Shattering the Glass Ceiling: Barriers and Breakthroughs for Women in Leadership

Muskaan Thakur

Assistant Professor, Chandigarh Group of Colleges Jhanjeri, Mohali - 140307, Punjab, India,
Department of Commerce, Chandigarh School of Business

Abstract

The under representation of women in executive roles in all professions is a persistent trend in the face of heightened awareness and efforts for gender equality. The literature review of women's success and woes of leadership, metaphorically referred to as the "glass ceiling," is provided in this article. Organizational and structural challenges in the guise of gender stereotyping, discriminatory behaviors, and lack of open channels of advancement continue to hinder the path ahead of women. These barriers are also supported by social and cultural expectations that maintain traditional gender identities and limit access to powerful networks and resources. Recent developments, however, bear testimony to the redemptive value of sponsorship, inclusive practice, mentoring, and empowered women's leadership in transcending barriers. Sector-specific differences and intersectional race and ethnicity considerations, which bear testimony to the multi-dimensionality of women's leadership experience, are also addressed. The article integrates the theoretical frameworks and the empirical evidence to give insight into effective factors for building gender-inclusive leadership. The article concludes by emphasizing the need for multi-dimensional interventions and further research to propel the empowerment of women towards leadership across the world.

Keywords

Glass Ceiling, Women in Leadership, Gender Barriers, Leadership Breakthroughs, Organizational Culture, Gender Diversity, Intersectionality, Gender Equality, Women Empowerment

Introduction

The last decades have witnessed the unprecedented streaming of women's participation in almost every corporate arena. Women are entering college in record numbers; women are entering previously male-dominated careers; women are exhibiting breathtaking leadership skills. All of this notwithstanding, however, is one nagging and infuriating issue still lingering in the background: women are still woefully underrepresented in top management and executive slots. This shortage has usually been explained in terms of the "glass ceiling" metaphor—a hidden, unpenetrable ceiling that hinders qualified and able women from accessing the upper echelons of organizational pyramids.

The "glass ceiling" was originally used in the 1980s to denote the hidden barriers that keep women from progressing to upper-management and executive ranks based on their competence, ability, and professional accomplishment. Unlike explicit discrimination, the glass ceiling hides behind cultures of organisations, social norms, and interpersonal relations and therefore prove elusive to

find and break. It is an intricate system of structural, cultural, and psychological barriers that collectively prevent women from advancing up the career ladder.

It is important to create the glass ceiling because leadership diversity is not just a social justice or equality concern, but an effectiveness and performance concern for the business. Time and time again, research has proven that gender-diverse leadership teams are more innovative, problem-solving, and robust in very uncertain business conditions. Diversity in leadership translates into more balanced decision-making and allows the business to reach more effectively to a broader customer and stakeholder base. Shattering the glass ceiling that faces women is therefore organizational strategic imperative in the cause of long-term success and survivability.

Although the value of gender diversity has been understood, the case is urgent. Latest global reports show that women occupy an insignificant proportion of CEO, board, and other high-level management roles in large corporations. World Economic Forum's Global Gender Gap Report consistently refers to the sluggish progress towards bridging the gap between females and leadership on a worldwide scale. Sluggish progress suggests that while legal and policy tools favoring gender equality have expanded, underlying cultural and structural obstacles remain.

Structural Barriers in Organizations

Structural barriers are the organization's official as well as unofficial practices, rules, and procedures that inadvertently or intentionally keep women from making a transition to leadership roles. They involve discriminatory recruitment and promotion processes. They also include unequal career development opportunities, lack of family-friendly policies. For example, most organizations rely significantly on traditional factors of leadership fit that privilege masculine traits or condone career disruption typical of women brought about by care work.

Besides that, sponsorship arrangements and social networks have also been handled by men, thus reducing women's opportunities to be the center and obtain instrumental sponsorships to serve as chief leaders. Vague promotion routes and middle-of-the-road evaluation become additional structural obstacles as well. Such system conditions are augmented by organizational cultures willing to tolerate hidden discrimination or subtle bias, which are resistant to the advance of women in spite of talent.

Studies have indicated that such an organisational structure with strict hierarchies and rules has a lesser percentage of women at higher levels of employment. It thus needs reformulation of policy and the creation of a new organisational culture, promotion criteria, and leadership development initiatives.

Cultural and Societal Barriers

Social and cultural exclusion of women from leadership also encompasses more overall social values, gender role assumption, and gender convention on women's leadership desire outside the workplace. Women are frequently in most societies only responsible for household work like raising children and taking care of elderly members of their families and are therefore not available for demanding leadership jobs with long working hours or travel.

These standards then create office bias, where women are not as committed or inferior leaders just because they are women. Legal or social constraints in some societies also limit women's mobility, education, or involvement in the labor market, further extending the glass ceiling.

Apart from this, intersectionality brings more complexity in the issue by showing how the experience of women varies based on race, ethnicity, class, and other social identities. Minority background women, for instance, may face multiple discrimination, and this brings more complexity in their leadership process.

These social and cultural constraints are very important to understand because organisational interventions are insufficient in breaking strongly rooted social norms. Social change through policy change and education needs to create a context in which women's leadership can get traction.

Mentorship, Sponsorship, and Networking as Breakthroughs

Networking, sponsorship, and mentorship were also strong enablers in helping women to avoid or go around the glass ceiling. Mentorship is where top leaders provide advice, guidance, and support to women and assist them in acquiring leadership competence and self-confidence.

Sponsorship goes one step further by engaging the top leaders who not only advocate for the growth of women but also nominate them for high-risk ventures and grant access to influential networks. The two distinctions between sponsors and mentors are that, whereas mentors counsel, sponsors fight on behalf of women to get things done.

Both informal and formal networking are also required. Women's participation in leadership networks, affinity groups, and professional associations provides women with opportunities for contact with role models, peer support, and strategic information. These advantages surpass isolation and exclusion from "old boys' networks" that are likely to exclude women.

The companies that have sponsorship and mentoring schemes and women's networks have sustained larger percentages of women at the top-management levels. Such arrangements not only empower women, but they also transform the organizational culture to become more inclusive.

Literature Review

The "glass ceiling" term is figurative, and it refers to the invisible yet strong barriers which deter women from advancing to senior levels of leadership roles even when their competence and skill are equal to those of their counterparts. This is happening globally as well as across industries and remains a current research concern in organizational and management literature. Over the last two decades, considerable scholarly research has explored the complex character of such barriers and progress made by women in leadership positions throughout history.

Structural and Organizational Barriers
The overarchingly salient theme in the literature is the identification and examination of structural barriers within organizations that discourage the career advancement of women. Diehl and Dzubinski (2016) suggest ways organizational cultures enable gendered norms and practices

partially but affirmatively excluding women from streams of leadership. These structural obstacles take the form of practices and policies such as recruitment biases, invisibility of certain promotion criteria, and absence of functional work-life balance support structures. Glass and Cook (2016) explain how such organizational practices are legitimized in terms of deeply ingrained gender stereotypes appreciating male leadership traits of assertiveness and decisiveness above female virtues of cooperation and empathy.

We cannot overestimate the unconscious role here. Cook and Glass (2014) argue that even sincerely well-meaning leaders unknowingly perpetuate gender discrimination through deeply ingrained stereotypes and assumptions. For example, female leaders will be called upon to embody assertiveness, in a "double bind" situation where assertiveness is penalized when it is against feminine gender norms (Diehl & Dzubinski, 2023). Such biases creep into decision making at all levels—from the time of recruitment to succession planning—creating a leadership deficit which will not be filled.

Cultural and Societal Factors
Beyond organizational limits, cultural and societal influences have an impact on women as leaders. Tlaiss and Kauser (2010, 2011) give an even-handed description of the Middle Eastern setting, in which religious gender values and social norms strictly limit professional ambitions for women. Limitations are typically expressed in terms of constraints such as low mobility, primary caregiving role, and reliance on social networks ("wasta") that penalize women in the absence of men's support. Stephenson, Dzubinski, and Diehl (2022) assume it as a premise and a premise that those cultural considerations cut across organizational boundaries and snowball barriers for women.

Its intersection with ethnicity and race makes it even more complex for the development of women's leadership. Double whammy faced by women of color in the struggle against gender and race discrimination to serve as CEOs or board members is seen by Glass and Cook (2014). Intersectionality also concerns multiple levels of practices and strategies being required in diversity and inclusion activities.

Role of Mentoring, Sponsorship, and Networks
Still another revolutionary area the study ushered in is the instrumental role sponsorship, mentoring, and career networks have in the creation of women's leadership. Diehl (2013) finds that successful women leaders who are able to rise through the leadership step utilize close mentoring relationships as a tool for buffering them from organizational politics and building credibility. Such networks provide access to information, counsel, and patronage that is unofficial but can accelerate career progress. Cook and Glass (2015) document evidence that gender-balanced boards of organizations have more robust mentoring arrangements and are able to promote women into top positions.

In addition, Stephenson, Diehl, Dzubinski, McErlean, and Huppertz (2022) describe that women leaders would construct and preserve webs of resilience and empowerment networks, especially in male-dominated workplaces. The spaces of protection are where women can share their experiences, establish leadership, and battle system reforms.

Sectoral and Contextual Variations

While some of the literature concerns corporate leadership, women's challenges and achievement in leadership differ sectorally and contextually. Howe-Walsh and Turnbull (2016) study women STEM academic leaders and find an entrenched "chilly climate" in which women are excluded from informal networks and questioned as to whether they can do the job. Likewise, Giglia and Smith (2024) study Catholic higher education, where institutional and religious culture intersect to create unique barriers to women's leadership, and find that gender bias is not limited to corporate or secular contexts.

The medical industry also has the same complex picture. Stephenson et al. (2022) depict how even in typically female careers such as medicine, women are trapped in junior leadership roles and still endure discrimination, refuting the belief that equality is quantitative equality.

Entrepreneurship nowadays is challenge and challenge for women who want to become leaders outside traditional corporate contexts. Tlaiss (2015) analyzes Islamic business ethics' impact on Middle Eastern women entrepreneurs, between religious duties and economic autonomy aspirations. These entrepreneurs face ever-greater challenges in securing capital, working within gendered environments, and acquiring legitimacy. Social capital's contribution to the avoidance of these challenges is highlighted by Tlaiss and Kauser (2011), to whom family and community hold key positions.

Literature also identifies that women leaders are drawn to CSR and ethical leadership. Cook and Glass (2016, 2018) argue that women managers will emphasize sustainability even more, and this will be to the advantage of societies and organizations. Such an ethical focus may result in organizational health culture and better stakeholder relations.

Policy and Institutional Interventions

Others advocate for intervention to shatter the glass ceiling. Women leadership development training courses supplemented with confidence building, building resilience, and strategic networking are suggested by Diehl and Dzubinski (2018). Open promotion channels and gender quotas have also been seen to increase the number of women (Cook & Glass, 2015).

Giglia (2023) maintains that institutional reforms must meet the challenge of cultural change, especially within religious and traditional institutions. If not modifying underlying norms and values, policy reforms are tokenism and not genuine inclusion.

Broader Impacts and Future Directions

The research body confirms evidence that breaking the glass ceiling is a strategic imperative as well as a women's issue with long-term implications. Gender diversity in organisations and leadership is associated with better decision-making, innovation, as well as ethical leadership (Cook & Glass, 2018). Gender-diverse leadership also sends a signal of commitment to equality that improves organisational reputation and as well as acquiring diversified talent.

Lastly, literature suggests a complex landscape on which women still face deep-seated structural, cultural, and interpersonal obstacles. Development in the making—through mentorship, reform of

policy, leadership through ethics, and resilience—suggests pathways to shattering the glass ceiling. Ongoing scholarship must focus on intersectionality, sector dynamics, and intervention efficacy to advance women into leadership across the world.

Theoretical Framework

The chronic underrepresentation of women in the upper echelons of leadership is a complex phenomenon in need of a robust theoretical framework to properly understand. Three fundamental theories—Social Role Theory, Role Congruity Theory, and Intersectionality—provide significant explanations of the social, psychological, and structural explanations for the existence and sustainability of the glass ceiling. These theories combined provide the explanation for why gendered assumptions, stereotypes, and intersectional identities present barriers to women seeking to take up high leadership roles.

Social Role Theory, first proposed by Eagly (1987), proposes gender difference in social behavior and social roles is caused mainly by learned expectations from culture of what men and women should do. Women have been homemakers and caretakers throughout history with men as decision-makers and breadwinners. These ascriptions establish generalized gender norms—just as the expectations of women being cooperative, social, and caring, men are routinely described as forceful, competitive, and agentic. Leadership is commonly simplified to a personality, and most typically equated with agentic strengths of decisiveness, dominance, and confidence, strengths more conventionally linked with male roles. These women leaders are therefore found to be breaching their assumed roles socially, evoking discomfort or opposition from decision-makers and peers. Socialization at organizational and individual levels thus creates perception, constricting the movement of women into leadership roles and solidifying the glass ceiling. The theory therefore offers an explanation of how gender roles get socially constructed and how such constructions affect leadership opportunity and expectation.

Subsequent to this, Role Congruity Theory (Eagly & Karau, 2002) posits that the psychological underpinning for why women are confronted with special challenge in competing for leadership roles. According to it, prejudice emerges where there is a discrepancy between female gender role and the role-embedded traits of a leader. Women are considered inappropriate leaders because leadership traits (e.g., competitiveness, assertiveness) clash with social definitions of femininity (e.g., submissiveness, warmth). This creates two types of bias: descriptive bias, in which women are less likely to be seen as having leadership traits, and prescriptive bias, in which women who do have leadership traits are socially penalized for being outside gender scripts. This leaves women in a "double bind"—if they act stereotypically feminine, they will appear weaker leaders; if they act more agentic, masculine, they will appear abrasive or unlikeable. Role Congruity Theory therefore places the glass ceiling as a result of ingrained stereotypes and evaluative biases that limit women's career path and measure of leadership quality.

The Intersectionality theory, as termed by Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989), supplements the critical analysis by bringing into context that women's lives are diverse. Intersectionality captures the fact that gender intersects with other social classifications of identity like race, ethnicity, class, sexual orientation, and disability, and this leads to varied and sophisticated patterns of privilege and oppression. For instance, women of color could be experiencing intersecting discrimination both

on the basis of sexism and racism at the same time, and lower-income women might face additional access- and resource-based barriers. This approach points to the simple male/female leadership dichotomy and encourages us to consider the glass ceiling more dimensionally and to think in multiple dimensions of identity. Intersectionality also shows how structural disadvantage within society—apart from attitudes—perpetuates gender barriers to women, especially women in disadvantaged groups. It is urging researchers and practitioners to use inclusive methods that recognize these intersecting aspects of disadvantage rather than recognizing gender as a monolithic entity.

Together, the theories collectively present an unbroken conceptualization of our knowledge of the glass ceiling. Social Role Theory and Role Congruity Theory identify the cognitive, social, and cultural discrimination on which gendered leadership presumption and organizational exclusion of women from leadership is based. They illustrate how gendered presumptions both condition the supply (women's aspirations and behavior) and demand (organizational mind-set and judgments)
sides of leadership choice and development. Intersectionality accomplishes this vision by context place these hindrances in a wider socio-political context, and recognizing women's experience and the intersecting hindrances that converge and enhance the glass ceiling phenomenon.

With the help of these theories, the glass ceiling is no longer conceived of as a flat, undifferentiated, monolithic force but as an interdimensional, multi-level force
hinged on social expectation, psychological bias, and intersectional identity. This theory model enables us to segment in exquisite detail finer-than-fine both the enduring barriers facing women and the advances won through policy reform, organizational change, and social movements. It calls for multilayer intervention not only aimed at gender stereotypes but also at structural inequalities and intersectionality to contribute to the building of leadership spaces that are inclusive in the truest sense.

Discussion

The study site surveys give one a general and prospective view of the multilevel barriers which face women as they strive for executive roles. This is an inclusive assembly of barriers, not one that has existence only in formal organization policy but also in day-to-day social fabric and cultural norms of regular workplaces. Stereotypes between leadership and stereotypically masculine qualities of assertiveness, decisiveness, and competitiveness are powerful inhibitions for women. This gendered language restrains women from occupying leadership positions by producing gendered assumptions about their competence and fitness for top jobs. Even when women possess such leadership traits, they would be censored or socially excluded for deviating from typical gender norms, a practice regularly legitimized as the "double bind." This unstoppable but nefarious force resists the removal of the glass ceiling in the face of increasing awareness of gender equality.

Organizational cultures and systems that reconfirm such biases through processes that unintentionally benefit men are also described in literature. Staffing, promotion, and performance reviews are typically subtle processes of sponsorship and informal networks that consistently

disadvantage women systematically. Lack of mentors and sponsors who take trips and open doors for women perpetuates the cycle.

Additionally, continuous efforts to balance work and caregiving obligations to society and families unevenly disadvantage women, and consequently, they are less available and perceived to be less committed to leadership positions. Such intersecting barriers accumulate cumulatively to form a cumulative disadvantage where women encounter multiple, interlocking barriers rather than one.

One of the reflection learning spaces in the literature is that the glass ceiling phenomenon is differential but strongly contextual and intersecting based on social identity and locations. Intersectionality acknowledges that women leaders' careers are affected by additive gender, race, ethnicity, socio-economic standing, and other social factors. Women of color in general are subject to a "double jeopardy" of gender and racial bias that generally result in greater marginalization and lesser opportunities for them than they would have as white equivalents. Similarly, women with lower socio-economic backgrounds experience special problems regarding limited access to education and professional networks. These common experiences highlight that attempts at gender equity must move beyond one template solution if they are going to be in a position to properly address the special barriers of diverse groups of women.

Organizational and cultural setting also has significant roles to play in framing the barriers and breakthroughs of women. Professions which are traditionally male, e.g., engineering, technology, and finance, have more gender bias and fewer models, thus making it even harder for women to break through to the top levels. Conversely, more feminized sectors such as education and healthcare have more diverse leadership cultures but are unable to achieve representative gender ratios at an executive level. Attitudes within cultures towards gender roles vary immensely by nation and also between nations. Gender stereotyping is more heavily embedded and culturally rooted within certain groups of patriarchal societies, drastically limiting the women's leadership capabilities and relegating them to subordination in public as well as domestic life.

Follow-up studies should further contribute to our body of knowledge by researching the experience of these under-represented groups of women, i.e. those with non-dominant ethnicities, lower socio-economic status, and non-Western cultures. Longitudinal studies would be particularly desirable so that the long-term impact of various types of intervention and shifts in culture on the leadership trajectories of women could be quantified. Also, fresh research on the work of male allies confirms the ability of men to be a part of shattering the glass ceiling by turning gender presumptions on their head and arming gender equity at firms. Continued development along this research track can offer valuable insights for ancillary efforts towards inclusive leadership.

Overall, the literature portrays a landscape where women's leadership is slowly making progress but is still limited by foundation and multiplex barriers. Such changes as do occur are stimulating and instructive but also demonstrate the multiplicity and adhesiveness of future challenges. In pursuit of achieving true gender balance at leadership levels, there must be consistent, intersectional, and inclusive efforts consolidating all interests, from independent organizations to societal institutions. It is only through such sustained collective efforts that the glass ceiling can be

shattered in its whole, opening the way to leadership that truly showcases the full diversity of talent and vision within our societies.

Conclusion

This systematic review of literature has the intention to highlight the deeply embedded, widespread, and intricate obstacles facing women on the leadership path. And even with the progress made over the last two decades, the "glass ceiling" metaphor is still an evocative imagery of the constraint of strongly entrenched gender biases, structural holes, and cultural norms. Women's representation in leadership trails that of men globally, fueled not only by organizational and personal obstacles as well as more inner intersectional and social ones that worsen problems proportionally more for women of marginalized identities. The studies included
verify that such barriers are interlinked, with a combined effect that discourages women from advancing irrespective of talent or will. Secondly, the review adds that the glass ceiling cannot be thought of as a single obstacle but as an area of problems to be resolved en masse.

Breaking the Glass Ceiling

Shattering the glass ceiling is not just a means to maintaining gender equity but also has some long-term implications on corporate performance and social progress. Fact in various studies time and again shows that female-inclusive leadership teams enhance problem-solving ability, innovativeness, and profitability. Businesses that build women leaders build more divergent thinking, enhanced representation of divergent customer bases, and enhanced image. In addition to organizational benefit, breaking the glass ceiling is a call to women professional winners to come to see that leadership positions are within reach for anyone, including women. Such a cultural change is capable of transforming ideas and assumptions regarding the workplace, allowing eradication of stereotype and prejudice which have conditioned so much regarding what actually represents "effective" leadership. Therefore, the glass ceiling is not an individual barrier but a social one that needs to be tackled by mass, systemic change.

Effective Strategies for Overcoming Obstacles

Literature also identifies a couple of effective interventions that have been proved to be effective for the purpose of overcoming women leaders' barriers. Sponsorship and mentorship interventions are critical interventions that offer women exposure to models, champions, and critical networks informally available to men. These relationships provide women career advancement visibility and sponsorship. Women-only leadership development programmes have been equally effective in providing women organizational politics, negotiation skills, and enhancing confidence levels. Policy reforms such as gender quotas, family-friendly work practices, work time flexibility, and parental leave have proven to be effective in suppressing structural restraints, particularly work-life balance constraints. Besides, attempts to shatter unconscious bias via training and creating a work culture that incorporates persons from diverse backgrounds help create spaces where women's contributions count and are valued.

But it is to be remembered that these programs need to be ongoing and need to be organizational culture to avoid tokenism. Systemic change and not fragmentary programs are necessary for successful change. Intersectional strategies are especially needed, realizing women's experiences

are highly varied depending on race, ethnicity, income level, and other identities. Programs that succeed for one might fail for another, indicating the need for targeted interventions.

References
1. Cook, A., & Glass, C. (2014). Women and top leadership positions: Towards an institutional analysis. *Gender, Work & Organization, 21*(1), 91–103.
2. Cook, A., & Glass, C. (2015). Diversity begets diversity? The effects of board composition on the appointment and success of women CEOs. *Social Science Research, 53*, 137–147.
3. Cook, A., & Glass, C. (2016). Do women leaders promote sustainability? Analyzing the effect of corporate governance composition on environmental performance. *Business Strategy and the Environment, 25*(7), 495–511.
4. Cook, A., & Glass, C. (2018). Women on corporate boards: Do they advance corporate social responsibility? *Human Relations, 71*(7), 897–924.
5. Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory, and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum, 1989*(1), 139–167.
6. Diehl, A. B. (2013). *Making meaning of adversity: Experiences of women leaders in higher education* (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University of Pennsylvania).
7. Diehl, A. B., & Dzubinski, L. M. (2016). Making the invisible visible: A cross-sector analysis of gender-based leadership barriers. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 27*(2), 181–206.
8. Diehl, A. B., & Dzubinski, L. M. (2018). Navigating adversity, barriers, and obstacles. In *Women and Leadership in Higher Education* (pp. 135–150).
9. Diehl, A. B., & Dzubinski, L. M. (2023). *Glass walls: Shattering the six gender bias barriers still holding women back at work*. Rowman & Littlefield.
10. Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
11. Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review, 109*(3), 573–598. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.109.3.573

12. Glass, C., & Cook, A. (2014). Above the glass ceiling: When are women and racial/ethnic minorities promoted to CEO? *Strategic Management Journal, 35*(7), 1080–1089.
13. Glass, C., & Cook, A. (2016). Leading at the top: Understanding women's challenges above the glass ceiling. *The Leadership Quarterly, 27*(1), 51–63.
14. Glass, C., & Cook, A. (2018). Do women leaders promote positive change? Analyzing the effect of gender on business practices and diversity initiatives. *Human Resource Management, 57*(4), 823–837.
15. Giglia, N. (2023). *The stained glass ceiling: Women college presidents in a Catholic higher education context* (Doctoral dissertation, Seton Hall University).
16. Giglia, N., & Smith, K. N. (2024). Breaking the stained-glass ceiling: The gendered experiences of women college presidents of Catholic institutions. *Journal of Women and Gender in Higher Education, 17*(3), 223–244.
17. Howe-Walsh, L., & Schyns, B. (2010). Self-initiated expatriation: Implications for HRM. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 21*(2), 260–273.

18. Howe-Walsh, L., & Turnbull, S. (2016). Barriers to women leaders in academia: Tales from science and technology. *Studies in Higher Education, 41*(3), 415–428.

19. Stephenson, A. L., Diehl, A. B., & Dzubinski, L. M. (2022). Research: How bias against women persists in female-dominated workplaces. *Harvard Business Review*.

20. Stephenson, A. L., Diehl, A. B., Dzubinski, L. M., McErlean, M., & Huppertz, J. (2022). An exploration of gender bias affecting women in medicine. *Journal of Women's Health, 31*(3), 234–242.

21. Stephenson, A. L., Dzubinski, L. M., & Diehl, A. B. (2022). A cross-industry comparison of how women leaders experience gender bias. *Personnel Review, 52*(1), 145–165.

22. Tlaiss, H. A. (2014). Women's entrepreneurship, barriers and culture: Insights from the United Arab Emirates. *The Journal of Entrepreneurship, 23*(2), 289–320.

23. Tlaiss, H. A. (2015). How Islamic business ethics impact women entrepreneurs: Insights from four Arab Middle Eastern countries. *Journal of Business Ethics, 129*(4), 859–877.

24. Tlaiss, H. A., & Kauser, S. (2010). Perceived organizational barriers to women's career advancement in Lebanon. *Gender in Management: An International Journal, 25*(6), 462–496.

25. Tlaiss, H. A., & Kauser, S. (2011). The impact of gender, family, and work on the career advancement of Lebanese women managers. *Gender in Management: An International Journal, 26*(1), 8–36.

26. Tlaiss, H. A., & Kauser, S. (2011). The importance of wasta in the career success of Middle Eastern managers. *Journal of European Industrial Training, 35*(5), 467–486.

27. Ryan, M. K., & Haslam, S. A. (2005). The glass cliff: Evidence that women are over-represented in precarious leadership positions. *British Journal of Management, 16*(2), 81–90.

28. Ryan, M. K., Haslam, S. A., Morgenroth, T., Rink, F., Stoker, J., & Peters, K. (2016). Getting on top of the glass cliff: Reviewing a decade of evidence, explanations, and impact. *The Leadership Quarterly, 27*(3), 446–455.