverted phenomenon in the feminist policy arena, as glass ceiling is affect women advancement career by organizational injustice that give less opportunities to promote women in next job cadre as their counter male part, while glass cliff affect women intention to leave the job due to less favorable support by their peers, and faced massive criticism on their assigned job tasks (Ryan and Haslam, 2005).

Women’s rights in Saudi Arabia are the customary bondage rather than conventional bondage, as Islam gives women security and rights more than any other country of the World (Nasr, 2004). The Holy Quran discussed the role of gender in two perspectives, at first, Islam provokes the equality of men and women, secondly, women consider as femininity and men assume to be the masculinity in his/her works capacity (Eaton 2000). One of the reports of World Economic Forum (2015) regarding gender parity index indicated that Saudi Arabia is ranked about 134th in number out of total 145 countries. The possible reason is that, all women are required to have a male guardian; therefore, women face little more challenges to work as compared to other part of the World. There are some crucial facts regarding women’s status in Saudi Arabia i.e., only 13% of Saudi women is the part of labour force, female literacy rate considerably increasing since last 4 decades and its reached around 91%, although its share as compared to its counterpart is slightly lower, however, the rate of change of literacy for female to male ratio is considerably improves (Arab News 2012). At the end of 2015, there are more than 350,000 women employed in private sector that reached to be expected around 450,000 women in private sector till 2016 (Arab News 2016). The glass ceiling effect although has a visible impact on Saudi women advancement career; however, its intensity would be slightly lower than in other part of the World due to Islamic values and integrity.

There are number of studies that evaluated glass ceiling and glass cliff effects in different organizational settings, however, this study is different from the previous studies as both the glass effects are evaluated simultaneous in a single study with a same target population that would to helpful to draw a strong policy framework for the betterment of women advancement career in organizational settings. In addition, the study identified different demographic factors that further impact on glass ceiling and glass cliff effects on women advancement career. Ragins et al. (1998) described the glass ceiling effects that faced female executives during their course of advancement in an organization. Albrecht et al. (2001) found glass ceiling effects in Sweden and concluded that Sweden job market is flared with organizational wage gap policies that differentiate women to pay fewer wages as compared to men for the same job tasks. Bass and Avolio (2006) concluded that women have a high transformational leadership quality that facilitates to complete their job tasks in an efficient manner as their male counterparts. Arulampalam et al. (2007) found glass ceiling effects across the Europe and explored wage differentials in gendered either in the form of glass ceiling effects and/or the ‘sticky-floor’ effects at the top and bottom wage distribution among women. Ryan et al. (2010) concluded that women are considered the strong opponent to the men in order to receive more critical leadership positions; however, this position is acquired with the hard-to win-contest seats. Ryan et al. (2011) enforced that women performance are ever criticized in company’s trouble time, as the company’s strategic failure linked with the hard time offering managerial positions to the women to escape out of the ship from the thunder. Sabharwal (2013) explored some key facts that faced women in working as senior executives members in US based organizations and found the fact of glass ceiling and glass cliff related issues during performing their assigned job tasks. Atkinson et al. (2014) concluded that glass ceiling effect mostly pronounced with pay gender gap which is quite high in both the UK and Canada, although glass ceiling effect is unobserved in top 1% women, however, this share in total income received is very low that required strong policy intervention to reduce the gender gap in all incomes. Ryan et al. (2016) argued that glass cliff effects visible in the discourse of women and leadership in an organization, however, this association is complex in nature that need further factors to sought out this issue in more diversified ways. Glass and Cook (2016) argued that although the proportion of women on top management positions mostly flared with high risk leadership positions that likely to get position as compared to male counterpart, however, the lack of peer and strategic supports make to accomplish this task more difficult, therefore, the tenure of leadership is far short of women to men in order to retain their positions in an organization that affect women advancement career with the label glass cliff.

The above debate comes to the following conclusions i.e., the glass ceiling and glass cliff effects both are visible impact on so-called democratic world where the human right activist talks about justice and equity. The gender ceiling effects pronounced majorly with pay gender gap, while very few studies talk about different dimensions of organizations i.e., organizational equity and work/life balance issues. The glass cliff effects also criticized by male counterparts, however, it is evident that lack of peer supports and organizational justice majorly effect the outcomes of women leadership, which is merely absent in the policy framework. This study evaluated both the glass ceiling and glass cliff effects under the organizational justice and work/life balance issues in the capital city of Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. The study hypothesize the following research questions i.e.,

***H1: The higher the organizational justice, the lower will be the glass ceiling and glass cliff effects.***

***H2: The higher the work/life balance issues, the higher will be the glass ceiling and glass cliff effects.***

***H3: There is a differential impact of demographic factors including women age, marital status, education, experience and income on women advancement career in an organization.***

These hypothesis required strong policy support to formulate feminist equity framework for direct actions.

**2. Methods and Materials**

The study identified different factors of glass ceiling and glass cliff effect that impact on women career advancement in Saudi Arabia. The main factors including organizational justice and work/life balance issues that considerably affect women career advancement by either in the form of glass ceiling and/or glass cliff effects. The demographic variables further mediate this relationship to expedite the process of equity and justice in business competitive era.

**2.1. Population of the Study**

The universe of the study is all working women in Saudi Arabia that have at least 2 years of job experience and may understand (and face) the visible barriers that hinders against the career advancement in their job market.

**2.2. Sample of the Study**

The sample of the study consists of 800 working women in a capital city of Riyadh, Saudi Arabia that is working in different traits such as education, banking, health, and insurance sectors, and has at least two years of working experience with the understanding of glass ceiling and glass cliff effects in their career life. Table 1 shows the response rate received from the questionnaires by dully filled and checked by different competitive businesses where women actively working since last two years.

**Table 1: Sample size and Response Rate**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sectors** | **Questionnaires Sent** | **Questionnaires Received** | **Percentage** |
| Bank | 200 | 105 | 52.5% |
| Education | 200 | 157 | 78.5% |
| Health | 200 | 139 | 69.5% |
| Insurance | 200 | 102 | 51% |
| Total | 800 | 503 | 62.875% |

Source: Authors estimated from the survey.

Table 1 shows that the total 800 questionnaires distributed to the four major sectors of Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, and the questionnaires received dully filled from the respondents is about 503 in number, which has a share of 62.875% in total sample. The larger share of questionnaires received from higher education sector where 200 questionnaires were send to the women that have at least two years of job experience and found returned from 157 women with a percentage share of 78.5%, followed health sector (received 139 questionnaires with a share of 69.5%), banking sector (105 and 52.5%), and insurance sector (102 and 51%).

**2.3. Sample Selection**

The sample is diversified as per the nature of job work; however, the barriers against the advancement of career life faced by women are nearly same as women faced in other traits including social barriers, organizational barriers, work/life balance issues etc, these barriers either effect on the women performance to leave the job market due to unable to perform their managerial task as their male counterpart (glass cliff) or it effects on women career advancement due to inequity and justice in the organizational attitudes (glass ceiling).

**2.4. Sampling Technique:** The study adopted probability sampling technique to evaluate the women voice against the gender ceiling and/or gender cliff due to socio-organizational-work life issues. The study used stratified random sampling and categorizes the women in different strata of work place i.e., education strata, banking strata, health strata, and insurance strata, and after that collects the samples from it on the basis of random sampling.

**2.5. Components of Structured Questionnaire**

The study used structured questionnaire that contain the list of items for glass ceiling, glass cliff, organizational justice, and work/life balance. The study pre-test this questionnaire on 20 women that worked in different industries and checked the questionnaire items, its validity, and content acceptability, afterward it is send it to the prospective samples for data collection. The questionnaire items largely based on 5-Likert points from 1-strongly disagree to 5-strongly agree, except glass cliff item, as this variable contains binary responses i.e., 1 for yes and 0 for no.

***2.5.1. Glass Ceiling***

The total 3 items represent the glass ceiling variable, which we borrowed from the work of Al- Manasra (2013). The description of glass ceiling items include, i) “women have fewer opportunities than men for career progress at work”, ii) “organizations support and trust in men more than women to reach top posts”, and iii) “when it comes to promotion to top posts in the organization women are discriminated”. The items validity and reliability is being checked by KMO and Cronbach’s alpha and both the test confirmed that the specific items for glass ceiling variable is valid and reliable (i.e., KMO = 0.599, and α value = 0.667).

***2.5.2. Glass Cliff***

The variable glass cliff has a binary response, which contains only two values i.e., 1 for yes and 0 for no. The single statement asked by the respondents to give their responses either to say yes or no. The statement is “Are you considering leaving your organization within the next year due to work stress?”. This statement is borrowed from the scholarly work of Sabharwal (2013).

***2.5.3. Organizational Justice***

The organizational justice consists of 7 items, which is based on 5-point Likert scale rated from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The items are borrowed from the work of Sabharwal (2013). These items are mainly based on three different forms of organizational equity, i.e., i) “procedural equity”, ii) “distributive equity”, and iii) interactional equity”. The value of KMO and α is about 0.677 and 0.799 respectively.

***2.5.4. Work/Life Balance Issue***

The work/life balance issue consists of 7 items that is related with work satisfaction, health satisfaction, satisfaction with training and assistance programmes, satisfaction with leadership working style, childcare and elder work support satisfaction etc. These items also borrowed from the work of Sabharwal (2013). The value of KMO and α is about 0.712 and 0.866 respectively.

**2.6. Research Framework**

This study is distinct with the previous studies of Sabharwal (2013), Al- Manasra (2013), and many more studies that provoked in the gender ceiling and gender cliff, as this study evaluated simultaneously both the gender ceiling and gender cliff phenomenon with the same target audience and record their responses in terms of gender inequality in the labour market (gender ceiling) and intention to quit the job due to heavy stress (gender cliff) in the diversified business industries.

The study specified two regression equations, one for gender ceiling and one for gender cliff with the number of regressors including organizational justice, work/life balance issue, and demographic characteristics of the respondents i.e.,



(1)



(2)

Where, GCEIL shows glass ceiling, GCLIFF shows glass cliff, OJ shows organizational justice, WLBI shows work/life balance issue, AGE shows women age, EDU shows women education, EXP shows women job experience, INCOME shows women income/salary, MSTATUS shows women marital status, and  shows error term.

Equation (1) is empirically evaluated by step-wise regression method where variables are entered in a schematic fashion of one by one. The equation (2) is estimated by binary-logit model, as the dependent variable is dichotomous and its responses are in a form of 1-yes and 0-no. The regressors including organizational justice is hypothesized to be ‘indirect’ in both of the regression equations, as higher the organizational justice lead to decrease glass ceiling and glass cliff effects on women advancement career, while the work/life balance issue if persistently raised it would impact on women career advancement in the form of either glass ceiling and/or glass cliff effects, therefore, the expected hypothetical relationship would be ‘direct’ between the variables. The demographic factors including women age, education, experience, income, and marital status would be the differential impacts on glass ceiling and glass cliff effects.

**2.7. Research Design**

The study followed the work of Sabharwal (2013) and Al- Manasra (2013), and developed a unique research model where organizational justice, work/life balance, and demographic factors simultaneously impact on glass ceiling and glass cliff that hinders the women advancement career. Figure 1 show the study research design for the ready reference.

**Figure 1**: Research Model for the Study
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Source: Adapted from the work of Sabharwal (2013) and Al- Manasra (2013).

**2.8. Empirical Modeling**

The study used step-wise regression to evaluate equation (1) in which variables are entered one-by-one and the relationships between the variables being observed by coefficients t-statistics and significant probability values. In addition, the study also perform collinearity Statistics to check the possibility of multicollinearity problem between the exogenous variables, for this purpose, the study estimated ‘tolerance’ and ‘variance inflation factor (VIF)’ that have certain threshold values, as tolerance value if exceeds or equal to unity, and VIF values if exceeds the value of 10, than we may conclude the existence of multicollinearity problem in the model.

The study further estimated equation (2) by binary-logit regression technique, as the dependent variable is dichotomous in nature. This technique based on certain critical linear regression assumptions i.e., i) the relationship between the variables should be discrete in nature due to binary responses, ii) No intercorrelations should be present among the explanatory factors that may observed by correlation results, and iii) No major outlier should be presented in the existing data series. Both the regression technique would helpful to obtained unbiased parameter estimates.

**3. Results and Discussions**

Table 2 shows the demographic survey of the respondents and found that around 20.080% women has a marital status is single/bachelor, whereas 69.781% women are married, 5.368% women have divorced, and 4.771% women are widow. The sample contain 43 women that have an age of more than 44 years, followed by 60 women fall in the age bracket of 38-44 years, 82 women, 211 women, and 107 women fall in 32-37year, 26-31 years, and 20-25 year of age bracket respectively. There is 23.260% women have a job experience in between 8 to 11 years, followed by 37.575% women fall in the experience bracket of 5 to 8 years, 9.145% women have a more than 11 years of experience and remaining women have more than 2 years but less than 5 years of job experience i.e., around 30.020%. The large sample of the women i.e., 44.732% women obtained a Graduation degree, while 30.020% women are Masters, 14.911% have 12 years of education and remaining 10.338% have a higher masters degree. There are 27.237% of women that received a salary in between the range of SR9001-12000, followed by 26.040% women received in between SR6001-9000, the remaining 20.080% women, 16.103% women, and 10.537% women received a salary bracket of SR2001-15000, SR3000-6000, and >SR15000 respectively.

**Table 2: Demographic Survey**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Demographic Survey** | **Frequency** | **Percentages** |
| **Marital Status** | | |
| Single/Bachelors | 101 | 20.080 |
| Married | 351 | 69.781 |
| Divorce | 27 | 5.368 |
| Widow | 24 | 4.771 |
| **Age** | | |
| 20-25 years | 107 | 21.272 |
| 26-31 years | 211 | 41.948 |
| 32-37 years | 82 | 16.302 |
| 38-44 years | 60 | 11.928 |
| More than 44 years | 43 | 8.549 |
| **Experience** | | |
| > 2 years but < 5 years | 151 | 30.020 |
| > 5 years but < 8 years | 189 | 37.575 |
| > 8 years but < 11 years | 117 | 23.260 |
| > 11 years | 46 | 9.145 |
| **Education** | | |
| 12 Years of education | 75 | 14.911 |
| Graduation | 225 | 44.732 |
| Masters | 151 | 30.020 |
| Higher education/Others | 52 | 10.338 |
| **Salary** | | |
| SR3000-6000 | 81 | 16.103 |
| SR6001-9000 | 131 | 26.044 |
| SR9001-12000 | 137 | 27.237 |
| SR12001-15000 | 101 | 20.080 |
| More than SR15000 | 53 | 10.537 |

Source: Authors’ estimate from the survey.

Table 3 presented the statistics of mean value, standard deviation, Cronbach’s alpha, eigenvalue, % of variance explained, and KMO value of the existing survey and found that glass ceiling has an average value of 3.328 with a standard deviation value of 0.547, which implies that the glass ceiling effect is in indecisive mode, as women are uncertain about their career advancement in male dominant society which are flared with injustice and inequity. This variable has an eigenvalue of 1.119 that is explained around 27.997% variations in the given model. The reliability and validity is checked by Cronbach’s alpha value and KMO value, and found that both the values are in acceptable mode of reliability and validity of the questionnaires’ items i.e., 0.667 (greater the acceptable threshold value of 0.60) and 0.599 (greater than acceptable threshold value of 0.50) respectively.

**Table 3: Descriptive Statistics, Factor Analysis, Reliability and Validity Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables** | **Items** | **Mean** | **Standard Deviation** | **Cronbach’s Alpha** | **Eigenvalues** | **% of variance explained** | **KMO** |
| Glass Ceiling | 3 | 3.328 | 0.547 | 0.667 | 1.119 | 27.977 | 0.599 |
| Glass Cliff | 1 | 0.300 | 0.459 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Organizational Justice | 7 | 3.537 | 0.434 | 0.799 | 0.794 | 19.861 | 0.677 |
| Work/Life Balance Issues | 7 | 3.432 | 0.390 | 0.866 | 0.836 | 20.895 | 0.712 |

Source: Authors’ estimation with survey data .n/a shows not applicable.

Table 3 further reported the statistics of glass cliff which is based on binary responses with the mean value of 0.300 and standard deviation of 0.459. As this variable contain a single item therefore, the factor analysis, reliability and validity statistics of the particular variables could not be measured. The organizational justice has 7 items with a mean value of 3.537 and standard deviation value of 0.434. The value of Cronbach’s alpha is 0.799 and KMO value is 0.677. The eigenvalue is about 0.794 that explained 19.861% variations to the ‘response’ variable. Finally, the work/life balance issue contained 7 items with an average value of 3.432 and standard deviation of 0.390. The reliability statistics is 0.866 and validity of items’ statistics is 0.712 with an eigenvalue of 0.836 that’s explained 20.895% in the total variations. Table 4 shows the correlation matrix between the factors.

**Table 4: Correlation Matrix**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Factors** | **Glass Cliff** | **Work/ Life Balance** | **Organizational Justice** | **Glass Ceiling** |
| Glass Cliff | 1 |  |  |  |
| Work/ Life Balance | -.168\* | 1 |  |  |
| Organizational Justice | .094 | .013 | 1 |  |
| Glass Ceiling | .058 | .008 | .181\*\* | 1 |

\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

The results of correlation matrix show that there is a negative correlation between work/life balance issue and glass cliff, while there is a positive correlation between organizational justice and glass cliff in a business competitive environment. The correlation between glass ceiling and work/life balance is very weak but positive while there is a positive and significant correlation between glass ceiling and organizational justice. The important result is that glass cliff is affect by work/life balance issues while glass ceiling is affect by organizational justice. This result indicates some useful information for the feminist scholars to resolve work/life balance issues and organizational equity that would helpful to advance women career progress in business competitive environment. Table 5 shows the step-wise regression for glass ceiling equation to identify the main predictors that influence women advancement in an organization.

**Table 5: Step-Wise Regression**

| **Model** | | **Unstandardized Coefficients** | | **Standardized Coefficients** | **t-statistics** | **Sig.** | **Statistical Test** | | | **Collinearity Statistics** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **B** | **Std. Error** | **Beta** | **R-squared** | **Adjusted R-squared** | **F-statistics** | **Tolerance** | **VIF** |
| 1 | (Constant) | 3.291 | .342 | -------- | 9.626 | .000 | 0.214 | 0.189 | 0.012  (0.912) |  | |
| WLBI | .011 | .099 | .008 | .111 | .912 | --------- | 1.000 |
| 2 | (Constant) | 2.497 | .455 | -------- | 5.489 | .000 | 0.543 | 0.501 | 3.376  (0.036) |  | |
| WLBI | .008 | .098 | .005 | .078 | .938 | -------- | 1.000 |
| **OJ** | **.228** | **.088** | **.181** | **2.596** | **.010** | -------- | 1.000 |
| 3 | (Constant) | 2.359 | .503 | -------- | 4.692 | .000 | 0.443 | 0.399 | 2.385  (0.070) |  | |
| WLBI | .020 | .100 | .014 | .202 | .840 | .962 | 1.039 |
| **OJ** | **.231** | **.088** | **.183** | **2.626** | **.009** | .996 | 1.004 |
| AGE | .022 | .034 | .046 | .650 | .517 | .959 | 1.043 |
| 4 | (Constant) | 2.175 | .510 | -------- | 4.266 | .000 | 0.612 | 0.576 | 2.645  (0.035) |  | |
| WLBI | .011 | .099 | .008 | .110 | .913 | .960 | 1.042 |
| **OJ** | **.233** | **.087** | **.185** | **2.669** | **.008** | .996 | 1.004 |
| AGE | .023 | .034 | .048 | .673 | .502 | .959 | 1.043 |
| **EXP** | **.077** | **.042** | **.127** | **1.828** | **.069** | .997 | 1.003 |
| 5 | (Constant) | 2.190 | .510 | -------- | 4.289 | .000 | 0.599 | 0.575 | 2.267  (0.049) |  | |
| WLBI | .022 | .100 | .016 | .223 | .824 | .944 | 1.060 |
| **OJ** | **.232** | **.087** | **.184** | **2.649** | **.009** | .996 | 1.004 |
| AGE | .031 | .035 | .066 | .890 | .374 | .884 | 1.131 |
| **EXP** | **.084** | **.043** | **.138** | **1.958** | **.052** | .962 | 1.040 |
| INCOME | -.031 | .036 | -.064 | -.875 | .383 | .886 | 1.129 |
| 6 | (Constant) | 2.070 | .517 | -------- | 4.004 | .000 | 0.389 | 0.372 | 2.205  (0.044) |  | |
| WLBI | .013 | .100 | .009 | .132 | .895 | .939 | 1.064 |
| **OJ** | **.234** | **.087** | **.186** | **2.680** | **.008** | .995 | 1.005 |
| AGE | .033 | .035 | .069 | .932 | .352 | .883 | 1.132 |
| EXP | .072 | .044 | .118 | 1.638 | .103 | .920 | 1.086 |
| INCOME | -.028 | .036 | -.057 | -.770 | .442 | .880 | 1.136 |
| EDU | .065 | .048 | .097 | 1.360 | .175 | .947 | 1.056 |
| 7 | (Constant) | 2.135 | .532 | -------- | 4.010 | .000 | 0.380 | 0.352 | 1.923  (0.068) |  | |
| WLBI | .014 | .100 | .010 | .140 | .889 | .939 | 1.065 |
| **OJ** | **.229** | **.088** | **.182** | **2.604** | **.010** | .984 | 1.016 |
| AGE | .029 | .036 | .060 | .803 | .423 | .846 | 1.182 |
| EXP | .070 | .044 | .116 | 1.597 | .112 | .917 | 1.091 |
| INCOME | -.027 | .036 | -.055 | -.746 | .457 | .879 | 1.138 |
| EDU | .069 | .049 | .103 | 1.429 | .155 | .918 | 1.090 |
| MSTATUS | -.022 | .041 | -.038 | -.527 | .598 | .914 | 1.094 |

Note: Dependent Variable: Glass Ceiling (GCEIL). WLBI indicates work/life balance issues, OJ indicates organizational justice, AGE indicates women age, EXP indicates experience, INCOME indicates women income, EDU indicated education, and MSTATUS indicates marital status. Small bracket shows probability values. Bold values indicate significant parameter estimates.

Table 5 shows the estimate of step-wise regression and includes variables in regression apparatus one-by-one and found 7 regression models in which model 2 to model 7 clearly exhibit that organizational justice is the main predictor to influence glass ceiling, while, among demographic factors, only experience is a significant factor that derives glass ceiling effect on women advancement career in an organization. The result implies that organizational inequity increase glass ceiling effect that hinders the women advancement career, while women experience further tend to increase glass ceiling effect, as higher job experience does not transform in to increase the women job ranks toward managerial cadre that violate women right towards job promotion in an organization. The gender inequality in the labour market mainly produce due to organizational inequity, therefore, the organizational policies should be made in a way to give equal promotional opportunities for both men and women. The statistical tests confirmed the goodness-of-fit of the model as adjusted R-squared moving between minimum 18.9% to maximum 57.6% in seven prescribed models of glass ceiling. The F-statistics value, except model 1, confirmed the model stability, as F-statistics value significant at 5% in the models of 2, 4, 5, and 6, while it is significant at 10% level in the models of 3 and 7 respectively. The collinearity statistics confirmed that there is no such intercorrelations exists between the study variables as the tolerance value is in the range of 0 to 1, while VIF value is less than the value 10. These statistics confirmed that the parameter estimates obtained from step-wise regression is unbiased and robust by many statistical tests.

Table 6 shows the binary-logit regression for glass cliff effects and found that there is a negative relationship between work/life balance and glass cliff i.e., higher the work/life balance, lower is the glass cliff effect (i.e., lower is the turnover intention due to less capability of handling managerial tasks by women), while there is a positive relationship between marital status and glass cliff effects, which implies that marital status affects the women advancement career in terms of managing the tasks under their supervisory controls.

**Table 6: Estimates of Binary-Logit Regression**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Dependent Variable: GLASSCLIFF (GCLIFF) | | | |  |
| Method: ML - Binary Logit (OPG - BHHH / Marquardt steps) | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Variable | Coefficient | Std. Error | z-Statistic | Prob. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | -1.233 | 2.277 | -0.541 | 0.588 |
| OJ | 0.625 | 0.384 | 1.627 | 0.103 |
| **WLBI** | **-1.002** | **0.431** | **-2.320** | **0.020** |
| **MSTATUS** | **0.391** | **0.177** | **2.206** | **0.027** |
| AGE | 0.117 | 0.154 | 0.756 | 0.449 |
| EDU | 0.001 | 0.208 | 0.007 | 0.993 |
| **EXP** | **0.442** | **0.190** | **2.321** | **0.020** |
| **INCOME** | **-0.293** | **0.155** | **-1.891** | **0.058** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| LR statistic | 20.519 | Avg. log likelihood | | -0.560 |
| Prob(LR statistic) | 0.004 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Obs with Dep=0 | 142 | Total observations | | 203 |
| Obs with Dep=1 | 61 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Note: Dependent Variable: Glass Cliff (GCLIFF). WLBI indicates work/life balance issues, OJ indicates organizational justice, AGE indicates women age, EXP indicates experience, INCOME indicates women income, EDU indicated education, and MSTATUS indicates marital status. Bold values indicate significant parameter estimates.

Table 6 further reveal that women education have a direct relationship while women income has an indirect relationship with the glass cliff i.e., higher the women education, higher will be the intention to leave the organization due to factor mobilization of one place to another place for the sake of promotion to the next cadre, while women income tend to decrease the intention to leave the organization that supports to retain the job and perform their managerial tasks in efficient manners. The other factors including organizational justice, women age, and education does not explain significant impact on women advancement career in terms of glass cliff in the organization. The results further supported with different statistics tests that show in below the regression estimates for ready reference. Finally at the end of the Table 6, there is a statistics for glass cliff effects in which 142 women replied ‘no’ in terms of leaving the organization due to unable to manage supervisory control on the organization resources, while 61 women agreed the notion of glass cliff in an organization.

**4. Conclusions**

This study identified different factors that affects women advancement career either in the form of glass ceiling effect and/or glass cliff effects. The glass cliff effects based on dichotomous responses therefore, we used binary-logit regression technique and found that work/life balance issue and women’ income have a negative relationship, while marital status and job experience have a positive relationship with women advancement career. The glass ceiling effects is further analyzed by step-wise regression in order to minimize the chances of intercorrelations between the explanatory factors and found that organizational justice and women job experience both have a positive relationship with women advancement career in the form of glass ceiling effect. The overall results confirmed the importance of organizational justice, work/life balance issues and demographic factors in glass ceiling and glass cliff effects that give food-for-thoughts to the policy makers for review their existing feminists’ policies of gender equity on workplace and balanced their policies with equity and justice in an organizational setup. The women advancement policies need effective legislation by policy interventions to reduce gender wage gap and promote female educations in order to get better job opportunities in the labour market, which would helpful to handle managerial tasks efficiently as compared to their male counterpart. The ray of hope for next Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) to reduce gender inequality by glass ceiling and glass cliff effects would decide for our tomorrow’s future of women centric approach of prosperity and happiness in business competitive era.
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