Pak. J. Commer. Soc. Sci.
2011 Vol. 5 (1), 177-191

Gender Discrimination in Workforce and its Impact on the Employees

Zahid Ali Channar (Corresponding Author)
HEC Indigenous Scholar for PhD in Management Sciences, Isra University, Hyderabad, Sindh and Adjunct Assistant, Department of Management Sciences, Isra University, Sindh, Pakistan
Cell No. 0332-2601242, E-mail: zachanar@yahoo.com

Zareen Abbassi
Associate Professor and Head of Department, Department of Public Administration, University of Sind, Jamshoro, Pakistan
E-mail: zareenabbassi@hotmail.com

Imran Anwar Ujan
Assistant Professor, Department of Information Technology, University of Sindh, Jamshoro, Pakistan
E-mail: iujan@yahoo.com

Abstract

This research paper explores the issue of gender discrimination in workforce and its impact on the satisfaction and motivation, commitment and enthusiasm and stress level of employees. Close ended questionnaire was administered from 526 males and females of lower, middle and higher category employees of public and private health and education departments of Hyderabad and Jamshoro districts. Gender discrimination in workforce was measured through independent samples-t test.

The analysis shows that females were discriminated more than males in private organizations. Thus the findings show that females are discriminated more than males in private sector than in public sector. The impact of gender discrimination on satisfaction & motivation, commitment & enthusiasm and stress level was assessed through Pearson product moment correlation co-efficient. The results show that gender discrimination decreases satisfaction & motivation and commitment & enthusiasm level of employees, and increases the stress level in the employees.

Keywords: Gender discrimination, Workforce, Satisfaction & Motivation, Commitment & Enthusiasm, Stress Level.

1. Introduction

Decenzo, (1998) has described that HRM in any organization is concerned with the staffing, training, developing, motivating and maintaining the employees. Staffing is concerned with strategic human resource planning, recruiting and selection. Fifty years ago, HRM was considerably simpler because work force was strikingly homogenous. Now-a-days work force has changed from homogeneous to heterogeneous type.

Wayne (1995) has explained that Managing Diversity means establishing a heterogeneous work force to perform to its potentials in an equitable work environment, where no member or group of members has an advantage or a disadvantage. Managing diversity is very essential for any organization, especially in this era of globalization. Managing diversity is required to close the unfair discrimination and thus enable employees to compete on equal basis.

2. Literature Review

Erik et al., (2006) have conducted the research on whether women are discriminated through sticky floor or glass ceiling effects in Sweden. They have found through their research that women in Sweden suffer more from sticky floor effects than glass ceilings. Their study also showed that women with small children face a largest gender penalty in careers. Gender penalty is larger for younger and older women and less for middle aged women. There was no any empirical support in their study that women have lesser career opportunities in the private sector than in public sector, relative to men.

Susan et al (1998) have focused on the work place gender discrimination rational bias theory. According to this theory, decision makers may choose to discriminate if they believe that their superiors or others having power over their careers expect or prefer it. The findings of their research showed that businessmen discriminated women and people at the top of the organization are most biased against women than people at the bottom. Their study has also confirmed that management support discrimination, though those discriminations were less than the findings of earlier research, reflecting increasing equal opportunity. It was also confirmed through their research that the discrimination is more because of external pressures than from internal.

Habib (2000) has studied the effects of Brick Wall and Glass ceiling in public administration of Bangladesh. His analysis has shown that women are discriminated in civil services of Bangladesh from entry to the higher posts (Glass Ceiling). Social cultural factors are the principal stumbling blocks and build a wall for entry of woman into civil services. Their career path was hindered by the impediments of the systematic and attitudinal reasons. Government laws and regulations in this regard are proving ineffective. However, that discrimination was not for the women who came from upper class. This disparate treatment against women had implications for their morale, motivation and performance.

Uzma (2004) found out that identity is created through the society, environment and parents. It is a two-way process - how people view you and how you view yourself. Attitude of parents towards their children formulate their identity. Parents usually consider their daughters as weak, timid, and too vulnerable; they need to be protected by the male members of the society. Because of this reason females cannot suggest or protest. This is the first step of subjugation and suppression. According to her; even the educated females have the double identity – professional and private. Another finding of her research was that the income of the women is not considered as the main financial source for the family, but as supplementary to the income of their males. She also found that those results were not valid for the upper and advanced families, where complete freedom is given to their females.

3. Gender Discrimination

Wayne (1995) says that no law has ever attempted to define precisely the term' discrimination', in the context of workforce, it can be defined as the giving of an unfair advantage (or disadvantage) to the members of the particular group in comparison to the members of other group. Narrating the decisions of the courts, Ivancevich (2003) writes that in interpreting title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and other laws, the United States' courts have held that both intentional (disparate treatment) and unintentional (disparate impact) acts of covered entities may constitute illegal employment discrimination.

4. Statement of the Problem

Gender discrimination turns the employees emotionally brittle, simple peace loving employees transform into paranoid and suspicious, fearful and angry individuals. Elimination of Gender Discrimination is crucial for the satisfaction and motivation, commitment and enthusiasm and less stress of the employees.

6. Objectives of the Study

- To assess the gender discrimination in work force.
- To study the impact of gender discrimination on women employees.
- To propose practices to help reduce the sticky floor and glass ceiling effects.

7. Hypotheses

- H_1 Gender Discrimination at work place prevails more in public sector than in private sector
- H_2 Gender Discrimination decreases job satisfaction in women workers.
- H_3 Gender Discrimination reduces commitment and enthusiasm in women workers.
- H_4 Gender Discrimination increases stress level in women workers.

8. Scope of the Study

This research was conducted to assess gender discrimination in workforce in the Public and Private organizations of Hyderabad and Jamshoro districts. Health and Education departments were taken from each of the above sectors. This study has measured the effect of the gender discrimination on the job satisfaction and motivation, commitment and enthusiasm and stress level of the women workers.

9. Research Methodology

Total sample size for this study is 526. This sample size is calculated at 95 % confidence level, Confidence Interval ,Margin of error = 4.23, Population = 27000, and percentage 50]. A sample size of male and female employees for public education department for both districts is 73 and 80 and for private education department of both districts is 44 and 78, respectively; whereas, sample size of 80 male and 85 females was collected from public health department of both districts and 46 males and 40 females from private health departments of both districts.

Stratified method of probability sampling is used for collecting data. In this research each one of the education and health departments, both public and private, was divided into four strata i.e. education into primary schools, high schools, colleges and universities and

health into paramedical, nurses, doctors (BPS-17) and Professors/Senior Doctors; and then random sample was drawn from each strata.

Standard instrument –Questionnaire- is used for measuring the variables. The aspects measured through questionnaire are: Gender Discrimination, Satisfaction and Motivation, Commitment and Enthusiasm, and Stress Level. Gender Discrimination in workforce is surveyed through the questions, based on the perceptions regarding gender discrimination in work force identified by the UNDP (1993, p.91). Satisfaction and Motivation is surveyed by the Motivation and Satisfaction scale (alpha=0.81) developed by Nick Foster (1999). Commitment and Enthusiasm at work is surveyed by using a similar set of questions as the ones used by the United States Merit Systems Protection Board (USMSPB) and reported in Naff (1994, p.512), latter on used by Habib Zafarullah (2000). Stress level of respondents is surveyed using GHQ-12 (General Health Questionnaire-12).

Five point Likert scale was used to ask the respondents how strongly they agree or disagree with a statement. Rating or Scale questions were used to collect opinion data from the respondents regarding the gender discrimination, satisfaction and motivation, commitment and enthusiasm and stress level.

Nominal, Ordinal and at some places Interval scales of measurements are used. However, ordinal scale of measurement is used mostly. In this research attitudes/tendencies of respondents regarding Gender Discrimination, Satisfaction and Motivation, Commitment and Enthusiasm and Stress Level were measured by means of questions, with alternative answers ranked in ascending or descending order.

9.1 Reliability of Gender Discrimination Scale

Reliability of Gender Discrimination scale, having eight questions, is 0.704, which is more than the required one i.e., 0.70. Hence this scale is reliable. Reliability of Satisfaction & Motivation is 0.800. Reliability of Commitment & Enthusiasm is 0.709. Reliability of Stress Level Scale is 0.728.

10. Analyses

10.1 Analyzing Gender Discrimination in Public Organizations

Gender Discrimination in workforce was assessed through Independent-samples t-test**.** Two variables are used for this test, one categorical and other continuous. For this research categorical variable used is Sex (with male coded as 1 and female coded as 2) and continuous variable used is ‘discrimination in work force”, which is the total score that participants recorded on 8 item gender discrimination scale.

Table I: Group statistics for gender discrimination (GD) in work force

	Sex	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Discrimination in work force	Male	153	19.6797	4.41536	.35696
	Female	165	23.1030	4.70680	.36642

Table II: Independent samples test for GD in workforce

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Discrimination in work force	Equal variances assumed	0.624	.430	-6.676	316	.000	-3.42329	.51279	-4.43221	-2.41437
	Equal variances not assumed			-6.692	315.9	.000	-3.42329	.51155	-4.42977	-2.41681

Table I provides the mean and standard deviation for males and females. N shows the number of males and females, here the number of males and females is 153 and 165 respectively.

In table II, the significant level for Levene's test is .430, which is larger than the cut-off of .05. This means that the assumption of equal variance has not been violated, therefore we will use the t-value provided in the equal variance assumed line.

As the assumption of equal variance has not been violated, therefore we choose the value of Sig (2-tailed) as provided in the equal variance assumed line. As the value of Sig (2-tailed) is less than .05(.000), there is a significant difference in the mean scores on gender discrimination for males and females.

An independent-sample test was conducted to compare the Gender discrimination scores for Males and Females. There was significant difference in scores for males (M= 19.679, SD= 4.415) and females (M=23.103, SD= 4.706); P=.000 (two-tailed).

Hence females are discriminated more than males in work force.

10.2 Analyzing Gender Discrimination in Private Organization

Gender Discrimination in workforce is assessed by independent-sample T-test. Two variables are used for this test, one categorical and other continuous. For this research categorical variable used is Sex (with male coded as 1 and female coded as 2) and continuous variable used is 'discrimination in work force", which is the total score that participants recorded on 8 item gender discrimination scale.

Table III: Group statistics for GD in work force

	Sex	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Discrimination in work force	Male	89	19.7640	4.05088	.42939
	Female	118	23.2542	5.18411	.47724

Table IV: Independent Samples Test for GD in Work Force

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Discrimination in work force	Equal variances assumed	6.01	.015	-5.255	205	.000	-3.49	.66421	-4.79975	-2.18064
	Equal variances not assumed			-5.437	204.72	.000	-3.49	.64197	-4.75592	-2.22446

Interpretation**:** In table III, SPSS gives the mean and standard deviation for males and females. N shows the number of males and females, here the number of males and females is 89 and 118, respectively.
In table IV, the significant level for Leven's test is .015, which is smaller than the cut-off of .05. This means that the assumption of equal variance has been violated, therefore we will use the t-value provided in the equal variance not assumed line.

As the assumption of equal variance has been violated, therefore we will choose the value of Sig (2-tailed) as provided in the equal variance not assumed line. As the value of Sig (2-tailed) is less than .05(.000), there is a significant difference in the mean scores on gender discrimination for males and females.

An independent-sample test was conducted to compare the Gender discrimination scores for Males and Females. There was significant difference in scores for males (M= 19.764, SD= 4.050) and females (M =23.254, SD= 5.184); P=.000 (two-tailed). Hence females are discriminated in work force.

10.3 Impact of Gender Discrimination (GD) on Satisfaction & Motivation (S&M)

Here we assess what is the relationship between the gender discrimination at work force and satisfaction and motivation. Two continuous variables are needed for this analysis, which are:

- Gender Discrimination at work force, and
- Satisfaction and Motivation

Table V: Correlation between GD and S&M

		GD	S&M
GD	Pearson Correlation	1	-.315**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	524	523
S&M	Pearson Correlation	-.315**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	523	525
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

Interpretation**:** The relationship between perceived gender discrimination and Job satisfaction and motivation was investigated using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumption of normality. There was a moderate negative correlation between the two variables, r = -.315, n = 523, p< .05.

10.4 Impact of Gender Discrimination on Commitment and Enthusiasm (C&E)

Here we assess the relationship between the gender discrimination at work force and commitment and enthusiasm. Two continuous variables used here are:

- Gender Discrimination at work force, and
- Commitment and Enthusiasm

Table VI: Correlation between GD and C&E

		GDscrmnWF8	C&E
GD	Pearson Correlation	1	-.319**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	524	521
C&E	Pearson Correlation	-.319**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	521	523
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

Interpretation**:** The relationship between perceived gender discrimination and Commitment & Enthusiasm was investigated using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumption of normality. There was a medium negative correlation between the two variables, r = -.319, n = 521, p< .05.

10.5 Impact of Gender Discrimination on Stress level (SL)

Here we assess the relation of gender discrimination at work force on stress level. Two continuous variables are needed for this, which are:

- Gender Discrimination at work force, and
- Stress Level

Table VII: Correlation between GD and Stress Level

		GD	SL
GD	Pearson Correlation	1	.240**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	524	502
SL	Pearson Correlation	.240**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	502	503
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

Interpretation**:** The relationship between perceived gender discrimination and stress level was investigated using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumption of normality. There was a small positive correlation between the two variables, r = .240, n = 502, p< .05.

10.6 Influence of S&M, C&E and SL on Gender Discrimination

Multiple Regression technique is used to answer the questions of how much variance in dependent variable can be explained by independent variables and what is the relative contribution of each independent variable to the dependent variable. Variables needed are:

- One continuous variable (Gender Discrimination); and
- Three continuous independent variables (Satisfaction & Motivation, Commitment & Enthusiasm and Stress Level)

Table VIII: Model summary for multiple regression

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.395[a]	.156	.151	4.59180
a. Predictors: (Constant), TStrsLvl, TSatMot, TComEnth				
b. Dependent Variable: Total discrimination				

Table IX: ANOVA for multiple regression

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1931.652	3	643.884	30.538	.000[a]
	Residual	10457.986	496	21.085		
	Total	12389.638	499			
a. Predictors: (Constant), TStrsLvl, TSatMot, TComEnth						
b. Dependent Variable: Total discrimination						

Table X: Coefficients for multiple regression

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval for B		Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	29.019	2.035		14.260	.000	25.021	33.017					
	TSatMot	-.190	.047	-.203	-4.066	.000	-.282	-.098	-.332	-.180	-.168	.681	1.468
	TComEnth	-.236	.071	-.171	-3.323	.001	-.375	-.096	-.330	-.148	-.137	.643	1.555
	TStrsLvl	.102	.034	.132	3.013	.003	.036	.169	.241	.134	.124	.880	1.136

a. Dependent Variable: Total discrimination

Table XI: Residual statistics for multiple regression

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Predicted Value	16.4346	26.9739	21.5820	1.96750	500
Std. Predicted Value	-2.616	2.740	.000	1.000	500
Standard Error of Predicted Value	.209	.967	.391	.126	500
Adjusted Predicted Value	16.3228	27.0189	21.5817	1.96882	500
Residual	-1.32356E1	16.33601	.00000	4.57798	500
Std. Residual	-2.882	3.558	.000	.997	500
Stud. Residual	-2.896	3.578	.000	1.001	500
Deleted Residual	-1.33585E1	16.52494	.00026	4.61573	500
Stud. Deleted Residual	-2.918	3.622	.000	1.003	500
Mahal. Distance	.037	21.127	2.994	2.837	500
Cook's Distance	.000	.037	.002	.004	500
Centered Leverage Value	.000	.042	.006	.006	500
a. Dependent Variable: Total discrimination					

10.6.1 Evaluating the model

The R Square value in table VIII tells how much of variance in the dependent variable (Gender Discrimination) is explained by the model (including the variables of Satisfaction & Motivation, Commitment & Enthusiasm and Stress level). In this research the value is .156, expressed as percentage it is 15.6 percent. This means that the model explains 15.6 percentage of the variance in gender discrimination.

10.6.2 Evaluating each of the independent variables

The table X lets us know that which of the variables included on the model contributed to the prediction of the dependent variable. As we are interested in comparing the contribution of each independent variable, therefore we will use the Beta values under the heading standardized co-efficients. We look at the largest value (ignoring any negative sign). In this research, the largest beta co-efficient is -.203 which is for total satisfaction and Motivation. This means that this variable makes the strongest unique contribution to explaining the dependent variable, when the variance explained by all other variables in the model is controlled for. The beta value for commitment and enthusiasm is -.171, indicating a lesser contribution to explaining the dependent variable. Stress level made the lowest contribution (b = .132) to explaining the dependent variable.

Next step is to check whether this value is making a statistically significant unique contribution to the equation. For this we check the significant value. The significant value for satisfaction and motivation, commitment and enthusiasm and stress level is .000, .001

and .003 respectively, which means that all of them are making a significant unique contribution to the prediction of the dependent variable.

The part correlation co-efficients, when squared, indicates the contribution of a variable to the total R squares. In other words, it tells how much of the total variance in the dependent variable is uniquely explained by that variable and how much R square would drop if it was not included in that model. In this research, satisfaction and motivation has part correlation coefficient of -.168, if we square this we will get .028, indicating that this variable uniquely explains 2.8 percent of the variance in the total gender discrimination. For commitment and enthusiasm, value is -.137; when squared we get .018. This indicates a unique contribution of 1.8 percent of the variance in the total gender discrimination. The part correlation co-efficient for stress level is .124, when squared it becomes .015; indicating 1.5 percent unique contribution to the explanation of variance in gender discrimination.

We can interpret the results as: This model, which includes satisfaction and motivation, commitment and enthusiasm and stress level, explains 15.6 percent of variance in total gender discrimination. Of these three variables, satisfaction and motivation makes the largest statistically significant (p=.000) unique contribution (beta = 2.8 percent); commitment and enthusiasm makes the second largest statistically significant (p=.001) unique contribution (beta = 1.8 percent); stress level makes the lowest statistically significant (p=.003) unique contribution (beta = 1.5 percent).

From the above conclusions a model is constructed as:

$$G.Dc = a + b_1SM + b_2CE + b_3SL$$

In this model:

GD = Gender Discrimination

SM = Satisfaction & Motivation

CE = Commitment & Enthusiasm, and

SL = Stress Level

Where GDc represents the Gender Discrimination as predicted by the equation (computed through R square).

'a' denotes the Gender Discrimination, when all the other three explanatory variables have a value of zero simultaneously.

'b_1' represents the change in Gender discrimination associated with a unit change in SM variable, when the other variables are held constant.

'b_2' represents the change in Gender discrimination associated with a unit change in CE variable, when the other variables are held constant.

'b_3' represents the change in Gender discrimination associated with a unit change in SL variable, when the other variables are held constant.

11. Results & Discussions

In hypothesis 1 we predicted that "females are more discriminated than males at work force in public organizations than in private organizations". Gender discrimination at workforce was calculated through the T-Test. For public organizations, the results showed that there was significant difference for females (Mean = 23.103, SD = 4.706) and males

(Mean = 19.679, SD = 4.415); p = 0.000 (two-tailed). Hence it was clear that females were discriminated more than males at workforce in public organizations. For private organizations, the results showed that there was significant difference for females (Mean = 23.254, SD = 5.184) and males (Mean = 19.764, SD = 4.050); p = 0.000 (two-tailed). Hence it was clear that females were also discriminated more than males at workforce in private organizations.

When we compare the results of public and private organizations, it was very clear that females were discriminated more than males at workplace in both organizations, but the score of discrimination was more in private sector (23.254) than in public sector (23.103). Hence we accept the null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypothesis:

H_0: Females are not discriminated more than males at work place in public organizations than in private organizations.

H_A: Females are discriminated more than males at work place in public organizations than in private organizations.

In hypothesis 2, it was predicted that gender discrimination decreases the satisfaction and motivation level of employees. This hypothesis was tested by correlation. The results of the correlation were: Pearson Correlation (r) = -0.315, n= 523, p< .05. The results showed that there was a negative relation between these two continuous variables, thus it confirmed our prediction that gender discrimination decreases satisfaction and motivation. On the basis of this analysis we reject the null hypothesis and accept alternative hypothesis:

H_o: Gender Discrimination does not decrease Job satisfaction & motivation.

H_A: Gender Discrimination decreases Job satisfaction & motivation

In hypothesis 3, it was predicted that gender discrimination decreases the commitment and enthusiasm level of employees. This hypothesis was also tested by correlation. The results of the correlation were: Pearson Correlation (r) = -0.319, n= 521, p< .05. The results showed that there was a negative relation between these two continuous variables, thus it confirmed our prediction that gender discrimination decreases commitment and enthusiasm. On the basis of this analysis we reject the null hypothesis and accept alternative hypothesis:

H_o: Gender Discrimination does not decrease commitment and enthusiasm.

H_A: Gender Discrimination decreases commitment and enthusiasm.

In hypothesis 4, it was predicted that gender discrimination increases the stress level of employees. This hypothesis was also tested by correlation. The results of the correlation were: Pearson Correlation (r) = .240, n = 502, p< .05. The results showed that there was a positive relation between these two continuous variables, thus it confirmed our prediction that gender discrimination increases stress level. On the basis of this analysis we reject the null hypothesis and accept alternative hypothesis:

H_o: Gender Discrimination does not increase stress.

H_A: Gender Discrimination increases stress.

12. Conclusions

From the statistical analysis presented above and the subsequent intensive discussions, the study identifies the following as the most significant conclusions.

1. The statistical analysis has revealed that females were prone to gender discrimination behavior at the work place, both in public and private organizations. However, that biased behaviors was more in public organizations than in private organizations.
2. Analysis showed a negative relation between GD and S&M; which means that gender discrimination resulted in low job satisfaction and motivation.
3. Analysis also showed that gender discrimination was inversely proportional with commitment and enthusiasm, i.e., because of discrimination, women showed less commitment and enthusiasm towards their job.
4. A positive relation between gender discrimination and stress level was indicated through statistical techniques; which meant that higher the gender discrimination, higher will be the level of the stress.

Acknowledgement

We are grateful to the editors and reviewers for their valuable comments to improve the earlier draft of the paper.

REFERENCES

Ackler, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, Bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender and Society*, 4(2), 139-158.

Anwar, Shaheen. (2004). Discrimination against women: an analysis of the manifestations, inclinations and protestations. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Social Sciences: Endangered and Engendered*, Fatima Jinnah Women University, Rawalpindi, Pakistan, 387-412.

Cotter, D. A., Hermson, J.G., OvadiaV. S., Vannerman,R. (2001). The glass ceiling effect. *Social Forces*, 80 (2), 655-681.

David, A.D. De Cenzo., Stephen, P. Robbins. (1998). Human Resource Management (5th edition). John Wiley & Sons, New York.

Eatzaz, Ahmad., Amtul, Hafeez. (2007). Labor supply & earning functions of educated working women. *The Pakistan Development Review*, 46(1), 45-62.

Erik, Bihagen., Marita Ohls. (2006). The glass ceiling-where is it? Women's and men's career prospects in the private vs. the public sector in Sweden 1979-2000. *The Sociological Review*, 54(1), 20-47.

Habib, Zafarullah. (2000).Through the brick wall and the glass ceiling: women in the civil services in Bangladesh. Gender, *Work and Organization*, 7(3), 197-209.

Hiau, Joo. Kee. (2008). Glass ceiling or sticky floor exploring the Australian gender pay gap. *The Economic Record*, 82(59), 408-427.

John, M. Ivancevich. (2004). *Human Resource Management* (9th edition). McGraw Hill, USA.

Maume, Jr, D. (1999). Occupational segregation and the career mobility of white men and women. *Social Forces*, 77 (4), 1433-1459.

Mehak, Aijaz. (2007). Determinants of labor force participation in Pakistan. *The Labor Journal of Pakistan*, 203-235. .

Nazimunissa Mahtab. (2004). Women's studies in Bangladesh: potential and challenges, *Proceedings of the International Conference on Social Sciences: Endangered and Engendered*, Fatima Jinnah Women University, Rawalpindi, Pakistan, 71-83.

Nick, Foster. (1999). Another 'glass ceiling'? : the experiences of women professionals and managers on international assignments, Gender, Work and Organization, Blackwell publishers ltd., 6 (2), 79-89.

Nikala,Lane.(2000). The lowest status of female part time NHS nurses: a bed-pan ceiling, Gender, Work & Organization, Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 7(4), 269-279.

Rosefed, R. A., Kallerberg, A.L. (1990). A cross national comparison of the gender gap in the income. *American Journal of Sociology*, 96(1), 69-106.

Susan, Trentham., Laurie, Larwood.(1998). Gender discrimination and the workplace: an examination of rational bias theory, Sex Roles. A Journal of Research, 38, 1-28.

Uzma Shoukat.(2004). Literacy and women's identity, *Proceedings of the International Conference on Social Sciences: Endangered and Engendered*, Fatima Jinnah Women University, Rawalpindi, Pakistan, 84-96.

Wayne, F. Casico. (1995). *Managing Human Resource, Productivity, Quality of work life, Profits*, McGraw Hill Internationals (4 th edition).

Ziaullah. (2008). Workforce management challenges for contemporary HR Managers: Review of Workforce Diversity and Employee Empowerment, *Pak Management Review*, XLV(1), 25-33.