

Gender Inequality Worsens Poverty in Rural Punjab Pakistan

Asmat Safdar^{1,*}, Naima Nawaz², Saira Akhtar³, Ayesha Riaz⁴

^{1,2,3}Department of Rural Sociology, University of Agriculture Faisalabad-38040, Pakistan;

⁴Institute of Home Sciences, University of Agriculture Faisalabad-38040, Pakistan

*Corresponding author's email: asmat.safdar@yahoo.com

Abstract

Poverty is the biggest problem that Pakistan faces, from the past decade poverty increased by 30-40 percent in Pakistan. That's mean 40 percent of the country's population lives under the poverty line. The concept of gender needs to be understood clearly as a cross-cutting socio-cultural variable. The research adopted triangulation approach. The field work exercises for the examination was completed by the analyst. Descriptive inferential and multivariate analysis was carried out to explore the research. The study showed that there is a strong significant association between age of the respondent and their thinking that gender inequality effect poverty. Gender is an integral part of rural livelihood. The major reason for this is high accusation of gender inequality at family level especially in rural areas. Gender disparities in educational attainment have a big impact on rural household poverty. Educated individuals can all the more likely comprehend local area issues and significance of gender equality. This examination looks at the impact of poverty and gender inequality in person's life. Schooling is the likely determinant of poverty. Literate people have healthy life, sustenance and better behavior. Most of the respondents thought that only men's education upgrades the family income and social status as compare to women. Gender preference, lack of awareness and knowledge, low living standard and financial barriers were the most important reasons of gender inequality. Hence the findings of the investigation suggested that implementation of a comprehensive set of policies will be helpful for poverty reduction and development of the society.

Keywords: Gender Inequality, Poverty, education, Awareness, Knowledge

INTRODUCTION

In reality of daily Life gender discrimination is very important issue. Especially in the developing countries gender inequality between male and female are more than the develop countries. Gender Inequality affect in education labor market and other household activities. In recent years these inequalities become lesser than the previous years. In South Asia and Africa gender inequality rate is very high (Klasen and Lamanna, 2009).

In Pakistan the condition of women is diverse from the other countries. One of the developing policies of Pakistani Community is gender. In a household female plays a vital role to run the house and perform other household work. Male plays a vital role as a wage earner but female plays many roles such as a mother and spouse she had to manage all the work of household and take care of the family as well. In Pakistani society there is a great difference between male and female. They provide best education and skills to the male and female are revealed to home services to stay virtuous and good mother and spouse. Female have lower chance to generate options for their personal lifestyle so in result a great gender inequality happen in the society (ADB, 2002). Gender inequality in education has adverse consequences on the nation's economic development by dropping splendid females from schooling which can assume fantastic part than the young men. Gender equality pays a vital role in development of the nation (King *et al.*, 2008). Low Education of women pulls adverse effects on the economic growth of country because gender discrimination pulls down the adequate level of individual resources development. (Klasen, 2002). In developed countries women education decrease the infant mortality rate and high fertility rate and high education of children which ultimately push nation toward development (Knowles *et al.*, 2002). The conventional slandered and traditions are associated with Pakistani culture. Gender discrimination rate is very high especially in the tribal zones of Pakistan. Where female are far from the social and economic forum and basically sticks to the household circles (Kay, 2007). The social standard of tribal zone in Pakistan are inadequate where young son and old male are the wage earner and the young girls and old female consider as only the caretaker of the household. In these families female have no extra time to go beyond the social boundaries that are neglecting their skill development and education (Ali *et al.*, 2010). The biggest social problem is poverty in all ages in whole world. Poverty is the aftereffect of monetary, social and political processes that interface with one another and habitually support in manners that compound the hardship where needy people live (Haq, 1999). According to World Development Report 2003-2004 poverty is "the articulated hardship in prosperity". As indicated by this report, the world has profound poverty in the midst of bounty. According to estimation the world's population 6.2 billion from which 2.8 billion live beneath the global poverty line which is one dollar per day. Pakistan being a non-developed nation, where 68% of the population lives in provincial regions and generally the financial development

to a great extent relies upon the development of the rural area. Farming contributes almost 24% to GDP, gives business to right around 47% of the functioning populace and is the primary wellspring of international trade income (Pakistan Economic Survey 2004-05). In spite of being a rural economy, the advancement of this area isn't pretty much as palatable as might have been. The rate of poverty is additionally extensively high in country regions. Pakistan today faces the difficulties of rising poverty, with very nearly 33% of its population delegated poor. This converts into almost 46 million individuals presently living underneath the global poverty line of 1 dollar per day. The poor are denied of pay and assets, yet they additionally need fundamental offices like instruction, wellbeing and clean drinking water. Pakistan contrasts inadequately and other agricultural nations on most social indicators. Apprehension for human advancement has not been sufficient of precedence.

According to Chaudhry and Rahman (2009) gender inequality in Pakistan can overcome by utilizing the regression investigation through primary informational collections. They study showed that gender inequality in schooling antagonistically affected rural neediness. The experimental finding recommended that girls/boys enrolment proportion, girls/boys proficiency proportion, girls/boys proportion of absolute long stretches of tutoring, girls/boys proportion of workers and instruction of family head contrarily affected provincial poverty. The outcomes demonstrated that family size and men/women proportion (individuals) had solid positive relationship with the likelihood of poverty. The backwards connection between factors of gender inequality in instruction and rustic poverty proposed that schooling gave greater work openings and rejects poverty in agricultural nations such as Pakistan. It was presumed that frequency of poverty was complex in families with smaller number of selected or proficient women, little instructive capability of women, more prominent percentage of women, little or no women investment in acquiring action, illiterate family head and enormous size of the family. Poverty was likewise impacted by actual resource and landholding. The conclusion of the examination proposed the significance of a bunch of strategies recommendations for poverty easing and practical development.

Gornick and Jantti (2010) stated that it make methodological problems while studying on gender inequality and poverty because gender itself is a fundamental characteristic of individual while poverty is on the whole a household concept. Gornick and Jantti (2010) again reported in another

research that the prime age gender men and women (aged between 25-54 years) has great disparity regarding poverty through public income transfer matter. They studies 26 countries that in Anglophone countries female were prey to become more poorer then male but they also said that social policies of the country plays a vital role in this matter. Especially pre and post transfer rate of poverty and they also reported that shifting from pre to post poverty transfer dropped the gender gap or somehow revered it. In Pakistan the great number of poor population of the country belong to rural areas as compare to urban areas. Whenever the researchers try to find out the poverty influence elements, the economic condition become more then a buyable level with effect the rural household poverty and socioeconomic empowerment. The study was conducted in the rural areas of Bahawalpur division. The results of the study indicated the stronger negative relationship between economic empowerment and poverty in the natural households (Khan *et al.*, 2015). Nawaz and Iqbal (2017) studied on education poverty. At first they construct an EPI (Education poverty Index) for Pakistan by using data from households. Secondly they investigate the difference of educational poverty at district level. At third they pointed out the social and economic determinants of educational poverty and at the last they used four different dimensions to construct education poverty by Alkire foster method. They concluded that about little less than on forth percent of Pakistan's population lives under the poverty line. The ratio is higher in rural areas as compare to urban areas of the country. The results showed that social and economic variables such as awareness level, income, religion thinking play vital role in explaining education poverty. They suggested that to eradicate educational poverty from the society it is necessary to upgrade the specific policies that required to effective use of resources. According to Rahman *et al.*, (2018) gender inequality especially in education has very worst effect on household poverty. Providing proper education and increase in literacy ratio reduce household to being poor. The size of a household and number of children in a household is strongly associated with poverty while other factors such as age, education and formal informal skills of the head of household have mild association with household poverty. They suggested through their study that providing proper education and technical skills to both genders help on reduce inequality and alleviate poverty threats.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was planned to investigate the gender inequality, hunger and poverty in rural Punjab Pakistan. A cross sectional survey (Research technique) was used for this purpose. The examination was directed in country spaces of Punjab region. Tests of 560 respondents were chosen. A very much planned meeting plan comprising of organized and unstructured inquiries was ready to investigate the research destinations. A multistage testing method was utilized for information assortment. The investigation comprised on two regions of Punjab. At the initial two tehsil was chosen randomly and from the chose thesil four Union Councils were taken through straight forward irregular example procedure and from every association committee, two villages were chosen haphazardly and from every village 35 respondents were taken randomly. The complete example size was 560. Enlightening analysis like frequency circulation, proportions of focal propensity and proportions of scattering will be utilized to depict the financial and social components of the respondents. Bi-variate investigation will be done to inspect the connection among autonomous and subordinate factors. Chi square and Gamma tests will be utilized to investigate the strength of the relationship (Steel *et al.*, 1997). Binary logistic model is used provides a summary of the accuracy of the classification of cases, which helps you determine the percent of predictions made from this model/equation that will be correct.

RESULTS

Table 1 depicts that most of the female respondents (42.5%) were illiterate, while around 25.7% male respondents were illiterate. Similarly, 29.3% female respondents were primary passed. On the other side, 19.3 percent of the male respondents were primary passed. Likewise, 23.6% female respondents were middle passed while, 12.9 percent of the male respondents were middle passed. However, at matriculation level, one-fourth (25%) of the male respondents were matric passed and only 2.1 percent of the female respondents were matriculated. And 17.1 percent of the male respondents had above matric level education. On the other hand, only 2.5 percent female respondents had above matric level education. Chi-square (139.37) statistics showed a highly significant association among the variables. Among these variables Gamma coefficient (.525) also displayed negative and significant relationship. It indicated that as compared to female participants male had more education.

Table 2 illustrates the differences in earning of the male and female participants. It was found that large proportion of the female respondents (91.3%) and 19.9% of the male participants had

up to Rs. 10000 per month income. However, 37.5% of the male respondents and only 6.0 percent of the female respondents had Rs. 10001-20000 monthly income. Similarly, 42.5 percent of the male participants and 2.7 percent female participants had above Rs. 20000 monthly incomes. Chi-square (224.05) statistics showed a highly significant association among the variables. Among these variables Gamma coefficient (.930) also displayed negative and significant relationship. It indicated that as compared to female participants male had more earnings. Table 3 presented the comparison of the respondents' opinion about education affected income and social status of the family. The result regarding 'Women's education upgrade family social status' indicate that the female participants (4.11 ± 1.06) more agreed with this statement as compared to male participants (3.89 ± 1.22). T-value (2.262) shows a significant ($p = .024$) difference in perception that 'Women's education upgrade family social status' in favor of female participants. It means female participants more agreed that women's education upgrade family social status compared to male participants. However, t-value (1.087) displays a non-significant ($p = .277$) difference in perception that 'Male's education upgrade family social status'. It means, both male and female participants had almost same thinking about 'male's education upgrade family social status'. The results regarding 'Women's education upgrades family income' indicate that the male participants ($4.34 \pm .88$) more agreed with this statement as compared to female participants (4.06 ± 1.04). T-value (3.412) shows a significant ($p = .001$) difference in perception that 'Women's education upgrade family income' in favor of male participants. It means male participants more agreed that women's education upgrade family income compared to female participants. However, the results regarding 'male's education upgrades family income' indicate that the female participants ($4.66 \pm .61$) more agreed with this statement as compared to male participants ($4.54 \pm .70$). T-value (2.097) shows a significant ($p = .036$) difference in perception that 'male's education upgrade family income' in favor of female participants. It means female participants more agreed that male's education upgrade family income compared to female participants.

Table 1: Distribution of respondents according to their education level

Education level	Gender		Total	Statistics
	Male	Female		
Illiterate	72	119	191	Chi-square = 139.37** Gamma = -.525**
	25.7%	42.5%	34.1%	
Primary	54	82	136	
	19.3%	29.3%	24.3%	
Middle	36	66	102	
	12.9%	23.6%	18.2%	
Matric	70	6	76	
	25.0%	2.1%	13.6%	
Above Matric	48	7	55	
	17.1%	2.5%	9.8%	
Total	280	280	560	
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table 2: Distribution of respondents according to their income (if employed)

Income (PKR)	Gender		Total	Statistics
	Male	Female		
Up to 10000	54	167	221	Chi-square = 224.05** Gamma = .930**
	19.9%	91.3%	48.6%	
10001-20000	102	11	113	
	37.5%	6.0%	24.8%	
20000+	116	5	121	
	42.6%	2.7%	26.6%	

Total	272	183	455	
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table 3: Gender wise comparison of the respondents’ opinion about education affected income and social status of the family

Factors	Gender	N	Mea n	S.D.	T-value	P-value
Women’s education upgrade family social status	Male	280	3.89	1.22	-2.262	.024*
	Female	280	4.11	1.05		
Male’s education upgrade family social status	Male	280	4.47	.91	-1.087	.277 ^{NS}
	Female	280	4.54	.62		
Women’s education upgrade family income	Male	280	4.34	.88	3.412	.001**
	Female	280	4.06	1.04		
Male’s education upgrade family income	Male	280	4.54	.70	-2.097	.036*
	Female	280	4.66	.61		

Table 4 displays that a large proportion of the respondents such as 80% male participants and 80.0% female participants had thought that gender inequality effects poverty. Statistics showed a non-significant ($\chi^2 = 4.37$) association among the variables. Gamma coefficient (.021) also displayed a non-significant among the variables. It means, both (male and female) participants had almost same thinking about gender inequality effects poverty.

Table 4: Distribution of respondents according to their thinking about gender inequality effects poverty

Response	Gender		Total	Statistics
	Male	Female		
Yes	224	224	448	Chi-square = 4.37 ^{NS}

	80.0%	80.0%	80.0%	Gamma = .021 ^{NS}
No	21	11	32	
	7.5%	3.9%	5.7%	
Don't know	35	45	80	
	12.5%	16.1%	14.3%	
Total	280	280	560	
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table 5 presented the gender-wise respondents' thinking about the extent of the effects of gender inequality on poverty. The result regarding 'decrease economic development' due to gender inequality indicates that the male participants ($3.71 \pm .71$) more agreed with this statement as compared to female participants (3.02 ± 1.08). T-value (7.99) shows a significant ($p = .000$) difference in the respondents' thought that 'decrease economic development' due to gender inequality. It means male participants more agreed that decrease in economic development due to gender inequality compared to female participants. The result regarding 'financial problems' due to gender inequality indicates that the male participants ($3.82 \pm .38$) more agreed with this statement as compared to female participants ($3.64 \pm .60$). T-value (3.82) shows a significant ($p = .000$) difference in the respondents' thought that 'financial problems' due to gender inequality. It means male participants more agreed that financial problems due to gender inequality compared to female participants. Study outcome regarding 'Insufficient economic activities for women' due to gender inequality indicates that the male participants ($3.65 \pm .55$) more agreed with this statement as compared to female participants ($3.40 \pm .61$). T-value (4.44) shows a significant ($p = .000$) difference in the respondents' thought that 'Insufficient economic activities for women' due to gender inequality. It means male participants more agreed that insufficient economic activities for women due to gender inequality compared to female participants. Study findings regarding 'Low standard of living' due to gender inequality indicates that the male participants ($3.62 \pm .48$) more agreed with this statement as compared to female participants ($3.38 \pm .63$). T-value (4.53) shows a significant ($p = .000$) difference in the respondents' thought that 'Low

standard of living' due to gender inequality. It means male participants more agreed that low standard of living due to gender inequality compared to female participants.

Table 5: Gender wise classification of the respondents concerning to their thinking about extent of effects of gender inequality on poverty

Effects	Gender	N	Mean	S.D.	T-value	P-value
Decrease economic development	Male	224	3.71	.71	7.99	.000**
	Female	224	3.02	1.08		
Financial problems	Male	224	3.82	.38	3.82	.000**
	Female	224	3.64	.60		
Insufficient economic activities for women	Male	224	3.65	.55	4.44	.000**
	Female	224	3.40	.61		
Low standard of living	Male	224	3.62	.48	4.53	.000**
	Female	224	3.38	.63		
Any other	Male	224	2.64	.81	8.39	.000**
	Female	224	2.03	.73		

Table 6 represents the respondents' height and weight (gender-wise). The table shows that the first age group (up to 30) of males had an average of 5.6 feet height and 73.50 kg weight, while female respondents had 5.4 feet height and 65.87 kg weight. Similarly, the second age group (31-40) of males had an average of 5.7 feet height and 75.07 kg weight, while female respondents had 5.3 feet height and 64.38 kg weight. And last age group (40+) of males had an average of 5.65 feet height and 73.72 kg weight, while female respondents had 5.3 feet height and 70.54 kg weight. The overall male respondents had an average of 5.65 feet height and 74.16 kg weight, while female respondents had 5.4 feet height and 66.11 weights.

Table 7 depicts that most of the male respondents (57.5%) had very good health, while one-fourth (25.0%) female respondents had good health while, 36.1% male participants and 51.1 percent female respondents had good health status. Similarly, 6.1 percent of the male

respondents and 20.7 percent female respondents had normal health status. Likewise, only one male respondent and 3.2% female respondents had not good status. Chi-square (71.89) statistics showed a highly significant association among the variables. Gamma coefficient (.576) also displayed a significant and positive relationship among the variables. It means, male participants had good health status as compared to female participants.

Table 6: Distribution of the respondents as per their height and weight

Age group (in years)		Male		Female	
		Height	Weight	Height	Weight
Up to 30	Mean	5.6	73.50	5.4	65.87
	N	66	66	155	155
	Std. Deviation	.21	7.82	.11	8.02
31-40	Mean	5.7	75.07	5.3	64.38
	N	102	102	84	84
	Std. Deviation	.22	7.0	.43	5.86
40+	Mean	5.65	73.72	5.3	70.54
	N	112	112	41	41
	Std. Deviation	.29	8.30	.29	9.48
Total	Mean	5.65	74.16	5.4	66.11
	N	280	280	280	280
	Std. Deviation	.25	7.74	.28	7.902

Table 7: Distribution of respondents according to their health status

Health status	Gender		Total	Statistics
	Male	Female		
VERY GOOD	161	70	231	Chi-square = 71.89**

	57.5%	25.0%	41.3%	Gamma = .576**
GOOD	101	143	244	
	36.1%	51.1%	43.6%	
NORMAL	17	58	75	
	6.1%	20.7%	13.4%	
NOT GOOD	1	9	10	
	0.4%	3.2%	1.8%	
Total	280	280	560	
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table 8 illustrates the differences in the participants' thinking about its' right women should be paid less for doing the same job as men because they have to take career breaks. It was found that a large proportion of the female respondents (46.1%), however, 32.1% of the male participants were not agreed that its' right women should be paid less for doing the same job as men because they have to take career breaks. On the other side, 58.2% of male participants and 31.1% of female participants had thought that its' right women should be paid less for doing the same job as men because they have to take career breaks. Chi-square (45.09) statistics showed a highly significant association among the variables. Gamma coefficient (.463) also displayed a negatively significant among the variables. That's means; male participants had more thanking for this statement as compared to female participants.

Table 8: Distribution of respondents according to their thinking about its' right women should be paid less for doing the same job as men because they have to take career breaks

Response	Gender		Total	Statistics
	Male	Female		
No	90	129	219	Chi-square =

	32.1%	46.1%	39.1%	45.09** Gamma = -.463**
May be	27	64	91	
	9.6%	22.9%	16.3%	
Yes	163	87	250	
	58.2%	31.1%	44.6%	
Total	280	280	560	
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table 9 illustrates the differences in the participants' thinking about feminism strives for equality of the sexes. It was found that a large proportion of the male respondents (70.0%), however, 30.7% of the male participants were agreed that feminism strives for equality of the sexes. On the other side, 2.1% of male participants and 31.1% of female participants never agreed that feminism strives for equality of the sexes. Chi-square (133.69) statistics showed a highly significant association among the variables. Gamma coefficient (.476) also displayed a negatively significant relationship among the variables. That's means; male participants had more thinking for this statement as compared to female participants.

Table 10 illustrates the differences in the participants believe that feminism is the best movement for gender equality. It was found that 32.5% male and 38.2% female participants believed that feminism is the best movement for gender equality. However, 39.6% of the male participants and 12.5% female participants never believe that feminism is the best movement for gender equality. Chi-square (69.29) statistics showed a highly significant association among the variables. Gamma coefficient (.180) displayed a positively significant relationship among the variables. That's means; female participants believe that feminism is the best movement for gender equality as compared to male participants.

Table 11 illustrates the differences in the participants' thinking about male gender also experiences gender inequality. It was found that 52.1% male and 48.6% female participants had thinking that male gender also experiences gender inequality. However, 27.5% males and 7.9% female participants had thinking that male gender also experiences gender inequality, whereas,

20.4% male and 43.6% female participants had no knowledge about this. Chi-square (54.51) statistics showed a highly significant association among the variables. Gamma coefficient (.219) displayed a significant and negative relationship among the variables. It means, male participants had more thinking that male gender also experiences gender inequality compared to female participants.

Table 9: Distribution of respondents according to their thinking about feminism strives for equality of the sexes

Response	Gender		Total	Statistics
	Male	Female		
Yes	196	86	282	Chi-square = 133.69** Gamma = -.476**
	70.0%	30.7%	50.4%	
No	6	87	93	
	2.1%	31.1%	16.6%	
May be	60	51	111	
	21.4%	18.2%	19.8%	
Don't know	18	56	74	
	6.4%	20.0%	13.2%	
Total	280	280	560	
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table 10: Distribution of respondents according to believe that feminism is the best movement for gender equality

Response	Gender		Total	Statistics
	Male	Female		

Yes	91	107	198	Chi-square = 69.29** Gamma = .180**
	32.5%	38.2%	35.4%	
No	111	35	146	
	39.6%	12.5%	26.1%	
May be	70	94	164	
	25.0%	33.6%	29.3%	
Don't know	8	44	52	
	2.9%	15.7%	9.3%	
Total	280	280	560	
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table 11: Distribution of respondents according to their thinking that male gender also experiences gender inequality

Response	Gender		Total	Statistics
	Male	Female		
Yes	146	136	282	Chi-square = 54.51** Gamma = - 0.219**
	52.1%	48.6%	50.4%	
No	77	22	99	
	27.5%	7.9%	17.7%	
Don't know	57	122	179	
	20.4%	43.6%	32.0%	
Total	280	280	560	
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Discussion

In Pakistan only 21 percent of the adult population is the part of economic institution while 89 percent of the male population lives in the urban areas of the country (World Bank, 2017). Females are totally depended on males it's the duty of male members of the family to fulfill all the needs of the family. This family burden makes the men disempowered (Sraboni *et al.*, 2013).

Many previous literature on gender inequality and economic development mostly revolve around that how economic development influenced gender inequality and what are basic reason behind this (Cuberes and Teigrier, 2014). Different studies stated that reason from inequality may be reduced by restricted the wage difference which help to improve gender inequality however these suggestion were not inequality affected economic development in three field like education, work productivity contribution and salaries (Kabeer and Natalia, 2013).

The effects of different socio-economic indicators of the respondents on their thinking that gender inequality effects poverty has been concentrated by utilizing the logistic model. The worth of log-probability (- 2LL) is 480.46 demonstrates that the impact of independent factors through the purposed model is critical and henceforth model assessment or attack of the model has been improved. There are two further measurements needed to clarify the provisions of the model. First are Cox and Snell R^2 whose worth is 0.33; demonstrates that 33% of all out variety is clarified by the independent factors in the picked model and 67% by different factors as well as by some coincidence. Second is Nagelkerke R^2 whose worth is 0.410; shows that 41% of complete variety is clarified by the independent factors in the picked model and 59% by different factors and additionally by some coincidence. Both of these actions actually called pseudo R^2 and its worth could barely be tried through inferential methodologies of the statistics (Menard, 2000). Resultantly; it couldn't be viewed as the great proportion of integrity of fit for the purposed model (Hosmer and Lemeshow, 2000).

Perceived Summary of Logistic Model

Variables	B	Wald	Sig.	Exp(B)
Age	-.373	5.381	.020*	.689
Education	.265	4.343	.037*	1.30

Gender	.626	4.757	.029*	1.87
Familytype	-.714	7.846	.005**	.490
Family size	-.522	11.654	.001**	.593
Income	1.042	22.282	.000**	2.83
Constant	1.327	2.395	.122 ^{NS}	3.77

Age: It is tracked down that in the examination region; the increment in age contributes in decline in respondents' reasoning that gender inequality impacts poverty. Chances proportion for the variable age is 0.689; clarified that every one-unit expansion in the age will liable to diminish 0.69 time chance for the insight about gender inequality impacts poverty was improved. The P-value shows that there is critical connection old enough of the respondents with their reasoning that gender inequality impacts poverty.

Education: Increase in training decidedly connected with the respondents' contemplating gender inequality impacts poverty. The chances proportion for the logical variable training is 1.30 and it tells that if the instruction of the respondents will be upgraded by one-unit (a time of additional tutoring) then, at that point there are 1.30 time chances to change as they would see it about gender inequality impacts poverty will liable to be improved.

Gender: The gender variable had a significant and positive relationship with their thinking about gender inequality effects poverty. It means, male respondents had more thinking that gender inequality effects poverty as compared to female respondents.

Family type: Above table also showed that the family structure also associated with the respondents' thinking that gender inequality effects poverty. Chances proportion for the variable age is 0.490; clarified that every one-unit change in the family design will liable to change 0.49 times chances for the insight about gender inequality effects poverty was improved. The P-value demonstrates that there is critical connection of family kind of the respondents with their reasoning that gender inequality impacts poverty.

Family size: It is tracked down that in the investigation region; the increment in family size contributes in decline in respondents' reasoning that gender inequality impacts poverty. Chances proportion for the variable age is 0.593; clarified that every one-unit expansion in the family size will prone to diminish 0.59 time chances for the insight about gender inequality impacts poverty was improved. The P-value shows that there is huge connection of family size of the respondents with their reasoning that gender inequality impacts poverty.

Income: The variable pay demonstrates the aggregate pay of the respondents from every single authentic source. The assessed coefficient of pay is positive and huge. It demonstrates that there is a positive connection between pay of the respondents and their reasoning that gender inequality impacts poverty. The chances proportion of pay is 2.83 and it clarified that for every unit increment of respondents' family pay, there will be 2.83 time chance their reasoning that gender inequality impacts poverty.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The purpose of the current study was to examine how gender disparity affects the poverty of rural families in Punjab, given the significance of gender discrimination (Pakistan). According to the study's findings, gender disparities in educational attainment have a big impact on rural household poverty. Through instructive achievement individual are empowered to expand their openness to various parts of life, improve and invigorate their innovativeness and to convey adequately. Educated individuals can all the more likely comprehend local area issues and significance of gender equality. This examination looks at the impact of poverty and gender inequality in person's life. Schooling is the likely determinant of poverty. Literate people have healthy life, sustenance and better behavior. Most of the respondents thought that only men's education upgrades the family income and social status as compare to women. A great majority of the respondents thought that gender inequality effects poverty and gender inequality in education effect poverty. Gender preference, lack of awareness and knowledge, low living standard and financial barriers were the most important reasons of gender inequality in education. About one third of the respondents coded that their household was about the same point of poverty level. More than half of the respondents felt that we were not living in an equal society and gender inequality also exist at workplace. Less than half of the respondents had thought that its right women should be paid less for doing the same job as men because they have

to take career breaks. Half of the respondents thought that feminism strives for equality of the sexes and they also indicated that male gender also experiences gender inequality. About one third of the respondents believed that feminism is the best movement for gender equality. The researcher suggested that gender inequality can be reduced by Give equal right to all, proper Education, Be realistic, to providing knowledge about the importance every gender and by providing Health education. The researcher also thought that gender inequality could be improved by improving government policies, Action taken against employers, Forcing employers and companies to close the pay gap, Lobbying MPs and More work done by trade unions etc.

REFERENCES

- ADB. 2002. Poverty in Pakistan issues, causes and international response. A Research Study Conducted by Asian Development Bank on Poverty in Pakistan”.
- Ali, W., I. F. Muhammad, S. Afzal and G. Yaseen. 2010. Cultural barriers in women empowerment: A Sociological analysis of Multan Pakistan”, European Journal of Social Sciences. 18: 153.
- Chaudhry, I. S. and S. Rehman. 2009. The impact of gender inequality in education on rural poverty in Pakistan: An empirical analysis. Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences, 15:1450-2275.
- Cuberes, D. and M. Teigrier. 2014. Gender inequality and economic growth: A critical review.
- Gornick, J. C. and M. Jantti. 2010. Women, poverty and social policy regimes: A cross-national analysis, LIS Working Paper 534, Luxembourg: Luxembourg Income Study.
- Haq, M. U. 1999. Reflections on Human Development. Oxford University Press, Delhi.
- Hosmer, D. W., S. Lemeshow. 2000. Applied Logistic Regression, Second Edition. Print ISBN:9780471356325 |Online ISBN:9780471722144 |DOI:10.1002/0471722146. Copyright © 2000 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Kay, T. 2007. Violence against women: harmful traditional and cultural practices in the Asian and pacific region. Economic and Social Commission for Asian and the pacific.

- Khan, R. E. A., H. U. Rehman and M. A. U. Haq. 2015. The role of household socioeconomic empowerment. *American-Eurasian J. Agric. & Environ. Sci.*, 15 (1) 93-98.
- King, E., M. Klasen and M. Porter. 2008. Gender and development challenge paper. Paper Prepared for 2008 round of Copenhagen Consensus Project: Mimeographed, Copenhagen Consensus Center.
- Klasen, S. and F. Lamanna. 2009. The impact of gender inequality in education and employment on economic growth: new evidence for a panel of countries. *Feminist Economic*, 15(3): 91-132.
- Klasen, S. 2002. Low schooling for girls, slower growth for all? Cross-country evidence on the effect of gender inequality in education on economic development. *World Bank Economic Review* 16(3): 345-73.
- Knowles, S., K. Paula, Lorgelly and O. Dorian. 2002. Are educational gender gaps a brake on economic development? some cross-country empirical evidence. *Oxford Economic Paper*, 54(1): 118-149.
- Kabeer, N. and L. Natali, 2003. *Gender Equality and Economic Growth. Is there a win-win.*
- Menard, S. 2000. *Coefficients of Determination for Multiple Logistic Regression Analysis.* Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado , 910 28th Street, Boulder , CO , 80303 , USA. 54 (1): 17-24.
- Nawaz, S. and N. Iqbal. 2017. Education poverty in Pakistan: A spatial analysis at district level. 10(2) 270-287. January 5 2017.
- Pakistan Economic Survey. 2004-05. *Pakistan Economic Survey.* Government of Pakistan, Finance Division, Economic Advise ring, Islamabad. www.finance.gov.pk.
- Rahman, S., I. S. Chaudhry and F. Farooq. 2018. Gender inequality in education and household poverty in pakistan: a case of Multan district. *Review of Economic and Development Studies*. 4(1): 115-126, 2018.
- Steel, R. G. D., J. H. Torrie and D. A. Dickey. 1997. *Principles and procedures of statistics. A biometric approach 3rd Ed.* McGraw Hill Book Co. Inc. N .Y.
- Sraboni, E., A. R. Quisumbing and A. U. Ahmed. 2013. *The women's empowerment in agriculture index: Results from the 2011–2012 Bangladesh integrated household survey.* Project report submitted to the U.S. Agency for International Development. Dhaka:

International Food Policy Research Institute. Available from <http://ebrary.ifpri.org/cdm/ref/collection/p15738coll2/id/127504>.

World Development Report. 2003-4. Attacking Published for the World Bank by Oxford University Press.

World Bank. 2017. The Global Findex Database 2017. Measuring Financial Inclusion and the Fintech Revolution, The World Bank, IBRD+IDA, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank 1818 H Street NW, Washington, DC 20433 Telephone: 202-473-1000; Internet: www.worldbank.org.