

Determining the Gender Equality Practices among Hotel Employees in Subic Bay Freeport Zone (SBFZ)

Mark Alvin V. Lazaro, DBA, Donna Mae L. Orias, Almera Mae Rojas, Erica Mae Agravante, Nathaniel Vida T. Montano, Mike Angelo P. Lugtu, Jan Noah B. Eclarin

Abstract: Gender equality is an essential principle that promotes equal rights, opportunities, and treatment regardless of gender. The main objective of this study is to identify gender equality practices among hotel employees in the Subic Bay Freeport Zone (SBFZ). More specifically, it determined gender equality among employees in terms of workplace gender bias, parity in appraisal and growth opportunities, natural gender differences, and gender-based work allocation; tested the significant difference among responses on gender equality when grouped by profile; and proposed criteria to promote gender equality in the hotel industry in Subic Bay Freeport Zone (SBFZ). A quantitative design and descriptive approach were used. The data was gathered from 180 respondents using a purposive sampling technique and a 4-point Likert scale survey form. The data was analyzed using statistical techniques such as the frequency and percentage tests, the Shapiro-Wilk test, and the test of differences. Examining gender equality in the workplace in terms of age, marital status, educational attainment, and years of service. It reveals that gender, age, marital status, educational attainment, and years of service have no significance on gender equality in the workplace, including gender bias, parity appraisal and advancement opportunities, natural gender disparities, and gender-based task allocation. While educational attainment is significant in gender equality in the workplace in terms of gender bias, natural gender differences, and gender-based work allocation. The criteria for the best implementer of gender equality practices in hotels in the Subic Bay Freeport Zone (SBFZ) have been proposed to hotel management for implementation to promote gender equality.

Keywords: Gender Equality Practices, Gender Bias, Gender Differences, Workplace Gender Equality

Introduction

Hospitality industry is one of the sectors to create a diverse workplace by practicing equality among individuals. Mixing cultures, age, backgrounds, sexuality, and gender preferences offer opportunities to develop and provide services for customers. Most of these difficulties fall under the category of gender segregation, which refers to the separation of men and women based on their biological sex in physical, cultural, social, and legal contexts (Jeffrey et al., 2018).

The relevance of beauty and physical appearance, especially as far as women are concerned, is another example of the gendered roles in the hospitality industry and eventually the objectification of women. Studies show that female employees who are considered beautiful are placed in more prominent locations, near the doors, at reception, or in places where they can easily welcome guests (Basnyat et al., 2021). Additionally, data show that women working in the tourism industry are segregated both horizontally and vertically and this must be addressed by the national policies, even because tourism may be a useful tool for development in the

emerging countries. (Rinaldi,2019). A study by Park and Kim (2018) explored the impact of gender diversity in hotel leadership positions. They found that hotels with a higher number of women in leadership roles tend to have better financial performance and customer satisfaction, suggesting that gender equality positively influences business outcomes.

According to Marasigan et al. (2021), factors determining gender equality among hotel employees are workplace gender bias, parity in the appraisal, and growth opportunities, natural gender differences, and gender-

based work allocation. Workplace gender bias is a discrimination when people are treated differently because of their gender which may be seen in pay disparities, harassment, and lack of opportunities. Growth opportunities are also important for employees since it helps improve on their skills, to advance their careers, and to be more productive at work. Natural gender differences by biology, hormones, and socialization are also often part of inequality. Gender-based work allocation can have a significant impact on the opportunities and outcomes in the workplace like different beliefs about the skills and abilities of men and women which had been influenced by social norms.

The Philippine government promotes gender equality through laws to ensure that every individual with different gender expression in the workplace is treated equally. Gender equality is included in the Magna Carta of Women as stated in the Republic Act No. 9710, it provides equality and shall promote equal opportunities and ensure that both can access resources and development results. Gender and Development (GAD) has been a program that is implemented in every agency, each agency is allotted enough funds for the implementation of the program. GAD assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies, or programs in all areas and at all levels. All companies are obliged to implement gender equality through the laws created and amended to ensure equality among gender diversity in the workplace. Government Service Insurance System (n.d.). In response to the laws, The Subic Bay Metropolitan Authority (SBMA) through the Gender and Development program has been an advocate of women's empowerment and gender equality. Since 2014, SBMA has continued to

organize events that will raise awareness in this advocacy as well as the anti-violence against women and their children. SBMA GAD Focal Point System continues to put forth a more diversified Gender and Development Program that will empower women and everyone who believes that everybody is regarded with respect and acceptance. Subic Bay Metropolitan Authority (n.d).

As stated by the Bill of Rights in the 1987 Constitution article III Section 1 of the Constitution, Senator Miriam Defensor Santiago stated that "No person shall be denied the equal protection of the laws" is highly relevant to the topic of "Determining the Gender Equality Practices among Hotel Employees in SBFZ". This constitutional provision emphasizes the fundamental principle that all individuals, regardless of their gender, should be treated equally under the law. In the context of promoting gender equality in hotels within the Subic Bay Freeport Zone (SBFZ), this statement highlights the importance of ensuring that all employees, regardless of their gender, are afforded equal opportunities, rights, and protections. It emphasizes the need for hotels to establish fair and unbiased policies, practices, and procedures that promote gender equality in areas such as recruitment, selection, compensation, career advancement, and work-life balance. Additionally, the Bureau of Working Conditions, a staff department of the Department of Labor and Employment, created rights for equal work opportunities that every worker is entitled to, "state shall protect labor, promote full employment, provide equal work opportunity regardless of gender, race, or creed; and regulate relations between employees and employers". Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines. (n.d.).

In line with the Commission on Human Rights (CHR), the approval of the newly revised Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity, Gender Expression, or Sex Characteristics (SOGIESC) Equality Bill by the Commission on Human Rights (CHR) and the House Committee on Women and Gender Equality is a significant step towards ensuring gender equality. This legislation, which aims to prohibit all forms of SOGIESC-based discrimination, could serve as a blueprint for best practices in various sectors, including the hotel industry in the Subic Bay Freeport Zone (SBFZ). By adhering to the principles outlined in this bill, hotels in the SBFZ can demonstrate their commitment to promoting an inclusive and non-discriminatory environment for all hotel

Results and Discussion

Below are the statistical analyses, their corresponding interpretations, and a discussion of the conclusions gathered from the conceptual framework that

employees and staffs regardless of their sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression. This aligns with the broader goal of achieving gender equality and upholding human rights standards at a national and international level. Commission on Human Rights (2023).

The study's intended result is an SBMA tourism department program proposal to proposed criteria for best implementer of gender equality practices in hotel at Subic Bay Freeport Zone (SBFZ).

Objectives

This research identifies gender equality practices among hotel employees in hotel at Subic Bay Freeport Zone (SBFZ).

Specifically, it presented:

1. The profile of the respondents;
2. The gender equality in workplace in terms of gender bias, parity in the appraisal and growth opportunities, natural gender differences, and gender-based work allocation;
3. And, proposed criteria for best implementer of gender equality practices in hotel at Subic Bay Freeport Zone (SBFZ).

Methodology

This study used a quantitative approach in a descriptive approach. The target population of this study are employees of hotel in Subic Bay Freeport Zone. The researchers adopted survey questionnaires with consent from the study of Marasigan, et al. (2021) entitled Gender Equality among Hotel Employees in Batangas: Basis for Continuous Improvement as the main tool for gathering data to determine gender equality practices among hotel employees in Subic Bay Freeport Zone. The questionnaires are divided into two parts. The first part determined the respondents' demographic profile such as: age, gender, marital status, educational attainment, years in service. The second part is to assess the employee's perceptions of gender equality in the workplace in terms of workplace gender bias, parity in appraisal and growth opportunities, natural gender differences, and gender-based work allocation. Data gathering method started as soon as the permit to conduct the study was approved by the manager of each hotel in Subic Bay Freeport Zone (SBFZ). The researchers used the frequency, percentage, the Shapiro-Wilk test, and tests of difference.

served as the basis for this research. Analyses of data, corresponding interpretation, and discussion of findings based on the conceptual framework that became the basis of this project are presented below.

Table 1. Profile of the Respondents According to Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	83	46.1
Female	77	42.8
LGBTQIA+	20	11.1

Composite Mean	180	100.0
-----------------------	------------	--------------

Table 1 presents an overview of the respondents' demographics, categorized by gender. The data illustrates a wide representation among the sample of 180 respondents. Among them, 46.1% identified as male (n =

83), 42.8% as female (n = 77), and 11.1% as LGBTQIA+ (n = 20). This distribution demonstrates a fairly equitable level of involvement across various gender identities.

Table 2. Profile of the Respondents According to Age

Age	Frequency	Percentage
25 and below	93	51.7
26-35	16	36.7
36-45	13	7.2
46 and above	8	4.4
Composite Mean	180	100.0

Table 2 presents an overview of the respondents' demographics, categorized by age. The data illustrates a wide presentation among the sample of 180 respondents. Among them, 51.7% identified as 25 and below age group (n = 93), 36.7% as 26–35 age group (n = 66), 7.2% as 36–

45 age group (n = 13), and 4.4% as 46 and above age group (n = 8). The age distribution indicates a diverse sample, which is beneficial for the generalizability of the study's findings.

Table 3. Profile of the Respondents According to Marital Status

Status	Frequency	Percentage
Single	136	75.6
Married	39	21.7
Separated	5	2.8
Composite Mean	180	100.0

Table 3 presents an overview of the respondents' demographics, categorized by marital status. The data illustrates a wide representation among the sample of 180 respondents. Among them, 75.6% identified as single (n = 136), 21.7% as married

(n = 39), and 2.8% as separated (n = 5). It's an ongoing effort to ensure fair treatment and equal opportunities for all employees, regardless of their marital status.

Table 4. Profile of the Respondents According to Educational Attainment

Level	Frequency	Percentage
High School	16	10.0
Vocation	35	19.4
College	127	70.6
Composite Mean	180	100.0

Table 4 presents the categories of profile of the respondents based on their educational attainment. Among them, 70.6% attained college education (n = 127), 19.4% as vocational (n = 35), and 10.0% as high

school graduates (n = 18). This indicates that those working in the industry have obtained a college education.

Table 5. Profile of the Respondents According to Years in Service

Years	Frequency	Percentage
Less than 1 year	58	32.2
1-5	85	47.2
6-10	32	17.8

11 years and above	5	2.8
Composite Mean	180	100.0

Table 5 presents an overview of the profile of the respondents according to years in service. The data illustrates a wide presentation among the sample of 180 respondents. Among them, 32.2% identified as less than a year ($n = 58$) and 1 - 5 ($n = 85$), 47.2% as 6 - 10 ($n = 32$), 17.8% as 11 years and above ($n = 5$), and 2.8%. This distribution highlights the diverse range of experience levels present among the respondents, which may have implications for any analysis or interpretation of the data. Previous studies have found that gender diverse management teams provide a wider range of relevant knowledge, skills, and competencies, which leads to

higher performance (Gröschl and Arcot, 2014; Menicucci et al., 2019). Furthermore, it was also found that female CEOs are better equipped to lead female workers through their ability to better communicate with one another (Flabbi et al., 2018). Considering the hospitality field is over 50% women (United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2020), it would make logical sense for there to be an equal number of men and women in all leadership positions to be representative of the industry.

Table 6. Gender Equality in the Workplace in Terms of Gender Bias

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Interpretation
1. Industry emphasizes more on physical appearance than intelligence in the case of hiring employees.	2.79	Prevalent
2. Employees face sexual harassment at the workplace regardless of gender expression	2.42	Moderately Prevalent
3. Customers create more problems with women and LGBTQ employees than men.	2.29	Moderately Prevalent
4. Civil status is not an issue in hiring employees.	3.15	Prevalent
5. Women and LGBTQ need to make extra effort to prove their credibility than men.	2.47	Moderately Prevalent
Composite Mean	3.35	Prevalent

Table 6 describes gender equality in the workplace in terms of gender bias. The highest mean value ($M = 3.15$, indicator 4), corresponding to the indicator stating that "*civil status is not an issue in hiring employees*," is interpreted as prevalent. This implies that there is a common understanding or agreement among respondents that civil status does not play a substantial role in employee hiring decisions. This could be seen as a positive aspect, indicating a perceived level of fairness and non-discrimination based on civil status. However, Hafeez (2020) indicated that there is a positive significant relationship between marital status and job performance. Human Resource Managers prefer employees towards job activity and job satisfaction after being married. Furthermore, Memon et al. (2022) stated that job performance is significantly influenced by marital status, with married females having a greater impact than unmarried females.

On the other hand, the lowest mean value ($M = 2.29$, indicator 3), associated with the indicator stating that "*customers create more problems with women and LGBTQ employees than men*," indicates that respondents perceive a moderate prevalence of problems created by customers specifically with women and LGBTQ employees. This implies that there is a noticeable level of concern regarding customer interactions affecting these

groups. This may highlight an area for improvement in customer relations and a need for workplace policies that address such challenges. According to Sears et al. (2021), in many cases, LGBTQ employees experience verbal harassment that comes from employees' supervisors and co-workers, as well as customers. Additionally, according to Wang (2016), female employees regularly endure customers misogynistic, verbal abuse, threats of violence, and physical battery, sometimes accompanied by racial slurs.

The composite mean ($M = 2.62$) categorized as "*prevalent*" indicates that respondents perceive a noteworthy level of gender bias across the various indicators related to workplace equality. This implies that there are prevalent issues that need attention, encompassing aspects such as hiring practices, harassment, customer interactions, and the perceived need for extra efforts by women and LGBTQ individuals to prove their credibility. Organizations may consider targeted interventions to address these concerns and enhance gender equality in the workplace. Research about LGBT workers has found that this group often faces heightened harassment and discrimination from co-workers, employers, and customers, and that their experiences can expose taken-for-granted gender norms embedded in the labor process. This is particularly apt in

low-wage services where LGBT workers are overrepresented (Waite et al., 2020; Whittington et al., 2020).

Table 7. Gender Equality in the Workplace in Terms of Parity in Appraisal and Growth Opportunities

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Interpretation
1. Women and LGBTQ are treated at par with men in the legal policy of the company.	2.73	Prevalent
2. Compensation is equal for men, women, and LGBTQ employees.	3.17	Prevalent
3. Evaluation of the performance of all employees regardless of their sex expression is fair.	3.13	Prevalent
4. Promotional opportunities are equal for all employees.	3.19	Prevalent
5. Men, women, and LGBTQ get the same retirement benefits.	3.36	Very Prevalent
6. Gender diversity is observed in the workplace.	2.98	Prevalent
Composite Mean	3.08	Prevalent

Table 7 describes gender equality in the workplace in terms of parity in appraisal and growth opportunities. The highest mean value ($M = 3.26$, indicator 5), corresponding to the indicator stating that "men, women, and LGBTQ get the same retirement benefits" is interpreted as very prevalent. This implies that the organization values each employee equally, recognizing their contributions and needs, irrespective of their gender identity or sexual orientation. However, Enda et al. (2020) stated that retirement savings gap between men and women remains wide, with women historically saving less due to wage gaps, women generally earn less than men and can have career gaps due to caregiver roles that can lead to lower savings, lifetime wages, and Social Security.

On the other hand, the lowest mean value ($M = 2.73$, indicator 1), associated with the indicator stating that "women and LGBTQ are treated at par with men in the legal policy of the company" is interpreted as prevalent. This implies a shared understanding or consensus among respondents that women and LGBTQ individuals are treated equally with men according to the company's legal policies. The finding implies a general agreement among participants, reflecting a positive perception of the company's dedication to gender and LGBTQ equality within its legal framework. This fosters an environment that promotes fairness and equality. n according to the company's legal policies. The finding implies a general agreement among participants, reflecting a positive perception of the company's

dedication to gender and LGBTQ equality within its legal framework. This fosters an environment that promotes fairness and equality. However, based on the study of Kennedy (2023), women might have a harder time achieving equal pay and authority despite displaying equal skill because gender dynamics distort people's views of women's skill and behavior. Additionally, according to a study conducted by Steele (2017), the study measured the effects of discrimination based on unfair treatment by employees, bosses and supervisors because of LGBT status and verbal insults or abuse.

The composite mean ($M = 3.08$) categorized as "prevalent" there is a noticeable degree of gender equality in the workplace regarding parity in appraisal and growth opportunities. This implies that, overall, there is a significant level of fairness and equal treatment between genders in terms of performance evaluations and opportunities for career growth within the workplace. However, according to the study of Berdhal et al. (2019), both men and women are negatively impact by the toxic masculinity of male-dominated workplaces, but they seem to reap the financial benefits of working in such sectors. In addition, Williams Institute (2021) found that 42% pf LGBTQ employees have experienced some form of discrimination at work, including discrimination in hiring and promotion. This is a concerning trend that underscores that need for continued efforts to promote equality and fairness in the workplace.

Table 8. Gender Equality in the Workplace in Terms of Natural Gender Differences

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Interpretation
1. Discrimination exists among all types of gender because of the nature of work.	2.62	Prevalent
2. Industry prefers young and single applicants	2.59	Prevalent

3. Industry prefers LGBTQ employees	2.26	Prevalent
4. The organization goes for the best fit between jobs and employees and uses inherent gender differences very effectively.	2.81	Prevalent
5. The contributions of women and LGBTQ are recognized but their upward movement in the hierarchy is not encouraged.	2.46	Very Prevalent
6. LGBTQ employees experience limitations in the freedom of gender expression and development in their careers.	2.52	Prevalent
Composite Mean	2.54	Prevalent

Table 8 displays the mean values for the indicators that represent the creative traits of the student leaders in terms of fluency. The highest mean value ($M = 3.64$, indicator 4) is a student leader's creative traits: "always look for better and more effective ways to do things, usually by trying out and learning through failure," indicating that a leader actively looks for innovative and better approaches to tasks, with an eagerness to experiment and learn through failure. It implies that student leaders may contribute to an organizational culture of continuous improvement and innovation by taking a proactive and flexible attitude towards identifying opportunities for improvement. According to Cannon, M. D., & Edmondson, A. C. (2005), it presents a strategy for organizations to learn from failures, focusing on identifying, analyzing, and experimenting. It suggests six recommendations for action, recommending leaders implement these practices as an integrated set of practices to redefine failure as a critical first step in discovery and learning.

On the other hand, the lowest mean value ($M = 3.44$, indicator 1) is a student leader's creative qualities: "Have the ability to come up with creative thoughts, concepts, and solutions to issues," yet still reasonably strong creative traits of a student leader. This indicates that the leader should produce innovative ideas, concepts, and solutions. Encouraging brainstorming sessions or creative workshops might improve this part of a leader's creative abilities. Based on Ola W. A. Gafour, Walid A. S. Gafour (2020), his research article explores creativity skills, which are highly sought-after in the 21st century. It emphasizes the importance of creativity in innovative thinking, problem-solving, and critical thinking. It highlights the role of creativity in promoting global understanding and navigating the knowledge economy era. It highlights the role of creativity in exploration and promoting different perspectives. According to PlayAblo LMS Blog (2021), leadership fluency is the state of being fluent, or the capacity to communicate learning thoughts effortlessly, quickly, and fluently. Fluency is the capacity to

"accurately and with facility" speak, write, or read a language. It also entails being able to absorb and apply concepts correctly.

The composite mean ($M = 3.54$) reveals that student leaders have highly creative fluency traits. This implies that student leaders have a high capacity to produce and apply creative ideas as a group. This may contribute in establishing an environment that encourages creativity, adaptation, and the desire for continual development.

Table 9 describes gender equality in the workplace in terms of gender-based work allocation. The highest mean value ($M = 2.53$, indicator 4), corresponding to the indicator stating that "women and LGBTQ are employed in areas where less physical work is required" is interpreted as prevalent. This implies reinforcing the notion that certain genders are inherently less capable of handling physically demanding tasks. This not only undermines the individual capabilities of women and LGBTQ employees but also contributes to a broader societal narrative that restricts opportunities based on gender. According to Kuahen (2022), men begin their careers at higher levels in the corporate hierarchy and are also more likely to be promoted. These differences in careers are an important factor underlying the gender wage gap. Gender differences in careers reflect both the differing choices of men and women before and after entering the labor market and the different treatment of men and women in the labor market. Additionally, using survey data collected in May 2021 by UCLA School of Law William Institute that examines the lifetime, five-year, and past-year experiences of discrimination among LGBT employees. It is one of the first studies to look at LGBT employment discrimination during the COVID-19 pandemic. The analysis indicates that employment discrimination against LGBT people continues to be persistent and widespread. Over 40% of LGBT workers (45.5%) reported experiencing unfair treatment at work, including being fired, not hired.

Table 9. Gender Equality in the Workplace in Terms of Gender-Based Work Allocation

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Interpretation
------------	------	----------------------------

1. Women and LGBTQ are employed more at operational levels.	2.42	Prevalent
2. Management prefers men for managerial positions.	2.21	Prevalent
3. Males dominate the work in the hotel.	2.31	Prevalent
4. Women and LGBTQ are employed in areas where less physical work is required.	2.53	Prevalent
5. LGBTQ and women employees are given lower positions in the industry	1.97	Very Prevalent
Composite Mean	2.29	Prevalent

On the other hand, the lowest mean value ($M = 1.97$, indicator 5), associated with the indicator stating that "LGBTQ and women employees are given lower positions in the industry" is interpreted as moderately prevalent, LGBTQ individuals and women tend to be assigned or occupy lower-ranking positions within the industry compared to other employees. This implies that there may be systemic biases, discrimination, or barriers that contribute to these groups facing challenges in career advancement and being underrepresented in higher-level roles. This suggests that there may be a lack of representation and visibility for LGBTQ employees in certain industries. According to the study of Ellsworth et al. (2020), LGBTQ+ women and trans employees frequently experience social isolation at work, which negatively impacts their motivation to advance to executive positions.

The composite mean ($M = 2.29$) categorized as "prevalent" indicates that respondents perceive a noteworthy level of gender equality in the workplace in terms of gender-based work allocation. This implies a positive perception of fair distribution of tasks regardless of gender. According to the study of Marasigan (2021), women and LGBTQ are employed in areas where less physical work, and LGBTQ and women employees are given lower positions in the industry, thus assessed as agree. The workplace is controlled by men. The edge men have over women and LGBTQ places them in positions that benefit them more than others. Top positions are entrusted to men and there are works where women and LGBTQ can take responsibility but still given to men. Women and LGBTQ are stagnant in terms of promotions and growth in the workplace.

Table 10. Gender Equality in the Workplace According to Gender

Constructs	Gender	n	Mdn	H	df	Asymp. Sig.	Conclusion
Gender Bias	Male	83	2.60	4.890	2	.087	Not Significant
	Female	77	2.60				
	LGBTQIA+	20	3.00				
Parity in Appraisal and Growth Opportunities	Male	83	3.00	2.312	2	.315	Not Significant
	Female	77	3.17				
	LGBTQIA+	20	3.00				
Natural Gender Differences	Male	83	2.67	2.325	2	.313	Not Significant
	Female	77	2.50				
	LGBTQIA+	20	2.75				
Gender-based Work Allocation	Male	83	2.40	1.311	2	.519	Not Significant
	Female	77	2.20				
	LGBTQIA+	20	2.30				

Table 10 shows the results of the difference in gender equality in the workplace according to gender using the Kruskal-Wallis H test. The test found no statistically significant difference in terms of gender bias among groups [$H(2) = 4.890$, $p = .087$], with a median value of 2.60 for those who are male, 2.60 for those who are female, and 3.00 for those who are LGBTQIA+; in terms of parity in appraisal and growth opportunities [$H(2) = 2.312$, $p = .315$], with a median

value of 3.00 for those who are male, 3.17 for those who are female, and 3.00 for those who are LGBTQIA+; in terms of natural gender differences [$H(2) = 2.325$, $p = .313$], with a median value of 2.67 for those who are male, 2.50 for those who are female, and 2.75 for those who are LGBTQIA+; and lastly in terms of gender-based work allocation [$H(2) = 1.313$, $p = .519$], with a median value of 2.40 for those who are male, 2.20 for those who are female, and 2.30 for those who are

LGBTQIA+ at the 5% significance level. This implies that, in the context of the examined workplace, people of different gender identities (male, female, LGBTQIA+) face the same level of gender bias, parity in appraisal and growth opportunities, natural gender differences, and gender-based work allocation. This could be considered as a positive impact, illustrating an equitable distribution of opportunities and treatment

regardless of gender identification. Decades of social science research dedicated to understanding how gender identity, sexual characteristics and sexual orientation intersect with work experiences have provided us with theories and applications we can use to address workplace bias, discrimination, and abuse and to create respectful and healthier organizational cultures (Morgenroth & Ryan 2021; Roberson, 2019).

Table 11. Gender Equality in the Workplace According to Age

Constructs	Age	n	Mdn	H	df	Asymp. Sig	Conclusion
Gender Bias	25 and below	93	2.60	1.407	3	.704	Not Significant
	26-35	66	2.60				
	36-45	13	2.60				
	46 and above	8	2.80				
Parity in Appraisal and Growth Opportunities	25 and below	93	3.00	3.322	3	.345	Not Significant
	26-35	66	3.00				
	36-45	13	3.50				
	46 and above	8	3.00				
Natural Gender Differences	25 and below	93	2.67	3.714	3	.294	Not Significant
	26-35	66	2.50				
	36-45	13	2.50				
	46 and above	8	2.75				
Gender-based Work Allocation	25 and below	93	2.40	2.497	3	.476	Not Significant
	26-35	66	2.20				
	36-45	13	2.00				
	46 and above	8	2.50				

Table 11 depicts the results of the difference in gender equality in the workplace according to age using the Kruskal-Wallis H test. The test found no statistically significant difference in terms of gender bias among groups [H(3) = 1.407, p = .704], with a median value of 2.60 for those who are 25 and below, 2.60 for those who are 26–35, 2.60 for those who are 36–45, and 2.80 for those who are 46 and above; in terms of parity in appraisal and growth opportunities [H(3) = 3.322, p = .345], with a median value of 3.00 for those who are 25 and below, 3.00 for those who are 26–35, 3.50 for those who are 36–45, and 3.00 for those who are 46 and above; in terms of natural gender differences [H(3) = 3.714, p = .294], with a median value of 2.67 for those who are 25 and below, 2.50 for those who are 26–35, 2.50 for those who are 36–45, and 2.75 for those who are 46 and above; and lastly in terms of gender-based work allocation [H(3) = 2.497, p = .476], with a median

value of 2.40 for those who are 25 and below, 2.20 for those who are 26–35, 2.00 for those who are 36–45, and 2.50 for those who are 46 and above at the 5% significance level. This implies that employees of different age groups are not experiencing substantial disparities in these specific areas. However, Schmutz et al. (2021) claims that workplaces of all kinds have shown favouritism and preference for one gender over another, resulting in a toxic environment for many employees. Similarly, many workplaces have long preferred a specific age range of eligible workers, which creates tension and disparity in the workplace. In addition, based on the study of Koshnitsky (2021), the earnings of older female workers are affected by the intersection of gender and age discrimination, so older female workers are at even greater risk of staying in low pay compared to the earnings of men in similar positions than their younger female counterparts.

Table 12. Gender Equality in the Workplace According to Marital Status

Constructs	M.S	n	Mdn	H	df	Asymp. Sig	Conclusion
------------	-----	---	-----	---	----	------------	------------

Gender Bias	Single	136	2.60	.079	2	.961	Not Significant
	Married	39	2.60				
	Separated	5	2.60				
Parity in Appraisal and Growth Opportunities	Single	136	3.00	2.305	2	.316	Not Significant
	Married	39	3.17				
	Separated	5	3.50				
Natural Gender Differences	Single	136	2.67	.007	2	.996	Not Significant
	Married	39	2.67				
	Separated	5	2.50				
Gender-based Work Allocation	Single	136	2.40	.009	2	.996	Not Significant
	Married	39	2.20				
	Separated	5	2.20				

Table 12 revealed the results of the difference in gender equality in the workplace according to civil status using the Kruskal-Wallis H test. The test found no statistically significant difference in terms of gender bias among age groups [$H(2) = .079, p = .961$], with a median value of 2.60 for those who are single, 2.60 for those who are married, and 2.60 for those who are separated; in terms of parity in appraisal and growth opportunities [$H(2) = 2.305, p = .316$], with a median value of 3.00 for those who are single, 3.17 for those who are married, and 3.50 for those who are separated; in terms of natural gender differences [$H(2) = .007, p = .996$], with a median value of 2.67 for those who are single, 2.67 for those who are married, and 2.50 for those who are separated; and lastly in terms of gender-based work allocation [$H(2) = .009, p = .996$], with a median value of 2.40 for those who are single, 2.20 for those who are married, and 2.20 for those who are separated at the 5% significance level. This implies that the results of the Kruskal-Wallis H test indicate that there is no statistically significant difference in gender bias, parity in appraisal and growth opportunities, natural gender differences, and gender-based work allocation among different civil status groups in terms of gender equality in the workplace. For gender bias, the median value for those who are single, married, and separated is 2.60, indicating a similar perception of gender bias regardless of civil status. In terms of parity in appraisal and growth opportunities, the median value is 3.00 for those who are single, 3.17 for those who are married, and 3.50 for those who are separated. Although there are slight differences in the median values, the Kruskal-Wallis H test found no statistically significant difference. Similarly, for natural gender differences and gender-based work allocation, the test found no statistically significant difference among the civil status groups. Overall, these results suggest that civil status does not play a significant role in determining gender

equality in the workplace based on the factors examined in the study.

According to Yellen (2020), the involvement of women in the U.S. workforce was very limited in the early 20th century, and those who worked were young and unmarried. The Census Bureau categorized that only 20 percent of women were recognized as “gainful workers”. As the opportunities for access to higher education became more widespread and women got more educated, the involvement of both married and single women in the workforce increased. Additionally, Belingheri et al. (2021) examines the persistent gender inequalities across the developed and developing world. It highlights the contribution of women's education and entry into the workforce to social and economic well-being, emphasizing that civil status does not significantly impact gender equality in the workplace. These findings align with the results of the Kruskal-Wallis H test, indicating that civil status does not play a significant role in determining gender equality in the workplace based on the factors examined in the study.

Table 13 shows the results of the difference in gender equality in the workplace according to educational attainment using the Kruskal-Wallis H test. The test found a statistically significant difference among groups in terms of gender bias [$H(2) = 6.139, p = .046$], with a median value of 2.70 for those who are at the high school level, 2.80 for those who are at the vocational level, and 2.60 for those who are at the college level. The post hoc analysis was conducted using the Kruskal-Wallis of homogeneous subsets based on asymptotic significance and the sample average rank of educational attainment. The result shows that those at the college level (M rank = 84.803) are statistically different from those at the vocational level (M rank = 109.057) at the 5% significance level (see Appendix K).

Table 13. Gender Equality in the Workplace According to Educational Attainment

Constructs	E.D	n	Mdn	H	df	Asymp. Sig	Conclusion
Gender Bias	High School	18	2.70	6.139	2	.046	Significant
	Vocational	35	2.80				
	College	127	2.60				
Parity in Appraisal and Growth Opportunities	High School	18	3.08	4.805	2	.090	Not Significant
	Vocational	35	3.00				
	College	127	3.00				
Natural Gender Differences	High School	18	2.83	7.209	2	.027	Significant
	Vocational	35	2.67				
	College	127	2.50				
Gender-based Work Allocation	High School	18	2.30	7.056	2	.029	Significant
	Vocational	35	2.60				
	College	127	2.20				

This implies that gender bias is perceived differently depending on educational attainment. Specifically, individuals with vocational education perceive more gender bias in the workplace compared to those with a college education. This significant difference highlights the varying experiences and perceptions of gender equality across different educational backgrounds, suggesting that vocational training environments might need more targeted interventions to address and reduce gender bias effectively. According to the study of Marasigan et al. (2021), education makes someone know and understand a lot about what is happening in the workplace, it affects the respondents' views and opinions regarding gender equality in their workplace, and laws about gender equality. This makes college graduates more aware of the labor code of the country, making them give higher assessments regarding work gender bias. The respondents' level of education affects their responses while also making them open to issues and concerns in an environment of employment.

In terms of natural gender differences, the result revealed that there is a significant difference among groups of educational attainment [$H(2) = 7.209$, $p = .027$], with a median value of 2.83 for those who are at the high school level, 2.67 for those who are at the vocational level, and 2.50 for those who are at the college level. The post hoc analysis was conducted using the Kruskal-Wallis of homogeneous subsets based on asymptotic significance and the sample average rank of educational attainment. The result shows that those at the college level (M rank = 83.811) are statistically different from those at the vocational level (M rank = 105.657) and high school level (M rank = 108.222) at the 5% significance level (*see Appendix L*). This implies that, in terms of natural gender

differences, college-educated individuals see less gender inequality compared to those with vocational or high school education. College education seems to promote more equal views of gender roles, likely due to greater exposure to diversity and inclusion topics. In contrast, those with vocational or high school education perceive more gender differences, indicating a need for specific educational and workplace programs to encourage more gender-inclusive attitudes among these groups. World Economic Forum (2020) stated that gender disparities in access to education refer to the unequal opportunities and barriers that girls and women face in obtaining quality education compared to their male counterparts. Despite progress made in recent years, significant gender gaps still exist in many parts of the world, particularly in developing countries and marginalized communities. Several factors contribute to these disparities, which have far-reaching implications for individuals, societies, and global development. Additionally, gender disparities in access to education, limited career choices for women, biases in curricula and teaching practices, and underrepresentation of women in leadership positions are some of the key challenges identified (Bharat Dhiman, 2023).

The test also revealed that there is a significant difference in gender-based work allocation among groups of educational attainment [$H(2) = 7.056$, $p = .029$], with a median value of 2.30 for those who are at the high school level, 2.60 for those who are at the vocational level, and 2.20 for those who are at the college level. The post hoc analysis was conducted using the Kruskal-Wallis of homogeneous subsets based on asymptotic significance and the sample average rank of educational attainment. The result shows that those at the college level (M rank = 84.213) are statistically different from those at the vocational

level (M rank = 109.900) at the 5% significance level (see Appendix M). This implies that those at the college level experience less gender-based work allocation disparity compared to those at the vocational level. This finding highlights the influence of educational attainment on the perception and distribution of gendered work roles, suggesting that higher educational levels may correlate with more equitable work allocation practices. Seehuus (2021) claims that women and men continue to select different educational paths despite significant advancements in gender equality in many sectors. This is a major factor in the gender wage gap since it strengthens the ongoing occupational gender segregation that exists in most of the world.

On the other hand, table 13 depicts that there is no significant difference among groups of educational attainment in terms of parity in appraisal and growth opportunities [$H(2) = 4.805, p = .090$], with a median value of 3.08 for those who are at the high school level, 3.00 for those who are at the vocational

level, and 3.00 for those who are at the college level at the 5% significance level. This implies that educational attainment does not play a significant role in determining differences in perceptions of parity in appraisal and growth opportunities in the workplace. Individuals with different educational backgrounds have similar perceptions in terms of these factors. From the study of Martin (2020), women attain higher levels of education than men, on average, but they are less likely than men to be employed and, when they are employed, they earn less. Despite good academic performance and the positive trends in women's overall participation in higher education, gender gaps in the labour market remain as wide as ever. Moreover, Lamichanne and Neupane (2022) iterate the importance of imbuing sustainability education at the tertiary and higher education levels to develop green competencies in the long run.

Table 14. Gender Equality in the Workplace According to Years in Service

Constructs	Years	n	Mdn	H	df	Asymp. Sig	Conclusion
Gender Bias	less than 1 year	58	2.60	4.026	3	.259	Not Significant
	1 – 5	85	2.60				
	6 – 10	32	2.80				
	11 years and above	5	2.20				
Parity in Appraisal and Growth Opportunities	less than 1 year	58	3.00	7.396	3	.060	Not Significant
	1 – 5	85	3.00				
	6 – 10	32	3.17				
	11 years and above	5	3.67				
Natural Gender Differences	less than 1 year	58	2.67	.331	3	.954	Not Significant
	1 – 5	85	2.67				
	6 – 10	32	2.67				
	11 years and above	5	2.67				
Gender-based Work Allocation	less than 1 year	58	2.20	2.962	3	.397	Not Significant
	1 – 5	85	2.40				
	6 – 10	32	2.20				
	11 years and above	5	2.00				

Table 14 shows the results of the difference in gender equality in the workplace according to years in service using the Kruskal-Wallis H test. The test found no statistically significant difference in terms of gender bias among groups [$H(3) = 4.026, p = .259$], with a median value of 2.60 for those who served less than 1 year, 2.60 for those who served 1–5, 2.80 for those who served 6–10, and 2.20 for those who served 11 years and above; in terms of parity in appraisal and growth opportunities [$H(3) = 7.396, p = .060$], with a median value of 3.00 for those who served less than 1 year, 3.00 for those who served 1–5, 3.17 for those who served 6–10, and 3.67 for those who served 11 years and above; in terms of natural gender differences [$H(3) = .331, p = .954$], with a median value of 2.67 for those who served less than 1 year, 2.67

for those who served 1–5, 2.67 for those who served 6–10, and 3.67 for those who served 11 years and above; and lastly, in terms of gender-based work allocation [$H(3) = 2.962, p = .397$], with a median value of 2.20 for those who served less than 1 year, 2.40 for those who served 1–5, 2.20 for those who served 6–10, and 2.00 for those who served 11 years and above at the 5% significance level. This implies that there is insufficient evidence to claim that perceptions of gender bias, parity in appraisal and growth opportunities, natural gender differences, or gender-based work allocation significantly differ among employees with varying years of service. According to Dyvik (2023), the difference between the earnings of women and men shrunk slightly over the past years. Considering the controlled gender pay gap, which

measures the median salary for men and women with the same job and qualifications, women earned one U.S. cent less. By comparison, the uncontrolled gender pay gap measures the median salary for all men and all women across all sectors and industries and regardless of location and qualification. In 2023, the uncontrolled gender pay gap in the world stood at 0.83, meaning that women earned 0.83 dollars for every dollar earned by men.

Additionally, Aragao (2023) stated that the gender gap in pay has remained relatively stable in the United States over the past 20 years or so. In 2022, women earned an average of 82% of what men earned, according to a new Pew Research Center analysis of median hourly earnings of both full- and part-time workers. These results are similar to where the pay gap stood in 2002, when women earned 80% as much as men.

Proposed Criteria

A hotel can be considered the best implementer of Gender Equality in hotel at Subic Bay Freeport Zone (SBFZ) when it meets the following criteria:

Equal Opportunities	Yes	No	Points
1. The hotel is able to review the hotel's hiring records of employees to ensure a balanced representation of all genders including LGBTQIA+++ across all departments			15
2. The hotel is able to evaluate promotion policies to ensure transparency, equal pay, and in advancement opportunities for all employees, regardless of gender			15
Total Points:			30
Training and Development	Yes	No	Points
1. The hotel has mandatory gender equality training for all staff members, including management.			5
2. The hotel is able to assess the availability of resources such as workshops, mentorship, seminars, or online courses addressing gender bias and sensitivity			5
Total Points:			10
Work Life Balance	Yes	No	Points
1. The hotel supports a healthy work-life balance for all employees, regardless of their gender			5
2. The hotel includes flexible working hours, parental leave, and support for employees with family responsibilities.			5
Total Points:			10
Safe and Inclusive Environment	Yes	No	Points
1. The hotel is able to evaluate the effectiveness of the hotel's harassment prevention policies and procedures.			5
2. The hotel is able to look for mechanisms to anonymously report incidents and ensure swift and appropriate action is taken to address any complaints			5
Total Points:			10
Policy and Commitment	Yes	No	Points
1. The hotel has a clear policy promoting gender equality and developing a strong anti-discrimination which is communicated to all employees and reflected in the hotel's mission and values.			20
Total Points:			20
Feedback Mechanism	Yes	No	Points
1. The hotel regularly reviews and updates its policies and practices to ensure they are promoting gender equality			10
2. The hotel includes conducting regular surveys or audits, and seeking feedback from employees			10
Total Points:			20
Best implementer of Gender Equality in hotel at Subic Bay Freeport Zone TOTAL SCORE:			100

Conclusions

Based on the findings, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. Profile of the Respondents

1.1 Gender: The test revealed there is no statistically significant difference in gender equality in the workplace according to gender. This difference shows among groups in terms of gender bias [H (2) = 4.890, p =.087], parity in appraisal and growth opportunities [H (2) = 2.312, p =.315], natural gender differences [H (2) = 2.325, p =.313], and gender-based work allocation [H (2) = 1.313, p =.519].

1.2 Age: The test revealed there is no statistically significant difference in gender equality in the workplace according to age. This difference shows among groups in terms of gender bias [H (3) = 1.407, p =.704], parity in appraisal and growth opportunities [H (3) = 3.322, p =.345], natural gender differences [H (3) = 3.714, p =.294], and gender-based work allocation [H (3) = 2.497, p =.476].

1.3 Marital Status: The test revealed there is no statistically significant difference in gender equality in the workplace according to marital status. This difference

Recommendations:

Equal Opportunities. The researchers recommend ensuring equal pay and opportunities for all employees, irrespective of gender, age, marital status, educational background, or years of service, to access career advancement and benefits within the organization.

Training and Development. The researchers recommend partnering with educational institutions to provide ongoing training and development opportunities for employees, promote gender equality awareness, and support the career advancement of women and LGBTQIA+++ individuals in the hospitality industry.

Work Life Balance. The researchers recommend promoting work-life balance by offering flexible work arrangements, parental leave policies, and support for employees managing family responsibilities, regardless of gender or marital status.

Safe and Inclusive Environment. The researchers recommend combating gender stereotypes by promoting a workplace culture that values diversity, challenges traditional gender norms and discrimination, and

shows among age groups in terms of gender bias [H (2) =.079, p =.961], parity in appraisal and growth opportunities [H (2) =2.305, p =.316], natural gender differences [H (2) =.007, p =.996], and gender-based work allocation [H (2) =.009, p =.996].

1.4 Educational Attainment: According to the data, there is statistically significant difference in gender equality in the workplace among groups of educational attainment in terms of gender bias [H (2) = 6.139, p =.046], natural gender differences [H (2) = 7.209, p =.027], gender-based work allocation [H (2) = 7.056, p =.029], however, there is no significant difference among groups of educational attainment in terms of parity in appraisal and growth opportunities [H (2) = 4.805, p =.090].

1.5 Years in Service: The test revealed there is no statistically significant difference in gender equality in the workplace according to years in service. This difference shows among groups in terms of gender bias [H (3) = 4.026, p =.259], parity in appraisal and growth opportunities [H (3) = 7.396, p =.060], natural gender differences [H (3) = .331, p =.954], gender-based work allocation [H (3) = 2.962, p =.397].

celebrates the unique contributions of all employees.

Policy and Commitment. The researchers recommend reviewing and updating organizational policies to ensure they are gender-neutral, no gender biases, discrimination by promoting fairness in recruitment, performance evaluations, salary structures, and work allocation.

Feedback Mechanism. The researchers recommend continuous monitoring and evaluation of gender equality initiatives, collecting feedback from employees, and making data-driven decisions to address disparities and improve gender equality practices within the organization.

By implementing these recommendations, hotels in Subic Bay Freeport Zone can create a more inclusive, diverse, and equitable work environment that values and supports the contributions of all employees. Promoting gender equality in the hospitality industry is not only a moral imperative but also a strategic advantage that leads to improved employee satisfaction, retention, and organizational success.

REFERENCES

Jeffrey, H., Riccio, A., & Paris, C. M. (2018). Let's Sit at the Table for Women's Empowerment. *E-Review of Tourism Research*, 15(4/5). <https://ertr-ojs-tamu.tdl.org/ertr/index.php/ertr/article/view/236>

Basnyat, S., Che, I. T. & Ip, K. H. (2021) 'Gender roles and the commodification of beauty and physical attractiveness in restaurants: Perspectives of female servers', *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 21(4), pp. 447–460. doi: 10.1177/14673584211000086.

Rinaldi, A., & Salerno, I. (2019). The tourism gender gap and its potential impact on the development of the emerging countries. *Quality and Quantity*, 54(5–6), 1465–

1477. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-019-00881-x>

Marasigan, Lourdaine Kaye D., Bolompo, Alyssa M., Bicol, Chester John R., Honorico, Beverly F., Obtina, Dulce Jane C., Noelah Mae D. Borbon, PhD IHM. (2021). Gender Equality among Hotel Employees in Batangas: Basis for Continuous Improvement. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management and Sustainable Development*. Vol. 9 No. 2, 89-99

Republic Act 9710 or the Magna Carta of Women. (n.d.). Magna Carta of Women (Republic Act 9710), Implementing Rules and Regulations.

The Gender and Development (Gad) Program. (n.d.).

- gsis.gov.ph. <https://www.gsis.gov.ph/gad/>
SBMA GAD Program. (n.d.). Mysubicbay. <https://www.mysubicbay.com.ph/gad/>
Rights of Employees. (n.d.). Official Gazette of Republic of the Philippines. <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/>
Statement of the Commission on Human Rights welcoming the approval of the SOGIESC equality bill by the House Committee on Women and Gender Equality. (2023, June 15). Commission on Human Rights. <https://chr.gov.ph/statement-on-the-commission-on-human-rights-welcoming-the-approval-of-the-sogiesc-equality-bill-by-the-house-committee-on-women-and-gender-equality/>
Gröschl, S., & Arcot, S. (2014). Female hospitality executives and their effects on firm performance. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 14(3), 143–151. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1467358414538997>
Flabbi, L., Piras, C., & Abrahams, S. (2017). Female corporate leadership in Latin America and the Caribbean region. *International Journal of Manpower*, 38(6), 790–818. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijm-10-2015-0180>
Hafeez, M. (2020). Evaluating the Impact of Marital Status on Employees' Job Performance: Moderating Role of Hired Hand's Gender. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, 29
Memon, Shah, Saifullah, M., Hussain, & Memon. (2022). Performance and Marital Status: A Study on Employees of Public Sector Universities of Sindh. *Journal of Peace Development & Communication*, 06. <https://doi.org/10.36968/JPCD-V06-I02-34>
Sears, B., & Mallory, C. (2021, September). LGBT People's experiences of workplace discrimination and harassment. Williams Institute. <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/publications/lgbt-workplace-discrimination/>
Ueno, K., Ritter, L.J., Ingram, R., Jackson, T.M., Šaras, E.D., D'Amours, J.V. and Grace, J. (2023), "Customer harassment against LGBTQ workers: highlighting its uniqueness as a group-based customer harassment", *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion*, Vol. 42 No. 2, pp. 210-227. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-07-2021-0165>
Whittington, C., Hadfield, K., & Calderón, C. (2020). The lives & livelihoods of many in the LGBTQ community are at risk amidst COVID-19 crisis. *Human Rights Campaign Foundation*, 7.
Grace, E., & Gale, G. (2020, July). How does gender equality affect women in retirement? *Brookings*. <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/how-does-gender-equality-affect-women-in-retirement/>
Kennedy, A. (2023, May 24). Gender Dynamics in the Workplace. *Vanderbilt Business School. Vanderbilt University Owen Graduate School of Management*.
Madera, J.M., Yang, W., Wu, L., Ma, E.J. and Xu, S.T (2023), "Diversity and inclusion in hospitality and tourism: bridging the gap between employee and customer perspectives", *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. Ahead-of-print No. Ahead-of-print
Madinga, N.W., van Eyk, M. And Amoah, F. (2022), "LGBT Tourism in South Africa: the influence of customer value on behavioral intention", *Current Issues in Tourism*, Vol. 26 No. 11, pp. 1-15.
Berdahl, L., Glick, P., & Cooper, M. (2018, November 2). How Masculinity Contests Undermine Organizations, and What to Do About It. *Harvard Business Review*.
Hastwell, C., & Erb, M. (2022). How to promote employee well-being in the workplace: *Global Study. Great Place to Work*. <https://greatplacetowork.com.ph/blog/how-to-promote-employee-well-being-in-the-workplace-global-study/>
Waite, S. (2020). Should I Stay or Should I Go? *Employment Discrimination and Workplace Harassment against Transgender and Other Minority Employees in Canada's Federal Public Service. Journal of Homosexuality*, 68(11), 1833–1859. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2020.1712140>
Russen, M., Dawson, M., & Madera, J. M. (2021). Gender discrimination and perceived fairness in the promotion process of hotel employees. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 33(1), 327–345. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijchm-07-2020-0647>
Kauhanen, A. (2022). Gender differences in corporate hierarchies. *IZA World of Labor*. <https://doi.org/10.15185/izawol.358.v2>
Ellsworth, D., Mendy, A., & Sullivan, G. (2020, June 23). How the LGBTQ+ community fares in the Workplace. *McKinsey & Company*. <https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/diversity-and-inclusion/how-the-lgbtq-plus-community-fares-in-the-workplace>
Marasigan, Lourdain Kaye D., Bolompo, Alyssa M., Bicol, Chester John R., Honorico, Beverly F., Obtina, Dulce Jane C., Noelah Mae D. Borbon, PhD IHM. (2021). Gender Equality among Hotel Employees in Batangas: Basis for Continuous Improvement. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management and Sustainable Development*. Vol. 9 No. 2, 89-99
Morgenroth, T., & Ryan, M. K. (2020). The Effects of Gender Trouble: An integrative theoretical framework of the perpetuation and Disruption of the Gender/Sex Binary. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 16(6), 1113–1142. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620902442>
Roberson, M. (2019). Diversity in the Workplace: A Review, Synthesis, and Future Research Agenda. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*. <https://www.annualreviews.org/content/journals/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012218-015243>
Schmutz, S. (2021). Age and Gender Discrimination in the Workplace. *Honors Capstone – HN-300-E*, 16. <https://digitalcommons.sacredheart.edu/acadfest/2022/all/70>
Koshnitsky, N., & Mehmet, Ö. (2021, February 17). Where age and gender discrimination meet: the challenges faced by older women in the workplace. *Kingsley Napley-When It Matters Most*. <https://www.kingsleynapley.co.uk/insights/blogs/employment-law-blog/>

- Belingheri, P., Chiarello, F., Colladon, A. F., & Rovelli, P. (2021). Twenty years of gender equality research: A scoping review based on a new semantic indicator. *PloS One*, 16(9), e0256474. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0256474>
- Yellen, J. (2020). The history of women's work and wages and how it has created success for us all. <https://www.brookings.edu/essay/the-history-of-womens-work-and-wages-and-how-it-has-created-success-for-us-all/>
- Global Gender Gap Report 2020. (2019, December 19). World Economic Forum. <https://www.weforum.org/publications/gender-gap-2020-report-100-years-pay-equality/>
- Dhiman, Dr. Bharat, Education's Role in Empowering Women and Promoting Gender Inequality: A Critical Review (August 15, 2023). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4556375> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4556375>
- Seehuus, S. (2021). Gender differences and similarities in work preferences: Results from a factorial survey experiment. *Acta Sociologica*, 66(1), 5–25. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00016993211060241>
- Martin, E. (2020, March 9). Why do gender gaps in education and work persist? OECD Education and Skills Today. <https://oecdeditoday.com/gender-gaps-education-work-persist/>
- Lamichhane, R. And Neupane, M.S. (2022), "Case study: Nepal. The inclusion of green competences in therecognition of prior learning", in Pavlova, Margarita and Singh, Madhu (Eds), *Recognizing GreenSkills through Non-formal Learning*, Springer, Singapore, pp. 189-210, Singapore, doi: 10.1007/978-981-19-2072-1_10.
- Dyvik, H. (2023, April 4). Global gender pay gap 2015-2023. Statista. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/1212140/>
- Aragão, C. (2023, March 1). Gender pay gap in U.S. hasn't changed much in two decades. Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2023/03/01/gender-pay-gap-facts/>