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#### Abstract

Female participation is very important in the economic development and growth of any economy or country. In Pakistan, the rate of female participation is very low, so the present study is conducted to found the Determinants of low Female Labor Force Participation. The objective of the study is not only to investigate the socio-economic factors but also to identify the demographic factors behind fewer female labor force participation.


#### Abstract

The universe for the present study was women aged 15-49 who work or not from Jalal-pur-Jattan (Gujrat). Purposive sampling, a type of Non-probability Sampling was used to select respondent with sample size of 250 . Questionnaire was used as a tool for data collection and Interviews schedule (face to face interview) for conducting information from respondents.Logistic Regression Model was used to analyze the data. The result shows that family system, age, attitude of society toward working female, Number of dependents in household, female education, and total household members were the factors that effect the female labor force participation.
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## 1. Introduction

Mostly in Asian countries, a big factor behind women not enters in labour force activities are male dominance and bad attitude of society towards working women. So, they mostly engaged in unpaid labor force, greater efficiency in taking care of one's children or one's health, or enhanced ability to deal with problems or "disequilibria" in one's daily life. In these nations the perception of parents toward labor force activities influence on female decision about participation.
Despite rapid development in female education and healthcare, they continue to lag behind men in almost all fields of life. Pakistani women like in many other developing economies lag behind men because of social, cultural and traditional norms. This setup force to believe that women stay behind males not only in the house but in the society too. Low literacy rate, high birth rate, low life expectancy and non recognition of their work in the family are some of the common characteristics of women of Pakistan.
It is observed that now female labour force participation is slightly increasing in Pakistan as it was 4\% in 1980-1990, $5.1 \%$ in 1995-98,14\% in 1999-2000 ( according to labour force survey 1999-2000) and 21.5\% in the year 2009-10. Still it is not very high as compared to other South Asian countries 42\% Bangladesh ,41\% Nepal, 32\% India and Bhutan ,37\% in Srilanka (World Bank ,2002) .The South Asian's average FLFP rate is $33 \%$ ( Human Development in South Asia 2000).
The current study is an effort to explore the different social, economic, and demographic factors which highly influencing the decision of women if they enter in job or not. There are many studies on the same topic .But still there are some factors which have not been caught insight by any researcher like mothers education of the respondent, society behavior towards working ladies, job restriction by head of the family, etc. So, the specialty of this study is to ensure the influence of above factors, weather they effect the women's decision to enter in paid labour force.
The decision to participate in economic activities by a female is normally based on two aspects/ levels. Firstly, at the individual level, she decide to work is subject to the factors like availability of job, her level of education, any skill she has or not. The second is on the aggregate level, here her choice is determined by the social, economic and demographic circumstances of her locality or area where she is living.
Neo-classical economists consider education to be one of the key determinants of women's entering in the labour market. The higher the level of education, the greater is women's participation in the labour market. It is also a fact that with more education they have more jobs available for them. With more and more
investment on human capital, i.e. for education, for skills, training workshops, all these will enhance the productivity of females.
The study is conducting in Jalal-pur-Jattan, Gujrat district. It is about 18 km far-away from Gujrat. Gujrat is the one of the main districts of Punjab (The largest province of Pakistan) and also important for political background. This district is leading for Crockery, fans and furniture. It has mixed rural and urban population.
So, in the current study, researcher tries to explore those factors which influence on female labour force participation. In particular, the study identifies the socio-economic determinants of women's labour force participation decision. In the current study, focus is mainly on education, family restrictions, their household income, mother's education, father's education, assets, and attitude of society towards working women.

## Objectives of the Study

1) To investigate the socio-economic factors behind female labor force participation.
2) To see the demographic factors behind female labor force participation.

## RESEARCH METHODOLGY

The study is conducting in Jalal-pur-Jattan (Gujrat). The primary data was collecting by conducting survey. The survey was based upon questionnaire which contained close ended as well as open ended questions. The purposive sampling is a type of Non-probability sampling was used in the present study for conducting the survey.

## Model Specification

Researcher has used Binary Logistic Regression Model for examining the impact of different factors that effected the women participation in labor force activities. This model has been selected for its chief properties. The dependent variable is qualitative and it have only two categories in yes (1) or no (0) form. Logistic Regression model is easily understood. From binary linear regression researcher used the Backward:LR method because it used all the variables in the model and omitting the insignificant variables on each step. At the end it provides only that variable which have significant role in the analysis. So, model only explained the significant variable.

## Model of Logistic Regression for Current Study FLFP $=\boldsymbol{\alpha}+\boldsymbol{\beta}$ ( I.V)

Where
FLFP = dependent variable
$\alpha=$ Intercept
$\boldsymbol{\beta}=$ Coefficient of determination
I.V= Independent variable

Model for the proposed study is as follows:
FLFP $=\alpha+E O R+$ RA + Age $+M S+E O H+H H S+F S+S P L A+H H I+N F+N C+N A M+N D+M L F P+A R$.
(Variables used in this equation is defined in appendix)

## ANALYSIS

The data were analyzed by using SPSS version 16.0 for windows. Most of the questions were categorized and coded before the data entry process. For the application of appropriate statistical test, some questions are recoded for the data reduction. To bring the data into comparable form, the percentage was also calculated to get proportion of different characteristics. The formula is as given below
Percentage = F/ N (100)

Where $F$ denotes frequencies of class and $N$ denotes the total respondents.

## Descriptive Analysis

The elementary analysis of our study is concerned with establishing descriptive statistics of some selected variables related to the demographic profile such as age of respondent, education of respondent, marital status, number of alive children, family structure, her mother's education, mother's working status, fathers education, husband education, father/husband job status, income of husband/father, total income of household, total household member, number of females in the household, total dependents in household and etc. This section is justified for enhanced decisions about results of inferential analysis which was discussed in the later section.

## Average

There are three types of average. In this section, researcher calculates the suitable average for qualitative as well as for quantitative questions.

In the study average is applicable on the following questions:

1. Age of respondent
2. Monthly income of father/husband
3. Total income of household

Age of Respondent

## Mean $=35.55$

This shows that the average age of respondents are 35.5 about 36 years. This indicates that mostly female in the study having the age 35-36. Actually at this the age when the female is married or the head of household, work for their children and husband or family.
Father/ Husband Monthly income

## Mean $=18900.00$

This indicates that the monthly income of father/husband is 18900 Rs. This shows that the people of Jalal-pur-Jattan have moderate wages. Not so less, neither so higher.
Monthly Household Income

## Mean = 40556.00

This indicates that on the average monthly household income is Rs 40556 Pakistani. This shows that on the average, in Jalal-pur-Jattan people have moderate status. Nor so rich neither too poor.

Table 1.Distribution of Demographic Profile of Respondents

| Demographic factors | Catagories | Frequency | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Respondent Age |  |  |  |
|  | 15-25 | 58 | 23.2 |
| $\square$ | 26-35 | 60 | 24.0 |
|  | 36-45 | 91 | 36.4 |
|  | 45 and Above | 41 | 16.4 |
| Attend <br> School |  |  |  |
|  | Yes | 228 | 91.2 |
|  | No | 22 | 8.8 |
| Qualification |  |  |  |
|  | Illiterate | 20 | 8.0 |
|  | Primary | 33 | 13.2 |
|  | Middle | 19 | 7.6 |
|  | Metric | 45 | 18.0 |
|  | F.A | 24 | 9.6 |
|  | Graduation | 50 | 20.0 |
|  | Master | 54 | 21.6 |
|  | M.phil/ ph.D | 5 | 2.0 |
| Marital <br> Status |  |  |  |
|  | Unmarried | 62 | 24.8 |
|  | Married | 181 | 72.4 |
|  | Widow | 7 | 2.8 |
| Living Children |  |  |  |
|  | 0-1 | 37 | 14.8 |
|  | 2-3 | 65 | 26.0 |
|  | 4-5 | 51 | 20.4 |


|  | $6-7$ | 27 | 10.8 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Family | Above than 7 | 70 | 28.0 |
| System | Nuclear | 139 | 55.6 |
|  | Joint | 111 | 44.4 |

The table 1 shows that most of the female (36\%) from our data belonging to the age category $36-45$. The $24 \%$ female are belonging to the category of 26-35. $23 \%$ females belonging to the age limit $15-25$ and $16 \%$ of females aged 45 \& above. The table also explains that majority of females from Jalal-pur-Jattan ever enrolled in school, and only $8 \%$ are those who have never enrolled in school at all. This indicates that now the literacy rate is higher among female of Jalal-pur-Jattan.
The table also indicates that majority of the respondents belonging to category completed Master degree that are $22 \%$. Then the $2^{\text {nd }}$ most common category is those who have completed their graduation that are $20 \%$. The $18 \%$ of females are done their metric. The respondent getting education at primary is $13 \%$. The female that remain illiterate are $8 \%$ and only $2 \%$ of female from Jalal-pur-Jattan get M.phil/P.hd degree. This shows that most of the female from Jalal-pur-Jattan are educated.
The table expresses that $25 \%$ females in our study are unmarried where as $72 \%$ of these are belonging to married category and $3 \%$ female are those who are widows. This shows that in our study majority of respondent are married. It also indicates that most of the female get married in the age of 15-49 and little number of females remains unmarried either they do job or not.
The table clarifies that bulk of female $28 \%$ from Jalal-pur-Jattan having above than 7 children. The female having 2-3 children are $26 \%$ and $20 \%$ are those who have $4-5$ children. $15 \%$ of female are those that have $0-1$ living children. $11 \%$ females are having 6-7 children. Over all the figures clarify that the fertility rate of Jalal-pur-Jattan is higher. Most of the female from defined area had more than 2 children.
The research results shows that $56 \%$ females lived in joint family system and $44 \%$ of those who lived in nuclear family system. It shows that the Nuclear family system is more common in Jalal-pur-Jattan.

## Inferential Statistics <br> Binary Logistic Regression

Table 2.Case Processing Summary

|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Un weighted Cases' | N | Percent |
| Selected | Included in Analysis | 250 | 100.0 |
| Cases | Total | 250 | 100.0 |
|  | Unselected Cases | 0 | .0 |
|  | Total | 250 | 100.0 |

The table 2 shows that we are modeling 250 cases here. It shows that how much cases are missing and how much are included in the model. The SPSS default for this is list wise. Only those cases in which all dependent and explanatory variables are complete are included in the analysis. This shows that there are no missing values in the data.

Table 3. Dependent Variable Encoding

| Original |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Value | Internal Value |  |
| No |  | 0 |
| Yes |  | 1 |

The table 3 shows that researcher coded her dependent variable in the right direction such as female who are not in labor force are coded as $\mathbf{0}$ and the female who participate in the labor force are coded as 1 . The table shows that coding which is done by SPSS and it used dummy variables i.e. 0 and 1.
Block 1: Method = Backward Stepwise (Likelihood Ratio)
Table 4. Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

|  |  | Chi-square | Df | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Step | Step | 195.469 | 16 | .000 |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | Block | 195.469 | 16 | .000 |


| Step $2^{a}$ | Model | 195.469 | 16 | . 000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Step | -. 001 | 1 | . 969 |
|  | Block | 195.468 | 15 | . 000 |
|  | Model | 195.468 | 15 | . 000 |
| Step 3a | Step | -. 012 | 1 | . 912 |
|  | Block | 195.456 | 14 | . 000 |
|  | Model | 195.456 | 14 | . 000 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Step } \\ 4^{\text {a }} \end{gathered}$ | Step | -. 015 | 1 | . 902 |
|  | Block | 195.441 | 13 | . 000 |
|  | Model | 195.441 | 13 | . 000 |
| Step 5 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Step | -. 019 | 1 | . 891 |
|  | Block | 195.422 | 12 | . 000 |
|  | Model | 195.422 | 12 | . 000 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Step } \\ \mathbf{6}^{\mathbf{a}} \end{gathered}$ | Step | -. 099 | 1 | . 753 |
|  | Block | 195.323 | 11 | . 000 |
|  | Model | 195.323 | 11 | . 000 |
| Step <br> 7a | Step | -. 125 | 1 | . 724 |
|  | Block | 195.198 | 10 | . 000 |
|  | Model | 195.198 | 10 | . 000 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Step } \\ \mathbf{8}^{\mathbf{a}} \end{gathered}$ | Step | -. 307 | 1 | . 580 |
|  | Block | 194.891 | 9 | . 000 |
|  | Model | 194.891 | 9 | . 000 |
| Step9a | Step | -. 293 | 1 | . 588 |
|  | Block | 194.598 | 8 | . 000 |
|  | Model | 194.598 | 8 | . 000 |
| Step | Step | -2.246 | 1 | . 134 |
|  | Block | 192.352 | 7 | . 000 |
|  | Model | 192.352 | 7 | . 000 |

In the table 4, by using the Backward: LR method of entering variables into the model, it took 10 steps for SPSS to enter all variables that significantly improved the model. This test is for checking the model coefficients, if they are significant or not. This specific test indicates that by adding the one new variable at each step, model remains significant or not and what is the impact of new variable? By significant mean model is good. If significant value is less than 0.05 , it means the model is good otherwise model is not significant.
Higher $\chi 2$ values indicates that the first variable added to the significantly impact the dependent variable. The step 2 indicates that add a second variable is insignificantly effect but the overall model remains significant. The step3 indicates that added one more variable has also significantly impact on the model. Step4 also described the fourth added variable in the model has significant impact. Step5 also indicates that fifth variable also has significant impact on the model. Step6 added the sixth variable also shows that there is significant impact on the model. Step7 clarify that seventh variable also has significant impact on the model.

## Cox and Snell R-Square and Negelkerke R-Square Tests

$\mathbf{H o}=$ Intercept are good fit
H1 = Intercept are not good fit
Level of significance:

$$
\alpha=0.05
$$

Test statistics to be used:
Cox and Snell R-Square and Negelkerke R-Square
Table 5.Cox \& Snell R-square and Negelkerke R square

| Step | -2 Log likelihood | Cox \& Snell <br> R Square | Negelkerke <br> R Square |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 1 | $127.999^{\mathrm{a}}$ | .544 | .748 |
| 2 | $128.000^{\mathrm{a}}$ | .544 | .748 |
| 3 | $128.012^{\mathrm{a}}$ | .544 | .748 |
| 4 | $128.027^{\mathrm{a}}$ | .544 | .748 |
| 5 | $128.046^{\mathrm{a}}$ | .544 | .748 |
| 6 | $128.145^{\mathrm{a}}$ | .544 | .748 |
| 7 | $128.270^{\mathrm{a}}$ | .543 | .747 |
| 8 | $128.577^{\mathrm{b}}$ | .543 | .746 |
| 9 | $128.870^{\mathrm{b}}$ | .542 | .746 |
| 10 | $131.116^{\mathrm{b}}$ | .538 | .740 |

Critical Region:
P-value < $\alpha$
Conclusion: The p-value is greater than 0.05 so researcher accepts Ho which indicates that researcher's all intercepts are good fit in the current regression model.

## Homser and Lemeshow Test

$\mathbf{H o}=$ Model is fit.
$\mathbf{H 1}=$ Model is not fit.
Level of significance:

$$
\alpha=0.05
$$

Test statistics to be used:
Hosmer and Lemeshow Test
Table 6.Hosmer and Lemeshow Test

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Step | Chi-square | Df | Sig. |
| 1 | 8.279 | 8 | .407 |
| 2 | 8.284 | 8 | .406 |
| 3 | 8.373 | 8 | .398 |
| 4 | 8.325 | 8 | .402 |
| 5 | 7.706 | 8 | .463 |
| 6 | 7.595 | 8 | .474 |
| 7 | 6.166 | 8 | .629 |
| 8 | 6.315 | 8 | .612 |
| 9 | 8.250 | 8 | .409 |
| 10 | 3.665 | 8 | .886 |

## Critical Region:

P-value < $\alpha$

## Conclusion:

The p-value is greater than 0.05 so researcher accept Ho. This shows that model for all variables are good fit.

## Estimation of Logistic Regression Model

Researcher estimates a linear logistic model on a set of independents variables considering the female labour force participation in economic activities. Table 4.14 explains the most significant factors or variables which effecting the participating decision of women in labour force at step 10 . In this table only step 1 and last is given and complete table has been given at the end (Appendix).
Some of the important statistics from logistic regression are listed below:
$\mathbf{B}=$ Estimated logistic coefficient of each variable. It indicates the effect of the predictor variable on the predict variable. (It can be interpreted as the change in the log odds association with a one-unit change in the independent variable).
S.E = Standard error of estimates.

Sig = Significance value (This value is compared with significance level to determine whether each independent variable is significant or not in the model. If the significance value of a variable is less than the designated value of $\alpha$, i.e.(5\%), the corresponding variable is significant.

WALD = A measure of the significance of B for the given variable; higher values, in combination with the degree of freedom, indicates significance.
EXP $(\mathbf{B})=$ It used to help in interpreting the meaning of the regression coefficients.
Table explains the binomial Logistic estimates of the female labour force participation. The researcher estimates the Logit model with a set of sixteen explanatory variables, considering female labour force participation in economic activities.
From the table 7 out of 13 independent variables, seven are obviously significant with $\alpha=0.05$; namely family system, attitude of society, age of the respondent, number of dependents, education, mother's education and household size. The sign of the B-values shows whether a variable has a positive or negative on employment. It also shows a positive or negative association between women employment status and each variable.
The coefficients of respondent's education, mother education, age, number of dependents and household size are positive. This implies that for an increase in one unit of education the log odds value will increase by 1.92. Similarly, the coefficient of age, number of dependents, mother education and household size has positive impact on female employment.

## Table 7. SPSS Results for the Model (Variables in the Equation)

| Variables |  | S.E | Wald | $d f$ | Sig | $\operatorname{Exp}(B)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STEP 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attend | -15.926 | 7.035 | . 000 | 1 | . 998 | . 000 |
| school |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MS | -. 296 | . 744 | . 158 | 1 | . 691 | . 744 |
| FS | -1.251 | . 595 | 4.424 | 1 | . 035 | . 286 |
| MLFP | . 128 | 1.097 | . 014 | 1 | . 907 | 1.136 |
| SPLA | . 000 | . 000 | 2.620 | 1 | . 106 | 1.000 |
| A R | . 083 | . 488 | . 029 | 1 | . 865 | 1.086 |
| Age | . 675 | . 333 | 4.102 | 1 | . 043 | 1.964 |
| ND | 2.210 | . 553 | 15.947 | 1 | . 000 | . 110 |
| HHI | . 018 | . 162 | . 013 | 1 | . 910 | 1.019 |
| EOR | 1.974 | . 294 | 45.071 | 1 | . 000 | 7.199 |
| NF | -. 186 | . 437 | . 181 | 1 | . 671 | . 831 |
| NAM | . 167 | . 507 | . 109 | 1 | . 742 | 1.182 |
| HHS | 1.042 | . 438 | 5.653 | 1 | . 017 | 2.834 |
| Step 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FS |  | . 497 | 4.816 | 1 | . 028 | . 336 |
| -1.090 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age |  | . 270 | 5.419 | 1 | . 020 | 1.877 |
| . 630 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ND |  | . 502 | 19.040 | 1 | . 000 | . 112 |
| 2.189 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EOR |  | . 271 | 50.488 | 1 | . 000 | 6.856 |
| 1.925 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EOM |  | . 186 | 13.240 | 1 | . 000 | . 508 |
| . 677 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HHS |  | . 264 | 13.420 | 1 | . 000 | 2.626 |
| . 965 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | -7.242 | 1.858 | 15.185 | 1 | . 000 | . 001 |

The negative association is found for the family system (joint) and attitude of society. This is true that if attitude of society would be bad, the fewer the number of women that participate in the work force. In joint family system, there is also many restrictions on a women by their in-laws, so it also illustrate the negative association between employment of a women and family system (joint).Now, the results explained in detail with economic theories.
The female level of EDUCATION is the most important factor, which influences women decision of economic participation. Human capital theory regards participation in education as an investment in human capital because of the expected returns later in the life (Becker, 1964). So, it can be argued that people become more creative, skilled and experts with the higher level of education. The female higher level of education,
not only have a great economic impacts on income, employment, and wages but also has positive effect on social outcomes like mortality, fertility, children's education and household budget and decision power.
Researcher found from table 7, that education of the respondent has positive significant impact on female labour participation. It implies that for an increase in one unit of education the log odds value will increase by 1.92 . Education of a woman turns out to be very important and plays vital role in determining the decision of labour force participation in economic activities.
Education and work experience manipulates the productivity of a woman positively. Employees with the primary or the middle school education receive some 12 to 14 percent higher than those with no education (Khan and Irfan 1985).
Females with higher education may have a strong propensity to perform fewer household
responsibilities; education is positively linked with women's control over income, in terms of retaining and spending, which provide an incentive to paid-work and contribute in household income; and education make the exposure of a woman to the other world and develop aspirations for quality of life, which give motivation to earn more income and enjoy with higher living standard.
The result of current study is consistent with the findings of Tansel (1994), Kozel and Alderman (1990), Safana (2009), Ercan (2010) and Faridi (2011). They emphasized that higher level of education increases the opportunities for women participate in the labour market. The economic explanation of this positive relationship between higher education and FLFP is that expected market return rises with the higher level of education. This thing motivates the women to work more in the labour market instead of only involving with household activities.
Female participation in economic activities is highly influenced by AGE. The decision of a women to come in the labour market based on age is subjective to number of factors like related to life cycle phenomenon, family formation factor, cultural norms, job structure and need for income.
Young girls behave differently in deciding to enter the labour market. Wage and income elasticity of time allocated to work is more for older than for younger girls and relative importance of participation is reversed as the woman grows older. Younger women are more concerned with the participation decisions while older women are more concerned with the hour's decision (Hartog and Theeuwes 1986).
The study incorporates the factor of age to trace out the relative effect on FLFP. The model, the age is a significant factor which has positive contact on women employment. It implies that a one year increase in age, the log odds value will increase by 0.63 .
The logistic coefficient is small, but it does not necessarily mean that it has a lesser effect on the probability of female employment. The reason may be that the females not participating in economic activities in early age because of early age marriages in rural areas, social constraints, lack of experience and skill and still studying in some educational institution.
The female labour force participation increased with increase in age due to married life and their children also lying in the age group of school going or sometime in the college or universities students. That' why female has more time for work outside the home. Over all the findings of the study express that the probability of female labour force participation increases with their age. The results regarding the age of the female labour force are similar to the studies of Faridi (2011), Shahnaz and Kazailbash (2002) and Hafeez and Ahmed (2002).
FAMILY SYSTEM is an important social factor, which determines the women participation in paid economic activities. Family structure is an important variable affecting the women's decision about work (Mcgrattan and Rogerson 2004). The coefficient of family system is positive and highly significant. Nuclear family system has a positive impact on the decision of a female to enter the labor market (Khan 1979; Shah 1975). Women living in a nuclear family participate more intensively in economic activity (Sathar and Desai 1996). To detangle the effect of nuclear or combined family on woman's contribution in household budget, we have included a binary variable, i.e. whether the household is nuclear or have combined family.
Current study has provides negative relationship between joint family system. Table 4.14 implies that joint family system decrease the female participation in economic activities by the unit 1.90.It explained the fact that although nuclear family has comparative disadvantage as compared to combined family system for labor force participation decision but if the women from nuclear families enter the labor market they contribute comparatively more chance to enter in economic activities.The further explanation may be that in combined family system the earning makers may be in larger number and consequently total income of the household remains high which decrease her participation in employment. On the other hand in nuclear family the earning member is only the husband so the ratio of contribution of women in the FLFP remains high.

The more clarification may be that for a woman living in a joint family the income earned by her may be used in meeting the family's requirements instead of being used on her own welfare. In nuclear family a woman enjoy greater authority within house-hold and confidence of decision making, as cultural pressures and influences particularly of in laws are less pronounced.
HOUSEHOLD SIZE is an important factor determining the contribution of women in the economic activities. It seems true that in larger household size, there have been more mouths to feed so women have to be economically active and participated more in labour force. In larger households, the family member may support the women in house-keeping and child-care and make her free to employ in economic activity and enhance the economic status of the household. Such type of support is usually provided by elder daughters and mother in-law.In the current study, the coefficient of household size is 0.96 . It expresses that with one unit increase in family member, the log odds value will increase by 0.965 . So, household size is positively related with involvement of women to economic activities. The reason may be that families are already living at their subsistence level and an increase in the number of household member increases expenditures (addition in mouths to feed) which force the women to participate in the economic activities. However, a positive coefficient of female participation is positive means that with large family, they have to participate more."Family size" indicates that having more family members increases the chance of women being in the workforce. The more family members in this case mean more dependent people in a family. This factor shows significant result as with more dependents the level of participation by female side increased. The results of present study are in line with the previous literature of Anbreen and Asma (2012 and Mayot Mon (2000).

## CONCLUSION

This study is an attempt to find out various demographic characteristics effecting female's participation in labor force. The researcher finds that the family system (joint or nuclear) have effect on FLFP; mostly the females from joint family system more likely to engaged in labour force activities because they have no child care, old and other family care issues. The age is bringing into being as another significant determinant that effect female participation. Mostly female in middle age (30-45) are busy in job. The too young girls or too old females have not done any job.
Researcher also found that number of dependents effect participation rate of women in labour force. If the dependents in the household are greater then it enhances chances of female to get any job to support their family. If the dependents are less then female just do work in the house i.e. non economic activities due to no need for job.The one more important factor behind women's work is the education of female. Female with higher education is more likely to engage with job as compared to that one which have low level of education or no education.
This study also explores that female having more children, more likely to participate in economic activities as compared to those who have fever number of children. It is so because more number of dependents in the family now. The education of husband also derived as significant factor behind female participation. The other factors that included in the study has no effect or lesser and insignificant impact on the female labour force Participation like father education, mother in the job, father/ husband job, number of females at home and respondent having any asset or not.

## REFRENCES

[1] Ali Mumtaz et.al; (2012), "Factorsaffecting development and job opportunities for youngfemales": Case study of Pakistan, American International Journal of Contemporary Research, Vol.2, No. 1, pp 60-62.
[2] Ahmad Eatzaz and Hafeez Amtul, (2007), "Labour supply and earning functions ofeducated married women": A case study of northern Punjab, The Pakistan DevelopmentReview, 46(1), pp 45-62.
[3] Azid T.,Aslam, M. and Chaudary, (2001), "Poverty, Female labour forceparticipation, and cottage industry": A case study of cloth embroidery in rural Multan, The Pakistan development Review, 40;4 , pp 1105-1118.
[4] Afzal M and N Zafar Moeen, (1987), "Is Female Labour Force Participation Really Lowand Declining in Pakistan"? A look at Alternative Data Sources. The Pakistan Development Review, vol XXIV, No. 4.
[5] Bibi Anbreen and Afzal Asma, (2012), "Determinants of Married Women Labour ForceParticipation in WAH Cantt": A Descriptive Analysis, ISSN: 2223-9944, Vol. 2, No. 1.
[6] Butt T Munir et.al; (2010), "Roleof Rural Women's in Agricultural Development andTheir Constraints", Journal of Agriculture \& Social Sciences, ISSN print: pp 1813-2235.
[7] Bloom David et.al; (2007), "Fertility Female Labour Force Participation, and TheDemographic Dividend": National Bureau Of Economic Research, 1050 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02138.
[8] Batool Tayyaba and Khan Aliya, (2004), "Determinants of female labour force participation": A case study of District Khushab, Population Dynamics and Security Public Policy Challenges, pp 54-82.
[9] Becker, G.S, (1965), "A Theory of the Allocation of Time", The Economic Journal, 75 (299), pp 493-517.
[10] Chuadhry, Iman Sharif and Nosheen, Farhana, (2009), "The Determinants of WomenEmpowerment in Southern Punjab (Pakistan)": An Empirical Analysis, European Journalof Social Sciences, 10(2): pp 216-229.
[11] Contreras Dante, (2008)," Female labour force participation in Chile: How Important areCultural factors"? JEL classification: D1, J2, B54.
[12] Chaudary, Imran and Jabeen Tahira, (2004), "The determinants of Fabor ForceParticipation of Higher Educated Women in Pakistan": A Logit Model Analysis, The Population and Regional Development Nexus: Islamabad, Pakistan, Vol 8 (1).
[13] Economic Survey of Pakistan (2010-2011).
[14] Ejaz Rana and Khan T, (2009), "Labour Force Participation of Married Women in Panjab(Pakistan)", Journal of Economic and Social Research, 11(2), pp 77-106.
[15] Ejaz Mehak, (2007), "The Determinants of Female Labour Force Participation inPakistan": An Instrumental Variable Approch, CREB Worling Paper No, pp 01-11.
[16] Faridi, M. Z, (2011), "Women's Efforts for Family Subsistence": A Rural Study of Pakistan, Journal of Social sciences (PJSS), Vol. 31, No. 2, pp 319-330.
[17] Faridi, M. Z,and Malik S and Basit.a.b, (2009), "Impact of Education on Female LabourForce Participation in Pakistan: Empirical Evidence from Primary DataAnalysis", Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences (PJSS) Vol. no. 1, pp. 127-140.
[18] Faridi, M. Z, et.al; (2009), "The Socio-Economic and Demographic Determinants ofWomenWork Participation in Pakistan": Evidence from Bahawalpur District, South Asian Studies, A research Journal of South Asian studies, Vol. 24, No. 2,pp. 351-367.
[19] Faridi, M. Z, Chuadhry, Imran Sharif and Mumtaz Anwer, (2009), "The Socio-Economicand Demographic Determinants of Women Work Participation in Pakistan": Evidencefrom Bahawalpur District , A Research journal of South Asian Studies, 24(2):351-36.
[20] Human Development Sector Unit, (2009), Europe and Central Asia Region, "Female Labour force Participation in Turkey": Trends, Determinants and Policy Framework, Report No 48508-TR.
[21] Hafeez A, (1998), "Women's Involvement in Earning Activities": Evidence from RuralPakistan, The Lahore Journal of Economics, Vol. 8, No. 8, pp. 123-138.
[22] International Labor Organization ILO, (2010), Youth employment: Breaking Gender barriers for young women and men.
[23] Jabeen Farah, (2006), "A socio-Economic Analysis of Working Females in Pakistan" , A thesis of Allama Iqbal Open Universty Islamabad.
[24] Jaumotte Florence, (2003), Female Labour Force Participation: Past Trends and MainDeterminants in OECD Countries, OECD Economics Department Working Papers, No. 376, OECD Publishing.
[25] Knowledge Inn, (2012), Female Labour Force of Pakistan, pp. 1-6.
[26] Khan,R. E. A. and Khan T, (2009), " Labour Force Participation of Married Women inPunjab (Pakistan)", Journal of Economics and Social Research, 11(2) 2009, pp 77-106.
[27] Kousar Tasneem, (2005), "Women's contribution to the family budge"t: Informal labour market of Pakistan, A case study of Bhawalpur, Thesis from Islamia university of Bhawlpur.
[28] Mubashara Zahida, (1999), "Parents attitude towards female student education", A sociological Review, Allama Iqbal Open University, Islamabad.
[29] Mumtaz, and Shaheed, (1987),"Women of Pakistan. Critical Social Research", Quality research international, London.
[30] Noreen Sadia, (2011), "Factors effecting income and labour force participation decisionof working females", Allama Iqbal Open University, Islamabad.
[31] Naz Iram, et.al; (2010), "Women Empowerment and Youth Perception in Pakistan", European Journal of scientific Research, ISSN 1450-216X , Vol. 39 No.1, pp. 75-89.
[32] Noback Inge et.al; (2002), "Determinants of Regional Female Labour MarketParticipation in the Netherlands": A Spatial structural Equation Modelling Approch, JEL J16, C31, C51, and R 23.
[33] Naqvi Zafreen and Shahnaz Lubna, (2002), "How Do Women Decide to Work inPakistan", The Pakistan Development Review, 41:4 Part 2, pp. 1-15.
[34] Ozaktas F D \& Konur F, (2011), "Female Labour Force Participation and Crude BirthRate in 1998-2008 Period": Evidence from Turkey, Middle Eastern Finance and Economics, ISSN: 1450-2889, Issue 10, pp.101-110.
[35] SD dimensions, (2012), People: Asia's women in agriculture, environment and rural production: Pakistan.
[36] Shaheen Safana et.al; (2011), "Female Labour Force Participation in Pakistan": A caseof Punjab, Journal of Social and Development Sciences, Vol. 2, No.3, pp. 104-110.
[37] Sajid M Rizwan et.al; (2011), "Determinants of Labour Force Participation of MarriedWomen" : A case from Study of District Gujrat, Acadimic Research International, ISSN 2223-9553, Vol 1 Issue 3,pp. 254-264.
[38] Second Quarterly Report for FY, (2005), The State of Pakistan's Economy.
[39] Shahnaz Lubna and Kizilbash Zainab, (2002), "Commenting on Causal Factor ControllingFemale Decision Making": A study of Female Decision Making RegardingPaid Employment: Punjab, Pakistan, The Lahore Journal of Economics, Vol.7,(1).
[40] Sultana Nargis, Nazil Hina, and Malik Sohail, (1994), "Determinant of female Time Allocation in Selected Districs of Rural Pakistan", The Pakistan Development Review, 33:4, Part 2.
[41] Tansel Aysit, (2002), "Economic Development and Female Labour Force Participation inTurkey": Time Series Evidence and Cross-Province Estimates, ERC Working Paper in Economics, 01/05, pp 1-7.
[42] United States Statistical Bearu, 2005.
[43] World Bank Report, (2010), Labour Force Participation in Pakistan.
[44] Yakubu A Yakubu, (2008),"Determinants of female labour force participation in SouthAfrica".Sessions CPMS.
[45] U.S Bureau of labor statistics, last modified on February 2008.
[46] http://www.bls.gov/bls/glossary.htm
[47] http://www.investorwords.com/273/asset.html\#ixzz1ujWG7bNy
[48] http://www.thefreedictionary.com//misc/HarperCollinsProducts.aspx?English

## Appendix

## Dependent variable:

FLFP = Female labor force participation
Explanatory variables:
EOR= Education of respondent
$\mathbf{R A}=$ Residential area of respondent
Age = Age of respondent
MS = Marital status of respondent
EOH = Education of Husband of respondent
HHS = Household size of respondent
FS = Family system of respondent
SPLA = Spouse participation in Labor Activities
HHI = Household income of respondent
NF = Number of female in respondent's household
NC = Number of children of respondent
NAM = Number of adult male in respondents' home
ND=Number of dependents in respondent's household
MLFP = Mother's labor force participation
A R=Assets of respondent

