

**International  
Institute of  
Social Studies**

The Erasmus logo is a stylized, handwritten-style script of the word "Erasmus" in a dark blue or black color.

## **Invisibility of women's productive work in labour statistics – special reference to Pakistan**

A Research Paper presented by:

***Muhammad Adnan Nazir (462424mn)***

(Pakistan)

in partial fulfilment of the requirements for obtaining the degree of  
MASTER OF ARTS IN DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

Major:

**Governance and Development Policy**

(GDP)

Specialization:

**Public Policy and Management**

**(PPM)**

Members of the Examining Committee:

Dr. (Karin Astrid) K.A. Siegmann

Kinsuk Mani Sinha

The Hague, The Netherlands

December 2017

***Disclaimer:***

This document represents part of the author's study programme while at the Institute of Social Studies. The views stated therein are those of the author and not necessarily those of the Institute.

***Inquiries:***

**Postal address:**

Institute of Social Studies  
P.O. Box 29776  
2502 LT The Hague  
The Netherlands

**Location:**

Kortenaerkade 12  
2518 AX The Hague  
The Netherlands

Telephone: +31 70 426 0460

Fax: +31 70 426 0799

Sr. No	CONTENTs	Page
i.	<i>Contents</i>	iii
ii.	<i>List of Table</i>	iv
iii.	<i>List of Appendices</i>	v
iv.	<i>List of Acronyms</i>	vi
v.	<i>Acknowledgement</i>	vii
vi.	<i>Abstract</i>	Viii
vii.	<i>Relevance to development studies</i>	viii
<b>1.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	1
1.1	True Labour Force statistics	2
1.2	Women in Pakistan	3
1.3	Research Problem	4
1.4	Research Objective and Question	4
<b>2.</b>	<b>LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	6
2.1	Structure and style of Questions	6
2.2	Enumerators Bias	7
2.3	Gender of Interviewer and Interviewee	7
2.4	Proxy Respondent	8
2.5	Women's own perception ( <i>for their work</i> )	9
2.6	Conceptual Framework	10
2.7	Sub-questions	11
<b>3.</b>	<b>RESEARCH METHODOLOGY</b>	12
3.1	Techniques for data generation	12
3.2	Data Generation	14
3.3	Selection of Research Participants	15
3.3.1	Official enumerators	15
3.3.2	Household / family	16
3.4	Location	16
3.5	Data analysis	16
3.6	Process of / and challenges in data gathering	17
<b>4.</b>	<b>FINDINGS &amp; DISCUSSION</b>	19
4.1	Structure & style of questions	19
4.2	Instructions/training vs <i>Ijtihad</i>	20
4.3	Enumerator's bias	22
4.4	Gender of Interviewer	24
4.5	Gender of Interviewee / Proxy respondent	25
4.6	Women's own perception	27
4.7	Education & location (area) of survey	29
4.7.1	Education of Respondent	29
4.7.2	Education of Enumerator	30
4.8	Ethnicity	30
4.9	Field work techniques or barriers	31
4.9.1	Selection of respondent	31
4.9.2	Time barrier	32
4.9.3	Semantic barrier	33
4.10	Intersectionality	33
<b>5.</b>	<b>CONCLUSION</b>	35
<b>6.</b>	<b>REFERENCES</b>	38

## Tables

Data Generation techniques	12
Statistical biases and literature methodology	13
Training for Enumerators	20
Enumerators' view for Women's involvement in work	22
Diversified responses of enumerators based on gender and ethnicity	23
Different proxies reporting work of women vs self-reporting	26
Enumerator's views for self reporting of working women	27
Enumerators' responses based on their education level	30

## **List of Appendices**

List of Research Participants - Enumerators	41
List of Research Participants - Households	43
Labour Force Questionnaire (2014-15)	44
Enumerator's Questionnaire	45
Map of Pakistan & Karachi City	50

## List of Acronyms

ADB	Asian Development Bank
CS	Construction Survey
FBS	Family Budget Survey
FLFPR	Female Labour Force Participation Rate
GOP	Government of Pakistan
HBWs	Home Based Workers
HHH	Head of Household
HIES	Household Integrated Economic Survey
HRCP	Human Rights Commission of Pakistan
HS	Health Survey
ILO	International Labour Organization
INGO	International Non-Government Organization
KILM	Key Indicators of the Labour Market
LFS	Labour Force Survey
LFPR	Labour Force Participation Rate
MHRC	Mahboob-ul-haq Research Centre
MS	Migration Survey
NGO	Non-Government Organization
PBS	Pakistan Bureau of Statistics
PBS-KRO	Pakistan Bureau of Statistics-Karachi Office
PDS	Pakistan Demographic Survey
PSLM	Pakistan Social and Living Standard Measurement
RS	Rent Survey
TS	Transportation Survey
UN	United Nations

## Acknowledgements

On successful completion of this research paper, I thank to *Almighty ALLAH* for blessing me an opportunity for learning at ISS, where I not only deepened my knowledge pool but also equipped with academic skills and capability. At this auspicious moment of completing graduation, I remember prays and wishes of my parents (*late*) who are still source of aspiration and strength in my life.

I am extremely grateful to my supervisor, Prof. Dr. Karin, A. Siegmann, who not only has supervised me but also turned this challenging journey into a smooth sailing and creatively learning experience. She has been very supportive and kind throughout this research study. She has always been welcome for giving her valuable guidance and advices at every moment, I need. And for this I am intellectually indebted to her objective academic guidance. I am also thankful to my second reader, Kinsuk, M. Sinha for her constructive critique and feedback that helped me give this study a more pragmatic and relevant orientation.

I am cordially thankful for all ISS staff in administration, library, IT, security and cleaning & maintenance staffs for facilitating us with congenial environment throughout our study period at ISS. My special gratitude to ISS faculty, particularly faculty of major, Governance and Development Policy (GDP) for imparting valuable knowledge through their impressive lectures and interaction with practical exposure to understand policy issues and design from development perspective.

I am thankful from the core of my heart to people without whom this research could not have been possible. All my research participants (enumerators and households) and my friends working at Government of Pakistan. Muhammad Arshad, Ministry of Finance, Islamabad, Mr. Shoukat Ali, Director, Pakistan Bureau Statistics (PBS), Islamabad, Mr. Faraz, Deputy Director and Ms. Shaban, Statistical Officer, PBS, Karachi Office. Special love to my nephew Sheraz who spared his valuable time to drive me throughout my field visit, in Karachi.

Last but definitely not least all members of my family especially my wife *Nosbee*, who always stand-by with me in every moment of life and been utmost supportive in all my endeavours both professional and academic. My sons, *Muhammad Zaid* and *Muhammad Mobid* who sacrificed my company for a long time. Especially my new-born son *Mobid* who really missed my company in early days of his birth. Love you both.

## Abstract

*Gender distinction in statistics, particularly labour statistics have real impact in formulating policies and programs for steering market towards economic as well as social development. True labour statistics are supposed to reflect dynamics of each individual participant in the labour force and their work situation irrespective of its gender / sex. However, studies reveal that official labour statistics don't provide real picture of women's paid economic activities, particularly in third world countries. The invisibility of women's work prevails due to perception about women's role confined to be housewife only. This perception stemmed from patriarchal gender roles and society norms. Improper field work survey of collection labour statistics also aggravates the invisibility. Enumerator and respondent are two main actors of field work of national survey and their being male with biased perception cause invisibility.*

*Though it is not easy to suggest remedial measures for addressing enumerator's or respondent's biases that shaped by culture and society norms, an attempt can be made to sensitize and address the problem. This paper suggests that Pakistan Bureau of Statistics (PBS) to have more female enumerators to seek out women respondents, can still reduce invisibility. As a result, PBS may consider labour force survey as more focused and important assignment being prime input for policy making, rather than routine official duty of collecting numbers and figures only. For the purpose, a policy measure has to be taken not only for capacity building for enumerators but also for review of questionnaire and time spent on each household. Without proper training and instructions, enumerator's own perception can influence their performance in collecting real labour force statistics which could lead to ineffective policy formulation and implementation.*

## Keywords

*Invisibility, labour statistics, women's productive economic activity, statistical bias, policy measures*

## Relevance to Development Studies

*Development studies is a interdisciplinary branch of social science that covers a wide range of socio-economic issues creating hurdles in development and discriminate individual on the basis of race, gender, ethnicity etc. It not only identifies issues but also explores possibilities to sensitize and address problem through effective policy formulation and implementation.*

*The objective of this research paper is to develop a greater understanding of gender based statistical biases in the official labour force statistics. These biases stemmed from society norms and biased human perception ignoring women's contribution for society as well as economy leading to wastage of scarce resources for ineffective and futile policy formulation. This discrimination can only be identified and addressed through corrective policy measures.*



## 1. Introduction:

Gender distinction in statistics, particularly labour statistics have real impact in formulating policies and programs for steering market towards economic as well as social development. The under estimation of women's economic activities has been under discussion since 1970s and it was recognized in UN Nairobi conference (1985) that pronounced *UN Decade for Women* (Boserup 1970, Beneria 1992, 1547). Labour force statistics and national income accounts are only source to depict the information regarding all participants and their economic activities with changes over time. (Beneria 1992, Mata-Greenwood 1999, Donahoe 1999). Labour statistics are supposed to be used by policy makers, researchers etc. therefore it has to be as realistic as possible for each individual involved in labour force with detail of their work scenario as how they behave in the labour market. Particularly, women who always found to be in the work inadequately described in the labour statistics (Mata-Greenwood 1999, 273 -274). Such characteristics of statistics depend on the methods and purpose of collecting data. The labour force participation is considered to be the main source of labour statistics. However, the way labour force survey conducted is not target oriented from the gender perspective. No attempt is made to seek women, because normally enumerators are male that may cause women stay away particularly in the settlement where women observe seclusion (Agarwal 1985, A-156). Adequate coverage of women in labour market like men would provide accurate depiction of individual's dynamics to policy analyst and decision makers as women and men carry different attributes, thus respond differently to market changes (Mata-Greenwood 1999, 273-274). In most part of the third world, interviewer as well as the respondent are male, thus limits possibilities of seeking women respondents because of *seclusion* (Agarwal 1985, A-156). Seclusion (or *purdah*) cause *women and their work invisible* due to separation of women from official enumerators being male (Carpenter 2001). Enumerator's perception about women keeps women out of labour (Grünenfelder & Siegmann 2016). Gender of interviewer and respondent may also cause under reporting of women labour force participation. The specified definition of work and emphasis on main activity within defined reference period also performs poor for measuring women's economic activities. (Anker 1983, Agarwal 1985, Bardasi et, al. 2010). Society norms and gender roles, particularly in third world, refrain women's from reporting their work mainly to maintain men's role of being sole breadwinner in the household. (Ustek 2015).

There are many studies conducted to find out the reasons for low female labour force participation rate (FLFPR) in Pakistan which concluded many reasons such as lack of high education & skills, sense of security, domestic household chores, transport facilities, political and cultural factors etc (Ejaz 2007, Isran & Isran 2012, Abbasi & Sarwar 2013, Sabir 2015). Yet, despite many claims of under estimation and low female LFPR, nobody has investigated the causal mechanism of under reporting and non-reporting. The objective of this study is to investigate the reasons responsible for under reporting women's productive work in labour statistics in Pakistan.

The study aims not to prove and argue with earlier studies but to find out possible factors responsible for under reporting of already existing women's

productive economic activities particularly in informal sector and approached official enumerators as well as household families as research participants.

### 1.1 True Labour Force Statistics:

The correct official labour force statistics is as important as blood in a body because it serves as prime input in formulating policies and programs particularly for the development. The timely and correct information can determine the economic roles of women and men to assess and design appropriate and effective policy measures for labour market. For instance, Pakistan labour force survey (LFS), though provides many characteristics of labour market helping policy makers, doesn't cover homebased workers (HBWs), *as separate category*, which is dominated by women (Roots 2011, 3). Akhter (2011) did an attempt to work out trends of HBWs 10+ years (from 1999-00 to 2008-09) in Pakistan with the help of questions in LFS questionnaire and concluded HBW as 1.69 million in 2008-09 with 70% share of women (Akhter 2011, 20-22). On contrary, Roots for Equity estimated HB women workers 10+ years as 12 million in a nation-wide survey in the same year of 2011 (Roots for Equity 2011, 103). Despite working long hour contributing to economy especially for export industry HBWs are deprived of any benefit from labour laws. Estimated over 12 million HBWs are even not captured adequately by labour statistics resulted in exploitation in term of work contract and low wages. HBWs depend on contractor or middleman for work and earnings, even below minimum wage. They work longer hours but are not in position to bargain for their wages (Zhou2017, 36-37). Government of Sindh is the first provincial government that has formulated and approved policy for HBWs in November 2017 and recognized HBWs for legal protection under labour laws and social security nets. However, in other provincial government for policy formulation for HBWs is in process, though crawling. If labour statistics serve its real purpose and demonstrate not only correct numbers of individuals in labour force but also its structure, characteristics and dynamics. These statistics are not only important from economic perspective to serve the purpose of monitoring and analyze performance but also social perspective as it serves to link the market with society to retain and produce better labour force through various policies and programs and assist *vulnerable* and marginalized segments of society *including youths, old, women etc* with equal approach to market (Mata-Greenwood 1999, 273). The statistics should have a comprehensive coverage catering not only characteristics of workers but also work situations and adaptability of labour market to all labour force within and outside market. The greater employment opportunities can be created and provide better access to helpless and marginalized but effective people to the market irrespective of their belonging to gender, etc.

The majority of women in Pakistan are living under socio-cultural norms within the household and society that confine them to limited access to basic human rights particularly a gainful access to employment opportunities resulting their potential goes un-noticed and un-reported. Though some of women struggling hard to break this vicious circle but their efforts, as their work, are not seen. (Isran & Isran 2012, Hassan & Azmam 2014, MHRC 2016, HRCP 2016).

## 1.2 Women in Pakistan:

Pakistani society is governed by traditional patriarchal culture and norms which is men dominated always putting constraints for women's role in the process of development, their empowerment and decision making. (Samina & Manzoor 2012, 463). Besides various articles in the Constitution in respect of human rights and equality such as Article 25, 27, 35 and 37 of constitution of Pakistan., Pakistan has several legislations and international commitment for women's economic, political and social empowerment (HRCP 2016, 149). However, these laws are ineffective and could not impact in their true spirits. "The role of justice system, including police and judiciary, has been crucial, but has generally been ineffective in implementation of most women's right related laws" (MHRC, 2016, 92). The most important International obligation is the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) for which Pakistan is a signatory since 1996. However, women in Pakistan society is still facing and struggling against domestic violence, forced marriages, no right to vote, no right to education and job of their own choice, confined to houses and problem of karo kari (honor killing) (HRCP 2016). Women generally are allowed to have access to education and skills which are in conformity to prescribed gender roles in household and society. Human Rights Commission, Pakistan revealed the facts in its report for 2016 that government has inclined to be more protective than preventive and various legal measures could not decline the cases of violence against women. Pakistan ranked 143<sup>rd</sup> out of 144<sup>th</sup> in global gender gap and stood at last in south Asian region. Further, 77% women in informal sector earn less than minimum wage. (HRCP 2016, 149-151). Women's higher rate of unemployment as compare to men is attributed to differences in educational attainment, labour market segregation, and a higher prevalence of temporary contracts (MHRC 2016, 80). Women's choice for employment is dependent on existing social pattern. Even in urban Pakistan, *purdah* keeps women aloof from male-dominated labour market and interaction with male realm (Carpenter 2001, Grunenfelder and Siegmann 2016). No more than 30% women are employed in industry and female graduates earn below minimum wage (HRCP 2016, 151). Despite low female labour force participation, a substantial number of women are actively participating in the economy whose contribution is unrecognized due to various reasons.

### 1.3 Research Problem:

The population census and labour force survey are important sources of data informing economic and social policy-making. However, such data does not cover women's presence accurately in the society and economy as well. It leads us to the point that the national statistics are biased, a gender biased, particularly. It is a fact that Pakistan society is more inclined towards traditional patriarchal culture and norms where most women are confined in *purdah* and reporting of their work depends on socio-cultural norms and their specific gender role at household. (Carpenter 2001, Samina & Manzoor 2012, Gruenfelder and Siegmann 2016). Many researchers acknowledged that female labour force participation is low and underestimated. They did attempts to find out the reasons for low participation of women in the economy. Farooq and Sulaiman (2009, 383-384) observed low female participation and differential in wage earning of women and men that men earns more than women workers with same characteristics. They concluded that female education can reduce the differential. Irfan et al. (2013, 221) also observed gender based segregation and suggested that education should be improved to reduce segregation in the labour market in Pakistan. Samina & Manzoor (2012, 464-465) observed economic invisibility of women and suggested that only economic empowerment can make women visible at houses, workplaces and society. Carpenter (2001, 12-17) did an attempt to find out the reasons for invisibility of women's work and who are responsible for invisibility? The study argued invisibility from the perspective of household (particularly rural) and the state. It discussed that the invisibility of women's work is intended by the household to safeguard their existence amongst the risk of commercialization and *development*. The study discussed the tradition of *purdah* (veil) in detail and found *purdah* is one of the reason dividing society in two domains, one public with male and other private with female. *Purdah* culture serves the purpose or it is being used for intended invisibility of women's work and subsistence sector to avoid commercialization. Yet, despite many claims of under estimation and low female LFPR, nobody has investigated the causal mechanism of under reporting and non-reporting. Neither any study approached or brought official enumerators into research study.

This study would explore the causal-factors and reasons of invisibility of already existing women's productive work which does exist but either under-reported or non-reported from the perspective of enumerators, who are sole responsible of data collection and the households and respondents whom data is collected.

### 1.4 Research objective and Question:

The prime objective of my research is to understand the reasons for the invisibility of women's productive work. This paper would discuss characteristics of women's productive work in formal and informal sector and the procedure of collecting labour force data and persons involved in collecting data and whom information is collected. I would rather go beyond the traditional reasonings and interpreting the socio-economic issues as sole responsible causal factors. It is fact that Pakistan has a patriarchal society having a variety of regional cultures and ethnicities. I acknowledge that there are certain reasons and situations within and outside cultures that intersect and resulting in the invis-

bility of already existing women's productive work in national survey. However, those responsible factors are yet to be found. This curiosity lead me to the following main research question.

*Research Question:           What are the reasons responsible for under-reporting women's productive work in Pakistan?*

## 2. Literature Review:

Many researchers studied invisibility of women's labour force activity in labour statistics and observed different causes ranges from style of question to perception about women and women's work. Many studies observed that the cultural and society norms shape the perception that how women's work to be reported. (Agarwal, 1985; Anker, 1983; Greenwood, 1999; Bardasi et al 2010). Franck & Olsson (2014) and Funda Ustek (2015) did their work on women's agency as how women perceive their work not worthy enough to report and why they refrain from reporting their work. How social construction of gender roles and cultural norms convince them not to *challenge* typical patriarchal family model where men are sole breadwinners and women as caretakers. Studies also discussed and observed the definition of work as what work is to be included or excluded, framing and asking question of labour force survey also have implication for reporting paid work of women, particularly in informal sector. The more emphasis on key words such as 'main activity', 'job' and type of defined work perform poor for reporting women's work in informal sector. (Anker, 1983; Agarwal, 1985; Anker & Gupta, 1987; Bardasi et al. 2010). Besides all above, sex of interviewer and respondent, field work technique, proxy respondent (mostly male) and enumerator's perception have also been under discussion of many studies to investigate statistical biases for invisibility of women's paid work.

### 2.1 Structure and style of Questions:

The way work is defined and activities to be asked have significant influence in reporting work especially for women working in informal sector. (Anker & Gupta 1987; Bardasi et al. 2010). More emphasis on specified key words such as '*main activity*', '*job*', 'secondary activity', were observed to have a radical effect and poorly performed for reporting women's work. (Anker & Gupta 1987, 165). The routinely specified reference period and questions have vital impact on labour statistics. For instance, "did you work in the last 7 days?" put some people/workers who are mainly engaged in household enterprises or work '*part time*' (off and on) or self-employed at home without direct wage or salary, in a situation where they cannot define themselves as 'working'. (Bardasi, et al. 2010). These are such works where women often dominate and these work and situations go "unnoticed or be inadequately described in labour statistics (United Nations, 1991 as cited in Mata-Greenwood 1999, 273). Bardasi et al. (2010, 418) developed a short and detail module of questions and observed that short module questions carrying key words performed lower female participation rate.

Frank & Olsson (2014) did an experiment and asked respondents (working women of informal sector) to choose their job title at their own to best describe their informal activity. "Around 70 per cent of the women stated titles such as hawker, self-employed, business woman, or market worker etc." (Frank & Olsson 2014, 217). Funda Ustek (2015, 34) viewed as "the emphasis on work, job, and main activity (stress original) produces greater variations in female relative to male statistics owing to the fact that many women engaged in multiple income-earning activities, in informal and seasonal work, and in activities that were not directly remunerated". Anker (1983, 720) summarized that no *labour force activity* may be pre-assumed, survey can define labour force in dif-

*ferent ways for different purpose* and various women's economic activities can also be covered. Women and men are not same at all in performing their duties, behaving to any situation nor face same constraints in the society. "Definitions need both to cover all qualifying work situations, regardless of whether they are performed by a man or a woman; and to describe the different work situations in sufficient detail to bring out any gender distinctions" (Mata-Greenwood 1999, 277). So enumerator's perception about differentiation as what counts as work and non-work for women, particularly in informal sector, has important implication as these perception are shaped by gender's roles in society. (Ustek 2015, 29)

## **2.2 Enumerator's bias:**

Enumerator's role as male for under-reporting women's work has been under discussion in many studies. However, enumerator's perception leading towards enumerator's bias for under reporting women's work has been discussed by few studies and statistical evidences are yet to be revealed (Anker 1983, Agarwal 1985, Ustek 2015, Grünenfelder & Siegmann 2016). Gender norms shaped enumerators' perceptions for women as housewife rather than their actual labour force activities and that perception leads enumerators to count women as housewives, hence keeps '*out of the labor force*' (Grünenfelder & Siegmann 2016, 4). Ustek (2015, 29) discussed enumerator's perception of understanding of women paid economic activity in terms of defining it as '*work*' or '*non work*' when perceptions are shaped by gender role of women at household and society. Agarwal (1985, A156 - A160) discussed enumerator's bias stemmed from gender of enumerator and cultural perception of women's role. This shaped a preconceived idea about women as housewife and due to seclusion women respondent is not sought out. In the male dominated society, enumerator already inclined to identify male as head of household, even "a boy of 12 could be cited or could cite himself as a household head in the absence of a male adult" (Agarwal 1985, A-160). Besides cultural and society norms, gender of enumerator shape biased perception that causes under estimation of women's economic activity in labour statistics. Anker (1983, 709-711) acknowledged that male enumerator's is supposedly would cause downward bias for reporting women's economic activity, though, this supposition lacks statistical evidence.

## **2.3 Gender of Interviewer and Interviewee (Respondent):**

Gender of interviewer as well as respondent is said to be a cause of statistical bias resulting in invisibility of women's paid work particularly in third world countries. This perception stemmed from socially constructed gender roles of male dominated society and culture where generally women are a submissive or dependent member of household. Official labour survey, generally, involved male respondent, interviewer and enumerator and it is likely these people have their own *preconceived idea* for women as '*housewives*' and report women as inactive for labour force (Ustek 2015, 34). "Women's economical productive work could be seen by the men as a part of housework and so reported". (Agarwal 1985, A-156). Male Interviewer is believed to have a presumption about women as "*housewives*", which resulted in biasing *female labour force activity rates* downward, however there is no enough statistical evidences for this proposition. Nonetheless, fact is that either male interviewer conducts in-

interview of male respondent or female respondent (*in presence of male*), the responses regarding women's work tend to be biased. (Anker 1983, 709-711). In a social setup where women's working is considered to negatively affect family, the respondent tends to under-report the female's economic activity. (ibid). In "third World, the person from whom information is sought and obtained is the male head of household or other male household member. Hence when questions relating to women's work status and her availability for work are asked, the answers tend to reflect a male perspective". (Agarwal 1985, A-156).

Since, the person whose information is obtained and the respondent is not always same, proxy respondents come forward, who may not have full knowledge of other household members' working or it is their discretion to report correctly or under-report. Proxy respondent has also been under consideration of many studies as a villain for causing under-reporting women's remunerated economic activity. Practically, (Bardasi et al. 2010, 426), in large surveys proxy is selected by interviewer on the basis of their knowledge and availability. Those, mostly, tend to be male.

## 2.4 Proxy Respondent:

It is common assumption that proxy respondent (mostly male) may not provide or under-report the economic activity performed by female member of household resulting in statistical biases, though significant evidence to test proxy responses, is scarce. (Anker & Gupta 1987; Bardasi et al. 2010, 423). Anker & Gupta (1987) and Bardasi et al. (2010) have worked in detail with certain experiments to test the assumption that proxy respondent (mostly males) under-report female labour force activity. Proxy respondent is not randomly selected in real official survey. The interviewer / enumerators have discretion to select them. Bardasi et al. (2010) has worked on bias reporting by proxy respondent and selected proxy respondent randomly with the acknowledgment that "in actual implementation of surveys, proxy informants are not randomly chosen, but are normally selected by interviewers on the basis of their knowledge and availability." (Bardasi et al. 2010, 426). Similarly, under the latest guidelines / manual of instruction for field enumerators / supervisors for LFS (2017-18) prepared by Pakistan Bureau of Statistics, enumerators are not bound for respondent's gender, age (only 10 years & above) and relation with head of household. The manual says "the enumerator should try to contact the head of the household or, in his/her absence, any other member of the household who may be able to furnish the required information". (GOP 2017, 19). Then the question arises how can proxy information be presumed, negative for under-reporting of women's performed economic activity, do we have any significant statistical evidences? Bardasi et al. (2010, 426-427) categorically described three (03) possibilities behind proxy's responses.

For example, if proxy informants report lower participation in employment, one cannot differentiate between explanations such as (1) proxies are not fully knowledgeable of the employment activity of the other household members, either because individuals hide their employment participation from other members, or simply because it is difficult to "keep track" of what others are doing, especially in large households; (2) proxies tend to have a "low opinion" of other house-



hold members and are likely to think that what they do does not qualify as work even when it does; or (3) the opposite, proxy informants are more likely to respond objectively and it is the individual who overstates his or her employment to make it appear that s/he works because “it looks better.”

Anker & Gupta (1987) interviewed (statistically identical to an official survey) sample of household “with roughly equal numbers of female and male interviewers, “self-respondents” (i.e. persons responding for themselves, who were all female) and “proxy-respondents” (i.e. persons responding for another, who were mainly male)”. The study observed contrary to the assumption that proxy respondent (i.e male) under reports female economic activity. The differences between proxy and self-respondents were found to be insignificant. The study concluded that “the sex of the proxy-respondents (mostly male) answering for female household members and of the investigators doing the interviewing was not found to be a major source of bias; i.e. male respondents and interviewers were not the chief villains in the underestimation of women's labour force participation.” (Anker & Gupta 1987, 165). The another empirical study of Bardassi et, al,. (2010) also observed that proxy response rather than self-report has no significant effects on female economic activity. “In all regressions, the small and not-significant effect of proxy informants on female employment rates is confirmed” (Bardasi et. al. 2010, 439). It is interesting to note that in the survey experiment conducted by Bardasi et, al,. (2010) “the proxy informant was randomly chosen among household members at least 16 years old” without emphasis on their gender. “The proxy informant is thus either the head of household, spouse of the head, or an older child or relative living in the household. The persons selected to be the proxy informants then reported on themselves and on up to two other randomly selected household members age 10 or older”. (Bardasi et, al 2010, 425-426). Thus, proxy can happen either to be male or female. Agarwal (1985, A-156) viewed that women and men have *same cultural perception for women role* and, in third world, women tend to categorize themselves as ‘*housewives*’ due to *common cultural pattern*, though *economically active*, they are.

## 2.5 Women’s own perception (of their work):

Women are also considered to be a source of invisibility of their paid economic activity. The perception about women’s role in household and society is shaped by *common cultural pattern* (Agarwal 1985) and *patriarchal family model* (Ustek 2015) which refrain women not to challenge already set gender roles. Frank & Olsson (2014) observed it differently as why women don’t report their work “this may involve a perception that reporting their work may lead to economic losses and/or reflect strategies to secure self-interest within the household bargaining process..... strategically label their activities as “housework” as a means of gaining access to work in public places while appearing to comply with the norm that their actual place is in the home or that the man is the family breadwinner.” (Frank & Olsson 2014, 219). Whereas Ustek (2015) argued that the women may not consider their work worthy enough because of *low pay, insecure job* without adequate perks and absence of employee-employer *contract* due to characteristics of informal sector. Mata-Greenwood (1999, 274) viewed as “because of their assigned role as dependent members of the house-

hold, women tend to be relatively more active than men in non-market activities and in the informal sector; to be considered by others and even by themselves as economically inactive”.

Invisible working women, generally, dominate in such type of works which fall under informal sector. Ustek (2015) highlighted the missing features of work of majority of women such as *adequate benefit, regular and stable income contractual relationship between employee and employer* which refrain women from reporting their remunerated economic activity. All these features are attributed to the *informal sector*. Elder et al. (1999, 457) while doing analysis of KILM-ILO disclosed that the women have larger share in employment in informal sector than that of men's, in all Asian and African countries.

## 2.6 Conceptual Framework:

Many researchers enlisted the reasons behind invisibility of women's work. Studies observed that official labour force statistics do not capture the women's remunerative labour force activity, particularly women's working in informal sector. The possible reasons for under reporting or non-reporting are enumerator's perception, gender of interviewer and respondents, women own perception about their work, definition of work, field work techniques, including structure of questions / style of asking question with probing techniques and proxy respondents (Anker (1983), Agarwal (1985), Anker & Gupta (1987), Greenwood (1999), Bardasi et al (2010), Frank & Olsson (2014) & Ustek (2015)). It has also been observed and established that, even paid women's work in informal sector especially domestic work, home based work, subsistence economic activities are ignored / unreported in national statistics (Beneria 1992, Carpenter 2001).

Frank & Olsson (2014, 219) observed that women don't report their work due to their perception that reporting work may lead to economic losses ..... strategically label their activities as “housework”.

Funda Ustek (2015, 52) concluded that “constrained by limited labor market opportunities and patriarchal gender roles, women in informal employment tend to undervalue their paid labour owing to its irregular, low pay and contingent characteristics.

Anker & Gupta (1987, 165) concluded that gender of enumerator/interviewer or proxy respondent (mostly male) was not the major cause for under reporting of female labour force activities. However, questionnaires design has radical effect on reporting of women's work. (Anker & Gupta 1987, 165).

Bardasi et, al (2010) observed that short questions perform lower employment for women and proxy respondent has no effect on reporting female labour force activities. “that there is no substantial benefit of self-reporting for women” (Bardasi et, al., 2010, 442-443).

Anker, Richard (1983, 721) suggested that “only by improving field-work techniques and questionnaire design can the statistical invisibility of much of the economic and labour force activity of women be eliminated”.

Agarwal (1985) and Greuenfelder & Siegmann (2016, 4) conceptualized enumerator's bias due to their perception that stemmed from society and cultural norms and gender of enumerators leading to preconceived idea for women as housewife *hence, categorize them as 'out of the labor force'*.

Many studies also discussed patriarchal society norms and gender roles as one of the main reason for preconception about women and women's work. It is generally believed that enumerators are happened to be male, thus there is a possibility that his preconception about women's gender role may affect his reporting about women's productive work (Agarwal 1985, Carpenter 2001, Roots for equity 2011). It is also a fact that biases resulting from proxy respondent (male) and enumerator's perception are lacking statistical evidences, though many studies mentioned enumerator's bias due to its gender (being male) and cultural perception of women's role as housewife causing under reporting of women's work. Despite various claims, none of the study has engaged with enumerator's perception nor approached them in field work, as research participant. This paper would also attempt to understand the prevalence of biases resulting from enumerator's perception and proxy respondent (male). Thus, with above conceptualization following sub questions emerged.

## **2.7 Sub-Questions:**

- i. what are the factors shaping enumerator's perception that lead to invisibility of women's labour force activity?*
- ii whether proxy respondent (male) under-reports work of female member of household?*

### 3. Research Methodology:

The literature suggests that there are various errors/biases in enumeration of women's paid economic activity and / or women labour force activities are under-reported. As elaborated in previous section the gender of enumerator and respondent, proxy respondent, field work technique, women's own perception and enumerators / surveyor's perception are identified some possible reasons of the under-reporting of female labour activities in the relevant literature. However, biases resulting from enumerator's perception and proxy respondent still need statistical evidences. The most important is the technique for data generation and analysis. Since the research question is to find out reasons responsible for under reporting of women's productive work, the previous studies were used to help evolve techniques for data generation and methodology.

#### 3.1 Techniques for data generation:

Following table shows data generation / techniques to find out possible reasons of under reporting of women's productive work, suggested by literature. However, techniques are not confined to only these possible reasons. The discussions in interviews and observations are open-ended to explore any other reason and hurdle in reporting women's productive work.

Possible reasons for under-reporting	Data generation / techniques
Gender of enumerator	Enumerators' observation and practical-hand information (through interviews and questionnaire) which is then testified with household's interviews. Both female and male interviewers did field visit for household interviews as an experiment.
Gender of respondent / Proxy respondent	Besides enumerator's experience, in household interviews both women and men are interviewed separately for LFS questionnaire. Both female (interview guide) and male (the researcher) interviewers together visited families. Both women and men were interviewed for her/his own productive work (self-reporting) and her/his spouse (proxy respondent).
Women's own perception	Both women and men enumerators were interviewed for their views. After formal family interview an informal discussion was held by interview-guide with women to find reasons / intentions behind their replies.
Field work techniques	Enumerators were asked for their approach to ask question in survey and how they try to elicit the right information either based on official instructions/training or personal capacity. The practical approach is also learnt during family's interview by an official and professional enumerator. Specific section (section – 5 regarding working status of every household members) of LFS questionnaire will be examined in terms of wording and style of questions and testified its implication in household interviews.
Enumerator's perception	Both female and male enumerators of different age, education belonging to different ethnicity were interviewed with same sequence of questions. Their responses/views and expression would be analyzed to understand their perception for women and women's work.

The objective of this paper is to develop a methodology to find out possible reasons of the under reporting of women's productive economic activity

from the perspective of enumerators and proxy respondent (from household) with special reference to Pakistan.

Interviews and questionnaire for enumerators and household families are adopted for data generation. This data generation methodology adopted by the some previous studies For instance, Frank & Olsson worked on under-recording of women's work in Malaysia with focus on women agency as why women refrain from reporting their work. They (Frank & Olsson) conducted interviews of working women involved in various works of informal sector such as street hawkers, vendors, home-based workers. (Frank & Olsson 2014, 213). Funda Ustek (2015) did research work on 'invisibility of women's paid work in informal sector'. Ustek focused on subjective definition of 'work' and 'non-work' and why women working in informal sector perceived them as housewives and don't consider their work worthy enough to report. Its field work comprises in-depth interviews, participant observations, and focus groups. The targeted respondents were low-income and low-educated working women engage in work in the informal sector. Anker & Gupta (1987) argued about under-reporting of women and worked on official results of Indian survey. They (Anker & Gupta) selected sample of households, statistically identical to official survey, and interviewed them. Hassan & Azmam (2014) studied home based women workers with objective "to understand the challenges and struggles faced by the women home based workers" (Hassan & Azmam 2014 – 49). The study used in-depth interviews and focused group discussion. The respondents were home-based working women aged 20 – 60 engaged in production activities, contribute to the family income, work on piece rate or own-account workers (Hassan & azmam 2014, 50 – 51).

Literature discussed or observed following statistical errors / biases as responsible factor by respective research methodology mentioned against each of them.

Statistical biases and literature methodology		
Author (s)	Statistical errors / Bias discussed or observed	Methodology
Anker (1983)	Interviewers, respondents, type of questions and definition	Review of field work techniques, questionnaire and definition of labour force.
Anker & Gupta (1987)	Questionnaire type Sex of interviewer Response of male for female on behalf of female	Use Method Test. Household <b>interviews</b> , labour force definitions used
Bardasi et al. (2010)	Style of question (short vs detailed) and proxy informant	The survey experiment through <b>interviews</b> and <b>questionnaire</b> . Regression model (OLS, Probit and Multinomial)
Funda Ustek (2015)	Women's subjective perception of the meaning of 'work' as why they (women) don't report their work.	<b>in-depth interviews</b> , participant observations, and focus groups of low-income and low-educated working women engage in work in the informal sector.
Frank & Olsson (2014)	Women's agency (women's own perception)	<b>Interview</b> working women at their workplaces
Agarwal (1985)	Enumerator's and Respondent's bias Definitional bias	conceptual study

It is important that male enumerator is presumed to under report women labour force activity due to his preconceived idea about women as housewife. However, none of the study has ever approached enumerators. Besides household interviews for data generation, for other possibly responsible factors, this paper also discussed enumerator's bias as well as approached official enumerators of different age, gender, education level, experience and ethnicity in field work for analysis of enumerator's bias due to their perceptions and factors shaping perception. Besides, in household interviews women and men were interviewed for self-reporting as well as proxy respondent to see whether proxy (male) respondent under-report economic activity of female member of household.

### 3.2 Data Generation:

Interviews of enumerators as well as household's families were used for data generation with two questionnaires. Questionnaire for enumerators was prepared whereas households were interviewed with LFS questionnaire to analyze the implication of wording and style of questions in LFS questionnaire and performance of proxy (male) respondent. The literature also suggested that the direct interaction with the respondents through interview and discussion is appropriate and an effective research tools. Not a single source of evidence ever has an absolute advantage over others'. Interviews are one of the important source of evidences when study is about *human affairs or action*. Source of direct observation and participant observation are also important and complement interviews to acquire additional information, (Yin, 2014, 105-118). It was expected that the investigation would revolve around system errors / measurement methods as well as human perceptions. The field work comprises interviews, direct observation and participants observations. Interviews comprises a questionnaire along with discussion with respondents. Interviews were mix of structure and unstructured types but open-ended. A questionnaire for enumerators' interviews was prepared, based on literature, and was filled during interview. Enumerators were free to talk and deliberate their views. The questionnaire was prepared on the basis of, but not confined to, findings and argument of literature. The questionnaire is carrying questions regarding self-reporting and proxy respondent (by male or female head of household), cultural and society norms. Enumerators were also asked for their approach how they seek and decide about respondents and ask question and trainings they received as part of field work techniques. Response from households were also discussed by enumerators. The discussion with enumerators were open-ended for their own views / opinions and practical observations and experience.

The field work comprises two modes of interviews, one with individual interviews with official enumerators/surveyors and other is with household families to fill-in labour force survey (LFS) questionnaire. The LFS questionnaire was selected for household interviews to analyse the implication of wording and style of questions in LFS questionnaire. The household interviews will, on the one hand helps understand the attitude / behaviour of self-respondent and proxy-respondents and on the other hand it testify and corroborate the views and observations of enumerators.

Household families were asked same questions, regarding family composition and paid economic activities and any other work if they are not engaged in paid economic activity, from LFS questionnaire (2014-15) by an official (pro-

fessional) enumerator to men and women, separately, of the same household. Interviews were recorded except one family who did not agree for recording. For individual interviews with enumerators, questions were asked to each interviewee in the same order and discussed in detail. I (interviewer) conducted individual interviews with enumerators and recorded interviews with permission of interviewees. However, three (03) interviewees were not agreed for recording and only one (01) of them filled questionnaire at his own without discussion/interview. We succeeded to get (03) household interviewed and all families were belonging to southern Punjab. Only one family allowed me to enter the house with interview guide for women interview. All other interviews were conducted by interview guide and recorded. Interviews of enumerators takes 15 – 20 minutes each. The household interviews lasted for half an hour wherein women's interviews took more time approx. 15 – 20 minutes. Only one family didn't allow recording. Difficulties / challenges in gathering data is discussed in following section.

### 3.3 Selection of Research Participants:

Since this paper intends to find out the reasons for under-reporting or non-reporting of women's paid economic activity and most of the literature observed reasons of women's own perception (Franck & Olsson 2014 & Ustek 2015), gender of interviewer and interviewee, enumerator's perception (Anker 1983, Agarwal 1985, Anker & Gupta 1987, Ustek 2015, Grunenfelder and Siegmann 2016), style of question and proxy respondents (Anker 1983, Anker & Gupta 1987, Bardasi, et al. 2010), my field work have focused on more than one group of actors.

**3.3.1 Official enumerators:** Many studies observed that, in third world, mostly enumerators are male so there is possibility that they have pre-conceived idea for women as *housework* while recording women's work (Anker 1983, Agarwal 1985, Anker & Gupta 1987, Bardasi 2010). The idea for this perception stems from traditional patriarchal society norms where women are considered to be a *caretaker* at home and are preconceived to be *housewife* depending on her men's earning. It is also observed that official enumerators for collecting data, generally in third world, are male and there is possibility that his perception may influence reporting of working women (Agarwal 1985, Roots for Equity 2011, Grunenfelder & Siegmann 2016). However, none of study ever contacted enumerators for their views and perceptions. Enumerators' attitude, training, experiences and observations are important to investigate invisibility of women paid economic activities, they are sole responsible for getting data as their training and own attitude/perception can influence the information. So far studies discussed enumerator's bias in term of their gender (mostly male) due to the fact that in third world enumerators are mostly male (Anker 1983, Agarwal 1985, Bardasi et al. 2010). Thus, I decided enumerators to be one of the respondent groups in my field work, besides household/family. Enumerators working in Pakistan Bureau of Statistics, (PBS) are one of the targeted respondents as none of research study ever contacted and interviewed enumerators who are sole responsible for collection of data and they possess very important practical ground realities about data collection. Further, besides training and instructions, how they use their personal capabilities and approach in data collection. How their approach leads to invisibility of women's paid economic activity. 11 official enumerators, including males as

well as female, are interviewed at PBS Karachi Office (PBS-KRO) and all are different in age, education level, experience and ethnicity.

Enumerators were approached in their office (PBS-KRO). During interviews enumerators were free to talk about any obstacles / challenges they face during survey. They were also asked whether they are satisfied with data/information they produce in respect of working women and what they perceive about involvement of women in paid work/labour force activity. They also talk about society-based gender norms and roles and whether these roles are hurdle in recording information about women or they (enumerators) consider these roles as acceptable norms rather than barriers, *their own perception*.

**3.3.2 Household / family:** In order to investigate the proxy respondent's bias and women's own perception for reporting their work, female and male members of 03 households were interviewed. Women and men of the same household was interviewed separately. Both women and men were interviewed for reporting her / his own work (self-reporting) and her / his spouse work (as proxy). These household interviews are also used as testing devise to corroborate findings from enumerators interviews. There were both female and male interviewer to counter the doubt if male interviewer may not be allowed for women's interview. Households were contacted at their houses in slum area, Jamali Colony, Gulshan-e-Iqbal, Karachi.

#### **3.4 Location:**

Karachi city was selected for field work as it is one of the most populated city with population of more than 14 million (GOP, 2017). Karachi is the most developed and metropolitan city with more slum areas with diversified ethnic groups. Karachi city is considered to be a mini Pakistan because of high diversification as its residents belong to a variety of race, education, occupations, their native language & culture. Karachi city provides better working opportunities to all women and men in formal as well as informal sector.

Karachi city has many slum areas dominated by specific ethnic group and mix of different ethnic groups. The Jamali Colony, Gulshane-e-Iqbal Karachi has many families for working women at their own houses and at others' house. This area is mix of different ethnic people with majority of southern Punjab (*srayekee*). It was expected to easy access to household for women interview. My earlier attempt to go alone in one of slum area was not fruitful, detail mentioned in following section of difficulties / challenging in gathering data.

#### **3.5 Data analysis:**

Since I collected primary data through questionnaires and qualitative interviews, both qualitative as well as quantitative analysis was attempted. For qualitative analysis all interviews were transcribed and annotated in detail with society norms, gender hierarchy and literature arguments. Attempt to cite relevant part from literature in support or contrary to my findings, as the case may be and see if they (previous studies) left a void that can be filled (Yin 2014, 192-193). Difference and similarity of views of various enumerators were also observed keeping in view their gender, age, education, experience and ethnicity. Observations of enumerators' interviews then compared and validate with finding of families' interviews and analyzed in light of literature arguments.



Besides, qualitative analysis, survey data was recorded and analyzed in statistical software i.e SPSS for quantitative analyses through tabulated information on frequencies, descriptive analysis, cross column and chart/graphical presentation. The whole analysis comprises (Yin 2014, 135) arranging all information into category and place the evidences with respective array and formulate tabulated form and other statistical tools for examining the data.

### 3.6 Process of and challenges in data gathering:

Though it was an uphill task to discuss and interview official enumerators as it was really difficult to get official surveyors for independent individual research. However, some friends of mine working at reasonable position in government helped me to conduct field work with enumerators. I also wanted to arrange focused group discussion but due to paucity of time and non-availability of all enumerators at one time and place, it could not have been possible. I kept visiting PBS-KRO everyday in the morning for more than one week to find official surveyors at their convenient time. As Yin (2014, 88) emphasized *protocol of research*, the *schedule and availability* of interviewees have to be catered instead of researcher's. Since my field work is to collect *data from people and institutions in their every day situation....to integrate real world situation in data* (Yin 2014, 88), I tried to create a conducive environment so that responses should not be influenced under boss permissions. Interviewees may not be influenced by controlled environment or confined to designed question only, it would rather be much more open-ended. (Yin 2014, 88). Interviews were recorded with permission. However, three (03) interviewees were not agreed for recording and only one (01) of them filled questionnaire at his own without discussion/interview. Although I came to know during discussion that no female has ever worked for LFS and this is first time PBS-KRO involved female enumerators for LFS and some female enumerators were trained for LFS. I approached three female enumerators (who got 2-day training for LFS) for questionnaire and interview to have female perception and professional experience as they were involved in other official surveys such as Pakistan Standard of Living Measurement (PSLM), Rent Survey (RS), Family Budget Survey (FBS) etc. Almost all male enumerators are more than 50 years of age with experience of more than 30 years. While three female enumerators have 11 to 15 years of experiences.

For family/household interview I alongwith my nephew visited one slum area at (Batah Town) North Nazimabad area of Karachi city with local casual dress hanging a bag on shoulder (to be looked like an enumerator/field worker). This area is full of lower middle class and poor people. I approached one house where two baby girls came out. On my query they informed their mother was working at others house but they didn't know exactly about father's work except that he went to work in morning and came in the evening. While we were standing outside some other people came to us and enquired about our presence there. I explained that I am from govt. office (PBS) for survey about working of women and men at houses with interviews of men and women, separately. They expressed their fear of taxes and some showed their dignity (*ghairat*) that they didn't show their women or allow me to interview women separately. I left them and changed some streets. I also met one of old lady at one house and she refused to tell anything except "we are very poor people, my son, and there is no one at home" (*hum buhat ghareeb log hn beta aur*

*abhi koi nai hy ghar par*)". She asked me to come in the evening when her son would be at home but I would not be allowed to interview women separately. After wondering for some hours, I realized that I am not trained enough to convince them and decided to arrange trained enumerator or, atleast, one female for this task. and we could In order to maintain originality and capture and *integrate real world* (Yin 2014) into data, I decided to discuss my intention with one of female enumerator at PBS-KRO. I didn't disclose my intention with any male enumerator because many male enumerators were even reluctant for their interviews and almost all male enumerators, during their interviews apprised that they never insisted to ask question from women separately. So it would have been difficult to get women's response directly if I could be able to arrange any male enumerator. Alternatively, I could act as male enumerator. I met and interviewed 03 female enumerators at PBS-KRO and decided to discuss my intention with one because I perceived a bit potential in her because she shared her experience of surveys at private organizations. Yin (2014, 89) also mentioned under data collection protocol that it is an important task to have *assistance and guidance from other team member or colleague*. After discussion and necessary settlements of schedule I got her services for family interviews.

## 4. Finding & Discussion:

In this section possible responsible factors will be discussed and analysed in light of interviews of enumerators and households families and an attempt will be made to explore any reason behind invisibility of women's labour force activity and causes of enumerator's perceptions and proxy (male) respondent leading to invisibility of women's labour force activities.

### 4.1 Structure & style of questions:

Structure of question or style of asking questions turn to be very effective in getting information. Every respondent has different capacity of understanding questions and purpose of survey. Anker (1983) reviewed question design and criticized *simple key-word type question* and suggested an activity schedule to obtain accurate labour force data with no prior assumption as what activity is to include or exclude from labour force definition. Anker & Gupta (1987, 165) also observed radical effects and poor performance for reporting women's work by more emphasis on specified key words such as 'main activity', 'job', 'secondary activity. Bardasi et al. (2010) observed that short module questions with short reference period carrying key words performed lower female participation rate.

Contrary to above literature, enumerators suggested to use key words, non-repetition, precise and easy to understand questionnaire and avoid lengthy questions. The most senior official elaborated the situation "we have to complete survey in short time respondent doesn't have time she/he wants quick disposal because they don't expect any remuneration (*milta milata kutch na-bee...*)" (time barrier will be discussed in detail in field work technique). Another senior male enumerator realized the importance of enumerator and viewed that "it also surveyor's capability that he asks question in (*such*) a way that he can get more and accurate answer". One enumerators informed that they have to use their own ability to make question easy to get accurate replies. However, female enumerators had difference of opinions. A female enumerator shared her experience of recording data about a family making lunch boxes but the work was reported only for male. Another female enumerator informed that a woman used to look after her husband's shop for 2 hours daily but her work could not be recorded. Franck and Olsson (2014, 211) also noted that the more emphasis on *work*, *job*, and *main activity* for labour force survey creates greater variations in female relative to male statistics because of the fact that many women, in third world, are involved in multiple unpaid activities of agriculture and family work which were not directly remunerated.

However, household interviews supported the suggestions of literature for detailed questioning. During a family interview, a woman didn't answer to the question for main activity within reference period but replied when it was asked with exemplified questions for different reference period "do you go outside for work and you earn money, for instance to any workplace (*shops, factory or other's home*)" and "do you do some work at your own home to earn (any) money?". The reply was bit slow but on probing it was learnt that she did 'sewing'. With further detail about reference period for last week, months, etc. it was revealed that she also did 'embroidery' on shirts and pillow covers. Here, part-time work become important. During experiment with family interviews, it is noticed that women do some work at home depending on availability of time out of their domestic responsibilities and availability of work received

from other people (particularly sewing, embroidery etc) and from some contractors working in formal sector. Her work depends on availability of work, if she received work of embroidery. “(agar koi kaam deta hy tou bantee hun nai deta tou nai banatee)”. She did not consider her work as principal activity as mentioned in Qs. No. 5.1 in LFS questionnaire (GOP-PBS 2014, 46).

Questions No. 5.1 and 5.2 at Section 5 (*current activity of all household members*) in LFS questionnaire of PBS is the main section to establish work of every member of household and all other questions of section 5 decide the nature of employer/establishment etc. Qs. No. 5.1 ask for *principal activities during last 12 months* and Qs. No. 5.2 ask for *any work for pay, profit, or family gain during last week, at least for one hour on any day* (GOP-PBS, 2014-15, 46). The emphasis on principal activity in Qs. No. 5.1 and reference period in Qs. No. 5.2 would not have served the purpose, had it been followed, strictly, in household interviews. Now the question arises on reference period for work. If she had not received any work in last month the answer would definitely, have been “No”. Interview guide had to give examples of different kind of work. The outcome of exemplified questions was also evident from the field work of Roots for Equity (2011) where women enumerators asked questions about any kind of work with examples for better understanding of questions. (Roots for Equity 2011, 7).

It does imply that proper training for capacity building of enumerators is very important and can play vital role to get more and accurate information as it is not possible, in short term, to sensitize the respondents however with better techniques of probing more accurate information could be obtained for evolving policies and programs for future.

#### 4.2 Instructions/training vs *Ijtihad*:

For discussion about training and capacity building, it was learnt that all field workers always get two-day training prior to survey and this training is routine type gathering mainly to discuss questionnaire of survey. A female enumerator who recently received LFS training described pre-survey training as

“we got two-day LFS training but it was not special as all (enumerators) are well experienced. To fill questionnaire is personal capacity. It is our observa-

Capacity Building / Training for Enumerators				
Questions	Mostly	Sometime	Rare	Never
Do you get/receive any particular training before going into every survey?	100%	--	--	--
How often do you receive training on gender issues/sensitivity in conducting survey?	9%	18%	9%	64%
Source: own calculation from primary data collected in field work				

tion and capacity how to fill questionnaire”. A senior male enumerator informed about previous practice and utility of pre-survey training “it was used to be a pre-testing (of questionnaire) and then training. The questionnaire was also used to be tested before. Now it doesn’t happen and LFS’s pre-survey training doesn’t impact. It is (*now*) also surveyor’s capability that he asks question in a way the he can get more and accurate answers”. It is also important to

mention that on query regarding attending any special training on gender issues/sensitivity organized by PBS-GOP or INGO/UN organizations, 64% replies were *No* even majority apprised that they heard *first time* about such training.

The type/style of questions and enumerator's own capacity are both important. A senior male enumerator informed that they had to use their own ability to make questions easy to get accurate replies. He further clarified that the information in the questionnaire can show the enumerator's capability. However, as per instruction manual, enumerators are instructed to use same words, as in questionnaire, for all sample household to minimize the misunderstanding created by the way enumerator asks question (GOP-PBS 2017, 20). A senior male enumerator told that he had to create a friendly environment with respondents and sometimes they got camouflage (wearing local dresses and speaking local language, if they know) to get more replies. Whereas instructions only asked enumerators to be friendly and un-officious and not to make any comment that could offend respondent (GOP-PBS 2017, 20). It is also important to note that the questionnaire is in english and enumerators are expected to translate it into "*local language of respondent*" (GOP-PBS 2017, 20). However, local language is not defined/named as Pakistan has many local languages besides national language i.e *urdu*. Instructions manual is also silent for specific probing techniques and interaction with communities. It all depends on enumerator's own observations and capacity and willingness to get as much information as possible. A male enumerator apprised that sometimes he had to wear dress and speak language according to area people so that they might feel comfortable while responding to questionnaire. While he was silent for the situation if he didn't know local language of respondent. Another senior male enumerator shared his experience of reporting invisible work "domestic work, home-based work of sewing and home tuition are the work that could not be captured. However, if 'tuition center' is written outside home, then we ask" and "if any child comes out and informs his mother is out for work then it will come under our observation and we record". A male enumerator threw some light on enumerator's own capability "...might be enumerator does not ask correctly because enumerator also has an important role, he should have command (*capability*) on survey. Enumerator knows how to get information. Information in questionnaire will tell how enumerator is! When we introduce ourselves then we have only 10 – 15 minutes to complete survey if there is command (capability)survey will complete".

In this respect, a proper capacity building training would definitely can play an important role for collecting data through enumerator. Instruction manual also acknowledged the importance of labour force statistics and the role of *field staff*, however practically field staff utilized their own capacity and *ijtihad* to complete their task. The personal capacity plays an important role, however it can cause enumerator's bias, based on their own perceptions resulting from different reasons such as society norms, ethnic culture pattern, lack of education etc.

### 4.3 Enumerator's bias:

As discussed in preceding section that enumerators are very important actors in collecting data and their views and perception can affect their professional assignment. It is very difficult to judge one's perception asking direct questions about their perceptions or using their own judgment in official assignments particularly when one is working for government's assignment. Besides patriarchal gender roles, different ethnic background of enumerator can also influence their perception particularly about women's employment and mobility outside house.

During interviews with enumerators it was difficult to ask direct questions about their attitude and performance for recording women's work during survey. However, replies to some questions can help understand their own perception. For instance, to one personal question about "involvement of women in economic activity (working outside home)". All female and only two male enumerators were of the same opinion 'excellent'. Both male enumerators belonged to rural areas of Sindh and Punjab province. However, one was educated with MPhil and other was brought-up and settled in urban areas of Karachi and his wife was also working women. One male enumerator (belonging to same ethnicity) was of the different view that "our society doesn't allow women to work", he opted an option 'good', reluctantly to show positive attitude.

Enumerators' views for Women's involvement in work		
Sex of Respondent	what is your opinion about women involved in economic activity ( <i>outside home</i> )?	
	Excellent	Good
Female	3	0
Male	2	6
Total	5	6

For inclusion / hiring more female enumerators, few male enumerators acknowledged the need of female enumerator and one of them (belonging to urdu speaking ethnic group) viewed "there should be female, it is a need". However, a senior enumerator (belonging to southern Punjab) replied it differently as "there should be female enumerator but they have to face problems in our society she can't go alone if they go they (have to) go with us or they go in group (*go together with other females*)".

Besides, gender and society norms, ethnic culture and level of education have influential role in making perception. Following table shows that female enumerators were consistently of same reply to almost all questions whereas males have difference of opinion depending on their education level and ethnicity. Male enumerators who were found to have same opinions of female either educated or they were grown up in urban developed city of Karachi.

Diversified responses of enumerators based on gender and ethnicity									
Sex of enumerator	What is your opinion about women involved in economic activity? ( <i>women's working outside home</i> )		Have you ever emphasized/convinced a male respondent to bring women to you for questions regarding women and women work?			Do you think gender/sex of an enumerator affect responses of an interviewee (particularly when a man interview women)?		Do you suggest/advice that only women should interview/enumerate women for their paid work in survey? ( <i>appoint more female enumerators</i> )	
	Excellent	Good	Mostly	Sometime	Never	Yes	No	Of-course	Makes no difference
Female	3	0	3	0	0	3	0	3	0
Male	2	6	0	4	4	5	3	5	3
Total	5	6	3	4	4	8	3	8	3
Source: own calculation from primary data collected in field work									

Male enumerators were divided in their opinion for seeking women for questions regarding women working during survey. Despite the fact that according to manual / instruction for LFS, they are not bound to seek women for interviews, 4 male enumerators emphasized '*sometime*' for seeking women respondent. These 4 male enumerators were from different ethnic background (Sindhi, Punjabi & Urdu speaking). It is interesting to note that the 3 male enumerators who have the same opinion for last two questions, in above table, are the same but not same as previous 4 male enumerators. However, ethnicities were same (Punjabi, Sindhi & Srayekee). Besides the same gender and ethnicity, male enumerators have difference of opinion.

Last but not least, perception and sensibility of gender issues can be learnt from practical observations and experience of under-reporting women's productive activities during a survey by female enumerator. She said "I did one survey and it came to my observation that one family used to make lunch boxes and wife was also used to work with her husband but that work was reported only for husband. Moreover, 3 – 4 members do sewing and embroidery work at home but (that) work is captured for only one member (mostly male)". Another female enumerator shared her experience that "a woman does helping work for her husband (*when he*) leaves (his shop (grocery store)) and wife looks after for 2 hours daily. It couldn't be reported....it has to be reported she is also in labour force, isn't she?" It is interestingly noted that no male enumerator has shared such experiences of under-reporting of women's productive economic activity. Agarwal (1985) also discussed that the enumerator and respondent biases resulting from gender of enumerator and respondent besides the reasons of cultural perception and style of question. "in most parts of the Third World, the person from whom information is sought and obtained is the male head of household or other male household member.... the answers tend to reflect a male perspective" (Agarwal 1985 : A156). Therefore, the perception

of surveyor and respondents are important to understand women's paid work in informal sector.

#### 4.4 Gender of Interviewer:

The gender of interviewer and interviewee is said to be a responsible factor for under-reporting of women's work. Agarwal (1985) also discussed that in third world countries enumerators and respondent are generally male that restrict the access to female respondent (Agarwal 1985, A-156). A Female enumerator said that women were more comfortable with women in survey "a female enumerator can easily talk to female respondent and get more correct replies, male enumerators are also well experienced but it depends on respondent's area some people don't respond to men some people who observe veil (*purdah*) don't come out but female (enumerator) can easily talk". Roots for Equity (2011, 3) also mentioned invisibility of women's work resulting from perception of male being enumerator and respondent as well as cultural norms and *patriarchal bias that women's labor is inferior and not worth counting*. This perception about gender of interviewer and interviewee came from gender roles of patriarchal society as well as culture of different ethnicities. Another female enumerator viewed that "it is better female enumerator should also be there because in some areas female can work better". It also is evident during household interviews when only interview guide (a female enumerator) was allowed to enter the house to see women for her interview and an experience was done when interview guide entered the house before a child came with permission and interview guide convinced women, at house, for interviews. Guide reported that initially wife was not agreed for interview without her husband's permission "*(mera aadmi ghar par nai hy)*". However, guide managed to convince her as this was official assignment and shouldn't worry about. However, wife has sent a child for her husband who joined interview at later stage. Through this experiment, it was learnt that a female has better access to women at houses, as many male enumerators also acknowledged the importance of gender of enumerator, "gender of surveyor also affect, women speaks better to women" a senior male enumerator viewed. Roots for equity (2011, 7) used only women enumerators for direct contact to women at houses.

A senior female enumerator shared her experience "if (we) go for a survey and any female comes to answer then she will feel comfortable. It also happened (*when*) we go with male enumerator (*and*) I knocked the door and female comes out she responded and (if) she saw male (enumerator) she told that "our men are not at home and I am not telling" I think level of comfort is better (with women to women) it is better female enumerator should also be there because in some areas female can work better". Contrary, 3 senior male enumerators belonging to ethnic group of Punjab and Sindh viewed that gender of enumerator makes no difference in conducting labour force survey. While another male enumerator belonging to same ethnicity but educated with master degree viewed it differently and stated that "if women ask (question) to women, then she will tell more in detail (*khul kar bata tee hyn*) because women observe hijab (*veil...purdah*) from men". The *purdah* also plays an important role in women's mobility outside household and exposing to *unknown* males. It also affects women's laboring practices in Pakistan. (Gruenenfelder & Siegmann 2016). *Purdah* makes women and their work invisible from men outside their domain particularly government officials designated for collection data for cen-



sus, tax, income etc. (Carpenter 2001, 12). For a male enumerator, it is difficult to seek for a women respondent and situation become more aggravated in the settlement where women seclusion is *strictly* practiced. It is observed that the gender of enumerator does impact the data generation particularly for women's work in society where women observe purdah. However, women respondent is not sought for enumeration of labour force activity. Also, as per PBS manual of instruction for LFS survey, enumerator don't need to seek women respondent nor emphasize gender of respondent (detail will be discussed in field work techniques). Thus, for enumerators there is no other choice than rely on proxy respondent.

#### 4.5 Gender of Interviewee / Proxy respondent:

Fieldwork of this paper also focused on both male and female as proxy respondent. In household interviews male proxy was asked for his working status and earnings as well as his wife and female was also asked same questions to compere the replies. Enumerators were also asked for their observations and experience for response regarding women's work from two main proxies, male (member or head of household), and female (any female member /oldest/ head of household) and working women reporting for themselves. They were also asked if they have ever felt male perception and difference in responses of male and female for questions regarding women's work. During enumerators interviews, it was also interesting that despite difference of opinion depending on their age, gender, experience and ethnicity all enumerators were agreed that male respondents *mostly* have a male perception, based on *culture/society norms* and don't report women's work and 91% replied '*mostly*' for differences in responses of female and male for questioning regarding women's work. A female enumerator overtly said "there is difference between women and men responses, in slum area women does tell her work whereas men always have "T" ("T" phenomenon i.e always try to take credit...). Bardasi et al. 2010 viewed this attitude of proxy respondent in different way as "proxies tend to have a "low opinion" of other household members and are likely to think that what they do does not qualify as work even when it does" (Bardasi et al. 2010, 427). A senior most enumerator from southern Punjab viewed in different way that "male tries not to tell about his wife work he likes to respond his wife as '*housewife*'". During families interviews it is evident that 02 males proxy did not report work of their wives. Husband (Olsson 2014) being the head of household has capacity to decide about his wife's employment. However, Anker & Gupta (1987) and Bardasi et al (2010) have worked in detail with certain experiments to test the assumption that proxy respondent (mostly males) under-report female labour force activity. However, both studies didn't find gender of respondent (mostly male in case of Anker & Gupta's work) as source of under reporting of women's work. Contrary, Anker (1983, 720)'s review of field work and questionnaire suggested that interviewer and respondent often are male and their perception about women as '*housewife*' caused to low female labour force participation. In Bardasi's work proxy was randomly selected from household irrespective of any gender.

Enumerators were asked about different proxies reporting work of women and self-reporting by working women. 73% replies were about housewife for working women by male respondent / HHH and 36% by older female respondent/ HHH.

Whereas 64% replies of enumerators viewed that older female HHH *some-time* report working women as

Different proxies reporting work of women vs self-reporting				
Questions	Mostly	Sometime	Rare	Never
Male HHH / respondent reporting working women as house wife or house women.	73%	27%	-	-
Older female HHH / respondent reporting working women as house wife or house women.	36%	64%	-	-
Working women report herself as house wife or house women?	--	--	27%	73%
Source: own calculation from primary data collected in field work				

housewife. Contrary, if working women turns up to respond, 73% enumerators assured that women would report her work correctly. A senior male enumerator was wondered saying that “even older female household, if not educated enough, never told her women (daughter or daughter in-law) as working women. “if working women comes to respond she tells correctly about her work either she sews cloths or goes out for work she will tell perhaps she wants herself empower that she also works (*shayad apny aap ko ooper lana chatee hy*). Another male enumerator clearly stated that “...and if working women happens to respond she must tell about her work irrespective of type of work whether sewing, embroidery she tactfully discloses in conversation (*baton baton ma bata dytee hy*) that “*I also do this work*” if she gives tuition she does tell this too”. A senior male shared his experience as “but we can’t argue with men. If women works and men tell us that she doesn’t work then what we can do! Many males don’t tell if their wives work they show their ‘supremacy’ that he only works”. Agarwal (1985, A-160) viewed “...in countries where male supremacy is the norm, both the enumerators and the respondents are pre-disposed to identify a man rather than a woman as the household head. Even a boy of 12 could be cited or could cite himself as a household head in the-absence of a male adult!” A senior male enumerator disclosed that, “....if a bacha (a baby boy) comes out we can ask to consult with mother or sister but we can’t say husband to consult his wife (for answers/replies)”.

Most of the enumerators were of the view that when they have male or female head of the household as respondent they ‘mostly’ informed their women members as ‘housewife’ or ‘house women’. Agarwal (1985, A-156) supported this notion “it is of course true that in many instances, women and men may share the same cultural perceptions regarding women's roles”. Contrary, working women themselves often inform about their work, if they turn up as respondent, they ‘rarely’ use their status as housewife or house women depending on their location as well as status of job.

During families interviews, differences were observed not only in responses of men and women but also in their attitude and expressions. Mr. Dildar

and Zahor as proxy respondents (husbands) didn't report work of their wives (Seema and Bina) despite detailed probing by interview guide. Mr. Hanif reported work of his wife (Asiya) but didn't report her earning as he informed that he didn't know about it. Mr. Hanif came a little late and refused to stay out and joined women's interview in the half. He was not friendly in interview and his replies were as short as one or one-word answer of 'yes / no'. He disclosed working of his wife for whole week. However, he didn't know his wife's income nor he correctly knew about working of his wife on holidays (Sunday). Zahor neither reported work of his wife Bina nor did he inform as who did household chores, if his wife was not working and remained at home whole day and what she did at home and how much time did she spend on each activity of household chores. He replied carelessly and lethargically that "this is not known to me (*ya tou mujhy pata nahi*)". His response seemed to show his attitude as this is not his job. In patriarchal society in third world countries like Pakistan (Samina & Manzoor 2012) man is always considered as sole breadwinner and women working has less social acceptance because it lowers the male status in the society. In the patriarchal family model, men always want to have things done in the household without indulging himself that how and who did cleaning and cooking. Ustek (2015, 51 – 52) pointed out "the inherently patriarchal »male breadwinner, female caretaker« family model entailed that men did not want to lose their status as the sole breadwinner in the family". Bardasi et al., (2010, 426 -427) elaborated the explanation for under-reporting by proxy respondent. The second explanation tend to reflect this attitude as "proxies tend to have a "low opinion" of other household members and are likely to think that what they do does not qualify as work even when it does".

#### 4.6 Women's own perception:

Women were also considered to be one of the main source of non-reporting of their productive work in national survey. Franck & Olsson (2014) and Ustek (2015) were the main researchers who devoted their studies on women agency as why they (women) don't report their work. however, both studies observed that working women, particularly in informal sector, don't report their work with different observations and reasons. Contrary, all enumerator regardless of their differences in age, gender and ethnicity agreed that working women 'mostly' inform about their work, if they turn up as respondent and only 03 male enumerators viewed that working women 'rarely' use their status as housewife or house women. However, these 03 male enumerators with difference of opinion were further asked as why working women don't report their work. He was turned to be more rational and categorically explained that some working women don't tell about their job if they have low paid or 'unprivileged' (if they feel) jobs "women if they work at good level like teaching, bank etc they tells otherwise they tell 'housewife' if they (women) work at houses or a factory how she tells. Mostly teachers, principals, professors and any work which has status, she tells correct". These types of jobs are only achievable

Enumerator's views for self reporting of working women.			
Qs. Working women report herself as house wife or house women?			
Sex of Enumerator	Rarely	Never	Total
Female	0	3	3
Male	3	5	8
Total	3	8	11

with high education (university level) which is impossibly attained in presence of gender norms of a patriarchal society. Factories working in informal sector don't provide congenial environment to female workers. The workplaces are not women-friendly nor standard ethics are observed. One of the respondent (in Hassan & Azmam 2014) expressed her views as "*I worked for another factory and it was really a bad experience for me. The environment was not congenial and women friendly as there were so many staring eyes around me*". (Hassan & Azmam 2014 : 52). A male enumerator belonging to sindhi ethnicity further clarified "if she (*working women*) is teacher she will tell openly but some type of work such as sewing at home or manufacturing... (she will not tell low privileged job)". On further probing about *unprivileged* jobs it was disclosed as helping work at non-standardized workplaces with low pay and insecure jobs. Another senior enumerator from urdu speaking ethnic group was of the view that "female labour force participation rate is not correct (*and*) its reason is not enumerator but respondent(s), they don't tell correct. Women mostly do domestic work and they don't like to tell. If (women) have good education and job she tells. (women) never tell unprivileged work (*chota kaam*...literally 'small work') or low paid job". Olsson 2014 interviewed working women at their workplaces and found many (*working*) women stating their status as housewife because of many reasons such as irregular income and status of work is not stable. Whereas Fund Ustek pointed out some features for proper work for women as "job benefits, regularity of employment, stable income, and a written contractual relationship between the employer and the employee are among the characteristics several women enumerated when defining what would count as [proper] work, adding that these features were all absent from their paid work in the informal sector" (Ustek 2015, 47).

A female enumerator further pointed out that "women who are teaching at school and provide tuition at home don't give information about tuition, besides sewing and embroidery". Nature of unprivileged or '*chota kaam*' (literally 'small work') was discussed in detail and it was learnt that these type of work such as working at factory or manufacturing, sewing or embroidery are reported well if men do these jobs. For instances if men are working on or running 'tailoring work' at home or at shop they definitely report their work being breadwinner and these works are not considered as 'unprivileged' or '*chota kaam*' but when it comes to women, the mindsets get changed. Work and non-work (Ustek 2015) for women is constructed by gender ideology governing women's role in and outside household and society. "The inherently patriarchal »male breadwinner, female caretaker« family model entailed that men did not want to lose their status as the sole breadwinner in the family, and hence attempted to strictly control women's entry into the public sphere" (Ustek 2015, 51 -52). Men do not tell or disclose their women's work due to their own perception of being 'head' or leading their houses but not for the reason of 'unprivileged or *chota kaam*'. However, Women's own perception about themselves is also adding not only to invisibility of their paid work but also to their submissive role in the household, community and society at large. A female enumerator pointed out an important cultural issue borne by gender role, "if husband earns less and wife earns more then she never tells correct of her salary and if she does two (02) job then she reports only one with low salary, family back ground also matters". In patriarchal society in third world countries like Pakistan (Samina & Manzoor 2012) man is always considered as sole breadwinner and women working has less social acceptance because it lowers the male

status in the society. Frank & Olsson (2014, 218) viewed these responses as “these responses could be interpreted along the traditional lines of women not reporting the true nature of their activities because of norms that tend to undervalue their labour.” Ustek (2015, 51-52) highlighted this societal norms as “the inherently patriarchal »male breadwinner, female caretaker« family model entailed that men did not want to lose their status as the sole breadwinner in the family, and hence attempted to strictly control women’s entry into the public sphere.”

Entirely contrary to the above discussion of *chota kaam*, it is interestingly noted in household interviews where all women reported their work even though, two of them were used to work at others’ home as *maid*. One of these women was active and voluntarily giving more details and replies. However, one of them was submissive and needed more clarifications and detailed probing. All these families happened to be belonging to southern Punjab settled in Karachi city. It is also important to note that these women were interviewed in a congenial environment by an interview guide who was a female.

#### **4.7 Education & location (area) of survey:**

**4.7.1 Education of Respondent:** Though education and specific area (location) were not discussed to be a cause of invisibility. However adequate numbers of enumerators pointed out that education of respondents and location of survey are also important and did impact on visibility of women’s work. A senior male enumerator was of the view that “education has important role if men is educated he tells if not he never reports his women work he feels insult”. This respondent was turned to be more realistic and straightforward when he used the word ‘insult’. On further probing he admitted that Pakistan society has male dominance particularly when people don’t have good level of education and grown-up in the environment where women are given due respect. In illiterate environment, women’s earning is used for satirizing “(such as living on women’s income)”. All enumerators clearly stated that educated people provide information about their women’s working but uneducated men don’t elicit correct information about women’s work. However, they could not describe as what is the level of education that make people more aware and sensible. However, a senior enumerator clarified while saying “it depends on area and people belonging to which nationality/ethnicity. “if area is of broad-minded people (*kebully zehan waly log*) even it is in rural then correct answer will come”. On further discussion as what is the criteria to know the correct answer. A well-educated enumerator with LLB and Master degree was despaired while saying that “...but we can’t argue with men”. Though education was not found to be a source of bias in literature, but lack of education and awareness about the importance of national statistics prevail among poor laborers working in informal sector. An experienced enumerator realized that current FLFPR is not correct “it is only about 70% correct”. He pointed out lack of education as main reason and fear of imposing tax and social problem (like robbery, dacoities...) of disclosing income and numbers of earners in the household. Another enumerator also pointed out same reasons of fear of disclosing household earners and income level “female labour force participation rate in LFS is not 100% correct. It is about 70% – 80% and reasons are people have fears that we (*enumerators*) are asking their income they (*respondents*) might have some problems in future like imposing tax etc.” Olsson (2014, 219] also

observed that respondents respond differently to government authorities and never tell government officials their correct working status and earning because they have fear to lose benefits or imposition of legislation.

**4.7.2 Education of enumerator:** Education not only influence response of respondent but also enumerator's perceptions and performance.

With the same gender but different education level made differences in their opinions. For question for hiring more women enumerators for interviews of women in survey comparatively less educated enumerators viewed that it would *make no difference*. Whereas with high education of Master degree enumerators (including

Enumerators' responses based on their education level			
<b>Qs.</b> Do you suggest/advice that only women should interview/enumerate women for their paid work in survey? (hiring / trained more women enumerators)			
Education of Enumerator	Of-course	Make no difference	Total
Graduation	2	3	5
M Phil	1	0	1
Master Degree	5	0	5
<b>Qs.</b> Do you think gender/sex of an enumerator affect responses of an interviewee (particularly when a man interview women)?			
Education of Enumerator	Yes	No	Total
Graduation	2	3	5
M Phil	1	0	1
Master Degree	5	0	5
Total	8	3	11

3 females enumerators) categorically said, of-course there should be more female enumerators. The same difference of opinion maintained by these three enumerators for the questions whether gender of an enumerators affect the response of an interviewee. In both responses, they viewed that it depends on education and awareness level of respondents for giving information about their working women and gender of the enumerator didn't impact for LFS questionnaire. It is interesting that one of them was quite experienced and acknowledged that society norms sometime created hurdles for working women and male respondents didn't report work of his women. Still, he was of the view that gender of enumerator doesn't impact and women enumerators can't complete survey. All these 3 enumerators belonged to ethnic groups from rural areas of Punjab and Sindh. Besides level of education ethnicity also matters when it comes to women and their working status. There are certain ethnic groups which are strict and non-flexible for giving information about their female members of household. Ethnic culture and education level shape perceptions of respondents as well as enumerators.

#### 4.8 Ethnicity:

There are certain areas, where people never talk about their women. A male enumerator belonging to urdu speaking ethnic group said "area (location of survey) also affect if area is of educated people they will tell correctly for example *defense area* and who will tell in *Pathan colony*!". The pathan colony are concentrated by Pushto speaking people who are migrated from Khyber Pukhtoon Khuaw (KPK former NWFP) province. They have their own traditions and strictly follow 'purdah' for women and never share their family issues outside with non-acquainted people. On query that whether a pushto family living in '*defense area*', an upper-class housing area in Karachi, will tell you about their women's working. The replied was "yes". But, it was not clarified that

what level of education make it possible to accept women's existence at par. Many enumerators disclosed certain areas and other ethnic groups (mostly belonging to KPK and Balochistan provinces) which never talked about their women. The province of Balochistan and KPK has less mobility for women of even wealthier or middle-class communities. (Samina & Manzoor 2012). Carpenter (2001, 11-12) while arguing concept of *purdah* in Pakistan viewed that because of *purdah* all information about household is conveyed through men to government authorities and it is very often to *offend* a man by asking questions about female members of his family.

Ethnicity does not only impact on respondent's attitude and behavior but also enumerator's perception. Due to limitations and constraints, field work could not be expanded to different ethnic-specific areas nor could approach to enumerators with more diversified ethnic background. With limited numbers of enumerators, this field work have less diversified ethnic background of enumerators. However, it is observed that ethnicity shape perceptions. For instance, male enumerators from different ethnicity have different views for women's mobility. For instance, a senior enumerator from urdu speaking ethnicity supported to appoint more female enumerators "its good to have female enumerators, it is need". However, enumerators from rural Punjab and Sindh viewed that women enumerator was not necessary for LFS. When they were informed that for instance it was not issue of LFS but gender-balanced appointments. They clearly replied that it would be difficult for women enumerator. Female enumerators face problems in the field and they couldn't go alone and sometimes society doesn't allow women to be involved in 'work'. Besides, culture pattern and society norms, field work has its own requirements and techniques to get real information out of field work.

#### **4.9 Field work techniques or barriers:**

Field work in any survey for collecting data has very crucial role and it will not be wrong to say that it is the field work that determine the credibility as well as scope of information gathered in survey. Every field work has its own techniques depending upon objectives and purpose of surveys. A purposeful field work always yields information close to reality. Field work for labour statistics not only depends on definition of work and type of questions but selection of respondent and probing techniques by enumerators. However, probing techniques and time spent on respondent can play an important role in collecting true statistics more close to reality. Anker (1983, 721) reviewed field work techniques from data collection problems, respondents, interviewer and question structure and observed that improved field work techniques can eliminate invisibility of women's economic/labour force activity.

**4.9.1 Selection of respondent:** For any survey respondent is as important as enumerator because s/he is the only gateway of information. Thus its selection cannot be under-valued. For labor force survey in Pakistan enumerators are not bound for a specific respondent nor respondent was selected randomly, as proxy in the study of Bardasi et al. (2010).

A senior male enumerator said, "any reasonable / responsible household can answer". Another senior male enumerator viewed that "(we) can't insist to call women – if a minor (*bacha*) comes out we can tell to consult with mother or sister but we can't say husband to consult his wife (for answers/replies)". However, female enumerators informed that they 'mostly' emphasized to seek

women for questionnaire for only special survey Pakistan Standard and Living Measurement (PSLM) as it has more sensitive/private questions regarding women. A female enumerator said “only for PSLM we are bound to ask some specific questions only to women” PSLM has a separate questionnaire for women carrying some specific questions of health of mother and child and pregnancy and baby feeding. For PSLM Pakistan Bureau Statistics has separate questionnaire for men and women. In separate women questionnaire Part 4 (A), (B), (C) & (D) are relating to health of mother and child carrying some private/personal questions for pregnancy history, pre and post-natal care, child feeding etc. (GOP 2013-14 PSLM Questionnaire). A male enumerator acknowledged that women can answer these questions correctly to women interviewer, only.

After going through the latest PBS’s manual of instructions for field enumerators / supervisors for LFS 2017-18, I didn’t find any instruction or restriction for the gender of the respondent. Any member of household of age 10 or above can be respondent. As per LFS questionnaire enumerator ask name of respondent and record its relation as code 1 for ‘head of household (HHH)’ 2 for ‘other member of household (relative)’ and 3 for ‘other member of household (non-relative)’. According to PBS instruction enumerators are not bound for respondent’s gender, age (only 10 years +) and relation with HHH. The manual says “the enumerator should try to contact the HHH or, in his/her absence, any other member of the household who may be able to furnish the required information”. (GOP – PBS 2017, 19). In case of family, husband / wife / son / daughter can be considered as HHH or respondent may be asked for ‘head’ or it can also be arbitrarily decided. “Either the respondent may be relied upon to determine the “head” or you (*enumerator*) may arbitrarily select the eldest one as the “head”. It is acceptable and probably most convenient to ask the household about their head. In case of a “mess” household, any household member may be reported as the head”. (GOP-PBS 2017, 8). Thus, there is no restriction for collecting labour force statistics to ask every individual at household about their employment status.

It was concluded that for LFS there is no restriction on age (except 10 years+) or gender of respondent. Neither LFS has separate questionnaire like PSLM. Most of enumerator were of the view that they didn’t take much time to select HHH, after little enquiry with 1<sup>st</sup> contacted person, they decided only in case of minor (less than 10 years) they request for any elder and responsible person for information. A senior enumerator was straightforward while saying “we have to complete survey in specified time (about 4 days) any responsible member of household can answer we are not bound for any particular member for survey”. On probing he further explained that they had to accept answers, though he wished to ask question to every relevant respondent but they had to complete survey in limited time (he mentioned 04 days) so they only insisted for any reasonable person irrespective of their education level and gender. This implied that the collecting data for LFS is a routine time-bound official assignment rather than a purposeful objective oriented task.

**4.9.2 Time barrier:** Time utilization and management during interviews is an important skill. With such skill, however, adequate time is required for enumerator to get accurate answers from respondents who either do not have understanding of questions or couldn’t respond to short questions. A senior enumerator was straightforward while saying “we have to complete survey



in specified time (about 4 days) any responsible member of household can answer we are not bound for any particular member for survey”. besides time, responses from respondents are also important without which it is not possible to collect data. The most senior enumerator viewed that “we have to complete survey in short time respondent doesn’t have time she/he wants quick disposal because they don’t expect any remuneration (*milta milata kutch nahee...*)”. Remuneration or draw-prizes for participants of survey can be effective in obtaining data.

**4.9.3 Semantic barrier:** Generally, the word ‘work’ has a typical meaning in Pakistani language ‘urdu’ as ‘*kaam*’ which does not necessarily mean to *work for earning*. It covers all daily routine of paid, unpaid work. for instance, when interview guide ask a Asiya (women at 1<sup>st</sup> family) about her daughter (15 years old) whether she did any work. Asiya replied “yes” (own *household chores*). Interview guide further asked how much time did her daughter spend and earn money. The women abruptly replied *no, no she (her daughter) did work at own house and didn’t go out to earn money*. Another word in urdu is *naukari* which exact means is job that implies that a full-time job with scheduled time and pay. This word is even not suitable for reporting women’s work. In a 3<sup>rd</sup> family interview, Bina reported her work as ‘sewing & embroidery’ at her home after detail probing and her work depends on time availability and work-orders she received from other people. She never considered her work as job or *naukari*. It is observed that the semantic barrier or lack of understanding is also adding to invisibility. Use of proper words in local language with some effective probing technique can improve visibility. Roots for Equity (2011, 9) not only used women enumerators but also translators in each province to eliminate semantic barriers.

#### 4.10 Intersectionality:

The invisibility of women’s productive work is not easy to understand with one simple reason to be identified. There are certain factor intersects with other reasons making it more complex but intersectional analysis paves the way for better understanding of its dimensions. On one hand traditional gender roles keep confined women at home because social norms does not allow women’s working which can affect the men’s dignity and family honor. (Roots for Equity 2011, 3). On the other hand society has gender biased perception about nature of work if its being done by women. An enumerator belonging to urdu speaking *ethnicity* was of the view that women’s never report her work if it is ‘unprivileged’ (*chota kaam*) however these works turned to be privileged if men report these works as breadwinner. Nature of work depends on biased perception of society governed by gender roles. Contrary, in family’s interviews all women reported their work irrespective of nature and type of work where two women were doing work at others’ home as maid. Besides, gender roles and society norms, Pakistan has a variety of ethnicities and invisible class system. enumerators mentioned some ethnic-specific areas where information about women is difficult to record such as *Pathan* colony (dominated by push-ton people) and *Liyari* (dominated by Baloch and sindhi people). Ethnic groups belonging to provinces of KPK, southern Punjab, Balochistan and interior Sindh are considered to be conservative for their traditions and more strict for women’s role within the house. Besides norms of society as whole, ethnic-specific culture further aggravates the situation of invisibility of women’s work. Such ethnic culture and patriarchal gender roles are so embedded in the society

that one can be offended “by asking questions about his women”. (Carpenter 2001, 12). In case of minors come out, male enumerators insist for any reasonable male respondent or consult with elder sister or mother but never seek for women respondent. A male enumerator said “(we) can’t insist to call women – if a *bacha* (*baby boy*) comes out we can ask to consult with mother or sister but we can’t say husband to consult his wife (for answers/replies)”. Agarwal (1985, A-160) “even a boy of 12 could be cited or could cite himself as a household head in the-absence of a male adult!”

At last but not least, work of the young working women are also influenced by same gender depending on age, relation and position at the same household. Anker (1983, 710) pointed out this attitude that generally in third world, women’s interview is conducted in presence of other people especially older people who make *interjections*. It was also evident during 1<sup>st</sup> family interview where an old woman was present and kept trying to advice interviewee-women during interview. A senior male enumerator pointed out that women don’t report work of other women members of household such as their sisters / sister in-law etc..

## 5. Conclusion:

Due to paucity of time and scope, the field work for this paper could not be spread throughout country nor its observations can be generalized, though it explored possibilities of many unknown reasons behind invisibility of women's productive work in labour statistics in Pakistan and did an attempt to pave the way for understanding the statistical invisibility and further research towards significant reasonings and corrective policy measures for collection true labour statistics.

It is now clear that invisibility of women's productive work exists. It is not only due to measurement errors and field work, but the cultural and society pattern has become a cross-cutting factor resulted many other causes leading to invisibility of women's economic activities in national survey. Discrepancies in responses of male proxy respondents prevail for the questions regarding women's work and earnings. Women reported their own as well as their husband's work and earnings but men didn't report work of their wives. It was not only disclosed by enumerators irrespective of their gender but also evident during household interviews. Husband's work and earning was the same when reported by themselves and proxies (by their wives). On the other hand, wives' work and earning were reported differently by proxies (their husbands) than what reported by themselves (self-reported). The proxy respondent (male) tends to have a low opinion for other members (particularly their wives) and think as their (wives') work are not worthy to report and they didn't want to lose their culturally driven gender role in the household.

Capacity building of officials involved in whole process of survey including data collection, compilation etc. is very important, particularly for field enumerators who are sole responsible to collect information on the ground. Collecting data doesn't mean only reading a question from questionnaire and move ahead. It requires specific techniques and skills for eliciting detailed and correct information, besides style of questions and time spent on respondent. As one of senior enumerators informed that he had (camouflage) to be looked like local people and used their local language to create conducive environment for respondents. As Anker (1983, 721) suggested that "*by improving field work techniques and questionnaire design* can eliminate the invisibility of women's labour force activity. Routine pre-survey (two-day) training doesn't have much impact to comprehend the objective, purpose and implication of survey results nor build the capacity of enumerators. As it is observed during enumerators' and families' interviews that the adequate number of women working in informal sector don't explain their work or they can't name their work. They consider it subsistence, supplement to their husband's work and earning, though wives' earning is, in some cases, essential for family's survival. Eliciting the correct and detail information only depends on probing techniques and capabilities of surveyors. Mostly enumerators used key words 'main activity' and reference period, however their own probing techniques help them elicit information.

It was also observed that the more emphases on main activity and reference period refrain working women of informal sector from reporting their work, particularly economic activities, though remunerated, depending on

availability of time and 'work'. In such scenario, the importance of 'part-time' work can also not be ignored particularly in reference of women skilled-workers working at home when their paid economic activity depends on receiving work from others and availability of time out of domestic household chores.

It is an established fact now that the gender of enumerator does affect during enumeration particularly collecting data for women's work in a society where women strictly practice seclusion (*or purdah*) and where there is possibility of under reporting of women's work due to preconception about women as *housewife* by male interviewer and respondent. Though, collecting data for labour force activities is not gender sensitive, more female enumerators can break the vicious circle of ethnicity, cultural taboos, lack of education and awareness of respondents, social practice of seclusions. It is evident in the field work of Roots for Pakistan's survey for homebased women worker where only women enumerators conducted survey and spoke to women at houses. They also asked questions about any kind of work women do with examples for better understanding of questions. (Roots for Equity 2011, 7). More female enumerators with proper training and probing techniques can reduce invisibility to quite extent.

Cultural and society norms are turned to be a cross-cutting characteristics of all kinds of statistical biases whether it is perception of enumerator or proxy (both male) or women's own, were born from the womb of gender roles, reinforced by society & cultural norms. Ethnicity and invisible class system also influence recognition of women's existence and role in household and society at large. Though it is not easy to suggest remedial measures for addressing enumerator's or respondent's biases that shaped by culture and society norms, an attempt to have more female enumerators to seek out women respondent can still reduce invisibility, though not eliminate completely till the structuration process of society norms towards balanced gender roles & patriarchal family model.

Pakistan Bureau of Statistics (PBS) is the sole responsible public sector organization to conduct important surveys such as population census, LFS, HIES etc. During field work at PBS -KRO office, it was learnt that PBS has never engaged women enumerators in LFS before. It is the PBS-KRO involved women enumerators first time in LFS in 2017 due to shortage of enumerators rather than gendering. It is interesting to mention here that chapter 3 of the training manual for population census 2017 deals with the gender issue. Manual also acknowledges that very often men don't report exact information about their women due to cultural taboos. In this chapter PBS has itself defined five (05) reasons of non-counting women in survey. The very first reason is gender of enumerators and respondent. (GOP-PBS 2017, 31). Government of Pakistan should take concrete necessary policy decision towards gender-balanced enumerators for all survey instead of only PSLM or temporary contract for current censuses 2017 through hiring / appointment of more female enumerators and arrange mandatory training for field work techniques with sensitizing gender issues and hidden/ invisible women's labour force activity.

PBS may consider labour force survey as more focused and important assignment being prime input for policy making, rather than routine official duty of collecting numbers and figures only. For the purpose, a policy measure has to be taken not only for capacity building for enumerators but also for review

of questionnaire and time spent on each household. Without proper training and instructions, enumerator's own perception can influence their performance in collecting real labour force statistics for an effective policy formulation and implementation.

## 6. References:

- Agarwal, B. (1985) 'Work Participation of Rural Women in Third World: Some Data and Conceptual Biases', *Economic and Political weekly*: A155-A164.
- Anker, R. (1983) 'Female Labour Force Participation in Developing Countries: A Critique of Current Definitions and Data Collection Methods', 122 *Int'l Lab. Rev.*: 709-724.
- Anker, R., M.E. Khan. and R.B. Gupta (1987) 'Biases in measuring the labour force Results of a methods test survey in Uttar Pradesh, India' *International Labour Review*, 126(2): 151 – 167.
- Akhtar, S. (2011) "searching for the invisible workers", a statistical study for of home based workers in Pakistan, Towards gender parity in Pakistan (TGP) Project, ILO country office Pakistan.
- Asian Development Bank, (ADB-2015) Women in the workforce: An unmet potential in Asia and the Pacific. Mandaluyong City, Philippines: Asian Development Bank, 2015.
- Bardasi, E., K. Beegle., A. Dillon. and P. Serneels (2010) 'Do labor statistics depend on how and to whom the questions are asked? Results from a survey experiment in Tanzania'. World Bank Development Research Group, Policy Research Working Paper No. 5192. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Beneria, L. (1992) 'Accounting for women's work: The progress of two decades', *World Development Review*, 20(11): 1547 – 1560.
- Carpenter, C. (2001) 'The role of economic invisibility in development: veiling women's work in rural Pakistan', *Natural Resources Forum* (25): 11-19.
- Donahoe, D.A. (1999) 'Measuring Women's Work in Developing Countries', *Population and Development Review*, 25(3): 543-576.
- Ejaz, M. (2007) 'Determinants of Female Labor Force Participation in Pakistan: An Empirical Analysis of PSLM (2004-05) Micro Data' *The International Journal of Economics* special edition: 203-235.
- Elder, S. and L.J. Johnson. (1999) 'Sex-specific labour market indicators: What they show' *International Labour Review*, 138(4).
- Farooq, M. and J. Sulaiman (2009) 'Gender Earnings Inequality and Discrimination in the Pakistani Labor Market'. The Dialogue. 4 (3).
- Field, E. and K. Vyborny (2016) 'Female Labor Force Participation in Asia: Pakistan Country Study'. *ADB Brief* No. 70.
- Franck, A.K. and J. Olsson (2014) 'Missing women? The under-recording and under-reporting of women's work in Malaysia' *International Labour Review*, 153(2).

- Government of Pakistan (2015) *Economic Surveys (various years)*, Ministry of Finance, Government of Pakistan, Islamabad, Pakistan.
- Government of Pakistan, *Labour Force Survey (various years)*, Pakistan Bureau of Statistics (PBS), Statistics Division, Government of Pakistan, Islamabad, Pakistan.
- Government of Pakistan, Pakistan Bureau of Statistics(2017) '*Manual for Population Census-2017*' online available at [http://www.pbscensus.gov.pk/sites/default/files/EnumData/MANUAL%20OF%20SHORT%20FORM%20%20%20%20\\_0.pdf](http://www.pbscensus.gov.pk/sites/default/files/EnumData/MANUAL%20OF%20SHORT%20FORM%20%20%20%20_0.pdf)
- Government of Pakistan (2017) Pakistan Bureau of Statistics, Population Census-2017 "*Population of Major Cities - Census 2017*" online available at [http://www.pbscensus.gov.pk/sites/default/files/population\\_of\\_major\\_cities\\_census\\_2017%20\\_0.pdf](http://www.pbscensus.gov.pk/sites/default/files/population_of_major_cities_census_2017%20_0.pdf)
- Government of Pakistan, Pakistan Bureau of Statistics (GOP-PBS) (2015) 'questionnaire for *Labour Force Survey for 2014-15*' online available at [http://www.pbs.gov.pk/sites/default/files//Labour%20Force/publications/lfs2014\\_15/questionnaire\\_2014\\_15\\_final.pdf](http://www.pbs.gov.pk/sites/default/files//Labour%20Force/publications/lfs2014_15/questionnaire_2014_15_final.pdf)
- Government of Pakistan, Pakistan Bureau of Statistics (GOP-PBS) (2014) 'questionnaire for Pakistan Social and Living Standards Measurement (PSLM), '*Female Questionnaire Round IX (2013-14)*' online available at <http://www.pbs.gov.pk/sites/default/files//pslm/publications/Female%20questionnaire%20round%209%20%282013-14%29.pdf>
- Grünenfelder, J. and K.A. Siegmann (2016) "Laboring Practices: Pakistan", in: Encyclopedia of Women & Islamic Cultures, *General Editor Suad Joseph*.
- Hassan, S.M. and A. Azmam (2014) 'Visible Work, Invisible Workers: A Study of Women Home Based Workers in Pakistan', *International Journal of Social Work and Human Services Practice* 2(2): 48-55.
- Human Rights Commission of Pakistan, "*State of Human Rights in 2016*" online available at [www.hrcp-web.org](http://www.hrcp-web.org)
- Hussain, I. (2008) '*Problems of Working Women in Karachi, Pakistan*' Cambridge Scholars Publishing
- Isran, S. and M.A. Isran (2012) 'Low Female Labour Participation in Pakistan: Causes and Consequences', *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences (PJSS)* 32(2): 453-468.
- Kandiyoti, D. (1988) 'Bargaining with Patriarchy', *Gender and Society*, Special Issue to Honor Jessie Bernard 2(3): 274-290.
- Mahbub ul Haq Research Centre, (MHRC) (2016) "*Human Development in South Asia 2016 Empowering Women in South Asia*" Lahore University of Management Sciences.

- Mata-Greenwood, A. (1999) 'Gender Issues in Labour Statistics', *Int'l Lab. Review*. pp. 138-273.
- Mammen, K.. and P. Christina. (2000) 'Women's Work and Economic Development', *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 14(4): 141-164.
- Muhammad I., S. Anwar, W. Akram, and I. Waqar. (2013) 'Occupational Gender Segregation and Its Determinants, an Analysis of Pakistan Labor Force Market'. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 1(7): 221-224.
- Roots For Equity. (2011) "*Unacknowledged Treasures: The Home-based Women Labor of Pakistan*"
- Sabir, M. (2015) 'Gender Inequality in Labour Force Participation: An Empirical Investigation' *The Pakistan Development Review* 54(4): 551–565.
- Sarwar, F. and A.S. Abbasi (2013) 'An In-Depth Analysis of Women's Labor Force Participation in Pakistan', *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research* 15(2): 208-215.
- United Nations. 1997. '*Handbook for producing national statistical reports on women and men. Social statistics indicators*'. Series K, No. 14. UN Sales No. E.97.XVII.10. New York, NY.
- Ustek, F. (2015) 'What is work? On the invisibility of women's paid work in the informal sector', *Inter Disciplines* 1.
- World Economic Forum (2016) "*The Global Gender Gap Report 2016*"
- Yin, R, K. (2014) '*Case Study Research, Design and Method*' 5<sup>th</sup> edition, Sage Publication.
- Zhou, M. (2017) 'Pakistan's hidden workers: Wages and conditions of home-based workers and the informal economy' *International Labour Organization*, Pakistan Office.



## Appendices

**LIST OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS ((ENUMERATORS) AT  
PAKISTAN BUREAU OF STATISTICS (PBS) KARACHI REGION  
OFFICE (PBS – KRO)  
(anonymity is maintained)**

Re-spond-ent No.	Name	Designa-tion	Age	Organiza-tion	Surveys conducted*
1.	Nawaz Khan	Statistical Assistant (SA)	55 years	PBS-KRO	LFS, FB, PSLM, RS, CS, HS etc.
2.	Ms. Samina	Statistical Assistant (SA)	34 years	-do-	PSLM, HS, TS, RS, MS FBS etc)
3.	M. Muneer Ali	Statistical Assistant (SA)	56 years	-d0-	LFS, MS, HIES, CS, Cable Survey etc)
4.	Ali Ahmed	Statistical Assistant (SA)	58 years	-do-	LFS, PDS, Censuses, HIES, CS, Non Mechanized Survey, PSLM, HIES etc)
5.	Mukarram	Statistical Officer (SO)		-do-	LFS, HIES, PDS, CS, HS Censuses FBS etc)
6.	Ms. Seema	Statistical Assistant (SA)	43 years	-do-	PSLM, HS, HIES RS, Cuiq Survey FBS)
7.	Ms. Aleena	Statistical Assistant (SA)	42 years	-do-	PSLM, RS, HS, TS, HIES etc)
8.	Khalid	Statistical Officer (SO)		-do-	4 surveys (not mentioned names)
9.	Umer	Statistical Assistant (SA)	57 years	-do-	LFS, PDS, RS, CS, Child Labour, Censuses etc)
10.	Waheed	Statistical Assistant (SA)	48 years	-do-	Not mentioned
11.	Waris Shah	Statistical Assistant (SA)	55 years	-do-	LFS, PDS, RS, Censuses, HIES GPS, CS

\*Full name of some surveys:

LFS : Labour Force Survey

PSLM : Pakistan Social and Living Standard Measurement

FBS : Family Budget Survey

PDS	:	Pakistan Demographic Survey
RS	:	Rent Survey
CS	:	Construction Surveu
HS	:	Health Survey
MS	:	Migration Survey
TS	:	Transportation Survey
HIES	:	Household Integrated Economic Survey

**LIST OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS (HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS)**

<b>Name of Respondent</b>	<b>Age</b>	<b>Address</b>
Hanif (Husband / HHH)	50	Jamali Colony 13-D, Gulshan-e-Iqbal Karachi.
Asiya (wife)	40	-do-
Dildar (Husband / HHH)	43	do-
Seema (wife)	40	do-
Zahor (Husband / HHH)	26	do-
Bina (wife)	22	do-
<b>Interviewer</b>		
Ms Aleena	Female Interviewer	
Mr. Adnan	Male Interviewer	

Due to the size and formatting issues, Annexure II (Labor Force Survey Questionnaire 2014/15) used for household interviews, is available at following link. It can easily be accessed via;

[http://www.pbs.gov.pk/sites/default/files//Labour%20Force/publications/lfs2014\\_15/questionnaire\\_2014\\_15\\_final.pdf](http://www.pbs.gov.pk/sites/default/files//Labour%20Force/publications/lfs2014_15/questionnaire_2014_15_final.pdf)



<b>COURSE ID</b>	:	ISS-5401-1617
<b>COURSE NAME</b>	:	Research Paper Process (Questionnaire)
<b>SUPERVISOR</b>	:	Dr. (Karin Astrid) K.A. Siegmann Senior Lecture

**QUESTIONNAIRE FOR RESEARCH PAPER**

**INVISIBILITY OF WOMEN'S PRODUCTIVE WORK IN LABOUR  
STATISTICS – SPECIAL REFERENCE TO PAKISTAN**

**STUDENT ID ERNA # (462424mn)**

INVISIBILITY OF WOMEN PAID WORK IN NATIONAL STATISTICS  
IN PAKISTAN

QUESTIONNAIRE

Name:\_\_\_\_\_ Designation:\_\_\_\_\_  
Organization:\_\_\_\_\_ Tel (off):\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ Mobile:\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ email:\_\_\_\_\_  
Date:\_\_\_\_\_

I am an independent researcher studying at International Institute of Social Studies (ISS), Erasmus University, The Hague, Netherlands. I am working on research thesis of Master Degree (MA in Development Studies). My research thesis is “Invisibility of women work in national statistics in Pakistan”. I would like you to fill the following questionnaire. All the information obtained will remain strictly confidential and anonymous.

Please add response of your choice, if you don't find appropriate answer given under each question.

Q,1, How many surveys you have worked for?

1. 1 to 5.                      2. 5 to 10                      3. More than 10

Please indicate

1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_ 3. \_\_\_\_\_  
4. \_\_\_\_\_ 5. \_\_\_\_\_ 6. \_\_\_\_\_  
7. \_\_\_\_\_ 8. \_\_\_\_\_

(please attach extra sheet, if required)

Q,2, Have you ever worked for Labour Force Survey (LFS) or any survey to enumerate / record the ‘work/ labour / economic activity?

- 1, Yes                                      2, No

Q.3. what is your opinion about women involved in economic activity?

1. Excellent                      2. Good                      3. Bad                      4. Indifferent  
5. Don't Know

Q.4. During enumeration / survey, are you officially bound/stick to ask questions related to women working only from women?

- 1, Yes                                      2, No

If answer is **yes**, do you easily find women for their response?

1. Mostly                      2. Sometime                      3. Rarely                      4. Never

If answer is **No** who is mostly respond (proxy respondent) on behalf of women for their working information.

1. Male head of household
2. Female Head of Household
3. any male household member

Q.5. Have you ever emphasized / convinced a male respondent to bring women to you for questions regarding women and women work?

1. Mostly
2. Sometime
3. Rarely
4. Never

Q.6. Have you ever felt differences in responses of men and women regarding questions relating to women economic activity?

- Mostly
2. Sometime
3. Rarely
4. Never

Q.7. Do you think that gender/sex of an enumerator affect responses of an interviewee (particularly when a man interview women)?

1. Yes
2. No

If answer is **yes**, please specify

---

---

Q.8. Do you suggest/advice that only women should interview/enumerate women for their paid work in survey?

1. of course
2. Makes no difference
3. Not at all

Q.9. How often do you come across cultural answer (*'house wife or house women'*) from male respondent rather than accurate / exact response for working women of his family?

1. Mostly
2. Sometime
3. Rarely
4. Never

Q.10. How often do you come across cultural answer (*'house wife or house women'*) from female household respondent rather than accurate / exact response for working women of her family?

1. Mostly
2. Sometime
3. Rarely
4. Never

Q.11. Have you ever felt that women herself follow cultural norm to respond to question about their paid economic activity such as housewife or house women rather than giving correct answer.?

1. Mostly
2. Sometime
3. Rarely
4. Never

Q.12. How often do you feel a response from male household regarding women paid work / economic activity have a more male perception instead of correct information for women work?

1. Mostly                      2. Sometime                      3. Rarely                      4. Never

Q.13. In your opinion whether questions or style of questions of survey have some problem / biases to record / enumerate paid economic activity of women.

1. Yes                      2. No

Please specify If answer is **yes**,

---

---

Q.14. Do you think women paid work is not captured correctly in survey?

1. Yes                      2. No

If answer is **yes**, In your opinion what are the reasons of under-reporting of women paid work/economic activity in survey

---

---

Q.15. In your experience, what are professions/ paid economic activities of women not covered or reported correctly?

1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_ 3. \_\_\_\_\_ 4. \_\_\_\_\_  
5. \_\_\_\_\_ 6. \_\_\_\_\_ 7. \_\_\_\_\_ 8. \_\_\_\_\_

(please attach extra sheet, if required)

Q.16. Do you get any particular training before going into every survey?

1. Yes                      2. No

If answer is **yes**, please specify theme of training

---

---

Q.17. How often do you receive gender based training for conducting survey?

1. Mostly                      2. Sometime                      3. Rarely                      4. Never



Q.18. Do you think gender based training change your own perception about gender role particularly for economic activity of women in society?

1. Yes                      2. No                      3. Trainings are not effectively designed  
4. Others

---

---

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Thank you very much for sparing your precious time for your valuable response to fill this questionnaire.

## Map of Pakistan:



Source:

[https://www.google.com.pk/search?ei=yIoLWrzGC4essAfgiLaADg&q=google+map+for+pakistan&oq=google+map+for+Pa&gs\\_l=psy-ab.3.0.0i13k1l2j0i22i30k1l6j0i22i10i30k1l2.7708143.7712761.0.7713907.16.16.0.0.0.0.194.1628.8j8.16.0....0...1.1.64.psy-ab..0.16.1618...0j0i67k1j0i10k1j0i10i67k1.0.3E7E3PcnDyM](https://www.google.com.pk/search?ei=yIoLWrzGC4essAfgiLaADg&q=google+map+for+pakistan&oq=google+map+for+Pa&gs_l=psy-ab.3.0.0i13k1l2j0i22i30k1l6j0i22i10i30k1l2.7708143.7712761.0.7713907.16.16.0.0.0.0.194.1628.8j8.16.0....0...1.1.64.psy-ab..0.16.1618...0j0i67k1j0i10k1j0i10i67k1.0.3E7E3PcnDyM)

## Map of Karachi City:



Source:

[https://www.google.com.pk/search?ei=66gLWsb\\_BYiJaL3IgIAG&q=google+map+for+Karachi&oq=google+map+for+Karachi&gs\\_l=psy-ab.3.0j0i22i30k1l9.229369.230729.0.231159.7.7.0.0.0.0.129.738.3j4.7.0....0...1.1.64.psy-ab..0.7.735....0.7XYMNkylqvY](https://www.google.com.pk/search?ei=66gLWsb_BYiJaL3IgIAG&q=google+map+for+Karachi&oq=google+map+for+Karachi&gs_l=psy-ab.3.0j0i22i30k1l9.229369.230729.0.231159.7.7.0.0.0.0.129.738.3j4.7.0....0...1.1.64.psy-ab..0.7.735....0.7XYMNkylqvY)