

## Gender Differences On objective and Subjective Career Outcomes: An Evidence From Nepalese Civil Service

Gyan Bahadur Tamang, Ph.D.

Faculty of Management and Law, Nepal Open University, Nepal

---

**Abstract:** Knowing the positive impact of diversity in organization and adoption of sustainable development goals by Nepal government leads to utmost requirement of promoting equality at every level of organization. The descriptive stats show lower representation of women at upper level of organizations. Being at upper level is one of the major objective indicators of career success. In this sense, women are generally considered not successful in their career as compare to men. Many career literatures examine career by subjective indicators as well.

The paper aims to access the significant difference on women's career success outcomes with men. The paper is based on 254 responses collected in survey conducted in Nepalese civil service covering Kathmandu valley during 2017. The study is based on deductive approach and Chi-square test and Mann-Whitney U tests are used to test association and significant differences.

The paper found significantly gender differences on objective measures and no differences with respect to subjective measures indicates women are happy with what they have achieved so far.

**Keywords:** Gender, Nepalese civil service, Objective career success, and Subjective career success,

---

Date of Submission: 31-12-2019

Date of Acceptance: 15-01-2020

---

### I. Introduction

Managing diversity and/or promoting equality in the workplace has become core issue in management theories and practices, demonstrated by a growing body of literatures (Cooke, 2003; Syed & Murray, 2008; Cooke & Saini, 2012; Patterson & Bae, 2013; Ravazzani, 2016; Kundu & Mor, 2017). Diversity within a workplace covers race, gender, ethnic groups, age, religion, sexual orientation, life experience and ability differences. The diverse characteristics are considered typically as the bases for disadvantage and marginalization in social and work life. Individuals can suffer refusal and unfair treatment in the workplace because they differ from the dominant social group across one or more of these characteristics. They can feel left out and overlooked. This disadvantage can manifest itself in human resource practices within organizations, especially on the career progression of employees working in different organizations.

Ignoring the influence of diversity in organizations is no longer possible (Kundu & Mor, 2017). Many studies (e.g. Foster & Harris, 2006; Ng & Burke, 2007; Süß & Kleiner, 2007) focused on the positive impact of diversity in organizations. Therefore, accepting diversity in the workplace or, alternatively, promoting equality seems strategic importance in the management research. In addition, sustainable development goals (SDG) has also covered "reducing inequalities" as 10th goal.

Among the different dimensions, gender has been found with highest scored diversity dimension (Ravazzani, 2016) – gender diversity. Gender diversity is fair representation between genders at all levels in social and organizational structure. Gender diversity most commonly refers to equitable ratio of men and women. Connecting with this, Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) targeted to achieving gender equality and aims to empower all women and girls. More precisely, section 5.5 of SDGs is to ensure women's full and effective participation and equal opportunities for leadership at all levels of decision-making in political, economic and public life. Consequently, the issue recently has been appeared in the slogan "Planet 50-50 by 2030: Step it up for gender equality" in 2016 on 106th International Women's Day.

In recent years, researches on gender diversity showed that achieving gender diversity at workplace leads to positive outcomes for organizations: influences on financial decision with regards to assessment of risk and loss (Bogan, Just, & Dev, 2013); lower variability of corporate performance (Lenard, Yu, York, & Wu, 2014); product innovation (Fernandez, 2015). Though the positive outcomes of achieving gender diversity at workplace is recognized, there is a lot of things remain to do to achieve gender equality as status of women in the labour market is not satisfactory.

According to Catalyst (2017), it is accounted that globally women held under a quarter (24 per cent) of senior roles across the world in 2016, which is just 3 per cent increment from 2011. One third of global

businesses had no women in senior management roles, a number which was not changed since 2011. It is concluded that women would not reach parity with men by 2060 (Catalyst, 2017).

In case of Nepal, only 0.2 per cent of employed women were reported on legislators and senior officials in Nepal labor force survey 2008 (Central Bureau of Statistics, 2009). However, Nepal Government implemented affirmative action measure like introducing reservations for women and marginalized groups in 2007 resulting to amended Civil Service Act (reserving 45 per cent of all vacancies to six marginalized groups of which 33 per cent of all vacancies for women). In 2017, Nepal GESI profile shows that women participation remains low at higher levels of decision-making (Government of Nepal, UN Women, 2017). Nepalese women were accounted in public life at low levels (e.g. around 16 per cent in civil service, 4.5 per cent in judiciary, 5.8 percent in Nepal Police, 5 per cent in Armed Police Force, 3.2 per cent in Nepalese Army). As per the National Review of the Sustainable Development Goals (2017), women now occupy 29.5 per cent of seats in the national parliament and approximately 40 per cent in local level governments. Women's participation in decision-making in the private sector is 25 per cent and 50 per cent in the cooperative sector. It is also claimed that women's participation in public sector decision making is low.

In addition to these evidences, career development literature identified that being in managerial level and moving towards to head/CEO of organization is one of the major indicators of career success. So, it seems that women are not successful in their career. Thereby, successful career is not determined only by organizational hierarchy. Besides income, promotion and other subjective indicators are also covered to define career success. Because of social role theory and gender role theory, women might have different criteria to define their career success, which may or may not be limited by few objective indicators that is set for men. So, the current paper aims to test the significance of gender differences on objective career outcomes. Furthermore, it aims to assess gender differences on subjective indicators as well. Examining both objective and subjective indicators of career success could be input to realize the possibility of difference on criteria of career success for men and women in the Nepalese context. The different criteria of career success measures across the gender leads organization to think differently in order to have career development strategies with respect to gender.

## **II. Literature Review**

### **2.1 Career Success**

Career success has been considerable interest to career scholars since early twentieth century and is being continued in twenty first century (Heslin, 2005). Many theories and models have been developed to conceptualize career success in better way than earlier in its history of more than 100 years. The history began with the work of Frank Parson in early 1900s – focusing the relationships that match between personal trait factors to the respective occupation. In 1950s Super's theory emerged being based on individual's concepts in relation to attitude towards work during their life-span. Likewise, in 1970s Bandura focused on occupational mobility and in 1980s. Holland's focus was on matching personality types with work environment. Gottfredson had come up with the theory that assumes career choice is a process of requiring high level of cognitive proficiency in 1981. She revised her theory with elaboration that career choice is the dynamic interplay between genetic makeup and environment in 2002 and later in 2005 (Leung, 2008).

A comprehensive system of theories and intervention strategies in career guidance and counselling has been developed in western world, most notably in the United States (USA). Even though the theories have been revised and updated, they are still anchored in the context of USA. In such case, Leung (2008) has noticed the indigenization of career theories and an author realized the need of cultural adaption and modification to transport these theories to other context rather than western one, especially USA.

With this fact, western conceptualization of career success cannot be used directly to Nepalese context. Thus, it is to explore how the career success is being conceptualized in Nepalese organization. For this the researcher would like to introduce the way of conceptualizing career success in western culture and that is reviewed with the intend of modification.

### **2.2 Conceptualizing Career Success**

As career success is the combination of two constructs "career" and "success", it would be better to understand the terms separately. The "success" is the fact one has achieved something that s/he wants and has been trying to do or get; the fact of becoming rich or famous or of getting a high social position (OUP, 2010). The statement "achieving something that we want", as defined in Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, is quite clear – it is the outcomes of something. "What sorts of outcomes one expects?" creates ambiguity to understand above statement as behavioral scientists believe that human's want and desire are complex and diversified. However, Oxford University Press (2010) has indicated the wants, desires and outcomes we expect like becoming rich or famous or getting a high social position – indicating both monetary and non-monetary or tangible and intangible outcomes. In general, outcomes may appear as (un)favourable, bad or good to him/her. These are relative terminologies to determine the level of achievement whether it is favourable or not. So, the

standard of (un)favourable, bad and good varies from individual to individual, group to group and society to society – i.e. criteria of success vary.

The construct “career” is called *jivanbriti*, in Nepali (Pathak, 2007), – has two meanings *baachnakaa lagi aangaliyeko pesa; jivannirbahakaa lagi gariyeko prabandh* meaning that one’s occupation for livelihood or a management to survive (NPP, 2067 B.S.) Both definitions emphasize “means to end” where “end” indicates surviving or (running life) and “means” refers to profession or (need of managing). The meaning of career is limited to profession taken as means to achieve those all requirements needed to survive one’s life in first meaning. In the second one, the meaning might have been broader - managing every side of life to run the whole life. A popular western definition of “career” is the unfolding sequence of a person’s work experiences over time (Arthur, Hall, & Lawrence, 1989). Next one, OUP (2010) defines it as the series of jobs that a person has in a particular area of work, usually involving more responsibility as time passes. The latest two definitions speak about experiences gained by an individual over the time.

When these two constructs “career” and “success” comes together, what does it mean? Career success is an outcome of a person’s career experiences (Arthur, Khapova, & Wilderom, 2005). As dealing with these two constructs earlier, does it mean to fulfilling wants, desires of individual through his/her profession? Does it mean that getting favourable outcomes from one’s work? Is one considered as successful in career once he/she meets his/her wants? Of course, it totally depends on the criteria of career success set by individual. In process of conceptualizing the career success one issue of many – what the criteria should be focused on – is to be understood (Gunz & Heslin, 2005). In this connection, it is worthy to see “how has career success being conceptualized?”

Career success has been defined widely as “positive psychological or work-related outcomes or achievements that the individual accumulates as a result of work experiences” (Judge & Bretz Jr., 1994; Judge T. A., Cable, Boudreau, & Bretz Jr., 1995; Seibert, Kraimer, & Liden, 2001). This definition accommodates two types of outcomes – psychological and non-psychological. The psychological outcome is largely related to subjective judgment. Consistent with this outcome, career success can be defined as “the experience of achieving goals that are personally meaningful to the individual, rather than those set by parents, peers, an organization, or society” (Mirvis & Hall, 1994). Though this definition insists on self-evaluation of work experiences’ outcome, it also speaks on outcomes judged by others. It might be related to non-psychological as noted earlier. Career success judged by others is determined based on relatively objective and visible criteria (Jaskolka, Beyer, & Trice, 1985). Moreover, career success has been viewed as having objective and subjective outcomes (Callanan, 2003) and they are called objective career success and subjective career success respectively.

### **2.3 Objective career success**

Achievement state of career outcomes, which are objective, visible (Jaskolka, Beyer, & Trice, 1985), more observable, more tangible, (Ballout, 2009) and publicly assessable (Arthur, Khapova, & Wilderom, 2005) is called objective career success. Objective career success, also called extrinsic career success, is measured in terms of salary and promotions (Judge T. A., Cable, Boudreau, & Bretz Jr., 1995); or hierarchical status, salary growth (Abele & Spurk, 2009), refers to outcomes that are instrument rewards (Seibert, Kraimer, & Liden, 2001) from job or occupation and are objectively observable (Callanan, 2003). These outcomes have long been considered the hallmarks of career success across a wide range of societies (Nicholson, 2000).

Another major traditional indicator of objective success, promotion refers to upward mobility which seems possible in tall organization to large extent. Today organizations have been changed - becoming flatter day by day. Heslin (2005) has noticed the reduction of relevance of this traditional indicator by the scope of lessening hierarchical progression through promotion due to organizational changes like organizational delayering, downsizing and outsourcing over the last three decades.

Contamination and deficient of objective criteria of career success have also been noticed by Heslin (2005) which limit the meaning of career success. Usually objective criteria have been contaminated because of contextual differences between countries. Similarly, jobs where pay and promotions are institutionalized such as civil service and military have limited meaning of career success (Thorndike, 1963). Rather than pay and promotion, other objective indicators are also valuing in one’s career which was not included in traditional objective criteria of success. For instance, school teachers and academic mentors (Parsons, 2002) define their career success in terms of hard data on the learning and attainments of their students and protégés. Likewise, the hard data years of driving without an accident would be the base of drivers’ career success and doctors on the proportion of emergency patients live they save (Heslin, 2005). Heslin (2005) insists on continual attainment of such objective outcomes that doesn’t lead to increase in pay, promotion, occupational status, or rank.

It is also not sure that receiving high pay and promotions always make people feel proud and successful (Hall, 2002) because materialistic rewards alone can’t fulfil the desire of all aspects of human life. People also expect less tangible and less visible outcomes such as work-life balance, a sense of meaning, purpose and contribution from their work. Indeed, one’s career success can’t be defined without addressing a

major portion of career success--subjective measure of career success. With the evidence, shown by Bandura (1997), of newly appointed managers lacking adequate authority can soon become overwhelmed and depressed, potentially leading to both subjective and objective career failure, Heslin (2005) had noticed subjective success is not necessarily a function of objective attainments.

#### **2.4 Subjective Career Success**

Subjective career success has been defined as one's feelings of accomplishment and satisfaction with his or her career, across any dimensions that are important to that individual (Van Maanen, 1977) and they are partially based on objective indicators (Judge T. A., Cable, Boudreau, & Bretz Jr., 1995). The later part of this definition insists personal judgment towards objective attainments to evaluate career success subjectively. While taking about earlier part "any dimensions important to individual", it covers boarder sense than subjective evaluation of objective attainments believing that these alone may not define individuals' career success. Thus, it is an individual's reactions to his or her unfolding career experiences (Hughes, 1937).

Job satisfaction and career satisfaction have been common measuring rods of subjective career success for a long time and being continued (e.g., Thorndike, 1934; Judge, Cable, Boudreau, & Bretz Jr., 1995; Seibert & Kraimer, 2001; Abele & Spurk, 2009). Job satisfaction refers to an individual's general attitude toward his or her job (Robbins, 2003). Normally, a person holds attitude towards something is the outcome of evaluating them as per his or her importance. A person with a high level of job satisfaction holds positive attitudes about the job, while a person who is dissatisfied with his or her job holds negative attitudes about the job (Robbins, 2003). It has been argued that as persons with dissatisfied with many aspects of their jobs are unlikely to consider their careers are successful (Judge, Higgins, Thoresen, & Barrick, 1999), job satisfaction has been considered the most salient aspect of subjective career success. On the other hand, it has also been noticed high job satisfaction may not necessarily lead to subjective career success when it exacts a high toll in terms of health, family relationships, or other salient personal values (Heslin, 2005). Likewise, Heslin (2005) has notified standardized measures developed by Greenhaus *et. al.* (1990) has been utilizing to measure the career satisfaction may not be sufficient to assess each respondent's subjective career success validly though it has acceptable levels of internal consistency.

As people have different career aspirations and they place different values on career outcomes such as income, employment security, the location of work, status, progression through different jobs, access to learning, the importance of work versus personal and family time, and so on (Arthur, Khapova, & Wilderom, 2005), job and career satisfaction, widely and commonly used measures for subjective career success (Heslin, 2005), may not cover all dimensions of individuals' subjective career success.

#### **2.5 Gender differences in career success**

Traditionally men have been expected the role of provider for their families and female as caregiver. Though today's increased number of women in labour market has violated the theme of traditional breadwinner system, the breadwinner role of male is being continued to be the central to the definition of masculinity (Faludi, 1991) and taken as fundamental to men's identity (Tolson, 1977).

Consistent with this masculinity socialization, the success has been defined with the factors associated with wealth and prestige (Deutschendorf, 1996). In another word, masculine definition of success is centered on the provision of material goods – a man feels more successful himself when more goods he provides for his family's material well-being (Doyle, 1983) and it is also claimed by Doyle that material success is central to many men. Such kind of material success and fulfilment of breadwinner role are achieved through the work. Indeed, success at work is the major mechanism of fulfilling other roles (Dyke & Murphy, 2006) viz. family role which is defined for men as a father and husband to support economically (Simon, 1995). In order to fulfil family obligation successfully and demonstrating the masculinity, being successful at work is essential for men which makes work as central domain of interest (Tolson, 1977; Simon, 1995; Deutschendorf, 1996). However, those men to whom caregiving is also important don't feel comfortable financial sacrifice for caregiving role (Dyke & Murphy, 2006). Thus, the reviews show that men define their success at work domain as it is the sole source and based on provider role to their families demonstrating the masculinity attitude.

In contrast, as stated earlier women's role is clustering around the caring family members and nurturing relationships, they have a different set of expectation than men do. Such different sets of expectations lead them to express different values and concerns. Many studies (Gilligan, 1982; Karniol, Grosz, & Schorr, 2003; Diekman & Murnen, 2004) were found consistent with Chodorow's (1978) model of gender difference in the development of identity based on psychodynamic theory. According to the model, young boys forge their gender identity through differentiation from other-sex caregiver (i.e. their mother), whereas young girls shaped their gender identity through identification with same-sex female caregiver. This type of differential identity formation results into belief of men who value independence and detachment and women who value interdependence and attachment (Diekman & Murnen, 2004) as they are socialized to restrict and increase

emotional expression respectively at their adolescent ages (Polce-Lynch, Myers, Kilmartin, Forssmann-Falck, & Kliewer, 1998).

Dyke and Murphy (2006) have, in their review, linked the emphasis on relationship and care as defining feminine identity with possibility of different measuring yardstick of women's success. Women were traditionally categorized as successful not by their achievement in public realm but by relationship in personal realm (Levinson & Levinson, 1996) as women's caregiving role to their families in male breadwinner system. Such personal standard of measuring success of women may, nonetheless, persist though increasing number of women in increasing rate have now taken work roles in public realm. All the employed women have viewed employment as added responsibility with the primary obligation of caregiving to their children and husband (Simon, 1995). Many other studies (Gallos, 1989; Gordon, 1991; Orenstein, 2000; Mckeen & Bu, 2005) have also supported caregiving to families to be central to women's success followed by economic independence. In the study conducted by Dyke and Murphy (2006) among traditionally measured successful women and men, women defined their success quite differently than their male colleagues did. They primarily focus on balancing work and family roles.

At last, the reviewed literature leads that women are likely to exhibit less on objective career success, however, that may not necessarily be lower as far as subjective career success is concerned. Based on this conclusion, the study has derived following hypotheses in order to address the research question.

H1: The distributions of objective career outcomes: i) income, and ii) promotion, for men and women are different.

H2: There is an association between gender and occupational status.

H3: The distributions of subjective career outcomes: i) perceived career success, and ii) interpersonal success for men and women are different.

### **III. Methodology**

#### **3.1 Research approach**

In course of addressing the research questions, the study attempted to test the hypotheses which were formulated by reviewing the existing theory with respect to the issue raised. The study attempted to confirm or reject the (causal) relationship between two concepts formed through existing theories. Therefore, the study is based on deductive approach of research (Saunders, Lewis, & Thronhill, 2012).

#### **3.2 Data, sampling, collection procedure and analysis technique**

375 copies of questionnaire were distributed and 254 were collected. Each of questionnaires were assigned with individual case number. A coding list was prepared for all variables in the questionnaire. Then, a data entry format was built in variable view of SPSS and entered data subsequently.

The research is based on questionnaire survey conducted in civil service sector within Kathmandu valley during 2017. With the experience of unwillingness to take part in survey that gained in pilot test by the researcher, snowball or chain-referral sampling method was adapted to collect the data. Snowball or chain-referral sampling is the technique that provides a study sample via referral made among the people who share or know others possessing some characteristics of research interest and is very useful in the study focusing relatively private matter (Biernacki & Waldorf, 1981). The current research fits the criterion because of finding respondents having research interest was so difficult that experienced in pilot test. In addition, data required to answer the research questions is relatively private matter as it seeks personal information relating to their career success.

The study adopted descriptive, causal comparative and analytical research design. The descriptive statistics were used to describe the status of career success. Furthermore, Mann-Whitney U test and chi-square test of association were used to test the distribution differences and association of career success outcomes with gender.

#### **3.3 Variable and Measures**

Career success has been examined by objective career success and subjective career success. The objective career success was measured by three outcomes: income, occupational status, and promotion.

The self-reported monthly income was converted into yearly income. By using the tax slab of income tax as cut-off point, the data was converted into low income earner group, coded as "0", and high-income earner group, coded as "1". The respondents were asked to report their designation to measure their Occupational status. Civil servants reported their designations as section officer, under-secretary, joint-secretary, and secretary. Under-secretary and above are categorized as upper level, coded as "1", and rest section officer as officer level, coded as "0". The respondents were asked to report number of times they have been promoted during their career. The mode was calculated to split them as upper half and lower half. Upper half was named as higher promotion and lower half as lower promotion and coded them "1" and "0" respectively.

Subjective career success was measured through two factors i) perceived career success, and ii) interpersonal success. Perceived career success (PCS) was measured with six items loaded as first factor. The items were developed in 7 point-likert scale. One sample item is – I am reaching my career goals within the time frame I set for myself. The reliability estimate for this variable was 0.835. Interpersonal success (IPS) was measured with three items loaded as fourth factor. The items used 7 point-likert scale. One sample item is – I am respected by my co-workers. The reliability estimate for this variable was 0.751.

#### IV. Analysis and Findings

##### 4.1 Gender and objective career outcomes

This section deals with assessing the status of objective career outcomes of both men and women via descriptive statistics and followed by statistical tests to examine the gender differences and its association. Three objective career outcomes: yearly income, number of promotions they achieved during their career and their occupational status are displayed in Table 1.

**Table 1** Descriptive Statistics of Objective Career Outcomes

	Yearly Income			Promotion			Occupational Status				
	Mean	95% CI for Mean		Max	Mean	95% CI for Mean		Max	Officer	Upper	Total
		Lower Bound	Upper Bound			Lower Bound	Upper Bound				
Men	4.63	4.32	4.94	18	1.48	1.29	1.67	4	81	74	155
Women	4.07	3.84	4.3	10	1	0.79	1.2	3	75	24	99
Total	4.41	4.19	4.61	18	1.28	1.14	1.42	4	156	98	254

Yearly Income was converted from self-reported monthly income – (figures are displayed in hundred thousand of Nepalese Rupees);

Promotion was measured by asking respondents to report number of promotions they achieved during their career;

Occupational Status is shown in frequency.

##### 4.1.1 Gender and Yearly Income

The measure of yearly income was presented in average value of self-reporting income. Mean score of yearly income shows that average yearly income for women was lower than for men. The 95% confidence interval (CI) of men and women are not overlapped. Upper bound scores of CI for women (4.3 hundred thousand) are lower than lower bound scores of CI for men (4.32 hundred thousand) which shows the yearly income of women is lower than men. Furthermore, the gap has also been evidenced by higher maximum score of yearly income for men than that for women.

The descriptive statistics of yearly income lead the study with the finding, that is

- Women’s average yearly income were lower than that of men.

Women’s lower average yearly income, descriptively observed, has further been put for significance test in order to test the hypothesis 1. Non-parametric equivalent test (i.e. Mann – Whitney U Test) was performed to ascertain difference of distribution of yearly income between men and women. The non-parametric test was run due to departure from normality distribution of dependent variable – yearly income,  $SW(224) = 0.694$ ,  $p < .0005$ . The distribution of yearly income for men and women were not similar, as assessed by visual inspection. Yearly income for men (mean rank = 113.95) was statistically higher than for women (mean rank = 86.91),  $U = 3727.5$ ,  $z = -3.229$ ,  $p < .01$ , using as exact sampling distribution for U (Dineen & Blakesley, 1973).

The major finding is:

- Annual income distribution for men was statistically higher than for women.

This finding supports the hypothesis 1 assuming gender difference on objective career success while examining with respect to income, first objective indicator of career success.

##### 4.1.2 Gender and Promotion

As second indicator of objective career success, respondents reported times they had been promoted during their career. The lower average value of number of promotions for women indicates women had been less promoted. In addition, having no overlapped the 95% confidence interval for mean and lesser maximum value for women also support that women were being less promoted.

The descriptive statistics of number of promotions lead the study with the finding:

- Women were less promoted than men.

Descriptively found lower promotion accounted for women has been tested for its significance in order to test hypothesis 1. Non-parametric equivalent test (i.e. Mann – Whitney U Test) was performed to ascertain

difference of distribution of promotion between men and women. The non-parametric test was run due to departure from normality distribution of dependent variable – promotion (SW (239) = .882,  $p < .0005$ ). The distribution of promotion for men and women were not similar, as assessed by visual inspection. Promotion for men (mean rank = 115.57) was statistically higher than for women (mean rank = 89.88),  $U = 3.988.5$ ,  $z = -3.150$ ,  $p < .01$ , using as exact sampling distribution for  $U$  (Dineen & Blakesley, 1973).

The major finding is:

- Average number of promotions for men was statistically higher than for women.

This finding supports the hypothesis 1 assuming gender difference on objective career success while examining with respect to promotion, second objective indicator of career success.

#### 4.1.3 Gender and Occupational Status

Third objective indicator of career success for the study, occupational status, is shown in table 1. The numbers of women in upper level were found fewer than men.

Of the participants, only 24 women (out of 99 women civil servant participated in survey) in civil service were found in upper level where as the counts for men were 74 (out of 155). The observed count shows that:

- Women were found less in upper level.

The third objective indicator of career success for the study, occupational status – categorized into officer level and upper level, has been examined by performing chi-square test of association (2×2) to test association between gender and occupational status in order to test hypothesis 2.

**Table 2** Crosstabulation: Gender and Occupational Status

Occupational Status	Officer Level		Upper Level		Total	
	Count	Expected Count	Count	Expected Count	Count	Expected Count
Men	81	95.2	74	59.8	155	155
Women	75	60.8	24	38.2	99	99
Total	156	156	98	98	254	254

Table 2 shows the crosstabulation of occupational status by gender across the types of sectors and in overall. For “women”, observed frequency was somewhat greater than expected for officer level, and lower than expected for upper level, and in “men”, the other way around. This might lead the study to suspect that there is an association between gender and occupational status, heading for chi-square test of association (2×2) between these two categorical variables.

A chi-square test of association (2×2) was conducted to test association between gender and occupational status. All expected cell frequencies were greater than five. There was a statistically significant association between gender and occupational status,  $\chi^2(1) = 14.079$ ,  $p < 0.001$ . There was moderately strong association between gender and occupational status,  $\phi = -0.235$ ,  $p < 0.001$

The major findings are:

- There was a statistically significant association between gender and occupational status.
- A negative phi-coefficient in overall and in both sectors indicates there is relationship between gender and occupational status with being men making it more likely in upper level, and being women making it more likely in officer level.

The findings relating to association between gender and occupational status support to accept hypothesis 2 with respect to third indicator of objective career success – occupational status.

In sum, significant test for descriptive findings of objective career outcomes showed women were less successful in their career with respect to objective career outcomes.

#### 4.2 Gender and Subjective career success outcomes

This section deals with assessing the status of subjective career outcomes of both men and women via descriptive statistics and followed by statistical tests to examine the gender differences. Table 3 shows the status of subjective career outcomes across the gender presented by mean scores, 95% confidence interval (CI) for mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum scores, skewness, mean per item (averaged over the numbers of items used to measure) and possible maximum value.

**Table 3** Descriptive Statistics of Subjective Career Outcomes

	Perceived Career Success					Interpersonal Success				
	Mean	95% CI for Mean		Skewness	Mean/item	Mean	95% CI for Mean		Skewness	Mean/item
		Lower Bound	Upper Bound				Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Men	29.06	27.9	30.21	-0.451	4.84	16.79	16.3	17.27	-1.152	5.6
Women	29.58	28.24	30.97	-0.51	4.93	16.94	16.38	17.52	-1.54	5.65
Total	29.27	28.39	30.15	-0.476	4.88	16.85	16.48	17.22	-1.281	5.62

**4.2.1 Gender and Perceived Career Success**

Positively tilted mean scores and mean/item scores of perceived career success (PCS) seen in table 3 indicated that respondents experienced success on their career, which has been supported by the negatively skewed value. Little bit higher mean score of perceived career success indicates women perceived their career relatively high successful than men. However, the overlapped 95% confidence interval for mean scores indicates similar level of perceived career success for both men and women. This all shows that both men and women perceived same level of career success.

Significance of similar level of perceived career success across the gender has also been examined by performing non-parametric equivalent test (i.e. Mann-Whitney U Test). The test was performed due to departure from normality distribution of dependent variable – perceived career success,  $SW(251) = 0.952$ ;  $p < 0.0005$ . The distribution of perceived career success for men and women were similar, as assessed by visual inspection. Perceived career success for men (mean rank = 125.36) was not statistically lower than for women (mean rank = 130.84),  $U = 8.003.5$ ,  $z = 0.580$ ,  $p = .562$ , using as exact sampling distribution for U (Dineen & Blakesley, 1973).

The major finding is:

- Perceived career success is similar for both men and women.

**4.2.2 Gender and Interpersonal Success**

Mean score, mean/item and negatively skewed interpersonal success for both men and women seen in table 3 indicate the similar level of interpersonal success has been experienced across the gender. In order to determine distribution difference of interpersonal success between men and women, the observed similar level of interpersonal success experiences has further been examined by performing non-parametric equivalent test (i.e. Mann-Whitney U Test). The test was performed due to departure from normality distribution of dependent variable – interpersonal success,  $SW(250) = .927$ ,  $p < .0005$ . The distribution of interpersonal success for men and women were similar, as assessed by visual inspection. Interpersonal success for men (mean rank = 126.22) was statistically similar to for women (mean rank = 129.51),  $U = 7,871.5$ ,  $z = 0.351$ ,  $p = .725$ , using as exact sampling distribution for U (Dineen & Blakesley, 1973).

The major finding is:

- Interpersonal success is similar for both men and women.

The findings relating to subjective career outcomes showed that women were not less successful in their career with respect to subjective indicators. Women were also experiencing same level of success as their counterpart, men.

**V. Discussion and Conclusion**

Women were accounted with less objective career success indicators showing that they were less successful in their career as compared to men counterpart. The findings seem the continuity of many other previous studies. The current study found women were with lesser yearly income as compared to men, which is consistent with Nigerian study that found a salary differential between male and female bank managers (Okpara, 2006). This has also been supported by another study conducted in Lebanon with the presence of gender pay gap in educational sector though believe was no pay gap (Jamali, Sidani, & Kobeissi, 2008). Likewise, other studies conducted in china (Xiu, 2013; Xiao, He, Lin, & Elkins, 2013), among Spanish managers (Scicchitano, 2014; Perez-Villadoniga & Rodriguez-Alvarez, 2017) and in Cameroon (Mbratana & Kenne, 2018) also support the existence of gender pay gap.

Women’s lesser promotion as compared to men for the study was found consistent with other study with the finding of gender difference in promotion (Okpara, 2006). Likewise, the study conducted in North East of England (Wynarczyk, 2007) support the finding of current study gender gap in upper level. Underrepresentation in upper level has also been supported from the study conducted in France (Barnet-Verzat & Wolf, 2008).

What the current study feels on examining the gender pay gap might be the cause of gender difference on occupational status, otherwise there would not be pay gap within the same hierarchical level between men and women. The underrepresentation of female in upper level and less promotion might have effect to produce gender pay gap. However, sticky floor and glass ceiling effect might be the cause of hindering female to promote in upper level.

In course of addressing research question, subjective career outcomes were also expected to be different across the gender. The expectation was consistent with the studies (Judge T. A., Cable, Boudreau, & Bretz Jr., 1995; Heslin, 2005; Dyke & Murphy, 2006). In addition, the result of lesser objective career outcomes for women in current study made the expectation on subjective career outcomes seems more sound and stronger. However, in contrast to expectation, the study found no gender differences on subjective career outcomes. This finding leads the study to conclude that women were happy with whatever they have got on their career. The logical explanation behind this would be the different criteria on defining career success across the gender, more precisely women's first priority for family and gender ideology (Afiouni & Karam, 2014). Therefore, they might have shown same level of subjective career outcome though they were less on objective achievement at workplace.

In conclude, having same level of satisfaction though different objective achievement across the gender indicates women's career should not be judged from same indicators that are used for men.

## References

- [1]. Cooke, F. L. (2003). Equal opportunity? Women's managerial careers in governmental organizations in China. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 14(2), 317-333.
- [2]. Syed, J., & Murray, P. A. (2008). A cultural feminist approach towards managing diversity in top management teams. *Equal Opportunities International*, 27(5), 413-432. doi:10.1108/02610150810882288
- [3]. Cooke, F. L., & Saini, D. S. (2012). Managing diversity in Chinese and Indian Organizations: A qualitative study. *Journal of Chinese Human Resource Management*, 3(1), 16-32. doi:10.1108/20408001211220548
- [4]. Patterson, L., & Bae, S. (2013). Gender (in)equality in Korean firms: Results from stakeholders interviews. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict*, 17(1), 93-113.
- [5]. Ravazzani, S. (2016). Understanding approaches to managing diversity in the workplace: An empirical investigation in Italy. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 35(2), 154-168. doi:10.1108/EDI-08-2014-0062
- [6]. Kundu, S. C., & Mor, A. (2017). Workforce diversity and organizational performance: A study of IT industry in India. *Employee Relations*, 39(2), 160-183. doi:10.1108/ER-06-2015-0114
- [7]. Bogan, V. L., Just, D. R., & Dev, C. S. (2013). Team gender diversity and investment decision-making behavior. *Review of Behavioral Finance*, 5(2), 134-152. doi:10.1108/RBF-04-2012-0003
- [8]. Lenard, M. J., Yu, B., York, E. A., & Wu, S. (2014). Impact of board gender diversity on firm risk. *Managerial Finance*, 40(8), 787-803. doi:10.1108/MF-06-2013-0164
- [9]. Fernandez, J. (2015). The impact of gender diversity in foreign subsidiaries' innovatoin outputs. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 7(2), 148-167. doi:10.1108/IJGE-07-2014-0022
- [10]. Catalyst. (2017). Quick take: Women in management. New York: Catalyst. Retrieved from <http://www.catalyst.org/knowledge/women-management>
- [11]. Central Bureau of Statistics. (2009). Nepal labour force survey 2008: Statistical report. Kathmandu: CBS.
- [12]. Government of Nepal, UN Women. (2017, August 31). Updates: Relief Web. Retrieved from Relief Web Web site: <https://reliefweb.int/report/nepal/nepal-gender-equality-and-social-inclusion-gesi-profile-humanitarian-action-and>
- [13]. Heslin, P. A. (2005, Mar). Conceptualizing and Evaluating Career Success. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(2), 113 -136.
- [14]. Leung, S. A. (2008). The big five career theories. In J. A. Athanassou, & R. Van Esbroeck, *International Handbook of Career Guidance* (pp. 115-132). Springer.
- [15]. OUP. (2010). Oxford advanced learner's dictionary (8th ed.). Oxford New York: Oxford University Press.
- [16]. Pathak, S. (2007). English - nepali comprehensive dictionary (1st ed.). Kathmandu: Padmaraj Pathak Smriti Pratisthan.
- [17]. NPP. (2067 B.S.). Nepali brihat shabdakosh (7th ed.). Kathmandu: Nepal Pragya Pratisthan.
- [18]. Arthur, M. B., Hall, D. T., & Lawrence, B. S. (1989). *Handbook of career theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [19]. Arthur, M. B., Khapova, S. N., & Wilderom, C. P. (2005, March). Career Success in a Boundaryless Career World. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(2), 177-202.
- [20]. Gunz, H. P., & Heslin, P. A. (2005). Reconceptualizing career success. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 26, 105 - 111.
- [21]. Judge, T. A., & Bretz Jr., R. D. (1994). Political influence behavior and career success. *Journal of Management*, 20(1), 43-65.
- [22]. Judge, T. A., Cable, D. M., Boudreau, J. W., & Bretz Jr., R. D. (1995). An Empirical Investigation of Predictors of Executive career success. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 485 - 519.
- [23]. Seibert, S. E., Kraimer, M. L., & Liden, R. C. (2001). A Social Capital Theory of Career Success. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(2), 219 - 237.
- [24]. Mirvis, H. P., & Hall, D. T. (1994). Psychological success and boundaryless career. In M. B. Arthur, & D. M. Rousseau, *The Boundaryless Career* (pp. 237-255). Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- [25]. Jaskolka, G., Beyer, J. M., & Trice, H. M. (1985). Measuring and predicting career success. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 26(2), 189-205. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791\(85\)90018-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(85)90018-1)
- [26]. Callanan, G. A. (2003). What price career success? *Career Development International*, 8/3, 126-133.
- [27]. Ballout, H. I. (2009). Career commitment and career success: Moderating role of self-efficacy. *Career Development International*, 14(7), 655-670.
- [28]. Abele, A. E., & Spurk, D. (2009). The longitudinal impact of self-efficacy and career goals on objective and subjective career success. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 74, 53 - 62.
- [29]. Nicholson, N. (2000). Motivation-selection-connection: an evolutionary model of career development. In M. Peiperl, M. Arthur, R. Goffee, & T. Morris, *Career frontiers: New concepts of working life* (pp. 54-75). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [30]. Thorndike, R. L. (1963). The prediction of vocational success. *Vocational Guidance Quarterly*, 11, 179-187.
- [31]. Parsons, B. A. (2002). *Evaluative inquiry: Using evaluation to promote student success*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

- [32]. Hall, D. T. (2002). *Careers in and out of organizations*. Thousand Oaks, C.A.: Sage.
- [33]. Van Maanen, J. (1977). Experiencing organization: notes on the meaning of careers and socialization. In J. Van Maanen, *Organizational careers: Some new perspectives*. New York: Wiley.
- [34]. Hughes, E. C. (1937). Institutional office and the person. *American Journal of Sociology*, 43, 404-413.
- [35]. Robbins, S. P. (2003). *Organizational behaviour* (10th ed.). Delhi: Pearson Education Inc.
- [36]. Judge, T. A., Higgins, C. A., Thoresen, C. J., & Barrick, M. R. (1999). The big five personality traits, general mental ability, and career success across the life span. *Personnel Psychology*, 52, 621 - 652.
- [37]. Faludi, A. (1991). *Blacklash: The undeclared war against American women*. New York: Crown.
- [38]. Tolson, A. (1977). *The limits of masculinity*. London: Tavistock.
- [39]. Deuschendorf, H. (1996). Of work and men: How men can become more than their careers. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fairview.
- [40]. Doyle, J. A. (1983). *The male experience*. Dubuque, Iowa: Brown.
- [41]. Dyke, L. S., & Murphy, S. A. (2006). How We Define Success: A Qualitative Study of What Matters Most to Women and Men. *Sex Roles*, 55, 357 - 371.
- [42]. Simon, R. W. (1995). Gender, multiple roles, role meaning, and mental health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 36, 182-194.
- [43]. Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- [44]. Karniol, R., Grosz, E., & Schorr, I. (2003). Caring, gender role orientation and volunteering. *Sex roles*, 49, 11-19.
- [45]. Diekmann, A. B., & Murnen, S. K. (2004). Learning to be little women and little men: The inequitable gender equality of nonsexist children's literature. *Sex Roles*, 50, 373-385.
- [46]. Polce-Lynch, M., Myers, B. J., Kilmartin, C. T., Forssmann-Falck, R., & Kliewer, W. (1998). Gender and age patterns in emotional expression, body image, and self-esteem: A qualitative analysis. *Sex Roles*, 38, 1025-1048.
- [47]. Levinson, D. J., & Levinson, J. D. (1996). *The seasons of a woman's life*. New York: Knopf.
- [48]. Gallos, J. V. (1989). Exploring women's development: Implications for career theory, practice, and research. In M. B. Arthur, D. T. Hall, & B. S. Lawrence, *Handbook of career theory* (pp. 110-132). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [49]. Gordon, S. (1991). *Prisoners of men's dreams*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- [50]. Orenstein, P. (2000). *Flux: Women on sex, work, kids, love, and life in a half-changed world*. New York: Doubleday.
- [51]. Mckeen, C. A., & Bu, N. (2005). Gender roles: An examination of the hopes and expectations of the next generation of managers in Canada and China. *Sex Roles*, 52, 533-546.
- [52]. Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thronhill, A. (2012). *Reserach Methods for Business Students*. Harlow: Pearson.
- [53]. Biernacki, P., & Waldrof, D. (1981). Snowball sampling: Problems and techniques of chain referral sampling. *Sociological Methods and Research*, 10(2), 143-163. doi:10.1177/004912418101000205
- [54]. Okpara, J. O. (2006). Gender and the relationship between perceived fairness in pay, promotion and job satisfaction in a sub-Saharan African economy. *Women in Management Review*, 21(3), 224-240.
- [55]. Jamali, D., Sidani, Y., & Kobeissi, A. (2008). The gender pay gap revisited: Insights from a developing country context. *Gender in Management: An international Journal*, 23(4), 230-246.
- [56]. Xiu, L. (2013). The gender gap in top corporate jobs in China: Evidence from an establishment-manager matched survey. *Evidence-based HRM: A Global Forum for Empirical Scholarship*, 1(1), 60-79.
- [57]. Xiao, Z., He, R., Lin, Z., & Elkins, H. (2013). CEO compensation in China: Accounting performance, corporate governance, and the gender gap. *Nankai Business Review International*, 4(4), 309-328. doi:10.1108/NBRI-09-2013-0032
- [58]. Scicchitano, S. (2014). The gender pay gap among Spanish managers. *International Journal of Manpower*, 35(3), 327-344. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-05-2012-0075>
- [59]. Perez-Villadoniga, M. J., & Rodriguez-Alvarez, A. (2017). Comparing the gender gap in gross and base wages. *International Journal of Manpower*, 38(5), 646-660. doi:10.1108/IJM-10-2015-0162
- [60]. Mbratana, T., & Kenne, A. F. (2018). Investigating gender wage gap in employment: A microeconomic type-analysis for Cameroon. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 45(5), 847-865. doi:10.1108/IJSE-04-2017-0131
- [61]. Wynarczyk, P. (2007). Addressing the "gender gap" in the managerial labour market: The case of scientific small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in the North East of England. *Management Reserach New*, 30(12), 942-954. doi:10.1108/01409170710833367
- [62]. Barnet-Verzat, C., & Wolf, F.-C. (2008). Gender wage gap and the glass ceiling effect: A firm-level investigation. *International Journal of Manpower*, 29(6), 482-496. doi:10.1108/01437720810904185
- [63]. Afiouni, F., & Karam, C. M. (2014). Structure, agency, and notions of career success: A process-oriented, subjectively malleable and localized approach. *Career Development International*, 19(5), 548-571. doi:10.1108/CDI-01-2013-0007
- [64]. Government of Nepal, NPC. (2017). *National Review of Sustainable Development Goals*. Kathmandu: National Planning Commission.
- [65]. Judge, T. A., Cable, D. M., Boudreau, J. W., & Bretz Jr., R. D. (1995). An Empirical Investigation of the Predictors of Executive Career Success. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 485 - 519.
- [66]. Duarte, C. M., Esperanca, J. P., Curto, J. D., Santos, M. C., & Carapeto, M. (2010). The determinants of gender pay gap in Portuguese private firms. *Gender in Management: An Internatioal Journal*, 25(6), 438 - 461.
- [67]. Gattiker, U. E., & Larwood, L. (1988). Predictor's for managers' career mobility, success and satisfaction. *Human Relations*, 41, 569 - 591.
- [68]. Dencker, J. C. (2008). Corporate restructuring and sex differences in managerial promotion. *American Sociological Review*, 73(3), 455-76.
- [69]. Kirchmeyer, C. (1998). Determinants of managerial career success: Evidence and explanation of male/female differences. *Journal of Management*, 24(6), 673-92.
- [70]. Tharenou, P., Latimer, S., & Conroy, D. (1994, August). How do you make it to the top? An Examinations of influences on Women's and Men's Managerial Advancement. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 37(4), 899 - 931.
- [71]. Forret, M. L., & Dougherty, T. W. (2004). Networking behaviors and career outcomes: differences for men and women? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 419-437.
- [72]. Metcalfe, B. D., & Afanassieva, M. (2005). Gender, work, and equal opportunities in central and eastern Europe. *Women in Management Review*, 20(6), 397 - 411.
- [73]. Doherty, L., & Manfredi, S. (2006). Women's progression to senior positions in English universities. *Employee relations*, 28(6), 553 - 572.
- [74]. Haas, L., & Hwang, C. P. (2007). Gender and Organizational Culture: Correlates of Companies' Responsiveness to Fathers in Sweden. *Gender and Society*, 21(1), 52 - 79.

- [75]. Ismail, M., & Ibrahim, M. (2008). Barriers to career progression faced by women: Evidence from a Malaysian multinational oil company. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 23(1), 51-66.
- [76]. Tlaiss, H., & Kauser, S. (2010). Perceived organizational barriers to women's career advancement in Lebanon. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 25(6), 462-496.
- [77]. Orser, B., & Leck, J. (2010). Gender influences on career success outcomes. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 25(5), 386 - 407. doi:10.1108/17542411011056877
- [78]. Vanderbroeck, P. (2010). The traps that keep women from reaching the top and how to avoid them. *Journal of Management Development*, 29(9), 764 - 770.

Gyan Bahadur Tamang. "Gender Differences On objective and Subjective Career Outcomes: An Evidence From Nepalese Civil Service." *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, 22(1), 2020, pp. 56-66.