Career Progression of Women Executives across Demographic Variables in Service Sector of India

[1]Rajesh Siwach,[2] Shabnam Saxena

[1]Research Scholar Haryana School of Business

Guru Jambheswar University of Sciences & Technology Hisar-125001

Haryana, India

Email Id: rsiwach6@gmail.com

[2]Professor Haryana School of Business

Guru Jambheswar University of Sciences & Technology Hisar-125001

Haryana, India

Email Id: shabnamsaxena@gmail.com

Abstract-This study explores the demographic factors regarding the career progression of women executives and unveiling barriers related to women career progression, focusing on sectors viz., education, banking, health and IT and insurance. By using descriptive-cum- explorative research design, data of 400 female executives across four metropolitan cities (Delhi, Pune, Hyderabad and Bangalore) is collected. Structured questionnaire with 25 statements of five point scale has been used to collect data. Twenty five statements capture into six factors viz Organizational Encouragement, Masculine Culture, Managerial Aspiration, Family Support, Mentoring, and Insensitive policy and three statements capture demographic profile of respondents. ANOVA is used to depict the demographic variables across career progression. The findings revealed that career development of women executives are significantly influenced by organizational encouragement, masculine culture, managerial aspiration, family support, mentoring, and insensitive policy. The study emphasizes the critical role of demographic factors played in either conserving or deconstructing the cultural and structural impediments that restrict women's career advancement. This study offers valuable understanding for developing strategies to promote women executives career progression within the service sector.

Introduction

From past few years many studies were conducted on gender diversity and females' career progression. Majority of research focused on females on board and upper management team, but there is no specific sector had been covered (Das, & Jha, 2024). Indian service sector viz., education, finance, healthcare, and hospitality, engage a considerable number of females. Despite considerable number of female employees, women are markedly less represented in top management. This imbalance brings an examination of the beliefs and attitude of male leaders, who primarily hold these top positions (Dhingra, & Singh, 2022).

In recent decades, there has been rise in the countless highly educated women professionals across different sectors. Since the late 20th century, many female employees have joined the career occupation. Skilled women workforce in India had increased (Ramli et al., 2016). This happened due to advancement in the education system, technology, higher awareness, innovative techniques and an increase in standard

of living. All these facilitates them to travel out and choose their career opportunities. Indian female employees are engaged and employed, they must work hard for recognition by their colleagues, superior and their society (Shalini, 2024). These perceptions give broad understanding of systemic barriers faced by females and recognize opportunities to increase women role in leadership. Male leader's attitude and belief play an important role in creating the workplace culture and affecting the career development of women executives, specifically in the service sector. Researchers often highlight the "glass ceiling" as the main barrier to women's advancement, traditional narratives propose that a "sticky floor" may be more significant, where women advance to middle management further development unsuitably difficult than their male counterparts (Schnarr, 2012). Research continuously shows that divergent teams have innovation, gender diversity, creativeness and boost overall organizations performance. Barriers like lack of mentorship opportunities, limited access to executive roles and work life balance challenges impede women's development (Lakshmidevi & Geetha, 2024). These hurdles are mainly composed of differences in leadership styles and gender socialization, as male and female experience leadership through different lenses (Budworth & Mann, 2010). Men are often perceived to have traits commonly related with managerial success like assertiveness, competitiveness and ambition (Kumar & Patel, 2023). These rooted perceptions play a part in the under-representation of female in top leadership roles, as females mainly face high benchmarks for promotion and see more critically during recruitment and performance evaluations. Research shows that male superiors mainly rate women staff lower in leadership capability, specifically in male-dominated industries (Bosak & Sczesny, 2011). Likewise female must continuously outdo men to be judged for promotions, as the benchmarks for their career development got illiberal (Lyness & Heilman, 2006). In performance assessment, while women staff may be perceived for their positive characteristics, but they are repeatedly assigned more negative attributes compared to their men counterparts (Smith et al., 2019). Female are viewed more praising when their roles highlight communal and nurturing qualities whereas males are rated highly effective when leadership roles line up with masculine traits (Eagly et al., 1995). This gendered bias creates a "double bind" for females, where they are essential to balance both communal (caring, empathetic) and agnatic (authoritative, assertive) qualities (Zheng et al., 2018).

This study seeks to extensively examine how different demographic factors impacts the career progression of women executives in the service sector of India.

By examining the perspective of female leaders, the research aims to exhibit the structural challenges, cultural norms and underlying biases that may restrict female's opportunities for leadership. Acknowledging these dynamics is necessary for developing strategies that encourage gender equality in leadership and equitable work environment where both women and men can improve. Through a clear exploration of these factors, the study features the critical role of various demographic factors in either dismantling or perpetuating the barriers female face in their career development within the service sector.

Review of Literature

Research highlights those females in male-dominated profession such as engineering and IT face crucial barriers to leadership roles, mainly need them to outdo their male counterparts to advance. Even with these accomplishments, their efforts continuously ignored or under- appreciated (Clerc & Kels, 2013). The inequality in leadership frequently shows the under- representation of females in senior positions, specifically in the service sector. According to Dhingra and Singh (2022), in spite of policies aimed at encouraging gender equality, female still face a 'glass ceiling' that restrict their development to top management roles. This happening is carry on by gender stereotypes that support male leaders, and restrain opportunities for female leaders (Goyal & Gupta, 2023). However, there is increase in female participation in various sectors, still they are unable to continue their career for long run or move to senior positions. Attitude of society toward females are still same as earlier. This attitude results in increase in workplace barriers faced by females (Mohaley & Srivastava, 2025). Sinha and Raj (2023) shows that male leaders often associate females with roles requiring communication skills and empathy, which are mainly not related with leadership positions. This concept can hinder women's access to top management roles and increase gender seclusion within organizations. Male leader may play a part in this invisibility through ineffective implementation of policies intended to address gender inequality. These discrepancies result

in a separation between corporate values and gender equity, enabling masculine cultures to carry on (Galea et al., 2020). Such cultures also continue male leaders to manage control through unethical conduct,including harassment, which further restrict female career progression (Powell & Sang, 2015). Bhattacharya and Saxena (2022) state that traditional gender roles are mainly require women to focus family responsibilities above their professional goals, resulting in restricted growth opportunities. Female and male leaders' perceptions are mainly established through a gendered disparity, effecting evaluation of female employees. Leadership roles often defined by masculine traits like competitiveness and assertiveness tend to outcome in male leaders being assess more effective (Mukherjee, 2022). Male leaders may recognize female as less qualified of handling leadership roles, which strengthen the existing gender inequality in leadership positions (Verma & Srivastava, 2023). Female leaders are perceived more positively when leadership highlights communal qualities such as cooperation and empathy. Male leaders perceived these characteristics as less related with traditional assumptions of leadership, which can affect their opinion on female leadership capabilities (Heilman & Okimoto, 2007). The "double-bind" challenge locates female leaders in tough positions, where females are expected to show both communal and agnatic characteristics. Females must improve authoritative and demanding behaviors with caring (Zheng et al., 2018). Where male leaders may outlook this as a weakness, that hindering female leaders' development, mainly in top management, where female leaders are seen on the basis of social and professional competence (Steffens & Mehl, 2003). Successful female leaders at the upper positions are perceived by their opposite counterparts as symbolizing both communal and agentic traits, shows higher expectations for them than male leaders (Rosette & Tost, 2010). In terms of office policies, male leaders also hold negative views of flexible work settings and parental leave, observing them as unfavorable to women's career progression. As a result, females are unwilling to take advantage of these practices due to fears of impeded advancement (Huppatz et al., 2018). HR policies for women career progression have been mattering of interest in gender diversity and leadership research. Organisations who have bias free hiring procedure give equal chance to females to enter in the executive level. Bias free hiring can be done through obligatory diversity hiring and blind resume review. Females who have consistent mentorship are exposed to less organizational barriers (Aggrawal et al., 2025). Informal office norms, continuously reinforced by male leaders, leads to females experiencing partiality when gaining these benefits (Galea et al., 2020). Male leaders' prejudice sometimes shared by female employees can preserve informal work enviornment that disadvantage women and impede their return to the personnel and hinder career development (Begeny et al., 2020). Behavior of male leaders for female executive's career development are shaped by fixed office norms and insensible biases. Women may need to develop resilience to succeed in male-dominated industries. Structural changes within

workplace are essential to dismantle these traditional masculine practices (Vries & Brink, 2016). Khilji and Pumroy (2018) suggested that organizations should evolve to encourage more inclusive environments for female leaders to thrive themselves. Male leaders should play an important role in this growth by cooperating with female, they can reshape the dominant masculine environment that currently impede female career development (Vries, 2015). These results are harmonious with the findings of Subramaniam et al., (2013) for examine the relationship between demographic variable and women managers' career progression, who found that age, marital status, job level have important relationship with female managers' career progression. This is due to married women are highly pressurized and more responsible than unmarried women. Their career is highly influenced because of discouragement, demotivation from their colleagues and superiors and lack of support from their family and society. Women workforce face difficulties due to unfair nature of policies implemented by their organizations.

Women are progressively occupying high-ranking positions in organisations; however, study has produced mixed results about their impact on gender equality in the workplace they manage. We aimed to shatter new ground in the negotiator change literature by showing how power experienced by women in the highest workplace positions during their role socialization shape their impact on gender equality in organizations (Wiersma et al., 2025)

Research objective

1. To analyse the career progression of women executives across age, education qualification and working experience.

Demographic profile of respondents Table 1: Demographic Profile

Demographic Variables	No. of Respondents	Percentage
Age (in yrs.)		
Less than 25	79	19.75
25-35	166	41.5
35-45	55	13.75
45-55	57	14.25
Above 55	43	10.75
Total	400	100
Education Qualification		
Graduate	124	31
Post Graduate	105	26.25
M.Phil/ Ph.D	80	20
Others	91	22.75
Total	400	100
Working Experience (in yrs.)		
Less than 2.5	78	19.5
2.5-5	99	24.75
5-10	183	45.75
More than 10	40	10
Total	400	100

Research methodology

This research used a descriptive-cum-explorative methodology to explore the demographic factors about the career progression of women executives in service sector of India. The population target includes senior management executives from five sectors viz., education, banking, health, IT and insurance sectors of India. The sample was drawn through a multistage random sampling technique to choose metropolitan cities. Purposive sampling technique was used to select related organizations for the study. The sampling includes four major metropolitan cities viz., Pune, Delhi, Hyderabad and Bangalore with a set of 100 female respondents per city. 20 female respondents were targeted from each sector in one metropolitan city, amounting total sample as 400. Data was collected through self-structured questionnaire comprises 25 statements.

Data Analysis

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and one way ANOVA are used to achieve the research objective of the study. In the context of examining women career progression, 25 variables of different factors have been used to provide deep insight into how female employees views different direction of women's career

progression in executive roles. EFA was applied on 25 statements of self-structured questionnaire of the study. After applying EFA, six factors were extracted from 25 statements. Profiling of these 25 statements is given below.

Table 2: Profiling of Career Progression of Women Executives Scale

Codes	Statements
CPW1	I like how my company appreciates women to assume leadership positions by offering them challenging assignments
CPW2	I believe the organization's human resources policy is just and provides everyone with an equal opportunity to advance within the company based on merit

Codes	Statements
CPW3	I feel, the organization's bureaucratic structure is indifferent to the distinct demands of women managers
CPW4	I think that the pay system, which is based on "equal pay for equal labor," motivates me to pursue advancement
CPW5	Despite being legal, I believe that maternity leave is seen as a negative for the company since it permits extended absences from the workplace
CPW6	In the specialized training programme for female managers, I learn better
CPW7	The organizational structure, in my observation, favors male hierarchy
CPW8	In order for me to pursue advancement, I would like the company to implement family-friendly policies like crèches, boarding schools, and senior care facilities
CPW9	To assist me in planning my career, I search for mentors within the company
CPW10	I encounter the normal masculine opposition in informal networks
CPW11	Within the next five years, I hope to hold a position of more significance
CPW12	I believe I have the same potential as males to hold high managerial Positions
CPW13	I believe that male superiors are favored by subordinates and colleagues than female superiors, which inhibited me from pursuing advancement
CPW14	My family gives ample support to balance work and family obligations

CPW15	I am trying to develop a working style that will suits superiors
CPW16	I look for alternatives to develop managerial experience
CPW17	My supporting spouse, I believe, is a terrific facilitator for my professional Development
CPW18	I believe having a family or non-family caregiver available is a tremendous facilitator for work advancement
CPW19	Regarding professional recognition, I believe my goals are very high
CPW20	I believe that the transfer-related promotion policy discourages women from pursuing promotions

CPW21	Compensatory offs seem to be used more in rule books than in actual practice, in my opinion
CPW22	I favor organizations that assist women in integrating their many responsibilities and bringing themselves together
CPW23	I suggest that the company should implement a structured mentorship Programme
CPW24	I think, my desire to pursue advancement is stifled by the aggressive leadership styles promoted by the male culture
CPW25	I am appreciative for the informal mentors who have helped me develop the necessary abilities to take on more responsibility in my life

Source: Primary Data

Table 3: Sampling Adequacy Result

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.831
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	10491.053
	Df	300
	Sig.	.000

Source: Primary Data

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sampling Adequacy is 0.831, indicating that the sample is adequate for conducting factor analysis. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity has a Chi-Square value of 10491.053 with 300 degrees of freedom and a significance level (Sig.) of 0.000, suggesting that the correlations between items are sufficiently large for applying exploratory factor analysis (Surucu et al., 2022).

Table 4: Exploratory Factor Analysis

Factor		Item Code	Factor Loading	Communalities	Eigen Value	Variance Explained
Organisational Encouragement		CPW2	.938	.893	6.660	26.641
		CPW8	.909	.859		
		CPW4	.904	.866		
		CPW6	.881	.821		
		CPW1	.809	.709		
		CPW22	.797	.685		
Masculine Culture		CPW7	.933	.899	4.614	18.457
		CPW3	.910	.861		
		CPW10	.909	.862		
		CPW24	.897	.794		
		CPW13	.794	.688		
Managerial Aspirations		CPW11	.936	.912	3.466	13.865
		CPW16	.929	.908		
		CPW15	.900	.844		
		CPW12	.825	.737		
		CPW19	.805	.678		
Family Support		CPW14	.913	.908	2.410	9.639
		CPW18	.890	.896		
		CPW17	.849	.765		
Insensitive Policy		CPW20	.937	.924	1.724	6.895
		CPW21	.937	.916		
		CPW5	.735	.556		
Mentoring		CPW9	.846	.803	1.475	5.901
		CPW25	.815	.831		
		CPW23	.775	.735		

Six factors were extracted from 25 items which are named as Organisational Encouragement, Masculine Culture, Managerial Aspirations, Family Support, Insensitive Policy, Mentoring.

Factor 1: Organisational Encouragement

Organisational encouragement is the first factor which includes six items i.e., "I like how my company appreciates women to assume leadership positions by offering them challenging

assignments, I believe the organization's human resources policy is just and provides everyone with an equal opportunity to advance within the company on the basis of merit, In order for me to pursue advancement, I would like the company implement family-friendly policies like crèches, boarding schools, and senior care facilities, I think that the pay system, which is based on "equal pay for equal labor," motivates me to pursue advancement, I favor organizations that assist women in integrating their many responsibilities and bringing themselves together, In the specialized training programme for female managers, I learn better". The range of factor loading vary from .797 to .938 and explained variance is 26.641. All the values lies in the minimum acceptable criteria.

Factor 2: Masculine Culture

Masculine culture is the second factor which includes five items i.e., "The organizational structure, in my observation, favors male hierarchy, I feel, the organization's bureaucratic structure is indifferent to the really distinct demands of women managers, I think, my desire to pursue advancement is stifled by the aggressive leadership styles promoted by the male culture, I encounter the normal masculine opposition in informal networks, I believe that male superiors are favored by subordinates and colleagues than female superiors, which inhibited me from pursuing advancement". The range of factor loading vary from .794 to .933, and explained variance is 18.457. All the values lies in the minimum acceptable criteria.

Factor 3: Managerial Aspiration

Managerial aspiration is the third factor which includes five items i.e., "I believe I have the same potential as males to hold high managerial positions, Within the next five years, I hope to hold a position of more significance, Regarding professional recognition, I believe my goals are very high, I am trying to developed a working style that will suits superiors, I look for alternatives to develop managerial experience". The range of factor loading vary from .805 to .936, and explained variance is 13.865. All the values lies in the minimum acceptable criteria.

Factor 4: Family Support

Family support is the fourth factor which includes three items i.e., "My supporting spouse, I believe, is a terrific facilitator for my professional development, I believe having a family or non-family caregiver available is a tremendous facilitator for work advancement, My family gives ample support to balance work and family obligation". The range of factor loading vary

from .849 to .913, and explained variance is 9.639. All the values lies in the minimum acceptable criteria.

Factor 5: Insensitive Policy

Insensitive policy is the fifth factor which includes three items i.e., "I believe that the transfer- related promotion policy discourages women from pursuing promotions, Compensatory offs seem to be used more in rule books than in actual practice, in my opinion, Despite being legal, I believe that maternity leave is seen as a negative for the company since it permits extended absences from the workplace". The range of factor loading vary from .735 to .937, and explained variance is 6.895. All the values lies in the minimum acceptable criteria.

Factor 6: Mentoring

Mentoring is the sixth factor which includes three items i.e., "To assist me in planning my career, I search for mentors within the company, I am appreciative for the informal mentors who have helped me develop

the necessary abilities to take on more responsibility in my life, I suggest that the company should implement a structured mentorship programme". The range of factor loading vary from .775 to .846, and explained variance is 5.901. All the values lies in the minimum acceptable criteria.

Career Progression of Women Executives across Different Demographic Variables Table 5: One Way ANOVA across Age for Career Progression of Women Executives

Factors	Age (yrs.)	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F Value	P Value
Organizational Encouragement	Less than 25	79	3.1407	.9076	3.784	.005
	25-35	166	4.1336	1.1398		
	35-45	55	4.3426	.7713		
	45-55	57	4.0328	.9437		
	Above 55	43	4.2923	.7501		
	Total	400	4.0000	1.0000		
Masculine Culture	Less than 25	79	4.1134	1.2796	2.898	.022
	25-35	166	4.0996	1.0349		
	35-45	55	4.1879	.5999		
	45-55	57	4.3352	.7668		
	Above 55	43	4.0914	.8562		
	Total	400	4.0000	1.0000		
Managerial Aspiration	Less than 25	79	4.2084	.8480	2.101	.030
	25-35	166	4.0076	1.0503		
	35-45	55	4.0223	.9245		
	45-55	57	4.2873	1.0584		
	Above 55	43	4.0561	1.0196		
	Total	400	4.0000	1.0000		

Family Support	Less than 25	79	4.6840	.9220	35.273	.000
	25-35	166	4.2214	.7824		
	35-45	55	4.1995	.9090		
	45-55	57	3.3301	1.1233		
	Above 55	43	1.0944	.5201		
	Total	400	4.0000	1.0000		
Insensitive Policy	Less than 25	79	4.3795	.8090	7.673	.000
	25-35	166	4.2358	1.0136		
	35-45	55	4.3724	1.2405		
	45-55	57	4.1833	.7701		
	Above 55	43	4.0421	.8929		

	Total	400	4.0000	1.0000		
Mentoring	Less than 25	79	3.5996	.8950	13.270	.153
	25-35	166	4.1421	1.1442		
	35-45	55	4.2897	.6491		
	45-55	57	4.0403	.9034		
	Above 55	43	3.4655	.3363		
	Total	400	4.0000	1.0000		

Table 5 shows the result of one-way ANOVA test values. It shows that there is certain difference between women executive's career progression across their age. P-value less than 0.05 shows that there is significant relationship exist. From the analysis it is depicted that there is significant difference across age for organizational encouragement (.005), masculine culture (.022), managerial aspiration (.030), family support (.000), and Insensitive policy (.000). While mentoring (.153) has no significant difference across their age.

Table 6: One Way ANOVA across Education Qualification for Career Progression of Women Executives

Factors	Education Qualification	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F Value	P Value
Organizational Encouragement	Graduation	124	4.3283	1.0584	10.771	.000
	Post Graduation	105	4.1386	1.0003		
	M. Phil/ Ph.D.	80	4.3457	.7707		
	Others	91	3.0583	.9439		
	Total	400	4.0000	1.0000		
Masculine Culture	Graduation	124	4.1835	.6628	3.631	.013
	Post Graduation	105	4.0946	1.0248		
	M. Phil/ Ph.D.	80	4.0999	1.2087		
	Others	91	4.2288	1.1035		
	Total	400	4.0000	1.0000		
Managerial Aspiration	Graduation	124	4.1867	1.008	2.186	.034
	Post Graduation	105	3.0593	.8984		
	M. Phil/ Ph.D.	80	4.1286	1.1006		
	Others	91	3.0729	.9882		

					F Value	P Value
	Total	400	4.0000	1.0000		
Family Support	Graduation	124	4.0545	1.0860	.765	.514
	Post Graduation	105	4.0254	.7921		
	M. Phil/ Ph.D.	80	4.1322	.7291		
	Others	91	4.0714	1.2756		
	Total	400	4.0000	1.0000		
Insensitive Policy	Graduation	124	4.0489	.9729	3.653	.013
	Post Graduation	105	4.1650	.9167		
	M. Phil/ Ph.D.	80	4.3075	1.1423		
	Others	91	4.0132	.9519		
	Total	400	3.0000	1.0000		
Mentoring	Graduation	124	3.2994	1.2920	9.972	.000
	Post Graduation	105	4.1324	.7606		
	M. Phil/ Ph. D.	80	4.4171	.7946		
	Others	91	4.1116	.7857		
	Total	400	4.0000	1.0000		

Table 6 shows that there is certain difference between women executive's career progression across their education qualification. From the analysis it is depicted that there is significant difference across education qualification for organizational encouragement (.000), masculine culture (.013), managerial aspiration (.034), mentoring (.013), and insensitive policy (.000). While family support (.514) has no significant difference across their education qualification.

Table 7: One Way ANOVA across Working Experience (yrs.) of Career Progression of Women Executives

Factors	Working Experience (yrs.)	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F Value	P Value
Organizational Encouragement	Less than 2.5	78	3.1737	8590	6.315	.000
	2.5- 5	99	3.0189	.9581		
	5-10	183	4.0697	.9476		

	More than 10	40	3.6110	1.3450		
	Total	400	4.0000	1.0000		
Masculine Culture	Less than 2.5	78	4.2124	.8591	2.311	.076
	2.5- 5	99	4.0486	1.1291		
	5-10	183	4.0033	1.0384		
	More than 10	40	3.2787	.6007		
	Total	400	4.0000	1.0000		
Managerial Aspiration	Less than 2.5	78	4.1830	.7804	15.078	.000
	2.5- 5	99	3.5279	.7164		
	5-10	183	3.1060	1.1666		
	More than 10	40	3.4646	.5809		
	Total	400	4.0000	1.0000		
Family Support	Less than 2.5	78	3.8131	.6785	32.037	.000
	2.5- 5	99	4.4633	.9413		
	5-10	183	4.1834	.8690		
	More than 10	40	4.3550	1.2540		
	Total	400	4.0000	1.0000		
Insensitive Policy	Less than 2.5	78	4.0055	.9186	11.549	.000
	2.5- 5	99	4.2335	.7470		
	5-10	183	4.0528	1.1045		
	More than 10	40	4.8091	.8034		
	Total	400	4.0000	1.0000		
Mentoring	Less than 2.5	78	4.0017	1.0035	6.646	.000
	2.5-5	99	4.3348	1.2751		
	5-10	183	4.9224	.8601		
	More than 10	40	4.3782	.4755		

Total	400	4.0000	1.0000		

Table 7 shows the result of one way ANOVA test values. It shows that there is certain difference between women executive's career progression across their working experience. From the analysis it is depicted that there is significant difference across working experience for organizational encouragement (.000), managerial aspiration (.000), family support (.000), mentoring (.000), and insensitive policy (.000). While masculine culture has no significant difference across their working experience (.076).

Conclusion

Career progression is a process that makes a person's work identity. The significance of this process is shown by the nature and quality of employees' lives. It includes the type of person they become. This study is providing valuable information into how women executives face the complexities in their career progression. The objective of the study is to examine the relationship between career progressions of women executives across demographic variables. Exploratory Factor Analysis and One-way ANOVA are used to depict the difference between women executive's career progression across age, education qualification and working experience. This study demonstrates that demographic variables do indeed influence not only on career progression but also on development of leadership traits in women executives. According to the study age influence career progression of women executives in many ways. Young women executives focus more on career progression and seen more interesting to work for long working hours. Educational qualifications are a critical component of career success, providing various skills and knowledge base Whether through formal education, specialized certifications, or ongoing professional development, the right qualifications can increase job opportunities, enhance job performance, and pave the way for long-term career advancement of women executives. By investing in their qualifications and continuously updating their skills, women executives can ensure they remain competitive, relevant, and prepared for the challenges of the modern workplace. Study also implies that women employees' organizational experiences may be more influential in shaping their views towards their career advancement process. job experience can be fruitful for career growth and advancement of women executives, It can assist women executives to gain skills, excel in job applications, and to prepare for a fulfilling career in desired field and organization. The study focuses the need for organizations to prioritize policies and practices that support work-life and promote career growth of women executives. By recognizing the differential impact of demographic variables on career advancement, organisations can customize their strategies to fulfill the diverse requirements of their women employee at the work place.

References

1. Aggarwal, S., Mutyalu, N., Nalinidevi, T., Goyal, N., Jahnavi, K. N., & Altamash, M. S. (2025). The impact of HR policies on women's career progression and leadership roles in corporate organization. *Journal of Informatics Education and Research, 5*(1), 104-111.

2. Bhattacharya, P., & Saxena, R. (2022). Gender roles and career advancement: Challenges for women in the Indian workforce. *Journal of Gender Studies, 15*(3), 210-225.

3. Begeny, C. T., Ryan, M. K., Moss-Racusin, C. A., &Ravetz, G. (2020). In some professions, women have become well-represented, yet gender bias persists – Perpetuated by those who thinkit is not happening. *Science Advances, 6*(26), eaaz7810.

4. Bosak, J., &Sczesny, S. (2011). Gender bias in leader selection? Evidence from a hiring simulation study. *Sex Roles, 65*(3-4), 234–242.

5. Bridges, D., Wulff, E., Bamberry, L., Krivokapic-Skoko, B., &Tonts, M. (2020). Gender equality and leadership in the Australian mining sector. *Gender, Work & Organization, 27*(6), 1166-1185.

6. Bridges, D., Wulff, E., Bamberry, L., Krivokapic-Skoko, B., &Tonts, M. (2021). Gender, leadership, and the changing nature of work: Lessons from mining. *Gender, Work & Organization, 28*(2), 474-490.

7. Bsudworth, M. H., & Mann, S. L. (2010). Becoming a leader: The challenge of modesty for women. *Journal of

Management Development, 29(2), 177-186.

8. Clerc, H., &Kels, P. (2013). The invisible leaders: Gender and leadership in IT and engineering sectors. *Gender & Management, 28*(5), 235-249.

9. Das, S., & Jha, S. (2023). Women's career advancement: Review of literature and future research agenda. *International Journal of Ethics and System, 40*(3).

10. De Vries, J. (2015). Champions of gender equality: Female and male executives as leaders of gender change. *Gender in Management: An International Journal, 30*(5), 271-285.

11. De Vries, J., & van den Brink, M. (2016). Transformational leadership and gender: Research on leadership in male-dominated organizations. *Leadership Quarterly, 27*(4), 463-481.

12. Dhingra, A., & Singh, S. (2022). The glass ceiling in India's service sector: An analysis of gender dynamics in leadership. *Asian Journal of Business Research, 11*(2), 89-104.

13. Eagly, A. H., Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders.

14. *Psychological Review, 109*(3), 573-598.

15. Eagly, A. H., Makhijani, M. G., &Klonsky, B. G. (1995). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*(1), 125-145.

16. Ely, R. J., & Meyerson, D. E. (2000). Advancing gender equity in organizations: The challenge and importance of maintaining a gender lens. *Organization, 7*(4), 589-608.

17. Faniko, K., Ellemers, N., Derks, B., &Lorenzi-Cioldi, F. (2017). Nothing changes, really: Why women who break through the glass ceiling end up reinforcing it. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 43*(5), 638-651.

18. Foley, M., Oxenbridge, S., Cooper, R., & Baird, M. (2022). Beyond the glass ceiling: Barriers to the career progression of women in male-dominated sectors. *Work, Employment and Society, 36*(2), 259-275.

19. Galea, N., Chappell, L. (2022). Masculinized organizational cultures: Persistence and change.

20. *Gender, Work & Organization, 29*(1), 85-100.

21. Galea, N., Fine, M., & Powell, A. (2015). The institutionalisation of gender inequality: Gender mainstreaming and organisational change. *Gender, Work & Organization, 22*(1), 49-65.

22. Galea, N., Powell, A., & Chappell, L. (2020). Gender and leadership in the Australian public service. *Public Administration Review, 80*(4), 639-651.

23. Goyal, K., & Gupta, M. (2023). Gender bias and leadership: Unconscious biases and their impact on women's career growth. *International Journal of Management Studies, 18*(1), 45-60.

24. Heilman, M. E., & Haynes, M. C. (2005). No credit where credit is due: Attributional rationalization of women's success in male-female teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(5), 905-916.

25. Heilman, M. E., &Okimoto, T. G. (2007). Why are women penalized for success at male tasks? The implied communality deficit. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(1), 81-92.

26. Hoover, A. E., Hack, T., Garcia, A. L., Goodfriend, W., &Habashi, M. M. (2019). Powerless men and agentic women: Gender bias in hiring decisions. *Sex Roles, 80*(11-12), 667-680.

27. Huppatz, K., Sang, K., & Powell, A. (2018). Gendered work cultures: Understanding the barriers to career progression for women in male-dominated industries. *Journal of Gender Studies, 27*(1), 29-43.

28. Keck, S. (2019). Gender and emotional displays: The case of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly, 30*(5), 1-11.

29. Khilji, S., & Pumroy, K. (2018). Gender resilience and advancement in male-dominated sectors.

30. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 39*(7), 898-914.

31. Kumar, R., & Patel, S. (2023). *Male leaders' support for gender diversity: Factors influencing attitudes in Indian organizations. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 32*(1), 35-50.

32. Lakshmidevi, R & Geetha, A. (2024). Career growth of women in professional field. *International Journal of Novel Research and Development, 9*(3),219-222.

33. Lyness, K. S., &Heilman, M. E. (2006). When fit is fundamental: Performance evaluations and promotions of upper-level female and male managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(4), 777-785.

34. Mohaley, S., & Srivastava, U. R. (2025). Challenges faced by women at workplace across the globe: A qualitative approach. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology, 13*(1).

35. Mukherjee, A. (2022). Gender stereotypes and leadership effectiveness: The impact of masculine traits. Journal of Leadership Studies, 16(3), 45-59.

36. O'Neil, D. A., & Hopkins, M. M. (2015). Women's career advancement in male-dominated professions: A systematic review. *Career Development International, 20*(3), 202-219.

37. O'Neil, D. A., Hopkins, M. M., &Bilimoria, D. (2011). Women's networks: A tool for professional growth. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 24*(3), 362-383.

38. Player, A., Randsley de Moura, G., Leite, A. C., Abrams, D., &Tresh, F. (2019). Overlooked leadership potential: The preference for leadership potential in job candidates who are men vs. women. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10*, 755.

39. Powell, A., & Sang, K. (2015). Gender, work, and the glass ceiling: The role of unconscious bias. *Human Resource Management Journal, 25*(4), 523-538.

40. Powell, G. N., Butterfield, D. A., & Parent, J. D. (2009). Gender and managerial stereotypes: Have the times changed? *Journal of Management, 28*(2), 177-193.

41. Ramli, S., Shaari, N., Rosnan, H., & Nor, N. M. (2024). Exploring the influence of organizational culture, organisational structure and pay structure on career progression of women in tech industry. *Environment-Behaviour Proceedings Journal*, *9*(SI19), 123-128.

42. Rosette, A. S., &Tost, L. P. (2010). Agentic women and communal leadership: How role prescriptions confer advantage to top women leaders. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(2), 221- 235.

43. Schnarr, K. (2012). The sticky floor: Women's advancement in the workplace. Canadian Women Studies, 29(1), 23-29.

44. Sheaffer, Z., Bogler, R., &Sarfaty, S. (2011). Leadership attributes, masculinity and risk taking as predictors of crisis proneness. *Gender in Management: An International Journal, 26*(2), 163- 187.

45. Sinha, A., & Raj, M. (2023). Gender roles and career paths: The impact of male leaders' perceptions on women's leadership in the service industry. *Gender in Management: An International Journal, 34*(2), 102-118.

46. Smith, D. G., Rosenstein, J. E., Nikolov, M. C., & Chaney, D. A. (2019). The power of language: Gender, status, and agency in performance evaluations. *Sex Roles, 80*(3-4), 159-171.

47. Steffens, N. K., &Mehl, M. R. (2003). Gender and competence attributions: Men versus women.

48. *Journal of Social Psychology, 143*(5), 673-692.

49. Verma, S., & Srivastava, N. (2023). Male leaders' perceptions and women's leadership potential in India: A qualitative study. *Journal of Human Resource Management, 22*(3), 55-71.

50. Wiersma, S., Lippényi, Z., & Abendroth,A. K. (2025). Change agents with a past: Women executives' early-career contexts and gender equality at workplaces. *Work & Organization,35*(5)1-39.

51. Williamson, S., & Colley, L. (2018). The illusion of progress: Gender equality and public sector reforms.

Australian Journal of Public Administration, 77(4), 495-509.

52. Wulff, E., Bridges, D., Bamberry, L., &Krivokapic-Skoko, B. (2021). Advancing gender diversity in male-dominated industries: A critical review of leadership approaches. *Gender, Work & Organization, 28*(6), 899-916.

53. Zheng, W., Kark, R., & Meister, A. (2018). The paradox of agency: Female leaders as agentic and communal. *The Leadership Quarterly, 29*(5), 504-513.

54. Zheng, W., Surgevil, O., &Kark, R. (2018). Dancing on the razor's edge: How top-level women leaders manage the paradoxical tensions between agency and communion. *Sex Roles, 79*(7-8), 633-650.